U.S. Congress. Congressional Record.

Appendix

The Farm Problem: Do We Need a New Approach?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Do We Need a New Approach?" which I delivered before the Texas Farm Bureau annual convention at Fort Worth, Tex., on November 8, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When I tried to put a title to the things which I wanted to discuss with members of the Texas Farm Bureau, I jotted down many suggestions that strongly appealed to me. I would have enjoyed, for example, spending my whole time talking with you about the problems of cotton, the need for decisions on cotton acreage in old areas and in new ones. I would have been happy to have discussed price cycles in the cattle trade. And as you can well imagine, I could have spent most of an afternoon examining with you the history of our whole program of price supports, acreage limitations, and marketing quotas.

I still feel that before another year rolls around I will have tried to reduce to writing what I know of the history of the long battle over price-support programs and levels. This battle is not something that can be dealt with casually in a few minutes. On the contrary, it has roots which run back to the days of the Federal Farm Board in the early 1930's—yes, even to the 1920's and the fight for the McNary-Haugen bills.

Through the fabric of that whole experience, through the changing patterns of processing taxes, soil-conservation payments, limited price-support operations, production payments, high-incentive prices and flexible price-support programs, there runs like a red threat one constant question from farmers in time of economic strain and financial difficulty: Do we need a new approach?

So I have taken that as a title and will talk about it today.

The minister rises in his pulpit and announces his text. He may travel far from it, but it is always there in case he wishes to return and avail himself of that anchor. I, too, have a text, and it is this chart prepared by the Agricultural Marketing Service in the Department of Agriculture following the form and pattern of a pencil sketch which I sent to the Service months ago and requested a reproduction in exact graphic proportions. I present it with no apologies, because I have studied figures and tried to draw from them crude charts as a means of graphic presentation almost as long as I have been in business.

This chart that I use today attempts to trace the relationship between national income and farm income over the past 45 years. By it, we see that beginning in 1910, particularly through the 5 years 1910 through 1914 which became the parity base for our earliest endeavors toward equality for the farmer, farm income and national income rose and fell together. I do not refer to actual dollars and cents, because farm income is only a fraction of national income, usually about from one-twelfth to one-fifteenth; but, nonetheless, they travel in the same relative pattern.

Then came the period prior to our entrance into World War I when those European nations which had been drawn into the conflict required enormous quantities of American farm products. Wheat prices rose to unprecedented levels as the armies in Europe surged back and forth over the hundred battlefields, digging trenches, developing barbed wire entanglements, tearing up the soil.

This was the great American era for ripping up pastures and plowing up the plains. I lived in the Dakotas, and my high school and college years were spent in an atmosphere of fervid agricultural expansion. Every available piece of land was put into wheat or corn. The Iowa farmer could turn a bumper corn crop into fat cattle which could be sold at such record levels that the value of Iowa farmland jumped from $50 or $100 an acre to $400, $500, and in Black Hawk County to $600 or more. People bought and sold farmlands with the frenzy with which they now dabble in uranium.

There came, of course, a day of reckoning. The armistice was signed to end World War I. The pipelines of wheat and meat and dairy products no longer needed to be filled. The wheat farmer had no guaranty that his market would last forever and no umbrella to protect him in the day when his product was no longer needed. Within a year after the close of the war, the boom was over and within 2 years the panic was on. There were six banks in my hometown. Five of them closed. The sixth was kept open by brute strength, but the whole agricultural economy was shattered and torn. You see that picture on the chart.

Then from 1921 for a period of 26 years farm income stayed relatively below but proportionately close to national income. It was never up to what we might call parity or equality except in the years 1924 and 1934, but it came close in the early 1940's and only dropped off in 1943, 1944, and 1945 when price controls worked more effectively against farm production than against the output of other segments of our economy.

The Congress tried to recognize that situation. It passed the Steagall legislation promising the farmer that he would have high, rigid price supports as an incentive to production during the period of the war, and that in recognition and reward for his stimulated and expanded production under price controls during the war he would have 2 full years after the war during which the Government of the United States would guarantee him adequate prices for his enlarged production. During these 2 years, of course, he was expected to adjust his production, to shrink it back to more normal levels and to prepare once again for the period when farm income and national income might move along together.

Now I am speaking of things that are within the orbit of my own acquaintance, because I came into the Department midway between the ending of the European and Japanese phases of World War II.

You see next on the chart a rapid lift in the relationship of farm income to national income, because we moved as rapidly as we could to eliminate price controls from the farm commodities and to give them a chance to reach their more normal relationship to farm income, but there were some clouds overhanging the farm price horizon. We had on hand 7½ million bales of ragtag cotton, cheap cotton that had moved under the Government loan at standard prices but had been of such inferior quality that it had not been taken out of warehouses for manufacturing into textiles. We had enormous stockpiles of butter, wool, fish, dried skim-milk powder, and a host of other things. We had thousands of cases of canned vegetables, millions of pounds of canned meats.

The problem then, and perhaps the problem now, was to move those commodities into markets other than the normal market of the American farmer. It is unnecessary to detail those now; but the surplus cotton, for example, went to China, Japan, Austria, and Germany in a fashion that did not interfere with the normal exports of American cotton to England, Belgium, Italy, and other large buyers. In 1945, 1946, and 1947, the release of these enormous stocks of surplus commodities did not drive down domestic agricultural prices because there was a world demand for our goods and we could find places to put away our food and fiber without disturbance to the normal American channels of domestic and international agricultural trade.

The separation of farm income from national income began in the year 1948 as you can see from the chart. Agricultural prices began to drop because agricultural production held up even after markets began to disappear. The people of Europe and Asia began to reestablish their wheat fields and their rice paddies. The rehabilitation work of UNRRA and other agencies had its effect. We moved from a period in which each year we had to scrape the bottom of the barrel for enough wheat for our needs at home and abroad to a time when we could remove all restrictions on the use of wheat and could be fairly generous with areas where shortage was the rule rather than the exception.

It was at the end of 1948 when the adjustment of agricultural production and consumption in the United States needed to be accomplished, but the Congress kept going through 1949 high, rigid 90-percent supports which had stimulated the production of agricultural commodities during and after World War II. The spread between national income and farm income continued downward to the end of 1949 and only lifted a little toward the end of 1950 because war started in Korea in the middle of 1950, and we could fill our military pipelines from our agricultural surpluses and thereby remove the strain from commodity purchasing.

There were those who had foreseen the possibility of a drastic reduction in farm income following the 2-year period of the Steagall guaranties. The Department of Agriculture had had a study committee looking steadily at this problem during World War II. In 1946 there was an intensive drive to bring together the lessons of that long

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

study and attempt to congeal into new legislation our best knowledge of what would safeguard American farmers and perpetuate the favorable relationship between farm and national income.

I am sure you know the results of that study. We, in the Department, recommended a program of flexible price supports giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretion to establish such price levels between about 75 percent and 90 percent as would permit him to guide farmers in their planting and help them toward the balance between production and consumption which brings about a healthy active market and a good price for agricultural commodities in the market place. We recommended that the Secretary have broad discretions as to the level at which prices were to be fixed. We advocated no sliding scale by which the level of price supports was to be measured against the supply of each commodity but we did feel that the flexibility which had been written into the Agricultural Act of 1938 was a proper power for a Secretary of Agriculture to possess, even though the level recommended was substantially above the 52 to 75 percent adopted in the administration of President Roosevelt.

Now, if I may return to the chart, I must point out that Korea did great things for our agricultural situation. Had it not been for Korea, the farm problem in 1950, 1951, and 1952 would have been comparable to some of our problems today; but Korea required that this country stockpile enormous quantities of butter, meat, and cereals. Whatever quantities the farmer was able to produce the Government stood ready to buy.

There was a very substantial turndown in income during 1952. It has carried on through 1953 and 1954; and it will follow on through 1955.

If you want to know what this loss in farm income has done, take two quick statistical references:

1. Farm assets have dropped three billion from their peak; and

2. Farm debt is up two billion from 1953.

What I wish to point out particularly is that during all the time in 1948, 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, farmers of this country had whatever protection there is in high, rigid 90 percent price supports. This great gap which has opened up between national income and farm income opened and developed during the years when the price-support program was pegged to a rigid 90-percent standard. No farmer should ever forget that.

This is the first year that flexible price supports have been operative. The decline under 90-percent supports began at a time when we were relatively free from surpluses. When I left the Department of Agriculture in May 1948, I believe that all Commodity Credit loans totaled around $1¼ billion, and a great deal of that was current and quickly liquidated. Now our borrowing authority from Commodity Credit is $12½ billion and we are using the major portion of that amount with steadily increasing Commodity Credit stocks. So it is fair to say that 90-percent supports had their chance to work in a market relatively free from surpluses. If we are to be fair we should give flexible price supports a chance to work in a market not glutted with a billion extra bushels of wheat and 12 million extra bales of cotton and 20 million hundredweight of rice and so on down the roll call of surplus crops which today makes our whole farm problem difficult if not desperate.

On October 17, 1955, the New York Times said: "National Income Sets a New Peak. The national income attained a record annual rate of $321 billion during the second quarter of this year, the Government reported today." That is higher than the figures go on my chart, but the chart is prepared by statisticians and bears this footnote: "Department of Commerce estimates of national income have been adjusted to make them comparable with farm income estimates. I believe, however, that the 1955 national income mark will be up from the 1953 and 1954 level, but this I do know—the 1955 net income of farmers will be down. The last estimate I saw was that farm net income now was running at the rate of 10.6 billions for 1955, and you will find that figure on page 3 of a pamphlet called the Farm Income Situation issued by the Department of Agriculture on October 31, 8 days ago.

The point I am constantly trying to make to you is that in 1947 national income was at the level of about $199 billions, and that farm income was at the level of about $16¾ billions. During the next years, national income went up past $300 billions, but farm income in 1954, at the end of the period when rigid 90-percent price supports were in effect, had dropped to $12.3 billions. (Farm Income Situation, FIS 155, Department of Agriculture, Oct. 31, 1955, p. 3.)

If you will look at the chart and realize that if farm income had moved in normal relationship to national income as it mounted up to $300 billion, farm net income would now be about $27 billion, yet the latest Government publication puts it at the rate of of $10.6 billion.

This is the farm problem. It is not important that we waste our energies in farm meetings debating whether we go back to the 90-percent supports which carried us from high farm prosperity and comparable high net farm income to the low figure of $12.3 billion for 1954, or whether we should try flexible price supports or two-price systems or export subsidies. The question is: What do we do now and do quickly to put the farmer in a safe spot economically and in a proper financial relationship to the businessmen, the doctors, lawyers, and engineers who live in the cities that our farm produce feeds.

I am going to talk about a few commodities, and then I am going to try to answer my own questions as to what we do now.

The Department of Agriculture, in its October reports, said that the 1955 harvest would be the second highest on record. Corn was estimated at 3,117,000,000 bushels. The wheat crop was 915 million bushels. Tobacco has been growing so well that a special story in the New York Times a month ago found the tobacco glut so bad that the Government owns now and has in storage about 425 million pounds of tobacco, acquired under the price-support system. In auction after auction the Government has been the biggest and at times the only bidder. Tobacco, you know, was the one crop that supposedly worked so perfectly under 90-percent supports that it has a special permanent status unlike any other crop, yet even tobacco isn't able to withstand the stimulation these rigid supports give it.

But I am talking in Texas to Texans. Maybe I better talk about cotton because Texas has 40 percent of the cotton acreage in the United States. The October crop report found the Department of Agriculture forced to raise its estimate of the 1955 crop to 13,920,000 bales, an outpouring of cotton that nullified the control measures which had been in effect and aggravated more than ever a surplus problem already severe. If that estimate holds up the 1955 crop is 232,000 bales above the 1954 harvest and nearly a million bales above the 10-year average from 1944 to 1953. Add that crop to the present surplus of 11,121,000 bales and you have a record supply of 25,049,000 bales which is greater than the previous record set in 1939. Next month the cotton producers will have to vote on a referendum to reduce acres below 18 million at a very time when legislation is pending in the Congress to raise the acreage to 21½ million.

Under our present supports, we have held an umbrella over cotton producers in Mexico, Brazil and many other Latin American countries until today they are able to move into our export markets at prices lower than our Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell under existing law. We have seen world production increase even when our production decreased. This year we will see a substantial increase even though your acreage has been cut down. If controls are continued, you can be reasonably sure that the 1957 acreage will have to be lower than the 1956 figure.

So what do you do? Do you plant more rice or wheat? Let's talk about rice.

Texas is a great producer of rice. We had a hearing in Washington last May dealing with rice programs, and these interesting facts developed.

In 1935 the United States produced 17,735,000 hundredweight of rough rice; in 1940, 24,495,000; in 1945, 30,668,000; in 1950, 37,971,000; and in 1954, 58,853,000. The Korean war had stimulated the production of rice and also stimulated the exportation of rice. Here are the figures on exportation: In 1935, 7½ percent of the United States crop was exported; in 1940, 25.3 percent; in 1945, 38.5 percent; in 1950, 40.9 percent; and in 1954, 43.8 percent.

No one need be told how important exports are to the American rice producer nor does any rice producer need to be told that exports are dropping rapidly. They are about half this year what they were last year and probably will be as low as 9 million hundredweight. Add that to a domestic consumption of only 24 million hundredweight, and you have need for perhaps 33 million hundredweight with a production nearly 59 million hundredweight. What do you do with the balance? Do you continue to store it year after year?

That's why rice producers now face drastic acreage reductions just after they have purchased additional rice production machinery. How do they propose to solve it? By a two-price system or by export subsidies, anything except bringing production in line with consumption. How much better it would have been if controls had gone on right after 1950 and we had produced what the Government and the market needed.

I could go on through basic and nonbasic commodities tracing the same pattern of accumulation and price deterioration, but I have promised that I would try to make a suggestion of what might be done.

One of our national news magazines (U. S. News & World Report, September 30, 1954) had an article entitled "Wanted: Magic Formula for the Farm Problem. After 35 Years of Search No Really New Ideas."

I agree with that heading. There is no device that we can hastily concoct to cure our ills, no magic wand that we can wave to make them disappear. There is, however, hard work to be done, and your organization, along with the American Farm Bureau Federation of which it is a part, has earnestly tried to study farm problems and work steadfastly for their solution. So I do not hesitate to present to you my belief that we do need a new approach and my ideas as to what that new approach might be.

First, I think we need to quiet the fighting on several farm fronts. By that I mean that we must soon be able to bring all farm organizations to a common position in behalf of the farmer. We must try to find a program that can be acceptable to both political parties, Republican and Democratic, and that unifies the individuals within each party. I need not tell you that the opponents of Secretary Benson are not all within the Democratic Party. He has stern, harsh critics within the Republican Party, and they are Members of the Senate and Members of the House.

J 11
R5
2d set

We need to find a basis for prompt action that can halt the decline in farm income. That basis must be able to enlist the 90 percenters like my good friends DICK RUSSELL and HAROLD COOLEY, as well as Senators who believe in flexible price supports like GEORGE AIKEN, SPESSARD HOLLAND, and me. I don't care how few things we agree on at first or how simple the early areas of agreement are, we need to take the farm program out of perpetual political strife, and substitute the bipartisan approach to farm problems which characterized the years when prosperity was being restored on the American farm.

I know that you will say at once that there is a wide gulf between the Farm Bureau and the Farmers' Union. I think I know the ground around that gulf and how deep it is. But I also recall two items:

1. In 1945, I named a special committee, with Milton Eisenhower as chairman, to work on the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. When that group and I had finished our joint endeavors, we presented the plan of reorganization to leaders of the Congress and to all farm organizations. After a little overhauling and some slight modifications we got complete approval by representatives of both political parties and all farm organizations. The Production and Marketing Administration was established. Personally, I think it was the only organization in the Department of Agriculture that made much sense.

2. In 1946, after years of study we prepared the farm legislation to which I have previously referred, but before it was presented to the Congress, it was considered by farm organizations. Even though it involved flexible price supports and modernized parity, it was supported by the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union, and the National Council of Farm Cooperatives.

From these two experiences, I have decided that it is possible to bring farmers and the Congress together on farm programs and agricultural administration.

Second, we must clean the shelves of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I mean we must dispose of our surpluses. No farm program—rigid 90-percent supports, flexible-price supports, soil-fertility banks, production payments, or two-price plans—will work with the surpluses we now have on hand. We should not fool the American farmer by pretending that we think they will.

We must clean our shelves if we expect to see the line representing farm net income turn upward and if we expect to see national income stay high. Economically, this Nation would be in a far sounder position if we gave away about $6 billion worth of food and fiber than it will be if we continue to keep these stocks hanging over every commodity market. At the end of World War II we dumped enormous quantities of food on islands around the Pacific and while I do not advocate dumping commodity stocks now, I do advocate getting rid of them.

If no one else takes the lead, I intend on the first appropriate day of the next session of Congress to introduce a bill requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to present to Congress within 30 days a program for the orderly but complete liquidation of surplus Commodity Credit stocks. I do not mean they must be liquidated in 1 month or 1 year but the mere announcement that they will be liquidated in 4 or 5 years will bring the buyers of commodities back into the market.

Why should a miller buy wheat or hedge his position when Commodity Credit has a billion bushels beyond our normal needs? Why should the manufacturer of cotton goods protect himself against a price rise when he knows that Commodity Credit has millions of bales that he can take out from under the loan any day he wants it? But once you earmark those surpluses for shipment abroad into markets not normally available to our farmers, the textile manufacturers will be frantically calling their agents to find some good cotton and tie it up.

When I took the oath of office as Secretary of Agriculture, I had to sign a receipt for 7½ million bales of cotton. It was sorry cotton at that but as long as it was hanging over the market there wasn't much trade in farm-produced cotton. We moved it all in a year or a year and a half; and the day we decided to move it outside of normal American trade zones, the cotton market stiffened and cotton prices went up and stayed up until cotton got it in a surplus situation again. I tell you, we can still move cotton when we want to.

A program to move these commodities may involve putting great quantities in the hands of people in other lands who could not otherwise afford to buy them. What is wrong with that? Our slogan in World War II proclaimed that food would win the war and write the peace. Well, it won the war, all right. Why not let it try to write the peace? These billions in food and fiber could implement our foreign policy far better than supplying arms to the Arabs or to the Israeli. Shooting irons placed in the hands of trigger-happy people lead to war; but food and fiber can lead to peace.

Food and fiber can help carry the spirit of Geneva at a time when that spirit seems to be mighty weak and when the foreign ministers find little on which to agree. When food and fiber lie in bins and pile up the storage, the accumulation only breaks our farmers. If they are sent abroad and removed from our economy, farm income will spurt upward, national income will stay at high levels, and in a few years we will have forgotten the cost of such a disposal program just as we forgot the cost of letting thousands of tanks, planes, and guns be captured by "General Rust" after World War II. We will have forgotten, but the heart of the world will not and it well might be that we would have created an atmosphere where the spirit of Geneva, the blessings of atomic power, and a host of other favoring circumstances might begin to work toward the achievement of peace.

Third, we must spend more on research and extension to build wider markets at home and abroad.

As I reflect on my years in the Department of Agriculture, I have many memories. Some relate to the problems of food rationing, shortages of essential supplies to farmers, reorganization of the Department to increase the emphasis on marketing; however, none is so satisfying as the fact that during this period the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 was enacted into law and a program for accentuating research in agriculture was set in motion.

For far too long we have been neglecting agricultural research and the task of bringing the results of research to farmers on the land. I regret that in the years immediately after 1946 we weren't able to get the program in "high gear" to the extent that should have been done. Therefore, it was gratifying to me that in the 1952 platforms of both political parties, there was a firm commitment to expand agricultural research.

The Democratic party platform pledged expanded research.

"We are justly proud of the outstanding achievements of our agricultural research. We favor a greatly expanded research and education program for American agriculture in order that both production and distribution may more effectively serve consumers and producers alike, and thus meet the needs of the modern world. We favor especial emphasis on the development of new crops and varieties, on crop and livestock disease and pest control, and on agricultural statistics and marketing services."

The Republican platform made a like promise.

"We recommend expanded agricultural research and education to promote new crops and uses, new markets, both foreign and domestic, more trustworthy crop and market estimates, a realistic trade program for agriculture aimed at restoring foreign markets and developing new outlets at home."

Progress has been made in getting more adequate funds for this important work. However, with the cost-price squeeze on in agriculture, it is more necessary than ever before that we bring to farmers the very best information on ways and means of cutting costs. This means that 1956 is no time to stop the accelerated program now underway. I shall be interested in the budget recommendations of the administration in this field. In the effort to balance the Federal budget, I hope that important programs like adequate research and education will not be victim of election-year political expediency.

To me nothing is more vital to a lasting solution of our farm problems than continued emphasis on research and extension. The route to newspaper headlines and publicity is to be for or against 90-percent price supports. The route of service to farmers is to be for increasing appropriations in our Federal budgets for the expansion of research and education in American agriculture.

Finally, my last words are not truly recommendations of programs, but I trust are words of hope. No. 4 in my program is to tell farmers to hold on until population catches up with the capacity of our agricultural plant. This is not too far in the future because of two circumstances: (1) We are losing farmland to cities, roads, and airports; and (2) the great American baby boom is on.

A recent magazine article (Chemurgic Digest, September 1955, p. 16) estimates that we are using up 1 million acres of farmland a year for city expansion. The road program has an even greater appetite. The turnpike from Canton, Ohio, to Chicago will gobble up some 70,000 to 100,000 acres of excellent cropland, and the proposed program of turnpikes and toll roads runs into millions of acres.

I talked to the school teachers of my State a few days ago about the American baby boom. I do not intend to review those statistics other than to say that 37 million babies were born in this country in the last decade. They are starting now to have their effect upon our economy. They have begun to accelerate the expansions of our markets for all sorts of commodities—food, clothing, shelter, automobiles, candy, soft drinks, television sets, new houses, new schools. My estimate has been that probably by 1965 and surely by 1970 we will need 4 or 5 billion more pounds of meat annually, a billion dozen extra eggs, several billion extra quarts of milk, and 15 million tons of feed grain more than we will produce in the harvest of 1955, the second largest in our history.

Hold on for the good days that are sure to come. Long before the dawn of the new century this country will be searching for new ways to grow food or new areas in other lands from which our bread basket may be filled. That day will mean increased activity in world trade, new markets for the products of our factories, and new customers abroad to match the increased industrial activity at home.

The farm problem has been with us for most of this generation. The next generation will have to endure it only a little while until world population catches up. That's why I hope that those people who are sincerely the friends of the American farmer may quit fighting each other and join on a program that will clean the commodity shelves, that will bring to the American farmer an alert, active and aggressive market for his produce, and will at the same time give truth at last to our slogan that food may have a voice in the final pronouncement of peace.

On Picking the Man of the (1956) Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from an article by Frank Kent in the Washington Star of January 1 entitled "On Picking the Man of the (1956) Year":

ON PICKING THE MAN OF THE (1956) YEAR
(By Frank R. Kent)

As the year 1956 opens, in which the American people must elect a President and Vice President, the situation that confronts them is not only unusual but practically unique—in the history of the Republic. Four years ago they elected General Eisenhower and Senator NIXON by an overwhelming popular and electoral majority. Immediately after the election there came many exceedingly dire predictions of what was ahead.

These came from the labor bosses, all of whom had opposed the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket. They came from the spokesmen of the Americans for Democratic Action, from all the leading radicals and left-wingers in the country from all the professional Democrats who had been in office for many years and could not believe that anything except calamity would follow a Democratic defeat. But none of these calamitous forecasts turned out to be well based. The bloody stalemate in Korea was ended. There was no depression. Instead there has ensued unprecedented prosperity and the highest employment in history.

DEVOID OF ISSUES

In a very short time these major administration indictments were dropped because there was no substance to them and developments showed them to be rather silly. Then there followed a period in which the political opponents of the administration tried to find a "goat" in the Cabinet. The first attack was on Secretary of Defense Wilson, but that didn't last long. It soon was recognized that Mr. Wilson was one of the ablest men in the Government.

He had made 1 or 2 slight slips of the tongue which the labor demagogs seized and distored, but the country as a whole disregarded. Then a drive was made to pillory Attorney General Brownell and Secretary of Agriculture Benson, but that also proved a flop. At the moment, the Democrats are so devoid of issues and complaints that they are concentrating on the claim that the President has turned the country over to Big Business and that the Dixon-Yates contract was a scandalous and outrageous proposal.

It is pretty generally admitted that these charges are too thin to be taken seriously. They are somewhat reminiscent of the first, second, and third campaigns of the late William Jennings Bryan. Yet, if any of the anti-Eisenhower aspirants for the Presidency in either party has anything more weighty in either the domestic or foreign field upon which to appeal he has not made it clear. The plain truth is that this President is the most utterly sincere, completely honest and truthful man who has been in the White House in a generation. He is also the most dearly beloved. There is nothing soft about him and nothing weak. He is a genuine fighting man who knows war but loves peace. He is able, determined and courageous. He can—and does—get mad occasionally—but he does not hate anyone personally, and if there is anyone who hates him personally he has not disclosed himself. This is a considerable contrast to his two predecessors.

THE VOTERS WANT HIM

Quite clearly, the voters will reelect him if they get the chance. Quite clearly, they do not want a change. Every poll, every test bears this out. Nobody really disputes it. The great question, of course, still is whether his health will permit him to run again. As to that, his doctors increasingly reflect the conviction that his recovery is such that there is no reason to feel that a second term would be more than he could stand. It is interesting and significant that, as the new year begins, more of his intimate friends and advisers are increasingly confident that he will be a candidate to succeed himself. The reasons for this decision, they say, are so overwhelming that they refuse to doubt it. Perhaps they are right. Of course, no one can be certain, but some of our most astute observers will be deeply disappointed if it does not work out that way.

Of course, if they turn out to be wrong, the plight of the country is not too pleasant to contemplate. Literally, there will be no one in sight in either party for whom there is a majority sentiment.

Archbishop O'Boyle's Sermon on the Communist Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 4, 1956, entitled "Communism and Intellectuals." This editorial emphasizes the necessity that Congress take positive action on House Joint Resolution 193, entitled "A commission to make available information as to the basic differences between the theories and practices of the American way of life and the theories and practices of atheistic communism." Gentlemen, we must stop shadowboxing and hit the Soviets and our friends with the truth.

COMMUNISM AND INTELLECTUALS

Archbishop O'Boyle, in his sermon last Sunday in St. Matthew's Cathedral, put his finger on one of the great reasons why Communist influence has been gaining at the expense of the West in general and of the United States in particular in so many parts of the world. It is, said the archbishop, in effect, because we have chosen to ignore the philosophical and ideological phases of the struggle, and to emphasize purely material advantages; accordingly we have created "a powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force. We have ringed the world with alliances, formed for the sole purpose of containing the Communist orbit. We spend millions for propaganda. At the same time we are strangely quiet about the purpose of all these activities.. We engage in a form of pretense, as if it were not proper to mention the subject of communism in polite circles. [All this] plays directly into the hands of the enemy."

One example, according to the Archbishop, is the prevalent American disparagement or contempt of the intellectuals, which has led us to underestimate grievously the influence of such persons on the evolution of events. Thus in the matter of propaganda we have permitted the Communists to exploit, however cynically or hypercritically, the power of mere ideals. And this, said the Archbishop, has had the effect of alienating persons of sensitive natures and altruistic purposes, especially in those areas of the world which have been newly freed from colonial status. It is in precisely these areas that the power of communism is growing with dangerous speed.

Archbishop O'Boyle's statements are interestingly reminiscent of the criticisms of western policy and propaganda, expressed by Dr. Charles Malik, the Lebanese Ambassador, in an address more than 6 years ago before the United Nations Assembly. To a superficial observer, said Dr. Malik, "there is little to choose between the soulless materialism of the West and the militant materialism of the Communist East. * * * Not the better and the truer, but the larger and physically stronger call forth moral approbation. * * * Yet the tragedy of the world today is that the traditions which embody the deepest truth are not bothering to articulate themselves. * * * If your only export is a distant reputation for wealth and prosperity and order, you cannot lead. Nor can you really lead if you send forth to others only technical advice and expert assistance. To be able to lead and to save yourself and others, you must above everything address their mind and soul."

The West, according to Dr. Malik, has persistently neglected its principal weapon in ideological struggle against communism. This weapon is nothing more nor less than its own free intellectual and religious traditions. We recall Dr. Malik's words for the sake of pointing up the Archbishop's warning against the danger of the present mood of anti-intellectualism in these United States, his insistence that prosecution of the conflict lies outside as well as within the range of government, and his assertion that what is most needed is to tell the whole truth about communism in contrast with the whole truth about the free world.

In Memory of the Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that we come to the contemplation of the untimely passing of our respected and esteemed colleague the Honorable VERA BUCHANAN. She was a stimulating and winsome person, and we all learned to appreciate her undoubted contribution to this body. As one who engages infrequently in debate myself, I know that a Member's greatest service to his constituents can never be gaged by his eloquency in debate on the floor, and it is with that in mind that we commend our late colleague to the consideration of all those who place value on a complete dedication to the welfare of a Member's constituents, which was her greatest attribute.

Mrs. BUCHANAN was my good and respected friend, and I shall continue to

mourn her passing as the loss of one for whom I always had an abiding admiration. My family joins with me in extending to her children and grandchildren our heartfelt condolences as well as our prayerful solicitation for that strength and courage which they so sorely need in this sad hour.

Congressman Walter Lauded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Press, St. Marys, Pa., of August 18, 1955, in which the paper lauds Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, for his forthright stand against the Communist conspiracy in the United States, and for his outstanding leadership as chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee:

DUE FOR SMEAR

Venerable Democratic Congressman F. E. WALTER, of Easton, Pa., chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, will soon be due for the smear treatment from all left of center publications in the United States, plus personal attacks from the breast thumpers who speak loudly of the Bill of Rights, but clam up when asked how come they once belonged to the Communist Party.

Mr. WALTER, presiding as chairman of the committee, has been questioning numerous witnesses connected with the entertainment world, and for the most part has received only evasive answers, dodgers under the fifth amendment and challenges as to the committees' right to question anybody on any question.

All of which is gradually leading up to an outright smear headed in Mr. WALTER'S general direction, the same type of smear Senator MCCARTHY was subjected to when he headed a similar Senate committee.

It happens to be a fact in America that the minute a man attacks communism he is made the target of verbal, and often physical, abuse. It goes back to the days of Congressman MARTIN DIES when he undertook a probe of Reds in Government employ, and got the back-of-the-hand treatment from F. D. R. and his wife, who went so far as to entertain at the White House some of the witnesses called before Mr. DIES to answer allegations relative to their Communist Party membership.

Today Congressman WALTER finds himself caught in the same smear trap that has been aimed at so many loyal Americans who want to protect this country from those who would destroy it. And it is puzzling to find so many so-called Americans lined up in sympathy with the Reds summoned to congressional quiz sessions.

And it is interesting to note the ways Reds use American gullibility to collect money for Communist causes. It has just been revealed the Justice for the Rosenbergs cause collected over $1 million presumably to save those two Reds spies from New York's electric chair. Not one penny of this amount was paid to assist the Rosenbergs, and only $1,279 has been turned over to the orphaned Rosenberg children.

What suckers we Americans are for conspiracies aimed at our national foundations. And what greater suckers we are for not giving more solid support to men like Congressman WALTER, battling to preserve democracy.

Christmas Message of Pope Pius XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in his annual Christmas message to the world, Pope Pius XII urged a three-point program for international disarmament based on a renunciation of nuclear arms. His three proposals call for: (a) renunciation of experimentation with nuclear weapons; (b) abandonment of the use of nuclear weapons; (c) control of armaments in general. He also mentioned favorably the proposal of President Eisenhower for mutual aerial inspection of armaments by the United States and Soviet Russia.

Subsequently thereafter, the Pontiff held audiences for members of the diplomatic corps assigned to the Vatican. He discussed with them the possibility of reaching an accord between the East-West powers on nuclear disarmament, but noted that it was impossible for the Vatican to undertake mediation "when two of the greatest powers are not represented at the Holy See." Pope Pius was referring, of course, to the United States and Soviet Russia, neither of whom presently maintain diplomatic relations with the Vatican.

Mr. Speaker, what a strange situation it is for the United States not to have a diplomatic representative at the Vatican. The Vatican maintains diplomatic relations with some 50 countries throughout the world, and these are not all Catholic countries. Such Protestant countries as Great Britain and the Netherlands find it advantageous to have official representatives attached to the Holy See. But oddly enough, among the major countries which have thus far not established such relations, are Communist Russia, Red China, and—I regret to include in this group—our own United States. For our country, which is the moral leader and spokesman of the free world, this is surely a most embarrassing position.

The Catholic Church is today a major force, spiritually and morally, in the struggle against the evil forces of communism. The Vatican is an important center of information and intelligence concerning the countries and peoples behind the Iron Curtain. This source of information would unquestionably be available to us, if we had a diplomatic representative at the Vatican.

I believe that this is a most appropriate time to bring up this matter for discussion and consideration. I believe that it is imperative for the United States to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican through the immediate appointment of an envoy as a gesture of friendship and because of our desire to promote world peace and greater understanding. In this way, we would not only show that our country has the highest esteem for the Catholic Church and its broad principles for achieving a world truly at peace, but it would also enable the Church to undertake mediation for disarmament and peace along the lines advocated in the Pope's Christmas message.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert into the RECORD the following excerpts from the Pope's message as published in the New York Times, Sunday, December 25, 1955:

EXCERPTS FROM POPE'S MESSAGE

With a heart open to welcome the sweet joy which the birth of the Redeemer will once again bring to the hearts of the faithful, we desire to express good wishes to you, beloved sons and daughters, and to all men without distinction. We shall draw the subject of our address, as in the past, from the inexhaustible mystery of light and grace, which shone forth from the cradle of the Divine Infant on the holy night in Bethlehem, whose brilliance will never be extinguished so long as one will hear on this earth the steps of those who in sorrow seek amid the thorns the path of true life.

O how we could wish that all men, scattered over the continents, in cities and towns, in valleys and across the deserts, on steppes and on the vast reaches of glacier wastes, and on the seas, throughout the whole world could again hear, as coming to each of them in particular, the voice of the angel announcing the mystery of the divine grandeur and of the infinite love which closed a past of darkness and condemnation, and ushered in the reign of truth and salvation.

"Do not be afraid; behold, the news I bring you is good news of a great rejoicing for the whole people. This day, in the city of David, a Saviour has been born for you, no other than the Lord Christ." (Luke II: x, xi.)

There is reason, indeed, for asking with fear and anxiety if modern man is still disposed to allow himself to yield to a supernatural truth so sublime, to be penetrated by the joy it has to offer; this man so convinced of his own increasing power, inclined to measure his stature according to the power of his instruments, his organizations, his weapons, the precision of his calculations, the vastness of his production, of the distance he can reach with his words, his gaze, and influence; this man who speaks at length with pride of an age of easy prosperity as if one just had to reach out a hand for it; who is so sure of himself and his future, he dares all, urged by an insatiable desire to know nature's deepest secrets, to bend its forces to his own will, eager to penetrate in his own person the interplanetary spaces.

In truth modern man, precisely because in possession of all that the mind and labor of man have produced, ought to recognize even more the infinite distance between what he can do and what proceeds from the limitless power of God.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY QUESTIONED

But can it be truly asserted that man has attained, or is on the way to attain, full self-sufficiency? Modern achievements, certainly remarkable, in scientific and technical development, will assuredly be able to give man an extensive mastery over the forces of nature and over sickness, and even over the beginning and the end of human life; but it is also certain that such mastery will not be able to transform the earth into a paradise of assured enjoyment. How, then, will every one of man's powers be reason-

ably cared for if the realities of new false developments, and also of new weaknesses, show the one-sided character of an idea which would wish to control life exclusively on the foundation of quantitative analysis and synthesis? Its application to social life is not only false, but also a simplification of many complex processes which is dangerous in practice. Conditions being what they are, modern man needs also to pray, and, if he is wise, he is ready to pray for security as well.

Yet this does not mean that man must abandon new ways, that is to say, give up adapting to present conditions for his own security, the order just referred to which has regard for true human nature. There is no objection to security insuring its own stability by also making use of results in technique and industry; yet it is necessary to resist the temptation to gain support for order and security from the above-mentioned purely quantitative method which takes no account of the order of nature, as is the wish of those who entrust man's destiny to the tremendous industrial power of the present age.

In this industrial age, the man who accuses, and rightly accuses, communism of having deprived of freedom the people over whom it holds sway, should not omit to note that, in the other part of the world also, liberty will be a very dubious possession if man's security is not derived to a greater extent from a condition of things which corresponds to this true nature.

In the Christmas radio message last year, we set forth the mind of the church on this topic, and we now intend once again to ratify it. We reject communism as a social system by virtue of Christ's doctrine, and we have a particular obligation to proclaim the fundamental principles of the natural law. For the same reason, we also reject the opinion that the Christian ought today to see communism as a phenomenon or a stage in the passage of history, one of the necessary "moments," as it were, of its evolution, and consequently to accept it as if decreed by Divine Providence.

MORAL ORDER SO STRESSED

But at the same time, we again warn the Christian of the industrial age, in the spirit of our immediate predecessors in the supreme pastoral and teaching office, against being satisfied with an anti-communism founded on the slogan and the defense of a liberty which is devoid of content; rather we urge them to build up a society in which man's security rests on that moral order of which we have very often set forth the need and the consequences, and which has regard for true human nature.

If, therefore, Christians unite to this end in various institutions and organizations, they are setting before themselves no other objective save the service willed by God for the benefit of the world. For the sake of this motive, and not out of weakness, let Christians group themselves together. But let them—and more so than others—remain open to every healthy undertaking and to all genuine progress, and not withdraw themselves into a sealed enclosure as if to preserve themselves from the world. Committed to promote the advantage of all men, let them not despise others, who, at any rate if they are submissive to the light of reason, both could and should accept from the teaching of Christianity, at least what is based on the natural law.

In obedience to this principle, our peace program cannot approve of an indiscriminate coexistence at all costs with everybody; certainly not at the cost of truth and justice. These irremovable boundary marks, in effect, demand complete observance. Where this is so, including today in the question of peace, religion is in a sure manner protected against abuse from the political quarter; whereas, when it has been restricted to the purely interior life, religion is more exposed to that danger.

This, though of its own accord leads us on to the ever acute question of peace which constitutes an object of solicitude always present to our heart, and at this moment one of its partial problems begs for special consideration. We propose to direct our attention to a recent proposal which aims at putting a check on experiments in nuclear weapons by means of an international agreement. There has been talk also of taking further steps toward conventions, through which the use of those weapons would be renounced, and all states subjected to an effective arms control. Thus, there would be question of three steps: Renunciation of experimentation with atomic weapons, renunciation of the use of such, and general control of armaments.

PROPOSALS' IMPORT ANALYZED

The supreme importance of these proposals is tragically illustrated, if one stops to consider what science thinks it can predict about such actions, and which we think it useful to sum up briefly here.

As for the experiments of atomic explosions, the opinion of those who fear the effects produced if they are multiplied, would seem to be finding greater acceptance. Too many such explosions would in time cause increased density of radioactive products in the atmosphere, whose diffusion depends on elements not under man's control; thus would be generated conditions very dangerous for many living beings.

Concerning the use: In a nuclear explosion an enormous amount of energy, equivalent to several thousand million kilowatts, is developed in an exceedingly short time; this energy is composed of electromagnetic radiations of very great intensity, distributed within a vast gamut of wavelengths even to the most penetrating, and of tiny bodies, produced by nuclear disintegration, which are hurled at nearly the speed of light. This energy is transferred to the atmosphere, and within thousandths of a second increases the temperature of the surrounding air masses by hundreds of degrees; their displacement is violent, propagated at the speed of sound. On the earth's surface, in an area of many square kilometers, reactions of unimaginable violence take place, material volatilized and utterly destroyed by direct radiation, by heat, by mechanical action, while an enormous amount of radioactive materials of varying life span, complete and continue the destruction through their activity.

This is the spectacle offered to the terrified gaze as a result of such use: entire cities, even the largest and the richest in art and history, wiped out; a pall of death over the pulverized ruins, covering countless victims with limbs burned, twisted and scattered, while others groan in their death agony. Meanwhile, the spectre of the radioactive cloud hinders the survivors from giving any help, and inexorably advances to snuff out any remaining life. There will be no song of victory, only the inconsolable weeping of humanity, which in desolation will gaze upon the catastrophe brought on by its own folly.

Concerning the control: inspection by properly equipped planes has been suggested, in view of watching over any atomic activities in broad territories. Others might, perhaps, think of the possibility of a world-wide network of observation posts, each one staffed by experts of different countries, and protected by solemn international pacts. Such centers would have to be equipped with delicate and precise meteorological and seismic instruments, with equipment for chemical analysis, with vast spectrographs and such like; they would render possible the real control of many, unfortunately not of all, the activities which antecedently would be outlawed in the field of atomic experimentation.

EQUAL SECURITY IS URGED

We do not hesitate to declare, as we have in previous allocutions, that the sum total of those three precautions as an object of international agreement, is an obligation in, coscience of nations and of their leaders. We said the sum of those precautions, because the reason they are morally binding is also that equal security be established for all. If, however, only the first point, concerning experimentation, be put into effect, the result would be that that condition would not be verified, the more so that there would be given sufficient reason to doubt a sincere desire to put into effect the other two conventions. We speak so frankly because the danger of insufficient proposals concerning peace depends in large part on the mutual suspicions that often trouble the dealings of the powers concerned, each accusing the other in varying degrees of mere tactics, even of a lack of sincerity in a matter basic to the fate of the whole human race.

For the rest, efforts toward peace must consist not only in measures aimed at restricting the possibility of waging war, but even more in preventing, or eliminating, or lessening with time the quarrels between nations which might lead to war.

To this kind of preventive pacification statesmen must devote themselves with great vigilance, imbued with a spirit of impartial justice and also of generosity, within the limits, of course, of healthy realism. In last year's Christmas message we indicated the points of dispute noted in the relations between Europeans and those non-Europeans who aspire to full political independence. Can those disputes be allowed to run their course, so to speak—a procedure which might easily increase their gravity, show hatred in men's souls, and create the so-called traditional enmities? And might not a third party come to profit from such enmities, a third party which neither of the others really wants, and cannot want? At any rate, let not those peoples be denied a fair and progessive political freedom and hindered in its pursuit. To Europe, however, they will give credit for their advancement to that Europe without whose influence, extended to all fields, they might be drawn by a blind nationalism to plunge into chaos or slavery.

PASSIVENESS DEPLORED

On the other hand, Western peoples, especially those of Europe, should not, in the face of such problems, remain passive, in futile regret over the past or in mutual recrimination over colonialism. Rather, they should set themselves constructively to work, to extend where it has not yet been done those true values of Europe and the West which have produced so many good fruits in other continents. The more Europeans strive for this, the more help will they be to the just freedom of young nations, which in turn will be saved from the pitfalls of false nationalism. This in truth is their real enemy, which would pit them one day against each other, to the advantage of third parties. Such a forecast, not unfounded, cannot be neglected or forgotten by those who handle their problems of peace at congresses, where, unfortunately, there gleams the splendor of a unity that is external and predominantly negative. We think that in such considerations and in such modes of procedure there is a valuable assurance of peace, in some respects even more important than an immediate prevention of war.

May the divine Infant deign to hear out our fervent prayer, so that His presence in today's world may be felt almost sensibly, as in the days of His dwelling on earth. Liv-

ing in the midst of men, may He enlighten the minds and strengthen the wills of those who rule over nations; to these latter may He assure justice and peace; may He encourage the zealous apostles of His divine message, sustain the good, draw the errant to Himself; console those persecuted for His name and for His church; succor the poor and the oppressed, assuage the pains of the sick, the imprisoned, the exiled. May He give to all a spark of His divine love, so that everywhere on earth His peaceful kingdom may triumph. Amen.

The Conflict Between Communism and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence in the Washington Star, commenting on the excellent address by George Meany, president of the newly merged AFL and CIO:

MEANY'S WARNING TO FREE WORLD—DECLARES COMMUNISM MORTAL THREAT—CALLED SPEECH FOR ALL TO READ

(By David Lawrence)

An address was delivered the other day that should have been printed in every newspaper in every country in the world.

It was made by George Meany, president of the newly merged AFL and CIO, and reflects better than any governmental pronouncement ever issued here what the American people really think about communism, about neutralism abroad, about package deals in the UN, and about misguided liberals, and anti-anti-Communists inside the United States.

Mr. Meany, who spoke before the National Religion and Labor Foundation in New York, pointedly questioned the course pursued by Nehru of India and Tito of Yugoslavia. But what he said might also be pondered by the leaders of both major parties in the British Parliament who want to appease Red China and by Messrs. Khrushchev and Bulganin of the Soviet Union because it comes from the head of the largest organization of free workers in the world with a membership of more than 15 million.

"Too many people in the free world," said Mr. Meany, "fail to see the real nature of communism as the mortal foe of everything that we hold dear, of every moral and spiritual value. Too many in the free world are still prisoners of the illusion that communism is, historically speaking, a progressive system—extreme liberalism temporarily making bad mistakes.

"Actually, communism represents darkest reaction. It is an antisocial system in which there are imbedded some of the worst features of savagery, slavery, feudalism and life-sapping exploitation manifested in the industrial revolution of early-day capitalism.

"Too many in the free world seem to have lost their capacity for moral indignation against the most brutal inhumanities when they are perpetrated by Communists. It is painful, but we must face the cruel facts of life.

"We of the democratic camp must develop a far more vigorous moral attitude. We must rekindle our capacity to cry out against, to protest against the godless dogmas and savage crimes being perpetrated by Moscow.

"Such struggles and such protests are not negative actions. They are positive. They are morally and politically constructive. I know of nothing more positive and constructive than a total struggle against the totalitarian cancer in the body politic of modern society.

"It is rather disturbing to me that many people in our country who call themselves liberals are stone silent about the Soviet concentration camps. They never find the time to utter a word of condemnation against the Communist-imperialist destruction of the national independence and democratic rights of hundreds of millions of people in Europe and Asia.

"It is shocking to see the studied attempts being made by Western diplomacy to tear to shreds the charter of the United Nations under the guise of the so-called package deal with Moscow and Peiping. Can it be that the free world is so weak in its moral spirit that it does not recognize this deal as appeasement of the worst kind?

"I am all for a fight to the finish against racialism in our own midst. Racialism is damnable and detestable in any form. But racialism in reverse—as now propagated in India and Burma by Khrushchev and Bulganin—is just as reprehensible.

"And the Communist imprisonment of hundreds of thousands of hostages—so-called war prisoners—10 years after the close of the war, in violation of every human right and international agreement—is morally reprehensible. One would expect the true liberal to cry out in protest against human beings being carted, tagged, and shuttled about for weeks in rail yards of Russia, as if they were carloads of coal or bags of potatoes.

"Not until we of the free world can give rebirth to a vibrant moral attitude, to a burning indignation against such frightful bestialties, can the freedom-loving people be sufficiently stirred to gather the moral strength for resisting and defeating the totally antimoral dogmas and deeds of communism at home and abroad. Yes, this means above all a moral struggle against communism.

"Communism is the very opposite of liberalism. Communism is the deadliest enemy of liberalism. Liberals should be the most consistent and energetic fighters against communism. Liberals must also be on guard against developing a certain type of McCarthyism of their own. They must shun like a plague the role of being anti-anti-Communist.

"Only by refusing to be thus entrapped, can liberals shep every vestige of subconscious and conscious regard for communism as a movement with which they have something in common.

"Much more regard must be shown by the democracies for principles—for the principles of human rights and human freedom. We must never sacrifice principles to expediency. This means being rigid in support of our principles.

"Moscow is sure it has history's timetable in its pocket. Hitler once thought so, too. We have nothing to fear from peaceful competition. They need our help. We do not need theirs. They have nothing that can hurt us.

"In conclusion, I cannot emphasize too strongly to you: The conflict between communism and freedom is the problem of our time. It overshadows all other problems. This conflict mirrors our age, its toils, its tensions, its troubles and its tasks. On the outcome of this conflict depends the future of all mankind. I pray that, on the threshold of the atomic age, we—all of the free world—can muster the moral courage and total strength to preserve the peace and promote the freedom of the men and women of every continent, and color and creed."

The Eighth World Health Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my privilege to attend the annual meeting of the National Citizens Committee of the World Health Organization at Kansas City, Mo., held November 16, 1955.

One of our most distinguished citizens, and a member of the United States delegation to the World Health Assembly, Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of the medical school, University of Minnesota, delivered a remarkable address to the National Citizens Committee Conference. His report on the Eighth World Health Assembly represents a review of the accomplishments of WHO and the immensity of the health problems that still confront the world. It is a report worthy of careful study and thoughtful attention.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EIGHTH WORLD HEALTH ASSEMBLY

(By Harold S. Diehl, M. D., Minneapolis)

I would like to express my appreciation to the National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization for this opportunity to report to you my impressions of the Eighth World Health Assembly, which was held in Mexico last May. It was my privilege to serve as a member of the United States delegation to this assembly, as well as to the Seventh World Health Assembly held in Geneva in 1954.

The large attendance at this luncheon meeting is evidence of the interest of public health workers in the activities of WHO. Yet, I am certain that many Americans fail to appreciate the full significance of world health activities. In this country, which is relatively free from preventable diseases, few realize the disastrous burden still imposed by disease in much of the world. Furthermore, those of us who presume to be health experts—even those of us concerned with international health—may be so much occupied with specific programs and technical details that we lose sight of the broad significance of the World Health Organization.

It is essential today that we learn to live with and adjust to the circumstances of a rapidly changing world. Part of this learning process, part of the adjustment, takes the form of a realization of the increasing international responsibilities which our country must assume,

Gradually we in the United States and the peoples of other nations are learning to cooperate to the end that mankind may live a better life, one less fraught with the urgent unfilled needs, the stresses, the animosities, which lead to unrest and conflict. I am proud that my fellow Minnesotan, who shares this plaform with me, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, is prominent among the growing number of those who are helping our Nation to understand the need for constructive cooperative international action.

But to turn to the subject assigned to me: The World Health Assembly is, as I am sure most of you know, a legislative body of member nations. Delegations are composed of

Ministers and Directors of Health; top level health administrators; Foreign Office and State Department representatives, and internationally known public health experts to wrestle with program considerations.

The Assembly considers and approves, disapproves, or modifies policies, programs, and budgets presented to it by the Director-General and the executive board. Its work is carried out primarily through two major committees of the Assembly as a whole; that is, committees in which each member nation has a representative. These committees are the Committee on Program and Budget, and the Committee on Administration, Finance, and Legal Affairs. The Assembly then in plenary or general sessions acts upon the reports and recommendations of these committees.

The skill and finesse of some of the chairmen of these large unwieldy committees in keeping discussions and debates within bounds and getting work done is truly amazing. An example of this which I found interesting and amusing occurred last year in a debate upon the size of the budget. After this debate had gone on for most of the day, and we were approaching the end of the afternoon, the French delegate who was serving as chairman said: "I have requests from quite a number of additional individuals to speak. They will all be heard. However, after all that we have listened to I cannot believe that there is anything new or significant that can be added to the discussion. Furthermore, the hour is getting late, and I am determined that we will have a vote on the budget today if we have to continue into the night to do so. I would, therefore, urge the remaining speakers to be brief." The next speaker followed this request by delivering a long flowery oration on the general thesis of the necessity of care and conservatism in the preparation of budgets, finishing with the comment that we must remember that "pennies make dollars, dollars make hundreds, hundreds make thousands, thousands make millions." As he sat down, the chairman thanked the honorable representative of country X for his eloquent address, and stated that he would paraphrase his final comments by reminding speakers that "seconds make minutes, minutes make hours, and hours make days."

Again to return to my subject, the Eighth Assembly was the first held in the Western Hemisphere, although the organization came into existence through the efforts of the International Health Conference, which met in New York in July of 1946. The Government of Mexico in 1954 had offered its facilities to WHO, and the invitation to hold the Eighth Assembly in Mexico City in May 1955 was accepted by the Seventh Assembly. This was a generous offer by Mexico since it carried with the obligation to pay all expenses of the Assembly in excess of what they would have been had the meeting been held in Geneva. In addition, the invitation carried with it the social obligations of a host country—and what superb and gracious hosts the Mexicans were, both officially and personally. In this connection I must make special mention of the Women's Committee which provided our wives with a most memorable and heartwarming experience.

The spirit and the significance of the Eighth World Health Assembly was splendidly expressed at the opening session by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Mexico, who stated that "20th century man, after the dreadful experience of two world wars, is striving to create a peaceful world. In our time there is no more urgent or basic problem than that of maintaining international peace. We all know that peace is not merely a political question to be resolved through treaties among states, but rather something closely linked to the general development of all nations. Peace is something quite different from war and truce. Peace means liberty and abundance, justice and respect for man, proper living standards, and, fundamentally, health. It is not sufficient to affirm that all peoples and all men have a right to liberty, justice, and bread; in order to enjoy these blessings and to live fully, it is necessary to have life; in other words, it is necessary to possess that energy to enjoy which only health can give.

"Yet, how can we hope to achieve a universal political equilibrium when more than half of humanity is still victim to plagues which science has vanquished in the laboratory but not in fact among the peoples? A world cannot aspire to be called civilized until such time as the aid of science and modern techniques are put into service on a universal scale for the health of man. That man is not an abstract idea. He is flesh and bone reality. In devoting your efforts and ideas to him you are laying the foundation of universal peace, for man's health is the foundation of the social edifice, the workshop of the world rests on his shoulders."

The First World Health Assembly, and I am certain that at least two of the members of this group have vivid memories of the event, authorized WHO to give assistance to governments in malaria control. An expert advisory committee was established and a small malaria section was added to the permanent secretariat. Experts were sent on request to advise governments on the latest control techniques; in some cases also demonstration teams were sent to carry the gospel of control into remote places where potentially productive areas of the world lay undeveloped because there was no one to till the fields, and where 600,000,000 people were exposed, and 300,000,000 people each year were affected by this disease.

Seven years later, in Mexico, the director-general proposed to the assembly "that the eradication of malaria from the world as a public-health problem is a basic objective of WHO." In those few years 230,000,000 of the 600,000,000 previous potential victims of malaria, have either been freed of the disease or are being protected. Experts now believe that a concerted all-out effort can accomplish the seemingly impossible task of eradication of malaria from large areas of the world within 10 to 15 years.

Eradication is both urgent and possible. In several areas of the world the anophelines are showing signs of resistance to insecticides and this has pointed to the need for a vigorous approach. The assembly appropriated moneys to be spent on technical meetings, advisory teams, research grants, and fellowships. This money, as priming to the pump, represents approximately 1 percent of the expected total cost to governments of the eradication program.

Environmental sanitation still remains a major public-health problem throughout the world. Improvement requires trained personnel, which are in short supply. WHO is trying to overcome this situation by helping countries in the training of sanitary engineers and allied workers. This subject is being incorporated also into other programs, and in recent years WHO has encouraged countries to place special emphasis on environmental sanitation activities, such as providing safe water supplies, vector control, and sewage disposal.

Inadequate nutrition, particularly protein malnutrition in the young child immediately following the weaning periods, is a serious problem in most areas of the world. A vigorous step forward in this area was the survey done by the organization in collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization. This has led WHO to initiate a study of a means of preventing this condition. Laboratories in Africa, Central America, and India are conducting research on the development of an acceptable plant protein, which it is hoped will take the place of the scarce animal protein unobtainable by the large percentage of the world's children.

Maternal and child health programs, sponsored by WHO and UNICEF, the United Nations International Children's Fund, are having great and lasting effects throughout the world. These programs cover broadly the fields of pediatrics, nursing, and midwifery. They include the teaching of pediatrics to medical students in New Zealand and Australia, a teacher training project in Thailand for the development of school health programs, and the development of services in several countries for the care of premature infants.

Seventy-seven million individuals have been tuberculin tested since the start of the WHO/UNICEF program and 22 million have been inoculated with BCG vaccine. Twenty-five million people have been examined for yaws and of these 6 million have been cured with the result that this disease has ceased to be a public-health problem in many areas of the world.

In the field of international epidemiology and its operative branch of international quarantine, the WHO has brought together existing conventions into one set of International Sanitary Regulations to which 60 member states, 73 overseas territories, and 1 nonmember state are bound without reservations. Ten member states and outlying territories are bound with reservation, and only four member states do not consider themselves bound by the regulations.

In Mexico City the yellow-fever provisions of the International Sanitary Regulations were discussed at length. The decision was taken, in light of newer epidemiological knowledge, to narrow the areas against which restrictions may be placed to those areas in which yellow fever actually exists, instead of continuing to include areas in which it was once known to exist. This action will serve to expedite travel and the flow of commerce while still providing adequate protection.

As you can well appreciate, there was great interest at the World Health Assembly last May in the use of Salk vaccine as a public-health measure—an interest which was intensified by the fact that Dr. Keefer and Surgeon General Scheele were unable to attend the assembly, being, as I explained, paralyzed in Washington by the vaccine controversy. Denmark had already used 400,000 doses for its child population with an intradermal vaccine similar to the Salk vaccine, but made in the Danish State Vaccine Laboratories, and was going ahead with its second dose schedule regardless of the controversy raging here. Several delegates stated in committee that WHO should make a pronouncement on the value of the vaccine. The United States delegate, sitting in a very warm seat, gave a summary of developments as they had occurred up to the time of the assembly, and quoted from Secretary Hobby's report to the President in the hope that this would give guidance, and yet not be misunderstood.

Continuing and expanding previous WHO activities, the Assembly made a small appropriation for the coordination of research and training in poliomyelitis and for setting up a system of strain identification laboratories, much like the influenza centers and the brucellosis center which the WHO supports in conjunction with FAO.

A small item budgetwise, but one which may have broad implications for the future, was the approval of $42,000 to finance an exploration into the health aspects of peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Director-General had laid the groundwork in this area by calling a meeting of experts with the head of the division of biology and medicine of the Atomic Energy Commission as chairman, to seek advice on how WHO might serve as an international nonpolitical agency in this field. Arising out of the meeting and the deliberations of the executive board, it was decided that its role properly included the immediate training of health personnel in

protection; facilitating the flow of information; and a long-term training program in all aspects of this field, including the use of isotopes, through such means as the exchange of professors and fellowships. The Assembly approved the Director-General's request and thus launched the organization on a course, as yet not fully charted, which may be as significant as any action ever taken by the Assembly.

The technical sessions of the Seventh World Health Assembly were devoted to rural health—a subject of such importance in most countries of the world that the same topic was selected for the technical sessions of the Eighth Assembly. Rural sanitation, communicable disease control, maternal and child health, nutrition, medical care, health education, and public health organization were all discussed by experts. In addition, a special feature of these sessions was a series of field trips arranged by the Ministry of Health of Mexico to enable delegates to observe rural health problems of that country. These trips were most interesting in affording a first-hand picture of life and living conditions of the vast rural population of Mexico, and of the very real progress which is being made in local cooperative planning and action for the improvement of health conditions.

Another aspect of the World Health Assembly business concerned the mundane but vitally important matter of finances; both budget totals and scales of assessments. At each of the two assemblies which I have attended our United States delegation has been embarrassed by the necessity of opposing any increase in the WHO budget because of the $3 million ceiling which Congress placed upon the United States contribution to WHO. It did not make for goodwill toward the United States for the richest country in the world to be opposing even moderate expansion of WHO activities which other countries believed desirable and were willing to support financially.

We were also opposed, and I feel rightfully so, to one aspect of the scale of assessments. In this regard an anomalous situation has existed since the withdrawal of the Iron Curtain countries from active participation in the work of the organization. Although they have been assessed their share of the budget yearly, they have made no contribution. This year the United States delegation was instructed to press for the removal of these noncontributing countries from the 100 percent scale of assessments. The Assembly agreed to this in principle. However, because this change, together with certain changes requested by other nations and agreed to by the Assembly, such as bringing the WHO scale in line with the present United Nations scale, would prove a financial strain to some of the poorer countries, it was decided that the changeover should be a progressive one over a 4-year period.

This represents a vastly improved situation, but even more significant is the removal of the congressional limitation on our United States contribution to the support of WHO. This remarkable change in our United States position is due, I am glad to state, primarily to two of our Minnesota Representatives in Congress, Dr. WALTER JUDD in the House of Representatives, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY in the Senate.

These were some of the actions that were taken at the Assembly. I was impressed by every minute of it. The delegations worked hard. They were honest and able; dedicated to their work, which cut across many political boundaries.

I came away with two thoughts uppermost in my mind. One was the concept in public health of eventual worldwide eradication of communicable disease. Yaws has disappeared from large areas of the globe under sustained attack. Now the nations of the world are taking on the greatest killer of all time in that class—malaria; and more, agreement had been reached by nations that this was the thing to do. A special fund had been set up to receive voluntary contributions of money, services, and material from countries to help each other in the fight. If malaria and yaws can be eradicated, we will look forward to the conquest of smallpox, for which WHO has been working on dried vaccines which can be carried into tropical areas away from civilization and refrigeration—and plague—and cholera—and rabies and brucellosis, tuberculosis, and poliomyelitis. The eradication concept is new in international health, but a concept that is within the realm of possibility and one that will make history.

The other concept is that health is a subject in which all people of the world, irrespective of color, race, and political philosophy, have a common interest; and that cooperation in the field of health is proving to be a common ground for the development of cooperation and understanding among nations. This is a field in which the United States has the ability as well as the unique opportunity to assume world leadership. It is important that health workers understand and participate in these efforts on the part of our Government. Such a participation helps protect the health of Americans at home and abroad; it furthers the progress of public health throughout the world; and probably most important, it is a force in our worldwide effort to build the conditions of peace.

The Harris-Fulbright Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two very excellent editorials from the Denver Post of December 12 and December 28, respectively, criticizing the so-called Harris-Fulbright gas bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of December 12, 1955]

A GAS MAN ATTACKS THE HARRIS BILL

The price of natural gas to residential consumers will increase 35 percent over 1953 average prices if the Harris-Fulbright bill is passed by the United States Senate next year.

That opinion comes not from any enemy of free private enterprise but from one of the best posted men in the gas business, Arthur K. Lee, president of United Cities Utilities company, which, through a string of subsidiaries, pipes and distributes gas for many cities in Illinois, Wisconsin, Tennessee, the Carolinas, and Georgia.

According to Mr. Lee, the field price of natural gas, which averaged 9.2 cents per thousand cubic feet in 1953, and has already risen to 17 cents or more in some localities, will go to 25 cents within a short time if the Harris-Fulbright bill should become law.

Since the average householder consumer paid 77.4 cents per thousand cubic feet for gas in 1953, it would be logical to believe an increase from 9.2 to 25 cents in the field price would add only 15.8 cents to the bill of the ultimate user.

But, Mr. Lee points out, the effect of an increase to 25 cents in the field price would not be as simple as that. A 25-cent price at the well would cause most industries that use natural gas on an interruptible basis to switch to cheaper fuels, oil or coal.

Industrial customers paid an average of 21 cents per thousand cubic feet for interruptible gas in 1953. A 25-cent field price plus pipeline transportation charges would make natural gas too expensive for industrial users. Hence pipeline companies would lose large sales revenues which would have to be made up by additional price increases to residential consumers.

Mr. Lee concludes that passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill would raise the average price of gas to householders from 77.4 cents in 1953, to slightly more than $1.04—or 35 percent.

The Harris-Fulbright bill would put producers of natural gas beyond effective control by the Federal Power Commission. For the last year and a half EPC control has been pretty much of a joke even under existing law. Gas prices have been rising rapidly all over the country. Colorado consumers have not been immune.

Mr. Lee cites the case of 1 producing company which is claiming the right to make a profit of $297 million on a gas field investment of $3 million under 1 FPC decision. He estimates a 25-cent field price for gas would add $9.7 billion to the value of the known gas reserves held by 29 large oil companies.

No wonder the oil industry is spending $1½ million in propaganda for the Harris-Fulbright bill and has enlisted its employees to flood newspapers and Congressmen with letters favorable to the bill.

Mr. Lee does not want us to abandon the principle that gas prices (and profits) should be fair and reasonable. But authors of the Harris-Fulbright bill admittedly and deliberately avoided the use of the word "fair"—or its equivalent, "just."

Authority to fix fair or just prices carries with it an obligation to determine if profits are excessive. The Harris-Fulbright bill would, without regard for the fairness of profits, allow prices to go as high as consumers would be willing to pay before junking their gas stoves and furnaces in favor of oil or coal burning equipment.

Mr. Lee has suggested that prices prevailing on June 7, 1954, be considered fair and reasonable and that they be adopted for regulatory purposes subject to any cost increases that have occurred since that time. But advocates of the Harris-Fulbright bill have set their sights on extra billions in profits and will not go along with Mr. Lee.

The Harris-Fulbright bill barely passed the House in the dying days of the last session. It is now before the Senate. Normally a bill so damaging to consumers would not have much chance for adoption in an election year.

But, according to the Wall Street Journal, gas producers, most of whom are oil companies, are afraid that if Mr. Eisenhower does not run for reelection 1956 may be their only chance to get the bill approved. So, they will push for enactment even at the risk of embarrassing many Senators and the Republican administration.

If the bill should pass there can be but little doubt that gas prices and giveaway will become major issues when next November rolls around no matter who the candidates may be.

[From the Denver Post of December 28, 1955]

NOT SO FAST

The Federal Power Commission has received a setback in its effort to give sharply higher prices to producers of natural gas as an incentive to make them want to go out and find new fields.

In a unanimous decision, the United States circuit court of apepals in Washington has set aside a multi-million-dollar rate increase the FPC had granted Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co., which serves Detroit, Mich., and vicinity.

Part of the increase was due to the abandonment by the FPC of the time-honored

principle that natural-gas companies should be allowed to earn no more than just and reasonable profits on their investments in production properties.

On the gas production part of Panhandle's business, the FPC had substituted a "fair field price" method of price fixing for the yardstick of just and reasonable returns.

The "fair field price," as intrepreted by the FPC, is the price at which unregulated gas producers are able to sell under supply and demand conditions. Of course, since World War II the demand for gas has far outstripped the supply. Hence, the "fair field price" is higher than any company would be allowed on the basis of just and reasonable return on investment.

While the court did not say "fair field price" may not be used as a method of price regulation, it said that if "fair field price" is used it still is necessary under the law to show that any increase is just and reasonable.

In other words, the FPC cannot give a regulated company a higher price merely because other companies not under regulation happen to be getting that price. The test of "reasonableness," which the FPC and the gas industry would like to avoid, must still be applied.

And if the FPC wants to use the "fair field price" yardstick, any increase in price resulting therefrom must be within the limits of what the company needs to realize a just and reasonable profit.

The decision, unless it should be upset by the Supreme Court or Congress, seems to mean that everything the FPC has been doing for the last year and a half in its effort to boost wellhead gas prices for the benefit of producers, without regard for the protection of consumers, is improper.

The ruling could result in lower prices for Colorado consumers since the rates now being collected in this area on a temporary basis, pending further hearings, are based in part on the "fair field price" theory.

The need for new incentives to encourage gas exploration has never been demonstrated satisfactorily. Most gas fields are discovered in the process of searching for oil and as long as it is profitable to drill for oil there is every expectation that all possible gas fields will be discovered in time.

However, the FPC, shortly after the advent of the present administration, became enamored of the idea that gas exploration should be encouraged by a lure of larger dividends. Invention of the "fair field price" followed.

Legalization of the "fair field price" method of pricing gas is the principal objective of the Harris-Fulbright bill which has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate.

The present FPC has been so eager to sidestep the just and reasonable requirements of the Natural Gas Act that it has tried to apply "fair field price" methods without waiting for legal authorization. That in itself is a strange performance for a Federal agency.

The Late John Dingell

SPEECH
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, words do not come easy for me in paying tribute to the life and work of the late JOHN DINGELL.

It was my privilege to have known and worked with JOHN DINGELL many years in Michigan before joining him as a Member of Congress. His friendly advice and assistance proved most valuable to me when I entered the House as a freshman Member a year ago.

His courage and steadfastness of purpose were an inspiration to all who knew him. His contribution to American life will be measured with increasing value as the years go by.

If it can be said of any man that he devoted his life to the service of his country, it can surely be said of JOHN DINGELL. His devotion to duty came from the highest precept of public office. The courage he displayed in standing for what he believed to be just stimulated others to positive action.

And may I take this opportunity to welcome his son, Congressman JOHN DINGELL, JR., to this Chamber. We who know Congressman DINGELL have confidence he will ably exemplify the spirit of his beloved father, and will, in his own right, demonstrate a capacity for good works.

The Westinghouse Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, all of us deplore differences between mangement and labor. In prolonged strikes, both sides lose.

The Westinghouse strike is now in its 12th week. The Wall Street Journal of January 3d contains a very timely editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSON FOR THE LEADERS

The International Union of Electrical Workers strike against 40 Westinghouse Electric Corp. plants is now in its 12th week. And as is usual in prolonged labor disputes, both company and workers are losing millions of dollars in profits and wages.

There is something a little different, though, about this strike. Aside from the monetary losses to both sides, the union is losing support of many of its members who are returning to work.

The reason is the difference between the tactics used by the company and by the union. Westinghouse knows they are dealing with people. Their campaign is aimed at getting the workers back to work. At the Lima, Ohio, plant, for example, they have had supervisors and foremen talk to their men; more than 1,800 of the plant's 2,000 wage earners have been reached at least once. Just before Christmas, Westinghouse offered to lend $100, free of interest, to all its workers, those who had returned and those who were still on strike. Around 30,000 employees borrowed the sum to carry them over Christmas. Some pay adjustments are being made to returned workers as well.

The union, on the other hand, acts as though people are just numbers. It has spent some $130,000 so far in an advertising campaign knocking Westinghouse products and has engaged in violence at some of the plants. Neither of these activities sits well with some of those on strike, and they returned to work in protest. "I came back because I didn't like the way the union was running down Westinghouse products," said one. "When a union goes out and runs down the goods made by the company that gives their workers a living, they're biting the hand that feeds them," said another. "Union leaders don't have to go around beating people or telling people their children will be hurt," said a 23-year-old woman assembler.

We do not mean to imply that the attitudes of these outspoken people are in the majority. Neither can we predict when the strike will be settled, or the settlement terms, any more than either the union or the company can just now.

But the attitude is there and it is growing. And in it is a lesson, it seems to us, for both union and management on how and how not to handle a strike.

Capital's Glamor Overrated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding article about Mrs. Wayne Morse which appeared in the Eugene Register-Guard under the title "Capital's Glamor Overrated, Mrs. Wayne Morse Reveals." This article is by the women's editor of the Register-Guard, Mrs. Kay Lundeen. I know that members of the Senate will be pleased to learn that the talented author of this article about the wife of my distinguished senior colleague, is the daughter-in-law of a former Member of this body, Senator Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota, and is also now the stepdaughter-in-law of another former Member of this body, Senator Rufus C. Holman, of Oregon. Mrs. Lundeen's association with these two distinguished past Senators, who served with distinction in this Chamber, adds interest to her fine tribute to Mrs. Wayne Morse.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL'S GLAMOR OVERRATED, MRS. WAYNE MORSE REVEALS

(By Kay Lundeen)

Most people have an exaggerated idea of the glamor of Washington life, says Mrs. Wayne Morse who after nearly a dozen years in the Nation's Capital describes her own life there as pretty workaday.

As she puts it:

"Housekeeping is just the same in Washington as anywhere else—if you do not do the dishes, they will pile up; if you plan a dinner party, that is the day the washing machine runs over and the cat gets mauled in a cat fight. You worry about making ends meet, just as anywhere else, and when the Ambassador comes to dinner you serve the best thing you can, then live on hamburger the rest of the week."

The wife of Oregon's senior Senator, here Tuesday to visit Democratic Women of Lane

County, gave some of her impressions of Washington life in an informal talk to them at a luncheon at Willamalane Memorial Building, and later in an interview. At the same time she attempted to put straight some of the misconceptions many people have, she feels, about the average Senator's wife.

As typical, she recalled with amusement how shortly after the Morses moved to Washington, she began to take her laundry to a nearby launderette and of how amazed the proprietor and his wife were when they happened to discover that she was a Senator's wife and doing her own laundry.

REPORTERS PHONE

"Didn't they know that a Senator's shirts get dirty, just as anyone else's?" she smiled.

Capital society reporters, Mrs. Morse continued, have helped to create and encourage this aura of glamor about official Washington. Before a White House reception, for instance, they'll call her along with other Senate wives to find out about the gowns they plan to wear.

"Then I have to think of some different way of describing the same old dress."

Mrs. Morse, whose own three daughters have spent much of their lives in Washington, said she thinks official children have a very hard life.

"They get more publicity than any child should have," she said firmly. "And they have to be protected from making mistakes. Actually the best way for people to learn is by making mistakes, but official children are almost certain to be criticized, if they blunder—so we have to rush in and protect them from making any mistakes."

CONSTANT REMINDING

She thought for a moment, then added:

"Also you have constantly to keep reminding them of things they have now, not because of anything they've done, but because of what their father has done."

Actually her own daughters seem to be doing very nicely in their own right:

Nancy, now Mrs. Hugh Campbell of Hartsville, S. C., is the mother of the Morse's first grandchild, Melaine, born October 25. Judy will be graduated in February from George Washington University, where she's majored in drawing and painting. Amy is in her sophomore year in nursing at the University of North Carolina.

As for her own activities, Mrs. Morse expressed greatest satisfaction in her membership in the Senate Ladies Group which meets weekly as a Red Cross unit to sew, knit, and fold bandages.

"Party lines are down in the group, even though our husbands may be locked in political battle," she related. "We are ladies, and we take care of the amenities. We discuss our children, our grandchildren, our gardens, and we exchange recipes. We never discuss controversial issues. It just isn't done."

COMMON BOND

The Senate Ladies, regardles of party, have a common bond, she pointed out, "because we've all been fired in the same crucible—statewide campaigning." With feeling, she added:

"We all know how fleeting is public opinion."

There's no such thing as an 8-hour day in the Morse household.

"Wayne leaves for the Capitol at 7 in the morning," she went on, "and if he gets back by 10 at night, we feel lucky. Often he'll arrive about 11 and announce that he's hungry, that he hasn't had anything to eat since lunch."

This is the time, she said, when the Senator usually tells her about the events of the day. While she never works in her husband's office, Mrs. Morse does take on innumerable housewifely jobs that assist him in carrying on his job.

"I buy everything for him," she said. "I have a terrible time getting him into the store for a new suit. Usually I go shopping ahead to pick out a couple of possibilities for him to try on, then I go in with him when he does try them. I even have trouble getting him to the dentist and to the doctor for a checkup. He just doesn't have the time."

Though Senator Morse seldom has the chance to go shopping for his wife, she reports that "when he does buy anything—jewelry, gloves, perfume—I always like his choice."

He enjoys complaining about her hats, she admitted, but it's unlikely he'd ever find any fault with her dresses, many of which she makes for herself. The becoming chalk-blue knit dress she was wearing is one she recently knitted in less than 3 months.

Mrs. Morse pint-sized and feminine taught sewing and cooking for 7 years, later served on the New York City staff of the Delineator Home Institute, where part of her job involved answering readers' correspondence about everything from household equipment to personal problems "I was a sort of Dorothy Dix."

TEACHES SEWING

Recently Mrs. Morse has been teaching adult education classes in clothing construction just outside of Washington. The prospect even loomed for her to give a course in home economics at one of the local universities. When she mentioned it to her family, the Senator protested:

"But Momma, you can't do that. We need you."

She knew how right he was.

"Wayne's job takes everything he has," she explained simply. "I couldn't start a job that would take everything of me and not leave anything to give to him and what his job demands of me."

The Responsibilities of the Medical Profession

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, every Member of this body has heard and read a great deal about the medical profession. Some of what has been said has been good, some of it not so good.

In the December 22 edition of the Delaware State News, Dover, Del., there was printed a letter to the editor. This letter was written by an 11-year-old person, but it expresses the sentiment of thousands of people in our community, including adults as well as children. I am very pleased to concur wholeheartedly in the expressions of the letter. No doubt many of our colleagues, as well as others, would like to read it, so I am asking unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 13, 1955.

Mr. JACK SMYTH,
Delaware State News,
Dover, Del.

DEAR MR. SMYTH: One night I was reading a magazine called the Upper Room. The artice was written by a man from Ontario. It was about a doctor who had served his community for 50 years. In the middle of town was a monument honoring the doctor for his unselfish work. He neither became rich or famous. But he made many people happy and helped people if they were sick. The article reminded me of Dr. Benjamin Burton. Dr. Burton answers calls all hours of the night. He would do anything for a sick child without thought of pay, he does a lot of things out of the kindness of his heart. Dr. Burton reminded me of the doctor in the story. I think he is one of the finest men I've ever known. I think he is what a doctor ought to be.

Sincerely yours,

A PATIENT OF DR. BURTON, AGE 11.

The Woman Behind Morse, Strong in Chosen Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding article from the Oregon Daily Statesman, of December 3, 1955, about the charming and gifted wife of the senior Senator from Oregon. This tribute to the capabilities and talents of Mrs. Mildred Morse was written by Marguerite W. Wright, of the Statesman staff. I should like to add, Mr. President, that perhaps the understanding and friendly tone of the article stems from the fact that both Mrs. Morse and Mrs. Wright have a great bond in common—each of these fine Oregon women is the mother of three atractive daughters.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WOMAN BEHIND MORSE, STRONG IN CHOSEN CAREER

(By Marguerite W. Wright)

In Time magazine's cover story on Oregon Senators NEUBERGER and MORSE earlier this year, Mrs. Wayne Morse was described briefly as a pretty and talented daughter of a Wisconsin railroad conductor, a wife who has remained in the background throughout the Senator's stormy career.

Is that all there is to be said about the woman who has been for 31 years at the side of one of the most controversial men in the United States. This reporter met Mildred (Midge) Morse at an informal tea here Thursday and the impression I received is that of a woman who has made a career of her husband and family—a career consciouly chosen from several other possibilities open to her.

MANY OPPORTUNITIES

She could have been a journalist. While WAYNE MORSE was working on his doctorate at Columbia in New York, Mrs. Morse was a staff writer on Delineator magazine, a popular woman's publication, now defunct.

She could have been a teacher—and was for several years a home economics teacher. Recently she has taught adult classes in sewing as a part-time activity, and not long ago she was asked to organize and head a home economics department at American University in Washington, D. C., but turned down the offer.

She could have become a part of Washington's frenetic social whirl, flitting around at cocktail parties and embassy balls.

Instead she chose to be the full-time wife of WAYNE MORSE and mother of his three daughters—Nancy, Judy, and Amy, all born in Eugene.

It has not been easy to maintain a normal, close family life with frequent moves betwene Eugene and Washington and the family separated about 6 months out of the year. Thus Mrs. Morse has had to make extraordinary efforts to get the children and their father together whenever possible. Breakfast became the only meal at which the whole family was regularly at the table. Fortunately, she said, the Senator is not one to retreat behind the morning newspaper, welcomed the opportunity to talk to the girls.

HORSE LOVERS

By encouraging the family's great mutual interest in horses and riding, Mrs. Morse has assured that father and daughters had something in common ever since the toddlers learned to ride their Shetland pony. Incidentally, they expect that same pony to produce a colt for the Morse's first granddaughter, born this year.

A major tie between mother and daughters has been Mrs. Morse's sewing. She's made most of their clothes, for reasons of economy and because sewing "satisfies a creative urge," and the girls prefer them to ready-mades.

Another form of relaxation for Mrs. Morse is reading. First on her list is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, then the Oregon newspapers, items in which she marks to bring to the Senator's attention.

Then when the Senator comes home late from work—which is frequently—Mrs. Morse can discuss the days' events while preparing his meal. He often misses dinner, so she has become "an expert short-order cook," she laughingly explains. Since the Morses stock their freezer with meat from their own farm, Mrs. Morse usually pops a steak or chop into her infrared broiler and slices off part of a brick of frozen vegetables for the Senator's supper. Quick trick: She sprinkles the steak with paprika (for appetizing color) before broiling it.

EUGENE IS HOME

Although the Morses have a town house in Washington, D. C., and rent part of a Maryland farm for the Senator's livestock, they consider their Eugene farm the family's home and look forward to returning there whenever congressional work permits. Two daughters attended the University of Oregon, and though the Senator resigned from the faculty (he was dean of the law school) as soon as he entered politics, the Morses still count many friends on the campus and in Eugene.

Mrs. Morse herself is a friendly person, although no extrovert. She is soft-voiced and poised in a group, and seems to be genuinely fond of and relaxed with children. She looks young for a grandmother, with her soft brown and grey hair and rosy, outdoor complexion. She is petite and feminine, and has the sweetness of a well-integrated, smooth-running, and sympathetic personality. But behind the softness there is iron self-discipline and unswerving dedication.

Has it been worth it—giving her husband and family precedence in all things and trying not to make demands on him? Mrs. Morse smiles as though that were a somewhat impertinent question and answers that she feels the Senator "is making a contribution to our time." The implication is that anything she can do to share his task is its own reward.

And then she adds that, after all, "I have long thought that WAYNE is wonderful. I thought so long before anyone else did." If others now think so, much of the credit must go to the pretty and talented schoolteacher who, with her children now grown, may emerge from the background and be recognized as a woman of stature in her own right.

Destroy Thrift and Incentive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a pertinent article that appeared in the monthly letter of the National City Bank of New York for October 1955. It points out quite vividly that confiscatory personal income tax rates work against thrift and incentives which spark the American economy. The article in question follows:

THE $64,000 QUESTION

The television program, "The $64,000 Question," the most popular on the screen today, has attracted audiences estimated as large as 55 million. It has also brought to the notice of listeners, and most emphatically to the attention of participants, the heavy cut Uncle Sam demands from the winnings of successful people.

Since the program was launched, 4 months ago, 4 persons have successfully doubled their money up to the $32,000 mark, answering questions on such varied topics as the Bible, opera, food, and baseball. Reaching $32,000, 3 of the contestants dropped out. It took the raw courage of a United States Marine, Capt. Richard McCutchen, to attempt the $64,000 question. Excusing his imprudence, he explained: "I belong to a very proud organization."

The participants have had a lot of good, free advice. Hundreds of listeners from all over the country have written or telegraphed warnings that $64,000 is not, as it might seem to be, double $32,000 but only about half again as much. The rules of the income tax supersede the laws of arithmetic. To a single person with a $4,000 income from other sources, a winning of $32,000 gets assessed an additional Federal tax of $15,400 leaving $16,600 as the actual prize. An extra $32,000 winning would get assessed a tax of $23,292, increasing the prize by no more than $8,708. Thus he is risking an assured $16,600 for a chance to win an additional $8,708.

The tax laws treat people who are married or have dependents less harshly. But our single person would need a nominal prize of $107,600 to have and keep $32,000, and a nominal prize running to $448,711 to have and keep $64,000.

Prizes before tax required to double prizes after tax

[For single person with regular income of $4,000]

Prize	Share of—	
	Tax collector	Contestant
$1,253.26	$253.26	$1,000
$2,558.75	558.75	2,000
$5,260.20	1,260.20	4,000
$11,675.47	3,675.47	8,000
$30,285.71	14,285.71	16,000
$107,600.00	75,600.00	32,000
$448,711.11	384,711.11	64,000

The program has provided a vivid illustration of the way confiscatory personal income tax rates stack the cards against risk-taking ventures. Tens of millions of listeners have seen people, because of tax considerations, decide against taking the chance of turning $32,000 into $64,000. They rebel, not unnaturally, when the internal-revenue collector claims the major slice of the pie. This strikes people instinctively as unjust.

Although less well advertised, tax rules dictate answers of "no" every day of the week to businessmen, investors, and professional men of every description. The injury is not only to the opportunities of people but also to the tax collections. Risk-taking enterprise affords the richest source of Government revenues.

In the consideration of changes in the personal income tax next year, Congress will do well to ponder the desirability of finding a schedule of rates that encourages people to go ahead. For people who feel the urge and have the talent to go ahead the real $64,000 question is what the Congress will determine to do.

Why I Like To Live in Our Town

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief essay written by Mrs. W. J. Baerg, of Fayetteville, Ark. The essay was judged best among thousands entered in a nationwide contest on the subject, Why I Like To Live in Our Town.

The town about which Mrs. Baerg has written is Fayetteville, which is also my hometown. She has been successful in summing up in a few words the feeling which all of the citizens of the community have about Fayetteville.

I know that all Senators have a similar affection for their hometowns, but I hope that in the course of the months ahead many of them will have an opportunity to visit Fayetteville which, I believe, is one of the most beautiful and most hospitable of cities.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I LIKE TO LIVE IN OUR TOWN

(By Eloise Baerg)

"So lost, so naked, and so lonely in America. Immense and cruel skies bend over us and all of us are driven on forever and we have no home." An accurate observation, I think, except for those fortunate ones who hold fast to one spot, as do the families in our town, Fayetteville, Ark. They have scooped out a place for themselves and thrown up the mountains to rim it.

Here the splendid repetition of life moves in happy rhythm. Lusty young husbands bring home their brides, sure in the knowledge that soon there will be cribs holding babies, who will grow lithe and strong as the Ozark Mountains. Our men go out to tend great brooder houses of chicks that grow into tender broilers to ride away in long trucks, or they teach at the university. Our women, quick limbed, move about their kitchens, glad they have work to do, untroubled by longings for servants. When our

young go out to explore the other side of the earth they come back and tell stories of the fabulous far places and we marvel at them and draw closer, for here in our town we have home.

Address by George Meany, President, AFL-CIO, Before the National Religion and Labor Foundation, December 13, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AFL-CIO, BEFORE THE NATIONAL RELIGION AND LABOR FOUNDATION, DECEMBER 13, 1955

In expressing my appreciation for this award today, may I also pay my respects to the National Religion and Labor Foundation for the splendid work which they are doing in bringing about mutual understanding between labor and religion on the basis of the dignity of man, as an individual creature of God, without regard for race, creed, or color.

Last Saturday, there was celebrated the seventh anniversary of the U. N. general assembly's adoption of the universal declaration of human rights. This week the American people will be—rather should be—celebrating the anniversary of the adoption of our country's Bill of Rights. The ideals of the two documents have much in common. In fact, the U. N. Charter owes much to our country's Bill of Rights.

Human rights are the first bridge and binding force between the free labor movement and religion. We, of free labor, reject and abhor Lenin's doctrine that: "Religion is the opium of the people." We also brand as sheer idiocy Lenin's dogma that "religion is a kind of spiritual vodka in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent life."

Without human rights, human progress—progress by the great mass of humanity—can at best, move only at a snail's pace. Without human rights—the right to freedom of conscience, the right to freedom of thought, expression, association and assembly, there can be no moral advancement. Without human rights, there can be no elevation but only the degradation and oppression of the individual human being.

This question of human rights is especially urgent in the present critical world situation. Today, we have a gigantic military machine fanatically dedicated to the destruction of all religion, free labor, and all human rights throughout the world. All totalitarian systems—in varying degrees—have it, as their first duty, to extirpate freedom of religion and to exterminate free labor organizations. The more total the dictatorship, the less freedom of conscience and the less free is labor. That is why Communist dictatorship—which is the most total of all totalitarianism—is the most ruthless and unrelenting foe of free labor and free religion.

This worldwide conspiracy is a vast anti-moral movement. Its philosophy is anti-moral, for with it—the end justifies any and all means. It sneers at our most cherished moral values as decadence and weakness. Its source of inspiration and ultimate goal is crude force, the power of violence, unlimited totalitarian terror over the individual who is denied all protection of law, religion, and free labor organization.

The present crisis is not only political. It is above all a moral crisis. No one can separate these features of the crisis of our times. If a democratic Russia had played as important a role in defeating Hitler, the postvictory claims and counterclaims could have been settled through the normal channels of statesmanship and diplomatic negotiations. If Russia were not a totalitarian dictatorship, a huge imperialist power with a world ambition and mission, we would not be facing today a worldwide fifth column, the international Communist conspiracy.

That is why the Communist parties are not political parties, in the democratic sense of the word. They are only national sectors of a Russian-directed world body. The military weight and material resources of the Soviet state are the base, the heart, and head of Communist activities everywhere. This brute force is combined with a phony religious fanaticism. The Soviet state and its foreign branches constitute a Godless church state. This Godless church state fights on all fronts, in all walks of life, and with any and all means. Its central aim is the extension of the present Moscow-Peiping Empire to include the entire world. In this light, the free world faces the following dangers: (1) The military power of the Moscow-Peiping axis; (2) Communist subversion within non-Communist countries—especially in colonial and underdeveloped areas. This subversion moves in various stages: Neutralization, paralysis, and full control; (3) diplomatic-commercial maneuvers.

We face three tasks in meeting these dangers: (1) To develop military forces strong enough to deter and defeat direct and indirect aggression. (2) Develop social, economic, and political superiority of democratic order through international cooperation, freedom, and social progress for colonial peoples and underdeveloped countries and through the advancement of social justice in every free country. (3) Defense of freedom and the free state against fifth column at home.

The three tasks are necessary. They are not alternatives. They are organically tied up with each other. They must go together and be applied simultaneously.

It is just as wrong to think that Communist imperialism can be defeated with arms alone as to say that it can be beaten with social reforms or social security legislation alone. We must defeat Communist imperialism, Communist ideology and Communist subversion, and not merely any one of these evils. If we win on 1 or 2 fronts and the enemy breaks through on the third, we of the free world might lose all. In addition, we must also exploit the political differences and economic difficulties within the Soviet empire. We must do nothing to ease Moscow's difficulties with the satellites. We must do nothing to help the Kremlin get over the difficulties arising from the struggle over succession to Stalin. In the diplomatic field, we should do nothing to help build up the authority of the new regime among the Soviet peoples.

We should avoid being fooled by the more flexible and more cautious tactics of a regime which is still seeking to consolidate itself and enhance its authority. In fact, the more the Khrushchev regime feels itself secure, the more harsh and frontal its attacks will become. The present Bulganin-Khrushchev tour of India and Burma is a striking example of Soviet insincerity.

Moscow has sought relaxation not as an end, but as a means to strengthen Soviet imperialism. This is proven by Russia's unchanged and uncompromising attitude to the basic causes of world tension. Moscow wants relaxation to affirm and strengthen its conquests of yesterday as a base for more Communist conquests tomorrow. Khrushchev Kaganovich and Bulganin have openly and impudently said so.

It would be wrong to think that the weakness of the free world in the face of the Communist onslaught has been only military. If it were that simple, there would be nothing to worry about. We have grave weaknesses in our social and economic armor. We have especially serious weaknesses in our moral and intellectual armor.

Too many in the free world fail to see the real nature of communism as the mortal foe of everything that we hold dear, of every moral and spiritual value. Too many in the free world are still prisoners of the illusion that communism is, historically speaking, a progressive system—extreme liberalism temporarily making bad mistakes. Actually, communism represents darkest reaction. It is an antisocial system in which there are imbedded some of the worst features of savagery, slavery, feudalism and life-sapping exploitation manifested in the industrial revolution of early-day capitalism.

Too many in the free world seem to have lost their capacity for moral indignation against the most brutal inhumanities when they are perpetrated by Communists. It is painful, but we must face the cruel facts of life. We of the democratic camp must develop a far more vigorous moral attitude. We must rekindle our capacity to cry out against, to protest against, the godless dogmas and savage crimes being perpetrated by Moscow. Such struggles and such protests are not negative actions. They are positive and constructive than a total struggle against the totalitarian cancer in the body-politic of modern society.

It is rather disturbing to me that many people in our country who call themselves liberals are stone silent about the Soviet concentration camps. They never find the time to utter a word of condemnation against the Communist imperialist destruction of the national independence and democratic rights of hundreds of millions of people in Europe and Asia. It is shocking to see the studied attempts being made by western diplomacy to tear to shreds the charter of the United Nations under the guise of the so-called package deal with Moscow and Peiping. Can it be that the free world is so weak in its moral spirit that it does not recognize this deal as appeasement of the worst kind?

I am all for a fight to the finish against racialism in our own midst. Racialism is damnable and detestable in any form. But racialism in reverse, as now propagated in India and Burma by Khrushchev and Bulganin is just as reprehensible.

And the Communist imprisonment of hundreds of thousands of hostages, so-called war prisoners, 10 years after the close of the war, in violation of every human right and international agreement, is morally reprehensible. One would expect the true liberal to cry out in protest against human beings being carted, tagged and shuttled about for weeks in railyards of Russia, as if they were carloads of coal or bags of potatoes. Not until we of the free world can give rebirth to a vibrant moral attitude, to a burning indignation against such frightful bestialities, can the freedom-loving people be sufficiently stirred to gather the moral strength for resisting and defeating the totally anti-moral dogmas and deeds of communism at home and abroad. Yes, this means above all a moral struggle against communism.

Communism is the very opposite of liberalism. Communism is the deadliest enemy of liberalism. Liberals should be the most consistent and energetic fighters against communism. Liberals must also be on guard against developing a certain type of McCarthyism of their own. They must shun

like a plague the role of being anti-anti-Communist. Only by refusing to be thus entrapped, can liberals shed every vestige of subconscious and conscious regard for communism as a movement with which they have something in common.

Much more regard must be shown by the democracies for principles—for the principles of human rights and human freedom. We must never sacrifice principles to expediency. This means being rigid in support of our principles.

Moscow is sure it has history's timetables in its pocket. Hitler once thought so too. We have nothing to fear from peaceful competition. They need our help. We do not need theirs. They have nothing that can help us. What they have can only hurt us. But what we have they want from us in order to help and save them from the follies of communism and Soviet imperialism.

We must avoid the suicidal self-deception of the popular front and united front.

No country, no people, no movement can stand aloof and be neutral in this struggle. Nehru and Tito are not neutral. They are aides and allies in fact and in effect, if not in diplomatic verbiage.

In conclusion, I cannot emphasize too strongly to you: The conflict between communism and freedom is the problem of our time. It overshadows all other problems. This conflict mirrors our age, its toils, its tensions, its troubles and its tasks. On the outcome of this conflict, depends the future of all mankind. I pray that, on the threshhold of the atomic age, we of the free world can muster the moral courage and total strength to preserve the peace and promote the freedom of the men and women of every continent, color, and creed.

Cardinal Mindszenty Held as Red Indictment by the Honorable Michael H. Prendergast, New York State Democratic Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks of the Honorable Michael H. Prendergast at the Cardinal Mindszenty rally, sponsored by the Hungarian Catholic League, in New York City, on Monday, December 26, 1955:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE MICHAEL H. PRENDERGAST, DEMOCRATIC STATE CHAIRMAN, AT THE CARDINAL MINDSZENTY RALLY, SPONSORED BY THE HUNGARIAN CATHOLIC LEAGUE, IN THE WHITE HALL OF ST. STEPHEN OF HUNGARY CHURCH, 414 EAST 82D STREET, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 26

I am deeply honored to have this opportunity to speak today, in communion with the millions of freedom-loving peoples all over the world, who are with us in spirit—as we pay our respects and our tribute to Cardinal Mindszenty.

It is fitting that we meet for this solemn occasion in the church which bears the revered name of Hungary's patron saint. And it is fitting, also, that we should be meeting in the same hall, and speaking from the same platform from which the Cardinal himself gave such an inspiring address during his last visit to New York in 1947, at which time I had the great privilege of meeting him.

On December 27th, 2 days after Christmas in 1948, the Iron Curtain came down on the life and works of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. But his spirit lives on in the hearts and minds of all of us as we join together to renew our protests and proclaim our indignation once more over the tragic and outrageous course of events which befell this courageous and valiant prelate under mankind's most dreaded disease—communism.

We come here on the seventh anniversary of the Cardinal's incarceration with determination and deep abiding faith that such tyranny will not prevail. The people of Hungary, and all the oppressed, captive peoples of Eastern Europe, will once again know the freedom Cardinal Mindszenty fought so courageously to defend.

We who have lived most of our lives in a democracy, where the sacred rights of religion and all man's other freedoms are paramount in our Government, find it difficult to comprehend the tragic drama now being enacted behind the Iron Curtain. We can only begin to imagine the agony of Cardinal Mindszenty, and the other members of the clergy and the faithful who are engaged in a life-and-death struggle against atheistic communism.

But realize it we must, if we are to help our enslaved brethren throw off the yoke of Communist slavery, and preserve the hard-won liberties for which freedom-loving peoples fought and died down through the centuries.

Cardinal Mindszenty stands as a symbol of faith—not only for the Church of Hungary and its more than 7 million Catholics, but for moral-thinking people of every religion and every walk of life all over the world. His steadfast devotion to his beliefs, and his valiant fight to preserve his and the Hungarian people's inalienable and God-given right to practice those beliefs, have etched him a place in history, and won him the everlasting devotion of freemen everywhere.

By his own supreme sacrifice he has awakened the world to the dangers of communism in all its horror and ruthlessness. He has opened our eyes—as never before—to the full meaning of Communist oppression and its ultimate goals—the debasement of religion, faith, and the dignity of man. He is living proof of the fate of any nation that comes under the Communist heel, but more important, he is a glowing symbol of faith in salvation and the ultimate victory of freedom over tyranny.

The Hungarian primate has become, in effect, the Communists' albatross. When the Communists condemned Cardinal Mindszenty they created a martyr, and brought upon themselves the anger and indignation of people both in and outside their satellite nations. Their totalitarian mock trial and reign of terror and intimidation against the cardinal served to do what they most feared—it lifted the Iron Curtain—and gave the people a close look at Communist persecution and subversion.

Our Holy Father pointed out, in an address before the College of Cardinals in February of 1949, right after the cardinal's sentencing: "In all this matter one thing alone stands out clearly, the principal object of the trial was to disrupt the Catholic Church in Hungary and precisely for the purpose set forth in sacred Scripture: 'I shall strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be dispersed.'"

The Soviet commanders followed the traditional party-line methods in attacking the Church of Hungary. In a rapid succession of events, starting in 1946, the Communists attacked the clergy, and progressively stripped the church of her schools, her press, and her religious institutions.

But the Communists didn't take into consideration in their devious schemes—the shepherd who wouldn't abandon his flock—the great and good Cardinal Mindszenty. And they were blind to what the Holy Father so well described as "the tenacious faith of the Catholics of Hungary, who are doing all they can, though faced with serious obstacles and difficulties, to defend their old religion and keep alive and fresh the glorious tradition of their ancestors."

The Communists will never be able to understand the great strength of spiritual weapons which cannot be purged or imprisoned behind an iron curtain. "The church," said one Communist contemptuously, "is brought to its knees." Father Robert A. Graham writing in a recent article in the June 4 issue of America answers that contempt so well that I would like to repeat some of it now:

Referring to the church, Father Graham says, "* * * it is on her knees that she implores the divine strength to endure the passing cruelty of tyrants. It is for us fellow Catholics and fellow believers in the free world to join our prayers and penances with the supplications and sufferings of the faithful in the Church of Silence."

Cardinal Mindszenty is a vital link in that church of silence behind the Iron Curtain.

Communism's real irony is that it is the source of its own destruction. In their very designs to dismantle the Hungarian primate, and disrupt the faith of the Hungarian people, the Red tyrants succeeded in laying the groundwork for their own inevitable destruction.

The Mindszenty persecution aroused public opinion throughout the entire democratic world. All over Italy protest gatherings were held. In Milan 5,000 Catholics bitterly fought the Communists who tried to break up their demonstration. In Paris 30,000 people of all faiths and all political beliefs conducted a mass protest meeting, and the French Government officially expressed its deep emotion. London's Albert Hall was filled to capacity by over 6,000 Britons, while 25,000 more waited outside in the rain, as speaker after speaker renounced the Mindszenty trial. In Rio de Janeiro 250,000 people gathered in the streets in demonstration. President Harry S. Truman called the trial "infamous," and said it had been conducted by a kangaroo court. The United States House of Representatives unanimously asked for U. N. action against Hungary.

In their panic over the harmful repercussions of the travesty of justice, Communist turned against Communist to eliminate all who could be blamed. Those liquidated included the three Ministers of Interior—all key witnesses against the cardinal—the secret-police agents who participated in his arrest—the Minister of Justice at the time of the trial—and all the interrogators of Mindszenty at the time of his arrest.

Perhaps the greatest indication of Communist fear over the boomerang of the Mindszenty case was the announcement this July from Budapest of the so-called interruption of the cardinal's life sentence. The Hungarian Government's announcement did not refer to the cardinal as cardinal, much less as archbishop. It did not even divulge the place where he was to live under what amounted to house arrest. As the Vatican paper said at the time: "* * * the innocence of the primate of Hungary has not been established, his freedom has not been restored, and the rights of the church have not been recognized." The free world could only view the empty Red gesture as a hoax, designed to mislead the critics of Red rule in Hungary and to offset adverse world opinion at the time of the Geneva summit conference.

No one was deluded by the transparent Communist scheme. No one will ever forget the brutality endured by Cardinal Mindszenty and his church at the hands of the Communists. For 39 terrible days between the time of his arrest and trial, the Hungarian primate was subjected to that special brand of brainwashing and torture Communists employ to force a confession. A so-called people's court, from which the people were barred, went through the motions of a mock trial and condemned the cardinal to life imprisonment.

The arrest of the cardinal during the Christmas festival revealed most clearly the fundamental materialist creed of communism in which neither Christian festival nor Christian faith has a place.

From the beginning of his incarceration, throughout the 7 long years he has been a prisoner of communism, Cardinal Mindszenty has never wavered in his defiance of the Red demagogs.

Beginning in 1953, the Hungarian Red leaders offered to release the cardinal if he would promise to leave Hungary. They later modified their terms and offered to free him on several repugnant conditions: that he renounce the Vatican; abdicate as primate and go into village exile as an ordinary priest; not issue any uncensored statements concerning his imprisonment; and personally express desire for clemency.

"I have my own conditions," the cardinal told them, "not those you put before me."

This was in keeping with the Mindszenty tradition.

Throughout his lifetime the cardinal had long been recognized as an unyielding foe of tyranny—first against the rise of nazism and later in the fight against communism. He could have escaped long before his trial in 1948, if he had wanted to surrender his principles. Time and time again, when it was suggested he leave Hungary, he refused because he wanted to stay home with his people. "We are in a period of storms and disturbances," he once said, "but the Hungarian church has outlasted the storms of centuries. She is under the protective wing of God."

Early in his childhood Cardinal Mindszenty had learned stories from his mother of the holy King Stephen whose crown remains one of Hungary's most sacred treasures. Just as that holy crown—still safe from Communist hands—remains a symbol of Catholic unity in Hungary so, too, does the servant of God—Cardinal Mindszenty.

He lived by what he believed, and for that he was persecuted. His only crime was his refusal to deny his God and his principles. Those who threaten any religion threaten all religions. The lesson we must learn from the Mindszenty case is that no one can be really free so long as any people anywhere in the world are forced to live in slavery.

The Communist war on religion, with all of its traditional contempt for justice and freedom, is attempting to bring about a society of class justice which is not justice at all. It strikes at the very heart of all our fundamental human rights, and threatens the whole concept of democracy.

The free world can never find peace or security until the Soviet Union liberates its captive satellite nations and allows truly free elections. Self-determination in Germany and Eastern Europe is an essential condition of peace. Since peace cannot exist without freedom, none of us will be secure until the people of Hungary and all the other captive peoples of Europe regain their independence.

As the Governor of our State, Averell Harriman, said recently at a memorial dinner commemorating the 10th anniversary of the last free election in Hungary:

"It is more important than ever that we demand, and that we continue to demand, that the Soviet Union adhere to the principle of true self-determination for the peoples of Central and Eastern Europe. It is also more important that ever that we strengthen, not weaken, our mutual defense, and that we accelerate, not relax, our efforts to help build up the economic strength and unity of purpose for the whole free world."

Hungary has a proud tradition of freedom and long history of glorious battles for its national independence. Until Hungary itself was invaded by Hitler in 1944, she willingly and anxiously gave asylum to hundreds of thousands fleeing from Nazi persecution.

The Hungarian people continue now to carry on their valiant fight against the Communist onslaught. Remember the local and national elections 10 years ago when the brave people of your country represented by the Small Holders Party— the peasant party—set an example for all the democracies of the world—by defying Soviet occupying authorities and electing the anti-Communists to power. The flame of freedom burned brightly in Kossuth Square—and people everywhere took pride in the courage of the Hungarian people.

The Soviet authorities have been trying to extinguish that flame ever since, but they never will. They may be able to dictate elections by sheer force, and they certainly know all the techniques of subversion and militaristic domination, but they will never be able to kill the spirit of the Hungarian people.

I feel deeply privileged, indeed, to have had some small connection with these valiant people behind the Iron Curtain as part of my activities for the Catholic War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

For some 9 years I lived the problem of displaced persons and Communist tyranny, and saw at first hand the courageous spirit of the Hungarian people. I can tell you it was an experience I shall never forget. War Relief Services was charged with bringing into this country for resettlement almost 50 percent of the total immigrants brought in under the special immigration bill between 1948 and 1949. Our agency was able to contribute substantial sums of money for the aid of the Hungarian clergy. In addition, we distributed hundreds of thousands of pounds of food, clothing, and medicine to the people of Hungary, under another great servant of the church, who now carries on similar work in Austria—the Reverend Fabian Flynn.

I was privileged to have been able to serve as the director of this particular project until, as you know, we were eventually driven from Hungary by the Communists, and forced to terminate our programs there.

The Catholic War Relief Services continues, nevertheless, to provide aid for the Hungarian people who have managed to escape from behind the Iron Curtain, and are living in various communities throughout Europe.

One of my fondest treasures is a medal presented to me jointly by the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Hungary and by the members of the anti-Communist Hungarian Government for my small part in this work. What little we were able to accomplish will always remain one of my greatest sources of satisfaction.

I want to say publicly now, that I intend to use every political influence at my command to insure the expansion and improvement of war-relief programs. I am deeply concerned with the present injustices and discriminatory provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act passed in 1952. The national origins quota system which unfairly favors some nations at the expense of others should be changed. Under the quota system now in force some 77 percent of the annual total of 154,657 immigrants permitted under the McCarran-Walter Act, is allotted to 5 nations, while 80 other countries must share in the remaining 23 percent.

Also, we must immediately concern ourselves with the problem of revising the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 in order to make it a functioning, meaningful program. There is nothing more heart-rendering than the sight of a refugee camp. We cannot encourage people to take flight from behind the Iron Curtain, and then turn around and close our door in their faces once they have escaped.

In 1953 Congress passed the Refugee Relief Act, providing for the admission of 214,000 refugees over a 3-year period, as a supplement to the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952. To date enforcement has bogged down, and the stringent eligibility and security provisions of the Relief Act have seriously curtailed admissions.

We must rescue these programs and make them the best we possibly can.

And by so doing, I firmly believe we will be doing our own Nation a great service. Our country has grown and thrived by welcoming freedom-loving peoples to its shores, and we shall continue to grow and thrive so long as we carry on this great democratic tradition.

The people of Hungary look back upon a thousand years of culture and independence. They have made great contributions to the vitality and diversity of American life—and we are indeed in their debt.

The beautiful Church of St. Emeric, on New York City's lower East Side, was founded on January 1, 1949, by his eminence, Cardinal Spellman, in honor of Cardinal Mindszenty and the plight of Hungarian Catholics. It was a tribute from Cardinal Spellman, who has taken deeply to heart the sorrow of Hungary and its imprisoned primate. His eminence named as the first pastor of this new parish in the great diocese of New York—one of the most humble and respected men of God—the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Vincent J. Brosnan.

A statute of Louis Kossuth—that heroic fighter for Hungarian liberty—stands on Riverside Drive right here in New York City—to remind us of Hungary's continuing battle for independence.

Hungary has given the world such great musicians as Franz Liszt, Bela Bartok, and Franz Lehar.

She has given us great poets and famous authors like Franz Molnar—whose writings have enriched us all.

The Hungarian nation has contributed to science such world famed atomic physicists as John Newman, Eugene Wigner, and Eduard Teller.

The list is long and rich with talent and greatness. And it is headed by the humble servant of God we meet to honor today.

It is fitting that I close my remarks on the occasion of this solemn commemoration with the same prayer with which the beloved Cardinal Mindszenty ended his final plea for justice on the date of his sentencing in 1949:

"God give us peace in these days, not merely in the future, but in these days * * * I ask this peace for my church, the love of which is constantly with me, for the Hungarian state to which I have shown my obedience, and for my own soul."

The case of Cardinal Mindszenty is not closed. He stands as a living indictment of Communist regime everywhere.

The road to freedom in Hungary, as elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, for Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, is yet a long one. Our continuing indignation, our steadfast determination to right the Communist wrongs, and our loyal devotion to the principles of God-fearing men may someday soon, with the help of God, restore the worldwide peace and sanctity for which Cardinal Mindszenty made his greatest sacrifice.

Thank you, and God bless you.

Reds Steal United States Tactics in Cold War, Prelate Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article from the Washington Evening Star, dated Monday, January 2, made by the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington:

REDS STEAL UNITED STATES TACTICS IN COLD WAR, PRELATE SAYS

An "agonizing reappraisal" of American policy and tactics in the cold war against communism is necessary, the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle said yesterday.

"They (Communists) utter their lies bluntly and fearlessly while we leave the truth muted and gaged," he declared in a sermon in St. Matthew's Cathedral.

Because we have "conceived the struggle too narrowly," we "talk in terms of material wealth and military power while our opponents monopolize slogans of justice, peace, and equality," the spiritual leader of Washington area Catholics said.

"And therein lies the secret of our frustration today," he continued. "We are outmaneuvered and outgunned in the very area where our strength should be the greatest. By default, we have permitted the enemy to use our choicest weapons."

APPEAL TO IDEALISTS

Archbishop O'Boyle warned of the continuing appeal of communism to the idealists.

"We must remember that the appeal of communism is not only to the disgruntled, the bitter, and the neurotic members of a community," he said. "It has been able to convince some men of sensitive natures and of high ideals."

He recalled the shock with which the free world learned of the defections of learned men in Canada, Great Britain, Australia, and the United States when Red spy rings were uncovered.

"These men were scientists, university professors, and others of real standing in their communities," the prelate said.

INTELLECTUALS UNDERESTIMATED

"The process of winning over misguided idealists still continues. And it is far more dangerous to the security of the world than most of us realize. Our country is inclined to underestimate the power of the intellectual.

"We call such persons eggheads, or ivory-tower professors. But in the brains of such scientists was born the fearful weapons of modern war—the ultimate weapons of fisson and fusion."

The archbishop warned that this country is engaging in a "form of pretense" by building powerful military machines, spending millions for propaganda, and, "at the same time, we are strangely quiet about the purpose of all these activities * * * as if it were not proper to mention the subject of communism in polite company."

PUSSYFOOTING DECRIED

"Pussyfooting on such issues plays directly into the hands of the enemy," he declared.

Moral rearmament by the free world is necessary, Archbishop O'Boyle said.

"If we ask the uncommitted peoples of the world to choose between our way of life and life under communism, we must be sure that we can stand the comparison. It is easy to say that the Communists are out-and-materialists, and that we honor God and respect our fellowman. But are we prepared to prove our point?

"Unfortunately, the answer is that many people think that there is little choice between the two systems."

The sermon was delivered during the nationwide observance of a Day of Reparation by American Catholics. Special prayers were offered in all Catholic churches for Christians, Jews, Hindus, Moslems, and other persons behind the Iron Curtain who are being persecuted for their religious beliefs.

Views of Senator Wiley on State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I listened today to the state of the Union message of the President of the United States, I felt for Dwight D. Eisenhower a deeper sense of gratitude for the immeasurable service he has given our country, and a renewal of my profound respect for him as our national and world leader.

I am confident that with him at the helm of our Nation, progress toward our domestic and foreign goals will continue evenly and effectively.

The message is a reflection of the dynamic spirit of President Eisenhower. As I have supported him in the past, so do I now again pledge my wholehearted and continued support to the President, and to the praiseworthy and constructive measures highlighted in the state of the Union address.

Facing the United States Congress, there are additional measures that will affect millions of Americans. I refer to such important issues as the battle against decontrolling of natural gas, the battle for completion of the St. Lawrence seaway, and others.

In a New Year's speech over Wisconsin radio stations, I had previously dealt with these significant matters. I feel that it would be useful, at this time, to bring these remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

I am pleased to point out that there is broad general agreement between the points I had presented in my talk and those set forth by the President today.

I request unanimous consent to have my New Year's speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY ANNOUNCES 20-POINT PROGRAM FOR 2D SESSION, 84TH CONGRESS—EMPHASIZES NEED FOR MAINTAINING UNITED STATES PROSPERITY AT PEAK LEVEL, THROUGH AN EXPANDING PEACEFUL ECONOMY

(Radio address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations on New Year's Day, 1956)

I am glad once more to speak to you through the courtesy of this station.

I would like to share with you some observations regarding Wisconsin's and America's bright future.

It is particularly appropriate to take stock of our national situation, as we head to what we believe will be a wonderful, peaceful, and prosperous 1956—with all its priceless abundance.

I am not simply referring to the great material resources which are ours—our wealth, our comforts, and conveniences. Rather, I refer principally to our spiritual blessings—the blessings from the source of all good, blessings which we enjoy as children of the all-knowing, all-seeing, all-present Creator. Yes; I refer to the heritage which the Wayshower said is ours—yours and mine—the Wayshower who came in order that we might "have life and have it more abundantly."

Let's look now at the overall picture in Wisconsin and in all America for 1956.

We will look, for example, at the prospects for peace. Then, we will turn to such varied subjects as roads, social security, taxes, housing, labor, agriculture, population, and the presidential elections of 1956.

FOUR GOALS: OUR GREATEST GOAL, PEACE

Question. First off, Senator, what would you say should be our principal aims for the New Year?

Answer. I believe that our aims as a people should be these:

First, to keep our country at peace.

Peace—no big wars, no little wars. Atoms for Peace and not for war.

But peace, how? How can we maintain and keep it?

Peace, through vigilance, against an atomic Pearl Harbor. That means vigilance against communism's plans to enslave the world.

Peace through strength, through a powerful modern defense, an Army, Navy, and Air Force, second to none, a guided missile and nuclear program superior to Russia's program. Such strength can serve as a continued deterrent to war.

How else, can we maintain peace?

Through understanding, understanding of historic differences, understanding the arguments among the nations and seeking to ease and erase them, seeking to remove frictions between ourselves and the peoples of Europe and Asia and Latin America.

And, lastly, we seek peace, through determination, through courage and God-given ingenuity, so as to banish bloodshed forever, if at all possible.

Preserving our freedom from attack

Question. That is our first objective, Senator. Now how about the second?

Answer. Secondly, our aim must be of course to preserve our heritage of freedom.

Nothing must imperil our traditional liberties, our freedoms of speech, press, assembly, worship, our freedom to own property, freedom to choose jobs, freedom to take our chances under the profit system. Nothing, neither big government nor big anything else must regiment us Americans.

Our civil, economic and political rights, the rights of majority and minority, must be preserved, from all harm, from any quarter.

Maintaining and expanding our prosperity

Question. What should be our third objective?

Answer. Our third great objective must, of course, be to maintain our country's prosperity.

I need not tell you in detail, that fortunately, we are today enjoying the greatest national income which we have ever known, almost $330 billion per year. Sixty-five million Americans are fortunately employed. One-third of our workers are women. Our Nation's salaries, dividends and bonuses are at peak levels. We want to continue to enjoy this great prosperity and to expand it. We want to continue to have a sound, stable dollar, not a cheap, inflated, worthless dollar. We want a healthy, growing economy.

As a matter of fact, we must do so, in order to pay off our heavy national debt, as well as our personal and corporate debt. More than 23 million families owe payments on installment plans. That means that they must have continued, high income to pay off their obligations. Prosperity, therefore, is not a luxury, it is a necessity for all of us.

We cannot afford a recession. And we will not have a recession.

Fraternal bonds between all Americans

Question. And our fourth need, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Our fourth vital goal, while enjoying these three other goals, while keeping the peace, while maintaining freedom, while expanding our prosperity, is to increase the actual happiness of all of our people, the peace of mind, the feeling of friendship and well-being.

That means more than simply increasing our national wealth. It means continuing warm, fraternal bonds of cooperation and mutual respect in our land. It means avoiding class warfare, keeping labor and management together, as a working team. It means cutting down on frictions between North and South and other regions of our country, as well as between racial, religious, and minority groups. This, too, is a worthy goal, especially in the time of the birthday of the Nazarene.

A. F. of L.-CIO merger welcome

Question. Well, speaking of cooperation, How does the new A. F. of L.-CIO merger affect that situation, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Well, the big merger of the formerly rival organizations is now an accomplished fact.

It brings together 15 million organized workers, out of the total of 17 million such workers and out of our 65 million labor force.

The merger of A. F. of L.-CIO can be a great force for good. It can open a new era of responsible, efficient, unionism. That means sensible, orderly, collective bargaining. The merger can strike important blows at any racketeering influences. It can help end the senseless and often bitter jurisdictional squabbles which have cost labor and have cost the public dearly.

And so, we are looking forward to good things from the merged organizations. We are hoping, of course, that minority rights—political rights, economic rights, will be fully respected by it. Each laboring man must remain absolutely free in his political choices. No one must attempt to dictate to him what he does inside the ballot booth.

Badger State's bright outlook

Question. Well, Senator, those are four splendid objectives for 1956.

Now, how does the outlook for Wisconsin look to you?

Answer. I would say that the outlook is excellent.

Our own State has of course shared in America's great prosperity. In many respects, we are actually doing far better than a great many other States.

Of course, the farm segment of Wisconsin's population has been having its difficulties, serious difficulties. I want to refer to that situation a little bit more later on.

But, in most other phases of our State's economy—in industry, especially manufacturing, in distribution, in consumption—Wisconsin has enjoyed and will continue to enjoy peak records.

Our State's population, which is now at the 3½ million mark, is headed for further increases. By 1965, there will be 4,100,000 people in Wisconsin.

In America as a whole, we are going to have 190 million citizens. That means 28 million more than we have now. That in turn means a vastly expanded market—increased demand for goods, throughout the 48 States and, in particular, in our own State.

Question. Senator, that leads us into what you propose to do for the State of Wisconsin and for our country as a whole during the next legislative year, opening in January.

What legislation, for example, will you be offering?

Completing seaway, social security, and roads

Answer. Well, it will be my purpose in this 2d session to try to secure the enactment of the numerous important bills which I introduced in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955. I will, moreover, be carrying forward overall policies for which I have been striving since I first came to the Senate in 1939—policies aimed at the goals of peace, freedom, prosperity, and cooperation.

Now, let me spell out exactly how I hope to achieve all this.

First of all, of course, it must mean passing the Wiley bill to complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. This bill will authorize deepening the connecting channels west of Lake Erie. This is by far the single most important bill affecting the State of Wisconsin in this Congress.

Secondly, I will once more resume the fight to improve the Nation's social security system. That means liberalizing pension benefits, particularly for elderly women. I want them to become eligible to receive their modest old-age pensions at the age of 60, instead of waiting and waiting until the age of 65.

Thirdly, another item on my legislative program is to make sure that this time Congress definitely enacts legislation for Federal improvements of our highway system. As we all know, the Nation's roads are choked with traffic. This universal traffic jam is costing us fortunes in terms of increased costs of distribution, in terms of highway accidents, and many other direct and indirect costs.

Opposing natural-gas rate increase

Question. I know, Senator, that one of the major items on your program is to oppose one particular bill, which you feel could be very damaging to the interest of Wisconsin—the natural gas rate bill.

Answer. That is exactly right.

One of the early bills which will probably be coming up is the so-called Harris bill. This dangerous bill could result in a third of a billion dollar increase in the already high gas rates which Wisconsin and 30 million other consumers pay for the fuel which is used in homes, offices, and factories.

This gas rate increase bill would very unfairly cancel out a decision of the United States Supreme Court. The Court had rightly held that gas rates should be—I repeat—should be subject to Federal control. Naturally I oppose very strongly the bill which would decontrol rates, and thus leave the consumer helpless and defenseless.

Fifth plan: Specific planks in farm program

Question. Senator, earlier you referred to the problem of Wisconsin agriculture. Would you tell us about some of the planks in your farm program?

Answer. I am glad to. I will just list them briefly, because time unfortunately is limited. The following are planks to halt the dangerous downward spiral in United States agriculture.

First, I propose that dairying be treated as a basic commodity, alongside the six so-called other "basic commodities," like wheat, corn, tobacco, and cotton.

Second, I propose that the dairyman have a minimum floor on his prices, just as the laboring man gets a minimum wage. That means the dairyman must get his cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

Third, dairy research should be strengthened, through a bill such as the Wiley bill for establishing a dairy research laboratory at Madison. That means finding new uses for milk and milk by-products.

Fourth, we have to step up our program of constructive use of the Nation's dairy surpluses. That means using dairy products for the needy folks in America. Moreover, to the extent that the supply is available, we should use the surplus to help relieve need among the hungry and starving people abroad.

Fifth, we've got to step up the consumption of dairy products right here at home. That means increased education of the American people on the value of eating wholesome, nutritious milk, cheese, ice cream, butter, and nonfat milk solids. It means making more dairy vending machines available. It means improved advertising, public relations and food recipe programs, to spread the dairy habit.

Sixth, we have got to increase the amount of milk which is used under the Nation's school-lunch program so as to feed our children's growing bodies with more milk.

Seventh, we must strengthen the battle against livestock and other diseases, which already cost the American dairy farmer so much.

Eighth, we must make sure that acreage is not diverted from other agricultural production into dairying. Why? Because that would only complicate our existing dairy problems, and make for a still more serious surplus.

Ninth, improve soil conservation through some such proposal as the soil bank.

Tenth, strengthen dairy production and marketing cooperatives.

These, then, are 10 points in my agricultural program. But please remember, folks, they are designed not simply to help the farmers, but to help our city people as well. That means making sure that the farmers can buy what the city people want to sell. It means, moreover, healthy bodies for 165 million Americans, consuming dairy products.

THREE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PHASES

Question. Senator WILEY, thus far, in our program, you've discussed 5 points in your plan for the 2d session of the 84th Congress, including 10 specific planks in your farm program.

In the time remaining to us, would you run down the list of the many other points which you are proposing on behalf of the people of Wisconsin and of our Nation?

Answer. Yes, indeed.

My sixth point is to strengthen the Nation's antitrust laws. Right now, those laws, which are designed to protect small enterprise—meaning 4 million small businesses—against monopoly, these laws are confusing and vague.

I personally have the privilege of serving on the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. And I am hoping that we will be able to come up with many specific recommendations to improve these antitrust laws. (Right now, I might point out, we are looking at America's automobile industry which is, of course, a mainstay of our economy.)

Next, one of the most important things we in Congress can do, relates to another subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee on which I serve. That is the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. Thus, I want us to come up with action on the Wiley bill, or similar legislation, to help curb the widespread crime which is committed by the Nation's youngsters. We must help prevent the crime, before it occurs in the first place, and/or help to rehabilitate the youngsters if they once get into trouble.

Question. That brings us down to the eighth point in your program, Senator.

Is it another point stemming out of your service as senior Republican on the Judiciary Committee?

Answer. That's right. You know, one of the important functions which I fulfill on the Judiciary Committee relates to its work in the field of combatting subversion. That means combatting the Communist enemy. So, I have offered numerous bills to

strengthen the Nation's antisedition laws. I am hoping that we will be able to close up some of the present loopholes in antisubversion statutes during the next session.

Question. Thus far, Senator, you have referred to the St. Lawrence seaway, social security, roads, opposition to natural gas rate increases, antimonopoly, antijuvenile delinquency, and antisubversion.

What is next on your program?

Answer. Here are some additional points.

Veterans, schools, health, reserve

9. We should pass veterans survivors' benefits legislation, so as to improve the position of the survivors of America's veterans, especially during this period of high cost of living. A bill for that purpose has already passed the House of Representatives, and is now passing the Senate.

10. The needs of the Nation's overcrowded schools must stand high in our priority list for the next session.

11. America's hospitals, particularly in rural areas, need both improvement and expansion. In addition, there is a clear need for stepping up medical research, so as to banish the illnesses which still take such a tragic toll among our people.

12. Congress needs to take another look at the Nation's Reserve program. Last year, we enacted an important new Reserve law, but already there are serious complaints to the effect that the law is not working out nearly as well as we might have hoped. Reserve units in many instances are mere skeletons, and Reserve obligations are still falling somewhat unfairly. We Americans want to be fair, and we want to be effective in the Reserve program. That is part of our efforts for vigilance against communism.

Question. That is an even dozen recommendations, so far, Senator. How about other points in your program?

Answer. Here they are:

Outdoors, housing, distress, disaster

The 13th point is to strengthen our Nation's outdoor heritage, step up the battle against water pollution, protect our national parks, forests, and monuments against danger from any quarter.

14. Strengthen America's housing. Fortunately, 3 out of every 5 of our people already own their homes, but millions of homes are obsolete and could stand repair or replacement, if sound credit is available. We're building 1¼ million new homes this year. That is still only a drop in the bucket compared to our unfulfilled housing needs.

15. Relieve distress in critical unemployment areas. Why? Because, in spite of widespread prosperity, there is still need in isolated "pockets" of our country, in individual communities where unemployment is high, unfortunately.

16. Explore disaster insurance plans, so as to help reduce the cost of natural disaster—flood, hurricane, tornado—if they should happen to strike.

Shipping, anticrime, labor, tax changes

Question. Any more points, Senator, in your program?

Answer. Yes, indeed.

17. Strengthen Great Lakes shipping, provide for restoration of package freight service on the lakes, deepen and improve Great Lakes harbors, so as to accommodate deeper draft shipping through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

18. Pass long-pending anticrime bills, measures to combat tax evasion by gangsters, together with antigambling bills, such as were recommended by our Senate Crime Committee.

19. Remove inequities in the Nation's labor-management laws, inequities on which labor and management, in many instances, both agree, and

20. Last but not least—revise the Nation's tax laws. Remove tax injustices. Take a new look at the nuisance excise taxes, the so-called sales taxes on individual purchases, provide additional relief for low income brackets, providing we can balance the budget.

Give the taxpayer a break, particularly by continuing the all-out battle against governmental waste and inefficiency. That's about it. Of course, if time permitted, I could add numerous other points in my proposed program for 1956.

The political situation

Question. Well, Senator WILEY, you have certainly provided a great deal of food for thought in these 20 recommendations. I know that the people of Wisconsin will be following closely your work on each of these fronts.

Now, how do you feel about the political situation as it shapes up in 1956?

Answer. Well, we of Wisconsin are of course looking forward to the April 3 date of the preferential primary for the presidency. The closing date for filing for the primary is March 2.

It is still too early, of course, to be very sure as to what the picture will look like, in either the Republican or Democratic races. But I do want you to know this: irrespective of the April presidential primary, and the September primary for the congressional races, we in public office all have an important job to do—in every single one of the 11 months of 1956 preceding the November election.

In other words, the American people don't want men in public office to be talking and playing politics all the time. The people expect, and are entitled to, constructive action immediately—on issues like roads, social security, tax revenue, schools, health, housing, the seaway, and the various other subjects which I have mentioned.

That will certainly be my aim—to provide such constructive action.

Question. I know, Senator, that this constructive note will be well received by the people of Wisconsin.

CONCLUSION

Answer. Yes; I think we should all remember the old song about "accentuating the positive." That means emphasizing the constructive, not the negative. Why? Because there is too much of a tendency these days to talk negatively about individual personalities or to take a gloomy look about possible troubles on the national or international scene.

To the contrary, we as a people have so much to be thankful for, we have so bright a future in store for us, that we should certainly look forward to the future with faith and optimism. In that way, we will be better able to meet the problems up ahead.

Southern Forestry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on October 3, 1955, I had the honor of delivering the keynote address at the 80th anniversary meeting of the American Forestry Association, in Jacksonville, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN FORESTRY: AN INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION WITH ROOTS

(Keynote address of United States Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida)

I was delighted when the American Forestry Association invited me to speak at this great convention. Naturally I have wondered just how I might contribute something to the success of this meeting. I am conscious of the fact that many of you have come here from distant States. Accordingly, every minute of your stay here should be both interesting and profitable. I am hoping that my part of the program may not be a roadblock in this connection.

First of all, as one born and bred in the Sunshine State, one of the fastest timber growing States in the Union, I welcome you to Florida and to the South—a region of fast-timber-growing States.

I think you came to the right place for this meeting. Here in Florida, the second largest State east of the Mississippi, you have all the elements to please the heart and mind of any forestry-conscious individual. Ponce de Leon, the Spaniard, aptly described this State in the year 1513, nearly 4½ centuries ago, and gave Florida her name. Here's what his ship's log, in an ancient English translation, contains by way of description:

"They steered then along ye coaste for the purpose of seekying a haven and this same nyghte they saw lande nearbye at eighte fathom water; which they supposed to be an ilande and straitwaye named it Florida, on account of the marvelous viewe which met their eyes of beautiful Orchardes, Plantes, level gardens and animal kynde; and then as Jean Ponce nowe allsoe discovered the daye to bee ('Pascua Florida,' Easter) Sunday, he determined for those twoo reasons to give this name to ye lande."

And it was here in Florida that one of our first Federal ventures into the field of forest management took place. I quote from Ovid Butler's American Conservation in Picture and in Story an item relating to the administration of President John Quincy Adams 130 years ago:

"Seapower in President Adams' day meant wooden ships and he foresaw that maintenance of a strong United States Navy depended upon a permanent supply of proper timber. One of his first acts upon becoming President was to establish a naval station in the live oak region of Pensacola, Fla. At the same time he had a reconnaissance made of the live oak supply along the coasts of Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina. The depleted conditions reported prompted him to initiate a project for the growing of live oak for naval timbers. To this end he withdrew 80,000 acres on Santa Rosa Island, across the bay from the new Pensacola Naval Station, and in December 1828 work began on this, the first Federal venture into the field of forest management."

You probably are wondering why I take this time to mention this bit of the history of conservation. On the Federal Archives Building in Washington is this saying, "What is past is prolog." It is my concern and I know that it is yours, too, that we learn well from the past in order to chart a wise course for the future. Here in the South we are building in forestry, in part at least, on the basis of our knowledge of past conditions and events.

My office within the past month has received an attractive bulletin called Native Land published by the National Association of Manufacturers. I commend to you its reading. It has much in it about forestry. In addition it points out that conservation—or rather lack of conservation—influenced the course of empires long before our country was established. I quote from it as follows:

"Trace the course of civilization westward from what historians call the Cradle of Civilization—the area through which the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers flow in Asia Minor. The way is marked by the remnants of the

glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome and Babylon and Persia and empires that flourished long before even these.

"You come upon areas where you find olive and wine presses, wrecked by time and weather. But you search the horizon in vain for a single olive tree or vineyard. Great cisterns still collect the water that falls from the skies. Meantime, stretching out for as far as you can see, are deserts—man-made deserts—where there were once waving fields of grain.

"Where there were once thriving populations and rich cities you find shepherds tending underfed flocks that nibble at the sparse grass. Farmers work their worn-out, sunbaked fields against a background of crumbled colosseums and tottering temples. The Cradle of Civilization has also been the Graveyard of Empires."

Each of us learns most, of course, from his own personal experiences. I would like to tell you of some of the things I have seen right here in Florida. I was born at Bartow, 200 miles south of here, and my home has always remained there. In my lifetime I have seen two relatively old forest industries boom, decline and rise to expand again and I have seen a new forest industry start and grow strong.

The older industries to which I refer are, of course, naval stores and lumber. As most of you know the naval stores industry is one of the oldest industries in the South, and in the Nation too. One of the reasons for the settlement of Jamestown was the hope of England to develop a source of naval stores. As early as the turn of this century it was believed that the gum naval stores industry was doomed because the big pine trees which were needed for the crude methods of gum collection in chopped out "boxes" were becoming scarce. Through research new methods were devised; first a cup and gutter system supplanted the old chopped box, and more recently a system of bark chipping, using acid and doubleheaded nails, has given the naval stores industry a new lease on life by making profitable use of second growth pines. Florida is now exceeded only by Georgia in our naval stores production.

The other older forestry industry to which I refer is the lumber industry. Pine lumber production reached its peak in Florida in 1909. At that time 75 large sawmills accounted for 70 percent of the production. From 1936 to 1944 Florida's lumber output dropped almost half. Today about 600 sawmills, most of them small, are cutting the lumber produced in Florida but, thanks to sounder forestry practices, lumber production has gone up again.

While our pines account for the larger part of our lumber industry, we still have substantial production of cypress, some cedar; and continuing production of various hardwoods, which our State forestry department is seeking to encourage and increase.

The forest industry which is relatively new to most parts of Florida and the South is the pulp and paper industry. In 1925 the Nation produced 5 million cords of pulpwood of which less than one-fifth came from the South. In 1954 when the Nation produced 27 million cords about two-thirds of all this came from the South. Florida alone contributed almost 2 million cords. Florida now stands third among the States in capacity of her mills to produce pulp.

While all forest industries—lumber, naval stores, poles, cooperage and pulp—have shared in the South's industrial revolution it is the pulp and paper industry that has had the most pronounced effect. It has led the way in making possible our forestry industrial revolution with roots.

The pulp and paper industry has made tremendous investments in the South. It has invested not only in multimillion-dollar mills but also in lands, operations, facilities and personnel. These big mills are not easily moved; they are permanent investments—they are here to stay.

What brought about the great movement of pulpmills into the South and their recent expansion? In addition to the excellent facilities such as workers, transportation, and steady supplies of clean water, which it offers all industry, the South has the additional wealth of fast-growing second-growth timber, and abundant land for new forests.

Most of our old growth timber has long been cut but through the benevolence of nature and the help of a few far-sighted pioneers a second growth of pine and hardwood developed throughout much of the South. At first this regrowth was considered practically worthless. Why? Simply because there was no market.

Then the pulp mills came, and now most of the South has good markets for its second-growth timber. There can be no argument as to which is more important—the timber or the markets. We must have both. One without the other is of little value. The mills are providing the markets, which make forestry profitable. But it is equally true that only through intelligent forestry will we be able to sustain in perpetuity this great industrial revolution with its roots in the renewable forest resources of the South.

Most people do not realize that more than half of the capacity of the pulp mills of this Nation is now in the South. Florida alone has 10 mills with a total 24-hour capacity of 5,415 tons which is about equal to one-half of the capacity of the mills throughout the entire northeastern region.

If I seem to emphasize too much the achievements of the pulp and paper industry and do not discuss sufficiently the accomplishments of the lumber and naval stores industries, I hope that my friends in lumber and naval stores will forgive me. Many big lumber companies and naval stores operators have been practicing good forestry for a long time. When I speak of forest industry I include all industries which provide markets for the forest growth. I like to think of industry also in its broadest sense including not only the mills but the workers, the land, and the consumers as well.

What is this great pulp and paper industry doing to assure its future? In the first place it has bought large forest holdings and is managing them intensively. Some of the finest forestry operations you'll see anywhere, and I hope you will see them while you are here, are in the Florida holdings of this industry. But most of the great quantities of wood these mills use come from noncompany lands. Consequently, it is in the interest of the mills to encourage their neighbors to practice good forestry. The millowners realize this and have started a good-neighbor policy of helping adjoining landowners practice forestry. Most of these neighbors are small landowners.

Both the problems and the opportunities of the small woodland owners have been pointed out many times since they were first emphasized by the Reappraisal Survey made by the Forest Service some 8 to 10 years ago. I fully expect that in the new study now nearing completion that has been made by the Forest Service with the help of the States, industry and others, we will find that the small woodland owner is still the key to the forestry future of the South.

One thing which the owners of small tracts urgently need is technical assistance, which is procured by large landowners from private professional foresters. I am especially proud of the accomplishments under the Cooperative Forest Management Act of 1950 whereby the State foresters in cooperation with the United States Forest Service have farm foresters working with the many small forest owners of the South. I was glad to work with Senator ELLENDER, and others on the committee which secured its passage. At this point I would like to pay a tribute to my colleague in the House of Representatives who has worked tirelessly for this act and many other pieces of forestry legislation—Congressman BOB SIKES, of West Florida.

We have made great progress in tree planting in the South. In 1954 the State of Florida produced about 75 million seedlings. The State Forestry Department produced two-thirds of them on its two great nurseries and industry nurseries produced the other third. The State is now completing a third large nursery, but I am told that even with that new production we will still not quite meet the demand which already exists. In other words our property owners are, for the most part, decidedly forestry minded.

Of course, protection of this great forest resource is basic.

You are all aware of the progress being made in our cooperative forest fire control program since its inception under the Weeks law of 1911. You know of its expansion under the Clarke-McNary law of 1924. Through this program a great deal of State and private forest and watershed lands is being protected, and many benefits accrue to us as a result. Along with other Southeastern States Florida is now completing the organization of the regional fire protection compact which was approved by Congress last year.

But, increased effort by the forestry agencies and the continued support of Congress are needed in the forest fire protection program. It was enheartening to me, and I am sure to you, to note this year that the 84th Congress is apparently more forestry conscious than its predecessors. Of special interest to us was the item of $300,000 provided for expanded research in the long-leaf slash-pine belt extending eastward from east Texas to the Atlantic. Another notable item was the increase of over a half million dollars for cooperative fire fighting.

In 1954 throughout the Nation on State and private lands, there were over 168,000 fires, burning about 9 million acres. The damage came to about $45 million, without considering the loss in wages of woods workers, loss in values of processed forest products, and the loss of many other values that mean much to our economy.

None of us should be happy to learn that 77 percent of all the fires and 80 percent of the total burn occurred in the Southern States. Here, too, is where we have 70 percent of the total forest land area that is still without organized forest-fire protection.

Even though my own State of Florida is making much progress, with protection now applying to over 14 million acres, there are still about 6 million Florida acres without organized fire protection. It was on this unprotected area that more than 3.4 million acres were burned out of a total of 3.84 million acres burned in our State in 1954. In other words more than half of the unprotected acreage was burned over in 1954 whereas, even in that severe drought year, fire damage injured only a little over 3 percent of the protected areas. It seems to me that this 1954 fire-loss experience in Florida offers conclusive proof of the value of organized fire protection.

The forest industry in Florida is exceeded only by the tourist industry and agriculture as a source of income. Our forest products were worth in 1953 $368 million with three principal divisions as follows: $247 million, pulp and paper at the mils, $62 million, lumber, and $28 million, naval stores. More than 200,000 Floridans—workers and their families—are directly dependent upon forest products for a livelihood. So we have a big stake in our forest lands—they are decidedly worth protecting.

More than that, they are worth building up to even higher levels of productivity. We must have continuing research to devise ways of growing more and better quality timber.

Our State can be proud of its leadership in forest research. The work is done mostly at the research centers of the United States Forest Service, with the strong assistance of the Florida Board of Forestry and the cooperation of forest industries.

The Lake City Research Center is a mecca for naval stores men from all over the world. New methods of turpentining developed there are making it possible to get more gum with less labor costs. Tree breeding research at Lake City is beginning to produce trees that run twice as much gum as wild trees. These trees will be available for the turpentine orchards of the near future. The pulpwood industry, with its tremendous payroll in our State, has also much to gain from slash pine timber growing research on the Olustee Experimental Forest near Lake City.

In west Florida and portions of the peninsula, the Forest Service Research men are learning how to reclaim the vast acreage of scrub-oak sandhills for pine-timber production. This research will ultimately mean millions of dollars to west Florida's economy.

Fifteen million acres of wild land plus 3 million acres of improved pasture provide grazing for nearly a million beef cattle in south Florida. What needs to be done here is to learn how to utilize the forage that is available without deteriorating the resource. Research may be able to find out how to increase the amount of land available for livestock in the future.

There are nearly 4 million acres of cutover forest land in south Florida. Some of this will go into cattle production, but a great deal of it should be reforested by planting. Unfortunately, the wet summers and dry winters in that region kill off many of the trees, but this is a problem that I'm sure research can solve if we keep at it.

I've been talking mainly about Florida because that is the State I know best. But what is going on in our State is fairly typical of what is happening all over the South. Now, in winding up, I want to emphasize that the South is intensely proud of its forest industrial revolution. We've come a long way in a comparatively short time and the future in prospect has a rosy hue. We think that what is happening here is good and that our forest industry will continue to prosper greatly. Our progress has its roots anchored firmly in the soil. Like the tap root of a longleaf pine, these roots run deep. Our forest industry will need continuous care, of course, else the "roots" might wither and die. We shall, of course, have many problems to meet, many difficulties to overcome, but we are rapidly gaining more technical knowledge and the facilities to provide, through good forest practices, the care needed to safeguard these roots, which sustain such great values, I assure you that the South in our own interest and in the interest of the Nation will do everything within its power to husband well our expanding forest resources and to encourage even further expansion of "southern forestry, an industrial revolution with roots."

Award of the Order of the Southern Cross to Dr. Joseph F. Thorning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the recent speech of His Excellency, Ambassador João Carlos Muñiz of Brazil, awarding the Nation's Order of the Southern Cross to Marylander author, educator, and lecturer, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. All the people of the Free State of Maryland rejoice, I am sure, that the Brazilian Government, acting in the name of the citizens of that great Republic, has seen fit to give this encouragement to a Marylander whose labors on behalf of the good-neighbor policy have been manifold and persevering.

Ambassador João Carlos Muñiz, who invested Dr. Thorning with the insignia of this famous decoration, is widely and favorably known, not only throughout the Western Hemisphere, but also throughout the world. It was Ambassador Muñiz who took a leading and successful part in the movement in the United Nations that brought about the reestablishment of full diplomatic relations with Spain. As one result, Spain is now one of the new members of the United Nations. Dr. Muñiz is celebrated as a diplomat, a jurist, and a philosopher. It was fitting that he should preside at the ceremonies that honored a citizen-scholar of Maryland.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HIS EXCELLENCY, AMBASSADOR JOÃO CARLOS MUÑIZ, OF BRAZIL, AT A DIPLOMATIC RECEPTION ON SEPTEMBER 26, 1955

Rev. Father Joseph Francis Thorning, in presenting to you, on behalf of the Brazilian Government, the diploma and insignia of the Order of the Southern Cross, with which Brazil signifies its recognition of your substantial contribution towards the divulgation in the United States of the values of the civilization and culture of my country, it is my pleasant duty also to tell my audience here of the affectionate interest which has marked your association with Brazilians over a period of almost 20 years. This is well evidenced by your articles relating to impressions gathered in your travels there, as well as by the contacts which you have constantly maintained with my fellow-countrymen, no matter how high or how modest their station in life; and, finally, by the frequency with which you have always tried to awaken the attention of the public toward the firm traits of historic solidarity existing between our two nations.

If, as André Maurois said, "a people is a mirror in which the traveller sees his own image reflected," your visits to Brazil and your knowledge of its people have enabled you to find spiritual affinities and an identity of sentiments in that land, marked at discovery by a mass and a cross—because Brazil, like your country, was born not from political conquest nor from economic expansion, but from a direct religious intention. In America, regardless of religious persuasion, the sentiment of faith and the concern over its dissemination have always been fundamental and intentional features. The great Lusitanian bard, Luis de Camões, touched upon this when he extolled "the glorious memory of those kings who fought to spread the faith and the empire through distant savage lands."

Yours is the spiritual group, which congregates mankind around the loftiest among its activities, that which takes man directly to God through prayer and a righteous life. Nevertheless, without neglecting your divine ministry, you have found the time to dedicate yourself to the missionary task of spreading light and truth among your fellow countrymen about distant lands, about this Latin America where Brazil became the object of your special attention.

It were idle to descant further upon your contributions to a closer state of relations between the American peoples. I will only refer to the tribute paid to you by the House of Representatives in 1951, when you were termed "a missionary of good will" and "a man whose name is synonymous with Christianity in Central and South America."

In making delivery to you of the insignia of the Southern Cross, in the degree of officer, I tender sincere wishes that you may long continue to serve the cause of the American community with the faith that characterizes your religious formation and with the dynamic enthusiasm peculiar to the teacher, thinker, and journalist that you are.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Hanukkah Festival Sponsored by Israeli Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on December 15, 1955, I had the privilege of addressing the Hanukkah Festival at Madison Square Garden in New York City. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From a full heart, and with a deep appreciation of the historic meaning of tonight's occasion, I say to you—and to all the world—"Shalom," peace be unto you. And in this greeting, I include the Arab world. I wish to all men, everywhere, the blessings of peace.

This is an occasion not so much for words as for deep and joyous feeling. While Hanukkah is a holiday of celebration and triumph, it is also a holiday of dedication. And tonight none of us is without a somber sense of the dangers which, at this very moment, confront our co-religionists in Israel.

Our concern for them is not based entirely on the fact that they are Jews and we are Jews. First of all, we are Americans. As Americans, we must have an abiding eagerness and a deep anxiety for the preservation of peace in the Middle East. As Americans, we must zealously strive, with hand as well as heart, to preserve the beacon of freedom and democracy that shines from Israel and sheds its light throughout the Middle East.

The fact that this light still burns undimmed impresses me as almost as great a miracle as the one which our spiritual forefathers witnessed ages ago in the Temple and which we commemorate tonight.

On this night let us make clear that the people of Israel are not isolated and alone, besieged and surrounded though they may be. Here and wherever men breathe free, there is an endless host who support the resolve of the Israeli people to defend and maintain their Republic, and the cause of freedom and democracy for which it stands.

This is not a night for captious criticism, but we cannot view with easy approval the irresolute policy of our own Government—a policy of half-measures and half-

answers—a policy of too little and almost too late—despite critical and growing dangers to the cause of peace and to our own vital interests in this crucial area of the earth.

Nor is this a night for intemperate anger or indignation, but still we must take note that while the voices of the Kremlin shrilly cry for peace, the hands of the Kremlin cynically feed the fires of war.

This is a night, an appropriate night, for affirmation of faith, and for prayer—faith in the power of right, and prayer for guidance and wisdom in the difficulties we face.

There are, of course, measures and actions which only our Government can take.

There are restraints and disciplines which only Israel and the Israelis can adopt.

Finally, there are actions which each of us, as individual Jews and individual citizens of America, can and must undertake.

Thus, as individuals, we can tribute to the UJA and buy bonds.

Tonight's gathering is a heartening token—indeed, a thrilling token—of the intention of Americans of Jewish faith, and of all faiths, to support this year's bond drive. As far as this activity goes, we are not going to let Israel down.

As far as our Government is concerned, the situation clearly calls for courageous and forthright action. We must assume a role of leadership that will rally the force and support of world opinion to the cause of peace and security in the Middle East.

A first order of action should be the negotiation of a security pact with Israel and any of her Arab neighbors who are willing to enter into such pacts with the United States.

Any such pact must guarantee the territorial integrity of Israel and of her Arab neighbors, too.

Our Government must press forward with its economic programs, such as the Johnson water resources development plan, giving assurance that our aims are unselfish, and that our sole interest is the welfare and security of all the peoples of this entire area.

Our Government should also give sympathetic consideration to any other proposals which might be made to alleviate tensions in this vital area. But we dare not lend support or comfort to so-called compromises which are not compromises at all, but would represent surrender of the vital interests of the State of Israel, and of the United States.

Let there be no Middle Eastern Munich.

In the meantime, in the face of the rapidly growing in-balance of military power, as a result of Soviet arms shipments to Egypt, we must supply arms to Israel. Israel must be enabled to purchase arms abroad.

But let us clearly understand that arms, and arms alone, do not furnish a satisfactory solution for the problems of Israel in her present plight.

There is only one end to an arms race—violence and disaster.

At the same time, it is true that while one side arms, the other must. There is only one thing worse than an arms race, and that is to lose one.

I believe that Israel must be kept strong, just as America must remain strong.

But armed strength alone is not even the answer for America. How can it be for Israel?

Israel must continue to represent, as she so nobly has in the past, a great moral purpose—the cause of democracy and freedom. And here I want to emphasize that in my considered opinion—and I hope Ambassador Eban will agree with me—the people of Israel must show restraint—as Jews have shown restraint for so many centuries—not only in order to endure and survive, but in order to remain true to the great moral heritage which is common to all who are of the Jewish faith. And though I drafted these remarks before the Syria incident, my remarks encompass that incident. Israel must continue, as in the past, to be the vibrant expression of a great moral idea and a great moral purpose. That idea and purpose must reflect in every act as well as word our people's traditional respect for the sanctity of each human life and of each individual human soul.

This moral purpose will give such a strength to the cause of Israel as to render impotent, in the end, all the designs of her enemies. Around this moral purpose, I am confident, the strength of the free world can be rallied.

In these ways, I believe peace will be assured in the Middle East, and Israel will be saved from the fate of Korea, or even worse.

The day must and will surely come when the present armistice lines that divide Israel from her neighbors will become permanent boundaries. These boundaries will then in turn cease to be passageways for marauders and infiltrators and become instead arteries for trade and commerce, those two historic ambassadors of peace and cooperation.

We pray that these lights, the lights of Hanukkah, will illuminate the path to such a day of peace and understanding, under the guidance of God, the Father of us all.

Your Congressman Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release by Representative USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN COMMENTS

(By USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota)

OUR LACK OF FOREIGN POLICY

WASHINGTON, D. C.—We have made so many blunders in our foreign policy that it is going to be difficult for the taxpayers of the United States to repair the damage. These mistakes are chargeable to Democratic and Republican administrations alike.

Making an agreement with Russia to let her enter Berlin first was a sad mistake. All the trouble we have had because the Russians were in control of a section of Berlin and East Germany could have been avoided. It will be recalled that our armies were delayed several weeks in order to let the Russian armies enter first. Another mistake was begging Russia to get into the war against Japan when we had Japan licked to a frazzle. The result of this mistake was the Korean war, and after it started we would not let our soldiers fight, and as a consequence the Korean war is not yet settled.

Another huge mistake was withdrawing our support to Chiang Kai-shek, and thus compelling him to retreat out of China. How we could possibly have done this when at Casa Blanca we gave positive assurance that we would support the Nationalist Chinese army is something that cannot be explained. The story is well known of how General Marshall withdrew arms from the Nationalists as the agent of the administration. The result was that the Communist armies overran all of China.

Another project we put forth was the forming of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in which many of the countries involved did not want membership, and most of them have been like worms ever since. No country in Europe was as excited about the danger from Russia as we were. The next blunder was going down into the heart of Asia and trying to organize a number of countries to join in one central organization to defend all of Asia against communism. The result has been that Russia is now doing the same thing, and, like us, promising money, guns, and everything else if they will rely on her protection. Many countries, like England, the Netherlands, France, and Spain, for centuries have had colonial empires, where the people did not rule and were subjected to foreign dictatorship. Some of these empires have been given back to the people, but many still continue. When we woo France, for example, to join the NATO, we impliedly approve of the colonial empire of France. Immediately the Russians come in and promise the people self-government and brand us as supporters of the colonial system; and this promise, even though the Russians have no intention of granting it, is great ammunition against us. The papers report that Russia is making loans and furnishing guns to the Afghanistan Government and support of guns to those Moslem countries fighting Israel. This situation is apt to be the powder keg of a great uprising among the Mohammedans.

We have rested our security on the fact that we organized the United Nations and that through it wars could be prevented. But look at the record. The U. N. has devoted most of its time, outside of debating, to trying to establish peace among the Israelites and the Mohammedans. But what are the facts? The trouble still continues and is apt to break out into a great war at any moment. Russia backs one faction and we back the other, yet both the United States and Russia are brother members in the United Nations. We propose measures for peace, and Russia promptly vetoes our plans. But still we cling to this organization. The United States and Russia have been in a cold war ever since World War II ended, and yet we are both members of an organization dedicated to peace.

If every nation in the world were a member of the United Nations, do you think that would stop the Russian cold war? Far from it. The Russians had a lot to do about starting this organization and they have and will continue to use this forum as a propaganda base for their own intent to destroy capitalism. We have held meeting after meeting, but the disciples of Karl Marx, Lenin, and Stalin are right on the job to do what they intend to do, and that is to bring about the total destruction of capitalism.

Some people in this country are afraid that we, alone, cannot defend this country. I venture to say that with 10 percent of the money we are now showering upon every country on earth we could not only defend ourselves but be in a position to maintain at least one other country on the face of this earth where liberty and freedom is secure. If we follow that path which leads us into every squabble anywhere in the world, the time will come when there will be grave doubt of our ability to preserve this country.

Recently the papers carried the information that we are to dig up four billion for aid to foreign countries in the way of economic support and to supply arms. We all want to see the budget balanced, but we have about as much chance of balancing it and keeping the debt limit within the law as we have in making a successful round trip to the moon in a model T Ford.

It takes this kind of money to correct the mistakes we have made and are still making in our foreign policy. We speak of loans to this country and that country. I would rather have a page out of the harness section of a Sears, Roebuck catalog than to

have a note against any nation which we are showering with money. We should not dignify these injections of money by calling them loans.

If we give foreign countries anything, let us give them the things known here as surpluses. Brother Benson just woke up to this method of cutting down surpluses, but still we are so used to voting billions of giveaway dollars that this $4-billion donation will undoubtedly be passed.

The Voice of a Free Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Times is a great, independent, patriotic American newspaper. It has served the people of the Nation faithfully for many generations, and today is serving them with courage, patriotism, and fairness. It has always been a tower of strength in the fight against communism and in the defense of the democratic principles which have made our country great.

Mr. President, this morning the New York Times printed a stirring and thought-provoking editorial entitled "The Voice of a Free Press." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed, along with my own remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VOICE OF A FREE PRESS

In executive hearings held recently in this city, in public hearings held last summer in Washington, and now again in public hearings held in Washington, a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, of Mississippi, has been looking for evidence of what it considers to be subversive infiltration of the press. A number of employees of this newspaper have been called to appear as witnesses before the subcommittee.

We do not question the right or the propriety of any investigation of the press by any agency of Congress. The press is not sacrosanct. It is as properly subject to congressional inquiry as any other institution in American life. It is the inescapable responsibility of Congress, however, to make certain that any such inquiry be conducted in good faith and not motivated by ulterior purpose.

A few employees of this newspaper who have appeared before the Eastland committee have pleaded the fifth amendment. A few others have testified to membership in the Communist Party over periods terminating at various dates in the past. So far as we are aware, no present member of the Communist Party has been found among the more than 4,000 employees on our rolls.

The policy of this newspaper with regard to the employment of Communist Party members has been stated many times, and may be stated here again. We would not knowingly employ a Communist Party member in the news or editorial departments of this paper, because we would not trust his ability to report the news objectively or to comment on it honestly, and the discovery of present Communist Party membership on the part of such an employee would lead to his immediate dismissal.

In the case of those employees who have testified to some Communist association in the past, or who have pleaded the fifth amendment for reasons of their own, it will be our policy to judge each case on its own merits, in the light of each individual's responsibilities in our organization and of the degree to which his relations with this newspaper entitle him to possess our confidence.

We may say this, however. We do not believe in the doctrine of irredeemable sin. We think it possible to atone through good performance for past error, and we have tried to supply the security and the favorable working conditions which should exist in a democracy and which should encourage men who were once misled to reconsider and to reshape their political thinking.

We have judged these men, and we shall continue to judge them, by the quality of their work and by our confidence in their ability to perform that work satisfactorily. It is our own business to decide whom we shall employ and not employ. We do not propose to hand over that function to the Eastland subcommittee.

Nor do we propose to permit the Eastland subcommittee, or any other agency outside this office, to determine in any way the policies of this newspaper. It seems to us quite obvious that the Eastland investigation has been aimed with particular emphasis at the New York Times. This is evident from several facts: from the heavy concentration of subpenas served on employees of this newspaper, from the nature of the examination conducted at earlier hearings by the subcommittee's counsel, Mr. Sourwine, and from that counsel's effort, at those hearings, to demonstrate some connection between a witness' one-time association with the Communist Party and the character of the news published in this paper.

It seems to us to be a further obvious conclusion that the Times has been singled out for this attack precisely because of the vigor of its opposition to many of the things for which Mr. EASTLAND, his colleague, Mr. JENNER, and the subcommittee's counsel stand—that is, because we have condemned segregation in the southern schools; because we have challenged the high-handed and abusive methods employed by various congressional committees; because we have denounced McCarthyism and all its works; because we have attacked the narrow and bigoted restrictions of the McCarran Immigration Act; because we have criticized a security system which conceals the accuser from his victim; because we have insisted that the true spirit of American democracy demands a scrupulous respect for the rights of even the lowliest individual and a high standard of fair play.

If this is the tactic of any member of the Eastland subcommittee, and if further evidence reveals that the real purpose of the present inquiry is to demonstrate that a free newspaper's policies can be swayed by congressional pressure, then we say to Mr. EASTLAND and his counsel that they are wasting their time. This newspaper will continue to determine its own policies. It will continue to condemn discrimination, whether in the South or in the North. It will continue to defend civil liberties. It will continue to challenge the unbridled power of governmental authority. It will continue to enlist goodwill against prejudice and confidence against fear.

We cannot speak unequivocally for the long future. But we can have faith. And our faith is strong that long after Senator EASTLAND and his present subcommittee are forgotten, long after segregation has lost its final battle in the South, long after all that was known as McCarthyism is a dim, unwelcome memory, long after the last congressional committee has learned that it cannot tamper successfully with a free press, the New York Times will still be speaking for the men who make it, and only for the men who make it, and speaking, without fear or favor, the truth as it sees it.

Importation of Swiss Watch Movements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, because there has been much discussion and considerable concern over the increase in tariff on imported watches, particularly are we concerned over legislation, introduced at the last session under the sponsorship of the Treasury Department, designed to prohibit the remanufacturing or upjeweling of watches by American manufacturers.

We Marylanders are justifiably disturbed over the obstacles placed in the path of the importation of Swiss watch movements because of the effect such obstacles would have on the sale of Maryland tobacco. I think our position is very clearly explained in an article appearing in Barron's, a national business and financial weekly, dated December 26, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPTY CASE: THE UNITED STATES WATCHMAKERS MERIT NO FEDERAL AID

The passage of time, we are reminded by the rapid approach of another New Year's Eve, is constantly with us. And so, it appears, are the woes of a handful of American companies, which, in a manner of speaking, earn their living from the fleeting seconds and minutes, the manufacturers of jeweled watches. Last week, as the sands of the old year were runing out, these firms filed an appeal with the United States Government, foreign competition, notably from Switzerland, is causing them serious injury, the domestic watchmakers averred. Unless Washington comes to their aid, they went on, in the form of higher tariffs, import quotas or subsidies, their industry sooner or later will go the way of the hour-glass and the grandfather clock.

This plea, it might be noted, is not exactly new. It has been voiced from time to time for over half-a-decade, recently with considerable effect. In mid-1954 the United States producers, with a powerful assist from the Office of Defense Mobilization, won an increase of 50 percent in the tariff on imported watches and movements. Since then, as official concern for their well-being has mounted, both the Treasury and Justice Departments, in their respective spheres, have taken steps to harass the Swiss. Such moves, it is argued, are vital to the well-being and safety of the United States. The facts, however, suggest otherwise. For the administration, in trying to cushion the domestic industry against competition, simply has struck a blow against the free economy. What is perhaps worse, it has undermined the principles of international

trade, to which this country is supposed to be unequivocally pledged.

Mainspring of the mischief, it seems, is a small group of medium-sized, old-line concerns which turn out watches containing movements of their own manufacture. Their quarrel lies with the far greater number of enterprises, including such well-known publicly held firms as Benrus, Gruen, and Longines-Wittnauer, which import the movements for their timepieces, add cases, and watchbands, and assemble them here. Over the years—since World War II in particular—the latter have captured a growing proportion of the market, especially in the lower and medium-price ranges. Lately they have been competing vigorously for the 17-jewel trade. As a consequence, out of an estimated 12 to 13 million jeweled watches sold in the United States each year, some 10 million contain parts or movements fabricated abroad. And so-called Swiss watches, which by and large happen to be American-made products with Swiss innards, have become a favorite target of the protectionists, in business and government alike.

The dispute between the two horological camps is a complicated one, involving wheels within wheels. These include, among others, the intricate issue of upjeweling or the practice of adding extra jewels to watch movements which, to qualify for lower duties, are imported with some missing. In a not unrelated hassle, the Swiss have been charged by the Department of Justice with restraint of trade and monopoly in the sale of watchmaking equipment. Where the right may lie in these controversies is something for customs men and lawyers to decide. But regarding the plea for greater protection, which is, after all, the heart of the matter, the domestic watchmakers apparently can make a case on neither economic nor military grounds.

On the first count, it is true that the importers have captured the bulk of the market. But that market today, owing largely, as it happens to the importers' own efforts, is vastly bigger than it was in the placid days of the dollar Ingersoll. In the past 25 years the population of the United States has increased by around one-third; the annual sale of watches, however, has more than doubled. This burgeoning of demand has resulted in part from the many technical innovations, such as self-winding and calendar timepieces, which the importers have introduced in this country, as well as from their aggressive merchandising and imaginative styling. It also has been stimulated by the higher quality and lower price of the imported product, made possible by a Swiss watchmaking technology which, in its modest sphere, resembles in some measure that of Detroit. In any event, the United States companies, while not perhaps as prosperous as they should like to be, on the whole are making money. Moreover, obviously spurred by the competition, they have devised some new timekeeping twists of their own lately, including a watch with a numbers cylinder instead of a dail, and, possibly for next year, one which runs electronically.

None of the foregoing suggests that the domestic industry has suffered grave financial injury. The military argument, though supported by ODM and its civilian chairman, Arthur S. Flemming, can be exploded just as quickly. In fact, the Defense Department in a report published last year (and ignored by all hands since), blew its flimsy logic sky-high. Watchmaking, to be sure, is a skilled craft, which in past emergencies has served the Armed Forces well. However, the Pentagon was at some pains to point out, times have changed. The watchmakers today can supply barely more than 10 percent of the timing devices needed for mobilization. As a clincher, the Defense Department has revealed that anything made by the industry is readily obtainable from a number of other sources. Greater protection for the watchmakers, in short, may benefit Elgin, Ill., or Waltham, Mass., but it will be of precious little help to the rest of the country.

What is being urged, in fact, is apt to do positive harm, to producer as well as consumer. In the realm of international trade, there is no way for government to favor one group except at the expense of another. In this case, the immediate victim was the Swiss watch industry, not to mention United States prestige abroad. More recently, however, the pendulum has swung the other way. Thus today the growers of Maryland tobacco, who sell the bulk of their output to Switzerland, suddenly have discovered that their market is in jeopardy and are up in arms about it. Such cause and effect are inevitable. For protectionism, in watches or anything else, must in the end make everyone poorer; only free trade among peoples can serve the general interest. It is time the administration reaffirmed its belief in these truths.

Equality of Opportunity and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at Tucson, Ariz., on October 30, 1955, by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Hon. J. Ernest Wilkins.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The right of every American to have a meaningful level of equality of opportunity and freedom is inherent in our form of government. We must face this fact squarely in order not only to vindicate the hopes of the founders of this Nation, but also in order to demonstrate to the peoples of the rest of the world our firm belief in this right. If this right is to be preserved we must respect the dignity of every human being. Unless this right is maintained and strengthened in the United States of America, how can we ever expect the fulfillment of full freedom in nations torn with suspicion, subjected to dictatorial governments and constantly engaged in a never ending arms race toward total destruction?

Those who insist upon thinking of groups in terms of individuals would do well to give thanks for the great and lasting benefits given to all of mankind by "the rejected." I would not here attempt to catalog the accomplishments which have emerged from our minority peoples. But I would remind you that the giant who has emerged in the fight against the dreaded polio disease—Dr. Jonas E. Salk—is a Jew. He is the same kind of person still barred from living anywhere he might please by the practical effect of obnoxious restrictive covenants. He is still not acceptable in country clubs and social organizations whose members search for superiority in caste aristocracy.

Irony also attends the work of the late Dr. Charles R. Drew, of Howard University, who perfected the process of preserving blood plasma. Many soldiers owe their very lives to this man they would not ask into their homes except by the back door for fear of violating the racial taboos that have too long blinded our people to individual worth.

But more and more, and in countless ways, our individual efforts are unifying all of our people in the common bonds of mutual understanding, faith and respect. The ability of differing peoples to live together in a stable, enduring and beneficial society is being proven in every corner of our land. It is evidenced in the greater number of businessmen who are realizing that when they hire for skill and talent alone, they best serve their personal interest and that of the Nation. It is reflected in the admission practices of most of our colleges which have eliminated the abominable quota system, a device to exclude qualified students from professional life simply because of the color of their skin, their religious faith, or their national origin. We see it in the awareness of the average American who now realizes that for his own well being he cannot regard as harmless indulgence giving vent to his irritation on Americans of foreign parentage or those of a particular creed or color.

In this growing atmosphere of amity and brotherhood our individual efforts have been greatly aided by community relations groups and national organizations. They have contributed significantly to adult education and social science research, to the protection of democracy without sacrifice of civil rights, and to the techniques for reducing group hostility.

The confidence with which everyone is facing the future is indeed encouraging. While most people are satisfied, they know that something is causing this good fortune which they cannot fully comprehend. I did not realize myself the reason for all of this until after President Eisenhower was stricken. I was then fully awakened to the fact that the propelling force in all of this new outlook is President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Immediately after the President's heart attack the country and the world were stunned. Everything semed to become paralyzed temporarily. The stock market began to do funny tricks, business slackened and there was general bedlam among the peoples and the nations of the world. While we in the United States do not subscribe to the principle of the indispensable man, we now realize the terrific influence which Dwight D. Eisenhower is having on the every day lives of all of us. As he regains his health it is gratifying to see the confidence return both at home and abroad. President Eisenhower is of the people, for the people and with the people.

Now to examine the record of this great world leader who has set the atmosphere for this overwhelming world confidence among men and women—whether they be laborers, housewives, business men, professional people, farmers or what have you.

When this administration took office on January 20, 1953, the world was in turmoil; we were at war in Korea. President Eisenhower said while campaigning—"I pledge a firm consistent foreign policy with one primary goal—the attainment of peace in the world for ourselves and for all free people."

Under his administration the 3-year-old Korean war was ended in July 1953, just 6 months after he took office, and our boys are home again and living normal lives.

Before his election our great President said that he pledged "that the full resources of our new administration will be thrown into the battle against inflation. Only if the steady whittling away of the value of the dollar is stopped can our farmers, or factory workers, white collar workers, or our aged find any security in their savings, social benefits, or pensions."

The average wages of American workers have reached new highs under this administration. Factory workers' wages in Septem-

ber 1955 were at an all-time record high of $77.90 a week. The cost of living has been stabilized so these increases in pay really mean something to the worker. All economists agree that a new record in goods and services will be reached before 1955 bows out. Nearly 65 million Americans are now on jobs; more than ever before in our history. Said AFL President George Meany, "American workers have never had it so good as right now."

Mr. Eisenhower promised that the "social gains achieved by the people, whether enacted by a Republican or Democrat administration, are not only here to stay but are here to be improved and extended."

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was established April 11, 1953. The Social Security Act was amended to extend old-age survivors insurance to 10 million more persons; benefits under this act were increased to all. A 3-year program of Federal aid to the States for facilities for the aged, chronically ill, and disabled was inaugurated; and other proposals made by President Eisenhower to provide schools, highways, and better health for a stronger America were not acted upon by the Democrat Congress despite pleas from the President.

Mr. Eisenhower said, "I pledge that I will support and strengthen, not weaken, the laws that protect the American worker. I will defend him against any action to destroy his union or his rights. I will enlist every resource, of private industry and of the Federal Government, to protect him against the awful consequence of depression and joblessness. I will work unceasingly to build an economy that will maintain for him a high level of wages with steady purchasing power so he and his family can share fully in the comforts of American living. Finally, I pledge that I shall strive to conduct myself so that at the end of my service the workers of America can honestly say: 'He has been fair. He has been my friend.'"

The AFL reported at its executive board meeting in Miami this year that "agreements were reached with fewer strikes and less work time loss in strike action than in any year since World War II." The A. F. of L., in that same report said, "But the increases in (wages) 1954 while modest, generally provided more of a gain in real wages than increases in other postwar years, for they were almost entirely over and beyond the amount needed to compensate for the rise in the cost of living."

Mr. Eisenhower said, "I pledge that if elected the President of the United States I will serve all the people irrespective of their race, creed, their national origin * * * I pledge to devote myself toward making equality of opportunity a living reality for every American. There is no room left in America for second class citizenship for anybody." He has kept his promise on this civil rights front. His effort in this field has been one of his brightest and most outstanding achievements. Our great President promised that he would "search for merit wherever it is. I will search for the qualifications needed to serve the United States well and if, in a particular field, I can find someone whose appointment would give reassurance to the great body of Negro men, I should like very much to do such a thing. * * *I tell you that there will never be anybody around me on whom I depend, whether I am a private citizen or an official, who is going to take what I consider a reactionary view." In keeping with this promise some 250 Negroes have been appointed to important jobs in this administration and thousands of others have been given smaller jobs.

The past 33 months of our American history has marked the greatest advances in social gains in the life of our great Nation. Out of Washington during this short period of time have come orders, decrees, and edicts that have restored to the largest minority segment in America some of the human dignity inherent in their birth but denied them in their daily living because of man's inhumanity to man. Out of Washington during this period has come the trumpeting of a new spiritual, moral, and political concept of the right of all Americans to walk the streets of this Nation in dignity and in peace, unfettered by any restricting bonds of race, color, religion, or national origin.

May I recite briefly just a few of the major orders that have come:

1. Segregation at Army post schools abolished by Executive directive.

2. Employment discrimination in District of Columbia service contracts, and segregation in eating places, outlawed.

3. Segregation in United States naval installations in the South ended.

4. Racial discrimination effectively banned on Federal contract jobs by the President's Government Contract Committee.

5. Segregation ended in major veterans' hospitals in the South and labeled "undemocratic, uneconomical, undesirable."

6. Committee on Government Employment Policy appointed to eliminate discrimination because of race, color, reliegion, or national origin in the employment of or in the upgrading of employees in the Federal agencies themselves.

7. Segregation abolished in District of Columbia recreation facilities 1 day after the Supreme Court schools decision.

8. Appointment of more than 250 Negroes—on the basis of their eminent qualifications—to high positions in the Federal Government, including many first-time appointments.

9. The historic decision of the United States Supreme Court outlawing segregation in public-school education.

In evaluating this great victory in human progress I am appalled that so few have acknowledged one of the vital human elements that made this epochal triumph possible. We have heaped praise on the brilliant and victorious lawyers who carried the segregation cases to court; we have extolled the virtues of an eloquent and enlightened court; we have acknowledged the hard, arduous, persistent, courageous 40 years' effort on the part of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; and we have cast grateful glances in the direction of any and all who made a contribution. But, in my opinion, few have recognized or publicly acclaimed the essential and conclusive work of one great citizen who in a large measure fashioned the atmosphere and climate in this country so that the kind of decision the Court rendered could be possible and accepted with calm and equanimity. I am speaking, of course, of the President of the United States.

I am happy to be able to quote from a speech made by the distinguished Senator from this State, Senator GOLDWATER (who is performing such an excellent job in furthering social progress in the Nation), who, in this city, in discussing the matter of civil rights before the Tucson branch of the NAACP on October 12, 1955, said, "This is a report on what has been accomplished for all Americans, because I don't think we should continue to look on Americans as a Nation of minorities and majorities, but rather as a Nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I believe we should recognize in these great words of Jefferson the source of our freedom and the fact that freedom given by God is given to all people whether they be white or black, or Catholic, Protestant, or Jew." And may I respectfully add to the distinguished Senator's words the following: If the United States of America is to continue in its role of leader of the free peoples of the world, two-thirds of whom are nonwhite, it must more and more practice at home the wise philosophy enunciated by Senator GOLDWATER.

One could talk on and on about the many significant social changes that have taken place during the past 33 months, but I realize every speech must close at some point. I do, however, want to mention briefly before closing two very significant proposals made by President Eisenhower in the area of world peace. One was his Atoms for Peace proposal launched at the meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations. This proposal earned for President Eisenhower the gratitude of the entire world and reflected his recognition and that of his administration of the fact that the problem of peaceful uses of atomic energy is both important and of primary interest to the entire world. The other was President Eisenhower's celebrated disarmament proposal made at the Geneva Summit Conference. The 10th General Assembly of the United Nations will consider this proposal and if agreement is reached, the nations of the world and humanity will be freed from the dangers of surprise attacks.

A nation that has made such great advances in tearing away the barriers of time and space through technological brilliance certainly must have the force, courage, and intelligence to continue the process of continuing and extending the social gains that have come to all Americans in less than 3 years.

In no other nation in the world's history have a people so nearly approached the realization of full freedom and equality for all its people as in the United States. The American people have demonstrated great courage and wisdom in the social progress thus far made. I see no reason why we cannot continue to demonstrate our ability to complete the solemn responsibility of every loyal American to bring full and complete justice, freedom, and equality of opportunity, and an abiding peace and happiness to all of the peoples of our great Nation.

Not All That Meets the Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Not All That Meets the Eye," which appeared in the January 3, 1956, issue of the Owensboro Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

NOT ALL THAT MEETS THE EYE

Taking a leaf from the United States, the Soviet Union is emphasizing firepower over manpower in its expenditures for armed forces next year.

A reduction of 8.5 percent in defense expenditures just announced is not all that meets the eye. If it aimed as the announcement says at reassuring the world of the Soviet's peaceful intention, it would have shown a much deeper cut.

In the first place, the unilateral cut of 640,000 men from the armed forces should have brought a 20-percent reduction in expenditures. Secondly, prices charged the Soviet Government for heavy industrial products were reduced last April and the ruble

buys more heavy goods. Similarly, there was a price reduction in food and clothing. Were all three of these developments truly reflected in the budget, there would have been a sharp decline.

The truth is inescapable. The Soviet Union is shifting from cheap cannon fodder to high firepower. It is investing in new weapons, to match the highly effective United States forces. Instead of cutting its military expenditures, the Soviet Union will be increasing them next year, and will be buying more, not less, military power.

Arseny G. Sverev, the Soviet finance minister, told the Soviet National Assembly "the reduction in military appropriations means the Soviet Union, not only in words but in deeds, shows its concern for lessening world tension and insuring peace and international security." But it was significant that he drew the loudest applause for his reference to the tour of India, Burma, and Afghanistan made by Communist Party Chief Khrushchev and Soviet Premier Bulganin. They tried to create disharmony and alienate South Asia from the West and create a new Communist sphere of influence, in the new-type Soviet colonialism fast replacing Britain, which recently granted independence to India and Burma and has long befriended Afghanistan.

Military Liberty: Antidote for Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, in the ideological debates accompanying the post World War II struggles between the East and West too little has been published as to the superior spiritual basis and philosophical resources of the free world. It is thus highly gratifying to see recognized by a responsible official the truly American concept of "militant liberty" as the antidote for communism, which is both international and militant.

In a notable address in the city of Washington on October 25, 1955, before the Second National Conference on Spiritual Foundations, Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, presented this thesis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have his inspiring statement published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, Admiral Radford's address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MIND AND THE SPIRIT IN NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Adm. Arthur Radford)

President Eisenhower recently issued a widely publicized Executive order to announce a code of conduct for the members of the Armed Forces.

In brief, pointed terms, the first article of this code said:

"I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense."

I believe most of you realize this is written in the form of a creed. Possibly some of you feel that it is written mostly for those of us in uniform. If so, you are not wrong. It is written as a guiding precept to be followed by the men in our Armed Forces.

I would suggest, however, that this creed could very well be a part of every American's atttiude. There is no hidden meaning, nor is there lack of meaning, when you pledge: "I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life." These words are the key to the part played by the mind and the spirit in our national security. They signify: militant liberty.

Ladies and gentlemen, every American should be dedicated to this mission. It is not sufficient for only a relatively few to defend the United States. In our present peril, people everywhere must unite in the fight against militant international communism, or any other threat to our American way of life.

What is this American way of life of which I speak? You know it and I know it. We have lived it and enjoyed its benefits. But how can we define something so nebulous?

Language is sometimes a peculiar thing. Sometimes it plays tricks on us. The word freedom has far different meaning when spoken from Communist lips. And in American speech, that word may become so loosely used that its meaning begins to wear thin and to become vague.

It has become increasingly apparent to me since World War II that men and nations who want to remain free must understand freedom and be able to explain it—by their example as well as in their own words.

It is obvious the Communists have made amazing gains, largely because they know what they believe, why they believe it, and can explain it. They are educated in it and completely versed in it.

On the other hand, we who are free have many times been incoherent or have lacked the verbal ability to explain or defend completely what our way of life really is. We must know what we mean by it. We must be convinced that it presents the very best way of life in today's world—and I think we are. But we must be able to explain this conviction to others.

FREEDOM

My own understanding of the American way of life is manyfold. First it is freedom and liberty.

Freedom began with a belief in human dignity, and it grew with the history of the world. Often it came in conflict with tyranny and despotism. Often it was knocked down, but always it arose to fight again. It would fight, and lose, and then fight again.

We learned this in history when Moses stood before Pharaoh and said: "Let my people go." We read it again when the barons stood before King John and the Magna Carta was embodied into laws. We lived it still again in the epic of Valley Forge.

Our Founding Fathers were adept at choosing the right words to explain the meaning of our way of life. Thomas Jefferson called it "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Patrick Henry summed it up when he said: "Give me liberty or give me death."

All of you know well the other meanings of our freedoms. They are all part of the American way of life: freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, and many more. We have lived with these freedoms so long, and have enjoyed them so much, that we are prone to take them for granted.

FAITH

A second primary ingredient in our American way of life is faith. Faith is essential. We must have it.

The New Testament calls faith "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." (Hebrews 11:1.) Let me repeat that. Faith is "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen."

Faith is our belief in the equality of man in the sight of God. It is our belief in what Alexander Hamilton referred to as "the sacred rights of mankind." Far beyond the point of lip-service, we must all believe that each and every human is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These are the "substance of things hoped for."

That cold winter at Valley Forge was truly an ordeal. The suffering from freezing and starvation almost led American troops to abandon their cause. Faith in their God; faith in their great leader, George Washington; and faith in the righteousness of their cause inspired the courage with which these men were victorious in their hour of trial. These are the "evidence of things not seen," to return again to the words of the New Testament.

Without such faith, we could not be ready, as written in the code of conduct "to give my life in their defense." But with it, we can meet successfully any future hour of trial.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Now, faith in the principles upon which this Nation was founded automatically implies a third important element of the American way of life, namely, the individual acceptance of responsibility to defend these principles against any threat.

To the young person growing up in a country such as ours, it is to easy to consider the rights of man as accepted facts rather than as prizes to be won. The world can too easily seem his for the taking, without personal effort.

The lessons of history, however, teach us otherwise. History is replete with instances to prove that nations who take their liberty for granted are apt to fall prey to tyrannical forces, from within as well as from without.

For every freedom there is a corresponding responsibility. If a person denies his responsibility, he runs the risk of losing his freedom. If he accepts his responsibility, he can do much to perpetuate freedom for generations to follow.

In this same vein, teaching a person to recite the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights by memory, line by line, word for word, is not enough, for you could teach a parrot to do that.

Instead, teaching him to understand the meaning of liberty is much better. It is all important. We should always give him a "Bill of Responsibilities" to go along with his "Bill of Rights," and at the same time, instill in him a spirit of service to God and country.

SPREADING THE WORD

Having established faith, responsibility, and freedom as the three elements of the American way of life, I am concerned with relating the whole to the concept of the mind and the spirit in national security. How do we go about perpetuating this American way of life, for us today and for our children tomorrow?

An important feature in the multifaced Soviet threat has been their conviction and complete command of their doctrine. Their successes have been achieved in great part by the subversive appeal of an artful logic, effectively spread by organized zealots. They have denied spiritual values and pretended to show that following the Communist system is the dynamic way to economic security for the masses. They have associated the United States with status quo powers whose only motivation is to hold onto the bounties they already possess.

Thus, the free world, in spite of its greater resources and spiritual values, has been sometimes outmaneuvered. Too many times we who are free have seemingly lacked the understanding conviction with which to defend our way of life.

The answer lies in the heart, the mind, and in the spirit of all Americans. We must teach a better understanding and appreciation of the American way of life; we must rebuild the conviction that our path is the closest to that which God would have us follow, that it is truly worthy of personal sacrifices.

We must spread the word, both at home and abroad. We must call on the good offices and influence of the home, church, school, and Armed Forces, to develop the sound minds and dedicated spirits upon which our national security is fundamentally based. We can take our cue from Nathan Hale, who, when asked by his captors if he had any last words, simply said: "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

You, ladies and gentlemen, are among the teachers. By virtue of the great wisdom you possess, you are able to wield your power and influence on people everywhere. Therefore, you have perhaps a greater responsibility to freedom.

Yes; you are accountable. You are accountable for your use of freedom and your powers to teach. Through your patriotic dedication, you can rekindle the fires of understanding conviction so that all Americans will proudly dedicate themselves to the words of our Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence:

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

This, ladies and gentlemen, is the mind and spirit in our national security.

Thank you.

Removal of Controls Would Not Eliminate Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Removal of Controls Would Not Eliminate Surplus," which appeared in the December 29, 1955, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

REMOVAL OF CONTROLS WOULD NOT ELIMINATE SURPLUSES

There are many farmers who believe high-price supports have caused the present surplus and ensuing low prices on their products; at least that is the impression gained from the recent Farm Bureau Convention in Chicago. It is possible, though, that the delegates mirrored political rather than practical thinking. The idea that if support prices are abandoned, the surplus will vanish, has found its way into the thinking of persons who have not checked the records. During the twenties when general prosperity was at a high level, farm products brought less than a living wage to their producers, and there were no support prices then, yet the ruinous prices were attributed to overproduction.

Surpluses of farm products followed by depressed prices are not new; in fact, they have been a recurring plague since man learned to produce more than he can use. Price supports without crop controls tend to aggravate the condition of unbalance, but it would not be fair to assume that they are the sole cause. They can add to surpluses if no real move is made to limit production.

Even persons who once advocated no controls at all have altered their thinking, proposing an outright subsidy to farmers to take land out of production. It should have been apparent to them long ago that farming is a large and diversified occupation, with little hope for limiting production to market demands unless there is some sort of authoritative control. Farmers themselves have favored these controls in every vote where the issue is between controls and unlimited production which could lead to low prices.

In developing a solution to the farm problem, nothing is gained by blaming surpluses on legislation of recent years. The goal should be to improve this legislation or abandon altogether the program of providing stable markets for products of 12 percent of the Nation's population. Dropping controls possibly would mean a greater exodus from the farm and eventual removal of the surplus under laws of supply and demand. But would it be best for the country to allow this 12 percent only the choice of selling their products below cost or entering some other occupation more remunerative?

Aviation and Transportation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 8 Mr. Louis E. Leverone, of Chicago, deilvered an address before the aviation committee of the Decatur Chamber of Commerce at Decatur, Ill. Mr. Leverone served several terms as president of the National Aeronautics Association, is presently a director of that organization, and is recognized as an able authority on national aviation problems. His address is therefore not only authoritative but very timely, and points out a number of aspects of the overall aviation and transportation problem which will prove useful and constructive. I therefore submit his address for inclusion in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within recent weeks, the largest public borrowing of all times was successfully completed in our Nation's money marts. This underwriting covered the financing of the Illinois toll-road program, and its success gives the assurance—in the months and years ahead—that our State will be given those new arteries of transportation so vitally necessary for the future. To speed up travel time within legal limits—to eliminate travel congestion and to provide safer highways—are sufficient reasons for this very new program.

But there is a more basic reason why this toll-road program is tremendously important. Highways—lots of them—are the outlets for cars, trucks, and busses. The high level of production of the automotive industry has been one of the great sustaining bulwarks of our prosperity of the postwar decade. If Detroit is to continue to produce automotive equipment, then public agencies must supply the roads and highways to handle this increased traffic.

We may be very thankful to our alert and farseeing Governor—Bill Stratton. He saw the need and acted promptly. He had to fight down tremendous opposition but he did so successfully and we, the people of Illinois, are beneficiaries of his good judgment.

I only mention this in preface and as parallel of a very comparable problem which faces us in air travel. Similarly, we need the same kind of public leadership and sound planning to avert a very critical situation which is slowly but certainly developing in aviation. Here are sample headlines which have recently appeared in the daily press:

"American Airlines purchases $165 million worth of Boeing 707 Jet Transports;" "United Airlines places order with Douglas Aircraft for 30 DC–8 Jet Transports for $175 million"; "Pan American enters large order for DC–8's"; "National Airlines buys $36 million worth of Jet Transports," and et cetera, and so forth.

The question is, "Are we ready?" Do we have the necessary ground facilities in the form of longer runways and airports of greater area to handle this expansion? I don't think so. You may remember that the DC–6 was introduced to commercial transportation less than 10 years ago. At that time airline presidents confidently predicted that this aircraft would be the answer to high-speed transportation for the next 20 years. The advent of the DC–6 caused the airport planners to increase runway lengths from 4,000 feet to more than 6,000 feet. Different airport patterns were acquired and it was a matter of several years before the necessary ground changes were made to accommodate the six. But, what happened concurrently with this development? The DC–6 was surpassed in performance by the Super G Constellation the DC–7 and the Vickers Viscount. So, it becomes evident that the air transportation industry in itself failed to foresee the tremendous advance which occurred much sooner than anyone was willing to predict. But the history of aviation is full of incidents where even the most thoughtful planners have failed to estimate even their own projected aims. One of my favorite stories has to do with one of our great aircraft manufacturing companies and its pioneer president who was and is recognized as an all-time leader in this field. Early in 1947, a brilliant young engineer from this company predicted, in a speech before the chamber of commerce, that we would see the time when aircraft would fly at speeds of more than 1,000 miles per hour. Our pioneer friend was so incensed and so irritated by what he considered brash and irresponsible boasting that he terminated this boy's services immediately. Within 1 year after this incident, Larry Bell, Lt. Chuck Yaeger, and John Stack, were jointly awarded the Collier Trophy, the highest aviation award of the world for producing and operating the X–1, the first plane to break the sonic barrier for traveling, mind you, at 1,100 miles per hour which my good friend, Glenn L. Martin, hadn't believed possible. And, it goes the same way in many other instances.

But, to get back to my subject on our particular emergency, I should like to point out that the progress and improved technique of aircraft manufacture are not at all paralleled by comparable planning in the field of airport design and development. Every one of these new planes on order require greater takeoff runs than any aircraft presently flying in commercial service. If these new types of aircraft were placed in service tomorrow, only a handful of American cities would have airport facilities adequate to handle this air traffic. Here are

some current figures which might give you some food for thought. There are approximately 7,000 counties in the United States. There is a total of 6,921 civil airports currently certificated in the United States; that amounts to less than 1 airport per county. But let's break down this figure. Out of the 6,921 airports, only 1,216 are lighted. Only 1,373 are paved. So we see that more than 80 percent of our total number of airports in the United States are unlighted and unpaved. Furthermore, of the 20 percent which are lighted and paved, a very small percentage of these airports are adequate to even handle our present four-engine air transport. In other words, most of our present facilities can't even handle our present multiengine aircraft, to say nothing of those airplanes planned for the future. I am not including, of course, military airbases for, logically, it would seem that these bases must continue to be bastions of our defense program and may not even be considered for civilian or commercial purposes. What is the answer?

I should like to make a few points:

1. That because of the immensity of the problem, it can't be handled through private channels but must be handled through public agencies—Federal, State, or local—or any combination of the three.

2. The realization of this need must come from the grassroots, and must be encouraged and stimulated at the community level so that the people themselves will be educated to the need and the importance of such a program. At this moment, I should like to review what we in Illinois are actually doing about it. Back in 1942, when air travel was coming into its own, the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, which I headed that year, established its first aviation committee, under Harry Neumiller, of Peoria. This committee, composed of community leaders throughout the State, sponsored and promoted the Illinois and Municipal Airport Act in the legislature and which statute was finally enacted into law. Through the Illinois Airport Authority Act, many cities in Illinois, have been enabled to build and finance their own facilities which has aided the commerce and prosperity of these communities. Even today, this particular legislation is regarded as a model by many other States who have patterned their own statutes along the same lines. But what happened to the aviation committee? It was disbanded several years ago because the communities had their airports and the members of the commitee felt the job was finished. In view of recent developments, it would appear that this was a premature assumption.

Other groups of local aviation enthusiasts seemed to have lost their interest and have fallen by the wayside. So, actually, we have no statewide civic group which is actively engaged in educating any large segment of the electorate, as a present problem.

Within the next 10 years at least $100 million will have to be expended in airport improvement within the boundaries of our own State if we are to keep up with progress. Some of it may be Federal grant and a substantial part of it may be obtained by local financing. There will be opposition, of course, as progress is always opposed and perhaps there will be those groups who will remark that the day of vertical ascent is upon us so that it would mean smaller and not larger airports. This is the kind of obstructionist thinking which tried to block the toll-road program, by the way.

We have too few leaders who can envision this progress; and not enough men of stature who realize that this is the golden era and the next 10 years may be the greatest decade of our entire history. We need men of courage and foresight who will accept these challenges and who will lead us to greatest peacetime prosperity.

One gentleman with an eye to the future, with whom I disagreed violently, politically, was former Mayor LaGuardia who I admired personally for his foresight on the subject of aviation. When the Little Flower announced plans for Idlewild, which was to cover an area, not of 40 acres but of 400, his detractors proclaimed him a candidate for the psychiatric ward. He had to fight his own associates to bring this program to completion and was able to see the New York International Airport in operation before his death. Today, Idlewild is the greatest international airport in the world and, believe it or not, needs further expansion from its original program which many claimed was overambitious.

I shall never forget the time that Mr. LaGuardia told me in Chicago that our city's airport was inadequate. This was in 1944 when he was a delegate to the International Civil Aviation Convention. As we sat in his hotel room, at the Stevens, he pointed to the lake front at 23d Street and said, "Fill in at that point and several miles out, and there will be an airport which will take care of Chicago at least for a few years." I told him that the idea had been discussed but that its cost—$160 million—seemed so high that the idea was abandoned. Today it seems that we should have heeded that counsel, for even O'Hare Field now open to public use, the two Chicago airports aren't going to be enough to handle our future traffic.

Perhaps we will finally build the lake front airport, but at a cost of somewhat more than $300 million. You will agree that this is a rather costly type of conservatism.

I hope that the time will arrive when every community of over 10,000 people in the United States is accessible to an airport, lighted and with hard-surfaced runways, to accommodate commercial aircraft. It is just as important to consider the economic advantages of airports as it was years ago to realize the need for hard roads. Don't forget that political action is aroused by alert public opinion and that public sentiment must be generated from just such groups as these. I am confident that in meetings like this, we can prepare material for editorial support of a constructive airport program and it will follow that our dreams and hopes will come to fruition.

Courier-Journal, New York Times Named on Every List in Survey as Among 10 Great United States Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Courier-Journal, New York Times Named on Every List in Survey as Among 10 Great United States Papers," which appeared in the December 29, 1955, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that generations of Kentuckians have watched the modern growth of the Louisville Courier-Journal beginning under the leadership of Henry Watterson with the certainty that the Courier is one of the finest papers in the United States. It is gratifying to have our faith upheld by a jury of outstanding journalists who place it as one of the 10 greatest newspapers in this country.

The article is as follows:

COURIER-JOURNAL, NEW YORK TIMES NAMED ON EVERY LIST IN SURVEY AS AMONG 10 GREAT UNITED STATES PAPERS

What is a great newspaper?

In any group of intelligent journalists there would be difference of opinion as to what was meant by the question and there would be great variation in the answers. But if each journalist indicated some of the newspapers he especially respected, a pattern of greatness might be worked out.

Accordingly, a group of outstanding journalists was asked to suggest the 10 greatest papers.

There were 29 replies from editors of large and small papers, from every region, and from syndicated columnists working on a national scale.

Two newspapers appear on all the lists. They are the New York Times and the Louisville Courier-Journal. The next highest number of votes went to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Two newspapers share the next bracket—the Christian Science Monitor and the Milwaukee Journal. The Washington Post stands alone in the fourth bracket.

Tied for fifth place in frequency of mention are the New York Post, Des Moines Register and Tribune, Baltimore Sun, and New York Herald Tribune. Next come the Wall Street Journal and the Madison Capital Times.

Highly regarded by a majority of the journalists are the Toledo Blade, Denver Post, Raleigh News and Observer, Minneapolis Star and Tribune, Providence Journal and Bulletin, Kansas City Star-Times, Washington Star, Chicago Daily News, and Hartford Courant. Receiving at least one mention are the San Francisco Chronicle, Atlanta Journal, Buffalo Courier-Express, Newark News, Oakland Tribune, Los Angeles Times, Cleveland Press, and Philadelphia Inquirer.

Obviously, some of these choices are favorite sons, valueless to any serious study of the subject. In any case, the selections offer food for thought.

In general, it would appear that the outstanding newspapermen think of a great newspaper as one having the confidence of its public. That would include many of the smaller publications whose impact on public and craft is not as great.

Integrity, fairness, willingnes sto take up unpopular and unprofitable causes when circumstances demand, responsible leadership and the putting of public service above private gain were some of the criteria. With few exceptions, all the newspapers mentioned are financially stable. It would be difficult to be great otherwise.

There is a curious regional alinement in this selection. Of the 31 newspapers mentioned, only 1 is in the Deep South. Only three are on the west coast, each mentioned only once, and none are in the Pacific Northwest. On the other hand, cities lying along the old faultline between North and South—in the so-called border States—have more than their share of recognition on the list. Baltimore, Washington, Louisville, St. Louis, and Kansas City are all in this area.

It is also noteworthy that The Chicago Tribune, which calls itself the "world's greatest newspaper," is chosen by none of the successful journalists queried.

The editor who named the Los Angeles Times said he was tempted to recognize the Chicago Tribune, even though he frequently disagreed with it, but it was not on his list.

WHY WAS AREA SKIPPED?

One wonders why the Pacific Northwest was ignored by this group. Is it because we are not long enough settled to establish essential traditions? Possibly, but that could

apply to the Mountain States, where at least one of the candidates is located.

If our youth is a factor, then how would one answer the journalist who said that a generation ago he would have nominated the Portland Oregonian "or maybe one other in that area," but he could not do so now?

The number and size of dailies in a region must be a consideration; but Denver, in a sparsely settled area, is on the list, and journalists as far away as Colorado, Missouri, and California listed one Midwest daily of only about 40,000 circulation.

Perhaps some of our readers could offer a plausible explanation as to why we have no representation on the list. (Reprinted from Northwest Communications, based on a survey made by that publication, which is a product of the University of Washington, Seattle. The executive editor of the Courier-Journal was invited to vote on the 10 greatest newspapers, but did not do so."

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before National Association of Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the National Association of Manufacturers on December 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Americans, in 179 years our Nation has grown from a small colony of three million people on the Atlantic seaboard to a great world power with a population of 166 million extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The American competitive enterprise economic system, which is represented in part by members of your organization, has provided our people with the most productive economy and the highest standard of living the world has ever known.

This growth and this economic productivity has taken place under our American Constitution which recognized that personal rights and property rights were and are inseparable.

No system of socialism, Marxian or Fabian, could have produced such a remarkable growth and development in a country that represents but 6 percent of the world's population.

Other nations have now, or did in the past contain, larger natural resources, more population, older civilizations, and wider geographic boundaries. So these alone or in combination do not represent the priceless ingredient that has brought us to our present position as a leader of the free world.

The catalyst is the American constitutional system wherein the Federal Government was created by the people and given limited and specified powers so it might not in turn make them subservient to an all-powerful central government.

Abroad and at home we face the challenge of those who would destroy us by Marxian brute power or by a Fabian process of sugar coating each Socialist pill to produce a devastating narcotic effect upon once free men.

Both the external and internal threats may be camouflaged until after the American people go to the polls 11 months from now.

That is why the year 1956 may become one of the great turning points of history.

A short time ago some at home and abroad were anticipating a release of tensions by a cooling plunge into the mirage of Lake Geneva rising from the desolate trackless waste of a Communist tyranny that today enslaves almost one-half of the world.

At almost the same time Soviet First Deputy Premier Kaganovich was laying down the hard line to the party faithful at a dinner on November 6 in Moscow:

"If the 19th century was a century of capitalism, the 20th century is a century of the triumph of socialism and communism."

A short time earlier between the last two Geneva meetings, a robust and ruthless colleague in the Kremlin hierarchy, Khrushchev, said:

"Anybody who takes our smile for withdrawal from the teachings of Karl Marx or Lenin is making a mistake.

"Those who expect this will have to wait until Easter Monday falls on Tuesday."

In language devastatingly frank, these spokesmen of the Kremlin have made clear to our diplomats and our people that despite vodka toasts and Communist smiles that political conclusions should not be drawn from social favors.

Their statements mean that to cheat, lie, and murder, to violate treaties and to destroy free nations are still a part of "the end justifies the means" policy of the Soviet Union and of international communism.

In the dialectics of communism it means that the struggle will continue not by the standards of civilized nations with an obligation to God and to humanity, but by the tooth, claw, and fang standards of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin.

For the past 12 years beginning at Tehran in 1943, through Yalta and Potsdam in 1945, to the Korean war and in 10 years of United Nations deliberations we have been compromised by our entanglements with the Soviet Union through accepting their words rather than requiring deeds.

Since the rulers of the Kremlin cannot renounce the Soviets' role as a spearhead for world revolution any agreement they enter into with the free world is fraudulent.

Lenin said: "Communists will disarm only after we have completely forced down and expropriated the bourgeoisie of the whole world."

Because of the Soviet threats we face, our defense budget for the next fiscal year has been reported at $34½ billion.

This compares with the total expenditures of the Federal Government from the day George Washington was inaugurated as President until we entered World War I in April 1917, which amounted to $24 billion.

A prolonged siesta of wishful dreaming and failure to face the facts with traditional American courage and commonsense can jeopardize the preservation of our Republic and the survival of human freedom here and abroad.

We should not forget the Biblical injunctions in II Corinthians:

"Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: For what fellowship has righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion has light with darkness?"

We are in a struggle for the minds and souls of men. We dare not continue to compromise our moral position if we are to win this conflict.

We must win the cold war if we are to successfully prevent world war III.

A prolonged stalemate will break us economically and ultimately undermine both our military and political position.

If America goes under in this struggle we would take the whole free world down with us. There would be no one left to bale out this Nation or our allies.

As for the neutrals, they can enjoy that luxury only so long as someone else is helping to preserve international law and order.

How long is a retreat from principle to be tolerated by the people of the free world?

Or have we become so immune that we do not want to be reminded of the facts by the press, radio, or television?

Are we or our allies to become so bewitched by the Soviet tactics that we ignore their long-term strategy?

Is the doctrine "peace at any price" to so throttle prudent warnings that men will dare not speak out for fear their political future will be damaged if not destroyed?

"Peace at any price" means the ultimate communization of the world. It is far different than peace based on freedom and justice.

For if we accept this doctrine of "peace at any price" and they do not, it means that with their cynical and brutal measures they will pick off our allies one by one, first the smaller ones and then the larger. The neutrals will go by default.

If we dare not risk a conflict what will stop the ruthless men in the Kremlin from moving during the next 10 years, by external aggression or Soviet directed internal subversion, against Norway, Denmark, Western Germany, Italy, France, Korea, Japan, the Republic of China, the Philippines, Australia, Great Britain, or our own Territory of Alaska?

Ten years ago at the time of the Yalta Conference there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. Tonight as we meet here in New York there are over 900 million people who have lost their freedom to the most godless tyranny the world has ever known.

The world should have learned at Munich that appeasement is not the road to peace—it is only surrender on the installment plan.

Let us take just three significant examples of retreat from principle.

1. At Yalta in 1945 when Stalin demanded recognition of the Lublin Polish Communist Government, British Prime Minister Churchill declared that British recognition of the exiled free Polish Government in London was a matter of honor. Later, on the Soviet promise of free elections which they never kept and because of their adamant position the free world yielded.

2. In 1945 in the discussions leading up to the organization of the United Nations, the Soviet Union demanded membership for the Ukraine and Byelorussia. President Roosevelt protested and stated that they were no more eligible than any of our 48 States. Again the free world yielded to Soviet demands.

3. Previously on numerous occasions, the official representatives of Great Britain and the United States have declared that the Soviet attempt to force a "package deal" wherein qualified nations could hurdle a Soviet veto only by the admission of unqualified Communist ones was unadulterated "blackmail." Now in December 1955, the British and Commonwealth countries affirmatively support and we acquiesce by abstaining from voting on the issue. Again the free world has in the United Nations General Assembly yielded to an adamant Soviet position.

The shocking sequel to this shift is that at the United Nations headquarters the Representatives of the Republic of China were informed that if they used their veto right in the Security Council there would likely be a majority vote in the General Assembly to seat Communist China next year.

In any event, after the 1956 American elections the neutrals, the Soviet bloc and the British Commonwealth, other than Australia, have given strong hints that they will seat Communist China in the General Assembly.

I wish to say to you and to the American people that it is later than you think.

Communist China was an aggressor in Korea that inflicted 140,000 casualties upon us, including 35,000 dead; is now a violator of the terms of the Korean armistice, and is an extortionist that has sought to use American civilian and military personnel for bargaining purposes. I am opposed to the admission of Communist China into the United Nations.

Foreign policy is too important to be left to Government alone. It must be based on a fully informed public.

It is far more important that we save freedom for ourselves and our posterity than we save face for any United Nations member or diplomat.

As long as I have a voice and a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall oppose diluting any of our rights under the American constitution with any form of world government, wherein freedom is compromised with totalitarian tyranny.

A sound national economy and a solvent Federal Government are essential prerequisites for successful domestic and foreign policies.

The Eisenhower Republican administration came into office on January 20, 1953, and has now been in office only 35 months. The previous New Deal administration had been in control of the executive branch of the Government for 20 years and the legislative branch for 18 years.

Among its accomplishments in the limited period of time that this Republican administration has held office are the following:

There are 65 million people gainfully employed which is the highest record of employment in the history of the Nation.

The previous Truman New Deal budget has been reduced by over 10 billions of dollars.

The American people have been given a 7½ billion dollar tax reduction, the largest in the history of our Nation.

The stalemated war in Korea was brought to an end.

Wage and price controls have been abolished to the encouragement of our free enterprise system.

The policy of this administration is to reduce and not increase Federal governmental competition with private enterprise.

It is the policy of the Federal Government to bring businessmen and business methods into the administration of our public affairs.

Since President Eisenhower took office in January of 1953, the gross national product is up 6 percent; production in factories and mines is up 4 percent; construction is up 19 percent; business investment in plant and equipment is up 4 percent; employment is up 2 percent; personal income is up 8 percent.

In October of this year retail sales reached the highest in history for any month of any year and amounted to over $15 billion.

The state of the Nation is good. To be sure there are certain agriculture, mining, and industrial areas that have not been up to the national averages.

We will not solve our agricultural problems by reenacting the 90 percent fixed parity legislation for the basic crops under which more than $7 billion of agricultural products were accumulated.

The American farmer understands agricultural facts as does the distinguished former Democratic Secretary of Agriculture, CLINTON ANDERSON, now Senator from New Mexico. At the November Texas Farm Bureau Federation meeting in Fort Worth, Senator ANDERSON said:

"No farmer should ever forget that during all the time from 1948 through 1954, when a great gap has opened up between national income and farm income, the price support program was pegged to a rigid 90 percent standard."

The farm problem needs thoughtful light from the farmers and sound economists rather than political heat for election-year purposes.

Prudent and thoughtful people in all areas know the importance of agriculture getting its fair share of the national income.

Our support program should give encouragement to quality production of basic and nonbasic crops rather than quantity alone.

We must also be careful that supports do not price American agriculture out of the world or domestic market.

We must renew foreign aid programs whereby taxes upon the American farmer, businessman and worker go to help finance similar crops or products at lower production costs across our borders or in distant lands and foreclose agriculture, industry and labor from the advantages of our historic markets.

The challenge our generation faces is to preserve man's identity as an individual. How can he be protected in his personal, political and property rights against overpowering business, labor or governmental mechanisms which would submerge him.

Every generation of Americans has desired to improve the well being of our people and leave to their children an even better land than they themselves found.

Our challenge is—to demonstrate that this can be better done by our American system of competitive enterprise rather than by an all powerful Federal Government exercising its taxing, price and wage control powers to make the Nation into the image designed by Washington planners.

Continued deficit financing leads to inflationary pressures that would bring on Federal controls of prices, wages and allocations of materials. In peacetime such a program would strangle free enterprise and be the road to socialism.

We have made progress toward a balanced budget, but to date it is not yet an accomplished fact.

When our budget is balanced I believe that sound fiscal policy would require a start on the repayment of the national debt.

It would take 280 years to pay off the national debt at a rate of $1 billion a year.

At the lower rate of repayment of $1 million a day it would take 769 years to eliminate the debt.

Under the circumstances, Congress and the administration should show prudence in advocacy of new spending programs.

The public may surprise both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue by judging the quality rather than the quantity of legislation recommended and passed.

As the Federal administrative structure grows, it becomes cumbersome, tends to be arbitrary and can be dangerous to our system of checks and balances.

In December 1944, it reached an all time high of 3,209,000, which is more people than constituted the population of our country at the time we won our freedom.

It is now 2,397,869 which is still a top-heavy Federal structure difficult for a President to administer, for Congress to check upon, or for the courts to safeguard equity and justice for the citizen in the multiplicity of decisions handed down by anonymous parts of a huge organization.

The Hoover Commission estimated that there were a total of over 2,500 commercial and industrial-type activities with an investment of $15 billion. The Commission recommended that 1,000 of these facilities could be eliminated without injury to our national defense or any essential governmental activities.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said:

"In questions of power, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the constitution."

The American system of competitive enterprise is as essential to labor as it is to the investor and the general public. No segment of the national economy can all for long without infecting the balance, to the detriment of all.

Heavy tax burdens, Federal and State, have in many cases resulted in the forced sale of successful small businesses or partnerships to their larger competitor when death suddenly brought tax obligations of a confiscatory nature.

We need to encourage the broadening of our private property economic base.

The more we can encourage widespread stock ownership among the general public and among employees, giving them all added incentive in private enterprise, the better it will be in combatting those who would turn more and more to public ownership.

Early in this century, the enactment of antitrust statutes established traffic signals along the economic highway to protect the pedestrian public or the individual small economic business vehicle owner from the highpowered ones which were operated without a sense of public responsibility.

Bigness alone does not necessarily make for more efficiency or better and more thoughtful relationships with the union member, the stockholder or the general public.

No business or labor organization should have the power to strangle the economic life of 166 million Americans and by so doing endanger the whole free world of freemen.

But overpowering business or labor organizations are not the only menaces to the dignity of man as an individual.

Big and overpowering Government is what our Founding Fathers sought to guard us against. We have already skipped too far down this primrose path.

The following are guide posts for the preservation of our free institutions:

1. Maintaining our constitutional system of checks and balances between the three great coordinate branches of the Federal Government.

2. The division of powers between the Federal and State Governments and limiting the Federal Government to its specified powers and preserving States' rights.

3. Keeping the military subordinate to the civil authority.

4. Maintaining control of education on the State and local level rather than in the Federal Government.

5. Balancing the Federal budget and making provision for a gradual reduction on the national debt.

6. A maintenance of the same standards of fiscal rectitude in the treatment of our social security trust funds that the Government expects of private insurance companies. It is also important to keep in mind that inflation hits the recipients of benefits in both cases.

7. Encouraging our free enterprise system so that our people will be gainfully employed and new opportunities will be constantly opened up for our increasing population.

8. The maintenance of peace with honor. We must realize it is neither necessary nor desirable to try to remake the world in our governmental, economic, or social image. Neither international nor personal friendships can be purchased.

9. In legislative programs seek to encourage a prosperous economic climate for agriculture, labor, industry, the investor, and the public by which they can provide for current needs and future normal requirements from adequate wages and earnings. This should take place under our American enterprise system rather than by political parties bidding against each other for group favor out of the Public Treasury.

10. Insist that both parties and their candidates discuss the basic issues confronting this generation. The time for the public to know where candidates stand is before their nomination and election, not afterwards. The times are too serious and

the consequences too great to permit, this year or next, any waltzing around on the fundamental issues confronting us.

All Americans who believe in our political and economic system, regardless of their party affiliation, should join in the pledge of Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The President—His Office and His Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address by the Honorable Sherman Adams, the assistant to the President of the United States at the dinner of the Advertising Council in honor of Clarence Francis, special consultant to the President, at the Plaza Hotel on December 1, 1955.

This address is worthy of the most careful consideration by each of us. It points up vividly both the challenge and the opportunity Americans have in supporting President Eisenhower's magnificent efforts to establish and guarantee peace in the world.

When I have a hard job or one which I do not know how to perform, I usually ask somebody how.

The answer to my query brought this—the first note—that I was to pay tribute to Clarence Francis for 1 minute. It seemed to me that Clarence Francis is worth at least a minute and a half. He is one of the few extremely able people in America who has never refused so far as I know, anything anybody asked him to do. When it was suggested that he was the best man who could be found to help liquidate a butter surplus of 365 million pounds he seemed surprised. I am satisfied he did not want the job, but he thought he ought to do it, and he did it.

If I had time enough, I would try to tell you just what he has done in giving a great lift to the business of selling off of commodities nobody wanted. It is quite a story. Yet there is still plenty of work remaining to be done. For instance, we own at the present time about 925 million bushels of wheat.

If Clarence Francis had been able to sell that, this meeting would have been called in the White House with the President at the head table. If he does it in 1956, we will give him the White House. If he can dispose of $7 billion worth of unneeded agricultural commodities that overhang the market in this country today, I even think he can be elected President of the United States.

Clarence Francis is one of the really superbly useful, dedicated Americans I know. His light has shone upon more than one field of intricately difficult administrative responsibilities. In public undertakings, his contribution has been outstanding. I can here give testimony to the fact that he is not only appreciated by yours truly, but by the staff, the Cabinet, and above all, by the President of the United States. This gives me the opportunity to thank Clarence Francis publicly, on behalf of the President, for his devoted spirit and generous undertakings.

What I have to say about the President deals largely with his recovery. This, I presume, is what you expect me to talk about. The President has a very large heart. Fortunately, this is a figurative statement, and not a pathological one. As everyone knows, he passed through a few years of great anxiety. Your doctors will tell you that you cannot have a substantial thought that does not have a physical reaction. Although our President was, on the statement of his doctors, in as good physical condition as any man of this age whom they ever saw, he did suffer an injury. That injury was caused by the stress of anxious years. In the doctors' view the most anxious years were those when his actions affected the security of his country, and the lives of American boys.

This explains a lot of things. In it you find the principal reason why the President has considered peace the great goal of his efforts since he was elected. Fundamentally, it is the reason why peace will continue to be the goal to which his full efforts will continue to be dedicated. And he will continue to devote himself to this goal as long as he continues to be President, and thereafter, I am sure, as long as his strength remains.

If you found yourself curious about the real condition of the President at the onset of his illness, you might like to know that the most curious person was the President himself. The first time I saw him after he was ill, he said, "If the doctors here didn't tell me differently, I would think this heart attack belonged to some other guy."

In any event, it is a fact that his recovery so far is thorough and complete. You can look forward to this particular case falling into that uninspired category of figures called average life expectancy, which means the President will probably live to an older age than you and I, that is, if you are a young man like myself.

Now the Advertising Council well knows what I think of it. For some time now I have been on the public record on this issue. To the best of my recollection, you were the most active post-election zealots of any organization in the Nation. Your emissaries, Mr. West and Mr. Repplier, were early Commodore visitors, and the lecture I got about the good deeds of the Advertising Council stood me in good stead. What I have since learned is that what they told me was the truth. The council, of course, is an indispensable mechanism. It not only has a head, but it has a heart, an attribute of the body of considerable significance these days.

The council is truly an organization devoted to the public interest, and here the public interest is more than a couple of fuzzy words. For you it means the use of your extraordinary talents and facilities for public enlightenment—to fulfill the need for common understanding of national urgencies of substantial importance to the peace, security, and well-being of our country.

The programs you have adopted are those whose success imposes a large measure of responsibility on the part of the Government. Therefore, they are a part of the business of the Federal administration, in short, the President's business. That you have effectively assumed the task of public information aspects of the giving of blood, for instance, the prevention of forest fires, the educational needs of our children, and the distribution of the public debt through United States savings bonds, all this has lightened the President's burden.

That brings up another subject. There has been a good deal said lately about lightening the President's load. I read recently that it was absurd that the President had to sign his name an average of 200 times a day. This is an inaccurate approximation. There are a considerable number of other misconceptions about the characteristics of his work.

A variety of ways have been devised by the Congress and the Constitution literally to require the President personally to make the major decisions. This is as it should be. No wise or responsible counselor would divest the Office of the demands upon it which determine the principal policy. Notwithstanding, over the years there have been added duties of signature, of directive, of decision which are in the nature of duties otherwise delegated, and which properly can and should be discharged by others. It is in this field that thorough attention is now being given toward the disposing of irrelevancies.

This by no means wholly meets the needs of the more perfect management of the Office. The physical competence of a man to carry the presidential burden is not determined by the number of times a day he must sign his name. Rather it lies more in the competence and judgment of his appointees, his Cabinet, his staff, and the agency chiefs to carry out their responsibilities and to discharge their trusts. The magnitude of his burden the President in great measure determines himself when he makes his appointments. The ability of a head of a vitally important Federal agency to do the work set out for him without continually needing to lean upon the Chief Executive often measures his stature and his usefulness as a public servant. Sometimes, from what I read, it seems that the importance of a man in the administration is metered by how many times a day he sees the President. Often the opposite can be the case.

The management of the presidential office is probably the most difficult task of its kind there is. Success in its initial organization is half the battle. It is how the presidential appointees conduct themselves that decides the dimensions of the burden of the Office of President. There is sufficient time without overburden for the necessary decisions, directives, yes, and signatures. There is no need to divest the office of its vital function and the extraordinary powers reposing in it. That is where they belong.

Now I come to my assigned topic. I approach it with some misgivings.

This summer I went to Berlin. There Ambassador Conant took me to see the great library John McCloy, formerly High Commissioner, dreamed of, and which he never saw until a few weeks ago. Here, hardly a stone's throw from the Brandenburg Gate separating free West Berlin from Communist East Berlin, close to the shambles of the Reichstag and the bombed out bunker of Hitler and Goering—a scant half mile or so from Stalinstrasse of East Berlin—stands a free library. There it is—modern, beautiful, free. Books, by the thousands, a cultural citadel for anybody who can read in whatever language, adult or child, whether his origins are East or West. If you reside in the East sector and are apprehended reading a capitalistic newspaper your conviction carries 25 years under close Communist military supervision. Yet the librarian told me that he estimated over 25,000 eager hungry readers had taken the subway this year from East to West Berlin to seek knowledge otherwise forbidden to them.

If you live in West Germany during these days, you are being persuaded by every conceivable means that the Soviet possesses the only remedy to a divided Germany. You are being taught that the West cannot provide it. Look at Geneva, they say, you can see for yourself.

Yet you do not want it that way. You still are distrustful of what will become of your liberty and your property. You believe in Eisenhower's sincerity of purpose, and you hope that somehow he can come back again. You feel that he will avoid the war whose weapons this time, if unloosened, means the destruction of a country like Germany. You want the West to prevail. But will it, you ask?

In a different climate, if you are an Egyptian and grow cotton, for instance, you would not be too particular whether your government sold it for you in exchange for arms from Czechoslovakia. The Americans didn't want your cotton, and cotton is your

bread. Wherever you are, are you so sure now that the West offers you the best choice? There are more opportunities now being offered, loans for a steel mill if you are in India, various trade and other inducements if you are in Syria, Afghanistan, or Ceylon.

We are aware of all this propaganda and negotiation, of course. We are sensitive to the influences at work which underlie all of it. And we are doing our best, in company with our allies, to promote the unification of Germany and help develop political and economic stability and self-reliance among all nations who desire freedom and self-government.

Let us be sure we Americans, that we understand all this for what it really is. Here we have a new phase of the Communist offensive. Let us be sure that we ourselves are clear about the difference between the blandishments offered in each new Soviet proffer, and what we hold out for the hope and the goal of the free world. We enter, it is true, a new phase of the cold war but the conflict is not changed. It is as ominous, as sinister, as deceptive as it has ever been. How do we meet it?

As an aftermath of Geneva somehow the notion took hold that we are involved in some new and unexpected crisis. Not so. If there has been a central purpose in the conduct of every phase of our foreign affairs, it has been the carrying out relentlessly of clearly stated objectives. Ours is a schedule of attainable strength, air squadrons, long range missiles, strategically located bases, evolving new atomic weapons, warning and communication lines on land and on the sea. These objectives, unchanged, were as explicit before Geneva as after it. We are not on a crash program basis.

Nor should be be blind to materialistic competition. The conflict of economic systems further reflect uncompromising ideological philosophies. In character was the recent reduction in the slight gains the harassed Soviet consumer was promised by the Malenkov government. It is not to the betterment of the consumers that their might and political ambition are committed. The largest peacetime military budget in Soviet history brings only increasing privation to the individual Soviet and to the satellite citizen.

While we condemn the system we seek to thwart we should be mindful of the increasing benefits of the new capitalism we seek to strengthen and preserve. We have actually achieved those things communism empty-handedly promises. We are literally Nation of middle class, few of us very rich, few of us very poor, most of us somewhere in the middle of the economic road. The growth of the middle income population has been enormous. The abundance of our land, the leisure to enjoy it, and the opportunity to grow intellectually and culturally are being shared by more and more Americans. It is ironic that this which was Marx's dream should have come about through an evolution of the very system he so deeply reviled.

Ownership of capital is rapidly moving into the hands of more and more Americans. The other day the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers gave me an interesting statistic. Consumer plant and equipment in the possession of our people, in homes, automobiles and durable household goods, exceeds by one-third the value of all industrial plant and equipment in the Nation. Almost everybody has a savings account, or life insurance, or belongs to a pension plan. More and more earnings of the individual are being invested in industry. Employees are now becoming stockholders. The funds of labor unions, in many cases, are being invested in the securities of the corporations which employ their membership.

Because the people supply both the capital and receive the benefit of our increased productivity, what has evolved in America today is truly a people's capitalism. The advertising council coined that phrase, and I like it. The United States Information Agency has adopted it as a meaningful way of describing our system abroad, and has asked the advertising council to produce an exhibit called people's capitalism for display at trade fairs around the world. That exhibit is presently building and will be set up at Union Station in Washington early in February, so many of us may see it before it begins its tour abroad.

The term "people's capitalism" has the virtue of reclaiming for America's aggressive use words which significantly characterize the very life blood of our whole system. In 1787 it was, "We the people," who did ordain and establish our Constitution. There is scarcely a citizen who does not feel himself strongly bound to Lincoln's "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and those words now describe not only our Government but our economic system as well.

We need not and should not be foolishly apologetic for the fact that what we have in this country is capitalism. We should not try to disguise it by calling it something it is not. Instead of the term capitalism becoming a weapon to be used against us it should become a proud description of what our system in fact now is, namely a new people's capitalism which serves our Nation in a way no other system has ever approached.

Actually it produces the most for the many. In America today it has not developed as Marx predicted. Far from the poor becoming poorer and the rich becoming richer, ever-increasing benefits have come to the great mass of our citizens. Contrast this with the wretched socialism of the Soviet, concealing behind its curtains and its barbed wire its low-living standards, slave labor and cruel restrictions on personal freedom.

There is no doubt that we are in a conflict, continuing and cold. Indeed there was little to indicate that the conferences just held this year at Geneva would do much to assuage this conflict. We can claim 'E' for wholehearted effort, but what these conferences made painfully clear is the need to press relentlessly the logic and justice of our own cause. Moreover our military and economic assistance programs must be continued. We can no more abandon the support of our freedom-loving friends than we can abandon our airfields, our bases abroad, or reduce our Armed Forces.

While we seek resolutely for better formulae for peace, we still are confronted by the need to keep forging ahead in the race for intercontinental missiles, and more modern and powerful atomic weapons. With all the frustrating scurrying for maximum defensive strength, a hard task of budget balancing confronts us. While Geneva's disappointments mean no crash programs of accelerated military preparedness, they reinforce decisions already made to provide for the maximum security of our country against a hatefully expanding communism. It is not easy to marshall public support for major expenditures of public funds for military security in the face of demands for tax reduction. It is not easy for the farm families of America, for instance, to accept with good grace the harrowing necessity of maintaining mutual-security programs of huge proportions. Yet we must not relax those efforts which meet the threat of Communist expansion. Vigilance is no dearer price to pay for our own liberty than it was to those who watched the building of this Republic.

To persuade others to our way of life we have to think for a moment, as we have tonight, of what has happened in America in the last 50 years. When we understand that it is something truly new and dynamic, we can carry that word abroad. There are, I think, two elements to this persuasion. The people of less-developed nations have two main concerns in determining the direction in which they will go. First, they want to follow the direction they believe to be the winning side. Second, they naturally want to pursue the path which will do the most for them in providing for their own needs, their own culture, and their own happiness.

George Mason, of Virginia, in the Revolutionary Convention of 1776 stated philosophically what he deemed to be one of the great objectives of the system of government then emerging. That objective was pursuing and obtaining happiness. That thought was adopted only 2 months later by Jefferson and his committee in the first section of a great declaration. One of the inalienable rights of all men ought to be, they said, the pursuit of happiness.

In this Christmas season it is not inappropriate to reflect upon the significance of that thought. If it belongs to us as it belonged to them we must believe in that right for others as we believe in it for ourselves. If we do we can fervently hope and willfully strive for the sharing of that right by every man as his universal possession.

The hunger and longing of human beings for sympathy and understanding are emotions common to every man whether he be a citizen of the East or of the West. These sentiments are not expressed simply in terms of money, or in rates of interest, or in the cold terms of conventions. If we will dedicate our efforts to the understanding of Eastern peoples that Americans have a warm heart, as well as a willing hand, and hold a firm interest in their welfare as human beings, we shall move toward a far better appreciation of our purposes as a people. The world of peace for which we strive will only be won by their confidence in us as well as our confidence in them. In that spirit we can hope for a better world for us and for all mankind.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California, Before the Women's National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Women's National Press Club on January 3, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Madam Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Majority Leader, my friend LYNDON JOHNSON, and fellow Americans, tonight as Americans we are thankful for the splendid recovery of President Eisenhower and Senate majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON.

We look forward to these annual gatherings with the Women's National Press Club. There is always a pleasant atmosphere. Some might say it is the calm before the storm.

At any rate we gather at this festive board before Members of Congress at the 2d session of the 84th Congress have had, at your hands, wrinkled brows from laurel wreaths piled upon them or hides so perforated by harpoons that one additional is hardly noticed.

With a free press and a women's press corps, which is second to none, there is, of course, the inference that these awards and demerits are nonpartisan in character.

Yet I would be less than frank if I did not reveal that in the inner sanctum where both Republicans and Democrats let their hair down, if they have any, there is sometimes expressed the strong belief that the Weather Bureau first got the idea for naming cyclones by latching on to one of your membership rosters.

No one has a crystal ball to predict with certainty what the future holds in store for our civilization in this atomic age, for the United States, our two great political parties or any of the individuals constituting them.

Lincoln, in his house-divided speech, said: "If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do, and how to do it."

As Americans, rather than as bitter partisans, we know that all the virtues are not in one party nor all the faults in the other.

Despite the claims that may be made as tensions mount when the session grows older the fact remains that neither party can, even if it would, ride roughshod over the opposition.

Any bill to become law will require a working majority which, because of defections one way or the other, will constantly change from issue to issue and time to time.

With the paper thin Democrat majority of one in the Senate and the narrow margin in the House it is doubtful that any veto could be overridden.

It is a difficult task confronting the leadership in the White House and among the two parties in both the House and the Senate.

In 1913, 43 years ago, my father completing his 10th year of 12 years of House service helped welcome three new freshman members: SAM RAYBURN, CARL HAYDEN, and ALBEN BARKLEY.

That year the total Federal budget reached the then astronomical heights of $1,021,349,990.63. How times have changed.

He was also a good friend of both Uncle Joe Cannon and Champ Clark. I learned early in life that though the center aisle may divide parties it does not divide friendships or the respect political opponents can have one for the other. Over in the House, for example, SAM RAYBURN and JOE MARTIN have established sort of a rotating speakership.

In certain other countries of the world such a divided governmental situation might provoke paralysis if not civil war.

Here, such is the firm foundation of our constitutional system and the sense of responsibility of the leadership and Members of both bodies that I predict there will be a constructive record of accomplishment.

The President, on Thursday, will make his recommendations in the state of the Union message. In addition there will be a number of special messages.

It is then the duty and responsibility of the Congress, a coequal branch of the Government, and the constitutional respository of the legislative power to act on these and other measures before it.

No person can know for certain what the men in the Kremlin or their associates in Europe, Asia or the Middle East may be planning for this wear of 1956. However, there is one thing certain, if they plan to take advantage of this year for some further adventures of aggression and are counting on our Nation being so paralzed by a great presidential election that it is unable to function to meet such a challenge they are making the mistake of their lives.

No matter how tense the campaign may become or how acrimonious the debate if our national security is challenged or human freedom in the world is endangered by overt acts of aggression, 165 million Americans will stand shoulder to shoulder in facing a common danger.

Our Nation was founded and grew to its present position of leadership based on faith and not on fear.

If we of this generation will only show the same courage and commonsense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe was divine inspiration, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States there are none of our great domestic problems we cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

War or Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following series of articles which appeared in the New York Daily Mirror are an important contribution to sober thinking about the problems of the Middle East. I set them forth without comment for the independent appraisal of our colleagues.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—REFUGEE PLAN VERSUS POWDER KEG

(By Erwin Savelson)

I have just returned from Israel and the Middle East where war is in the making.

At best, the leading diplomats, military experts, and even some of President Eisenhower's most trusted aides with whom I talked in Cairo and Jerusalem, give the Holy Land tinderbox only 6 more months of peace—unless the Big Four powers intervene effectively at once.

After talking frankly with Defense Minister David Ben-Gurion in Israel, Prime Minister Gamal Abdel Nasser in Egypt, and observing conditions for the fourth time in 6 years in Israel and the Middle East, this is what became quite clear to me:

The situation is critical, dangerously critical—but not hopeless.

For in the Libyan Desert of Egypt, this writer was permitted to inspect a project which offers a possible solution to the biggest stumbling block to peace in the Middle East—the resettlement of hundreds of thousands of Palestine Arab refugees.

The refugees have now been 7 years in camps in the dangerous Gaza Strip of Egypt, in Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan. As long as they are kept in camps, as long as the Arab States delay their resettlement, just so long will the tension exist.

Amid the gathering war clouds, the blustering of military spokesmen, and the heightening tensions, I was probably the first American newspaperman permitted by Egypt to visit this little-publicized yet seemingly vast project known as the liberation province.

Before me in the desert, 100 miles from Cairo, off the Alexandria Road, was unfolded the first 3 of some 132 modern towns—all strikingly similar to the Kibbutsim and Moshavim (cooperative) settlements which flourish in Israel and which have contributed so much to the dynamic democracy and high standards of that brave little republic.

Here, on the hot sands facing historic El Alamein, this observer saw what he believes presents an almost perfect solution to the refugee problem; the resettlement of thousands of the 250,000 refugees concentrated in Egypt's Gaza Strip on Israel's border. For Gaza is the powder keg of the northern Negev where, at any moment, a spark along the strip might set off a terrible holocaust.

Prime Minister Nasser himself said he plans to settle at least 1 million young peasants on 1,300,000 acres of his Liberation Province as part of his social revolution. He further intimated he is considering resettling 50,000 Gaza refugees, but did not specify whether any of these would be removed to Liberation Province.

Yet, with the aid of the United Nations. American loans, compensation which Israel has set aside to pay Palestine refugees, plus moneys contributed by the Arab States, tens of thousands could be resettled in similar Liberation Provinces throughout the spacious Arab world.

Thus would be removed the most festering sore spot in that troubled part of the globe, since even the most ardent Arab pleaders admit solution of the refugee problem would open the door at least to discussions of peace.

But time today in the Middle East is not on the side of peace; time to achieve resettlement of the Arab refugees is running out fast. And the entire crisis has been dangerously aggravated by the flow of tanks, guns, and planes into Egypt from the Communists via their Red Czechoslovakian pipeline.

For it is obvious that Israel—whose progress this writer can only describe as miraculous and inspirational—must arm itself tooth and nail to meet the dreaded scourge of a threatening second round with the Arab forces it vanquished to win independence in 1948.

As hopeful as I am that settlement of the refugee problem will remove the major obstacle to peace, I am just as convinced that only immediate action by the Foreign Ministers' meeting in Geneva and the U. N.—not in a few weeks or even a month, but now—can head off a terrible war.

With the Red network and Russia—whose age-old ambition has been to establish itself on the Persian Gulf or Mediterranean—pouring arms into Egypt, the Western World will, of necessity, be compelled to balance this with arms for Israel.

Strife and turmoil in the Middle East serve only the cause of the Communists. The Arabs, who now outlaw communism but buy Red arms, will rapidly become dependent upon the Kremlin for more supplies and replacement parts. The Reds will move in with technicians and agents demanding concessions and obligations.

Even as pro-American a publisher as Moustafa Amin, coowner and editor of Akhbar-el-Youm, Egypt's largest newspaper and magazine group and all-powerful in his country, told me bluntly in Cairo:

"This time we negotiated for arms without obligations. The next time we won't be able to do that. There will be obligations."

The intimation? The Soviet Union will demand the right to protect its new interests in the Middle East in event of war.

The result? Threat of a full-scale conflict between East and West for control of the most strategic and oil-rich area in the world—the Mediterranean, the Middle East, Suez, the gateway to the Orient and the Far East.

One top military observer warned that if the Big Four Foreign Ministers do not prevent an arms race in the Middle East and maintain a balance of armed power between Israel and the Arabs, the region will flame with a conflict that would make the Korean war look like a skirmish.

It was against this saber-rattling background and amid the joyful proclamation from Jerusalem that oil was discovered in Israel, that I traveled to Cairo and Jerusalem in search of rays of hope for peace.

In Israel, I found all the people want peace, but show no fear of being able to give a good

account of themselves if the "second round" bell is ever sounded.

In Cairo, where the Arab League was meeting during my week-long visit, I found little talk of peace publicly or officially. But privately, a number of influential and prominent Egyptians conceded that Israel "is here to stay" and advocated that the Arab world adopt a more realistic attitude, dropping demands that another attempt be made to drive the Israelis into the sea.

But everywhere, I found evidence of preparation for fighting.

What can be done to check this growing menace to peace and to Israel's security and equal security for the Arab world?

Drawing upon experiences in four assignments to Israel and the Middle East since 1949, this writer believes:

1. Israel must be provided with sufficient arms by the West to balance the flow of Red-made munitions and guns to Egypt.

2. A United Nations Commission should be established immediately to study Colonel Nasser's amazing "liberation province" program and develop means to apply it to resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees.

3. Eric Johnston's Jordan River development program should be adopted without further delay. It will provide Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan with 60 percent of the river's waters for reclamation, irrigation, and power, 40 percent going to Israel. Even the slightest agreement on Johnston's plan will be a step toward peace.

4. The U. N., Big 4, and Security Council support must make it clear that they will brook no attempt by Israel or the Arabs to alter boundaries by force.

5. The Arabs have repeatedly demanded a "corridor" through Israel to permit them to travel without difficulty from Egypt to Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon. Israel is prepared to offer "free port" facilities at Haifa, from where railroad connections can reach any part of the three latter Arab states in a few hours.

6. The Arabs must stop confusing the world on the question of anti-Semitism. On one hand, I was assured by the most influential Egyptians that their nation was not "anti-Semitic," that nearly 100,000 Egyptian Jews live in peace and harmony within the nation.

On the other hand, some of their propagandists have learned they need not refer to the word "Jew," but only make disparaging use of the term "Zionist"—a practice standard among the most unprincipled anti-Semites throughout the world.

Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, perhaps summed up the most sensible approach to the problem of war or peace in the Middle East. He said:

"We must continue to work with the people and governments of both sides to improve their economic status and speed up the program for establishment of permanent peace in the area."

In Israel, after an absence of 3 years, I saw the fruits of peace. I saw the seeds of the same fruits growing in Egypt's "liberation province."

What I saw in Israel on my fourth visit—amazing progress, development and almost miraculous achievement which will be described in this series of articles—convinces me it would be folly for the Arabs to start all over again.

It would be tragic indeed if the Middle East were plunged into war again—for peace in the Holy Land can bring an era of prosperity and abundance which that ancient region has seldom known and which it badly needs.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—DEFENSE ONLY AIM, EGYPT SAYS

(By Erwin Savelson)

I shuttled between Cairo and Jerusalem to interview the two men who hold the key to war or peace in the Middle East.

The first was Prime Minister Gamal Abdel Nasser, Egypt's ambitious "Tiger of Faluja" and current strong boy of the Arab world.

The second was white-haired Defense Minister David Ben-Gurion, the unflinching, realistic soldier-pioneer, under whose drive Israel won its independence and went on to turn ancient deserts into flourishing, fertile fields.

I have returned home utterly dismayed by what I heard and found in Cairo, where Arab leaders have developed a habit of talking about peace out of one side of the mouth, but practice devastating propaganda warfare to justify their arms deal with the Communists.

Yet, I am still hopeful that calmer heads among great statesmen of the world will realize the gravity of what is taking place and act before it is too late: Act by either bolstering Israel's economic and military strength to counter the steadily rising might of Red arms flowing into Arab hands, or persuading the Kremlin to call off its foolhardy and dangerous incursion into the Middle East tinderbox.

Colonel Nasser, his military tunic replaced by a gray business suit, fingering a cigarette, flashing a broad smile, walked jauntily from behind his desk in the heavily guarded presidency of the Council of Ministers in Cairo to extend a cordial greeting.

A moment later, we plunged into frank and revealing talks about the mounting crisis in the East. He asked for no quarter in our give-and-take and I tried to give none. I came with some hope that the "Tiger of Faluja" might offer even the slightest clue that the Arabs are willing to talk about peace.

But little hope came from this 38-year-old revolutionary militarist who first boosted his old friend, ex-Premier Naguib, to power, then dumped both him and fat boy ex-King Farouk to bid for power as the up-and-coming man of the hour among 45 million Arabs.

His line was clear: The Arabs want peace but on terms which would decimate Israel.

"Egypt will do its best to avoid war with Israel," he began. "All my acts show Egypt has no aggressive intentions."

"Then why not sit down and talk about peace with Israel?" I countered.

Slipping into a long harangue about the retaliatory raid staged last February 28 by Israel on an Egyptian position in Gaza, Nasser rolled on:

"Nobody likes a peace brought about by force and I have felt threats against me for the last few months. I'm feeling threats from February 28 until now."

The bloody February 28 skirmish cost the Egyptians 38 men and the Israelis 8. It came on the heels of raids by Fedayeen (Suicide Squad) commandoes who infiltrated Israel's countryside, spreading terror, ambushing and killing scores.

"Until that day (February 28) I had hopes the difficulties might pass away," continued Nasser. "But after that, my officers came to me and said they needed arms to defend themselves. Now I wake up with nightmares about being attacked."

It was the closest he came to acknowledging that the military junta which helped rocket him to power and whose hatred of Israel knows no bounds had practically served a "produce—or else" ultimatum on Nasser. Either he found new sources of weapons or else hazarded the risk of going the way of Naguib and playboy Farouk.

I said it was impossible to believe Israel, a bustling nation of 1,800,000 free souls—all busied with the monumental task of hammering out a solvent democracy—would chance a military campaign to subjugate 23 million Egyptians.

The Tiger of Faluja shrugged the remark off with:

"I want arms to defend—not to attack!"

There was no reference to the warlike blustering in the Arab press, to the scorn being heaped on the United States and Britain for seeking an amicable solution of the Israeli-Arab tension or to the dreadful pronouncement 20 months ago by King Saud of Saudi-Arabia that it was worth sacrificing 10 million Arabs to wipe Israel off the map.

I tried another tack—Nasser's arms deal with Red Czechoslovakia.

Was he aware that the course he was pursuing was bound to set off an arms race?

Was he cognizant of the risk of enabling Soviet Russia to secure an influential grip on a strategic area long regarded as vital to the security of the Western and Free World?

Again came the new Arab theme:

"I need arms for defense—not for attack," Nasser replied. "We asked for weapons that would enable us to achieve a true defense of our country."

"How can you reconcile your dealings with the Communists when Egypt outlaws communism as one of its worst crimes?" I pressed.

"We made no deals in return for the arms," he answered.

The talk switched for a moment to his social reforms—particularly the Liberation Province, which this reporter—probably first among American newspapermen—was permitted to inspect. The province is in the Libyan Desert between Cairo and Alexandria, toward El Alamein.

It is probably the major contribution produced thus far by Nasser's revolutionary government to ease, on a mass scale, the plight of Egypt's downtrodden millions. For Nasser hopes 1 million young peasants will ultimately be settled in cooperative villages (not unlike the ones which have flourished for generations in Israel) stretching over 1,200,000 Libyan desert acres.

I sought an opening by suggesting that similar liberation provinces could be created to resettle tens of thousands of Palestine Arab refugees—huddled for 7 years in border camps, living on United Nations subsistence.

When I implied this might serve as a solution to remove the No. 1 obstacle to peace talks in the Middle East, Nasser indicated:

"We are planning a scheme—50,000 acres for them, near Suez, but they still refuse to go."

I could not help but observe it was distressing that Egypt and the Arabs should spend millions on arms instead of applying the same moneys to create "liberation provinces" to improve the lot of the Egyptians as well as of the languishing Palestine Arab refugees.

For a moment I thought I had touched a vulnerable spot in Nasser's makeup. Then came his answer:

"I feel the same way, but I also feel the fears of attack, so I had to take money for the projects out of my budget for defense use."

The talks suddenly turned to Nasser's "enemies" and he launched into a vitriolic diatribe against what he termed the "Zionist" conspiracy.

I caught him up on the point emphasizing that unprincipled anti-Semites frequently apply the term "Zionists" when they desire to attack the Jews, but he quickly denied harboring any antisemitism in his makeup.

Like other leading Egyptians, including Moustafa Amin, powerful American-trained publisher, Nasser maintained that Egyptian Jews live in peace. Amin went so far as to point out to me that Cairo papers even wished their citizens of the Jewish faith a "Happy New Year" during the recent High Holy Days. Nasser, Amin, and the other prominent Egyptians sought to draw sharp distinctions between usage of the term "Zionists" and Jews.

However, 24 hours after I left Egypt, news agencies reported that the Egyptian Masonic Grand Lodge had ordered dissolution of all local Jewish Masonic lodges.

And the London Jewish Chronicle, in a special report from Cairo, warned Jews in Egypt are in danger. Calling Nasser "an open enemy of the Jews," the Chronicle reported that the former division in the Interior Ministry known as "anti-Zionist department" had been reorganized into a "department for Jewish problems."

The purpose, according to the Chronicle: "To supervise Jewish businesses and liquidate them."

Getting back to my closing moments with Nasser, the Egyptian ruler told me:

"During World War II, I was friendly with a Jewish officer in the Middle East. During armistice negotiations with Israel, I met him. We'd shake hands, sit down, and talk. Then, I'd go my way, maybe to figure out how to fight him, and he'd go his way, maybe to do the same. There was nothing personal about the whole thing."

I repeated:

"Then why isn't it possible to sit down now and talk about peace?"

"It'll take time for the difficulties to pass away," he reiterated.

"I am going to Jerusalem," I told the Premier. "You have made some pretty serious charges about Israel preparing to attack you. I am going to Israel to ask for answers."

"Good," he replied. We rose to say goodby and, as if by some prearranged signal, photographers rushed into the room to photograph the farewell.

Forty-eight hours later, I was in Jerusalem where Ben-Gurion listened intently while I repeated Nasser's statements.

There were no guards around as we talked after lunching at the President Hotel in Jerusalem, where he lives with his wife, Paula.

The Israeli leader, who returned from life in a desert settlement to take up the defense cudgels once more when the land he sired found itself confronted by a threatening second round with the Arabs, looked up sharply and replied:

"Nonsense. If Nasser wants peace, really wants peace, he can have it right now. I told that to Mr. Hearst (William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst newspapers) in June and what was true in June is true now."

As for the Arab fears of attack from Israel, Ben-Gurion was just as blunt:

"They're a bunch of liars."

One of Ben-Gurion's top aides interrupted:

"There isn't a single Arab who really believes the Arab world is in danger of attack. It's a colossal falsehood. We live in peace with millions of Moslems in other states. Tens of thousands of Arabs live peacefully in Israel. But what's new about that? We're a democracy where all people are treated alike, regardless of race, religion or national origin."

The Israeli leader continued:

"If we were aggressive, then we were a bunch of schmoes because we certainly missed the boat often. First, when Jordan was disrupted by Abdullah's assassination and again when Egypt was disrupted right after they kicked out Farouk.

"The same Ben-Gurion about whom Nasser is complaining wished Egypt well; told them not to worry about any interference from us because we hoped the end of Farouk was the beginning of a new deal for the Egyptian people.

"We told Nasser he could carry on with his social revolution without worrying about keeping an eye on the frontier, because we realized he needed all his troops to help consolidate his revolutionary position. All we want, we told them, is an honorable peace."

From Israel Prime Minister Sharett came the assertion that his republic did not have military superiority over Egypt.

"The Soviet by supplying arms to Egypt are letting loose a war of destruction," Sharett told me.

The Prime Minister added: "The Soviet Union arms aid to Egypt exposes the Middle East to grave peril and casts a shadow over the entire world arena."

On this same day when Ben-Gurion and Sharett were extending new olive branches of peace to Nasser and the Arabs, Dr. Ali Amini, Persian Minister of Justice, offered to serve as mediator to end the Israel-Arab hostilities. His reason:

Iran, a Moslem state, lives in mortal fear of Soviet intervention and influence in the Middle East.

The Arabs, Israel, and the entire free world have much to fear if this happens.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—HOPE BLOOMS IN LIBYA DESERT

(By Erwin Savelson)

If the Arabs really want peace they have a chance to show it and help 900,000 kinsmen at the same time.

All they need do is sit down in the United Nations and end their 7-year holdout against settling the burning issue of the Palestine Arab refugees within their borders.

For 7 years the Arabs have kept the refugees huddled in camps, 250,000 of them in the dangerous Gaza Strip facing Israel; crying about their plight, but seemingly doing little to help end their privation and frustration.

Why?

A former representative of the United Nations agency which provides subsistence for the refugees was quoted as telling an American study group in Amman, Jordan, in 1952:

"Arab nations do not want to solve the Arab refugee problem. They want to keep it as an open sore, as an affront against the United Nations and a weapon against Israel. The Arab leaders don't give a damn whether the refugees live or die."

WESTERN DIPLOMATS AGREE REFUGEE PROBLEM IS MOST PRESSING

Regardless of the accuracy of that biting analysis, the simple fact is:

Every Western diplomat with whom I talked—including one of America's highest-ranking world figures—is convinced that solution of the refugee problem would remove the most festering sore spot in the Middle East, open the door to possible peace and avoid a conflagration which could ultimately drag in the big powers.

It's a tall order to expect the Arab leaders to reverse such thinking as that of King Saud of Saudi-Arabia, whose dreadful muttering about sacrificing 10 million Arabs in order to wipe out Israel still rings in the ears of the beleaguered 1,800,000 free people in that dynamic new republic.

But, as our worried diplomats and strategists put it to me:

"Anything reasonable is worth trying to head off war."

LIBERATION PROVINCE MAY PROVE ARABS' SALVATION

And, on a sandy plain, 100 miles west of Cairo, far from the Negev frontier where the sparks of a possible new war are beginning to fly, I found what many believe may be a solution to the consuming fire now raging in the Holy Land tinderbox.

Amid all the poverty, disease, and suffering under which the Egyptian masses have slaved for generations (Prime Minister Nasser's revolutonary government insists it will reverse that trend) I found a green swath of hope cutting across the Libyan Desert, west of the rich Nile Delta, facing historic El Alamein.

The Egyptians call it their liberation province. They boast it is the greatest plan the East has known in modern times. They opened the road to show me how they contemplate settling 1 million young peasants in 132 new towns sprawled over 1,200,000 acres.

I could not help but be struck by the amazing similarity of the first three villages I inspected in this new province with the new desert settlements (kibbutsim and cooperative moshavim towns) which the Israelis erected somewhat miraculously on the barren wastes of their own soil.

"We will struggle against the desert * * * we will live off the soil."

The words flowed from Therwet Rachid, young director of press affairs for the province, who accompanied this writer and P. Juel Jensen, counsellor of the Danish Legation in Cairo, on the inspection tour.

Where had I heard the same tune before?

Ironically, it was in Israel—the land of modern miracles, where 1,000,000 Jewish refugees from Europe and other lands arrived destitute, penniless, with few belongings, to be clothed, housed and resettled in cities, towns and villages redeemed from once barren wastes.

The million, incidentally, include 380,000 Jewish refugees from hostile Moslem and Arab areas, whence they fled, leaving behind their possessions and property.

And what Israel did for the refugees it embraced, the Arab world, at least to this observer, can do for its 900,000 refugees on a similarly large scale.

SOLUTION STAMPED "MADE IN EGYPT"

The Arabs need not go outside their borders to erase the sore spot which is a major contribution to unrest in the Holy Land. They have a solution:

It's stamped "Made in Egypt." It's called: The "Liberation Province" theory.

Establishment of similar projects in Arab countries would implement Secretary of State Dulles' hope that President Eisenhower's desire for a "better way of life" for the refugees can be found.

This opinion is shared not only by your reporter but by leading diplomats, military figures, reclamation experts and engineers busy coping with the monumental job of raising living standards in the Middle East.

In a small office in the Libyan Desert, Rachid traced on a large map the area to be covered by Egypt's "Liberation Province." Pinpointed were 12 "central towns"—each surrounded by 11 villages.

A hundred yards away from where we talked, a new "Liberation Canal," tapped from the Rayah El-Beheiri branch of the Nile River, flowed with water for irrigation.

SECOND CANAL WILL SERVE 24,000 ACRES

Another canal, he related, would eventually run from Kafr David (the village in which we stopped) to Nobaria, irrigating 24,000 acres of land in this section alone.

"Each village," he went on, "will cover an area of 1,500 acres, but the buildings themselves will occupy only 70 acres, housing approximately 1,000 inhabitants—averaging 230 families living in 230 separate homes."

Surrounding the broad plaza of Kafr David (Israelis call many of their settlements Kfar, etc.) were the homes, each containing two bedrooms, a combination small foyer and living room, an extremely modest kitchen, bathroom and simple, sturdy furniture.

In the back of each home was a plot, 150 by 150 feet, where the planners hope to encourage families to grow vegetables. Each village is equipped with a central stable for the cows, sheep and other animals to be kept by that village unit.

Under the plan, each village will have a mosque, with a Christian church in each "town." The villages will have their own medical clinics, supplemented by a 40-bed hospital in the "central town."

The schools we saw were modern, with semi-circular recreational courtyards outside. Rachid said primary grades will serve pupils aged 6 to 12, with older children attending "secondary schools" in each town.

"We want to create a new generation proud of their motherland and wipe out illiteracy and poverty," said Rachid, adding this eye opener: "It's possible our women

may get suffrage for the first time in Egypt's history in this province."

A DREAM ONE HOPES WILL COME TRUE

Rachid is one of Egypt's young dreamers and I hope his dream comes true in the land where the American visitor usually grows heartsick over the miserable poverty which emanates from all sides once one leaves the luxury of modern Cairo.

At this writing, as the war clouds gather in the East, a United Nations commission estimates the value of property left behind by the Arabs in Israel totals $300,000,000.

Israel has repeatedly declared its willingness to pay maximum compensation to the Arabs for their land and holdings.

Secretary Dulles, aware of the ever-present danger in permitting the refugees to exist on Israel's borders, has offered United States help in arranging an international loan to finance the compensation. The funds also would help resettle the refugees and finance development and irrigation projects to make them self-supporting.

Nasser told me he had some plan to settle 50,000 of the refugees, but gave no details. Neither he nor his aides would speculate on whether similar liberation provinces might be feasible to take care of the refugees.

However, some Arab commentators are now calling for international action to rid the Middle East of this sore spot.

ISRAEL IS PROOF OF WHAT CAN BE DONE

In four visits to Israel, reaching back to the closing days of the War for Independence, I saw at first hand the wonders a free and untrammeled people can achieve. I venture to say that a bit of Israel's spirit has spilled over into Egypt in the form of the "liberation province."

Six years ago, I saw the start of Israel's valiant attempt to conquer the desert, feed, clothe, house and employ its million refugees. Two weeks ago, I returned and marveled at their accomplishment. Let me tell you in the next article how they did it.

It's a lesson the Arabs could well take to heart. It might prevent war.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—BEERSHEBA AFTER 7 YEARS—A CITY RISEN FROM SANDS

(By Erwin Savelson)

Nearly 7 years ago, in the closing hours of the Israeli-Arab war, I traveled south from Tel Aviv through the northern Negev to ancient Beersheba.

From Rehovot, we swept past miles of barren rock and sand, skirting dried-out gullies and into the outpost of the Israeli desert command. There was hardly a blade of grass or a home along the tortuous 80-mile stretch.

Beersheba was an old village, with a cluster of mud-brick huts, a few rows of sturdier bazaar stalls, a handful of trees near the Well of Abraham, Israel's Biblical patriarch.

I remember how my Israeli friend, Ben (Flatbush Benny) Chorin, a Kibbutznick (member) of Kfar Menachim, a settlement on the desert's northern fringe and as rabid a Dodger fan as you could find, kicked the crusty, yellow soil of Beersheba and boasted:

"Come back in 10 years. You'll find a modern city of 50,000. You might even find the Dodgers in spring training here."

"FLATBUSH BENNY" PRAISES THE DODGERS

"Flatbush Benny" was waiting when I returned just 2 weeks ago, hopping with enthusiasm.

"Didn't I tell you?" he challenged. "The Dodgers won, and so did we. Look around."

He had no need to inform me of the amazing transformation that had taken place—not only in Beersheba, but along almost every inch of the once empty desert road I had traversed from Rehovot south.

The empty fields had disappeared. The long twisting highway south was a miniature Bronx River Parkway, lined with tall eucalyptus and cypress trees, planted by the Jewish National Fund.

Where rock and sand had imprisoned the earth for centuries, tractors and plows had churned once dismal soil to yield rich crops, from tomatoes to cotton. On a hilltop in the distance loomed the Derrick of Helets, where Israel's first oil gushed to the surface on September 23, carrying with it great promise for the struggling republic.

On the dash from Nahal-Oz, the tiny settlement sitting on top of the Egyptian big guns in Gaza, the first grapes and vines grown in the Negev in thousands of years flourished against the desert horizon.

Dozens of new settlements sat on hilltops and in flatlands, visible evidence of the results achieved by funds poured into Israel through the United States point 4 program, the United Jewish Appeal and Bonds for Israel.

The loneliness of the Northern Negev was gone; a land which had lain idle and forbidding for centuries had been redeemed.

And in Beersheba, ruddy-faced and outspoken Mayor David Tuvyahu was waiting to describe how he and the immigrants from 50 nations had wrestled with the desert and had won—so that today the ancient village is a bustling metropolis of nearly 25,000, with a better than even chance it will hit Chorin's 50,000 mark before long.

AS GREEN AS KANSAS

We strolled down Beersheba's main street and a peanut vendor with a sign in Hebrew proclaiming that his name was 'Abraham America" shouted a warm "Shalom."

The mayor pointed to a movie sign. It announced that the feature was John Wayne in "Red River Valley."

"I don't know if Red River Valley is in Kansas," said Tuvyahu, "but if you want to see a piece of Kansas just look at our fertile fields. And to think when I saw you a few years ago we had nothing but sand.

"We're out to build 2,500 new flats before April, 1956, to handle a new migration of 250 families a month, about 1,000 men, women and children every 30 days," he went on.

"Besides, I want to finish our city library so we can have 35,000 books in Hebrew, Yiddish, English, French, German and Arabic for our people."

THE MELTING POT IDEA

"Think your mayor, Bob Wagner, whom I met in New York last year, has headaches? You ought to see mine, trying to build a new city out of people from 50 different countries who speak almost as many languages. But we're doing it."

When we returned to city hall, he asked about my visit to Cairo and my talks with Egyptian Prime Minister Abdul Gamal Nasser.

"He's quite a fellow, this Nasser," said the outspoken mayor of Beersheba. "For a time I thought everything would go well. But now—well, let's say I'm sorry to see he's not on our side."

The old Beersheba is rapidly disappearing as Israel pushes the desert back while remaining alert to the war clouds gathering in the East.

I saw Arab and Jew living peacefully in the desert. I saw Sheikh Suleiman, the Desert King, roll into Beersheba in his green Buick stationwagon on Market Day when the Bedouins gather in the capital to trade and exchange gossip. Suleiman told me he is a firm believer in the democracy being hammered out in Israel.

On the outskirts of Beersheba, where 3 years ago I saw immigrants huddled in flooded, mud-filled tent cities, row upon row of white stone apartment houses, grass courtyards, paved streets and all the other utilities which make up a modern city had risen out of the desert.

"We have 3,800 of our Sabras (native born) in 7 elementary schools, we have 32 kindergarten classes; a Beersheba high school with 100 students and another 100 youngsters, all ex-soldiers, in our vocational school," Tuvyahu said with pride.

We walked by the famed Hadassah Hospital, where Bedouin and Israeli alike are served by a corps of doctors and nurses, and Tuvayahu said he was planning a new hospital of 200 beds to augment the present one. Then he added with a smile:

"We have a pretty big religious community. We have 35 synagogues representing all sects."

Tuvayahu, reelected recently to a 4-year term by the 13-member Beersheba city council, has cut out quite a job for himself in the next 12 months.

ISRAEL SHOWS THE WAY

Beersheba is a lesson in how a determined people can conquer prejudice, fear, and the elements.

If the Israelis can build a city of 25,000 out of the bare Negev soil, one can ask why the Arab world cannot do the same for the 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees who have been in camps 7 years, by developing Liberation Provinces such as I discussed in previous articles.

Given a home and piece of land, a man will dream of peace.

It's much better—and cheaper—than war.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—IT'S ON THE VERGE OF BECOMING LAND FLOWING WITH OIL

(By Erwin Savelson)

Mack Cagle is an amiable, but toughened chief tool pusher who would rather talk about his wife and kids waiting back in Wichita Falls, Tex., than the history he has just helped to make 7,000 miles from his home.

Menachem Wakstok, 27, an engineer scarred by the Nazis in Auschwitz concentration camp, escaped to England, reached Israel and then did a blazing stint in the Negev Desert Corps during the war for independence in 1948.

Between them—the man from Texas and the boy with the brand of Hitler in his heart and flesh—they brought in the first gusher of oil in the Holy Land; an event which may alter the entire course of events troubling the Middle East today.

I saw them both on a hill at Heletz in the once howling wilderness of the Northern Negev, barely 5 miles from the jittery Gaza Strip where armed legions of Israel and Egypt are poised should the fateful "second round" ever start.

Just how much oil is located in the field struck last September 23 by the Texas-Israeli team has not yet been determined.

But, if a major oil sea floats under the Negev sands, the back of the ruthless Arab economic blockade imposed on the young republic may very well be torn asunder.

For oil is the commodity which has lifted the Middle East to the great strategic importance it occupies in world affairs today, pouring hundreds of millions in revenue into the pockets of independent states, shiekdoms, and British protectorates reaching from the Mediterranean around to the Persian Gulf and down to the Gulf of Aden.

The United Nations estimates the revenue of the five Arab oil-producing countries of Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Kuweit, Bahrein and Quatar, with a total population of 9,300,000, reached the staggering total of $434 million in 1952 alone.

And Israel, with a population of 1,800,000, may be on the verge of hitting the same economic jackpot.

Israeli experts estimate that the Heletz well alone may furnish 7 to 10 percent of the nation's oil needs.

MAY SAVE $60 MILLION

If the well is part of a large deposit, it may yield up to 25 percent of Israel's needs, saving the nation $60 million it now spends to import crude petroleum which is refined in the huge half-idle Haifa plant.

A good supply will:

Enable Israel to put the Haifa plant—one of the largest in the East—into full operation, providing employment for thousands.

Make Israel independent of outside sources for oil and gasoline; strengthen its military establishment and even conceivably compel hostile Arab neighbors to accept it as a permanent, economically strong nation; not a land dependent on loans and grants from friendly powers.

Small wonder then that Soviet Russia is casting its wary and covetous eyes on the Middle East.

A substantial oil strike in Israel will be a strong buffer against the Kremlin Communist plot to sneak into power and influence in the vital Middle East by stirring unrest and conflict with its flow of heavy armament to the Israeli-hating Arabs.

Aware of all this, plus the fact that hostile Arab forces are massed in nearby Gaza, Israel has surrounded the Heletz operation with substantial security.

Well-armed troops halted us outside the barbed wire gate near the 145-foot-high oil rig, inspected our pass closely, phoned Wakstok for permission to let us enter and ordered all cigarets, matches and lighters left behind.

Curious, oil-enthusiastic Israelis, approaching the gate, are shunted across the field towards a dried-out creek through which lazies the excess flow of the Heletz oil and where they fill bottles with the fluid to take home to the folks.

ABANDONED BY BRITISH

Wakstok told how the British-owned Iraq Petroleum Co. abandoned the Heletz site in 1951 after boring 3,644 feet in operations both before and after World War II. The British removed their rigs, plugged the deep hole with cement, covered it with sand and left.

The Israeli Government then granted a concession for a drilling operation on the same plot to the Lapidot Co. and Israel Oil Prospectors, Inc., two Israeli firms with associates from the United States.

Wakstok arrived with his men just before Cagle flew in August 22 with 3 Texas drillers, Wesley Douglas, J. D. Clayton and Herbert Harrison, all of Wichita Falls. Previously, they had shipped a machine manufactured by the Ideco Co. of Beaumont, Tex., capable of drilling down to 15,000 feet.

The Yank-Israeli team removed the cement plug and went to work on a round-the-clock basis, first penetrating down to the 3,644-foot level reached by the British.

On Thursday night, September 22, Cagle, Wakstok and Dr. H. J. Tschopp, chief geologist of the company, realized they had struck a strata of oil at 4,905 feet. But it was decided for safety reasons not to try to bring the gusher in during the night.

At sunrise, Development Minister Dov Joseph, Dr. Tschopp and other officials assembled and the signal was given to "let her go."

Wakstok described the scene for us:

"It was a terrific moment. We hit a 60-foot gusher. Everybody got soaked in oil but nobody cared. I never saw so many happy faces."

Cagle picked the ball up and added:

BROADCAST TO NATION

"They started squirting oil at each other, the big shots and the little fellows. They soaked it into their hair and their clothes. I never saw anything like it. Everybody kept slapping me on the back. They were singing and dancing, shaking hands and even crying. It was wonderful—just wonderful."

Joseph hurried back to Tel Aviv, held a beer bottle full of oil before newsmen and told the nation in a special broadcast:

"Gentlemen, this is oil, not wine."

Defense Minister David Ben-Gurion, en route to his desert home at Sde Boker, arrived, clambered over machinery, soaked his hands in the black stuff, then came up smiling with:

"Now I believe this is oil."

Analysis at the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot determined the quality reached some 30.5 percent A. P. I. (American Petroleum Institute rating) indicating the oil was as good as other rich Middle East types.

The news reached Beersheba, capital of the Negev, where a bottle of oil was hung over a cafe with an inscription: "First oil found in Israel."

When a barrelful arrived, jubilant youngsters started bonfires with the "black gold," snake-dancing around the flames joyously.

On Wednesday, Oct. 12, a second gusher, higher than the first, was brought in from a depth of 4,965 feet.

Minister Joseph told me: "We are on the threshold of a new era—a step has been taken towards economic independence."

The cautious Dr. Tschopp, a Swiss geologist, advised it would be some time before the actual size of the field was determined. But he said, the discovery at Heletz prompts him to believe there are similar fields in the southern coastal region of Israel, "from the sea to the mountains."

LOOKS JUST LIKE TEXAS

Said Mayor Ray Hoffins, of Houston, Tex., as he dropped in while on a Middle East tour to congratulate his fellow Texans:

"Looks just like Texas to me—that's the way we started."

But this was in the Holy Land and call it a miracle if you will—but the week's portion of the Song of Moses which was scheduled to be read and was read in the synagogues of Israel on Saturday, Sept. 24, 1955, contains this passage "Deuteronomy 32-10-13):

"He found him (i. e. Israel) in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness . . . he made him to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock."

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—75 HEROIC KIDS WORK IN SHADOW OF ENEMY GUNS

(By Erwin Savelson)

General Allenby, British World War I conqueror of Palestine, must be looking down today with no little awe and admiration on the handful of gutsy sun-baked kids in the powder-keg Gaza frontier settlement of Nahal-Oz.

For the young in heart at Nahal-Oz took me into their corn, cotton, and tomato fields to show me how they lived and worked under the noses of the big Egyptian batteries clustered menacingly on and around Aly Muntar Hill, scarcely 1,000 feet away.

Then they told me:

"Allenby lost a whole brigade, 7,000 men, trying to capture that hill from the Turks. He fought here a year trying to take it because it blocked his way into Gaza. Finally, he gave up and went on to capture Jerusalem."

To the right of Aly Muntar, I could see the spires of Gaza where Egypt has massed its border strength. Gaza also is the strip housing 250,000 Palestine Arab refugees, where for 7 years they have been adding to the explosive tension along the entire desert frontier.

But you don't hear a squawk from the laughing, outwardly carefree 75 boys and girls who have been sitting in Allenby's old post in Nahal-Oz for more than 3 years, taking it and dishing it out.

Yet, you know, without asking, that all of them—the oldest is 22—know what they're sweating out on the trigger-happy Gaza border where I saw war in the making in the Middle East.

Nahal-Oz, just a stepping stone from Nirim and Kissufim where 72 hours ago the Egyptians and Israelis clashed again, is the Corregidor of Gaza. In Israeli hands, it blocks the Arab path into the Western Negev. So it may be the first of the border settlements to feel the full brunt of the Communist-fed Arab armor and firepower if the "second round" in Israel ever explodes.

That's why Nahal-Oz has become a must on Israel itinerary of every visiting dignitary, of every foreign newspaperman trying to understand the meaning of Gaza.

It is not only the closest point in Israel to the tinderbox strip. It is also the rangy homestead in the Western Negev where you feel the vitality of the growing young republic; gaining in a little measure an understanding of the sacrifices which youth is still willing to bear to keep the peace—or fight the war which no one in Israel wants.

RECALLS DEWEY VISIT

Gaza is also the home of the 250,000 Arab refugees, whose resettlement in such projects as Egypt's liberation province—described in detail for the first time earlier in this series—would remove the sore point of tension in the Middle East, turning the hopes of the world to peace in the Holy Land.

Mordecai Haor, a stock 21-year-old Israeli, boasted how "Governor Dewey was our guest of honor last week." He recalled how Dewey told the youngsters Nahal-Oz was the closest to an American frontier village of Indian days; marveling at the courage and stamina of the 75 kids.

Then, Mordecai led me to a shell-battered house pointed to the blasted ground around it and said amusingly:

"Here's where your boss stood just a few months ago."

(William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, visited Nahal-Oz during his Middle East tour last June.)

Mordecai's young companions spotted us, began ribbing him, calling out good-naturedly:

"How's the Chussin (bridegroom)?"

Mordecai blushed and explained:

"I'm getting married on the 25th. They're jealous that Leah (dark-eyed and attractive 20-year-old Leah Mishkevsky, one of the settlers) likes me, that's all."

ALL ARE VOLUNTEERS

That's the way it is at Nahal-Oz on the Strip; life as usual even though imminent war sits on top of them only five blocks away.

The settlement, a former Army base, was converted into a 2,750-acre farm and advance defense post. Israel needs the extra acreage to help provide the food to nourish its growth from 750,000 in 1948 to 1,800,000 today.

The youngsters at Nahal-Oz are all city-born and city-bred volunteers, handpicked from Nahal (Fighting Pioneer Youth). When they finished military training they were given an alternative: return to the safety of their city or cast their lot with others in the desert. They are here by choice, not by compulsion.

The 75, including 25 girls, tilled the old soil to produce green fields of corn, cotton, tomatoes, carrots, beets, green and yellow beans and watermelons. They live in six buildings, are erecting another home and rushing a nursery because, Mordecai explained:

"We have one baby in the settlement and another one is on the way—due in a week or so."

ATTACK IS DESCRIBED

They eat at a central kitchen and dining room, relax in a reading room building

donated by worried parents back in the big cities of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and Haifa. They include 12 married couples, and the baby, a 6-month-old girl, is the idol of the village.

Water, precious water, is piped to them from Nirim, the settlement and desert pumping station now under attack. But Nahal-Oz dreams of the day when the huge 66-inch pipe, "the Big 66," will reach them with plentiful supplies from rivers in the north.

Time was when the kids of Nahal-Oz also dreamed of peace, thought their troubles with the Arabs were over; that an era of good will was spreading throughout their desolate countryside. But, that was before November 7, 1953.

Let Mordecai tell what happened:

"We were working in the fields unarmed and stopped to talk to Egyptian soldiers. The border had been quiet and we used to chat with them often. There was no warning of what was to happen. Suddenly, Egyptians in another position opened fire. Those we had been talking to also opened up and we jumped into a ditch for safety. But we lost Yaakev Tuchman. He was only 19. Another boy had both arms blown off, one girl lost a leg. The rest of us got back safely."

That ended their dreams of peace.

"After that they threw a shell or two at us from Aly Muntar without causing too much damage." Hoar went on.

"That was before the big attack August 22 after Mr. Hearst was here. It started while we were at breakfast. They let loose with a surprise barrage. We heard a great noise and saw black smoke coming from one of our houses. Then the shells started falling. Some of our girls went into bunker shelters with the baby. A shell exploded 6 feet from them, but no one was hurt. The girls just ate a little dirt.

"The rest of us took our guns, went to defense posts and fired back. Reinforcements came but the Egyptians kept up their fire about 4½ hours, dropping about 200 shells around us. Then it was all over. It's been quiet since, but we don't know how long that will last."

FARMING GOES ON

They were at work when I arrived feeding their 5,000 chickens, caring for 30 cows, while 2 donkeys pulled carts with the young battling farmers into fields, followed by the settlement's 2 yelping hounds, a bulldog and wolfdog.

Asked Odden Levin, the settlement's 21-year-old rugged director:

"Do you think they'll (the Arabs) really start another war?"

I told them I did not know, but that Prime Minister Nasser, of Egypt, informed me he feared the Israelis would attack him, setting off a new conflict. Neither Levin nor his companions would buy that.

They asked about the "Liberation Province" I had seen in Egypt, showing keen interest in the development of what they called the Kibbutsim of the Libyan Desert.

Like others with whom I talked, they agreed that resettlement of the 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees would remove the most festering sore in Arab-Israel relations.

(Israel is prepared to pay maximum compensation to the refugees for the property they leave behind. Secretary of State Dulles has announced the United States would help arrange an international loan to resettle the refugees and help develop areas in Arab lands where they could live a better life.)

Mordecai laughed as we talked of war or peace in the Middle East.

"I'm getting married next week. Nobody better interfere with that. Leah won't like it, and if Leah gets mad, everybody better look out."

The "Chussin" of Nahal-Oz had spoken.

As I left their barbed wire gates, riding past the watchtower, waving farewell to the kids with the plows and the guns, I looked back at the Hill of Aly Muntar and pondered:

"How Allenby could have used the kids of Nahal-Oz."

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—RESCUE PLAN FOR JEWS AN EXAMPLE TO ARAB LEADERS

(By Erwin Savelson)

In the decayed foothills of the Valley of Elah, where the Philistine giant Goliath fell before the humble shepherd boy David, I saw the premiere of another of those feats with which Israel keeps astounding the world.

Israel has labeled it "Operation Lachish." It is a vast humanitarian endeavor to rescue 100,000 or more Jews now living among hostile tribesmen and fiercely nationalistic elements in troubled Morocco.

Hundreds of miles to the west in Libyan Desert, I saw the start of the "Liberation Province," where Egypt, in its first major reform in centuries, is striving to better the lot of 1 million of its poverty-stricken peasants.

The names and locations of the two operations are different, but the lesson inherent in each is the same:

How much better off the Arabs would be if they abandoned their senseless pursuit of conflict with Israel and turned to developing new "Lachishes" and "Liberation Provinces" for 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees in border camps in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan.

Perhaps it is too much to expect an Operation Lachish from men harboring such intense hatred of Israel they are willing to subject the Middle East to another war by trading for arms with the Communists.

But I repeat the words expressed to me by one of America's world famous diplomats:

"Eliminate the Arab refugee question and you eliminate the chief cause of strife in the Middle East."

Then, this ranking diplomat added frankly:

"But that would take away their (the Arabs') main arguing point against Israel. Still, it's worth encouraging "Liberation Provinces" if it will help bring peace."

That is why it is so necessary to understand Operation Lachish. For wrapped up in this project, like the "Liberation Province," is the almost perfect solution to war or peace. If the refugee issue is resolved there can be but one result: Peace.

ONE HOUR FROM GAZA

The Lachish region is an hour's ride from the flaming Gaza strip where war is imminent. It lies midway between Jerusalem and Beersheba, capital of the Negev Desert. It is astride the principal trade routes to Egypt and Mesopotamia.

Once its rich lands flourished with vineyards and olive groves. But today, 14 centuries after warring Canaanite and Egyptian, Maccabean and Roman scarred its hills with some of history's greatest battles, it lies barren and almost desolate.

Looking at the scattered stones, ruined irrigation works, and collapsed terraces, I wondered how Israel could ever redeem the fertility of the ancient soil—much less make it breathe life and hope for 100,000 new settlers.

The answer came from Moshe Kol, a new member of Israel's Cabinet and head of the Youth Aliyah (immigration) movement.

You believe Kol when he describes his devotion to the task of rescuing fellow Jews wherever they survive under the terror of persecution. Why? Because Kol's father was killed by the Nazis in the memorable Warsaw ghetto uprising of World War II; his mother and sister were slain by the Nazis in Pinsk.

"You've been here four times and still you ask how we are going to get things done?" he asked with a tone of incredulity.

"We'll do it by creating free men and women; we'll give them the tools and their own land; we'll give them hope so they can sink their roots into their own soil."

Admittedly the monumental task of restoring 750,000 dunams of wildlife (roughly 187,000 acres) is challenging, but Kol persisted:

"If we were able to turn the Emek Jezreel (northern Israel) from a malaria swamp into a green belt under more unfavorable circumstances, then the same pioneering zeal, plus modern machines, will surmount the difficulties in Lachish."

NO TIME TO LOSE

"But we must act before it is too late," Kol continued. "We must bring as many Jews out of north African danger zones as rapidly as possible."

The immediate goal is 40,000 to 45,000 by next October. The migration and resettlement will be undertaken principally with funds from the United Jewish Appeal.

Of the plight of Jews in Morocco, Kol warned:

"The Egyptian Government has been influencing the populace against our people. The Jews in Morocco have no civil rights. They remain there under the personal protection of the Sultan. They are terrorized in Marrakech and in their Atlas Mountain homes."

Under the Lachish plan:

1. Each migrant family must have at least 1 physically capable breadwinner under 45 so as not to tax Israel with future public charges.

2. Worried parents will be permitted to send their children, then migrate at a later stage.

MAKE GOOD CITIZENS

A streamlined ship-to-settlement plan has been developed. This eliminates the necessity of first lodging immigrants in tent cities or broken-down huts before moving them into permanent homes. The permanent homes are there. I saw them, modest, well-constructed concrete houses with land aplenty for each man.

"Our experience with the north African Jew shows he makes a good and constructive citizen," Kol went on.

"Many have already made good officers in our army. We've absorbed 15,000 of their children since 1949. We have a scholarship fund for their education in secondary (high) schools."

The blueprint of Lachish follows four objectives:

1. Harness the soil in Israel's drive for a self-sustaining economy.

2. Create a network of settlements to house the immigrants.

3. Cultivate industrial crops and establish industries in the region which can use such crops.

4. Fill in a border vacuum which the planners say "creates a dangerous gap in Israel's defense perimeter."

I saw the first stage of the operation in action by going to Haifa, Israel's great port in the north, as the steamship *Negbah* arrived.

The new citizens of Israel moved ashore carrying their possessions in boxes and handbags. Children clung to their mothers, others tagged along. All were processed swiftly, then driven in trucks and buses to Otzem—first village created in Lachish.

Otzem means strength and honors the Israeli forces which beat back Egyptian attacks in the area in 1948.

The settlers—mostly from the village of Bugmaz in the Atlas Mountains—lugged mattresses and crates into their new homes, then eagerly inspected the land about them.

Meir Maman, sporting a beret, lit a cigarette and moved right into the plot behind his home to sow the soil.

INDEPENDENT UNIT

The size of each settlement in Lachish will range from 60 to 100 families. Every 6 to 8 settlements will have a district center with a population of 800 to 1,000 families. This center, in turn, will be linked with a regional town of 15,000 to 20,000 families.

"In this way," Kol related, "the entire region will become to a large extent an independent economic, social, and cultural unit."

The region is criss-crossed by three new highways and the new railroad running south to Beersheba. Surveyors were taking readings for the new roads when I arrived. Not far away big ditches were prepared for the huge 66-inch pipes, part of the Yarkon-Negev pipeline, which will bring water into the area.

The UJA and Israel Government estimate 50 settlements (4,500 farms) will eventually be established.

Behind the drive to redeem Lachish is Israel's Premier and Defense Minister, David Ben-Gurion, a Negev Desert settler himself.

Later, in Paris I talked with such eminent Americans as Edward M. M. Warburg, United Jewish Appeals president; William Rosenwald, United Jewish Appeals general chairman; New York industrialist Leon Lowenstein; New York City tax commissioner Nathan Math; and Dewey D. Stone, of Brockton, Mass., philanthropist.

FITTING EXAMPLE FOR BOTH

They were en route to Israel and Africa as members of an American mission to study the plight of Jews in hostile areas and the great lachish operation. Warburg told me:

"Lachish is another demostration of the good intentions of men of good will and peace. It is a fitting example for both Arab and Jew."

It is difficult to reconcile Egyptian Premier Nasser's fears with the almost universal desire in Israel for peace—a peace that will enable it to complete lachish without draining any funds for defense.

Egypt's well-intentioned liberation province can serve the same purpose for Arab refugees as lachish will for immigrant Jews. Arab investment in future lachishes and liberation provinces would pay richer dividends than war.

More important—it would thwart Communist aspiration to gain a foothold in the vital Middle East—where Red Czechoslovakian arms are fomenting war.

Lachish and the liberation province offer great hope and promise.

It's a bargain you can't buy when you engage in pursuit of arms instead of pursuit of happiness.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—FACE OF COUNTRY SHOWS DRAMATIC GAINS IN 7 YEARS

(By Erwin Savelson)

It's down on the farm and home on the range in Israel, 1955.

That's a long way from 1949 when a lot of us dieted on "liverless liver" and meager rations while covering the final stages of Israel's war for independence.

The enthusiastic little state—the threat of war again rumbling about its head—emerged from the first round with the Arabs with two ambitious self-set missions.

1. Peace with the Arab world.

2. Battle against deserts and swamplands to redeem idle soil and fill the empty stomachs of 750,000 citizens—now grown to 1,800,000.

Victory over the desert and malarial swamps is within sight, though the pangs of hunger endured by the Israelis for 7 long years have not disappeared entirely.

But the cherished peace—menaced by a threatening "second round" with the hostile Arabs—is not in sight.

In the hills of Gallilee near Tabcha, I saw Bud Molohon, Israel's favorite Texas cowboy, riding the hilly range, teaching young Israelis how to raise cattle. From Dan to Beersheba and even farther south into the Negev, I saw what peace means.

For the Israelis, in 7 short years, had raised the cultivated area of their land from 1,650,000 dunams (4 dunams equal 1 acre) in 1949 to 3,675,000 dunams today.

PROGRESS SPECTACULAR

It was visible evidence of the peace which Israel welcomes so that it may use its limited resources to consolidate the spectacular economic gains achieved since 1949.

Ironically, the same type of peace would enable Egypt to move forward at an accelerated pace with such revolutionary reforms as the "liberation province" without draining its treasury to pay—even cutrate prices—for arms from Communist Czechoslovakia.

Even Egyptian Prime Minister Nasser acknowledged during our recent talk in Cairo that it was distressing, as he put it, to spend money on guns, tanks, and planes instead of "Liberation Provinces."

But when I suggested that the Arabs turn to creating "Liberation Provinces" throughout their lands for 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees, I was greeted with silence.

The resettlement of the refugees would remove one of the chief issues involved in the bitter dispute between the Arabs and Israel and open the way at least to talks of peace, in the opinion of America's leading diplomats and observers.

In Israel, the average citizen in the big cities or the kibbutznick in the desert settlements, prepared for mobilization at any moment, would rather talk about the country's progress than the ominous second round threat.

Even my chauffeur, Shmuel Baker, had his opinion:

"There's so much still to be done, so let's do it. We don't like the idea of war. We'll never start one, I'm sure. But we're as ready as we can be. In the meantime, we're doing what has to be done."

BLUEPRINT CHALLENGING

Doing what has to be done?

The blueprint of Israel's future challenges the imagination.

In a back-breaking commando-car journey from Beersheba far south of Eilat at the tip of the gulf of Aqaba, millions of acres of sun-scarred wastes stretched before our eyes.

But the Israelis dream of new cities and urban centers of 10,000 and 25,000 in this desolate soutern Negev.

To the north, swamps are being drained where Cowboy Molohon and his range hands ride in Galilee, setting the pace for ultimate utilization of 2 million dunams (500,000 acres) of grazing land for beef cattle.

When you ask Molohon, of the United States point 4 missions, about the youngsters riding with him, he answers with a western twang:

"Good hands. Good people. They'll do all right!"

Seven years ago, I skirted the old road to Jerusalem, climbed to the heights leading into the Valley of Courage where youngsters perished to lift the siege of the holy city. The ancient terraces tilled by Arab and Jew were nothing but crags of rock.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the same hilltop. Before me nestled reaches of vineyards in the Judean hills. The terraces were green with cypress and eucalyptus and tropical and sub-tropical fruits and plants.

EGGS NOW PLENTIFUL

Seven years ago, an egg was a precious commodity. In 1955, I feasted on all the eggs one could desire and watched my friend Ben (Flatbush Benny) Chorin caring tenderly for hundreds of thousands of chicks in his scientific coops at Kfar Menachem on the northern fringe of the Negev.

Seven years ago, a handful of religious youngsters were eking a living out of Kfar Darom in the Negev. A fortnight ago, the 40 Darom youngsters were still there, plus 160 others from 20 different countries.

In 1948 and 1949, the 261 combines and 681 tractors represented the nation's agricultural industrial wealth. Today, there are 915 combines and 3,415 tractors harvesting cotton, groundnuts and sugar beets on a large scale and flax and tropical fruits on a smaller scale.

During my last on-the-spot survey in 1952, the Israelis were shelling out $65 million a year to import meat, wheat, tea and coffee. Similar food imports now average $14 million annually.

Once the war clouds were lifted, Israel pursued its plans to educate Arab farmers, training them to use modern methods and irrigation systems. It paid off. Arab villages now cultivate not only 550,000 dunams of land, but have increased tobacco production tenfold. And in desert regions, the Bedouins have turned an additional 300,000 dunams into fertile fields.

BOYCOTT DISCUSSED

Industrial development has kept pace with agricultural progress; witness the fact that where 80,000 were employed in 1949, there are 125,000 on the job today.

But all this does not mean that Israel is over the hump economically. Far from it. The ruthless Arab economic boycott only adds to Israel's trials. The nation's breadbaskets in the north and south have filled empty stomachs, but there still are extremely short supplies of such vital items as meat, wheat, and sugar.

In the settlements and cities, former white-collar workers, small shopkeepers, and others who are becoming experienced farmers, tell you the gathering war clouds only drive them to a greater tenacity and resolution to finish what must be done.

When I had concluded my interview with Defense Minister Ben-Gurion in Jerusalem, one of his aides took me aside to discuss relations with Egypt and the other Arab powers bent on destroying Israel.

"The Arabs go around kidding themselves that if they trade with Israel, then Israel will swamp their world with its industrial goods," he said.

"Nothing is farther from the truth. If they end their economic boycott and trade with us it will bring capital investment into the whole area. The capacity for Israel to attract capital, not only for its own development but for the betterment of neighboring states as well, is tremendous."

The blossoming hills of Jerusalem and the green in the Negev were welcome sights compared to the arms exhibits I saw in both Israel and Cairo.

The huge pumping stations and reservoirs forming part of the 70-mile Yarkon-Negev pipeline—which took 45,000 66-inch pipes and a million workdays to build—seemed better lifelines than the tense armed forces dug in along the Gaza strip.

UNFOUND TREASURES

There are still unfound treasures in Israel's Negev, the Judean hills and Galilee. There must be equal treasures in the "Liberation Province" where Egypt hopes to settle 1 million down-trodden peasants.

I saw many "Bud" Molohons scattered around delivering the goods of American know-how and good will. They were actresses and actors, cowboys and diplomats, builders and planners, TWA fliers and soldiers.

In war and peace, I found the face of the land of Israel changing—for the better.

The Arab world—which can build Liberation Provinces to ease the burden of the refugees living within its borders—can benefit from the simple philosophy being spun in Israel and around the globe by "Bud" Molohons. Summed up, it is:

In the long run a home on the range is worth a dozen divisions equipped with imported Red arms.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—HEALING HANDS OF HADASSAH TOUCH JEW, ARAB ALIKE

(By Erwin Savelson)

War thunders to the south in the Holy Land, but it is quiet in the hills of Jerusalem.

The blood of Israeli and Arab spills on the moonlit Sinai Desert, but it is peaceful on the road to Ain Karem, birthplace of St. John the Baptist, where the highway winds down into a beautiful valley enriched with vineyards and olive trees.

For Ain Karem has been touched by the blessed healing hand of Hadassah—America's 300,000 Queen Esthers—and there a magnificent hospital is rising above the ridges to minister to Arab and Israeli alike.

Frightened children huddle in Israeli settlements and in the refugee camps in Egyptian-held Gaza as men tear at each other with weapons of destruction.

But it is calm in the blue hills atop picturesque Bayit Vegan, where 125,000 B'nai B'rith Women of America have erected a home for children terrorized by the horrors of war.

I can still hear the words of Mayor Gershon Agron of Jerusalem as we stood on the mountain at Bayit Vegan and talked about the imminence of war and the home built for war-stricken maladjusted children.

"There are no disturbed children," said Agron. "There are disturbed circumstances."

I had just flown to Israel from Egypt, via Cyprus, after inspecting the huge Liberation Province in the Libyan Desert between Cairo and Alexandria.

The disturbed circumstances of which Agron spoke were as absent in the Libyan Desert as in the Judean hills. There was a degree of similarity between the great Hadassah installations of mercy I saw in Israel's north and in the Negev Desert and the new clinics, hospitals, and schools I saw in Egypt's Liberation Province.

And I could not help but think:

Here was an almost perfect solution to the chief cause of strife in the Middle East: The presence of 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees on Israel's borders, 250,000 of them in the Gaza tinderbox.

There is universal agreement among the world's diplomats that settlement of the refugee problem is the key to war or peace in the Middle East. The refugees, cut off from farms or properties by the armistice lines drawn in 1948, have been in camps in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan for 7 years.

There was general agreement as well among the diplomats and military figures with whom I talked on three continents that Egypt's plan to resettle 1 million of its peasants in the liberation province could just as readily be adapted to the refugeed question, namely:

Establishment of similar liberation provinces throughout the spacious Arab States for the 900,000 refugees.

Israel is prepared to pay compensation to the refugees; the United States and Britain have announced they would arrange an international loan to help resettle them, and the United Nations has offered its assistance.

KEPT UNUSED BY WAR

It remains only for the Arab States to accept and contribute to a resettlement program.

That such action would bring vast benefits to the entire Middle East was made clear to me in Ain Karem and at Bayit Vegan.

I stood on the site at Ain Karem where indefatigable Dr. Kalman J. Mann, Hadassah Medical Organization director general, enthusiastically watched the first stages of construction on the new Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Center.

We recalled how in 1952 we looked up at Arab-held Mount Scopus, atop of which still stands the original Hadassah Hospital and famed university—still closed and unused because men cannot attain peace.

Then we reached the bare 500-acre plateau at Ain Karem, where Dr. Mann shouted enthusiastically: "This is the spot."

This time the spot was not empty. Above the ridge rose the beginning of a new 500-bed hospital, the most modern in the Middle East; the Henrietta Szold School of Nursing, named for the founder of Hadassah; a medical school to train 450 students; a mother-and-child pavilion for maternity cases and infant care and a shikun (housing development) for the 500 families of the center's personnel.

Dr. Mann is a man of peace, a healer, and his talk was refreshing when compared with the sword-rattling words of so many men I met in the Middle East.

He spoke words which he later reiterated before the Hadassah convention in Chicago:

"Even if the Arabs are unwilling to meet with us on political problems, they should, for the welfare of their own people, contact Israel medical authorities to conquer jointly regional health scourges."

The figures he cited on comparative Israeli-Egyptian mortality rates were not meant to deride Egypt, but rather to drive home his point that disease knows no border strips like Gaza. Here are only two of Dr. Mann's startling figures:

The average life span of an Israeli male in 1953 was 68 years as compared with 35½ in Egypt.

The infant mortality rate in Israel was 36 per 1,000 against 180 in Egypt.

READY TO SHARE

Then, he added, Hadassah was ready to share its know-how with the Arabs.

This was not empty talk. For in the Negev one can witness practical application of Hadassah's belief that disease does not differentiate between Moslem and Jew.

Arab patients waited outside the Yassky Memorial Hospital in Beersheba to receive first-rate medical care; they mingled with the Israeli settlers; the nurses moved from one to another, ministering to each meticulously; an anxious Arab father held his little son as a doctor treated the child for trachoma.

I recalled what Dr. Mann had said:

"Health is an instrument for peace that provides a common ground for the masses of Arab and Israel people."

Hadassah is providing that common ground through its seven hospitals in Israel, its health centers, vocational schools, welfare stations, antitrachoma service, and other projects too numerous to list.

If Hadassah had ended its work with the prewar and postwar rescue of 70,000 youthful refugees from 72 lands, it would have been enough. But it has gone on to plant the heart of American womanhood in the Middle East to the lasting benefit of Arab and Israeli. I was proud of them.

I was just as proud the day I watched 45 American women leaders of B'nai B'rith assemble on the hill at Bayit Vegan to dedicate a $250,000 home for maladjusted children.

Old Glory and Israeli flags flew over the buildings in the picturesque setting. Capt. Naftali Gribov led his Israeli Police Band in playing national anthems, then swung into Oklahoma.

URGED HOME IN 1943

The spirit of Henrietta Szold also was at Bayit Vegan, for it was in 1943 that she urged B'nai B'rith, America's 113-year-old and largest Jewish service organization to build a home for children afflicted by the aftermath of war and persecution.

Mrs. Isaac Ben-Zvi, wife of the President of Israel, chatted with such American leaders as Mrs. Louis L. Perlman (Chicago), president of the B'nai B'rith Women of America; Mrs. Maurice Turner (Los Angeles), Mrs. Arthur G. Laufman (Chicago), Mrs. William Rabkin (New York) and others.

United States Ambassador Edward B. Lawson led the scores of diplomats and military attachés of many nations at the scene, then expressed his admiration for the contributions made to peace by American women.

The children of the home marched through its gates singing their thanks in Hebrew and English. For they were home, no longer fearful.

Before I left Egypt, one of Prime Minister Nasser's chief aides looked quizzically at the pin in the lapel of my coat and asked: "Menorah?"

Rather good-naturedly, I smiled and replied:

"No, Liberace's Fan Club."

As he laughed, I explained that Liberace's stage props were featured by the presence of a seven-pronged candelabra on a piano, then told him the "Menorah" in my lapel signified my B'nai B'rith membership.

"What does it stand for?" he asked.

"Benevolence, brotherly love, and harmony—service to mankind of all creeds and faiths," I answered.

"It's a wonderful philosophy," he admitted.

In Ain Karem and Beersheba, the children of Arab and Israeli look to the healers of Hadassah.

In Gaza and elsewhere on the war-jittery borders, the children of the refugees await the better life to which they also are entitled.

They are entitled to liberation provinces. All children can do without disturbed circumstances.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—JOHNSTON'S PLAN: QUELL MIDDLE EAST FIRE WITH WATER

(By Erwin Savelson)

Water is the life of the Middle East. The Nile is Egypt and the Jordan is Israel. And there are men in Arab lands so filled with hatred of Israel they say the twain shall never meet. But, if I were they, I wouldn't bet on it.

For I have seen a man with a mission in action. He is Eric Johnston. His title—President Eisenhower's Special Ambassador to the Middle East. Americans know him better as the "czar" of the movie industry.

His mission: Peace—not war.

I met this patient troubleshooter extraordinary in Cairo on a Sunday morning. Two days later, we met again in Jerusalem. Though he has been shuttling back and forth from Hollywood to the Middle East for 2 years, he is far from discouraged. He moves forward with a determination to persuade the Arab states and Israel to accept the United States-backed formula for peaceful division of the Jordan Valley waters.

His success may mean the difference between war and peace. It will also mean:

Resettlement of about 200,000 of the 900,000 Arab refugees who have been in border camps in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan for 7 years.

The generation of electric power in the Jordan Valley, bringing with it the richness of newly irrigated soil; homes and green fields for tens of thousands; a better way of life for all in the explosive Middle East.

It's a difficult assignment, but Johnston is not an ordinary man. He has virtually made the Middle East his home since 1953, demonstrating the patience of a Job in the Holy Land; entreating with Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan on one hand; negotiating with Israel on the other.

"Tough, yes," he told me in Cairo, "but impossible of solution—no."

"WATER WAR" FOR JORDAN?

The eyes of the military experts are focused on the Gaza Strip, bloody El Auja and the sands of the Negev and Sinai Deserts.

But, the eyes of the diplomats are riveted on Johnston and the Jordan Valley to the

north, where feverish behind-the-scenes efforts have been going on for months to avert what the Eisenhower administration fears almost as much as the current disturbing desert border clashes—

A "Water War" over the Jordan Valley.

Johnston's reclamation and resettlement experts listened avidly to our description of forts have ben going on for months to try's plan to settle 1 million poverty-stricken peasants. They said they were aware of the project, describing it as apparently "mighty impressive."

There was general agreement among the diplomats that establishment of "Liberation Provinces" throughout spacious Arab states for the 900,000 refugees sitting on Israel's tense borders would remove the chief cause of war.

Johnston's plan for the Jordan Valley, therefore, looms high on the horizon. For it would open the way to new opportunities for the Middle East where Communist Russia is seeking to exploit Arab bitterness against Israel with its Red Czechoslovakian arms shipments to Egypt.

Thus, we have the sharp contrast of two missions in the Middle East where I saw war in the making.

1. Johnston, skillfully seeking agreement on a plan that would give the three Arab states about 60 percent of the water and Israel about 40 percent; Johnston working against ancient hatred and antagonisms to bring order out of chaos.

2. Communist Russia, seeking to expand its influence into the Arab world; pursuing a reckless policy that can only mean conflict unless it is checked by the Western World.

Johnston's approach to the problem is unorthodox. His job is made all the more difficult by the inane refusal of the Arab overlords to even acknowledge that Israel exists.

So, he negotiates with the Arab League technicians first in Cairo, Beirut, Amman, Jordan, or Damascus. Then he hops across frontiers to talk with the Israelis.

At this moment, he is encouraged by the willingness of both sides to discuss their technical objections to his program, though there are some skeptics who doubt much will come of his prolonged mission.

TVA SETUP IN EAST

Generally, Johnston's plan provides for a water development in the Jordan River Valley along lines of the Tennessee Valley Authority. It would divide the Jordan's waters between Israel and Syria and Jordan. Powerplants would be constructed on the headwaters of the Jordan and on its tributary, the Yarmuk River, and irrigate large areas in the three countries.

More important, it would permit resettling of at least 200,000 Arab refugees in the valley of the lower Jordan.

The entire scheme would cost $121 million. It would be money well spent because the alternative is: A "water war" in the north.

For Israel, water is the crucial element in its fight for economic survival. Israel's climate is characterized by a long dry spell from April to November, and a short rainy winter. The Jordan is the only river of any size in the country. The Yarkon River, Israel's second, is fed from an accumulation of springs near Tel Aviv.

The new state's overall national plan is designed to bring surplus water from the Jordan tributaries in the north to the Negev in the south.

Topping all is the Yarkon-Negev pipeline—the Big 66—most dramatic and biggest project of its kind ever undertaken in the Middle East.

At one end, the Yarkon flows into the Mediterranean. At the other end, the southern Negev Desert—hope of Israel's future—has remained unproductive because of lack of water.

But this situation has started to change with the advent of the "Big 66" which will carry almost half of the Yarkon's waters 60 miles to the south for irrigation.

"Tahal," the Israel Government's Water Authority, envisions the day soon when the water of the "Big 66" will bring fields and plantations to the barren east and northeast of the Gaza Strip, where men now are fighting and dying on a thirsty land.

"BIG 66," FIRST STAGE

Four months ago, Israeli President Isaac Ben-Zvi set into operation the first stage of the "Big 66" network.

The water moves south through giant underground pipes manufactured in Israel. Three pumping stations life it 650 to 800 feet to meet the plateau elevation in the south. Smaller pipelines and channels then stream it off into the settlements and villages.

Israel estimates 75,000 acres will be irrigated when a second branch of the Yarkon pipeline is opened. They estimate that about 2½ acres of irrigable land is needed for each farming family, so the plan is sufficient to support 30,000 families.

Compare this with the situation during my first visit to Israel in the final hours of the war in 1949:

Only 57,500 acres were irrigated in all of Israel when the republic was established. But, by December 31, 1955 the irrigated area will reach almost 250,000 acres.

And Tahal envisions the day within 10 years when 750,000 acres will be irrigated to cover the industrial and domestic needs of 3 million people. Israel's population today is near 1,800,000.

THE STAGE IS SET

Thus, the stage is set in the Middle East for the struggle for water—its most precious commodity.

Said Johnston:

"The differences between the Arab states and Israel on technical aspects of the water plan are now so small * * *"

So small—yet so big that men are willing to die for the precious fluid.

For the Arab world, the Johnston plan brings peace, not a Communist political penetration.

The Jordan Valley offers a new and better way of life for 200,000 Arab refugees.

Egypt's "Liberation Province" theory can be adapted by the Arabs to care for thousands of others, including the 250,000 still huddled in the tension-filled Gaza Strip.

I recommend you keep an eye on the Jordan Valley as well as on the flaming desert frontiers.

For was it not the prophet Isaiah who foretold the blessing of green lands where peace reigns:

"The wilderness and the dry land shall be glad thereat; and the desert shall rejoice, and blossom as the lily."

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE—SANDS OF THE NEGEV HOLD HOPE OF A BRIGHT FUTURE

(By Erwin Savelson)

Surrounded on three sides by hostile Arab states, and bounded on the fourth by the Mediterranean, war-threatened Israel still looks south for its rendezvous with destiny in the triangle-shaped Negev Desert.

The Bible is Israel's supreme authority for its hope of a fruitful future in this sliver of land which reaches from Beersheba to the Gulf of Eilat (Aqaba), the republic's "Window to the East."

The Israelis say the Bible tells them that the Negev was a store of rich treasures in ancient days, yielding earthly sustenance for millions of people and rich minerals for the glory that was Solomon's.

For 2 days, I crisscrossed the southern Negev with a convoy commanded by Capt. Rolfe Sommerfeld of the Desert Corps—just as I ranged over the massive "Liberation Province" in Egypt's hot Libyan Desert between Cairo and Alexandria, east of El Alamein.

In the Negev, I watched laborers from Europe, Iran and Iraq and from the Druz Moslem sect, some of whom fought for Israel against the Arabs, blast through rocky ridges and sandstone hillsides to build "Burma Roads" to the Dead Sea and the Bay of Eilat.

In Egypt's "Liberation Province," I saw men and machines level Libyan mounds, slice huge long ditches to receive tributary waters of the Nile, rip away eroded sand-swept spaces to create living space for better days.

Once again, I saw man engage in his ceaseless struggle for survival, pitting his endurance and ingenuity against the wilderness to restore lost outposts of civilization.

Here was man at his best.

In the Negev, he was pointing the way toward reclamation of ancient riches so that a free democracy might achieve a decent standard of life. In the "Liberation Province" he was pinning his revolutionary hope on a master plan to raise the level of the future for 1 million poverty-stricken persons.

SOLUTION FOR PEACE

Join the two plans and what do we have?

A perfect solution to the strife in the Middle East—an answer to peace or war in the Holy Land.

A perfect solution to the ever-present danger to peace in the 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees who have endured 7 years in camps in the Gaza tinderbox strip, in Syria, Lebanon, and Jordan.

For Egypt's "Liberation Province" reform is indicative of the Arab world's ability to wage peace—not war—if it so wills.

Stability and progress would be advanced at a dizzying pace in the Middle East; the costly strife of Gaza, El Auja, and Khan Yunis, where I saw war in the making, would vanish if:

The 900,000 refugees are resettled in spacious Arab lands.

Toward that end and in a statesmanlike approcah, the United States and Britain have offered to arrange an international loan to help resettle them and finance development and irrigation projects in regions where they would be self-supporting.

Israel is prepared to make maximum compensation for properties lost by the refugees when they were cut off from their lands by the armistice lines drawn in 1948. The United Nations only waits the calls to give assistance.

The lone requirement:

Arab acceptance of this humane "liberation province" approach.

The stumbling block:

Arab unwillingness even to recognize the existence of Israel.

The result:

Intervention by Communist Russia to gain a foothold in the strategic Middle East by exploiting to the hilt Arab bitterness against Israel; setting the stage for a war that eventually could involve the Big Powers by channeling guns, tanks, planes, and submarines to Egypt.

No one will gain by war in the Middle East except the Communists. No one will gain from this intrigue but the Communists who are bent on fulfilling an ambition nurtured since Czarist days to achieve an outlet on the Mediterranean or Persian Gulf in the oil- and mineral-rich Middle East—even at the cost of conflict.

The stakes are high. Take Israel's for example:

Its stake in the battle with the Negev wastes is very high since the Machtesh Gadol, a deep desert depression into which I descended from mountainous heights with Captain Sommerfeld's convoy, is the home—so I was told—of geological treasures.

You now hear a new word in the land below the Scorpion's Trail, a winding and twisting highway cut out of the side of a mountain, leading into the desert plain below. It is: Uranium.

Israel scientists advised me that their researchers at the Weizmann Institute of Science in Rehovot have developed means of extracting uranium from Negev phosphate ores, found principally in the Machtesh and used for fertilizers. There were admissions, however, that the phosphate thus far has been found to contain low grade uranium.

But phosphate is not the only mineral target of the Israelis. As we bounced over the Negev roads, they told me of looking ahead to discovering such desert treasures as:

NEGEV TREASURES

Magnesium, bromide and salt plus the potash already existing in the flat salt pans of Sodom on the Red Sea; gypsum at Sde Boker, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's desert retreat; clay, iron and manganese in the Wadi (huge gully) Ramon copper and manganese at the Wadi Nehoushtan and ornamental stone at Eilat on the Red Sea—from where King Solomon's treasure-laden ships once sailed to distant lands.

Israel is alive to the wonders which await its people if it can triumph in the desert from Beersheba west to the Egyptian border, east to Sodom and the Jordan Mountains and south to the Bay of Eilat—its gateway to the East.

With dreams of abundant oil at Helets (the quantity of oil in this field has not been determined as yet) in the north, minerals in the south and flourishing farmlands in old Holy Land wastelands, Israel looks ahead with hope of victory in the Negev.

The same type of war is being waged by the builders of Egypt's "Liberation Province" where they told me victory is in sight in that nation's first great reform attempt in centuries to lift the yoke off a million peasants.

But Israel and Egypt will need peace to achieve such lofty aims—a peace which Israel has offered but which the Arabs do not talk about, except on terms which would, in effect, decimate Israel.

BEN-GURION'S VISION

The Middle East can take to heart the words of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion, staunch advocate of the drive to the south, who told me I would "never know the real Israel, the Israel of future generations, until you've stood on the shores of the Red Sea."

Upon my return from the long journey to the land of Eilat, Ben-Gurion again envisioned great and new civilizations in the desert, stating:

"We are under no obligations to accept the heritage of desolation from the past, for it is within our power to reforest the waste, to fertilize the sand dunes, to dig wells, to build and revive the dust of the earth, to redeem its minerals and natural treasures.

"Indeed, this is the true conquest of the land; the great mission we are called upon to undertake in our own day."

There is no other alternative to the question of war or peace in the Middle East.

The "true conquest" of the land means peace for Israel and the Arabs. The "true conquest" means new homes for the 900,000 refugees.

The other choice: War.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—DEATH LURKS IN 10 PLAGUE SPOTS OF MIDDLE EAST

(By Erwin Savelson)

Israel has 10 frontiers where war may explode.

That's a lot of territory to watch for a nation the size of New Jersey with a population of 1,800,000, surorunded as it is by hostile Arab states with 45 million inhabitants spread over an area nearly two-thirds the size of the United States.

At the moment, the world's attention is focused on the fighting on the Egyptian-Israeli border in the Negev Desert.

But war also threatens in other hot spots—ranging north from the Straits of Tiran where the Gulf of Aqaba (Eilat) meets the Red Sea to far-flung Lebanese-Syrian outposts in the north.

Just check off these names and paste them in your military hat. For if the full-fledged war which the United States and free world are striving to prevent does come, blood will flow unnecessarily in:

1. The Gaza strip.
2. The demilitarized zone of El Auja.
3. The desert frontier around El Sabha, where last week Israelis claimed they killed 50 Egyptians and the latter claim 200 Israelis perished.
4. The seaport of Eliat and the Straits of Tiran.
5. The Israeli-Jordon frontier around Jerusalem.
6. The territory in Jordan known as the Nabius-Jenin-Tulkarm Triangle northeast of Tel Aviv and pointed directly at the plains leading to the Israeli seashore town of Natany.
7. The Hebron Hills below Jerusalem.
8. The region around Ein Gev opposite Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee, adjacent to the Syrian border.
9. The Jordan Valley where dispute over use of the Jordan waters and draining of the malarial Huleh swamps for new Israeli farms and settlers threatens to explode in a Water War unless Eric Johnston's United States-backed development plan is accepted by both sides.
10. The Lebanese border.

And the flow of blood in these hot spots would be unnecessary because there is a solution to the current strife caused in the Middle East by Red Czechoslovakia's shipments of arms to Egypt.

The solution is:

Resettlement of 900,000 Arab refugees—who have been in Gaza, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon for 7 years—in "Liberation Provinces" such as I saw in Egypt's Libyan Desert.

The "Liberation Province" plan advanced by this newspaper has evoked the wildest interest among diplomats and would, they agree, erase the No. 1 obstacle to peace in the Middle East.

It would mean new hope and life for the refugees who were cut off from their Palestine properties by armistice lines drawn in 1948.

That was the year the outnumbered and ill-equipped Israeli Army staged what its historians now describe as "Operation 10 Plagues."

They severed the Arab "jugular vein" in the Northern Negev, ended isolation of surrounded Negev settlements, trapped sizeable Arab forces in the desert—all of which led to the Rhodes Island armistice agreement in February 1949.

CAN ISRAEL REPEAT?

Can Israel repeat its bold defensive tactics of 7 years ago?

The answer lies in whether it can obtain security guarantees and arms to guard its many explosive frontiers against the new might pouring into Egypt via the Communist pipeline.

At this writing, it appears the free world, reappraising the situation and anxious to maintain a balance of power between Israel and the Arabs, may provide some arms to offset the Red-made superiority piling up on the Arab side.

If the West is unable to head off a deadly arms race or unable to persuade the Kremlin to halt its dangerous incursion into an area long regarded as vital to defense of the free world, you can expect serious trouble in any of the 10 hot spots discussed above.

Though Gaza and El Sabha are making headlines now, the Gulf of Aqaba, from where King Solomon's treasure-laden ships sailed thousands of years ago to the East, may be the area of the next serious and dangerous flareup.

Israel has developed a port in the small strip of land it occupies on the Gulf of Aqaba at Eilat. But it cannot use the gulf to reach Africa and the Far East.

The west shore of the gulf belongs to Egypt, the east shore to Jordan and Saudi Arabia. At the bottom of the gulf is the Red Sea. The way to the sea is blocked by two small Egyptian-controlled islands in the Straits of Tiran. They are Tiran and Sanafi where Egyptian batteries overlook the straits while their ships patrol the waters.

A few months ago, a British freighter was fired upon while passing through. Some Israeli-chartered ships, flying foreign flags, managed to slip through in recent years. But that was before Egypt demanded 72 hours notice before permitting any foreign ship to negotiate the straits.

Egypt also refuses to permit any Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal, linked to the Red Sea by the Gulf of Suez.

Israel has repeatedly demanded Egypt permit its ships free access through the straits. It has tacitly warned of a determination to protect such passage of ships whenever necessary.

So, look out for a conflagration in the Straits of Tiran if Egypt keeps up its blockade and Israel decides to run the gauntlet.

North of strife-ridden, El Auja, El Sabha, and Gaza are the other explosive frontiers.

Facing the Nablus-Jenin-Tulkarm Triangle are scores of new Israeli settlements, alerted around the clock for any possible thrust by Jordan Arab Legion troops, based only 10 miles from Israel's Mediterranean seashore towns.

In Jerusalem, you can still look from your hotel window at Arab Legion troops patrolling walls of the Old City a few blocks away.

At Ein Gev, on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, Israeli fishermen throw nets into the landlocked water, but always watchful for Arab marauders from neighboring Syria.

These are some of the hotspots where a war, spurred on by arms from Communist satellite states, is imminent unless the West acts to check the flames.

In Cairo, Maj. Gen. Abdul Hakim Amer, War Minister and Commander in Chief, hastened to assure foreign correspondents that Egypt's purchase of Red-made arms does not mean war.

In Jerusalem, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion told me:

"If Nasser wants peace, he can have it right now. All we want is an honorable peace."

A few days later, Ben-Gurion repeated his offer in the Israeli Knesset (Parliament). There has been no answer to date from the Arab world which still refuses even to recognize the existence of Israel.

New war maps may show 10 new "plague spots" of death, destruction, and sorrow in the Middle East.

Ten "Liberation Provinces" would be so much better for the Arabs, Israel, and the free world.

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—SECURITY OF FREE WORLD AT STAKE IN MIDDLE EAST

(By Erwin Savelson)

The diplomats in Jerusalem and Cairo told me:

"It's necessary to neutralize military advantages held by both sides to minimize the danger of war."

In simple language they meant:

They are having nightmares over the prospect of Red-manufactured subs lurking in the Mediterranean.

In diplomatic language they meant:

Neither Israel nor the hostile Arab States surrounding the little republic should have more guns, tanks, planes, and even seapower than the other.

They call that the balance of power.

That was all right in 1950. The free world then hailed the Big Three—United States,

Britain, and France—for assuring Israel and the Arabs that they would not tolerate attempts by either side to wrest territory from each other by force.

But, the Middle East applecart has been upset by the Communists. Why?

It has been a military axiom almost since the days of Ghengis Khan:

"The power which controls the Middle East controls the world."

RED ARMS ON WAY

This is the stake of the free world in the Middle East today. And that stake will soon be threatened by:

Red-made subs in the Mediterranean for the first time in history, perhaps 6 to 12 of them. It's enough to make American and British admirals sit up nights.

Red-trained technicians in Egypt. There is only a handful around Cairo now. But the number will soon increase to dozens.

The arrival of 6 to 10 ships carrying Red Czechoslovakian arms at Port Said—part of the deal with Egypt.

The shipment of several hundred planes and jet fighters to Egypt via the Communist pipeline.

A top-ranking American observer in Cairo advised me that the Russians are trying to move in en masse to achieve their dream of getting a foothold on the strategic Middle East.

"They're all around us," he said.

And, from what reporters hear and see in the Middle East, new and stronger pronouncements and actions must come from the free world if a full-fledged war—spurred by Red-produced weapons—is to be avoided.

Though the Israel-Arab area is the hottest at the moment, there are other tension zones in the Middle East which are causing concern in Washington, London, and Paris. A few are:

The unrest in French North Africa.

Demands of the Greeks in Cyprus for self-determination.

The anger of Arab States over the Iraqi-Turkish pact linking those countries to a Western-Middle East defense setup.

The dispute between Egypt and the Sudanese who will soon vote on whether they prefer to become in independent state or part of Egypt.

Aware of these tensions, the Soviets have moved in to exploit the trouble, particularly the struggle between Israel and the Arabs; providing the arms to Egypt which upset the balance of power in the Middle East.

Aware of this, the West has offered its aid in trying to solve the chief cause of strife between Israel and the Arabs:

The presence of 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees on Israel's tense borders. One of the proposed solutions to this problem is the establishment of projects similar to the Egyptian "Liberation Province."

Elimination of the refugee problem would be the first step toward thwarting Russia's Middle East expansionist ambitions—for it would remove the No. 1 obstacle to peace talks.

It is estimated the heavy equipment being shipped by the Red Czechs will cost Egypt $60 million to $85 million.

"It's at bargain prices," a military expert said.

It is esetimated that 10 "Liberation Provinces" can be created to resettle the 900,000 refugees, give them a new and better way of life and remove the principle cause of strife.

"The spirit of conciliation and of the good neighbor brings rich rewards to the people and to the nations," Secretary of State Dulles has told Egypt and Israel.

Ten months ago, Prime Minister Nasser, of Egypt, told correspondents he does not believe Russia will make aggressive moves in the Middle East, adding:

"We would renew the mistrust and fear of foreign domination to enter such a pact (Middle East defense pact) with the West."

But Secretary Dulles' statement does not sound as if he was plotting how to bring about foreign domination of Egypt.

The Middle East tinderbox presents perhaps the most serious threat to free-world security since the end of World War II.

The seriousness of the situation was admitted to me in Europe and Africa, and as late as 48 hours ago by one of our most informed and respected diplomats.

His concern was expressed upon receipt of reports that at least 200 planes and 100 tanks would be shipped by Red Czechoslovakia to Egypt as part of their deal.

"It'll knock all hell out of the balance of power we've been trying to maintain," he confessed.

Expressing interest in the Liberation Province plan for resettlement of the 900,000 refugees, 250,000 of them sitting in the dangerous Gaza Strip, he added:

"If we can at least get them to sit down and talk about the refugees we would open the door to peace talks. In fact, it would be the first step toward closing the door on the expansion ambitions of the Communists.

"I hate to think of the consequences if the Russians are ever able to really get a grip on the Middle East."

ISRAEL: WAR OR PEACE?—END OF HOSTILITIES WOULD RESULT IN ARAB PROSPERITY

(By Erwin Savelson)

Three years ago, upon returning from Israel and the Middle East, I wrote:

"Democracy has a vital stake in keeping Israel strong and free. For Israel has lined up with the free nations opposed to any Communist encroachment in the Middle East."

Here is another observation from 1952:

"The road ahead for a reborn Israel is no easier today than it was in 1948—it may even become rougher in the next few years."

What was true in 1952 in Israel and the Middle East is just as true today.

My fourth on-the-spot survey in 7 years leads to no other conclusion but this:

The destiny of Israel and the oil-rich, vital Middle East, is now linked more than ever with the fate of the free world.

Granted peace, Israel is in a position to contribute materially to the prosperity of the entire region and to its own 1,800,000 citizens.

Plunged into war, Israel is now in a position to give a good defense account unless confronted by overwhelming superiority of armaments and firepower channeled into hostile Arab hands by Red Czechoslovakia—with the blessings of the Kremlin.

The choice is not Israel's. The final decision rests with the free world.

I asked one of the new nation's top level diplomats in Jerusalem:

"What is the future?"

He smiled, looked somewhat longingly at an equally important diplomat from a free world nation lunching with us, and replied:

"Tell me what the free world will do to help bring the peace we all want, to help insure our security now that the Arabs are getting heavy Communist arms and I will tell you Israel's future."

I received the same answer from almost every Israeli during my new survey of the land from Dan on the northern border and into the empty Negev desert wastes. But they also talked of their hopes for the future.

In Tel Aviv, health officials talked about the fact that the annual birth rate was about 50,000 against a death rate of 10,000, giving the country a natural increase of 40,000; not counting new immigrants.

Trade authorities seeking to emphasize how Israel can live with its neighbors, pointed to the new treaty it has signed with Islamic Turkey to purchase 50,000 tons of wheat in return for $2.5 million in exported goods.

My friend, Justice Shalon Kassan, the first civil jurist appointed to preside over the Galilee, home of tens of thousands of Israeli Arab citizens, told me somewhat proudly:

"We're spending tens of millions of dollars for new roads, schools, homes, health centers, and municipal and religious institutions in regions populated by our Arab citizens. Such development is an important part of Israel's future."

WHAT PEACE BROUGHT

This was only part of the fruits of peace—if you can call 7 years of an uneasy truce with 7 hostile neighboring Arab states peace—as I saw them after 7 years.

What other blessings has this tenuous peace given to Israel?

An increase in population from 750,000 to nearly 1,800,000.

A rise in national income from 220 million Israeli pounds to 1,426 million at the end of 1954.

An increase in consumption of electric power from 260 million kilowatt-hours to 820 million in 1954.

An extraordinary rise in land under irrigation from 412,000 acres to 925,000.

A boost in industrial production from 121 million Israeli pounds to 780 million pounds.

A rise in total exports from $5,500,000 in 1948 to $84,300,000 in 1954.

Yet, with all this progress, Israel is still a long way from economic self-sufficiency, blocked as it is from trade with its Arab neighboring states by a ruthless blockade.

No wonder many prominent Americans among a United Jewish Appeal delegation which I greeted abroad told me that a permanent peace would open new frontiers of prosperity for all the Middle East.

Everywhere people ask about Israel's future—but it is a future linked with the ultimate solution of many problems.

In Cairo and Jerusalem, diplomats agreed that resettlement of the 900,000 Palestine Arab refugees—cut off from their properties by the 1948 armistice lines—was first and foremost on the list.

RESETTLEMENT PROBLEM

The solution: Resettlement of hundreds of thousands of refugees in liberation provinces such as the one created by Egypt in the Libyan Desert and described for the first time for Americans in this series.

Problem 2: Development of the Jordan Valley. The solution: Adoption of Eric Johnston's plan to divide the Jordan waters between Israel and the Arabs, opening the way for resettlement of 200,00 more refugees in reclaimed soil in the lower Jordan Valley.

Problem 3. Communications. The solution? Establishment of a free port in Haifa for Arab states. Israel looks upon this proposal with favor.

Problem 4: Border clashes. The solution? Creation of physical barriers with firm international control to prevent raids by either side.

Problem 5: Trade. The solution? Israel would buy substantial quantities of food and other vital products from the Arab States and furnish them with the industrial and agricultural products it now is able to export.

These are the issues which will affect the future of Israel. The only obstacle to their solution is a stubborn insistence by Arab overlords to refuse even to recognize the existence of Israel.

In Cairo, Prime Minister Nasser sought to assure me that he has no fear of Red aggression; that he bought arms from Red Czechoslovakia—at bargain prices—for "defense" only.

But I was not assured. Not when reports indicated Red-made submarines would, for the first time in history, break out of the

Black Sea to penetrate the Mediterranean—the free world's lifeline to the Far East.

Such is the future Israel faces. But somehow, after viewing the state for the fourth time, gazing in awe at its progress and looking upon the spirited populace, I am convinced Israel will also weather this storm.

When I left Lydda Airport aboard a TWA liner, I felt I was leaving a child I had come to know well.

This time it was a healthier and sturdier child, no longer a baby, still anxious to fulfill its destiny as a democracy at peace with the world and its Arab neighbors—but unafraid of the challenges of the unknown future.

At the end of the long journey to the Middle East, I realized there are men—in Israel and even in Arab lands—who cry for peace.

But there still is no peace in the Holy Land.

There will be none unless the free world acts with courage and vision.

Building a Sound Peacetime Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the address by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson made in Chicago on December 1, 1955.

This speech sets forward in clear, honest language the hopes and efforts of the present administration to put American agriculture back on a sound track.

We have got to have a dynamic program in the future. We cannot return to a program that proved its worthlessness and brought our farmers to their present plight.

The address follows:

BUILDING A SOUND PEACETIME FARM PROGRAM

As all of you know, the question of what this Nation's farm policy of the future shall be is very much in the news. I know that you are as determined as I am that the Republican Party shall always consistently champion the cause of a prosperous, free, and expanding agriculture.

The Republican Party has a long and illustrious record as the true friend of the American farmer. That reputation has been built in no small measure because our party has steadfastly espoused the same basic principles in which most farmers believe.

We have respected the rights of farmers as individuals. We have emphasized the need to help farmers help themselves. We have visualized the role of Government in agriculture as that of a partner—not a master.

I have been reading of late that there is no room for moderates in the Democrat Party—that there isn't even such a word in their vocublary. To me that means there is no room for farmers in the Democrat organization—for most of the farmers I know are moderates, and rightly proud of it.

There is a farm problem—and it is a difficult one. There is this difficult problem because the same Democrats who have all of the easy answers now were never able to develop a workable, peacetime agricultural program during all their years in office.

Agriculture is a dynamic industry. It has special problems not generally encountered in other pursuits. In addition, farming in America has been going through a great technological revolution—a revolution which will bring lasting benefits to both farmers and consumers but one which poses real problems during the period of adjustment.

Agriculture has also had to face the dislocations which have always marked the changeover from war to more nearly normal markets and conditions. Difficult though this experience has been, agriculture is making the transition with less difficulty than ever before following a major war. You will recall the collapse of farm real estate valuation and the wave of mortgage foreclosures which came after World War I. In contrast, farm real estate valuations today are at the all time peak and mortgage foreclosures are near the record low.

Nevertheless, the Democrats have chosen agriculture as the major domestic battlefield for 1956. They did this through a process of selection. First there was the abortive attempt of the prophets of disaster to talk the country into a depresison. Instead the general economy moved ahead at a record rate.

Then there were the minor skirmishes, such as the scurrilous assault upon the President's churchgoing activities. Of course, that backfired.

Next the Democrat leadership apparently decided it would be smart politics to capitalize upon agriculture's troubles. The same people who had shackled the farmer with price controls and regimentation—the same people who had sought to ram the Brannan plan down the throat of agriculture—suddenly began popping up all over the place with quack remedies and discarded nostrums.

Despite the basically sound health of American agriculture, I seriously doubt that it could survive the witch's brew now being stirred up in the Democrat cauldrons. I have been in this business long enough to know that there are no quick and easy answers. Even when the best possible farm program is evolved, it is unlikely to bear the imprint of such agricultural experts as Jake Arvey and Carmine DeSapio.

The efforts of Governors Harriman and Stevenson to outbid each other in this realm of what they think is agricultural planning have already reached ludicrous proportions. When Adlai Stevenson recently flip-flopped back to rigid, 90 percent price supports and then threw in his version of the Brannan plan for good measure, I watched with some interest to see if Averell Harriman could top that. He did. He even chided Adlai for being too moderate.

It might be worth noting that such a well remembered moderate of the New Deal as Henry Wallace has thrown up his hands in horror at the frantic farm proposals of the Democratic presidential hopefuls.

Even though there is nothing flexible about the price-support plans of the Democrats' spokesmen, there appears to be plenty of flexibility of conscience behind their public pronouncements. It has always seemed to me that truth has an important place, even in political argument.

Therefore, it was with some amazement that I read last week a report by the Democrat National Committee's special advisory committee on agriculture. Even allowing for the fact that this committee is comprised mainly of former political appointees of the Department of Agriculture, I had not expected to see it come forward with so many demonstrably false statements.

There was the flat statement that the Eisenhower administration "immediately upon coming into office" had "put into force the sliding scale of flexible-price program behind a smokescreen of greatly exaggerated 'surpluses.'" The fact is that flexible price supports for the basic commodities are just beginning to become operative with the 1955 harvests. The act which made this possible was not even approved by Congress until August of 1954. Flexible price supports for a variety of nonbasic commodities were flexed in both directions by the Democrats over a long period of years.

Furthermore, the two former Secretaries of Agriculture who signed this statement—Brannan and Wickard—once favored flexible price supports, as their boss, President Truman, did. In fact, flexible price supports for the basic commodities were a part of both the Republican and Democrat platforms in 1948. And the Agricultural Act of 1949, approved by a Democrat Congress, had as its very heart a system of flexible supports.

I wonder, too, how much this question of surpluses has been exaggerated. There is no exaggeration in the fact that the Federal Government today has some $7.5 billion invested in farm price support operations. The cost of storing commodities owned outright by Commodity Credit Corporation is $1 million a day. Virtually all of this accumulation was piled up under a system which the Democrats now say is a solution to the farm problem.

A storage program is not a market—nor is a Government bin a customer. And it is markets that we need, and customers we must have.

Moreover, it needs to be emphasized again and again that it was not high price supports that resulted in high farm prices and incomes during the war and postwar years. It was war that produced them—the destruction of war, and the inflation that goes with war. No political party can or should take credit for wartime prices unless it also assumes responsibility for the war and the bloodshed.

Now I should like to discuss what kind of a farm program agriculture needs and wants. Farmers are in a cost-price squeeze. For nearly 5 years, farm prices have been declining while prices paid by farmers for goods and services have remained near their peak levels.

Some of agriculture's most perplexing questions developed because an emergency price-support program, born of wartime needs, was permitted to continue long after the emergency had ended.

From the end of World War II back in 1945, until the end of 1952, there was little real effort by the Democrats to evolve a workable, peacetime farm program. Instead, production incentives were continued in the face of dwindling demands. Even when supplies began building up to dangerous proportions, production controls provided in the law were not invoked. The throttle was kept wide open and nobody bothered about the brakes.

There were plenty of warning signals during the latter part of 1951 and throughout 1952. The parity ratio, which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, tumbled from 113 in February of 1951 to 94 by the time this administration took office in January of 1953. That's a decline of 19 points in less than 2 years. Ten points of that decline occurred in the last 7 months of the Truman administration.

The new administration inherited a large and fast-growing inventory of various farm commodities. We inherited the falling prices that go with accumulating surpluses. We inherited a legal situation under which production controls could not be made effective until 1954. And we also inherited a law which required us to support the six basic commodities at 90 percent of parity through 1954.

Now the same people who handed us this neat package of carefully fused bombs are blaming us for the explosions.

This administration has been kept busy for nearly 3 years putting out the fires,

cleaning up the debris, and attempting to rebuild our agricultural economy upon a solid foundation. It has not been an easy job. But we are making substantial progress.

We have been recapturing lost markets abroad. United States agricultural exports during the last fiscal period were up 11 percent over the 1952–53 fiscal year. We are moving aggressively to increase these farm exports even more. For the first 3 months of the current fiscal year, exports were 20 percent higher than for a year earlier.

We have been utilizing record quantities of Government-owned surplus foods in school lunch programs and in welfare distribution at home and abroad.

This administration has acted swiftly and vigorously to provide assistance to farmers hit by such natural disasters as flood, drought and early frost.

The rural electrification and telephone programs have been aggressively pushed forward. The borrowers are in stronger financial position than ever before in the history of REA. They have already paid off nearly half a billion dollars in loans and in both programs less than 45 borrowers are behind in their payments.

We are willing and ready to do anything that is economically sound and fair to all of our people.

We moved effectively to ease the price decline brought on by heavy marketing of cattle 2 years ago through direct purchases of beef. Now we are undertaking a similar program for pork to meet a price problem stemming from unusually heavy hog marketings this fall. The Department of Agriculture is cooperating fully in a promotional campaign launched by the industry to increase consumption of pork products.

This year the average American will eat about 20 more pounds of red meat than he did 4 or 5 years ago.

We have increased expenditures for agricultural research and education. We are seeking to develop new crops which may do for the Great Plains and elsewhere what the soybean and hybrid corn have done for the Midwest.

The adjustment in dairy-price supports made early in 1954 has shown solid results. Consumption has moved steadily higher, Government purchases and inventories of dairy products are down sharply. And dairy farmers are now receiving higher prices for milk as a result in the better balance between production and consumption.

We can point to these and other important accomplishments in building toward a sound agriculture. Yet the business of meeting new challenges in a dynamic industry such as agriculture is never finished. We must constantly strive to broaden, strengthen and improve our farm policies to meet changing needs and conditions.

At a recent meeting with the President, we agreed upon a 6-point program to implement the present plan. This includes:

1. A stepped-up program of surplus disposal and expansion of exports.

2. A vigorous purchase program to remove market gluts wherever they occur and assist farmers in adjusting to market demands.

3. An enlarged program of soil conservation and incentive payments to divert cropland into grass, trees, and forage, particularly in drought areas.

4. Expansion of the rural development program for low-income farm families.

5. A stepped-up program of research, emphasizing lower costs of production, new uses for farm products, new crops, and expansion of markets.

6. A speedup in the Great Plains program in cooperation with the 10 States involved. (This is a program concentrated in the area between the Rocky Mountains and the Corn Belt—generally the Nation's grazing and wheat center—to make better use of the land and achieve a better balance of production.)

We shall make recommendations to the Congress in January along the lines of these six points. We are now putting the finishing touches on those recommendations. Obviously I cannot now discuss them in detail. But I can give you a general idea.

There will be a program which will aid farmers in shifting from harvested crops to grass. This idea, which has wide acceptance, has been called a "soil bank" by some and an "acreage reserve" by others. The scope of the program we shall recommend and the precise nature of it cannot now be reported. I can say, however, that our proposal will be geared primarily to better land use.

Its impact will be chiefly in areas where topsoil is being wasted in growing crops not needed by today's markets. It will mean better soil and water conservation; it will mean added income to agriculture and it will have the effect, at least for a time, of bringing about a reduction in the overall volume of agricultural production. This will be no nostrum, no one-shot remedy, no cure-all. It will be constructive. It will help, along with other programs, to move us in the direction we must go.

We shall also propose changes in the production control program which will give farmers more freedom. There are crops now under control where controls are not working, where controls work more hardship than benefit. For these crops we shall recommend the necessary modifications.

We shall propose vigorous programs of surplus disposal, both the strengthening of present activities and the development of new operations. This will be done in an orderly fashion without disrupting markets at home or abroad.

Since July 1, 1953—that is, in the past 28 months—we have moved out of the CCC inventory approximately 434 million bushels of wheat, 309 million bushels of corn, 2.6 billion pounds of dairy products, and more than 4 billion 400 million pounds of cottonseed products.

In February 1954 the CCC held peak stocks of 1.2 billion pounds of cottonseed oil. We have not only disposed of these stocks, we have moved an additional 250 million pounds that were acquired in the meantime. Most of these stocks were exported. They were sold mainly for dollars and at competitive prices.

We are determined to pull down the hoard of surplus built up under the old program, and to reduce our acquisitions. This surplus is the corpse of past unworkable programs. It is beginning to smell. We propose to move out this corpse so that we can deal with living things. Once this overhang is removed, prices will start working up again and farmers can look to a better day of freedom and prosperity.

These approaches to the farm problem make sense. Sensible people will recognize that fact. It will stand up well in comparison with what is offered by the opposition, now vacillating between a return to the bankrupt program of the past and a headlong plunge into the Brannan plan.

The Need for New Maturity in American Political Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think there can be little question but that American political life is of vital concern to all of us in the House of Representatives. But this is a very large problem with many facets. One of the most important of these lies in the maturity, or lack of it, in that political life.

This subject was dealt with in admirable fashion by one of our colleagues, STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, in a recent address before the Sunday Evening Forum in Tuscon, Ariz. Mr. UDALL, after discussing the present state of our political maturity with great thoughtfulness, goes on to state that he feels optimistic about the chances to increase that maturity and he offers a program which he feels would do much to make it possible.

Because it is both thoughtful and penetrating, I should like to include the text of the speech as a part of my remarks. The body of the address follows:

THE NEED FOR NEW MATURITY IN AMERICA POLITICAL LIFE

(By Representative STEWART L. UDALL, October 16, 1955)

I had a definite purpose this evening in choosing to discuss the quality of American political life. In the future we will, I fear, fritter away our opportunities for leadership if we are intemperate or short-sighted or narrow in our views. And on the other hand, if we fully understand and develop the attitudes and beliefs and principles that have made us a great Nation, we will be able to make the great decisions that will test our leadership in the years ahead.

Not long ago one of our eminent Washington political reporters, James Reston of the New York Times, tersely summarized our predicament in these words: "We are in more than an arms race. We are in a race with the pace of our own history, and the pace is so swift that our habits of mind and our institutions are lagging behind."

Similarly, H. G. Wells summoned his generation to battle nearly half a century ago with the utterance, "Life is a race between education and catastrophe," and that was at a time when even catastrophe, by our standards, had predicable boundaries and was not synonymous with annihilation.

Whichever description you prefer, the race is on, and it is a good bet that this generation will survive only if it learns to run and read (i. e., to educate itself) simultaneously. We in this country have learned the hard way in the past two decades that history cannot be escaped—and never stands still.

The central question now would seem to be whether we can manage to meet history halfway—whether we can acquire sufficient wisdom and adaptability to pass through the fateful years just ahead to safer ground beyond.

Like Pyrrhus in ancient Greece, many nations in this century have been the winners of military "victories" that cost them more than they gained. And now our newest weapons have left civilization a margin for error that is perilously thin. Plainly, we need a new maturity in public affairs, both here and abroad, if we are to reach accommodations which will avert catastrophe. As never before the time demands leaders who can conduct our affairs with regard for hard realities, and yet inform their actions with vision and spiritual strength.

How should this crisis of leadership be met?

And where may we look for new answers to the new problems which confront us daily?

Our leading political philosopher, Walter Lippmann, has attempted lately to suggest some answers. In his book, The Public Philosophy, he has described what he calls the

"mounting disorder of western society." Events, he says, tend to outrun public opinion in the democracies, and he has no trouble in concluding that elected leaders are, for the most port, "timid, insecure men." Their political cowardice derives, he asserts, from being too fearful of a mass opinion which is often so outdated or unenlightened that it discourages creative thought and independent action.

Lippmann, it would seem, looks back with longing on the early morning of our Republic when Adams, Madison and Jefferson acted almost entirely on the promptings of acquired wisdom, and impassively awaited public response.

Pausing to look back upon the great decisions these men made, we cannot help but see some of the faults which divide our counsels and weaken our policymakers today. For example, it is anticipated in some quarters that men in politics see a mandate of the people in every opinion poll. Yet, these polls only purport to show what people are thinking at a given time, and quite often an enlightened public policy may run counter to the dominant opinion of the moment. In fact, it is quite likely that the leaders of our Government often have access to intelligence which may suggest that the long-term national interest lies in a policy or tactic which might be unpopular or misunderstood if it were forthrightly announced.

It is all too obvious, I think, that we are in need of a new public philosophy which would permit wise men to enter the seats of power and freely govern. Beset by exceedingly grave problems, we can ill afford to gamble on anything less than the highest order of leadership and intelligence.

Many political scientists (and practical politicians, too) advocate overhauling our Constitution and political system as a means of insulating public men from intolerable pressures and freeing them for high statesmanship. Here are several concrete proposals which are frequently discussed today:

1. Presidential terms might be extended to 6 or perhaps 8 years, with no right of succession. (We all have been witnesses of late to some of the unavoidable strains placed on our policymakers by the demands of an impending election.)

2. Congressmen also might be given longer tenure. (President Eisenhower, for one, has spoken up in favor of a 4-year term for Members of Congress.) A constitutional amendment along these lines should increase the chances that Members of Congress would take the long view and put first things first. During the 1954 campaign I had the feeling several times that the Eisenhower administration had not been in power long enough to formulate and try out new policies, and much of our debate was, as a consequence, unsatisfactory and highly inconclusive.

3. Our outmoded system of political campaigns, which usually paralyze our leadership for months on end could be modernized.

4. Congress could act to modify the seniority system, which ignores quality of service and rewards mere longevity to the end that the national will sometimes is thwarted.

If they could be enacted forthwith, these reforms might help transform our national life. However, short of a political miracle, it is highly unlikely that any of these changes will be brought about in time to influence the decisions our generation faces.

Clearly, then, we must somehow generate a new statesmanship from within the existing governmental framework. And if, as the President has suggested, we must contemplate a 50-year cold war, there may be time yet to create a moderate political climate in which statesmanship can flourish.

In our history as a Nation we can point both to periods characterized by national self-restraint and to eras when irresponsibility reigned. Some historians have formed a judgment that immature political conduct was the decisive factor in setting in motion the train of events which culminated in the Civil War, and the same certainly can be said of the Spanish-American War. In both instances, repressible conflicts became irrepressible, mainly because politicians willed it and fanned unreasoning popular passions to suit political purposes. Reconcilable differences could not be negotiated when inflexible attitudes were adopted, and even so great a man as Lincoln dared not swim against the tide. In the end he, too, was powerless to prevent the horrible conflict between our States. The leading historian of that sad era, James Garfield Randall, has scored its politicians, including Lincoln himself, as a "blundering generation."

We also are in danger of becoming a "blundering generation" unless we are wise enough to leave our diplomats and elected leaders freedom in which to negotiate settlements and pursue their best conceptions of the long-term national interest.

Fortunately, at least sporadically, the country has demonstrated mature self-control. The reaction of the country and the Congress to the startling inspection plan proposed at Geneva by President Eisenhower was heartening; and we stood together in the China coast crisis last winter and spring in a way which reflected confidence and national unity. Looking backward, we should be proud—and even mildly astonished—at the vision and statesmanship which enabled us to execute the Marshall plan and set up the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This willingness to sacrifice for the general good required a broad, mature outlook by the political leaders of both parties and strong support by citizens at the grassroots level.

As a freshman Congressman, I have been deeply stirred by the role played this year in foreign affairs by Senator WALTER GEORGE, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This man, in the twilight of a brilliant career as a lawmaker, has helped all of us recapture some of that breadth of spirit which is the real greatness of our country. What he has done to guide our foreign policy in recent months perhaps exceeds the great work done a few years ago by the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg.

In mid-April, at a time when the situation in the Far East seemed to hang by a thread, he delivered an impromptu address in Washington to the newspaper editors of America which may have marked a turning point in our foreign policy.

It is well to recall the circumstances at the time he spoke. Red China's Chou En-lai at the close of the Bandung Conference only a few hours before, had announced unexpectedly that he was willing to talk with the United States about relieving tensions in the Far East. The State Department had issued an immediate reply that the United States was not interested in such talks.

At this moment in history, then, Senator GEORGE spoke. He told the newspaper editors he thought we should be "big enough" to consider the Chinese offer, and when the President and Secretary of State returned to Washington the next day his advice was heeded. They countermanded the original reply, and fruitful talks subsequently were arranged.

More than anything I have read, this extraordinary speech by Senator GEORGE exemplifies the sober thought we need in these trying times. For instance, he said:

"I think it important that we know precisely the thinking * * * of our friendly nations * * * on the important problems that have arisen in the Far East and precisely what adjustments, if any, we should be willing to make to meet changing times and changing conditions.

"That is not appeasement. It never has been and never will be appeasement for any strong power to say to another power that it is willing to sit down and talk about the problems that concern you and concern the world."

Senator GEORGE also confessed that he changed his mind as events occurred, and he advocated the patient, step-by-step approach in dealing with other nations.

Something else the Senator said also foreshadowed a new public philosophy for America:

"We didn't seek world leadership. You don't get it by seeking it. World leadership comes to a nation, if it comes at all, because of the superb and supreme heroism of its people; because of their devotion to duty, private, and public, because of their tireless exertions to bring it about.

"Above everything else, it comes to a nation when it is great enough and big enough and strong enough, when mighty impulses are running through the world, to rise to the challenge of stirring times."

I would suggest to you that Senator GEORGE personifies the spirit that qualifies us for leadership among the free communities of the world. Would anyone deny that if we had a few more public men like him (men who have bold, growing minds, whether their ages are 36 or 57 or 78) our citizens would always rally behind those who govern?

What, then, is this new maturity we are talking about? Let me attempt to describe it:

1. It is an attitude which would place the national purposes first, and thereby build a broader sense of responsibility and put competing local prejudices into a proper perspective.

(It is a peculiar, but well established fact, for example, that certain Members of Congress make a career of opposing mutual security programs, even though both political parties recognize them as vital to this Nation's security. Using arguments and methods which sometimes border on the demagogic, they play upon the ignorance of the people concerning the importance of such legislation rather than seeking to educate their constituents to the value of these programs.)

2. It is the belief that national unity should be a paramount consideration, and that forces tending to divide our counsels through secondary issues should be resisted. (Our Yalta post-mortem is in point here.)

3. It is based on the conviction that any venture is a gamble and that men must have enough courage to pursue the course prompted by their best judgment and be quick to revise it later according to a better judgment. (For example, our flexible attitude in dealing with Marshal Tito's Yugoslavia has paid big dividends.)

4. It is a spirit which would decline to use vital national policies for partisan purposes. (There is still altogether too much partisan use made of foreign policy issues, particularly at present when differences between the views of the two political parties on the big issues are largely verbal.)

5. It is the principle that the interests of other nations always should be weighed in the scales, and that we should strive to understand the motives of neighbor peoples.

(At the NATO Interparliamentary Conference in Paris last July a member of the House of Commons commented to me that India's neutralism and unwillingness to see the world in terms of blacks and whites had a rather striking parallel in the outlook of our country in the years just preceding World War II.)

6. It is a frame of mind that would avoid military and political absolutes and would set up, instead, as many limited objectives as possible, directing our diplomacy to the

achievement of these useful ends, however undramatic they might appear.

(We all recall the naval-blockade, China-coast-landing-party school of thought as applied to the Far Eastern crisis, and we can be thankful that more mature judgment prevailed.)

7. It is the belief that negotiation should be undertaken wherever there is a chance that it may be fruitful, and that our negotiators should be ensured enough freedom of action that wise bargains can be struck.

(In the days to come, particularly in our dealings with Russia and Communist China, our President and diplomats are going to need elbowroom in which to make concessions and negotiate settlements. Unless negotiators have something to concede there is no point in talking.)

8. It would seek out and cultivate the virtues of humility and patience in our dealings with other nations and peoples.

(Our good friend, Ambassador Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, is a firm believer in this principle. To illustrate this point he told recently of a visit Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt made to India. When met by reporters as she deplaned at New Delhi she was asked for a statement but declined, saying she had come only "to learn." This, he said, increased our prestige in India immeasurably.)

9. It is the spirit which would cherish those attitudes fostering mutual regard among men, not losing sight of the inner man and his Maker.

10. And last, this new maturity would reaffirm in word and deed the worth of the enduring ideas and institutions which make democracy the hope of mankind.

(In the long run our greatest asset is the freedom we enjoy under the Constitution, just as fear, suspicion, and repression of individual freedom are the long-term liabilities that ultimately will destroy the Communist governments of the world.)

These, then, are some of the attributes of the new maturity we need in American public life. It is my faith that we can achieve most of them without benefit of superhuman effort if only we will meet the challenges that beckon to us on every side. It would be unfair to expect our politicians to pull themselves up by their bootstraps and become minor statesmen overnight. The main effort, if we are to improve the caliber of our statesmanship, must come from citizens who will not settle for timid or short-sighted leadership and will drive demagogues and irresponsible men from the temples of government.

We would do well, I think, to recall the adage of Plato's Republic that the punishment of wise men who refuse to take part in the affairs of government is to live under the government of unwise men.

We face an uncertain future, but we can prevail if we look to the future with courage and high confidence in the rightness of our cause. No generation ever has confronted problems such as we face, and ours is, therefore, a great adventure where determination and wisdom yet may carry off the long-sought prize of an enduring peace.

Let me conclude finally with the magnificent peroration that Winston Churchill uttered last March in his final speech to the Commons as Prime Minister:

"There is time and hope if we combine patience and courage. All deterrents will improve and gain authority during the next 10 years. By that time, the deterrent may well reach its acme and reap its final reward. The day may dawn when fair play, love for one's fellow men, respect for justice and freedom, will enable tormented generations to march forth serene and triumphant from the hideous epoch in which we have to dwell. Meanwhile, never flinch, never weary, never despair."

Postmaster General Summerfield Says We Can Break Even With Higher Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under approval of the House, I am including with my remarks a statement by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield that appeared in the January issue of the Nation's Business. It is entitled "We Can Break Even With Higher Rates." In view of the importance of the subject matter, I believe the Members of the House will be particularly interested in reading this statement.

The statement follows:

The United States Post Office Department has a new look—and a new spirit.

The new look is dramatized by the eye-catching red, white, and blue colors which now modernize mail boxes and postal trucks.

But the improvements taking place in the postal establishment—which serves more of our citizens more intimately and more frequently than any other Government department—are far more fundamental and much more significant than this new color scheme.

Never before have the post offices of the United States handled so much mail volume, so quickly, so efficiently, so economically.

Deficits are lower. The postal deficit of $362,700,000 for the 1955 fiscal year is less than half of the all-time high reported deficit of $727 million for fiscal 1952.

When our team of executives recruited from industry assumed responsibility for the management of the Post Office Department January 20, 1953, we found:

The Post Office Department had no certified public accountants on its payroll although its financial transactions exceeded $20 billion a year.

There was no modern personnel department to meet the needs of 500,000 employees.

No training program was being used.

The salary structure contained innumerable inequities and offered no real incentives for advancement to supervisory positions.

Although the Post Office Department handled more than 50 billion pieces of mail annually, it had no materials-handling engineers.

The worst highway safety record in Government.

No public information services were being used to help the public help itself to better mail service or to provide communication channels between management and employees.

No basic review of its transportation policies and methods had been made in 25 years.

Nearly 40,000 postmasters reported directly to Washington on even the most trivial problems.

Management control tools and methods were so completely lacking that when I first called for a financial report on the previous months' operations, I was told that such data would not be available for 18 months; that such reports were considered historical documents and never intended for management control purposes.

In 3 years the Post Office Department has been overhauled and reorganization is nearly complete.

Tried and proven concepts of modern business management have been introduced and the results are becoming increasingly apparent to the public.

The faster, more efficient, and more economical mail service is due in part to these improvements.

Mailers and postal patrons benefit from more than 70 changes in procedures. Post offices in most major cities are open longer and mail is collected later. More than 5,000 city letter carrier routes are being added annually. Modern rural-delivery service is being expanded constantly. New services are being added—and others simplified. The new certified mail provides important benefits of registered mail, including proof of delivery, at lower cost. A new money order procedure eliminates forms and reduces time spent in line. New pamphlets help the public help itself to better mail service.

The internal procedures of handling money,, bookkeeping, and financial reporting have been greatly streamlined. Payrolls are being handled by modern punchcard checks and equipment in 15 centralized locations. The daily task of processing and accounting for 1,500,000 paid money order forms is centralized in the new Kansas City Money Order Center which will ultimately use the most modern electronic equipment. Simpler financial procedures generally will achieve a total reduction of 5,000 positions from the overhead. This program relieves postmasters of unnecessary paperwork, gives them modern business methods, and enables them to concentrate on the major job of moving the mail.

A nationwide safety program has already reduced motor vehicle accidents from 13 to 8 per 100,000 miles. Even better results are anticipated.

Broader and better use is being made of all types of transportation by employing the one best equipped to do the individual job speedily, efficiently, and economically. This means expanded use of trucks and tractor-trailers, bus lines, highway post offices, and air cargo carriers; using the unused space on scheduled airliners for the experimental movement of 3-cent mail; a better coordination with railroad operations; and revision of schedules to deliver the mail on the day it arrives at destination post offices.

With the opening soon of the Wichita, Kans., regional office, postal operations will be decentralized into 15 regions and 91 districts, and operated on a home-rule basis.

The first coordinated progressive personnel program in the Department's history has been established. The installation of a sound salary structure, based on position evaluation, provides 508,000 postal employees with fair wages, incentive to advance in the career service, and compensation related directly to duties performed.

The Department has leased more than 900 new postal buildings, valued at approximately $45 million, through its commercial leasing activities from January 1953 to November 15, 1955. The new lease-purchase program by which buildings are bought out of rent, includes 27 further projects approved as of November 15, 1955. This will create $14 million in new construction. Both programs use the financing and construction capacity of private industry.

Close cost control has been established over the 85,000 motor vehicles the Post Office Department uses (of which 25,000 are owned by the Government). Postmasters are charged for the use of this equipment and personnel to make them cost-conscious. A Post Office Department fleet is being developed consisting of four basic standard production-line trucks which will do the same job better than the 7 types of special built, often hand-made vehicles formerly purchased. The estimated savings are 20

percent in purchase prices and 20 percent or more in operating cost.

Practical training programs aimed at improving personnel and mail service—involving 10 courses of instruction ranging from tying bundles of letter mail to executive development—have been launched. The suggestions and incentive awards program has been modernized, and the Department received, in 20 months ending November 15, 1955, double the number of employee suggestions offered in the previous 5 years, with savings estimated at $2,261,000. Uniforms are being redesigned, standardized, and brightened effective this month, although employees having garments of the previous design in good condition will be permitted to wear them until January 1957.

Unnecessary service units are being eliminated. Approximately 3,000 small post offices have been closed, at a saving of more than $4 million, with the patrons generally getting better service through rural delivery.

Practical experiments and research are being carried on continuously. Those now under way include: (1) a variety of motorized conveyances for city carriers; (2) an automatic mail facing machine; (3) automatic sorting by electronic scanning; (4) self-service equipment for post office lobbies; and (5) mechanical parcel post sorting.

The first nationwide effort to attract desirable new career employees into the postal service was launched in December 1955. Display posters in 10,000 post offices and on 16,000 Air Force recruitment billboards in 3,000 communities are being used for a 30-day period, outlining salaries and benefits of postal employment.

Despite the progress made in modernizing the mail service and reducing its cost, the Post Office Department faces two serious problems.

One is the inadequacy and the deterioration of its physical plant. Many post offices were built 50 or even more years ago. Far too many of our postal facilities are badly run down, outgrown, outmoded.

In some larger cities, facilities are so inadequate that mail is sorted outside post offices on the sidewalks or in the alleys, rain or shine. At numerous points, trucks cannot squeeze into the small post office loading and unloading areas. Many post offices and mail terminals are dingy, badly in need of renovation and better lighting, and completely lacking in modern equipment to speed mail distribution.

To correct these conditions will take time and money. We cannot continue to ignore these needs, particularly since they grow increasingly worse as the mail volume of this dynamic and growing country is constantly increasing. It is now 45 percent greater in volume than it was 10 years ago.

The other and more serious problem concerns the fiscal plight of the Post Office Department. The postal deficit accumulated since World War II—during a period of unprecedented prosperity—has now reached $4,600,000,000 and is costing taxpayers more than $100 million a year in interest alone.

Despite the efficiencies and economies we have been able to make, the Post Office Department now faces a yearly deficit of about $500 million. Nearly $200 million of this is the cost of the recently enacted pay raises and other employee benefits.

Basically, our failure to operate on a more nearly break-even basis is due to the fact that postage rates today are essentially the same as they were in 1932. Meanwhile, the cost of nearly everything the Department buys or uses has more than doubled, as have most household or business expenses.

That is why we are recommending moderate increases in postage rates on first-, second-, and third-class mail to Congress.

We believe Congress and the American people appreciate the need for reasonable rate increases so that their Post Office Department may improve its services and facilities and operate on a self-supporting basis as do the postal establishments of most major nations. Our neighbor, Canada, for example, has shown losses in only 3 of the past 20 years with an overall surplus for these 2 decades of $89,523,932.

Many Members of Congress have polled their constituents on this question of postage rates. So has the Post Office Department. In all parts of the country, the people queried indicated that they favor, usually by margins of at least 3 to 1, increasing postal rates to make the Post Office Department self-supporting. Public opinion here is apparently no different than in Europe where competent observers state that a postal deficit would not be tolerated.

If these rate increases are granted we can complete the job the Post Office Department set out to accomplish nearly 3 years ago: provide better service, lower costs, reduce the postal deficit, and operate on a break-even basis.

Then the Post Office Department can provide the most efficient service possible to meet the constantly expanding needs of this most prosperous Nation on earth.

This Year and Years to Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a striking editorial entitled "This Year and Years to Come," published in the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S. C., on January 4, 1956:

THIS YEAR AND YEARS TO COME

As we start this new year, two statements are being repeated in a number of ways:

Russia and world communism have been gaining:

America and the free nations of the world have been slipping.

So, many Americans, like people in other free nations and probably like people in nations under Communist dictatorship, are asking questions about the future which reflect worry and even fear:

What will Russia do next? And after that?

What will world communism do this year and in the years to follow?

And it is after such questions that we ask ourselves: What can we do to try to stop the Russians? to try to block communism's long-term program to take over the whole world?

Such thinking is wrong. All wrong.

For example, look at a football game. Which team wins, the one that just plays a defense, or the one that carries the ball?

To win, your team has to get the ball across the goal line. Carry it. Pass it. Kick it. But hold on to the ball, advance, keep the other team on the defensive.

Part of last year, we carried the ball against the Russians. That was done by President Eisenhower's address to the United Nations. By President Eisenhower taking the top position of world leadership at the first Geneva meeting, the meeting of heads of nations.

Then Russia got the ball. Maybe we fumbled.

We can recover.

We are still the stronger team.

We are stronger in our moral position. (Although we have been weaker in our propaganda about it.) Stronger in the honesty of our desire for peace in the world. Stronger in combination with the other free nations in industry, in the initiative of free men.

Stronger because we want for human beings around the whole world those freedoms which their instincts cry for.

Let's carry the ball again. Carry it this year. Plan to carry it for many long years to come; for that is the only way we can expect our way to win.

President Eisenhower, we hope, is regaining the strength to re-enter the struggle. Meanwhile, we of the American people can encourage others of our team to really carry the ball.

We can encourage the men in our Government. Those in the executive branch. And particularly those in the Congress. For us South Carolinans, that means Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND. For us in the the Fifth District, it means Representative RICHARDS in his highly important position of chairman of the House Foreign Affairs committee.

Above all, we can ourselves start thinking—and talking—constructively instead of defensively. For what is thought and talked by the people across the United States in time determines not only the talking and thinking in Washington but also the actions of our Government throughout the world.

We can win the long struggle for a free world.

We must win.

Stewards of the Soil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, Paul A. Johnson, author of the following, is one who has long experience and great knowledge of problems of soil and water conservation:

STEWARDS OF THE SOIL

(By Paul A. Johnson)

"To America much has been given; much is expected of us." Reading history from the standpoint of cause and effect, one may wonder if America, as a nation is not following in the footsteps of older nations, a path that leads to destruction.

In Iowa, we are a land between two great rivers, perhaps the richest large area of fertile topsoil that any people in history ever had to farm and make their homes on. There were older nations, once great and powerful, highly civilized, world leaders, that also flourished between two great rivers, the countries of Chaldea, Assyria, and Babylonia, rich, powerful, mighty in war, highly cultured with the people fed in abundance, on food raised from fertile soil, soil that was maintained, irrigated, and built up.

Today their great cities are just mounds in desert sands. They ceased to use the soil wisely, deserts marched in, marshes grew, and they perished as nations becoming only names on the scroll of history.

It is a story repeated many times. Rome, world leader in a period of history longer than that of any other nation, kept peace with well-fed legions that marched over well-built roads to every frontier of her em-

pire. Her then fertile soils produced wheat and oil that fed, not only her soldiers but her people. A republic existed that framed a system of laws that the world still uses. She gave the world a large part of its language and for a long period demonstrated a republican form of representative government. Until her soil exhausted, her legions hired mercenaries, her opportunities for Roman citizens gone, emperors became the rulers, and Rome declined.

Italy today is mostly a poor country. A big share of its food is imported. With the exception of the marshes that Mussolini drained, her soils are exhausted and shallow. Her story just another one on the pages of history that tells that the strength of a nation depends on the good use of the soil.

There was handwriting on the wall of the palace that told an ancient king that his kingdom was overthrown. Written on the fields of Iowa there is God's handwriting in the gullies, the land cancers, that cutting back up the slopes forecast the end of profitable farming if there is continued abuse of the soil.

No better system for rushing topsoil off the slopes was ever devised than up and down hill farming. The billions of tons of fertile topsoil that has gone down the rivers to build the Mississippi Delta has carried with it more potential bushels of corn and grain, more tons of hay and forage than can be made up by all the commercial fertilizer than can be bought and used.

Since the first white settlers came to America, we have cut down and destroyed the forests. Left behind, in all too many instances, are the slashings that cause destructive fires, fires that not only destroy far more trees than are used for lumber, but also fires that burn up towns and people. One can still remember the Moose Lake-Cloquet fire in northeastern Minnesota and its tragic loss of lives.

Older nations like Germany have planted 2 trees where 1 was cut down. They managed their woodlands as a national asset to be preserved and improved through scientific cutting. America today is starting to replant the barren slopes denuded of forest cover. Seed trees are left. Young trees grown on Government and State nurseries are set out by hand. At last even the lumber barons realize that if wood is to be had, it must be grown, as the virgin forests shrink both in size and quality.

In North America, South and Central America and Africa, the rain forests are moisture storage reservoirs that equalize and spread out the rainfall, temper the climate. They are balance wheels lessening both droughts and floods. Stripping these forest belts has upset this natural balance. Floods are larger and more numerous; droughts longer and more frequent; dust bowls develop as a result of removal of protective grass coverings; snow piled on mountain slopes, causes large destructive floods as summer sun melts it rapidly without the shade of trees. In New England, in the Midwest, in the Northwest, floods result with loss of life and property largely because of the removal of forest cover.

God has been good to our Nation; not only in the great natural resources: soils, forests, mines, fisheries, but also in the kind of folks that came here to the land of opportunity to make their homes and to build an America. They were the hardy adventuresome folks willing to try a new life in a new land that God had made ready for them. They left behind them the traditions and hatreds of the old world. Mingling their blood streams they built a new race of folks. They developed new traditions, new ideas, a new form of government which as Lincoln said was "Of the people, by the people, and for the people"; they stated that, "All men are created free and equal"; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That governments are formed to protect these rights, to serve the people, who are the government not creatures of the state.

These folks brought with them a deep seated belief in God, God, the giver of all great and perfect gifts that man receives. Accepting this belief, they became "Stewards of His bounty." Americans fought, suffered and died that this concept of government and freedom should endure. The right to free enterprise became the American way. It has made and kept America a land of opportunity.

The choice has been ours, the knowledge of how to preserve and even increase the resources that God gave to us is ours. Ours to use or not to abuse. In the past, there has always been an accounting of the use of or the abuse of God's gifts to man. Can we here in America expect less of an accounting?

Soil and water conservation must start up on the slopes where the rain falls. In a Christian America, our desire to preserve and build up the soil starts with our belief in God. Conserving God's gifts to man is practicing Christianity. It is assurance of the future of our children, and their children, that America will continue as a land of opportunity, a land where Christianity can flourish and communism and atheism cannot prevail. Cause and effect are the lessons that history shows to us as her pages unroll. It is there to read; it is truly patriotic to leave a farm better than when we took it over.

There is a just pride in fertile acres, in well-kept buildings, in sleek, well-fed livestock. These show not only a love of farming but a love of our Creator. They are an incentive to do our best. There is another incentive; soil- and water-conservation methods give the largest acre yields, the largest net profits, the highest management return. Farm values increase and the family has a just pride in a well-kept farm home. There is a satisfaction that comes from work well and skillfully done, a deeper satisfaction in working in partnership with God.

Life, on earth, is made up of two parts: Earning a living; living a life. The two together make for happy homes.

To us in America much has been given, much is expected from us. Are we good stewards of what God has given to us?

Bastogne Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, the attached is an article which appeared in the Tribune-Press of Gouverneur, N. Y., and the St. Lawrence Plaindealer in Canton, N. Y., written by Mr. Mason Rossiter Smith, editor and publisher of both these papers, in my congressional district, the 33d of New York.

I hope the Members will read this article which may contribute in some way toward obtaining for Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall, author of the text inscribed in the Bastogne Monument, the recognition which he so thoroughly deserves.

MONUMENT AT BASTOGNE COMMEMORATES BATTLE OF BULGE

(By Mason Rossiter Smith)

When you search for it in your atlas, it's but a pinpoint in the vast and intricate embroidery of Europe. As you drive through the lovely green, gently rolling countryside which surrounds it in the summertime, this hardly seems a place men would choose for war.

But the small Belgian village of Bastogne has been tried in battle many times before, and over the centuries the soil of the Ardennes has been enriched again and again with the blood of men contesting for mastery of this land.

Only 11 years ago this week thousands of Americans—among them many brave young men from our own St. Lawrence County—joined in the Battle of the Bulge to fight and die in heroism and sacrifice in support of the faith and traditions which have made our country the greatest in the world.

Today a handsome monument shaped in marble in the form of the five-pointed star our soldiers wore as a shoulder patch during the war, stands high on a hill overlooking Bastogne. It is a memorial erected by the Belgian people to commemorate not only this historic victory of American arms, but, even more, the love of freedom and the deep and abiding friendship which Belgium shares with us.

Its tall pillars bear the names of every American State, and all United States Army and Air Force units which participated in the Battle of the Bulge. A carillon, concealed in one of the pylons, sounds on the quarter-, half-, three-quarter hour and hour—a gift of the American Legion post of Antwerp, Belgium. Engraved in large Roman lettering on the interior walls of the monument is the moving story of the historic contest—all in English.

Rarely printed in America—hardly known at all in this country—it ranks, I think, with the greatest of American patriotic literature. Better than any piece I have ever read before, it tells—more by way of suggestion than by actually expressing it in words—why men have been willing to leave their homes and families to fight for their country. There is no more moving story in American history.

Deeply touched by it when we visited the monument this past summer, as we motored from Luxembourg into Belgium, we searched the inscription for the name of the author, but finding none, determined to obtain it together with the original text from Washington upon our return home.

That search constitutes a story in itself. It began in the office of Congressman CLARENCE E. KILBURN, who traced it for me through the State Department to the Army and finally to the author himself.

It was concluded by correspondence with the "Nuts" Museum in Bastogne (its title commemorates the defending American commander's famous reply to German demands for surrender) which, as subsequent investigation discovered, publishes a souvenir booklet containing the text of the inscription—credited to somebody else.

For strangely enough, the real author has received scant recognition for his services—even by the Belgian authorities who originally requested our State Department to provide a suitable text for the monument.

In processing the request, the State Department turned to the Army, and the Army sought out a former member of its wartime historical section, Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshall who by this time—the monument was raised in 1949 and dedicated in 1950—had retired from active duty with the permanent rank of colonel and was now associated with the Detroit (Mich.) News. Colonel Marshall had previously permitted

the Belgians to make free use of the material in his book, "Bastogne: the First Eight Days" in pamphlets sold to aid their charities, so it is not surprising that he should write the text for the monument as an act of goodwill, with no thought of compensation or copyright.

The Army, in turning over the text to the Belgian authorities, appears to have requested that Colonel Marshall's name be placed under the completed inscription on the monument. But it isn't there—and, surprisingly enough, an abbreviated text of the story sold in Bastogne as a souvenir, lists a mythical Colonel Armstrong (no first name or initials given) as the author.

Meanwhile, a few copies of the inscription were printed for distribution in the United States by friends of Colonel Marshall. One of the most treasured volumes in the Tribune-Press library, indeed, is a copy of this little booklet—autographed and forwarded to me recently by the author himself.

This is the text:

"This memorial and the earth here surrounding are dedicated to the enduring friendship of the peoples of Belgium and the United States, who forged a bond from their common struggle to defeat the enemy of all free peoples.

"Among the mountains of the Ardennes and at the crossroads where sit its villages, the arms of the United States, supported by the courage and faith of its friends in this Belgian countryside, won a victory which will be remembered as long as there are free men to tell the story.

"During the Christmastide of 1944 and as the New Year came, the last crisis of the Second European Campaign began and ended there. It opened with defeat. It closed with the enemy routed and in final retreat.

"For the armies of the United States, in numbers of men engaged, in the courage shown by all forces, in the intrepid decision of their leaders, and in final accomplishment, it was the great battle of their history.

"For the people of Belgium, it was the final stand against an enemy who for nearly 5 years had violated their soil and vainly tried to crush their national spirit. It was the last act of the great liberation.

"Lacking a common speech, these forces together met their great emergency in the same exalted way. The uniformed ranks of the United States fought for this soil with as great devotion as if it had been their homeland. The Belgian civilians unarmed, refused to abandon it in the face of the oncoming enemy.

"By this mutual confidence and by the help which came of it, the defense was made possible. Here was launched the counterattack which did not end until tyranny had been crushed in Western Europe.

"The campaign takes its name from this quiet countryside. In the history of nations it is called the Battle of the Ardennes.

"But the extent of the enemy's early success fixed upon it a more popular but unofficial title. Men know it as the Battle of the Bulge.

"It opened on December 16, 1944, with an attack by the German enemy which broke the American front, enveloped the Ardennes country, and at its extremities reached almost to the River Meuse.

"It closed in the final week of January 1945, with the last of the enemy departing the last remnant of soil gained during the advance.

"The German enemy had been long in planning his attack and was greatly skilled in concealing it.

"The plan was born in early September 1944, while his forces were withdrawing eastward from these mountains, and except around the approaches to Antwerp, were being driven from Belgium by the liberating armies.

"It was then that the enemy high command decided that a last supreme effort might reverse the tide of war if staged in the most favorable season.

"The far object was to be the port of Antwerp. The far hope was that its capture would split the Allied armies apart, deny them their major base of supply and compel at least one of them to sue for peace.

"Toward fulfilling these hopes, the enemy husbanded his reserves during the fighting of the autumn, and raised fresh divisions.

"Mid-November was the appointed time, chosen because in this place and climate, it is of all seasons the most fog-laden. Thereby surprise would be helped and the defending aviation would be ineffective against the attacking armor.

"The place had been long decided. In the spring of 1940, the enemy had made his fortune by an armored advance through the seemingly impassable Ardennes upland. It was intended to repeat this maneuver.

"Events conspired to enlarge his second opportunity. Following the great advance of the summer, the American positions became stabilized along a line which ran through Germany just eastward of the Belgium and Luxembourg borders.

"It was a quiet front for the most part, used for the training of green divisions and the resting of those grown battle-weary. Of such forces, in a strength of less than four divisions, was composed the one American corps which stood directly in the enemy pathway.

"Thus as the weeks passed, it was chance, more than foresight, that the area against which the enemy had been storing his strength became the most thinly defended part of the long Allied front.

"But November came and went and the battle was not begun. The three enemy armies of the attack simply awaited the hour. The expected new divisions had not been made ready in time.

"Of what was to come, there still was no strong foreboding in the opposite camp. In the first days of December, it was noted that the enemy front was being strengthened by fresh divisions coming into the line. The whereabouts of his armor, and whether it might be concentrating in the north, remained a mystery, wrapped in impenetrable fog.

"So while there were muffled warnings, there was no final alert. In the threatened sector, the troops watched and rested, feeling no extra concern. Nor was there greater alarm in higher headquarters. Though the signs and portents read that the enemy might be preparing an attack, all military reason argued that this was pretension.

"For 6 months past the enemy had known only crushing defeats. His armies were already wasted. He was not in position to waste them more. His policy now could be served by only one grand object—to prolong the war and bargain for a more favorable peace. Facing toward winter, his forces had settled for the first time in permanent defensive works. So placed, they could make the Allied advance slow and costly and could store their own strength for the spring. What advantage he now possessed would be lost if he sallied forth.

"Such was the logic of the situation, both as viewed by commanders in the Allied camp and as reviewed on the other side by those who must carry the battle.

"But the dictator who had personally ordered the plan, and who was planning to direct its execution, was not logical. In defeat, he remained a dreamer. For logic, he substituted intuition. This was the mystery still not understood, that it was futile to reason about the unreasonable.

"Reckless of the fears of his generals, he now sat watching the weather.

"On December 14, his intuition told him that the hour was almost at hand. The fog lay thick over the country. The outlook was that it would not lift. His new formations were in place. His massed armor was at its rendezvous. He ordered that the attack would begin on the morning after tomorrow.

"He had brought together 25 divisions for the breakthrough, of which 17 would be used in the beginning.

"The brunt of the attack would be carried by the two panzer armies which the fog had well concealed. They were to move straight forward. The infantry divisions, well supported by heavy formations of antitank and antiaircraft artillery, would block to the north and south of the salient, holding and extending the flanks as the armor drove through the center.

"He expected to see his armor holding bridgeheads across the River Meuse by the second night of the battle.

"He expected to close Belgium within his hands before its defenders could react to his daring.

"He expected to destroy at one blow fully a third of the divisions opposing him in the west.

"He expected that these effects would be decisive.

"His dreams took no account of distance. It was 65 miles to the Meuse and 125 miles to Antwerp and the way to an Allied surrender was infinite.

"Still, he believed in his plan with a fervor not less than frantic.

"However vain his illusions, history records that in one thing he accomplished greatly. He had managed to screen from his enemies an operation which concentrated one quarter million men.

"It was this which made his not too clever plan diabolic.

"The battle began with fog and darkness, in men's minds as well as of time and weather. Briefly the quiet front was shaken by the heavy fires of artillery. From Monschau in the north to that point in the south-running line where it turned the far corner of Luxembourg, the barrage gave warning.

"It was an alarm meant to stir the world. But only the men directly under the guns heard it.

"Along the 80 miles of threatened front, they were awakened. They stood to arms and awaited what would come.

"But the hour was late and their strength was very small.

"The barrage fire lifted even as the dawn broke a dawn without light for seeing, such was the fog.

"Behind this screen, the enemy storm battalions pressed forward, seeking the weakly guarded places, turning the flanks of strong points in the line.

"At noon the dictator heard from his chief adviser: 'The fight goes well: we obtained complete surprise.'

"All that day as he looked at the maps of battle, he could believe that victory was at hand.

"His armored host advanced in the evening twilight, storming a field already stricken by defeat.

"Against the blow, the thin defending line tried bravely to rally. It was overwhelmed and broken under weight of fire and metal.

"And so passed the first day. In distance gained, the attack was not prodigious. But it had nigh completed the wreck of the defending corps.

"The crust was broken: The Ardennes door lay open. Already the tide of invasion moved on Belgian soil.

"Through three great gaps in the line the spearheads were advancing. Toward St. Vith from both flanks around the Schnee Eifel. Toward Bastogne after leaping the River Our.

"These are the rocks on which the defense of the Ardennes must anchor.

"These are the citadels which its would-be conqueror must take.

"The key to control of its roads lie in these cities.

"Lacking the roads, the fight could not be won.

"And so on the field the crisis mounted hourly, as more men and metal poured through the shattered line.

"But fast though the danger rose, men did not see it, except the few who shared in the fire fight.

"Between the armored host and the vital prizes, there was no organized defense line or men for the making of it, but only occasional batteries and scattered forces of rear area troops.

"Against these elements, enemy paratroopers already were moving, and enemy saboteurs dressed in the guise of friends.

"Of reserves, the Theater had but two divisions, undermanned and underequipped, and resting in France from battles recently fought in Holland.

"These were but a token of what the situation required. It could be saved only by bringing many divisions out of line from north and south, and from Britain, and rushing them to the Ardennes.

"Such were the naked terms of the contest, made so by the scale on which the attack was mounted.

"But on the first day the reaction was not in keeping. Among the defenders the strength of the challenge went unseen.

"Even men at the front had seen but a few battalions moving. The weather concealed the mass coming forward by every road and trail. As sensed by command, it was at worst a local battle, perhaps an assault by three divisions or four.

"But by God's grace and the hearts of determined men a miracle already was occurring by which in the end the situation would be saved.

"In the north near Monschau there is a ridge called Elsenborn which is nature's bastion, guarding the road to Liege and the far-off ports.

"In the very hour when the enemy loosed his lightning, and American corps was attacking near this ground.

"As the shock of the enemy guns and armor fell on these divisions, their right flank folded back and stood fast on the heights of Elsenborn.

"On the hills near Monschau the line of American guns beat time with this movement and their fire withered the enemy corps on the right.

"Together, the working of these forces at the beginning denied the enemy his chance to expand his salient toward the great cities and the sea.

"Together, they were an anchor of strength to the higher commanders when on the next day the situation became more clearly revealed.

"By then the armored spearheads were deep in the country.

"The line was broken. The enemy had engaged in massive strength. His armies threatened the whole position in the west.

"These things at least were clear amid the battle's confusions. The word was flashed to the capitals of the world and everywhere men's thoughts turned anxiously toward the Ardennes.

"From the hour the Allied command and its armies came to grips with the danger, there was neither doubt about what had to be done or indecision in the doing of it.

"The strategy elected by the defenders proposed but two main objects—to strengthen the shoulders which still held firm against the enemy flankward pressures, to man the bastions which still might hold in the Ardennes center.

"The first step would limit the drive and then confine it, denying it grand objectives from the start.

"The second would set the anvil for the hammer, insuring the ground for successful counterattack.

"So went the plan. So went its execution.

"From out of the north American armor rode to St. Vith, at first a combat team and then a division.

"From out of the south, a garrison rode for Bastogne. It counted one airborne division and a team of armor. On the ground it would link with a battalion of tank destroyers sent from the north.

"With these scant forces there rode the chance for swift decision. Time and situation had not permitted more.

"Elsewhere as armies realigned to face the battle, their divisions marched to wall-up the threatened flanks. There was just time enough to look where the ground was strongest, take position and then face toward the storm and fire.

"Right under the guns, the odd-ments joined the fighting, repairmen, clerks, police, and drivers of trucks. They picked up arms and moved to a threatened crossroads, or blew a bridge or guarded the precious stores.

"In Britain, the newly arrived formations were alerted to go by air to defend the line of the Meuse.

"The base of supply in France reorganized to feed the battle; its convoys going elsewhere were halted and faced about.

"Along the general front running from Switzerland to Holland the allied armies shifted weight toward the danger zone.

"In the United States there was swift reapportionment of training forces to provide replacements for the wasting infantry line.

"Thus in one round of the clock the Allies gained unity of action, and the signals were called for the month-long struggle on ahead.

"Momentous decisions had been taken. There remained the weeks of execution wherein deeds would match thoughts and courage would prove equal to the plan.

"At St. Vith the enemy already swarmed over the country. But the rescuing armor arrived in time to block the road, blunt the blow and cripple the enemy power during the crisis hours.

"The spearhead of the panzer army in the north rolled off the flank of this defense and on past Stavelot. Then in the defiles beyond the River Ambleve it was trapped and held by the new forces of the counter-attack. The fighting was within 20 miles of Liege.

"The race to Bastogne was won by the American column; it closed in just in time to confront an enemy armored corps. The fighting began before the defenders could take position. They organized under fire from enemy guns.

"In this way began the siege now famed in history. The lines of Bastogne held firm though the storm beat all around. By direct assault the enemy armored corps tried to gain the city. Its men and metal were driven back at every point.

"And so the defeated armor flowed on around Bastogne, still seeking to gain the line of the River Meuse.

"Its spearpoint reached almost to the door of Dinant before it was stopped by the fire of the new American line.

"Even so, the defeat of this southern panzer army was made sure by the stand made at Bastogne. When the armor bypassed this isle of resistance, its power was maimed and its forces were slowed down.

"The hope this spelled reacted like a magnet upon the general force of the counterattack. To the south of the Bulge an American army had been attacking eastward. It was called now to halt and wheel to the north. Its nearest corps moved out upon this mission. From out of the corps, one division struck toward Bastogne.

"So while Monschau and St. Vith doomed the attack of the northern forces, Bastogne and the armor advancing to its relief squeezed hard on the southern flank.

"The weather at last turned cold; there were gales and snows deep drifting. A general change was wrought on the battlefront.

"The loss from exposure grew great as the loss from fire. Attacking in snow suits, the enemy could scarcely be seen. The village became the chief prize in the daily struggle, as men fought for shelter and for warmth.

"The folk of the Ardennes opened their hearts and hearths to the defenders. They shared with them their food, their blankets and their fuel. They tore up their bedsheets for use in concealing men and weapons. They nursed the wounded and helped to comfort the ill.

"But the weather's curse was also in part a blessing. The cold cleared the skies so that airpower could again take wing. Its fighter-bombers caught the foe in his hour of greatest extension. The trains of guns and armor were closed up tight along the roads. So the air strike took toll of his strength all along the columns while from both flanks riflemen, guns, and armor beat his spearheads back.

"By Christmas Eve the enemy knew that his plan was defeated.

"Yet the fight flamed higher still on Christmas Day.

"On the next day the American armored column from the south broke through to Bastogne and the corridor thus won was never broken.

"But still the enemy persisted in the siege. And still his forces of the attack struggled to break the vise now closing from both sides of the salient.

"The period of surprise having passed, the panzer armies were now committed to the vain task of trying to batter their way through.

"Instead of beginning a gradual withdrawal, more men and more guns were sent forward to the Bulge in the effort to hold what was gained and expand the front if possible.

"That stage of the battle which followed the passing of the American crisis was the most blood-letting of all.

"None of the ground of the Ardennes was given back. There was no sudden strategic retreat. Every hill and roadway had to be rewon by the fire power and by paying a price in the lives of valiant men.

"When at last toward the close of January the enemy could stand American forces from both sides of the salient threatened a general envelopment, his surviving units backed away, still fighting with utmost desperation. But the power which they carried out with them was small indeed compared with that which had been scattered and broken on this ground. The storms which beat upon the Ardennes throughout the battle at last had quieted; so had the last full fury of the tempest of Germany tyranny.

"Though the full story of the fight cannot be told here, it will be sung through the ages.

"There is hardly a town or village in this upland area which has not served as a shield and fortress for troops of the United States.

"The scars of the fight are still marked on the land, the forest, the bridges, and the dwelling places.

"But the memory of what was done continues high and unscarred in the hearts of two peoples.

"In the battle fought here, 76,890 Americans were killed or wounded or were marked missing.

"On no other soil the earth over has more American blood been spilled in the course of a single battle.

"The number of Belgians who died or suffered wounds or great privation helping these friends from overseas in the common defense cannot be known.

"They together share the true glory, though many of the heroes of this field are unsung and some of the bravest deeds were unseen.

"The comrades and countrymen who knew them in their great hour gave their sacrifice its highest meaning.

"By continuing the battle until won, they paid the dead the perfect tribute of faith and courage.

"Of these dead and of all who fought here, the now living may attest the greatness of the deed only by increased devotion to the freedom for which they braved the fire."

International Congress for the Peace of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the Washington report about the International Congress on Christian Culture for the Peace of the World which will take place in Ciudad Trujillo, the Dominican Republic, from February 28 to March 6. It is gratifying to note that my dear friend, the Reverend Dr. (Father) Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, will be one of the principal speakers. Without doubt, the gathering of numerous spiritual leaders, all men of good will, should accomplish a great deal to bring about understanding among all the peoples, all the races, and all the religions of the world. Faith in God is our chief resource in the present crisis. Religion means love of God and love of our neighbor. Obviously, whatever can be done to strengthen the foundations of our culture is bound to have a good effect on mankind. In this connection, it may be recalled that the Dominican Republic offered a refuge to people flying from the Nazi terror and that religious freedom is guaranteed in the Dominican constitution. The initiative of Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo in setting the stage for this international congress is worthy of all praise. The program follows:

DR. THORNING IS INVITED TO CONGRESS ON CHRISTIAN CULTURE

WASHINGTON, December 30.—The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, Carrollton Manor, Md., specialist on inter-American affairs and associate editor of World Affairs, a magazine published in the Capital, is one of the first scholars of the free world invited by Auxiliary Archbishop Octavio A. Beras, of Santo Domingo, to be a principal speaker at the International Congress on Christian Culture for the Peace of the World that will meet at Ciudad Trujillo, the Dominican Republic, from February 28 to March 6. Archbishop Beras is the president of the organizing committee of the congress, while the secretary general is the distinguished Dominican intellectual, Dr. Salvador Iglesias. The conference is being convoked in connection with the International Exposition of Peace and Fraternity of the Free World which is now underway in the Dominican Republic.

The Most Reverend Salvatore Süno, titular archbishop of Perge and Apostolic Nuncio to the Dominican Republic, will officiate in the Cathedral of Santo Domingo at 9 a. m. on Tuesday, February 28, when the delegates to this international congress will chant a solemn veni Creator, imploring the blessing of the Holy Spirit upon the work of the conference. The Apostolic Nuncio will also deliver an address of welcome to the delegates at this opening session in the basilica.

On the same day, an inaugural address will be given, in the auditorium of the University of Santo Domingo, by Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, whose leadership has been responsible for notable progress in the republic during the past 25 years. At noon, the delegates will pay their respects to the Apostolic Nuncio. At five in the afternoon, the keynote address of the congress will be delivered by the Most Reverend Octavio A. Beras, auxiliary archbishop of Santo Domingo.

Among the subjects to be discussed, according to the provisional program just made public, will be Peace in the Christian Family; Peace in the Industrial World; Peace in the World of Farm Work; Peace Programs for Youth Leaders in City and County; Peace and Harmony Among all Races; Christianity: the Fountainhead of Human Dignity and Human Rights; the Unifying Role of Catholic Church in Modern Society; and Christian Leadership on a World Scale.

The program will include visits to many historic monuments in Ciudad Trujillo, to the 40 national pavilions of the International Fair, and to the social welfare centers of the capital. One night will be devoted to concert of sacred music and another to Dominican folklore, dancing, and songs.

On Sunday, March 4, a solemn mass for the delegates will be celebrated in the Shrine of Our Lady of High Grace. Lunch will be served that day in the St. Ignatius Loyola Polytechnic Institute which is directed by the Jesuit Fathers. There will also be an excursion to San Cristobal and to the huge Rio Haina sugar mill.

On Wednesday, March 7, the delegates will visit Cibao, often called the bread basket of Santo Domingo. This trip will include inspection of country schools, institutes for teacher training, and centers of scientific farming. The day will conclude with prayers and benediction in the famous Shrine of Our Lady of Thanksgiving.

The World Congress delegates will be entertained by Gen. Hector-B. Trujillo Molina, President of the Dominican Republic (a brother of the Generalissimo) at a gala reception in the National Palace. The final act of the conference will be a solemn Te Deum in the Cathedral intoned by the Most Reverend Ricardo Pittini, Archbishop of Santo Domingo.

Compliments to the Walnut Grove Products Co., of Atlantic, Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Walnut Grove Products Co., of Atlantic, Iowa, has had a long and successful career in manufacturing and distributing Walnut Grove stock feeds, which has gained great popularity all over the Middle West.

They learned long ago that there is no substitute for honest, proper advertising, to acquaint the people with the values of their products. Walnut Grove is now taking the lead to effectively publicize the food values of the best food on earth, healthful, muscle-building, tasty cornfed pork and beef.

Last week the board of directors of the Walnut Grove Products Co. announced their decision to set aside 50 cents from the sale of each ton of swine and beef feeds manufactured by the company.

The money to be given to a livestock organization devoted to the promotion and education of the value of meat and meat products. I have no doubt but what many, many other companies in the breadbasket of America will follow Walnut Grove's lead in their desire to induce this American people to eat more of the wonderful food and which will benefit all who eat it and produce it.

My compliments go to President A. E. Kelloway and his board, may success crown their efforts.

State of the Union Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the President's state of the Union message today certainly provoked no surprises and very little congressional discussion. I can support most of what the President has requested in his message. However, I fear that the message is distinguished by its omissions and its inadequacies.

In his discussion of the discharge of world responsibility, very little is recommended beyond the making of long-term commitments for assistance to economic development of friendly nations abroad.

A great claim is made for the development of national fiscal integrity and a balanced budget. Very little recognition is given to the times which have changed the atmosphere of the Nation from a war economy to a peacetime economy. In the volatile Near East dispute between the Arab States and Israel, the President urges that we promote a fair solution and that both sides will make the contribution necessary to achieve that purpose. Where does leadership appear in these words?

It was, indeed, surprising to have the President tell us about his desire to continue the Federal-aid highway program. There has been very little argument on this subject for years. All reference was omitted to the conflict in financing proposals which proved to be the roadblock to the adoption of a workable highway program in the last session. The nonpartisan, noncontroversial issue of occupational safety received consideration in two separate instances in his message.

On the schools issue, Congress was deadlocked on the proposal of integra-

tion. Where does the administration stand on that issue?

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress the House of Representatives passed legislation reducing the retirement age for women to age 62 and provided for compensation benefits to the totally disabled at age 50. The House has clearly spoken on this subject. What guidance can Congress receive from these words:

In developing improvements in the system, we must give the most careful consideration to population and social trends and to fiscal requirements.

Is the President for or is he against the House bill?

On the question of civil rights, a bipartisan commission is recommended. The issues on this subject are resolved and the lines are already clearly drawn. A bipartisan commission would serve no other purpose but the occasion for delay in enacting an effective civil-rights program. Congress knows the subject matter and Congress is bipartisan. A commission would serve no useful purpose.

In his message the President said: "Change is the inexorable law of life." His message promises none. It reflects an America becalmed by Executive decree.

Additional Cotton in the "Set-Aside"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, December 29, I wrote to Secretary of Agriculture Benson suggesting that he utilize the full authority of his office in placing an additional 1 million bales of cotton in the "set-aside."

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I place this letter in the RECORD.

DECEMBER 29, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
The Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Under the "set-aside" provisions of the present agricultural laws, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to reserve as much as 4 million bales of cotton to insure the domestic economy and to provide an adequate supply of cotton in the event of emergency.

Having had the privilege of talking with hundreds of cotton farmers in recent weeks, I have found that they are deeply perturbed and depressed about their high-production costs. Year by year they find that they are paying more for the things they have to buy to carry on their operations, and, at the same time, they have seen a continuing decline in the price of cotton at the market place. This cost-price squeeze is driving great numbers of our people from the land and placing heavy burdens and added problems on our urban citizens.

By utilizing the full powers that Congress has placed in your hands by enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1954, this action on your part would serve to stabilize the price of cotton and would give the farmer a more equitable return for the product of his labor. It was the intention of those of us who drafted this legislation, that you be given this authority to cushion the shock of just such a situation as now exists throughout the cotton-growing areas.

For this reason, I urge you to utilize the full powers of your office in exercising the maximum set-aside for cotton prior to the announcement of price-support levels. Our American farmer should receive the maximum protection of the law and our national security program must have the full benefits of an adequate set-aside in case of a national crisis.

Such action on the part of the Department would increase the present set-aside by 1 million bales and would benefit not only the cotton farmers but also the business economy of all areas producing cotton.

It would, in addition, increase our ability to cope with any contingency that might occur in this far from peaceful world and would take into account the increasing demands created by an expanding American economy and a growing American population.

I urge you take this action immediately.

Yours very sincerely,

E. C. GATHINGS.

Fruits of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the President's message on the State of the Union which the House has just listened to with great interest and respect will brighten the hearts of the American people and likewise those of other freedom-loving nations. In foreign and domestic issues we have had renewed evidence of leadership dedicated to equality, individual dignity, and justice.

The President has invited a comparison of "fruits of freedom" here and elsewhere as against the record of the Communists, and he pointed up our progress in the field of civil rights. It is especially gratifying to note in his message a determination to continue this progress. In this regard I applaud his recommendation that charges of lack of voting rights and economic pressure on Negro citizens be examined by a bipartisan commission—and promptly.

Through the past 3 years, as the President pointed out with pride, our stature in the free world has increased because we have made more progress than ever before in a similar period to give all citizens equality in justice, in opportunity, and in civil rights. But the President emphasized the great need to expand this progress, and I for one look forward to the program he promised to give us to accomplish this objective.

Recently I read that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] had named me with 14 other Representatives as possible "key regional leaders" to fight for justice in civil-rights matters. When I saw this report I immediately wrote the gentleman from New York, saying he could count on me. Since then I have personally assured him of my desire to actively support a civil-rights legislative program. President Eisenhower's message points in the direction we must move, and I will be proud to continue supporting such a program.

Liberian Presidential Inauguration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity of congratulating the Republic of Liberia in general and, especially, the President of Liberia, His Excellency William V. S. Tubman, on the occasion of the presidential inauguration.

The daily press has given reports of the attendance of the Soviet delegation as indicated in the attached clipping from the Sunday, January 1, 1956, copy of the New York Times. The American delegation has not received the publicity it should have from our own press. It is an excellent delegation composed of the following individuals: United States Ambassador to Liberia Richard Jones; former Senator Robert Upton, New Hampshire; Lt. Gen. Leon Johnson; Mrs. Robert Vann; Mr. Asa Spaulding; and Mr. Garfield Kass.

It is to be regretted that no Member of the United States Congress attended the ceremonies. I, personally, would have gone—even at my own expense—if the convening of the second session of the 84th Congress had not conflicted with the celebration.

The article referred to follows:

RUSSIANS ON HAND FOR LIBERIA FETE—ARRIVAL OF DELEGATION FOR TUBMAN'S THIRD INAUGURATION STIRS MUCH SPECULATION

(By Leonard Ingalls)

MONROVIA, LIBERIA, December 31.—Representatives of 35 countries and the United Nations are gathering here for the inauguration Monday of William Vacanarat Shadrach Tubman for his third term as President of the Republic of Liberia.

One delegation, that of the Soviet Union, has been a subject of particular interest and speculation. Nearly everyone is wondering whether its appearance here is just another of the friendly visits Soviet officials have been making lately to various parts of the world or whether there may be some deeper significance.

Four years ago the Soviet Union did not accept an invitation to President Tubman's second inauguration. This time Moscow has sent a delegation led by a fairly high Soviet official, Alexander P. Volkov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, one of the houses of the Supreme Soviet.

In their conjecturing over the meaning of the Russian visit here, diplomatic observers have concluded it is a fairly obvious indication of the Soviet Union's growing interest in Africa and its desire to spread Soviet influence on the African continent. Liberia, whose government sent representatives to the Asian-African Conference at Bandung, Indonesia, earlier this year, seems quite

pleased as well as curious about the Soviet representation at the inauguration.

SOVIET AID SEEN POSSIBLE

Since Liberia is an economically poor country that needs large amounts of foreign assistance for development, there has been some speculation on whether the Soviet representatives may be exploring the possibilities of establishing a mission here and of offering economic assistance.

At a diplomatic reception this afternoon Mr. Volkov read a message to Mr. Tubman from Marshal Kliment E. Voroshilov, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union. Marshal Voroshilov said he hoped the presence of the Soviet delegation in Liberia would serve the cause of establishing friendly relations between our two countries.

Mr. Tubman expressed pleasure at the message and said he also hoped for friendly relations between the Soviet Union and Liberia.

In two other formal presentations President Tubman received the grand cordon of the Order of Leopold, highest decoration of the Belgian Government, and an original copy from the West German Government of the commercial treaty of 1855 between Liberia and the Free Hanseatic Republics.

With the inauguration only 2 days away, the capital city of Monrovia is a scene of intense activity and excitement. Its buildings gleam with coats of paint, the streets are heavily decorated with bunting in red, white, and blue, the Liberian national colors, and many roadbuilding projects are nearing completion.

One sour note in the festivities is a controversy between the Government and contractors over the construction of an extremely modernistic new silver-domed capitol building. There is some doubt whether the scheduled dedication of the building as part of the inauguration festivities will be held.

Barratt O'Hara Paid High Honor by Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, overdue and well-earned recognition of meritorous service just came to our distinguished colleague the gentleman from the Second Congressional District of Illinois, a former resident of Berrien County in the Fourth Michigan Congressional District, where he has many friends, is loved and respected by many. But let the News Palladium of Benton Harbor and the Herald Press of St. Joseph, Mich., tell the story.

Permit me to read:

BARRATT O'HARA PAID HIGH HONOR BY CUBA

Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, of Chicago, native of St. Joseph and one-time twin city newspaper reporter, today was the recipient of Cuba's highest decoration—the Order of Military Merit of Distinction—at a presentation ceremony scheduled in Havana, where he flew at the invitation of President Batista.

The presentation was to be made by President Batista personally, after which the former twin-city newsman was to be honored by the Cuban Congress.

FIRST HONOR FOR CIVILIAN

It will be the first time such an honor has been conferred on a civilian.

Now 73, Representative O'HARA is the only Member of the United States House of Representatives who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War which liberated Cuba.

O'HARA served with old Company I of the 33d Michigan Volunteer Infantry. The company was comprised chiefly of twin city youths, many of who left high school to enlist. It was one of the first American units to land on Cuban soil and took part in all major military actions which ended Spanish rule in the Western Hemisphere.

From St. Joseph, O'HARA went to Chicago, where he carved out a distinguished journalistic and political career. He served as lieutenant-governor of Illinois and has long been a Democratic Congressman.

During Congressman O'HARA's flying visit to Cuba he will visit old battlefields, including San Juan Hill, where the famous Rough Riders participated in a fight that helped break the siege of Santiago.

It has been O'HARA's custom annually on February 15, anniversary of the sinking of the United States battleship *Maine*, to address the House of Representatives in Washington.

Archbishop Cushing Cites Need of God in 1956 Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my extension, the text of a living New Year's message, issued by His Excellency, Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Boston. The New Year's message of Archbishop Cushing is one that should appeal to, and find response from, all persons, without regard to religious convictions, who believe in God and His law and His word:

ARCHBISHOP CUSHING CITES NEED OF GOD IN 1956 MESSAGE

In an era of unprecedented prosperity our greatest need is still help from God, says Archbishop Richard J. Cushing in his annual New Year's message.

The text of the message follows:

A thought often given expression by poets and philosophers is that life is short but life's lessons are long in the learning. As we begin the New Year of 1956 we may remind ourselves that no one of us can live to the point of becoming completely wise and self-sufficient. There is always something new to learn, some uncharted field of experience to explore, some new disappointments to bear within resignation to God's will. These sobering truths teach us our dependence upon God and upon one another as creatures of God.

Upon Almighty God first of all.

STILL HELPLESS DESPITE POWER

In an age in which we have attained undreamed-of power over the resources of nature we sense nevertheless our human helplessness. Never before have so many been at the mercy of so few. Never before has strength been so complicated by weakness and power so productive of frustation and insecurity. We have vainly sought in the researches of historians and psychologists the explanation of this seemingly contradictory prevalence of both force and fear in our modern life.

If we are fearful even while we are so strong, it can be only because our strength comes to us from a higher source and we have been acting as though it were our own. The God of our fathers has disappeared from our thinking only to reappear in the yearnings of our deeper selves which worldly pleasures and man-made plans of living have left unsatisfied. In an era of unprecedented prosperity we are forced to admit that our greatest need is help from God. Even amid comforts and conveniences that release us so generously from the struggle for existence we can find rest and peace only by lifting up our minds and hearts to Him Who made us to enjoy the contemplation of His divine beauty.

Because we need God so much and because God is so far removed from us in His infinite perfection we must look for the way that will lead to Him in the service of our fellow men. It is gratifying that we have made such long strides toward the ideal of a united world, that national barriers are becoming more penetrable and collective responsibility is replacing rugged individualism as the guiding principle of our social philosophy.

Let us be sure, however, that we see this idea of a united world in its true perspective. It was presented to us by Christ our Lord, who suffered and died that all men might realize the human dignity with which His Father had endowed them. It was reasserted four centuries ago by Christian social philosophers who saw the inconsistency of extreme nationalism in a world which the progress of science was so rapidly forcing into a pattern of social and economic unity. Today a terrified humanity is instinctively groping toward this ideal as the one hope of averting the global annihilation which a third world war must inevitably bring about.

COMMON EFFORTS POINTS TO GOD

Let us begin the year 1956 by recognizing first of all how little and insignificant we are as individual men, and how much we need the strength that comes to us from the tradtions of the past and from the cooperative effort which 20th-century social organization makes possible. Let us recognize on the other hand that it will profit us nothing to be helpful to one another unless our common efforts are directed ultimately towards our unification in the love of God. It is because we are independent on God that we are so independent on one another. Only by sanctifying our relations with one another in the warmth of supernatural charity can we remove the contradiction of a godless society among men who belong body and soul to God.

If our efforts to construct a better world are inspired by love of God and unqualified submission to God's law, we need have no fear for the future. With this thought in mind I wish you all a happy New Year—a year that may be happy not merely in the possession of material security and increasing prosperity, but happy in the awareness that with God in our hearts and in the works of our hands we are in direct contact with the Source Itself of true happiness and abiding peace.

Flood Control Is Everyone's Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an article from the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press Democrat dated December 28, 1955, containing information from the

Army Corps of Engineers to the effect that the Coyote Valley Dam would have cut in half the $4 million in damage inflicted in the Russian River area during the recent floods in California.

This article points out the necessity of initiating construction of this vital project at the earliest possible time. Initial construction funds were approved during the first session of this 84th Congress. The people of Sonoma County approved a $5,598,000 bond issue to provide their full share of the costs of this project, but sale of the bonds has been delayed by a lawsuit which questioned the sufficiency of the local contribution in view of cost adjustments since authorization of the project by the Flood Control Act of 1950.

The people met their local obligation in good faith in accordance with the act of 1950. Adjusted costs revealed that an estimated additional amount of $1,165,000 will be required to accomplish the initial plan for flood control in the Russian River Basin.

On January 3, 1956, I introduced H. R. 7930 authorizing the additional appropriation. The bill was unanimously approved by the House Public Works Committee on January 5 and has been ordered reported favorably.

On behalf of the hundreds of people who suffered personal discomfort and millions of dollars of damages because of the flood in the Russian River Basin, I sincerely urge approval of this bill by the Congress at the earliest possible date. To emphasize the necessity of this project in the prevention of future damage to life and property, I respectfully refer your attention to the following article:

ENGINEERS SAY COYOTE COULD HAVE HALVED $4 MILLION RIVER DAMAGE—WOULD HAVE DROPPED CREST 2 TO 4½ FEET

(By Fred Fletcher)

The swollen Russian River last week caused direct flood damage totaling $4 million, and the Coyote Valley Dam would have prevented $2,100,000 of it.

The dam, if in operation, would have reduced the highest crest recorded at Guerneville during the flood by 2 feet—to 45.9 feet, or almost a foot below the crest recorded in the record-setting 1940 flood.

These are estimates made yesterday by the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The damage total is for overflow damage alone—not for "storm damage"—and is for damage to private and public property along the Russian River itself, not its tributaries.

It is a preliminary estimate, one subject to daily revision as the Army engineers' damage survey gets deeper into detail.

A survey of damage along the tributaries is underway.

The effects of a theoretical operation of the Coyote Dam during the flood were calculated separately by the Army. They were based upon the known operating capacity of the projected 122,000-acre-foot dam northeast of Ukiah, and known peak river stages and flows at various gage points on the river last week.

Both sets of estimates came from the Army engineers' San Francisco district office.

MEETING LAST NIGHT

Some of the figures on the estimated effects of Coyote Dam were brought out last night by Col. William F. Cassidy, Chief of the Engineers' South Pacific division, in a meeting of top Sonoma and Marin County officials in Ignacio.

The Alexander Valley area appeared to have suffered the most damage. The preliminary estimates assigned a $1,200,000 figure to that broad overflow area.

The damage at Guerneville and to the sea was estimated at about $1,000,000.

All estimates were based upon a knowledge of property values, partly from surveys for the Coyote project, plus field surveys of damage by crews now in the area.

WITH DAM HELP

The Army said that if the multiple-purpose Coyote Dam had been in operation last week, it could have accomplished this:

Reduced the peak flow and river crest at Hopland by 12,000 cubic feet per second and 4.2 feet, respectively. The peak flow was about 38,000 CFS, the highest crest 26.8 feet.

Reduced the peak flow at Cloverdale from 46,000 CFS to 25,000 CFS, and the crest from 30.9 feet to 26.3 feet, or 4.6 feet.

Reduced the peak flow at Healdsburg from 70,000 to 61,000 CFS, and the crest from 26.16 to 23.66 feet or 2½ feet.

Reduced the peak flow at Guerneville from 90,000 to 84,000 CFS, and the crest from 47.9 feet to 45.9 feet, or 2 feet.

BENEFITS ELSEWHERE

Colonel Cassidy and Representative HUBERT B. SCUDDER (R-Sebastopol) last night also pointed out that completed flood control projects in California provided distinctly measurable flood protection last week.

Sacramento, dry in all the flooding, unquestionably would have been inundated were it not for Shasta Dam and the recently completed and filling Folsom Dam, they said.

The Friant and recently completed Pine Flat Dams kept Fresno, the State's second largest inland city, from flooding.

OTHER ESTIMATES

Earlier yesterday, Colonel Cassidy came up with these estimates for northern California:

Completed flood-control projects saved millions upon millions of dollars last week.

Those under construction could have saved $100,600,000.

Those authorized but not started would have saved another $19 million.

All the above plus those projects still in the planning or discussion stage would have prevented a possible $175 million in damage.

Representative SCUDDER said last week's disaster has given him a "fighting chance" to get a Federal resurvey of long-discussed but dormant flood-control projects between San Francisco and Oregon.

He said he hopes to persuade the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Public Works Committee to visit northern California and recognize its problem.

Among other dormant projects mentioned was one once authorized for Richardson Bay in Marin County, and several on the Eel. Only active Federal flood-control project in the region now is the Coyote Dam project, construction of which now is stalled by a taxpayers' suit.

RIVER NEEDS SPACE

Colonel Cassidy also had some pertinent advice for the two boards of supervisors attending last night's Ignacio meeting.

"You must leave space for old man river to go through," he said.

The northern California floods last and this week, and the recent floods in New England, he said, showed that buildings have been placed knowingly in the path of past floods.

He described a new motel he found in a tour of damage areas yesterday. It had a water mark 7 feet high on the walls. The builder knew that water reached that height at that spot only 5 years ago, he said.

Mentioning a permit system, he obviously was referring to possible county-level legislation. He said such improperly located buildings not only suffer damage themselves but restrict the flow of swollen streams, adding to flooding.

Only 2 weeks ago, Paul L. Nichols, Sonoma County flood-control and water engineer, suggested that the supervisors here consider legislation prohibiting construction or other activities in natural water courses except under county permits. The suggestion is under study.

Do You Know You Can Lose Your Civil and Retirement Pay Even for a Traffic Violation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article entitled "Do You Know You Can Lose Your Civil and Retirement Pay Even for a Traffic Violation?" written by York D. Mathes, which appeared in the April 1955 issue of the Federal Bar News.

The article is a summary of an analysis made of Public Law 769 of the 83d Congress, entitled "To prohibit payment of annuities to officers and employees of the United States convicted of certain offenses."

On January 3, 1956, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7933, to repeal this statute, which has been referred to as one to reach disloyal persons, but which, in effect, is much too broad in scope.

The article follows:

DO YOU KNOW YOU CAN LOSE YOUR CIVIL AND RETIREMENT PAY EVEN FOR A TRAFFIC VIOLATION?—YORK D. MATHES SUBMITS EXCELLENT CONVENTION COMMITTEE REPORT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Below is a summary, abbreviated of an analysis made of Public Law 769, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 1142). It affects potentially several million persons, the past, present, and future employees of the United States; and their dependents. While it was prepared at the request of a committee of the association for its use, it seems likely it will interest all members of FBA. The statute has been referred to as one to reach disloyal persons. But its scope is much broader.)

1. As a practical matter the tragic consequences of the cited legislation probably will be visited on very few, if any, disloyal persons. If it is not extensively amended, or repealed, it will work a serious injustice on a substantial number of loyal, but unfortunate employees; and on dependents who have not done anything inappropriate, much less wrong.

2. In the Jerry Kluttz column of the Washington Post for March 7, 1955, the statement was made that 14 persons have been denied pension, and 50 more are being investigated. The article also says the statute was enacted to deny a civil-service pension to Alger Hiss. If so, it is somewhat analogous to destroying the Pentagon Building to capture one escaped prisoner.

3. The act cites about 75 criminal statutes, which as a rough estimate describe probably 250 different offenses. With respect to each, any, and all of said offenses the act provides in section 1 (68 Stat. 1142):

"* * * There shall not be paid to any person convicted prior to, on, or after the date of enactment of this act of any of the following offenses described in this section, or to the survivor or beneficiary of such person so

convicted, for any period subsequent to the date of such conviction or the date of the enactment of this act, whichever is later, any annuity or retired pay on the basis of the service of such person as an officer or employee of the Government:".

4. Paragraph (2) of said first section, (which follows the enumeration in par. 1 of said criminal statutes), and to which the above quoted language is equally applicable, reads:

"Any offense," * * * (excluding 18 U. S. C. 13, which adopts existing State statutes as to Federal reservations therein), "which is a felony under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia (A) committed in the exercise of his authority, influence, power, or privileges as an officer or employee of the Government, or (B) committed after the termination of his service as an officer or employee of the Government but directly involving, directly resulting from, or directly relating to, the improper exercise of his authority, influence, power, or privileges during any period of his service as such an officer or employee."

5. The language just quoted defies exact analysis or definition, or the statement of any boundaries upon which one would be willing to advise a client to rely.

6. Title 18, United States Code, section 284, is one of the statutes cited in paragraph (1) of section 1. Conviction for violating that statute entails the forfetiure described by Public Law 769. The existing section 284 is somewhat ambiguous and it will be recalled that the Government recently sought, unsuccessfully, to obtain a construction thereof which would have given it a much broader application than it has at this time. Said section 284 makes it an offense to act as agent or counsel for "prosecuting any claims against the United States" "involving any subject matter directly connected with which such person was so employed or performed duty * * *." Under the construction urged by the prosecution, a lawyer who once was employed by the Government must hesitate to advise ("counsel") anyone, even a relative, about "any subject matter" with respect to which he was formerly employed by the Government (whether free or for a fee is immaterial). For example, an employee or former employee of the VA would be running some risk if he advised his wife how to make a claim for the Government Employee's Group insurance payable upon the employee's death. The subject matter is insurance in both instances. That "subject matter" is one of several within the jurisdiction of the VA. If he did so advise (and conviction followed), he and his widow, according to the terms of Public Law 769, would forfeit the civil-service retirement pay otherwise payable to each. To be sure, the illustration is extreme, and probably absurd practically. But that is the proper way to test language in a criminal or a forfeiture statute. The important point is that statutes involving criminal penalties, or forfeitures of money payable, ought to be very explicit in describing the offense. Of course there ought to be great conservatism in creating offenses, and in applying forfeitures. Public Law 769 does not meet either test. The offenses which can result in forfeiture of retirement pay range down from really serious felonies to offenses which are hardly more than improprieties in the absence of the statute making such conduct an offense. An analytical appendix hereto is available for perusal at the association office but its length precludes publication.

7. Paragraph 3 of said section 1 of the act enumerates as bases for forfeiture a conviction "prior to, on or after the date of enactment" for "perjury committed," "under the laws of the United States or of the District of Columbia (A) in falsely denying the commission of an act which constitutes any of the offenses described in paragraph (1) or (2) of this section, (B) in falsely testifying before any Federal grand jury or court of the United States with respect to his service as an officer or employee of the Government, or (C) in falsely testifying before any congressional committee in connection with any matter under inquiry before such congressional committee; or subornation of perjury committed in connection with the false denial or false testimony of another person as specified in this paragraph."

8. Obviously every good citizen deplores perjury. Nevertheless every experienced trial lawyer knows that some false testimony, (which may or may not be "perjury"), is fairly frequent in the trial of cases, albeit convictions for perjury or "false swearing" are comparatively rare. Therefore the paragraph just quoted from the statute probably will become pertinent only rarely. This fact does not determine the question of whether it is wise to include the offense of perjury. It is appropriate to raise the question whether it is any more reprehensible for a former employee of the Government to commit perjury than it is for a minister of the gospel, or other citizen to commit perjury. This suggests the general question whether it is sound criminology to vary the penalties of persons convicted of offenses, most any offenses, according to their previous occupation (viz, Government employee, railroad employee, or other) rather than according to the circumstances surrounding the commission of the particular offense. At least for the past 30 years the consensus seems to have been that the penalty to be imposed for the commission of an offense ought to be governed largely by the circumstances, surrounding the denounced conduct. It is quite unlikely that whether the defendant was an employee of the Government, or a railroad company, or a bank, has been considered as one of the factors properly influencing the penalty to be imposed upon him for an offense that is not peculiar to his occupation.

9. Another group of persons whose annuities are to be forfeited under said Public Law 769 (and such forfeiture applies also to their "survivor or beneficiary"), are those who have "failed or refused * * * upon the ground of self-incrimination" (it is difficult to see how one can fail on the ground of self-incrimination), "to appear, testify, or produce any paper, record or other document, with respect to his service as on officer or employee of the Government, or with respect to any relationship which he has had or has with a foreign government in any proceeding before a Federal grand jury, court of the United States or congressional committee; * * *."

10. It will be noticed that the forfeiture as to the individual and as to his "survivor or beneficiary" occurs upon his failing or refusing. No judicial inquiry is provided. No suggestion that he has committed any offense is implicit in the statutory language here mentioned. On the contrary the forfeiture occurs because he asserts a right given him by the Constitution of the United States; to wit, not to present evidence of self-incrimination (fifth amendment). In view of a distressingly extensive erroneous impression as to the scope of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, I remark here that it embraces a great deal more subject matter than is here discussed. Apparently forfeiture is applicable only if he relies on a right given him by the Constitution. Quaere: Is this valid constitutionally? It is impossible to say what is the significance of the statutory language when he "fails" to appear. Compare *United States* v. *Rumley*, 345 U. S., 41, 97 L. ed. 770). No comment is here attempted as to the meaning of the statutory language "with respect to his service" as applied to various books and papers.

11. The next ground for forfeiture of annuity prescribed by the statute is in paragraph (b) of section 2. That section forbids payment to one who "knowingly and willfully has made or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or * * * has concealed or conceals any material fact, with respect to his * * *" (membership or support of the Communist Party, or any element thereof), "or any other organization, * * *" advocating (a) the overthrow of the Government by unconstitutional means, "(b) establishment of a communistic dictatorship in the United States, or (c) the right to strike against the Government of the United States."

Similar forfeiture occurs because of knowingly making false statement concerning the person's conviction of any of the offenses described in the first section of the act, or failure to appeal, or testify, or produce records "as specified in subsection (a)" of section 2. This forfeiture also applies against the person's "survivor or beneficiary."

12. Section 3 of the act apparently undertakes to anticipate constitutional objection by providing that the amounts contributed (plus interest thereon shall be paid to the person whose annuity is forfeited, less any annuity theretofore paid him. It also provides that "such person shall not be required to repay any annuity properly received by him which is in excess of the amount of his own contributions with interest." (If forfeited per statute how could it be properly received?)

13. Section 6 defines certain terms used in the act. It provides that the word "annuity" "does not include any retirement benefit of any person to whom such benefit has been awarded or granted prior to the date of enactment of this act insofar as concerns the conviction of such person, prior to such date, of any offense specified in the first section of this act, or the commission by such person, prior to such date, of any violation of section 2 of this act."

Manifestly these savings clauses do not avoid the result that the act deprives one of a vested right, much more valuable than that saved.

14. Section 4 provides for restoration of the convicted person's right to receive annuity if he shall have been pardoned by the President. The legislative history indicates consideration in respect to said section 4 as applied to two Members of Congress heretofore convicted of one or more offenses and who were pardoned. Of course the pardoning power also exists as to offenses hereafter committed and in the event of such pardon the forfeiture prescribed by said Public Law 769 would not be effective for any period subsequent to the date of the pardon.

15. While the references herein are to annuities, all that is said is equally applicable to retired pay of members or former members of the Armed Forces. However, as to former military personnel the forfeitures of the statute do not apply to any benefit under laws administered by the Veterans Administration. An exactly opposite provision expressly forfeiting such benefits also (other than insurance contracts) was contained in S. 3720.

16. Section 10 added by the Senate enlarges the statute of limitations as to sundry offenses.

17. There exists considerable doubt as to the validity of the provisions in the act forfeiting the annuity rights of the survivor or beneficiary of the employee or former employee so convicted. Article III, section 3 of the Constitution provides that "no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood, or forfeiture except during the life of the person attained * * *." The scope of said constitutional protection was considered in *Bigelow* v. *Forrest* (9 Wall. 330, 19 L. Ed. 696); and *Wallack* v. *Vanrisivich* (92 U. S. 202, 23 L. Ed. 473).

18. Clause 3 of section 9 of article I provides that "No * * * ex post facto law

shall be passed." As to events which occurred prior to September 1, 1954, it may well be that the act is invalid not only with respect to "his survivor or beneficiary" but also with respect to the employee, assuming he entered the employ of the Government before September 1, 1954. This portion of the Constitution was considered in *Lovett* v. *U. S.* (328 U. S. 303–330, 90 L. Ed. 1252); *Ex parte, etc., Garland* (71 U. S. 33, 18 L. Ed. 336); *Burgess* v. *Salmon* (97 U. S. 381, 24 L. Ed. 1104); *Cases* v. *U. S.* (131 F. (2) 916 (certiorari denied), 87 L. Ed. 1718). See also *Inland Steel Co.* v. *National Labor Relations Board* (170 F. (2) 247).

19. As to those persons entitled to retirement annuities (and this is not limited to those already retired) prior to the effective date (September 1, 1954) of said act, it appears that said act may be invalid so far as it would deprive any such person of one or more of such existing rights. Those rights would seem to be protected under the following portion of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, viz: "No person shall * * * be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law * * *." (See *Lynch* v. *U. S.* (292 U. S. 571).)

20. To be sure, the above mentioned constitutional objections with respect to vested contract, or other right to receive annuities, will be unavailable to persons who enter the employ of the Government subsequent to September 1, 1954, and probably those who were previously in the employ of the Government but were not within the purview of the pertinent retirement statutes. In this connection it is of some importance from a practical, as distinguished from a legal, standpoint to consider the potential detriment to the Government of this type of legislation. It singles out Government employees (and members of the military forces), from the rest of the population and imposes upon such groups penalties far more severe than the penalties imposed upon the other elements in the population for the same offenses. (Moreover the amount of penalty in any one case is purely accidental.) It must be borne in mind that we are not dealing here only with treason, or acts somewhat related to treason, or with disloyalty to the Government, or indeed with only "felony," ancient or artificial. On the contrary, the act deals also (in par. 1 of sec. 1 thereof), with what properly may be termed ordinary police measures. If there be conviction these severe forfeitures would apply, notwithstanding that perchance the circumstances were such that in the criminal case the court would impose the minimum statutory penalty, and suspend it. It is no answer to say that everyone can avoid the penalties by avoiding the violation of any of the statutes cited. A number of those statutes can be violated quite inadvertently. For example, an autoist can inadvertently drive on a prohibited area of a Federal reservation, or a lawyer in one of the Government agencies might routinely sign an opinion dealing with a contract with X company, which might be a subsidiary of the Y company, in which such Government lawyer owns 10 shares of stock. He might not notice the name of the company or recall at the moment the fact of his share ownership; or, if he did, he might not know of the relationship between the two corporations. Negotiating a loan or collecting a lawyer's fee, under perfectly honest and honorable conditions can result, in some circumstances, in such a forfeiture of annuity (38 U. S. C. A. 218–221). Likewise an employee acting in perfect good faith in an emergency might conceivably forfeit all of his retirement rights, e. g., a Treasury guard believes he sees a man trying to burglarize an office of the Treasury and in the melee incident to his attempt to arrest the intruder he uses more force than the jury later concludes upon calm reflection he ought to have used under the circumstances, and kills the man. Thus the killing of the intruder is manslaughter, for which he is convicted. That is a felony. It was committed "in the exercise of his authority and power" as an official. Hence forfeiture of his annuity follows by reason of paragraph 2 of section 1 of said Public Law 769. Many other illustrations could be stated in support of the conclusion reached upon the present analysis, to wit, that the statute is unfair to the employees and to the Government; and probably will result in more harm than good from the Government's standpoint alone, ignoring entirely the question of fair treatment of employees as such, and any question of constitutionality (as to some classes of persons).

21. I have not discussed in any detail the portions of the statute pertaining to conflicts with committees of the Congress. In principle what has been said as to the criminal offenses largely applies to such other conflicts. In a number of such investigations conflicts arise that are wholly unrelated to any questions of loyalty or security. There are additional considerations, the discussion of which reasonable limitations of space prevent.

22. Quite apart from fair treatment of employees, who also are citizens, the statute will be detrimental to the Government. It ought to be repealed, or at least radically amended.

An American Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1955, my colleague, Hon. ALBERT H. BOSCH, introduced House Resolution 137 to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47. This resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules of which I am a member.

On May 3, 1955, the gentleman from New York, Mr. BOSCH, appeared before our committee in support of his resolution. To date, no action has been taken by the committee.

Under leave to extend by remarks, I include an article from the December 21, 1955, issue of the National Review entitled "An American Crime." This article was written by Mr. Julius Epstein and deals with the subject matter of House Resolution 137. I commend this for the careful study of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle:

AN AMERICAN CRIME

(By Julius Epstein)

Modern military history hardly knows a more atrocious crime than the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians to their Soviet executioners. It also hardly knows any other crime which so completely slipped the minds of the people who committed it.

The crime was committed by the three Western Allies, the United States, Great Britain and France, in the years 1945, 1946, and 1947. Based upon a painstaking research into the history of forced repatriation after World War II, the following facts are beyond any doubt. No conspiracy of silence will ever eradicate them from the record of history.

1. At least 2 and possibly as many as 5 million anti-Communist prisoners of war and liberated civilians were returned, against their wishes, to the Soviets to be hanged, shot, or imprisoned in Siberian slave labor camps.

2. We not only forcibly repatriated prisoners of war and civilians but also former Soviet nationals who had fought within the ranks of our own military forces in Italy and elsewhere, against the Nazis. Some of these Soviet defectors who had enlisted with our army were even decorated and given citations for outstanding bravery beyond the call of duty.

3. The crime of forced repatriation was not only committed in Europe but also on American soil. In some cases—for instance at Fort Dix, N. J.—we had to dope Soviet prisoners of war captured in German uniforms in order to deliver them to their executioners, waiting on Soviet boats in American ports.

4. American military authorities who carried out this crime were well aware of the fate that awaited the forcibly repatriated prisoners and civilians.

5. Pentagon high brass as well as State Department officials were well aware that the forced repatriation of Soviet nationals, captured in German uniforms (as for instance those held in American camps, and hundreds of thousands in Germany, Great Britain, Austria, Italy and France), was unlawful. Acting Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew warned our delegation at Yalta against the conclusion of any agreement with the Soviets which might result in forced repatriation. The Yalta Papers contain his telegrams to our Secretary of State Stettinius, then at Yalta. In these telegrams, Grew entreated Stettinius not to violate the Geneva Convention. He also referred to the official diplomatic note of February 1, 1945, in which the State Department, over Grew's signature, had already explained to Mr. Nikolai V. Novikov, Soviet representative in Washington, why we could never forcibly repatriate Soviet nationals taken prisoner in German uniforms. The reason was simple: They were captured in German uniforms and had therefore to be treated as German prisoners of war. Grew quoted the Geneva Convention which does not permit the retaining state "to look behind the uniform." This was an excellent doctrine, long shared by all civilized nations. But this important diplomatic note was not included in the Yalta Papers as released by the State Department on March 16, 1955. (After the discovery of the existence of that note, and of its absence from the Yalta Papers, I asked Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to make the note available to me. Mr. Dulles was kind enough to do so.)

6. The Grew note as well as his most competent warnings to Mr. Stettinius were in vain. Our Yalta delegation, including Mr. Alger Hiss, overruled Grew, the State Department's opinion, the Geneva Convention, and the time-honored American tradition of asylum for political exiles. Our delegation then entered into an agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and liberated civilians. This agreement was signed on behalf of the United States by Gen. John R. Deane on February 11, 1945.

7. While forced repatriation was undoubtedly the direct result of the Yalta deal, the Army's own official historian, Col. Harold E. Potter, has stated that even the Yalta agreement could not justify forced repatriation: it did not contain any reference to the use of force. According to Colonel Potter's well-documented report, it was the arbitrary interpretation of the Yalta agreement by our Joint Chiefs of Staff which caused the use of force and the tragedies of 1945–47.

8. The still top secret Army document "383.7–14.1 Forcible Repatriation of Displaced Soviet Citizens—Operation Keelhaul" contains the most complete description of the crime. The mere fact that the Army chose the code name "Operation Keelhaul"

proves that the Pentagon was aware of the atrocious and criminal character of forced repatriation. According to Webster, "Keelhaul" means, "To haul under the keel of a ship, either athwartships or from bow to stern, by ropes attached to the yardarms on each side. It was formerly a punishment in the Dutch and British navies and a method of torture used by pirates."

9. That President Truman was likewise well aware of the character of forced repatriation was revealed to the whole world by Truman's Secretary of State, Dean G. Acheson. On October 24, 1952, Mr. Acheson enumerated in an excellent speech before Committee One of the United Nations General Assembly (32 pages, legal size, single-spaced) why forced repatriation of prisoners of war has always been considered a crime against humanity and incompatible with the Geneva Convention. Speaking of the anti-Communist North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war in U. N. custody, Mr. Acheson thus upheld the principle of nonforcible repatriation:

"It was quite unthinkable to the United Nations command that is should use force to drive into the hands of the Communists, people who would be resisting that effort by force. That was the attitude taken by the United Nations command. It was the attitude taken by all other governments whose troops were in Korea and who would be required to carry out this forcible return if it were instituted. So far as I know, there has been no member of the United Nations outside the Communist group that has ever suggested that it was right, proper, legal or necessary to return these prisoners by force."

And to show that the principle of nonforcible repatriation not only applied to the Korean situation, but was an old principle of international law, Mr. Acheson went back in history. He quoted 15 international treaties entered into by the Soviet Government since 1918 ,all of which contained a clause preventing forced repatriation of prisoners of war. To give just one example, the treaty with Turkey, signed by the Soviet Government at Moscow on March 28, 1921, contained the following article 2: "The mutual repatriation of prisoners shall be effected with their consent. Forced repatriation shall in no way be admissible."

But Mr. Acheson not only dealt with Korea and the peace treaties signed and ratified by the Soviets since 1918, but also with Soviet behavior concerning forced repatriation in World War II:

"Those are treaties signed by the Soviet Union Government. As Mr. Casey, the Foreign Minister of Australia, told us the other day, in World War II the Soviet Union, in an ultimatum to the commander of the German troops at Stalingrad on January 8, 1943, guaranteed to all who surrendered that, after the end of the war, they would be allowed to return to Germany, or to any country where war prisoners might desire to go. Later, in the Budapest area, a similar offer was made to German troops. And this is very interesting: a Soviet Union publication refers to these episodes as expressing the highest act of humanitarianism. And I agree with that. That, indeed, is the international practice, the international law, in relation to this subject."

Acheson's speech of October 24, 1952, was in truth the strongest possible indictment of Acheson's own government. If Acheson was right in saying that forced repatriation of North Korean and Chinese prisoners of war was wrong, improper, illegal and unnecessary, and if he proved his point, then it was certainly wrong, improper, illegal and unnecessary to repatriate by force between two and five million anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians after World War II.

INVESTIGATION NEEDED

These are the facts. Their documentation—especially the documentation of the barbarous acts committed by our own troops at Plattling, Lempten, Linz, and many other places where our MP's cracked skulls, and thousands of Soviet nationals committed suicide rather than be forced to go back to the Soviet executioners—would require a big volume; and I hope that some day this volume will be published, though it would take a grant from Dr. Hutchins' Fund for the Republic to get the job done. But the job cannot be done before a congressional inquiry a la Katyn Investigation has brought into the open a few top secret facts:

1. Who was it at Yalta who made the innocuous Stettinius overrule Grew's warnings and the established policy of the Department of State?

2. Who was the driving force among the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, responsible for the arbitrary interpretation of the Yalta agreement in favor of forced repatriation? Who had sold to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the idea that force should be used? Were members of G–2 involved?

3. Was there any secret Yalta agreement, written or oral, that stipulated the use of force?

4. What was the attitude of the Judge Advocate General of the Army whose office has repeatedly expressed the opinion during the last 40 years that forced repatriation of prisoners of war who had enlisted in the enemy's army contradicted international law? Did he ever protest against the Joint Chiefs of Staff's interpretation of the Yalta agreement? Did he ever try to cancel the instructions sent by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the European theater headquarters?

5. Why did the Army also forcibly repatriate Soviet nationals who had fought as enlisted officers and men with our own forces in Italy? (Since they were by no stretch of the imagination prisoners of war, the Yalta agreement clearly did not cover them, no matter how it was interpreted.)

6. Why is the Pentagon still maintaining the high secrecy classification of all official documents dealing with the forced repatriation of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians 10 years ago? How can such a classification be justified in view of the President's executive order according to which the only valid reason for withholding information from the press and the American people is the endangering of our national security? How could the release of the truth about forced repatriation, 10 years ago, endanger our national security?

Since only a congressional investigation will get the answers to these—and some other—questions, I suggested in early 1955 that a resolution be introduced on the floor of the House of Representatives. This was done. On February 8, 1955, House Resolution 137 was dropped into the hopper of the House by Congressman ALBERT H. BOSCH (Republican, New York). It called for the creation of a select seven-member committee to investigate the "facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances of the forced repatriation program carried out by our military and civilian authorities in Germany and other countries in the years 1945–47, under which millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians were forcibly repatriated to Soviet-controlled countries, and to fix the responsibility for such program."

The preamble of the Bosch resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas the forced repatriation to Soviet-controlled countries of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians by American military and civilian authorities in the years 1945–47 in Germany and in other countries brought death and misery to untold thousands of these anti-Communists before Soviet firing squads, on Soviet gallows, and in the Siberian slave-labor camps; and

"Whereas this forced repatriation was in violation of the rulings in implementation of the Yalta agreement on prisoners of war, made public by the Department of State on March 8, 1946; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation of prisoners of war who had enlisted in the enemy's army was in contradiction to the opinions of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, as expressed during the last 40 years; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians represents an indelible blot on the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles; and

"Whereas the forced repatriation and annihilation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians of Russian, and Ukrainian, Polish, Hungarian, Baltic, and other origin, is still poisoning our spiritual relations with the vigorously anti-Communist peoples behind the iron curtain, and is therefore impeding our foreign policy: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That * * *."

From the point of view of political ethics, the Bosch resolution is one of the most significant resolutions ever introduced in the American Congress. It is probably the first time in American history that Congress has been asked to investigate a crime of such magnitude, a crime committed by an American administration.

NO NEWS REPORT

But no American wire service carried the story. No American newspaper printed a single line about it. Were it not for a few letters to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, a few articles in Patrick F. Scanlan's Tablet, and some remarks in O'Donnell's, Pegler's and E. F. Tompkins' columns, no American would have ever seen a word in print about Congressman BOSCH's iniative.

The resolution itself was immediately sent to the House Committee on Rules (Chairman: HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat from Virginia). Some weeks after its introduction, Congressman BOSCH defended House Resolution 137 before the Committee on Rules. The Committee did not act, nor did it kill the resolution. It is still pending.

Only vigorous action of those organizations and individuals who are earnestly interested in the Bosch resolution will induce the Rules Committe to send House Resolution 137 to the floor to be debated, voted upon and adopted. And so, fully aware of an author's commitment not to plead special interests, I ask for an exceptional privilege. I ask to be allowed to address the readers of this article with a request: please, use your influence upon your Congressman to assure the success of ALBERT H. BOSCH'S House Resolution 137.

Address by Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, Before Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, Revere, Mass., November 30, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include remarks that I made at a luncheon of the members of the Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association held in Revere, Mass., on November 30, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, the position and duties of a police official and police officer are of an

importance that cannot be emphasized too strongly. The apprenticeship of a police official or member of a police force never stops. He must constantly be alert mentally and physically. For upon his shoulders rests primarily the responsibility of maintaining internal order. If it were not for our police forces, officials and patrolmen, standing as the guardians of the law, ever alert to maintain order and protect the law abiding, the small minority—the criminals and the reckless minded—would quickly turn any community into one of fear. The presence and the restraining influence of the police officer—and by "police officer" I mean officials of all ranks and the patrolmen—plays a most important part in maintaining law and order. As we view them as a whole, realizing that they, like everyone else, are human beings, we see that so few err or fail in performing their duties.

A member of a police force, I have said, is a guardian of the law. But he is more than that. He is a friend. He not only fearlessly protects the public against the criminal, never knowing when his life might be imperiled, but the real member of a police force is ever alert to help the sick, the afflicted, and the poor. And very few fail in this humane impulse and activity. We find him the friend and confidant of the youngster, of the aged, as well as the sick, the afflicted, and the poor. He is recognized by a uniform, but somehow or other we feel happier when we see him. But he is even more. In the first instance he is a judge.

I think one of the gravest responsibilities anyone can have is where he has to pass in judgment on other persons. When the average person thinks or talks of a judge, he thinks of a judge in a courtroom. But how many persons realize that a police officer patrolling his route or beat, so to speak, is, in the first instance, a judge—that the sergeant, lieutenant, captain, police chief or commissioner must constantly, in the first instance, make judgments of great import to others. And in this respect they are judges.

As an example, how many of us can remember as youngsters when we took apples from a tree in an orchard, or stole a ride on a streetcar, or did other things prohibited by law, and we were caught—and instead of bringing us into court, with the resultant court record, the police officer took us home to our parents or warned our parents from whom we received parental punishment—instead of a court record. I could give many other illustrations of where they are judges.

Your apprenticeship days never end. There is always something new to learn in law and evidence and procedure; there is always something new to learn in human nature. Yes; there is always something new to learn in the efforts and technique of the criminal to carry out his criminal intent, and something new to learn how to prevent, or detect and apprehend them.

The efforts of the criminal in his attack on society and individuals never ends. He usually operates secretly to succeed in his crime without detection and arrest and conviction. No one knows when he is going to move. The individual who stands between him and the great majority of our people who are law abiding, is the police officer and our police forces. The "cop," and this term is not used derisively, but as a complimentary characterization, where would we be without him. I believe in giving "credit where credit is due."

When a police officer or police official does anything wrong, it usually receives wide publicity. But for every one who goes wrong, there are thousands who are courageously, and in an honorable and trustworthy manner, performing their duties. As a citizen—as a lawyer of many years and an active trial lawyer before I was elected to Congress—and as a legislator—not to flatter you but to pay you a deserved compliment—it is my opinion that there is no group of public or private officials and employees who perform their duties more honorably, more courageously, or more honestly than do the members of our various police forces.

And last but not least, their love of and loyalty to country has never been questioned. I have yet to hear of any police official or police officer who is a Communist.

In closing, I extend my congratulations to Police Chief Gillis of Beverly, Mass., in his election and his induction today as president of your splendid association. Chief Gillis will give to your association an outstanding administration. I also extend to the other officers installed today my congratulations. I know, like Chief Gillis, they will perform their duties with ability and loyalty.

The Serious Situation in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the January issue of the Missouri Farmer contains an article that very dramatically emphasizes the seriousness of the situation in agriculture today.

In an attempt to get a better understanding of the farm situation, Jack Hackethorn, public relations director of the Missouri Farmers Association, sent out about 100 letters to bankers, farm leaders, and farmers asking the question:

A young man in good health has $25,000, and wants to start farming. In view of present conditions and realizing this young man wants to make money next year, what type of farming would you advise?

The article summarizes the 70 replies received. It is significant to note that the bankers almost unanimously advised the young man not to enter farming, if he expected to make any money on the investment. It is even more significant because of the failure of most people to understand how much of an investment is required to get a start in farming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO MAKE MONEY—HOW WOULD YOU INVEST THIS IN FARMING TODAY?

A stunned agriculture faces the year 1956. Almost every commodity can trace its beginning back to the soil, and yet the national economy continues in its refusal to face up to the importance of equitable treatment for those who tend and till the land. While take-home pay for others has enjoyed unprecedented new heights, farm income has experienced a 25-percent slump in the past 4 years. Sharp adjustments are being made in rural communities. But at every turn farmers bump up against climbing costs and lower returns. And while a flurry of solutions have been offered to atone for this strangling squeeze now confronting agriculture, it becomes evident that those in the country are rapidly losing patience with the political bickering which so continually keeps the issue in the spotlight. Many are now voicing the opinion that the variety of long-range proposals do not strike at the root of the problem, and that at best seem only half-hearted attempts to promote economic betterment.

Recently more than 100 active farmers and leaders were asked, "In view of present conditions, how would you advise a young man who wants to start farming and has $25,000 to invest?" Their answers told of the underlying concern which they feel for their business—but then, let the farmers themselves tell the story.

"The best I can figure this out," replies W. R. Kendrick, of Albany, "he had better get a job for a year or so and leave his money in the bank. The price of livestock would not be too dangerous but the machinery needed would cost so much. I think he would lose part of his investment and all of his labor."

"If the young man is going to start farming in spite of the present price squeeze, his best bet would be grade A dairy, but," reminds Whitney Rockenbach, of Cuba, "he must like cows and be willing to work with them constantly. Start with good cows and fairly new, used machinery."

"I only know one kind of farming and that is grain, pasture, and livestock," answered Jim Briscoe, Tipton. "A farmer cannot possibly make money farming under 75 percent of a fair price next year unless he has abnormally high yields of everything. I've been in it since 1932 and never seen that kind of a season yet. If people in business and those with salaries don't believe this let them take 25 percent off their sales or salaries. Then they can really get the feel of 75 percent of a fair price."

"In my opinion, cattle feeding is the only thing you could make money on the first year," says Robert Taylor, of Elsberry, "so I would invest the $25,000 in cattle and feed. Machinery is so high that by the time you pay for it and put in a grain crop, you couldn't expect to make much money. Farming is a gamble."

"Believe dairy farming may have the best long time outlook, as well as a very good chance to make some money next year, but the high cost of farm equipment makes this a tough time to start farming," states R. E. Hoffman, of near Novingear. "Belonging to a balanced farming ring will help. Seems to me the most successful farmers now are those who specialize in one or two lines of livestock.

"I don't see much future for a young man starting out with $12 hogs and cattle at present prices with an outlook of worse to come." cautions Frank Boatright, of Shackleford. "To a young man with $25,000, I wouldn't advise any kind of farming if he wants to make money under the present conditions. Wages from a job and interest from the money will make him more than farming now. He would have a lot more in the end."

Bill Sherman, of Foley, wrote, "I'd recommend grain-crop farming on a renter basis. Perhaps some hogs this fall if the market seems stronger. But $25,000 isn't much to begin farming with today, and I doubt if very many young farmers want to go in deeper than this or can afford to with the 'not so bright' outlook. Renting is a slower way to get into the business but there's less risk involved."

Dean Smith of Pollock was more optimistic than many as he replied, "Would advise livestock farming in general. Sheep are among the top money makers year after year. The lamb and wool crop will almost pay for the breeding flock. I think that in the next few years cattle will take an upward trend—now is time to get in."

But a Henry County banker had this to say. "I have been an active farmer most of my life though am now in banking. If I were young and had $25,000, I wouldn't be interested in any kind of farming opera-

tion under present conditions. The income derived from farming is far too low for the amount of money required to own and operate a farm. It is necessary for most of our farmer customers to have outside incomes in order to meet their obligations."

Plan around high cost farm machinery and specialize, Adolph Berendzen of Eugene recommends. "Buy an average 160 acres and build facilities to handle 4,000 or more laying hens. Also plan for a dairy herd, or feed steers. With the high cost of farm machinery I would work out a system to farm with a minimum of equipment."

From Pattonsburg, Glenn Maize had a short answer, "If he wants to keep his money together, he'd better stay out of farming—best bet would be wheat raising or sheep."

There is still some measure of stability in grain farming, reminds Frank Kolks of Glasgow, as he advises, "With grain production, he will have some idea of what he will receive for his product for there are support prices on grains, but none on livestock. At present prices there is no profit in livestock."

Dairy farming, is the suggestion of Chester Haak, of Moberly, if the young man is willing to work. "However, I can't see any bright spots in the farming picture at the present time—I cannot see why the farmer is not entitled to 100 percent of parity."

Another vote for dairying with stress on grade A came from C. E. Letsinger, of Mansfield. "While $25,000 wouldn't set a man up in a big way, it would give him a start. I am convinced that this enterprise will provide a moderate living and retire the investment in southwest Missouri quicker than any other type farm operation. Of course I am assuming the man is willing to work."

"I honestly believe that if I were a young man with this money to invest I would never jump into any type of farming at the present time," begins Harvey Young, Jr., a Kirksville banker. "I make this statement with the idea that very little money has been made in our area this year on the farm."

From up near the Northwest corner of the State, Orlen Kelley, Nodaway Countian writes, "Under present conditions any young man with $25,000 would be foolish to invest in any type farming unless we get a farm program through the Government which includes production controls, or subsidies, or something that will help agriculture attain a fair share of the national income—otherwise he'd just as well take his chances in a crap game."

Grayson McCrea, Maysville said, "Today hogs went to the lowest level in 14 years. My 35 head of cattle in dry lot will have to weigh twice to bring their dollars back. The average farm investment in the United States, according to USDA, is $35,000. Those with this investment make up 13 percent of the population, but are receiving only about 7 percent of the income. Your man has $25,000. That is a lot of money. Could be that he should be counseled to find industrial work. Invest nothing but his time, sit on the $25,000 and save himself a lot of worry."

Going into an even more detailed answer, J. W. Waitman, of Tina, had this to say: "In view of present conditions my advice is to invest his money in E bonds, postal savings, or other place where his capital will be safe and readily available. Then if he must farm, obtain a job as a hand. Some other line of work would most certainly give greater income," this writer states. "I give these reasons against an investment in farming at this time. Land values don't reflect the drop in net farm income. Prices on machinery and supplies are out of line. Farmers have the ability to, and probably will, overproduce every important commodity. Supports will be 7½ percent lower for 1956." Waitman then cautioned, "We are probably nearing the end of a period of boom during which credit sales have risen to fantastic heights. When this end is reached, look out." Among other comments, this Carroll Countian asked, "Will farmers be forced through their own organizations to set up agencies at primary markets to buy up and destroy all commodities failing to move at predetermined prices?"

A banker effectively explained that there are factors which greatly limit a farmer's choice of enterprise and that once set up for one commodity's production it is not easy to switch to another. "* * * farming is a slow turnover and long-time proposition and the individual cannot advantageously jump from one type of enterprise to another. So our choice for a particular individual is limited at the start," remarked Henry Hamilton, Marshall.

This is a $64 question, remarked Howard Shirkey, Ray County farmer. "If the young man can't be talked out of the idea of going into farming, my observation would be as follows: Rent a general-purpose farm for a few years, if possible, while he acquires essential farm machinery and foundation livestock within the limits of his capital. This will give him time to get necessary experience in price and production problems which are so closely related to farm income at this time."

"Your question is a rather big order," wrote Bryan Hoermann, Greencastle. "I doubt that he could expect to make money for the coming year, but if he would put next year against at least 5 coming years he might expect to do all right with a diversified program. Beef cows are now selling way below what they are really worth. Hogs and sheep are all low. Something is going to change or land is going to go down."

GO EASY

Hope of improvement was suggested by Richard Morris, of Gilman City, as he advised, "Take it easy, invest only a small part of his capital. Rent a farm, use a minimum of used machinery. Specialize in sheep and dairy cows. The farming situation should improve in 2 or 3 years."

A farmer and State senator, W. M. Quinn, of Maywood, gave his reply in this way. "My advice is that he keep his $25,000 in cash in some good bank until the farm economy improves to the point where he could expect a fair return on his labor and investment; he cannot expect it under present prices and conditions. Having been actively engaged in farming for the past 40 to 45 years, I am convinced the national economy will in a few years reach somewhere near the level of those engaged in farming, or vice versa."

Robert Hill of Columbia, farmer and executive manager of the Missouri Bankers Association, stated bluntly, "I would urge him not to start farming. He cannot make a fair return on his investment."

Another warning came from J. E. Finlay, Sturgeon. "I wouldn't advise investing $25,000 in the farming game under present conditions. It looks dangerous to me. If the boy has to farm and has to make money in 1956, I'd say grow only crops with a Government guaranty and take the loan."

DOES HE ACCEPT RISK?

George Young, Howard County farmer and member of the Missouri House of Representatives was critical of Government farm policy. "If he wants to make money next year, I don't think he wants to try farming. Until we get a Department of Agriculture friendly to farmers—one which is willing to do something about the present farm decline—I don't think we can expect much. I would advise him to consider a long time before acting. But, if he's vitally interested, and accepts the risk, I recommend he go into some specialized field—perhaps poultry or hog feeding where he'll not have to get too much money tied up in land or machinery."

"As long as CCC buys it at present price, grain farming would be the safest bet now," John Schanzmeyer of Freeberg, wrote. "In the long run though, get all kinds of stock—especially sheep and good wool goats if there is a lot of brush land on the farm. That's what we're doing and making a little even on hogs!"

Replying from deep in the bootheel, J. S. Wallace, who is chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the Missouri General Assembly, had this to volunteer. "I have a farm of 320 acres. I am farming in cotton, corn, wheat, and hay. I also have some cattle and hogs. But cotton is the only crop we can make any money on—and Mr. Benson has cut our acres down so low we can't pay taxes. I would advise this young man to go in some other business."

Odie Riley, of Boone County, is another farmer who cautions, "I would hesitate very much to advise a young man to start farming at this time. If he is determined to stick to it for "better or worse," I'd suggest diversified farming. He would have to be a lover of the soil and livestock. Present conditions are far out of balance for the farmer. There is a large surplus and I see no end in sight. When things we produce get cheaper, we have to sell more to get a certain amount of money. Now we are selling below cost of production. How long this will last we can't tell. That golden promise of 100 percent in the market place has turned green. We just can't find that market place."

If a man is to start farming now he needs good land, good buildings, and should raise small grain, corn, hogs, and cattle, thinks J. A. Duffin, of Vienna. "However," he adds, "I do not believe he would make money next year, as prices are too low to offer a chance of a profit. If he were able to stay in the business, prices might increase in a few years as we might get the 90 percent or 100 percent parity which the farmer deserves. We would have to curtail production to get full parity, but that is what we need. Because the farm population is decreasing, we are going to have to have better farm organization to get fair prices. We need a workable union for farmers such as there now is for labor. The present program of flexible supports won't work."

FARMING IS WORK

"Here is my answer to your $64 question," L. H. Kullman, of Warrensburg, replied. "I never did believe in putting all eggs in one basket. So I'd advise a general, diversified type of farming. I fully realize that this type of farming will tie a person down much more than strictly grain farming. But if a farmer thinks he is going to get by on an 8-hour day and 5-day week he'd better not try farming in the first place."

Farmers aren't sharing in the bounding prosperity that has touched other elements of our economy, states Andrew Diercks of Jefferson City. "If this man wants to make money next year, he'd better keep his $25,000 and seek a job in the city * * * no matter what type of farming he goes into, the squeeze is on."

A bank farming representative suggests a plan for large volume and high efficiency as a possibility. Marion Murray of Chillicothe explains, "Keep the entire amount for use as operating capital and rent the most productive farm available in a fertile area that can be handled with four-row equipment. Get set for high hog volume by spring of 1957 when prices should be better. In the meantime it may be better to seal corn. Plan with landowner to build a large, self-feeding trench silo. Consider picking corn early at 30 percent moisture and use forced air drying. Put stalks and leaves in the trench. Sow small grain on corn stubble for fall pasture. Depending on the amount of pasture, use common 600-pound cattle or young wet cows to consume the large volume of roughage on a quick turnover basis. Work

in 500 to 1,000 head of July feeder lambs and finish on small grain pasture."

WATCH DEBT

"Don't plunge too heavy," says Jerry Main who is just getting started himself on a farm near Bucklin. "Diversify, but practice intensive, not extensive operations. As a long-range investment buy young beef cows. Spend a minimum for machinery. Get into hogs, chickens and a few milk cows for quickest returns. Keep as near out of debt as possible."

From Gallatin, E. R. Vyrostek's reply reflects the toil and tears which for many years have characterized the farmer's position in our economy. "During the time I was 30 to 40 years old I farmed 320 acres, hired no help but at harvest time. I have gone broke three times, flat, worked as a farm hand for a coupla' years, jumped in debt up to my ears, and here I am at 75 years young owning 126 acres—except for $900 debt. The wife and I raised five boys and one girl." What does Vyrostek think of the future for farmers? "Even in the face of coming events, it is my honest belief that a young couple with a real like for farming can make a go of it, make money, and enjoy life."

Adequate Ground Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following timely editorial from the Boston Daily Globe, December 12, 1955:

ARMS WITHOUT THE MEN

Have nuclear weapons lessened the need for a large standing army? Many would have answered this affirmatively back in the days when the United States possessed a monopoly over them.

But that monopoly long since has vanished. And whether or not the use of such weapons can be avoided in case of war, it is clear that an adequate ground army is more vital than ever before to our defense. To this, the failure of the Geneva Conference has added emphasis.

Yet it also is clear that the United States cannot afford a peacetime standing Army, say, of 3 million. The answer seems to lie, then, in the Reserve components.

To strengthen them, Congress passed the watered-down Reserve Forces Act of 1955. It was enacted last August, when the bloom was still on the ethereal spirit of Geneva. Its purpose was to increase, eventually, the size of the Ready Reserve from 1,500,000 to 2,900,000.

As part of this strengthening, the Army had hoped to get 100,000 predraft-age youths into active training in the first year. Instead, there comes now a report from the Army that only 1,224 youths have started training in the first 3 months of the new program.

This is hardly a good showing. The evidence seems clear, moreover, that the Army, which is doing its best to make the program work, cannot be blamed.

The responsibility may rest, rather, with Congress or the public. Congress refused to pass Universal Military Training; perhaps this represented the popular will. But it also refused to allow a compulsion clause, which woul penalize refusal to fulfill Reserve duties, to take effect until 1957.

After 2 years' service, the draftee has faced 6 years in Reserve—on paper. But this Reserve is a paper army. Less than 1 percent have joined a unit. No law said they had to. Congress has created a dangerous period of hiatus for 2 more years. It had been hoped that predraftage youths could help take up the slack.

The only alternative to compulsion, and a better one in an informed, free society, is voluntary popular support. Will this be forthcoming?

Chief selling-point of the new teenage program has been that youths from 17 to 18½ years old could avoid a 2-year draft by volunteering for 6 months' active duty, and then serving 7½ years in the active Reserve with 48 drill nights and 17 days of summer training a year.

But a recent cartoon in the Army Times pointed up the fact that of the 100,000 youngsters becoming eligible for the draft each month, only 10,000 are drafted. In February, only 6,000 will be called.

With such 10-to-1 odds, the cartoon showed youths rushing into a "Beat the Draft Gambling Joint" while a recruiting sergeant told Congress outside that it ought to be shut down.

There never were odds, however, that could not be changed by later events. Youths and their parents, moreover, should weigh the new program's advantages. Active duty can be finished after 6 months, before starting college, and employers are assured that one's active military obligation has been satisfied.

Here in Massachusetts, the program should deservedly benefit the State's famed 94th Reserve Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Ralph A. Palladino, and one of 10 divisions selected to grow to full strength of 14,700 by 1960. The Bay State, too, can take some pride in being second only to New York in recruiting for the program.

But more must be done. The Nation's security is everyone's business, and now depends to a great extent on the program's success. If that is to be achieved, public understanding and cooperation are necessary.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, many deserving and glowing tributes have been paid to our late colleague, VERA BUCHANAN, by Members of Congress. They clearly show the place that she has held in our hearts.

I also want to pay my humble homage to the memory of this remarkable lady who has been called to the far beyond so early in life. Her warm, friendly spirit, and her strong courage will be missed by all of her colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BUCHANAN'S unselfish and devoted service to her constituents will be greatly missed by the people of her district in Pennsylvania. Her devotion to her husband when he was a Congressman, and the manner in which she carried on after him, have been an inspiriation to many of us. She made significant contributions to constructive legislation, and her humanitarian principles were constantly in evidence in her actions and speeches on this floor.

I wish to extend my sincerest sympathy to Mrs. BUCHANAN'S family upon their tremendous loss. May they draw some consolation from the knowledge of the fact that we share their sorrow, and from the hope that the Almighty has called her to be among His very own.

Dixon-Yates and the Power Outlook

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I am glad to insert in the RECORD with a few remarks of my own a copy of an article appearing in the September 1955 issue of the Guaranty Survey, published monthly by the Guaranty Trust Company of New York, entitled "Dixon-Yates and the Power Outlook." This is a factual statement, approached from a strictly business point of view, and I believe Members of Congress will be interested to read it.

I can fully understand the political overtones involved in this controversy, and I would be the last to condone any rascality which might be connected with this or any other Government project, but it is evident that confusion has arisen in the minds of many concerning the fundamental business principles inherent in this transaction. I think the Guaranty Trust Co. has done a public service in publishing this article, and I submit it to my colleagues for their consideration:

DIXON-YATES AND THE POWER OUTLOOK

One of the evils that arise from too much Government in business is the tendency for a clear-cut economic question to become shrouded in a fog of political irrelevancies. Partisan maneuvering, sectional jealosies, and sheer obstinacy can distort a simple issue almost beyond recognition. The result is likely to be either no solution at all or a makeshift and belated settlement that satisfies no one.

THE SMEAR CAMPAIGN

This is the fate that seems to have befallen the much-debated Dixon-Yates contract. A straightforward, businesslike, orthodox agreement to meet the growing need for electric power in a limited area has been caught up by the political winds, inflated into a symbol for the whole issue of private versus public power, and converted into ammunition for the 1956 presidential and congressional campaigns. Although the President has ordered that the contract be canceled the assault against it rages on, giving evidence, if more were needed, that the real purpose of the attack was not to prevent the execution of the agreement but to serve the ends of practical politics. In the course of the controversy, regional antagonisms have been created which may persist for years, and the area facing a shortage of power has been left with very uncertain prospects of meeting its problem in time.

Now that the contract is in process of being canceled and is presumably dead, its merit or lack of merit as a fair business

proposition is no longer important in itself. What is important at present is the continuing effort to use it as a means of discrediting the whole principle of power development by private enterprise.

The attack on Dixon-Yates has borne all the earmarks of a "smear" campaign. Charges of numerous kinds have been hurled against it and the persons connected with it, in disregard of essential underlying facts and, in some instances, even of the terms of the contract itself. Free use has been made of such familiar political mudballs as "plot," "deal," "windfall," and "give-away."

It has been charged, for example, that the whole transaction was a plot to scuttle the Tennessee Valley Authority. Actually, there was nothing in the contract to injure TVA or curtail its activities. It was TVA itself that informed Congress in 1953 of an impending power shortage in the area it served, and it was Congress that refused to authorize TVA to spend $100 million for a new steam generating plant. This refusal was not surprising in view of the fact that in 1950 TVA (which had started as a river-improvement agency combining flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric development) had set up an expansion program scheduled to alter its generating capacity from 85 percent hydroelectric and 15 percent steam in 1950 to 37 percent hydroelectric and 63 percent steam by 1957.

The administration's attitude toward TVA was clear. In June 1953, the President expressly disclaimed any intention of destroying TVA but referred with disapproval to the practice of taxing the whole country to provide cheap power for one region, enabling that region to take industry away from other sections. Later he elaborated this view, in part as follows: "If the Federal Government assumes responsibility in perpetuity for providing the TVA area with all the power it can accept, generated by any means whatsoever, it has a similar responsibility with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States. * * * No one in this administration has any intention of destroying or damaging TVA or of diminishing its effectiveness in any way. But this is not the same thing as fastening on the Federal Government a continuing and never-ending responsibility which I frankly do not believe is logical nor, in the long run, in the best interests of the country."

HOW THE PLAN DEVELOPED

The action of Congress in refusing TVA's request for additional funds left the question of new generating capacity still open. In his budget message of January 1954, the President stated that arrangements are being made to reduce, by the fall of 1957, existing commitments of the Tennessee Valley Authority to the Atomic Energy Commission. * * * This would release the equivalent amount of Tennessee Valley Authority generating capacity to meet increased load requirements of other consumers in the power system and at the same time eliminate the need for appropriating funds from the Treasury to finance additional generating units.

The arrangements referred to by the President consisted of discussions between the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission on the question of negotiating with private companies for additional power at Paducah, Ky., to satisfy the increasing demands of the AEC installation there. The negotiations ended with the signing of the so-called Dixon-Yates contract between AEC and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., formed jointly by Middle South Utilities, Inc., of which Mr. Dixon is president, and the Southern Co., of which Mr. Yates is board chairman. The subsidiaries of the two parent companies are the major suppliers of power in the regions adjoining the TVA area on the west and south, respectively.

So the alleged plot to scuttle TVA boils down to the fact that Congress refused to appropriate funds for TVA's program to expand its steam generating capacity, and the administration, in line with its clearly stated policy, proceeded to arrange for AEC's additional power requirements. If the contract had been carried out, TVA would have received power from the Dixon-Yates company at Memphis and delivered a like amount to AEC at Paducah. It would have been relieved of future additional obligations to AEC and thus would have been in a position to meet the growing demands elsewhere.

COMPETITIVE BIDDING

It has also been complained that no competitive bids were sought and that one unsolicited bid was summarily refused. The fact is that competitive bidding is usually not practicable in connection with contracts of this type and hence that established precedent is on the side of negotiated agreements. AEC had negotiated contracts with two private companies during the previous administration without competitive bidding, and these contracts had gone into effect without arousing criticism.

Organized companies with the proven competence and the financial backing to execute a large power contract are few. In this case, the Dixon company and the Yates company might conceivably have been invited to bid against each other. There was, however, good reason to believe that a joint contract would yield the Government better terms than an agreement with either company acting alone. Not only were the two parent companies enabled to share the risks involved, but one major risk—that of being caught with large excess capacity in the event of cancellation of the contract—was actually reduced.

A power company selling electricity under contract to a single buyer with the right of cancellation must have (1) a strong prospect of finding an alternative market for the power within a reasonable period and (2) the financial resources to bear the cost of excess capacity until such a market is found. The Dixon-Yates group appeared to be the only one that met these requirements.

As for the rejected competitive bid, the Bureau of the Budget explained that it was refused because of its uncertainty and indefiniteness, because there was no established organization to do the job, because the entire financial risk would have fallen on the Government with no real ceiling on the Government's liability, and because the proposal would have provided no clear savings to the Government as compared with the Dixon-Yates proposal.

TERMS OF THE CONTRACT

The terms of the Dixon-Yates contract also have been criticized. It has been charged, for example, that the rates the Government agreed to pay were extortionate. Actually, the cost to the Government, based on estimated costs of construction and operation, exclusive of all taxes, was figured by AEC at 3.55 mills per kilowatt-hour. This compared with net costs of 3.79 and 3.86 mills then being paid by AEC to two private companies and with costs of 3.78 and 3.83 mills being paid to two TVA plants. The annual rate of return on the power company's equity investment, also based on estimated costs, would have been 9 percent, as compared with a reported average of 10.5 for all electric companies in 1954.

It is essential to bear in mind that this estimated 9 percent return was not to apply to the entire capital investment of more than $100 million, but only to the company's proprietary interest of $5½ million. The remainder of the investment was to be in the form of loans and securities at an estimated annual interest cost of 3.6 percent. This would have brought the overall return on invested capital to about 3.85 percent a year.

The cost estimates on which the foregoing figures are based were agreed upon by teams of experts representing the Government and the company as being the most reasonable that could be arrived at in advance. Like most long-term power contracts, including TVA contracts, the agreement provided for rate adjustments in the event that actual costs proved to be higher or lower than estimated costs. Possible benefits from lower costs and possible losses due to higher costs were to be shared. There was a limit, however, on the company's benefit, in the form of an absolute ceiling of 10.9 percent on the annual rate of earnings on the equity investment. Up to this limit, the Government was to receive 50 percent of the benefit through lower rates for power. At present tax rates, the Government would also receive 52 percent of the remainder in additional tax revenue. Beyond the profit ceiling, all benefits from reduced costs were to go to the Government.

If construction costs exceeded the estimate by 12½ percent or less, the loss was to be shared equally. Above that limit, the company was to bear the entire burden. Excess operating and maintenance costs due entirely to increases in prevailing fuel prices and general wage rates were to be borne by the Government, subject to the stipulation that AEC could supply fuel if it found that it could do so more cheaply than the company. If operating and maintenance costs rose because the company paid more than the prevailing wage or because it used more labor and materials than estimated, the excess cost was to be borne by the company.

These carefully drawn provisions for the sharing of risks stand out sharply in reply to the loose allegations that the contract "guaranteed" the company's profit. Actually, it did nothing of the kind. Unexpectedly high costs could have eliminated the estimated 9 percent return on equity altogether. The only risk that the company was not required to bear, in whole or in part, was the risk of higher operating and maintenance costs due entirely to general price and wage increases—which, obviously, were completely beyond the company's control.

THE REAL ISSUE

Space limitations prevent detailed consideration of other charges—such as, for example, the statement that the contract would have obligated the Government to pay large sums for power not used, and that it would have allowed the company to obtain the plant at the Government's expense. Examination shows that these complaints are as weakly supported as those discussed above.

It is impossible to escape the concluison that the assault on Dioxn-Yates had little to do with the terms and conditions of the contract. These merely formed a flimsy pretext for an attack whose real purpose was to provide an issue for the 1956 political campaign and to throw discredit on private power in general with a view to influencing the future course of power development.

There is no doubt that the United States faces a period of rapid expansion in electric power. Some expert estimates place the increase in demand from 1950 to 1960 as high as 100 percent. What form is future expansion to take? Is it to be shaped by the careful balancing of costs against benefits that is inherent in unsubsidized private business enterprise? Or is it to be determined by governmental authority, whereby the State's-power of compulsion is invoked to force the taxpayers to underwrite and support projects which may be dictated by civic pride or political favoritism rather than real economic justification?

A tangible example of this question is now pending in Hell's Canyon on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon. Advocates of

public power favor the construction of a great Federal dam at an estimated cost of nearly $400 million. A private company proposes to build three small dams, producing almost as much power at less than half the cost. The Federal Power Commission, for obvious reasons, has approved the private project. Yet the plan has been assailed as a giveaway, a betrayal, and a piecemeal development of the river. It is difficult to see what is being given away except the ability of one section to obtain a Federal subsidy at the expense of others.

THE LURE OF "PUBLIC POWER"

The phrase public power has a strange lure for many minds. It suggests a project owned by all the people and operated for their common benefit. Private power, on the other hand, seems to connote an enterprise which, being operated for private profit, must therefore deprive the people of part of the benefit that should rightfully accrue to them. The attraction of public power is especially strong in connection with the development of a conspicuous natural resource such as a waterfall or a steeply dropping river.

Neither of the phrases actually means what the words are often taken to imply. In reality, public power means an industrial project owned by a governmental body, constructed by compulsive authority, paid for by the taxpayers, and often operated for the benefit of a favored group. Whether public or private, the power must be paid for, and the payment must cover essentially the same costs—interest on the invested funds and the purchase of labor and materials. The essential question is, under which type of organization is the power likely to be produced most economically and paid for by those who benefit from it?

As for the natural resource aspect of the question, this too is misleading. True, falling water is a gift of nature, but so are coal, oil, gas, metals and minerals, and the productive powers of the soil. All industries and trades use natural resources, directly or indirectly. Does this mean that all industry, commerce and agriculture should be public rather than private? The natural resources, including the falling water, have relatively little value until extracted, cultivated, or otherwise made useful by human effort. The effort, which is privately exerted by individual men and women, is the real cost of the final product and accounts for by far the greater part of its price.

COMMON FALLACIES

In the current controversy over further power development on the Niagara River, the advocates of public power apparently assume that, because the water is a natural gift, the power to be generated from it would also be a natural gift and should not be allowed to fall into private hands. This is a fallacy. The power would be the result of a heavy expenditure of labor and capital, which would have to be paid for whether the power were produced by a public or a private agency.

There is another alleged advantage of public power which proves upon examination to be purely fictitious. This is the supposed saving due to the fact that public power agencies are exempt from taxation. Surely nothing could be more obvious than that taxes saved by a power agency are lost to the public treasury and must be recovered from some other source, so that what the people appear to save as consumers of power they must give back as taxpayers. There is no saving to the people as a whole. There may be—indeed there is very likely to be—a saving to some at the expense of others; in that case the tax exemption operates as a hidden and therefore particularly vicious form of subsidy. In any case, the real cost of power to the people as a whole is the cost of actually producing it, and taxes do not enter into the calculation.

In the final analysis, the question of public versus private power is simply a question of industrial organization. After centuries of unhappy experience with public control of economic activity, the peoples of the western world decided to try the private form. The payoff has been rich in terms of efficiency, equity and freedom, and the principles that have made it so apply to productive effort in general. Why should the generation of power be a unique exception?

Water, the Root of the Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following truthful editorial from the Machinist, the official weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, which appeared in the October 27, 1955, edition:

HAD ENOUGH?

Two of the most prized possessions of New England working people have been washed away in recent years—their homes and their jobs.

In both cases, water is at the root of the problem. The two floods within a month in New England washed away hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of homes. The erosion of jobs has been slower, but it is just as much connected with the water problem as the floods.

New England is crisscrossed with fast-moving streams. The Nation's first small industries were located on them. They utilized the rushing water to turn the mill wheels.

Later as the region became highly industrialized, the factories outgrew their water wheels. The private electric companies came with power from steam. But they clung to obsolete equipment and paid tribute to a pyramid of parent corporations. It was—still is—a high-priced operation.

Then came the hydroelectric developments in other areas. The Tennessee Valley Authority harnessed the rampaging Tennessee River to control floods, improve navigation, conserve the land, and generate low-cost power. Huge public power projects were opened in the West.

Many New England companies either moved to the hydroelectric regions where power cost is low or transferred expansion planned for New England to those other areas. The result was the loss of thousands of jobs in New England. The loss has been frequently blamed on the high cost of labor. Actually, New England is the second lowest wage area in the country. The facts show industry migrated largely because of high-cost power.

Now in the past month unharnessed New England water has killed scores of people, destroyed thousands of homes and washed out factories. Possibly the best flood-control system could not have prevented all the damage. However, we have seen that, while other areas are being inundated, the TVA region in equally heavy periods of rainfall opens and closes its network of dams to produce an orderly runoff without floods. The impounded water produces low-cost power.

It seems to us that now is the time for our Governors, Congressmen, and Senators to extend to the Northeast the one method of flood prevention which can pay in part for itself, for full scale flood prevention is a costly matter.

That method is an area-wide system of multiple-purpose dams and reservoirs which can use the flood water impounded in preventing floods to generate power to help pay the cost. Only that cute phrase "creeping socialism" invented by the private power companies stands in the way.

No one spoke of "creeping socialism" when Gov. Allan Shivers of Texas called for Federal relief during the drought in Texas in 1953. No one speaks of "creeping socialism" when the governors of half a dozen Northeastern States properly ask for Federal flood-relief money this year.

Yet the private power companies inspire the cry of "socialism" when it's suggested that Federal money be used to do the flood-prevention job the thorough, sensible way. That way is through multiple purpose, power-producing dams and reservoirs. Lives could be saved, homes and plants could be better protected, and jobs could be created. Isn't it time for a little "creeping progress" in New England?

Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time when widespread juvenile delinquency is of so great concern to the country, the following report by the United Veterans' Organization of Essex County To Fight Juvenile Delinquency will be of interest to the Congress.

Eight public meetings were held in Essex County, N. J., at which the following authorities on the subject testified: Dr. Herscel Libby, Dr. Hirsch L. Silverman, Dr. Raphael Russomanno, Lt. Col. Paul H. Goodwin, Lt. Larry H. Jackson, Sgt. Barda Sizemore, Peter Fujarczyk, Sheriff Neil G. Duffy, Lt. Dominic Spina, Edward C. Krah, William A. O'Toole, Philip E. Gordon, and Joseph A. Liddy.

The following high-school students also appeared under the chaperonage of Louis Bernheim: Joan Rose, Joan Meyers, Arthur Lloyed, Michael Freedman.

The delegates who appeared at the meetings and who helped to draft the report are:

American Legion: John Monaco, Richard Schuler, William Lyons.

VFW: Edward Simandl, Roy C. Walker, William Butler, Dominic Spina, Henry Mehrtens, Robert D. Trott.

Civic group: Samuel Stewart, Herbert Weiner, Columbus Johnson.

AMVETS: John Orlando.

Spanish American Veterans: George W. Milligan, Newton Smith.

Civic Veterans League: Samuel Sachs.

Catholic War Veterans: William Howe, Eugene Walsh.

City and State employees: Jack Forbes Smith, Alfred R. Gail, David Lawrie.

County employees: James W. McGrady.

DAV: Joseph Tenner, James McDermott, Louis Norulak.

Cooties: Edward Barry, Robert Gaswind, Angus McNaught, Louis Bernheim.

JWV: George Geller, Irving Feldman, Harold Turner.

Ukranian American Veterans: Peter Grentus.

Lithuanian American Veterans: Michael F. Kidzuz, Peter G. Guoba.

Sports: Vinnie Carlessimo.

Music: John Brown, Jerry Grant.

Prisoners of War Chapter: William Barnes, Joseph Pallito.

Labor: Martin Block.

The report follows:

HOME

Where a child is reared with a sense of filial respect and regard as a cardinal virtue; where a child from earliest years has come to know and realize from within that he cannot shame his parents, and stops to think before he even attempts to plan a crime what the reaction of his parents will be; where a child truly respects parents themselves worthy of respect because of their personal honesty and characterful living; where in the child's democratic, yet strict home life he has come to know his responsibilities, and has learned basic rules and even regulations of daily living; where in family-unit living young children have come to know values of education and schooling, plus the true reverance of religion that is practiced in day to day activity, and decorum personally coupled with regard for the elders in the household and in the family—there will we find no delinquency. For it is most often in the home that the cure for delinquency will be ultimately found.

Some parents, in trying to give their child care and independence, get themselves so involved, and in many ways go to far, and by so doing deprive the child of needed family security and guidance. Unknowingly the parents are forcing their child to stand on legs to weak to hold them. Some parents dare not direct their child after he reaches 16 years of age. Parents should grow up with the child but it is certainly wise to remain more mature than the child.

We believe that the primary elements of sex education should be the responsibility of the parents much more so than a school course. The family relationship is between parents and in feeling tones with the child. We believe the parents should take their children to Church and Sunday school regularly and set a good example for the children. Do not do things you would object to your child doing. Accept a more personal responsibility for building your child's character and do not depend upon schools and other agencies to do the job for them.

Many parents put their own social life above the life with their children. Family gatherings should be held more often; the problems of the children should be discussed with them. Parents should make it a point to be at home certain nights and make the family a better unit. Mothers and fathers should have a regular bed check on the child. When children go out the parents should know where they have gone, what time they return home and, most important, whom they are with and what they plan to do.

Parents should not give children spending money unless they earn it. Give them chores to do about the house.

Children should be encouraged to join organizations such as the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4–H Clubs, Police Athletic Leagues, Drum Corps, and to attend well supervised city playgrounds. Parents should join with their children in these activities. Do more things with your child than for them. This is sure to work.

The family car is a problem. Exercise greater judgment before you allow your child to use it.

Make a periodic room check. Turn everything over to find out if there is something the child is hiding that he should not have about his person. If the child is spending too much money—where is it coming from? Exercise control of movies and television the child sees, watch the reading matter. An old time woodshed spanking is not wrong as punishment.

We believe parents should discuss wearing apparel with the child. See that the child is neatly dressed and he will have pride in his appearance.

POLICE

We must establish a Commission to study delinquency in all its forms, to make recommendations and to seek legislation and be given governmental support to implement its suggestions practically and functionally.

Mobilize all resources of the State, including private organizations, State and local agencies, and individual citizens, to formulate a joint attack on this disturbing problem, and utilize to the full all needed educational, scientific, social welfare, and religious groups.

The State must be encouraged and induced to assist in the development and improvement of local probation services and in the recruitment and training of probation officers, properly trained and with insight into the problems of the adolescent in our present-day world.

Special custodial schools should be established where the worst offenders can be sent for 24-hour-a-day care and psychological help and thus be removed from poor home environment.

Enactment of legislation to hold parents and guardians of the children personally responsible for whatever damage—property, personal, civic—caused by the children due to negligence and disinterest on the part of such adults.

Identification cards issued by the school system for all boys and girls at the age of 16, including photographs, to be retained until the 18th birthday. This will afford positive identification to police and business houses.

Adopt a positive policy in the supervision of public places that might influence the youth, such as poolrooms, social clubs, confectionery stores with jukeboxes and bagatelle machines, demand the loitering in front of taverns be stopped. Irrespective of special duties, all policemen should be instructed to take an interest in any and all violations that they might see from the juvenile level as well as from the adult violation.

All teen-age clubs should be registered along with a listing of all members. A strict curfew should be enacted at 11 p. m. to see that all teen-agers are off the streets unless accompanied by a parent or someone of responsibility. The police should be empowered to enforce this to a "t."

More police officers should be placed on a walking beat during the hours children are out of school to give better supervision to local neighborhoods.

Where it is found that the parents are to blame, due to neglect, a program should be put into effect to show the delinquent parent just what damage these juvenile delinquents can do.

The police department should be allowed to enlarge its PAL program. Officers should be assigned to this duty and should be supervised by well-trained instructors who qualify for a teen-age program.

Penalties for repeated juvenile offences should be increased. Offenders who repeat often should be considered first as criminals and second as juveniles. In such cases newspaper publicity should be allowed to use names to serve as a deterrent to parents who do not heed the early signs of delinquency in their child.

JUDICIAL AND LEGISLATIVE

Legally, "delinquency" has been the label attributed to acts of depravation, narcotics, speeding, burglary, stickup, purse-snatching, or mugging accusations when a so-called minor (in the eyes of the law) is involved in such or related acts. Psychologically, however, such misbehavior indicates not a "problem child" involved in a crime, but a child with problems who sometimes uses the crime as an outlet for phobias, complexes, emotional difficulties, even deep-seated neuroticism requiring psychotherapy and psychological counseling and guidance.

Each case of delinquency must be treated and investigated as an individual case. Judges in juvenile courts must have available full information before passing judgment. This requires enlargement of the investigative arm of the judge. Moneys must be appropriated for this purpose. Lack of sufficient information can impair the judicial decision for the handling of each case.

Reestablishment of such programs as the CCC (Civilian Conservation Camps) under the guidance of such men as veterans of war service that the boys can look up to. These leaders should be properly trained in the handling of youths.

The draft laws should be revised to eliminate the long wait many youths have before being drafted. Many employers feel that a boy who will be drafted is a poor risk since training the boy will be wasted when he is called into service. This leaves many youths, at an extremely impressionable age, free to roam the streets with too much time on their hands.

Stricter laws that will hold parents responsible for the delinquent acts of the juvenile. Fines or jail terms should not be beyond the scope that a judge can hand out to a parent who has shown a lack of interest in the action of the child. In cases of damage to civil or private property the parent should be made to pay for the damage.

Stronger measures are needed to handle the narcotics offender. Juveniles found to be under the habit of drugs should immediately be sent to institutions for the cure of the habit. Postinstitutional care should require regular visits to a doctor who can find any renewal of the drug habit before it secures too firmly a hold.

For those that are convicted of selling narcotics to juveniles extremely severe penalties should be given. The death sentence would not be too severe for these sellers.

SCHOOLS

While delinquency has in many cases its starting causes in the home it may also come as a result of occurrences in the school system. Often learning difficulties are an important cause of wrongdoings of the child. In today's schools the overcrowded conditions leave little room for individual care. Where a child has learning difficulties he often uses the outburst as a means of expression. This leads to eventual delinquency. Many times the educators fall back on the excuse that classes are too large as a coverup for their own failings. We must make a greater effort to build new schools and more classrooms and at the same time insist that our educators give more attention to the care of those potential juvenile delinquents.

We must have more supervised recreation centers with properly trained instructors in them. Playgrounds must be kept open longer hours with sufficient activity to keep the children busy. Youths must be encouraged to build character by use of the hands as well as the mind.

We feel our educational system should sponsor programs of adult education with emphasis on the care of youth. Many parents need and want such instructions and our school systems are ideally suited to this purpose.

Closer relation between the courts and the schools should be established in order that both may follow similar courses in dealing with delinquents.

We feel that schools should arrange to have classes attend courts where punishment is meted out to juvenile offenders in order to see that punishment is the end result of juvenile delinquency.

A reappraisal of our vocational school setup should be made. Too often a child is put into a vocational school as a means of punishment.. We feel that these schools should be used to teach youths, that do not do well in a regular school, a trade at which he can earn a living and become a useful citizen.

We have found that the system of parent-teacher conference should be expanded in order that parent and teacher may exchange ideas about the individual student. In cases where the child has shown habits that might lead to delinquency a child welfare worker should sit in on the conference in order to coordinate the study of the child.

Every classroom teacher should be given instructions in the recognition of early signs of narcotic use. We feel that youths will assist in breaking up of narcotic rings if the habit is stopped early.

PRESS

The newspapers of a community can be a potent force in fighting juvenile delinquency. We feel that by playing down lurid stories and playing up the penalties of crime more of our youths will see the end results are not as glamorous as they seem.

We feel that there are times when the press does not press hard enough on juvenile cases. Strong, forthright, and vigorous campaign to destroy juvenile delinquency. A strong campaign by the press to show the damage, both financial and physical, caused by delinquency will bring the public to the realization that more moneys must be expended in preventive action rather than in corrective action. This should bring to the public the needs of schools, juvenile courts, and for an expanded police force.

Another campaign by the press, who are molders of public opinion, should be for Cadet Corps that will take the youths in hand to teach them subjects useful to the community. A campaign should be undertaken to build the Women's Aid Corp. who service our hospitals and relief work. Such campaigns will attract the youths and take up that excess time they have.

The press should be allowed to use the names of offenders who are repeaters. We feel that by publicizing such names and the sentences meted out it will cause many parents and youths to pause and reflect on the public disgrace they will face.

The Late John D. Dingell, of Michigan

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of the late Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan. It was a shock to me to learn of his passing last September, when I was home in Milwaukee, and whence I went to attend his funeral in Detroit. His loss will be felt deeply by our Nation.

It was a privilege and honor for me to serve in the House with such a distinguished, hardworking, and conscientious man as the late JOHN DINGELL. For many years, he fought courageously for the interests of our people, and for legislation intended to raise the standard of living throughout the Nation. He was dedicated to high moral, social, and political principles in his spheres of action.

JOHN DINGELL will be missed by his colleagues, and by the people of Michigan whom he served so well and so long. It is our mutual consolation and hope that his son, who has been chosen to represent the people of the 15th district of Michigan, will carry on the work and the ideals of his father in these Halls of Congress.

To our late colleague's family, I extend my deepest sympathy and the prayer that the Almighty Creator may grant him peace in eternity.

Eavesdropping Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting editorial from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., October 15, 1955:

DESTROYING THE COURTS

Admission by the faculty of the University of Chicago Law School that Federal jury rooms were bugged with hidden microphones to eavedrop on the deliberations of Federal juries has raised a storm in Washington.

This eavesdropping project, started in September 1952, under a grant from the Ford Foundation, is under probe of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The committee has been told that the research group intends to continue to plant secret microphones in Federal jury rooms.

The Federal courts have apparently surrendered all their considerable power to regulate and direct the Federal court system. The bugging of Federal jury rooms is so clearly illegal and contemptuous of the courts that it is simply incredible that Attorney General Brownell hasn't moved to indict those responsible for this outrage.

The Federal judge who authorized this secret bugging of a jury room in Kansas must certainly have taken leave of his senses, and deserves the strongest kind of censure. If counsel for either the Government, plaintiff or defendant had been guilty of any such breach, a contempt citation would have been issued forthwith.

The jury system is far from perfect, but it is not going to be improved by secret eavesdropping in jury rooms. That kind of police-state research can only tear down the confidence of the people in the jury system, and, by the same method, destroy the courts.

If microphones can be secretly planted in Federal jury rooms with the consent of the judge and without the knowledge of jurors, counsel or litigants, where is the line to be drawn against wire-tapping intrusion?

Federal courts have some very strict precedents against wire-tapping evidence. Why then is a private research project permitted to eavesdrop on one of the basic rights of the American citizen—the right to secret consideration of evidence by a jury?

The Justice Department is shirking its sworn duty if this outrage is overlooked. The Justice Department lost an important case against a Communist agent named Judith Coplon because the evidence against her had been developed from a wire-tapped telephone conversation. Certainly the wire tapping of a Federal jury room is a matter of grave concern to the Justice Department. Why then hasn't there been a move to deal with the jury room wire tappers?

Our President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article, which appears in the January 6, 1956, issue of U. S. News & World Report, expresses the feeling of many millions of Americans:

THE MAN OF THE ERA

(By David Lawrence)

Through the annals of time we have always revered the soldier. In the face of an unknown destiny, he has dedicated his life to the service of his fellowman. On his return from war, his crusade won, we have hailed him with exultant cheers—and then his life-work has usually ended.

In this era the tale is different.

We applaud the achievements of a great soldier, but we ask him to stay on in another kind of active duty—to serve us in the battle to maintain peace.

In 1942, the great soldier of our times landed his armies on the shores of North Africa.

In 1944, the same leader, commanding the huge forces of many Allied nations, invaded the coast of France in a military feat of great skill and unprecedented magnitude. It meant victory in 1945 and the end of World War II.

We recall the beaming faces in a crowded metropolis, ticker tape flung like ribbons across the streets of New York City, as the military hero was welcomed home by a grateful country.

But leadership of armies was not to be his only form of service. In 1952 the same soldier was summoned to higher duty—to be Commander in Chief of all the military forces of the most powerful nation in the world, and at the same time to assume the responsibilities of the Chief Executive of the entire Government.

Here was a rare opportunity to test the soldier—to learn whether among his talents was an ability to steer the ship of state through the shoals of factional strife at home and through the storms of diplomacy abroad into the quiet waters of national and international serenity.

The conscience that commanded tens of thousands of young men to go to their death in battle twinged at the thought of the many more tens of thousands who might have to go to future wars, and of the millions of innocent men, women, and children who might be the victims of an atomic disaster.

To the tremendous task of peace, the soldier devoted himself. Thrusting aside protocol and precedents, he offered to go anywhere in the world at any time to make every effort to advance the cause of peace.

The Geneva Conference of 1955, at the summit, widely characterized as a failure, was not a failure for the great soldier. He went with peace in his heart and came away

still believing that man can find some other way to resolve international disputes than by organized murder.

Then the hand of God intervened. Was it a mystic warning to us all in the midst of our indulgence in the excesses of materialism? Did we really deserve peace?

The heart of the soldier faltered. The whole world stood aghast—worried that he might be taken from us. The prayers of hundreds of millions of people fervently petitioned the Almighty to preserve this man—his energizing force for peace.

The power of God can humble the greatest of soldiers or statesmen and take them from us at the moment of their greatest glory.

There come to mind the lines of Walt Whitman eulogizing the stricken Lincoln:

"O Captain! my Captain! our fearful trip is done,
The ship has weather'd every rack, the prize we sought is won."

But today the "fearful trip" is not yet done. The ship has not weathered every rack, and the prize is not won. The world is still half-slave and half-free.

These are the days when the mysteries of divine guidance are no more revealed to us than before but His omnipresent influence can, if we accept it, rule mankind. It can shape human behavior. It can apply a restraining hand to an evil purpose. It can help us win in the long run a victory for honesty, for freedom and for justice. The destiny of the whole world is in the hands of those statesmen who can interpret faithfully the commands of the Almighty.

We happily are witnessing now the gradual recovery of the soldier-statesman from an illness which might have been fatal had the Lord willed it so.

Maybe this means that the crusade of the soldier-statesman is to go on and that the years of his own usefulness as the servant of his people are to continue until his mission is fulfilled.

There is ahead for Dwight Eisenhower the greatest of all calls to duty—service to the world.

For Dwight Eisenhower is the man of the era. He is the Captain who can steer the ship of state safely through dangerous seas amid the hazards of mutual suspicion and the frequent provocations to war.

On the horizon already are the dim outlines of the shore. There the true victory can be won, sooner than most of us imagine. There, rooted in the unorganized and unasserted will of the men and women of all nations, is the means by which to assure peace.

To that shore, God willing, the Captain, our Captain, must sail on until this divided world is united in freedom—until the "fearful trip is done."

Report on Gold Section of Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference, Sacramento, Calif., November 7–8, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, on November 7–8, 1955, in Sacramento, Gov. Goodwin J. Knight called a Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference. In addition to some 500 persons from the 11 Western States, South Dakota and Alaska, there were the following six governors in attendance: Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, of California; Gov. Robert E. Smylie, of Idaho; Gov. Charles H. Russell, of Nevada; Gov. J. Bracken Lee, of Utah; Gov. Milward L. Simpson, of Wyoming; and Acting Gov. Stephen L. R. McNichols, of Colorado.

Western Governors Mining Advisory Council: The Western Governors Mining Advisory Council was formed in February of 1953 by Governor Earl Warren of California, now Supreme Court Justice Warren, at the suggestion of former Gov. Douglas McKay of Oregon, now Secretary of the Interior. The powers of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council are severely limited. They may make recommendations only to the governors of the Western States and the governors are in no way bound to follow such recommendations. The council is made up of men appointed by the respective governors in whom they have confidence. It may vary in number as each governor may desire. It has been customary to rotate the chairmanship and also the vice-chairmanship of the council each year so that neither officer may succeed himself.

The governors of the Western States insist that the recommendations of the council be both reasonable and feasible.

One of my esteemed constituents, Dr. John R. Lechner, 629 East 99th Street, Inglewood, Calif., has reecntly forwarded to me the report of the gold section of the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference held in Sacramento on November 7–8, together with the resolution adopted by the gold section. Many of those who are interested in the mining of gold and the problem of gold backing of our currency will, I believe, find this of interest.

The report and resolution follow:

REPORT ON GOLD SECTION OF WESTERN GOVERNORS MINERAL POLICIES CONFERENCE, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., NOVEMBER 7–8

Nineteen sections representing principal minerals in the 11 Western States met in separate meetings at the Western Governors Mineral Policies Conference at Sacramento, November 6–8 to analyze their major problems and to make recommendations to the governors of these States for united action.

Perhaps the most important of these sections was the gold section. On Sunday afternoon, 14 members of the gold committee, under the chairmanship of L. L. Huelsdonk, met at the Senator Hotel to discuss the problems of this section of the conference, and to arrive at a plan and organization for the meeting the following day. As a result of the discussion at this organization meeting, a resolutions committee was appointed to draft a suitable resolution for the consideration of the entire section on Monday. Harry Sears, Charles Gilmore, J. C. KempVanee and Dr. Lechner were appointed, and these men met on Sunday evening to carry out their duties.

The resolution which was drafted on Sunday night, was presented for approval at the Monday meeting of the entire section, with nearly 100 in attendance. Dr. Donald H. McLaughlin presided at this section meeting. Although there was ample opportunity for discussion, and with only one dissenting vote, the resolution was adopted.

Following the adoption of the gold resolution, several members of the section commented on the need for public enlightenment on this vital issue. Mrs. Kitzmiller spoke of the opportunity and the responsibility of members of the gold section to inform the public of the relationship of the gold problems to the preservation of our currency reserve, and urged those present to support such a program financially.

A motion was then made by Dr. Lechner and seconded by Charles Hendel of Nevada, that a permanent subcommittee be appointed with full power to act.

It was then moved by Moss of Arizona, and seconded by Robert Wilson of Taylorsville, Calif., that this subcommittee be empowered to raise and disburse moneys needed to conduct its educational program. Dr. McLaughlin then appointed as members of this permanent subcommittee the following: L. L. Huelsdonk, chairman; J. C. KempVanee, treasurer; Dr. John R. Lechner, secretary; Charles L. Gilmore, attorney; and Harry Sears, research.

Members of this new subcommittee met on several occasions during the 8th and 9th, discussing plans for the work of this committee. It was decided to establish an advisory council, consisting of 1 representative from each of the 11 Western States to help guide the work of the executive committee. As soon as the appointments are made to this advisory council, suitable stationery will be printed, and the subcommittee will go to work on a program consistent with the policies outlined by the governors conference.

RESOLUTION BY GOLD SECTION

Whereas there are three principal rights basic to the jurisprudence of all free countries; the right of personal liberty, the right of personal security, and the right of private property; and

Whereas the arbitrary and absolute control exercised by the United States Treasury over the production and disposition of domestic gold is in direct violation of these fundamental rights of free men; and

Whereas the Government has usurped the right of private enterprise to sell newly mined gold to industry and to the arts in contradiction to the fundamental laws of the land, and has denied individuals the right to own, buy, or sell this commodity in open competition; and

Whereas this restrictive and monopolistic policy by the United States Treasury has given special advantages to a small group of manufacturers privileged to buy gold for industry, while at the same time imposing such rigid restrictions upon the gold producer that 95 percent of primary gold mines have been forced to close down, leaving vast potential sources of supply undeveloped; and

Whereas the sale of gold from our Federal gold reserve to private industry and to the arts, which annually exceeds in amount the total domestic production of gold—together with the progressively declining production of new gold, is dangerously dissipating the United States gold reserves, which rightfully belong to the people of this country, who have been led to believe that these reserves have been safely held for their protection as a guarantee for the stability and security of their dollars: Therefore be it

Resolved, That members of the gold section recommend to the governors of the Western States that they urge the Congress to restore to the gold producer the right to sell gold as a commodity to industry and to the arts, and that there shall be a free market for all newly mined domestic gold; and be it further

Resolved, That the governors of the several States represented at this conference be urged to request their respective legislators to memoralize the Congress in support of these two vital bills.

The Marks of a Free Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, at the annual interfaith breakfast held on Staten Island, New York, on December 11, 1955, under the auspices of the B'nai B'rith of Staten Island, Rabbi Charles E. Shulman, of Riverdale Temple, New York City, delivered the address which I am happy to place in the RECORD today. The timeliness of the subject, the simplicity and freshness of the speaker's approach, and the effectiveness of his statement led me to ask his permission to place the address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I commend it to the careful attention of all Members of the House.

The address follows:

THE MARKS OF A FREE MAN

The American way of life could have no finer example of its uniqueness and its greatness than this gathering of distinguished American citizens in all walks of life met at the invitation of the B'nai B'rith of Staten Island to honor an outstanding resident of the community and attended by members of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths who have not only saluted a common flag that protects them all equally but who have often shared the pride and joy of working together as friends in the larger community. You honor more than the person of a faithful American who has exemplified the American creed. You honor and affirm anew the principles which have kept us a Nation and which will, under God's grace, continue to do so in days to come.

The chairman, in his introduction of me, stated that as a former Army man he was sorry that I had served as a chaplain in the Navy during World War II because I could not appreciate sufficiently the lot of Army officers and men under Navy transport during the war. For his benefit, I would like to tell him that almost 2,000 of us in the Navy were transported to our first destination in the Southwest Pacific by a ship in command of Army personnel. There was an Army chaplain aboard, a member of the Salvation Army sect. And I was even pressed into playing the marimba for him at times in keeping up the morale aboard the ship. Besides it is always a moot question as to whether the Army or Navy is God's holy area of military service. I recall the story of the man who asked his friend to join the "Army of the Lord." His friend told him he already belonged to the "Army of the Lord." "What denomination do you belong to?" the first demanded. "The Baptists" was the reply. To which the man said, "Listen, brother, you're not in the Army. You're in the Navy."

A gathering of this character is essentially an unwritten expression of the faith we have in our free type of government and our appreciation of our free institutions. And it is eminently fitting on this occasion that we consider the marks of a free man. It is important that we speak of such a theme often and anon these days when the false propaganda of dictatorship would delude the world into believing that freedom can be anything less than the ideal we in America cherish and enact when we function at our best. I have been in countries dominated by both Fascist and Communist oppressors and I can tell you that one must see what passes for freedom in other parts of the world to appreciate how blessed the American people really are in their good fortune.

The first mark of a free man is confidence. He is unafraid in his daily living. He is natural in his pursuits. It is not so in lands that are enslaved. They used to tell a story of the Russian dictator Stalin as they told it of Hitler and Mussolini. The dictator walked into a movie incognito and sat in the last row. Suddenly his picture was flashed on the screen and everybody rose in salute. He remained seated enjoying the spectacle of his power when suddenly an usher poked him in the back and whispered harshly: "You'd better get up too if you know what's good for you. I don't like him any more than you do. But you'd better get up. It's safer."

Confidence is displayed by free men not only in their government, but also in their neighbors. Confidence breeds trust. You will not find much trust where there is no freedom. How can one trust another when the state compels uniformity of thought and rewards espionage? The greatest asset that America possesses is mutuality of trust exemplified by the democratic way of life and inspired by the Bible words: "Behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity." Unlike the lands of oppression our unity is not forced unwillingly from us. We give voluntarily of ourselves in obeying our laws and serving our commonwealth. It is a pity, I think, that we always tend to give more freely of our lives and labor in time of war than in peace. The great American philosopher, William James, once wrote a short essay that bears rereading in our time. It is called "The Moral Equivalent of War." He points out that if people in a democracy could be prevailed on to make the sacrifices in peacetime commensurate with what they do in wartime for their Nation a long step could be taken in insuring more durable peace in the world. Democracy is basically an adventure in cooperative living. Our system of government is founded on the concept of equality before the law. No man is good enough to rule over another. And while we often stray from this precept we cannot forget its solemn lesson. If we ever strayed too far from it our freedom would be in great danger.

A second mark of a free man is humor. Only the free can laugh at themselves and their neighbors. In a dictatorship men are afraid to laugh. I know no greater cleansing agent to help restore people to sanity than laughter. Nothing can quite show more clearly the immaturity of prejudice and bigotry than the element of humor. Take the matter of smugness in religion, something that ought to concern us in this interfaith meeting. There is a wonderful story told to illustrate the folly of exclusiveness in worship of a God who made us all and whose tender mercies are over all His works. A colored man passed a fashionable church. He thought he would like to worship there, and spoke to the minister about joining the congregation. The minister told him that God did not wish us to change our denominations, that he had better go home and talk this matter over with God. The colored man returned in a short time. The minister asked him whether he had talked it over with God. And if so what did God say? The colored man told him: "God said to me, Sam I've been trying to get into that church myself for 25 years and ain't had any luck. No use your trying."

Sometimes we reveal our own lack of understanding and faith in our fellowmen in the excitement of a moment of disturbance. It is typically American and typically a free man's way of reducing human shortcomings to their proper level through humor. There is the story of the man who belonged to the expressive holy roller sect. He had entered a church for prayer. In the course of the minister's sermon he became excited and jumped up and shouted "Hallelujah! Amen, brother." Two ushers rushed over to him and whispered: "Here, what are you trying to do?" "I'm getting religious," he said. And before they could stop themselves they said: "This is no place to get it."

A third mark of a free man is healthy mindedness which gives scope and imagination to his life. It is no accident that some of the greatest adventures on earth were first undertaken on American soil, and they were undertaken by people who had the health to enable them to dare move in new directions. They cleared the forests and conquered a wilderness with only the protection of a covered wagon. They fought each other in a terrible civil war in order to establish the right of a Negro to be free on free soil. They established the first public school in the history of the world in order that every child could have the means of improving his lot and gaining greater enjoyment of the world into which he was born. They were the first people on the face of the earth to give women the right to vote and to encourage her participation in the arts, sciences and government; and they dreamed great dreams of other people rising on improved standards of living to democratic heights where the common man would be released from his burdens and live as an equal partner in the world's destiny.

Sometimes the free man in America becomes careless. Sometimes he loses his healthy mindedness and he for the moment is faithless to the American ideal, a disappointment to peoples elsewhere. I was in Morocco a short while after the people in Cicero, Ill., had rioted in a diaspora of intolerance toward a Negro war veteran who had rented a home in their midst. The Arabs were making capital of that mistake, egged on by Communist agitators who value power more than freedom. But in spite of our mistakes we are a healthy people because our freedom makes us healthy minded. The Romans, centuries ago observed that the physical life is closely tied to the mental attitudes when they spoke of "mens sana in corpore sano." Our traditions and our instincts on the whole guide us into channels of mutual respect. And while we have a long way to go to achieve a more perfect union we have done remarkably well in welding our diverse raees and stocks and faiths into a great nation.

A fourth mark of a free man is hope. He sees his life and the life of his nation as a goal. That goal may be distant, but the incentive to labor is the actual realization of the dream, not the fulfillment. I imagine that the newly published volume on Robert Louis Stevenson and his wife will stimulate Americans anew to the rereading of some of Stevenson's charming essays. One that we remember from our student days is called El Dorado and reminds us that it is not the arrival at our destination that gives our lives such zest and enjoyment, but the travel toward it.

America is seen by her free citizens as a nation in being. We have before us unclimbed heights, unrealized goals. Yesterday when we were children we traveled in trains and ships spending days and weeks to get to our destination. Today we move swiftly in airplanes and tomorrow the distances of the earth will become as naught. Now we depend on coal and oil for our energy. Who knows what great revolutions of life lie before us as we follow President Eisenhower's call to support the movement of atoms for peace? The freeman constantly hopes that as his hand produces the goods that make life a physical luxury so his mind will keep pace and recognize the common need of all men to warm their hands by the common fire of life. In America this hope has shown itself in the inventive genius of people. Nothing that is made is not subject to improvement. It is shown in the distribu-

tion of our wealth and the average American today lives with greater comfort and opportunity than kings and princes used to. The freeman's hope is seen in the dignity of labor and the acknowledged place of the laboring man in society. And it is seen in the brighter religious conscience of free citizens. For they do not let others remain hungry in their land and their record of helpfulness to other nations through point 4 and technical assistance programs is essentially an example of religious ethics applied in an economic manner. Whatever dictator countries offer other nations has proved to be in conformity to a plan to enslave them and to develop at their expense. Whatever our free people have offered other peoples has been in terms of humanity and the hope of elevating them sufficiently that they might perceive the advantages inherent in the freedom which enables a man to decide his own destiny.

But the free man must not lose this hope. He must not be discouraged by the enormity of the problems that lie before a shrunken world. He must not be aghast at the terrible destructive power in the hydrogen bombs his scientists have created. The Jewish sages of antiquity tell a parable of Moses the law giver, standing on the lonely mountain top and seeing the promised land that he would not enter. He turned to his God to challenge Him. "Why did you take me at the burning bush to be the leader of this people?" he asked his God. "Why did you rob me of my youth and manhood in their service, and now deny me my reward of the promised land?" And God answered him: "When you stood at the burning bush and I told you to go tell Pharaoh to let the children of Israel go, what did you say? You said you were tongue-tied. I had to tell you that your brother Aaron would speak for you. You had no faith in yourself, and I forgave you that. Then you wanted to know in whose name you would be speaking if Pharaoh asked you by what authority you came. I had to tell you, 'tell him I Am sent you'—God sent you. You doubted your God and I forgave you that. But when in the wilderness your people were thirsting for water and I told you to speak to the rock, what did you do? You struck the rock and said in effect, 'what do I care about these people?' There is no promised land for him who has no faith in humanity, in his fellow men."

When a teacher loses that kind of faith he cannot teach adequately. When a judge loses that kind of faith he cannot judge justly. When a clergyman loses that faith his tongue loses its eloquence. When a political leader loses that faith he becomes cynical. When a scientist loses that faith, he becomes indifferent.

Confidence, humor, health, and hope are present when an assembly of American people of varying races and faiths meet under a common flag to remember their free common heritage. It augurs well for a country when we can hold meetings such as this.

Sports in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an article which was written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Washington bureau of the Los Angeles Times, concerning a football game he observed during his recent visit to the Soviet Union.

The article follows:

NINETY THOUSAND JAM MOSCOW STADIUM—RUSSIANS RED HOT ABOUT FOOTBALL—THEY'LL EVEN PLAY BALL WITH THE WEST

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

Moscow, October 23.—A big Red machine was held to a 2–2 tie today by an underdog squad of fighting Frenchmen who came a lot closer to capturing Moscow than Napoleon did.

This is my idea of how sports writers do their leads, so nobody but sports fans can understand what they mean. In plain English, very little of which is heard here, this means the French and Soviet soccer teams played to a draw at Dynamo Stadium before 90,000 football fans.

In Paris, a headwaiter was quite excited when he heard we were going to Moscow. He said we must see the big international match scheduled for Sunday. The Russian headwaiter at the National Hotel here said the same, proving all headwaiters are kin.

It was just like the UCLA–SC game at Memorial Coliseum in Los Angeles. Following a week of good weather, it begins to drizzle just before game time. And the traffic jam—in Russian "traffikd jam"—is just as bad.

We sat amid a covey of Parisian patriots, who hollered "Allez, Allez" throughout the affair. The Frenchman next to me should have bought two seats, but here all men are equal. This, though, was a living testimonial to superior French cooking and the only time I could get a full breath was when he stood up to "Allez" some more.

There were a bunch of French movie stars on hand, among them Danielle Darrieux, and when I stood up to see her I lost 3 yards.

It was a good clean game. Only one Frenchman got knocked cold by the Soviet goalkeeper and this was an accident, according to the British referee and two Bulgarian line umpires.

The French wore blue jerseys and the Reds naturally wore red. There was one Negro player on the French squad but the Soviet squad was strictly Caucasian.

The Russians are really wild about this sport. One comrade sitting behind us kept shouting at the Soviet team, "You're playing like a bunch of peasants just in from the collective farm."

The outstanding player was a baldheaded Frenchman who must have got that way bouncing the ball off his skull. He was all over the mushy field and saved many a situation before the final gun—I mean whistle—since this is a peace-loving country.

Ungrateful Nation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following excellent editorial from the Manchester Union Leader, Manchester, N. H., which appeared in the issue of Tuesday, October 18, 1955:

UNGRATEFUL NATION?

(By William Loeb)

The tragic death of William Teto, who served 13 years as FBI undercover agent inside the Communist party, points the finger at a real problem. Teto, after his job inside the Communist party was completed for the FBI, received no further payments from the Government.

Although his normal life and work had been interrupted, it was almost impossible for him to find employment. In addition, he was subjected to planned vilification by the Communist Party apparatus. The difficulties he found himself in caused his health to break down, and ultimately, resulted in his death.

Teto's problem was not limited to him alone. In too many instances, it is the fate of those who enter the Communist Party to discover, for the benefit and protection of this Nation, the plots, plans and personnel of the Communist conspiracy in this country.

These men and women risk their lives, lose their reputations in the community, and suffer continuing hardship, sometimes over a long period of years. Then, when their turn comes to testify and tell what they have discovered, their usefulness in that position inside the Communist Party comes to an end. They are then cast aside by an ungrateful government without further consideration or assistance.

This does not seem fair or just, by any standard of personal or national morality.

This writer recently came across another such man. Like Teto, he had to see his mother die, burdened down with the sorrow of thinking her son was a Communist, and not being able even to whisper in her dying ear that he was, in truth, a patriotic American. Like Teto, when his job was over, he also was cast aside. Were it not for the assistance of certain patriotic private individuals he, too, would be in dire need today. As was Teto's fate, he did not escape vilification from the Communist Party. Indeed, he continues to be the victim of their smears.

The practical matter is that it is going to be harder and harder to recruit patriotic men and women to ferret out the Communist conspiracy if they know that at the end of that difficult and dangerous task, they are to be discarded without receiving tangible recognition.

But, above all, this neglect is not the proper and patriotic way to treat these people. As much as a soldier in war, they have well served their nation. We make every provision for the medical care, education, and hospitalization of our veterans and for pensioning them when disabled. Can we do less than this for men and women who also have served their nation bravely?

Virginia Referendum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Mr. Robert Van Deusen, Washington secretary of the division of public relations of the National Lutheran Council. The article, which appeared in the current issue of the Lutheran, follows:

VIRGINIA REFERENDUM

(By Robert Van Deusen)

Racial integration in the public schools promises to be one of the hottest issues of 1956. Resistance to the Supreme Court decision is growing and efforts are being made to sidestep its requirements.

In Virginia, the problem will focus in a popular referendum. Voters will decide on January 9 whether to call a constitutional convention to amend the State constitution. The amendment would alter section 141, which prohibits the use of public funds for support of private schools, so as to permit the payment of tuition to students attending private schools.

This constitutional change is one of the recommendations of the Gray commission, after studying the practical implications of the Supreme Court decision. The commission's report suggested that school districts which wish to eliminate segregation be permitted to do so. Its main thrust, however, was in three proposals designed to postpone integration or bypass it entirely, in those parts of the State where this is preferred:

1. Assignment of pupils and teachers to various schools on the basis of health, aptitude, availability of facilities, and general welfare, without regard to race.

2. Tuition grants to pupils who are unwilling to go to integrated schools or whose local authorities decide not to operate such schools, and who go to private nonsectarian schools.

3. Modification of the compulsory education law, so that no child can be compelled to attend an integrated school.

The big problem faced by Virginia voters is whether they are willing to sacrifice their long tradition of free, compulsory, public education, for the sake of preserving a system of racial segregation whose days are numbered. One pitfall is met by the stipulation that pupils must attend nonsectarian private schools to be eligible for tuition grants. But voters should consider these questions:

Where will the thousands of children who elect not to attend public school go? Are enough private schools in existence to handle them? If new ones are organized, where will they be housed? Who will administer them? Where will teachers be secured? Will the quality of instruction equal that of public schools?

How will tuition grants be handled? Will they be paid to the schools? If so, will the State have any control over the curriculum? Would they not then become "public schools," subject to the Supreme Court decision? Or will they be paid to the parents? If so, how will the State check up on their actual use for payment of tuition? If the compulsory attendance laws are relaxed, what if parents decide not to make use of any school?

Even though sectarian schools are ruled out in Virginia as being eligible for tuition grants, will not the breaking of the historic distinction between public and private schools provide a precedent which can be used in other States by those who seek public support for parochial schools?

The Virginia Council of Churches has taken the courageous stand of opposing the revision of the State constitution. Whatever the result of the referendum, the churches will have gained in stature by taking an unpopular position on the basis of Christian principles.

Delay in Construction of Coyote Valley Dam Detrimental to Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the December 22, 1955, Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat entitled "Sonoma County Loses Two Ways if Dam Delayed."

Residents of the Russian River Basin area in Sonoma and Mendocino Counties, Calif., were hard hit during the floods in California. Expert estimates from the Army Corps of Engineers reveal that the Coyote Valley Dam would have reduced the $4 million property damage by at least one-half, and perhaps even more.

A delay in the sale of the bonds voted by local residents will put off the start of construction for at least another year, subjecting the area to possible further flood damage and resultant loss of life and property.

H. R. 7930, which I introduced January 3 and which has been reported favorably by the House Public Works Committee, authorizes the additional funds necessary to carry out the Federal obligation. Passage of this bill will resolve questions as to sale of the bonds within the time limit specified, and permit construction to commence at an early date.

As evidence of the necessity for expeditious congressional approval of the bill, I submit the following editorial:

SONOMA COUNTY LOSES TWO WAYS IF DAM DELAYED

In case you're wondering why District Attorney Joseph Maddux is doing everything possible to secure earliest possible high-court hearings on the Coyote Valley Dam litigation, there are two good reasons.

One is that if the bonds cannot be delivered on schedule, both start and completion of the dam will be delayed by at least a year. That means one or more additional years that heavy flood damage will take place.

The other reason is that the bonds were sold at a time when the money market was such that the taxpayers of Sonoma County received an extremely favorable break on interest.

Since then, the money market has become less favorable for sellers, more favorable for purchasers, of bonds. And the more interest the county has to pay, the greater your tax bill must be to cover that interest.

Unless the bonds are delivered, free of lawsuits, by January 16, the buyers can withdraw their offer of 2.58 percent average interest. In that case, new bids would have to be called.

Bond experts think that today the interest rate would be around 3 percent. And that would amount to more than $590,000 additional to be met by the taxpayers of Sonoma County. Instead of a tax rate of 9 cents to cover interest the rate would be 10½ cents per $100 assessed valuation.

Other costs, of course, would also be involved if the bonds cannot be delivered by January 16. It would cost around $2,000 to print new bonds. Another $1,000 would have to go to readvertise that the bonds are for sale.

Those are the costs that affect all taxpayers.

Flood damage, while restricted to those who live along the Russian River, is even more costly. In the first heavy storm of 1955, damage was estimated by Col. J. A. Graf, of the Army engineers, at $2 million.

That damage, to relatively few people and in just 1 storm, is nearly 4 times the probable added interest costs that would be spread among all taxpayers, and over many years.

Delay in selling the bonds would be an extremely serious and costly matter.

Flood Protection, Relief, and Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 1955, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power of the House Committee on Government Operations held a hearing at Springfield, Mass. Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the text of my statement to the subcommittee.

The material follows:

FLOOD PROTECTION, RELIEF, AND REHABILITATION

(Statement of Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN before the House Special Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power, Springfield, Mass., October 24, 1955)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I heartily welcome you all to Massachusetts and express deep gratitude for the opportunity you have extended me and my colleagues in the Congress to present our views on water resources problems that have arisen in our State and area as a result of recent disastrous floods.

Let me assure you I greatly appreciate the able attention and study which my good friend from Alabama, Mr. JONES, and all the members of your committee are giving to these questions. Since there are many witnesses to be heard today I will confine my own remarks as much as possible.

Several other members of the Flood Prevention Committee of our Massachusetts congressional delegation, of which I am chairman, all distinguished colleagues of ours in the House, are here present and desirous of presenting their views.

I recognize that some of the problems connected with the flood may not in a strict sense fall under the jurisdiction of this committee. However, many of them are definitely relevant to your current studies on water resources and flood control and remedial measures which Congress may take at the next session.

I have in mind, of course, that the esteemed chairman of this committee, Mr. JONES, is also a high ranking and very valuable member of the House Committee on Public Works and, in that capacity, is fully conversant and very well informed on essential flood control projects throughout the Nation.

Now, it is hardly necessary for me to detail in extent the loss of life and damage to property caused by recent and repeated floods in our area. Great tropical storms swept over much of the Northeast last August 19, and the week before last, pouring a deluge of heavy rain over the countryside for hundreds of miles.

Rivers and their tributaries overflowed their banks, hundreds of small dams broke or overflowed, many people lost their lives, hundreds of homes were completely washed away, roads, bridges, public communications, water and sewer systems, and business establishments and industries were destroyed or damaged in varying degrees, rich farmlands were gutted and covered with silt and debris. The ensuing destruction, havoc, and distress were widespread. Our section was struck with cataclysmic force. As yet we are unable to estimate all the damage. Many communities were paralyzed and crippled, not only by the first storm, but by the second which followed just a few days ago.

I want to make it clear to the committee that all appropriate agencies of the Federal Government under the direction of our great President, who flew from Denver to Bradley Field, Conn., personally, to supervise relief and rehabilitation operations, have rendered a very great service and have extended valuable assistance. I will not take the time here to enumerate those cooperating agencies, but without exception they worked together, with the Red Cross and with State and local agencies to restore public services, to bring order out of the chaos, to help get our economy back on its feet and, above all, to relieve human misery. They did wonderful work. We are all very grateful for these efforts even as we are mindful that a great deal of work of further relief, rehabilitation, and flood control must be accomplished before many stricken areas can return to normal, and before they can be given maximum protection against loss of life and property from devastating natural disasters in the future.

Of all congressional districts in this State, I believe that the one I represent sustained the most serious damage here. Lives were lost, homes were carried away, people left homeless and industry and business sustained tremendous losses and damage. But there is hardly a section of our great State which was not affected and damaged in some way. Our neighbors to the south, the people of Rhode Island and Connecticut, suffered greatly. The same is true of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. The situation in our own State is indeed most difficult and with humility and deepest respect, I would bespeak your consideration of the following proposals.

1. Immediate appropriations by Congress of adequate funds to proceed with studies and construction of flood-control projects already authorized, and wherever necessary, in the Connecticut River Basin, the Thames River Basin, the Housatonic River Basin, the Blackstone River Basin, the Hoosic River Basin, the Neponset River Basin, the Charles River Basin, the Merrimac River Basin, and in all the tributaries and branches of these streams, including industrial and other smaller dams, which constitute so much of our water resources throughout the State of Massachusetts and New England.

It is clear that we must have Federal flood control and we must have it as soon as possible. Delay will be fraught with grave possibilities of fresh disaster. Our flood committee, of which I am chairman, is studying many specific projects. The entire situation is being reviewed by the Army engineers and we propose to press for earliest possible action by the Congress so as to secure adequate protection against future floods.

2. A second proposal which has been widely discussed and which I would like to suggest at this time is the urgent need for flood insurance and natural disaster insurance. Following the terrible Worcester tornado of 1953, I introduced in the Congress a number of bills seeking to cope, on a national basis, with great natural disasters. Among them was H. R. 6129. This bill would create a Government-owned corporation to insure against all natural disasters such as floods, tornadoes, droughts, forest fires, earthquakes, hurricanes, and all disturbances and conditions of such impact and severity that it becomes necessary for the President to declare disaster areas in any part of the Nation.

As you know, at present, flood insurance or disaster insurance cannot be procured from private insurance companies because, under normal insurance practices, its cost is prohibitive. Under the proposed bill, the Government would reinsure disaster policies designed to cover every part of the United States against the ravages of all natural disasters.

We can take notice of the fact that these natural disasters can and do strike, often like a bolt from the blue, at any time and at any place.

I believe that, when they have had the opportunity to study this proposal in its entirety, that the private companies would be willing to cooperate with the Federal Government in such an undertaking and would welcome a system whereby these heavy periodic disaster losses could be insured with Government support. This insurance would not interfere in any way with current insurance coverages because it would not go into effect in any area until the President has declared an emergency. It would constitute an additional, valuable, ready Government device for coping with great disasters. I would like to insert in the RECORD, with your permission, the text of H. R. 6129.

3. Expansion of the Weather Bureau to permit and promote greater Federal participation in weather and climatic research by the establishment of an appropriate Commission to make recommendations looking toward the accomplishment of this end.

I have prepared a tentative draft of this proposed legislation and with your permission would like to insert it in the RECORD. It contemplates a long-range program of research, coordinated with Weather Bureau activities, to speed intensive study of weather problems and to inaugurate as early as possible more effective hurricane and storm warning systems.

This is something, I think, that has been greatly needed in the Nation for a long time. As you all recall, Congress recently substantially increased the appropriations for the Weather Bureau to amplify present services. However, I think that a much broader basis is required in order to integrate the gathering and dissemination of information and forecasting of weather and climatic conditions. Such a system, if adopted, could very conceivably be used in coordination with civil defense and the armed services to warn our civilian population against approaching military attack. It would also aid our farmers, our shipping and air industries.

4. I also think that the Congress will have to strengthen and expand our machinery for disaster relief and rehabilitation. For one thing it should be more closely coordinated in the Federal Government and with the State and local communities. It should be put on a permanent basis.

Furthermore, I seriously doubt that situations of such magnitude can be satisfactorily handled by Government loans alone. Many people have lost their homes, but are still saddled with mortgage debt on nonexisting property. As a practical matter, they cannot possibly undertake further staggering debt on new homes because, even if it could be negotiated, it would snow them under financially, and it is unfair to American citizens so grievously afflicted to give them the feeling that they are objects of charity.

Many worthy business men employing our citizens are in the same predicament. The Small Business Administration has done a fine job under its present authority. But many businesses wracked by floods cannot survive under the burdens of heavy additional debt. Some consideration must be promptly given to the equitable and humane problems of putting these groups into the status quo ante—the position they were in before disaster struck them.

If proposals are to be adopted on a large-scale calling for huge Government funds for relocating entire communities—and such proposals are already under serious study by high-ranking Federal officials—the problems of rendering adequate financial aid to those who desire to remain in their present locations in order to save them harmless should also be carefully appraised.

These losses are far beyond the resources of individuals, or the State and local government. They will require the assistance of the Federal Government.

That will be costly. But so is foreign relief and aid; so are agricultural subsidies; so are great public projects in other sections of the Nation. The stricken people of the Eastern Seaboard who contribute so much in taxes to the Treasury are also entitled to the generous help and assistance of the Federal Government. I most respectfully urge that you carefully consider our plight and take every measure you can to assist us with rehabilitation and in safeguarding our area and every other area of the Nation, as well as it is possible for Congress to do, against the ravages of great natural disasters.

In conclusion, let me simply say this. Our need is very great, my friends. We have been sorely stricken, almost beyond description. Our own people have responded with extraordinary courage, resourcefulness, and compelling determination to try to reestablish their homes, their industries and their communities. But if ever we needed it, we now need the sympathetic help and assistance of the Federal Government to ward off the effects of these disastrous flood and to set up adequate safeguards against possible future visitations of great natural disasters, so unpredictable in their advent and point of attack, and so paralyzing and devastating in their consequences.

If this fine committee of the House comprised of our able, esteemed colleagues from other sections of the country working so diligently and intelligently under the leadership of our energetic, genial and capable friend, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, can help us in any way to realize the objectives in this field which we in Massachusetts feel must be so urgently pursued, then we will indeed by very grateful.

Let me thank you all, Mr. Chairman, for bearing with me and giving your valuable time, and, most of all, for your sincere and sympathetic consideration of our very serious problems.

And now, with your permission, I should like the honor of presenting to you our distinguished colleagues, all members of our congressional delegation Flood Committee, Mr. HESELTON, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. BOLAND, and our beloved friend and colleague, Mrs. ROGERS, all of whom desire to present their views. Our distinguished colleague, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, also a member of the committee is presently overseas on official business and will undoubtedly want to present his views to you upon his return.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, sympathy and understanding, joined with a dedicated devotion to duty, were the characteristics of Mrs. VERA BUCHANAN which make her passing such a great loss to all of us in this House, as well as to the citizens whom she so ably represented.

Serving with her on the Banking and Currency Committee, as a freshman member I benefited greatly from her conscientious example of public service. She gave freely of her warm friendship, and the compassionate qualities of her concern for the welfare of the men and women of her district were an inspiration to all of her colleagues.

The personal loss I feel at VERA BUCHANAN'S death, after only 1 year of service together in this House, is a measure of —and a tribute to—the heart and soul of a great American.

Charles D. McCarthy Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, a familiar figure is gone from the New York City scene. In November of 1955, Charles D. McCarthy retired after having served faithfully for 23 years as doorman at the RCA Building, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City. Charlie, as he is known to his many friends, had been on the job since April 26, 1933, 4 days before the center's second office building was occupied. He was never without a cheerful greeting for one and all, and will be greatly missed by those who had come to know him. It is my hope that he will enjoy many happy, peaceful years of rest which he so richly deserves. I should like to include the following article which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of November 20, 1955:

DOORMAN AT RCA TO RETIRE—ADMINISTRATOR FOR 23 YEARS

Charles D. McCarthy, who was doorman of the RCA Building at 30 Rockefeller Plaza before there were tenants to open the door for, is retiring next month in the position of a man who has taken Rockefeller Center into partnership.

"We have been very fortunate in the tenants we have had in that they take a pride in being here," he recalls. "But, of course, we try to be as nice to them as we can."

An erect, stately man with a square ruddy face, Mr. McCarthy donned the brown uniform of a special officer doorman at No. 30 on April 26, 1933, 4 days before the center's second office building was occupied. He's been there ever since, rain and shine, with a ready grin for his tenants, "the people who have equity here."

Mr. McCarthy, who is called Charlie by most of the tenants, and Mac by most of the RCA executives, could have retired last year when he was 65. He chose instead to stay on until the end of the year because, as he explained, "I felt that in the pursuit of happiness, this was the place for me to be a little longer. But in the inexorable movement of time your physique gets a little older and I did think I needed a rest. After all, I'll be 67 next April 20."

From his station at the red canopy in front of the building, Mr. McCarthy's job, as he explained, is, "administrator of the most valuable piece of property in the world—as far as parking is concerned." His is the final word on who shall move on and who shall be allowed to rest on the street between 49th and 50th Streets, in front of No. 30.

After retiring, Mr. McCarthy plans to live a quiet life with his wife, Eva, in their home at 1936 East Tremont Avenue, the Bronx, which is a part of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.'s Parkchester development. Before he came to the center, Mr. McCarthy was a floorwalker for Cimbels and Arnold Constable's and now, he said, looking down at his high-laced black shoes, "I'm going to sit down and do some reading."

Interview on WNAC–TV, Boston, Featuring Hon. John W. McCormack, Conducted by Lester Smith, Special Features Department, December 6, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a question and answer interview in which I participated over WNAC–TV station of Boston, Mass., on December 6, 1955. This television program interview was conducted by Lester Smith of the special features department with Les Smith of the same station the questioner.

The interview follows:

LES SMITH. Good evening, everyone, I am Lester Smith, of the WNAC–TV, Yankee Network Special Features Department.

Following the policy of the Yankee Network—to keep its viewers and listeners completely posted on affairs which affect not only our community, but our State and our Nation as well—we are again very happy to have with us tonight another of the distinguished members of the Massachusetts congressional delegation in Washington to discuss topics of importance in world affairs. We are happy to welcome the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, the majority leader in the House of Representatives in Washington. Congressman MCCORMACK, we are happy that you were able to join us.

Congressman MCCORMACK. Thank you, Mr. Smith. I am very happy to be with you.

LES SMITH. The events of the last few days—the last few weeks—and the last few months, Congressman, have sort of jumbled themselves together into a patchwork which has made a lot of people in this country very apprehensive and concerned over the way the turns of events are going in the world situation. To your mind, as matters stand today, how are we faring in the world as a whole?

Congressman MCCORMACK. Throughout the world, Mr. Smith, as we look it over, we have got to develop policies that will enable us to have a better—a stronger—position. You use the word "faring"—I think it is a very good word. Since last July and the so-called summit meeting, the situation throughout the world has not been favorable to us and psychologically, we are in an unfavorable situation and position. It is not too late to get back and recover and obtain our affirmativeness. But we can't—we shouldn't—delay too long. Because, the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear; and, that is military power and strength greater than they possess. They respect only firmness in the field of diplomacy where you have definite leadership, not uncertain leadership that changes from day to day and week to week—and where that firm leadership in the field of diplomacy is supported by that which the Communists respect—namely, military power and strength.

LES SMITH. Congressman, there was a reference made, just recently to the effect that perhaps the Soviet Union prefers this so-called cold war stalemate to either full peace or a full-scale war with the United States. What do you think of that reference?

Congressman MCCORMACK. Well, in my opinion, I think that that is their probable state of mind. All we can do is weigh the probabilities; and, what the probabilities in the mind of a Communist are is rather hard to weigh. You, and I, and others—thinking the way we do—can weigh the probabilities in our minds and in other's minds; but, on this matter we are dealing with the minds of world-killers who are out to impose communism by revolution, force, or otherwise upon all of the other peoples of the world. Frankly, I do not think that they want a full-scale war, now. But, we have ever got to be on the alert with our Intelligence working every minute of the day with all the other facilities of our country and of every other free country working ever to be on the alert. And, the reason I do not think they want an all-out war is because the nuclear bomb is so destructive that if they undertook to murder, so to speak, some other country—before they did it they'd commit suicide themselves. So, I think they are using this smile, this, mask of a smile to try and deceive people. And remember, behind the mask of that smile is that same cruel mind that has sent millions of persons to imprisonment and to their death. So, I think what they want is a status quo, which the so-called spirit of Geneva has developed for their benefit, while continuing their work of subversion wherever they can and taking over country after country.

LES SMITH. Congressman, the recent events in the last few days in Berlin, insofar as the actions of the Soviet Union are concerned—what are their basic significances?

Congressman MCCORMACK. It is another one of their moves. They feel that there is weakness among the countries of the Western world. They're probing. They're hoping that we will manifest uncertainty. Berlin is a symbol to countless of millions of peoples and the free world—the Western world cannot afford to let them get by with that. The United States has got to pursue a firm policy. I admire the American High Commissioner to Germany the other day when he rode through East Germany. That is something that the Communists understand; but, if we vacillate, if we engage in uncertain actions, if they obtain their victory there—a psychological victory—it will be most harmful to the free world's cause. So, that is one place where we have got to be firm, very firm.

LES SMITH. Now, let's dwell on one other point for a moment. We, of course, realize the danger spots that exist in various sections of Europe, the Far East, the Middle East. What in your mind are the key danger spots with which we have to be concerned?

Congressman MCCORMACK. Well, there are several spots. There is southeast Asia—all of southeast Asia—South Vietnam. There is Formosa, the Pescadores, Matsu, Quemoy—the British have possessions like Hong Kong. And there is Malaya and Thailand—the latter is a very important country to us—and Indonesia. These are important because if they get southeast Asia our whole far-eastern defenses are outflanked and we would have to come back to the continental defense—Hawaii and Alaska. Then, there is in the Near East, the Egyptian threat against Israel—Egypt trying and determined to destroy that little nation of brave people over there; and, in that area they are the only people, the only friends we have there. There's the weakening of NATO, the status quo in Europe, and behind the Iron Curtain they're saying to non-Communists that the Western World has let you down. In other countries like Italy, they are saying to non-Communists, "Why do you doubt our sincerity? Even President Eisenhower says we are sincere in our desire for peace." So, it is a worldwide pattern; and, Berlin is a more recent evidence of the hardened minds of the Communists and their determination to undermine us by every means possible short of general war. We have got to be watchful for that—it is a calculated risk—but short of general war—as I see it they plan to take over country after country and to weaken the Western cause. And, we have

been weakened. But it is not too late for us to recover if we only determine to do so.

Congressman, if we may, may we go back for a moment, and take up the question of the seriousness of the problem involving Israel and the Arab States? At the moment, of course, there is the tremendous problem of the Egyptian purchase of arms from Communist satellites and the question of "if" and "where" Israel is to get arms. Is there a solution there?

Congressman MCCORMACK. Well, Israel is a nation of about 8,000 square miles. It has about 1,500,000 people. It is a democracy in fact as well as in name. It is western minded. The people of Israel are our friends. The Egyptians—the Arabs—you never could rely upon in World War I or World War II. Egypt alone has over 40 million population. If in the course of 2 years they are able to develop their manpower, that is their military manpower, a nation like Israel could be in a very dangerous position with not more than a 250 thousand to 300 thousand maximum army. America could not and should not permit Israel to be exterminated and America should furnish arms. But that is not the solution alone. America should so inform the Kremlin firmly, because they are the ones selling the arms to Egypt and Nasser. We should tell them that not only the United States, but also Great Britain and France under no condition intend to see the free people of Israel exterminated or weakened. Furthermore, might I make this observation, Mr. Smith, that Nasser, who is the Prime Minister of Egypt, would never dare think of buying arms from any Communist nation if he had any fear of the United States. It is our weakened, uncertain leadership that has brought about that feeling of confidence on their part, where they go to a Communist nation and buy arms; and yet we are powerful America. We have got to get back to the basic policy of peace through strength and firmness, and leadership—not bullying but firm leadership on the highest governmental level and in the fields of diplomacy.

LES SMITH. Well, that brings up in some respects the question I was going to ask you, and perhaps you can elaborate a bit, that is, "In your mind, what is the most effective way to meet Russia's cold war"?

Congressman MCCORMACK. The most effective way is to have America aroused—our people informed. Our people will make every sacrifice necessary when they are given information. The American people are fighters. We fight for what we believe in—in the right of the sanctity of the home; freedom of speech; freedom of religion; freedom of the press—those great rights that are ours and are contained in the Constitution. Those are intangibles, that free men and free women, when they possess them, will fight to preserve. We have got to have a military organization that commands the respect, through fear, of the Communist leaders, because they are out to conquer the world and to subject all the peoples of the world to Communist persecution and death. So, the price we pay is the price for our preservation and for freedom; and, it is far better to err if we are going to err, on the side of strength than on the side of weakness and that is one of the basic positions I have taken as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

LES SMITH. Well, Congressman, as the majority leader in the House of Representatives, I believe we have about a minute or so left, would you care to make some reference to the bi-partisanship of our foreign policies?

Congressman MCCORMACK. Well, fortunately, we have a very strong bi-partisan policy today because the Democratic Party is united on foreign affairs. The Republican Party is very badly split and divided; so, the Democratic Party is the unifying force in our bi-partisanship. But, now, bi-partisanship does not mean that we cannot constructively criticize; or constructively suggest; or that the right of dissent is taken away from us in America.

Henry Cabot Lodge the other night at a Republican gathering—and it was rather strange that the Ambassador should give Democrats advice in the field of foreign affairs, at the Republican gathering—said, however, that they would tell of the present administration's achievements in the field of foreign affairs and let the people judge. I am satisfied with that; but with one more addition that we should tell them of the "non-achievements" and then let the people judge. With that I will be satisfied.

LES SMITH. We are sorry that we are just about at the end of our time and again, our sincere thanks to you for joining us. It has been the pleasure of the Special Features Department of WNAC–TV and the Yankee Network to be able to talk tonight with the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, majority leader in the House of Representatives.

The Late John D. Dingell

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my voice to the many that have eulogized our distinguished late colleague JOHN DINGELL. I knew him from the time he came to Congress, and learned to have an affectionate regard for him, as I am sure he had for me.

Just as cream rises to the top of the bottle, so he, in a short time, rose and grew in his ability and effectiveness as a Member of the House. He won the admiration of all the Members for his integrity of purpose, high aims, exemplary character, and excellence in parliamentary procedure. He rendered excellent service as a ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee. His words on the floor of the House always carried conviction.

Unfortunately, in the last few years, illness pursued him. May we say that the Good Lord wished to see an end to the suffering he endured and bestowed upon him an endless sleep. Even when suffering with pain, he insisted on coming to committee meetings and to the floor of the House. He bore his pain unflinchingly and uncomplainingly. He was indeed a stoic.

JOHN DINGELL's constituents loved him and honored him, and returned him to office many times. They placed upon him this accolade of distinction for having the courage of his convictions and for his devoted service. He is now succeeded by his son who, I am sure, will walk in the paths hewn out for him by his revered father. Like father, like son. The mantle of his office now falls upon him. From what I have already seen and know about him, he will keep the memory of his father alive in this House by distinguished service, honor and integrity.

Violation of the Constitutional Guaranties of Members of the Armed Forces Under the Status of Forces Agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the resolutions and discussions in the last session of Congress with reference to the Status of Forces Agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, I have made a thorough investigation of the entire situation and am, herewith, citing these facts which have convinced me more than ever before of the necessity for the elimination of this constitutional violation:

VIOLATION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL GUARANTIES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES UNDER THE STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Up to 1951 when our military personnel were sent to any foreign country and accused of committing a crime or a violation of a local law, they were subject to trial by a court-martial of their own command and were not turned over to foreign governments to be tried in a foreign land by foreign courts. Since the signing of the Status of Forces Agreement in 1951 by the United States Government and its ratification by the United States Senate in 1953, whenever a member of the United States military personnel is accused of a crime while serving in a foreign country and that country requests the accused to be turned over to it for trial, we must abide by its request.

One must understand that before this treaty, when a GI was accused or arrested, the United States military forces could determine, when requested by a foreign government, whether the young man should be turned over, and this would take place only where the man was accused of a very major crime and evidence against him was overwhelming. This system should be continued and the constitutional guaranties of American soldiers upheld.

In order to understand this agreement fully, I am setting forth a description of article VII of the agreement so that one may properly understand exactly what it does and its purpose:

Article VII of the agreement prescribes the circumstances under which the sending or receiving States will have either exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction to try offenders. In those situations where both states have concurrent jurisdiction articles VII prescribes which state shall have the "primary" jurisdiction. Exclusive jurisdiction implies that only one state has the right to try an offender, as in a case for example, of security offenses which are against the laws of one country but not of another. If an offense violates the laws of both states, both states may have jurisdiction. However, the state that has the right to try the offender in the first instance, and in this sense may be said to have the prior or superior right to try the

offender, is deemed to be the state having the "primary" jurisdiction. This does not imply, however, that in the ordinary case a person may twice be in jeopardy. Paragraph 8 of article VII expressly provides: "Where an accused has been tried in accordance with the provisions of this article by the authorities of one contracting party and has been acquitted, or has been convicted and is serving, or has served his sentence or has been pardoned, he may not be tried again for the same offense within the same territory by the authorities of another contracting party." This section safeguards an accused against double jeopardy. This, however, is subject to what may be deemed a military exception to double jeopardy which does not prevent the military authorities of a sending state from trying a member of its force for a violation of rules of discipline arising from an act or omission which constituted an offense for which he was tried by the receiving state.

This means that military personnel are not exempt from double jeopardy because after their conviction in a foreign court, they may be tried and convicted by a court-martial held subsequent to the serving of their original sentence.

It must be further pointed out, that members of our diplomatic service have immunity when in foreign countries.

"Diplomatic immunity" simply means that our diplomatic officials, both of our embassies and our consulates, are immune from prosecution by foreign countries for crimes of which they may be accused. And yet these same members of our diplomatic corps go there by choice. They do not have to go if they do not want to. But our military personnel, some of whom enlist and a great majority of whom are drafted into the service involuntarily, are sent to foreign countries, not because they want to go, but simply because once they have been sworn into the military forces and the uniform of the United States Government is placed on them, they have to do exactly as they are told. They not only must do as they are told and ordered, but in the event of war or fighting, they must die if necessary in order to carry out the order that was given to them when they became members of the military forces. Therefore, it is very difficult to understand, in the light of this comparison alone, why the military man should be excepted, and certain agreements made whereby he loses the guaranties of the very Constitution that he is supporting and willing to fight for.

After testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee in July on this subject, I decided that since I was going to Europe on other business, I would make arrangements to visit a number of our military personnel who had been tried in foreign courts and were serving sentences in foreign prisons.

I left New York by plane on August 5, 1955, and flew to London, England. Through the cooperation of the American Embassy and our military officials, arrangements were made for me to visit several English prisons for the purpose of interviewing our GI's personally and getting their stories and reactions.

Accompanying me was Maj. W. Charlotte from the United States Provost Marshal's Department and Captain Barnes of the Judge Advocate's Department, who informed me that I was the first Congressman to visit our GI's in prison.

My first visit was to the Wormwood Scrubs Prison, where, after discussing the reason for my visit with the governor, I was permitted to interview three GI's imprisoned there. They were brought in one at a time, and a guard was stationed in the room with us.

I went over each case separately, the cause of the arrest, the trial, and the conviction, as well as the sentence. These three were serving from 1 to 3 years. Each one of them stated that he would have had a fairer trial before a United States Military court-martial.

I spent another day with Major Charlotte and Captain Barnes on a visit to the Maidstone Prison in England. At this prison I interviewed four GI's imprisoned there and the story was the same. They felt that they had been let down. It was not my thought to judge the innocence or guilt of these young men. I do feel, that so far as the English courts were concerned, they were treated fairly in accordance with their system.

I spent another day at Scotland Yard and at the Sessions Court in London where one of our GI's was up for trial. However, he pleaded guilty, and after a very good argument by his defense counsel, he was given a light sentence, a fine, which was paid.

I then went to France, and here was another highly difficult situation. In the French courts, and under French law, a man is presumed guilty and must prove his innocence. This is completely the opposite of American law.

Here again, I interviewed young GI's in prison. I traveled from Paris to Fontevrault Prison and interviewed two GI's. Their stories were pathetic. I saw them together and talked to both at the same time, as they were convicted of the same crime. Both of them stated that they did not know what was going on during their arrest and at their trial. They were assigned French counsel and an interpreter. Everything went on in French and they could not even get the drift through the interpreter. They both stated that everything was not interpreted to them and the next thing they knew they were sentenced to 5 years each. These two cases have had much publicity in the United States papers because of the harsh sentence. I visited another young GI at the Hotel Dieu (prison ward hospital) in Paris. He was quite satisfied and was the only one that I know of who was. He had not been brought to trial as yet, but will have been by this fall. He also intimated to me why he was satisfied to be tried by a French court and I am not at liberty to state his reason here.

I have avoided mentioning any names, as I did not in any way want to hurt further these young Americans. The two at Fontevrault Prison also stated that they should have been tried by a court-martial and they would have known what was going on and would have felt they had a fair trial.

The Status of Forces Treaty had not been signed in Italy as yet, I was informed when I visited Rome.

After my journey abroad, I am more concerned than ever that this treaty should be revised—for the following reasons:

First. All through American history, the American flag followed our soldiers wherever they went and was their protection.

Second. There is distinct violation of the constitutional privileges and protection for our military personnel under this treaty.

Third. Today, as soon as they are shipped to foreign soil, where the treaty is in force, our soldiers no longer have the protection of the Constitution. Why? Because they cannot be tried by a jury of their peers in a foreign court. They cannot have their own American counsel defend them. There certainly is a "hostile atmosphere." By this I simply mean, without casting any reflection upon the integrity of any foreign people, that in many areas where our troops are stationed, the people do not want them there. The people do not understand why they are there, either, and I find little is done in these areas, intelligently, to inform the people why our troops are there.

Fourth. There is an erosion of the right of appeal. While our GI's have the right of appeal, it is far different from the American judicial system and a man runs a real hazard by filing an appeal. Why? Because, if his appeal is lost, the higher court has the right to add to the sentence, and in many instances does so. For example: if a man is sentenced to 1 year on a charge where he could have been given up to 5 years, the appeals court could give him and usually does, the balance of the other 4 years. I understand that this is done to prevent appealing. Even in our courts-martial system, a man has an automatic review and further appeal.

Fifth. There have been many citations of cases and trials of American servicemen in foreign countries. There also is the question of the penalties prescribed in certain foreign countries, either those with whom we have agreements or with whom we may sign these agreements in the future. Violations of the laws of these countries, laws that are absolutely unknown to the average American citizen, may bring penalties that are far beyond anything ever thought of in American jurisprudence.

We must remember that we have troops serving with air base in countries such as Morocco and Pakistan and others. If we look into the history of these countries, insofar as penalties for violations of civil laws are concerned, we will find that in many, many instances people there, instead of being sent to prison, would lose a hand or a foot, an arm or a leg, or even an eye for offenses which in our country would be mere misdemeanors. Imagine what could happen if steps are taken to sign agreements such as this with these countries. We must also remember that while this agreement ostensibly was arranged for the NATO countries and the United States, that a similar agreement has also been signed and is in operation in Japan. So it is possible that agreements may be signed with these other

countries. I think you will agree with me that this must be stopped and our feelings made known to the President of the United States through a resolution of the Congress.

There are many other arguments for revision of this treaty. It must be noted that for quite a number of years we have been hearing and reading about the demands for the protection of the civil rights of the people of the United States for one cause or another. Secondly, we have been hearing and reading constantly about citizens of the United States being called either before the courts or before congressional committees and using the 1st, 5th, and 14th, amendments in order to avoid testifying or giving information. All of these protections are parts of the Constitution of the United States. Many of the people who are on trial or being interrogated before the congressional committees use the fifth amendment to avoid giving information as to their own participation in the Communist cause to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence, or to avoid giving information as to whether they belong or ever did belong to any Communist front organization. All of these rights are provided for these people in our Constitution, even though many of them are working for the destruction of the very Constitution behind which they seek protection.

Justice John Marshall, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court (1775–1835), in the early days of the Republic, clearly ruled and defined that:

> Service in the Armed Forces of the Republic of the United States shall not abrogate or nullify the constitutional rights of an American citizen.

What then becomes of the constitutional rights of hundreds and thousands of servicemen who are in foreign countries involuntarily and who are sent to jail by foreign courts for breaking some local laws? The military justice committee of the New York County Lawyers' Association has been working on this matter since 1954. The committee has been negotiating with the Defense Department following the expression of the opinion by the association committee that the Status of Forces Agreements with the NATO countries and Japan did not secure to Americans in the Armed Forces the same legal rights a defendant would have in the United States. It was held by the committee that American defense personnel were not on foreign soil of their own free volition as in the case of a citizen traveling with a passport and the Government should not sign away, even in a mutual defense pact, the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

With reference to the editorial of the New York Law Journal of September 22, 1955, the committee states:

> The Defense Department later informed the Senate Military Affairs Committee that in the first 6 months of 1954, only 33 American servicemen were sent to jail by foreign courts. In the opinion of the lawyers' committee, unless the 33 receive the same standard of protection they would receive under our Constitution, it was 35 too many.

That is the whole point involved in the Status of Forces Agreement. It is immaterial how many or how few are involved. The real question is the whittling away of the constitutional guaranties reserved for every American citizens whether he be in the Armed Forces on domestic or foreign soil.

I am convinced that the Status of Foreices Agreement violates the ruling mentioned above of Chief Justice John Marshall, the greatest authority on the Constitution of the United States.

At the last session of Congress, that is, the first session of the Eighty-fourth Congress, resolutions were introduced calling upon the President and State Department to work with any country with whom we had signed a Status of Forces Agreement for the purpose of eliminating it and returning to the conditions that prevailed through all the years up to 1951. Congress should pass a resolution calling upon the executive branch of our Government to nullify this Status of Forces Agreement.

I have noted with great interest a recent report in the press that the Defense Department has directed our military commanders abroad to take all possible steps to assure fair treatment of American military personnel facing charges in foreign courts. The following story appeared in the New York Times of December 6, 1955:

> The Defense Department has laid down strict procedures to be followed by overseas commanders to protect to "the maximum extent possible" United States military personnel tried in foreign courts.
>
> A new directive to all military commands says Defense Department policy requires that all steps be taken to assure "fair trial and fair treatment" of men and women facing charges in foreign civil courts.
>
> The directive orders overseas commanders to follow the trials closely, provide free counsel if necessary, check on prison conditions and protest through diplomatic channels if they consider the trial or sentence unfair.
>
> Under so-called status of force treaties, United States service men overseas can be tried by foreign courts for crimes committed while they are off duty. In turn, foreign troops stationed here are subject to United States laws.
>
> The new directive safeguards the interests of United States military personnel as specified by the Senate when it ratified the status of force treaties in July, 1953. While most of the procedures have been specified, the directive incorporates them in one document.

I have cited heretofore the very many reasons why this agreement should be eliminated from the NATO treaty. The very fact that the Pentagon now is taking cognizance of this situation and is belatedly taking some steps to provide some degree of protection does not, of course, solve the problem of the violation of the constitutional rights of our servicemen.

It must also be noted that whenever I have discussed this with our State Department people, the only answer that I have been able to get from anyone, anywhere, at any time, is the fact that this agreement was brought about as a matter of necessity, and that we must realize that foreign troops serving in the United States or on United States territory may be tried in our civil courts for the violation of the laws of our country. The fact remains that there are practically no foreign troops serving in this country. Only a few are here, for such purposes as special training, and I feel certain that it will be in the best interest of our country to have these men tried by their own courts-martial and not by our civil courts. The few that are serving here certainly do not justify us in sacrificing the constitutional rights of hundreds of thousands of young Americans serving abroad.

It must be recognized that the Congress has no power to alter or change this agreement. However, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 438 for the purpose of securing the support of Congress in requesting the President to bring about the elimination of this Status of Forces Agreement and trust that it will receive favorable action in this session of Congress.

An Appeal for the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, as this 2d session of the 84th Congress gets under way I do not want the sun to set on our first full day's deliberations without a fresh appeal for action—and action at the earliest possible date—to halt the downward spiral of farm prices and restore our farm income to fair levels.

Peace is undoubtedly our number one national objective, but I do not believe any fair-minded person can question the fact that our number one problem within the United States economy is the mounting problem of American agriculture.

In the January 3 copy of the New York Times, there is an excellent dispatch from Des Moines, Iowa, which begins as follows:

> As the new economic year begins, many of of the Nation's farmers have come to regard themselves as poor children with their noses pressed against the toyshop windows.
>
> After years of riding on top of the postwar prosperity wave, they have now been dumped on the beach. From the record levels of early 1951, farm prices have dropped as much as 25 percent. Ten percent of this decline occurred in 1955.
>
> All this has happened in a year when stock dividends attained new highs and average take-home pay for workers set a record.
>
> To add to the farmers' general unhappiness, farm costs have failed to match the deflationary trend of farm prices. In some instances, the things farmers must buy are now actually higher than they were in 1951.

In my own State of Oklahoma, where farm problems have been compounded by long and bitter years of drought, these blunt statements fall short of describing the gravity of the situation.

Literally thousands of Oklahoma farmers, who own productive farms and good dairy and cattle herds, are today eating three meals a day only because they are holding down some kind of job in town, or on county or State roads, to offset their losses on farm operations.

In many farm families, the wives and children are also working off the farm, in order to make ends narrowly meet—and it has not been a bright Christmas in many of these households. Food relief rolls are at record heights, and still increasing in rural areas.

The future is darkened by the prospect of further cuts in farm price supports, under the administration's new "modified parity" formula. A further cut of 5 percent, in the overall picture, will be bitter medicine indeed for America's hard-hit farmers and their families.

Surely there is a sound and sensible answer to our farm dilemma, which does not require further drastic cuts in farm income. There must be ways in which our foreign exports of farm products can be recovered, and ways in which our farm surpluses can be used to advantage and good purpose in the cold war and in meeting our own domestic needs, without shoving the farmer completely off the economic ladder.

Let us give to the farm problem the high priority of consideration and legislation which it rightly deserves. Let us demand from the Secretary of Agriculture the fair and helpful action which it is his duty to give our farm population.

Let us see that prosperity in 1956 does not bypass the American farmer.

The New York Times article follows:

FARMERS PINCHED BY FALLING PRICES AND RISING COSTS—WHOLESALE INDEX, AT 119.4 FOR INDUSTRY, IS DOWN TO 83.3 FOR AGRICULTURE—SOME SUFFERING LOSSES—FURTHER DETERIORATION SEEN AS UNITED STATES LOAN SUPPORTS ON BASIC CROPS ARE PARED

(By Seth S. King)

DES MOINES, IOWA.—As the new economic year begins, many of the Nation's farmers have come to regard themselves as poor children with their noses pressed against the toy shop windows.

After years of riding on top of the postwar prosperity wave, they have now been dumped on the beach. From the record levels of early 1951 farm prices have dropped as much as 25 percent. Ten percent of this decline occurred in 1955.

All this has happened in a year when stock dividends attained new highs and the average take-home pay for workers set a record.

To add to the farmers' general unhappiness, farm costs have failed to match the deflationary trend of farm prices. In some instances, the things farmers must buy are now actually higher than they were in 1951.

This is well illustrated by the Government's price index of wholesale commodities. Figured on the 1947–49 base, the index in December for industrials was at 119.4 percent. The index for agriculture was at 83.3 percent, the lowest since June 1946. In 1946 farm prices were at 78.3 percent, 2.8 points higher than the industrials.

NO IMPROVEMENT IN SIGHT

For 1956 there is little statistical hope for improvement in this situation. The United States Department of Agriculture has predicted a 5 percent drop this year over last year, and the outlook for individual farm products seemed to bear out this gloomy appraisal.

In this part of the Midwest, the bulk of the farming is based on a corn-hog-fattened cattle operation. The rotation of crops may include oats and alfalfa, but these are largely grown for feed. The only other cash crop of any importance is soybeans.

In 1955 many farmers in Iowa and other Corn Belt States west of the Mississippi were hit hard by the drought. This State's corn production was 12 percent lower than 1954's and 8 percent below the 10-year average. But this reduction in the yield did not have any strengthening effect on the market. At the moment there are 437 million bushels of corn stored in Government bins and on Iowa farms. This is more than half the normal supply raised in this state each year.

In addition, the total corn crop throughout the Nation was 7 percent larger than in 1954. In many sections the land diverted from other crops went into corn and thirty-five new counties in States outside Iowa increased their corn production enough to be classed as "basic corn areas."

All this has meant that the cash value of corn has decreased. Last year a farmer could get Government price supports at about $1.54 a bushel when corn was $1.20 in the open market. This was at 88 percent of parity.

But this year the new "modified parity" formula goes into effect. Under this, the parity is figured on the average of the last 10 years instead of the old 1909–14 average. The effect of this will be to lower supports about 5 percent.

Added to all this will be a new and more stringent acreage allotment. To be eligible for price supports, a farmer must agree to plant no more corn than is allowed by this allotment, which is governed by the total national supply. In 1956 this allotment is expected to be about 10 percent smaller than in 1955.

Since most midwestern farmers feed part or all of the corn they raise to hogs or beef cattle, the market prices of corn can be offset by putting it into an animal instead of selling it.

But such an operation is profitable only if the price for the animal is greater than the cost of the feed it took to fatten him.

At this time hogs are eating considerably more than they are worth. At the close of the 1955 market year, they were bringing around $10.50 a hundred pounds at interior Iowa and Nebraska markets.

The cost of raising these animals to market weights varies with different farmers. But it is generally agreed that it takes from $13.50 to $15.35 a hundred pounds to accomplish this.

The price of hogs dipped below $15 last fall, and the profit from the record numbers sent to market was either negligible or nonexistent. Some of them, in recent weeks, have been sold with serious losses.

Finally, the price of soybeans dropped to $2.08 a bushel last fall compared with $2.54 in 1954. The support price on these was lowered to 70 percent of parity in 1955 by order of the Secretary of Agriculture. Last year 372 million bushels were raised and this was a record amount. At the end of the marketing year, the price had climbed back to about $2.15. But there were still towering piles of soybeans in storage and the support prices may be lowered again next year in the hope that more will be forced onto the market.

The generally discouraging outlook in the Corn Belt was matched by dim prospects in the wheat areas.

For the winter wheat crop now in the ground and the spring crop to be planted later this year, the support level has been set at 76 percent of parity or about $1.81 a bushel. The 1955 crop was supported at 82½ cents, or $2.08.

Surplus supplies of wheat are greater than for any other commodity and the acreage allotments of 55 million acres now in effect are the absolute minimum the law allows.

All this adds up to a certain drop in income for 1956. Last year many farmers in the wheat areas said their income was from 10 to 15 percent lower than in 1954. Many of them expect their 1956 income to be from $1,000 to $2,000 less than in 1955.

Exactly how badly hurt the farmers now are and how much more they will suffer in 1956 are still highly debatable issues. There can be no question that they made less money in 1955 than they did in 1954 and they are probably going to make less in 1956 than they did last year.

Lowered farm income was beginning to be felt in some phases of midwestern economy. Iowa retail stores reported Christmas sales held even with 1954's. But farm implement sales were down last fall below a year ago and the banks were beginning to report the need for greater efforts in collecting loans.

Cathedral of the Pines—A National Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CATHEDRAL OF THE PINES,
Rindge, N. H., November 28, 1955.

Congressman PERKINS BASS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BASS: Regarding the proposed joint action by you and Senator STYLES BRIDGES of introducing legislation by the Congress of the United States to effect recognition of the altar of the Nation in the Cathedral of the Pines, Rindge, N. H., as a national shrine I do want you to know that we are most grateful to have your continuing help and interest in securing this further assurance by the Congress that every life is as precious and of as much meaning as another, that there should be national recognition given for the lives of all Americans sacrificed in war service.

This proposed effort is not to further memorialize the military alone but all Americans who sacrificed their lives in war service—those in the uniforms of the military and those in or out of uniforms of other organizations also in war service. The proposed action by you and Senator BRIDGES, if effected, will correct in particular a lack of national recognition for the debt we owe for the sacrifice of the lives of women as well as of men. I am quite sure the American women will appreciate what is done in this matter.

The Bureau of the Budget is assured no cost of any kind to the Government is involved in this proposed action.

I am in receipt of a communication under date of November 10, 1955, from Col. Charles B. Shaw, officer in charge, the American Battle Monuments Commission, that the Commission has not erected in the United States a monument or memorial recalling the sacrifices of the men and women in war service, both the military and the civilian.

Referring to correspondence under date of April 20, 1953, from the Secretary of the Interior to the Honorable Hugh Butler, chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the thought was expressed that eventually the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery will commemorate American war dead of all wars. I doubt this because there are now the WAC's, WAVES, and WAF's—certainly this Unknown Soldier's Tomb can hardly become

a memorial for the sacrifices of the lives of women.

The Cathedral of the Pines with all of its appointments is held by the Cathedral of the Pines trust whose trustees are members of differing faiths charged with maintaining and perpetuating this cathedral "dedicated to Almighty God as a place where all people may worship."

The Altar of the Nation was dedicated in 1950 by the late Rev. Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, president of the Union Theological Seminary, as a memorial for all the American war dead. The Altar of the Nation has been given national recognition for the tributes of the following have been placed at the Altar of the Nation:

The President of the Uinted States (three times).

Each of the Governors of the 48 States.

The national commanders of the following national patriotic organizations: American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jewish War Veterans, AMVETS, Marine Corps League, Fleet Reserve Association, Military Order of the World Wars, Veterans of the Y. D., United Spanish-American War Veterans, Disabled American Veterans.

Sons of the American Revolution by three of the president generals.

Daughters of the American Revolution by President Generals Carraway and O'Byrne.

The Overseas Press Club of America, Inc., by Louis P. Lochner, president.

Service organizations: The Salvation Army, by Col. Ralph T. Miller, provincial commander; the YMCA, by General Secretary Jay A. Urice; the Knights of Columbus, by Luke E. Hart, supreme commander.

The General Federation of Women's Clubs, by Mrs. Theodore Chapman, president.

For the scientists, by Mrs. Robert H. Goddard, widow of the inventor of the rocket bomb who gave his life in service to his country.

The American Federation of Labor, by George Meany, president.

Farmers' organizations: The Grange, the 4-H Clubs.

Fraternal organizations: Masons, DeMolay, Order of the Eastern Star, Odd Fellows and Rebekahs, Knights of Pythias, Kiwanis, United Commercial Travelers, Order of Scottish Clans of New England.

It is fitting that the Altar of the Nation, the first national recognition recalling the sacrifices of the lives of all the American war dead, is in New Hampshire, New England, for here came and here were born the sons and daughters who strove for better living, freedom, and independence, and who were among the first to sacrifice their lives for America.

The Altar of the Nation is expressive of the character of the people who founded this country—rugged and useful. This altar is no great example of artist's sculpturing. The Altar of the Nation is mostly built of the rough rocks wrenched from the cathedral grounds by the pioneers, who took possession of this land in 1760, and their descendants. These rocks recall man's struggle and intent in creating America. The three huge blocks of verde antique marble forming the top of the Altar of the Nation came from the quarry in Cardiff, Md., through which runs the Mason-Dixon line and thus symbolizes the North, the South, and the Union. Incorporated into the face of the Altar of Nation are the tributes of stones from each of the 48 States, bound together to express the unity and strength of a grateful Nation in this memorial to all her war dead, and stones as tributes from Eisenhower, Marshall, Leahy, MacArthur, Nimitz, Halsey, Bradley, Summerall, Ridgway, and Doolittle.

The Altar of the Nation is useful because representatives of 35 different faiths have conducted, each in its own way, services of divine worship before this altar—Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, and other faiths; white, black, and yellow—thus giving meaning to "one Nation, under God, indivisible."

Almost half of the people of America signify they see no necessity for supporting the authority for both the moral and the civil laws—the church, synagogue, temple, or meetinghouse—for they belong to no church of any sort in any way. Because this altar is unique it is arousing curiosity on the part of some of these seventy or more million people of America sufficiently to get them here. There is abundant proof accumulated over these first 10 years of establishment of the Cathedral of the Pines that few, even those who said they "did not believe in God" left the cathedral knoll without some sense of appreciation of or obligation to Almighty God. According to the State troopers and the local police on traffic duty there have been almost 2 million visitors to the Cathedral of the Pines from all of the 48 States, the Territories, and from every country of the world, yet Rindge is a very small hill town and far away from any large center of population. Recalling this response, please remember publicity has not been asked for, not one cent has been paid for advertising, and there has been no solicitation in this cathedral effort except for the stones from the States and the commanding officers of the Armed Forces.

All faiths are invited to use without charge the Cathedral of the Pines, its appointments, the parking fields with attendant traffic police, and the services of the entire cathedral staff. There are never any collections taken at any service, sacred concert or daily organ meditation, there are never any parking charges nor tickets of admission. The entire support of the Cathedral of the Pines is voluntary and unsolicited.

Noted members of the clergy, educators, lawmakers and many of the outstanding businessmen of this country have expressed their appreciation of the Cathedral of the Pines with its Altar of the Nation.

It has come as a shock to a great many visitors to the Cathedral of the Pines to learn that nowhere else in America is there national public recognition given for the sacrifice of the lives in war service of those of the American Red Cross, of the Salvation Army, the YMCA and K. of C., nor for the lives of the scientists sacrificed in war service in the laboratories, nor for the sacrifices of the lives of men and women in war service killed in the shops and factories. Where else is national recognition given for the sacrifice of the lives of the war correspondents who braved the heaviest gunfire to get the news to boost the morale of the men at the front and the folks back home? or for the sacrifice of the lives of all the pioneer women killed defending their homes whilst their men were answering their country's call?

I know we agree there are degrees of sacrifices; that is, the sacrifice of life in armed conflict or the sacrifice of life by disease or by accident but while in the uniform and a member of the Armed Forces. It seems to me that if the latter are national heroes and buried in the Arlington National Cemetery the sacrifices of the lives other than they who as truly gave their lives for all of us should not be forgotten and that national recognition by the Congress of the United States of America of the Altar of the Nation in the Cathedral of the Pines in Rindge, N. H., should thus be accorded this memorial appointment of service to God and country as it has been by the individuals and organizations heretofore listed.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS SLOANE,
Founder.

Benefits for World War II and Korean Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the November 1955 issue of Redbook magazine entitled "What Veterans and Their Families Should Know Now," written by Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I believe this to be a very timely article which will be of great interest to veterans and their families.

The article follows:

WHAT VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES SHOULD KNOW NOW—KOREAN RETURNEES HAVE A NEW GI BILL OF RIGHTS—WORLD WAR II BENEFITS ARE CHANGING AND EXPIRING—HERE ARE ANSWERS TO A VETERAN'S 30 MOST IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

(By Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs)

Our grateful Nation has granted a wide variety of benefits to veterans and their dependents. Nearly 8 million of the 15 million World War II veterans have participated in the GI bill education and training program. Already an additional million Korean veterans have joined their ranks. More than 4 million GI loans for homes, farms, and businesses have been guaranteed or insured under World War II and Korean GI bills. During 1954 VA contact representatives assisted more than 12 million veterans and their dependents.

Under the law, the VA cannot approach the 21,500,000 veterans to inform them of their personal status in the veterans' benefit program. The VA discusses individual cases only if and when veterans or their dependents decide that they want to claim a benefit. Then the VA can help them determine what they are entitled to and assist them in filling out the proper forms.

Several of the most important veterans' benefits have deadlines. We suggest that each veteran prepare a memo book of dates on which his GI insurance premiums are due, the cut-off dates for GI loans, and the starting and final deadlines for educational benefits.

Here are the answers to the most important questions asked by veterans and their dependents:

LOANS

Question. For what purposes may a veteran get a GI loan?

Answer. Three types of loans are permissible: 1. To purchase, construct, or improve a home. 2. To buy a farm, farm land, stock, feed and seed, farm machinery, and other farm supplies and equipment. 3. To buy a business or otherwise to enable a veteran to undertake or expand a legitimate business venture.

Question. How much loan entitlement does a veteran have for various purposes?

Answer. Sixty percent of a home loan, or a loan for a farm on which there is a farmhouse, is guaranteed, up to a maximum of $7,500; 50 percent of a real-estate loan, up to $4,000; 50 percent of a non-real-estate loan, up to $2,000. The total maximum entitlement is $7,500.

Question. What is the maximum duration of loans?

Answer. Farm real-estate loans can run up to 40 years; business real-estate loans, to 30 years; home loans to 25 years; non-real-estate loans, to 10 years.

Question. Where can a veteran obtain a loan?

Answer. From any private lending institution that is willing to grant one. In rural areas where the VA finds that GI home loans are not available from private sources, it will give direct loans, but the VA is limited by the funds it has available.

Question. Does it make any difference whether the lender grants his loan on the basis of Government guaranty or Government insurance?

Answer. Yes. It makes a big difference. Insured loans use up a veteran's loan entitlement only to the extent of 15 percent of the amount borrowed, but lenders usually make them only for non-real-estate, business, and farm purposes. Guaranteed loans use up much more, if not all, of the entitlement and are made mostly for home loans.

Question. Will a veteran be able to get a GI loan indefinitely?

Answer. No. The deadline for World War II veterans is July 25, 1957. For Korean veterans, the cut-off date is January 31, 1965.

Question. Can two or more veterans pool their loan entitlements to buy real estate, a business, or a farm?

Answer. Yes. The VA sees to it in such a case that each veteran is protected and is not liable for more than his own share of the loan.

Question. Can a veteran get a loan for a home or business if he buys it jointly with a nonveteran?

Answer. Yes, but only the veteran's portion of the loan will be guaranteed or insured by the VA.

Question. Does the VA guarantee veterans against faulty construction or materials in the homes they buy?

Answer. No. The VA does, however, make a minimum of three inspections during construction of a new house to make sure it conforms with VA's minimum property requirements.

Question. If a veteran sells the home he bought with a GI loan, is he entitled to a new loan for purchase of another house?

Answer. Ordinarily, no. But if ill health, condemnation of the property, or unforeseeable transfer to another job location forces a veteran to sell his home, the VA may grant him a second loan, provided that the first one has been repaid in full.

Question. What can a veteran do if he wants to buy a certain home, yet the VA refuses to guarantee the loan because its appraiser has set a valuation lower than the price demanded by the seller?

Answer. He can only negotiate with the seller to meet the appraised value. If he attempts to make a hidden side deal by paying the difference between the seller's price and the VA valuation, he is subject to prosecution and can lose all his veteran's benefits.

HOSPITALIZATION

Question. If a veteran needs medical care, what can the VA do for him?

Answer. In Veterans' Hospitals, the number one priority goes to all veterans who need treatment for service-connected disabilities. Number two priority belongs to wartime veterans who have service-connected disabilities, but who need treatment for nonservice-connected disabilities. Number three priority goes to all wartime veterans who have no service-connected disabilities. In order to get treatment, members of the third group must sign a sworn statement that they cannot afford to pay for medical attention elsewhere.

Question. If a veteran needs emergency treatment in a non-Government hospital, will the VA reimburse him for the expenses?

Answer. Yes; but only for service-connected disabilities and if there were no Government facilities available and if a delay would have been dangerous. Also, the hospital must get immediate authorization from the VA for the treatment.

Question. Can a disabled veteran remain indefinitely in a VA hospital?

Answer. He can stay as long as need for hospitalization exists. After that, if his condition prevents him from earning a living and if he needs a home, he may be sent to a domiciliary home.

Question. If a veteran needs a medical check-up because he doesn't feel well, can the VA give him an examination?

Answer. No; the VA is not permitted to do this under the law. Medical examinations may be given only in connection with VA benefits.

INSURANCE

Question. Is it possible to convert Korean GI term insurance to permanent plans?

Answer. Only disabled Korean veterans who have convertible term policies because of service-connected disabilities may convert their GI insurance.

Question. Are peacetime veterans entitled to any GI insurance after discharge?

Answer. They have the same insurance privileges as Korean veterans.

Question. A Korean veteran has 120 days from discharge to obtain term insurance. If he applies early, does he lose his 120 days of free indemnity?

Answer. If the veteran states in his application that he wants his insurance to go into effect at the end of the 120-day period, he will suffer no loss. He must remember, however, that the deadline for application and first payment is 120 days, not 4 calendar months. If he is late, he loses his entitlement.

Question. How is GI insurance money paid out if the veteran failed to specify the method of payment?

Answer. It is paid to the beneficiary in 36 equal installments. The beneficiary can select a longer rate of installment payments, but he cannot get the money in a lump sum.

Question. If a veteran allows his World War II National Service Life Insurance to lapse, can he have it reinstated?

Answer. If he has a term policy, it can be reinstated during the term period. If he has a permanent policy, it can be reinstated at any time by paying all the back premiums. In both cases, the veteran must meet health requirements.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Question. Who is classified as a Korean veteran?

Answer. Anyone who served in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, is entitled to some benefits of the Korean GI Bill. For service begun in this period, a veteran is entitled to educational benefits at the rate of 1½ days of schooling for each day served before his discharge or the end of his first enlistment.

Question. How much money will a Korean veteran get to finance his education and training?

Answer. For full-time training he will get $110 a month if he has no dependents, $135 if he has one dependent, and $160 if he has more than one dependent. This amount is for tuition, maintenance, fees, supplies, books and equipment.

Question. Is there a VA restriction on the amount of money a veteran may earn through part-time employment while attending school under the Korean GI Bill?

Answer. No. Regardless of his earnings, his monthly allowance remains unchanged as long as he is taking a full-time course in school.

Question. What are the time limitations on the educational and training benefits for Korean veterans?

Question. Is there a VA restriction on the

Answer. A veteran must have begun his course of study within 3 years from the date of his separation from service. It is not sufficient merely to have made an application. Those veterans discharged on or before January 31, 1955, must finish by January 31, 1963, or 8 years after discharge, whichever is earlier. Those discharged on or after February 1, 1955, must finish by January 13, 1965, or 8 years after discharge, whichever is earlier.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

Question. What is the difference between disability compensation and pension?

Answer. Compensation is payable to veterans whose disabilities are due to service. Pension is payable only to totally and permanently disabled veterans whose disabilities are not due to service and whose income from other sources does not exceed certain limits.

Question. If a veteran's disability increases, can he have his compensation payments increased?

Answer. Compensation can be increased in proportion to the disability. A certificate from a private physician will be sufficient basis to reopen a veteran's case.

Question. Does the law provide disability compensation for peacetime veterans?

Answer. Yes, at the rate of 80 percent of the wartime scale. If the disability is due to armed conflict (during peacetime) or to extra hazardous service, compensation is provided at full wartime rates.

Question. Can a World War II veteran still file a claim for disability compensation?

Answer. Yes, he can file at any time.

Question. If the widow of a Korean GI remarries, will she lose the monthly $92.90 indemnity payment she has been receiving?

Answer. No. Remarriage does not bar the widow of a Korean veteran from receiving full indemnity payment for 120 consecutive months.

Question. Is there a time limit for filing claim for reimbursement of expenses for burying a veteran?

Answer. Yes. The claim must be filed within 2 years after the date the veteran was buried. Up to $150 is payable toward the burial expenses of eligible wartime veterans and disabled peacetime veterans.

Increase Rates of Education and Training Allowances for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain is credited with having referred to the weather as something that everyone talks about, but no one ever does anything about it.

I have heard, frequently, the same kind of criticism about legislative enactments by the Congress. Everyone talks about what is wrong with the law, but nobody does anything about it. I would like to claim a place in history for having inspired the 84th Congress to do something about the shortcomings of the education provisions of the Veterans Readjustment Act of 1952—that is Public Law 550 of the 82d Congress.

I am today introducing legislation which will provide a general increase in the rates of education and training al-

lowance payable to veteran trainees enrolled under title II of the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

The bill I have introduced is restricted to increases in rates of payments for education and training only and in no manner affects the eligibility requirements for those veterans who desire to qualify; also, the bill applies only to veterans of the Korean conflict. No basic change is intended or implied; all that is asked is that this session of Congress recognize some basic facts—and do something specific to help veterans meet the problem which those basic facts have created.

Basic fact No. 1 is—the Congress of the United States provided a machinery whereby the veteran of America's wars could get an education and so readjust himself to society, thus helping himself to be a better citizen and, at the same time, helping his country to make better use of the veteran as a member of society who is making the maximum contribution of which he is capable.

Basic fact No. 2 is—the veteran in school today is finding it very difficult to make ends meet; this strain jeopardizes his opportunity to be a good student, a good graduate, and hence, a good citizen who can provide his country with the maximum benefits of his talents.

My proposal asks only that we recognize these two facts and provide an increase in the allowances provided for in Public Law 550, as amended.

I would like to remind my colleagues that we live in a day when the spotlight is on the need for aid to education.

In the area of the sciences which, to our own personal knowledge, take on ever greater significance with each forward thrust of mechanical, electrical, aeronautical developments—to say nothing of developments in the atomic field—there is a woeful lack of students devoted to the subject of study and exploration. It has been my personal experience that a student worried by financial harassment is not the best possible student. A little worry may be a good thing—but if we want the young men who were foremost in our minds when we enacted the Veterans' Readjustment Act to be good students—and future good scientists, or scholars—or even mighty good citizens—we should do whatever we can to reduce this worry factor to a minimum. For this reason, I have become acutely concerned with the need for an increase in these educational payment rates.

The Congress has considered and enacted two so-called GI bills—in 1944 and 1952. To the best of my recollection when these proposals were first broached there was no suggestion of a bonus or reward or pension. There was a recognition—and I have to admit that this plea made the greatest impression on me—that because of war, a large segment of the youth of our country had been lifted from the natural stream of youth who would, in the normal course, attend college. In addition, there was a recognition of the fact that many young men and women who, under normal circumstances, would not attend college, had been made more mature by their wartime experiences and had become educable material. Unless I am gravely mistaken, this was the moving cause behind the GI bills. There was, too, the readjustment phase—during which young men and women could get themselves better prepared to assume their proper places in the democratic society which is ours—with emphasis on education constantly rising.

That was the reason for the GI bills, in their educational aspects. It has now reached the point where it is so difficult for eligible and qualified and eager young men and women to continue in school because of the increase in the cost of living and the cost of education since the basic laws were written that the very purpose of this excellent legislation is being frustrated.

The GI bills, so-called, were never intended to be a complete subsidy. However, they were intended to be a great inducement—and a substantial help—to each veteran in obtaining a good education—to the betterment of himself, his family and our society.

Statistics are, to many, a bothersome thing, and I will not annoy you with them. I know I can rely on your intimate knowledge of the fact that it costs more today to obtain a degree in an institution of higher learing that it did when the original GI bill was passed in 1944.

The increase in the rates of payment to veterans which my bill asks for are small enough. But—and I urge my colleagues to consider this well—the need for an inducement to our veterans to go to school, to stay in school, to acquire all the knowledge which a good education can provide is far greater today than it was when the original GI bill was enacted.

The whole pattern of this legislation has been one of assistance. I say again, never was it thought there would be a complete subsidy.

Times have changed—the need has changed only in the sense that it has grown greater. Costs have changed in two areas—they are greater and what is more fearful, they maye become discouraging. We had faith in these veterans as defenders of our country. We should be proud of our continuing faith in them as crusaders for our country.

Help them to get the best possible education and we need have little fear for the future of their children, who, after all, see America through their father's eyes, whether it is a good and intelligent approach to Americanism or a discouraged and disillusioned portrayal of the attitude of the American Congress.

A Program for Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to note in the President's message that he proposes to stir something up in reference to the national parks. I know that the National Parks Service has been working on a program for about a year now, called mission 66. I understand that this program is anticipating a development and management plan that will put our parks in shape. With the anticipated increase in visitors to the parks—80 million by 1966, I believe these parks are of tremendous value to the people and a great economical asset, and they have been going to pot by overuse and lack of funds to properly develop and maintain them. I, for one, am going to do all in my power to get a good, long-range program for the national parks, so that our great national heritage in the national parks will be put in proper shape and not allowed to be further abused or rundown.

As chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, I am going to push so that this program will be submitted to us at the earliest possible date.

Remarks of Len Jordan, Chairman, United States Section, International Joint Commission, Before the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation, Salem, Oreg., November 15, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, there follows the studied and informative address of the Honorable Len Jordan, Chairman, United States Section of the International Joint Commission, before the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation at Salem, Oreg., on November 15, 1955. Chairman Len Jordan is a distinguished former governor of the State of Idaho, who is also serving with ability and distinction as chairman of the United States Section of the International Joint Commission:

I am greatly pleased that you asked me here to speak to the annual meeting of the Oregon Farm Bureau Federation. Back through the years I have come to have a very special regard for your fine oganization and the high principles for which you stand. Because all of my life I have lived close to the soil, I share with you an unswerving dedication to sound farming practices and the rewarding satisfaction that comes from taking good care of our land and water resources. My interest therefore is not purely speculative, but derives from many years of practicing conservation and working daily with the problems of resource development.

Then, too, I am always pleased to have an excuse to come back to Oregon. My family home is Enterprise, Oreg. Enterprise is the Oregon gateway to the Hells Canyon country. I attended public schools there and finally graduated from the University of Oregon. It was there I met my wife, who was also an Oregonian. I shall always be grateful to this State for all that

was done to provide me with an education. I remember, too, how the $25 per month which Oregon provided for her veterans made it possible for me to stay in school.

Here in Oregon, it is good to renew many old and highly valued friendships, not the least of which is with your able and distinguished governor. Paul Patterson and I are friends of long standing—not only were we classmates at the University of Oregon, but for part of a year when we were doing graduate work, we lived together. So I take personal pride in his fine record of accomplishment and, knowing his qualifications as I do, I predict for him, should he seek it, a great future in the service of his State and Nation.

I am reminded that Salem is the home of another great Oregonian who is making good in the major leagues—the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, whom I came to know and respect when he served you well as governor. Back in Washington, he is discharging one of the toughest jobs in the Cabinet with complete fairness and with dignity and skill. In the 10 months I have been in Washington, I have found it both pleasant and productive to consult with him frequently on matters having to do with water-resources development.

As Chairman of the United States Section of the International Joint Commission, it is my duty along with my two colleagues to safeguard the interests of the United States in our dealings with Canada over boundary waters and rivers which cross the boundary. Our instructions under the treaty of 1909 with respect to boundary waters are very well defined with the result that we are able to proceed amicably and equitably with such splendid joint projects as the Niagara River remedial works, the St. Lawrence seaway project, and the gigantic power project in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River at Barnhart Island.

Unfortunately, the principles having to do with rivers which cross the boundary are not so explicit as those principles for rivers forming the boundary. Thus, with respect to the Columbia, we find ourselves occupied with the Canadian section in discussions of diversions, of fish versus dams, and of downstream benefits from headwater storage. I shall not at this time detail either our differences or our areas of agreement.

I should like to repeat, however, that the United States section is eager and willing to discuss development plans for the Columbia River that will be of benefit to both countries.

On April 12, 1954, when, as Governor of Idaho and chairman of the Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee, I made a speech before the Pacific Northwest Trade Association at Portland, Oreg., in which I said:

"I am pleased that in our Northwest Governors' Power Policy Committee we have enjoyed the active participation of Canada. Not only the Province of British Columbia but Canadian utilities as well have served with us and we profit by their service. Our interests are so closely integrated that it would be folly to plan separately. Much of the ultimate success of maximum river development will depend on how well we can integrate our planning.

"Adequate annual storage as close to headwaters as possible is absolutely necessary to efficient river system power production. Records indicate that about half of the annual run-off of the Columbia takes place in the 3 months of May, June, and July. Recorded flows at The Dalles show a variation of from a low of 40,000 cubic feet per second to a record high of nearly a million cubic feet per second. Several of the best storage sites are on the Canadian side. The Mica Creek site alone could store 10 million acre-feet of usable annual storage. In addition to at-site production, downstream benefits from such storage are substantial. We urgently need a cost and benefit allocation survey for upstream storage as an equitable basis for agreement with our Canadian neighbors. No other single accomplishment would lend greater stimulus to river basin progress than this."

These quotes indicate how I felt 18 months ago, before I even knew there was to be a vacancy on the International Joint Commission. I have not changed my mind.

I tell you frankly that the reason I went to Washington, D. C., to work on the Eisenhower team in the field of water resource development was because I believe in the rightness of the administration policy.

But before we discuss the policy of the present administration, let us have a look at the water resource picture of 1953 when the new administration moved in.

For 20 years, first in the Tennessee Valley and later in the Pacific Northwest, we had drifted—and at times almost galloped—toward a Federal monopoly in water resource development—toward a philosophy that the Federal Government has an obligation to supply the electric power for these regions (just why in these two basins and not elsewhere is not clear).

In support of this philosophy there evolved a school of thought whose disciples believe that the Federal Government can meet the situation bigger, better, quicker, and cheaper than anyone else. Just why these "Federal-or-nothing" zealots limited their sphere of conquest to water resource development is also not clear.

It would seem that since the Federal Government owns about two-thirds of the area of the 11 Western States, the possibility of federally owned sawmills to process the timber—of federally owned mines to develop the mineral resources—of federally owned fish canneries to harvest the salmon run—of federally owned farms and livestock ranches to utilize the crop and grazing lands—all of these should have been attractive to the Federal-or-nothing schemers.

But it may be that these last mentioned programs to develop the resources that belong to all of the people would have come along later in their timetable of conquest. Certainly it is easy to see that the control of the electric power of an area is a very alluring and exciting goal in power politics.

There is a special kind of challenge in the political power that is inherent in the control of the electrical power of a region.

Electricity has come to be a necessity in your home, on your farm, in the business houses and industrial plants of the Nation. It is almost as essential as the water we drink and the air we breathe. Under conditions of scarcity, Federal officials who control the production and distribution of electricity in a region of Federal monopoly can dictate the location of industry, the rates which users must pay, and the amount of energy available. They are not subject to regultaion by the Federal Power Commission or by State regulatory commissions as are non-Federal agencies. They have within their hands the economic life or death of the customers or of a community under this monopoly.

This might not be true if there were always an ample supply of energy available, but history has demonstrated that in these areas where a Federal monopoly exists, the region lives from one crisis to another, from one power shortage to another, depending on the whims of an always reluctant Congress to provide money for additional power. Such areas live in a perennial power shortage.

We have seen here in our own Northwest various electricity customers pleading for additional power from a system that produced not enough to go around. This is not a healthy situation. It is not good for America when political officials, whether they belong to my party or the other fellow's party, are in a position to grant or deny the right of any American citizen to start or expand a business.

Unregulated monopoly is not good—whether it be private or public monopoly, it results in arbitrary management, in indifference to the wishes of the people to be served, and it removes all incentive toward economy and efficiency, the two factors which are so essential to a free economy.

But let us assume for a moment (and certainly for no longer than is necessary to emphasize a point)—let us assume that the Federal monopoly advocates have entirely overcome the resistance locally—that not one single voice in the entire Northwest speaks out in opposition to their Federal-or-nothing philosophy—the question then is: Just what chance have they dollarwise to keep their promises for 100 percent Federal development?

First, we must consider the demand—what kind of money will be needed to keep ahead of the load growth? A joint committee representing all the non-Federal agencies in the power business in the Northwest appeared before a committee of Congress last spring with some figures. They have agreed, and they have officially and publicly declared that it will require $3 billion in the next 10 years to provide an adequate power supply for this region.

Future needs will require an average expenditure of $300 million a year.

Do you know what has been the average appropriation for the Northwest for the last 10 years including the free-spending appropriations to complete war emergency commitments? Past appropriations have averaged $150 million a year.

Do you realize that during the last 10 years, the Northwest, with about 3 percent of the population, has had approximately 40 percent of all the money of the whole United States that has been appropriated by Congress for hydroelectric development?

Now I ask you, is it realistic to assume that the other 97 percent of the people in the other 44 States of the Nation are going to continue to put 40 percent of the total appropriations for hydropower into 1 limited area?

And I ask you further, do you believe that in this day when the emphasis in Washington is on a balanced budget and a reduction of the Federal debt—when the trend of this administration is definitely away from Federal monopoly—do you think for 1 minute that the Federal-or-nothing candidates here in the Northwest who ask you to support their philosophy can bring home twice as much money for hydropower as you have had in the past?

I'm sure you don't believe any such thing and I don't think they do, either. Here is another case of political sophistry that we could pass off for the fraud that it is if it were not for the very serious effect that their tactics of delay and obstruction have on the orderly development of our water resources. I shall have more to say about this later.

Other Senators have taken a much more realistic attitude when faced by the inability or unwillingness of the Congress to appropriate Federal money for projects already authorized for Federal construction.

Witness the case of the Coosa River project. Last year Senators SPARKMAN and HILL, together with 8 of the 9 Alabama Congressmen, introduced and secured the passage of a bill to deauthorize Federal construction of hydroelectric dams on the Coosa River in Alabama and permit that construction to proceed by an investor-owned utility, the Alabama Power Co. Because, they said, the project had been authorized for many years and, loyal Democrats that they were, they were never able to get money for its actual construction from either the Roosevelt or Truman administrations.

Witness also a similar case in Oklahoma. Last year, Senators KERR and MONRONEY secured the passage of a bill to deauthorize construction of hydroelectric dams on the Grand River in Oklahoma and to authorize

the Grand River Dam Authority, a State agency, to proceed with that construction. They also had waited 10 years for Federal appropriations.

These Senators and Congressmen from Alabama and Oklahoma are realists. They recognize the practical political fact that it had not been possible to secure from the Congress controlled by their own party and under Presidents of their own party, the money that was required for necessary hydroelectric development in their own States.

I hope you will pardon me for relating a few personal experiences to point up the transition that has taken place in the field of water-resource development in the past 4 years or from one administration to another.

When I became Governor of Idaho in January 1951, the Federal monopoly advocates were still in the saddle, but riding with some caution. They had suffered some setbacks at the polls because the voters of the Northwest were alerted to the danger of a valley authority for the Columbia patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority and had in most instances defeated the candidates who espoused the valley authority concept. The three Northwest Governors—McKay, Langlie, and Robins—had in 1948 openly and publicly declared against any form of a Columbia Valley Authority.

The most pressing and interesting prospect for resource development from where I sat in the spring of 1951 was the renewal of a proposal by the Bureau of Reclamation to construct a high dam at Hells Canyon. Personally this had great interest for me.

It was in 1932, at the depth of the depression, that my wife and I, with our three children—Steve, aged 7 months; Joe, 3½; and Patsy, 6—moved to an Idaho sheep ranch on the Snake River just below Hells Canyon. There were no roads, no schools, no churches, few neighbors. The roof-pitched hillsides—"steep as a cow's face," we used to say—were covered with bunchgrass that was abundant and lush and nutritious.

Despite the inconveniences and occasional hardships, this epoch in our lives was full of rich and rewarding experiences. Nine years later, we emerged with excellent health, a wholesome respect for plain living and hard work, and an abiding determination to conserve and protect the bounteous resources of nature.

Many times I have dreamed of the day when the tremendous power potential of the river would be harnessed for man's use. And from personal experience I know some of the vagaries of the river.

Moreover, as Governor, I was interested in the development of my State. I was aware of the tremendous short-term prosperity my State would enjoy with the spending of that kind of outside money.

Few people realize to what extent the Snake is a "working" river. It is the lifeblood of Idaho. Nearly 3 million acres in southern and eastern Idaho are irrigated from its waters and possibly another million acres are available to be reclaimed when economic conditions warrant. The headwaters of the Snake are used and reused for irrigation. In most years all of the water in the river near Twin Falls is diverted at Milner Dam for irrigation.

Hells Canyon is downstream from all present or future irrigation in Idaho. Not one single acre could be irrigated from Hells Canyon storage. The high dam advocates have always painted a rosy picture of the availability of power revenues to subsidize future irrigation projects. But more of that later.

Of all the tributaries of the mighty Columbia, Snake River is by far the best regulated. Contributing at Hells Canyon no more than 10 percent of the average annual flow of the Columbia, this one-tenth part which is Snake River now has in use and under construction about 9 million acre-feet of irrigation and flood control storage—practically as much storage as exists in the other nine-tenths share—or all of the rest of the entire Columbia system. To be more specific, if the entire Columbia system had storage in the same ratio as Snake River above Hells Canyon, the system would have about 90 million acre-feet which is more than 3 times as much storage as the Corps of Engineers considers necessary for their main control plan.

As a consequence the Snake is not a "flooder." In the flood season of 1948, it contributed less than one-half the flood flow of Salmon River and less than one-third the flood flow of Clearwater River.

President Truman had endorsed a high dam for Hells Canyon. Naturally it had the blessings of the Bureau of the Budget and of Secretary of the Interior Chapman and of Commissioner of Reclamation Strauss. Having failed once before in securing an authorization, they apparently decided this time to enlist local support by working out the draft of the authorization bill from the Boise office of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Among other things the sponsors of the Federal high dam promised to meet two essential requirements, viz:

1. Protection of present and future water rights for irrigation.

2. Use of power revenues to subsidize reclamation of approximately 300,000 acres of new land near Mountain Home, Idaho.

These were laudable objectives. Many conferences were held in my office between officials of the Bureau of Reclamation who were instructed to draft a bill and various State officials and other interested Idaho people. Some of us even made a trip to Washington, D. C., to consult with Secretary Chapman, Commissioner Strauss, and others.

Our intense research and scrutiny began to point up some very disquieting facts. Congressman BUDGE, of Idaho, himself an able water lawyer, was among the first to suspect that Idaho's water rights were being placed in jeopardy. This was a shocking discovery and was supported by all of our legal advisers.

Our counsel contended that the right of the Federal Government to build hydro powerplants derived from the Constitution, either the navigation or general welfare clauses; that for this reason, words written into an authorization bill intended to guarantee protection to private irrigation rights, present and future, could not possibly supersede the paramount constitutional right of the Federal Government to control the waters of the Snake River; that some future administration might conclude that water flowing through the turbines at high Hells Canyon to sustain the production of electric energy might better serve the public interest than if this same water were consumed upstream by present or future irrigators. To date, no one has convinced me otherwise.

On the other hand, a like development by non-Federal interests would definitely be subject to and controlled by State law under which both our Constitution and numerous statutes declare that the use of water for irrigation has a higher preference than the use of water for power.

Meanwhile, Governor Langlie had assigned competent engineering personnel to assist in scrutinizing the economic feasibility of the high dam. After much research and many consultations, our engineers working together reached the conclusion that the Department of Interior proposal to build a high dam at Hells Canyon was not the best plan for the development of that stretch of the Snake River. (The rightness of their conclusion is borne out by the recent unanimous decision of the Federal Power Commission which, after hearing evidence for nearly 2 years, approved the applications of Idaho Power Co. to construct three dams at a cost less than half that of the single high dam.)

Our investigations further disclosed that the Bureau of Reclamation figures on cost of supplying water to land to be reclaimed in the Mountain Home project would exceed $1,200 per acre, about $200 of which could be repaid by the landowner, while similar land could be bought with water and with improvements for about $400 per acre. I believe in reclamation; I like to see the desert made productive with water, but someone has to pay for these projects. Is it fair, is it justifiable, to spend taxpayers' money for a dam that would cost 2½ times as much as its comparable alternate just in order to take advantage of reclamation law which permits power revenues to be used, under certain conditions, to subsidize irrigation? The subsidy in this instance would be about $1,000 per acre. Someone in the future would be charged enough more for his electricity to pay not only the excessive cost of the high dam but also the excessive cost of the irrigation subsidy.

I am sure there are better ways to get water on the Mountain Home project.

Having reached these conclusions, I was completely disillusioned with the promises of the high dammers to safeguard our water rights and to provide subsidies from power to reclaim new land. That is why I felt it was my duty to go to Washington late in the spring of 1952 and oppose, before a committee of the Congress, a bill to authorize Federal construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon. I think my appearance there on that mission was probably the reversal of a pattern. Over the years it had become the accepted custom for a governor to go periodically to Washington, hat in hand, pleading for handouts. I know that many of the Congressmen on the committee were shocked to hear me say that Idaho did not want some $400 million of Federal money spent for a high dam on our border; that I feared such a project would jeopardize our water rights and that I believed we could best develop our own river under our own State laws subject, of course, to such Federal regulations as required of the licensee by the Federal Power Commission as a condition of the granting of a license.

Late in July of 1952, I was invited to Denver, as were many others, to confer with Candidate Eisenhower and staff on matters of importance to my State in the coming campaign. Among other matters, a water resources policy was discussed because it was of such vital concern to my Idaho constituents.

At this Denver meeting we set up a conference of Candidate Eisenhower and his staff with the Western Governors at Boise, Idaho, to further discuss problems of the West. Here again at Boise, late in August, among other matters we discussed the importance of a sound water resources policy.

Naturally we were pleased when, early in the campaign General Eisenhower expressed his confidence in the American people and his belief that our future in water resource development lies with the people and not solely with a Washington bureaucracy. He said:

"We insist that this must be done through partnership, through first of all getting the wisdom, the power, and the facilities that are available in the locality and bringing in the Federal Government, not as a boss, not as your dictator, but as a friendly partner ready to help, and to get its long nose out of your business as quickly as that can be accomplished.

"We hold that these projects are far better planned, developed and operated with the full cooperation and wisdom of the local authorities than they are by putting them exclusively under the direction of some longhaired bureaucrat sitting behind a desk in far away Washington, D. C."

What a gratifying relief to have such a fresh, new look into the problem. The President has faith in America. He has faith in the American people, in their ability to solve their own problems, to stand on their own feet, and to carry on the traditions of their forefathers.

The Eisenhower administration believes in a dynamic and expanding economy for the United States. It believes that by unleashing the ability, the determination, and the ambition of the American people, the economy will continue to expand, the output of goods and services will continue to rise, living conditions will constantly improve, wages will keep pace with the economy, and that the United States, guided by this buoyant confidence, is approaching greater horizons of progress than many of us could foresee.

But, you say, what are the tangible results of this program?

We are at peace, and uneasy though it may be, it has raised the hopes of people throughout the world to the highest point in many years.

We are at an alltime level of prosperity. Our gross national product stands today at an annual rate of $390 billion. Our personal disposable income is $272 billion. We have never approached these figures before.

We have more people at work, more jobs, more employment than every before, and these people are receiving more take-home pay with more purchasing power than they ever had before.

I agree that the one discordant note in the entire picture is the fact that farmers are not sharing proportionately in this prosperity. It is very difficult to overcome the very damaging consequences of an inherited farm program that was never right or workable from the outset. There is no easy answer to the farm problem. You may be sure of one thing—this administration will not return to the high rigid price support program which contributed substantially to our present condition. Your fine organization has cooperated fully in trying to find a workable solution to the vexing problem. I am sure that you will continue to advise and work with the best talent which this administration can devote to the task of improving the farmers' share of the national prosperity.

But, returning to the matter of water resources—

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message to the 1st session of the 83d Congress, said:

"The best natural resources program will not result from exclusive dependence on Federal bureaucracy. It will involve a partnership of the States and local communities, private citizens, and the Federal Government, all working together. This combined effort will advance the development of the great river valleys of our Nation and the power that they can generate."

I am amazed that anyone would criticize the President's type of approach to this great public program. The partnership idea means people working together. There is nothing new or startling in this approach. It is simply the reactivation of a time-tested American custom. It means that the Federal Government will continue to sponsor those projects which, because of international or other extraordinary conditions, cannot be undertaken locally. It means that local interests, public or private, will be encouraged by the Federal Government to go ahead with necessary power projects on their own. It means also that in some instances the Federal Government will share the cost of a project with local interests.

I call your attention now to a splendid example of international partnership achieved by this administration. I refer to the great St. Lawrence seaway and power project. This billion-dollar development comes under the purview of the International Joint Commission. Last month I had the pleasure, with my colleagues from both the United States and Canadian sections, of a 2-day inspection of the works. When completed this project will provide a 27-foot navigation channel from the Great Lakes to the Atlatnic, and a powerplant which in total output will be second only to Grand Coulee. The local sponsor in this instance, working with the Federal Government on the United States share of this development, is the Power Authority of the State of New York.

You may be surprised to know that during the period 1906 to 1953, some 27 partnership projects were constructed in 13 States. In these cases the Federal Government was operating on a partnership basis with States, municipalities, and with private corporations.

You may be surprised to know also that of these 27 projects, 12 were built under Republican administrations and 15 were built under Democratic administrations.

Not until this administration advocated a return to sound principles did the word "partnership" assume an evil connotation, and then only in the minds of a few frustrated people who seek to play power politics with power development.

At least three partnership proposals are being discussed that affect Oregon directly.

A meritorious bill sponsored by Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH presently before Congress would authorize the partnership construction of the Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge projects here in Oregon.

Both are flood control projects and units of the partially completed Willamette Basin project. Their construction would prevent flood damage estimated at $2,500,000 annually.

The Corps of Engineers would build Cougar and Green Peter-White Bridge dams. The power facilities, including re-regulating dams, may be constructed under FPC licenses by the local interests, or by the Corps of Engineers as agents, and paid for by the local interests. The power facilities would be owned by the non-Federal agencies and operated at their expense.

The dams remain the property of the Federal Government, and except for the power facilities, are to be operated and maintained by the Corps of Engineers. The licensees pay to the United States the proportionate shares of the cost of construction, operation and maintenance of the dams that are allocated to power, as determined by the Corps of Engineers and the FPC.

The bill authorizes the Corps of Engineers to enter into agreements with the licensees for operation of the dams and reservoirs to secure the maximum multiple benefits from the projects.

This legislation permits construction of two critically needed flood control projects at a saving of approximately $40,000,000.

The bill does not specify local participants but the Eugene Water and Electric Board, an arm of the city of Eugene, Oreg., had indicated a desire to participate in the Cougar project. The Pacific Power & Light Co., of Portland, Oreg., has stated its willingness to participate in the Green Peter project. The dams are located within the respective areas served by these utilities.

A unique application of the partnership principle is embodied in the bill introduced in Congress last spring by Representative SAM COON to authorize the building of John Day Dam on the Columbia River between The Dalles and McNary. Under the provisions of this bill, John Day Dam would be designed, built and operated by the Corps of Engineers and ownership would at all times remain in the Federal Government. Investor-owned utilities are willing to sponsor this project but provision is made for the participation of other local interests, public or private, which meet certain specified requirements.

Under this bill the Federal Government would assume costs of navigation, flood control, and other so-called nonreimbursable benefits. These costs are estimated to be about 10 percent of the total cost of the $310,000,000 project.

Local interests would supply the major share amounting to $273,000,000 which would be in the nature of a prepaid contract for the power output of the project for a period of 50 years.

Encouraged by the administration's policy of cooperation, proposals for dam construction have come from many and various applicants. Here are some examples of recent activity. Last week the Federal Power Commission granted licenses to Grant County Public Utility District in Washington to construct the Priest Rapids and Wanapum Dams on the Columbia. These two dams are to replace the single Priest Rapids Dam which had been originally set up for Federal construction, but was deauthorized, with administration approval, so that the local public power agency could proceed.

A group of investor-owned utilities, after completing preliminary surveys, have applied to the Federal Power Commission to build Pleasant Valley and Mountain Sheep Dams on the Snake River below Hells Canyon. Many more projects are being studied—some with varying degrees of partnership participation, others with none. All come under FPC and State regulation.

Until this new wave of confidence in the administration policy took effect, more dams were needed than there were sponsors to build them. That situation is changing rapidly—but please remember that dams are not paid for by political ballyhoo, propaganda, or wishful thinking but by cold cash at the damsite. It takes time to work out the details of the shift of emphasis from all-Federal to Federal-plus-local responsibility. These non-Federal sponsors consisting of local public agencies and privately owned companies are now ready and eager to assume their responsibilities to supply the power needs of their respective service areas.

The one and only reason why these objectives may not be met is because the people who insist on Federal-or-nothing development may be able to block or delay the progress. Personally, I question the sincerity of those who continually carp about the administration's partnership program and at the same time have no solution to offer except Federal development or no development.

I think we should make it crystal clear now that any power shortage that develops in the region must be charged to those people who use every possible device to confuse, delay, and obstruct the orderly and time-honored American way of developing our water resources.

Justice MacCrate Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, last month one of Brooklyn's most distinguished judges retired. Justice John MacCrate served with distinction for 35 years in the second judicial district of the New York State Supreme Court. Prior to his election to the court in 1920, he served a 2-year term in the

House of Representatives. One of Brooklyn's most beloved figures Judge MacCrate is well known as an orator and much in demand as a dinner speaker. Truly a devoted public servant—a gentle, kindly man whom it has been my privilege to have as a friend for many years. I can think of no finer tribute to Judge MacCrate than the following article by James P. McCaffrey which appeared in The New York Times of December 26, 1956:

JUSTICE MACCRATE TO LEAVE BENCH—POPULAR JURIST, A BROOKLYN HISTORIAN, TO RETIRE AND BECOME REFEREE JANUARY 3

(By James P. McCaffrey)

One of Brooklyn's most popular jurists will retire on Saturday as a result of having reached the statutory age limit of 70 years.

He is John MacCrate, who has been a member of the supreme court bench in the Second Judicial District for 35 years. He has been assigned to the Second Department's Appellate Division since 1948.

Looking much younger than his years, the retiring jurist will become an official referee on January 3. He will be assigned quarters in the Brooklyn Supreme Court or the nearby Borough Hall.

During his long career on the bench Justice MacCrate has been noted for the common sense that has marked his opinions. Nor was he averse to letting a bit of dry humor slip in between the lines of his formal decisions.

His friends describe the soft-spoken, white-haired dean of the Brooklyn judiciary as one who has never forgotten his long-time neighbors in the Greenpoint district of Brooklyn. Although an enrolled Republican, he has often bragged that many of his closest friends are topflight Democrats.

POPULAR DINNER SPEAKER

Even though his judicial duties have kept him busy, Justice MacCrate has been a close student of Brooklyn's history. This, coupled with his renown as a speaker, is a factor in the many invitations he receives to address civic, religious, and political affairs.

A few months ago Justice MacCrate accepted a bid to address the 75th anniversary dinner of the Society of Old Brooklynites. He told a close friend the night before that he did not have the slightest idea what his subject would be.

But at the dinner the jurist held his audience spellbound by recounting what had happened in Brooklyn on the day the society was organized. It was learned later that he had slipped into the Brooklyn Public Library on the morning of his scheduled speech and had memorized front-page stories hidden in the bound volume of the Brooklyn Daily Eagle.

Justice MacCrate said last week in his chambers at the courthouse, 45 Monroe Place, Brooklyn, that he was in good health. He attributed this to his habit of taking long walks, particularly through the narrow streets of Brooklyn Heights.

Justice MacCrate's family came from Scotland, where the jurist was born, to the Red Hook district of Brooklyn before the turn of the century. The future justice got his early schooling in that area and he likes to recall that his high-school principal, Isabelle Ennis, encouraged him to study for the bar, which he did at New York University Law School. Another friend who urged him on later became presiding justice of the appellate division. This was the late Harry E. Lewis.

SERVED IN CONGRESS

Justice MacCrate had no difficulty getting the Republican nomination for the House of Representatives from Greenpoint in 1918. With the help of his Democratic neighbors, including the late Peter J. McGuinness, he also won the Democratic nomination in that party's primary. He had no real opposition on election day.

As a result of his activities in Washington during the 2-year term, Justice MacCrate was nominated for the supreme court bench in 1920. Although the second judicial district was considered predominantly Democratic, Justice MacCrate was elected. It was the same year the late Warren G. Harding won the Presidency with a landslide vote.

Justice MacCrate lives with his wife, Flora, at 134 Milton Street. They moved into this home when they were married 44 years ago. They have two sons, Robert, a lawyer, and John, Jr., a real estate and insurance broker, and three grandchildren.

Participation of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein portions of a speech which I made before the Junior Chamber of Commerce at Leominster, Mass., on October 24, 1955.

The material follows:

"Young people throughout the Nation must not only interest themselves but must participate actively in public affairs, if democracy is to remain strong," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN addressing the Leominster Junior Chamber of Commerce last night.

"Our system presupposes the active participation of our citizens," said PHILBIN, "but large numbers of Americans often stay away from the polls and it is becoming more difficult every day to get qualified citizens to service their communities."

"More than ever people are completely engroused with their own affairs and occupied by the many demands of modern day living. That is quite understandable and necessary from the individual point of view," said PHILBIN.

"But if the democratic way is to retain its vitality and achieve its maximum goals in the world and in strengthening and building this great Nation, trained young people will have to assume some of the responsibilities of the leadership which will be theirs in the future."

"And the people as a whole must ever maintain a lively interest and keep constantly on guard in order at every level to insure honest, capable government, expressive of the popular will and the American ideal of freedom."

PHILBIN declared that "your new organization of able, aspiring, young business and professional men can do much not only to promote your own group interest, but by the example of your vigorous spirit elevate the tone and level of community contributions."

PHILBIN said that business, industrial, and professional leaders were as vital as political statesmen to the proper development of the country.

"We are coming into great, revolutionary changes in business and economics stemming from continuing, astonishing advances in science."

"There are more opportunities in American business than ever before," he said, "because the national economy is moving ahead in leaps and bounds. Immediately confronting us is the greatest age of all history, if we can only preserve world peace. But in any event we will need business leaders of patriotism, marked capacity and and social consciousness. They will be recruited from the ranks of your generation.

"And they will have to know, just as those charged with leadership today should know, that in a free enterprise competitive society, if it is to endure against radical panaceas, true national prosperity and opportunity must extend to all.

"If in our philosophy and practice, we maintain proper balance in our economy between legitimate self-interest and human social needs, the American people of every class is destined to move steadily in the direction of unparallelled prosperity."

Meanwhile, let us resolutely build our national strength. Tensions have eased somewhat. Smiles have replaced scowls in Soviet diplomacy. But the Marxist plot still surges toward world conquest. Neutralism impairs the unity and strength of the free world. Great problems and dangers confront us from the Communist conspiracy.

But I think that if we remain strong and powerful, militarily, economically and spiritually, we have nothing to fear.

Commenting on the current diplomatic impasse, PHILBIN said, "It is our task as well as our duty to press for peace even in the face of discouragement. In time, if we persevere in our militant devotion to freedom and properly develop our strength, God willing, there is a good prospect for world peace."

The Congressman congratulated and lauded the junior chamber for its efforts and predicted that it would enjoy great success and render distinctive service.

An Address by Justice Albert Conway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Justice Albert Conway, chief judge of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, at the annual dinner of the Colonel Francis Vigo Post, No. 1093, of the American Legion held in Brooklyn, N. Y., and at which Justice Conway was the guest of honor:

I should like to speak of a subject which it seems to me should be of moment to you as members of the patriotic organization which you represent as well as to every thinking person. The world today consists not of land and buildings or of mines and forests or of any material things. They would be the same whether we lived under our form of government with a written constitution binding both the sovereign and the subject or under a dictator. For all intents and purposes today America consists of the ideas and ideals of the children of today. It is for them that we are doing all the things which we think are so important. For them we are building our churches, our schools, our universities and our businesses. In about 30 or 40 years they will have to take them over and manage them. They will be our prelates, our ministers and rabbis, our governors and senators and representatives—one of them is on his way to becoming our President. They will be the supervisors and other officers, and will manage our towns and counties, our cities and States, and this Na-

tion. We may join the United Nations and we may make treaties but if the children of today do not approve of what we have done they will change our policies and put an end to our treaties and leagues and pacts. Our fate in city, State and Nation, and indeed, the fate of humanity, is in their hands.

This, it seems to me, is a very great challenge to you and me because it depends upon how the children are educated what they will be. Will they have disciplined minds? Will they have the desire to acquire qualities of leadership? Will there be instilled into them the will to learn and to achieve? It is not guesswork or speculation but absolute certainty that in all walks of life the leaders of 30 or 40 years from now will come from the children who are between 10 and 20 years of age today.

Ideas are nurtured, if not implanted, by parents, by the church, and by the teachers in the schools, and children as they grow older spend more time with their teachers than with their parents or in their church. Thus, we may say that teachers have equal responsibility with parents to see to it that the children are taught to think straight, to understand the ideals behind our form of government which have made us the most powerful Nation in the world in the short space of approximately 175 years and to help them become honorable and upright participating citizens in our Republic. There is a parable that comes down to us from the third century which expresses what I have in mind respecting teachers. This is the parable. A patriarch sent his three emissaries on a circuit throughout the towns of his land to check on elementary and intermediate teachers. His emissaries came to one town and found neither elementary nor intermediate teachers. Thereupon they said to the inhabitants, "Bring us the watchmen of your town." The inhabitants brought before them the city guards and the watchmen at the gates; but the emissaries said to the inhabitants, "Why, these are not the watchmen of the town—these may, under certain circumstances, be the destroyers of the town." Whereupon, the inhabitants asked, "Who then are the watchmen of the town"; and the emissaries answered, "Your teachers and instructors."

What I think we must fear and guard against is the possibility that our youth through the leadership of ignorant or frustrated or even ill-intentioned men or women, with the twisted ideas natural to such individuals, may destroy for mankind the fulfillment of the dream of freedom which man has had since he came upon this earth and which in America we have enjoyed to a greater degree than any people heretofore. In your youth and mine there was instilled into children love of God and country. See that that is continued. The blueprint of the ideas of the children of America today is the America of the future. It is as simple as that.

Two Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch marking the anniversaries of two of our Nation's most courageous editors, Josia W. Gitt, editor and publisher of the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily and William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times:

TWO FREE MEN

Two of the truly courageous editors in the United States—and unhappily there are very few in that vital company—have just celebrated notable milestones. Josiah W. Gitt, editor and publisher of the Gazette and Daily at York, Pa., has observed the 40th anniversary of his direction of that 160-year-old newspaper. In Madison, Wis., William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, has completed his 50th year in the journalism of his State.

Each is a brave, free man. Each has been unshakeable in standing for honesty, integrity, intelligence, and information. Each has see from experience that where these prevail there will be progress and growth and high standards in political and social affairs.

Mr. Evjue, who grew up in the great tradition of the elder LaFollette, has exposed and battled against McCarthyism from the beginning. It is his satisfaction to have been right all along and now to see others belatedly trying to catch up with him. His newspaper is a daily application of his motto, "Let the people have the truth and freedom to discuss it and all will go well." Thanks in large part to Editor Evjue and his fearless staff, Madison stands high among the best-informed, most forward-looking communities in the country.

Similarly the people of York, Pa., can be grateful for the unswerving attachment of J. W. Gitt to constitutional principles and particularly to the civil liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. No influence peddler, high or low, in politics or out, has ever pushed around York's stanch editor. His slogan is "Print the truth and let it speak." And that is just what he has been doing—enabling truth to speak—for 4 decades. No editor need do more than that.

If there were even a dozen William T. Evjues and Josiah W. Gitts in American journalism, the American people would be infinitely better informed. Our people would be less inclined to listen to demagogues, quacks, and self-servers. They would be far quicker to recognize and support leaders in the tradition of freedom and freemen. May the Gitt and Evjue examples wax and multiply.

New Plants for New Jobs in Labor-Surplus Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, November 19, 1955:

Let's look at the national picture first; the economic condition of the United States as a whole.

It's good—very good.

Until the complete returns for the year are tabulated, we cannot speak with certainty. With little more than a month to go, and with a big volume of Christmas trade expected, however, we can venture the prediction that this will probably be the most prosperous year in our history.

More people are working than ever before.

The largest corporation in the world, which is located in this country, will report profits of more than a billion dollars for the year 1955, which is another first in economic history.

To repeat, the overall picture is very good.

In this broadcast, however, I want to point out local trouble spots, where unemployment is heavy, and has been for several years.

In a problem as complex as this, it is impossible to weigh all the factors, within 15 minutes.

Therefore, I intend to concentrate on a major factor, and a major solution.

Even though the Nation as a whole is booming, we have scattered areas that are plagued by economic blight.

These cannot be ignored.

For, if we fail to find a cure, other areas, in turn may become affected, and the problem becomes more difficult to solve.

The United States Department of Labor makes a job survey every 2 months, on both large and small areas, to determine local economic conditions.

Suppose we confine ourselves to the 149 major labor-market areas. These are the most important production and employment centers.

In July of 1955, unemployment of 6 percent or more was reported from 31 of these 149 areas. At a time of great national prosperity, we have these pockets of unemployment in 32 of the 48 States. That is why the problem calls for some measure of attention and assistance by the Federal Government.

Moreover, 19 of these areas are listed as "chronic."

Ten of these have had substantial unemployment for more than 4 years.

What are the causes of this economic disease that has hit textile communities in New England, and coal-mining communities in Pennsylvania, among others?

Many of these depended upon one industry, and when this declined they found themselves in serious trouble.

Heroic efforts are being made on the local level to attract new replacement industries, but the going is hard.

Several years ago, when a textile mill closed down, hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of workers were dismissed from employment in the only occupation which they knew. Machinery was moved away. The empty factories were sold to dealers in second-hand industrial properties.

The outlook was bleak, for the displaced workers and the communities.

Groups of local citizens were organized to purchase the vacant mills. Chambers of commerce, or industrial development committees, worked hard to attract new industries. But recovery has been painfully slow and difficult.

Local resources, however, are limited. At times they have not been fully mobilized. The rental or reconversion of old mill plants is an emergency measure. It offers only a partial solution. The type of industries that are attracted to a community under these conditions, are usually small ones, that operate on a shoe-string basis, and barely pay the legal minimum wage.

This is a desperate compromise that does put some of the unemployed to work, but at lower pay than they once earned, and at a sacrifice in the average standard of living.

The brave fight being put up by some communities, is worthy of our admiration, but it is not enough. They need help.

The hundreds of thousands of dollars that have been raised in the larger areas to buy up old plants and lease them to other industrial tenants, is a form of treadmill progress. They seem to be making a recovery, while they are losing ground to other communities whose standards are improving, in line with the Nation's progress.

In one small Pennsylvania town, a nickel-a-week plan, with the 6,000 inhabitants contributing 5 cents each week for 5 years, to

raise funds for new industries, is stark evidence of the valiant effort that some communities are making to save themselves.

But when we add up the results of all these local bootstrap operations, we find that few of them have come anywhere near the realization of their employment goals.

As I said before in this brief broadcast, there is not time to consider all factors. Businessmen, when they consider plant-location alternatives, must be satisfied as to the proximity of raw materials, markets, transportation facilities, cheap and abundant power resources, sufficient water and sewerage facilities, and whether a community is an attractive place in which to live. Plus other factors.

However, to quote one official in a labor-surplus community that was once a leading producer of textiles: "We must build new factories or die."

To my way of thinking, this comes very close to the heart of the problem.

On May 13, 1954, I introduced a bill in the United States House of Representatives known as the Industrial Development Act of 1954, to authorize Federal loans to assist local communities in building modern industrial plants in labor-surplus areas.

This would not be a handout, but an assist to local initiative, providing the final lift that would enable labor-surplus areas to get over the hump.

The legislation I seek would apply only to those communities that have had a substantial labor surplus for at least 1 year prior to the application for a Federal loan. The United States Department of Labor, from unemployment totals obtained from the United States Employment Service, and from State affiliates, would determine eligibility.

A $50 million revolving fund would be made available for capitalization. Publicly authorized, nonprofit industrial development committees, composed of representative citizens in the eligible areas, would submit plans and costs for the building of medium-sized modern plants to attract new industries. Upon approval, and on condition that local banks and citizens would provide half the cost, the Federal Government would advance a loan covering the remaining half.

Lack of sufficient capital is the one factor that presently deters local industrial development committees from proceeding with the construction of new plants that are needed to effect an economic transition.

In the preamble of the Employment Act of 1946, the Congress declared that, "It is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to coordinate and utilize all of its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining * * * maximum employment."

In March of this year the joint congressional Committee of the Economic Report unanimously declared: "We are very concerned with distressed conditions which persist in certain industries and regions even in an expanding economy * * * the Federal Government should recognize its responsibility."

In a vital economy like ours, no enterprise or community can stand still.

We are on the threshold of a second industrial revolution. Automation and atomic power are not just theories. We can see them coming around the corner. Existing machines and factories will be outmoded rapidly.

What then of plans that are ancient, even by present standards?

The textile cities of New England have 6 story factories that are 40, 50, and in some cases, many years older. Not a single new industrial plant has been built to replace the ones that are becoming more obsolete with each passing day.

These cities are in danger of becoming industrial slums unless there is a program of modernization. Because no dynamic growth industry, capable of providing steady work at good wages, is going to move into an old-fashioned high-cost plant.

In fact, one of the reasons why labor-surplus areas have lost the industries that once supported them, was because other areas offered inducements to build new plants in response to the new technology.

My bill, I believe, would encourage and assist labor-surplus communities to modernize, and become inviting to growth industries. In this connection, it is pleasing to note that the White House has taken up the suggestion.

President Eisenhower, during his convalescence, has approved a new approach to an old contradiction—the challenge of chronically depressed industrial areas in the midst of national prosperity.

In his state of the Union message to Congress, in January, he will propose a technical-assistance program to show labor-surplus communities how to help themselves, coordinating all forms of Federal assistance under a new agency to be created for that prime purpose.

Furthermore, he will recommend self-liquidating loans to help local communities in the effort to build modern industrial parks following the legislation that I introduced last year.

To become effective, this will require your support and that of the Congress.

By working together as a team we can insure the success of the Industrial Development Act in the American way through the voluntary cooperation of city, State, and Nation, with capital and labor putting their shoulders to the wheel and with every citizen taking part in the modernization of our labor-surplus areas in order to restore them to full and progressive economic activity.

"We must build new plants or die."

The Industrial Development Act shows us how we can take up the slack, and go forward again.

Granting of Amnesty to Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, during the Christmas holidays, the following article appeared in the Evening Independent, a daily newspaper published in St. Petersburg, Fla.:

ELEANOR JOINS PLEA FOR COMMIE AMNESTY

NEW YORK.—Forty-two persons, including Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, have petitioned President Eisenhower to grant a "Christmas amnesty" to Communist Party leaders jailed under the Smith Act.

The petition stressed that the signers were "in fundamental disagreement with the philosophy of the Communist Party and with essential elements of its program." It added that the motive for their appeal was "their attachment to the democratic way of life."

The petition, made public yesterday, asked that sentences of 16 jailed Communists be commuted to time already served. They were sent to prison after being convicted of teaching or advocating forcible overthrow of the Government.

The petition said the trials "were carried through in a period of the cold war and in an atmosphere often marked by hysteria." It also sought postponement of more than 100 similar cases now pending or under appeal.

Mr. Speaker, it is shocking that the crime of advocating the forcible overthrow of our Government is regarded so lightly by those petitioners, and that the petitioners would have the President annul the Smith Act by commuting the sentences of all that have been convicted thereunder, and postponing the trials of all cases pending or under appeal. Such advocacy simply means that those petitioners do not want anyone prosecuted for the violation of that law in the future.

It is further strange that these petitioners only recommended that persons violating the Smith Act be granted amnesty. We have many 18- and 19-year-old boys that unknowingly, or certainly without design, violated some military rule while serving our country in actual combat, and have been imprisoned for some years and have many years yet to serve. It would seem that the Christmas spirit would have been directed to this class, instead of persons advocating a theory that caused our Government to take those boys from their homes and send them into combat in defense of our form of government. Our penitentiaries are filled with American citizens who fudged a little on their income tax, or committed some other Federal offenses which were not to their credit, but none of whom would overthrow our Government by violence, but, despite their dereliction, would fight for our country and our way of life. Nevertheless, all of those persons were forgotten through the Christmas season by those petitioners, and only those who advocated the overthrowing of our Government excited their sympathies.

The assertion that the trials of those parties were in an "atmosphere marked by hysteria" is astounding. All of those defendants were accorded fair trials and given all constitutional rights, and doubtless had fairer and fuller trials than the 18- and 19-year-old boys that I have previously referred to.

Of course our President ignored the petition. The article does not say who the other petitioners were. I believe that the public would like to know.

Conference of the U. N. Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the annual conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization—FAO—took place November 4–25, 1955, in Rome, where the Organization's headquarters are located. Although this was the 8th session of the Conference, FAO celebrated the 10th anniversary of its existence. FAO was officially launched in October 1945 at a conference in Quebec.

The United States was ably represented at the Rome Conference by a delegation comprised of specialists and experts from the Department of Agricul-

ture and the Department of State. Our distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable CLIFFORD R. HOPE, and I had the great honor of being appointed by the distinguished Speaker of this House as congressional advisers to the United States delegation.

The chairman of our delegation was the Honorable Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture. I wish to take this opportunity of informing all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that Mr. Butz was an extraordinarily able chairman. He was fair and just in all deliberations in and out of committee and made it possible for the United States delegation to present a united front before the Conference.

The purpose of FAO is "to promote the common welfare" of the nations associated with the Organization by "furthering separate and collective action" which is aimed to accomplish the following major goals: First, raise the levels of nutrition and the standards of living of the peoples under the jurisdiction of these nations; second, secure improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products; third, better the condition of rural populations; and fourth, contribute toward an expanding world economy.

Originally, 32 nations had joined in the formation of FAO. Now, after 10 years of successful existence, 71 nations throughout the world are participants in the work of FAO. Of noteworthy interest is the fact that none of the countries behind the Iron Curtain, neither Russia, Red China, nor any of their satellites in Europe or Asia, are members of FAO. This accounts not only for a minimum of bickering in the Organization, but also for a very high degree of harmonious cooperation between the member nations and a fine record of achievements over the past decade.

The Italian Government has erected, at its own expense, three magnificent buildings in Rome where the agency and its staff are housed. The organization's annual budget comes to about $6 million, of which the United States contributes 31.50 percent, or less than one-third of the total. Other nations, in the order of their contributions, are: United Kingdom, 11.30 percent; France, 7.53 percent; Germany, 5.55 percent; Canada, 4.64 percent; India, 4.21 percent; Italy, 2.83 percent; Japan, 2.55 percent; Australia, 2.30 percent; Sweden, 2.03 percent. Other nations contribute sums in lesser percentages.

Our delegation was highly honored when our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], was asked to deliver one of the major addresses at the opening session of the conference. Following a welcoming address by the Italian Minister of Agriculture, Emilio Colombo, the conference heard three major addresses on the general theme "FAO in a Changing World." The Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Joaquin M. Elizalde, discussed the international political aspects of the theme. He was followed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who discussed the economic aspects. The third and last address was by M. Andre Mayer, one of France's leading scientists and a founder of FAO, who talked about the social and human aspects.

I trust that our colleague the gentleman from Kansas will place into the RECORD his most interesting and illuminating address so that all of us may have the opportunity to acquaint ourselves with its contents. With his kind permission, I should like to quote only one brief paragraph from his address:

> In my lifetime I have been associated with many organizations but none in which I have felt a more sincere interest or a greater appreciation of its activities than FAO. For in FAO we have an organization which deals with the very fundamentals of life and which concerns the interest and well-being of every human being. The very fact that 71 sovereign nations are now members and active participants in FAO bears this out.

The agenda of the conference was quite long and extensive. Let me at this time merely point out that the major problems discussed were the following: a comprehensive review was made of the world food and agricultural situation since the last conference; problems of food distribution and consumption were considered; studies were made of production trends and the adjustments to food consumption; a survey is being planned to determine the world's agricultural, fishery, and forestry resources in relation to the needs of the world's population; there was considerable discussion of the question of agricultural surpluses; and the conference also took up the peaceful uses of atomic energy in agriculture and food production. Needless to add, that there were also extensive reports on FAO's growing activities in recent years and a program of work was planned for the future, as well as various legal, procedural, and financial aspects of the organization.

Instead of burdening my colleagues with a detailed review of the proceedings of the FAO Conference, I should like at this time to share with you some of my thoughts and findings based on what I heard at the conference and discussions I had with members of other delegations, most of whom I found to be extremely friendly towards the United States and the American people.

We learned at the conference that the population of the world is growing at the rate of 100,000 souls daily. In 1953 there were estimated to be more than 2½ billion people in the world. Each year we add about 30 million to the world's population. If it continues at this rate, the world will have about four and a half billion people by the end of the 20th century, and probably twice as many a hundred years from now.

The question is, now and in the future, how to produce enough food for a world population of such enormous proportions. Our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] was absolutely correct when he stressed in his address that this is not time to talk about slowing down world agricultural production. It is perhaps not too widely known that even now, with huge agricultural surpluses in some countries, nearly two-thirds of the world's population is inadequately fed or undernourished. If this situation is not improved by wiser planning, we may all be confronted with tragic economic, political, and social consequences in the years ahead.

To be sure, some progress has been made in recent years since the end of World War II, particularly at the instigation of FAO. Progress has been recorded in research, in spreading technical knowledge and education concerning agricultural production, standards of nutrition, and the like. The great problems which still remain unsolved and with which FAO is struggling to find a satisfactory solution are better distribution of agricultural products and raising the level of consumption. We have the paradoxical situation in the world today of huge agricultural surpluses in some countries and people who are undernourished and poorly clothed in other countries. In the United States and other countries the people produce an over-abundance of food. Other parts of the world, like Asia and Africa, cannot produce sufficient food and the peoples of these areas have to live on a subnormal or starvation diet.

Despite this tragic situation, we in the United States are not in a position to give away much of our food surpluses even if we wanted to do so. We are not the only food-producing nation in the world; consequently, we must exercise great care so as not to disturb the world markets. Nor do the peoples who are in need of these food surpluses want them for nothing. Some of them are too proud to take it for nothing. Others are jealous of their sovereignty and independence and fear that in taking this food they will become indebted to other nations.

Shortly before Christmas, you will recall, our Government announced that it will make available considerable quantities of wheat, corn, and other products to needy persons in foreign countries. These are to be distributed through church and private welfare agencies "until such time as any or all of the commodities can be disposed of in normal domestic channels or until they can be sold abroad." I consider this action by our Goverment as one of the most potent ways to fight communism in the world.

During the FAO conference in Rome, I discussed this very suggestion with my colleague and fellow delegate [Mr. HOPE] and also with the Honorable Earl Butz. We visited private church agencies where we saw at firsthand how some of our surpluses were being distributed to the poor and needy, irrespective of their politics. Both of these gentlemen assured me that upon their return to the United States they would urge our Government to release more of our food surpluses to such private agencies. After my return from abroad, I again conferred with Mr. Butz and others in Washington concerning this matter. I was therefore very elated when I learned of the action taken by our Government, although I am not seeking any personal credit for such action.

I merely wish to state that we are not losing anything because some of these commodities have been in danger of rotting in the warehouses and ships where

they are stored. By donating this food to the needy abroad we stand to gain immeasurably. We stand to win the support of much-needed friends all over the world.

Unfortunately, our position has not always been clear to the peoples of Asia. At times it was felt by some of them that we had abandoned our concepts of freedom and independence in order to support our Western allies in fostering colonialism. For example, the cry to save Indochina was: "Aid France." The Asian peoples thought it should have been: "Save the People of Indochina for Freedom." Communism, on the other hand, won victory after victory by the cry: "The land belongs to the people who work it."

Because of colonialism we have lost out in China, Indochina, and to some extent in North Korea. We have succeeded in saving South Korea, the Philippines, Japan, Burma, Thailand and others because the peoples of those countries were granted their freedom and independence. There is no escaping the fact that America is on the defensive in Asia. Unless we are willing to help the peoples of Asia and other areas of the world in safeguarding their inalienable rights to freedom and independence, we can expect that the misunderstanding about our aims will deepen and we will be in danger of completely losing their friendship and support.

How important is this? Let us face the fact that, as things stand now, the democratic forces are snowed under by Communist numbers. The Chinese and North Koreans are fighting Russia's wars in Asia, while Russia's own tremendous manpower reserve remains untouched. At the present time, all we can count on definitely in Asia are the 21 million people of the Philippines, 18 million in Thailand, and 80 million in Pakistan—119 million in all, as against about a billion people for Russia, Red China, North Korea, North Vietman, and so forth. The rest, including the vast numbers in India, are pursuing a neutral course which is bound to be detrimental to them and the whole free world.

This is far from being a very encouraging picture of the situation. But we need not become despondent. We are far from lost in Asia. If we pursued the same policy in Asia as we recently did in defeating communism in the Philippines, and if we strongly encourage an organization such as FAO, we can still hope to regain our moral and political leadership among the nations and preserve freedom and democracy in the world. If we can help to fill empty stomachs, substitute contentment for hunger and disease, and free the minds of people everywhere, then there will be no place for communism in the world.

The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization offers a wonderful opportunity to help bring this about. While Soviet Russia seeks to promote communism and confusion by arming nations in the Far East and Middle East and is encouraging them to wage war, the FAO promotes democracy and freedom by encouraging the production of agricultural commodities and improving the distribution of food in the underdeveloped areas.

Perhaps even more important is the fact that FAO is trying to develop the purchasing power of the peoples in these underdeveloped countries. This can be accomplished in some degree through the use of our food surpluses and by helping them to exploit their natural resources and build up local industries. This will provide more employment for the people and enable them to become buyers on the world market.

By distributing some of our food surpluses we help to prevent famine and disorder, we improve our relations with countries which are given such assistance, and we help to promote peace. The facilities of FAO are at our disposal in the effort to achieve these goals.

Mr. Speaker, FAO is bent on the very laudable task of raising the status and the dignity of all human beings. It is dedicated to the cause of removing slavery and bondage in the world. It is pursuing a course which seeks to help make all peoples free and independent in the eyes of God and man. For these reasons, I shall strongly support this organization and its program. I urge you and all my colleagues to give it their support. FAO holds out a great promise to us, but also a great challenge.

In conclusion, I take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to you for affording me the honor to represent this House on the United States delegation to the FAO conference.

They Envy and Admire Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, H. B. Snyder, editor of the Gary Post Tribune, sets out in the following editorial in simple facts why the free nations of the world must continue to fight to curb communism.

The two Soviet leaders revealed to the world during their trip to India and Burma that they need more support from nations outside the Iron Curtain or their economy will continue on the road to failure.

Well-financed lobbies are at work within our own borders to force our Government to relent in its drive against further Communist aggresion and infiltration.

THEY ENVY AND ADMIRE US

The failure of many Americans to understand the true meaning of the Communist attack on civilization is shown in the opposition stirred up by President Eisenhower's recommendation for the appropriation of increased funds for use abroad. We call this fight the cold war and yet it is not thought necessary to spend enough money to win it.

There is never opposition to spending enough money to win a hot war. We know we simply must win regardless of the cost, even though a good part of that cost may eventually be recognized as waste. But it was part of the process of winning and we overlook the mistakes of people who ought to have known better or the plans which were suddenly thrown together without enough consideration to make them get the results we expected.

Not so with the cold war. We call it war but we act as if it were merely a phase of peaceful and friendly competition. But it is not competition at all. And it is not friendly. The bluster and enmity and lies shown and told by Khrushchev in India, Burma, and Kashmir were not aspects of friendly competition. They were moves in war.

We think it is a step toward peace to try to build up better understandings between the peoples of the West and the East but there seems to be little hope of much progress as long as the Khrushchevs rule Russia and India and Burma are led by such neutralists as Nehru and Nu. But we must make the effort.

However, it is even more important to build up our military power and to offer economic help to those countries whose living standards are so low as to make them envious of us and easily led into the opposition because of that envy.

We must understand that every country in the world wants an improved standard of living and looks to us not only in envy but in admiration. We have what they all want and we must find some way to prove that we want them to have it and will cooperate in helping them to get it. If we can do that there will be no doubt about the outcome of the cold war if in the meantime we make it impossible by our own military strength for the Communists to make further inroads in the free or neutralist world.

Mellon and the Republican Trickle-Down Tax Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include parts 1 and 2 of a series of articles from the newspaper Labor's Daily. The series was written by Mr. George B. Holcomb and is of special significance because of forthcoming action on tax legislation this session. The articles trace the historic development of the trickle-down tax philosophy advanced by former Treasury Secretary Andrew Mellon and his associates during the 1920's and more recently championed by the present Republican administration.

ANDY MELLON AND GHOST SAVED RICH MAN THE MOST

(By G. B. Holcomb)

Part I

WASHINGTON.—On Tuesday, December 20, the Eisenhower administration will cannonize one of its political saints—the billionaire Secretary of the Treasury who helped skid the Nation into its worst depression—Andrew W. Mellon.

If the administration wished to identify itself with gigantic, legalized tax evasions, conflict of interest between business and Government, and the trickle-down theory

of taxation, it could find no more appropriate symbol than "Uncle Andy," as he was referred to by President Harding.

Andrew Mellon was the richest man ever to hold a Government office. And when others were jailed or rejected from office for mixing business with Government—as in the Teapot Dome scandal—Mellon continued in his shy, modest and scrupulous way.

WROTE TAX LAWS

There was nothing flagrantly illegal in the way he avoided taxes—his boys wrote the tax laws.

Yet Uncle Andy was only the leading figurehead on the advocates of the trickle-down tax theory. If authorship of the book were the sole reason for the Tuesday ceremonies, then the Republican Party really should be honoring Mellon's ghost—a ghost who walks.

The ghost, incidentally, is still on the Federal payroll, and in a different cause—art.

The story of the associations between Mellon and his ghost is one of the bits of history which has escaped most people. It is related here because it reveals much about the man whom the Nation will honor Tuesday.

STARTED ART GALLERY

It would be comforting to remember only that Andrew Mellon helped start the National Gallery of Art and supplied some $50 million worth of paintings to furnish it.

But in the process there also has been a close connection with his managing to free himself from a charge by the F. D. Roosevelt administration that he owed $2.5 million in back taxes to the United States Treasury.

It was Mellon's ghost, the ghost who walks, who also helped get that little item cleared up, through a settlement for $668,000 after Mellon's death in 1937.

It was Mellon's ghost who assisted the old man in his duties as supervisor over the collection of the Nation's taxes and over its banking system.

It was Mellon's ghost who has helped divert some $150 million worth of paintings into the National Gallery of Art, thus making it world-renowned.

HERE'S THE GHOST

The ghost is David E. Finley, director of the gallery and chairman of the Federal Commission of Fine Arts. He was born in 1890 at York, S. C. He plans to retire next year, culminating a career as the millionaires' friend.

The Saturday Evening Post once described him as a "small, slender, almost birdlike man with a continual smile and chirp."

But his brain is not that of a bird, for Finley wrote Andrew Mellon's book on taxation in 10 days.

And Finley had enough knowhow to get millionaires to build up their tax deductions, through gifts of paintings by artists who must be at least 20 years deceased. (This requirement is supposed to make sure that only famous artists' works are shown.)

SOMETHING FISHY

But, as the Post recorded:

"Of course, there are a few detractors of Finley, disapointed rivals in other museums, mostly, who sourly insist that Federal inheritance and gift taxes have been a big help to him.

"They point out that a millionaire with a really valuable collection of paintings must choose eventually between giving it away or saddling his heirs with a staggering tax burden.

"Since Federal taxes are larger than most State taxes in this respect, it is often cheaper to make such a gift to the national gallery than to a local institution."

As it was put by the late Chester Dale (utilities and investment banker and magnate):

"There are just about three things you can do with your money when you have as much as I have. You can give a building to a university or church. Or you can go in for jewelry, damned expensive, and I don't care for it, anyway."

ART'S MORE FUN

"Or you can spend it on art, which costs even more than the others, but is a lot more fun. That's why I chose art."

There are other charities, but apparently Dale couldn't think of them at the moment.

The tax burden on his heirs, if Andrew Mellon hadn't given away his $50 million worth of paintings, would have been onerous indeed.

Raphael's Alba Madonna cost the old man $1,166,000. Many of the paintings cost several hundreds of thousands apiece.

He paid $8 million to the Soviet Government for 23 paintings in 1930. (One of them was Titian's Toilet of Venus, "a very nude painting which Mellon never would have hung in his home," the Post said, and which cost $544,320.)

These paintings from Russia were hidden for a number of years, and Mellon and his ghost flatly denied that they existed. The oils were kept in a vault of the Corcoran Gallery in Washington during this period.

One reason for this secrecy, speculated the Statevepost, "may have been the depression which settled over the country after the stock market collapse of 1929.

"It probably would not have been good politics for the Secretary of the Treasury publicly to spend millions for rare paintings, at a time when the Government was swamped with unemployment, bank failures, and general distress."

In 1932, Andrew Mellon, in his seventies, was removed by President Hoover from his post as head of the Treasury Department, and was made Ambassador to Great Britain.

His ghost went with him, of course.

GHOST LOSES JOB

In 1933, that man, Roosevelt, entered the White House, and Mellon stopped being Ambassador to Great Britain. Although Finely originally entered Government service under a Democratic administration (Woodrow Wilson's), he too, lost his job when the Democratic broom began sweeping.

He was rehired—to his present position—in 1937.

But meanwhile, he and Donald D. Shepard set up a law office in Washington early in 1933. By sheer coincidence, their chief client was Andrew Mellon, and their first big case was on his behalf against the Treasury Department.

One reason the New Deal was hated and feared among certain financial circles was because it sometimes cracked down on tax evaders. It went so far as to accuse Mellon of cheating the Treasury out of $3,089,000 in taxes while Mellon was guardian of taxation—in the one year 1931.

MAGNANIMOUS OFFER

Finley and associates fought the case until 1937, with the settlement mentioned above.

In between the time the New Deal began that case and its conclusion, Mellon drafted a letter to President Roosevelt offering his entire art collection and money to build and equip a gallery for the "peepul" of the Nation.

There are some who say this was a kind of deal.

At any rate, President Roosevelt obviously saw this as an excellent method to add to the prestige of the Capital and to enhance the cultural heritage of the Nation. He readily agreed to the Mellon offer.

FINLEY THERE, OF COURSE

Finley was on hand to give any assistance he could.

On March 24, 1937, Congress set up the National Gallery, and ground was broken for the 182,000-ton pink marble mausoleum shortly afterward, about the time Andrew Mellon died.

It is modeled after the Emperor Hadrian's Pantheon in Rome, but is much larger.

David Finley's biggest triumph over the years probably was getting the huge collection of Pennsylvania Dutchman, Samuel H. Kress, the five-and-dime store king who bought paintings by the hundreds.

Until his death, S. H. Kress was the president of the board of trustees of the National Gallery.

TRICKLE-DOWN THEORY TRICKLED US SMACK INTO HISTORIC DEPRESSION

(By G. B. Holcomb)

Part II

WASHINGTON.—Unlike the man who put it down on paper under the pseudonym of Andrew M. Mellon, former Secretary of the Treasury, the trickle-down theory of taxation has not operated in seclusion.

David (the millionaires' friend) Finley may not be well known, but his theory is just as popular now as it was when he authored Taxation: The People's Business, in 1924, and said Mellon wrote it.

This theory, as most active labor members know, promotes the idea that income taxes should be greatly reduced on corporations and large incomes.

This is to provide incentive for more investments, so that prosperity can roll on boomingly forever—with only a few inevitable setbacks.

As Saturday Evening Post pointed out in an article a few years ago:

"USHERED IN DEPRESSION

"This scheme of taxation was followed, in fact, right up to the great collapse of 1929.

"Finley, despite his Democratic upbringing, put it into such eloquent and persuasive words that Mellon was delighted.

"He lifted Finley out of his routine job and made him special assistant. Today, there are hundreds and probably thousands of 'special assistants' in Washington, but Finley might well claim to be the granddaddy of them all."

The tax book was widely used as a Republican campaign document in 1924.

It came about as a result of Finley's main duty under Mellon, which was to answer letters from citizens wanting explanations on tax matters.

He suggested that a book on the subject might be helpful in heading off so many inquiries, and Mellon agreed. The book was published by Macmillan of New York. It contains 227 pages of relatively large type.

Some of the evidence that the trickle-down theory is just as much alive today as it was in the twenties is quoted on this page.

There are many who believe the theory, which has been occasionally called "Mellonism," may have been a major factor in causing the disastrous depression of the thirties.

President Truman maintained this in 1953 before a Labor Day rally of Michigan unions affiliated with the AFL and CIO. Said the doughty Missourian:

"The main answer to the question of what caused the depression is, I think, that in 1929 we had a very unhealthy distribution of the national income.

TOO MUCH AT TOP

"The people at the top had more than they could use, and the rest of the people did not have enough purchasing power to buy the output of our factories and farms.

"The big boom of the twenties increased the income of the top 5 percent of the people, but it actually decreased the income of the remaining 95 percent. Stock issues were boomed to fantastic heights by speculation," Truman said.

"But even when the speculators were rolling in profits, agriculture was in a depression.

"Workers, teachers, professional people were at the mercy of a speculative bubble, blown by the few in the interest of the few.

"The Government, controlled by the very groups who were doing the speculating, was

entirely helpless. All that Mr. Wilson could suggest as the disaster approached was that it looked like a good time to buy bonds," Truman told the rally.

"But no one had any money to buy bonds, and Mellon didn't know how to give the poor people any money, either. Naturally, the national economy couldn't go ahead in this lopsided fashion and it collapsed."

The New Deal, according to Truman, "stopped wild speculation. We taxed in accordance with ability to pay. We enacted minimum-wage laws and social-security laws.

"We helped agriculture and small business. We moved to develop the great natural resources of the country in the interest not of a few exploiters but of all the people.

"And, not least, we saw to it that the American labor movement got an even break with its employers in bargaining for decent wages and better working conditions, in order to raise the general standard of living in America," Truman said.

He said, "We did this in spite of the most bitter opposition. And, according to the leading Republicans, this was 'socialism.'

"It used to be called 'galloping socialism,' but now I understand it is more fashionable to call New Deal measures, like the Tennessee Valley Authority, 'creeping socialism.' My friends, they're both pure nonsense."

Truman said the New Deal proved that depressions and recessions are not necessary.

"And what is the reason, A major factor, this article (in Life magazine) says: 'is that we are constantly redistributing the national income into the pockets of the less prosperous'."

WHO WOULD HAVE THOUGHT

"Well, my friends," said Truman, "I never thought I'd see the day when Life magazine would praise us for that, but there it is, in black and white. And you can see the same kind of article in everything from the Sunday supplements to the Wall Street Journal," he said.

"And all this was possible because the Democratic Party did not believe in a sharply divided class society in America. We believed in a government that belongs to all the people, and an economic system that benefits all the people."

Truman claimed, "That is what saved us and saved our system of free enterprise and capitalism at a time when other countries have fallen into socialism or communism or fascism."

A HANDFUL

Today, in 1955, there are only a few men in the Eisenhower administration who continue to say that prosperity can be maintained only by continuing social security, jobless compensation programs, Federal projects, and taxation according to ability to pay.

But the spirit of Mellonism, as put down in a small book by his ghost, David Finley, lives on. The Saturday Evening Post described Finley as "the millionaire's best friend," and "little David, the rich man's pal."

There is little doubt but that the Post knew whereof it spoke, for the trickle-down theory is surely no friend of the poor.

Mellon and the Republican Trickle-Down Tax Philosophy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include part 3 and the concluding article of the series written by Mr. George B. Holcomb and appearing in the newspaper Labor's Daily:

MILLIONAIRE'S SON, MELLON GREW RICHER IN DEPRESSION

Part III

(By G. B. Holcomb)

WASHINGTON.—Taxes on the rich encourage tax avoidance, according to spokesmen for the upper income brackets.

Back in 1924, David E. Finley, the man behind Andrew W. Mellon, quoted approvingly in the book, Taxation: The People's Business, the following statement by a Yale University economics professor:

"Who will be responsible for the further degradation of the income tax? We shall not be able to blame the rich. They escape, for the most part, by legal avoidance, not by illegal evasion."

These were among reasons advanced by Mellon then and by his disciples today for drastic surtax reductions.

Mellon was very successful, but then he had longer to work at it than Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey has had; Mellon was in that office for 11 years.

Mellon might have looked better in public if he had stayed out of the Cabinet. But the memory of him seems to be suffering little, what with the 3-cent stamp issued to honor him on December 20.

WHY DID HE CONSENT?

Just why did Mellon consent to go down to Washington, as he put it?

Maybe he got bored in Pittsburgh with his millions and minions.

Andy, 1 or 8 children, was the chief heir-by-nature of his father, a successful judge. The judge hired his son at $75 a month when he was 18. This was the last time he received a salary until he became Secretary of the Treasury.

By the time he was 30, Andrew was in charge of most of the Mellon family's interests in coal, land, steel, and banking.

By 1920, he was a lonely man. His children were away at school, and his wife had left him to get away from money grubbing, it was said.

So he welcomed the chance to join the administration of Warren Gamaliel Harding. President Harding decided that anyone with as much money as Mellon would make a good treasurer.

OOH, THOSE CONNECTIONS

When he got to Washington, Mellon was surprised to learn that he couldn't serve in various Treasury capacities, such as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, without first divesting himself of his business connections.

This was easily done—and still is.

Mellon resigned from 51 boards of directors and scores of corporation offices.

He "sold" his bank stocks to his brother, Richard B. Mellon, for $10,520,495.

In return for this sale, he took a "note" bearing a return of 5½ percent interest. By coincidence this was just the same as the amount of dividends being paid on the stock.

This was one of the oddest notes in existence. The interest rate fluctuated up and down—just as did the dividend rate. Mostly it went up.

Within a few years, according to David Loth in this book, Public Plunder, Richard Mellon netted $300,000 from the stocks—in addition to the interest which he had paid to Andrew. So Richard gave the $300,000 to Andrew, too.

FORTUNE GROWS

In those days the slogan may well have been, "What's good for Mellon is good for America."

The business community needed a man it could trust in the Treasury. It got him.

And while he was in the Cabinet, Andrew Mellon's fortune grew from a mere $600 or $700 million to some $2 billion, during the depth of the depression.

Andrew Mellon led the great crusade to take the burden of repressive taxes off of the shoulders of the downtrodden rich. The crusaders pointed out that victims of high taxes had to pay as much as 65 percent in surtaxes on the biggest fortunes.

The fact that few of them paid it—Mellon paid in taxes only about 3 percent of his total income in 1931—was ignored.

During Harding's tenure, Mellon succeeded in getting a law through Congress to reduce the income taxes. According to Loth, Mellon's tax savings as a result of that law amounted to $500,000 a year.

Under the old rates, during the slump of 1921, he paid $1,492,883 in taxes. The next year he paid $950,958, under the new law.

JUST A BEGINNING

But this was only the beginning. Mellon requested and got a letter from one of his subordinates, a Bureau of Internal Revenue Commissioner, David H. Blair, "setting forth some of the various ways by which an individual may legally avoid tax * * * prepared by a member of the income tax unit of this Bureau."

This was written in the covering letter to Mellon. The various ways numbered a dozen.

Here are the results of one of these loopholes:

In earlier years, Mellon paid $6 million for some Pittsburgh Coal Co. stocks. In 1931, he noticed that the stock market value of these stocks, because of the depression, had dropped to $500,000.

This then, could become a loss of $5½ million on his 1931 income tax return, provided he sold the stocks at the low figure.

So Mellon sold the stocks to the Union Trust Co., headed by one of Mellon's men. Then 118 days later, one of the Mellon holding companies repurchased the stocks at the same price plus 118 days' worth of interest at 6 percent. But the loss stayed on the tax return.

BUSINESS FRIENDS

That some of Mellon's friends in the business world also shared in this legal avoidance of taxes can be assumed on the basis of the billions in refunds paid out during those years.

And, wrote Loth, "Uncle Andy and his companies shared to the extent of at least $7 billion. Papers relating to the Standard Steel Car Co.'s request for an amortization allowance of more than $3 million bore a notation: 'This is a Mellon company.' It got what it asked * * *."

Mellon's boys were active on other fronts. Aluminum Company of America, enjoying a near-perfect monopoly, narrowly escaped a congressional investigation—by only two votes—thanks to its heroic defender, Senator Reed of Pennsylvania, recognized Mellon spokesman in Congress.

The South American nation, Colombia, sought to cancel a concession it had granted to Gulf Oil, a Mellon company.

Suddenly Colombia became a bad risk, and could get no more loans out of National City Bank in New York.

Andrew Mellon, as Secretary of Treasury, later assured the president of Colombia that Colombia's credit might be better if it settled its difficulties with Gulf Oil.

This is history, mostly forgotten.

And on Tuesday, the Nation will honor this mostly forgotten man, Andrew Mellon, with a 3-cent stamp. It is altogether fitting and proper that he should be well remembered.

LABOR ECONOMISTS GIVE LIE TO TRICKLE-DOWN TAX PLAN

Part IV

(By G. B. Holcomb)

WASHINGTON.—The trickle-down theory of economics will be just as much an issue next

year as it has been during every recent political season.

Its strongest proponents are the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

Chamber spokesman Emerson P. Schmidt put it this way in a report issued last month:

"That we can maintain prosperity and progress without new investment is doubtful.

"If its benefits trickle, flow, and spread all around * * * there should be no complaint. * * *

"High and uncertain taxes on investment and achievement can be among the chief factors which will hold us to lower scales of living than those we could achieve."

MAKES MORE SENSE

Yet Prof. William L. Cary of Columbia University recently told a congressional committee that the large investor probably constitutes the most important beneficiary of preferential treatment in tax laws.

This was substantiated by Prof. J. Keith Butters of Harvard, who said, "The evidence indicates that, as a group, individuals in the upper income percentiles are still accumulating large amounts of new investable funds despite existing tax rates."

Peter Henle, AFL economist, writing in the current issue of the Federationist, said that the Federal tax laws, far from treating the upper-income groups and corporations unfairly, actually contain special privileges for such taxpayers.

"There is every evidence that low-income families bear a disproportionately high share of the tax burden," he reported.

Henle urged a return to the principle that the burden of taxes should fall according to ability to pay.

CLOSE LOOPHOLES

While Congress possibly should consider cutting taxes for the lower-income groups, it should at the same time try to put an end to some of the loopholes favoring upper income groups, he wrote.

CIO Research and Education Director Stanley Ruttenberg pointed out recently that during the past 2 decades, growing corporation tax rates, for example, seem to have had little effect on investment.

What's more, even though the tax rate dropped in 1954, so did business expenditures for new plant and equipment.

Past experience indicates, said Ruttenberg, that it is the money spent by consumers which is the biggest factor in fostering and holding prosperity.

In other words, the tax rate on business and high incomes has less effect on the economy than the corporation spokesmen like to admit.

Thus the emphasis in government policies should be to see that those consumer expenditures are not interrupted or abruptly reduced, but constantly and steadily expanded, liberals say.

TRICKLES: 1924 AND 1954

1924: TREASURY SECRETARY MELLON

"A sound tax policy must take into consideration three factors. It must produce sufficient revenue for the Government; it must lessen, so far as possible, the burden of taxation on those least able to bear it; and it must also remove those influences which might retard the continued steady development of business and industry on which, in the last analysis, so much of our prosperity depends."

1954: TREASURY SECRETARY HUMPHREY

"In addition to the $5 billion tax cuts of January 1, we are recommending a general revision of the tax system. It will do two principal things:

"(1) It will make the tax burden fairer for millions of individuals by removing the more serious tax inequities and complications.

"(2) It will stimulate production and create bigger payrolls and more and better jobs by reducing restraints and by encouraging initiative and investment."

The Hebrew Home for the Aged, Riverdale, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous approval of the House, I am including an effective and inspiring address delivered by Supreme Court Justice Sidney A. Fine, our former colleague, under date of September 11, 1955, on the occasion of the dedication of a cottage at the Hebrew Home for the Aged at Riverdale, N. Y., as follows:

I am privileged to say a word of greeting and to congratulate the officers and active leaders and workers of the Hebrew Home for the Aged at Riverdale at these ceremonies.

I count it a high honor to be associated in this very notable undertaking to provide a modern, up-to-date home for the Jewish aged.

From the beginning, the plans for this magnificent haven were drawn with imagination and faith. The organizers relied upon the generosity and charity of our friends and neighbors, and their faith was justified. Already, more than a million and a half dollars has been contributed to acquire and to build this home. The organizers also gave to the planning of the home, the imagination and heart required to establish it in a setting unique among institutions for the aged.

This afternoon we dedicate another cottage to expand the bed capacity of the home to accommodate 260 elderly persons. This is a good time to point out that the facilities we are providing here for sheltering and caring for old people are unmatched anywhere in our city and in many other places in the world.

This park setting overlooking the beautiful Hudson River and the Palisades is ideally suited to quiet retirement at the end of a busy and often hard life. Yet, the home is situated within the limits of the greatest city in the world and within convenient distance of the relatives and friends of those who live here.

The rooms in the main building and in the cottages are airy, light, and tastefully and comfortably decorated and furnished. The pastel shades of the walls combine with the streaming sunlight to make this a happy place full of cheer and hope. The decor compares favorably with that in a comfortable, modern hotel accommodating well-paying guests.

The beautiful dining and social hall makes mealtime a festive occasion, and every motion-picture show a visit to a motion-picture palace.

The solaria, the lounges, the terraces, the occupational therapy and leisure rooms are comfortable places for socializing.

The fine synagogue is ideally suited for prayer, study and meditation, and inspiration for many of the old folks.

I am impressed with the facilities provided for the care of the sick. With the advancing years, those residents who become ill and who are infirm are looked after in an infirmary that compares favorably with many hospitals. Those who have temporary illnesses of weaknesses are tended in the treatment rooms and clinics. The X-ray rooms, the laboratories, the dental, eye, and foot rooms and the physiotherapy departments are the last word in medical facilities for serving the aged.

This is a home in the modern sense of the word. The residents have all the freedom of movement on and off the grounds that they desire. The aged here are not subjected to stringent rules and disciplines. The large staff—almost 1 employee for every 2 old people—has been charged with the responsibility and is instructed in the spirit of service and respect for the personality and the dignity of each individual resident.

I am proud of my community for making possible such an enlightened, progressive agency for the care of the homeless aged.

With the increasing numbers of aged in our population, every branch of our Government must be vitally interested in the welfare of our senior citizens. The Federal, State, and municipal authorities are moving to help meet the problems—special problems which confront all of us with the advancing years. The Council of State Governments has recently outlined a plan of action in aging. Our own Governor Averell Harriman has appointed a special commission to accelerate plans for helping the large older segment of our population. Our city fathers, much to their credit, have been attempting to set up special facilities for aged persons.

However, it remains for the individual citizen to establish and to sponsor an institution such as the Hebrew Home for the Aged at Riverdale. To help our fellowman who at the end of his years is no longer able to help himself—to provide him with loving care in an atmosphere of sympathy and understanding—we must maintain and support this home.

We must expand it and build it and sustain it and continue to dedicate more buildings and more facilities for those whose strength fails them in their old age.

On the eve of the Jewish New Year, let us wish each other a happy, healthy, and prosperous New Year. Let us join in making the New Year a better year for elderly men and women.

Disaster Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the statement I made before the United States Senate Committee on Banking and Currency at its Boston hearing on disaster insurance on November 9, 1955.

The material follows:

DISASTER INSURANCE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: First, Mr. Chairman, let me extend to you and your colleagues a hearty welcome to Massachusetts and express the gratitude of our delegation and people for the painstaking attention your committee is giving to the very serious problems which recent disastrous floods have created for us.

I am very thankful also for this opportunity to appear before you and present my views. My distinguished and beloved colleague, Mrs. ROGERS, a member of our dele-

gation, and of our Flood Control Committee, is also here and I know you will be pleased to hear from her.

While some of the problems connected with the flood are not precisely under the jurisdiction of your fine committee, many of them are pertinent to your current studies and inquiries and undoubtedly present avenues for effective remedial action by the Congress.

Let me state also that I have been very much gratified by the work to date of your distinguished committee and the very able leadership of our good friend, Senator LEHMAN, one of the outstanding members of the United States Senate, marked and distinguished for his long, valuable service as Governor of the great State of New York as well as his conspicuous service in the Senate. There are many bonds of friendship and admiration which tie him to Massachusetts people, and to our particular cause, and we appreciate more than I can say the thoughtful, forward-looking approach which he and the committee are pursuing.

The great havoc wrought by the floods in our State and area, indeed throughout much of the Northeast, hardly requires detailed description by me. It suffices for me to emphasize the fact that the ensuing destruction, havoc, and distress were widespread and that the resulting problems of relief, rehabilitation, and flood control and protection will have to be tackled vigorously on a very broad front.

Let me state further that all our people are deeply grateful for the efforts which the Federal Government has made to date. At the President's direction many Federal agencies too numerous to mention here have rendered us valuable and effective assistance and plans are in being which, if carried out by the Congress, should be of immeasurable benefit.

First, I should like to suggest the urgency of immediate appropriations by Congress of adequate funds to proceed as fast as possible with studies and construction of flood-control projects already authorized, and wherever necessary, in the various river basins of our State and region.

Delay would be fraught with grave possibilities of fresh disaster. Our flood committee, of which I am chairman, is intensively studying many necessary, specific projects and the Army engineers are conducting exhaustive surveys. Earliest possible action is of paramount importance.

A second proposal is one which your honorable committee is intensively studying and that is the urgent need for flood insurance and disaster insurance. I am very glad that Senator LEHMAN and your committee have broadened your studies to cover complete disaster insurance, because following the terrible Worcester tornado of 1953 I introduced H. R. 6129 which would create a Government-owned corporation to insure against all natural disasters such as floods, tornadoes, droughts, forest fires, earthquakes, hurricanes, and all disturbances and conditions of such impact and severity that it becomes necessary for the President to declare disaster areas in any part of the Nation. I have previously submitted to the committee for insertion in the RECORD the text of H. R. 6129.

You all realize that it is impossible to secure flood insurance, or disaster insurance, from private insurance companies because its cost would be prohibitive. Under the proposed bill the Government would reinsure disaster policies designed to cover every part of the United States against the ravages of all natural disasters.

I am desirous, insofar as it is practicable and feasible, of having private companies cooperate with the Federal Government in this coverage because it would not interfere in any way with current private insurance coverages wherever they exist, of storm and wind damage and the like, because the proposed insurance would not go into effect in any area until the President has declared an emergency.

I note from the press, Mr. Chairman, that you are considering a measure to include damage from atomic attack and possibly other war damage, and, so far as I am concerned, I believe that this proposal is not only sound and feasible, but vitally necessary, if we are to be prepared for any great national emergency that might strike us like a bolt from the blue with devastating effects.

In this connection, it might be relevant to refer to the War Damage Corporation organized during World War II on the theory that war risk is catastrophic in nature, arising out of a single peril, and war risk losses are unpredictable, as well as impossible for private companies to undertake by themselves.

You will recall that the Act of March 22, 1942 provided specifically for property loss or damage which might have occurred after Pearl Harbor to the end of the war period, and the War Damage Corporation entered into agreements with some 546 established insurance carriers to transact general war-risk insurance protection available to the public.

Under the program the companies were permitted to make a reasonable profit for their work in writing the insurance and handling claims and the like. It was not necessary for the Corporation to request or receive any direct appropriation from the Congress and it was capitalized for something like a hundred million dollars and its stock was held by the RFC.

You will recall that from December, 1941 to June, 1945 premium revenues aggregating something like $250 million were more than adequate to enable the Corporation to meet its operating expenses and pay approved claims for property loss and damage.

Actually the only funds made available to the Corporation by RFC were $1 million for the acquisition of the initial issue of 1,000 shares of capital stock.

About $372,000 was expended in approved claims for losses which occurred before inauguration of the premium insurance program.

This insurance was set up so that it could cover all the property in the United States—homes and residential, business, churches, public institutions, and the like with the assistance and participation of the private companies.

Let me repeat that I regard such a program not only to be sound and feasible, but decidedly necessary at this time, and I hope and urge that the committee will consider H. R. 6129 in connection with its study of other pending proposals you are studying.

In the third place, I have made certain efforts looking toward expansion of the Weather Bureau to speed intensive study of weather problems and to inaugurate as early as possible more effective hurricane and storm-warning systems. I think there is a real need for increased and improved research on weather and weather service and am introducing appropriate legislation when Congress reconvenes. I respectfully ask the subcommittee's permission to include in the record the text of the preliminary draft of my weather bill.

Fourthly, I also think that Congress will have to strengthen and expand our machinery for disaster relief and rehabilitation. It should be permanent, it should be more closely coordinated with the States and local communities. It should be broader and more generous in its coverage.

I seriously question that relief of disasters of such great magnitude as we are dealing with now, and will have to deal with from time to time, and which may hit anywhere in the country, can be satisfactorily handled by Government loans. The Small Business Administration, acting under its present mandate, has done splendid work and I would be the first wholeheartedly to commend this Government agency for the help it rendered to us, and is still rendering to us.

However, I believe that these relief and rehabilitation problems will have to be approached on a much broader front and that consideration must be promptly given to the equitable and humane aims of putting flood and disatser sufferers, as nearly as we can, into the status quo ante—the position they were in before disaster struck them.

It can be definitely said, I think, that many of these losses, individual and collective, human and material, are far beyond the resources of individuals, or the State and local governments, to cope with adequately. A broader measure of assistance by the Federal Government is required.

Such a program will be costly and expensive. But so is foreign relief; so are agricultural subsidies; so are great public projects in other sections of the Nation. The stricken people of the eastern seaboard who pay such heavy taxes to the Federal Treasury are also entitled to the generous help and assistance of the Federal Government in their time of terrible affliction.

In conclusion, I earnestly plead for your cooperation and assistance. We have been sorely stricken. Our own people have shown tremendous courage and resourcefulness in trying to reestablish their homes, their industries and their communities. But our need is still very great. To ward off the effects of the disastrous floods and to set up adequate safeguards against possible future visitation of great natural disasters, so unpredictable in their approach and point of attack, and so paralyzing in their consequences, we now need the sympathetic help and assistance of the Government.

If your illustrious committee comprised of great leaders of the United States Senate and great leaders of the Nation, able, esteemed and patriotic, working so diligently under the leadership of the very distinguished Senator from New York, can help us measurably in any way to realize the objectives in this field of relief, rehabilitation and protection which we in Massachusetts feel must be so urgently and vigorously pursued, then we will indeed be very grateful to you.

Please let me thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for hearing me this morning and giving your valuable time, and most of all your sincere and sympathetic consideration of our serious flood problems. I am sure that you will do everything you can to assist us.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen.

Brooklyn Campaign of the Boy Scouts of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Andrew S. Roscoe, president of the Equitable Savings & Loan Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., and adjunct professor of economics at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, at the annual Brooklyn luncheon of the Boy Scouts of

America held at the Granada Hotel on Tuesday, November 29, 1955:

I feel complimented by your invitation to visit with you at this luncheon dedicated to the launching of the Brooklyn campaign of the Boy Scouts of America.

I could devote my allotted time to a discussion of the great work of the leadership and staff of the great Boy Scout organization in Brooklyn. I feel that the many years of scrvice contributed by Brooklyn's great supreme court judge, the Honorable J. Vincent Keogh, the Honorable Richard Hannah, our beloved general chairman, a great engineering educator, Dean Henry Q. Middendorf of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, Mr. Justice George Arkwright, our beloved friend, Comdr. Barney Nova, Commander Lieblich, and others have served as a source of inspiration to the youth of America and to all of us adults who join the Scout movement in an effort to implement and supplement the labors of these pioneers.

At greater length, I might discuss the devotion of the Scout organization. When Jim Boyer visited with me, accompanied by your general chairman, Richard Wesley Hannah, supplementing the invitation of Judge Keogh, I asked quite a few questions. It was simply wonderful to learn that in the Scout organization the professional staff wishes to remain in the background. It is a pattern that we seldom meet with, but when we do meet this pattern we cherish it, and we single it out as a beacon of hope, attesting that we do have men with the highest degree of integrity and morality dedicated to a profession, laboring for modest compensation and seeking neither power nor acclaim.

Your Scout executive, Jim Boyer, a highly educated Texan, has contributed 30 years of professional work to Scouting, having served as a Scout executive in small farming areas as well as in large industrial cities and with a record equaled by few other social workers in our great country. With almost a decade of service to his credit in Brooklyn, he is commanding a volunteer group of 8,500 adults, the good men and good women in a community, who in turn provide help, advice, and guidance to 700 Scouting packs, troops, and posts commanding our armada of 25,000 boys. The Brooklyn Boy Scouts, the future of America.

Nothing indicates the kind of a leadership that Jim Boyer has provided more than the fact that he is able to attract and retain the cooperation of outstanding Brooklyn men.

I choose, however, to call to your kind attention the purpose of our luncheon meeting today. We have a splendid Scout organization. The leadership is here. We have a wonderful volunteer group to assist this leadership, and we have 25,000 boys, eager to mold their thinking according to our finest American traditions. I mean 25,000 boys on the inside, and I am told there are at least as many on the outside who should have an opportunity to participate in the great program of Scouting, but who cannot do so simply because we do not have the money to provide them with such an opportunity.

Brooklyn is blessed with 2 percent of the population of the whole country and an equaly impressive percentage of the total national income. We have 20 percent of the population of the State and almost 40 percent of the population of the city. As a matter of fact, we spend one-third of all scout dollars collected in the greater city of Brooklyn, yet we have been only able to raise 10 percent of the total quota of the greater city. For 10 percent cash, Manhattan gives us 33 percent of the total collected. It is always nice to have a piggy-back ride but I am just wondering what the answer is to the financial aspects of the problems of such youth organizations as the Boy Scouts. Certainly, we have great leadership.

Your general chairman, Richard Hannah, one of our great barristers, a gentleman with a background of accomplishments not limited to the field of practice of law. As you know he is general counsel to the General Accident, Fire, and Life Assurance Corp., Ltd., and, as well, a leader in many fields of religious, educational, and social welfare. It is simply wonderful to be associated with this type of leader, and this leadership should assure our volunteers in this effort to obtain our quota for the Brooklyn Boy Scouts. Such effort will enable us to say to Brooklyn boys: "We want you to have the benefit of scouting and we love you even to the extent of willing to pay for this affection. We want you to have the same opportunity to become scouts in Brooklyn as you would have if you were living in other communities." For if a boy lives in Queens, he has 2 chances to Brooklyn's 1 of becoming a scout; if he lives in Nassau he has even a greater hope of becoming a scout. But in Brooklyn his chances are very slim because of the lack of funds. We hear a lot about Federal aid, State aid, and municipal aid for our youth. Scouting does not get funds from government. Scouts are good kids. They present no threatening mental, emotional, or moral problems.

Certainly these youngsters, the children of our neighborrs, merit our moral and substantial support. This is a great cause! Providing for the good kids is a great purpose, and all of you are as dedicated to the great ideals of scouting. To carry this campaign to full fruition wil merit community reward not measured in gold but infinitely worthy of community pride.

The poet Wadsworth once spoke of his youth thus:

"In that great dawn, 'twas bliss to be alive,
But to be young 'twas very heaven."

Our youth should know, the early impact of heaven. They should not be dispossessed!

Israel Must Have Arms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith an address I made on January 4, 1956, in Chicago, Ill., before the Congregation Rodfei Zedek:

ISRAEL MUST HAVE ARMS

Israel must have arms. Let us remember this: Wherever you stand in Israel, you can see a border line with scarcely the twist of a neck. Thus, if there is an attack upon Israel and Israel is unprepared to meet it, Israel will be forced into the sea before any aid whatsoever can be rushed to her.

The only defense Israel can have against an attack is to be able to meet it head on. A Pearl Harbor would mean the end of Israel. There is no space for retreat.

Israel asks for arms for another reason which, above all else, most certainly should be understood by the United States. The United States has consistently pursued the policy that the most effective deterrent against war is to maintain adequate arms for herself and her allies. To that end, we have devoted the major portion of our budget, keeping strong our armed forces and trying to keep ahead in military developments and supplying our allies with military aid.

Is it, therefore, unreasonable—can we possibly view it as unreasonable—that Israel, small and friendless, should likewise view an adequate defense as the best deterrent against war, and as the best assurance for peace? We in the United States have sought, through a system of defense pacts—NATO, SEATO, and the encouragement of pacts like the Baghdad pact and the Northern Tier arrangements—to promote the cause of peace in the world. Is it, therefore, unreasonable that Israel, in her isolation—the only democratic country in the world so isolated—should seek a pact with the United States, the country which once befriended her, the country which once, through legislative action and through presidential proclamation, gave so much sympathy and understanding to the ideals of the Jewish homeland?

The situation in the Middle East has deteriorated where it now constitutes one of our own weakest points, securitywise. Through a lack of firmness with the Western Powers, our obvious indecisiveness, so open to the Arab States that they played the East against the West, we now face Soviet penetration of the Middle East. Right now we seem to be running around in circles, crying loudly at the Communist apparition in the area, obviously distraught, now patting the Arab nations on the head, now murmuring sympathetically to Israel, promising and withdrawing, promising and withdrawing again.

Let us make no mistake about it. We have been less than forthright. The Western World has reason for its alarm.

To me it is amazing that the Western World, dedicated to the preservation and even to the expansion of democracy, should have turned its back on the one practicing democratic nation in that area of the world. The British Government is openly pro-Arab, so openly pro-Arab, so vigorously pro-Arab, that the voices of protest are heard around the land. As a result of this mounting protest, Prime Minister Anthony Eden has reluctantly consented to a decree that no license be granted for the export of materiels that could be reconditioned and re-exported for use as weapons of war "unless the government of destination is prepared to give a guaranty against that happening."

Such a decree is meaningless. It is impossible of enforcement. Inspections certainly cannot be maintained in any country where this materiel eventually lands. It is especially meaningless in view of the fact that Great Britain has been feeding the Egyptian maw great supplies of arms, including 64 Centurion tanks, scores of jets, and some 180 to 190 reconditioned British Valentine tanks.

A shipment of these arms in part and parcel of Eden's policy of Arab appeasement. Eden is like a man who keeps feeding steaks to a tiger in the hope of making him a vegetarian.

Is it that the Government of Great Britain considers Israel expendable? Can Eden on one hand deprecate an arms race in the Middle East and on the other condone the supply of arms all out of proportion to that of Israel to the country of declared and open hostility?

The situation is so fraught with danger that top priority was given a few days ago by the newly appointed British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, to that very situation by summoning to London eight British envoys in Middle East countries for a 2-day conference. Among those summoned were the British ambassadors from Israel, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

It is also said that Great Britain may find it necessary, in view of the storm of protest, to isue a white paper explaining its policy in the Middle East.

In all this, where is United States policy? Will our leadership go by default?

We cannot, of course, conclude—since we do not know—that our Government will steer the wrong course. We do know that there has been too much reliance on wishful thinking. We do know that there has been—and still exists—a split among the State Department advisers. We do know that our diplomacy has failed in Egypt. But the course must be set and set soon—with realism, with staring of the facts straight in the face. We cannot afford any conflagration in that area in the name of our own security.

As Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion said, eloquently and with wisdom, in a recent address to the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament:

"We know that any war—one even in which we gain the upper hand—involves ruin and destruction for both parties and intensifies hatred between nations. We know that, after our victory in one war, a second round is possible, and after our victory in a second war, a third round may come, and there is no end of this business."

First Order of Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following instructive and enlightening editorial from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., September 14, 1955:

GAP IN THE DIKE

The gap between planning and construction of flood control projects in New England was graphically illustrated at the meeting of the Bay State congressional delegation with Army engineers.

Flood control projects amounting to $196 million have been authorized for New England since the disastrous floods of 1936—in all 27 projects—but less than $2 million has been spent to carry out the plans.

There are several reasons why this gap exists. One of the big reasons is the failure of local and State authorities to concur in the projects. In many cases the objections are reasonable, and in many others purely capricious. Usually the objections center around the destruction of taxable property necessary to create storage basins.

Another reason, however, is the cloud of indifference which descends upon the flood-afflicted areas after the emergency has passed. After the cleanup, and after the rubble is replaced by new construction, people delude themselves with the assurance that it can't happen twice in the same place.

If local and State authorities become indifferent to flood control because the people are no longer pressing for relief and reparation, it follows that the pressure will be off the delegation in Congress. If local and State authorities will not concur in flood-control plans there is not a great deal that the Corps of Engineers can or will do to push through a flood-control project.

Flood-control projects on the Merrimack, Hoosac, Housatonic, Connecticut, Winooski, and Thames Rivers, which are a serious annual threat, should be given priority, should be pressed through to conclusion, and should be backed by generous congressional appropriations.

It must be remembered that the New England delegation in Congress must first secure appropriations to reimburse the Corps of Engineers for about $28 million which will have been spent by the end of this year on the basis of an agreement between President Eisenhower and the party leaders.

Money must be appropriated over and above these flood-reparation funds for the flood-control projects. Authorization of a flood-control project doesn't contain floodwaters. Only storage basins built to contain the floodwaters can do that.

The United States Corps of Engineers has prepared a New England flood-control plan. All that is needed is State and local concurrence and the money. The fact that this flood control scheme lies within an area of chronic labor surplus should stimulate swift action in the Congress.

The presence of the majority of the Bay State delegation in Congress at the conference with the Corps of Engineers is heartening. We would like to see the New England delegation in Congress brought together at frequent intervals for conferences of this kind which would produce a cohesive plan for New England betterments.

Governor Leader's Israel Bond Drive Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, at the State of Israel bond dinner held in Wilkes-Barre on October 23, 1955:

Americans of my generation can claim a viewpoint on Israel. It really couldn't be otherwise. This country's actual existence coincides with our own.

We were a generation that grew up in a world in which the cause of Israel took shape, out of the dreams of idealists, out of the Balfour Declaration into an independent nation, transforming the desert sands.

I remember reading, while attending school, the grim tales told in banner headlines of another tragic chapter of the Jewish people. The appeals of Israel reverberated in the conscience of the world.

Many of us shall never forget the fight we individually and as a Nation made against the ruthless forces of modern tyranny during World War II. All of us were appalled when we witnessed how brutality and mass destruction were systematically employed in an attempt to erase the name of Jew from the face of the globe. By my age, I am a part of that group of Americans who opposed the cancerous spread of fascism.

By my ancestry, I am happy to boast, of being Pennsylvania Dutch. They are a species unto themselves. By family religious tradition, I have a legacy of simple creed and good deeds derived from my ancestral plain people. Their unique sense of how to live a faith and express a family folklore in all one's dealings with one's fellow human beings still colors the moral sense of my own social and spiritual obligations.

I am sure you won't think it exactly strange when I say I am for Israel because I am Pennsylvania Dutch and still function in the motives of the Christian beliefs of my family predecessors.

I am sure it must come immediately to mind how my ancestors and my immediate family life has at least some identity with how you and your immediate relatives frequently live. When one grows up in a family atmosphere where faith presides over patterns of conduct in almost every precise aspect of daily living, you at least sense an affinity, even if not an identity, of attitude. When one accepts the basic tenet that daily living is an external expression of accustomed regulations—formed by an inner, simple, spiritual compulsion, then there are bonds of attachment with another people—whose way of life pursues rules of conduct stemming from the law of the prophets and the kings.

But there is really much more to the explanation of why I am committed to the cause of Israel than that. As Pennsylvanians, I think you will see my point. All of us boast of being lineal descendants in a spiritual sense of the viewpoint of William Penn. Do you recall what really was the proprietor's vision when he described his attempt at establishing a Commonwealth as the holy experiment?

Penn felt he must establish a colony in the clean, fresh air of a bright, new world as a haven for religious and personal liberty.

We sometimes don't appreciate what this event really meant. Penn's plan was a really new notion put into practice in the experience of men. Religious toleration is not too old an idea. Penn wanted people to find in his woodlands space for liberty of person in all its forms: for a man to think as he liked, worship as he was convinced, work as he saw fit, live as he felt obliged to as a responsible member of a common community.

Once the word finally got out about the holy experiment, immigrants were certainly not lacking. Among those who came for a new start in life were many from Germany. In these were some of my ancestors who nearly nine generations ago took William Penn at his word. They came from the gingerbread duchies and principalities that divided up the real estate of south Germany because these pocket-sized potentates made their conception of religion a civic handicap.

They wanted out; they wanted a land where they could be made as free as they believed God intended them to be.

So it was—300 years ago—that my forebears settled in the counties of what today are York, Lancaster, and Berks to find out what life and liberty meant, to see if what they heard about Penn's experiment was a fact. They had uprooted themselves from where their people had lived for generations. They tossed aside many relations and customs that they had shared with their fellow subjects. Now, they took their roots anew in our rich, red loam. They began to grow in freedom as their crops grew by the sweat of their brow. They recognized a man's quenchless desire for respect and dignity and they accepted freedom as a sign and a mark of the presence of God.

That was my family tradition. It was a part of me. It still is.

We were in our American origin refugees of tyranny because of our faith in God and man. We were immigrants for freedom. We were tough enough, cantankerous enough of body, mind, and spirit not to knuckle down and surrender to circumstances but get up and go on to a better deal. We abandoned a wormy past for a bright future. We had faith, given the opportunity, we would succeed afresh in a new land. Any people that relive a similar chronicle could not help but enlist my deep, abiding support.

Looking back on my sharp reactions of horror and abhorrence to the tragedy of modern Jewry which I expressed in college days, I cannot help but recall how my family history awoke in me a sense of kinship in suffering for those who were the victims of the ruthless Hitler regime of prewar days.

Recently I had an occasion to remember the reactions that were average among my classmates in the last half of the 1930's. They just couldn't understand any more

than could I the motives and psychology of a ruling political party that could coldbloodedly make their nation a tool of a people's torture and a world's fear. We felt outraged that any human beings, because they adhered to a religious way of life, automatically were candidates for a gas chamber, or for an impersonal listing for a taste of living death in a concentration camp. More than one of us who had been so comfortable in the security of our rolling family farmlands in central Pennsylvania woke uneasily to a sense of identity with those who then were actually experiencing on a more collossal scale the same repression and persecution as once did those from whom we sprung.

The Pennsylvania Dutch know the worth of liberty and they teach it to their children because they will not forget that one time they did not have it. They know the need for limitations on public power, because one time they suffered from its excess. They, too, recognize the terror of fear. They, too, had known legal discrimination. They, too, had felt the heavy, harsh hand of an indifferent authority brush aside their rights to pursue the ways of God in the light of their conscience. You can't escape this kind of background. It supplies strong roots of sympathy and understanding that make up my bonds for Israel formed quite awhile ago.

When I was asked to talk with you this evening, these memories came flooding back. I cannot conclude that the survival and the accomplishment of the renaissance of Israel could have happened aside from the spiritual vigor of the insight and moral character of your co-religionists that brought about the birth of the new republic and has sustained it in its epic efforts to put aright its diplomacy and its economy.

I make no pretense to a comprehensive understanding of all the complex issues engaging Israel. Yet, I cannot otherwise explain the treasury of courage and stamina, the pioneering spirit that raised the Israeli Republic from nothing and won the respect and admiration of fair-thinking people throughout the world.

Israel came to birth, a new land in an ancient, outworn corner of the globe, more rich in history than in natural resources.

Israel came into being as though a response to the ancient prophecy in the Holy Land surrounded by a hostile, bitter Arab world. Israel came into existence over the lethargy and indifference of European powers.

Israel came to life anew, a nascent state of an ancient people, a fledgling government for an ageless faith.

I can claim only a layman's knowledge gathered from newspapers and magazines to confirm the similarity of spirit and inner strength I perceive between the early Pennsylvanians and the modern citizens of Israel.

Pennsylvanians had all the advantages on their side. They came to a virgin territory of vast space and immeasurable deposits of natural resources. They have built steadily over the generations. Time has been on their side.

On the other hand, Israel is new and has just begun in limited terrain and worn soil. Nevertheless, a sense of contagious confidence belongs to both, a spirit of pioneering in a new land in response to a new challenge is abroad.

The Israelis see their country as our forebears saw America, as a land where the intangibles count as much as physical wealth. They see a lond where dignity can be breathed with the air. They want there what our ancestors achieved here:

Freedom to one's opinion that the truth might prevail;

Freedom in occupation and economic enterprise that careers may be carved by talent and service;

Freedom from arbitrary government and the violent prejudices of fellow man, so no man might be compelled against his will.

The Israelis work for the happiness that comes from freedom and which drew like a magnet the homeless and the ill, the aged and the suffering, the young and the equipped among your co-religionists from every trouble spot of the five continents. They brought their persons and their courage, their experiences and their inexhaustible hope that no might and majesty of naked power would ultimately stay their course of achieving a free society compatible with their ideas.

Today Israel stands for the kind of freedom every American understands, almost alone in the Middle East. I think it is honest to say that the new republic is an outpost of 20th century progress in a blighted 14th century dominated area. This is so because of the spirit of Israel's people, the spirit of venture that marks out the pioneer, the spirit of vision that comes from faith, the spirit of confidence that depends on man's capacity to remold the earth. Such cards of credentials will always be honored by the American people.

Here is a country whose very population has doubled in 7 years and yet practices no barriers in immigration policy. Here is a new republic that in this time has increased its national income in a single year over 30 percent, even if its new citizens are more endowed with assets of the spirit than this world's goods. This is the strength of Israel which cannot be lightly dismissed.

The Israelis are devoted to their religious faith as a pattern of conduct in the course of national affairs. Their new immigrants blend their sense of exaltation with the old as a powerful, almost atomic, force of the human spirit.

I do not think that I can forget to pay my tribute on this occasion to the extraordinary record of generosity that is the sacrifices of my fellow Americans of the Jewish faith in their unparalleled contributions to the maintenance of this gripping cause. American Jewry have displayed a measure of sharing with their distressed coreligionists abroad that may well remain a model of charity for a century. Now, charity is being supplanted to some degree at least by investment. I know you will not slacken now.

Some of my friends believe I have been engaged quite steadily during the last 8 months in my own problems of fund raising. I hope you will permit me one special appeal for your cause tonight.

I am frequently told that it's hard to sell intangibles or get people to believe that intangibles make a good invstment. Yet I cannot help persisting in my belief that I know of no better investment than in maintaining and sustaining freedom. I cannot recall any greater opportunity for doing what one ought than in supporting the efforts of free men devoted to the proper use of the opportunities provided by liberty.

At least Emerson was partially correct when he once remarked that the essence of a nation's history is a composite of the biographies of its individual men. I think you have got the right type of man in Israel. They are tough, they are hard, they are energetic, they are workers, they know the price that must be paid for freedom. They have been molded in the cauldron of one of the most trying crises of our modern history. They have experienced suffering. They have felt terror. They suffered exile and imprisonment. They bore persecution. They were snuffed out by war. They hurt with the memories of death that struck their children and their relatives. They experienced dispossession of property and goods. They walked, forlorn, as the homeless of the world.

And yet, they lived. They survived. They endured. They did not succumb. They lived on the faith within them, faith in their God and His way, faith in the conquest of good within the human spirit, faith in themselves in good, hard work, in stark, commonsense, in self-sacrifice, faith in the chance to prove themselves by building a homeland.

As friends of freedom, believers in the inevitable triumph of the democratic process throughout the world, as guardians of Israel, let us join together in working together to sustain this outpost of freedom where human dignity walks without fear among men.

How To Get Rid of Our Agricultural Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

HOW TO GET RID OF OUR AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

(By Dave Livingston, Washington, Iowa)

SELL THE GRAIN BACK TO THE FARMERS WHO RAISED IT, AT A CUT PRICE IN RETURN FOR ACREAGE REDUCTIONS

If corn and wheat farmers will seed down, or fallow, part of their acreage allotments next year then let them buy, from the Government surplus stocks of corn and wheat, 50 bushels for each acre of corn or 20 bushels for each acre of wheat seeded down or fallowed at their own expense. This surplus to be bought for 75 cents a bushel.

This would be starting a soil-bank plan immediately and paying for it with surplus grain instead of new tax money. Farms with less than 50 acres of allotment could elect to seed down their whole allotment and for larger farms an additional 20 percent over the first 50 acres.

For example, I have a farm with an acreage allotment of 50 acres of corn out of a total of 235 acres. Thus, under this plan, I could buy a total of 2,500 bushels during 1956, at 75 cents a bushel. In return I would seed down the whole 50 acres at my own expense. I would then buy this feed through my local ASC office, where they already have my whole allotment record. In order to spread this surplus selling so that livestock numbers would not be increased, nor the grain trade upset they could restrict my purchases to 25 percent of my allowance in any 60-day period and also begin delivery at the beginning of the crop year (July 1 on wheat and September 1 on corn).

This farm is the kind that is commonly referred to as the family-size farm. It is rough and hilly in spots. The 50-acre allotment is already so low that it is next to impossible for a man to make a living farming it because it takes as much machinery and more labor to grow this 50 acres of corn than it does to grow 100 acres or more on a better farm. On the other hand this farm lends itself to a grass-farming program and should be planted to grass. It is one of the hundreds of thousands of farms where the hilltops and pastures were plowed up, during World War II and the Korean police action, to produce the much needed extra corn and soybeans at that time. Because of the lowering of farm prices and income as well as the rise in expenses since that time it has been

necessary to continue to farm these hills intensively to make a living.

The return of this farm, and others like it, to grass farming presents a much greater problem to the individual farmer than has been generally recognized.

First. A farmer of this type must have some grain to balance his grass in order to get maximum returns on his livestock program. A livestock program is inevitable on this type of land because that is the only way you can convert grass into income. This need for grain has been the main reason for the continuation of corn farming on these hill farms.

Second. When a farmer converts his land from grain to grass there will be a time lag of 1 year in his income until this new grass becomes available as livestock feed. If a soil-bank plan were developed, where the Government rented this land to get it out of grain production, it would break these farmers financially.

Let us suppose the Government paid as much as $20 per acre rental. That would be $1,000 rental on the 50 acres. Then the farmer must buy his grain. Even at $1 per bushel he can get only 1,000 bushels which is not enough. Actually he will be able to buy much less than 1,000 bushels at the current market price. Under my plan he can get 2,500 bushels, or about normal production, while he makes this conversion.

Third. Not only will the individual farmers income be cut, during this lag time, but eventually this farmer will need a little more capital to stock this new grass properly. Through my plan he could bridge the immediate gap, without being hurt financially, and still reduce grain acreage.

I'm not enough of an expert to figure out what will be needed more than a year in advance in agriculture (and the experts are not doing so good either) but I know that if you want corn ground seeded down to grass on my farm you can get it done in 1956 by my "Grain Purchase Plan." I'll be very happy to seed down my ground at my own expense and thus take my chances on this year of lag time.

Some people will try to find fault with this idea because it will increase livestock numbers. It will be 2 years before that could start. After that cattle and sheep will gradually increase. They will have to increase for two reasons. In the first place we will need more livestock to furnish food for our increasing population. Second, from the farmers standpoint, he will have to buy livestock to eat up this new grass. If these farmers cannot increase their livestock numbers to consume this grass then they will go broke. The reason livestock will not increase immediately, and will not increase too rapidly in the future, is that livestock numbers are geared to the amount of the supply and price of grain. Under this plan the farmers would have no more grain on their farms than if they continued production. They simply buy a year's supply out of surplus instead of raising it. Who says that is not what we need in this country?

From my standpoint this plan would temporarily reduce my production costs.

From the standpoint of the Government it would get rid of the grain surpluses in return for acreage reductions. Production of wheat and corn would be reduced in direct proportion to the amount of the surpluses sold. Thus storage problem of the normal carryover would be minimized to say nothing of the future savings in storage costs and the waste through spoilage. When this surplus is once used up then the problems of agriculture are minimized no matter what kind of a farm plan we have. It would take the farm problem out of politics.

From the standpoint of the general taxpaying public it would reduce the cost of any soil-bank plan by paying for it, at least in the beginning, with money already invested in surpluses and it will get immediate action.

It can be done in 1956 with very little new legislation.

This whole plan is purely and simply an additional option under the proposed soil-bank plan. It can be offered along with the land-rental option already proposed, and endorsed, by many of the leading farm organizations.

One trouble with most farm plans up to date has been that they start with a great big overall situation and work down to the individual farm. This plan works in reverse. It begins at the proper starting point, the individual farm, and works up. As soon as the surplus is gone it is finished and it takes no new organization to make it work. It is simply an additional feature of the ASC.

It is the sum total of the production of a lot of little farmers over a period of the last 10 years, which created most of the surplus in the first place. So why not take the perfectly logical step and let these same little farmers use it up while they get their farms back into grass?

Keep one thing clearly in mind. The collective excess we have today, of both wheat and corn, has been accumulated over a period of 10 years. In fact the gross total has increased very little during the past 5 years. It makes no difference whether this accumulation took place under the Democrats or the Republicans. It makes no difference whether rigid 90-percent supports or flexible supports are to blame. It makes little difference whether the Farm Bureau, Farmers Union or the National Grange are in favor of rigid or flexible supports nor what plan they advocate in the future. The fact remains that we have about 1 billion bushels of wheat and corn as a combined accumulated surplus, over and above a normal carryover, and the big job is to get it consumed.

Why run around all over the world trying to sell wheat for export? In the first place we have very little really good wheat available for export. In the second place the State Department would probably tear their hair out if we got the job done. In the third place we already have a pretty lousy reputation for poor-grade wheat because of carelessness in shipments already made. I was in Europe, the Middle East, and Egypt last spring and almost everywhere I heard the complaint that American wheat was inferior and a poor buy.

Because of low-protein content, poor grade, contamination, and other causes most of the wheat we now have in storage is only good for livestock feed so let's quit kidding ourselves and use it up for that purpose.

Now to answer several questions involved in this plan.

Why do I propose 50 bushels or corn to the acre?

Because that is a high average yield. Remember we are trying to get rid of surpluses so that is a pretty fair deal for both the farmer and the Government. If 1 billion bushels of surplus grain were sold at that rate it would put 20 million acres out of production. This is assuming it would all be used to put corn land out of production.

Why sell 20 bushels to the acre of wheat land?

Because here also it is a fair high average yield figure. If the wheat surplus were all bought back by wheat farmers, at the rate of 20 bushels to the acre, it would put 50 million acres out of production.

As a matter of fact this plan would get rid of surpluses so fast that the amount to be liquidated in any one year would probably have to be limited to 300 million bushels or we could suddenly create famine conditions. Remerber. When you sell 300 million bushels by this method you also take out of production another 300 million bushels for the next year making a net change in position of 600 million bushels.

How can a small farmer pay for this grain?

He can buy it one truck load at a time. He will need less money at one time to do this than he would need to buy seed, fertilizer, and gasoline to plant his whole crop in the spring. If he can't do this he is "busted."

If either a wheat or corn farmer has no livestock what can he do?

He can sell it into the cash grain market. But he cannot dump a lot at one time because of the provision that he can only buy 25 percent of his allowance in any 60-day period. He simply buys it from the Government, in lieu of raising it, and then sells it in the open market. As an additional feature this would prevent the market gluts at harvest time.

Will this plan increase livestock numbers?

I partially answered this earlier. It would not do it immediately but it would as time went on. This plan, in itself, would not do it, because of the "cheap" grain, because no single farmer would get enough grain, and second, he would have his purchases spread out. Any additional grain he needed for increased livestock he would have to buy on the open market. It is reasonable to assume that the cash grain market would stabilize around the loan figure so that any livestock producer would think twice before he increased production.

Would it interfere with soil conservation?

The answer is "No." Most soil conservation practices such as contour ridges, waterways, ponds, et cetera, are carried out when the fields are in grass. It is the farms in the hill country that need these practices and these are the ones which would benefit most from this plan, therefore it would have the effect of speeding up conservation measures.

The Stranger in Their Midst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Milwaukee Journal. The editorial follows:

THE STRANGER IN THEIR MIDST

Adolphe H. Wenzell, who played a dual role in the defunct Dixon-Yates contract, was long the mystery man of the deal in which congressional Democrats scented scandal. How mysterious he was is only now being pointed up. The Government—if you can buy the idea—didn't even know who he was.

Wenzell, it will be remembered, had been an executive of the first Boston Corp., first adviser and then financial agent of the Dixon-Yates combine. He was also a top aide in the Budget Bureau. Wenzell, in effect, sat on both sides of the table in the negotiations between the Government and Dixon-Yates. For this we have no less than the word of William Mitchell, general counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, who says: "The matters on which Wenzell was advising the contractor (Mr. Dixon) were the same on which he had been employed to advise the Government."

But Mitchell also says this: The "conflicting private interest of Mr. Wenzell was not known to his superiors in the Government, and only came to light recently."

Where did Wenzell's superiors think he came from? How did they happen to hire him? If they didn't know who he was and where he had obtained his experience, how did the Budget Bureau happen to engage him as an expert on utility financing and use him as adviser on a $107 million deal?

Assuming that they were so naive and uninformed about the man they named as adviser, how could they escape learning about his connections when the charge of conflict of interest was made months ago? How is it possible that they learned of the conflict of interests only recently? The Milwaukee Journal and other newspapers printed the information.

And when Budget Director Hughes telephoned Wenzell to come to Washington to advise him on the Dixon-Yates contract, how did he reach him? Did he think that Wenzell's address—the First Boston Corp.—was a dummy number or that Wenzell just had a phone there for convenience?

The American people are tolerant and patient and will accept a lot of pretty silly stuff. But if they accept the idea that the Government used a mysterious stranger as a top adviser with no idea of his past connections, they'll believe anything.

And we don't think they will.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from the New Jersey members, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, 30 Clinton Street, Newark, N. J., dated December 14, 1955, warrants careful consideration. Like the organizations signing the letter, I feel strongly that this Nation owes to all citizens of the United States wherever they reside, the rights to which they are entitled under the Bill of Rights and Constitution and that we cannot tolerate narrowing or restricting the blessings of liberty and democracy to a selected few in certain areas of the Nation. I urge the Congress to take action promptly on civil rights legislation that the recent tragedies in Mississippi show is so urgently needed.

The letter follows:

NEW JERSEY MEMBERS,
LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Newark, N. J., December 14, 1955.

Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ADDONIZIO: Bill of Rights Day, the 15th of December, will mark the 164th anniversay of the adoption of the Bill of Rights. This day offers us an opportunity to reevaluate the importance of the Bill of Rights as a cornerstone of the American system of government and to reiterate our adherence to the principles contained therein. We believe that fundamentally, the Bill of Rights, as part of our Constitution, recognizes the rights and the dignity of the individual and constitutes a prohibition against any infringement on those rights or that dignity.

Down through the years of its existence, the courts have given depth and meaning to the provisions of the Bill of Rights. The most recent Supreme Court decision against segregation in public schools is a dramatic illustration of this legal interpretation.

However, our own United States Congress has not kept pace with the growth or with the need for growth and understanding of the provisions of the Bill of Rights and has failed to provide us with legislative safeguards in implementation of these constitutional provisions. Not for 80 years has the Congress of the United States passed any civil rights legislation. Fortunately, our Federal system of Government has not allowed this failure on the part of the national legislature to deprive all citizens of the benefits of wise and humanitarian legislative practices. Many States of the Union have found it necessary to pass civil rights legislation.

We, in New Jersey, can be rightfully proud of the leadership which our State government has provided in this essential field. Many States have followed the step that New Jersey took 10 years ago in passing civil-rights legislation which forbids discrimination on the grounds of race, creed, or national origin in employment, education, public accommodation, public housing, and in the National Guard.

It is unfortunate, however, that citizens of New Jersey, traveling in other parts of the country, do not have the benefit of similar legislation. We, the undersigned organizations, therefore take this opportunity on this, the 164th anniversary of the adoption of the Bill of Rights, to urge our New Jersey Representatives to exert every effort to see to it that Congress passes such laws which will guarantee to the citizens of New Jersey the same kind of protection in all parts of the Nation as we have in our own State.

Americans for Democratic Action; American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Veterans Committee; B'nai B'rith; Ethical Society of Essex County; International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish War Veterans, Department of New Jersey; National Council of Jewish Women, New Jersey Region; National Council of Negro Women; National Frontiers Club; New Jersey C. I. O. Council; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Counterattack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a news release concerning a statement which I made on December 29 for broadcast to some 70 million people in Soviet satellite nations through the facilities of Radio Free Europe, a most effective organization which is continuously performing an excellent service in combating Communist propaganda in the enslaved nations of Europe.

Also included is a letter to me concerning the statement from Mr. Leslie Whitten of Radio Free Europe:

Representative ALBERT P. MORANO has told Radio Free Europe that the attack by Nikita Khrushchev on President Eisenhower for his Christmas message over RFE to the captive East European peoples "shows the basic insecurity of the Soviet Empire."

The House Foreign Affairs member said that "In effect the captive East European peoples are experiencing an enslavement that is worse than colonialism."

"To react in this fashion to a Christmas message from the President of the United States demonstrates the fear inherent in the Kremlin regime," the Connecticut legislator said. "It shows that only through methods of fear and force can Russia attempt the continued enslavement of its satellites."

"This statement by Khrushchev is itself interference in the affairs of the captive East European nations which the Kremlin pretends are independent and free."

Representative MORANO said he congratulated and complimented Radio Free Europe for its continuing work in broadcasting the truth to the people behind the Iron Curtain.

"Without truth no nation is free" he said.

RADIO FREE EUROPE,
New York, N. Y., December 29, 1955.

Hon. ALBERT P. MORANO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MORANO: Thank you for your kindness in giving us a statement on the Khrushchev attack upon President Eisenhower. As you can see from the attached it was wired to Munich for immediate broadcast to our audiences in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania.

We estimate our listener potential at some 70 million and reach them through our 29 transmitters in Europe.

To them, as you no doubt know, strong, incisive statements on current affairs by free world leaders mean a great deal in terms of hope and encouragement in their struggle against communism.

We appreciate your cooperation on the story, the more so since we asked it of you on the spur of the moment, and know that your statement will be gratefully received by the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Sincerely yours,

LESLIE WHITTEN,
Assistant Chief, News and Special Events.

Governor McKeldin's Address to Joint Meeting of Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs on Steamship "America"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on my voyage home from Europe last September on board the steamship *America*, a joint meeting of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs was held which was presided over by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland. Among the passengers aboard the *America* were Rotarians and Kiwanians from many parts of the United States, Europe, and Asia.

It was a very interesting meeting, and Governor McKeldin made a speech concerning the relationship and cooperation between the United States and Great Britain and the responsibility of these two great nations in world affairs which I am including herewith in my remarks.

As an honorary member of the Southwest Los Angeles Kiwanis Club, I had the privilege of attending this meeting together with the following members of the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs from the United States and other countries: Rotarians: Jacob Alkow, Tel Aviv, Israel; Herbert Bartlett, New York, N. Y.; William N. Eklund, Carmel, Calif.; Emerson Hinchliff, Ithaca, N. Y.; Paul Ihle, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; Grover Ivey, Orlando, Fla.; Dr. Jules Lechaux, Le Havre, France; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Annapolis, Md. (also Kiwanis); Adalbert Wettstein, Hoboken, N. J. Kiwanis: Charles Lightman, Abington, Pa.; Congressman Gordon L. McDonough, Los Angeles, Calif.; Lew Prosser, Plant City, Fla.; Frank Schreyer, Salt Lake City, Utah.

The following is the speech that was made on this occasion by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland:

An American returning to his native land after a sojourn abroad in 1955 has either kept his eyes shut or he has his mind filled with a multitude of new impressions, some of them contradictory, many of them puzzling and confusing. But I do not believe that any man of sense can fail to receive one vivid, sharp, and clear-cut impression. We may be perplexed about many things, but there is no shadow of doubt about the importance of the issues that hang upon the smooth adjustment of relations between the United States and Great Britain.

Adjustment is the right word because the course of events has, without the consent of either nation, brought about shifts of weight and power that compel new adjustments of relations; and it is a delicate operation easily ruined, not by evil intent, but by mere lack of forethought.

One of the most conspicuous political developments of the 20th century has been the accession of power to the United States. Our manpower, industrial power, financial power, and military power have all increased prodigiously; but Americans, as they contemplate this, should never forget that it has been attended by a corresponding increase in an unpleasant kind of power, namely, the power to be offensive. Bad manners in a small and relatively impotent nation may be regarded by the world with tolerant amusement, but similar conduct in a first-class power may arouse hatred that eventually will explode in disaster.

I am persuaded that there is not even remote danger of an actual clash between Great Britain and the United States; but it is obvious that tensions between the two countries are inevitable, and those tensions should not be needlessly increased by thoughtless action on either side. Tensions are inevitable whenever enormous weights shift. At the very moment when American power was expanding tremendously, Great Britain was suffering prodigious losses. The weights shifted, and some crackling and sparking of static electricity was bound to result.

I am not concerned with the British side of this development, and I have no comment to make upon it, except to say that history does not offer an instance of a great power's acceptance of the fortune of war with more dignity and grace. I am concerned only with the American side; for tremendous issues hang upon our ability to accept the increase of responsibility that accompanies every increase in power.

It is as yet far too soon to claim that this ability has been demonstrated. It will take at least another 50 years to demonstrate it conclusively, and an American has no higher duty than to support every effort to make our country's response equal to the calls upon it. Those calls are already very exacting and they are bound to increase in urgency with the passage of time.

As wielders of possibly the greatest concentration of power on earth, and certainly the second greatest, we have incurred the responsibility that rested upon the British for the 100 years preceding the First World War. We should, therefore, be more than anxious to learn all that they can tell us about the just exercise of power, for it is an art that, like any other, must be learned.

This is not a suggestion that we should be content to remain in tutelage. The responsibility is ours. The British cannot assume it if they would. It is our inescapable obligation to use our own judgment; we must proceed, as Lincoln put it, "with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." But firmness in the right is entirely consistent with willingness to listen courteously to what others have to say, and, when the others are old and experienced friends, not merely to listen but to weigh their arguments carefully before coming to a decision. This is all that the British have a right to expect of us, and, I am certain, all that they desire of us; but so much they have a right to demand, and every fair-minded American admits it.

The historical processes that brought about the transfer of power across the Atlantic were not within the control of any one nation, and perhaps not within human control. Nevertheless, I repudiate with all possible vigor the Marxian doctrine of man's irresponsibility. Granting that we cannot control history does not entail admitting that we cannot control our responses to the challenges of history. The shift of power may have been inevitable, but it is not inevitable that it shall be accompanied by the follies and misunderstandings and wrongs that have attended such shifts in years gone by. That part of history is well within the control of the two nations concerned.

I think the United States and Great Britain may congratulate themselves that they have, so far, set an example to the world in the civilized conduct of such a shift. The harder part of the task fell upon the British, and they were equal to it only because of their belief that the shift did not involve a threat to the political system of self-government by free men that they had been steadily perfecting for a thousand years.

This imposes upon us the responsibility of seeing that the event shall justify that faith. This means that the liberty of an American citizen is henceforth more than a domestic matter; for when an American's freedom is infringed the shock will run through all free nations just as, for a hundred years, the denial of an Englishman's rights alarmed free men everywhere. For England was the great citadel of freedom. Americans understood perfectly John Randolph's assertion that if he might have a Westminster jury to try him he "would rather walk through the fires of ministerial persecution with Horne Tooke" than risk any sort of judicial procedure under a dictator.

It is now our formidable task to establish the same confidence in American justice, not in Manchester and Glasgow, where liberty is understood, but in Delhi and Tehran, where the doctrines of western democracy are new. It will not be easy. Nobody knows better how hard it is than our British predecessors, and we shall be well advised to emulate the care that they have taken to safeguard an Englishman's freedom of speech and freedom of opinion. For they furnished encouragement and inspiration not to Englishmen alone, but to all lovers of liberty everywhere.

In the nature of things the new relation of the two countries cannot be altogether pleasing either to citizens of the Republic or to subjects of the Queen; but it seems to me that it offers an opportunity for a joint enterprise of immeasurable significance to the world. If we can continue to make the readjustment smoothly, justly and amiably, it will be a demonstration to all the world of the safety with which power can be transferred among nations when all are firmly committed to protection of the freedom of the individual.

For a firm conviction that the best government is self-government by freemen excludes the possibility of belief in aggression as a justifiable national policy; and if the threat of aggression is eliminated, power may be left anywhere. For more than a century the increasing power of Washington has been a matter of indifference to Canadians because they were convinced that it would not be used against them. In recent years, I am happy to believe, Mexicans for the same reason have observed with complete tranquility the increase of the Armed Forces of the United States from thousands to millions of men.

But these examples of international amity are less impressive because an enormous disparity of relative strength was involved. It is an entirely different matter when the balance sways between two countries that are, or recently have been and may again be of approximately equal strength. It is the clash of great powers that is the ruin of the world; and by the same token it is amicable adjustment of their relations by great powers that gives mankind reassurance and hope.

For the past 10 years our ill-wishers have waited confidently for the split between the United States and Great Britain. They were confident because they were sure that the course of events was making a split inevitable. They took note of the material losses that Great Britain had suffered, and of the material gains that the United States had made. They were aware that these gains and losses signalized a considerable shift of the balance of power; and they were perfectly sure that the inevitable result of the shift would be rancorous envy on the part of Great Britain, or intolerable arrogance on the part of the United States, or probably both. They felt that they had only to wait to see us at each other's throats.

But 10 years have passed, and it has not happened. It is possible that there have been some twinges of envy in Great Britain, and I must regretfully admit that a few Americans have worked their mouths a great deal more than their brains. But these have been pin-pricks. The great mass of the British people do not believe that their safety dimnishes in proportion as America grows strong, and the great mass of the American people are learning that the responsibilities outweigh the privileges that go along with power.

Thus our ill-wishers, forseeing accurately the trend of events, have been utterly wrong in their calculation of the results. It is evident that they must have failed to take into an account some important factor in the equation. It would be gratifying if one could say that this missing factor is a combination of wisdom and virtue that raises the British and the Americans above the moral level of the rest of humanity; but unfortunately the facts do not support any such claim. The thing that our enemies failed to take into account is a good deal less resplendent; it is merely the fact that both nations are committed to the doctrine that every man by reason of his humanity is endowed with certain inalienable rights and that among these are life and liberty, to which Americans add the pursuit of happiness. This doctrine implies that no nation can rightfully deprive any man of these rights merely to increase its own wealth and power; and it follows that no nation so committed can commit unprovoked aggression without denying its faith and becoming worse than the infidel.

Liberty is the factor that has upset the calculations of those who were certain that a shift in power would inevitably be followed by the clash of arms, or certainly by mutual distrust, suspicion and hatred. These people, knowing nothing of the nature of liberty, could not forsee its effects; but they are beginning to see, although they are still far from understanding.

Nevertheless, every day is making the thing plainer. Every success that the English speaking nations achieve in the admittedly difficult work of readjusting their relations brings nearer the day when all men will begin to understand that when peace and freedom go hand in hand the twists and turns of the current of history that shift physical power from side to side will offer no threat to any man and cause no nation to be afraid.

Recreation Facilities in National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, recreation facilities in our national forests have been going to pieces for many years. A continual lack of sufficient appropriations, plus a soaring increase in popular use, has led to this situation.

Time after time sincere efforts have been made to get appropriations sufficient to meet the needs. The needs never have been met. The 1956 appropriation for national forest recreation facilities was $1,670,000, a mere drop in the bucket when you realize that some 44 million persons used the national forests for recreation in 1955, an increase of 26 million persons over the number of annual visits just 9 years before.

To end this meager hand-to-mouth existence of our forest recreation facilities, I have introduced H. R. 1823. In the main it is the same solution as was proposed in the Tackett bills of the 81st and 82d Congresses and the Baker bill of the 83d Congress.

It establishes public recreation use of the national forests as a policy of Congress; no such basic policy exists.

It provides for the setting aside of 10 percent of the national forest receipts each year for development, maintenance, and operation of facilities and areas for recreation use; improvement and maintenance of wildlife habitat; and safety, sanitation, and health in connection with uses of the national forests. The amount so set aside shall not exceed $5,500,000 in any 1 year. None of the money shall be used for land acquisition.

It provides that in those few cases in which fees are charged for the recreational use of national forests—a charge which the Secretary of Agriculture already is authorized to make, and is making—the money collected shall be spent wholly for the above-noted recreation facilities.

There can be no argument with the first portion of the bill establishing a basic recreation policy. Among those of us who know the great need for funds there can be no argument on the second portion, providing for reinvestment of 10 percent of forest revenues for recreation facilities.

But on the last portion of the bill there has been considerable argument, based on misunderstanding. Contrary to some opposition statements based on this misunderstanding, this portion does not give any new power to the Forest Service, in fact it limits this power. It limits the Forest Service's authority to charge fees for recreation use to only those few specialized areas in which there are specially equipped campgrounds and picnic areas; at present the Forest Service could impose such a charge at any recreation area on the forests.

An example of such a change was that made at Pattee Canyon in Lolo National Forest some 15 miles from Missoula. This popular camping and picnicking area has a heavy use from Missoula residents, university students, and various groups. The facilities are described by the Forest Service as "one of our better areas." For a time a charge of 25 cents per car party was being made for use of the picnic or camping facilities. But, contrary to the belief of users who paid this charge, the money thus received by the Forest Service could not be used to keep up the facilities there. The money has been going directly into the United States Treasury. Charges for use of Pattee Canyon were discontinued in 1955.

If my bill did not include this final portion setting aside 100 percent of these recreation receipts for maintaining the recreation facilities, only 10 percent of the receipts could go for such purposes. I feel it is fair to allocate 10 percent of the forest revenue from such sources as grazing fees and timber sales to recreation—but it is foolish to allocate less than 100 percent of the recreation fees for this purpose.

Charges are being made to users of recreation facilities only in some 49 of the larger and especially equipped campgrounds and picnic areas. The average charge is 15 cents per person per day, with children under 12 being free. The highest charge is 25 cents per person per day. Nearly all of these facilities are being operated by concessioners as the Forest Service seeks some means of solving its problem of inadequate funds. At most, the Service estimates only 200 of the 4,700 improved campground and picnic areas are large enough to be successfully operated as charge areas.

The alternatives to this bill may be a spread of the concessioner-operated facilities and perhaps even a system of personal licenses in which a charge would be made for every recreation use of the national forests. We do not want either of these alternatives.

Montana contains 9.4 percent of the acreage of the national forests, a total of 16,986,393 acres, of which more than three-quarters are in the First District. The number of visitors that used the national forests in Montana during 1954 totaled 1,311,000. Yet for all this vast acreage, and the relatively heavy usage in consideration of the population of this area, the Forest Service was able to spend only about $60,000 on Montana forest recreational facilities during the year.

Many of the recreation facilities, nationally, are worn out. Most of them date from the 1930's. Niggardly appropriations have made it impossible to maintain them properly, much less expand them to meet the soaring need. As a result, some have been closed because of their deterioration and unsanitary condition. On those public recreation facilities that remain in use the Forest Service has been able to spend only 8 cents per visit for maintenance and cleanup. And that figure does not take into account the millions of visits made to wilderness areas and other places where facilities are nil, or the millions of visits made to resorts, summer homes, and the like in the forests on which no Federal money is spent. To do what the foresters feel would be a fully adequate job they believe close to 20 cents per visit would be needed. To keep the facilities just going along in a satisfactory manner they place the estimated cost at 14 cents per visit.

The situation has deteriorated to the point now that the Forest Service declares it needs $3,300,000 for current cleanup and maintenance alone. For capital investment to rehabilitate these facilities and to construct desperately needed new ones, the foresters advise that some $24 million is needed.

Contrast those figures with the amount budgeted for the current fiscal year and the contrast between what has been sought and what has been granted is painfully clear.

The hearings during the 83d Congress on the Baker bill brought forth from many sources the tale of deterioration of facilities.

Representative CARL ELLIOTT, of Alabama, testified:

> Annual expenditures by the Forest Service for the operation and maintenance of these recreational facilities * * * in no way meets the need for adequately providing for the large number of our citizens who take advantage of these facilities each year. During the days of the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, many of these recreational facilities were originally constructed. Today many of them are in a state of deterioration; forest roads and campsites are badly in need of repair; the dangers of forest fires are not always properly guarded against; public safety, sanitation and health often is not given proper attention because of the limited amount of appropriations.

Chester Wilson, conservation director of the State of Minnesota, declared:

> The deteriorated conditions of the recreational facilities and wildlife habitat in the national forests was observed many years ago, and that was due to the lack of sufficient funds for taking care of those interests. * * * It is literally a case of starvation in the midst of plenty. * * * We have a great contrast right in our State of Minnesota where we have ample funds for all of our game and fish activities with an annual surplus which is available for the maintenance of recreational facilities and the development of game and fish opportunities and resources throughout the State, but by contrast in the national forests the resources are just going to seed.

In the view of Thomas Kimball, director of the Colorado Game and Fish Commission—

The recreational needs in particular have not been met; in fact, what facilities are available for the great mass of people using the national forests are in a very bad state of repair * * * the lack of adequate sanitary facilities is important. You can imagine what that does when an increase runs from 300,000 to almost 1,300,000 visitors, with no increase in facilities to take care of that load, or the increase from 60,000 fishermen to 366,000 fishermen, with no increase in sanitary facilities and no increase in the picnicking grounds or campgrounds.

Kelly E. Bennett, chairman of the North Carolina National Park, Parkway, and Forests Development Commission, testified:

Because of inadequate recreation facilities, many people tramp and picnic on unimproved areas where there is danger of polluting water used for domestic purposes and creating fire hazards when the camper builds his fire in locations which have not been provided with fireplaces and other facilities.

William Voigt, Jr., executive director of the Izaak Walton League, pointed out:

It is about all the Forest Service people can do, under existing appropriations, to play garbageman and clean up after the public has passed through * * * the eighty-odd percent of our national population that lives in cities and towns is fast running out of private land and water where it can freely find the outdoor recreation so many millions of us crave and seek. We already have learned that, generally speaking, the national forests are among the choicest recreation areas anywhere in the interior of the country. As a nation we are going to have to depend ever more upon our national forests to handle the increasing recreational load.

The tale of pennypinching went on and on.

Seth Gordon, director of the California Fish and Game Department:

The recreational developments in connection with the national forests have been so badly neglected that in our States the merchants in the nearby areas are begging their customers for money to help maintain the toilet facilities and to clean up the trash.

I. T. Quinn, director, Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries:

The failure due to lack of funds to provide recreational facilities has become little less than tragic.

Harold I. Bowman, president, National Forest Recreation Association:

Large numbers of campers are forced to camp in undeveloped areas, thereby increasing the fire hazard and the threat to safe water supplies and public health. This is no criticism of the Forest Service. The forest officers are doing everything possible. They are working overtime, trying desperately to take care of the public. They simply do not have the funds to do the job.

As the Baker bill, this legislation received support in the hearings from the National Wildlife Federation, National Association of Travel Organizations, Wildlife Management Institute, Outdoor Writers Association of America, Montana State Federation of Labor, Utah Wildlife Federation, Izaak Walton League, Western Montana Fish and Game Association, Ohio League of Sportsmen, Oklahoma Outdoor Council, United States Industrial Union Council of the CIO, Virginia Wildlife Federation, Appalachian Mountain Club, National Farmers Union, Billings (Mont.) Rod and Gun Club, California Alpine Club, Southeast Texas section of the American Camping Association, National Forest Recreation Association, Darrington (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, Dude Ranchers Association, Washoe County (Nev.), Council of Social Agencies, Florida Wildlife Federation, Silver City (N. Mex.) Lions Club, the American Legion Post of Everett, Wash., Taos (N. Mex.) Chamber of Commerce, Marin Conservation League of California, West Montana Fish and Game Association, American Camping Association, Cascade County (Mont.) Wildlife Association, National Ski Association of America, Arizona Game Protective Association, Mountainburg (Ark.) Lions Club, the American Museum of Natural History, Pensacola Anglers and Hunters Club, Montana State Federation of Labor, Intermountain Ski Association, and many more.

Also lending their voices in support of the legislation were representatives of State and local government agencies, among them representatives of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission; Iowa State Conservation Commission; North Carolina National Park, Parkway, and Forest Development Commission; Missouri Conservation Commission; California Fish and Game Department; Colorado Fish and Game Commission; Virginia Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries; Wisconsin Conservation Department; Minnesota Conservation Department; Snohomish County, Wash., school system; Box Elder (Utah) County Commission; Cache (Utah) County Commission; and the New Mexico Department of Fish and Game.

National forest recreation is important from the business standpoint. Many business enterprises are supported by tourist and vacation activities. National forest recreation is the economic backbone of many communities.

Frank Menke, the sports historian, in his New Encyclopedia of Sports, shows the financial impact of hunting and fishing alone:

The two armies—the anglers and the gunners—who rarely are mentioned on the sport pages—spend more money each year than would be needed to buy all the racetracks in America, all the racehorses, all the football stadia, all the baseball parks, all the professional ballplayers, all the ice rinks and hockey players, all the dog racing tracks and dogs, all the polo fields and horses, all the rodeos with their complete equipment, all the automobile speedways—and there still would be enough left to buy handsome post offices in wholesale quantities.

Menke estimates there are 25 major horse parks plus 75 minor tracks, and that approximately 17,500 thoroughbreds and trotters are campaigned annually. These properties, plus all sires and brood mares, are worth, he says, less than one-tenth of what anglers and hunters spend in every 12 months.

The startling lack of appropriations for forest recreation for the American people cannot be blamed on a lack of effort. All the dynamite that forest users could carry has been used in attempt after attempt to shatter the appropriations roadblock.

Our national forests are making money for us. Receipts in fiscal 1955 totaled $80,563,879.28. Timber sales accounted for $75,421,418.96 of this. Another $3,354,225.51 came from grazing permits. The remaining $1,788,234.81 came from land uses, recreation, leases, power, and so forth. That same year, Congress appropriated about $30 million for the national forests. So $50 million went into the Treasury from operation of our national forests. We should reinvest some of this profit in the business.

Two precedents for such an allocating of revenues have been in use for more than 40 years in the national forests.

One, enacted in 1908, sets aside 25 percent of all money received from the forests to be used by the States in which the forests are located for the public roads and schools in counties in which there are national forests.

The other precedent, enacted in 1913, provides for reinvestment of 10 percent of all national forest receipts for use of the Forest Service in construction and maintenance of roads and trails within the forests.

I might note that the reinvestment for recreation of 10 percent or not more than $5,500,000 annually, as proposed in H. R. 1823, will not reduce the funds set aside in the above two acts.

Several national and regional organizations have again expressed themselves on this legislation within the past few months by specifically endorsing H. R. 1823. Their recommendations are as follows:

International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, September 12 to 14, 1955, Augusta, Ga.:

A resolution was adopted which calls upon Congress to hasten action on H. R. 1823 and other incidental bills that set aside 10 percent, but not more than $5½ million annually, of the forest receipts from the sale of timber, grazing privileges, and other uses for recreational and sanitary purposes and the improvement of wildlife habitat within national forests.

Outdoor Writers Association of America, June 22, 1955:

Whereas some 180,000,000 acres of national forest lands unposted hunting, fishing, and recreational areas for all Americans; and

Whereas H. R. 1823, by Representative LEE METCALF, would provide for multiple uses of these areas, and provide funds for a stepped-up program for wildlife habitat and recreation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the OWAA urges the Congress to enact legislation embodying the objectives of H. R. 1823 thus implementing public use of these lands; and be it

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all such Members of the United States Congress and to all such other groups and individuals as may be interested.

Western Division Outdoor Writers Association, June 16, 1955:

Whereas the recreation visits on the national forests were reported at over 40 million for 1954, an alltime high; and

Whereas this has created serious problems of fire protection, sanitations, and crowding on the limited developed national forest recreation areas; and

Whereas a program of expanded development of recreation facilities as well as an accompanying program of improvement for

national forest fish and wildlife habitats is urgent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Outdoor Writers Association of American urge Members of Congress in the respective States to support H. R. 1823 and companion bills which would set aside 10 percent of the national forest receipts each fiscal year, not to exceed $5,500,000 in any year, for recreation development and wildlife habitant improvement of the national forests.

Montana District Council, Lumber and Sawmill Workers, Local 2405, July 16–17, 1955:

Whereas Congressman LEE METCALF has introduced H. R. 1823 providing funds for maintenance of recreational facilities in the national forests by setting aside 10 percent of Forest Service revenues from timber sales, etc., for that purpose; and

Whereas the national forests should be utilized where possible for the enjoyment and recreation of all citizens of the United States that find an opportunity to visit them: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention of the Montana district council and all affiliated local unions go on record as endorsing and supporting passage of H. R. 1823 and commending Representative LEE METCALF for his good efforts to utilize the national forests for the benefit of all; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the next convention of the Montana State Federation of Labor for concurrence.

The district 2 Wildlife Federation, with offices in Lewiston, Idaho, passed a resolution favoring enactment of H. R. 1823 at its last district meeting.

All these people realize that the money spent under this bill would be an investment in the future of our Nation. They realize that the annual appropriation procedure is not providing the money that is so urgently needed for this work. They have learned through bitter experience that such funds cannot be obtained by appropriation. They believe, as I believe, that the time is long past due for legislation permitting a reinvestment of national forest receipts for this major recreational purpose of our national forests. This year is the time to act.

My bill meets the need. With 10 percent of the National Forest revenues, but not more than $5,500,000 annually, the Forest Service can do a good job of bringing the forest recreation facilities up to date to handle the steadily increasing demand. And the provision that the Forest Service be limited in what it can charge for, in the way of recreation facilities, but that all such fee revenues be plowed back into the recreation facilities, just makes plain good sense. This bill, H. R. 1823, deserves the support of all persons who want our forests to remain "the people's playgrounds."

The 42d National Convention, Knights of Lithuania, Newark, N. J., August 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a greeting which I addressed to the 42d national convention, Knights of Lithuania, assembled at the Hotel Robert Treat, Newark, N. J., during August 1955:

THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA

MY ESTEEMED FRIENDS: I am greatly honored to address this annual convention of the Knights of Lithuania. I know that this meeting presents you with the opportunity to express your anxiety for the land of your forebears which is presently under the totalitarian oppression of the godless Soviet Union. It also offers a chance for all freedom-loving Americans to join with you assembled here in emphatically protesting against the inhuman tactics of Soviet aggression as well as transmitting a message of hope for eventual freedom of all Lithuanians from their present bondage. It is essential that we incessantly remind your Lithuanian kinsmen we have not deserted them, and try to strengthen them spiritually so that they will continue their gallant struggle against Communist tyranny despite great odds.

The premeditated plan by which the Soviets enslaved the brave Lithuanian Nation and the methods used to subjugate them profoundly shacked the American people. The unscrupulous and inhuman practice of deportation and mass exterminations, which the ruthless Communists have had to employ in their efforts to mold the social, economic, and cultural standards of Soviet Russia, is ample evidence of the indomitable determination of the Lithuanian people to resist the tyrant and to remain free. The Communists' total disregard for human rights and fundamental freedoms is a violation of the law of nations and the law of nature.

However, incredible as it may seem, despite the threat of brutal persecutions the resistance movement among Lithuanians still continues in the homeland as well as abroad. It has been estimated that over 15 underground newspapers are published in Lithuania. Moreover, in the face of constant pressure to enforce communism, it has been estimated that Lithuania has the smallest Communist Party membership of any of the satellite countries—only 0.8 percent of the entire population.

The American people have not forgotten the valiant efforts of the Lithuanian people to hold tenaciously to the last vestiges of freedom. Evidence of our concern for their plight was the formation of the House Baltic Committee to investigate the incorporation of the Baltic States into the U. S. S. R. Extensive hearings were held and the testimony given by eyewitnesses demonstrated for all the world to see the pattern of Communist aggression in the Baltic States. This thorough and well documented investigation should be a source of encouragement to these captive peoples in assuring them that we have not fotgotten them and that we do not condone their captivity. These documents are available in colleges and libraries throughout the United States and are a means of informing the American people regarding the ruthless tactics employed by the Soviets in conquering free countries.

The American people have never recognized the absorption of Lithuania into the Soviet system. The Lithuanian people, conscious of their right of freedom, will never surrender and renounce their independence of soul and they will oppose the foreign aggressor. Their fight for freedom is a symbol and inspiration for oppressed nations everywhere; we are sure that such a determination for liberty will not be in vain. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has stated that a despotism of the Soviet type cannot indefinitely perpetuate its rule over hundreds of millions of people who love God, who love country, and who have a sense of personal dignity.

It is fitting that on this occasion of the annual convention of the Knights of Lithuania that I express my sincerest hope for the liberation of the Lithuanian homeland and its restoration once more as an independent republic.

Sincerely yours,

PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Member of Congress.

Your Food Dollar—Middleman Gets More, the Farmer Less, United States Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to a most enlightening and well-written series of articles which recently appeared in the Cleveland Press under the byline of the distinguished and highly respected journalist, Mr. Dick Preston. The series follows:

YOUR FOOD DOLLAR—MIDDLEMAN GETS MORE, THE FARMER LESS, UNITED STATES REPORTS

(By Dick Preston)

WASHINGTON, December 19.—The average Ohio housewife had the biggest grocery bills of her life this year. Yet farm income, as everyone knows, is on the skids.

This is the sort of puzzle which sets mom to talking to herself and pop to wondering if she's secretly playing the numbers with the household funds.

It also has set the United States Agriculture Department to looking for some new answers to an old problem: What happens to the housewife's food dollar?

The farmer gets 7 cents less out of each food dollar than he got 4 years ago. And overall spending on food keeps climbing even though retail prices for basic commodities remain about the same.

Where does the money go? Here, according to Agriculture Department experts, are some answers:

You're paying considerably more to the middlemen—the processors, wholesalers and retailers—than you did in 1951. This isn't all profit. Their costs have gone up, too.

FOOD IS BETTER

You're buying better food than you used to—more meat, eggs, fresh vegetables, less bread, beans, and potatoes. You're eating well, but it costs you more.

You're paying the grocer for services you used to perform at home—prepared frozen foods, ready-to-bake pies, cake mixes, and the like. These items are not reflected in the cost-of-living index, which deals in basic foods. But they are reflected in what you spend.

The food handlers' bite out of your grocery dollar has been going up steadily for several years. It accounted for only 48 percent of retail costs in 1946. Today it is up to 59 percent.

WHERE DOLLAR GOES

Here is a brief breakdown of where each dollar goes:

To the grocer—18 cents.

(Out of this his net profit, on the average, is about 1 cent, his United States taxes about a penny more. He pays 9 cents for labor, and 7 cents for the costs of doing business, including electricity, fuel, rent, advertising, State and local taxes, depreciation, paper bags, and so on.)

To the wholesaler and processor—34 cents.

(The average wholesaler's net profit is one cent, the processor's about 1½ cents. United

States taxes are approximately the same. Labor costs account for 17 cents. Canning, packaging, commissions and other costs make up the 12 remaining cents).

To the transporter—seven cents.

(This includes railway freight transportation of raw materials, trucking of garden products and milk, shipments from the farm to the processor as well as from the processor to the retail store.)

To the farmer—41 cents.

CANNERIES HUM

Most of the middlemen are making a little more profit today than they did 4 years ago. Canneries and dairies are doing especially well. And chain groceries are expected to show higher profits than in 1951.

However, labor costs account for the biggest share of the increase. The average food-processing worker was paid $1.47 an hour in 1951. Today he gets $1.76. Labor is about half of the total cost of food processing.

Railway freight rates, another big item, are up more than 10 percent, with new increases on the way. Advertising budgets, especially for the national brands, have jumped with the advent of TV. (Advertising still accounts for less than 2 percent of the food processor's costs, however.)

Other things which have gone up include State and local taxes, paper products for packaging, cans, plant and equipment costs and many smaller items.

YOUR FOOD DOLLAR—NUMEROUS MIDDLEMEN TAKE LARGE BITE

(By Dick Preston)

WASHINGTON, December 20.—You're going to be hearing a lot about the middleman's profit in the food industry during the 1956 political campaign.

There'll be a great political hue and cry over the fact that the farmer today gets only 41 cents or less out of every dollar you spend for food, compared with 52 cents 10 years ago.

The remainder goes for marketing charges, which have risen steadily since the end of World War II.

Already Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler has called for a congressional investigation of this continuing trend. And Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, trying to beat Congress to the punch, has started a study of it in his own department.

Who is this food middleman? What does he do besides buy and sell commodities, making a commission on each step from the farm to your table?

HE DELIVERS GOODS

Well, for one, he is the fellow who hauls the wheat, or hog, or vegetables from where they're grown to where they're sold. He is also the fellow who converts grain into flour, milk into cheese, steers into steaks.

He's the man who freezes the peas, cans the tomatoes, cooks the soup, bakes the bread, candles the eggs, bottles the milk, and sorts the oranges.

He's the grocer who buys 5,000 different food products from all over the world and sets them out on convenient shelves so that you, the American housewife, can feed your family better than anyone ever was fed before.

CHARGES GO UP

His charges for doing all this have risen so rapidly that they have absorbed nearly all of what you might have saved in food bills from the current farm price drop.

This winter it costs 26 percent more to market a typical basket of farm food products than it did in 1947. Farmers, meanwhile, are getting 14 percent less.

Of course, you are getting more service for your money than you did a few years ago. Things are put up in fancier packages. Potatoes are washed, vegetables cleaned, meat divided into handly purchasing units.

This accounts for some of the increased cost. But the Agriculture Department's market basket does not include many of the ready-to-cook, labor-saving items found in modern stores. Except for frozen vegetables and a few mixes, it sticks pretty close to basic food products.

WIDER SELECTION

You are also getting more products from which to choose. A typical grocery today carries 5,000 items. Twenty years ago it carried about 1,000. The 4,000 new ones are largely specialty goods of one sort or another or out-of-season items which once you didn't buy at all.

You are paying for higher wages in the marketing industry, higher taxes all around, and higher costs of doing business.

Are the marketers making too much profit? That depends on what you think too much profit is.

Food processors today are earning considerably more after taxes on their investment than they did before World War II. The average net then was about 7 percent; today it is 9 percent or more. And with much higher investments, the dollar profits are even greater.

BAKERIES DO WELL

Best off are baking companies (which average about 12 percent), grain millers (nearly 13 percent) and dairy products firms. Grocery chains are netting 11 percent or more.

Meat packers, on the other hand, aren't doing so well. The net profit for 11 of them after taxes in 1954 was only 2,7 percent, compared with 5.6 percent before the war. This year they'll do a little better.

However, the profit these processors make on each item they sell is smaller than it used to be. As a percentage of sales, profits this year average only about 2 percent compared with 3 percent in 1935–39.

The difference comes from greatly increased volume and from higher prices per unit sold.

YOUR FOOD DOLLAR—MAID SERVICE RUNS UP GROCERY BILL

(By Dick Preston)

WASHINGTON, December 21.—You housewives are spending a lot of your grocery money for maid service these days.

Its' pretty expensive maid service, too, if your'e in the market for that sort of thing. The Agriculture Department estimates it costs you only 45 cents an hour.

But it accounts for much of the increase in your food bill during the last 4 years.

"Maid service" is what the food-processing companies like to call all the many things they now do for you that you used to do for yourselves.

It includes scraping the carrots, washing the spinach, topping the celery, mixing the cake, cutting up the chicken, shaping the hamburger patties, raising the rolls, slicing the french fries, boning the fish, portioning the cereal, and even crimping the crust on your pie.

SELL LIKE HOT CAKES

Such "convenience" items are the biggest new thing in the postwar grocery business. They sell like hot cakes (in fact, one of the biggest sellers is ready-to-cook hot cakes) and housewives of this prosperous era don't seem to boggle at the extra cost.

A few food economists are worried that the packaging, preparing, and precooking spree may be getting out of hand. But the majority point to booming sales as proof they're filling a consumer demand, and the outlook is for more food processing rather than less.

Since 1948, so many new convenience foods have gone on the shelves that entire grocery stores have had to be redesigned. One food chain reports 570 such items on sale which it didn't handle 7 years ago.

The frozen-food industry alone topped $1.5 billion this year—5 percent of all grocery sales. Mixes now account for one-third of the flour business. Completely prepared frozen dinners are expected to sell at the rate of 45 million pounds in 1956.

"Practically nobody makes pies any more," said John A. Logan, of the National Association of Food Chains, proudly. "If they don't buy ready-to-bake frozen pies, they buy the mixes."

Almost none of this costly service is reflected in the food price index by which the Bureau of Labor Statistics measures your theoretical cost of living.

BLS bases its estimates on 60 basic food items, such as bread, potatoes, meat, and coffee, in nonprocessed form. Its theory is that "maid service" is a luxury, not a necessity.

That explains why your grocery bills have gone up even though the Government says food costs in Ohio have remained the same or even dropped in the last 4 years.

All this modern merchandising is so attractive that you may not realize how much you're paying for it. But consider these examples:

Ten pounds of unprocessed potatoes cost about 55 cents in Ohio stores. Ten pounds of frozen French fries, one of the booming convenience foods, cost $3.

An 8-ounce box of corn flakes can still be bought for a dime. The same 8 ounces, neatly packaged in convenient dish-sized boxes, cost 25 cents.

Arthur Godfrey's favorite tea (and other brands, too) comes to about 65 cents for 3¾ ounces done up in teabags. If you want to use your own teaspoon, you can buy 4 ounces of the same tea for 45 cents.

Agriculture Department experts estimate the time you save—and the extra money you pay—like this:

A day's meals for a family of 4, with mom doing all the old-fashioned work, cost an average of $4.90. She must spend 5½ hours in preparing them.

The same meals, made from ready-to-cook items, cost $6.70 and take only about 1½ hours of preparation.

Thus the housewife saves 4 hours' work at a cost of $1.80, or 45 cents an hour.

That sounds like a bargain today. But if hard times ever return, you'll know where to save plenty of pennies.

YOUR FOOD DOLLAR—UNITED STATES FARE IS BETTER TODAY, SO COST IS HIGH

(By Dick Preston)

WASHINGTON, December 22.—One reason your grocery bill is higher than ever, in spite of falling farm prices, is that you're literally eating "higher on the hog" today.

For many American families in 1955 it's pork chops and apple pie instead of bacon and beans.

"You've little use for the cheaper foods which used to be staples, and you're demanding more and more steaks and roasts, fresh vegetables and fruits, tangy salads, and fancy desserts.

The change is healthy, of course. It means a better fed, better looking America, with bigger, stronger, healthier children. But it is costing you money.

GOOD SPENDING HIGHER

If you're an average family, you spent a higher proportion of your income on food this year than you did in 1939, even though you are earning far more.

As a result, some products once in great demand have little or no market today. Lard is difficult to sell at any price. Salt pork no longer is a staple. Cheaper meat cuts of all kinds move slowly. Bread sales are dropping every year.

On the other hand, fancier meat cuts have zoomed in price. Pressure from buyers has virtually tripled the price of steak since

World War II, while chuck and hamburger have lagged behind.

Still you want steak so insistently that grocers have to put on elaborate campaigns to remind you other kinds of meat are really better buys.

PIGS IN THE STREETS

In Kewanee, Ill., for instance, 4 carloads of pigs were turned loose in the streets recently to call attention to pork's cheapness and plentiful supply. Then the town's grocers rounded them all up and threw a barbecue.

Here are some of the ways your buying habits have changed since pre-depression days:

Today you're buying 30 percent more meat, fish and poultry for each household member than you did in 1929. Most of the increase has been in beef and chicken.

You're eating nearly 100 more eggs a year, twice as much ice cream, 25 percent more milk and butter. Your consumption of such vitamin-packed products as oranges and tomatoes has almost doubled.

But you don't eat as many potatoes (one-third less a person) and not nearly as much bread.

GET MORE VITAMINS

Over-all, you're eating about 3 percent less food but getting 15 to 25 percent more of the essential vitamins and minerals, 5 percent more protein, 30 percent less starch.

These changes in what you eat are all to the good, as long as you can afford them. But they do complicate things for the farmer.

He can't raise a pork chop without raising an equivalent amount of sausage meat and shoulder. He can't produce 30 pounds of fancy steaks without producing another 970 pounds of steer. And since World War II he's been geared to grow far more wheat than you'll consume.

In the long run, his only answer is to sell the things you don't want to other nations. There are still plenty of people in the world who aren't too rich for hamburger, too well nourished for bread.

I Am the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, because of the great interest that was shown by various audiences which I had the opportunity to speak to, during the recent congressional recess, in the following brief narrative history of the United States entitled "I Am the United States," it occurred to me that the people of the Nation as a whole would be equally interested. Any American can take pride in his native land when he reads this inspiring brief history of the United States.

I am, therefore, including herewith this statement which attracted so much attention and aroused so much interest that additional copies were requested whenever it was read:

I AM THE UNITED STATES

I was born on July 4, 1776, and the Declaration of Independence is my birth certificate. The bloodlines of the world run in my veins, because I offered freedom to the oppressed. I am many things, and many people. I am the United States.

I am 165 million living souls—and the ghost of millions who have lived and died for me.

I am Nathan Hale and Paul Revere. I stood at Lexington and fired the shot heard around the world. I am Washington, Jefferson, and Patrick Henry. I am John Paul Jones, the Green Mountain Boys, and Davy Crockett. I am Lee and Grant, and Abe Lincoln.

I remember the Alamo, the Maine and Pearl Harbor. When freedom called, I answered and stayed until it was over, over there. I left my heroic dead in Flanders Field, on the rock of Corregidor, and on the bleak slopes of Korea.

I am the Brooklyn Bridge, the wheatlands of Kansas, and the granite hills of Vermont. I am the coalfields of the Virginias and Pennsylvania, the fertile lands of the West, the Golden Gate, and Grand Canyon. I am Independence Hall, the *Monitor*, and the *Merrimac*.

I am big. I sprawl from the Atlantic to the Pacific, 3 million square miles throbbing with industry. I am more than 5 million farms. I am forest, field, mountain, and desert. I am quiet villages—and cities that never sleep.

You can look at me and see Ben Franklin walking down the streets of Philadelphia with his breadloaf under his arm. You can see Betsy Ross with her needle. You can see the lights of Christmas, and hear the strains of Auld Lang Syne as the calendar turns.

I am Babe Ruth and the world series. I am 169,000 schools and colleges, and 250,000 churches where my people worship God as they think best. I am a ballot dropped in a box, the roar of a crowd in a stadium, and the voice of a choir in a cathedral. I am an editorial in a newspaper, and a letter to a Congressman.

I am Eli Whitney and Stephen Foster. I am Tom Edison, Albert Einstein, and Billy Graham. I am Horace Greeley, Will Rogers, and the Wright brothers. I am George Washington Carver, Daniel Webster, and Jonas Salk.

I am Longfellow, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Walt Whitman, and Thomas Paine.

Yes, I am the United States of America, and these are the things that I am. I was conceived in freedom and, God willing, in freedom I will spend the rest of my days.

May I possess always the integrity, the courage, and the strength to keep myself unshackled, to remain a citadel of freedom and a beacon of hope to the world.

Our National Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the recognition by the President, in his message to Congress, of the needs of our national parks, and indications that something will be done to overcome present inadequate conditions is most gratifying to me. A nation cannot afford to neglect a great asset of such scenic and historic areas. As population and industrial expansion continue to increase, such areas will be even more cherished. The proper provision for use of leisure time becomes even more important to our citizens. The 50 million who visited areas of the National Park System last year were disappointed in some of the things they encountered. Facilities were inadequate, and many of them over-age. Many areas were crowded. Those who had visited the same places in previous years made comparisons not flattering.

The National Park Service has been studying this matter from every angle. They anticipate visitation increasing to 80 million in the next 10 years. They expect to submit a long-range program called Mission 66 containing the answers to today's deficiencies, together with meeting the increasing demands of the future, both in the fields of development and in preserving the areas so that future Americans can also enjoy them. Such a program should meet with ready approval by the Congress. I shall lend my full support to it.

The Cabaret Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to abolish the 20 percent so-called cabaret tax. That segment of the amusement industry presently laboring under this very discriminatory and wholly uneconomical tax has long been in need of this essential relief. Competent economists say that this wartime emergency tax which has never been discontinued since the war, instead of producing income to the Government, is actually resulting in less revenue to the Treasury. Hearings on this legislation will show that if this unfair tax is repealed the Treasury will gain by at least $11 million in excess of the nearly $39 million which this tax brought in during the last fiscal year. I am satisfied such a gain in revenue would result from persons operating places of entertainment now subject to the tax, plus personal tax accruals resulting from more musicians working longer hours at these places. Furthermore, additional accruals are certain to result from the reopening of places that have been forced to close because of the tax. I should like to point out that the American Hotel Association reports that approximately two-thirds of its dining-with-entertainment rooms have been discontinued or forced to close since 1946 as a direct result of this tax. I also wish to point out the large additional revenue that would result from the employment of entertainers other than musicians, as well as supplementary service personnel, in dining-with-entertainment rooms that would be reopened as a result of the discontinuance of this tax. Statistics show that musicians alone have lost approximately 50 percent of their employment in these taxed places of entertainment since 1943. Also, for every musician so displaced there has been an equal number of jobs lost by other entertainers and substantial numbers among waiters, waitresses,

culinary, and other service help. All this adds up to a loss of thousands of jobs at a time of generally high employment.

The decadence of our national cultural standards, with particular reference to musicians, is becoming daily more apparent. While mechanized music plays some small part in this recession of our cultural standards, the major basic underlying cause is, I believe, unsound economic policy as represented by this discriminatory tax. Surveys show that only 32.8 percent of the approximately 252,500 instrumentalists belonging to the musicians union can at the present time earn all or a large part of their livelihood at their profession. Conservatively, 35 percent of the membership of this union can no longer follow their profession to any marked degree. A good one-half of the musicians union's total job potential is being destroyed by this unsound tax policy. In order to sustain our musical cultural heritage, great musicians must be developed. Generally speaking, these come only from the masses of working instrumentalists. If large reservoirs of employment are continually siphoned off as is now happening, it is indeed possible that our cultural life, from a musical standpoint, will disappear from the national scene.

For these reasons, I urge the membership of the Ways and Means Committee to give favorable consideration to repealing the 20 percent cabaret tax and hope the measure will come to the floor during this session and receive favorable action.

The Red Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to insert the sermon of the Reverend Thomas J. O'Day, S. J., delivered at the annual red Mass held at St. Charles Borromeo Church in Brooklyn, N. Y., on September 15, 1955, which marks the opening of the courts:

With almost a lifelong interest in persuasive speech, I have often visited courtrooms to hear some well-known trial lawyer make his final appeal to the jury. In some cases this appeal was very rhetorical and majestic, and the jury was deeply and visibly moved. In other cases the speech was plain, factual, direct, almost informal, and while not as memorable or stirring as the other type, it, too, successfully accomplished its purpose. In similar settings the speeches differed, chiefly because of the difference in the talents and personality of those making the appeal.

A like difference is to be found in sermons. On very special occasions, such as this, the sermon is often an elegant and eloquent discourse on the philosophy of law or some difficult points of jurisprudence. It will not be that today, for my eloquence is limited and I am not capable of discoursing on fine legal points to men who have spent years in the intense study and the exacting practice of the law.

Rather, I would talk over with you this morning something more simple and fundamental but which has a definite bearing not only on your professional work but on your entire life. I would speak with you about the relationship which exists between you and Almighty God, the relationship of a creature to his Creator, of a servant to his Lord and Master.

What does it mean to be a creature? It means that God made you out of nothing. You did not choose the time or place, you did not choose your parents—because you were nothing. Forty, sixty, eighty years ago nobody was talking about you, nobody was even thinking about you—because you did not exist. Then God gave to your parents a share in His own creative power, and into that body they formed, God Himself breathed a soul. Only He could create that, because it is spiritual and immortal. Through His infinite power and loving providence you came out of nothingness into existence as a human being, a creature composed of body and soul and made to the image and likeness of God.

That is an old truth, isn't it, familiar to you since you studied the first page of the catechism at your mother's knee or in Sunday school. Yet it is a truth that is basic for all right living, and to the thinking man, its consequences must affect his whole life. Ponder this fundamental relationship to Almighty God as creature to Creator and you cannot escape its conclusion of an absolute, essential, creaturely dependence upon God, in all things, everywhere, always. All that you are and all that you have, you owe to God. St. Paul used to ask the men of his time: "What have you which you have not received?" Then with that logic of his, he followed it up with: "And if you have received it, why do you act as if you had not, why do you act as if it were all your own?" All the gifts and talents and powers you have—God gave them to you. And if you have trained and developed them and used them to full capacity, you are doing only what God intended and expected when He bestowed them.

Now from this conclusion of complete and essential dependence comes another. Since all you have and even your very existence you owe to God, it follows that He has something to say about your life and how you should live it. In fact, He has everything to say. He has the absolute right to command and forbid, and because we are His creatures, with that essential and complete dependence, we have an absolute obligation to submit and obey. And we know what His will is for us—He has made it known in the divine and natural law, in His Commandments, in the Commandments and teaching of his church, in the obligations that are an intrinsic part of your family life and of your legal profession.

It is vitally important for every man to frequently consider this relationship of absolute dependence on and submission to Almighty God. If he forgets it or ignores it, his whole way of life will be affected seriously and disastrously, as we can see perhaps more clearly in others than in ourselves. So much of the restlessness and unhappiness and disorder in the world and in individual lives can be traced to those lives being completely self-centered instead of God-centered. It is beginning to dawn now, on many people that they have not been looking for the right things in life, nor have they been looking to the right person. With all their preoccupation with the right and the left, they are realizing they have forgotten that there is an above and beyond.

It is especially important for you to remember. The honor and respect rightfully shown to jurists and counselors and public officials can make a man forgetful of that fundamental truth of absolute dependence on and submission to God. In a position of authority, he may quite easily lose all sense of submission to a higher, and divine authority. He can, without realizing it, become very independent and proud, high-handed, and selfish, almost a little God unto himself, conducting his private and professional life according to his own ambitions and whims and passions, without regard for what God commands or forbids.

From a man's attitude toward the will and law of God, we may measure his character and this will also be the norm by which we may judge him a success or failure in life.

First, it will be a measure of his character. A man of character is one whose decisions and actions are based habitually not on feelings, passions, human respect, but on principle, on what God wants him to do. Now what is your habitual attitude toward the law of God? In your daily life, when you have to make decisions, what is the chief consideration which determines the choice? Take a legislator, whose primary consideration should be the common good of the Nation or city or State. Will he frequently subordinate the common welfare to personal or political motives? Will a judge, in consideration of a gift, render verdicts he knows to be unjust? And if elected to office, will he sacrifice principles and justice in order to show special favor to those responsible for his nomination or election? Will the public official sometimes try to justify bribery and dishonesty and graft by falsely asserting that everyone in public life does the same thing? And what of the lawyer who is concerned only with staying within the limits of legal immunity and has little or no regard for any other obligation?

For all these the chief consideration is: What do I feel like doing? What are others doing? What will others think? What is there in it for me? How much can I get away with and not get caught? These are not strong characters but weak ones—their decisions and actions are based habitually on feelings, passions, human respect. Like a house built on shifting sand, there is no foundation on which to build character there. For a man of principle, for a strong character, the big consideration is: What is the right thing to do? What does God expect of me? Not what I like, but what is right, cost what it will, no matter what others may be doing, or what they'll say or think about me.

This habitual attitude toward the will of God is not only the measure of a man's character, but it is also the norm of real success in life. In judging anything a success, don't we ask: "Is it doing that for which it was made?" For example, this watch was made to tell time accurately. It may appear rich and beautiful, may have a very expensive band and all sorts of gadgets on it—but even with all these things, if it does not tell time accurately—as a watch, it is a failure. To judge therefore whether a man is making a real success of his life, I have to ask—Is he doing that for which God created him? It certainly is a very futile thing for a man to discuss real success or to discuss anything that is really important to him as a man until he has first determined the reason for his existence, the direction in which he is travelling and the goal he is destined to reach. God created each and everyone of us to know Him, to love Him and to serve Him, and by this means to save our souls and to be eternally happy with Him in heaven. Are we moving in the right direction toward that goal?

Remember Roy Reigel in that famous Rose Bowl game of 1929? The sensational run down the field toward the wrong goal line? Many a man is doing a Roy Reigel in the game of life. He may hold high political offices; he may be advancing rapidly from the position of a magistrate in the lower court to that of an eminent jurist in the highest; he may be a famous criminal lawyer or head the legal staff of a great corporation;

he may have a fabulous income and enjoy all sorts of prestige and popularity; he may be considered in his community to be eminently successful—and yet in God's book he may be doing a Roy Reigel—running sensationally toward the wrong goal and to eternal failure.

In the tenth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke, we read that a certain lawyer came to Our Lord, "trying to put Him to the test and saying: Master, what must I do to possess eternal life?" Jesus answered him: "What is written in the law? What is thy reading of it?" The lawyer pondered for a moment, and searching his memory, answered from the Old Testament: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart and with thy whole soul and with all thy strength and with thy whole mind, and they neighbor as thyself." Jesus said to him: "Thou hast answered right; do this, and thou shalt live."

It is evident that the supreme law of life is the law which bids us to love God above all things and our neighbor as ourselves. To love God above all things, means to be willing to sacrifice anything, however attractive, which would prevent me from doing what He wants. And love of neighbor is universal—no one is to be excluded from that love, whatever his nationality or race or creed, and no matter how he may have treated us. And this law of love is for every phase of our daily lives, not just for a particular part of it. It has been one of the heresies of our time to assert that while love of God and of our neighbor may be desirable in our lives as private individuals, it need have no place of importance in education, in business, in government, in the professions. But such a separation is unjustifed and disastrous. If we try to be Christians in our private lives but abstract from the fundamental law of Christianity in our professional lives, we shall end as pagan in both. In clear and uncertain terms the Church teaches us that there is no human activity whatever from which Almighty God and the greatest of laws promulgated by His divine Son, can ever safely be excluded. Therefore, we cannot be Christians at home and Christians before the altar on a Sunday morning, and then feel free to shed our Christianity as we enter our office or the courtroom.

Our divine Lord himself, of course, is the perfect ideal on which we should strive to model our lives. He came upon earth not only to redeem us, but also to show us how to live. The keynote of His life on earth was perfect submission to the will of His Father. In the awful agony in the garden on the night before His crucifixion, He could say to his Heavenly Father as He did throughout every day of His life; "Not My will but Thine be done." And with this uncompromising strength of character there was also and always the gentleness, the graciousness, the understanding, the compassion toward all men—toward the poor, the unfortunate, the sick, the sinner.

We may have fallen far short of this ideal in the past, but the important thing this morning is not what we have been but what we will try to be. We have taken a little time to recall some basic truths. Now if we apply them and live them, God, in His infinite generosity, will reward our efforts with His richest blessings on our work.

For every member of the judiciary we pray in the words our Holy Father used in his urgent pleas to a group of judges: "May you labor in every way to make for yourselves the perfect ideal of a jurist who, through his competence, his wisdom, his conscientiousness, his rectitude, merits and gains the esteem and confidence of all."

Members of the Catholic Lawyers Guild of the diocese of Brooklyn, and your colleagues and friends who have graciously accepted your invitation to assist with you at this mass of the Holy Ghost, in the pursuit of the highest ideals of your profession, your course is clearly charted. It remains for you to walk that way in the knowledge and love of God and men. Bowed down this morning before this altar, with the deep humility befitting men in high places, yet your prayer rise to the throne of God, that in your private lives and in your work of defending and administering the law, you be just and honorable and courageous, men of principle, men whose daily lives are an outstanding expression of the supreme law of life—love of God above all things and love of neighbor as thyself.

Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, some time ago the Tariff Commission voted almost unanimously against granting relief to the manufacturers of wool gloves.

As a result of this failure several manufacturers of knit goods have been unable to compete with foreign markets and the glove industry has begun to dry up.

I quote herewith an article recently published in the Leader-Herald which indicates the truth of my statement:

GLOVERSVILLE COMPANY WILL CEASE ALL OPERATIONS AT ROYALKNIT; TO TRANSFER SOME OF 20 WORKERS—SAY CONSOLIDATION MADE NECESSARY BY CHEAP IMPORTS

The Gloversville Knitting Co. will cease all operations on January 1 in the Royalknit plant at 19 West Main Street, Johnstown. All of the operations, according to officials of the concern, are being consolidated in the main glove plant located in Schenectady and the Gloversville plant on Beaver Street.

Only a few minor operations, according to the company, have been carried on in the Johnstown plant during the past year.

About 20 employees will be affected. Some of them will transfer their activities to the other plants.

IMPORTS HURT

According to Ralph O. Collins, Sr., president of the Gloversville Knitting Co., the consolidation was made necessary by the terrific impact of cheap knit glove imports on the American knit glove industry.

The Royalknit glove line of the Gloversville Knitting Co. will henceforth be merchandised from the main offices at 51 Beaver Street in Gloversville.

The passing of the Royalknit plant in Johnstown marks the exit of one of the oldest of this type in the city. It was established many years ago by the firm of Obenhoff & Potter. Later it was taken over by the firm of Blewer & Hager. When Blewer entered the service, the assets of the firm were sold to the Gloversville Knitting Co. early in 1943.

The press releases from Tokyo indicate that imports from Japan will be much greater than this year's imports. The Tokyo press has likewise indicated greater imports to this country of bamboo products, furniture, and pottery.

To protect our American industries becomes the obligation of the Congress since the constitutional function of Congress is to regulate imports.

I suggest, therefore, that Members of the House whose districts are adversely affected by the importation of foreign merchandise consider the resolution of the American Knit Handwear Association, Inc., set forth below:

Be it resolved—

1. That import quotas be recognized as a superior method of regulation of import competition, under many present-day circumstances, to tariff rates that have been bound against increase or cut to inadequate levels under conditions that are despairing to all who seek relief;

2. That such import quotas should be authorized by Congress under specified conditions permitting to imports a fair share of the domestic market of particular products and providing for flexibility both to overcome domestic shortages and to adjust to surplus conditions;

3. That such quotas be designed to lend encouragement to exports to this country according to the higher wage standards prevailing in the countries of origin of such exports by granting special quota bonuses to any higher wage-level countries currently shipping to us and offering the same inducement to any other countries that may attain such levels in the future;

4. That the appropriate governmental agency to establish such import quotas be the United States Tariff Commission, an agency created by Congress and responsive only to Congress, guided by specific terms setting forth the conditions under which quotas may be established, the conditions that will determine the share of the domestic market to which imports will be entitled, the basis of quota allotment in accordance both with average wage levels abroad and historic exports to this country, and the conditions that will determine modification of the quotas to assure appropriate flexibility and adjustment to changing economic and technological trends; and

5. That legislation incorporating these principles be sought in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

National Reserve Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I wish to present herewith an address made by the Honorable Carter L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel, and Reserve, before the National Conference, of State Directors of Selective Service, held in Washington, D. C., on December 6, 1955. This national conference was called by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System. I feel my colleagues will be interested in reading this address:

General Hershey and gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity of being here, and I want to thank you for having me over. In behalf of the Department of Defense, and Secretary Wilson, I want to particularly salute you for a job consistently well done.

I consider General Hershey and each of you as full partners in the Nation's defense program, completely knowledgeable of the problems we face internationally and trigger ready to respond to all needs.

No one has been more helpful to me and my labors than the good general and the members of his able staff. I hope they have found me equally helpful, for that is my sincere desire.

We bear an indispensable relationship, one to another, and we should face our tasks realistically and with all face cards up.

The general and I are merchants of what we have and not mourners of what we don't have.

Some mourners have recently taken the position that what we gained this year in Reserve affairs is not worthwhile, and I simply will not agree with them. Nor will I accept the defeatism that such an attitude develops.

Those nations not allied with us in our quest for a strong free world would like for the general and you and me to waste our time and energies over what we don't have, and in worrying about the imperfections of what we do have.

I say to you:

Let's get busy wtih what we've got.

The great adjutant general of the State of Louisiana, Ray Flemming, helped to further sell me on this philosophry over a couple of Sazeracs in New Orleans last week. His emphasis is on the forward outlook for the future. And so is mine.

Lest we forget, let's take a brief inventory of the blessings gained this year as a result of congressional action. They include:

1. Extension of the Selective Service Act to 1959.

2. Expansion of the Ready Reserve ceiling from 1,500,000 to 2,900,000.

3. Authority for the President to call up to 1 million Ready reservists in a proclaimed emergency without the approval of Congress.

4. Screening processes that are designed to improve the status of the Ready and Standby Reserves, which will help industry and individuals through the orderly processes of selective service.

5. Additional volunteer choices for our young people to fulfill their military obligations through shorter periods of basic active service and longer periods of Ready Reserve service.

This provision opens up opportunity for enlisted reservists and ROTC graduates alike. By this action Congress increased by defense action the choices for service to well over 30 plans for our youth.

6. Enforcement measures applying to Reserve service that became effective for all men entering the Armed Forces after August 9, 1955, and which will not become fully meaningful toward meeting the defense Reserve requirement until after 1957.

Refinements and clarifications covering many features of Active and Reserve serivce are contained in the 1955 legislation.

With positive accomplishment of this kind on the record, it is not clear to me how anyone could characterize this action by Congress as not being worthwhile.

It's true it won't be worthwhile if each of us fails to put his shoulder to the wheel and get the program moving. And that, as a matter of fact, is the real crux of the problem we are facing.

As of today, about 4,000 young men have volunteered for the Army's 6-month training program, and of these 2,300 have actually begun training, with remainder deferred. Of the 2,300 in training, 1,224 represent new recruits, and 1,081 are members of the National Guard. The Marines have thus far begun training for about 75 men, with around 400 recruited as of November 1.

Figures such as these indicate the extent of the problem which we face—in terms of effectiveness, fairness, and contribution to the national security.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

General Hershey knows as do I that the President believes in the equitable sharing of the military obligation by all of our young people of induction age. In July of 1953, he said: "I am confident that it is the will of this Nation that the responsibilities for its defense should be shared as equally as possible by all of its citizens." I believe also that this is the congressional belief in large measure.

To the greatest extent possible, and dependent upon congressional action in 1959, this policy of American fairness could have best been achieved under the provisions of the original national Reserve plan.

When this plan did not fully succeed, we lost the automatic features of distributing equally the sharing of the military obligation among our young people. We lost the right to induct persons into the Reserve 6-month program after volunteer methods failed. This authority would have been for persons from 18½ to 26 which would have helped you and Defense in our manpower pool problems. Further, we lost all features which would have assigned to the guard its share of prior service veterans and basically trained reservists. Our efforts and record in behalf of these provisions before the House and Senate speak for themselves. We went down swinging hard.

All of this placed a more difficult burden on the President, the Pentagon, and upon Selective Service, and I trust we all will be willing to share a part of the additional tasks this has imposed.

For Defense this means—

1. Requesting the draft each time our recruitment efforts start to fall behind active force program requirements just as we did in the case of the Navy.

2. Improving Reserve staff organization within the services and doing a productive job of enlisted, Reserve, and ROTC sales work. Intensifying the effort in getting Reserve and National Guard units behind the job of recruiting their requirements.

3. Doing a successful job of giving first-class basic and elementary specialist training for 6-month reservists, and encouraging the guard and their garrisons to use this opportunity to build up further their training and overseas qualification for all National Guard units. This is precisely what President Eisenhower urged the Army and Joint Chiefs of Staff to accomplish in his August 9 statement.

4. Completing at the earliest possible date the remaining Executive orders called for under the Reserve Forces Act—with respect to screening the Ready Reserve, and implementing the 6 months' critical-skill provision.

5. Considering placing into program action wherever possible some of the interim features included in the Reserve Forces Act for expediting a partial buildup of the Reserve until the enforceable measures become fully effective during 1957.

For Selective Service:

1. Continuing to faithfully meet the Defense calls for draftees.

2. To have on hand sufficient registrants to fill a 3-month training cycle if a mobilization call should come.

3. Sell the Reserve program.

4. Get ready for administering the 6 months' critical skill Executive order.

5. Advance planning for selective recall of Standby Reserve in a general mobilization.

The big 6-months' plan must show promise soon. We will give it a fair trial, based on all our efforts.

If our total push fails, then the program will have to be withdrawn from the books.

Our Services can't operate empty training establishments designed to provide training for over 100,000 reservists and guardsmen annually only to wind up with a smidgen group.

The Selective Service System, as I have stated, can help us with this serious problem. Through your local boards you exert a broad and continuing influence on the community level. You can do much to show young men the wisdom, and the necessity, of going forward to honor their military obligation and to do their part.

Urge our youth to volunteer for the National Guard and the Reserve. Point out the futility to them—to their employer and to their community—of adopting the wait-and-see attitude. Show them the advantages of the Reserve program. In this way they will go to camp for 6 months and return to their homes to take up their employment, permitting him to be absent for a minimum period of time.

There is something in all our programs for everybody—for the man who wants an education, for the man who wants a family, for the scientist, and the highly skilled worker.

I've mentioned the choices the Reserve program affords. We need to get across to the young man and his parents that the best way to plan his life in these uncertain times is to face the problem squarely and take on his military obligation. Each qualified young man should make his decision at around age 17 on what branch of the service he wants to enter, and then get on with the business of exercising his obligation to help protect this country. In this way he does his full part and makes his most productive contribution. Everybody benefits—business and industry; the military; the community and the individual himself.

SUMMARY

Now I understand you are going to have intensive panels and seminars on the 6-month critical skill program, on screening the Ready Reserve, and on Selective recall of the Standby Reserve, so I will not discuss them. General Hershey knows my position on each of these proposals.

I will just say, however, that the prospect of several of these provisions have already won widespread approval from business and industry spokesmen—and will unquestionably permit a more equitable distribution of critical defense-supporting skills, as well as minimizing the disruptive effects of a possible mobilization.

The Department of Defense knows that the Selective Service System will work at its customary efficiency in conjunction with the new Reserve program. You will have new and added responsibilities in selection for the 6-month critical skills program, and administration of the Selective recall process of Standby Reservists in event of a mobilization.

We know that orderly processes will prevail. We have the fullest confidence in your handling of these matters.

In connection with mobilization readiness, I was gratified to learn that another of your seminars will concern the functioning of your national organization under conditions of catastrophe. That is the kind of constructive forward planning we have long since learned to expect of the Selective Service System.

CONCLUSION

And now I want to thank you again for having me over here today. In conclusion, I'll make just this brief point:

Let's all remember that we have the same Commander in Chief and the same objectives. I look forward to working more closely with you in getting the President's program over the top for stronger and larger and better trained Federal Reseves and National Guardsmen. Your comments and criticisms are always welcome, and my doorway is open 24 hours a day in order to have a good visit with you. Even better, I will come and see you. I trust that it will result in our meeting all the requirements, by doing together a better job with what we have.

Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to insert the letter received from Miss Martha Herzog, of Marion, Ind., in the Appendix of the RECORD.

She expresses interest in Hawaiian statehood. I have had the privilege of visiting the Hawaiian Islands on several occasions and can appreciate Miss Herzog's enthusiasm for this paradise of the Pacific:

Hon. JOHN BEAMER,
Congressman, Fifth District, Indiana:

HAWAII

"In the beginning God created the Heavens and the Earth" (Gen. 1:1).

"Our God of the universe saw it was good,
Yet never did He cease,
For while He planned the beginning
He also made plans for increase.

"As ages pass He sometimes wills
New land by its eruption.
Then molten rock comes gushing forth,
Sometimes midst great destruction.

"Yet land and life come forth from this
In God's good time and season;
They come from rock formed long ago,
According to His reason.

"Thus He made some tropical isles
Which still erupt, expand.
He smiles on them from sunny skies;
He waters the fruitful land.

"He planned for them the tradewind
Refreshing as it blows,
And these isles of rain and sunshine
Are the isles of rare rainbows.

"Many are the people.
Who have found these beauteous isles.
They found life good, so stayed there
In a land of love and smiles.

"They are a happy people.
They sing, and dance, and smile—
Yet 'neath it all there's longing,
A yearning all the while.

"Our beautiful Isles of Hawaii,
Which we call 'Our Territory,'
Belong to us, yet are not of us—
The pathos of this story!

"They help defend Our Country!
They harbor Our Country's fleet!
They take the blows intended for us!
Love and loyalty keep them sweet.

"They never mention secession.
Nor clamor to be free!
They simply wish to be one of us,
Secure in equality.

"They pay their taxes loyally.
With faith and hope they pray
Their efforts will be judged of worth;
That love will find a way.

"They've given final resting place
Upon their beauteous Isle
To thousands of Our Country's sons,
Including Ernie Pyle.

"These islands have many rainbows!
The rainbow have many ends!
And there we've found 'the pot of gold'
In the hearts of our island friends!

"They give of themselves untiringly!
They give, and they give anew!
This the people ask in return:
'Let us be one of you'!

"Most of our States now in being
Were once of a territory.
Did any, when seeking statehood,
Experience the same hard story?

"Weren't they all duly accepted,
All in good time and season.
Regardless of their politics?
Must politics be a reason?

"Our statesmen are good politicians!
We chose them for that part!
But politics needs an open mind,
And also an open heart!

"Let's use consideration!
Let's end the lengthy debate!
Extend heart and hand to Hawaii,
And make her our forty-ninth State!"

Sincerely yours,

MARTHA HERZOG.

P. S.: During the past summer I realized a long-time dream. I visited Hawaii.

Several years ago, in a course in political geography, I chose Hawaii as a special study. I became very much interested, and also very much concerned because of the unsettled question of statehood. My concern has continued even as the question has continued to be unsettled, and I've wished very much to visit the islands.

Last summer, as a member of an NEA tour group, I spent 17 days on the islands. It was a delightful, as well as instructive experience. The islands are truly lovely and most interesting—and so are the people who live there.

Interest, concern, and appreciation all deepened, blended, and finally erupted in the foregoing expression—a very small voice crying in the wilderness perhaps. But sometimes even a wee small voice can be heard.

Won't you, personally, please do whatever you can to terminate favorably this question of statehood? I know the people of Hawaii would be most grateful.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

MARTHA HERZOG.

MARION, IND.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Assistance to Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, every American who reads the newspapers knows of course without me talking about it that the Midwest stockraisers, and that takes in at least 95 percent of the farmers in that great area of our Nation, are in a terrific price squeeze, which as the records will show started way back in 1951.

The evil day was the day in February 1951 when Mike DiSalle, Administrator of the Office of Price Stabilization, announced he would roll back cattle prices 10 percent, just so he could approve the 9 percent wage boost which the packinghouse workers were then demanding. The "little dictator" did both with President Truman's approval. Look at the record.

Their reasoning was that to approve the 9 percent wage boost, without reducing meat prices, would raise the cost of living to the American consumer, who at that very time was spending just 24 percent of his income for food, while the rest of the peoples of the world were spending on an average of over 70 percent of their income for food. The cattle rollback took most every farm commodity down the toboggan with it. Then for several months, after the Republican Congress in the early spring of 1953 abolished the Office of Price Stabilization, all farm commodity prices leveled off until Secretary of Agriculture Benson and the farm leaders of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of both parties got into a squabble over 90 percent and flexible price supports for our 6 basic farm crops: corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts. And from the very day that squabble started most all farm commodity prices again began to slip downward until at this time fat hogs and cattle are bringing the farmers an average of about 60 percent of parity and according to the last Department of Agriculture report, the American farmers' dollar is only buying 80 cents worth of manufactured and processed goods at the counter. To make matters worse, droughts, grasshoppers, and corn borers have to no small degree added greatly to the farmers' problem in many sections of the Midwest; that is especially true of most of southern Iowa, parts of Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, as well as other parts of the Middle West to a more or less degree. That, my colleagues, is not a condition that the American economy, let alone the American farmer, can long endure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, neither your party nor my party should take all the blame for the plight of our farmers, nor does the average farmer place all the blame on us; for they know they have produced more than has been consumed for many past years, but let us not forget that they were urged to produce, produce produce all during World War II and the Korean war in order to feed and clothe, not only our military forces and civilians, but to a very great degree our Allies too, both military and civilian. Farmers of all ages, old men and old women, and young teenage boys and girls rolled up their sleeves and really produced; sometimes running their tractors, plows, planters, and harvesters around the clock, while millions of the farmers grown sons and daughters were serving their country in the Armed Forces, and in war plants, all over this wide, troubled world.

Let us never forget, but be forever grateful to the American farmer for the great and important part he has played in all our military victories. And let us also never forget the fact that the victors in every major war in recorded history, was the nation which God had blessed with the greatest supply of food, feed, and fiber. For the reasons I have just stated, I for one am willing and anxious, yes, Mr. Speaker, more than that, I plead and pray that this session of Congress disregard party lines and adopt the necessary legislation to help our farmers help themselves over the present emergency, and then adopt a farm bill providing the least possible controls and Federal domination, but plainly sufficient in its benefits to our farmers, to do a good job over the long pull. Permit me to say that I sincerely hope a repetition of the last session will not again occur during this session, wherein this House of Representatives passed a fairly good farm bill, and which I supported, but which never saw the light of day from the committee room of the other body. Hence, it would seem there might be a plague on both our Houses, Democrat and Republican.

But that is water over the dam. What should we do now? There are many ways this Congress can extend a helping hand to our farmers without too great an outlay of money, and without telling the farmers when to plant and when to reap. I believe it was Thomas Jefferson who once said:

> If the time ever comes when the Federal Government tells the farmer when he shall plant and when he shall reap, we shall soon want bread.

I have seen that very thing happen to many nations around this world in my lifetime. I will have no part of it here. This is the 18th session I have had the honor of serving the people of the Seventh Iowa District in the United States Congress. My district is an agriculture district. I was born and raised on a farm, and during all my adult life I have lived and dealt with farmers. I know their problems and their heartbeats, and I know when they are in trouble, and believe me, they are really in trouble now.. Especially the younger farmers, a great majority of them veterans, who have not had time to get their finances in order before this farm panic occurred.

I visited with hundreds of them last fall, and have had hundreds of letters from farmers, large and small, young and old, and businessmen since then telling me of their plight and giving me their ideas of the kind of laws Congress should pass for their immediate relief and for the long pull. I have read every word of every letter in the hope that they would be helpful to me in writing and recommending a farm bill, and they have.

Here are my recommendations to the Agricultural Committees of both Houses of Congress. Hold hearings every day for one week starting immediately, and bring a bill to the floor of both Houses the following Monday, that bill to provide emergency assistance to agriculture as follows:

If corn and wheat farmers will seed down, or fallow, part of their acreage allotments next year, then let them buy from the Government surplus stocks of corn and wheat, 50 bushels for each acre of corn, or 20 bushels for each acre of wheat seeded down or fallowed, at their own expense. This surplus to be bought for 75 cents a bushel. This would be starting a soil-bank plan immediately, and paying for it with surplus grain, instead of new tax money. Farms with less than 50 acres of allotment could select to seed down their whole allotment, and for larger farms an additional 20 percent over the first 50 acres.

This plan has been recommended to me by farmers and others. This plan would require no cash outlay, would give almost immediate aid to thousands upon thousands of distressed farmers. It would dispose of a great quantity of our surpluses, a lot of which is spoiling as time goes on. It would empty thousands upon thousands of Government-owned bins, making purchases of more new bins for next year's crop unnecessary.

For further details of this plan and in order to save time and space, I direct your attention to the extension of my remarks in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on another page, wherein, after receiving unanimous consent, I am having printed the recommendations of Mr.

Dave Livingston, a farmer living at Washington, Iowa. Mr. Livingston, a respected farm leader, has traveled far and wide over America and the world, seeking for knowledge and speaking to farm and business meetings everywhere.

Yes, and I would go further. If I had my way I would in the same bill specifically direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of cattle and hogs at a price of at least $4 per hundredweight more than the present market price on cattle and hogs, until the prices on cattle and hogs reached 90 percent of parity. I would expect the Agriculture Committee to set weights and grades. Sure, this will cost some money, but nothing compared to the loss of tax revenue to the United States Treasury by the lost revenue which will be brought about by the thousands of bankrupt farmers if immediate relief such as this is not provided. Some may accuse me of being too liberal. Yes, I will admit I have been quite liberal when any segment of people, the American people, need emergency relief, as desperately as the Midwest farmer needs it right now. But look at my record; I will put my record of the past 17 sessions in Congress up against the best of them for not squandering the taxpayers' money.

I just said I would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of hogs and cattle. Now the reason I would do that is simply because, if I were Secretary of Agriculture I would welcome such a directive from the representatives of the taxpayers of America, even though I had the authority under existing law to do it, as the Secretary of Agriculture has right now. But is is plain to see he will not exercise that authority for fear it would encourage greater production of hogs and cattle. My studied opinion is, that is a risk he is justified in taking under the circumstances, and which all fairminded, informed people know, or should know at this late date.

And in addition, I cannot recommend too strongly that we place a complete embargo on the importation of meat and live cattle from foreign countries until such time that hogs and cattle prices bring 100 percent of parity to our own producers. Here are the figures on imports and exports of beef, pork and cattle for the first 9 months of 1955, furnished me by the Department of Agriculture:

Beef and veal imports, 90,700,000 pounds.

Beef and veal exports, 34,751,000 pounds.

Pork product imports, 124,148,000 pounds.

Pork product exports, exclusive of lard, 54,144,000 pounds.

Live cattle, mostly from Mexico, 240,135 head.

Exports, 19,823 head.

My friends, that borders on criminal in the face of constantly falling prices on meats here in the U. S. A. Oh, some may say that is only a drop in the bucket compared to our total production. Well, it is a mighty big drop and simply adds that extra straw which is breaking the camel's back. And let me tell you here and now, my dear friends, there is no other Nation in this whole, wide world that hesitates one minute to impose a complete embargo on imports from us when they have a plentiful supply of their own, even though we have shoveled our taxpayers' dollars into their coffers by the millions and billions of dollars. How stupid can we be? And that silly business has been going on for the past 10 years. For all our sakes let us stop.

That, Mr. Speaker, is my recommendation for quick and I believe effective aid to help our distressed farmers over the present emergency farm price squeeze or farm panic, whatever you wish to call it.

I also know the cotton farmer is having a bad time. I will leave that problem to my colleagues from the cotton producing States, with the assurance that I shall be just as fair to the cotton producer as I am to the farmers on whom America depends for a plentiful supply of food for our daily bread.

I am gathering facts and figures, in preparation for introduction of two bills which, after a lot of study, I have concluded should be made law to help bring about a stable prosperous farm economy over the long pull. But first and foremost in my mind now is to assist my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee in bringing out a bill at the earliest possible time which can pass both Houses of Congress quickly and be signed by the President for immediate, effective aid to a great multitude of our distressed farmers.

How To Get Rid of Our Agricultural Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

HOW TO GET RID OF OUR AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

(By Dave Livingston, Washington, Iowa)

SELL THE GRAIN BACK TO THE FARMERS WHO RAISED IT, AT A CUT PRICE IN RETURN FOR ACREAGE REDUCTIONS

If corn and wheat farmers will seed down, or fallow, part of their acreage allotments next year then let them buy, from the Government surplus stocks of corn and wheat, 50 bushels for each acre of corn or 20 bushels for each acre of wheat seeded down or fallowed at their own expense. This surplus to be bought for 75 cents a bushel.

This would be starting a soil-bank plan immediately and paying for it with surplus grain instead of new tax money. Farms with less than 50 acres of allotment could elect to seed down their whole allotment and for larger farms an additional 20 percent over the first 50 acres.

For example, I have a farm with an acreage allotment of 50 acres of corn out of a total of 235 acres. Thus, under this plan, I could buy a total of 2,500 bushels during 1956, at 75 cents a bushel. In return I would seed down the whole 50 acres at my own expense. I would then buy this feed through my local ASC office, where they already have my whole allotment record. In order to spread this surplus selling so that livestock numbers would not be increased, nor the grain trade upset they could restrict my purchases to 25 percent of my allowance in any 60-day period and also begin delivery at the beginning of the crop year (July 1 on wheat and September 1 on corn).

This farm is the kind that is commonly referred to as the family-size farm. It is rough and hilly in spots. The 50-acre allotment is already so low that it is next to impossible for a man to make a living farming it because it takes as much machinery and more labor to grow this 50 acres of corn than it does to grow 100 acres or more on a better farm. On the other hand this farm lends itself to a grass-farming program and should be planted to grass. It is one of the hundreds of thousands of farms where the hilltops and pastures were plowed up, during World War II and the Korean police action, to produce the much needed extra corn and soybeans at that time. Because of the lowering of farm prices and income as well as the rise in expenses since that time it has been necessary to continue to farm these hills intensively to make a living.

The return of this farm, and others like it, to grass farming presents a much greater problem to the individual farmer than has been generally recognized.

First. A farmer of this type must have some grain to balance his grass in order to get maximum returns on his livestock program. A livestock program is inevitable on this type of land because that is the only way you can convert grass into income. This need for grain has been the main reason for the continuation of corn farming on these hill farms.

Second. When a farmer converts his land from grain to grass there will be a time lag of 1 year in his income until this new grass becomes available as livestock feed. If a soil-bank plan were developed, where the Government rented this land to get it out of grain production, it would break these farmers financially.

Let us suppose the Government paid as much as $20 per acre rental. That would be $1,000 rental on the 50 acres. Then the farmer must buy his grain. Even at $1 per bushel he can get only 1,000 bushels which is not enough. Actually he will be able to buy much less than 1,000 bushels at the current market price. Under my plan he can get 2,500 bushels, or about normal production, while he makes this conversion.

Third. Not only will the individual farmers income be cut, during this lag time, but eventually this farmer will need a little more capital to stock this new grass properly. Through my plan he could bridge the immediate gap, without being hurt financially, and still reduce grain acreage.

I'm not enough of an expert to figure out what will be needed more than a year in advance in agriculture (and the experts are not doing so good either) but I know that if you want corn ground seeded down to grass on my farm you can get it done in 1956 by my "Grain Purchase Plan." I'll be very happy to seed down my ground at my own expense and thus take my chances on this year of lag time.

Some people will try to find fault with this idea because it will increase livestock numbers. It will be 2 years before that could start. After that cattle and sheep will gradually increase. They will have to increase for two reasons. In the first place we will need more livestock to furnish food for our increasing population. Second, from the farmers standpoint, he will have to buy livestock to eat up this new grass. If these farmers cannot increase their livestock numbers to consume this grass then they will go broke. The reason livestock will not increase immediately, and will not increase too rapidly in the future, is that livestock numbers are geared to the amount of the supply and price of grain. Under this plan

the farmers would have no more grain on their farms than if they continued production. They simply buy a year's supply out of surplus instead of raising it. Who says that is not what we need in this country?

From my standpoint this plan would temporarily reduce my production costs.

From the standpoint of the Government it would get rid of the grain surpluses in return for acreage reductions. Production of wheat and corn would be reduced in direct proportion to the amount of the surpluses sold. Thus storage problem of the normal carryover would be minimized to say nothing of the future savings in storage costs and the waste through spoilage. When this surplus is once used up then the problems of agriculture are minimized no matter what kind of a farm plan we have. It would take the farm problem out of politics.

From the standpoint of the general taxpaying public it would reduce the cost of any soil-bank plan by paying for it, at least in the beginning, with money already invested in surpluses and it will get immediate action.

It can be done in 1956 with very little new legislation.

This whole plan is purely and simply an additional option under the proposed soil-bank plan. It can be offered along with the land-rental option already proposed, and endorsed, by many of the leading farm organizations.

One trouble with most farm plans up to date has been that they start with a great big overall situation and work down to the individual farm. This plan works in reverse. It begins at the proper starting point, the individual farm, and works up. As soon as the surplus is gone it is finished and it takes no new organization to make it work. It is simply an additional feature of the ASC.

It is the sum total of the production of a lot of little farmers over a period of the last 10 years, which created most of the surplus in the first place. So why not take the perfectly logical step and let these same little farmers use it up while they get their farms back into grass?

Keep one thing clearly in mind. The collective excess we have today, of both wheat and corn, has been accumulated over a period of 10 years. In fact the gross total has increased very little during the past 5 years. It makes no difference whether this accumulation took place under the Democrats or the Republicans. It makes no difference whether rigid 90-percent supports or flexible supports are to blame. It makes little difference whether the Farm Bureau, Farmers Union or the National Grange are in favor of rigid or flexible supports nor what plan they advocate in the future. The fact remains that we have about 1 billion bushels of wheat and corn as a combined accumulated surplus, over and above a normal carryover, and the big job is to get it consumed.

Why run around all over the world trying to sell wheat for export? In the first place we have very little really good wheat available for export. In the second place the State Department would probably tear their hair out if we got the job done. In the third place we already have a pretty lousy reputation for poor-grade wheat because of carelessness in shipments already made. I was in Europe, the Middle East, and Egypt last spring and almost everywhere I heard the complaint that American wheat was inferior and a poor buy.

Because of low-protein content, poor grade, contamination, and other causes most of the wheat we now have in storage is only good for livestock feed so let's quit kidding ourselves and use it up for that purpose.

Now to answer several questions involved in this plan.

Why do I propose 50 bushels or corn to the acre?

Because that is a high average yield. Remember we are trying to get rid of surpluses so that is a pretty fair deal for both the farmer and the Government. If 1 billion bushels of surplus grain were sold at that rate it would put 20 million acres out of production. This is assuming it would all be used to put corn land out of production.

Why sell 20 bushels to the acre of wheat land?

Because here also it is a fair high average yield figure. If the wheat surplus were all bought back by wheat farmers, at the rate of 20 bushels to the acre, it would put 50 million acres out of production.

As a matter of fact this plan would get rid of surpluses so fast that the amount to be liquidated in any one year would probably have to be limited to 300 million bushels or we could suddenly create famine conditions. Remember. When you sell 300 million bushels by this method you also take out of production another 300 million bushels for the next year making a net change in position of 600 million bushels.

How can a small farmer pay for this grain?

He can buy it one truck load at a time. He will need less money at one time to do this than he would need to buy seed, fertilizer, and gasoline to plant his whole crop in the spring. If he can't do this he is "busted."

If either a wheat or corn farmer has no livestock what can he do?

He can sell it into the cash grain market. But he cannot dump a lot at one time because of the provision that he can only buy 25 percent of his allowance in any 60-day period. He simply buys it from the Government, in lieu of raising it, and then sells it in the open market. As an additional feature this would prevent the market gluts at harvest time.

Will this plan increase livestock numbers?

I partially answered this earlier. It would not do it immediately but it would as time went on. This plan, in itself, would not do it, because of the "cheap" grain, because no single farmer would get enough grain, and second, he would have his purchases spread out. Any additional grain he needed for increased livestock he would have to buy on the open market. It is reasonable to assume that the cash grain market would stabilize around the loan figure so that any livestock producer would think twice before he increased production.

Would it interfere with soil conservation?

The answer is "No." Most soil conservation practices such as contour ridges, waterways, ponds, et cetera, are carried out when the fields are in grass. It is the farms in the hill country that need these practices and these are the ones which would benefit most from this plan, therefore it would have the effect of speeding up conservation measures.

Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial for Cancer Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to call the Members' attention to the remarkable humanitarian accomplishments of the Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial for Cancer Research which has been in existence for only a few years.

Mrs. Mervin Eisenberg, of Newark, N. J., publicity chairman of this splendid organization, has kindly furnished the following account of the memorial's history and growth:

RUTH ESTRIN GOLDBERG
MEMORIAL FOR CANCER RESEARCH,
Newark, N. J., October 27, 1955.

Representative HUGH ADDONIZIO,
Congressional Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ADDONIZIO: It has recently come to my attention that Members of Congress may read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD outstanding work that an organization in their community has done.

I am a member of the Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial for Cancer Research and feel that this organization has done a remarkable job in a few short years. I am, therefore, enclosing herein a record of our organization's founding and growth as well as a complete list of it's financial grants to date. I have heard a great deal about the sincere interest you have in the people and the groups that you represent, and I hope that you will find our record sufficiently interesting and our accomplishments great enough to read to Congress as an example of the excellent work one organization in the State of New Jersey is doing.

Although we are very proud of our accomplishments, we realize the enormity of the task we have undertaken, and we will continue to work diligently to improve our record until the wonderful day when cancer, the reason for our existence, will be wiped out forever.

Thank you for any consideration you may give us in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. MERVIN EISENBERG,
Publicity Chairman.

HISTORY AND GROWTH OF RUTH ESTRIN GOLDBERG MEMORIAL FOR CANCER RESEARCH

The Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial for Cancer Research was founded in 1949 in the State of New Jersey by nine young women who had lost their good friend, the late Mrs. Goldberg, through cancer at the age of 28. They were so deeply affected by her death that they decided to establish an organization which would serve as a living memorial to their friend wherein they could work to eradicate the menace that had taken her life.

REGM, as it is frequently called, is a nonsectarian organization with a membership of over 500 women now, who, during their spare time work solely to raise money to find a cure for cancer through research. All of the funds raised by this group go directly to cancer research.

Financial grants are issued to any hospital or institution in this country that does outstanding work in the field of cancer, and is in need of financial assistance to continue its field of study. Final selection of the institution to receive a grant is made by the membership at large under the advice and counsel of its advisory board, which consists of 11 honorary members who are mainly physicians and scientists, and its officers. Dr. James B. Allison, Director of the Rutgers University Bureau of Biological Research, is a member of this advisory board.

In 6 short years the Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial has donated $47,292.80 to cancer research. Their proudest achievement is the establishment of the Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial for Cancer Research Isotope Laboratories at the Bureau of Biological Research of Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J. This laboratory is specifically designed for the use of radioactive isotopes in cancer research, and the group has donated $11,510 to the laboratory to date. It is their sincerest hope that continued success in their fund-raising activities will enable them to go on equipping and enlarging the laboratory they have established.

During the past year they have donated $1,450 to the Children's Cancer Research

Foundation, Boston, Mass., a sonic oscillator; $5,000 to the New York Medical College for the Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial Fellowship in Pediatric Cancer; $3,500 to the Roscoe B. Jackson Memorial, Bar Harbor, Maine, for cancer tissue culture study; and $1,500 to the Newark Beth Israel Hospital Research Foundation Laboratory in completion of a pledge to their laboratory.

They now have $6,361.19 in the treasury and, therefore, expect to issue additional grants very soon. Although they are very pleased with their accomplishments, they realize that they must continue to work to raise money for this all-important purpose so that some day the disease that killed their young friend will be wiped out forever.

The list of Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial donations to date is most impressive and is indicative of the zeal and enthusiasm of the membership:

List of Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial donations to date

1949	
September: Newark Beth Israel Hospital	$500.00
1950	
September: Rutgers University	1,500.00
1951	
September: Newark Beth Israel Hospital	3,000.00
1952	
February: Newark Beth Israel Hospital (apparatus in animal testing room)	2,000.00
September: Rutgers University	4,000.00
1953	
March, September: Newark Beth Israel Hospital (both grants for clinical evaluation of leukemia)	6,000.00
1954	
January: Rutgers University (hood for Radio Isotope Laboratory)	1,485.00
April: Children's Cancer Research Foundation, Boston, Mass., for refrigerated centrifuge for leukemia	2,222.80
March: Francis Delafield Hospital, New York	3,200.00
September: Newark Beth Israel Hospital (to their research foundation laboratory)	2,000.00
September: Roscoe B. Jackson Memorial, Bar Harbor, Maine (cancer tissue culture study)	3,500.00
September: Institute for Cancer Research, Lankenau Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa. (automatic sample changer)	1,910.00
1955	
March: Children's Cancer Research Foundation, Boston, Mass. (sonic oscillator)	1,450.00
March: Rutgers University (scaler-counter-timer)	1,525.00
March: New York Medical College (REGM fellowship in pediatric cancer)	5,000.00
September: Rutgers University (animal room and equipment for REGM Radio Isotope Laboratory)	3,000.00
September: Roscoe B. Jackson Memorial, Bar Harbor, Maine (cancer tissue culture study)	3,500.00
September: Newark Beth Israel Hospital (research foundation laboratory, 2d payment of pledge)	1,500.00
Total	47,292.80

The February 1954 issue of the monthly, Report From Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, contained the following tribute to the memorial:

IN MEMORY OF COURAGE

The Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial for Cancer Research is a foundation which provides funds for research on cancer. Other foundations do too, but that is where any resemblance of the Ruth Estrin Goldberg Memorial to any other ends abruptly.

Unlike most foundations, the Memorial didn't simply come into full-blown being through a bequest or gift. It is a living and growing thing, supported by the individual hard work and enthusiasm of a group of North Jersey housewives who have vowed a personal vengeance against the disease which claimed the life of Mrs. Ruth Estrin Goldberg, young, charming, and, like themselves, a housewife, at 28.

Nine close friends of Mrs. Goldberg, fellow members of an informal social club, felt so strongly about her death that they decided to turn the club into a memorial which has now been expanded to a membership of more than 400.

Over the course of but a few years, their support of Rutgers cancer research has totaled $10,000, no vast sum as the assets of conventional foundations go, but highly useful in providing tools for the expansion of the fundamental studies undertaken in the State university's bureau of biological research.

This year for instance, a compact but efficient laboratory specifically designed for the use of radio-active isotopes in cancer research has been opened at the Bureau. A bronze plaque notes its dedication to the memory of Ruth Goldberg.

The new laboratory was built with an original $4,000 grant from the REGM. Subsequently the Bureau of Biological Research found that it needed a $1,500 exhaust hood for the safe handling of radio-active materials and the ladies promptly responded with a gift in that amount.

These radio-active isotopes are byproducts of atomic radiation. They are chemicals deliberately made to absorb measurable amounts of radiation, amounts that can be accurately metered after they have been taken into the body's tissues.

For example, if the scientist needs to measure the amount of a drug or compound he believes potentially effective against a cancer, it can be combined with a radio-active substance. Then after the substance under test is within the body, the amount which goes to and is absorbed by the tumor can be traced and measured.

Funds which bought the laboratory equipment came from many sources. "Coin catcher" is the phrase used by the women to describe everything from cake sales to fashion shows, diaper service rebates to collecting used nylons.

The bureau research program, supported by organizations such as the Damon Runyon Fund and the American Cancer Society, as well as foundations, industry and the university's own research funds, is playing an important role in the concerted national and international research program aimed at cancer.

And in the work of the bureau, this memorial to a young, lovely and selfless lady is playing an esential part.

Norman Chandler's Visit Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Norman Chandler, distinguished publisher of the Los Angeles Times, visited Russia, Latvia, and Czechoslovakia last fall. He was accompanied by Mrs. Chandler and Mr. Robert Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau.

Mr. Chandler discussed conditions in the Communist world in a series of articles which appeared in the Los Angeles Times. I suggest that all Members of Congress read Mr. Chandler's illuminating account of conditions behind the Iron Curtain.

The following are the first 3 articles which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on November 6, 7, and 8, 1955:

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 6, 1955]

ENTRY INTO RUSSIA FOUND STILL DIFFICULT—PUBLISHER OF TIMES TELLS OF LONG WAIT FOR SOVIET TRAVEL PERMIT

(This is the first of a series of articles in which Mr. Chandler, publisher of the Times, will report his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was airmailed uncensored from Vienna.)

(By Norman Chandler)

LENINGRAD.—It's still far from easy to get into the Soviet Union. But, thanks to the "spirit of Geneva," it is a little easier than it used to be and, once inside the country, an American tourist can do things which 6 months ago would have been impossible.

We arrived here after 3 months of trying. This, I am told by other Americans here—we have seen only about a dozen outside of the permanent United States Embassy and news agency staffs—is something of a speed record for the course. Many have waited 6 or 9 months and many more never get permission.

PUT TO THE TEST

When I read the final communique from the Big Four Conference at Geneva last summer, it seemed to me the agreement to facilitate a freer exchange of visitors and cultural groups was the one solid result of the meeting. I decided to put it to the test, and asked the Times Washington Bureau to apply at the Soviet Embassy for visas for Mrs. Chandler and myself.

Mrs. Chandler was most interested because of her activities in the cultural and educational fields. She wanted to see the best Soviet artists performing in their own country and to discuss with top Russian officials the prospects of bringing them to the United States in a talent exchange.

BACKGROUND VALUABLE

If we were admitted, I also planned to take Bob Hartmann, chief of our Washington bureau, along. So much of the news from our Nation's Capital concerns the relations between the United States and the U. S. S. R. that I felt a background of firsthand knowledge of the Soviet Union would be most valuable to him and give our Washington bureau a real advantage in the months ahead.

Nevertheless, when we left the United States in mid-September for Europe and a vacation made memorable by the magnificent service provided us by TWA and Howard Hughes, no reply had been received from Moscow.

The combined efforts of our Washington bureau, the Associated Press in New York and Moscow, the good offices of Vice President NIXON and Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., seemed to no avail. The Soviet authorities, we were to learn later, do things in their own good time, if at all.

THE RIGHT COMBINATION

We had virtually decided to abandon the visit to Russia, with winter fast coming on, when as a last-chance effort I sat down in Frankfurt, Germany, and wrote a telegram directly to Nikita Khrushchev, first secretary of the Communist Party. I reiterated our

reasons for wanting to visit the Soviet Union and added I had to be back at my office in Los Angeles by November 12.

The workings of the inner Kremlin are like a combination lock. No outsider knows the exact combination that makes the tumblers fall into place and produce a decision to open the door. But something certainly happened, and when it did things moved fast.

I was informed our visas had been granted and could be picked up at the Soviet Embassy in Vienna. We had already left Vienna, so we asked to have them transferred to Paris. Within 24 hours, in what dumfounded American experts on Russia call the swiftest bureaucratic switch on record, the all-important stamp was on our green United States passports.

Joined by Bob Hartmann, who did a modern Nellie Bly by getting to Paris some 17 hours after picking up his visa in Washington, we took off immediately for Helsinki via Copenhagen and Stockholm—some of the neatest cities of Europe.

INTO THE UNKNOWN

At the Helsinki Airport we were met by our good friends Holger and Ulla Semelius. He is president of the Finnish Newsprint Association which supplies paper for 1 out of every 7 pages in the Times and Mirror-News. After a delightful visit and typical Finnish lunch, our flight was called and we boarded the Soviet plane with the inner feeling of jumping off into the unknown.

Right then we had to discard our first bit of misinformation about Russia. We had heard that Soviet planes have no seat belts. This one did, although it was the only one we found in Russia so equipped.

AIRBORNE HOT RODDERS

All civil aviation in the U. S. S. R. is run by Aeroflot which simply means "air fleet." The usual commercial transport is a Soviet version of our old work horse of the skies, the Douglas DC-3, seating 21 passengers. We saw no four-motored civilian planes.

The pilots tend to wheel their planes around the airfield like hot rodders, and they take off and land without very much ado, but appear to be skillful aviators. Travel by Aeroflot, as we found it, is safe enough and reasonably comfortable, though the planes vibrate more than ours and there are no such frills as meals or vodka aloft.

Our Soviet hostess was a smiling girl with the sturdy peasant figure so typical of Russian women. She wore an untidy black uniform and cap from which escaped considerable unruly red hair. She wore a little lipstick, which is not very common in the Soviet Union.

The flight began with a matter-of-fact distribution of paper sacks for air sickness. Later she distributed some lemon drops, mineral water, and Russian magazines—which I could read only enough to tell that the main article was about peaceful atomic powerplants.

BLUE VELVET ELEGANCE

The seats were upholstered in a coarse frieze and the interior was of blue plastic. Lap robes were passed out for high-altitude flying, though the cabin was heated. At the rear was a heavy blue velvet curtain—the first we were to see of this material, which evidently is thought the height of elegance throughout the country, as it is used everywhere. There was a single rest room for all passengers, fairly clean.

At each window were translucent plastic shutters, which, I surmised, could be closed if we were not supposed to look out. But they were not closed. We peered down eagerly for our first view of the biggest nation on earth, so long a dread mystery to Americans, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 7, 1955]

IRON CURTAIN NOT VISIBLE FROM AIR—RUSSIA FOUND TO BE COSTLY LAND BY VISITING PUBLISHER OF TIMES

(This is the second of a series of articles in which Mr. Chandler, publisher of the Times, will report his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was airmailed uncensored from Vienna.)

(By Norman Chandler)

LENINGRAD.—The Iron Curtain is invisible from the air.

Flying from Helsinki in our two-engined Soviet transport there was nothing to see below but a sea of white clouds when our Russian stewardess announced, in hesitant English:

"We are now in the Soviet Union."

I felt no particular sensation, neither thrill nor chill, after months of waiting for this moment.

It was in this objective frame of mind, actually, that I went to Russia. I was resolved to forget, if I could, that this was the capital of the Communist world. For the duration of my visit I would try to see it as just another foreign country, with different way from our own.

THE GOOD AND BAD

As a tourist and private American citizen, traveling with Mrs. Chandler and Bob Hartmann, chief of our Washington bureau, I hoped to record for our readers the impressions and experiences of a visit to the Soviet Union, the good and the bad, just as I might do in Pakistan or Uruguay or any other place I had never seen before.

I am not an expert on the Soviet Union, nor could I become one in a fortnight. Able professionals like Dick O'Malley and Stan Johnson of the Associated Press bureau in Moscow or our hard-working and rigidly restricted Embassy staff are reporting the twists and turns of Kremlin politics to the American people and the United States Government.

But we were among the few individual Americans permitted to tour the U. S. S. R. since Geneva. The Soviets prefer large delegations, or foreign officials, to the hard-to-watch, hard-to-please private tourists who annually swarm over Western Europe.

OFFICIAL AGENCY

The all-embracing official Soviet travel agency, Intourist, takes care of all foreigners inside Russia. To somewhat soften the outrageous official exchange rate of 4 rubles to $1 (the ruble will buy about a nickel's worth of goods) Intourist sells coupon books ranging from $30 a day for "luxe" service through 5 less expensive classes. The "luxe" coupon book covers transport to and from railway stations and airports to an Intourist hotel, lodging and 4 meals (including tea but not wines, liquors, or bottled water), plus sightseeing with an English-speaking interpreter, guide, and chaperon.

It sounds like a lot for $30 until you see it. Actually, without buying anything in the way of souvenirs—there is nothing worth buying except postcards and postage stamps—we found ourselves getting rid of rubles at the rate of about $100 per person a day in addition to the Intourist coupons.

LIVING EXPENSIVE

So I won't predict any great volume of American tourists to the Soviet Union next summer, even if, improbably, all visa requirements are suddenly abolished. Food and hotel rooms are as good as the U. S. S. R. has to offer, and one is whisked about in a shiny black Zim, which resembles a 147 Buick or Oldsmobile such as only the wealthier Soviet officials and artists can afford.

But by American or Western European standards, the food is bad and the accommodations primitive. Living is terribly expensive and all you get for your money is an inside look at a fascinating and heretofore almost forbidden land.

To a newsman this makes it worth while—for a while.

I'm well aware that first impressions often are deceiving. But here are those I jotted down driving from the airport into Leningrad, Peter the Great's planned city on the Baltic.

Our first sight of the Soviet Union's second metropolis was obscured by a familiar phenomenon, smog. A heavy blanket of smog hung over the city and for a moment made us feel at home. But our wheels had scarcely touched the hexagonal concrete paving blocks of the airstrip before we knew Leningrad was definitely not Los Angeles. It was like landing on another planet.

CAMERAS O. K.'D

Customs and passport formalities were amazingly easy at the airport. We were asked to declare how much money and jewels we carried, and whether we had any reindeer horns or hashish with us. Nobody raised an eyebrow at our cameras and plentiful supply of film.

The Intourist man—we were seldom to be without one from then on—met our plane and put us in a Zim limousine for the Hotel Astoria. The paved highway was good but something was lacking—suddenly I realized it was the absence of advertising billboards. Where the state owns everything, why advertise?

It was just dusk, and factory workers were queued up for buses and trolleys along Stalin Avenue, the extremely wide boulevard leading to town. Their faces were expressionless. Their clothing, while warm, was drab and dirty. Almost everybody wore black. They stared at us, but we could not be sure whether it was because they recognized us as Americans or because of the limousine. There were some trucks but only a handful of private cars on the streets. We saw few smiles.

CITY COLD AND GRIM

While in the country the birches were just turning gold, the city of Leningrad had few trees or touches of green. It looked cold and grim, like a vast forced-labor camp. Massive multiple apartment houses, built of brick with little or no structural steel, were rising behind old Russian-log houses of incredible disrepair but somehow in better taste. Soviet architecture is a nightmare, somewhat like piling the Lincoln Memorial on top of the Los Angeles city hall, with colossal statues of workers and peasants at every corner.

At the Astoria Hotel, a prerevolutionary relic of masonry furnished with massive period furniture in garish colors, we walked into a lobby teeming with French movie people here for a cinema festival. An antique elevator took us to our suite, but we soon learned that you must walk down five flights to descend. Scrubwomen constantly scour the stairs, but seldom the bathroom. There is very little unemployment in the Soviet Union and very little good plumbing.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 8, 1955]

SOVIET LAND FAILS AS UTOPIA MODEL—IT'S ABOUT 50 YEARS BEHIND UNITED STATES, VISITING TIMES PUBLISHER REPORTS

(This is the third of a series of articles in which Mr. Chandler, publisher of the Times, will report his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was airmailed uncensored from Leningrad.)

(By Norman Chandler)

LENINGRAD.—I had not been in the Soviet Union for 24 hours before I was convinced that every American should see this country. Especially those who consider it the model of the future Socialist world utopia.

Actually it is about 50 years behind the United States in most visible facilities and at least 20 years behind any Asiatic or European country I have ever seen.

This is not to make the rash statement that Russia is not moving ahead technologically, perhaps equaling or surpassing us in some things—things which the planners of the Kremlin give top priority such as the odd combination of bombs and ballets. Compared with what the Soviets had achieved a decade ago, life is undoubtedly better for the Soviet citizen, who appears remarkably resigned to a way of life which, to the average American, would be unbearable.

LETDOWN FOR VISITOR

No matter how much you have heard, read, seen in pictures, or imagined about the U. S. S. R., I'm sure you would find it very different from your preconceptions. I know I did.

Looking back, I have to admit that suspicious as we Americans have been of Soviet propaganda about their material progress, we have all subconsciously swallowed some of it. For while I never thought things would be as good as the Russians boast, neither did I ever dream they could be as bad as they are—with some notable exceptions I shall mention later.

On the other hand, where I expected some hostility toward Americans and the kind of contentious belligerance you get from our rabid leftwingers at home, I found considerable courtesy and no hostility. I found my freedom of movement around the city much greater than I anticipated and if we were "tailed" or followed it was done so skillfully we were unaware of it. I do not think we were, although the authorities certainly had a general idea of where we were all the time, as we made no secret of it.

NO BAN ON CAMERA

I openly carried my camera and took pictures wherever I pleased, with or without a Soviet guide. Only once was I told "Nyet" about photographing. That was when a small formation of soldiers marched past our hotel.

Leningrad, at least in late fall, is a poor introduction to the Soviet Union, however. The food at the hotel, invariably the same menu of tired canned vegetables and potatoes fried in strong grease, with tough or tasteless meat and apples the only fruit to be had, was a shock after Paris and Scandinavia.

A few things are good. Caviar, of course, which Intourist guests can have with every meal if they like it that well, strong tea served in a glass in a silver holder; ice cream—which I pray was pasteurized. The black bread is good but the white is only fair. Sturegon is a tasty fish if you can get some without the cooking oil aroma. Borsch is better at any Kosher restaurant in the United States.

VODKA EXPENSIVE

There are virtually no imported goods in the country—except a few things from Czechoslovakia such as cut crystal which adorns every table. You cannot buy Scotch whisky for comradeship or money and about an ounce of vodka costs $1. While there are no bars, I saw considerable drunkenness on the streets and even in hotel dinning rooms. In all fairness, it probably was not more than you would see in America, but it seemed worse because these inebriates were never gay, just drunk.

My overall impression of Leningrad is grim. Perhaps this is because the contrast with the West was so startling; perhaps because cold weather was coming on; perhaps because it is too close to the frontier for Soviet planners to assign it a very high priority.

Yet there were many things of interest to see.

Most impressive was the rehearsal, by what must have been 10,000 crack troops of the Red army and navy, for the national Red October holiday on November 7 (Russia clung to the Julian calendar until after the revolution; thus the October uprising was November 7 under the Gregorian system used universally today.)

PRECISION MARCHERS

With marvelous precision, these massed formations marched through the plaza of the Czar's winter palace where the revolution actually began. Not far away, anchored in the Neva River, was the cruiser *Aurora*—of the same vintage as the U. S. S. *Maine*—whose crew mutinied and turned the ship's guns on the palace.

We watched this parade rehearsal from a window of the palace, now one of the world's richest art museums. The collection itself is remarkable and the palace of the last Romanoffs, well-kept and better preserved than most of the slapdash construction of the past few years, is a treasure house deserving more time than we could give it.

Leningrad, formerly Petrograd, formerly St. Petersburg, was laid out by Peter the Great on the plan of Paris in his effort to Europeanize his country. It has broad boulevards and circles, but little traffic; it has Stony Park where czarist nobility once had their summer dachas and now Soviet kindergarten children play while their mothers work.

BUILT ON 101 ISLANDS

It also resembles Venice in that it is built on 101 islands, with many canals and bridges. We saw husky Soviet oarsmen shelling, and our intourist guide frankly voiced the hope the U. S. S. R. would beat the U. S. in the next Olympics. He showed us the Kirov Stadium, seating 100,000, and pointed out with local pride it was the largest in the Soviet Union. I noted an elegant central box obviously reserved for VIP's in this land of equality.

But the resemblance to Paris or Venice ends very quickly. There seems little gaiety; a sad orchestra ground out tunes in the Astoria's dining room and a dumpy girl vocalist sang Besame Mucho, which appeared most unlikely. There was no dancing.

There are only 15 churches operating in Leningrad, 1 each for Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews, the rest Russian orthodox. The best of the onion-spired orthodox churches have been turned into museums or movie theaters, the rest are crumbling ruins.

CATHEDRAL MUSEUMS

In the once-splendid Kazan Cathedral we visited the antireligious museum, which the Soviets prefer to call the Museum of Science and Religion. From what I had heard, the more offensive and blasphemous exhibits apparently have been discarded, though I could not read the slogans.

The museum was thronged with groups of Russian schoolchildren, attentive and well behaved, getting their first lessons in the new religion of Marxist materialism. They were as cute and happy as children anywhere, and this frightened me more than the marching columns in Revolution Square.

Norman Chandler's Visit Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following are the fourth, fifth, and sixth in the series of articles by Mr. Norman Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times, in which he describes his experiences behind the Iron Curtain. These articles appeared in the Los Angeles Times on November 9, 10, and 11, 1955:

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 9, 1955]

MOSCOW REMAINS SOVIET SHOWPLACE—ENDLESS PROCESSION STILL FILES BY LENIN TOMB, TIMES PUBLISHER FINDS

(This is the fourth of a series of articles in which Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, is reporting his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was airmailed uncensored from Moscow.)

(By Norman Chandler)

Moscow.—The desk in my room at the National Hotel, where this is written, looks out directly on Red Square, the brick walls and gilded spires of the Kremlin, and the severe marble pyramid beneath which lie the first Pharaohs of a new empire, Lenin and Stalin.

It all seems like a dream, from which one will momentarily waken, to watch the shuffling line of Soviet citizens moving two-by-two in a seemingly endless procession that winds around the Kremlin's ancient battlements, rain or shine.

Yet we are in the Soviet capital, one of the largest cities on earth (estimates vary from 5 to 7 million) and the very heart of the world revolution which has changed the lives and postwar hopes of all of us. And we got here, as ordinary tourists, much the same way you would hop a plane from Los Angeles to San Francisco.

START DELAYED

Aeroflot, the only Soviet airline, is not the only one in the world that gets you up at 6 a. m. to go to the airport and then tells you the flight will be delayed until noon. On the Leningrad-Moscow run there are two flights daily, but on most others planes fly only once or twice a week. So you don't just grab a standby card for the next plane.

The Russian version of a DC–3 which we finally boarded for Moscow was almost identical with the one in which we entered the Soviet Union, but it had no seat belts and the stewardess wore no uniform. We paid about $15 for overweight baggage as the limit of 20 kilograms each is less than that allowed on international flights.

Whether Moscow has smog like Leningrad, I may never know, for we saw nothing until we plunged down through the fog and leveled out just over the brown fields near Moscow Airport. I wondered how President Eisenhower's aerial inspection plan would work if Soviet skies are always overcast as they were every day but one during our stay there.

MET AT AIRPORT

Both the omnipresent Intourist guide and Dick O'Malley, chief of the Associated Press bureau, were there to meet us. We went with O'Malley in the only Chevrolet we saw in Moscow (plus 7 or 8 other American cars, owned by diplomats) for the 40-minute ride to town.

At first glance, Moscow is far more impressive than Leningrad. It is twice as big; automotive traffic is so heavy that traffic jams—the Russian word is actually "traffikdjam"—are quite common. People are better dressed—though there is no such thing as style in Soviet apparel—and appear more natural and content than in the northern city.

There is much evidence of new construction—mostly huge housing developments—with the peculiar portable cranes used by Russian masons silhouetted everywhere against the sky like huge storks.

FEW WORKMEN ON BUILDINGS

But oddly enough, with all the scaffolding, safety fences and piles of bricks, I seldom saw anyone actually working on these buildings. Maybe they do it at night.

The National Hotel, built in 1903 as a showplace of Czarist Moscow, is even more ornately decorated and furnished than the

Astoria in Leningrad. All "luxe" suites have pianos—ours was a Steinway—but our bathroom was a fright. The cusine, thank goodness, was better than in Leningrad—although the only really palatable meal is breakfast, since you can't do much to ruin a soft-boiled egg, and Russian ham is good.

REALLY TRY TO PLEASE

While it's impossible to avoid comparing Soviet food and service with American and European ways, I must add that the hotel staff and Intourist people were unfailingly attentive and accommodating, once we could make our wants known through the language barrier. Intourist obviously was ill-prepared for the "spirit of Geneva" and any great number of English-speaking tourists—though delegations of French, Germans (both East and West) and Asian nationalities are fairly frequent.

But the Intourist manager in Moscow, Mr. Rogov, and the woman guide assigned to us, Mrs. Zoya Novikova, really knocked themselves out to try to please. To an American, it takes a maddeningly long time to get anything done in Russia. But this is true almost everywhere in Asia and there is much truth in the old saying: "Scratch a Russian, find a Tartar." From a Russian viewpoint our Intourist staff worked miracle after miracle of red-tape cutting and arrangement-making. Nor would they accept any tips for their services, although, despite the official "no tipping" policy, hotel and restaurant workers seldom turn down an outstretched ruble.

Of course, the Intourist people tried to show us what they wanted us to see—as we would very likely do, come to think of it, in showing foreign (especially Russian) visitors around our own country. But they did make an effort to show us everything we wanted to see until we ran out of time, and bore our frequent changes in plans with Slavic patience.

ONLY OUTRIGHT REFUSAL

The only outright refusal we met was on a comparatively simple request to visit inside a typical Soviet home or flat of a city worker. This is the first thing anyone who is really trying to understand a foreign country better wants to do. But it is not done in the Soviet Union—the excuse is that it would be rude to invade a stranger's privacy—but the guide never asks you to his or her home instead. Social contact between Americans and Russians is almost nonexistent, despite the spirit of Geneva.

Moreover, aside from officials with whom I arranged interviews and the English-speaking intourist employees, I did not have a single informal conversation with a Soviet citizen during my entire stay. It was not for want of trying, nor entirely due to my ignorance of the Russian language. It just isn't done.

The result is that the diplomatic corps and the few foreigners living in Moscow for other reasons, such as press and radio correspondents, find themselves pretty much talking to each other. The passing tourist has no chance at all, and the next time I read a report by a fortnight visitor giving Americans the lowdown on what the Russian people are thinking, I'm not going to believe it any more than I'd believe Pravda on that subject.

One can, however, offer a few fast impressions—hardly more than hunches. I don't think there's going to be any revolution in the U. S. S. R. soon. The feel of discontent and desperation is not in the air; quite the contrary—that patient line of black-clad figures waiting to see Lenin's and Stalin's remains are not driven there with whips—they wait years for an admission card. Nor do I think anybody in the Soviet Union—rulers or ruled—wants war now. They want Mir—peace—because they have so much to do.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 10, 1955]

KREMLIN TYPIFIES COMMUNIST POWER, BUT IN ITS SHADOW NOBODY ARGUES POLITICS, TIMES PUBLISHER REPORTS

(This is the fifth of a series of articles in which Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, is reporting his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was airmailed uncensored from Moscow.)

(By Norman Chandler)

Moscow.—At night seven red stars, illuminated from within and constructed of ruby crystal, brood over Moscow from the seven towers of the Kremlin.

They are the symbols of Communist power at the center of an empire already larger than that of the Roman Caesars, whose imperial eagles they replaced, or that of the Mongol hordes against whose forays the first log walls of the Kremlin were built.

The present medieval walls were under construction when Columbus was discovering America, obviously with better brick and mortar than Soviet builders use now to erect buildings that begin to crumble after 2 or 3 years.

IMPORTED ARCHITECTS

Then, too, the imported Italian and Byzantine architects who built the Kremlin worked without the pitiless production norms which the Soviet system substitutes for competition in almost every phase of its economic life.

As a short sojourner, I cannot say that the Soviet system does not work. But I have seen enough to convince me that it doesn't work very well.

Laying aside for the moment considerations of individual freedoms which in our society are more highly valued than elsewhere, the Soviet economy seems to have done best in those endeavors which most resemble the discarded capitalist system. One of the first pure Marxist principles to go out the window was "to each according to his needs." Now there are all gradations of income—including some ruble millionaires—as a result of wage and salary incentives which recognize that all men are not equal in ability.

TALENT REWARDED

As in America, managerial and artistic talent command high incomes. Managers strive to show a profit, in which they share. The rest goes not to stockholders but to capital expansion, which is the primary goal.

But a curious thing about visiting the capital of the Communist world is that in the very shadow of the Kremlin nobody will argue politics with you or try to convert you to communism. You could do a lot better in Pershing Square.

I had only one real discussion in this vein, and that with Kromeinov, chief of the American section of Pravda. It was a most illuminating demonstration of the workings of an intelligent Soviet mind.

Kromeinov sat in at an interview I had with the acting editor of Pravda, a big, dark-haired gentleman named Zhukov, like the famous marshal. Zhukov did not speak English, nor I Russian, but we exchanged questions and answers of a technical nature while tea and cakes were served.

REACHES 4,900,000

Pravda has only 4 pages—newsprint is as scarce here as anywhere—but circulates to 4,900,000 readers throughout the Soviet Union. Matrices of its daily Moscow edition are rushed by jet aircraft to 14 distant cities, so that the word of the Kremlin, which Pravda speaks, goes out in identical form to every corner of the largest nation on earth.

I asked Zhukov if he felt the American press had been more friendly to the Soviet Union since Geneva. He said some. I asked if Pravda had taken a more peaceful tone toward the United States.

"The Soviet people have always had friendly feelings for the American people," Zhukov replied. "So we have not had to change. We have known President Eisenhower a long time—he has been here—and we have always been careful to respect him, although we have sometimes been rough with MCCARTHY and KNOWLAND. But your papers are always rough with our leaders."

SPECIFIC EXAMPLE

This scolding led me to ask for a specific example, whereupon Zhukov said, through the interpreter, he was most disappointed that Secretary Dulles had said the Soviet farm delegation should never have been allowed to tour the United States.

I said frankly I'd never heard of that, so he went for the TASS report from Washington. (TASS, the official Soviet news agency, serves 4,500 papers in the U. S. S. R. and exchanges news with agencies abroad, where it is served by 40 bureaus and some 200 correspondents. The deputy director of TASS, Mr. Vishnevski, in an earlier interview, gave me almost identical answers about the spirit of Geneva, as practiced by the United States.)

Kromeinov, whose English (and tailoring) reflected 5 years in the United States as a Pravda correspondent, produced the Dulles quotation and read it to us. Even after two translations, it was apparent that Dulles was saying he regretted the few protest demonstrations that occurred during the Soviet farm delegation's tour, and was afraid they would be magnified in Moscow. Or so I interpreted it, and said so.

ARGUE OVER MEANING

"Nyet," the Soviet editors chorused. Kromeinov quite seriously explained that Mr. Dulles regretted that American crowds had warmly welcomed the Soviet delegation, and wished they hadn't come.

We argued inconclusively about it for 15 minutes, and parted equally unconverted. Yet I am convinced my hosts absolutely believed everything they said. It gave me an eerie feeling, for newspapermen everywhere else can argue with certain facts mutually agreed upon. But here, with the one Russian I found willing and able to discuss the news in my language, I realized that the impenetrable Iron Curtain is not around the Soviet frontiers but around their minds.

I also interviewed the deputy head of the press section in the Soviet Foreign Ministry, which is housed in one of Moscow's seven skycrapers which average about 30 stories in height and dominate the flat terrain in every direction. This official (one always talks to deputies or assistants and wonders whether the head man is really on vacation in the Crimea), Khokov by name, was polite but uninformative.

"What is in our power we shall do," he replied to our specific requests, none of which was heard of further. For all questions concerning Soviet policy he had some variation of this answer: "It is very difficult to speak for the government now."

None of the Soviet officials I interviewed offered much more than courtesy, and I doubt if any of them could, except at the very top—nor would anyone say who is at the top just now. There are very few pictures on the walls of anyone except Lenin and Stalin, although I saw one each of Malenkov and Molotov and a couple of Bulganin. I saw

none of Khrushchev, who probably comes closer than anyone else to being the boss.

But if the Soviet authorities continue to complain that the American press is inaccurate in its information about their country, they have only themselves to blame. When you cannot communicate either with the government or the people of the Soviet Union, you can only look and surmise—and wonder.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 11, 1955]

LENIN AND STALIN VISITED IN DEATH—TIMES PUBLISHER VIEWS BODIES AND TAKES PICTURE IN KREMLIN ITSELF

(This is the sixth of a series of articles in which Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, is reporting his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was air mailed uncensored from Moscow.)

(By Norman Chandler)

Moscow.—If anyone had told me a year ago that today I would stand looking into the faces of Lenin and Stalin, inscrutable even in death, I would have questioned his sanity.

And if he had added that I would stroll within the walls of the Kremlin, nonchalantly snapping pictures of the very palace where Stalin lived and so many of his enemies died—while Red army sentries watched with equal nonchalance—I would have sent for the padded wagon.

Yet it was actually as easy to arrange as a tour of the White House.

CITY IN ITSELF

The Kremlin is not a single building, but a collection of palaces, churches, government buildings, and barracks surrounded by a brick wall. On a hillock at the junction of the Moscow and Neglinnaia Rivers, it was the fortified center of the ancient city. Behind its pentagonal wooden walls the first Muscovites defied the Tartar Khans and later czars stored up treasures while the Communist regime, for all its theoretical disdain of wealth, has carefully preserved.

An American tourist is by no means free to roam the Kremlin at will. But since last July—coincident with the Geneva Conference—parts of this once mysterious citadel of the Communist world have been open to visitors, Soviet citizens and foreigns alike.

It may be symbolic of the authority which resides in the Kremlin that inside it is the only place I saw in the Soviet Union where pedestrians—and most Russians are—pay the slightest attention to crosswalks or traffic cops. Elsewhere it's a hair-raising contest between man and machine in which miraculously nobody seems to get hurt or even angry.

FABULOUS COLLECTION

The area of the Kremlin open to sightseers contains one of the world's most fabulous collections of medieval armor, weapons, court and clerical clothing, and the rich gifts of princes and potentates to the imperial Czars. You can also see the cluster of Russian Orthodox churches, now museums, in which the czars worshipped, were crowned and finally entombed, even during the two centuries when the capital was moved to St. Petersburg (Leningrad).

Unlike Stalin, today's top Soviet leaders no longer live in the Kremlin. They have luxurious (by Soviet standards) apartments or houses in town and summer dachas in the country.

Except for the Foreign Ministry, which is located in 1 of Moscow's 7 skyscrapers which average about 30 stories high, most of the principal Soviet Government offices are housed in the Kremlin; in an area where tourists do not wander.

MONOPOLY ON BEST CARS

These high-ranking Communist officials are instantly recognizable because they have a virtual monopoly of the best Soviet-made car, the Zis, a big, black limousine which somewhat resembles a 1947 Packard. They whiz out of the Spasskaia (Saviour's Tower) into Red Square, the rear seat always curtained, and always at a high rate of speed. One afternoon, taking a snapshot of colorful St. Basil's Church, I was almost run down by Georgi Malenkov, who observers say is still very much around despite his apparent demotion.

It is here in Red Square, just under the Kremlin walls, that the two saints of the new religion are enshrined in a handsome mausoleum of red Ukrainian granite and black labradorite. Severely modern, in contrast to its medieval surroundings, the pyramidal tomb was erected originally for the embalmed body of Lenin alone. But room was made for Stalin when he died, permitting irreverant foreigners in Moscow to coin the title "The Gruesome Twosome."

WAITING LINE IMPRESSIVE

Not knowing quite what to expect, I ate lightly before paying my respects, but the experience was neither gruesome nor particularly moving. The really impressive thing, to an American, is the half mile-long line of Soviet citizens waiting, inching forward, their clothing a dreary black, their faces expressionless masks.

Our intourist guide flashed a pass at the cordon of police and we walked briskly—it is too cool for a California topcoat in Moscow—past the long waiting line. I asked if foreigners cutting in at the head of the line didn't make these patient Soviet people a little annoyed.

"Oh, no," she said. "They consider that you are the guests of the Soviet Union."

ALL REMOVE HATS

I removed my hat at the entrance as automatically as I had seen crowds of supposedly atheistic Soviet citizens do upon entering a former church. If I had not, I might not have got past the two ramrod stiff Red Army sentries with fixed bayonets.

Inside, two-by-two, the procession filed down the marble stairs and around the glass caskets. Four more soldiers stand at each corner, almost as still as their former masters. Only the faces and hands of the bodies are visible, and whether they are real or exceedingly good wax casts you cannot tell in the dim, funereal lighting. Stalin looks more lifelike than Lenin, who has been there a lot longer.

Not a sound is heard save the shuffling of feet, as the Soviet people pass by the remains of this once-powerful pair who discarded the immortal soul as a superstitious opiate. No sobs are heard, and when one reaches daylight again, no tears can be seen.

FACES BLANK MASKS

The faces of the Soviet citizens emerging from the tomb—which many of them have waited 4 or 5 years to enter—are the same blank masks I saw when they filed in.

What does this mean? You never find out.

Even more incredible than shooting snapshots inside the Kremlin, or passing Lenin's and Stalin's biers, is this: Throughout my stay in the Soviet Union I did not talk informally with one single ordinary Russian.

I had scheduled interviews with Soviet officials. I asked questions and got civil answers from Intourist guides and hotel employees. But not once was I alone with a Russian for just a friendly chat. I thought prhaps this was because I spoke no Russian, or because we were there only a short time.

But I was told by our Embassy officials that foreigners who have lived in the Soviet Union for years, and speak Russian fluently, have never had a real heart-to-heart talk with a Russian either. It still isn't done, despite the "spirit of Geneva."

That "spirit" gets you inside the country, but not inside its people.

Norman Chandler's Visit Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, the following are the seventh, eighth, and ninth in the series of articles by Mr. Norman Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times, in which he describes his experiences behind the Iron Curtain. These articles appeared in the Los Angeles Times on November 13, 14, and 15, 1955:

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 13, 1955]

CULTURE IN RUSSIA IMPRESS VISITORS—COMMAND THEATER PERFORMANCE IS HIGHLIGHT FOR TIMES PUBLISHER

(This is the seventh of a series of articles in which Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, is reporting his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was air-mailed uncensored from Moscow.)

(By Norman Chandler)

Moscow.—The play's the thing, as Shakespeare said, in the Soviet Union.

When it comes to showmanship, the Russians really excel. But like everything else they do, there is a coldly calculated purpose behind the Communists' preoccupation with culture and the arts. They are not, it seemed to me, an end to be enjoyed in themselves, but a means to further the goals of the all-powerful Soviet state.

Mrs. Chandler is the expert in our family on music and the theater. Doors opened readily for her in the Soviet Ministry of Culture and VOKS, the Society for Cultural Exchanges. We found ourselves on the invitation lists for special closed performances at the century-old Bolshoi Theater and saw the best in Soviet talent.

COMMAND PERFORMANCE

While I was unimpressed and have been frankly critical of many phases of Soviet life, the standard of their cultural presentations is very impressive, indeed. To me, the most memorable experience was a command performance given in honor of visiting Premier U Nu of Burma by the Turkmen Soviet Republic chorus.

Soviet Prime Minister Bulganin, whose genial grandfatherly appearance is perfectly suited to the new spirit of Geneva line, sat beside his Burmese guest in the royal box. Behind were other Soviet leaders, including Foreign Minister Molotov, ex-Premier Malenkov, Kaganovich—almost all of the Presidium members except Khrushchev, who was reportedly out of town. Our seats were in the orchestra not 50 yards from this galaxy of ordinary-looking men whose word is law over half the world.

The Turkmen Republic is one of the 15 units of the Soviet Union, in the south adjoining Turkey and Iran. Its people speak a Turkish dialect and are, or were, Moslems. The spectacle emphasized the oriental character of the U. S. S. R., which too many westerners overlook.

BIGWIGS AT LAST PERFORMANCE

These national troupes are invited regularly to perform in Moscow—for the Soviets make a great pretense that they are semi-autonomous, though they have less independence than Los Angeles County has from Washington. The final performance is usually attended by the Kremlin bigwigs and invited guests.

I must say the costuming, staging, and lighting of the spectacle were magnificent. The massed chorus and wild Turkmen dances also were superb and unique. Individual artists were not outstanding, but they gave their best for Bulganinn & Co., who applauded for repeated encores.

Technically, Le Ballet Sovietique, a Soviet folk ballet now touring Europe, which we saw in Paris before coming here, and the dancing of the Soviet's Prima Ballerina Ulanova, whom we saw in the colorful Tartar legend, "The Fountains of Bacheserai," were far more polished and professional.

INGENIOUS STAGE EFFECTS

There were ingenious stage effects, too, such as realistic churning waves of the sea in Rimsky-Korsakov's opera Sadko. But the Turkmen command performance was unforgetable, for it demonstrated perfectly the uses of culture in the U. S. S. R.

Circuses in lieu of bread are an old gimmick of dictators from Caesar to Hitler. But the Soviet idea is more subtle. All the richness and splendor seen on the stage is a promise of a brighter tomorrow to dispel the drab realities of today.

The emphasis on culture in every school and peoples' club permits the only kind of self-expression the Soviet people are allowed, and enables them to feel as civilized as any other nation—or more so—despite the contrary evidence all about them. "Uncultured" is a common term of insult in modern Russian, often applied to Americans in the pre-Geneva era.

IMPRESSIVE FAIR

The same substitution of an impressive display for reality was shown us in the Moscow agricultural fair. This was a truly beautiful exhibition of the products of Soviet agriculture and industry, not for foreigners but for visitors from all parts of the U. S. S. R.

Each of the 15 Soviet Republics has a pavilion in its own architectural style, showing the various products—cereals, fruits, textiles, furs, farm machinery, etc.—in tasteful displays. Excellent photographs and murals decorate the walls along with graphs showing production today as compared with the past—and shooting upward toward a future goal.

This is not the way life is in the Soviet Union today. It is the promise of the way it will be tomorrow if everyone works a little harder. And dubious as an American visitor is inclined to be, he cannot help being impressed—unless he goes out into the country and sees what Soviet agriculture is really like.

I confess I almost canceled our planned tour of a collective farm. I assumed it would be a model farm especially set aside for foreign tourists and far superior to the real thing. Our intourist guide admitted that it was hardly typical because it was so close—about 30 miles—to a large city. But I'm glad I changed my mind and went.

The guide and the woman director of the collective farm—which is named Molotov Kolhoz, after the Foreign Minister—were obviously proud as punch of its accomplishments. This farm supports 285 families, they explained, from 4 villages round about. They have 160 milk cows and 326 head of livestock in all. They raise their own feed, poultry, and hothouse tomatoes; sell some of their surplus to the state at low fixed prices and the balance in the free market for whatever the traffic will bear.

DAIRY UNSANITARY

If this was a better-than-average farm, I can understand why the Soviet farm delegation was so impressed on its tour of America. The dairy was indescribably unsanitary, though it had milking machines and an electric refrigerating unit to cool the milk. The rest of the layout, I'm sorry to say, was even more primitive. I have seen nothing as bad in America or Western Europe—yet this was a kolhoz they proudly show to tourists.

Along the road we passed the first individual homes we saw in the Soviet Union, old Russian log houses being thatched with straw for the winter. The paved road itself was easily up to the European standard, at least as far as we went, but the fields appeared poorly developed and animals were few. There are more churches open in the country, and more smiles for strangers, than in the cities.

In one day the model collective farm and the brilliant Bolshoi ballet taught me more about the Soviet Union than 100 books.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 14, 1955]

WARMER RECEPTION FOUND IN LATVIA—RIGA CITIZENS MORE LIKE WESTERN EUROPEANS, TIMES PUBLISHER WRITES

(This is the eighth of a series of articles in which Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, is reporting his observations in the Soviet Union and some of its neighbors. It was airmailed uncensored from Riga.)

(By Norman Chandler)

RIGA.—Few if any Americans have been allowed to see this former capital of Latvia, 1 of the 3 Baltic nations swallowed up by the Soviet Union just before the last war. United States Congressmen touring the U. S. S. R. this summer were turned down when they asked to come here.

But here we are, Mrs. Chandler; Bob Hartmann, our Washington bureau chief, and I, and we got here without even trying. Intourist, the official Soviet travel agency, matter-of-factly routed us through here when we said we wanted to fly to Prague, Czechoslovakia.

True, all we saw of Riga was a fleeting glimpse of much shipbuilding activity as our plane circled for a landing, plus the new airport terminal which is better than either Moscow's or Leningrad's. We saw enough, however, to convince us that Latvia, now consolidated with Lithuania and Esthonia as one republic in the Soviet Union, is a far more European and civilized land than anything we saw in Russia proper.

WESTERNERS ENFOLDED

The Soviet people, imprisoned within their own frontiers and knowing nothing of the outside world except what they are told, don't know how bad off they are. The new generation has absolutely no basis for comparison. But the tragedy of the Iron Curtain is that it has enfolded people like these who for centuries have been part of the Western World.

Even under Communist rule, you detect instantly from the warmth and genuine cordiality of these captive peoples that they are a different breed from the carefully correct but cold Russians. If the spirit of Geneva permits more movement of Americans and other free peoples through these borderlands, it will help to maintain at least a slight contact between them and the world to which they really belong.

THROUGH CUSTOMS

Here in Riga, our checkout point for leaving the Soviet Union(we were again whisked through customs and passport control without a bag being opened. However, it is forbidden to take Soviet money out of the country—not that it is worth anything abroad, but it is a regulation.

Between us we had about 100 rubles ($25 in United States money) which we had been unable to spend, since there is little in the Soviet Union one wants or can afford to buy. To see whether the money regulation was a shakedown and if our rubles would wind up in the pocket of the customs officer, we declared them.

"You will have to surrender them and we will give you a receipt," the interpreter said. "If you return to the Soviet Union within 3 years, you can get them back."

I had a hunch I wouldn't be returning that soon, if ever; so I asked if I could spend them at the airport. The plane was due to take off in a few minutes. Then, wonder of wonders, the customs officer himself accompanied us to the airport restaurant and into the kitchen, which was the cleanest I saw in Russia. He made sure I spent every last ruble for small jars of caviar, and refused a tip for his courtesy.

LAST HUMAN CONTACT

As we dashed for the waiting plane, he smiled and shook bands heartily. It was the most human contact I had with a Soviet citizen—and the last. But I must add that the same kind of meticulous honesty prevailed everywhere. Nobody shortchanged us Americans, bewildered by strange sums in rubles and kopeks.

Though we left valuable and hard-to-get items in our hotel rooms—the ancient locks of which I'm sure everyone in the hotel could open—not a thing was stolen, not even money left purposely for the chambermaid.

In the Czech plane, Soviet-built, but run with considerably more service to passengers than Aeroflot provides, I looked out the window at the neatly cultivated farms and picture-postcard villages of Czechoslovakia and tried to set down in retrospect a few impressions of a tourist's trip through the Soviet Union.

RANDOM OBSERVATIONS

Here they are at random:

In the very best hotels and restaurants of Moscow—which are none too good and charge $20 for dinner—alongside well-to-do Soviet officials and visiting dignitaries you often see slovenly, dirty people, with no neckties or coats, living it up noisily. They are workers or minor party stalwarts, presumably, who have been given a Moscow holiday as a reward for surpassing their production quotas.

During my entire stay in the U. S. S. R. I did not see a single well-dressed or attractive woman. Whenever we walked about the streets, Mrs. Chandler was stared at—not rudely but with evident curiosity and envy—although male Americans don't seem to attract much attention. Even in the best state stores, such as GUM on Red Square, women's fashions are devoid of any style. Maybe this is because the models are selected by men.

CHILDREN SEEM HAPPIEST

Children seem to be the happiest and healthiest of Soviet citizens. Parents appear to make a lot of their youngsters but, contrary to my experience in most countries, you cannot penetrate the language barrier by admiring the young ones.

Translating Soviet prices into United States dollars is somewhat misleading due to the artificial exchange rate. But figuring the average city worker's wage is something like $200 a month, it's hard to understand store-window prices equal to $60 to $120 for a pair of women's shoes; $600 and up for a 10-inch television set; $37 for an ordinary alarm clock; and $2,000 for an Austin-sized Moskvitch car.

CLEANER THAN LOS ANGELES

Mrs. Chandler went shopping in the free market where farmers can sell any surpluses over what they must deliver to the state stores at low fixed prices. She paid $5.50 for two pears and a small bunch of grapes.

Moscow streets are remarkably clean for a big city—cleaner than Los Angeles, I'm ashamed to admit. Public transport services also seem better, especially the subway system, which is the most modern I've ever seen, with each station an immaculate marble palace equipped with escalators.

But behind the facade of imposing buildings lining Gorky Street in downtown Moscow I found some of the darkest, most odoriferous alleys and wretched slums imaginable. Yet I have to say nobody stopped me from exploring them

There is a terrible sameness about all the people in Moscow. While the Communists make much of racial minority problems in other lands, I saw no Negroes and only a few orientals—Red Chinese army officers or tourists like myself. And the Russians not only look a lot alike, but have very little variety in dress, except for uniforms, which are not as prevalent as I had expected.

VISITORS NOT WANTED

The Soviet Union certainly is not ready to receive any numbers of American or western tourists who demand minimum service and fair food. But the Kremlin doesn't want visitors for their dollars or to show them a good time.

Like everything else in the planned Soviet society, there is a deadly serious purpose behind the slight parting of the Iron Curtain of which we were early beneficiaries.

The reason is to convince the world, and America in particular, that the spirit of Geneva is genuine. But the real test is not whether the Soviet authorities will let more foreigners in, but whether they will let any considerable number of their own people out.

Frankly, I don't think they dare to.

[From the Los Angeles Times of November 15, 1955]

CZECHS FRIENDLIER TO UNITED STATES THAN RUSS—PUBLISHER HAS CHILLING NIGHTMARE WHEN HE LEAVES PRAGUE, HOWEVER

(This is the concluding article in a series of reports by Norman Chandler, publisher of the Times, on his recent tour of the Soviet Union and some of its near neighbors.)

(By Norman Chandler)

VIENNA.—The last Soviet soldier left here 3 weeks ago. And you don't know how glad I am.

I never return from a foreign trip to the United States without a renewed feeling of thanksgiving that I had the good fortune to be born an American citizen. But today, as I stepped off a Czechoslovak Airlines plane from Prague, I almost kissed the soil of Austria in my relief to be back in the free world.

This was a curious reaction, because not once within the Soviet Union had I experienced the slightest sensation of danger or dread. In fact, Mrs. Chandler, Bob Hartmann, chief of the Times Washington Bureau, and I found it so much simpler to move around in the U. S. S. R. than we had imagined that, for a moment, we let our guard down and almost didn't get out.

NIGHTMARE

What happened to us in Prague on the last leg of our journey was a spine-chilling nightmare right out of an Alfred Hitchcock thriller.

We found Czechoslovakia, a picture-postcard country, much like Austria or Switzerland in outward appearance, a sharp contrast to the Soviet Union.

Even under a Communist satellite government, the Czechs like America and the Western World so much they can't conceal it. They are a friendly people, who historically belong to the free world. Although the Iron Curtain has fallen around them and the red flag of the U. S. S. R. flies alongside theirs, they still remember freedom and strive desperately to show their yearning in many subtle ways.

GENUINE SMILES

In contrast to the mechanical and dutiful politeness we found in Moscow, every Czech we saw had a genuine smile and made an extra effort to accommodate Americans. There was a certain spontaneous gaiety and humanity in the coffee houses and on the streets which we never saw in the Soviet Union.

While the Czechs apparently import very little from the West, there is more variety and a better quality of goods in their stores. Their industry, now thoroughly socialized but still benefiting from past managerial know-how and skilled labor, is flooding markets in Eastern Europe and the Middle East.

The Alcron Hotel in Prague was so superior to any we saw in the Soviet Union, the food and service so much better, and the couples dancing to a pleasant little orchestra's American and Latin tunes so normal that for a while I almost imagined I was outside the Iron Curtain.

SORRY TO LEAVE

We were genuinely sorry to leave Prague, after seeing a few of its historic monuments that speak eloquently of Czechoslovakia's contributions to Christian civilization. But our plane connection at Vienna was extremely close, so we started for the airport in plenty of time. Outside, I noticed a Chevrolet with a small Ameircan flag on its fender.

As in arriving, we breezed through customs and headed for the field when the Czech airline ground hostess came running after us.

"You have no exit visa," she said apologetically. "Without it you cannot leave the country."

"What do we have to do?" I asked. "Why didn't anyone tell us?"

"You must go to the Foreign Ministry, back in town. Or perhaps to your Embassy," she said.

IN KREMLIN'S POWER

In that second I suddenly was aware how utterly helpless any American actually is once he crosses the invisible line that marks off the Communist world. For all our illusion of security, we had been completely in the Kremlin's power all the time. And this is how every resident of the peoples' democracies must feel every day of his life.

Then I remembered that tiny American flag on the Chevrolet parked outside. I told the Czech hostess about it and for an instant she hesitated. Then she said: "I will see if I can find someone from the American Embassy. It will be all right."

She returned with Col. Thomas Ryan, United States Air Attaché in Prague. He was there to see some friends off on another flight but readily rushed to our rescue. I can't remember when a friendly American face ever looked so good.

AGONIZING MINUTES

To make a long story short, Colonel Ryan called the Embassy, the Embassy called the Czech Foreign Office, Czech Airlines held the plane, and we waited to see if the Czech authorities would telephone permission for us to depart. They did, after 20 agonizing minutes, and we took off for Vienna.

When we crossed the Soviet frontier from Finland a fortnight ago I felt no qualms at all. But when we left Czechoslovakia behind us and the copilot said we were over Austria, I found myself suddenly relaxed and indescribably weary.

We chatted gaily about our future plans, and waited for the plane to let down at Vienna. But as we approached the runway Mrs. Chandler whispered:

"This isn't Vienna at all—they've taken us somewhere else."

We looked at the terminal. The sign read "Prague."

FOG CLOSES IN

They explained that fog had closed in over Vienna, but by now we were not sure. We had been through the Iron Curtain and now we were back. Two plump women who were the only other passengers in the plane now looked suspiciously like secret police agents. I fumbled guiltily in my pocket with the few Soviet kopeks I'd taken out of the country for my grandchildren.

Actually nothing was wrong but the weather. After 2 hours we took off again, and this time we made it. The Viennese officials at the airport all seemed like long-lost brothers. The Viennese hostesses were all beautiful. Best of all there was Charles B. Edmonds, our unfailingly helpful friend from TWA who had waited outside the Iron Curtain for us, with everything efficiently prearranged for the rest of our journey.

TELLS OF HOPES

I hope the day will come when Americans and Russians can visit each other's countries, learn to understand each other better, and make real and lasting friendships as we do in other distant lands.

I hope someday it will be possible for a traveler to leave Russia with happy memories, hoping to return again.

But from what I've seen I'm afraid that day is not very near. No one can know the difference between the two worlds, free and slave, until he has been in both.

What Labor Wants in a Health Insurance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, in the Machinists Monthly Journal of September-October 1955 there appeared such an interesting article regarding health insurance that I feel that my honorable colleagues who may have missed it will be most interested in reading it, and, with the express permission of its author, Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, I wish to insert it in the RECORD.

The article follows:

WHAT LABOR WANTS IN A HEALTH INSURANCE PLAN

(Address by A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, before the 1955 convention of the American Hospital Association, Atlantic City, N. J., September 20, 1955)

I am extremely grateful for this opportunity of discussing with you the topic of the health opportunities of the American people, for that is precisely what is embodied in the subject assigned to me—What Labor Wants in a Health Insurance Plan—no more, and not a whit less.

Many folks who are strangers to the American labor movement, its history and its philosophy, are inclined to look upon us as a self-seeking group, whose recent growth and forthcoming unity are causes for anxiety. But objective persons, who are acquainted with our aspirations and our programs know that our interest spreads far beyond the immediate ranks of organized labor, to encompass the good and welfare of all our fellow countrymen. Nowhere is this more evident than in our position regarding health insurance.

To me, as a representative of organized labor, as a consumer of medical services, and above all as an American, nothing is more important than the health and the health opportunities of our people.

As a worker in American industry I learned early the tragedy of inadequate and improper health care. As a consumer of medical service I came to know the severe drain on the family budget of proper care.

As an American, in this midtwentieth century, I rate the health and the education

of the American people as one of our greatest national assets, and its improvement as one of our most important and immediate goals. This is not a question of welfare work, or of namby-pamby do-goodism. It is a matter of stark survival in an era of tensions and tempests.

We cannot tell at this point what fruit the recent summit conference at Geneva will bear. We can only hope. But this I do know from my trade-union experience—and don't forget that American unions have long been the target of Communist infiltration and strategems—this I do know—that until the Communist tiger changes his stripes, the tension between the free world and the Soviet-dominated nations will alternately diminish and grow with the ever-present danger of a shooting war.

This being the case, it is up to us to preserve and to improve our relative advantages on the world stage.

It would be conservative to say that insofar as natural resources are concerned, the free world and the Communist world are on even terms. And that may be underestimating the potential resources of Russia and her satellites.

So far as manpower goes, the Communists have by far the advantage in sheer numbers.

The strength of the free world—and it is still largely centered in Canada and the United States despite the rapid economic recovery and development of our allies in freedom—lies in industrial know-how and the quality of our manpower.

Technical development is not the primary concern of a union official. We entrust that important phase of our national potential to management and its competent corps of engineers. But by the very nature of my union position I am vitally concerned with the men and women who carry out the techniques and operate the machines of industry. And one of the most certain ways to insure their presence on the job and to improve their productive capacities is to cut down on the absences and the inefficiencies which stem from ill health.

NOTHING PERSONAL

You will forgive me, then, if I am blunt. Try to think of me in the light of the Irish patriot during the Black and Tan wars of 30 years ago. According to an account I heard, that fighter for freedom was concealed in some bushes along a highway when a member of the British Tans appeared. The Irishman set the bolt of his rifle, and the Englishman turned at the click. Looking his intended victim squarely in the face, the Irishman said, "I hope you realize there's nothing personal in this"—and squeezed the trigger.

You and I, of course, are allies, not adversaries, but the point still holds: I hope you realize there is nothing personal in what I may have to say. Indeed, I hope that what I have to say will contribute to our mutual understanding of the job to be done, so that we may work together to help develop some plan of insurance which will meet the health needs of the American people.

As representatives of America's hospitals, which constitute one of our more important health facilities, you are to be commended on the 25th anniversary of Blue Cross. The inception of that nonprofit community plan of insurance a quarter century ago marked the beginning of an era which has seen more and more people, and more and more families, enrolled under some type of health insurance, until today well over half of our countrymen have some sort of medical care insurance.

As trailblazer and pace setter, Blue Cross has a proud history. Beyond the mediate service embodied in its benefits, Blue Cross has contributed much to the health education and the health facilities of Americans. It has increased the understanding of the assets and facilities of good health, and the value of prepayment in meeting their costs. It has helped in expanding and improving hospital facilities. And through such devices as Health Services, Inc., and the Inter-Plan Service Benefit Bank, Blue Cross has helped toward meeting the needs for a national plan of hospital insurance without sacrificing the benefits of community interest and community control.

As a representative of the consumers of medical care services, I am happy to be here to congratulate Blue Cross on its silver anniversary.

In its inception, Blue Cross was a consumer-sponsored plan, although not a cooperative in the true sense of the word. It is natural that a group of consumers would start off with some plan of insuring against the costs of hospitalization, because hospitalization is one of our more expensive medical care services. And it is just as natural for hospitals to aid in the establishment and development of such a plan.

Now there is no doubt about the value or the necessity for some means of insuring against the cost of hospitalization. But, from the broader health viewpoint, didn't we actually put the cart before the horse by starting out with hospitalization insurance? Properly considered, hospitalization is not really health insurance at all, but rather insurance against one of the high costs of neglected health.

This same approach to the problem marks most of the so-called health insurance plans currently available. Very few of them provide in any way for the medical services essential to good health; all of them stress protection against the costs of ill health. In addition, many of them depart from the service principle embodied in the Blue Cross plan and operate purely on an indemnity basis.

But, to return briefly to what might be termed our negative approach to health insurance, let me cite an example offered by the Blue Cross plan in Washington, D. C.—Group Hospitalization, Inc.

LET'S NOT FORGET PREVENTIVE MEDICINE

In recent months Group Hospitalization has stepped up its promotion and advertising program, evidently to meet the competition of inferior plans which have been using glib talk on the air and in direct mail to seduce unwary searchers after health insurance. I am completely in accord with the stepped up Blue Cross campaign. But consider its approach. We are told as we listen to the radio that in the next 12 months 1 out of every 3 families in Washington will need hospitalization for 1 of its members. Therefore, enroll now in Group Hospitalization. Granted the truth of the figures—which are appalling—shouldn't we ask ourselves this question, How many of those people who will need hospitalization could have been kept out of hospitals by preventive medicine or early diagnosis and treatment?

A NEW APPROACH NEEDED

And that is exactly the kind of question we have been avoiding all along the line in our fragmentized, cart-before-the-horse approach to health insurance. It is high time, I believe, that we stopped emphasizing insurance against the high cost of neglected health, and devoted more of our efforts to developing a system of insurance or prepayment which will give the American people greater access to the kind of health care which prevents illness or nips it in the bud. This approach to the problem is logical; it is economical, and it is practical.

What labor wants first in a health insurance plan is that it be comprehensive, running the gamut from periodic physical checkups to care for long-term or catastrophic illness. A plan which creates the incentive to keep well and which encourages health education, periodical checkups, early diagnosis, and treatment.

The results of our fragmentized, cart-before-the-horse system are costly, and sometimes ludicrous. Now mind you I have the greatest admiration for Blue Cross, and the Blue Shield plan which so often is integrated with it these days. But limiting Blue Shield benefits to medical and surgical services performed in hospitals can have ridiculous and wasteful results. Several years ago in one of our Washington, D. C., newspapers there was a letter to the editor from a perplexed subscriber to Blue Cross-Blue Shield. His son had his arm broken in an accident. The mother rushed the boy to the office of the family doctor, about 3 miles away, and the physician set the arm. Application for Blue Shield benefits was denied because the arm had not been set in a hospital. And the bewildered father, in his letter to the editor, wondered why it should be required that the service be performed in a hospital, with the nearest hospital 15 miles away, when the job could be, and was, done satisfactorily in the doctor's office. I can find no logical answer to that question. And I certainly can see no sense to requiring hospitals, which are generally overtaxed with work, making space and facilities available for medical services which can be performed just as well in the patient's home or the physician's office.

Labor's second desire in a health-insurance plan is corollary to the first and equal to it in importance—and that is that the plan should be based on the service, rather than the indemnity, principle.

The application of indemnity features in accident and health insurance has always baffled me. I know of no other field of insurance in which so many price tags appear. For example, I have collision insurance on my car. Of course, it has a $50 deductible clause, a principle, by the way, which I consider wholly inapplicable to health insurance. But nowhere in the policy do I find anything which says the company will pay so much for a crumpled fender, so much for a sprung door, or so much for a broken windshield. If the car is in a collision I take it to a repair shop, after proper arrangements have been made, and have the damage repaired at the expense of the insurance company.

But when it comes to the human body the insurance companies go around hanging price tags on the allowable price for services to remove ailing tonsils or appendixes or to set broken limbs.

Beyond this there are grounds for believing that the application of the indemnity to surgical and medical insurance has played a part in increasing the cost of medical care. Many unions' negotiated health plans are underwritten on the indemnity basis. That may sound at odds with what I am saying about labor's wants in health insurance, but when unions started negotiating health and welfare plans they had to take what was available. In case after case where the union negotiates higher schedule benefits in an attempt to relieve the covered employees of additional medical costs, the level of medical charges rises soon after, leaving the covered employees no better off than they were before. Now, this phenomenon may be logical in the light of the sliding-fee system medical charge based on ability to pay, since, in a way, the insurance benefits constitute an additional resource to the patient. But the ultimate result will be to convert health insurance to a benefit plan for the physicians.

The important question is not how many dollars the company paid out to Mary Smith when she came down with pneumonia (although that might make good advertising copy), but whether or not Mary Smith received the care necessary to restore her quickly and certainly to good health. And that latter question can be answered only in terms of service, not cash benefits. Beyond that, in judging the adequacy of a health insurance plan we must always pose the question, Could the illness have been prevented,

or at least cured before it became serious enough to require major medical services?

PLAN WANTED FOR ALL

In addition to desiring a health insurance plan which provides comprehensive medical services, labor wants a plan that is available on a universal basis.

In discussing coverage of health insurance, let us rule out immediately any consideration of the type of so-called health insurance which is sold on an individual basis. That type of plan may be defended on the basis that something—anything—is better than nothing. It has no other recommendations. Its costs are high. Its benefits are few and limited. And its cancellable features—however necessary they may be from an actuarial point of view—make it subject to grave and often-practiced abuses. It has no place in any serious discussion of desirable health insurances.

Our fragmentized approach to health insurance has resulted in a variety of group plans, most of them tied to employment for a specified employer or residence in a specific community, or both. This is a grave weakness in the light of the tremendous geographical shifts in population and industrial shifts in labor force which have marked the past 16 years. It will become even more grave in the future with such factors as decentralization of industry, automation, and atomic energy promising continuing shifts in the population and the labor force.

While practical considerations may dictate that a health-insurance plan be applied basically to employed persons and their dependents, parallel provisions must be made for the unemployed, the retired, the chronically ill, and other groups of people who need the protection of health insurance but who are not in the employed labor force.

Blue Cross has already demonstrated the possibility of developing coverage on a national basis and of extending protection to such groups as farmers and retired workers, and even, in cooperation with the Veterans' Administration, to groups of people needing hospital and medical care who are generally considered noninsurable. These pioneering ventures of Blue Cross are worthwhile guides in the development of universal comprehensive-service health insurance.

EMPLOYERS' ROLE IN FINANCING

As to the financing of health insurance for the employed population, labor believes that the cost should be borne, in part at least, by employers. Under many negotiated health and welfare plans, employers bear the entire cost and find it a sound investment. In order to make it possible for every employed person to enjoy the full benefits of a health and welfare plan, the charges must be computed in terms of percentage of wages and salary rather than on a flat-fee basis.

So far as the administration of health insurance is concerned, labor believes strongly that the consuming public should have a voice in decisions relating to the economic, as distinguished from the purely medical or professional, aspects of any plan.

Finally, labor believes strongly that any universal plan of health insurance must be carefully coordinated with an overall plan for the development of our health facilities and medical personnel.

William S. McNary, executive vice president and general manager of the Michigan Hospital Service, summed this need up neatly when he testified several years ago before the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation on an evaluation of Blue Cross plans. This is what he said:

"Just putting money in the hands of the people will not solve the problem. For instance, if we in Blue Cross were to double our enrollment in the next 30 days, the result would probably be the nationwide collapse of our hospital and medical services."

We are woefully short in medical and parimedical personnel, and in many medical facilities. And we of labor believe that the need for additional personnel and facilities is too acute to be left to the slow process of gradual evolution. The Hill-Burton hospital construction program is an example of how the Federal Government can assist its citizens in meeting their health needs by helping to overcome existing shortages. Similar programs should be developed to aid medical and nursing schools and institutions for training parimedical personnel. And financial assistance should be provided ot competent candidates for the medical profession.

In addition to an overall shortage in medical personnel and facilities, our existing resources are badly distributed among our people. Labor believes that the hospitals, which are developing into medical centers, can help solve this problem of maldistribution through a system of branch hospitals, which will aid both patients and physicians in rural and remote areas by bringing to them the facilities and know-how of modern medicine.

This—in summary—is what labor wants in a health-insurance plan: A system of universal, comprehensive service health insurance, with consumer or public representation at the economic policymaking level, carefully tied in with a comprehensive Federal program for developing the personnel and facilities to make it work.

That is a large order. We of labor know it. And we realize, too, that it will not come over night. But nothing short of that program will enable us of the United States to accomplish what we must accomplish to conserve and develop the healthy, skilled manpower needed to meet the growing peacetime needs of our dynamic economy and to keep up strong and alert on the international scene.

We know that such a program is practical. We have seen such plans developed and work in the crucible of experience. As one outstanding example, consider the Labor Health Institute of St. Louis, Mo. Here is a description of that plan which appeared recently in a thought-provoking discussion of the subject Are Medical Centers the Answer, by the publishers of Employee Benefit Plan Review and Research Reports:

"It provides complete, comprehensive medical services through a group practice medical center, but with the addition of home and hospital care. * * *

"The services include general medical, specialist, and surgical care, with the usual ancillary services; hospitalization up to 90 days each year, complete dental services except for dentures, visiting nurse service, drugs at special rates, and eyeglasses at a discount. The average out-of-pocket expenses of an average institute member's family in 1951–52 were only $37."

As the report noted earlier, "this is presumably the most expensive" form of health insurance. Yet in the fiscal year 1951–52, contributions to the plan, which are based upon a percentage of wages, averaged $130.05 for a worker and his family, and $58.63 for an individual.

So far as results are concerned, the employers, who bear the entire cost of the plan, find their contributions to be a worthwhile investment in good health. Days lost by illness among institute members averages 3 days in 1952, as against a generally accepted national average of 7 to 8.

There is positive proof that comprehensive health services can be furnished economically and efficiently. The only question from the national viewpoint is how?

We of labor believe that the answer to that question rests with the medical and related professions and the insurance people. If they succeed in developing voluntary, nonprofit plans like Blue Cross, and in obtaining Government assistance in meeting the health needs of the aged, the unemployed, the indigent, and the chronically ill, perhaps the results will be achieved through privately operated systems. If, on the other hand, segments of the medical profession and the insurance world persist in profiting on the ill health of America, then we must and we will turn to some system of national insurance.

However it may come about, labors' wants in this field will be met, the dream of access to proper health care for all Americans will be fulfilled. As individuals the American people will not much longer tolerate a system of medical economics which denies proper medical care to themselves and their children.

As a nation we cannot continue to run the risk entailed in lost time and production deficiencies stemming from ill health. There is no pursuit of happiness for persons whose capacities for advancement and enjoyment are sapped by disease. There may be, in this troubled world, no continuing liberty for a nation which permits its manpower resources to waste away for lack of proper health care.

We of labor rate health as a prized personal possession, and a vital national asset. We earnestly solicit your cooperation, and the cooperation of others in the health and health insurance fields, in developing a system of health insurance which will give to every American access to the miracles of modern medicine.

In our progress toward this goal, we must not be impeded by timorous tradition or empty epithets. Where Government assistance is necessary let us accept it—yes, let us demand it, as an essential service of a modern state. Wherever the answers may lie, and the answers are many in this complex field, let us search them out logically, conscious only of the health needs of the American people, and the demands which history has imposed upon our country.

Robert E. Sherwood and Bernard DeVoto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, 2 months ago America lost one of her leading authors when Bernard DeVoto died of a heart attack.

His history of the fur trade in the West, Across the Wide Missouri, won the Pulitzer prize for historical literature in 1948. In 1952 he won the national book award with Course of Empire, a history of the search for the Northwest Passage from Columbus to Lewis and Clark.

In addition to being a great historian, Mr. DeVoto was an authority on western life. He traveled widely in the West and knew our resources, our people, and our problems.

This Nation's loss goes far beyond the mere absence of an author-historian. For Bernard DeVoto was a conservationist in the tradition of Theodore Roosevelt and George Norris.

In tribute to a friend, I call attention to the following newspaper editorials on

DeVoto and another great man of letters, Robert E. Sherwood:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 15, 1955]

TWO ARMED WITH WORDS

The writing trade was deprived of two of its most proficient American practitioners when heart attacks struck down almost simultaneously Robert E. Sherwood and Bernard DeVoto. And fair play lost two of its most vigilant and vigorous advocates; this second loss being the greater.

But for the string of crises which began with the depression, ran through the war and the end of which is not yet, the paths of these two might have come together only briefly as students at Harvard College. Sherwood might have gone his way as a playwright and movie writer, turning out hit after hit and winning a Pulitzer prize every now and then.

DeVoto might have been well content to be Harvard's best writing teacher since Bliss Perry, turning out magazine fiction or history, just to show he could practice what he preached and also getting his recognitions.

Both did get their Pulitzer prizes, Sherwood three of them for Idiot's Delight, Abe Lincoln in Illinois, and There Shall Be No Night. DeVoto's came for Beyond the Wide Missouri, a book prepared largely in St. Louis in the archives of the Missouri Historical Society.

These two Americans, however, were not cut out to be nonpolitical, after the fashion of so many of their European counterparts. There would be no American Hitler except "over their dead bodies." And the threat did not have to be so great to arouse them. Sherwood came to Franklin D. Roosevelt's aid in the writing of speeches, worked hard in the wartime information services, wrote articles for liberal causes and crowned them with Roosevelt and Hopkins, winner of a Pulitzer biography award.

DeVoto's birth in Utah made him conscious not only of the history of the West but of the necesity for defending its natural resources against ever-present plunderers. He was just as zealous for personal rights as for public property. He fought battle after battle against erosion of the Bill of Rights, whether by book banning or by the prying of public authorities.

Occasionally he might devote one of his Easy Chairs in Harper's magazine to kidding the female beautification industry or to ruminations on Mark Twain, whose unpublished papers were in his custody. But mostly he was fighting. He loved good fights and he was always determined to win them.

Sherwood and DeVoto showed that they could write for money the easy way, but they were not minded to take that way. To them writing was not just a way of making money; it was the great instrument of enlightenment and progress, the great weapon against the enemies of enlightenment and progress. So they will be missed—and remembered.

[From the Dayton Daily News of November 15, 1955]

SHERWOOD AND DEVOTO

American politics, philosophy, and letters suffered a grievous double blow over the weekend in the untimely deaths of Robert Sherwood and Bernard DeVoto.

Sherwood at 59 and DeVoto at 58 should have had many useful years ahead of them. Yet heart attacks claimed the lives of both.

This was one of many similarities between two men whose personalities and careers were different in numerous other ways. Sherwood was primarily the playwright, DeVoto the essayist. Yet both brought their interests and talents into focus in the field of history and in the lists of down-to-date political combat.

DeVoto was by turns relaxed and stern as for a score of years he purveyed opinions on morals and manners from Harper's "Easy Chair." He was a sophisticated connoisseur of the nuances of the cocktail hour, yet he was a mordant, Jeremiac crier of the havoc that greedy men have tried to wreak on his native western lands.

More of the poet and humanist, Sherwood made his impact on contemporary politics through presidential speech writing, and his contribution to history through his chronicle of the crusades of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins.

Two brave and sensitive men have been taken from the scene at a time when there is urgent need for persons of like ideals and comparable effectiveness in championing them.

[From the New Orleans Item of November 16, 1955]

DOUBLE LOSS

The deaths of Robert Sherwood and Bernard DeVoto almost at the same time and both from heart attacks must surely have had a doubly sad effect on many of their readers.

For these two writers were enough alike in their viewpoints and fields of interest that a great many people who admired one would also admire the other.

They were, to be sure, not at all alike in literary style. Sherwood was best known as a playright and DeVoto as an essayist and historian.

Yet both wrote from deep convictions and they had a common devotion to the American heritage and the fundamental truths of democracy.

They were of the same generation—in fact, their ages were 59 and 58—and each was representative of it. Their influence on the creative literature of their own time has been great, and in both cases this was at least partly due to their sincere concern for the world and the country in which they lived.

[From the Oregon Statesman of November 17, 1955]

AUTHORITY ON THE WEST

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Two distinguished American men of letters, both winners of the Pulitzer prize, died this week, prematurely one might say, for neither had reached the age of 60. Robert E. Sherwood, who won his laurels as a playright, was a New Yorker, aged 59. Bernard DeVoto, 58, native of Utah but long-time resident of Cambridge, Mass., was a man of varied interests and talents: teacher, novelist, historian, critic, conservationist.

Each took a keen interest in public affairs; both were liberal in political outlook, but their expressions of public interest differed. Sherwood was a frequent aid to the late President Roosevelt as speechwriter. He was a strong internationalist in the pre-World War II days. The only American author to win the Pulitzer award four times, Sherwood won it for his play Idiot's Delight, Abe Lincoln in Illinois, and There Shall Be No Night, and fourth for the biography Roosevelt and Hopkins. He was still busy at writing plays for stage and screen, and his death removes one of the ablest of American dramatists.

DeVoto was a much more versatile individual. His writings were addressed to a much wider audience, and his frequent plunges into controversy brought him into nationwide prominence. Not only were his interests diverse, his scholarly attainments were multiple. Teaching and lecturing at Harvard where he graduated did not occupy him long. He turned his hand to fiction writing, both as novelist and, under the pseudonym of John August, as writer of thrillers for popular magazines.

As literary critic he found himself in frequent feud with fellow litterati, for he was a man of independent mind, disinclined to hunt with the pack. Thus he turned from such modern stylists as Hemingway and Thomas Wolfe to favor writers of an elder day, particularly Mark Twain, who was a frequent subject for his literary efforts. (He regarded Huckleberry Finn as the greatest American novel, and Thoreau's Walden as the greatest piece of nonfiction written by an American.)

DeVoto's works of most solid worth, however, relate to the great West where he was born and reared. He became the greatest living authority on the exploration of Western America. Four great historical volumes are the fruit of his labors in this field: The Year of Decision, 1846; Across the Wide Missouri; the Course of Empire, and an edition of the Lewis and Clark Journals. As a historian, DeVoto was not merely one to grub in libraries and to decipher old manuscripts though he did much of that. He crossed and crisscrossed the great West whose geography was a vital part of history he was writing. He knew Montana and Idaho and Utah and Oregon intimately. It was his practice to revisit the West by automobile at frequent intervals so he kept fresh his acquaintances with the West.

This exploration made him a stout champion of conservation. He poured out his bitterest philippics against the despoilers of the range and the rivers and the beauties of the West. Recently he turned his guns on those who are desecrating the attractions of New England. DeVoto was a vigorous foe of the D'Ewart bill of 1953 to entrench graziers' rights in national forests. He became, too, a sharp critic of Secretary McKay—and worked among his conservationist friends for the election of RICHARD NEUBERGER as Senator in 1954.

These articles were done for the Easy Chair in Harper's magazine, "the oldest editorial feature in American journalism" as he noted in the current issue of the magazine. In this number DeVoto took a backward look over his 20 years of supplying this feature to Harper's. Referring to the 30 articles and the monthly column he figured he had written some 800,000 words for Harper's—"more than anyone else now living." He admitted this was personal journalism and classified it as cultural criticism. That may do as well as any other label. Fact is, that his range of subjects for the Easy Chair was extremely wide. The feature may have been easy for him, but it made many of its readers very unhappy. DeVoto admitted an indulgence in polemics, and when that is permitted for one with as sharp a wit and facile a style as DeVoto, polemics is a mild word for the product. Where it was to hound book censors or nail to the corral fence the western stockmen who had stripped the land of its cover of vegetation or to jibe at prohibitionists, DeVoto wrote with such vigor and pace that his victims were left dead Indians. Variety was characteristic of DeVoto's themes for the Easy Chair. This gave freshness to the subject matter and added to the zest which Harper's readers had for the feature.

Though his death comes as a shock to his constituency, it might be said that if it had to come, the time was well chosen. DeVoto had completed the trilogy on Western exploration; he regarded the Lewis and Clark Expedition as of the greatest historical significance in the settlement of the continent. He had rounded out 20 years of cultural criticism in Harper's. (A book is just coming off the press with a compilation of selected articles from the Easy Chair.) And he had won a substantial victory for protection of public lands.

A man with such varied interests and tastes and such physical and intellectual energy would never be content to retire. In his 58 years, however, DeVoto had packed important and durable work in history, in literary criticism, and carried responsibilities of citizenship.

[From the New Republic of November 28, 1955]

BERNARD DEVOTO: AMERICAN PATRIOT

(By Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.)

Bernard DeVoto was, above all, a man who loved his country—who loved it deeply, with knowledge and with compassion, sometimes with exasperation and an appearance of despair but always with a basic faith. He hated ever to leave it. He never set foot outside the North American Continent, and it was only with great reluctance that he would venture across the Canadian border. "Love," Whitehead somewhere says, "is very penetrating; but it penetrates, not to facts, but to possibilities." Bernard DeVoto's love for his native land included both facts and possibilities. He sought out facts, cherished them, armed himself with them, used them to club others over the head, felt uneasy away from them. But he penetrated always to what lay beyond—the hope, the dream, the fertile valley over the next hill.

His so-called irascibility was not old-curmudgeonism. It was rather the outrage of a man who could not bear to see his Nation falling below its own highest standards. One of the last incidents of his life made the point. When he condemned the transformation of the beautiful State of Maine into a jerry-built, neon-lighted vacationland, he did so, no because he hated Maine, but because he loved it. (One State official responded by canceling the State's advertising in Harper's, where DeVoto's article appeared; but Governor Muskie understood DeVoto's passion and reversed the action of his subordinate.)

This love for country meant an inexhaustible delight in its physical aspects, from the deserts and canyons of his native Utah to the green hills of his beloved Vermont. But DeVoto was no sentimental nature writer. He cared, not only about deserts, but what caused them; not only about forests, but what threatened them; not only about rivers, but what could be done to purify them, control them and enlist them in strengthening the land and the people. He was dedicated to the struggle for the preservation and development of the country's natural resources.

But Bernard DeVoto's passion above all was for the moral dimension of America. He was a fanatic for the tradition of individual freedom. "When an American says that he loves his country," wrote DeVoto's friend, Adlai Stevenson, "he means not only that he loves the New England hills, the prairies glistening in the sun, the wide and rising plains, the great mountains, and the sea. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect." Because Bernard DeVoto loved freedom, he hated the smellers and the snoopers, the witch-hunters and the book-burners, the censors and the investigators.

[From the Times of London of November 16, 1955]

MR. BERNARD DEVOTO: HISTORIAN OF THE FRONTIER

Mr. Bernard DeVoto, who collapsed and died on Sunday night at the age of 58, shortly after appearing in a television program in New York, was a scholar who did not believe in remaining in the study.

Bernard Augustine DeVoto was born at Ogden, Utah, on January 11, 1897, and was educated at the University of Utah and Harvard. His studies were interrupted by the entry of the United States into the 1914–18 war and he served in the Army as a musketry instructor. Having graduated from Harvard in 1920, he worked for a time as a schoolmaster and then as assistant professor of English at Northwestern University. In 1929 he joined the teaching staff of Harvard and remained there for some 5 years. For the next 20 years he was editor of the excellent feature in Harper's magazine, the Easy Chair.

As befitted his origin, he was intensely interested in the frontier, and his greatest work, a trilogy which appeared between 1943 and 1953, stands in the forefront of vivid historical writing. The pioneers, Verendrye, Michaux, Mackenzie, Bill Burrows, Lewis and Clark, move life-size across the broad canvas, vital and imposing. The Pulitzer and the Bancroft prizes awarded to him were the recognition of perhaps the greatest historian of America, who has done for the settlers of the West what Trevelyan has done for the men of the Risorgimento. The three volumes, The Year of Decision, 1846; Across the Wide Missouri; and Westward the Course of Empire, look a formidable task to read; they are, however, so gripping that once the reader has begun there is only pleasure. The material on which they are based is not only documentary, though all seems to have been consulted. What makes DeVoto's writing so vivid is the fact that not only was he born in the territory he describes but constantly visited the scenes he depicted.

His other works on the Middle West, though on a smaller scale, are of high merit, and his understanding of the quaint genius of Mark Twain is deep and communicable. In lighter vein he wrote a number of "thrillers" and popular magazine fiction under the nom de plume John August. Indeed, when the extent and gravity of his historical writing are considered, his output, serious and gay, was immense and of fine quality.

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly of November 17, 1955]

KEEP OFF THE GRASS

(By Alistair Cooke)

It is impossible to imagine DeVoto dead and gone—this restless historian who made other restless men dead for centuries—La Verendrye, Michaux, Mackenzie, Bill Burrows, Lewis and Clark—more vital than the newspapers can make most of our living statesmen. He had achieved and delivered his great work—the three-volume masterpiece on the settling of the West: The Year of Decision, 1846; Across the Wide Missouri; and The Course of Empire. He chose his field as a young man and would let nothing—not comfort, nor friendship, nor the easy chance of riches—keep him from it. He even gave up teaching to pursue it, by the mountain pass and the mule as well as by the forgotten journal, buried text, and maps, and Government surveys, expiring on the shelves of the Library of Congress.

He took the prize all good scholars, writers, and artists of every kind hanker after: to have seen one's mark and made it. DeVoto had made it by 30 years of ceaseless probing and reading and journeying. Yet he was too good and necessary a man to die so soon. For he never used his scholarship as a sanctuary from the battle of his own time. When he was not up to his knees on an old voyageur's trail through the Rockies, he was up to his powerful larynx in all the controversies of the day. He defied the Federal Bureau of Investigation to come and force him to tell about any personal association, however trivial. He blasted continuously the power and conservation policy of the Republican administration. He saw the public domain being gradually preempted, not by evil men but by ignorance of the history and the disciplines necessary to preserve it.

Only last month he protested at the deterioration of the Maine coast into a "jerry-built, neon-lighted, overpopulated slum," and had the wounded Down-Easters foaming at him. One of his proudest moments was to be sitting on the Stevenson campaign train 3 years ago and just be able to hear MCCARTHY, over a radio, crackling with static, identify him as "Richard" DeVoto, one of Stevenson's malignant crew of associates.

The individual's right of privacy. The public's right to its own public lands. These were his gospel. There ought to be some simple, strong, Twainian epitaph for him, something as succinct as the inscriptions on the graves in Tombstone, Ariz. "Bernard DeVoto, 1897–1955. Keep Off the Grass" would do very well.

[From the Winnipeg Free Press of November 26, 1955]

THE CAUSERIE

(By M. F.)

Many Canadians are familiar with the articles which Mr. Bernard DeVoto has been contributing over many years to Harper's magazine. He has made the Easy Chair not only the oldest feature in American journalism but also one of the most intelligent and stimulating. His death robs American journalism of a stalwart warrior for freedom and enemy of conformity.

It is usually forgotten, and even the obituary notices in the American press forgot to point it out, that Mr. DeVoto wrote the single, most impressive political commentary on the 1952 Presidential campaign.

Very early in that campaign he wrote an article pointing out the serious risks of giving the Republicans control of Congress and thereby of the committee chairmanships. He published the list of the Republicans who would serve as chairmen and gave them the contemptuous nickname of "murderers' row."

It would be of little avail, he warned, for Mr. Eisenhower to be making noble gestures when his policies would be exposed to this ugly gauntlet in Congress. He predicted that national affairs in the event of a Republican victory would waiver ominously between a stalemate and a feud. One must recall the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration to realize the cruel precision of this prophecy.

Mr. Walter Lippmann tried to counter Mr. DeVoto's argument by claiming that it was essential to convert the Republican leaders in Congress to a sense of responsibility by making them partners in a Republican administration. Mr. Stevenson sneered at this syllogism by observing that never before in American politics had a party gone to the country with the cry "throw the rascals in."

The last footnote to this episode was written when Mr. Lippmann, some months ago, formally abandoned his discredited theory. He announced his new revelation that the strength and progress of the American people demanded a Republican President and a Democratic Congress.

Enough writers have praised DeVoto's books on the West, his veritable passion for conversation, his love of Mark Twain. But his life was spent in controversy and it is as a controversial figure and not as a stuffed saint that he should be remembered.

[From the New York Times of November 15, 1955]

BERNARD DEVOTO

The sudden death of Bernard DeVoto is a major loss to the world of American letters. Historian and novelist, critic and editor, he was a writer both scholarly and colorful, pugnacious and humorous, skillfull and profound.

Bernard DeVoto was first of all a careful and distinguished chronicler of the majestic story of this country. His famous trilogy—The Year of Decision: 1846, Across the Wide Missouri, and the Course of Empire—comprise a classic of America's westward expansion, written by a man whose knowledge and love of the West has been surpassed by no other contemporary historian. But he was not content to be considered a writer of merely western history—he complained about

being known as some kind of tributary of the Missouri River—and there is little doubt that had he lived he would have made equally great contributions to the history of other areas. He was renowned for his work in literary history, too, and one of his books on Mark Twain has been described as the first thorough application of the methods of social history to the problems of literary criticism.

But he probably exerted his greatest influence on American life and thought through his 20 years of editing the famed department of Harper's magazine called the Easy Chair. Crusader, critic, and caustic commentator, his trenchant paragraphs were in the best tradition of literary journalism. Though the Easy Chair covered many fields, that one in which he was perhaps most effective of all was as a conservationist who knew what he was talking about and who pulled no punches. His contribution in awakening the national conscience on this subject has been of the most practical and enduring value.

It is sad but fitting that Bernard DeVoto's last memorial should have been a collection of essays, largely from the Easy Chair, published only a few days ago. In it he was justly proud to write: "No one has got me to say anything I did not want to say and no one has prevented me from saying anything I wanted to." That expressed the spirit of DeVoto, a great American, and the spirit of the America he loved.

Natural Gas Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier today it was my privilege to deliver an address before a variety of public-spirited individuals and organizations which have banded together to protect the interests of American consumers of natural gas by advocating defeat of the Fulbright bill.

It is my intention to do everything I can toward the objective of protecting the public interest by carrying on my share in this battle, as I have down through the years, when the predecessor legislation to this bill came up.

I send to the desk the text of the statement which I delivered, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES AVALANCHE OF PUBLIC REACTION TO PROTEST AND KILL NATURAL GAS EXEMPTION BILL—SAYS BOTH PARTIES HAVE TO IMPROVE THEIR POSITION ON ISSUE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican on Senate Judiciary and Foreign Relations Committees, before meeting of consumer-labor-women's-business groups opposed to national gas-exemption bill, Washington, D. C.)

It is a pleasure for me to greet this fine assembly of civic-minded citizens.

I am particularly pleased with the wide variety of groups which you represent, because the task which you have undertaken—the protection of the interests of upward of 29 million American consumers of natural gas—is one which definitely requires the strongest possible alliance of grassroots Americans in every walk of life.

I am going to talk to you today exclusively about the practical aspects in the battle now looming before us.

OUR PURPOSE TODAY IS TO PLAN FOR BATTLE

I am not going to attempt at this point to make a detailed evaluation of the Fulbright-Harris bill which would basically exempt producers of natural gas from Federal control. There is not time on this occasion for either a detailed legal evaluation or a detailed economic evaluation.

I believe, of course, that you are already familiar with the evil effects of the legislation in its arbitrary nullifying of effective regulation under the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and its deliberate overturning of the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case.

Let us therefore use this brief occasion as a public planning session. Planning for what? Planning for the battle to protect the public interest. This is deservedly a factual public session because, unlike our opposition, we are trying to thwart ignorance and misinformation and behind-the-scenes deception. We seek an informed, aroused public, eager to do battle against greedy, entrenched monopolistic forces.

Now, let me spell out a few of the points which I think should command our attention, as we prepare to do battle:

AN AVALANCHE REACTION OF PROTEST BY THE PUBLIC IS NECESSARY

1. First and foremost, I want to emphasize that nothing short of an avalanche reaction from the grassroots of America will suffice to defeat this legislation.

I mean an avalanche through the air and on the ground—an avalanche of responsible phone calls, personal visits, telegrams, letters, postal cards, petitions, and every other means available to the people at the grassroots of this Republic.

I am not asking for any blind or artificial propaganda effort, such as may sometimes occur on an issue which the people do not understand, but on which they are told to communicate to the Congress.

Instead, I am urging the only sort of voluntary, enlightened campaign in which I feel you of this audience and I are interested. It must be an intelligent reaction, based upon at least a general understanding of the issues. I refer to an understanding that this bill can have disastrous consequences on our economy by skyrocketing inflationary pressures, an understanding that this is perhaps one of the final, decisive rounds in a long effort by a relatively small group of individuals ruthlessly to exploit the American public by charging all that the traffic will bear.

Of course you in this audience today will be engaged in the very democratic process which I am urging—responsibly contacting Members of the Congress. But I want to say that infinitely more must be done by your associated groups and affiliated members throughout the Nation, and it must be done now.

MARGIN OF VICTORY IN DOUBT

Now, of course, both sides in the approaching Senate fight have been making nose counts, so to speak.

They have counted up the Senators who are committed for and against the bill.

They have counted up those who are still uncommitted, but who may lean in one direction or another.

As a result of the nose counts, opinion may vary as to the precise number of Senators in each category.

Fortunately for America, it is certain that our side, the public side, has been gaining strength in past months. It is certain that the superoptimistic outlook—"it's in the bag"—on the part of our opponents has been dampened a good deal by recent impressive additions, allies to our side, the public's side.

Nevertheless, as of the present date, January 9, 1956, I want to state very factually and frankly that, in my personal opinion, we definitely do not have a margin of superiority to defeat this bill.

That does not mean, however, that the opposition has a decisive margin.

On the contrary, the group of Senators who are today uncommitted, will swing this vote either way. And I want to stress that an objective view of the facts, an objective view of the enormous pressures being brought to bear from the other side, seems to signify this: Unless there is a blizzard of protest against this bill, then the chances are probably better than even, that the supporters of the Harris-Fulbright bill will win out.

In other words, the time for the American people to act in their own enlightened self-interest is now. They have the opportunity to protect themselves, and they must not lose this fleeting opportunity.

FUEL RATES WILL SHOOT UPWARD

If the bill is enacted, you can expect another type of blizzard to occur. It will be a blizzard of rate increase applications—which will cost consumers upwards of three-fourths billion dollars per year.

Not only will producers charge more and more for natural gas, but you can expect petroleum prices to edge upward as well.

The whole situation resembles a contrived Alphonse-Gaston act. The petroleum people will say to their friends and affiliates—the natural-gas people—"our rate increase after yours my dear Alphonse." And the gas people will say, "after yours, my dear Gaston."

First, the gas price will go up, then petroleum, then gas, then petroleum. And the net result will be that the consumers will more and more lose out while the gas industry, already representing $16 billion in assets will enrich its owners further..

IF PEOPLE ACT NOW, CONGRESS WILL PROTECT THEM

Some months from now, if this evil, greedy bill is approved, we can almost imagine the scene in the average American breakfast room. The husband will be reading his morning paper. His wife will be telling him, "John, I don't know where we're going to find the money to pay all these increasing bills. Our gas rate has gone up still again."

And one can almost imagine John replying, "Well, it's probably those fellows in Washington who are responsible."

Well, the so-called "fellows in Washington" would certainly be partly responsible. But it is really John, Mary, Susan, and Jack at the grassroots who would be responsible for the fate of this legislation—for the trend, vertically upward of their own gas rate.

Let no one pass the buck exclusively to the Congress. It is we in the Senate, of course, who are responsible for actually writing the bill at this stage.

But the Congress is only the voice and reflection of the American people.

If the American people choose to be silent (while eloquent proponents of the natural-gas interests are busily talking up their case), if the American people choose to sit on their hands, while the multi-million-dollar natral-gas lobby works tirelessly, night and day, 12 months a year, then the result is forecast.

But we need not get a negative result. We, the people, can achieve success, if we set our minds and our hearts and, yes, our shoe leather to it.

I am delighted at the support which has already been given to the battle against the bill. In my own State, with its outstanding tradition of safeguarding the public, an impressive number of public officials, organizations, and individual citizens have given me the fullest support in my personal efforts.

I am particular delighted that throughout our country, local gas distribution companies are acting with commonsense and devoted

public spirit in this fight to inform the American people of precisely the peril that is involved to the United States.

But infinitely more needs still be done.

BILL SHOULD HAVE BEEN RECOMMITTED TO COMMERCE COMMITTEE

2. The second major point that I should like to make is that, in the judgment of many people, including myself, the bill should really have been recommitted to the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee.

I do not believe that the record of that committee is complete in either the necessary legal or the economic data.

I point out, too, that a considerable amount of new evidence has come in since the committee, by a vote of 11 to 4, reported it out.

I do not question the fact that the bill has nominally been on the Senate Calendar for some months. But I think that the people would have been entitled to be heard further on this matter before the Commerce Committee.

Let me point out very clearly that, as a believer in the democratic, representative process, I definitely do not believe in arbitrarily pigeonholing or bottling up legislation. That is particularly my feeling when an expert committee of the Senate has already made its report and a recommittal proposal is considered.

Rather, I would have hoped that this committee could have studied the issue anew in all of its serious implications to our economy, in the light of the facts which are known as of January 1956. Then, the committee could have reported the bill out in its original or amended form, with comparatively little time elapsing.

Of course, the bill is now the pending business of the Senate.

If the Senate is disinclined to recommit the bill, if it wants a showdown now, then I say that, at the very minimum, there must and will be the fullest possible debate of every single angle of this issue. There are going to be a very considerable number of amendments which are going to have to be taken up one by one, slowly and surely.

Let me make it quite clear that I fully recognize that the general arguments over this issue are old one. Most of the principal points have been hashed and rehased many times. But that does not diminish our obligation to give to the American people, to give to the Federal Power Commission, to give to the courts—the fullest and most complete possible record, for their later study of this issue, as it may come up.

BOTH PARTIES SHOULD STRENGHTEN THEIR POSITION IN PROTECTING THE CONSUMER

3. Now, the third point that I should like to make relates to the political parties. I am not going to make a partisan statement at the present time, because this is of course, not a partisan occasion or issue.

We all know that party lines and so-called 'liberal'—conservative lines within the parties have tended to be somewhat scrambled on this issue.

We have seen men who are commonly called liberals reverse their pattern and support the Harris-Fulbright bill for exemption from Federal control.

We have seen men who are regarded as so-called rock-ribbed conservatives fight ably against the bill for exemption from Federal controls. (These latter colleagues of mine will be somewhat surprised, incidentally, to note the fantastic charges by the opposition that they—uniformly respected as conservative Senators—are supporting a measure which allegedly leads to socialism and public ownership. Such charges are obviously absurd; they are an insult to the intelligence of any thinking person who notes the thousand and one precedents, yes, during Republican, as well as Democratic Administrations, for Federal regulation in the public interest.

In any event, in this election year of 1956, I want to say very frankly that neither of the major political parties has covered itself with honor in this respect—neither my friends in the Democratic camp, nor my own Republican Party.

WHO IS SO-CALLED FRIEND OF BIG BUSINESS?

I would hope that my own party would strive to improve its position on this issue in both legislative and executive branches. And, if I may be permitted, I would certainly hope that those Democrats who so often have criticized my party as the so-called friend of big business would take the blinders off their own eyes and see exactly who is fighting for so-called Big Business on this issue.

The facts are that this Harris-Fulbright bill, will add perhaps 20 or more billion dollars in value to reserves in the ground, held by gas blue-chip companies. And this little unearned bonus to them—has been sponsored by Democrats, steamrolled through Democratic controled committees, and rushed to Senate and House floors, to be led rather ably—I may say, by Democratic leadership.

Concerning the question of so-called big business and free enterprise, I shall say—somewhat more later on.

FINE EFFORTS BY SOME SEGMENTS OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY

To keep the record straight, however, I want to say right now in all fairness, that there are segments of the Democratic Party which have nobly fulfilled the traditions of Woodrow Wilson and other great Democratic leaders of both North and South on this issue. Yes, from Virginia, mother of Presidents, from "little Rhodie," Rhode Island, and from other Democratic strongholds have come magnificent support.

In the Senate, in particular, this Nation is indebted to a great many individual Democrats, without whose help we who are fighting for the public could not possibly be as far advanced as we are in our uphill efforts toward victory. And if I were to single out any one champion, it would, of course, be the gentlemen from Illinois, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, who, true to his valiant marine record of ably fighting against odds, come what may, has been masterfully leading the fight for what he holds dear to his conscience, as do you and I.

VOTERS SHOULD QUESTION SENATORS ON THEIR STAND

In any event, one-third of the United States Senate wil go to the people in November and even before that, will face the people in a good many primary fights, as well.

And I should think that not a single one of them should be excused from stating, at the outset, in his campaign precisely why he voted one way or the other on this evil bill.

Yes; the American people have a particular right to ask every supporter of the Harris-Fulbright bill in the House, the Senate, why he did not act to protect the rights of the public in this battle.

ALL-OUT, NOT TOKEN ACTION REQUESTED

I say "act," not just "vote." I am not seeking simply votes for our side; I am seeking all-out action.

Let none of us—inside or outside the Senate—who are opposing the Harris-Fulbright bill think that a half-hearted, token fight on any of our parts will suffice. All-out action—a fight to amend this bill in the public interest from stem to stern, to debate it in fullest detail rather than willy-nilly chitchat merely over the Fulbright or Harris versions—this is what is called for.

THE MASQUERADE OF THIS BILL

4. Now, fourth, I want to turn briefly to the bill itself and to the arguments which have been advanced by its supporters.

First, let me say, however, that as individuals, I have a tremendously high personal regard for many of the Members of the Senate who happen to be leading the effort for this bill. I am sorry to have to oppose them on it, first, because they are able battlers, and, second, because I wish they would put their abundant talents to better use right now in terms of fulfilling the needs of the American people.

ABLE OPPONENTS ARRAYED

I am thinking of that young, masterful Texan, the Senate's tireless majority leader, who the entire Nation rejoices, has recovered from his sudden physical misfortune. I am thinking of my good, scholarly friend from Arkansas, who has contributed so expertly on the Foreign Relations Committee, on which I am privileged to serve. And I am thinking of the two able scrappers from Oklahoma and the junior Senator from Texas, and others. Yes, I am thinking, too, of "Mr. SAM" over on the House side, whose long record of service to the Republic is hailed by friend and foe alike.

My remarks, of course, carry no imputation whatsoever on the individual Members of the Senate or House as legislators. I believe that they, in good faith, are fighting for what they believe will best serve the interests of the American people.

I believe, however, that my good friends of the opposition are wrong in their beliefs and evaluation. But I believe, too, that we can lock horns in this fight, as we have in the past, on the level of issues and never on personalities.

THIS BILL IS STRICTLY A PHONY

It just so happens, in my judgment, that this bill is now and has always been as phony as a 3-cent piece or a $4 bill. It was a phony as the Moore-Rizley bill. It was a phony as the Kerr bill. It is a phony as the Harris-Fulbright bill. (The last named, i. e., the present bill before us, is incidentally even worse than the Kerr bill in that it would go so far as to extend the "carte blanche" exemption from control not only to independent producers, but even to production activities of the pipeline companies and to producing affiliates of the pipelines).

Why is this bill a phony? Because the bill is not anything like what its supporters say it is.

YOU CAN'T CONTROL A PRICE IN MIDSTREAM

It is a phony because every thinking person knows that you cannot control a price in midstream; you've got to control, if the control is to be at all effective, at the source. But section 2 trickily redefines "sales" so that they are to be considered in interstate commerce only after transportation has commenced. Thus, the Federal Power Commission loses all effective control authority.

So, we are supposed to have controls without controls—now you see them, now you don't.

Continuing, the bill's so-called protections to consumers are a farce, so ambiguous and unenforceable are the so-called standards for fixing the price of natural gas at the source.

And there are other sham features as well.

It is alleged that this is a free-enterprise bill, but it is basically a bill to advance the cause of monopolistic forces which are the very contradiction of free enterprise.

THE GAS INDUSTRY HAS PIONEERED

It is alleged that if this bill is not enacted, the natural-gas industry will not have sufficient incentive to expand.

That phony argument is riddled by the whole record of the past, in which the natural-gas industry, despite admitted doubts over this legislation and the status of controls, has been skyrocketing in expansion.

Now, I want, at this point, to say a sincere word of tribute to the natural-gas industry.

Starting from scratch to the point where today it serves approximately 25 percent of the energy market of the Nation, it is a breathtaking example of the dyanmic force which the profit-and-loss system provides.

Here we have an amazing material which was formerly regarded as mere waste, emerging by the wizardry of production, transportation, and storage as a tremendous economic asset to the United States and to the free world.

I want to pay tribute to the men inside and outside the Lone Star State who had the vision, the financial acumen, the pioneering strength to take risks and build this industry up as one of the great pillars on the American scene. The fact that I oppose them in their effort to reach out greedily for too much profit does not mean that I have any less regard for their building of the industry so fast.

It is a big business, but I, for one, welcome large-scale enterprise in this complex, technological age, so long as it does not trample the little fellow or the public.

One would think from some of the artificial groans issued by the big companies' skilled public relations and advertising agencies, that this industry would hover at death's door if this bill is not enacted. But the contrary facts have shown, I believe, that in our entire country, no individual industry, but one, has a better record of avoiding business failures, that is, in the terms of the number of companies which have gone out of business. Yes, the only industry which has had relatively fewer business failures in our country is that old standby, the undertaking industry.

The natural-gas industry has prospered, and I hope it will continue to prosper. I want its stockholders and its bondholders to get a fair break. I believe 100 percent in Americans being entitled to the fruits of their labor, the fruits of their savings and investment—subject, of course, to any possible infringements of the public's rights.

But one may rightly ask just how much incentive does this industry reasonably expect it is entitled to? Does it think it must have say, an astronomic 25 or 30 percent return on its investment in order to expand?

Would it also prefer, say, a 50 percent depletion allowance, to begin with? Does it not believe that the public has any rights—or the United States Treasury? Or does it feel, the "public be damned" as some other mistaken sources seemed to feel at odd times in American history?

Remember, it is 29 million United States consumers whose interests are right now at stake—small consumers with an enormous investment in gas appliances which they are stuck with—if prices skyrocket. Last year, there were 200 household customers of natural gas for every 15 commercial customers and every single industrial customer.

CONCLUSION

Now, friends, I have spelled out a few of what I regard to be major elements in this fight. I could have referred in detail to a great many more issues involved in it.

I have spoken frankly, because I believe that this is a time for frankness.

I have spoken grimly, because I believe that it is no time for a Polyanna-like optimism, which assumes that there will be success for the public side automatically, when we know the reverse could be the case.

Victory will not come automatically, but it can come and it should come—with lots of sweat.

In any event, we are in the battle for the duration—in the Congress, in the Federal Power Commission, and yes, in the courts, beyond.

I am humbly proud of the role which my State, the Badger State, has played thus far—in the long Phillips battle from Bartlesville to Washington. You can be sure that this particular son of the Badger State is not going to give in nor will you, of Virginia, or New York, or Illinois, or Michigan, or Ohio, or the other States as well.

It has been a great pleasure to be with you today, and I wish you every success in your efforts to protect the public interest.

The Oregon Highway System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, anyone who has driven along the beautiful roads of Oregon will have recognized that our State has a network of highways which constitutes one of the finest State systems in the Nation. The mastermind of this system has been R. H. Baldock, State highway engineer. His counsel is valued today whenever and wherever highway planners consult with men of experience and vision.

This is attested to by the inclusion of his statement in a two-page advertisement appearing in the Washington Post on Wednesday, January 4, 1956. This advertisement, Mr. President, presents, for the consideration of the 84th Congress, the ideas of 16 men, each an authority in his field, but all concerned with the development of more, better, and safer highways. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Baldock's statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY R. H. BALDOCK, STATE HIGHWAY ENGINEER OF OREGON

This fall the Western Association of State Highway Officials passed a resolution calling for a compromise road bill based on a 15-year plan in accord with the amounts shown in table A.

For the interstate system, Federal funds would be allotted to the States in proportion to the estimated costs of building the system in the several States, the State to match 10 percent of the cost. For the noninterstate system, the Federal funds, increased over the 1954 schedule by approximately 30 percent, would be allotted as at present and on the historical 50–50 matching basis.

It is further suggested that the 15-year plan be broken into three 5-year authorization periods in which the expenditures on the interstate system are gradually increased, the expenditures on the noninterstate system to be uniform. This permits a gradual increase in the engineering and contracting forces necessary to perform the work.

Table B below indicates the Federal funds required in each of the 5-year authorization periods.

Two plans of financing are proposed. Plan A proposes the authorization of one-half rather than one-third of present road-user taxes for roads, which is presently about $2,600 million; a moderate increase in road-user taxes—1 cent per gallon on gasoline and 2 cents per gallon on diesel fuel—all of which is to be used for roads; the borrowing of a reasonable amount of money—$5,225 million, on which the interest to be paid would be $1,166 million.

Plan B is based upon the same conditions as given in plan A except that the taxes (all to be used for road construction) are increased to eliminate the necessity of borrowing money. The increases in taxes over and above tax increases as proposed in plan A in order to accomplish this objective would be:

1. A 3-cent-per-pound increase in tire tax.
2. A 3-cent-per-pound increase in tube tax.
3. A 4-cent-per-gallon increase in lubricating-oil tax.
4. A 2-percent increase in present 8-percent tax on new trucks, buses, and trailers.

It is suggested that at least half of the present Federal road-user taxes be made available for roads each year, while all additional Federal road-user taxes be used solely for road purposes. Some people advocate the use of all presently levied Federal road-user taxes for road-construction purposes. This plan proposes to use half for road construction.

Some objection may be made to the modest amounts for the interstate system for the first 5-year authorizations. The amounts for the interstate system can be increased to a uniform $1,600 million per year for each of the 15 years by increasing the bonds from $5,225 million to $5,800 million and the amount of the interest from $1,116 million to $1,990 million to conform to plan A. However, it would be necessary to increase the Federal tax on gasoline from 2 cents to 4 cents per gallon for the first 5 years to do the same job on a pay-as-you-go basis as shown in plan B, a rather stiff tax increase. Moreover, the increase in expenditures for the first 5 years would make it quite difficult for many of the States to match Federal funds.

While either plan A or plan B will accomplish the objective of building the important interstate system in a reasonable period of time and of increasing the funds available for the building of the noninterstate Federal-aid system, it is recommended that plan A be selected. Plan A, as recommended by the Western Association of State Highway Officials, would require lower taxes and result in future users paying part of the bill. It is a more balanced plan.

TABLE A

[Amounts are in millions of dollars]

	Interstate system	Noninterstate system	Forest system	All systems
Federal funds	24,000	13,500	495	37,995
State funds	2,300	12,375	----	14,675
Total	26,300	25,875	495	52,670

TABLE B

[Amounts are in millions of dollars]

	1st 5 years	2d 5 years	3d 5 years	Total, 15 years
Interstate system	5,750	8,850	9,400	24,000
Noninterstate system	4,500	4,500	4,500	13,500
Forest highways	165	165	165	495
Total	10,415	13,515	14,065	37,995

Ireland's Economic and Social Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this noon the National Press Club entertained

at luncheon the Deputy Prime Minister of the Republic of Ireland, the Honorable William Norton, who is also Minister for Industry and Commerce in the Government of Ireland. I count it as a signal honor that I had the opportunity to be invited to sit at the head table with the Deputy Prime Minister. His speech upon the industrial and economic progress of the land which he represents was one of notable attraction. From the beginning to the end, he held the attention of that very large audience, which filled the dining room of the Press Club. I only wish that I could relate to the Senate the answers he gave to some of the questions propounded to him at the close of his address. When the meeting was over, it was the universal judgment of all present that the Deputy Prime Minister of Ireland is a man of wit and eloquence. I was very much pleased to be present.

I now have the honor of requesting unanimous consent that the address delivered by him on that occasion, and dealing with the economic development of Ireland, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRELAND'S ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

(Speech by Mr. William Norton, T. D., Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Industry and Commerce in the Government of Ireland)

I propose in the course of this talk to review what Ireland has accomplished in the field of economic and social progress since regaining political independence 33 years ago. As Minister for Industry and Commerce, I am particularly concerned with developments in the industrial field and I will pay special attention to this aspect, while also endeavoring to sketch our progress in other fields.

The magnitude of the task which faced the new state in 1922 may readily be pictured. At that time there existed in the country relatively few large manufacturing industries; our people lacked industrial experience; the country lacked many of the natural resources such as coal and oil which were then regarded as essential for the development of industries; there was no money market to facilitate the investment of savings in Irish industries; imported goods were well established in the Irish market and in a home market based on a total population of approximately 3 million people it would have been impossible, unless special measures were taken, for the products of new Irish industries to gain a foothold in competition with imports from long-established factories in highly industrialized competing countries.

Vigorous action was necessary to overcome these obstacles to industrial progress. From the outset, Government policy was directed toward creating and maintaining conditions favorable to industrial development and expansion. Protection against imports was afforded to new industries to enable them to become established in the face of competition from abroad. New industries requiring capital and unable to raise it through the normal channels were assisted by means of state guaranties of borrowing, and a special Industrial Credit Company was established and financed out of state funds to underwrite capital issues and to provide other financial accommodations in suitable cases.

The efforts to develop the industrial economy of the country achieved remarkable success. Official statistics show that the volume of industrial production has trebled since 1926 and industrial employment has more than doubled.

NEW INDUSTRIES ESTABLISHED

Numerous industries have been set up and expanded and are operating at a high level of efficiency, producing a diversity of goods to supply the needs of the Irish market and, in many cases, competing successfully in export markets with the manufactured products of other nations. Workers have thus been trained in industrial processes and techniques, and directors and management executives have acquired experience in the hard school of practical business management. It would not be possible, in a short address of this kind, to detail the list of such industries, but the following may be mentioned by way of illustration: leather and leather goods, sugar and sugar products, cement, textiles and wearing apparel, ropes and twines, paper and paper products, flour and flour confectionery, furniture, motor vehicles assembly, rubber products, foundry products, cutlery and hardware goods, earthenware and tableware, glass and glass products, beer and spirits, biscuits, bacon, meat, etc.

Irish industry is based on private enterprise and credit for much of the development already achieved is due to the energy and courage shown by our business people and to the support given by the public by investing their savings in the new and expanded industries. However, due to the leeway which our economy had to make up, the government found it necessary not only to create an economic environment which would encourage the development of private enterprise but also to set up certain State-sponsored companies to undertake work which was not attractive to or which was beyond the ambit of private enterprise. Industries developed under State auspices include the production and distribution of electricity, peat, sugar, industrial alcohol, and steel. A State-sponsored body was also established for mineral exploration work.

PUBLIC POWER AT SHANNON

The Electricity Supply Board, the State agency which is responsible for the production of electricity, has developed hydroelectric power and has also built stations for generating electricity from native peat and from imported fuels. Production of electricity has increased from 120 million kilowatt-hours in the year ended March 31, 1931, to 1,458 million kilowatt-hours in the year ended March 31, 1955, and the board has in hand a development program extending to the year 1961 to provide additional generating capacity to meet the continuing growth in demand. The cost of the first hydroelectric scheme—the Shannon scheme—was about $17 million. So great has been the demand for current to keep up with industrial and social progress, that the total capital investment of the Electricity Supply Board is now over $200 million, and further expenditure of the same order is expected to be incurred between now and the year 1961.

Bórd na Móna, the body responsible for peat production, has applied modern machinery and research to the utilization for industrial and domestic purposes of peat—a product of tracts of our country once regarded by many as wastelands. Thirty years ago peat was entirely harvested by hand and used as a domestic fuel. Now it is harvested and processed by the most modern machinery—much of which was specially devised or adapted by Irish engineering skill. Some peat-fired stations for the generation of electricity on an economic basis are already in operation and others are being constructed; close coordination between the Electricity Supply Board and Bórd na Móna is established in this joint enterprise.

TRANSPORTATION PROGRESS

On the establishment of the state the railway companies were in serious financial difficulties due to heavy increases in operating costs during and after the First World War. In 1924, 26 railway companies were amalgamated into a new company. Nevertheless the difficulties of the railways continued and by the commencement of the Second World War it became clear that, on the basis of private enterprise, the railways could not find the additional capital necessary to renew and modernize their equipment as railways were no longer an attractive form of investment. Since then a new transport organization has been set up under state auspices and with state guaranties for borrowing. A program for the substitution of diesel traction for steam is now well advanced. Results are already beginning to show and it is hoped to have the railways placed on a sound economic basis before the lapse of many years. When this program has been completed, our rail services will compare very favorably with those in any other country.

HOW AVIATION HAS PROSPERED

Aviation was in its infancy when our state was established but at an early stage we recognized the advantages of our geographical position in relation to transatlantic services. In 1935 it was decided to establish an international airport for use by transatlantic services and in the following year construction of the land airdrome at Shannon was commenced. During the period when flying boats were used on transatlantic flights facilities were provided and when flying-boat operations ceased in 1945 the land plane base was ready for the change over. Since then we have kept abreast of the rapid developments in airport equipment and services. The growth in traffic (4,216 aircraft landed at the airport in 1946 and 8,208 in 1954) gives ground for our confidence that we continue to satisfy the operating companies and provide a service conforming to the most exacting standards of safety and efficiency. It is worthy of note that our customs-free airport, established at Shannon in 1947 was the first in the world.

We entered into the operation side of civil aviation with the establishment of a state-sponsored company called Aer Lingus in 1936. Development was slow during the war years, but since then progress has been rapid. In the year to March 31, 1955, Aer Lingus carried 340,000 fare-paying passengers compared with 4,300 in 1944. This company, operating from Dublin Airport, provides services to Britain and other European countries as well as internal services.

HEALTH SERVICES IMPROVED

The health services in the country have been steadily improved. There is not time now to describe improvements in detail, but it will give you some idea of what has been achieved when I tell you that in the past 25 years expenditure on hospital buildings works amounted to some $78 million and that in order to complete current hospitalization programs further expenditure of the order of $56 million will be required.

Remarkable progress has also been made in housing. Thirty years ago many of our rural dwellings were small and insanitary or in bad repair; there were extensive slums in Dublin and in some other cities. To meet this problem local authorities, utility societies, and private individuals were assisted by means of direct state grants and loan accommodation to provide dwelling houses for our people. In the period since 1922 the number of private dwelling houses built or reconstructed totals some 235,000. The result of these measures is now to be seen in the large number of bright new houses which girdle our cities and towns and in a greatly improved standard of rural housing.

WORKERS' WELFARE PROTECTED

In our industrial and economic development, the interests of the workers have not been overlooked. In general, wages are fixed by collective agreements between employers and employees, but legal provision has been made for fixing minimum wages for agricultural workers and for workers in certain other industries who were not sufficiently

organized to secure just wages. The Industrial Relations Act, 1946, is designed to promote harmonious relations between workers and employers generally. Under this act a Labor Court was established and this tribunal has achieved considerable success in settling differences between workers and employers on the basis of free and voluntary negotiation. Legislation has also been enacted to regulate the hours of work of all industrial workers and to prohibit night work by women and young persons. Legislation relating to safety and welfare of workers in factories and workshops has been codified and brought up to date in the Factory Act, 1955, which will come into force shortly.

Apart from the improvement in working conditions, measures have been taken to provide assistance for people at times when their own resources are not adequate to cope with eventualities such as illness or unemployment. Provision is made for unemployment and illness, and for widows and orphans by means of an insurance scheme to which workers, employers, and the State contribute. There is also provision for children's allowances, unemployment assistance, old-age pensions, and for accident benefits for people who are not covered by insurance. Widows and orphans not covered by insurance are eligible to obtain pensions and allowances in certain cases.

TOURIST ATTRACTIONS

Ireland, with her beautiful scenery and pleasant way of life, has many natural attractions for tourists. The potentialities of the Irish tourist industry have been recognized by successive Irish Governments since the founding of the state, and progressive legislation for the promotion and development of the industry is in force. Responsibility for the development and publicising of the industry is vested in a statutory body—Irish Tourist Board (Bórd Fáilte Eireann)—which receives a substantial annual grant from the state for the discharge of its functions. Some measure of the success of our endeavor in this field may be gaged from the fact that expenditure by visitors to Ireland in 1954 amounted to over $80 million.

The use which we have made of our opportunities can be seen in the increased prosperity of our country and in the well-being of our people. While we are proud of what we have achieved so far, we are determined that no complacency about our past achievements will blunt our determination to press ahead with further improvements until we have made our country worthy of the great sacrifices and courage of past generations who preserved for us through the ages the spirit of freedom and of nationhood.

My reason for this visit to the United States is directly connected with our desire and determination further to improve our country's economy. I am particularly concerned with the part which American businessmen may be able to play in contributing to our industrial advancement. Ireland has many advantages and attractions to offer to United States industrialists who may decide to extend their industrial activities to our country; in particular, we have many advantages as a base for production for export markets in Britain and other European countries. These attractions and favorable factors have been detailed in a brochure which has already been circulated among you, and the members of the official delegation, which I have arranged will visit you shortly and will be happy to supply full details and to inform and advise interested parties who may wish to know more about our industrial potentialities.

CONCLUSION

Where in other generations, speaking in this great land, millions of our people found a home and a refuge from alien prosecution and a vicious economic thralldom which accompanied it, may I, on behalf of the Irish people, express our profound thanks and gratitude to the American people and pray for their sympathy, their generosity, and understanding of Ireland in our darkest hours.

We shall seek ever to maintain and extend the bonds of friendship and understanding between our two peoples and to strive with the American people for the attainment of peace based on those concepts of liberty which are cherished by the American and Irish peoples.

Tribute to Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, during the past year Lena Madesin Phillips, one of America's outstanding women, passed away. She was not only a leader in the Federation of Business and Professional Womens Clubs, in which I have so much pride, but she was a leader of women generally.

A very fitting tribute has been written about her by Ruth Roach Robinson. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. LENA MADESIN PHILLIPS: WE PRAISE HER WITH AFFECTIONATE VOICE

One of our most revered leaders, Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips, world minded citizen, who had made the trip across the Atlantic so many times, died May 20, in France, en route to the Middle East to attend a conference of women leaders at Beirut, Lebanon. This conference was to conclude the international federation's 10-month research project to study the role of women, their activities and organizations in Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. It was a great distinction that our international federation had been chosen to carry out this study under a Ford Foundation grant. We know the conference held early in June sorely missed the wisdom and guidance of our great leader who worked so effectively for all mankind.

Dr. Phillips had planned to spend some time in Greece and Italy before attending the silver-jubilee board meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, August 23 to 26, where in 1930, our international federation had its birth with Dr. Phillips founder president.

From our federation's historical records we find the following:

"Lena Madesin Phillips, among other YWCA leaders, was present and participating when, at the Ann Fulton Cafeteria in May 1918, the plan for the formation of a national business women's organization was written on a scrap of brown paper. As organizer, Dr. Phillips succeeded in interesting 400 business and professional women to attend that meeting in St. Louis in 1919. As the first executive secretary of the federation, she set up and carried on the work of the office in New York and attended to the publication of the magazine. Later she became the president of the national federation, serving from 1926 to 1929. She led the goodwill tours which resulted in the formation of national federations in other countries and the organization of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women in 1930. She became its founder president and served for 17 years in that capacity."

Let me be personal. I can write no other way of Lena Madesin Phillips. Through 35 years association with her I had been privileged to know her well. She will always be alive for me. But I am quite certain some of the color of our conventions will fade when she is no more around. She had a joyous breath of life. Yes, she was a personality, radiant and colorful, with a mind brilliant and scintillating. Her wit and humor vitalized her every undertaking. Her exuberance was what you took home from any meeting with her and hung onto forever—to put with the keepsakes of a lifetime.

I can see her now, and I'm sure you can, speaking from the floor as a delegate, performing from the banquet dias as a lecturer, sitting at the great pipe organ playing My Old Kentucky Home, and being treated as "royalty" by royalty at the great World Congress in London.

What pageantry the retelling of her life story will unfold. The telling of which will refresh and encourage us all.

Speaking for all of you, let me say, we were never in her presence, be it private conversation, committee conference, banquet hall or convention assembled but what we were burdened with some new challenge that humbled us—in the first place because we had been unable to see it ourselves, and second because we had not been strong enough to dare more. Whenever she heard a need knocking, she had a dream, a vision of a new and larger enterprise and a more costly consecration. She saw things hidden beyond the horizon, brought us in and told us of the visions, and not only the visions, but the meaning of them as well, and there was no escape from their implications for us.

She was known by every chancellery in Europe and by every American President and Secretary of State and other leaders. All felt more than admiration for her intellectual gifts and accomplishments, as recorded in a long list of honors.

She worked for all mankind through the office of the business and professional women of the world. She believed in univeral education, especially for the girls who will be the mothers and first educators of the next generation. She believed in world-wide language. She believed in the equality of men and women. She believed in an universal league of nations to be obtained without violence and to function through an international parliament. She loved America with burning patriotism, but she could, even in thought, disengage herself and look at policies and behaviours as they must appear from other vantage points. Hence she was an active and effective representative of our International Federation at the United Nations.

She was a Protestant, an Episcopalian, but believed "The Word of God is one Word, the spokesmen are many." She steered the course of our national and international federations, venturing fearlessly into untried seas. As a lawyer and a woman she went forth in life eager to put more into the world than she ever could hope to take out of it and possessed unshakable faith in the eternal laws of justice and righteousness. She found life joyous. She accepted difficulties as challenges to womankind. One never knew her to be tempted to give way to despair.

It is amazing that one woman carrying forward so many duties which exhaust most people, and fulfilling them, should have had time and strength and talent for so many things. She never gave just occasional interest or indirect support. Lena Madesin Phillips couldn't go into anything no matter how small or how great—she couldn't go into

anything for which she did not assume a responsibility and trusteeship.

Henceforth, everything we do in dedicating the resources of the womanhood of our federation to human progress will be a tribute to Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips.

RUTH ROBINSON ROACH.

If I should die and leave you here awhile,
Be not like others, sore, undone, who keep
Long vigils for the silent dust and weep.
For my sake turn again to life and smile,
Nerving thy heart and trembling hand to do
Something to comfort weaker hands than thine;
Complete these dear unfinished tasks of mine,
And I, perchance, may therein comfort you.

(Anonymous.)

Strikes and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in view of the various crippling strikes which have recently taken place in some of our industrial plants in the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Black Day for Civil Rights," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK DAY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS—COLUMBUS STRIKE VIOLENCE FAILS TO STIR LIBERAL ORGANIZATIONS

(By David Lawrence)

Yesterday was a black day in American history. The Constitution was trampled upon. Civil rights were flagrantly abused. And yet not a single committee of Congress and not a single liberal organization showed any signs of raising a voice in protest.

No word of disapproval came from any of the groups which usually award prizes to defenders of civil liberties and no comment came from the organizations which are quick to denounce a jury's acquittal of persons charged with violence in the South.

Yet the dispatches from Columbus, Ohio, tell the story plainly of how nearly 1,700 American citizens tried to exercise their right to work at the Westinghouse plant and were set upon by a mob of other workers ordered to engage in mass picketing by a labor-union official. This was in defiance of a court order limiting the number of pickets. The United Press reports:

"The trouble broke out about 5:10 a. m. when some 2,000 members of the striking CIO-A. F. of L. International Union of Electrical Workers massed at the plant gates for a demonstration scheduled by the president of local 746.

"Sheriff's deputies said 2 or 3 cars were overturned early in the demonstration. The demonstration was called by President Charles Clark of the local union to protest the company's back to work movement.

"Eighty-six strikers were arrested. Sheriff's deputies reported 74 men and 12 women were jailed. Cars of workers attempting to enter the plant were smashed and at least seven persons suffered injuries during the uprising. * * *

"Troy Tadlock, 27, died during the demonstration. There were no marks on his body, officials said, indicating he died of natural causes.

"The 86 strikers who were arrested were held in the bullpen of the Franklin County jail on charges of inciting a riot. * * *

"The union called Sheriff Paul's handling of the situation 'one of the worst cases of police brutality ever seen in such a situation.' * * *

"Gov. Frank J. Lausche termed the conduct of the strike leaders 'indefensible.' He said the State would 'intervene to maintain law and order' if necessary."

But the damage cannot be measured in terms of persons arrested or injured or the amount of violence manifested at the gates of the plant. The real measure is in the extent of the intimidation exercised on the many thousands of workers who stayed at home and now do not dare to return to work, though they may desire to do so.

Thus is the right to work abolished by physical force in a big manufacturing plant in free America. Labor union leaders know full well that mass picketing has been prohibited by the laws of many States and that it invariably leads to violence. Yet they order mass demonstrations as a means of frightening those who may wish to return to work.

The laws of the land are designed to protect unions if employers refuse to bargain, and there is no justification, of course, for using violence as a means of enforcing union demands.

Only moral force can prevail in the court of public opinion. It is regrettable that no national leaders of trade unionism have come forth to denounce the use of physical force to win strikes or to intimidate workers. Some employers used to do such things, and the courts promptly punished "goon squads." But today various labor unions evidently feel that, with their present political power, they can threaten to defeat at the polls the mayors of cities or Governors of States who dare to use public authority to squelch violence.

Civil rights are important, because they protect citizens of every race or creed or color, but it is a mark of the hypocrisy of so-called liberalism today that it spends so much of its energies in defense of security risks accused of Communist affiliations or associations and doesn't seem to be bothered by the fact that thousands upon thousands of loyal Americans are losing their civil liberties at the gates of the plants there they try to exercise their right to work.

Winning the Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, at the 37th annual department convention of the American Legion, held in Detroit, Mich., last August, Dr. Richard C. Hertz, senior rabbi of Temple Beth El, Detroit, delivered a stirring address at the memorial service on the subject of winning the peace. The words which he spoke on that occasion carry inspiration and are well worth our consideration. In the interest of our struggle to strengthen and improve the peace we now have, I ask unanimous consent that the address of Dr. Hertz be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled together at this memorial hour, not as Catholics, Protestants, or Jews, not as white or Negro, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as Americans all, united in comradeship and dedicated to the advancement of freedom and democracy in our world. We have come together in convention as comrades who have served our country in war and in peace, and as we gather together in this memorial hour to think about those of our comrades who have fallen in the service of our country, we realize that this memorial hour by the very essence of its nature cannot be a happy sort of celebration. There is no place for any thought of festivity. It is rather an hour of hallowing the sacrifices of our sons and our friends' sons who have fallen on the field of battle and who lie buried on land or in the sea in honored graves.

This memorial hour, therefore, is a time for examination, a time to pause and think over in pride of the dedication that brought on their sacrifice, to review our own sense of values. Our beloved dead gave up their lives for causes, for ideals. They died in the grim doing of a hard duty that was not of their making. It is for us the living to amply demonstrate that their sacrifice was worthwhile. If this memorial hour would serve any purpose at all it must awaken within us the spirit that those that died shall not have died in vain. For, truly, Abraham Lincoln uttered the greatest memorial lines ever spoken: "It is for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us * * * that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause to which they gave the last full measure of devotion * * * that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain * * * that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom * * *."

There is only one way I know in which this Nation or any nation can have a new birth of freedom, and that is by dedicating themselves to peace. Wars can be won, why not peace? The real meaning of this memorial hour, therefore, is to touch our hearts and spirits in such a way that across time and space we link hands and spirits with those who have traveled onward, and from this communion draw renewed faith to press forward the work of building a better world.

Archibald MacLeish penned these lines in the darkest hours of World War II. He tells what a memorial hour should really be. This poem is called The Young Dead Soldiers.

"The young dead soldiers do not speak.
Nevertheless they are heard in the still houses.
(Who has not heard them?)
They say,
We were young. We have died. Remember us.
They say,
We have done what we could
But until it is finished it is not done.
They say,
We have given our lives
But until it is finished no one can know what our lives gave.
They say,
Our deaths are not ours,
They are yours,
They will mean what you make them.
They say,
Whether our lives and our deaths were for peace and a new hope
Or for nothing
We cannot say.
It is you who must say this.
They say,
We leave you our deaths,
Give them their meaning,

Give them an end to the war and a true peace.
Give them victory that ends the war and a peace afterwards,
Give them their meaning.
We were young, they say.
We have died.
Remember us."

We do remember the young dead soldiers at this hour. We can best commemorate their sacrifice by rekindling the torch of peace they died to keep aflame. Our honored dead lie buried on the far shores because they thought peace could be won by victory. Today we know that peace can be won only by and through peace itself. Peace is not just the absence of war. Peace is the presence of justice, security, and freedom operating in a world so released from anxieties, so freed from fear that "every man can sit under his own vine and fig tree with none to make him afraid." Peace can be won no less than war. But peace is harder to win than war. Wars are won in days, weeks, months, campaigns, deployment, reconnaissance, advance—these are the strategies of war. But peace can be won only in years, decades, generations.

We may not know as much about winning peace as we do about winning wars. The world is much better at wars. We train our admirals and generals much more thoroughly than our statesmen. Somebody usually wins a war with a victory, but nobody seems to win a peace. As little as we do know about the problem of peace, this much seems sure: Peace cannot grow and prosper on an empty stomach—on illiteracy, rickets, starvation, or disease. General Marshall, when he spoke at Harvard University on June 5, 1947, as then Secretary of State, may have uttered the wisest prescription in our time for peace. "Our policy," he said, "is not directed against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, and desperation, and nothing else." Thoughtful people have come to understand that hunger, poverty, disease and, ignorance are the basic causes of human unhappiness, the basic factors that move men to violence, revolution, and war. The underprivileged peoples of the world, particularly in Asia, have until recently accepted their lot like patient beasts of burden, but now they are rebelling because they clearly see that their suffering is due to oppression, to exploitation, materialism, colonialism, and not to any immutable fate assigned to them by a divine being. The point 4 policy of the United States, therefore, in sending technical aid and assistance to underprivileged peoples of the world should be applauded and commended as a step toward removing the causes of war, for wars are made in the minds of men.

So many people these days are willing to write off the United Nations as useless. Even its stanchest supporters at San Francisco, celebrating the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations Organization, could not claim to be entirely pleased with its history, but its bitterest critics must admit that the effort to establish a meeting place with a resolving of differences, and for the nations of the world to nurture the growth of international law, to encourage the development of a world-minded attitude, a world-minded consciousness on the part of the great and the small, is all worth the struggle. No infant organization can be expected to lead to full maturity overnight. Bernard Baruch's wise warning comes back to us: "We must embrace international cooperation or international disintegration." Until a better instrument for world cooperation is forged, the United Nations is our best evidence of a will toward world community.

Grave weaknesses there may be in the U. N., and these must be removed as speedily as possible, but to secede from the U. N. because Russia has abused the veto, or because the Security Council may be helpless at times, is to throw away a potential for good, and to be left with empty hands. America has done much for the United Nations, but not enough. We may have contributed more in terms of dollars and cents than any other nation, but still our share is but a paltry bit in our multibillion dollar budget. What I am saying, therefore, is that ultimately the United Nations will have to play a larger role in winning the peace. There is no other avenue yet built. We of the American Legion ought to support the U. N. so that it can become a broad highway over which nations can travel to and fro, a viable artery of communications from which will flow greater understanding of friends and greater tolerance of foes.

We of the American Legion have long been concerned with the issue of communism. We have said over and over again in statements and resolutions that America must stop communism. But how are we going to stop communism? With guns? You cannot shoot communism with a gun. Communism is an idea, it is a program; it is a way of rescuing mankind from the ghastly misery in which most of it now lives. I say that the only way to stop communism is to offer the one world in which we all live a better solution to the real problem of human misery than communism can offer. I believe that democracy has a better answer than communism. Russia is not all that stands between mankind and a stable peace. Neither containment or appeasement will win the peace. Our only chance is to do something about the real issues of human misery. That is the proper place to begin and the problem to lick.

Some people naively think that Russia is all that stands between mankind and a stable peace. Why, if all the Russians in the world obligingly died today, if all the Communists, whether in Russia or China, or in our fifth column, were to commit suicide tomorrow, the world revolution for equality would not stop. Backward peoples in Asia and Africa and elsewhere are not only sick and hungry and desperate, but they now have discovered how modern science and modern communication, can break down the walls that have separated them from civilization. They now know that their hunger and their sickness and their misery are unnecessary. These backward peoples are in a state of ferment. They are in motion, fighting and insisting on the right to eat, the right to live. So to think that we can get a stable world by frightening or defeating Russia is naive. There is much more to building a secure foundation for a just and equitable society than merely scaring Russia or rattling new atomic sabers against them.

More than ever before, therefore, this memorial hour is a time for solemn thanksgiving. Guns have at least been silenced in Korea, the smoke of artillery has been lifted in Indochina, the rugged terrain of Asia has been left gutted but quiet. Our American soldiers, sailors, and airmen no longer move in deadly peril of Communist shells. For parents and loved ones at home the clock of human waiting no longer ticks, waiting for the ever-dreaded telegram of death. Yet there is no victory nor even peace—only gratitude that cease-fire orders have been signed and the chance for a just and enduring peace settlement has been won.

In Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East lies the grim task of converting the present armed truce—that is all it is, an armed truce—into a peace worthy of the name. Unless the diplomats and treatymakers succeed all else fails. Resumption of hostilities would solve nothing that negotiations cannot do better. Mankind knows, yet too often forgets, that wars inevitably create more problems than they resolve.

The Communists have at last learned in Korea and Indochina that the free world will not stand idly by in the presence of unbridled aggression. We Americans have also learned at terrific cost that Russia can alternate with lightning speed between cooing softly like a dove and striking hard like a poison rattlesnake. At last we know that Russia's tactics may change while her global strategy for world domination remains fixed. Even though there is now a New Look at the summit as a result of the conferences in Geneva, we should not be deceived by any soft talk from the Kremlin. Right now, Russia needs peace probably even more than does America. The death of Stalin and the consequent struggle for political power among the successors, including the liquidation of Beria, have laid bare the inner convulsion now going on behind the Iron Curtain. Russia needs time for her new dictators to fight it out among themselves and see who will emerge with the mantle of Lenin and Stalin. Then the winner and new champion must consolidate his position, banish his enemies, and solidify his tenuous reign of terror.

So America has a little time—a breather, but it is so little time. We can fritter away this time of decision or we can put it to good advantage. Which will it be? Stockpiling war material is not the only way to strengthen our security. We need to stockpile peace material. We need spiritual rearmament no less than military rearmament. We need defense and depth to toughen our moral fiber and remember the "courage and honor, the hope and pride, and compassion and pity and sacrifice which have been the glory of man's past."

At the very time of danger from without, our country also faces a danger from within. Reaction is on the march. Loud voices of political opportunists seek to silence the lips of clergymen, educators, writers, or anyone else who dares to stand up and be counted for freedom. Brainwashing is becoming stylish. We of the American Legion ought to stop and realize that the freedom we have defended with force can be subverted even in the name of freedom. Smear tactics, intimidations, guilt by association, half-truths and whole distortions have become a straitjacket of thought control. The whole world is watching America now to see whether we practice what we preach about freedom and democracy. The American Legion ought to make sure that in the name of Americanism no strong-arm gaulieters or vigilantes try to usurp the constitutional liberties vouchsafed to every citizen of America regardless of race, color, or creed.

A great debate on foreign policy is going on in this country; one that is not confined to the halls of Congress. It rests on responsible citizens everywhere. Unless we are willing to rise to our full stature and resume a personal responsibility for the decisions of peace, we are little better than sheep being led to the slaughter. Peace can be won! Not will be won, but can be won—if we lick the problem of human misery, if we summon the best brains, the finest idealism, the most inspired leadership, the most sacrificial living ever dreamed of, if we live up to the best that American freedom demands of us. Time runs on but we are still free to remember, as Herbert Agar suggested a few years ago, that now may be the last chance for the white race to join the human race as an equal. Stringfellow Barr said, "Let's join the human race."

The future alone will tell how late the hour is for civilization's last chance. It may be later than we think, if not nearly as late as we fear, for until the hour of doom strikes and all hope vanishes, every man and woman must work at the task of waging peace. More than this we cannot do. Less than this we do not dare. We of the American Legion must realize that negative anticommunism is not enough. We must settle down to the day-to-day, undramatic task of building a bulwark against war and communism by

sharing food, health, education, and freedom with all. We must become world-minded Americans, and see to it that our Nation lives up to the responsibilities which two World Wars have thrust upon our country. We must rouse ourselves from the winter of defeatism and pessimism, that perennial war is inevitable, and find a springtime of hope for man. The Voice of America must echo around the world rekindling the old hope of humanity for peace and freedom.

This memorial hour, therefore, reminds us that man's ability to build a democratic and peaceful world has not yet equalled his capacity for heroism and self-sacrifice, and that consecration and devotion to Christian and Jewish ideals have to be constantly renewed and reaffirmed. America must prove worthy of the sacrifices of its citizens who gave up their lives in time of war in order to build a better world. Americans in service, whether they be Negro or white, Catholic, Protestant or Jewish, now wear the uniform of our country proudly. They must not come back home to a country of discrimination and violation of civil rights. Every man, regardless of race, color, or creed is entitled to freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of education, freedom of employment. We in the American Legion must see that all Americans, regardless of differences among us, must live, fight, and work together for a world democratic society. This memorial hour will have been in vain unless we build a kind of world in which men everywhere shall be free, in which "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

Tragically enough we have learned how to die together. Now the time has come when we must learn to live together—as Americans, as brothers, as Christians and Jews, whites and Negroes, united in the common cause of liberty and justice for all, God and country. Then we shall indeed understand the meaning of ancient scriptures, where it was written with profound wisdom, "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."

Privilege and Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Privilege and Responsibility," published in the Wall Street Journal of December 9, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Henry Ford, whose family's fortune is responsible for the Fund for the Republic, has now joined the ranks of those who think some of its actions have been "dubious in character and inevitably have led to charges of poor judgment."

It is not necessary to enter the argument on the merits of the Fund for the Republic to see that Mr. Ford's forthright explanation of his own position explains also one of the chief reasons why the whole question of these funds and foundations has become such a matter of public concern.

Mr. Ford says that although this fund was created from Ford funds he has no legal right whatsoever to intervene in its affairs. He writes:

"Because the Fund for the Republic was established as a completely independent organization, neither I nor any of the other trustees of the (Ford) Foundation has a voice in the fund's activities or projects. We have no control over the selection of personnel for the fund's staff. * * * These (original) directors were given the authority to select other directors and their successors without reference to us. They * * * have carried out their program on their own responsibility."

So here are a group of men who have been handed $15 million to spend in the Ford name for political and educational purposes without being accountable in any way to anyone. They are not subject to recall or referendum. They appoint their own successors. They could, if they chose, adopt projects to educate for communism, fascism or whatever fancy struck their heads. And no one could say them nay.

Of course no one could say nay either if Mr. Hutchins, the Fund's president, and the other individuals were spending money out of their own pockets to propagandize whatever views they wished. But as it is the money these men spend is not wholly private. This is a tax-free agency and to that extent receives both subsidy and privilege from the body politic.

And that is the crux of the matter. All these funds, foundations or what-you-call-them have a quasi-public character. And it is hardly surprising that the public is concerned if they seem to have privilege without commensurate responsibility.

Here perhaps someone will say, "Yes, but we have had tax-free foundations for years without public controversy. Why all the sudden outcry?"

The difference, we think, is that the traditional tax-free foundations did not invade the political arena. People might think the Carnegie or Rockefeller Foundations were wasting some of their money but they did not fear they were trying to use tax-free money to propagandize social or political viewpoints. Their political independence was never challenged because they did not deal primarily in political questions.

Today there are many organizations like the Fund for the Republic, though varying in size and political viewpoint, which seem to be using the privileges granted by society to influence the character of society. It is precisely because they have chosen to enter the political arena that their status has become a political question.

And the questioning is inevitably intensified when, as here, the men exercising the power of these privileged and subsidized funds are answerable to nobody at all.

Mr. Ford observes that "no public trust can expect to fulfill its responsibilities if it does not respond to intelligent and constructive public criticism."

And he might have added that in the long run if the public does not think these institutions live up to their responsibilities then the public will in time take away their privileges.

Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are delighted that the majority leader has returned to his place in the Senate. During his absence from the Senate the Washington Evening Star of December 14, 1955, carried an editorial entitled "Moderate Man."

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, which I believe sums up the feeling of both Republicans and Democrats, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. We are all happy that our distinguished leader is back with us, and we know that with him at the helm, we are in good hands.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In its issue of June 27, 1955, Newsweek magazine said this of Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON:

"These days JOHNSON throws everything he has into the leadership job—the stamina of his 200-pound 6-foot, 3-inch physique, the political experience and his persuasive gifts. He ordinarily works through the evening with a staff which keeps him well briefed on legislative issues as they arise and on the quirks of Senators immediately concerned with them. He accepts no social engagements and spends what little time off he has with his wife and their two young daughters."

Five days later the dynamic Texan was cut down by a severe heart attack. It looked for a while as though his active career in politics was over.

But Senator JOHNSON has won his battle. This week saw his temporary return to Washington for a legislative conference with the President, and it was good to have him with us again. For the esteem in which Senator JOHNSON is so widely held goes beyond considerations of personal friendship and respect. In his own words, he is a moderate man, a man to whom moderation means "tolerance—a failure to embrace extremes, a willingness to listen to the viewpoint of others, and learn." Certainly there is no necessity to dwell upon the need for such a man, especially when he holds a place of such high importance on our political stage.

The news reports of the White House meeting do not tell us what Senator JOHNSON said to the President, or what the President said to Senator JOHNSON. Nor do we need to know in order to be certain of one thing. These men have shared an experience which tends to put things in proper perspective. The petty triumphs of partisan politics cannot seem of great importance to one who has returned from the dark valley which they have visited. We may be sure that the President and majority leader, though of opposing political faiths, will strive for the common good as they see it in the days ahead. And for that we may be truly thankful.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I know all our hearts have been saddened by the untimely passing of our dear friend and distinguished colleague, the Honorable VERA BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania. It is with deep emotion and a feeling of great sorrow that I pay brief, but nonetheless sincere tribute to the life and character and public service of such a noble lady.

We know the valiant fight she made during her illness and her courageous

efforts to carry on with the duties to which she had dedicated herself in this body. As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee she was a considerable influence in securing the enactment of legislative proposals beneficial to the people of her district, State, and Nation.

VERA BUCHANAN was a most sincere and conscientious legislator who capably followed the footsteps of her late husband, my good friend, Frank Buchanan, whose memory I shall always cherish.

VERA was always gracious and charming and endeared herself to her host of friends and constituents. I shall always remember with fond recollection her appearance at the third assembly district Democratic organization reception and ball, held last May in my congressional district in Brooklyn. At that time she was in New York with a group of congressional friends on a tour of the city and it was a pleasant surprise when she took the time on such a short trip to come over to Brooklyn and honor us with her presence.

I am sure that I speak not only for myself but for all the Members of this House and her legion of friends when I say that her memory will linger in our hearts forever. My prayer is that her two lovely daughters will be consoled by the fact that her life was dedicated to fulfilling her role as a conscientious mother and carrying on with the fight for liberal and democratic principles to which her late husband had devoted his life. Her daughters and their families have my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Pay for United States Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the question of pay or lack of pay for those working in the higher echelons of the Government is a question deserving immediate attention. Congress has granted pay raises to practically every other segment of our Federal personnel, but so far has held up increases in pay for top executives in the executive departments. It is good to know that the President in his state of the Union message approved a raise for such employees. They have not been given a raise since 1949.

It is my understanding that a bill providing for such pay raises has passed the House. It is my hope that before long the Senate will pass such a bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article on the subject, written by Jerry Kluttz, which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, be printed in the RECORD. It is worth our serious consideration.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PAY FOR EXECUTIVES UNEQUAL, DISCRIMINATORY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Uncle Sam pays his top executives under a patchwork system that is shot full of inequalities and outright discriminations.

No major business would dream of using this system to fix the salaries of its leaders for the very simple reason that it would be poor business to do so. And the Government is big business—the biggest business—whether we like it or not.

Congress fixes the salaries of the executives in the three branches of our Government—executive, legislative, and judicial.

The House pays its parliamentarian $20,500 a year and his assistant gets $16,500. In contrast, the salary of the Senate parliamentarian, an equally important position, is a mere $14,800.

The legislative counsel of the House is paid $16,125. This compares to the $15,500 salary of his counterpart, the Senate legislative counsel.

Only one employee of each Senate committee may be paid a $14,800 annual salary. In the House, there is no limit on the number of committee staff members who can be paid $14,800 salaries, the maximum.

The congressional system for setting the salaries of its executives could be used to cover up the actual salaries paid to legislative employees.

For example, the maximum that can be paid a committee executive is $14,800 but no where in the congressional salary law does that figure appear. The amount used in the law is $8,820.

It takes an alert CPA and a lawyer to figure out how an $8,820 "basic" salary can be made into a $14,800 "gross" salary, but anyway, that's the system.

It should come as no surprise to find wide disparities and rank discriminations in the pay of executives in the executive branch.

It isn't generally realized, but an assistant district attorney can be paid more than most "little Cabinet" members of most Federal commissions and boards.

The top salary that can be paid to an assistant district attorney is $16,000 compared to $15,000 for most "little Cabinet" and commission members.

The $20,000 top salary that can be paid a district attorney places him close to the top of the Federal structure, salarywise, though his job, important as it is, doesn't compare with the heavy responsibilities of others in Government that pay substantially less.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who is responsible for collecting the billions of Uncle Sam and supervises 54,000 employees, is paid $15,000, less than that of an assistant district attorney.

Small Business Administration rates as a minor agency. Yet its Administrator is paid $17,500. Also, SBA has three $15,000 deputies.

A full-time referee in bankruptcy can be paid $15,000, the same wage paid the heads of Civil Aeronautics Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and numerous others.

The deputies and assistants in most of those and in other agencies are paid $14,800, the top classified salary. They have little financial incentive to be promoted to the boss' job for an insignificant increase of $200 a year.

John Foster Dulles is the Secretary of State, and as such, he's the No. 1 man in his department—but not according to the pay scale set by Congress. He's paid $22,500 a year; he appoints chiefs of foreign missions who report to him and who are paid $25,000 a year.

In numerous other instances in the executive branch the boss is paid either the same or less than an underling.

Assistant Postmaster General Norman Abrams is charged with supervising the Nation's 38,000 postmasters. However, several big city postmasters are paid more than his $15,000 salary.

It isn't unusual to find a general counsel or a budget officer in a Federal agency who is paid as much or more than the assistant secretaries.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell has been uniquely successful in persuading Congress to raise the salaries of his top officials. As a result, the top-bracket Justice salary scale is superior to that of any other Federal agency.

The Deputy Attorney General is paid $21,000, which is tops for any No. 2 Cabinet job; the Solicitor General is paid $20,500, and each Assistant Attorney General is paid $20,000 which is $5,000 more than most other "little Cabinet" members are paid.

Also, the Administrative Assistant Attorney General is paid $17,500 and it is $2,500 more than similar positions elsewhere in Government.

The House passed a bill last summer to raise the salaries of many Federal executives and to lift the $14,800 ceiling on classified salaries to $16,000. The bill is pending in the Senate.

In his State of the Union message, the President again urged the Congress to approve a bill to raise the salaries of Federal executives, the only group in Government which hasn't been given a general increase in salaries since 1949.

United States Position on Disarmament

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on October 23, 1955, the Sunday editorial section of the New York Times carried a most cogent and thought-provoking column by the eminent journalist, Mr. James Reston. That column dealt with the United States position on disarmament, and commented at some length on the priority given to propaganda over diplomacy in this vital area.

I ask unanimous consent that this revealing discussion of the situation by Mr. Reston, which is as true today as it was when he wrote it 2 months ago, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY UNITED STATES DISARMAMENT PLAN ISN'T WORKING

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, October 22.—The United States is now engaged in the most ambitious search for a workable arms limitation program in the centuries-old history of this subject.

It has mobilized committees in the main Government departments, interdepartmental committees, interallied committees and committes of distinguished private citizens, and the hope now is that the work of all these organizations will be brought together into some kind of a Government plan late this year or early next.

Meanwhile Harold E. Stassen, the President's disarmament assistant, is running around the country complaining that the Russians are not accepting President Eisenhower's aerial inspection plan, and saying things about that plan that mislead nobody but the American people.

"President Eisenhower's proposal," he told the southern governors at Point Clear, Ala., this week, "would provide against great surprise attack, whether by nuclear or conventional means."

A MISLEADING STATEMENT

There is some truth in this, but not much. The President's plan provides for an exchange of military blueprints and for the right of the United States and the U. S. S. R. to fly over and inspect one another's territory, taking detailed aerial photographs if they choose.

The plan was limited to the territory of the United States and the Soviet Union. It did not cover our allies or the Soviet allies. It would not give the United States authority to fly over or inspect Soviet bases in the territory of the Eastern European satellites or permit the Soviet fliers to check what was going on in our bases in Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Spain, North Africa, Turkey, Pakistan, the Philippines, or Japan.

The Russians could accept the Eisenhower plan tomorrow and still be in a position—assuming they had the planes and the bombs—to launch a "great surprise attack" against the United States from Eastern Europe and against the United States bases in Japan from Communist China.

Similarly, their planes could be circling over the Air Force's strategic command in Nebraska and over every other bomber base in the United States this weekend, and this would not assure the Soviet Union against a massive surprise attack from United States bases in other countries or from United States atom-bomb carrying ships at sea.

Mr. Stassen knows this. He knows the Russians know it and have been asking him about it for weeks. He also knows that the Eisenhower plan will not be accepted or even carefully explored until the rest of our disarmament studies are complete. Yet he runs about the country like a middle western Dr. Coué, saying every day and every way we are getting nearer and nearer a disarmament agreement with the Russians.

As usual it is not what the United States does but what the United States says that is objectionable. Nobody blames the United States for taking its time to study the disarmament problem. A mistake in this field, a careless acceptance of phony Russian disarmament plans or a hastily drafted American plan produced in the glow of the Geneva spirit could place the whole Western World in jeopardy. What our own allies blame us for is for pressing everybody to accept the Eisenhower plan as a gateway to disarmament when we are not ready to say what is beyond the gateway.

Everybody, of course, wants to get started, but everybody has his own "first step" or "gateway." For example, the Russians want us to start by agreeing not to use atomic bombs and to limit armies to specific levels. The United States very properly rejects this pending a study of what is beyond the Russian "gateway."

A TIME FOR PATIENCE

Consequently, very little can be expected out of the discussions of disarmament at the United Nations or the negotiations on this subject by the Big Four foreign ministers at Geneva starting next week unless the United States completes its mammoth exploration of the problem and produces a plan.

The Russians are doing precisely what we are doing. They are waiting to see the whole of the American disarmament plan before accepting a part of it, just as we are waiting to study all aspects of their proposals before committing ourselves to any part of theirs.

Meanwhile, the sensible thing to do is to "pipe down" until the studies are complete on both sides and everybody is prepared to negotiate. Mr. Stassen and Ambassador Lodge at the U. N. could take this view without any damage to the United States position.

At no time since the start of the cold war has any country got so much propaganda mileage out of an idea as the United States has got out of the aerial inspection proposal, but the proposal is full of holes as it now stands, and the more Mr. Stassen and Ambassador Lodge agitate for its acceptance, the more they will expose its practical weaknesses, and jeopardize its ultimate acceptance.

Sovietizing Central Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor of the New York Times, dated December 26, 1955, by Hon. Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The letter appeared in the January 2, 1956, issue of the New York Times. The letter is worth the attention of every Member of the Senate because it indicates quite plainly that the Soviet Union itself has been a colonizing power for many years, and in view of what the Soviet Union has been saying in south Asia and elsewhere it is an example of the pot calling the kettle black.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIETIZING CENTRAL ASIA—RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL SUPPRESSION IN AREA CHARGED

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer of the following letter is chief counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. He recently accompanied Justice William Douglas on a trip through central Asia.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your most commendable editorial of December 23 on Soviet colonialism you concentrated on Russian exploitation of the people of the Baltic States and Eastern Europe and passed over a most glaring example of Soviet colonialism—namely, in the 1,500,000 square miles which comprise the 5 republics of Soviet central Asia.

The Russians began their conquest of these ancient and independent States in the 1860's, but some sections remained free until they were finally subjugated by the Soviets during the 1920's. The people are of Turkish and Persian stock with a strong Mongolian strain. They have slanted eyes, high cheekbones, marked oriental dress, and are as different from the Russians as the Malayan is different from the Englishman, the Moroccan from the Frenchman.

The Communists, when they attack Western colonial policies, speak of broken promises, failure to grant local autonomy, segregation and the torture and murder of colonial peoples in order to subjugate them. By every one of these standards Soviet control of these areas qualifies as colonialism of a peculiarly harsh and intractable kind.

DISAPPEARANCE OF MOSQUES

The people of this region were promised by the Communists in 1917 that they could continue their religious practices. Yet in Bukhara, for example, where before the revolutian there were over 300 mosques and religious schools, now there exists, only 1 mosque, in a bad state of disrepair, and a single school that must serve the more than 10 million Moslems of the whole of central Asia. In Krasnovodsk, in Ashkhabad, with a population of 225,000, and in Stalinabad, with a population of 300,000, there are no mosques at all.

The people are denied local autonomy, for all sources of income, all means of livelihood, all social and political activity are controlled by Moscow.

The Communists practice rigorous segregation in this area, with separate school systems for the European Russian children and for the local children, and with the western Russian given more favored treatment in all areas of employment.

In order to promote their system against the wishes of the people during the 1920's and 1930's the Communists systematically eliminated one-third of the local Kazak population who desired to maintain their ancient ways. Based on statistics for the 1926 and 1939 census, published by the Soviets themselves, a million of these people disappeared from the Soviet Union.

ATTACK ON WEST'S POLICIES

The evils of the policies of certain western nations in colonial areas are now being widely publicized. The Soviets are directing all their agencies of propaganda toward the exploitation of these difficulties. And, yet, at the same time the Communists, with hardly any objection from us, have been permitted to wipe out the freedom of millions of people occupying an area larger than that of Western Europe.

It is, I believe, high time that we in the West understood and spotlighted in the United Nations and in our own propaganda throughout the world this aggression against freedom.

And, as the Soviets continue their "peaceful" encroachments in the Middle East, Afghanistan, and southeast Asia, using as their chief weapon eastern hostility to colonialism, it would be well if the peoples and leaders of these areas pondered what had been the fate of their brothers to the north, in Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tadzhikistan, Kirghizia, and Kazakhstan.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

WASHINGTON, *December 26, 1955.*

Nation-States and the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, published on yesterday, Sunday, January 8, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, and written by Mr. Herbert Elliston, formerly an editor of the Post, and now a special feature writer for that newspaper.

The article deals with a matter of tremendous importance, namely, a method for putting more life and vitality into our NATO organization, so as to hold together the NATO nations. In the article

Mr. Elliston discusses a resolution which I have submitted, asking that the President call a meeting of the NATO countries, in order to see whether they can agree upon further steps for unity and permanence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION-STATES AND THE NUCLEAR AGE

(By Herbert Elliston)

It was one of the philosophers of ancient times, I believe, who said that the size of the state should be as broad as was necessary for defense. What is the Government limit required for our security in this thermonuclear age? It has obviously overleaped the national, most probably the continental, range—as obviously as in the case of the city-states of ancient Greece.

Science has shown that the security requirement for rulership is now as big as the planet. This is at the base of the advocacy of one or other form of world, or supranational, government; the safety of the "great globe itself" has become indistinguishable from the safety of the individuals upon it.

So, at the beginning of the New Year, as at the beginning of last year, I put in plug for the Senate resolution for an Atlantic exploratory convention standing in the name of ESTES KEFAUVER.

Pity for the resolution that this is election year, for it has influential backing both inside and outside the Senate. General Marshall is now for it, though he was cool toward the idea when he was Secretary of State. Out of office, Secretary Dulles spoke of the language of Atlantic unionism, though he now feels he has to be neutral. In any case, an election year is a drag upon any American initiative in world affairs on new lines corresponding with the swiftly moving times. Then there is the handicap that the man whose name heads the senatorial sponsorship is himself a presidential aspirant.

Nevertheless the necessity for an Atlantic convention (alongside, of course, the United Nations) continues to be sharpened with the clearer and clearer demonstration of the national insecurity prevailing amid the prospect of intercontinental missiles in the hands of national states responsible only to themselves.

You may say that, even if the convention were to lead to a supranational unity of the Atlantic nation-states, this would not necessarily preclude war. That is true enough. There will always be a danger of war—and big-scale war at that—so long as all nation-states have not bound themselves under a supranational authority. This is the logic of the spread of thermonuclear means and know-how—a spread that will eventually take in all the nation-states. As Ciano said in his memoirs, and Speer later at the Nuremberg trials: "Gone are the frontiers except in our minds."

However, there has to be a start somewhere in the quest for security in a new age which has left the nation-states as obsolete as the old city-state. Two world wars have already been the price we have paid for the nation-state system. Some historians would dispute this. Champions of the doctrine of free will, they insist that the people and their leaders were responsible for what happened. But it is legitimate, I think, to agree with this theory and at the same time to believe that the political framework in which at the time we were operating made the catastrophes almost impossible to avert. Interconnectedness of events is the law of history; otherwise there would be no such thing as an historical explanation of anything.

Note that the Kefauver resolution does not commit the sponsors to any particular sort of supranational government. Some of the supporters of the Kefauver resolution want a federation of Atlantic peoples, others a confederation, and still others would be content with a commonwealth which would strengthen and formalize the political ties of the constituent members. There is of course the North Atlantic Alliance. But NATO ties provide only a common strategy for military action against Russia—or do they? And otherwise merely for consultation. The organization looks more and more like an elaborate hoax giving the false impression that common policies on the part of the free world are in existence. It has lapsed into little more than the debating society that Senator JACKSON calls SEATO. Shadow boxing with the political challenge has indeed become the mode.

Personally, I would go much further than try to persuade the proposed convention to achieve a better coordination in diplomatic relations. The convention should focus the need for some pooling, some modification of national sovereignty so that our physical situation may have an adequate political counterpart. It should stir men's minds to get politically into the hydrogen world. Otherwise the bankruptcy of our foreign policy will be increasingly evident.

Veterans of Three Wars Guard Against Air Attack Near Custer National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news article appearing in the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of January 2, 1956, entitled "Vets of Three Wars Man Custer Lookout," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The people who are manning the ground observer post in the shadow of the Custer National Monument serve as an outstanding and patriotic reminder to our fellow citizens as to what the word "duty" implies. They are all a credit and an asset to our country and I commend them most highly for their continued active participation in insuring its security.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETS OF THREE WARS MAN CUSTER LOOKOUT

CROW AGENCY.—In the shadow of the Custer National Monument that stands as a reminder, a handful of men guard against enemy air attack.

On the small Montana hill, where Custer fought and died 80 years ago, the handful of men, who have fought for America in 3 wars, set up and operate a 24-hour a day ground observer post.

The organizer of the air defense organization is Maj. Edward S. Luce, retired superintendent of the Custer National Monument.

Luce served at one time with the 7th Cavalry Regiment, Custer's old outfit, and developed a keen interest in the general and his battle.

"The same thing could happen to this country that happened here on June 26–26, 1876," the major says. He added that adequate intelligence—or warning such as the GOC can provide—could perhaps have saved Custer and his men.

Full-time observers at the post, in addition to Major Luce, include Clarence T. Griep, a Marine from 1942–46, who lost a leg at Iwo Jima and still has 37 pieces of a land mine in him; Albert F. Jacobson, a World War II paratrooper who saw action on Luzon and Leyte; Don Rickey, Jr., a Navy machinists mate who participated in eight major naval engagements aboard the aircraft carrier *Enterprise;* Leland W. Georgen, who was with the Navy in Korea; Marion Terry, and Mrs. Evelyn Luce, chief observer at the post. All 7 live on the grounds and insure complete 24-hour coverage. Others who observe during working hours are Ray C. Davis, and Bruce Miller, both service veterans.

On a clear day it is possible to see at least 70 miles in some directions from the post.

"We can be sure they are always on the job," says Lt. Arnold Williams, filter center commander in Billings. "I am confident that enemy planes would not fly over the Custer Battlefield undetected as long as these people are on the job."

Elective Governor of Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide for an elective Governor and an elective Lieutenant Governor of Alaska. I have taken this action as a stanch supporter of full statehood for Alaska. My research has convinced me enactment of the legislation I introduced today would hasten, rather than delay, the day when Congress will finally recognize that the people of this vast and rich area are entitled to full citizenship rights—including the right to be represented in this Chamber.

This legislation is not being introduced as a substitute for statehood. There is no substitute for the full representative rights of the United States citizen. This measure is introduced as a step toward full statehood.

But this legislation is more than just a step toward full statehood. It fills an immediate administrative need of the Territory of Alaska. All issues of statehood aside, the present method of governing Alaska is outmoded and some rather serious administrative troubles are developing that this measure would correct.

An appointive governor was first provided for Alaska by an act of Congress in 1884. Since that time, there have been only two other measures enacted by Congress having any marked impact on Alaska's governmental setup. In 1906, Congress granted the Alaskan people the right to send an elected delegate to this House and in 1912 an act of Congress created the Territorial Legislature.

Congress has not enacted any legislation to add to Alaska's powers of self-government since 1912—44 years ago. This is a sorry record.

As a member of the House Interior Committee, I went to Alaska during adjournment and learned first hand of some of the problems Alaskans are having. Many of them could be solved by passage of this legislation.

The Governor of Alaska administers laws enacted by an elected legislature. But the Governor is responsible—not to the legislature, not to the electorate of Alaska—but to the President of the United States. Fortunately, because of the caliber of appointive governors, no serious conflicts have as yet occurred. But the potential is certainly there.

Knowing that they have no voice in the selection of their chief territorial executive, the people of Alaska, through their elected legislators, are reluctant to vest him with any authority over their affairs. This is understandable and is no reflection on the integrity of the present or past governors of Alaska.

As a consequence of this reluctance to give the governor authority to govern, there has now grown up in the Territory of Alaska a government by boards, and commissions, of which the governor is not even allowed to sit as a member. This system is creating all sorts of administrative difficulties, and I am confident it would cease to exist if the Alaskan people had a right to elect their own chief executive and it would never have come into being if this power had been given the Territory years ago when the complexities of government first showed it was needed.

The people of Alaska, I am sure, would not tolerate an unwieldly government by boards and commissions if they had the power to elect, and vote out, their own governor. This legislation is needed during the period when the fight for statehood is still going on. I hope you all can give it your support, regardless of your position on full statehood for Alaska.

Roy H. Glover Named Montana Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Mr. Roy H. Glover, chairman of the board of directors for the Anaconda Co., was on January 2, 1956, designated as Montana's Man of the Year in a poll conducted by the United Press of Montana radio station owners and managers.

I think that honor is well merited, because Mr. Glover who was born in the State of Washington, received his education at the University of Oregon, and spent most of his life in Montana, is a distinguished citizen of our part of the country known as the Northwest. He has made many outstanding contributions to the betterment and welfare of Montana and its people and we are proud indeed that this additional honor has been conferred upon him.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story covering the announcement of the award which appeared in the Montana Standard, of Butte, Mont., on January 3, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROY H. GLOVER IS NAMED MONTANA MAN OF THE YEAR

HELENA.—Roy H. Glover, chairman, of the board of directors for the Anaconda Co., Monday was named Montana's Man of the Year in a United Press poll of Montana radio station owners and managers.

Glover was selected from more than a dozen top leaders in the fields of politics, industry, education, social, and other activities.

A native of Goldendale, Wash., Glover received his degree in law from the University of Oregon in 1916, practicing in Portland until he enlisted in the Army during World War I.

After his return from overseas duty, he located in Great Falls, starting as a law clerk in 1919. In the ensuing years, he became one of the State's leading attorneys. He was a member of the firm of Cooper, Stephenson, and Glover in Great Falls when he entered the Anaconda Co.'s legal department in Butte in 1943.

In 1945, he was appointed western general counsel for Anaconda and in the same year became general counsel for the Montana Power Co.

He was named vice president, general counsel and a director of the Anaconda Co. on October 12, 1951, moving his headquarters at that time from Butte to New York.

He has since spent considerable time in Chile in connection with Anaconda's large operations.

Chilean President Carlos Ibanez personally decorated Glover with the award of Knight Commander, Order of Merit of Bernardo O'Higgins, on April 6, 1955. The honor is one of the highest awards of Chile and was given for his valuable services to Chile.

Glover was elected chairman of the board of the Anaconda Co. on May 26, 1955, succeeding Cornelius F. Kelley. Mr. Kelley had announced his retirement earlier at the annual stockholders meeting in Anaconda.

While residing in Montana, Glover took an active part in civic affairs. His leadership was in constant demand for community projects.

Glover was interested in stockraising for many years and has maintained a summer home in the Sun River country in addition to his homes in Butte and New York.

Before becoming chairman of the board, he was vice president and general counsel of the parent Anaconda Co. and held the same titles with the subsidiary Chile Copper Co. and Chile Exploration Co.

He is a director of the First National City Bank of New York, the First Bank Stock Corp. of Minneapolis and other organizations. He is also a member of the American and Montana Bar Associations and of the Federal Power Bar Association.

For Aid With Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article, For Aid With Strings, by Peter Meyer appeared in the last issue of the New Leader.

The article seems to me very worthy of consideration. Many of us are disturbed by the fact that in our policy we are soft to our enemies and ungenerous to our friends. We are an easy prey to blackmail in our foreign relations, and this may account for our unpopularity in many places today.

Let us help and reward our friends and keep our word to them, and let us stop worrying about what the Soviet Republics are doing for our enemies.

FOR AID WITH "STRINGS"—OUR ECONOMIC SUPPORT SHOULD BE GENEROUS AND UNSTINTING, BUT WE SHOULD REFUSE HELP TO NATIONS WHEN THEIR LEADERS GIVE COMFORT TO TOTALITARIANISM

(By Peter Meyer)

The diplomatic struggle between the free and Communist worlds has been marked in recent months by several highly paradoxical developments.

Take the repercussions which the recent Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference has had in Germany: At Geneva the Western Powers acted as champions of Germany's basic national interests. They demanded German unity. The Soviet Union refused to allow it. They fought for the right of a united Germany to decide by free elections whether to ally itself with the West or the East, or remain neutral. The Soviet Union denied the German people this elementary freedom. The Western Powers came to Geneva supporting the basic goals of the German nation: unification and self-determination. The Communists came as blackmailers; they showed clearly that they would allow German unity only on terms which would condemn Germany to the fate of Czechoslovakia.

One would expect this to enhance the West's prestige and influence in Germany and destroy that of the Soviet Union. Yet, the opposite seems to be true. Never was there so much talk that Germany must negotiate independently with Moscow and make a deal behind her allies' backs. The Social Democrats are ready to give in to Soviet blackmail to the point of dropping the NATO alliance. Western chancelleries are trembling lest the Government parties follow this lead if something should happen to Chancellor Adenauer.

Take another example: The United States and all the democratic powers supported Japan's membership in the United Nations. The Soviet Union vetoed it. One would expect an outburst of indignation against the Kremlin in Japan. But, instead, the Japanese Socialists propose a resolution in Parliament blaming the United States. At the same time, correspondents report that the whole affair may strengthen Soviet influence in Japan and that the latter may have to yield to Soviet blackmail in the current peace-treaty negotiations.

Thus, the champions of German and Japanese interests are punished and their enemies rewarded. And nobody seems surprised.

Why is this so? Obviously, neither the Germans nor the Japanese have any great love for Russia or the Soviet system. They are merely being realistic. If they want something from the Soviet Union, even such an elementary right as national unity or representation in the United Nations, they have to pay for it, pay an immense price. On the other hand, if they want something from the United States, even something like economic and financial support which is not theirs by right, they can rely on a loud chorus demanding that such support be given with no strings attached.

This article seeks to make two points: First, in the worldwide struggle against totalitarian tyranny, America must be prepared to give liberal aid to her friends in this struggle, without pinching pennies or

extracting economic privileges for herself. Second, giving economic help to our enemies or their supporters is stupid, irresponsible, and immoral.

Every nation in the world has the right to self-determination and to freedom from foreign rule and oppression. We should support this right equally as regards Indochina, Tunisia and Morocco, or East Germany, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine and Uzbekistan, or Goa and Kashmir. Every nation also has the right to decide freely how to organize its economic life and utilize its natural resources; so long as the decision is arrived at in a democratic way, we have to respect it.

But may we not modestly claim the same right for the people of the United States? This Nation does not live by exploiting colonies, and its income is essentially derived from its own resources and its own work. It has the right to decide how much of its wealth to give to whom and on what conditions. Unquestionably, we have a moral obligation to share some of our wealth with the unfortunate inhabitants of underdeveloped countries. But that obligation is matched by the no less forceful moral obligation of all who are free from totalitarian tyranny to defend freedom that it may not perish from the earth.

If India falls into Communist hands, the Indians will suffer and so will we. If America succumbs to Soviet power because of the betrayal of neutralists all over the world, the "neutral" countries will be quickly enslaved. Thus, the moral obligation is mutual. If a non-Communist government wants to barter the common interests of freedom for some economic favors from Khrushchev and Bulganin, or for their support in attacking another free country, America's answer should be: Not with our money, gentlemen. Such a government should not get a penny of United States aid.

One can, of course, argue that the right to self-determination includes the right to national suicide. But surely we are not obliged to cooperate in such a suicide. We must warn against it, offer our help if the suicidal policy is reversed, and withhold it, openly and clearly, if it is pursued. If the Afghan Government wants to put its neck in the Soviet noose in return for Soviet aid in its drive against Pakistan, let us tell them to beware. If the rulers of Egypt want to use Soviet arms to start an aggressive war in the Middle East, let us not force our economic and military aid on them. The high dam at Aswan is a meritorious enterprise and should be supported—on condition that Egypt stops flirting with the Soviets.

We must pay no heed to the threat that refusing to help will push the wavering governments deeper into the Soviet camp. What we are dealing with here is blackmail, and it never pays to give in to the blackmailer—it only increases his appetite. America does not have to fear competition between Soviet and American economic aid. If we really resolve to help our friends without penny-pinching we need not fear a comparison of the countries helped by us with those helped by the Kremlin.

George F. Kennan was right when he wrote, in Realities of American Foreign Policy, that favors habitually granted or unduly prolonged cease in time to be regarded by the recipients as favors and come to be regarded as rights. Then, of course, withdrawal of the favor becomes an injury to be resented even though the recipient may have had no actual right to the favor in the first place. Kennan went on to say that the policy of aid cannot be effective unless people feel that, while our favor is a possibility offering certain advantages to them, our disfavor is also a tangible possibility attended by certain disadvantages.

For decades the American Federation of Labor had the slogan, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," and no liberal ever found anything wrong with this common-sense maxim. But apply it to international policies and the same people will tell you that the right policy is to offer the left cheek to every blackmailer who has just slapped your right one.

Proclaiming the principle of "no strings attached" only opens American policy to the reproach of hypocrisy. Since the need for help is immense and the means limited, America's enemies everywhere will claim that their country did not get enough, while another nation, more friendly to American policy, got more than it deserved. Even if the United States poured billions into India, the pro-Soviet intelligentsia would never stop complaining that the Pakistanis, who are ready to defend the subcontinent against Soviet invasion, received more help than the Indians, who do everything in their power to sabotage collective defense and to deliver Formosa and Vietnam to Communist slavery. So why not say clearly: Our help goes first to those governments which, in their own interests as well as those of other free nations, are ready to participate in common defense.

The only possible objection is that peoples should not be made to suffer for the policies of their governments. Philanthropic aid to the population of nonfriendly countries should not be excluded, provided it is distributed to the needy and under such controls that it cannot be misused by the governments (as UNRRA supplies often were in Communist-ruled countries). United States agricultural surpluses could certainly be used to great benefit in many places.

But many countries are in need of industrialization, electrification, mechanization of agriculture, greater efficiency in public administration, and consolidation of their armed forces. The resources are limited, and one must make a choice. South Korea, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Turkey have no less need of the benefits of civilization than countries whose leaders consider it the height of statesmanship to serve as impresarios for the Khrushchev-Bulganin circus.

If we cannot help everybody and must make a choice, let us establish an order of priorities. Those who are able and willing to participate in the common defense against totalitarian tyranny should certainly have first priority. Nations with democratic institutions which combine traditional neutrality with a firm resolution to defend themselves against attack—like Sweden or Switzerland—should be given help if they need it.

But governments which side with the totalitarians and help them, politically and diplomatically, to enslave other parts of the free world certainly cannot expect to receive American aid with no strings attached. The United States Government should greatly increase the scope of its foreign economic aid. But it should be used to drive home the point that it pays to defend freedom and does not pay to betray it.

How I Became America's 1955 Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most illuminating article by Miss Margaret Perry of Monmouth, Oreg., from the December 1955, issue of Oregon Education, official monthly periodical of the Oregon Education Association. Miss Perry was honored in 1955 by being chosen as America's teacher of the year. Her article is entitled "This Is How I Became America's 1955 Teacher of Year." Her discussion should be of special interest to the Congress now, because we soon shall prepare and debate proposed legislation calling for some measure of Federal aid to education, and I trust it will be a generous and adequate measure. Some of that assistance, if it is provided, will help to hire and compensate teachers like Margaret Perry, who are charged with the great responsibility of preparing America's children for citizenship.

Miss Perry advocates higher standards of teacher training, and this goal can be attained only if teachers' colleges are ready for such a task, and if the profession of teaching itself offers sufficient material and cultural rewards to attract outstanding men and women to its banner.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS HOW I BECAME AMERICA'S 1955 TEACHER OF THE YEAR

(By Margaret Perry, supervising teacher, Oregon College of Education)

"Who dares to teach must never cease to learn."

This inscription, which is to be found above the entrance of the Monmouth Elementary School, has certainly been true for me. Its truth is guaranteed to any teacher who enjoys the daily association with boys and girls and fellow educators.

RURAL SCHOOL BEGINNINGS

Teaching is my career.

It was the achievement of a lifelong ambition when I began to teach in a rural school far out upon the Dakota prairies—40 miles from the nearest dry-goods store. For me this was no strange adventure because I had received my education in the similar rural schools of Tripp County and in the nearest high school in Winner, S. Dak.

Since these were the days of minimum requirements in teaching experience, a factor which is practically unknown today, I returned to my home town (Winner) to teach after I had secured this necessary experience. There were several interesting features about this return. I came back to my home town, back to become a faculty member with some of my former teachers and to work under a very understanding and professional superintendent who had been there when I was in high school.

I wish that I could pay proper tribute to that superintendent for the guidance and counsel which he has given to me during my life. I realize that I can never repay him but just hope that I can be an inspiration to some other teacher. Oregonians will be interested to know that this person is Superintendent J. W. Poynter, of the Hillsboro elementary schools.

For 10 years I taught in Winner in the intermediate and upper grades. I have pleasant memories of the many students who have been in my classes and I consider it a real privilege to meet them as I travel about the country. Students change so much. I have difficulty in recognizing some of them but teachers seem to go on forever. For this, I'm grateful, because there's no pleasure which quite compares to reminiscing with former students.

ON TO OREGON

These eventful and troublesome years passed. Grasshoppers, drought and crop

failure after crop failure didn't do much for teachers' salaries. I decided to apply in another school system which I considered to be an advancement. In getting together credentials, I contacted my former superintendent, Mr. Poynter, who unexpectedly offered me a position in the Hillsboro elementary schools. I was prompt to accept. This position brought me much happiness, many new friends, and a far better salary than I had ever known. I also had an opportunity to continue my education.

And so it was that I came to my present position in the laboratory school at the Oregon College of Education. I've long had convictions about programs of teacher education and have worked to the best of my ability towards their improvement. When the opportunity came to become a supervisor of teaching at the Oregon College of Education, I left Hillsboro with some hesitancy to enter upon this new venture.

STUDENT TEACHER WORK

Each new experience brings growth. My present position is most challenging because I work with children and with student teachers. The daily contact with the student teachers who are filled with ideas, energy and enthusiasm does something for me. I know that I am assisting in the preparation of several new teachers for the schools of this Nation each year and gain a feeling of added usefulness to our society. Many of these teachers remain in Oregon and I fairly burst with pride when I see them assuming responsible positions of educational leadership within our State.

My education was a long, slow and arduous process. I started to teach with a certificate based upon 2 years of preparation; 20 years later I received my master's degree from the University of Oregon. I have taught continuously, so the last 3 years of education were completed in 20 years of summers and evening sessions—a slow way to acquire a degree.

One of the important facets of my teaching has been my interest in higher standards of teacher preparation and the need for a competent teacher in every classroom.

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITY

I have always been an active and participating member of my State education association. In South Dakota, I can well remember the county institute when I was chosen to represent the county at the South Dakota Education Association. It was a momentous occasion. Throughout the years I have had many other memorable experiences, but one tends to remember first events longer than succeeding events. There is no thrill like a first thrill—my first trip across the United States, my first NEA, my first national appointment, my first visit to Edinburgh and Paris or my teacher of the year award.

In Oregon I had the good fortune to be elected vice president of the Department of Classroom Teachers and later served as president. I've worked on several State committees, am perhaps a veteran of the Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission; served 2 years as coordinator of the Future Teachers of Oregon and am sponsor of the John Dewey chapter on the campus at the Oregon College of Education.

TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Why was I chosen McCall's fourth annual teacher of the year? In my opinion, there is no one specific reason but rather a constellation of favorable factors which contributed to my selection.

The teacher of the year is selected by McCall's in cooperation with the United States Office of Education. Nominations are submitted by the State superintendents at the invitation of Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education. The funds for the project come from McCall's which is doing this in an attempt to call attention to teaching as a career and in recognition of all the teachers of the Nation.

The United States Office of Education lists these criteria for the selection of teacher of the year: Sound professional education; successful teaching experience; personal qualities—skill in human relations, intellectual ability, emotional maturity, good health, community participation; being an active citizen and helping to make children better citizens; love of children, and wide cultural interests.

After I had been notified by the Oregon State Department of Education that I would represent the elementary teachers in Oregon, they told me that a staff member from the United States Office of Education would observe me in action.

Mrs. Adele Reed arrived one Monday morning in November 1954. There were three student teachers in the room, a few observers, parent conferences scheduled for late afternoon and evening, a visit to the blood bank. It was, in fact, one of those busy days when there wasn't an extra minute. But Mrs. Reed was a very warm and understanding individual who was able to make me feel very much at ease, so it was a pleasure to have her visit in my room and in our school.

It will always be a wonder to me to know how she could glean so much from casual observation and yet be able to relate in detail the method of room procedure, children's conversations and items on the bulletin board. (Her story appeared in the June 1955 issue of School Life.) When I took her to Salem, after the blood bank and before the evening parent conferences, I knew that I had had another first experience in learning to know Mrs. Reed, but I felt sure that this would be as far as I would proceed in the project.

Imagine my surprise when one morning in January Henry Ehrlich, the feature editor of McCall's, called Dr. William Wagner, my principal, and told him that he would be in Monmouth the next week to do the story. He arrived with a photographer, and they were in my room for 3 days—another first experience.

About the first week in April, McCall's called me from New York and told me that two of my students and I would be taken to Washington, D. C., and New York City as guests of McCall's. The students, Sue Mull and Dickie Peterson, were selected by their classmates.

TRIP TO WASHINGTON

On May 17 we left Salem by plane and were met at the Washington airport by Frank Hogan, manager of public relations for McCall's. From that time until he put us on the plane in New York to return to Monmouth, we were officially escorted by various McCall's representatives.

In Washington, D. C., we occupied a suite of rooms at the Hay-Adams Hotel, just across from the White House. For three days we enjoyed limousine service and other luxuries unknown to the three of us.

During the first two days a McCall's photographer recorded our activities (see the September issue of the magazine.) Our first official visit was made to Mt. Vernon. The chief guide was waiting to welcome our party and gave us a very special tour of the estate. It was a beautiful day; the sun's rays shone upon the Potomac; the rose gardens, which are replicas of those in Washington's time, were in full bloom.

In the mansion, ropes were cast aside as we walked into each of the rooms, special permission was given to us to climb into the cupola, and our guide allowed us to mount Washington's coach which stands in the old coach house.

VISITS WITH CONGRESSMEN

Mrs. Reed, the person who had written the original story on me—to whom I am very much indebted for the final selection, and Christine Sadler, Washington editor of McCall's, accompanied us to have lunch with Congressman EDITH GREEN in the House Restaurant. Edith arranged a special tour of the White House for us, gave us passes for the Bureau of Engraving, took us through the House of Representatives and gave us unlimited time from her busy schedule. We were impressed by the cordial welcome and genuine interest which was evidenced by our Senators and Congresswoman.

We visited with Congressman WALTER NORBLAD from our own district who had souvenirs for the children and a photographer to take our pictures for the local papers. Senator WAYNE MORSE displayed many of his trophies, pictures of his famous horses and discussed the rather uncomplimentary cartoons which adorn the walls of his office.

We were entertained at dinner on the Washington roof where the panorama of the city made us understand why Washington is our most beautiful city and made it rather easy for us to identify monuments and buildings when we viewed them later on.

PUPILS WERE PERFECT

Jane Wheeler, a young employee at McCall's, came to Washington to share in the events and to be a hostess for Sue and Dickie in the evenings. I was taken to an informal garden party where I met Otis Weise, editor and publisher of the magazine. This was the first time that he had come to Washington for the teacher of the year.

Our trip was another first, because this was the first time McCall's had taken children from a teacher's room. The various representatives who visited my room found my students stimulating and alert. I'm sure that McCall's had no regret about the decision because the children were adorable. I knew that they were outstanding in the classroom, but it was my first experience in living with them for 24-hour periods. At all times I was proud of them. My only regret is that all 35 pupils in my room could not have had the experience because I could never have been chosen without their assistance.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER GREETS

Thursday, May 19, was the day. Not only was the June issue of McCall's released on the newstands, but we arrived at the White House at 9 o'clock in the morning to be received by President Eisenhower. Our identifications were checked at the gate, and all of us were approved except our photographer who had to enter via the regular press entrance. Commissioner Brownell presented us to the President. Our official McCall's representatives and Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Chief State School Officers, accompanied us in our White House visit. The President was very jovial, seemed pleased to visit with us, talked about the importance of education and teachers, told of his interest in Teachers College when he was president of Columbia University, gave Sue and Dickie a pen, gave us an autographed picture for our fourth-grade class, and dismissed us through his special rose garden—which is unusual for visitors.

Immediately afterwards we went to the Health, Education, and Welfare building for a meeting with officials in the United States Office of Education. Mrs. Reed produced a poem which she had taken from Sue's file when she visited our classroom. Sue read the poem at the staff meeting.

NEW NEA BUILDING

Our next stop was the new wing of the National Education Association Building. I was certainly among old friends because I serve as NEA director for Oregon. This, however, was the first time that I had seen the first wing of our great new educational center in Washington.

We hurried to the Senate dining room to have lunch with Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER

who had reserved special tables for our party. He also told us that he had made a speech about us on the floor of the Senate (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 19, 1955, p. 5617). On the following day we returned to the Senate recording room and cut a tape with him. At this time he presented Sue and Dickie an autographed copy of his Landmark book, The Lewis and Clark Expedition, which was to be placed in the Monmouth School library.

For some reason Vice President NIXON, appointments had got behind schedule. We found a receptionist harassed by the appointments which must precede an official engagement. However, the Vice President took time to meet and visit with us in a leisurely fashion. He presented the scroll which named me as the 1955 teacher of the year. In addition, I was given a scroll for the Monmouth Elementary School "which made it possible for Margaret Perry to receive the teacher of the year award." Sue and Dickie received a pen and Dickie was given an autographed picture for the fourth grade class.

In the evening the adults heard T. S. Eliot who read from his poems with a few excerpts from his plays. He had real audience appeal and was extremely witty and clever.

A FREE DAY

One day in Washington was left free for us. We had some previous commitments but there was time to walk up the marble steps at Lincoln Memorial and read together the inspiring Gettysburg Address, to see our money in process at the Bureau of Engraving, to view the new Marine Iwo Jima Statue, to go on our special tour of the White House, to see the changing of the guard at Arlington, to marvel at the bravery of the Wright Brothers and Lindbergh when we saw their planes at the Smithsonian, and to drive briefly through the Washington zoo.

TO NEW YORK

On Armed Forces Day we left Washington during the parade and arrived in New York City in the midst of another parade. We came into LaGuardia Airport and then located our suite of rooms in the Waldorf Astoria—one of the most luxurious, famous, and biggest hotels in the world.

Sue and Dickie went to see the United Nations Building. They also visited the world's highest structure and New York's most famous and most visited—the Empire State Buildfng. At the 86th floor there was some controversy—Sue had gone high enough but Dickie wanted to go on to the top. They want to the top. It is said that 15 million people live within sight of this building—one-tenth of our entire population.

NEW YORK AT NIGHT

After dinner at the Hotel Astor, we joined the throng in the nightly promenade along the great white way, that area between 42d and 47th Streets which is divided by Broadway. The array of apparel stores, windows filled with tempting foods, street vendors and hawkers selling souvenirs and flowers, the theaters, the neon signs, the news traveling around the Times Building, and the cigarette ad blowing huge smoke rings were indeed a strange world to two youngsters from Monmouth.

Frank Hogan and I attended the theater to see a popular Broadway musical while Sue and Dickie were entertained by the Waldorf-Astoria baby sitter, a n'er-to-be-forgotten person.

Sue, Dickie, and I made a quick trip out to Fifth Avenue on Sunday morning to see the throngs of people as they came to and from church at St. Patrick's Cathedral. Later, Tony Salisbury from McCall's, called for us in his shiny convertible and took us for a close view of the Manhattan skyline. Our tour took us past Grant's Tomb, Columbia University, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, through Central Park, along the East River, through the Wall Street area and back to Rockefeller Center.

Tony, Sue, and I attended the stage show at Radio City Music Hall, and Dickie and Frank Hogan went to the Yankee Stadium to see the Yanks play the Baltimore Orioles. The Yankee pennant and the autographed baseball are the envy of every fourth-grade boy in Monmouth.

TELEVISION APPEARANCE

On our final day in New York we arose early because we were to be at the RCA Building at 7 o'clock in the morning for the Dave Garroway show. Inasmuch as I almost never see television I had no background for the Dave Garroway show and certain unpardonable errors resulted. The program was done three times for the benefit of the various areas of the Nation. After 3 hours of the Dave Garroway show—he proved very interesting—we went to see our benefactors, McCall's. The address is 230 Park Avenue, just above the clock in the Grand Central Building. Their offices were much like any office and, as you would expect, they were very busy people. The homemaking department, the kitchens, the appliance testing rooms and other related activities were very interesting. They were preparing to frost cakes but we could not wait to determine whether it takes more than one attempt to get one for a picture in the magazine.

We left at 12 o'clock noon for home. Inasmuch as New York was on daylight saving time, it was only 8 o'clock in the morning in Portland, but we had been up and active for 6 hours. You can imagine that there were three weary travelers who deplaned at Portland at 9:30 o'clock that night—still 1½ hours from our home.

The wonderful thing about this fabulous week in Washington and New York was that all expenses were paid by McCall's. In addition, we made many new friends on the McCall's staff—kind and friendly people whom any you would be delighted to know. We are deeply indebted and trust that the project brings equal pleasure to them.

FAN MAIL FOR TEACHER

There are many facets to the teacher of the year project. One has been the amazing amount of mail which I have received—from former classmates, students, and teachers, parents, fellow teachers, friends and, much of it fan mail, I guess, because I do not know the writers. It is very evident that the magazine is widely read and that many persons are really interested in education.

Several events have taken place locally which have given me great satisfaction. A surprise party which was sponsored by students and parents and a reception in my honor which was sponsored by the Civic Clubs in Monmouth and Independence and attended by many, many people who came to wish me well will never be forgotten. A desk pen from my local teachers' association with an inscription will be a daily reminder.

At the State level there was the certificate of recognition, a truly beautiful certificate, which was presented to me at the Governor's Conference on Education on June 15, 1955, "to Margaret Perry, outstanding teacher, friend of boys and girls, sympathetic counselor, professional leader, and an inspiration to all who know her." Those, as well as the comments made by Governor Patterson, are indeed generous words. Equally thrilling was the bouquet of red roses which was presented to me at the Governor's Conference and the celebrities dinner at the National Education Association convention in Chicago. Both presentations were made by Mrs. Antonia Crater, president of the Oregon Education Association, another outstanding teacher, who would be deserving of every remark which was made about me.

As Teacher of the Year I was a platform guest at the NEA convention in Chicago and a guest at the celebrities dinner.

All in all, I have been very fortunate to have been chosen as a representative of thousands of outstanding teachers. The June issue of School Life summarizes it very well thus:

"There are many teachers like Miss Perry in the Nation's schools. All of them deserve credit for the contributions they are making to the growth and development of children and young people. Although the Teacher of the Year project does focus attention upon one teacher's accomplishments, it is believed that they are symbolic of those of many other teachers."

The Defense Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of December 18, 1955:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

THE DEFENSE FRAUD

WASHINGTON.—The country has not yet been told the real story of next year's defense budget—which can, perhaps, turn out to be a life-and-death story for every American. The administration has proudly announced an increase in defense spending of about $1 billion, raising the total in the new budget to about $35.5 billion. Great efforts have been made to convey the impression that this belated concession to the requirements of national defense is both generous and adequate. Nothing could be more misleading. The history of the increase is simple enough. On the one hand, defense spending in the current fiscal year had been held down by one-shot savings on a very big scale, especially in the Air Force. No more one-shot savings were possible next year. Hence a substantial increase in spending would have been necessary, in any case, in order to avoid quite serious cuts in fighting power. On the other hand, the Killian report on guided missiles development, first described in this space, had also forced the Eisenhower policymakers to face a really gruesomely unpleasant fact. In effect, the Killian report said that we were behind the Soviets in guided missiles; that we were getting further behind all the time; and that we would have to spend substantial sums to catch up.

Even the most ardent budget balancers did not wish to accept responsibility for this kind of fatal lag. Hence the National Security Council voted, some time ago, to give guided missile development an overriding priority. Thus spending on missile programs had to be increased by about $600 million, or 60 percent of the entire announced increase in the total budget.

Spurred on by the Treasury and the Budget Bureau, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson tried long and hard to hold the budget at the current level. His aim was to barrow enough money from the Peter of general defense costs, in order to pay the Paul of guided-missile development, and to compensate, as well, for the absence of further one-shot savings. In the end, the resistance was too great. Further concealed cuts in fighting power were not made, after all.

But except in the single sphere of guided missiles, this leaves the defense problem almost exactly where it was before budget-

making began. A few fairly horrifying examples will show the nature of the problem clearly enough.

After producing no less than 15,000 MIG-15 fighters, the Soviets are throwing this immense investment on the dump heap, and are rapidly replacing the MIG's with the highly superior "Farmer" and "Flashlight" day and night fighters. When this became obvious last spring, Secretary of Defense Wilson declared that money was available from existing Air Force funds to step up procurement of our own advanced fighters, the F-101B, the F-102 night fighter, and the F-104.

Wilson promised to order the stepup immediately, and then broke the promise. Nearly 6 months went by before increased fighter procurement was finally ordered. Moreover, the increase was not massive. While the Soviets are getting "Farmers" and "Flashlights" in quantity, the next budget will only provide our Air Force with a tiny trickle of superior fighters.

The Soviet Air Force is now ahead of the American Air Force in the production of advanced types in every single important category but one—the medium-range jet-bomber represented in this country by our B-47s. Even in the vital long-range jet bomber category, our output of B-52s is still lagging well behind the Soviet output of "Bisons." Yet the appropriations in the new defense budget will actually give this country about 30 percent less new aircraft than were ordered under the current budget.

Other examples could be cited at great length. For instance, there is the fairly hair-raising fact that the Soviets are now rapidly remodeling at least the core of their huge ground forces for atomic war. But whereas the Soviets are "atomicizing" some scores of divisions, the United States Army has only been permitted to make this vital conversion in one division, with two more test divisions partly converted.

But examples do not need to be multiplied to suggest the real nature of the defense issue. Phony publicity and misleading token gestures have concealed the central fact. The Soviets have spent, are spending and clearly intend to continue to spend, enough to provide an enormous, fully modern force-in-being at all times.

This country is not doing anything of the sort. Therefore, if the worst happens, American soldiers and airmen will go into combat not only heavily outnumbered by the enemy, but also with weapons far less good than the enemy's weapons.

To maintain an adequate, continuously modernized force-in-being is an enormously costly task. Maybe the budget-balancers are right, that the United States cannot afford to pay the bill for survival. But if that is the settled national policy, it might at least be admitted to the country.

The Late John Dingell

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was very much saddened when I learned of the passing of our good friend, the Honorable JOHN DAVID DINGELL, of Michigan, and take this opportunity to add my voice to those who have expressed such deserving tributes to the memory of our distinguished departed colleague.

JOHN DINGELL represented the 15th Congressional District in Detroit, Mich., from 1932 until his passing on September 19, 1955. His long continuous service is indeed a splendid tribute to the esteem in which he was held by his constitutents. During all those years he stood out as a champion of the little people and on every occasion fought valiantly to protect their rights. JOHN possessed a fine Christian character and never waivered in his devotion to duty or at any time sacrificed principle for expediency.

I am proud to say that I had the privilege of knowing JOHN quite well and one year traveled in Europe with him and his good wife. Despite the fact that he had been ill for a number of years he always had a kind word and a gracious smile for everyone, and it was a joy and inspiration to be in his presence. He had a great gift for knowing how to make friends and above all how to retain them.

During JOHN DINGELL'S distinguished career in this body he made many substantial contributions to good government and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee rendered valuable service as an authority on our Federal tax structure. His passing is a tragic loss to his district, his State, and our country. His capable and distinguished young son who follows him as a Member of Congress has every reason to be justly proud of his father's splendid record as a public servant.

I shall always miss JOHN DINGELL. I extend my sincere sympathy to his beloved wife and children in their great bereavement.

Address of United States Senator Thomas C. Hennings, Jr., of Missouri, Before the Lawyers' Association of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo., November 3, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following fine address by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., deserves the attention of all those who love liberty:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, about a year ago you graciously invited me to address the Lawyers Association of St. Louis on its 20th anniversary. And now again you have honored me with an invitation to participate in an equally significant ceremoney. It is a privilege to join with you tonight in paying tribute to the members of our Federal and State judiciary who sit here in St. Louis and in St. Louis County. We Missourians, indeed, are most fortunate in having as judges, lawyers of such outstanding ability and character. This fact is the pride of our bar. It is also the pride of the people of the State of Missouri.

This meeting is also held as part of the Lawyers Association's observance of the John Marshall bicentennial. We cannot discuss questions of American constitutional law, as we shall do tonight, without bringing vividly to mind John Marshall and his great leadership in shaping American constitutional doctrine. He has become a symbol of the Constitution of the United States. John Marshall was the first who fully understood the role of the Constitution in molding a national government. During his 34-year tenure as the Chief Justice of the United States he enunciated and implemented the constitutional position of the Supreme Court as 1 of the 3 great powers of our constitutional government and thus decisively determined the course of American democracy. With reverence we commemorate him tonight.

Last year, I emphasized that an incorruptible, independent judiciary and a learned, gallant bar are the mainstays of our country and of our civilization—one of the cornerstones of constitutional democracy. Liberty of person and security of property depend on our ancient tradition to provide a fair trial and an adequate defense for one accused of crime.

The highest dignity of law finds its manifestation in the administration of criminal justice, because here the State pits its authority against the honor of human personality. In a democracy, where the individual enjoys the constitutional guaranties of freedom, a criminal trial is also the crucial test of dedication to the principles of democratic society. And in this test the harmonious interaction between a high-minded, impartial judge and informed and fearless advocates is indispensable.

We lawyers often bear the brunt of heavy criticism for being conservative, for resisting change, for reactionary defense of the status quo. We lawyers and judges alike are proud of our conservatism. It is our tradition, our heritage. It flows naturally from our knowledge of history and from our intimate acquaintance with legal institutions—an acquaintance which is constantly renewed by our daily contact with the law courts. We know that liberty and security are, at best, precarious. Our training and our traditions at the bar impel us, in spite of the calumny that is heaped upon us from time to time as individual advocates and judges, to do everything within the law to preserve the hard-won rights of our people—the rights our ancestors wrung from the British Crown by revolutionary action. Most important of these rights is the right of one accused of crime, however heinous, to receive a fair trial and an adequate defense.

Where a government of law prevails, the legal profession exerts a decisive influence in society. Because of our training, we know intimately the protective value of our traditional institutions and fully realize the dangers of change occasioned by hasty rulings and hurried enactments. We are keenly aware of the dynamic quality of the law which may easily affect the balance of the social order. We recognize that, carelessly used, it may destroy the very rights and freedoms that our forefathers have fought for generations to establish. For these reasons—and rightly so—we instinctively follow the exhortation of Tacitus: "Think of your forefathers! Think of your posterity!"—as it was rendered by John Quincy Adams in his historic speech in Plymouth in the year 1803.

If this attitude of lawyers—our respect for the past and our care for the future—is termed conservatism, let us accept it as a compliment—as proof that we are fulfilling our highest duty to society and to our free institutions.

In this spirit, I sponsored in the Senate one of several resolutions calling for more orderly procedures of investigating committees. None of these have been passed, but several Senate committees have, on their own, established rules for a fairer treatment of witnesses and issues. The effort, as you see, was not in vain, and the dangerous investigative trends on which I reported to you last year, have subsided. The same ideas

led me to oppose such radical constitutional innovations as the Bricker amendment. And I have said, over and over again, that I shall resist with all my force any efforts to treat lightly the provisions of the Constitution.

In the same spirit of conservatism, I have looked with growing apprehension at some hasty, yet far-reaching, changes which recently took place in our municipal law. Their effect on individuals has been noticed by many, but their impact on the foundations of our law, I think, has escaped general notice.

As a lawyer, identifying myself with the conservative essence of the law, I shall discuss with you my apprehensions regarding some of these radical departures from our legal traditions.

The threat of Communist ideology and subversive activities to the survival of democracy calls for measures to secure our national integrity. This urgent task confronts us with the fateful problem: how to curb subversive elements without seriously jeopardizing democratic institutions—the cherished patrimony which we defend. The seriousness of our problem is highlighted by the fact that a totalitarian regime is burdened with no such considerations; it simply destroys its internal enemies.

The guarantee of a constitution lies, as Hegel said, "in the indwelling spirit and the history of the nation by which consituations have been made and are made." It is a proud task to examine, in this light, our national record.

The greatness of our Constitution is in its realism. With admirable skill and vision the Founding Fathers translated the spirit of our country into simple, restrained yet forceful words. For this reason, the Constitution has become our life, and our life—the Constitution. Not only do we Americans feel this, but it is a fact recognized the world over—by free peoples, with reverence, by totalitarians with hatred and misgivings.

The Constitution was born in the 18th century when man began to free himself from the political and economic shackles of feudal estatism and started on the road of individual self-determination. Our Constitution was the first political document that unreservedly gave expression to the new order of things and thus became the starting point of a new epoch based on the principle of individual liberty. Our social order is that of an association of free men protected in the expression of their personality.

The spiritual core of our Constitution is the Bill of Rights. Although the body of the Constitution itself contains few protective clauses, we know from the debates in the Constitutional Convention and in the First Congress, which passed the first 10 amendments that, in the view of the Founding Fathers, the Constitution itself embodied by implication the ideas of the Bill of Rights.

Through our entire history, these facts and principles have been recognized by the American people. Every generation of Americans dedicated itself to sustain them as the way of our life, despite some tendency in times of international and internal strain to depart from this straight road. Examples of such temporary departures can be found in the turbulent episode of the Alien and Sedition Acts and in the suppression by President Lincoln of the writ of habeas corpus during the Civil War.

Our consistent dedication to the supreme principle of individual freedom and dignity imposes on us additional strains today when, in the unprecedented conditions of the cold war with the Communist world, we seek a way to expose and to fight totalitarian subversion without endangering the tenets and practices of democracy. It is, therefore, not surprising that in our attempt to perform such a formidable task, we witness relaxations in the operation of the Bill of Rights.

Last February, Chief Justice Warren, speaking here at Washington University, called the attention of the country to the erosion of individual rights which the Constitution guarantees. Some thoughtful people, said the Chief Justice, have begun to doubt that the Bill of Rights would be passed by Congress at the present time. It was a shocking experience to hear from Justice Warren of a case where Government employees hesitated to display the Bill of Rights because, they argued, it is a controversial document.

Similar warnings have been and are sounded by other distinguished judges, by members of the bar and by church and civic groups and leaders. Recently, the Federal courts, by reversing administrative rulings involving individual rights, have indicated that grave constitutional questions confront us as a people. The fact of erosion cannot be doubted.

To understand the causes underlying the present abridgements of constitutional rights, however, does not justify apathy, nor does it minimize the seriousness of the relevant facts. The democratic traditions of our country forcefully demand a considered discussion of the issues that threaten their survival.

As lawyers, we all know a number of cases where individual rights have been violated and—this is most important—where the ax of infringement fell not on Communists or subversives but upon innocent people caught in the meshes of administrative practices. The cause of this evil, it seems to me, lies in a creeping but inordinate extension of administrative law, a kind of creeping statism. Such extension spells dangers not only to the constitutional guaranties but, if unchecked, will seriously affect our traditional concepts of justice and fair play. In this light, then, we must examine the practices of the Department of State governing the issuance of passports, and some features of the loyalty-security program.

According to the recent article of Chief Justice Warren in Fortune magazine, the loyalty-security program alone affects more than 8 million Americans, including some 3 million in the Armed Forces, 2.4 million civilian government employees, and nearly 3 million employees of defense contractors.

Actually, this figure is higher if we consider security investigations in nondefense industry and the families of these people. On this basis, the editors of Fortune magazine say that the total number of Americans now subject to Federal security investigations might be as high as 20 million. This program, as we see, is no longer remote; it has become a truly national problem. Now it touches you and me, our friends and our neighbors.

The administrative innovations, in their newest development, decisively deviate from our legal traditions. The use of undisclosed witnesses in security hearings who cannot be confronted or cross-examined; the shifting of the burden of proof to the accused (which is tantamount to a presumption of guilt); the doctrines of guilt by assiciation, guilt by friendship, and guilt by kinship—these are some of the strange aspects of the growing new body of law. If fully accepted and consistently followed, they may destroy our civil liberties and, in fact, nullify the protective clauses of the Constitution. The application of such doctrines, tending to make the Bill of Rights a simulacrum of right, can result only in the subversion of democracy and the destruction of the spirit of our country.

Considering the far-reaching and dangerous implications of these new legal practices, why is it that the discussion of this trend is not more widespread and that more people are not deply concerned? In a country with our traditions, this lack of keener interest cannot be accidental. In my opinion, it derives from our failure to evaluate in technical traditional terms the significance of these novel and undemocratic doctrines within the framework of our legal system. Into what part of our law do they fall? The answer is that they belong to a new branch of law which I would call administrative criminal law and which appears incompatible with the Anglo-Saxon ideas of justice, at least as we have known them in the past.

Administrative Law came into being during the last few decades as a result of the growing complexity of government. It introduced into our law a principle repugnant to our traditional notions of justice—the principle that an administrative agency, which, as distinguished from a court, may be a party in interest, has the power to decide controversies and to dispose of property rights involving individuals and corporations. The development of administrative law was recognized as a threat to individual rights, and administrative proceedings were subjected to judicial review. In this way, the danger to the operation of the due process clause was, at least in part, checked. Even so, some of us who have practiced before administrative tribunals feel that much more should be done to limit the authority of these agencies.

The position of administrative proceedings within the system of our law was pointedly defined in the following words of the United States Supreme Court:

"The vast expansion of the field of administrative regulation in response to the pressure of social needs is made possible under our system by adherence to the basic principles that the legislature shall appropriately determine the standards of administrative actions and that in administrative proceedings of a quasi-judicial character the liberty and property of the citizen shall be protected by the rudimentary requirements of fair play." (*Morgan* v. *United States* (304 U. S. 1, 58 S. Ct. 773, 999).)

Furthermore, in the process of judicial review, the United States Supreme Court established more detailed tests for the validity of administrative determinations. Aside from jurisdictional competence, a valid administrative proceding must be based on a hearing where the party in interest has the opportunity to submit and to scrutinize evidence. An administrative determination cannot stand unless it is supported by substantial evidence. Inversely, it is reversible of arbitrary and capricious. In short, administrative proceedings are admitted into our law only insofar as they represent administrative trials.

At this point, it is important to keep in mind that administrative proceedings were conceived as being in the nature of civil actions. Administrative law was intended primarily to regulate property rights. When it tends to enlarge the scope of its subject matter, we are confronted with a new situation. The fact that we have adopted administrative procedures into our law does not imply that we are willing to permit without a scrutiny de novo, the extension of administrative law to other domain of social relationships.

Suppose for a moment that an administrative agency would attempt to decide a divorce case, claiming jurisdiction because one or both parties are its employees. Would we recognize the validity of such arrogation just because we recognize administrative proceedings as an institution of our law? The answer is, of course, an emphatic no. The subject matter of the issue would stamp the proceeding as an, administrative divorce case, an institution utterly foreign to our legal tradition.

Some of you may consider this example as too remote and as such lacking persuasion. To this I would reply that institutions, like principles, once established and recognized have the tendency to expand themselves to the limit of logic. I still also remind you that equity acquired its jurisdiction by setting forth the doctrine of

adjudication in personam. This doctrine, when first asserted, caused a violent clash between the Chancellor and the courts of common law, and, as a result, equity jurisdiction found its beneficial though limited place, in the system of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence.

At the present time, administrative law has invaded fields hitherto not within its domain. In this sense, though under different historical circumstances, the struggle between the courts of common law and the King's Chancellor, is revived. To understand this fact is our duty as citizens and as lawyers. It is also our duty to seek a sensible solution of the controversy.

For this reason, I feel it necessary to emphasize that in the loyalty-security program, administrative law has specifically invaded the domain of criminal law, and that these proceedings are administrative criminal trials.

If we detach ourselves from border cases, we have no difficulties in discerning the nature of criminal law. In the course of this discussion, a general definition is impossible and unnecessary, but we will all agree that it is severe law operating directly against the person of the individual, placing in jeopardy his life, social status, and honor. We will also agree that punishment is the outward manifestation of the logic of criminal law.

It is my submission that loyalty-security proceedings are substantially trials for treason which in the eyes of our law belong to the category of infamous crimes. As a matter of fact, our Constitution regards treason as the infamous crime and takes special care to afford the accused a special protection.

There is no question, I believe, that loyalty-security proceedings place the individual in jeopardy of infamy and punishment. As a matter of fact, the punishment that hangs over his head is a severe punishment. At first glance we may not see this, but it is clear the moment we determine legally the kind of punishment it is. In substance, it is outlawry. Modern criminal law does not recognize it, but primitive Anglo-Saxon law and early common law did. The security risk not only is stigmatized as a traitor, he is, in fact, expelled from the community, and his stigma may strike his entire family. In these circumstances, it is irrelevant to consider whether Government employment is a right or a privilege.

I am aware of the argument that a punishment which is not on the statute books cannot technically be considered as such. As lawyers we all appreciate the significance of statutory words and phrases. But in our time and age where the law has shed the idea of formulas magic, we cannot close our eyes to situations which do violence to our ideas of justice.

I am also aware that our statute books carry criminal provisions which deal with certain offenses akin to treason. The fact that these statutes do not mention treason, does not, however, lift them from the class of treasonable actions.

Here we come to another aspect of criminal jurisprudence. The recognized severity of criminal law has led to a special care for the protection of the accused person's rights.

It is certainly not accidental that modern criminal law rests on the principle nulla poena sine lege. Nor is it accidental that criminal statutes must be based on the traditional formulations of the common law or must be the result of considered legislative actions. This position is fortified by the corollary that criminal statutes are subject to strict interpretation and that there can be no prosecution for analogically constructed offenses. In the light of these principles, it seems an incredible thought that an individual may today be placed in jeopardy of infamy and outlawry on the basis of administrative regulations which can be altered by arbitrary administrative action. In this connection, it is sufficient to mention the 1950 amendment of the loyalty order of March 21, 1947. In the original order, the standard of disqualification of Government employees was reasonable grounds for belief that the person involved is disloyal. But a stroke of the pen, the amendment substituted the words "reasonable doubts" for "reasonable grounds." This substitution largely escaped notice but we as lawyers should not fail to realize that the change destroyed the presumption of innocence. From then on, the accused had the burden of proving his loyalty beyond reasonable doubt.

Here we have a flagrant example of how an easy administrative reformulation may, under the color of administrative law, casually remove an agelong protection of our legal institutions.

This example of the easy mood in which the loyalty-security program is operated is not unique. Another, by no means less significant, illustration is the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations. The International Military Tribunal in Nuremberg took months of hearings to declare some of the Nazi organizations criminal. Vast evidence was submitted, witnesses were heard and cross-examined and the issue was argued by counsel. Even so, the prosecution was granted only a part of its recommendations. But here, in the United States of America, where the issue touches on the dignity of United States citizens, the Attorney General, without hearings, on the basis of undisclosed evidence, declares innumerable organizations subversive with the inevitable result of stigmatizing their members automatically. And such a list now determines not only the fate of our Government employees, but has become a decisive factor in private employment.

The loyalty-security program equally disregards other rules of criminal procedure devised to protect the individual right of the accused to his freedom. Especially grave is the denial of confrontation with accusers and the resulting impossibility of cross-examination.

The argument for such denial is the reluctance of the Government to expose its sources of information. The detrimental consequences to the accused, however, create a situation which may be repugnant to constitutional guaranties. This issue has not yet been finally resolved by the courts.

The Supreme Court has not yet spoken. But last week the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in a 2 to 1 decision declared unconstitutional the Coast Guard's Port Security Regulations. The court's decision is squarely placed on the issue of confrontation and cross-examination. "It is a matter of public record," the decision states, "that the somewhat comparable security risk program directed at Government employees has been used to victimize perfectly innocent men." "The objective of perpetuating a doubtful system of secret informers likely to bear upon the innocent as well as upon the guilty, and carrying so high a degree of unfairness to the merchant seamen involved cannot justify an abandonment here of the ancient standards of due process."

This decision confirms me in my doubts as to the fairness of the Federal loyalty-security procedures.

Those of us who have had experience as prosecutors well know the necessity of relying on the testimony of informers and accomplices. During my many years as an assistant circuit attorney and later as a circuit attorney, I had occasion in a good many cases to use the testimony of informers before grand juries and in trials in open court. No one knows better than I how important such testimony is in obtaining indictments and in finally convicting the guilty. But not informers themselves are here at issue—only their omnious anonymity, which utterly destroys the principles of our law. Anglo-Saxon legal history retains a vivid recollection of the trial and execution of Sir Walter Raleigh. The chief evidence against him came from a confessed conspirator whose testimony thus was tainted by the suspicion that by accusing Raleigh he expected to save his neck. The court received his written statement but refused to permit confrontation and cross-examination. In this refusal, the court persisted even after the accused had produced a retraction. Finally, the judgment was passed when the prosecution produced a retraction of the retraction. But Raleigh was lucky. At least he knew the name of his accuser.

Incredibly enough, in the security proceedings, this anonymity does not stop with the accused. Not even the determining security officers and boards are permitted to hear the secret informers, but must rely on unevaluated summaries of investigative agencies. Even if we assume that by submitting its report the investigative agency expresses its belief in the trustworthiness of the informer, we still have only its word for it, a conclusion which no one else can check, reached by men, who being human, might err. And we know that men do err. The recognition of this fact is embodied in the sixth amendment.

Still another feature of the loyalty-security program is the lack of provision for the standards of its personnel. It is known, for instance, that the charges in the Fort Monmouth case were prepared by a man whose sole qualifications as a security officer were those of a chauffeur and a uniformed plant guard. By comparison, the administration of criminal justice lies exclusively in the hands of experienced judges and government attorneys, excluding even referees and arbitrators recognized in civil procedure.

The advocates of the loyalty-security program emphasize that it is carried out in good faith and that administrative proceedings themselves supply avenues of righting wrongs. Secretary Benson, for instance, was finally compelled to admit the injustice of declaring Ladejinsky a security risk. As now conceded by the Secretary, the loyalty-security stigma was used simply as an expedient. The real reason for dismissal was the opinion of Mr. Benson that the Department of Agriculture must be staffed with native-born Americans.

This case, relating to a recognized expert on agriculture and a faithful servant of our country, conclusively proves how dangerous it is to substitute the rule of men for the rule of law, and unchecked administrative procedures for established procedures of our traditional law. Even if it is true that our security procedures have the means of rectifying wrongs, it is a fact that the majority of our security cases were reversed only under the pressure of the press and public opinion.

During the last decade we have successfully checked the arbitrary growth of administrative law in order to protect property rights. And it seems inconceivable to me that now administrative law shuold be permitted free reing when it attempts to invade individual freedoms, freedoms which are the foundation of our Constitution. I respectfully submit that judicial review and legislative action are urgently needed to protect our citizens from administrative criminal trials where not only the principles of criminal law are being violated but where even the accepted rules of administrative proceedings—including confrontation and cross-examination—are disregarded.

I fully realize that the clash between the reluctance of the Government to disclose the sources of its information and the right of the accused to be confronted with witnesses against him, presents difficulties of the first order. But even this issue, I be-

lieve, with good will, is capable of practical solution. It occurs to me—and I submit this idea for your consideration and study—that it might be possible to appoint a sufficiently large panel composed of members of the bar who would get a top security clearance, and whose character would not be tainted by religious, racial, and other bias. The lawyers so appointed will have the right, on the request and in behalf of the accused or his counsel, to confront and to cross-examine the undisclosed witnesses. For their services these attorneys will be compensated by the Government and it should be provided that any indiscretion on the part of these, let us call them public defenders, will be subject to criminal prosecution and punishment.

The seriousness of the issues just discussed moved the members of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to undertake the difficult task of inquiring into the state of individual rights under the Constitution.

It was a task never before undertaken in our Nation's history, and we decided to make a comprehensive study of the questions before us. For the sake of completeness and objectivity we decided on a systematic examination of grievances following, clause by clause, the first 10 amendments, the Civil War amendments, and then the relative provisions of the Constitution. Also—and this seemed to me particularly important—we decided to examine individual cases indicative of some policy or rule or practice which in itself constitutes an infringement of some constitutional right.

In making this latter decision we knew that the facts revealed might, in many instances, be unpleasant and shocking. We knew that, in consequence, we might find ourselves in the realm of sharp controversy, personally unpopular, and subject to slander and political attacks.

We realized that extremists of all sorts and disgruntled individuals might do everything to frustrate and discredit our work. They might attempt by every devious means of innuendo, trickery, and downright deceit to impeach our motives, to stir animosities among us, and to demoralize our staff.

These tactics are not new and, unfortunately, I have been exposed to them before. Many of you, I am sure, will recall that these same unsavory methods were used in an effort to halt the work of several committees on which I served—committees which were assigned the duties of investigating the 1950 Maryland election campaign, of inquiring into the affairs of the junior Senator from Wisconsin, of investigating campaign expenditures. In none of these instances did the committee allow itself to be diverted from its purpose, and I know I speak for my fellow members on the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee when I say they will not be intimidated. We have chosen an uphill road, but, in good conscience, we could not choose the alternative.

This judgment of freemen by governmental boards or officials without either the safeguards given to property rights under administrative boards or the safeguards given to accused criminals in our courts may be illegal. It may be suicidal. This return to outlawry as a punishment without benefit of legal trial could produce public sympathy for those convicted as dangerous to our rule of law as that once given to Robin Hood. If our new and radical ways of weeding out traitors are, even though meant in good faith and for desirable ends, unconsciously leading us toward the destruction of our Constitution and our freedom under the Bill of Rights, we must know it. Our committee will try to find out the facts and show them to you as lawyers and to all the American people.

The peoples of the world have awakened to the unlimited possibilities of present-day technological revolution. They strive for a share in its benefits, and there is no doubt that they will proceed on the road of technical progress with ever-increasing insistence. This promising and happy development, however, is unfortunately not unmarred. In many parts of the globe, the break-through to technological mastery has been accompanied by social upheavals. It is tragic that the national and economic awakening resulted in the establishment of a number of totalitarian regimes. Never before was totalitarianism so strong and so beguiling. This plague seems to be the historical price mankind has to pay for its onward march. As a result, never has the struggle for freedom and dignity of the individual reached such tensity and sharpness. In fact, the deadly struggle between the free and the Communist world is waged on this spiritual issue. Dangers surround our social order.

In addition, experts tell us that the Communist world has challenged our technical ability and gradually matches our weapons and military strength. In the face of this threat to our national security, we must keep strong and dedicate our ingenuity to meeting the challenge. Yet it is possible that we are approaching a stalemate. If so, it is time that we search the arsenal of democracy for a superweapon.

In my view, democracy possesses it, a weapon unsurpassed and unsurpassable—I mean the Bill of Rights which guarantees man his individual liberty and dignity.

To defend it in its operation is the duty of all the people of the United States. It is a special duty of the American bar to guide the people in this sacred and fateful fight.

Such is the present. But time will pass, the intoxication of technical achievement will wear off. The achievements of our technological revolutionary age will solve economic problems which prior generations, because of scarcity, were unable to resolve. Then, I am convinced, a period of meditation will set in, and people the world over will long for individual freedom and dignity. When that happens, democracy will fulfill its historic destiny and the world will greet us as the fathers of the blessings of liberty.

With this faith in my heart, I say to our country the solemn words once addressed to Constantine the Great: "In this sign thou shalt conquer."

What of Japan?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted me, I am very pleased to insert in the RECORD with a few of my remarks an abridged edition of an article, entitled "What of Japan?" written by Joseph Z. Reday, an American businessman, Far East general manager of the Celanese Corp. This article was brought to my attention by the Japanese Embassy and in doing so they asserted that in no way "constitutes endorsement or indicates agreement" to the views expressed by the author. Mr. Reday, who is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy, took special training in the field of economics and international affairs after he resigned from the service. In 1943 he represented the Board of Economic Warfare in Venezuela and returned to duty with the Navy during World War II. He was Chief of the Industry Division of Supreme Commander Allied Powers in Japan and served in the Military Sea Transportation Service in the Pacific. In 1953, after returning to civilian status, he served as Chief of Industry and Transportation in the Technical Assistance Mission in Indonesia, all of which indicates that he is experienced in oriental affairs. Mr. Reday states in a footnote to his article that—

The opinions or assertions in this article are the private ones of the author and are not to be construed as official or as reflecting the views of the Navy Department or the United States Naval Institute.

This is a thought-provoking treatise of the problems which confront our relations with Japan and as Japanese friendship is essential to us in our dealings in the Far East and as her economic stability must be adequately understood, I hope my colleagues in the Congress will take the time to read this article.

WHAT OF JAPAN?

(By Joseph Z. Reday)

It is perhaps unwary of a writer in this nuclear age to classify anything, even a country, as a key feature of a power position. But if there is any longer such a thing as an area of paramount importance to us in the Pacific, it is Japan. The reasons why this is so make an impressive list.

First: location. Japan is a string of islands about 2,000 miles long stretched across the main ocean approaches to East Asia. On our side, these islands do much to neutralize the ability of the mainland enemy to project its power anywhere and give us the ability to exert power on it. On the enemy's side, the Japanese islands would act as a gigantic shield, protecting the mainland from our Pacific power and enabling the enemy to use its power overseas. Our whole strategic posture in the Far East is based—as it should be—on a chain of islands from Australia north. Loss of Japan would neutralize the whole island system.

Second: strength. Japan is to East Asia what Britain is to Western Europe. With 89 million people and a modern industry Japan contains the greatest concentration of industrial power between the Western United States and Russia industry in Eastern Europe and Central Asia.

Not only is the East Asiatic mainland for the most part without an industrial complex, hence without power in itself, but also, unlike the Western European mainland, East Asia is without the network of modern transportation and communication facilities necessary to move and utilize power.

In Britain, therefore, we have a major industrialized island base athwart the approaches to Western Europe but subordinate in power itself to the adjacent mainland. In Japan we have the same industrialized base on Asia's doorstep, and in addition the best, most concentrated and most usable power potential in the East, facing an Asiatic littoral thousands of miles from the sources of its power.

We possess, one must believe, in the United States and in the Americas the ability to create enough power to counter anything that can be developed behind the Iron Curtain, regardless of Soviet progress in H-bombs, aircraft, and naval strength. As long as both Britain and Japan remain firmly on the side of the free world, this American power is mobile and capable of projection, and Soviet power can be contained within its heartland boundaries. The loss of the strength and strategic posi-

tion of either Britain or Japan to the free world would immediately reverse this posture and make us a beleaguered fortress.

Third: Ideology. In spite of Red China's ability to shoot its way into a de facto great power status, and in spite of the assumption by India's Prime Minister Nehru of a position as moral spokesman for Asia, the Japanese have enjoyed more than a half century of leadership in oriental political thinking.

* * * * *

On the economic and social side, it is easy for Americans and western Europeans to classify all of the Orient as an area of poverty and lack of opportunity. From an oriental point of view, however, there is a vast difference among countries, and Japan's living standards is far higher than that of any other country in the Far East. Her population is literate, health conditions are good, and her material technology is well developed and comparable to that of the West. Japanese technicians have participated in the post-war establishment of textile industry in India, Burma, and Pakistan, and in the development of iron-ore mines in Malaya and the Philippines, and of the fishing industry of Ceylon, and of many others. Japanese machinery, rolling stock, and ships are being extensively used in the industrialization of most of the oriental countries, and engineers from many of those countries are being trained in Japan at present. Japanese agricultural techniques, exported all over the orient, are the main hope for increasing rice and other food production the overpopulated and hungry Asia outside the Iron Curtain.

Not only does Japan represent technical and material leadership in the Far East, but also to the rest of the Orient Japan's social and economic organization has in the past provided a degree of opportunity for the Japanese people not readily avaliable in most of the other areas, hence an objective to them. Finally, the prewar decade or so of sword-clanking militarism in Japan obscured for the world the fact that Japan, before the Manchurian adventure, had attained a high degree of working political democracy, the only such example in Oriental history.

It seems obvious that the war of ideology between the free world and that of totalitarianism demands a set of ideas and social objectives to counter the blandishments of communism. If this is true anywhere, it is many times more true in the oriental half of the world. To a billion or so people who have always lived close to misery and who have been brainwashed to the point of attributing their misery to Western colonialism, communism will continue unbeatable until some better example is set before them.

We have succeeded to date in capturing relatively few oriental minds with our Western presentation of alternatives to communism. Our operation in Korea, though resolute and of salutory military effect, ended on a note of weakness in the eyes of orientals. If we are to achieve any real success in the direction of freedom in the Orient, we must do it through example, and leadership. Japan provides us not only with a logical choice as a field for our endeavors but with the only one we have. For that reason, if for no other, Japan becomes a key to the future of the free world in the Far East.

* * * * *

PASSIVE ISOLATION OF JAPAN

While budget troubles in the precariously hard-up Japan of today will make it very difficult to build the sort of defensive military organization necessary, it seems to this writer that the continued reluctance of the Japanese people is too universal to be attributed merely to lack of funds or distaste for the military inspired by the past war. It is a reflection of that inert and passive attitude toward the world and its own position in it which has characterized Japan until very recently. It can only be overcome by a foreign policy for Japan which makes sense to Japanese and which can give them a positive feeling of direction and position. From our point of view, this foreign policy must also be steeped in freedom as not only to establish Japan outside the Soviet orbit but also to make Japan a leading voice in the Orient for the free half of the world. The present period, therefore, constitutes an opportunity for us to try to guide the Japanese into a firm position on our side. It is also a large-scale hazard because the present passive state cannot go on. Like a pendulum, Japan must swing away from us if we fail to swing her toward us.

* * * * *

JAPAN NEEDS FOREIGN POLICY

In foreign affairs Japan has quite naturally remained very closely connected with the United States. We continue by treaty to maintain military forces in Japan, we have helped the Japanese economy with large scale military procurement in Japan, and in many ways we have intertwined our activities in the Far East with Japan. * * *

This interconnection of Japan with our activities in the Far East is good. The community of interest between us is great and it is both to Japan's advantage and to ours to strengthen these relations in every way possible. It is not healthful for Japan, however, to drift in international affairs with no foreign policy of her own. A community of interest between the two countries is good for both, but a dependence of Japan upon the United States for a foreign policy and particularly a Far East policy is not good.

In the first place, it leads to the passiveness in international relations which is the major handicap to Japan taking a leading role in Far East affairs at present. The Japanese people cannot be expected to resolutely make the secrifices necessary to build an adequate defense force if that force is looked upon merely as something dictated by American strategy. Nor can Japan make her voice felt in Far East affairs until the rest of the Far East knows that she is speaking for Japan.

Until Japan assumes more responsible leadership in the Far East, it is not likely either that she will succeed in solving the problems of unsettled relations with her Far East neighbors. * * *

* * * * *

Since modern political policies are governed so increasingly by economic demands, we must look at Japanese economics in order to estimate the course of Japanese politics, both domestic and international. For if Japan is to feel that overwhelming stake in the free world which is necessary to make her assume a leading position of partnership with us in the Far East, that stake will have to be as much economic as political.

None of the forces which tend to pull Japan toward the Iron Curtain are political. * * * Japan has no history of cordiality with Russia and is far too proud to accept a position subordinate to Red China in the Asiatic Communist hierarchy of power. The economic lure, however, is quite considerable, even though the trade Japan expects from the Reds would in all probability turn out to be mostly mirage. Furthermore, the existing lack of Japanese foreign policy is due as much to the economic frustration of Japan at present as it is to any other reason. * * *

ECONOMIC PICTURE IS FRUSTRATING

The Japanese economy * * * is extremely ragged. In very round numbers it may be called an economy capable of giving a reasonably good life to a population of something like 60 million, but called upon to support the 89 million Japanese now crowded into the home islands. The population goes up steadily at a rate of more than 1 million a year without a corresponding increase in economic productivity.

Japan has about 15 million cultivatable acres of farmland, intensively worked in rice, other cereals, and vegetables. The Japanese have raised production per acre probably to the maximum attainable. Rice output, for example, is about twice that per acre of the United States and may be three times that of India. So many people work at this production, however, that rice output per man is extremely low. In rough terms, total food production in Japan falls to supply the country's needs by about 20 percent. Some help may be obtained from land development in Hokkaido and elsewhere, but for all practical purposes Japan's food deficiency will remain large and will increase as her population grows. The much publicized land reform under the occupation was undoubtedly a popular political and social measure, but its status is transitory at best and its economic effect on production has been negative, if anything, by virtue of fragmentation of land holding.

Japan's food deficit must be met by imported food which must be paid for by exports. * * *

* * * * *

INDUSTEIAL RESOURCES LIMITED

The Japanese population pressure long ago forced the country into industry and world trade for economic survival. Here again, however, they have no resources but their own intelligence, organization, and willingness to work. The Japanese islands are barren of most of the raw materials needed by industry. In the all-important field of fuel, Japan is scantily supplied. They have a very ordinary grade coal, which is not suitable for steelmaking and costs so much to mine that coal in Japan retails at close to $30 a ton. Coking coal for the steel industry must be imported at about the same final cost. About 90 percent of the petroleum requirements must be purchased abroad.

The Japanese textile industry, one of the largest in the world, depends completely upon imported cotton and wool. About one-third of the woodpulp for rayon also must be imported. In minerals, Japan has enough of a poor grade iron ore for maybe one-sixth of her steel needs; she has no bauxite for aluminum; and only barely enough copper, lead, and zinc.

An industrialized country without rich raw-material resources must depend upon trade goods for production. Japan must import raw materials on favorable terms of trade, must process them in efficient low-cost industry, and must be able to sell enough of the product abroad and on terms favorable enough to pay for the consumed raw materials and fuel and to pay for the imported food and other deficiencies which her growing population has created.

* * * * *

The terms of trade on this distorted import supply for Japan are bad. Far too much of the coal, wheat, pulp, petroleum, and other bulk commodities now have to be imported from such dollar areas as the United States and Canada. Japan's trade was unbalanced in 1954 by $590 million per year in excess of purchases from the United States over sales to us. * * *

A corollary to the availability of industrial materials would be the efficiency of the industry which processes them. With some notable exceptions, this efficiency was lost with the Pacific war, from which Japan in an industrial sense has hardly begun to recover. Japanese industry is on an average at least 10 years and probably closer to 20 years behind the United States. * * *

As a consequence, Japanese industrial production costs, hampered by high-priced capital and obsolescence of equipment and by

very high cost fuel and utilities, have gone up fantastically. The pre-World War II Japanese bicycles which sold in South America for $5 have now become $25 luxuries. Even Japanese textiles, long a specialty which Japan could produce at a cost untouchable by other countries, now tend to be priced out of markets by other oriental producers and even by Europe.

Labor, organized by the occupation, is still relatively cheap in Japan by American or European standards, but has become a social force of greater and more inflexible cost to industry. Japanese management, though alert commercially, has not learned to get the most out of either labor, or plant, or high-priced fuel.

FOREIGN TRADE DIFFICULTIES

The third and last element of Japan's industrial position is that of favorable sales of industrial products abroad. This is obviously the key feature of her trading economy. It is at the same time the weakest link in the commercial-industrial chain and the one which can be made to offer the only hope of large-scale improvement in the overall economy.

Like Britain, Japan built her trading economy upon an industrial headstart over the rest of the Orient. And as in the case of Britain, the other areas, formerly undeveloped sources of raw materials and markets for consumer manufacturers, have begun to catch up. India, 20 years ago a large market for textiles, is now a major producer and likely to supply much of the oriental export market. All of the so-called undeveloped countries are bending every effort to establish industry, particularly the light manufacturing industry which has always been the source of Japanese export strength.

This is nothing more than historical progress, and Japan will have to learn to cope with it as Britain has, by reaching additional markets for machinery, rolling stock, ships, chemicals, and other more advanced products. The process is difficult, however, at best and for Japan at present is made enormously more difficult by the politics of the world.

Mainland China, for example, with its 500 million people is the major market of the Orient. As a matter of normal, peaceful development, Japan could be kept busy for a long while supplying merely the needs for establishing industry, transportation, and modern living in that country. So also the rich areas of southeast Asia badly need Japanese help and products in developing their resources. Indonesia is a third example.

Unfortunately for Japan, however, China is Red and committed to a wholly different method of development. * * *

While southeast Asia has been a postwar mainstay to Japan, the fighting in Indochina and guerrilla activity in Malaya and Burma have held trade more or less to subsistence levels and prevented any real development of the southeast Asia economies. * * *

Indonesia, with some 60 million people and substantially no manufacturing industry, is a logically large Japanese market. To date, however, wrangling over reparations and political adventuring in Indonesia have brought trade to a standstill, the large balance owed to Japan probably being written off by Indonesia. Current unsettled reparations hamper and threaten to sever trade also with the Philippines. The South Korean Government has in effect embargoed purchases from Japan and also owes a large balance to Japan.

Japan has not been appreciably more fortunate in trade with the rest of the world. The United States continues to sponsor the Japanese position, but * * * the so-called Flammable Fabrics Act indeed has served to reduce imports of Japanese silk scarves; and other competitive interests, tunafish and plywood, for example, are attempting quota limitations on Japanese goods. President Eisenhower's trade bill was, indeed, passed by the present Congress, but it seems to have evoked formidable opposition by large segments of American industry. In 1954 Japan bought goods worth $867 million from the United States and was able to sell only $277 million in the American market. Canada and Australia present the same unbalanced trade picture with Japan and show little evidence of willingness to allow entry to more Japanese products.

* * * * *

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEM

As a major trading nation, and one with a weak and inconvertible currency, Japan suffers greatly in the postwar throttling of trade by reason of worldwide currency controls. With no freely convertible currency except the dollar, and a few others of little trade consequence, there has been no possibility since World War II of multilateral clearing of trade accounts. Under forced bilateralism, the trade between each two trading countries or, at best, group of countries has had to be balanced. This automatically limits the overall trade possible. Under multilateral clearing one country buys what it needs from another country and sells what it can, making up any unbalance by trade and clearing with other countries. The balancing between each two countries under bilateral trade naturally is done at the lower figure. Japan is doubly unfortunate since she normally buys more than she sells in the dollar areas, hence cannot accumulate dollars to settle other accounts at higher levels.

All of the above has meant a Japanese trade account heavily unbalanced, principally by dollar area purchases. In 1953 the visible foreign trade deficit reached the alarming total of $945 million. In spite of American Security Force spending including offshore procurement, which amounted to $809 million, the final balance of payments at the end of the Japanese fiscal year, March 31, 1954, was in the red by $313 million.

The rigidly applied tight money policy of the government has limited imports so drastically in 1954 and to date in 1955 that many industries are living on inventory for raw materials. The most strenuous efforts also have been made to boost exports. * * *

Japan can hardly better her 1954 payments record by her own efforts. Exports were promoted through every known commercial device of linkage, subsidy, and so on. Imports were held down severely, and since about 98 percent of imports are raw materials and food, they can be restricted further only by arbitrary reduction of the basic standard of living. In spite of this effort, the Japanese balance of payments came out plus only by virtue of continued spending by the American military.

Although necessary to balance her international accounts, the Japanese Government's tight money policy had the bad effect of severely reducing overall business activity in Japan without cutting substantially the cost of production. * * * All of this constitutes contraction of an economy which must support a population expanding by nearly 2 percent a year. It cannot go on.

JAPAN WILL BE PUSHED INTO ACTION

We have, therefore, an economic Japan squeezed between the demands of a far too large and far too rapidly growing population on the one hand, and a much restricted commercial and industrial environment on the other. * * *

The entire economic situation is one of frustration. As it stands it does not appear to the Japanese to give them enough return or enough hope from the future to justify an enthusiastic defense of freedom and democracy in the Far East. While it is nobody's fault specifically, it is a condition which is hazardous to our objectives in the Far East, therefore, one for which we must attempt to find a solution.

Politically, the Japanese have adopted no positive policy of their own and have no clearly thought-out Japanese objectives in international affairs. Frustrated economically, barred from participation in many of the international organizations and without coherent relations with most of her oriental neighbors, Japan drifts passively in a world which does not tolerate political aimlessness. Aimless and passive Japan remains still on our side through strategic, economic, and other ties, and probably is not in much immediate danger of slipping away completely from the free world. As a consequence of her lack of positive approach, however, Japan's voice means little in Far East affairs, and the weight she brings to the side of the free world is only a fraction of her capabilities.

This political stagnation, moreover, when combined with economic frustration can be explosive. The Japanese are much too vigorous and much too ingenious not to try some way out. * * * Japan will move in one direction or another and will do so shortly. If we can make Japan see that it is to her best interest to move strongly and independently along the lines we are following in the Far East, then we have a good chance of stopping communism and throwing it back in that half of the world.

If, on the other hand, Japan can see no help for her present frustration in close association with the aims of the United States, then we stand a good chance of complete debacle in the Far East. For the Japanese political and economic impasse cannot be solved by any sort of straddling the two sides of the cold war. There is not enough in either political prestige or economic gain for Japan in merely reopening diplomatic and commercial relations with Red China and the Soviet. Any attempt by Japan to enjoy the best of the two worlds is doomed, before it begins, to failure and a continued frustration.

If, therefore, Japan moves at all toward Red Asia, the movement is eventually bound to tempt political collaboration of one sort or another. This is especially true if the Chinese Reds manage to conquer by subversion or otherwise the balance of Southeast Asia, which would present Japan with something close to commercial collapse. The cards are all stacked in favor of Red China in any political collaboration with Japan; maybe the Japanese can see it. We however, can risk allowing it to happen only at a most deadly peril to ourselves.

What then can we do? What American policies can be changed to bring Japan more forcefully into our free world, and specifically what can we do to help Japan discover an independent policy and viewpoint in the Far East which will be good both for Japan and for the free world of which Japan is a part? Finally, what can we do to better the Japanese economy and to give it the opportunity which is necessary if Japan is to play its part in the free world?

* * * * *

PARTNERSHIP WITH JAPAN IS AN ANSWER

Our trouble to date lies not in what Japan is doing or in what we have done. It lies instead in the fact that the cold war and the strategic movement of power in the Far East has progressed too rapidly. We are now only 10 years away from the end of the Pacific war with Japan and roughly 3 years from our military occupation of Japan. But we do not have time to let what in another age would be called normal relations with

Japan develop. Japan is going to move one way or another and break out of her present passive and frustrated state. As a matter of imperative strategic necessity we must see that Japan stays firmly in the free world and makes a maximum contribution to it.

To bring that about will require nothing less than a working partnership between the United States and Japan in the Far East and a set of economic incentives which will make that partnership good business for Japan. Nothing less will retain our strategic military posture in the Pacific, in my opinion, nor will anything less give us a real chance of leading the oriental mind away from communism. This working partnership with Japan in the Far East would not be entirely a matter of give on our part. The Japanese are orientals and well versed in the ways of the Orient. Our judgment in things oriental has not to date been impressively good. A Japanese contribution could well improve it.

* * * * *

In the economic field the choice is simple. It hurts a little; therefore we back away from it. Japan's problem is that of not enough export trade to earn a living, and the only place that export trade can be found is in the American market. It is just as simple as that.

We try to think hopefully of development of Southeast Asia and other parts of Asia as providing enough outlets for Japanese exports to give Japan the expanding economy she needs. This is a mirage—just as much so as the Japanese hopes for Red China trade. Unless we wish to spend many billions of dollars on grant aid which will be largely wasted, there is little which can be expected from early Asiatic development.

The hard economics of Japan's trade imbalance lies in the fact that it derives mainly from buying many times more than she sells in the dollar countries, principally the United States. The only direction in which to expand is in those dollar area sales.

Expanded Japanese sales in the United States would hurt certain American industries directly competitive to Japanese products. They are already crying—too loudly, but not without reason. The question as far as some of these industries are concerned is one of survival, and they are right in objecting. Individual American businesses should not be called upon to sacrifice themselves.

But on a national scale the question is also one of survival in reverse. We must have a free and economically healthy Japan on our side, or we may not survive as a Nation. We must, therefore, find ways to allow Japan to export more to us. In a market of hundreds of billions of dollars a year, the problem of increasing Japanese sales on a selective basis can be done without sacrificing American business. Maybe selective import quotas are the answer in order to avoid concentration of low-price Japanese goods in certain fields. Perhaps graduated tariff scales based on volume in any commodity could limit competition against any one American industry.

Whatever the mechanics, we had better get busy and find the formula. The cost to us as a Nation is absurdly small. The required expansion of Japan's sales to the United States would be far less than the grant aid we have given to many countries of less than Japan's size and a fraction of Japan's importance. In doing this for Japan, we will give away none of the taxpayers' money. We will merely buy from Japan as much as Japan buys from us. In the process we can make a firm and economically vigorous friend of Japan—a bargain at any price. At this price, it is the bargain of this tortuous century, and one logical answer to a perplexing problem.

Reclamation in the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on December 14, 1955, the Deseret News, a newspaper published in Salt Lake City, Utah, published two articles, the first entitled "It Pays Its Own Freight," the second relating to reclamation in the West, entitled "A Plan To Aid Waste," relating to the upper Colorado River storage project in particular. I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, of December 14, 1955]

IT PAYS ITS OWN FREIGHT—RECLAMATION HAS BUILT THE WEST—WEALTH POURS INTO THE TREASURY LONG AFTER COSTS ARE REPAID

Opponents of the Colorado River storage project recently have broadened the scope of their attack to include reclamation itself.

"The Nation can no longer afford reclamation projects," they say.

Actually, the Nation cannot afford to pass up the opportunity.

Reclamation has built the modern West, and every westerner knows it. So does anyone who has taken the time to study the history and economy of our part of the country.

However, bitter foes of the Colorado River storage project currently are loudly proclaiming that the project is a western giveaway to be paid for by nonwestern taxpayers.

Quite frequently, uninformed citizens will be taken in by this "pocketbook" appeal; particularly if they are from the eastern or southern part of the Nation and are unfamiliar with the benefits which have resulted from our modern "pays-for-itself" reclamation policy.

These uninformed citizens are not aware that:

1. Today some 6,200,000 acres of arid and semi-arid lands are irrigated from reclamation projects and are producing wealth in which all America shares.

2. Power-generating capacity of reclamation units now stands at 4,300,000 kilowatts—enough to supply the power needs of 8½ million citizens.

3. Crops produced with reclamation water last year were valued at $865 million.

4. People in the areas served by reclamation projects have paid some $2,500 million in Federal taxes since 1916. This is 25 percent more than the entire cost of reclamation in our Nation to date.

5. The cumulative crop values on all reclamation projects up to 1953 is nearly $10 billion.

Reclamation creates wealth which continues to pour tax revenues into the Public Treasury long after the total cost of the project has been repaid.

Here is just one example of how reclamation has more than paid for itself.

This fall the $11 million Salt River project will be paid in full. The last contract installment will be paid by the water users, repaying in full the original investment.

REPAID COST

But, like all reclamation projects, this unit has more than repaid its original cost. The annual return in Federal taxes from Maricopa County, Ariz., in which the Salt River project lies, equals about nine times the total Federal expenditure in the original Salt River project.

The project has been largely responsible for the development of this county from just another desert valley into its present position as one of the Nation's leading and most prosperous agricultural communities.

And the benefits from this single reclamation project will continue to pour in as long as water continues to flow down the Salt River.

If anyone is still skeptical about the success of our Nation's reclamation policy, he has but to study another typical reclamation project on which we have first-hand facts and figures.

STRAWBERRY PROJECT

That is Utah's strawberry project. This project is the oldest one in Utah and one of the first in the Nation. It cost $3,348,518 back in 1905–13 to build a 3.75-mile tunnel and other structures needed to divert surplus water into southern Utah County.

Today, 42 years later, more than 80 percent of its cost has been repaid by water users. In another 10 years, every cent the United States Government spent on the project will have been returned.

And here are some of the things the project has done:

1. Some 45,000 fertile acres are safeguarded against drought.

2. The assessed valuation of the southern end of Utah County—that part of the valley which the project directly affected—jumped from $6,271,000 in 1911 to $30,558,000 in 1920. Most of the increase is directly attributable to the strawberry project.

The strawberry project also resulted in many new crops being introduced by farmers of the area—crops which replaced the former dry-farm grain staples. Onions, string beans, tomatoes, peas, lima beans, carrots, cabbage, squash, lettuce seed and grapes became major crops of the area.

And that example illustrates how the Colorado River storage project, even though it will bring new acreage into production, will not materially add to current crop surpluses.

As noted, crops presently in surplus are crops which can be grown on marginal lands—dry-farm crops like wheat, oats, rye, and barley. When those lands enjoy a stable water supply, the farmer then can grow diversified crops, crops which are in demand and not in surplus.

The Colorado project will provide supplemental water for 233,930 acres—acres now restricted to dry farm or limited irrigation crops, most of which is now producing Government-supported crops. It would do this while providing full water supplies to 132,360 new fertile but dry acres. (Both of these figures are based on the project as provided by the House-amended bill.)

DEMAND CROPS

With Colorado River project water, all this new acreage then could grow crops in demand: fruits, vegetables, livestock forage crops, beef and related items.

On the other hand, if the Colorado River storage project isn't built the water belonging by solemn compact to the upper basin States will flow downhill to southern California and Mexico. And there it very materially will add to crops which are in surplus, cotton for example.

Few persons realize the phenomenal growth of cotton acreage in California in recent years. Immediately after the war, California's Imperial Valley—whose crops are entirely grown with water from the Colorado River—had a total of just 9 acres in cotton.

Paloverde and Coachella Valleys in nearby Riverside County, also watered from the Colorado River, had a mere 829 acres in cotton production in 1946.

In 1953, however, Imperial Valley's 9 acres had grown to a staggering 116,630 acres and Riverside County had 46,500 acres in cotton production.

Cotton currently is California's most valuable crop, accounting for 13 percent of the total income of her farmers.

Cotton production also has been booming in parts of Mexico irrigated by the Colorado River. Mexico's cotton exports in 1946 totaled 47,664 metric tons; in 1954 the figure had risen to 259,419 metric tons. In recent years, Mexico, which is guaranteed 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water by treaty has been diverting as much as 4 million acre-feet a year, the surplus being water belonging to the upper basin States which cannot be used there until the river system is regulated and controlled.

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, of December 14, 1955]

A PLAN TO END WASTE—A DOZEN RECLAMATION PROJECTS WOULD USE WATER STORED IN DAMS OF STORAGE PROJECT

Comprising the Colorado River storage project, along with the proposed 4 major dams, are 11 smaller participating projects which will put to use the water stored behind the large dams.

Typical of these participating projects—and by far the largest—is the Central Utah project. It would cost an estimated $207,939,600 to build.

The central Utah project is an ingeniously conceived plan to provide for current needs and future growth of Utah. It would involve the central section of the State from Salt Lake Valley on the north to Nephi on the south and extend eastward to the Colorado line.

It is designed to equalize a geographic deficiency. Bonneville Basin (the western section of the project west of the Wasatch Mountains) suffers from a shortage of water. Uintah Basin (the eastern section of the project east of the Wasatch Mountains) has a surplus of water.

WOULD DIVERT WATER

Simply, the plan is to divert Uintah Basin water westward by aqueducts and tunnels to where it can be used for Bonneville Basin municipal and farm use. En route, it would be used to generate power to help pay for the project.

The populous Salt Lake and Utah Valleys have a vital stake in the program. The project is the only foreseeable means of providing additional water and power, which the area will need soon to prevent its normal growth from being stunted. There is no other prospective water supply for the future.

This very real need was pointed up recently in studies conducted by two prominent engineering firms for the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City.

These surveys reported that Salt Lake City will be in a critical water supply situation by 1970. In that year, the engineers predict, Salt Lake City's water demand will exceed the capacity of all existing supplies.

URGED ACTION

The engineers urged immediate action to augment water supplies for metropolitan Salt Lake City.

Making the survey were the firms of Headman, Ferguson, and Carollo, of Phoenix, Ariz., and Black and Veatch, Kansas City, Mo.

And if Salt Lake City is to have sufficient water in 1970, action must be taken now, to allow sufficient construction time. In fact, the time is already late. The solution: the central Utah project.

The central Utah project is of such magnitude that it has been planned in two parts:

1. The initial phase—a unified portion that could be developed and operated independently.

2. The ultimate phase—an extension of the initial phase which would more than double acreage served and quadruple power output.

ONLY INITIAL PHASE

The project now before Congress consists solely of the initial phase. The ultimate phase would have to pass Congress when needed. It is mentioned here because the two cannot fairly be considered separately.

Under the general plan of development, streams draining the southern slope of the Uinta Mountains in the Uintah Basin in northeastern Utah would be intercepted. They would be conveyed westerly by gravity flow through the Wasatch Mountains into the Bonneville Basin.

The water would be collected by an aqueduct leading to a storage reservoir high in the Wasatch range. From the reservoir the water would drop through a series of hydroelectric powerplants before being used for irrigation, municipal, and industrial purposes.

Replacement water and water for additional development in the Uintah Basin would be provided by smaller developments on local streams for the initial phase. And by a major diversion from the Green River for the ultimate phase.

The project primarily would serve the eastern portion of the Bonneville Basin, including the cities of Salt Lake City, Provo, Heber, Spanish Fork, Payson, Nephi, Richfield, Delta and Fillmore, and portions of the Uintah Basin. But also served eventually through aqueduct links with the Provo and Duchesne Rivers would be the Weber River, and thus the entire Weber Basin.

LIMITED DEVELOPMENT

In the initial phase of the project, only Rock Creek and Uinta Mountain streams west of Rock Creek would be diverted into the Bonneville Basin, where development would be limited to areas between Salt Lake City and Nephi. Initial phase development in the Uintah Basin would include the Jensen, Vernal, Upalco and Duchesne River areas.

The initial phase of the project would provide for the irrigation of 28,540 acres of new land and 131,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water. Full seasonal regulation would be provided for 42,600 acres of land in the Duchesne River area, more than half of which is owned by Indians or has been acquired from them.

Some 48,800 acre-feet of water would be provided annually for municipal, industrial and other miscellaneous uses. Power plants with an installed acapacity of 61,000 kilowatts would generate approximately 373 million kilowatt hours of electricity energy annually. The power plants would be interconnected with plants of the Colorado River storage project.

Where practical, the project reservoirs would impound water for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes.

ULTIMATE PHASE

So much for the initial phase. The ultimate phase would merely extend the scope of the project. The flow of all important streams on the south slope of the Uinta Mountains would be intercepted by a 110-mile aqueduct which for its last 36.8 miles would parallel the initial-phase Strawberry Aqueduct. To compensate for the diversion of this water, water would be channeled into the Uintah Basin from the Green River.

With the ultimate phase completed, the central Utah project would provide a full irrigation water supply for 200,000 acres of new land, a supplemental water supply for 239,000 acres now inadequately irrigated, and 48,000 acre-feet of water to meet foreseeable demands for municipal, industrial and other miscellaneous purposes. Project power plants would have an installed capacity of 249,000 kilowatts and generate almost 1.2 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually.

FIGURES ON COST

An average of 800,600 acre-feet or one half of the water available to Utah under terms of the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact would be put to use under the ultimate phase of the project.

Critics of the Central Utah project have singled out the cost of the project for special fire, charging that the cost per acre of putting water on the land will run as high as $5,000.

Fact of the matter is that the actual cost per acre is $715. And if the cost of water on Indian lands is not included, but is assumed by the Federal Government which is responsible for the tribes' welfare, then the cost per acre drops to $564.

This is the second highest cost per acre of the 11 participating projects. Highest is the Hammond project of New Mexico at $565. Average cost per acre for all participating projects is $491.

However, to westerners who understand how well-engineered and needed reclamation projects such as this quickly repay their initial investment, this price per acre is entirely reasonable. And after all, these citizens are the ones who will be paying for it, in the form of water and power revenues.

However, cost per acre is only one yardstick by which the project should be measured. Most important is its importance as a supplier of needed municipal and industrial water and power for the future, not just irrigation land.

Considering that it is the last source of water for the State, and thus involves the future of the entire area, the central Utah project would be feasible at twice the cost, Mountain Westerners—who will pay for it—feel.

There are also many subsidiary benefits not included in the statistical columns. For example, the interconnecting tunnels and aqueducts will enable engineers to exchange and shift water wherever needed. Thus the available water supplies will be utilized to the last drop. That is functional economy.

Prof. Daniel R. Mandelker Points the Way for Improving Our Poor Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Daniel R. Mandelker, of the University of Indiana Law School, has written a recent article in the American Bar Association Journal on The American Poor Laws: A Legislative Backwater which commends itself to the attention of all those interested in welfare work. Professor Mandelker, though still a young man, has already made great contributions to legal research. His father, Adolph I. Mandelker, of Milwaukee, Wis., has long been a leader of the Wisconsin bar. I submit herewith Professor Mandelker's article:

The American Poor Law: A Legislative Backwater

(By Daniel R. Mandelker, assistant professor of law, Indiana University)

As the noted historian, R. H. Tawney, has written with reference to the poor laws, "there is no touchstone, except the treatment of childhood, which reveals the true character of a social philosophy more clearly than the spirit in which it regards the misfortunes of those of its members who fall by the way." However, with billions spent by local, State and Federal governments each year on over 5 million persons receiving some form of public assistance, the general assistance or poor laws still remain a little known and little understood legislative backwater. Yet, the consequences of public indifference appear all the more serious since the general assistance statutes, in many respects, are out of tune with contemporary democratic institutions.

Any attempt to write or communicate on this problem is difficult because even the function of general assistance appears to be a mystery to many people. Chiefly in the last two decades, many statutory programs have been adopted with the aim of affording some security against some of the common risks of an industrial society. Workmen's compensation laws were first adopted to compensate workmen for injuries received in the course of their employment.[1] With the help of Federal grants-in-aid, the States have also established programs of categorical public assistance to the needy blind, aged and disabled, and to dependent children of families in which the father is dead, absent, or incapacitated. Unemployment compensation seeks to protect workers against the hardships of temporary job layoffs, and Federal old-age and survivors insurance provides a form of security against retirement.

Despite all these attempts to provide against the contingencies that bring about economic need, the old poor laws are still with us. Their function must be defined negatively. Individuals who are not covered by one of the programs of social insurance or categorical assistance, or who are not adequately provided for under these programs,[2] or whose benefits under these programs have expired, must rely for subsistence wholly or in part on the aid provided by general assistance. For this reason, this program remains the last real bulwark against unemployment produced by a prolonged depression. Today, about 300,000 persons and families are dependent on the poor laws for their support.

Unlike the programs of categorical assistance, however, no Federal grants-in-aid are made available for general assistance. This program, which is usually administered at the municipal or county level, is entirely the creature of State statute.

In their basic outline, American poor laws vary amazingly little from their English prototype of 1601, from which they were derived. As was the case under the English statute, eligibility for general assistance is based on an economic need test. In addition, the applicant for public aid must usually have settlement, or residence, in the locality in which he is applying for help. Members of the applicant's immediate (and sometimes remote) family are usually made primarily or equally liable for any assistance that is granted, and the recipient of aid in many States is also liable to make restitution of what he has received in the event he is ultimately able to do so. Often there are special provisions containing civil and criminal penalties for any fraud committed by applicants or recipients in connection with the assistance program.

While a simple recitation of these provisions does not make them appear unduly severe, their cumulative effect, and a certain harshness which has been a part of poor law administration since its inception in this country, combine to make the lot of the individual in need of assistance an unhappy one.

The settlement requirement may be taken as one example. Most settlement laws contain a residence requirement of at least 1 year and many require more than this. The length of the residence period, together with the fact that residence must be acquired in most States on a local county or township basis, and cannot be acquired during the period public aid is received, often makes it difficult for the average working family, which tends more and more to be migrant, to get a settlement. If the community in which the individual applies for assistance turns out not to be his place of settlement, his only alternative usually is to search out his settlement and seek relief there. There are laws in most States making it a duty of the locality to assist nonresidents as well as residents, but they are ignored as a practical matter in many instances.

Pulling up roots, however, may not always be an easy thing to do. And in some cases one's settlement may turn up where it is quite unexpected. There are many technicalities in the law, and a young widow with children, for example, may suddenly find that she has settlement only in the distant and strange community of her husband's birth, a place where she may never have resided.

But the lot of the nonsettled person in need may be even worse in some jurisdictions. Some States still have in their statutes the English settlement law of 1662, which authorizes the compustory removal to the place of his settlement of any individual who does not have settlement in the town where he applies for relief. That persons may be forced to move against their will seems shocking in the 20th century, and there is some evidence that the judicial process under which compulsory removal orders may be obtained has fallen somewhat into disuse. However, the experience of the recent depression indicated that relief officials are not averse to dumping all nonsettled persons they find in need of relief on a near or distant locality. The reports have yielded a decision, handed down only 10 years ago, involving a helpless farm family forcibly removed from their home in subzero weather and dumped in a farmyard in a neighboring locality.

But it is in the administration of these statutes that their unnecessary severity seems most evident. There are a substantial number of States in which general assistance, like the categorical assistance programs, is administered by county welfare departments under the supervision of the State department of welfare. Where this is the case, the result has usually been improved methods of administration and utilization of better-trained personnel to administer the program.

Unfortunately, as a carry-over from the early English plan, local, unsupervised administration of general assistance is still the rule. This results in the placing of the program in the hands of unskilled political officeholders, who are not trained to carry out this function. They can make the receipt of assistance unpleasant in many ways. For example, few of the statutes contain any restriction on the method in which poor relief is to be paid, and the practice of making payments in kind instead of in cash was still found to be quite general in one recent survey. The humiliating consequences of being deprived of the power of choice that this system entails must be felt to be appreciated.

In many areas the policy is to deny general relief to anyone who can work, and several statutes so provide. If this policy were followed in times of serious economic dislocation, able-bodied persons, out of work in substantial numbers due to no fault of their own, would be denied aid. In addition, relief officials were found to deny aid to anybody who turned down an available job, whether this was required by statute, as in several States, or not. There can be no objection to this requirement as such, but where relief officials take an unrealistic view of what an applicant is able to do, he may as a practical matter be denied both a livelihood and public aid. In some areas the work test is used as a means of keeping many Negro applicants from receiving relief.

This brief review has pointed up only some of the anachronisms and inequities that inhere in the present patchwork of general assistance legislation. Not the least of these is the considerable variation in the quality of the program and in the level of assistance grants, not only from State to State but from community to community within a particular State. This is a consequence of placing the administration of the program in the hands of so many units of local government. The continued reliance on the New England town, and on townships in some States, as the administrative unit for general assistance, has led one authority to estimate that there are still 10,000 political units concerned with the administration of poor relief in this country.

What would seem to be needed is a wholesale revision and revaluation of the general assistance laws in the light of modern attitudes. Some States, indeed, have overhauled their general assistance statutes with noticeably beneficial results. In New York, for example, settlement in the State is all that is needed. In that State, too, by statute, the payment of assistance in cash rather than in kind seems to be the general rule.

Throughout most of the country, however, the trend seems to be the other way. Due apparently to burgeoning welfare costs, there is a strong movement, much like that which took hold of England in the early 19th century, to reduce the number of persons depending on public assistance for their support. The movement has been felt most by the general assistance laws, unprotected as they are by any minimum requirements imposed by Federal statute as a prerequisite to grants-in-aid.

What seems to have happened is that the unpenitent, sturdy, fraud-minded beggar has been conjured up to stalk the land. Several State legislatures in recent years have amended their general assistance statutes to elaborate the penalties for client fraud, to broaden the base of family responsibility and to find new methods for enforcing it, and to open the public assistance rolls for public inspection. Behind this new legislation there appears to be the feeling that usually persons who need public assistance are somehow personally deficient and personally responsible. Hence, these people must be deterred from applying for help by making public assistance as unpleasant as possible.

It is not denied that the problem of welfare costs is a staggering one, nor that there are persons who will use fraud to get public assistance. What the solution to these problems should be will take a considerable amount of serious thought, and the acquisition of more knowledge about the way people act. There are no easy answers. In the meantime, it seems a mistake to revert to the theory that poverty is based on personal fault.

Actually, this country has never solved its public-assistance problem. When the depression came in 1932 the poor laws were the only system of public relief available. Funds available under these programs proved inadequate to meet the need, and Federal help was inevitable. Federal help was only tem-

[1] New York and a few other States also have statutory nonoccupational accident and disability programs.

[2] In some areas, however, grants received under other assistance and insurance programs may not be supplemented by general assistance.

porary, and terminated once certain categories of individuals, such as the aged and the blind, were singled out for separate and more adequate treatment under programs for which the Federal Government shared the expense.

Even today, however, general assistance cannot meet all of the economic need that is dependent on it. In particular, the needs of families and individuals for public aid for medical expenditures is staggering and continues to become more so, with the continuing increase in medical costs. What will happen in the case of another prolonged depression that ultimately may involve the exhaustion of unemployment benefits can only be conjectured. In the meantime, the Nation must rely, for the underpinning of its entire welfare structure, on a statutory framework that dates back 3½ centuries, and that carries with it all the earmarks of an earlier and less compassionate age.

Statement in Praise of the President's Message on Agriculture and the Method and Spirit in Which It Was Evolved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, Senator ELLENDER, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, and Representative COOLEY, Democrat, South Carolina, chairman, House Agricultural Committee, have made earnest pleas that farm legislation be kept out of partisan politics. If it is possible for both parties to hold the line for this approach, which I devoutly hope will be possible, I am satisfied that we will come out with an excellent farm program.

The more political and emotional the issue becomes the greater the likelihood for the disputants to freeze on one solution to the exclusion of many other equally good solutions and to become insensitive to the recommendations of the farmers, the farm organizations, the professional people, the United States Department of Agriculture, and to the National Agricultural Advisory Committee.

The less political the issue becomes the greater the opportunity for a scientific approach and the greater the opportunity to include in the legislation the best ideas that have been developed regardless of their source and regardless of who gets the credit.

The President's message on agriculture still retains the flexible price support principle; yet he and Secretary Benson adopted the scientific approach in seeking from all sources suggestions for modifications in the former program.

I commend the President, Secretary of Agriculture, and the many people and organizations representing different parties and different points of view upon the democratic way in which the message was evolved, and also upon the great merit of this message.

A National Prosperity Budget for Agriculture—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the President has rightly stressed in his state of the Union message the need for a broad vision in our approach to the problems of agriculture in the United States. The question is, Will the approach be not only broad but bold enough to accomplish a permanent solution? In November of last year there was published by the Conference on Economic Progress a most interesting booklet entitled "Full Prosperity for Agriculture." I would highly recommend that the entire booklet be read but realizing the pressure of time on my colleagues and because of the vast importance of the subject matter to all of us, whether we represent farm or nonfarm constituencies, I respectfully submit merely the summary and theme of the first chapter, "A National Prosperity Budget for Agriculture". Because of its length, I have divided it into two parts.

PART I

I. SUMMARY AND THEME: A NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET FOR AGRICULTURE

The American farm problem has seldom been projected on a broad enough canvas to reveal its full significance or to promote a full solution. Hence neither rigid adherence to current farm policies nor unqualified return to earlier policies is adequate. The problem raises these momentous and unresolved issues:

Do commodity adjustments require sacrifice of human well-being? Must the incomes of 22 million farm people be severely depressed to dissuade over-production of farm commodities?

Is there real overproduction whenever farmers cannot market all their products, or is underconsumption the real problem when much of our own population suffers from malnutrition and inadequate clothing, and when our exports of farm products are below our free world responsibilities and our own capacities?

And if we need fewer farms and farmers, what practical alternatives are being offered to enable those dispossessed from agriculture to enjoy the full employment, production, and purchasing power written into national policy under the Employment Act of 1946?

The farm problem, viewed in the context of the whole economy rather than in superficial isolation, raises in acute form the whole issue of whether rapidly rising productivity on the farm and the advance of technology and automation in the factory are to lead inexorably to "surpluses" and mass unemployment or underemployment of plant and manpower, or whether increasing potential abundance can be translated into sustained full employment and rising living standards for all on an equitable basis.

Seven basic elements in the farm problem

1. Paradox of farm surpluses despite unmet consumer needs: If the 8 million multiple and single-person families in the United States with incomes under $2,000 before taxes were brought up to a moderate standard of diet and nutrition, the additional annual consumption of farm products would approach the average annual size of surplus production during the past 3 years. Our farm exports have dropped 25 percent since 1951; yet world consumtion of food would need to rise by 15 to 50 percent, for various items, to achieve by 1960 even a moderate improvement in the dangerously poor diets of the hungry countries. If in all the years since World War II we had raised very low income American familities to an adequate standard of clothing, and maintained even the minimum exports that free world needs and our own capacities justify, the accumulation of cotton stocks would have been held to a reasonable reserve. With proper steps toward full domestic and export consumption, farm product use would be up about 10 precent above 1954 levels in 1956 and about 22 percent in 1960.

2. Distortion of farm production relative to current and future needs: To meet population growth, changing domestic incomes and tastes, and changing world conditions, total farm production needs to be increased about 22 percent by 1960; however, great shifts in production are needed, and due to rapidly increasing yields about 8½ million acres need to be withdrawn from cultivation by 1960. But the current effort to force some lines of farm production and incomes downward, without constructive outlets for farm energies, is leading to more intensive cultivation and shifts to unrestricted lines. Thus the total surpluses are mounting.

3. Gross deflation of farm income, with other income rising: The decline in farm income became severe and commenced to accelerate after 1951. Since then, measured in uniform dollars, the net income of farm operators has dropped 35 percent, and about 12 percent during the past year. The total income of the entire farm population, including nonfarm sources of income, has declined 21 percent since 1951, and in 1955 has fallen about $1 billion or about 5 percent below 1954. In contrast, total national income, also measured in uniform dollars, has risen 13 percent since 1951, and 7 percent since 1954. The average per capita income of the farm population has fallen about $135 since 1951, and the income of the average farm operator's family about 20 percent. A minimum practical goal for 1956 would be to raise the income of the farm population from all sources to about $3½ billion dollars above the severely depressed 1955 level, which would still be about $1½ billion below 1951. By 1960, to bring a reduced farm population even to two-thirds of parity of income with other groups, its annual income from all sources needs to be raised by $10 billion above current levels.

4. The plight of the family-type farm: Of about 5 million farms, about 3 million are either commercial family units of very small size or noncommercial part-time or residential farms. These are generally marked by very low incomes and productivity, and contribute only about 10 percent to total farm product sales. At the other extreme, about 100,000 very large or giant farms contribute about 26 percent to total sales. In the middle, about 2 million adequate family-type farms are losing ground, hurt by the more powerful units and by the inefficient units. Between now and 1960, the low-income, low-productivity farms should be reduced by about a million, and family-type farms increased by about 450,000, while the trend toward concentration in giant farms should be checked.

5. Poverty in farm areas which transcends the traditional farm problem: Although the farm population is only about one-seventh of the national total, about one-half of all the families in the United States with incomes below $2,000 a year, and about three-quarters of those below $1,000, are farm operator families. More than a third of all farm operator families are below $2,000, and about one-eighth below $1,000. Including

low-income residential farm workers, about 3 million poverty-ridden American families are concentrated in farm areas. This poverty problem is far bigger than the traditional problem of income derived from farming, because many of these families would need to move out of agriculture to find an American living standard, while many part-time or nominal farmers suffer from low income from nonfarm sources to supplement their low farm incomes. Many are debilitated by inadequate educational and health services, poor housing, and a stultifying environment which affects their whole lives. By efforts on many fronts between now and 1960, the Nation has the economic capacity to lift 6 out of 7 of these families out of the below $1,000 income category, and to reduce the number below $2,000 to about one-third of a million.

6. Surplus farm population rooted to deprivation on the farm instead of offered other productive outlets: The deflation of farm income is not taking people off the farm; instead, during the past 3 years, the exodus from the farm population has been below the desirable long-term adjustment. Masses of underemployed people on the farm eking out a substandard living, nullify any assertion that the economy as a whole enjoys full employment, production, and purchasing power. Between now and 1960, about three-quarters of a million farm family workers and hired workers, comprising with their families about 2 million people, need opportunity outside of agriculture for an American standard of employment and living.

7. The American people hurt by disunity rather than unity on the farm problem: Urban consumers are told that lower farm prices help them; but a drop in farm prices of 22 percent since 1951 has been accompanied by a drop of less than 1 percent in retail consumer prices for commodities using farm products. Farmers are told that rising industrial wages hurt them; but whatever income gains farmers may make must be correlated closely with rising nonfarm incomes and consumer demand. Businessmen are told that the plight of agriculture no longer matters much to them, because the farm population and farm income are now a much smaller part of the national totals than a generation ago. But the spending of farmers for their business purchases, for industrial products, and for capital goods, are as high a percent of the national totals as a generation ago. When the true level of unemployment throughout the whole economy during the recent recession rose to about 3 million above minimum unemployment, the depressed state of farming may have accounted for 1 out of every 6 workers who should have had jobs and didn't. Progress toward parity of income and living standards for agriculture would create immense new markets for the products of industrial firms and workers.

Main defects in national farm policies

Current farm policies stem from the thesis that the surpluses of farm commodities reflect surplus farm productive plant and farmers; that the contrived deflation of farm income will reduce the farm plant and population; that less farm output will automatically raise farm prices and income; and that those forced out by this process will either land on their feet or have only their inefficiency to blame if they land on their heads. When the facts show that the commodity surpluses are mounting, farm incomes falling, and the human surpluses not moving with acceptable speed into rewarding nonfarm employment, the plea is for more time.

This effort to substitute spurious commodity adjustments for genuine human adjustments is a sad throwback to the method by which other surpluses were cured a generation ago. If mass unemployment (a labor surplus) arose, the cure was to let wages fall until reemployment became profitable, or until hunger-driven men would accept jobs at any wage. If prices were falling, the cure was to let them fall until they hit bottom. If production exceeded consumption, the cure was to let enough surplus smallbusinessmen fail. Thus every depression would ultimately end.

The great progress of our general economy during the past quarter century from boom-and-bust to improved stability, and from inhumanity to conscience, has rejected this mythology. The improvements in private business policy have included careful studies of expanding consumer market opportunities, and coordinated adjustment of business investment and price policies to the requirements for long-range growth on a balanced basis. These do not seek to adjust downward to cumulate depressionary forces; they strive to adjust upward to strengthen expansionist forces. Intelligent collective bargaining has helped to substitute stability of wage rates for wage cutting even during periods of economic recession and to develop regularized plans for income advances to keep pace with rising productivity. While we recognize the need for shifts in the patterns of production and consumption from time to time, we also recognize that the sum total of both should expand enough to maintain full employment, production, and purchasing power. And even when surpluses of plant and of manpower occur, we resort to public works, unemployment insurance, Government credit, subsidies, and many other devices which spread the risk and check the decline.

Even the farmer has benefited by these improvements in general economic policy; if the general economy were less stable and less inclined toward expansion, he would be even worse off than he now is. Nonetheless there is a farm depression in the midst of general prosperity because the gains in economic thought and action in other areas of the economy are not being applied with appropriate variations to agriculture itself. National farm policy reflects the outworn approaches which were tried with disastrous results in other general depressions—efforts to get rid of surpluses by putting millions of people through the wringer to eliminate the inefficient. The farmer on the whole is not less efficient than others; farm productivity has risen faster than other productivity. Nor is the farmer singularly guilty of overproduction. The farm surpluses, while too large, are neither so big nor so costly as surpluses of unemployed plant and manpower elsewhere. And even where there are no substantial surpluses and no support prices, for example livestock, the farmer recently has taken extremely severe income losses. When total farm production was far short of effective demand during wartime, the farmer was much better off than now but nowhere near attained parity of income or living standards with other groups.

Farmers are depressed primarily because of their chronic relative weakness in the market place; because their organization does not permit them to stimulate consumption or rationalize production and prices and incomes as others do; because trends in food distribution and prices have cut their share of the consumers' foodbasket dollar from 51 cents in 1947 to 40 cents now; and because farm policy is not countering these disabilities.

A National Prosperity Budget for Agriculture—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the concluding portion of the summary and theme of the booklet Full Prosperity for Agriculture, part II, follows:

PART II

Farmers are depressed primarily because of their chronic relative weakness in the market place; because their organization does not permit them to stimulate consumption or rationalize production and prices and incomes as others do; because trends in food distribution and prices have cut their share of the consumers' foodbasket dollar from 51 cents in 1947 to 40 cents now; and because farm policy is not countering these disabilities.

Main policy recommendations

The short-range and long-range (1960) program recommended in this study suggests these steps toward genuine parity for agriculture.

To expand domestic and export consumption of farm products, the study recommends a rounded program to promote full employment for all, with the highest noninflationary rate of growth that our technology permits; consideration of proposals to subsidize food distribution to needy consumers, plus expansion of the school-lunch program; further mutual liberalization of trade barriers, and an increase in imports in an expanding economy, which could substantially enlarge dollar availability to other countries; and a sizable immediate increase in foreign economic assistance and technical aid for all purposes with reduction by 1960 to a level about half a billion dollars about 1954, but with a higher level of loans and a lower level of grants.

On the production front, the study recommends that current and future production of farm products be adjusted on a carefully coordinated basis to desirable long-range and sustainable growth targets for domestic and export consumption. It rejects as shortsighted the effort to force production below long-range and sustainable consumption objectives, in order to get rid of the "surpluses"—first because this policy has not worked, and second, because even if it worked it would produce shortages in future and thus perpetuate a feast and famine cycle for agriculture. Simultaneously, the current farm surpluses should be worked down in the immediate years ahead by more liberal food distribution policies at home and abroad than would be sustainable or desirable for the longer run.

A large program of land conservation and food reserves is recommended, coupled with withdrawal of acreage from cultivation coming to an estimated 8½ million acres by 1960. But unless payments to farmers for this purpose are geared to adequate income objectives any such program would fail in a major objective and also be unworkable because income deflation forces farmers to overproduce through even more intense cultivation.

On the farm income front, the study stresses that the correct guiding objective

for all price supports or other protective measures is to help farmers move gradually toward parity of income and living standards with other groups. Unless guided by clearly defined income objectives, such protective measures are mere shots in the dark. An expanding level of domestic and export consumption between now and 1960 is the main road toward farm income progress. But because of the farmer's intrinsic weakness in the market place, special measures are also needed. Guided by proper income objectives, the study recommends as a first emergency measure the restoration of price supports in 1956 averaging in the neighborhood of 90 percent of parity, because, in view of the depressed condition of farm income, tested devices should precede innovations. But as soon as feasible, price supports should be used in combination with income or production payments, at least for some commodities. This combination can be fairer to the farmer, less burdensome to the taxpayer, more consistent with improved export markets, and more suited to inducing shifts in production to conform with consumption goals. Any workable system of income protection must be meshed carefully with adjustments in acreage and other productive units to feasible levels of consumption. But income protection rather than income penalties are conducive to such adjustments—and much fairer to the farmer.

To strengthen the family type farm, and to reduce and ultimately remove the acute problem of farm poverty, farm income protection should be realined so that more of the benefits accrue to the family type farmer, instead of being substantially dissipated in payments to large or giant farm enterprises; farm credit should be expanded and made cheaper, and cooperatives encouraged; and public services—including education, social security, health, and housing—should be expanded with increasing resort to equalization.

To facilitate the shift from farm work to nonfarm employment, the study stresses the prime importance of an overall full employment program. Underemployment on the farm is only a shade less evil than unemployment in the city. A surplus labor supply on the farm is bad for urban workers. Special emphasis should be placed upon further industrialization, improved labor standards, the expansion of collective bargaining, and enlarged "employment servicing," especially in those areas where a large part of this new opportunity needs to be created.

The total net cost to the Government under this recommended program is estimated to come by 1960 to about 4 percent of the Federal budget, moderate amount, indeed, measured against the size of the problem. This includes not only income protection and other payments to farmers, but also the subsidies to low-income consumers. The net cost to the Government of the basic price-support programs during more than 22 years of operation through mid-1955 has been less than $2½ billion, or on the average less than $1 a year for every person in the United States. This has been a relatively inadequate effort, compared with public outlays to stabilize markets for industrial products, to cushion industry against the shock of reconversion, to conserve and develop other resources, to maintain purchasing power during unemployment, and for other desirable purposes.

Above all, a national prosperity budget for agriculture is proposed. All aspects of "the farm problem" interact upon each other, and any effort to solve one without meeting the others falls of its own weight and tends to increase the distortion at all points. Therefore, the study recommends that the Department of Agriculture, working in concert with other agencies, and with representatives of farmers, workers, businessmen, and consumers, be required to develop a national prosperity budget for agriculture. This budget would project ahead, at least until 1960 (with appropriate annual readjustments) interrelated goals for the expansion of domestic consumption and export of farm products; for corresponding adjustments in farm production; for handling of farm surpluses; for the movement of farm income and living standards toward parity with those of other groups; for improvements in the farm structure to strengthen the family type farm; and for the reduction and ultimate liquidation of mass poverty in rural areas. These goals should be squared with overall full employment goals which envisage opportunity for those moving off the land to obtain an American standard of employment and living in industry or in service occupations.

This national prosperity budget for agriculture involves neither dictation to farmers, nor excessive planning, nor major additions to the range of coverage of already well-defined Government services. Even now the Government exerts, and will continue to exert profound influence upon all of the important aspects of the farm problem to which these goals would relate. There are already references in basic farm legislation to the desirability of establishing these kinds of coordinated goals; moreover, their pursuit could not be undertaken without the voluntary concord of formers nor without the approval of the elected representatives of the American people. The provisions of the Employment Act of 1946, that "needed levels of employment, production, and purchasing power" be established as a guide to needed economic policies, is another assertion of this responsibility.

In other sectors of the economy, these goals are largely established by large groups of businessmen and workers, as their economic education advances and as their sense of responsibility for the well-being of the whole economy increases. But it is manifestly clear that the farm population or its leadership cannot alone perform any similar function in view of the organization of agriculture. This is why the initiators of national farm policies, working in concert with farmers and others, should help develop the very approaches which have worked so well in other sectors.

All members of the National Committee of the Conference on Economic Progress, listed on the back cover of this study, do not necessarily subscribe to all of the analysis or all of the recommendations. But they all join in the desirability of placing the study before the public for full discussion and consideration. Those members of the national committee who are not members of farm organizations are desirous to avoid any semblance of intrusion into the province of farm people or their leadership, although they desire the elevation of agriculture to a fair share in an expanding national prosperity. The staff work on this study, directed by Leon H. Keyserling, has been done by Joel Darmstadter, Peter G. Franck, Mary Dublin Keyserling, Philip M. Ritz, and Warren C. Robinson. The study has benefited by comments of a number of economists and others, especially John A. Baker, Louis Bean, Frank Fernbach, Carl Huhndorff, Robert A. Rennie, Gordon Roth, and Elmer E. Walker.

From Hogs to Pork Chops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I noticed recently on examining a current issue of the Farm Journal a very interesting article entitled "Who's Making the Money on Your Hogs?"

The article was written by Dean Wolf, a well-informed person, who took the time to follow a shipment of hogs from an Iowa farm to a farmer in New York who purchased and prepared pork chops taken from the hog.

The author undertakes to show all of the costs that are applied as the hogs move from the market to the dinner table. This information throws considerable light on the challenging question of the price spread between producer and consumer.

I believe the article will prove to be informative to Members of the Senate and House, and also to the people of the country; therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO'S MAKING THE MONEY ON YOUR HOGS?

(By Dean Wolf)

How come hogs are selling for less than 13 cents at the farm—a 13-year low—and pork chops are still bringing 79 cents a pound?

Who gets the money in between and why?

And is everybody along the line getting less than a year ago, or are farmers the only ones taking a beating?

Those questions Farm Journal put to me early one morning about 2 weeks ago. By the next afternoon I was on a truck loaded with hogs in eastern Iowa, headed for Chicago.

My job was to stick with those hogs until they were sold and butchered. Then follow the meat to a supermarket somewhere—even go home with someone who bought some pork chops and help eat them.

"Keep score along the way on who makes what on these hogs, and why. Compare it with a year ago if you can," were my instructions.

I started out on the farm of Mrs. Anna Hack, operated by her son Henry in Jones County, Iowa. Farmers in their area raised 5 percent more spring pigs than last year; the country as a whole, 9 percent more. But the week these pigs went to market, slaughter was 24 percent higher than a year ago—and that explains much of the trouble.

The first cost on the Hack hogs started when the Frahm Bros. truck picked up the 32 head and took them to nearby Clarence, Iowa. There they were reloaded into one of Frahm's big semis for the 200-mile trip to Chicago. I climbed aboard and went along.

By the time we got to the Chicago Stock Yards we'd rolled up charges of 63½ cents per hundredweight: 50 cents for the truck; 3 percent Federal tax on the trucking charge; and 12 cents for in-transit insurance.

"How's the trucking business?" I asked Freeman Frahm.

"Not good. I'm making less money than I did a year ago. Costs are up; income down," he said. "Trucks, tires, gasoline, maintenance—they all cost more. Our rates are the same as last year, and there's too much competition to raise them."

One of the big tires on the semitrailer blew out on the trip. Frahm told me it cost $127 new.

We rolled into Chicago at 3 a. m. I helped unload, caught a short nap, and then watched the pigs sell. The Union Stockyards' bite came to $11.16 for yardage on the 31 head (1 died on the truck) and $4.20 for the 2 bushels of corn. Fire insurance took 7 cents; the National Livestock and Meat Board got 21 cents to use for promoting pork.

The corn charge is 15 cents a bushel cheaper than last year. It's the only yard charge that's changed since then—even though the CIO unionized stockyard employees got a 5-cent-per-hour raise last December and another 13-cent boost in August. Average base pay at the yards is $1.60 an hour. Labor makes up 75 percent of the total stockyards costs, says M. J. Cook, vice president in charge of operations.

"We're holding the line on our charges," Yard President William Wood Prince told me. "We decided that despite the wage boost it's a poor time to raise our charges when the farmer is taking it on the chin."

Commission firms have held the line, too. Dolan and Ludeman sold the 31 Hack hogs, charging $11.77 or 38 cents a hog. Their rates haven't changed since November 5, 1951, but their firm's salaries (their biggest cost) have gone up 5 percent to 10 percent in the past year.

So, the commission firm and the stockyards company are making no more than a year ago—and probably less. But the men who work for them are making more money.

Up to this point, all the charges on the hogs came out of the pocket of Mrs. Anna Hack & Son. Their hogs, which sold for $14 a hundred pounds in Chicago, returned them $12.88 a hundred back in Iowa. With hogs down $5 a hundred from last year, the Hacks, like many farmers, have taken a big cut in income.

The minute the hogs were bought for 14 cents a pound, more people started getting a "take" out of those pork chops that I found selling for 79 cents a pound at the end of the trip.

Armour & Co. bought the 31 hogs to slaughter in their plant in Jersey City, N. J., so I climbed on the caboose of an NF6 (no-feed) Pennsylvania Line freight train and was off with the hogs for a 30-hour ride for Jersey. The hogs made the 971-mile trip without a stop for feed, water, or rest. (I didn't get much of these, either, back in the caboose.)

This is what the railroads call a "hot-shot" train. Other freights and even local passenger trains were shunted aside to give us a clear track. This nonstop service is one way the railroad is trying to cut costs; it gets faster turnaround on freight cars. For the packers it cuts livestock shrink about a third, eliminates feed charges en route, and reduces injury and death losses. One veteran Chicago order buyers say "hot shots" save the packer about $50 per carload of hogs.

Freight charges on these hogs were 15 percent higher than a year ago and now total $1.05 a hundred pounds as the hogs come off the cars. (The shipper doesn't have to pay freight on shrink.)

Railroad officials say their costs are up, too, so it's hard to tell whether they are making more money on livestock hauling today than a year ago. Their employees are making more for sure. Yardmasters' paychecks are $21 a month fatter. Base pay for trainmen is up 10½ cents an hour.

As we sipped strong black coffee between jolts in the caboose, the conductor told me he makes $7,300 a year. He's been on the railroad a long time and he's happy.

By the time the Jersey City plant started slaughtering, those $14 hogs had now cost Armour $16.48. The $2.48 spread included freight charges, commission for the Armour hog buyer who bought the hogs in Chicago for Armour's Jersey City plant, a service charge, and feed bill at the holding pens of the Jersey City Stockyards.

Actually, Armour's cost was more because the 192-pound hogs had shrunk 12 pounds apiece on the trip, or 6.34 percent (it usually runs closer to 8 percent). I expected it would be more by the way that caboose threw me around.

That shrink was the only thing I didn't see converted into some kind of salable product. Everything from snout to tail was put to some use.

The only reason for shipping the hogs live at all is that the eastern trade will pay 1½ to 2 cents a pound more for fresh pork processed in the East than for meat shipped from the Midwest. Why? No one seems to know—apparently it's just habit carried over from the days when we didn't have good refrigerated freight cars.

The week that these hogs sold, packers were paying 28 percent less for hogs than a year ago (down from a $19.16 average to $13.79 in Chicago). However, the New York wholesale price on pork loins had dropped only 17 percent (from $45 to $37.20). The October wholesale price on all pork in New York was down only 16½ percent from last year.

The packers' handling margain on the fresh pork from a 192-pound hog averaged $3.89 the week these hogs sold compared to a $3.17 margin a year ago, according to Government figures. That's an 18½-percent boost, compared to the farmers' 28 percent cut in price—and packers were getting this on 24 percent more pork volume than a year earlier.

This isn't all profit—costs are also averaging 12 percent higher than a year ago in the Jersey City plant, according to plant officials. Labor, the biggest cost item, is up 19.3 percent. Packinghouse workers in this plant got a 5-cent raise per hour, plus fringe benefits, in September 1954. They got another flat 14-cent raise in August. The average wage rate there is now $1.97 per hour.

B. F. Bracy, manager of the plant where these hogs were killed, summed up his books for the year this way: "We're doing a little better than last year—because we're losing a little less money." By the time he toted up his costs he figured he was out 69 cents on every hog in the Hack shipment.

Each 192-pound hog—killed, cut up, and in the plant's cooler—was worth $31.80 to the packer, according to his figures, and costs up to that point had amounted to $32.49. The hog ended up a 132½-pound carcass which yielded: 25 pounds of ham valued at $8.64; 12 pounds of picnics worth $2.53; 8½ pounds of Boston butts, $2.12; 20½ pounds of belly, $5; 20 pounds of loin, $6.54; 3 pounds of spare ribs, 87 cents; 2 pounds of neck bones, 11 cents; 3½ pounds of feet, 20 cents; ¼ pound of tail, 1 cent; 4½ pounds of skinned jowls, 50 cents, and 4¼ pounds of trimmings, 76 cents.

Besides the carcass, there were 7 pounds of variety meats worth 94 cents to the packer at this stage. These include brains, liver, tongue, cheek and head meat, ears, heart, kidneys, spleen, snout, and stomach. And there were 27½ pounds of lard worth $2.92 loose.

The rest which goes into byproducts, brought 66 cents. This includes hair, blood, yellow grease, casings, tankage, pituitary and thyroid glands.

Only a small portion of the pork goes immediately into the wholesale market. The rest may not be sold by the packer for several weeks, if processed further, or for months if it goes into storage. This delay can either make or lose the packer money. This year, packers claim they have sold on a declining market as farmers have. Up to this point, it was easy to tell who had been paid, and how much, for handling these hogs. From here on out, it was impossible: The hogs were cut into dozens of pieces and went in all directions. So I followed a pork loin to the Grestide Bros. supermarket at 17th Street and First Avenue in New York City.

Grestide paid Armour a wholesale price of 40 cents a pound, only 3 cents less than on the same day a year ago. (The live hog brought the Hacks 5 cents a pound less back in Iowa, remember.)

Center-cut pork chops from that 40-cent loin sold that day for 79 cents a pound in the Grestide supermarket. Yet, the meat department manager said he was having a hard time making year-ago profits. Like everyone else, he complained about rising costs.

Supermarket costs on a pork loin are for slicing, drapping two chops in a cellophane package, and various overhead charges. Labor, a big item, has gone up 30 percent in the Grestide store in the past year, I was told. The average wage rate there is now $1.83 per hour.

It costs 12 cents just to put an empty package on the Grestide's meat counter by the time all of the overhead is figured in.

What the retailers of the country are making on meats is impossible to say. All the major supermarket chains have been showing good earnings, and in most of them meat accounts for a fourth of their volume. Typical New York stores took $10.98 for handling the pork from a 192-pound hog in October last year. This year, they're taking $11.25 and are handling more pork.

I watched Mrs. S. J. Ciaccio, a New York City homemaker, shop for meat. She just didn't walk up and pick up some pork chops. She looked at beef, lamb, chicken, and pork. And once she made up her mind on pork she was pretty choosy about the kind of chops she bought—she didn't want too much fat or waste.

Right there, I realized that Mrs. Ciaccio's decision on what to buy—multiplied by the decision of millions of homemakers like her—is a big part of what makes hog prices go up or down.

I wound up this trip riding the tube-train under the Hudson River to the Ciaccio home in one of New York City's big, tall apartment buildings at 301 East 21st Street. There I enjoyed pork chop dinner with the Ciaccio family.

Mr. Ciaccio, I learned, is a dentist and there's a 12-year-old daughter, Theodora. The family's meat bill runs about $15 per week, about a fourth of it for pork.

Mrs. Ciaccio winces a little at 79-cent pork chops, but she buys only the most popular cuts of pork.

What could I conclude from the trip? Well, one thing was that the farther you go back toward the farmer in the line-up of middlemen, the less anybody was making. And the farmer is by far the worst off of all.

It was hard to tell what the retailer and the packer were making compared with a year ago, but it is generally believed that they are doing better. The railroads are showing increased earnings, too.

But the one group that is doing better for sure is organized labor, whereever you find it.

And the one group that is doing a lot worse is the hog raiser.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN].

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all Members of the House shared my shock and deep regret at the passing of our beloved colleague, VERA BUCHANAN during the recent recess period. When I first became a Member of the House, I had the pleasure of living in the same building with her and her good husband, and we cherished their friendship. Dur-

ing the 5 years of VERA BUCHANAN'S service in the House, I learned to know her well and to know her was to love her and to respect her. She was a valued Member of this body, and she served her district and her State and Nation with distinction.

I, and my husband joins with me, extend our very deepest and sincerest sympathy to the members of her family. May God strengthen and comfort them.

Interference of Federal Government in Administration of State Criminal Laws

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Like my colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and also my colleague from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], before being elected to the House of Representatives of the United States I served as a solicitor general of the State of Georgia. In fact 8 of the 10 Members of the House of Representatives from Georgia have served either as Superior Court Judge, Superior Court Solicitor General or as a member of the bar and as an officer of the courts of Georgia. I commend my colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] for bringing the attention of this body to the unwarranted and unprecedented action by the United States Department of Justice, which he has so well and so ably referred to in his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I support the position which has just been taken by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]. The Justice Department of the United States, by and at the direction of the Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, and an Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Olney, has brought about an action, referred to in detail by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], which is a direct invasion of the sovereignty of the State of Georgia and which is an effront and an insult to our system of jurisprudence, and a personal insult to the distinguished judge—Hon. James T. Manning— and solicitor general—Hon. Luther C. Hames, Jr.—of the superior court of Cobb County, Ga., both of whom I know well and for whom I have the very highest admiration and regard.

Recently, the Supreme Court of Georgia in the case of *Amos Reece* v. *The State* (211 Ga. 339) affirmed a death sentence imposed by a jury in the superior court of Cobb County. Upon writ of certiorari to the United States Supreme Court, this latter court in an unprecedented procedure went wholly outside the record and transcript of the case and found imaginary procedural errors, not real errors which in fact existed and were shown to exist by the certified record in the case but imaginary errors which were conceived and born in the fragmentary imagination of one or more of the Justices. In that opinion of the United States Supreme Court, the Court said that an error might have been committed when such an allegation did not appear in the statement of the case nor in the assignments of error—and they could not have so appeared because they did not so exist.

Among other things the laws of the State of Georgia, on the question of jury selection, provide as follows:

59–101. (813 P. C.) Jury commissioners; appointment; number; qualifications; terms; removal: In each county there shall be a board of jury commissioners, composed of six discreet persons, who are not practicing attorneys at law nor county officers, who shall hold their appointment for 6 years, and who shall be appointed by the judge of the superior court. On the first appointment two shall be appointed for 2 years, 2 for 4 years, and 2 for 6 years, and their successors shall be appointed for 6 years. The judge shall have the right to remove said commissioners at any time, in his discretion, for cause, and appoint a successor. (Acts 1878–9, p. 27; 1887, p. 52; 1901, p. 43.)

59–103. (815 P. C.) Same; oath, entry on minutes of court of ordinary: Jury commissioners, before entering on the discharge of their duties, shall take and subscribe before the ordinary of their respective counties, the following oath which shall be entered on the minutes of the court of ordinary, viz: "You shall faithfully and impartially discharge the duty of jury commissioners for the county of ——— in accordance with the constitution of this State, to the best of your skill and knowledge; and the deliberations and counsel of the jury commissioners, while in the discharge of their duties, you shall forever keep secret and inviolate unless called upon to give evidence thereof in some court of justice of other legal tribunal of this State. So help you God." (Acts 1832–3, p. 101.)

59–104. (817 P. C.) Same; clerk of superior court as clerk of the board; oath, duties: The clerk of the superior court shall be the clerk of the board of commissioners, and shall perform all the clerical duties required by law. Before entering upon the performance of his duties as clerk of said board he shall take an oath, before the ordinary, to faithfully discharge his duties as required by law, and that he will never divulge, any of the proceedings and deliberations of the jury commissioners, unless compelled to testify thereof in some court in this State. (Acts 1878–9, p. 28; 1882–3, p. 101.)

59–201. (811 P. C.) Qualifications of grand jurors; incompetency of certain public officers to serve: All citizens of this State, above the age of 21 years, being neither idiots, lunatics, nor insane, who have resided in the county for six months preceding the time of serving, and who are the most experienced, intelligent, and upright persons, are qualified and liable to serve as grand jurors, unless exempted by law: *Provided, however*, That county commissioners, tax receivers, tax collectors, members of the county board of education, county school commissioners, ordinaries, and county treasurers shall be incompetent to serve as grand jurors during their respective terms of office. (Constitution, art. VI, sec. XVIII, par. II (sec. 2–4502), Acts 1887, p. 53.)

59–202. (812 P. C.) Number of grand jurors: A grand jury shall consist of not less than 18 nor more than 23 persons. (Cobb, 547. Acts 1869, p. 140.)

59–701. (856 P. C.) How drawn and summoned: Petit juries shall be selected, and their names placed in a box, as provided in sections 59–106 and 59–108. At the same time, and in the same manner, that grand juries are drawn, the judge of the superior court shall draw out of the same compartment of the jury box 36 names to serve as petit jurors for the trial of civil and criminal cases; and such petit jurors shall be summoned in the same manner as is provided in section 59–206 for summoning grand jurors. (Acts 1869, pp. 139, 140; 1878–9, p. 27.)

59–703. (857 P. C.) Panels, how made; procedure where parties do not agree on panel; striking jurors: The judges of the superior courts, at each term, shall, from the petit jurors, have made up 2 panels of 12 jurors each, which shall be known and distinguished as panels "number one" and "number two"; all cases in said courts shall be tried by one or the other of said panels if the parties shall agree upon a panel. If the parties shall not agree upon a panel, the clerk shall furnish the parties or their attorneys a list of both panels, from which the parties of their attorneys may strike alternately until there shall be but 12 left, which shall constitute the jury to try the case. In all cases the plaintiff shall have the first strike. (Acts 1869, p. 141.)

59–704. (858 P. C.) Parties entitled to full panels; filling panel with tales jurors: In civil cases and cases of misdemeanors in the superior court, each party may demand a full panel of 24 competent and impartial jurors from which to strike a jury, and when one or more of the regular panel of traverse jurors shall be absent or for any reason disqualified, the presiding judge, at the request of counsel for either party, shall cause the panel to be filled by tales jurors to the number of 24, before requiring the parties, or their counsel, to strike a jury. (Acts 1878–9, p. 145.)

59–706. (860 P. C.) Oath of panels of jury: Each panel of the petit jury shall take the following oath: "You shall well and truly try each cause submitted to you during the present term, and a true verdict give, according to the law as given you in charge, and the opinion you entertain of the evidence produced to you, to the best of your skill and knowledge, without favor or affection to either party, provided you are not discharged from the consideration of the case submitted. So help you God." (Acts 1869, p. 141.)

I regret to lengthen the record and belabor you who might be listening with an enumeration of these code sections, but I want them made a part of the record at this time so that anyone interested might know the stautory requirements and procedures which are provided for and followed in the courts of my State.

We are proud of our courts and the constitutional and statute provisions and system of jurisprudence under which the courts of Georgia are operated. I have practiced considerably in the courts of Georgia, other States, and in the district courts, circuit court of appeals, and Supreme Court of the United States since 1938, and I might add that I was quite active in both office and courtroom practice until my election to Congress—excepting, of course, the time I served in the Armed Forces of our country, and even then I performed my full share of duty as trial judge advocate, trial counsel, defense counsel, and member of many general and special courts-martial; and I believe that I am qualified to compare Georgia courts with not a few but with many others.

Of all the courts in which I have practiced, and all the others which I have seen in operation, there is none which more zealously protects and defends the rights of the accused and—and I emphasize—the rights of the victims, too, than do the courts of the State of Georgia, without fear of favor, and without regard to the race, creed, or color of either the accused or the victims.

I am devotedly proud of my State and its people, and I am equally proud and jealous of the courts of my State and our system of law and jurisprudence. They need no defense from me or anyone else, but I would be derelict in my duty as an American citizen, a Georgia citizen, and a Member of Congress from Georgia, if I did not here and now openly and without apology denounce the unprecedented arrogation of powers unto themselves by the Supreme Court of the United States in its recent decision in the Reece case and by the Department of Justice in its unwarranted encroachment upon the perogatives and duties of the superior court of my State.

I denounce these actions, and I condemn them as usurpations of power by the Federal judiciary and Federal Justice Department which are more reminiscent of Germany under Hitler and Russia of today than they are of orderly procedure under the constitutional Government of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon you and upon every Member of this House to solemnly consider the full impact of what has happened in this case. If the Supreme Court and the Justice Department of the United States can drive a wedge into the court system of the State of Georgia, not on facts which really exist but upon pure figments of the imaginations in the minds of utopian dreamers, and thereby weaken or seek to destroy the judicial and court system and rules of law and procedure of our State to any degree, however small, and go unchallenged by us; then the next step by arorgant, power-mad groups, will be to seek to break down and destroy every last and remaining vestige of local self-government and local self-determination.

Never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for you.

Hearings Are Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to quote for information a letter from the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce, Anchorage, Alaska, which was sent to a newspaper in the congressional district which I represent. The letter, which followed the hearings conducted by a subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, is as quoted below:

OCTOBER 1, 1955.

DEAR SIR: We would like to take this opportunity to send to you a copy of an editorial from the Anchorage Daily Times of Saturday, September 24, lauding the work of the Subcommittee on Territories of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, United States Congress.

We call this to your attention because the Representative from your district, JAMES UTT, played an outstanding role in making these hearings such a success. We would certainly like to point out that Representative UTT's sincere interest and hard work would make every voter in your district proud that you have such a Representative in Congress. To the people of Anchorage's Alaska, this subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee conducted the finest hearings that we have ever had in this community, and worked so diligently and hard that the committee themselves hardly had a moment to relax and enjoy the beauties of Alaska and the hospitality of our people.

We want you all to know that we here in Anchorage, Alaska, appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. STOOKEY,
President, Anchorage Chamber of Commerce.

[From the Anchorage Daily Times of September 24, 1955]

HEARINGS ARE WORK

The House committee conducting hearings in Alaska this month is chalking up a record that must represent a new high mark for application to duty.

In a short period of 2 weeks the committee has scheduled public hearings in 17 different places. The places are scattered widely over Alaska's 586,400 square miles. They include Point Barrow in the north, Nome in the west, and Ketchikan in the south.

The hearings will occupy between 75 and 80 hours. Actually, the total will run even higher because extra sessions have already become common.

The hours devoted to Alaska problems in this 2-week interval will be greater than those devoted to all legislation that came before the committee during the first session of Congress.

This is impressive. It means that Alaska is getting more committee attention now than did all the Territories and insular possesions, and the various States, during the congressional session.

While this record must be a new high mark, it is not the first time Alaskans have seen congressional committees work arduously while in the Territory.

Alaskans have seen many committees carry heavy work schedules while in Alaska. They have also learned of the value of the sessions.

They have found hearings so beneficial in the handling of their problems that they have come to welcome and even solicit them.

The visitations of congressional groups, often called "junkets," have been such that Alaskans view them with none of the ugly connotation that goes with that word.

Congress is the top authority on everything pertaining to Alaska. The greatest need of the Territory is a proper understand in the body that controls.

The Members of Congress have more power over Alaska than the people's elected representatives who sit in the territorial legislature. They have more power than the bureaucrats who administer the Federal agencies. If that power is to be used intelligently, it must be used with a thorough understanding of the people and the area involved.

As long as this system prevails, there is no better approach to that understanding than by public hearings such as are now being held.

The Congressmen who come here do more than conduct hearings that are fat and bulky when the record is printed in book form.

They form impressions that are invaluable in guiding them as to the potentials of the people and the land. Their personal observations enable them to understand the facts more thoroughly. A map may tell a story but it is often harder to discover and understand it from the map than it is by visiting the people and the places that are shown as names and dots.

The record itself is a document that has an enduring value in Washington. The testimony of the witnesses makes a reference document that is used by the Congressmen as they deliberate the legislative matters that follow.

Without the record, the testimony of the witnesses would be only a memory when the visit has been concluded. With it, all the Members of Congress can check the details of the views expressed.

The House committee is compiling a volume of some 500,000 words which will be their compendium of the reports and observations of Alaskans on the many subjects that need legislative attention.

While the Alaskans have found it arduous, too, in preparing and presenting this information, they are appreciative of the patience and sincerity of the Congressmen in coming to the Territory and devoting so many hours to the job.

The only criticism that might be made of the present schedule is that it has required constant attendance at hearings. The Congressmen have had no opportunity to become acquainted with the many glorious features for which Alaska is famous. These include fishing, hunting, sightseeing, and social activities that have been given no attention at all.

Mr. John J. Forbes (Mr. Mine Safety) Retires as Director of the United States Bureau of Mines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on December 1, 1955, the American people lost the services of one of the finest officials in public life in the person of John J. Forbes, formerly Director of the United States Bureau of Mines, an agency in which he spent 41 fruitful years.

No finer tribute can be tendered Mr. John J. Forbes than the following editorial which appeared in the December 15, 1955, issue of the United Mine Workers Journal:

THE SAGA OF JOHN J. FORBES

(By Jeanne Dubendorf)

John J. Forbes, who has played a pioneering role in developing and winning acceptance for many of the safety standards and practices regarded as basic in the coal industry today, retired December 1 as Director of the United States Bureau of Mines after nearly 41 years with that agency.

His long association with the coal industry, going back 60 years to a stint as an anthracite breaker boy, was capped by a

4-year tenure as Director of the Bureau of Mines, during which time notable and hard-fought safety advances were realized.

During that time also, Forbes saw the bituminous industry hit bottom economically and begin a comeback this year which he predicts is just a starter on a very bright future. And he is optimistic about the future of the depressed anthracite industry, which stands to benefit from current research developments and an impending shortage of coking coals for steelmaking.

Forbes, who reached the mandatory retirement age on November 21, when he was 70, started with the Bureau in 1915 as a first-aid miner. He was the first career man to rise through the ranks to the directorship.

Until a successor is appointed by President Eisenhower, subject to Senate confirmation, James Westfield, Assistant Director in charge of health and safety, will serve as Acting Director.

Mr. Eisenhower, in a personal letter to Forbes, praised his twoscore years of dedicated work in the Bureau and credited him with helping to save thousands of lives in American coal mines.

Two leather-bound albums of pictures, including many taken at mines where Forbes directed disaster recovery work, and two albums of farewell letters from Bureau associates, including nearly every health and safety emlpoyee, were given to him on his retirement. One letter spoke of the revitalized enthusiasm, reminiscent of the Bureau's early years, under his directorship; another of his "open door" policy; others referred to his humanitarianism and real contributions in the safety field, to which he has devoted most of his energies and enthusiasm in the past 40 years.

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, who was persuaded by the Senate Interior Committee to drop his plan to place a political appointee in the directorship when the present administration took office, had words of high praise at a Washington ceremony honoring Forbes. He noted that Forbes has "earned worldwide recognition as a pioneer in the field of mine health and safety." His long years of service, McKay said tell "the story of a man who has dedicated his entire working life to the greatest of all causes, the conservation and betterment of priceless human life."

In recognition of his safety work, he was given a distinguished service award in 1951 by the Interior Department.

The Bureau had been in existence less than 5 years when Forbes began his Government career. It had about 400 employees and a budget of $758,000 a year. It now has 4,000 employees and a budget of $28,563,000. About the future, he says:

"There is no reason why things shouldn't go forward. The coal industry, with which I have been very closely associated, has a very bright future. The research now underway in hydrogenation and gasification of coal will bear real fruit in the not-far-distant future, in my opinion.

"The metallurgical research, the experimental work going on at the various Bureau stations, is also doing a good job for the future. The Bureau of Mines has some of the finest scientific minds that exist in Government."

In 40 years with the Bureau, Forbes worked up from the bottom and has played a key role in developing important programs, such as the Federal Mine Inspection Service organized in 1941–42. As with the law that created the agency in 1910, a shocking series of mine disasters galvanized Congress into authorizing Federal mine inspections in 1941. It appropriated money for 107 inspectors the first year. But the inspectors had only the power to recommend improvements. There are now about 265 Federal inspectors.

Forbes has continually emphasized the need for safety education in the coal and other mineral industries. Under his supervision nearly 2 million men have been trained in first-aid, about 100,000 have taken rescue training, and more than 130,000 coal miners have taken accident prevention courses. He has visited the coal and metal mine fields of every State in the country.

Shortly after he was appointed director by President Truman in November 1951, the West Frankfort (Ill.) mine disaster prodded Congress into passing a bill giving Federal inspectors limited enforcement powers to prevent such disasters. Forbes supported the measure in the congressional hearings in 1952, as he had a similar bill in 1949 when he headed the Bureau's Health and Safety Division.

"In this day and age there is no excuse for a major mine disaster," he reiterated recently. "We have the knowledge. It is just simply a question of applying that knowledge."

This conviction grew out of personal experience in recovery operations and investigations of around 100 disasters, including the West Frankfort explosion.

After 3 years under the mandatory Federal law, he believes it has been proved a "complete success" and most producers "now appreciate that it is for the benefit of the industry. It's a long story and I'm very happy to have been a part of it."

He adds that he has "looked forward for many years to finding a situation like we have today, where the mine workers, the operators, States and Federal bureau are cooperating sincerely to bring down the death and injury rates in coal mines. In other words, they might have differences of opinion regarding wages and working conditions, but when it comes to life and limb, there should be no differences of opinion. The situation today is better than it ever has been in my lifetime."

Born in Shamokin, Pa., November 21, 1885, Forbes became a breaker boy when he was 10 years old. By work during summer vacations as a laborer, miner and engineer, he obtained a teaching degree in 1905. After teaching 2 years and continuing mining work in vacations, he entered what is now Pennsylvania State University and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in mining in 1911. He received a "distinguished alumnus" award from Pennsylvania State University in 1952.

In 1913 he was offered a job as safety inspector for an eastern Ohio producer, one of the first in the State to recognize a need in this field. It started him on a rugged road that was to make him a widely recognized expert on mine safety, on mine rescue and rehabilitation work.

In such work, one of his precepts, shared by close associates, was that "we never expected our people to go anywhere we would not go." In the early days especially, that involved risks which probably no mining man in his right mind would take today. It meant a lot of "dirty work."

"I wouldn't want to go through it again," Forbes recently said of his early experience, "but thank God for it."

One of his first assignments with the Bureau, in 1915, was at the Harwick Mine of the old Harwick Coal & Coke, Co., Cheswick, Pa., where he helped train a rescue crew. He had been with the Bureau less than a month. In conversation with the superintendent it came out that just over 11 years before 179 men lost their lives in an explosion in the mine. This disclosure was on the minds of the rescue men as they rode the cage down.

After the training session, they were met by the "super" who was waving a Pittsburgh newspaper telling of an explosion in Layland, W. Va. Forbes recalls that Bill German, an associate, took off for Layland, hopped freights and everything else to get there. German led a crew that found some 50 survivors who had barricaded themselves against afterdamp. One hundred and twelve others died in the disaster.

Other photos recall circumstances that illustrate the long road traveled by Forbes and other veteran safety advocates. It took a long time to convince the industry that black powder is extremely hazardous. It took even longer to convince the industry that all bituminous coal dust will explode, and that rock dusting is an elementary precaution.

One of the photos shows a rescue team in a mine near Pittsburg, Kans., situated in a then (1917) productive field which had a shotfirer explosion about twice a month. Black powder was used for shooting the solid coal. A Bureau man and the chief State inspector customarily stayed in the latter's office until all shotfirers were accounted for.

Forbes took an explosion call one cold evening in February, 1917, from a mine that had had about a dozen previous explosions. Some rescue crewmen he had just trained—never met a finer bunch—were rounded up. With the cages knocked out, they descended the 250-foot shaft on a rope-and-pulley rig. They rescued the lone survivor of four shotfirers caught in the mine, and later that night they crawled 3,500 feet in low coal looking for the others.

Meanwhile, the future Mrs. Forbes arrived by train in Pittsburgh, but was not met by the intended bridegroom, as planned. They were to be married the next day. The postponed wedding took place on March 26, 1917.

A month later, on a railroad siding where the Bureau's old Rescue Car No. 4 was hastily loaded, Mrs. Forbes saw her husband off to the Hastings, Colo., mine, where an explosion had just snuffed out 121 lives. He was gone 3 months.

Recovery work in the Hastings mine was a terrible job. Forbes recalls there were as many as 100 men doing nothing but carrying bodies. The entire mine was destroyed and the Victor American Fuel Co., he adds, had to sell out to raise money for recovery operations. The bodies of eight of the victims are still in the mine. A trip rider who crawled out a slope portal was the only survivor.

Mrs. Forbes made a trip into a mine in 1918 at Somerset, Colo., after a fire there. It had a thin seam, and she remembers her trepidations at seeing men crouched on the floor of the mine cars. She has been content ever since to acquire her mining knowledge secondhand.

In the early days, Forbes was on the go so much his family sometimes lived in a town only 2 or 3 months at a stretch. His wife, daughter of a Kansas miner, and their two youngsters, a son and a daughter, now grown, accompanied him whenever possible. Mrs. Forbes is convinced today's Bureau wives are very well off in comparison.

The Clymer, Pa., mine disaster in 1926 resulted in Forbes missing his only national first-aid and mine-rescue contest during nearly 41 years with the Bureau. He was director of the last three national contests, and previously took an enthusiastic hand in many State and local contests.

War Claims Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Monroe County News, of Albia, Iowa, of recent date carried an editorial on the

subject of the War Claims Commission hearings held for eight former prisoners of war in Korea. I recommend that it be read by every Member of Congress. The same editorial was reproduced in the Bloomfield (Iowa) Republican of January 3. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial, calling attention to the arbitrary manner in which these hearings were conducted.

INVESTIGATE THE ARMY

The United States Army, which once was the victim of McCarthyism and fought back bitterly—although not too well—now appears to have adopted the very philosophy it resented.

The latest instance is connected with War Claims Commission hearings recently held in Chicago for 8 former prisoners of war in Korea.

Based on information compiled by the Army, the 8 men have been accused of giving "aid and comfort to the enemy" and, under the war claims act, becomes ineligible to receive prisoner of war compensation at the rate of $2.50 a day.

Some of the former war prisoners involved have honorable Army discharges. Others are still in the Army.

Each was called before the bar in the United States Court of Appeals Building in Chicago and told that he could not hear any details of the accusations against him, nor learn when, where or what acts he allegedly committed.

The hearings were conducted by Henry J. Clay, a member of the 5-man War Claims Commission. Like the other members, Clay was appointed by President Eisenhower and is responsible to him.

One of the men called before the bar, Robert W. Mahrenholz of Des Moines, protested to Clay: 'This is contrary to all the principles of the American Constitution. I believe I have the right to know the charges in details and face my accusers."

Mr. Clay is said to have agreed with the statement, but added, "I can do no more than inform you of the circumstances of this hearing. The Army has declared that its files relating to you and to accusations against you to be top secret and therefore not releasable even to you—the accused.

In that connection it is possible Mr. Clay is confused about the identity of his boss. After all, he's working for Mr. Eisenhower, not the Army. Couldn't he tell the Army to stand back of its allegations with witnesses who could be questioned by the accused?

The actions against the 8 men and 79 others in similar circumstances began after they filed claims with the Government for the $2.50 a day bonus for any prisoner of the Korean war who "suffered cruel and inhuman treatment, or whose rights under the Geneva Convention for prisoners who were contravened."

One of the eight, who lost several fingers and toes because of exposure to freezing weather, was informed by the Army he had been accused of getting preferential treatment in the hospital and better rations.

This same man has Army hospital records showing he was suffering from malnutrition and amputations when he returned from the prison camps.

Another, charged with editing a Communist newspaper and writing propaganda radio skits, is listed on Army records as nearly illiterate.

The Army's denial to soldiers of the rights soldiers are supposed to fight and die for is not limited to these particular cases. It has cropped up in other phases of military management.

The Army's get-tough policy with former prisoners of war in comparison with the Air Force policy of accepting germ warfare confession signers as heroes would be a national scandal if it occurred outside the military.

There's nothing sacred about the Department of Defense. It is an agency of the Government just like the Department of Agriculture and Department of Interior.

Generals and admirals and colonels and majors and commanders are employees of the people—just like postmasters and school teachers and extension directors and cabinet members.

It is hight time the military explained to the people of this Nation just what caused some soldiers to become turncoats. After all, they were indoctrinated by our Army before the Communists got them. Why weren't they indoctrinated good?

It is high time the military explained to the people of this Nation just why a man accused of an offense against the people of this Nation cannot hear the accusation detailed and be faced by his accusers?

It is hight time the military explained to the people of this Nation just what it thinks is wrong with the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

A well-conducted congressional investigation of the military's policy in regard to subversives, real and alleged, would be healthy for it and the Nation.

This is, after all, Democracy—not a military dictatorship. Let's prove it. (Monroe County News.)

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness we recorded the passing of our beloved friend, VERA BUCHANAN, of McKeesport, Pa.

VERA BUCHANAN joined us in the 82d Congress succeeding her late husband, Frank Buchanan, to represent one of the great industrial areas—not alone in Pennsylvania but in the United States.

She was very close to the people of her district, and she understood the people of her district, which eminently qualified her to so ably represent them. She evidenced a love of people by her good counsel, kind deeds, and useful services. She had the power of understanding and sympathizing with people regardless of whom or what their difficulties may have been. She was a very hard-working, conscientious Representatives who took the problems of her people to heart, always manifesting great interest and concern for the welfare of those she represented.

The people of her district loved her and respected her ability which was evidenced by the great popularity she enjoyed.

She was very faithful in the performance of her duties and by her work in the Congress won great respect and the admiration of the membership on both sides of the aisle.

VERA had a legion of friends. In a life such as hers, perhaps the thing most to be admired was her gracious, kindly attitude and the great civic, social, and spiritual contributions she made to the area in which she lived.

It can be said of VERA that she made the best of life as she found it and rejoiced mightily when any little word or deed of hers added to the happiness of any of us. In all things she had charity; tolerance was of her nature. She respected in others the quality she possessed herself—sincerity of conviction and frankness of expression.

She was a firm believer in our American way of life and her great ambition was to hand on to posterity and the generations of tomorrow a greater and finer America than was handed to her.

She was kindly and sympathetic to all; always glad to see one; gracious to everyone; and will be long remembered for her many little acts of kindness that marked her friendship and good will toward all of us who knew her.

So today we mourn her loss. She will be greatly missed by her many friends and by the people she represented. It is with profound sadness we record her passing. We extend to her family our heartfelt sympathy.

Mrs. Bolton: A Truly Remarkable Woman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 5, 1956, there appeared an editorial entitled "Mrs. BOLTON: A Truly Remarkable Woman," which I recommend to the attention of each Member of the Congress.

Our distinguished colleague has represented her country in the Congress with true distinction. Her diligence, her unselfish devotion to duty, and her brilliant service could well serve as a guide to every Member.

While her plaudits have been justly acclaimed throughout the world, it is a privilege and an honor for me to insert this latest testimonial with her already outstanding record in the annals of the Congress of the United States:

MRS. BOLTON: A TRULY REMARKABLE WOMAN

There are newsletters and newsletters, but few possess the charm of those written by Representative FRANCES P. BOLTON, 22d Congressional District, Ohio.

Mr. BOLTON returned recently from what loosely might be called a junket to Africa—99 days on the African Continent itself. But it differed from the usual junket in that Mrs. BOLTON was in dead earnest in her attempt to study Africa, and that, although the trip was made in an official capacity, she paid most of her expenses out of her own pocketbook.

True, she met such leaders as the President of Liberia, the Prime Minister of the Gold Coast, and the Emperor of Ethiopia—but she didn't stop there. She talked with the people themselves—and in a 20,000-mile trip in 24 countries and territories, one is bound to see a lot of people.

It required the use of commercial aircraft, trains, riverboats, coastwise freighters, cars, and jeeps, but she did it. And it rings true when she writes:

"• • • If you could have gone with me into the 'native cities' • • • if you could have seen the efforts being made to give de-

cent homes and the beginnings of education and health training * * * if you could have seen the passionate eagerness to learn. * * * It is no simple matter, this overwhelming urge that wells up out of the very ground of Africa. There is no question but that the African must and will be his own master, but if he is to make a successful leap from the past he will need to learn many things. No; he will not need to experience all the stages through which others have come from the era of the wheel to the era of jet planes, but some transition period is absolutely necessary. If you could have experienced some of these things with me, I am sure you would feel—as I do—that the people of Africa are going to play a wonderful part in the world's future."

FRANCIS PAYNE BOLTON: a truly remarkable woman.

Coal Is Coming Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the prosperity of southeastern Ohio is dependent to a large degree upon the production of coal. With its abundance of this natural resource, the people of my area have experienced a long period of curtailed coal production. To some extent, the outlook for the future bears promise of reversing this trend. This has resulted largely from the establishment of plants which utilize coal to generate vast quantities of electric power. Abundant coal and electric power coupled with the concerted effort of the people of the area I represent to press forward on the economic front, are causing major industries to take renewed interest in these rich resources in selecting plant sites.

I wish to recommend to the House the following editorial from the Marietta (Ohio) Daily Times for December 19, 1955, which deals with the resurgence of the coal industry in Ohio:

COAL IS COMING BACK

Ohio coal production continues to improve, the State Department of Industrial Relations reported after getting its third-quarter statistics compiled. In the 3 months ending September 30, Ohio's mines had an output of 8,700,000 tons, which is more than a half-million tons better than second-quarter production and 1,400,000 tons better than the third quarter of last year.

Ohio coal producers started this year at a good pace. Production in the first quarter was up 14 percent over 1954. By the third quarter the increase had risen to 20 percent. Such improvement is not in itself sufficient to lift the depression from the coal industry, but it is not without significance in visualizing a trend.

These comparisons are, of course, being made with a poor year for the industry. Coal production in 1954 was down 7.7 percent from 1953 in Ohio, which was much better off in this respect than some of the other coal States. National production was down 13.7 percent.

The coal industry should be making a comeback, and particularly in Ohio. The new and projected powerplants of this State are going to require enormous amounts of this standard fuel. The atomic energy plant in Pike County alone has power requirements which mean consumption of 3 million tons a year, or close to one-tenth of Ohio's total 1954 production.

Coal has long been the source of chemicals as well as of energy. A great growth is certain in the use of coal by the expanding chemical industry. One of the most promising developments is hydrogenation of coal, which Union Carbide & Carbon Corp. is bringing closer to the large-scale commercial stage. It has been frequently stated that the upper Ohio Valley, adjacent to vast coal reserves, will continue to have a major share in the chemical industry's growth.

Ohio can provide coal in just about any amount industry demands of it. Belmont County alone is reported to have nearly 2 billion tons of unmined Pittsburgh coal. Known recoverable reserves of the entire State, which are concentrated in the eastern and southern counties, are considerably more than 40 billion tons. For another century at least, there will be no reason for worrying about a possible shortage of coal in this region.

Mexico Uses Colorado River Water Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, little consideration has been given during the discussion of the upper Colorado River storage scheme to the fact that Mexico has substantial claims on the river's waters in addition to those of the upper and lower basins. The United States is obliged by solemn treaty to see to it that sufficient waters to meet these claims crosses the Mexican border.

Water withheld upstream by the gigantic and unneeded storage reservoirs proposed in the upper Colorado River project would, of course, not be available for use by Mexico and would have to be made up out of allotments of the river's water to domestic users.

The December issue of Western Water News carried the following item showing that even now Mexico's needs are 300,000 acre-feet annually in excess of her allotment:

COLORADO RIVER IN MEXICO

All of the 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water allocated to Mexico, in accordance with the treaty, is used and actually more is needed, declared James W. Stone, managing director, Cia. Industrial Jabonera de Pacifico of Mexicali, B. C., Mexico, speaking before the recent meeting of the Colorado River Water Users Association at Las Vegas.

Stone, who estimated the 1956 needs of Colorado River water in Mexico at 1,800,000 acre-feet, told the group that for 5 months—from March to October, 1955, not 1 drop of river water reached the Gulf of California and urged the group of Colorado River users "not to begrudge this water to Mexico."

WHERE USED

The water is used in the Mexicali Valley, which includes 900,000 acres of land with 841,000 in the irrigation district. The economy supports some 200,000 people. There are 50 coton gins; 4 oil mills; and 4 compresses in the area with the result that Mexicali is the largest cotton ginning center in the world.

During 1955, some 503,000 acres were cropped, with water the limiting power in expansion of the acreage, Stone estimated that 200,000 additional acres could be cultivated if water was available. In 1955, 482,000 acres of cotton were produced which went into export markets. Actual diversions from the river have totaled 1,955,000 acre-feet in 1953 and 1,977,000 in 1955 for an average of 3.4 acre-feet per acre which is not a sufficient supply to meet the needs of the plants and maintain a satisfactory salt balance.

PROGRAM

To supplement the anticipated limited quantity of river water the Mexican Government has under way a comprehensive well development program which will eventually supply 800,000 acre-feet to the project from the large underground basin.

Address of Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on December 12 of the year just past, the Greater New York Fund, an agency that raises millions of dollars for the support of philanthropic institutions in the city of New York, held its fund distribution ceremony at the Hotel Sheraton Astor. Among several fine addresses delivered on that afternoon, there was one by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of NewYork, an address that, though brief, manifested the same quality of broad compassion, depth of human feeling, and understanding that marked his late father, himself so distinguished in Congress for achievements that have left a permanent imprint on American history. This philanthropic effort, the Greater New York Fund, was responsible for the collection of over $5,600,000 during 1955, which was distributed to 425 charitable institutions in New York City. It is only natural that such a humanitarian effort and such philanthropic generosity, unlimited by race, creed, or origin, should evoke the special tribute of the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, Robert F. Wagner. I think his remarks on that occasion, that I am here inserting in the RECORD, deserve to be read and reread.

REMARKS BY MAYOR ROBERT F. WAGNER AT GREATER NEW YORK FUND DISTRIBUTION CEREMONY, HELD AT HOTEL SHERATON-ASTOR, MONDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1955

This distribution ceremony of the Greater New York Fund is a happy occasion and I am delighted to be here to greet the friends and representatives of the fund.

Long before I was privileged to become mayor I took an active part in the city-wide work of the Greater New York Fund, an organization which in the widest sense is close to home.

My work in volunteer philanthropy is brief indeed, however, beside the impressive record of your chairman, Mr. Norman S.

Goetz. He has given without stint to many civi and philanthropic causes for more than 30 years. I salute him as one who has lived up to the highest standards of his citizenship, his religion and his profession.

As your mayor, with a natural concern for the health and welfare of all the people of our vast metropolis, I wish most of all to commend the many hundreds of firms and corporations and the hundreds of thousands of persons, including organized labor union members who work within this city, for making it possible to disperse these millions.

Their gifts, made during this holiday season when we reaffirm our faith in the doctrine of good-will to all men, have a peculiar carrying power. While there are faint sounds of sleigh-bells in the canyons of Manhattan today, these gifts this afternoon will last throughout the year. They are the 12-month gifts—the ones that last. They may bring laughter to a boy or girl in a swimming pool next summer, new hope and courage to a family next Spring or soothe pain of an old woman 2 years from now. These gifts bring direct benefits to 3 million persons who use hospitals and health and welfare agencies helped by the fund.

These gifts, gathered by an army of volunteers headed by Mr. Richard S. Perkins, the 1955 campaign chairman, represent a side of New York we seldom have the time or opportunity to study. That is why, at such a gathering as this, we can be both proud and happy.

Many sides of this great capital of the world are known around the globe. People of both the Atlantic and Pacific basins know of our great shipping, manufacturing, transportation, and communication facilities; of our great retail establishments, libraries, and educational institutions, and of our entertainment and finance; and, of course, of our compelling skyscrapers.

What they don't know about is our 8 million people, people with hearts, consideration, and kind feelings toward their fellow humans—the people who make up the vast concourse from Todt Hill to the Yonkers line and from Chelsea to Little Neck.

Without being vainglorious, we can say that the dateline on a news story—New York—or the stencil on a crate—New York—or the label on a dress—New York—stands with the best in any market in the world.

I only wish that the world knew a little bit more about the warm heart that is New York—a heart for the world and a heart for its own.

Millions of dollars flow from this town to spell help all over the world. And millions of dollars are given here, in private and public contributions, to ease pain, combat disease, encourage good citizenship, hold families together, or give a boy and girl the chance to take the right road toward good citizenship. It is not something new in New York. It is as old as the original Dutch founders, and it persists in our polyglot town today.

New York has a big heart.

You here today represent a big part of that heart.

Thank you.

The University and the American Jewish Tercentenary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Bulletin of the Catholic University of America for October 1955:

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE AMERICAN JEWISH TERCENTENARY

(By Rev. Henry J. Browne, Ph. D., archivist, associate professor of history)

This year marks the 300th year since the first Jews arrived in the area that was to become the United States. The occasion is being marked by tributes of all kinds, by lectures, by concerts, and by publications. On the campus of the university, the Washington committee for the celebration has sponsored under the auspices of the history department an essay contest with a $50 prize for the best contribution on American Jewish history. This is then a fitting time to pause to recollect what the University has done for the American Jewish community and what it in turn has contributed to the national and pontifical university of their Catholic fellow citizens.

Very early in its history, the sole test of intellectual qualification was enunciated at the university by its rector, Bishop Thomas J. Conaty, at a reception for President McKinley in 1900, when he said: "like the Catholic Church, with its message of knowledge to the world, it knows no race line, and no color line, while its doors are open to non-Catholics who may desire to receive instruction at its hands." That this was carried out in practice was shown by the fact that the very first degree in social sciences was given to a Negro school teacher from the District of Columbia. This fact is known only from the comment of a local newspaper, not from any record of the university. A similar obscurity of records hides the first Jewish students from the searcher, but the list of names for the first 20 years reveals that it was even only a rare German, Italian, or Pole who broke into the Irish ranks.

Yet it is obvious from the recent years of the university that young men and women of Jewish religious affiliation have been found on the campus, and it may be estimated that this has been so for at least a half of its 66-year history. They have studied engineering and law perhaps in greatest numbers, and have also been in the graduate school and school of social sciences. A survey of charitable agencies conducted by Jews between Richmond and Baltimore would show that a great many of their workers have been trained in social work on the Washington campus. Many of these students are remembered by present faculty members as being beyond the ordinary in their loyalty and appreciation of the university. More interesting still are the several rabbis who in the past 10 years have studied Semitic literature in the department of Semitic and Egyptian languages and literature.

Through the advancement given to Hebrew studies, this last division of the school has made a contribution to American Jewish life. Father Patrick Skehan, at the invitation of the Institute of Oriental Studies, is currently spending time in Jerusalem deciphering the ancient Hebrew manuscripts being found in the desert places of Palestine. Msgr. Henri Hyvernat, the first professor recruited by the university, was the founder of this important department. Through his efforts and the care of his successors there has been built up one of the outstanding libraries in the country on Semitics and related fields. Monsignor Hyvernat had most cordial relations with Hebrew scholars throughout the world and especially with those at Dropsie College in Philadelphia, who often came to see this patriarch, who died only in 1941, while on their trips to Washington. The Semitics department as it is popularly called has continued its tradition of interest in Christian oriental literature, but naturally work on the Old Testament, the common heritage of Jew and Catholic, continues to absorb a good deal of its efforts.

In other less direct ways the faculty has made a contribution to American Judaism. One study done under the guidance of the Latin and Greek department by Dr. Robert Wilde dealt with Jewish as well as Christian history in treating the opinions of the pre-Nicean Greek Fathers concerning the Jews. In areas of action as well as theory, the tradition of social justice dating from the university's first professor of moral theology, Thomas Bouquillon, through Doctors William Kerby, John A. Ryan, and Francis J. Haas has counteracted anti-Semitism in the United States. When Pope Pius XI called on the Catholic universities of the world in 1938 to undertake to refute the raging Hitlerian doctrine of racism, two volumes of symposia were edited from the campus, in 1941 and 1944. They were entitled, Scientific Aspects of the Race Problem and Race: Nation: Person. Social Aspects of the Race Problem. In the field were found such as Father Maurice Sheehy, who in 1938 became a member of the Council against Intolerance in America and spoke on the Papal condemnation of anti-Semitism. Professor Richard J. Purcell of the history department in 1945 joined with Albert Einstein in a public petition to the President of the United States to seek to have Palestine opened up to the Jewish refugees of Europe.

In recent years, under the inspiration of the department of sociology, a program of interest to many community-minded people has been developed in the intergroup workshop conducted every June. Various races and religions have always been represented, including both religious and lay Catholics, and Mr. Issac Franck, executive secretary of the Washington Jewish Community Council, has been an enthusiastic faculty participant.

Occasionally, university faculty members have been respected Jewish citizens of the Nation's Capital, and this has been particularly true of lecturers from Government positions who have assisted greatly in the professing of the social sciences. Henry Spiegel, professor of economics, is the first Jewish faculty member promoted to the rank of ordinary professor; and also currently on the faculty is Arthur Lustberg in the department of speech and drama.

There have been Jewish benefactions toward the university in money and books, but the one that stands out in the history of the university is that of Max Pam, prominent Chicago lawyer, made in 1911. At a time when the institution was badly in need of financial help, he established a scholarship in the social sciences which continues to the present day and is held by a student from the city of Chicago. Pam was attracted to the person of the chancellor of the university, James Cardinal Gibbons, and it was to him he explained his motives of hoping to advance mutual tolerance in America and of showing his admiration for the Catholic church which stood for authority, for government, for the rights of the individual, and for the rights of property, and these to my mind are the chief elements that enter into individual and national happiness.

The presence of Babe Greenberg on this year's boxing team in a position of prominence points up Jewish participation in the sports life of the university. His counterpart in the 1920's was Isidore Goldberg. Eddie LaFond, for over 25 years athletic director on campus, tells of the time he was jokingly accused of being anti-Semitic when he had Coach Fox for football line coach; for basketball, Abe Rosenfield, and for wrestling, Dave Bernstein, all Jewish. Athletes of that belief are scattered throughout the university's sports pages without any evidence of such devices as that said to have been used to cover a partially colored baseball player about 30 years ago, when his

teammates called him Chief to pass him off as an American Indian.

The Catholic University of America is national and accordingly serves more than an immediate community, and in doing so it has served to a measure unmeasured American Jewry. No one has ever counted the numbers of Jewish students on campus and only little things, like several very faithful members of the alumni association being rabbis, serve to remind a predominantly Catholic scholastic community of its catholicity. The institution has profited greatly, as have all in America, by Jewish contributions to scholarship, sometimes made directly by its own lecturers. If the university in turn has made any contribution for the making of a better America for the descendants of the pilgrims or refugees of three centuries ago, it has in that served also the cause of the God of truth and justice who is the greatest common bond with our Jewish neighbors.

International Labor Organization, Communist Dominated—Contributions to It Should Be Reduced

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a news item that appeared in Human Events for July 31, 1955.

It points out that Mr. W. L. McGrath, a Cincinnati businessman, who has represented the United States at the Geneva organization since 1949, has stated that the ILO, known as the International Labor Organization, is just another Communist-dominated organization. He recommends that the United States should withdraw from the ILO and that no further funds be appropriated to maintain it.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. McGrath, and trust that the President will not submit a request for additional funds to maintain this Communist-dominated organization. The United States last year contributed $1,750,000 to it and there is a move underway at the present time to increase the contribution to $3 million a year. This is a most fantastic request in view of the makeup of this world organization.

Mr. Speaker, the article from Human Events follows:

On the eve of the return of Congress, congressional staffers are looking for unpopular requests for appropriations to eliminate and, it is widely agreed, they could well start with money put up for the socialistic International Labor Organization of Geneva, Switzerland, of which the United States share amounts to $1,750,000 annually. The opportunity for a paring job is all the better for two reasons: (1) there is a move underway to raise the United States contributions to ILO to $3 million a year; and (2) the United States employer delegate to the ILO for many years has issued a scathing attack on the organization. That delegate is W. L. McGrath, a Cincinnati businessman who has represented the United States at the Geneva organization since 1949.

McGrath, in a recent statement, recommended that not only United States employers but also the United States Government refrain from sending delegations to the ILO and granting it further financial support. The immediate reason for Mr. McGrath's revolt against the ILO stems from the more aggressive policies of the Soviet Union and Soviet satellite delegations in the ILO since 1954. Mr. McGrath particularly objected to the presence of what the Iron Curtain countries termed businessmen delegates to the Geneva meetings. Obviously, the so-called employer delegates from the Communist countries are simply government agents and per se agents for the Communist Party. McGrath led the fight in 1954 and 1955 to get these employer delegates thrown out of the ILO, but was overruled by the majority of the ILO. "At the 1955 conference," says McGrath, "I withdrew the United States employer delegation from participation in any ILO working committees upon which Communist so-called employers had been seated."

The United States in the ILO today finds itself very much in the minority. The Iron Curtain countries now have a total of 32 votes within the ILO to 4 from the United States. McGrath until recently entertained some hope that the ILO would disqualify the Communist worker and employer delegates. But today he sees no such possibility and envisages the future of the ILO as one of just another Communist-dominated organization. Hence, his statement and recommendation—that the United States should get out of the ILO and give it no more money—will undoubtedly have a powerful effect on the next session of Congress.

California's Cross-Filing System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, for those non-Californians who are concerned about the golden State's cross-filing system, I offer the following explanatory editorial carried recently in the Long Beach, Calif., Press-Telegram newspaper:

CROSSED UP BY CRISS-CROSS, CROSS-FILING

California's cross-filing system is widely misunderstood. Many Californians are confused about it, and the confusion is multiplied outside the State.

In a recent editorial comment on the prospective clash between Adlai Stevenson and Senator Estes Kefauver in the California presidential primary, the Wall Street Journal said California is a State where primaries are so confused with cross-filings and criss-cross voting that nobody ever knows what they mean.

The Wall Street Journal is incorrect if it believes cross-filing will affect the presidential primary in June. In presidential preference voting in California, registered Democrats only will ballot on Democratic preference, and registered Republicans only on Republican preference.

Cross-filing applies only on State primary contests for partisan offices. Under that system, a candidate may seek the nomination of another party as well as his own. But presidential candidates, if they decide to enter the California primary, are not given that privilege. There is, in fact, no criss-cross voting in any phase of the California primary. Voters ballot only on nominations by their own parties.

California's presidential preference primary differs from those in some other States in that no presidential nomination candidate can be entered without his consent. And the convention delegates chosen at the primary are pledged by oath to the candidate who wins at the primary.

Farmers Need Tax, Labor Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, in the issue of the Fairmont (Minn.) Daily Sentinel of December 6, 1955, appears an article by Harold Groven on the problems which confront farmers in Minnesota.

Certainly one of the most difficult problems that Congress has today is that of dealing with the critical problems of the farmer, and I am sure my colleagues will be impressed with the article written by my constituent, Mr. Harold Groven, of Huntley, Minn.

FARMERS NEED TAX, LABOR CUTS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article is written by Harold Groven, one of the Martin County soil conservation district commissions and one of the most well-known Martin County farmers. He is interested in the tax problems facing Minnesota as well as its conservation needs.)

I have been asked to write a brief summary of what I think of the farm problem, or, better stated, the farmers' problems.

We realize that to determine the right solutions to these problems is as dangerous and controversial as a discussion on what is the best religion.

All one can do is to stick as closely to the truth and as far away from politics as possible. When one discusses the weather or clothes or automobiles he does not think of politics, but, just as soon as the farm situation comes up there is immediately a suspicion as to what party one may belong.

This is the first serious hurdle in its solution. It is like trying to judge cattle while wearing a blindfold. It can be done by feeling, but the total conformity is lost.

The farmer is often accused, and, in many cases, justly, of taking a negative attitude. He does have problems and serious ones, and problems with which he cannot individually cope, such as unreasonably high labor costs and taxes.

There are the begging and griping kinds of farmers and—I feel in the majority—the positive farmers who try to create for themselves a more efficient system of farming. Any businessman or professional man who takes a grumbling attitude soon defeats himself.

Along this line, we have a good example in the dairy industry. When it took a positive attitude and began advertising, its problem was pretty well solved.

If the pork and beef producers who, certainly, have the best selling points in the food world, would advertise their products even half as much as a distillery, a tobacco company, a home permanent wave company or a beer company, I am sure they would not only improve their own financial situation, but also the health of the Nation.

I feel that there are farmers on small farms who should hire more custom work. It would not seem economical to have a $5,000 combine on a quarter section of land when one can hire it done for $4 per acre. This applies to many processes which cause some farmers to have three or four tractors. It would pay many of these farmers to spend more time on their livestock.

It seems that in all phases of work, specialization is of prime importance. We must assume that it should also apply to farmers. The farmer who does a good job of milking—hog production—beef production—egg production would make a larger net profit than one who does a haphazard job of all of them.

Bookkeeping with a disregard for a large gross profit and emphasis on a large net profit are necessary in any business. There are a number of farmers like the new businessman, who explained to his worried banker, "I couldn't show a net profit but you would be surprised how much goods I sold." Since the war, farmers must watch the cost of operation even more closely.

This leads to a little talked of and important cost—taxes. So many of our taxes today are hidden. They are necessarily added to the price of manufactured products and with the large amount of machinery and high protein feeds, it might surprise farmers that they spend several thousand dollars on these hidden taxes every year.

Farm real estate is bearing a disproportionate share of the cost of State and county government. According to Dean M. Schwieckhar, Minnesota Commissioner of Education—"Farm property with an estimated market value of $3.4 billion was assessed at $1.5 billion by various assessors, while $5.3 billion of residential property was valued at only $1.6 billion. Therefore you can see that farm real estate was assessed at 40 percent and residential at only 30 percent.

"This means that farm property valued at $10,000 is assessed at $4,368 while residential property is valued at only $3,044," according to James P. McDonnell, president of Minnesota Taxpayers Association.

He states, "A farmer is taxed out of all proportion to the owner of residential property so far as State and county governments are concerned. The farmer is also being penalized where the State school aids, which are based upon the wealth of a community as measured by assessed values, are concerned."

We know the personal property tax in Minnesota is a great burden on farmers. The assessor knows when a neighbor gets a new stove. He knows how many cattle you have or when you bought your manure spreader. There is no way of hiding these products.

Now consider the manufacturers agent in the city—he has nothing visible to tax. Think of the many people in apartments and trailer houses who escape these taxes entirely or their taxes are so small that they do not cover the cost of collection.

The farmers of Minnesota would do well to create a committee for revision of taxation.

Now we cannot entirely escape politics, inasmuch as subsidies and ASC are concerned. It would seem that the Government should not promote new irrigation areas to compete with the already too-large farm production areas, but rather buy up much of the marginal producing land, where fertility can be saved for other generations.

Payments for commercitl fertilizers and land clearance seem ridiculous when we already have overproduction. I think it would be much better for the farmer to set up good rotation and soil conservation practices.

It is my old fashioned opinion that every farm should have some livestock on it. This is taught us by nature the world over, and where, over a period of years, people have not conformed with this practice, soils have deteriorated and civilizations have disappeared.

Lowering of taxes to farmers and a reasonable control over increasing labor costs would be the greatest boon to establishing sound agricultural economy in this country.

Aping the Gestapo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, civil-service employees throughout my congressional district have directed complaints against the recent revelation that the Civil Service Commission has been collecting and filing rumors derogatory to 2 million Americans.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Belleville News-Democrat of December 5, 1955, titled "Aping the Gestapo." I sincerely feel that such files described are an injustice to the people, and I call upon my colleagues to join with me in appealing to the Civil Service Commission that these files be destroyed and their maintenance discontinued.

APING THE GESTAPO

The revelation to the Senate subcommittee by United States Civil Service Commission Chairman Philip Young that during recent years the Commission has been collecting and filing rumors derogatory to 2 million Americans, should have been voiced with shame, not pride.

Chairman Young boasted that the Commission's rumor and gossip files are second in size only to the FBI files, but he didn't justify to the Senators why his organization had strayed so far from its legitimate function. It has busily collected hints, innuendos, rumors, sly remarks, particularly anything which alleges that persons are subversive. These are put into the black book without any investigation as to truth, and this information is used as a guide by personnel officers and other Government agencies.

It is quite likely that in the United States Civil Service Commission's slander and rumor files repose unfounded and vicious gossip reports against some good people here in Belleville, and that some day in some matter involving a passport, Federal job application, congressional inquiry, legal residence, jury or election committee service, etc., the Commission will bring out its nasty black book.

Hundreds of sterling citizens have been fired from jobs, subjected to humiliation, branded for life, by similar rumors, such has been our patriotic climate of late. It is an unhealthy climate which makes suspect any organization mentioning terms like peace or world brotherhood. It is a climate which makes a casual $5 contribution to a movement two decades ago suddenly become a stigma or dropping in on a meeting of public affairs zealots back in 1940 now emblazoned as an act intended to overthrow our whole Government by force and violence.

How much can we imitate Hitler's Gestapo or Russia's secret spies without feeling shame?

A Grand Old Man of American Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Henry H. Parke, of De Kalb County, Ill., will be 80 years old on February 4, 1956. He is the father of the American Farm Bureau. He was presented with the 1952 award for distinguished and meritorious service in the interests of American agriculture by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The Civic Committee, of Sycamore, Ill.—the county seat of De Kalb County—is planning a countywide celebration in recognition of Mr. Parke's 80th birthday. I am a friend and great admirer of Mr. Parke; therefore this personal tribute.

Mr. Speaker, the name of Henry H. Parke has an honored place on the pages of "Who's Who in American Agriculture," and stands especially high upon the records of the Illinois Agricultural Association. Mr. Parke is a pioneer in the field of better farming, livestock improvement, soil conservation, better marketing of farm products, as well as in the field of better human relations in farming. He was closely associated with and an ardent coworker of the Honorable Frank O. Lowden in the Governor's efforts to improve American agricultural methods. American agriculture can say with Shakespeare of old: "Here is a man, whence comes such another?"

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the ceremonies granting the 1952 Distinguished Service Award to Mr. Parke, Mr. Wilfred Shaw, secretary of the Illinois Agricultural Association, prepared and presented a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Parke. In this tribute Mr. Shaw listed the services Mr. Parke had rendered and outlined briefly Mr. Parke's biography. It is quite a colorful tribute to Mr. Parke, a much more effective and interesting presentation than any I could possibly prepare; therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include Mr. Wilfred Shaw's tribute to Mr. Henry H. Parke as a part of my remarks on this occasion for the benefit of my colleagues in Congress, and for the information of the American people in general. I think it is especially fitting at this particular time in the history of American agriculture—when the so-called farm problem looms up so large on the congressional horizon—that this tribute should be paid to Mr. Parke, a grand old pioneer in American agriculture, and be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. HENRY H. PARKE

(By Wilford Shaw, secretary, Illinois Agricultural Association, September 1952)

The name of Henry H. Parke, of De Kalb County, Ill., is written widely across the pages of American agriculture. A pioneer in

the development of the Farm Bureau and in the promotion of an improved agriculture, Mr. Parke's influence has been recorded far beyond the limits of his home community and State.

The story of Henry H. Parke, his zeal for better farming, and how his search led to the formation of a farm organization in his county to further the science of agriculture, is a fascinating one and exemplifies the traditions that have made this country great.

Dean H. P. Rusk, of the University of Illinois College of Agriculture, made one of the most able estimates of all time of Mr. Parke when he presented the Illinois Farm Managers Association award to the De Kalb pioneer in 1945.

Said Dean Rusk in part:

"Henry H. Parke was born on a farm in De Kalb County where his mother's father settled in 1836 and built the original log cabin that became the Parke homestead. Since then the name Parke has become legend not only in De Kalb County and in Illinois, but throughout this land.

"In 1898, Henry Parke received his B. S. degree from the University of Michigan and his M. S. from the same institution in 1900. He was for a time a member of the faculty of the University of West Virginia, where he taught biology. He has the scholar's passion for mastery of facts and has an intellect that would have earned him distinction in any field he cared to enter.

"The black prairie soil of Illinois, however, was the magnet that finally attracted him to his lifework in the service of agriculture. In the University of Illinois library I found a little booklet published in June 1922, on the occasion of the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Farm Bureau movement in Illinois.

"From this booklet, I quote:

" 'The birth of the Farm Bureau was not an accident. We now know that as early as 1902 the mind of a certain young college trained farmer was inoculated with the germ of improved agriculture. This young man's father before him was an exponent of improved breeding, better feeding, and a more or less regular crop rotation.

" 'It was this father who influenced his son, Henry Park, of De Kalb County, Ill., to go to college to study agricultural science. It was he who gave Henry the responsibilities which directly led him to attend the agricultural short course at Urbana in 1903 and 1904.

" 'From this time on,' " says the publication, " 'Henry Park was a leader.' "

"He is named as the man largely responsible for an important series of events that finally culminated in the organization on March 27, 1912, of the De Kalb County Soil Improvement Association, the forerunner of county farm bureaus in Illinois.

"This made De Kalb the first county in the United States to build a definite farmers' organization to carry local responsibility for extension work in agriculture. It was the pattern set in De Kalb County and followed throughout the State that gave the Agricultural Extension Service a firmer anchorage with the people of Illinois than it enjoys in any other State I know."

Henry Parke was secretary-treasurer of the De Kalb County Soil Improvement Association from May 11, 1912, to January 28, 1922; served as vice president from that date to February 12, 1923. He was president of the organization when it changed its name to the De Kalb County Farm Bureau on February 12, 1923, and served until December 13, 1924, in that capacity. From 1924 until April 28, 1926, he served as vice president.

From these early beginnings, Mr. Parke went on to serve agriculture on a broader basis first as assistant director of agriculture in Illinois from 1917 to 1921; then as director of the Chicago Producers Commission Association from 1924 to 1927 and as president from 1927 to 1947. His leadership and contribution to the livestock industry of the Midwest and Nation is also a matter of record.

Henry Parke gave constructive counsel and assistance in the development of the old National Producers and in its reorganization into the National Live Stock Marketing Association, together with the formation of two subsidiary companies—the Feeder & Finance Corp. and the National Live Stock Publishing Co.

He also played a prominent role in the original organization of Producers Live Stock Credit Corporation, forerunner of the entire credit setup of the country's cooperative livestock industry.

Henry Parke became president of the Producers Live Stock Credit Corporation in May 1924, and held this office until December 1946. He served as vice president and later as treasurer of the National Live Stock Producers Association.

In 1938 he was elected a director of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and served in that capacity until his retirement in 1947.

As the November 1942 issue of the National Live Stock Producers publication pointed out:

"* * * with a pride in farming and an enduring hope that the lot of the average farmer and stockman can be elevated best by intelligent self-help, H. H. Parke, of Sycamore, Ill., has devoted much of his life for the past 25 years to the common problems of farmers. Marketing, legislative, social, and recreational activities have offered opportunities for his quiet, effective leadership to find expression, while all the time he has successfully operated his 410 acres of fertile DeKalb county land, to say nothing of his contribution to cooperative livestock marketing."

Another longtime associate of Henry Parke said of him recently: "To know Henry Parke is to love him, and probably his greatest achievement has been his demonstration and pioneering in the field of human relations in agriculture so that farmers could have a voice in determining their proper sphere in this wonderful country of ours.

"Trying to describe the influence of Henry H. Parke in agriculture is comparable to attempting to describe the benefits of good soil, sunshine, and rain to the people of this planet."

National Minerals Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Arizona delegation to the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council introduced the following resolution at the November 9, 1955, meeting in Sacramento. Since it was beyond the authority of the Western Governors Mining Advisory Council to approve such a resolution, the council referred the resolution to the Western Governors Conference presumably to be held in Reno in early 1956 with the council's unanimous recommendation that the governors give this resolution favorable consideration. The resolution follows:

Whereas the mineral industry of the United States is vital to the welfare of the Nation both in war and peace, ours being essentially a minerals and metals economy; and

Whereas for the above and other reasons it is essential that the United States be as nearly self-sufficient as possible in both the minerals and metals commonly used as well as those classified by the Government as strategic and critical; and

Whereas dependence upon foreign sources of supply for our minerals and metals needs, in this atomic age, would invite possible national suicide; and

Whereas only by constant exploration, development, research, and production can our minerals industry maintain its reserves and its supply position in a healthy condition: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Governors Conference ask the Congress of the United States to declare a national minerals policy recognizing the aforementioned basic facts, and implement its declaration of policy with appropriate legislation to make our Nation self-sufficient insofar as possible in respect to our tremendous minerals and metals requirements.

Information Service Is in Need of New Slant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial in the McClatchy Newspapers of California for November 7, 1955, dealing with the operating policies of the United States Information Agency. The editorial follows:

INFORMATION SERVICE IS IN NEED OF NEW SLANT

Emily Davie, of New York, wrote a book entitled "Profile of America." She described it as an autobiography of the United States. It was copiously illustrated and got many good notices.

One of its admirers was Theodore C. Streibert, head of the United States Information Agency. He was so impressed with its presentation of the history of this country that he sent a copy to President Dwight D. Eisenhower for his personal reading.

He also ordered the book sent to all American libraries overseas, where it was an immediate hit.

But the later story of Profile of America is not such a happy one. The book was withdrawn from circulation abroad because some Congressmen objected to it for such reasons as this:

It has a picture of a little red schoolhouse which Russians might think represents American schools of today. Yet the picture is captioned 1750.

Another illustration shows the dust bowl.

A southern Member of Congress took offense because two Negro Americans are shown in a dance routine. Another does not think anything not typically American should be circulated abroad.

What mountains out of molehills picayunish minds can raise.

In discussing the fate which overtook her book, Miss Davie suggested in the Saturday

Review that Congress appoint a joint committee, similar to the atomic energy committee, to give the United States Information Agency the protection it so badly needs and find a way to circumvent small minds at home.

A backbone for the USIA not so much resembling rubber might be useful also.

How Will Digging Up Corpses Improve Internal Security?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Reading Times of January 7, 1956:

HOW WILL DIGGING UP CORPSES IMPROVE INTERNAL SECURITY?

At the opening of 3 days of hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on Communist infiltration of newspapers, radio, television and the theater, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS said the committee wanted to "make it abundantly clear that this is not in any sense an investigation of the free press in the United States" and Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the subcommittee, echoed the remark: "Why, certainly that's true."

If this little expedition isn't an investigation of the free press in the United States, we pause to wonder what in the world it is. A strawberry festival, perhaps? For, judging from the testimony that so far has come from witnesses summoned by the committee, it certainly serves no other purpose than to cast a cloud over some highly respected and respectable newspapers and newspapermen. Let's look at some of the testimony.

Clayton Knowles, a member of the New York Times Washington bureau from 1947 to 1954 and for some time before 1947 and ever since 1954 a member of the New York staff of the Times, testified that he was a Communist from 1937 until 1939, when he was on the staff of another paper.

James Glaser, a copy reader for the New York Post and onetime editor of the Daily Worker, Communist organ, admitted membership in the Communist Party in the midthirties but said he quit the party and his Daily Worker post in 1936.

Nobody in his democratic senses can, of course, condone communism, either the variety we have today or the variety that existed in the 1930's. One can only feel sorry for those who were its dupes at any time. Apparently at least one of these now feels sorry for himself, for Glaser labeled himself as a "chump" and a "lunkhead" for ever having joined the party in the first place. Knowles said he was "naive" ever to join the party.

In the matter of communism and membership in the Communist Party, those who read the story of Knowles and Glaser might consider two angles of their testimony. First, both renounced the party nearly 20 years ago and have denounced it ever since. There is no question whatever about their having any connection or sympathy with the party today or for these many years past. Again, they might reasonably concur with the New York Times, which said editorially, in commenting on the hearing, that "we do not believe in irredeemable sin. We think it is possible to atone through good performance for past error, and we have tried to supply the security and the favorable working conditions which should exist in a democracy and which should encourage men who were once misled to reconsider and to reconsider and to reshape their political thinking."

It is little short of amazing how some former Communists are regarded by congressional committees as against other former Communists. The Elizabeth Bentleys, the Louis Budenzes, the Whittaker Chambers are loved like brothers and sisters—yet they were active much more recently in the party and had much greater influence in it than the Knowles and the Glasers and the Jimmy Wechslers, the New York Post editor whom McCarthy brutalized.

Why, at this late date, after such long and obvious recantation, does the Eastland committee now choose to crucify these men? What purpose does it serve, nearly 20 years later, to dig up their past sins? How will it make the security of the United States any more secure? The questions produce only an echo of themselves, and no answers.

It seems to us that Senator EASTLAND might well turn his attention to the problem his own State of Mississippi now refuses to face squarely, the Supreme Court's antischool-segregation order, rather than to a handful of potlically and ideologically dead Communists.

Hydro Versus Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the December Bulletin of the Sport Fishing Institute has reprinted a persuasive warning by Governor Langlie, of Washington, against hasty investments in costly hydroelectric without fully considering the rapid advancements being made toward the production of electric power at small cost from nuclear fuels. This warning is particularly appropriate at a time when Congress has before it the multibillion dollar upper Colorado River storage project scheme that would require 6-mill power to be commercially saleable for a full century in order to recoup the taxpayer's investment in its construction.

Governor Langlie's warning was reprinted as follows:

HYDRO-STEAM-ATOMIC

Important comments by Governor Langlie (Washington) in a talk delivered over KTNT-TV, Tacoma, August 1, from an editorial in the Connecticut Outdoor Sportsman (Meriden) for November:

"There is the question of the benefits to be derived in the future from the power that can be developed by atomic energy. Almost monthly the reports indicate that such rapid strides are being made in that field that within 8 to 10 to 12 years the cost of electricity produced by nuclear fission, will result in power that will be competitive with steam and a few years thereafter competitive with low cost hydroelectric energy. It is on the basis of this information that I presently feel that we should go slow on building hydroelectric dams that mitigate against the use and development of other resources that are valuable to the people of the State of Washington. Within 10 or 15 years we will have developed all of the low cost hydroelectric power in the Pacific Northwest. When that power has been developed we will turn to steam generation and to atomic energy power for further expansion of our power facilities. As that time nears we should keep constantly in mind that we cannot afford to build high cost hydroelectric energy because it does damage to our streams, does not produce for our people the values that are oftentimes held up for us. For whatever investment is made in these dams it must be retired with interest charges and, afer all, if we can build steam plants, use our own energy soures such as coal and do it as cheaply as some of these dams, in the long run we will have a more adjustable facility that will serve us better at lower costs and in the long range benefit us most by protecting some of our valuable resources."

The Republican Party and Its Adherence to Our Concepts of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a letter from Mr. Willard M. Hanzlik, an electrical contractor at Seal Beach, Calif., addressed to the Seal Beach Republican Club. I believe that this letter contains an extremely accurate description of the Republican Party and its adherence to the concepts of liberty which we as Americans have so long cherished. The letter is quoted as follows:

SEAL BEACH, CALIF., *September 29, 1955.*

DEAR FELLOW REPUBLICANS: Some people believe that our ultimate destination must be socialism. And many of these people are actually hopeful that our journey to this Never-Never Land will soon be resumed.

I say resumed because for about 20 years the United States did embrace the welfare state, did denounce business. It might charitably be said that it was somewhat discreetly done. Everything was not collectivized and nationalized overnight. Instead, regulation, super taxation, allocation, subsidization, coercion through labor monopolies and other devices were used to hamstring private enterprise so that eventually it might become necessary for Government to "liberate" industry and farming from private hands.

During this period the minds of too many Americans became conditioned: The traditional love of liberty was supplanted by desire for a phantom substance called security. Perhaps these words don't tell the story forcefully enough. What actually happened was destruction of faith in individuals, destruction of self-confidence, destruction of belief in a man as a man. It might be described as a vast brutally ignorant destruction of the components of that pioneering force which made this country great. And along with this, the handing over of enormous powers to those very same individuals who were bleating that only the state, not the individuals, must have power.

A period of frantic spending of public funds raised by mortgaging the future of our grandchildren failed to accomplish what was promised. And it was only the threat of war, then the promise of war, then war it-

self, creating the chaotic era when money was thrown wildly about without any but wartime justification, that kept the pump handle bobbing.

Now we are in the midst of the first Republican administration in 20 years, an administration which was faced by this complicated problems of stopping bloodshed and at the same time stiffening resolve; of encouraging private enterprise and at the same time stabilizing the workingman's standard; above all of stopping the insidious process of "creeping" socialism.

Yet in spit of its problems, the Eisenhower administration has accomplished tremendous progress. And the accomplishments have been made in a businesslike manner, without fanfare and the lurid expensive agonies of self-admiration we became so accustomed to during the 20 years.

But political facts are often peculiar facts. People seem to delight in doing the unexpected. And for some unaccountable reason the very people who trooped to the polls and put Dwight Eisenhower into office have become politically indifferent. Perhaps we as a Nation became so conditioned to hearing politicians bombard us with oratory of their simply wonderful deeds that unless we hear such sounds we think nothing is being done.

This is a dangerous condition. We won something very valuable 3 years ago. And we may well lose it now by sheer indifference.

We have every intelligent, practical argument on our side. Unfortunately, those people who were so thoroughly conditioned by 20 years of fairy tales don't always take easily to practical reasoning. To many of them the ethereal dream of a money tree or a candy mountain is still more real than the facts of life.

It is peculiar to the point of being alarming that many people fail to realize that one of the biggest reasons Russia has not opened wide her gates and invited the world to visit freely is that within a state of that kind life is not all money trees and candy mountains.

Think about Russia for a moment. Think hard about Russia.

Then realize that there, but for the grace of God, goes America. Under the tutoring of our dewey-eyed liberals America was certainly headed in that direction. A few more years and the momentum might have been unstopable.

It could happen again.

It is corny but there isn't any other way to say what I want to say: if you believe in the inherent rights of individuals; if you think that personal liberty is more than a catch phrase; if you distrust intense concentrations of power in any central government—then you must know that the Republican Party, standing fast against further Socialist encroachment, is the party for you to sustain. The party is not perfect, and the people who work within the party are not perfect. But the direction is right; and the belief in America is sincere and rock hard.

During the coming months much emphasis will be placed on the physical condition of President Eisenhower. The opposition will openly exhibit long faces and indwardly gleefully greet all notices of his illness. We should strongy feel our great loss and recognize the enormous loss the Nation will suffer if the President does not rally; but perhaps this attack will stimulate a cohesive and moving force in the Republican Party. Perhaps we will grow in stature to where we can face the job ahead without the "Eisenhower crutch." Perhaps we can figure a way to win next year's elections by hard work.

It has been done before. Let's try it again.

Sincerely,

WILLARD M. HANZLIK,
Electrical Contractor.

Neutral Nehru

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial from the Detroit Times of November 25, 1955, entitled "Neutral Nehru":

Nehru of India says he is neutral.

These are his words:

"We are convinced it is not by military pacts and alliances and by piling up armaments that world peace and security can be attained * * * There is talk of a cold war and rival camps and groupings and military blocs and alliances—all in the name of peace.

"We are in no camp and no military alliance.

"The only camp we should like to be in is the camp of peace and good will, which should include as many countries as possible and be opposed to none.

"The only alliance we seek is an alliance based on good will and cooperation."

This is well and good, but where do we come off?

United States is now engaged in a bitter struggle to prevent Soviet Russia from conquering more countries and peoples in Asia and from expanding its influence in Germany beyond the River Elbe to the River Rhine.

In this struggle, the United States has allies, the NATO and SEATO countries. India is not one of those allies.

Nehru says India is strictly neutral. In the United Nations, India has sided consistently with Soviet Russia and against the United States.

At the Bandung conference, India was the leader of the pro-Russian and pro-Red Chinese faction.

Is that strict neutrality?

As a matter of fact, when Nehru visited Mao Tze-Tung in Peking, he drew up a formula of five points for peaceful coexistence which was precisely what the Kremlin was saying to all the world. He became an advocate of their line of thought.

Was that strict neutrality?

It is possible and even probable that Nehru believes he is neutral. It is difficult, if not impossible, for any of us to view our own thoughts and their expression objectively.

Nehru might pay some heed then to the impression he has made upon the world and even more, the impression that his spokesman, Krishna Menon, has made.

Surely in the United States, it is difficult to believe that Menon's conduct has been strictly neutral.

Via Peking radio, Prof. Chien Hseuh-Sen, who had lived in the United States for 20 years, from 1935 to 1955, working on jet propulsion at the California Institute of Technology, had much to say about the United States.

He spoke of the problems facing Chinese students who desire to return to Red China. This paragraph in his interview is particularly pertinent:

"They always worry about whether they have enough money on hand for them to live in the United States between the day they announce their intention to leave the United States and the day they can actually leave, and the money for the long journey home.

"They know they most likely will lose their jobs as the first consequence of announcing their intention.

"This is especially a problem for those with a large family. But this problem now is resolved by the well-known support and help offered by the Indian Embassy at Washington, D. C., as a result of the negotiations at Geneva."

What does the Indian Embassy have to do with the Chinese living in the United States?

Are they recruiting these Chinese on behalf of the Red Chinese?

Are they financing them?

By what authority does a foreign embassy function in this manner in the United States?

And is this activity a sign of strict neutrality?

Address by National Commander J. Addington Wagner, of the American Legion, Before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce Luncheon, Indianapolis Athletic Club, November 17, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by National Commander J. Addington Wagner, of the American Legion, before the Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce luncheon, Indianapolis Athletic Club, on Thursday, November 17, 1955. I think the message will be of interest to the Members of the House:

Mr. Chairman, members of the chamber of commerce of Indianapolis, friends, it is a very great pleasure for me to have lunch with you today, and to represent before you the American Legion. I have visited Indianapolis many times in recent years in the course of my Legion activity. I have always enjoyed coming to your city.

The American Legion has maintained its national headquarters in this heartland city of America for nearly 37 years. Obviously, we like it here; we prize the fine relationship we have always enjoyed with you people of Indianapolis. We consider it to be important and significant that we maintain the nerve center of our operations here in the great Midwest. There are many reasons for this, including geographical location and the fact that here we feel able to keep in closer touch with the grassroots thinking of the Legionnaires—and of all the American people. And not the least factor in our remaining here has been the friendly hospitality which has always been shown us by the people, and by the many business firms with which we deal, day in and day out, here in Indianapolis.

So I come here today, very much aware of the fine kinship which has existed through the years between the American Legion and this great city. On behalf of the American Legion, I renew to all of you our pledge of friendship, and our warm assurance that we will be here as long as we are welcome.

On at least two occasions each year you may notice a bustle of activity for a few days

around our national headquarters building. Red caps, white caps, and blue caps are in evidence at these times. These are the meetings of our State commanders and adjutants and of our national executive committee, which is the board of directors so to speak, and the chief policymaking body of the American Legion between our national conventions.

You may wonder sometimes what we are doing and what we are thinking down in our Indiana-limestone building on Pennsylvania Street. As a matter of fact, we are engaged in the routine business of housekeeping, budgets and finances and personnel, and things of that kind. And at the same time we are thinking about and considering those things which concern most Americans, the welfare and the betterment of our beloved country.

I want to tell you about one of the things to which we are giving much thought during the course of our fall meetings, which are now in session. We are much troubled as to whether the American people are alert to the fact that at the present time there is in the United States a well-financed and a seemingly well-planned movement to dissipate the efforts of our Government to protect itself from the destructive forces which are at work within our borders.

The American Legion, through our former national commander, Seaborn Collins, spoke out a few weeks ago, warning our members against the dangerous effect of the work being done by the Fund for the Republic. I would like to tell you, if I may, just exactly how the American Legion feels about the Fund for the Republic, and its management—and why we feel that way.

The Fund for the Republic has a $15 million dollar principal fund which it apparently feels free to dispose of in any way that it wishes, without any tax accountability. We say that by virtue of its tax-exempt status, the American public acquires a legal and moral interest in how the fund spends its money.

I submit to you that by their own words and actions, the managers of the Fund for the Republic have clearly demonstrated that it is their intention to debunk what they consider to be the myth of the Communist menace in the United States. They say they are against communism, and in the next breath they say that the greatest danger to the country lies, not in communism, but in those whom they claim will cost us our freedom in the effort to destroy communism. In example of this I quote from the report of the Fund for the Republic dated May 31, 1955: "A political party in this country has been identified with the enemy. * * * It has appeared that the peril to the country could be dealt with only by methods that drastically departed from those which have characterized Anglo-American jurisprudence." Incidentally, the Fund report puts the word "enemy" in quotation marks as they use it.

Communism in the United States is not a political party. It is rather a conspiracy to organize a revolution by force against the Government. It has been so judged by the courts of the land. Anyone who does not recognize this fact by now is either implicated in the conspiracy or is so naive as to be wholly irresponsible.

I quote to you the purpose of existence of the Fund for the Republic as expressed by the fund's board of directors in a statement to be published in the December American Legion magazine: "We hope to make a contribution to the better understanding of effective procedures for dealing with the Communist menace while at the same time strengthening the American traditions of liberty and freedom." Now I give you this significant quote from the same source of how the fund proposes to implement this noble purpose: "The areas on which the board has long since decided to concentrate its attention are: (1) Restrictions and assaults upon academic freedom, (2) due process and equal protecton of the laws, (3) the protection of the rights of minorities, (4) censorship, boycotting, and blacklisting activities by private groups, (5) the principle of guilt by association and its application in the United States today."

Now without arguing with any of these stated methods, may I inquire whether it might be in order for this fund to spend some of its $15 million to find out how it became possible for Communist agents to successfully infiltrate the United States Government to its highest councils, and perhaps to make some suggestions as to how we can prevent such a thing from happening again? Would it perhaps be helpful to our country for the fund to spend some of its plentiful funds to check into the methods whereby communism has been able to exert a disproportionate influence in our schools and colleges, confusing our children and implanting in their minds ideas which bear evil fruit?

No, the fund officials do not seem to feel that this would be good. Instead, what projects do they see fit to finance? Permit me to give you some choice examples.

There is the case of Mrs. Mary Knowles. This lady was identified by Herbert Philbrick, an undecover agent for the FBI, as a member of the Communist Party. Before a Senate investigating committee she refused to testify on the grounds of constitutional privilege. When her employer, the William Jeanes Memorial Library, of Plymouth Meeting, Pa., declined to fire her for her action, the Fund for the Republic took the amazing action of granting the library the sum of $5,000 for, as they termed it, "courageous and effective defense of democratic principles." At the moment I do not argue whether this lady should be fired from her job. But that the fund should give money for such a purpose defies my comprehension. I am not aware that they have offered grants to persons like Herbert Philbrick for his courageous and effective efforts to preserve democratic principles.

Another example, according to its annual report of May 31, 1955, the fund has made, and I quote, "an expanded version of the television film of Edward R. Murrow's interview with J. Robert Oppenheimer available to educational institutions and groups concerned with public affairs." They spent money for this, and the film was shown in many schools. The interview was a clear attempt to show Oppenheimer to be a victim of character assassination due to anti-Communist hysteria. We ask why, in fairness to both sides of the question, the film did not report the mass of evidence laid bare by the special board of the Atomic Energy Commission, which shows Dr. Oppenheimer's record to be a tangled skein of Communist association and doubtful conduct, much of which the doctor himself did not deny. Why, for example, did the film not report that in 1943, during the most crucial period of the development of the atom bomb, the Counterintelligence Branch of Military Intelligence, responsible for the security of the Manhattan project, recommended that Dr. Oppenheimer be disassociated from the project? This recommendation was made after intensive personal surveillance of the doctor's activities. To this day, the Chief of that counterintelligence agency does not know why the recommendation was not carried out. The film did not report this fact, nor many other things, including the doctor's admission that he made a deliberate effort to confuse and misinform the security agency charged with protecting the Manhattan project.

Another example. The fund has financed the distribution of 35,000 copies of a book titled "The Fifth Amendment Today," written by Edwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard University Law School. This book is an exposition of the theory that American jurisprudence sanctions the invocation of the fifth amendment by a witness, and that the people at the same time are not supposed to infer that the witness has anything to hide.

The spring, 1955, issue of the Fordham Law Review carries an article by C. Dickerson Williams, a prominent New York attorney. This article, entitled "Problems of the Fifth Amendment," adopts a premise opposed to that of Dean Griswold. Mr. Williams proposes the theory that the fifth amendment is designed only to protect the witness from criminal prosecution as a result of his refusal to give evidence which might incriminate him. It argues that the courts and the people are entitled to draw the inference that he who refused to answer has something to hide, and that while a man may not be put in jail for this reason, neither is he entitled to benefit by reason of his action.

The Fund for the Republic distributed 1,000 copies of this article. That is a ratio of 35 to 1. When asked in a recent interview the reason for the disparity Dr. Robert Hutchins, president of the fund, explained that it was a matter of judgment, while stating that he personally leaned toward Dean Griswold's view of the matter.

We ask the question: Is this a fair and impartial approach to a controversial subject, or could the fund be promoting one school of thought as against another?

One further example. It has recently been revealed that the fund is paying a salary to Mr. Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party of the United States, for information which he is providing, as an expert on communism (which he most assuredly is), in connection with a fund project. So that now we have a privately endowed, tax-exempt fund, paying money to a man for information on the very same subject on which he has repeatedly refused to testify before congressional committees and on which he has repeatedly refused to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not for money, but as a matter of civic duty. How patriotic can we get?

On the basis of these and other available examples the American Legion believes that the Bureau of Internal Revenue should study the activities of the fund, and determine whether it qualifies for tax-exempt status.

This brings me to the question of just who is responsible for the direction which the activities of the fund has taken. On the basis of our evaluation of the record, the principal direction emanates from Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, the president of the fund, and from Mr. W. H. Ferry, the vice president.

Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins' record shows a willful refusal to consider communism as anything more than a political ideology. As late as July of this year, Dr. Hutchins hired as the fund's press agent a man named Amos Landman, who had, 3 weeks before his employment by the fund, repeatedly pleaded the fifth amendment before a Senate investigating committee when asked whether he was, or ever had been a Communist. In reply to questions from the press, Dr. Hutchins reportedly said that Mr. Landman was not now a Communist and had left the party in 1939. He said that he had taken Mr. Landman's word that this was true. This was more information, apparently, than Mr. Landman was prepared to give to the United States Senate. In an interview with the press on November 7 of this year—less than 2 weeks ago—it is reported Dr. Hutchins said that he would not hesitate to hire a present member of the Communist Party to do a job for which he was qualified. I say to you that the record of Dr. Hutchins, and the record of the Fund for the Republic under his direction, is replete with evidence that he does not believe communism is a clear and present danger in this country, and that

he is more interested in opposing communism's enemies than in opposing communism.

Dr. Hutchins is aided and abetted in his direction of the fund by his vice president, Mr. W. H. (Ping) Ferry. The actions of Mr. Ferry indicate that he holds substantially the same beliefs as his chief.

My friends, I solemnly say to you now that none of us here knows how much damage has been done—how many American lives have been lost—what future catastrophe may yet befall our people as a result of the successful operations of the Communist espionage apparatus in this country. I do not speak idle words. Read the official records in the cases of Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White and those associated with them. Read the sordid trial records of the Rosenbergs and the Greenglasses and the others. And after reading ask yourselves whether our Government is justified in taking security measures deemed necessary by the agencies responsible for America's national security.

It is true that a few errors have occurred in the operation of the Federal loyalty program. When you consider that more than four million individuals have been checked, the wonder is not that there were a few mistakes but that there were so few. Certainly, that record is a credit to President Eisenhower and the judgment of the civil servants who have carried on this work.

I would leave one final thought with you I believe that it is now time for the American people to make known whether they personally approve a heavily-financed, tax-exempt movement whose actions have served to discredit the legislative and executive agencies of the Government in carrying out their constitutional responsibilities to preserve the security of the United States.

You may be sure that in all that the American Legion does it is guided by only one principle: What is best for America. We would not destroy one fraction of the freedom of our people. But freedom connotes duty. It does not embrace license. Freedom does not permit murder, robbery, nor any act which hinders the right of each citizen to live in tranquillity with his neighbors. By the same definition it does not encompass the right of any person or group to subvert or violently overthrow the form of government which we have chosen for ourselves.

The American Legion formally charges that by its action under its current direction, the Fund for the Republic renders comfort to the enemies of America.

We are convinced that the fund is doing evil work. We intend to tell the facts about this organization and its leadership to the American people throughout the country. We believe that it is your responsibility as American citizens to satisfy yourself as to the truth of what we say. Check the record. It contains a great deal more evidence than time has permitted me to relate here. If you will study the facts in the light of patriotism, I am confident you will join with us in combating and exposing this massive threat to the security of our country.

Hon. Sam Rayburn

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in felicitating our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, on the 74th anniversary of his birth.

It has truly been a privilege for me to serve with and to know intimately this great American. Everyone loves, admires and respects Mr. SAM.

"Mr. Democrat," as he is so well and often called, has rendered a service to his country beyond our power to express. My hope and prayer is that he may be spared for many, many more years of faithful and fruitful service.

Mr. RAYBURN, my heartiest congratulations.

Cult of Doubt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article by William A. Rusher, which appeared in the November 3, 1955, issue of the Harvard Times-Republican:

CULT OF DOUBT

The gravest problem facing America today is neither political, economic nor military, but moral and psychological. It is the loss, by a substantial segment of the American society, of faith in that society and its values.

The most cursory review of history will bring to mind many nations and communities which have flourished like the green bay tree without any particular pretensions to cultural or intellectual preeminence in their milieux. At one time or another, great nations have sanctioned almost every reprehensible practice known to man—not excluding infanticide, ritual sacrifice and cannibalism—yet the species has survived, an on balance has even progressed. The one sin for which nature exacts the supreme penalty of national extinction is a failure on the part of the members of a society to believe in its inherent worth.

When a society loses faith in itself, its destruction is only a matter of time. Since the disease is commonest among mature and elderly societies, whose cultural and intellectual attainments are high, the process of disintegration is often obscured by a fluorescence of the arts and the intellect. But once the dread threshold has been crossed, no cultural supremacy, no intellectual subtlety, no exquisite refinement of the spirit can commute the death sentence of the doomed society. As Greece, for all her brilliance, succumbed to the Roman legions; as Rome in turn, its grandeur blotched, fell to the Goths; as the hothouse blossom of the T'ang Dynasty crumpled under the blade of An Lu-shan; as the Third French Republic, wielding its cynicism like a paper sword, died at the hands of Adolf Hitler—so must every society die which forgets to preserve its belief in itself.

In the United States today, there are many people, dangerously many, who have lost their faith in the American society. I am not referring to the domestic Communists—though they, of course, have condemned the society to death and welcome each sign of weakness. The great bulk of those who have lost faith in the society, however, are not actively disloyal to it; they have merely become indifferent or hostile to its tenets. They exist in both parties and all economic and social strata, for theirs is a fraternity of the intellect.

To these people the rights which according to the Declaration of Independence were conferred upon all men by their divine Creator are merely the benevolent statutes of a humanistic national society, and the society in turn is but a convenient transitional form on the road to a more perfect (but still completely materialistic) international union. To the holders of such opinions, the preservation of the American society as such can mean little. Deprived by their materialistic premises of the ability to accept its moral postulates, and unable for the same reason to formulate others of their own, they accept the protection of the American society while denying it their moral support—constantly refining their analyses of its defects, and guiltily identifying themselves with its active enemies.

Such people are philosophically incapable of a robust contribution to the vitality of the society. Organizations of a patriotic character, avowedly dedicated to the support of the society, are (not surprisingly) their particular bêtes noires; organizations designed to encourage the ultimate supersession of all national societies by a single materialistic international commonwealth are their special pets. As for the Communist world, hostile to the West yet philosophically unassailable from the standpoint of the thoroughgoing materialist, it exerts upon such people the same hypnotic fascination that a snake exerts upon a chicken.

These people uneasily sense the social danger posed by their loss of faith in the society. But, rather than abandon their tacit opposition, they have sought to camouflage it by treating it as a virtuous skepticism. Thus has arisen the cult of doubt, a complete relativistic philosophy, which denies all positive beliefs in the sphere of social values and elevates doubt itself to the status of a first principle.

We are told, for example, that Harvard's greatest merit is its insistence upon the constantly questioning mind. Or again, learned judges enunciate a new doctrine of chronic dubiety, and warn us against the dangers of firm convictions. At last the very holding of an opinion becomes a sign of bad taste, and an opinion favorable to the American society is considered in the worst taste of all.

How can people in that condition defend the American society against its philosophical rival, communism? They can't, they haven't, and they won't. Let no one suppose that an array of questioning minds, however cooly balanced, can defend a free society against the fiercely held convictions of the brilliant leaders and propagandized masses of the Communist world. We will either meet and defeat the challenge of the Communists with convictions stronger than their own, or we will lose to them the battle for the future of the world.

In this connection, we do ourselves a great disservice to regard Communist leaders like Khrushchev and Mao as mere power-mad barbarians. No political revolution in all history, and few religions, have ever relied less than communism upon force as the preferred weapon of conquest. The Communist dictators are grimly adept politicians, no doubt, and able soldiers as well; but they are also passionately sure of the supposed scientific rightness of their social theories—as Molotov's recent rather ludicrous recantation of a dialectical solecism clearly demonstrates. Against that sort of earnestness, have we nothing better to hurl than the other-handed insipidities of the cult of doubt?

There is some hope that we have. The revelation in the past 8 years of how deeply the morale rot of materialism, not to mention the cancer of communism, had bitten into the body politic has produced a revulsion of popular sentiment whose consequences are

not yet wholly foreseeable. The great majority of the American people are now convinced that the struggle for survival must not be led, on behalf of the American society, by some doubt-riddled egghead exquisitely poised between yea and nay. The world will go—and perhaps rightly—to those who want it most. If it is to go to the defenders of freedom, they must want that freedom, not merely in order to doubt, but to believe.

It will not matter if what they believe proves wrong in the perspective of a millenium. Perfect rightness is the prerogative of God; man's role is to strive for a perfection he cannot achieve. And while final success will forever elude him, he does not always fail. Through the smoke and haze of history we have seen him struggling on—now lost, now stumbling, now rising again "with truth a silver trumpet at his lips."

Greater North Dakota Association Asks Federal Funds To Help City of Williston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit with my remarks a copy of a resolution recently made by the Greater North Dakota Association. This resolution supports an appropriation of Federal funds to pay for the replacement of municipal facilities of the city of Williston, N. Dak., which may be damaged or rendered useless, if the Army engineers get their way and operate the dam at the 1,840-foot level. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF GREATER NORTH DAKOTA ASSOCIATION SUPPORTING AN APPROPRIATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR PROVIDING REPLACEMENT OF MUNICIPAL FACILITIES OF THE CITY OF WILLISTON, N. DAK., DAMAGED, RENDERED USELESS OR MADE NECESSARY DUE TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT ON THE MISSOURI RIVER, OR FOR REIMBURSING THE CITY THEREFOR

Whereas the operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project works on the Missouri River in North Dakota to their maximum height and capacity will adversely affect, damage, and render useless many of the essential municipal facilities of the city of Williston, N. Dak., and may require additional and new facilities; and

Whereas in order to replace, relocate and reconstruct such facilities to adequately serve the present and foreseeable needs of the municipality it will become necessary, among other things, to—

1. Relocate, alter, and reconstruct the water treatment plant;

2. Relocate, extend, alter, and reconstruct the raw water intake facilities;

3. Locate, design, and construct sewage treatment facilities;

4. Replace, relocate, and construct the garbage dump;

5. Replace and reconstruct the powerline to the raw water intake and to the treatment plant; and

Whereas it appears that most, if not all, of the cost of providing such replacements and new facilities is the responsibility and obligation of, and should therefore be fully borne by, the Federal Government because of the construction and operation of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Greater North Dakota Association, the North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, in annual meeting in the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., November 28–29, 1955, That this association actively support an appropriation of Federal funds for the complete relocation, replacement and reconstruction of the municipal facilities of the city of Williston, N. Dak., adversely affected, damaged or rendered useless or inoperable due to the construction and operation of said public works project, as well as for providing such new facilities as may become necessary by reason thereof, all of such replacements and necessary new facilities to be of sufficient size and capacity to adequately serve the present and foreseeable needs and requirements of said municipality, or for the full reimbursement therefor in the event said city provides such replacements and necessary new facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed to the City Commission of Williston, the State water conservation commission, the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, and to Representatives USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following press release from the National Federation of Independent Business regarding foreign aid:

"Let Congress start the new year right," says George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business.

Burger's remark is made with reference to the foreign-aid prorgam which will be considered shortly after the reconvening of the Congress.

Mr. Burger voiced the opinion of the nationwide membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, comprising approximately 100,000 independent business and professional men nationwide, as a result of a poll recently completed, which discloses that 80 percent of the members voted for discontinuance of the foreign aid as a permanent feature of our Nation's foreign policy.

The 80 percent of the members voting came to the conclusion from facts submitted, that the United States taxpayers have ponied up about $69 billion for foreign aid since July 1, 1945, which has resulted in our Nation having the highest deficit of any country in the world. The members believe that "You can't finance or buy friendship." Korea was a good example—where the United States taxpayers bore almost 90 percent of the burden.

Mr. Burger added: "The foreign-aid program is now centered on aid to Asia, and the facts will show that India, an Asian country which has taken foreign aid, is flirting with Communist China. Indonesia which would get aid has indulged in ventures sure to wreck its economy."

Small business, the grassroots of our economy, has spoken, and, Burger concludes: "It is now up to Congress to pay heed to the voice of this largest segment of our Nation's economy."

Friendship Airport Could Solve Washington Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Capital, Annapolis, Md., of January 5, 1956:

FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT COULD SOLVE WASHINGTON PROBLEM

The recommendation of the Department of Commerce that Andrews Airport, a military airbase, be developed as a supplementary commercial airport for the Washington area, instead of using the facilities of the Friendship International Airport, should, and will, likely run into opposition in the Congress.

As a matter of fact, Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, in his letter to Senator MAGNUSON (Democrat, of Washintgon), chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, placed Friendship in third place, rating Andrews Field as first; a proposed airport at Burke, Va., second, and Friendship last.

Yet, both the Andrews field and the proposed field at Burke, Va., have been debated and discussed many times in past years and have always been pigeon-holed.

The Department of Commerce made its recommendation in spite of the fact that its survey concluded that "Friendship Airport could serve as a supplemental facility for Washington for some time" and added "even though it does not provide the best long-range solution of Washington airport needs."

It is estimated that it would cost $30 million, or twice the cost of the Friendship Airport, to develop the Andrews military field as a commercial base. In addition, despite, protests in the past, the Federal Government has acquired 1,030 acres of land at the Burke site at a cost of $900,654.26, which has been lying fallow since construction there was stopped in early 1953. It was estimated that the cost of constructing an airport at Burke would be more than $48,400,000.

One of the main problems facing the Congress which recently assembled will be the balancing of the Federal budget and tax cuts. Why should the Federal Government rush into spending $30 million on the Andrews base, after investing $900,654.26 at the Burke site, when its own survey concludes that the Friendship Airport could serve as a supplemental facility for some time? Why not use the Friendship Airport to relieve the congestion at the Washington Airport and save considerable Federal funds? There is no definite date that can be given when traffic at the Friendship Airport will grow to such an extent that another airport might have to be considered.

Objections that have been made in the past to the use of the Andrews base are just as pertinent today. They have been founded on the mixing of military and commercial air traffic. Speaking of long-range planning, in event of a war, the Andrews base would probably be in such use that commercial flying might have to be banned or curtailed.

One thing that the selection of the Friendship Airport as a supplemental site would do would be to cut down traffic at the Washington Airport almost as soon as an agreement was worked out. This would tend to reduce any stacking of planes that may exist over

the Washington Airport, waiting clearance to land, by dividing the volume of traffic between Washington and Friendship.

At a recent meeting held in Indianapolis on flying safety, some astonishing facts were brought to light dealing with "crowded air" over major airports.

W. G. Jensen, of the Air Transport Association, representing the scheduled lines, gave the conference details of the agency's survey of near-misses in commercial flying.

He asserted that 65 percent of the near-misses occurred in full daylight and 43 percent under conditions with 15 miles or more of visibility. And he noted that almost a third took place in the Nation's chief terminal areas—New York, Chicago, Washington, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Dallas, Kansas City, and Miami.

To underline what is happening with the great growth of civil and military aviation, Lt. Col. Jack Tueller, Chief of the Strategic Air Command's Flying Safety Branch, reported that since January 1 of last year, up to the time of the meeting, there had been several hundred incidents in which bombers and fighters narrowly averted midair collisions.

And not all of them were missed. It was pointed out that from the second half of 1950 to the second half of 1952, Air Force collisions in midair rose from 4 to 7 a month. Since then the rate has leveled off.

Naturally Air Force planes by the nature of their business often fly in close formation with relatively small clearance margins.

Though military and civil air operations differ markedly, there is a big common element in the congestion problem they face. That being the case, why should the Department of Commerce seek to complicate the problem at the Andrews Base, by mixing military and commercial flying in the same area?

The Friendship Airport, with facilities available, would seem to be the ideal answer to the Washington problem, rather than mixing types of aviation, and pouring out sums of Federal money.

The recently completed Baltimore-Washington Expressway offers an ideal highway artery between the Friendship Field and Washington, and the speed of travel between the two points is more to be considered than actual mileage between Washington and Andrews Field or between Washington and Burke, Va.

The statement in the Department of Commerce report that Washington air traffic is predominantly shorthaul, deserves some inquiry by the Congress.

What does the Department consider shorthaul traffic? Planes land at the Washington Airport from any distant points. One reads time and again of diplomats and representatives of foreign countries being met at the airport.

Is a flight from Washington to Chicago considered a shorthaul for instance? Is one from the Midwest to Washington shorthaul? It would seem that this phase of the report should be clarified.

Harry Sandager

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with deep regret of the passing of our former friend and colleague, Harry Sandager, of Rhode Island.

Born in 1887, he played an active part in public life in the field of journalism; as a Representative in the Rhode Island General Assembly for 8 years; as a Member of the 71st Congress, and as Republican national committeeman for the State of Rhode Island.

He had a very wide circle of friends, among whom I have been happy to be included. I have valued his friendship ever since the day of our service here together in this House.

I join in heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Sandager and to all those close to him.

The Church of Christ in Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

LAWRENCEBURG, TENN.,
January 2, 1956.

Hon. ROSS BASS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROSS: Copy of my letter of last September to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, is enclosed.

Cline and Harold Paden went to Italy 7 years ago to reestablish the Church of Christ in Italy. Although Harold had been successful in helping win the battle for Italy in World War II, Cline had, by resisting orders of the government which had violated his conscience, to close the orphanage in 1949, to close the churches in 1952, and finally the order in 1953 to take down the church sign which was a question of religious liberty, become "the symbol of the persecuted religious minorities in Italy," and, as such he had to be removed, even though the appeal of his arrest was pending and juridical recognition to enable the Church of Christ to function freely continued to be withheld.

While Paden was receiving the third degree in reverse fellowship at the hands of a supposedly friendly Christian democratic government, a news story distributed by the Chicago Daily News Service on November 19 from Rome told of plans for a Catholic colony in a rural area of South Carolina, evidently for the specific purpose of evangelization, as Priest Ligutti stated: "I want healthy Italian wives to increase the number of Catholics in that area." In contrast, the cry against Paden had been: "We do not need missionaries from the Church of Christ in Italy for the Italians are satisfied religiously and, certainly, we do not need foreigners to teach us religion." Incidentally, under the President's refugee relief program up to now 62,000 persons from Italy out of the total of 131,750 refugees will have found haven in the land of the free. Yes, everything would appear to be in readiness as we extend the handclasp of welcome for President Gronchi's state visit late next month.

The religion may be primarily an internal matter under the jurisdiction of a sovereign government, yet, in any country where it is necessary to go to the police for permission to worship, even though my voice be a lone one, I feel impelled in the goodly heritage of freemen, to cry out against such a despotic system condoned by a government sealed in the blood of American arms and transfused by almost five billions from the American taxpayer.

While all would agree the desire to return to the "meritorious inquisition" is inopportune and out of place in our time, at least the equality of all religious professions and the freedom of conscience should like the rose be indigenous to every clime and especially so in that country where it is the duty of the ruler under the 8-year old Italian republic to respect and have respected its constitutional guaranties.

With cordial good wishes, I remain
Sincerely,

MARCUS A. GALLAHER.

LAWRENCEBURG, TENN., *September 16, 1955.*
The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On August 16, Mr. Cline Paden, head of the Church of Christ mission in Italy, informed the American Embassy in Rome of his intention to return to America. His replacement is Mr. Hillard Story. The conviction of Cline Paden of refusing to obey police orders in erecting the sign "Cheisa di Cristo" on the meeting place of the church in Rome has been appealed. "Both the Italian and American Governments have shown great interest in the outcome of the trial which was expected to end the 2-year-old controversy over the sign."

Italy in adopting the republican constitution of 1947 guaranteeing freedom of worship to all, neglected to repeal a Fascist law of 1929 prohibiting public worship by "cults" without police permission. Even though the ban has been lifted for the moment—the power to ban remains—and the basic question is, therefore, still unresolved.

It was the Fascist-Lateran pact of 1929, signed by Mussolini and the Roman Catholic Church, which was opposed by Croce, one of modern man's great thinkers, and four other senators, all in the liberal tradition critical of close relations between the Roman church and the Italian state, that met half-way the papal claim to sovereignty. Manifestly, the crooning of some about modern liberties cannot be based on canon law but finds its melody in expediency, since old Fascist restrictions dangerously curtaining democratic freedoms are interpreted in effect though in conflict with the constitution and make a mockery of it. Even collaborators would appear to strain a point in blessing the invasion and ravishing of Ethiopia, one of the oldest Christian countries, and the destruction by aggression of the late Spanish Republic.

Dictator Franco may with impunity curtail freedom of speech, harm the religious sensibilities, and restrict the right to worship of Protestants in his fortress of catholicism, yet contrarywise in Peronland where similar measures now sometimes fit the other foot, some face the dilemma of obeying conscience or a temporary ruler, making a difference as to whose foot the shoe pinches, thus, it would appear to be benign where church and state are one, but malign where even a "moral separation" exists, to naturalize over here but to normalize over there.

Mr. Secretary, believe me, this is not an effort to bedevil, but in the peace of Christian conscience it is really mortifying, that in Italy, an ally with whom we have a treaty of friendship, a land thousands leave from each year to make new careers in this land of refuge and promise, should withdraw the handclasp of welcome from a friend and brother in Christ, since there is one God here as there and His unchanging law is universal.

Certain ecclesiastics in America are adepts at adjusting in volume problems similar to Cline Paden's by use of the private immigration bill device. In the 83d and 84th Congresses no less than 100 such bills, each of which would grant permanent residence to

from 1 to 14 priests, nuns or nurses who have overstayed their visa extensions in this country, have been introduced. Although they are no longer called up and passed out of regular order they are usually favorably reported by a generous Congress, while during this period Messrs. Caliandro and Geno, American citizens and Protestant ministers, were among those ordered out of Italy.

It is interesting to note that across history those manifesting the greatest ecclesiastical sensitivity, while coercing with the tyranny of thought control in clear violation of individual freedom so often nourished in blood and basically cherished and yearned for by all mankind, have remained insolent and bigoted in continuing their drive for temporal power and aiming at keener and sharper ecclesiastical control and immunities.

Every reason persuades that in a country consecrated by the blood of American heroes, the avengers of freedom, that the liberty of conscience and of worship proclaimed by the Republican constitution of 1947, and guaranteed for American citizens in Italy by the 1949 treaty of friendship, should not be flouted and interfered with by police action, but respected as Italy's highest administrative tribunal, the Council of State, has ordered.

To this end, may I respectfully solicit and commend your continued interest and intervention in justice and equity.

Yours very respectfully.

MARCUS A. GALLAHER.

The Charm of the U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Columbia Democratic Club, a very active organization in my district, are keenly aware of the rights and privileges we enjoy as American citizens, and endeavor to keep the community in which they are located, conscious of these benefits and also of their duties. They are particularly active in getting the voters to the polls at election days.

Mr. Ernest J. Pegelow, president emeritus of this club, has written a song poem entitled "The Charm of the U. S. A," which I would like to include in the RECORD, under permission to extend my remarks:

THE CHARM OF THE U. S. A.

Out where the sky meets the ocean,
The sentry on New York bay,
Holds forth the great lamp of Freedom,
"The charm of the U. S. A.!"

Greeting the weary trav'ler,
A welcome to those who despair,
Liberty offers a haven,
To those so oppres'ed "Over There."

"Miss Liberty;" "My Country 'Tis of Thee,"
Millions of hearts proclaim.
"Miss Liberty:" Forever you shall be,
The symbol of "Old Glory's" fame.

For "Columbia the Gem of the Ocean,"
A vigil you keep "Night and Day."
"God Bless" "The Statue of Liberty,"
"The charm of the U. S. A.!"

—*Ernest J. Pegelow.*

Russia Objects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Nikita S. Khrushchev, head of the Communist Party in Russia, got on his "high horse" last week and balled out the President of the United States for sending Christmas greetings to the people of Eastern Europe and expressing the hope that some day they might be free and have a government of their own choosing. That was the most Christian greeting that could be imagined. It did not fit in, however, with the ideas of the dictatorship of Russia, where 3½ percent of the population govern absolutely the other 96½ percent.

The President replied to that tirade and announced that it has been, still is, and will continue to be the policy of the United States to liberate the voiceless people behind the Iron Curtain, and that we will not cease our efforts until we are successful. That was all he had to say, period. That gave Mr. Khrushchev something to chew over, and I am glad someone gave this bragging, chest-pounding dictator something to digest. I do not think we need fear enemies of this stamp, for usually anyone who prances around, pounds his chest, exhibits his biceps and announces what he is going to do, uses up all his energy before the fight begins, and such boasters are not difficult to dispose of.

While I am glad the President tackled Khrushchev for a loss, it will be a long costly grind if we undertake the liberation of all peoples behind the Iron Curtain. Those people must realize that they themselves will have to fight for their liberty. They did that before in Russia, and they can do it again. They cannot count too much on our intervening in their revolution.

First of all, it is a costly undertaking in money and men, and many of the people here, or their ancestors, came to America in the first place to get away from the wars in Europe. They saw how useless it was to try to keep the peace, as history shows that every three years from the date of recorded history there has been some conflict raging somewhere. They objected to having their boys compelled to join the armed forces, and were tired of being submerged in a sea of taxation. They pulled stakes and came here and proceeded to build on these shores a government that existed for the people, and which guaranteed liberty and freedom. How well they succeeded is evidenced by the wonderful progress made by the United States in the last 150 years. We started out with 13 settlements, called colonies, with no fixed central government, and were probably the weakest looking nation in the then list of nations. After 150 years of free government we became the world's strongest government, and one which many other nations envied and endeavored to copy.

Our first step in European entanglements was taken in 1918. Again in 1941 we got enmeshed, then once more in Korea. After World War II stopped we endeavored to use our money, men and resources to establish peace. Since that date we have expended the following sums: Outright gifts to foreign governments, $44,103,112,291; credits—which will not be paid—$12,347,775,908; other credits—still gifts—$10,123,872,197.

Today everyone will admit that we are no nearer to world peace than we were before we began this program. In the meantime we have increased our debt limit, and now again we are dangerously near the new limit. In addition, we are running on an unbalanced budget. Other countries like Great Britain and Yugoslavia have balanced their budgets from gifts made by the United States. What is more important, the above costs do not take into consideration that other awful price element which was inflicted on our troops by death, wounds, imprisonment and torture.

The argument is made that it will not take us long to carry out our intention of liberating the enslaved people of other countries. It has been 10 years since the end of World War II, and still we have not accomplished our purpose, nor have we made much progress. As the second session of Congress starts, one of the first things to come before it will be a request for a further appropriation of $4 billion in foreign aid.

The official opinion seems to be that in this atomic age a war will not last long. It will be a matter of days, not years. The people have been given to understand that one bomb, or at best a very few of them, will destroy the earth itself. I do not subscribe to this theory at all. This earth was created by divine power, and people were put here on this planet by that same power. It is consistent with faith to say that a few insignificant creatures inhabiting the earth by the grace of this divine power can undo in a matter of minutes all that the Almighty has done? This is fear in the nth degree. If the mind of man can contrive such a dangerous instrumentality the brain of man can also contrive a means of making it ineffective. Every positive has a negative, and the whole world and everything in it constitutes a system of balances.

I would like to see the people of Russia liberated, but remember that when a reigning government which has 3½ percent of the people voluntarily supporting it and the other 96½ percent of the population are vassals living under the heel of dictators, any change will have to come from within. The people themselves will finally have to take action to emerge from their condition of serfdom. There will be much blood spilled, but the road to freedom is costly, and no nation knows it better than we do.

However, there are certain things that we can do now to help the people of Russia and other dictator-dominated countries. They are: First, withdraw recognition from this bloody regime of

Russia; second, oust Russia from the United Nations or get out ourselves.

We know now, and should have known right along that Russia is our enemy, and has, does, and will continue to oppose every move we make in the interest of world peace. While we sit in the United Nations with our arm around our beloved brother, with both of us pledged to world peace, this beloved brother is looking for the most favorable opportunity to stab us in the back, and is working with unremitting energy to destroy us and all we stand for.

If we take the steps above suggested these moves will give the people behind the Iron Curtain new hope, and they will gain new strength when they see that the United States will no longer uphold or condone the tyranny of the Russian leaders.

Van Zandt Urges Congressional Action on Proposed Amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress of a large group of active and retired railroad employees, at their request I introduced on January 3 a series of bills designed to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act and increase benefits.

During the past several months in covering the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania I had the opportunity of meeting and talking personally with hundreds of active and retired railroaders as well as widows of deceased railroad employees and other survivors. Not only did I find a lot of dissatisfaction among the retired people because of the failure of Congress to increase benefits, but also a general feeling among active railroaders that the retirement law should be revised for the purpose of providing a more adequate annuity at the time of retirement.

The series of bills introduced today are in addition to the following bills introduced in January 1955 at the beginning of the first session of this Congress, namely:

H. R. 856, which provides full annuities at compensation of half salary or wages based on the 5 years of highest earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60.

H. R. 858 provides retirement on a full annuity at age 60 or after 30 years of service and that such annuity for any month shall not be less than one-half of the individual's average monthly compensation for the 5 years of highest earnings.

H. R. 859 provides for an across-the-board increase of 25 percent in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees or their survivors.

H. R. 2443 provides that an annuitant may be eligible for his retirement annuity even though he renders compensated service for an employer other than railroads by whom he was last employed before his annuity became effective. This bill covers the situation where a retired employee is denied the opportunity to serve as a clerical employee of a church, civic, fraternal, or social organization.

In regard to the series of bills which I have introduced this date they are as follows:

H. R. 7982 provides that the present dual benefit restrictions on spouse's annuities shall be eliminated. If this bill becomes a law some 6,000 spouses who have earned social-security benefits in their own right will be entitled to receive such benefits without having the amount deducted from their railroad retirement benefits as is being done at the present time.

H. R. 7984 provides for a 25-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows, or other survivors. This bill is a revision of H. R. 859 and is necessary because of changes made by the 1955 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

H. R. 7990 provides a 10-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows, or other survivors.

H. R. 7988 provides a 15-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows, or other survivors.

H. R. 7986 provides a 20-percent across-the-board increase in the annuities and pensions payable to retired railroad employees, their widows, or other survivors.

H. R. 7983 is a bill designed to provide a 25-percent increase in widows' annuities.

H. R. 7989 provides a 10-percent increase in widows' annuities.

H. R. 7987 provides a 15-percent increase in widows' annuities.

H. R. 7985 provides a 20-percent increase in widows' annuities.

Mr. Speaker, on November 1, 1955, the Railroad Retirement Board was paying 313,116 annuities and pensions to retired railroaders, 108,896 annuities to spouses of retired employees, and 205,371 monthly survivor benefits to widows and other survivors, or a grand total of 627,383 monthly annuities. Many of these beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act live in my congressional district, and it is at their request that I have introduced railroad retirement legislation in both sessions of this Congress.

Already in an effort to secure prompt consideration of the bills mentioned I have written to Chairman PERCY PRIEST, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and to A. E. Lyon, secretary, Railway Labor Executives Association, as well as to the legislative representatives of the railroad brotherhoods, the International Association of Machinists, and the A. F. of L.-CIO.

Mr. Speaker, the interest of the active and retired railroad employees in seeking amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act should receive serious consideration by Congress. This is their retirement system supported entirely by contributions from the employees and railroad management, and its is the duty of Congress to give full consideration to the request for liberalization of the Railroad Retirement Act and an increase in benefits.

Tide of Wetbacks Cut 90 Percent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, my district was overrun with thousands of so-called wetbacks who were looking for traditional employment in the truck farms and citrus groves of southern California. They were victims of an unrealistic and unworkable agreement between Mexico and the United States whereby employment of contract workers was so complicated that most farmers felt compelled to hire illegal workers rather than contract workers.

The 83d Congress, 2 years ago, remedied this situation by passing legislation that makes it possible for the farmers to hire workers who are experienced and readily available. The new law, coupled with the effective administration of the border patrol by Joseph M. Swing, United States Commissioner of Immigration, has remarkably improved the picture as evidenced by the Commissioner's report submitted to Attorney General Brownell.

Under unanimous consent, I enclose the following newspaper article from the San Diego Union, of December 31, 1955, pointing up the success of this program:

TIDE OF WETBACKS CUT 90 PERCENT

WASHINGTON, December 30.—The number of Mexican aliens crossing illegally into the United States was reduced more than 90 percent in 1955, Joseph M. Swing, United States Immigration Commissioner, reported today.

In an analysis of immigration-naturalization service for the year, submitted to Attorney General Brownell, Swing said continued patrol of the border against welbacks was "the top operational achievement of the service in 1955."

The 1954 roundup of illegal Mexican aliens brought effective control of the international boundary for the first time, Swing said.

"Continued vigilance and effective use of men and equipment has maintained that control this year," he said.

THREE THOUSAND EACH DAY

Prior to 1954, he said, border patrolmen were picking up 3,000 Mexican aliens each day. In 1955 the average was fewer than 200 a day.

In 1955 fewer than 105,000 Mexican aliens were arrested for illegal entry, compared with more than 640,000 in 1954, Swing reported.

He credited the revamped United States-Mexican farm labor importation program as a major factor in reducing the infiltration of wetbacks, along with the border patrol's vigilance.

Under the farm labor setup agreed upon by the United States and Mexican Governments this year American farmers were allowed to draw their workers from border

reception centers minus much of the red-tape and procedural delays which hampered the program previously. The two Governments have agreed to continue the program through 1956.

CRIME REDUCED

Swing said the sharp cut in wetbacks has reduced crime by a corresponding rate in areas previously overrun by Mexican aliens. It also has diminished charity demands and has improved health conditions, he said.

"These improved conditions were accompanied by increased employment opportunities for Americans formerly displaced by illegal wetback labor, both in agriculture and industry," Swing reported.

Swing disclosed he set up a headquarters intelligence branch last November to deal with the wetbacks.

An air intelligence center was established at El Centro, Calif., as part of the border patrol air arm, he reported.

"This organization collects and disseminates information concerning illegal aircraft crossing the Mexican border into the United States," he said.

Free Enterprise Benefits All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial in the Evening Observer published at Dunkirk, N. Y., Wednesday, December 14, 1955, on the subject of Free Enterprise Benefits All. I am quite sure that those who have benefited by these benefactions from the Ford Foundation will agree with this editorial:

FREE ENTERPRISE BENEFITS ALL

The money which the Brooks Memorial Hospital is receiving from the Ford Foundation is one of the fruits of the American system of free private enterprise.

The Ford Foundation received the money from the Ford family.

The Ford family made the money by the production of motorcars.

The Ford enterprise made the money not by exploiting the market nor yet by exploiting labor. Most of the money was amassed when Ford was making motorcars and delivering them to the public at a cheaper rate than any other manufacturer could duplicate.

At the same time he was pioneering in advancing wage rates beyond those of his competitors. When five dollars a day was the rare exception rather than the rule Ford announced a plan to make that sum a minimum for the humblest jobs in his shops. And at the same time he was putting the motorcar, once regarded as a luxury reserved for the rich, within the means of virtually every American.

It was the miracle of quantity production possible only through the free play of private enterprise. It marked a new concept in production for human use—producing in quantity at the lowest unit cost at the same time that higher and higher wages were possible and paid to the workers. Ford set a pattern and America has prospered to the benefit of all and without the exploitation of anyone.

For a time Ford got the lion's share of the market but as he introduced his old Model T, once at a price as low as $298, he was creating a market for others. And he was making money, a lot of it, more than he could ever spend. Millions of his vast earnings are being returned to the people through the Ford Foundation.

Beyond a certain point money becomes only a system of scoring, a means by which men can measure their success in enterprise. The power to produce or to organize production is unlimited with some men of special talents. But the power to consume is strictly limited. The body can only be adorned with one outfit of clothing at a time, and its intake is limited to a certain number of calories a day. Beyond those basic needs the earnings of the wealthy must revert to general uses through taxation, through the capital provided for other enterprise, through gifts and legacies.

Under the American system the fruits of extraordinary ingenuity and production find their way back, deviously but inevitably, to the general welfare. What is announced as the goal of socialism can be shown to be the indisputable fact of capitalism. For the capitalists cannot take it with them, nor can they leave it in idleness. Nor is it possible to use accumulations of money in any way whatsoever without some benefit to others.

Money begets money but only if it be employed in ways which benefit others than its owner. Even the glutton who consumes more than he needs can only consume the things which others have profited in producing.

So Dunkirk has $62,300 available for improved hospital facilities. That car you bought in 1925 yielded a profit to Henry Ford. Now you are getting some of the profit back. And all the other profit earned that year or any other year by anybody found its way back to benefit all. Under the free enterprise system the employment of the genius at the very maximum rate justified by his peculiar abilities is profitable to all. Ford tapped riches which nobody else thought existed but in one way or another the riches he accumulated helped to enrich the Nation.

You can carry the thought along indefinitely, for you know that the riches of America, based more on quantity production than on natural resources, have spread to the farthest corners of the world. In witness whereof, take a look at the 60 billions America has given or advanced to scores of other nations in the last decade.

Ownership Pride: Hundreds Start Improvement Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, immediately after I was sworn in as a Member of Congress in January 1953, my first official duties concerned the sale of Linda Vista homes to the occupants. Linda Vista was a defense housing community and the Government had promised for many years to make the homes available to those who had lived in them. I was happy to have played a part in making good on this promise.

Now, at a time when we are considering additional units of public housing for other parts of the country, I feel that my colleagues will be interested in learning what happens when public housing units are put into private ownership. Everyone benefits when this happens. The Government gets its investment back, the property goes on the local tax rolls and Government tenants become individual homeowners with a pride of ownership that adds to the community well-being. I am proud of the manner in which the citizens of Linda Vista have spruced up their homes and have demonstrated in a very forcible way the many advantages of private versus public ownership. Under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the San Diego Union, by Clyde V. Smith, the homes and building editor:

OWNERSHIP PRIDE: HUNDREDS START IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Linda Vista is sprucing up.

Families are fixing up the homes they have newly acquired from the Government.

Now they are homeowners instead of tenants in a public housing project.

The new Linda Vista is living, obvious proof of the values in the pride of home ownership, contrasted with what happens when all residents are renters.

Better homes and a better community with a better appearance are being created.

Linda Vista has 2,999 permanent dwelling units which were built by the Federal Government in 1940 and 1941 to meet the housing needs of San Diego's defense and war-swollen population. Originally, there were 3,000 permanent units, but one of the houses was destroyed by an airplane crash.

For 15 years, Linda Vista has been a public housing project, operated primarily for low and moderate-income families. The Government last fall began selling the homes under a priority system that gave veteran and non-veteran occupants the first choices.

The opening sale was last October 25. By the time these deals cleared escrow, it was December before the first families acquired title to their homes. The progress in home improvements has been amazing in the interval of 6 to 8 months since the first group of tenants became homeowners.

Projects are large and small. Remodeling has been undertaken on a major scale. Room additions have been numerous. Garages and carports are going up, literally by the hundreds.

Patios are popular. The fence companies have had a field day in Linda Vista. There are miles of new redwood fences in assorted patterns and designs. New concrete block walls have created private outdoor rooms in the backyard of many homes. Other families have bordered their property with chain-link metal fences.

Cement sales also must have been heavy in Linda Vista during the first half of this year. The new homeowners are pouring concrete driveways and concrete terraces. Many are building barbeque fireplaces.

Kitchen remodeling is one of the favorite projects for those who can afford it. A few are adding interior fireplaces. Second bathrooms also have been added in some homes.

The new Linda Vista is also a community of gardeners. Landscaping changes are evident everywhere in the areas that have been sold. A nursery owner with a garden shop off Morena Boulevard, at the western entrance of Linda Vista, reported his sales of plants and garden equipment has increased 50 percent since the Government started selling homes in the project.

Hedges are being planted, new trees and shrubbery have been planted, flower borders are blooming and lawns are being renovated.

It would be nearly impossible to estimate the gallons of paint sprayed and brushed on

Linda Vista homes, inside and outside, since the pride of ownership began to show.

There is even a new private swimming pool in the rear yard of one Linda Vista home, belonging to Mr. and Mrs. Charles D. Hopkins, 1755 Coolidge Street. After enclosing their yard with a high redwood fence, their first project was a plastic pool, 13 by 27 feet and 6 feet deep in the center. It now adjoins a sun deck which extends from the rear of their house.

Many families after purchasing Linda Vista homes could not afford immediate improvements, other than painting or gardening, but most of them have ambitious plans for the future which involve room rearrangements, carports or garages, and patios.

Even those who have made improvements are not through. They are now excited about additional possibilities to make their homes larger, convenient, and more attractive.

With many it will be a continuing project, lasting 5 to 10 years or more, depending on time and finances. A large share of the home improvements are being undertaken by do-it-yourselfers.

However, the building contractors have also found business good in Linda Vista, especially with projects involving structural changes, room additions and new plumbing installations.

Of the 2,999 permanent units in Linda Vista, 1,007 are single-family houses, each with 750 square feet of interior space, 2 bedrooms and a single bath. The typical house has two doors, one at the kitchen and the other at the living room, both at the front of the house. There is no rear access. These places also lack a carport or a garage. What can be done? Here are a few examples of what has been done:

Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Clonts, 1584 Acheson Street, added a wing 7 by 12 feet on the kitchen side, making a window out of the former kitchen door and moving the door to the rear. This gave them a much larger kitchen, with breakfast nook.

There was a complete plumbing exchange, bringing it up to city code. (Plumbing in Linda Vista does not meet city requirements, although it satisfies safety regulations of the health department.) Natural birch cabinets were installed in this kitchen, and the hot water heater, formerly exposed, was enclosed in a cabinet. The addition also provided a laundry corner.

Other improvements made by the Clonts family included expansion of the living room by removal of a former closet, installation of sliding doors to make more room in existing closets, a garage at the rear of the property which also provides part of the enclosure for a concrete patio, and a complete redecorating job, with fresh paint inside and outside and wallpaper in the living room. A brick planter border added to the exterior trim.

The Clonts have plans for other improvements. So far they have spent about $3,000 on remodeling and additions, half the cost of the original price. Veterans are able to buy these single-family homes from the Government for $5,690, with a downpayment of 5 percent, plus escrow and closing costs.

Mr. and Mrs. W. D. Makinson, 1489 Acheson Street, are remodeling their home another way.

Cognizant of the trend toward open planning, they removed all partitions that separated living room, dining nook, and kitchen, making it one large room. They plan later to install an open divider to define the kitchen area, but they have refinished this area with maple plywood cabinets, thus making it an attractive living kitchen.

They also added a bedroom and utility room at the rear, with a laundry and a half bath. Farther back on their property, in a separate building, they erected a carport and a storage room, also a patio slab. Their home has been reroofed with a white-rock covering.

Some families who purchased duplexes plan to convert these into a single, large home. Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Nielsen, 1517 Coolidge Street, plan to convert part of their second unit into a larger residence for themselves, and reduce the rental side to a one-bedroom unit.

Mr. and Mrs. Gus DeFord, 6560 Osler Street, also bought a duplex and have ambitious plans. They have already walled in a large backyard with concrete block 6 feet high. Later they plan to add a breakfast room off the kitchen, erect a garage, and build a barbecue and shuffleboard court inside this wall.

One of the major projects under way is at the home of Mr. and Mrs. William F. Wilson, 1430 Coolidge Street. Wilson, a masonry contractor, has already installed a used-brick interior fireplace. Now he is putting up an extra bedroom, walling in a large yard with concrete block, erecting a huge outdoor fireplace, and plans a covered terrace, also a carport.

Some Linda Vista homes have outstanding view sites. An example is the property of Mr. and Mrs. Ben C. Strange, on the rim at 1402 Burton Street.

Their view matches some of the best in San Diego. They look down on the fairways and greens of the Mission Valley Golf Course, the spreading buildings and swimming pool of Town and Country Hotel, the stables with oval training tracks on the valley floor, the cloverleaf at the intersection of Cabrillo and Mission Valley Freeways, and a winding strip of Cabrillo Freeway with its constant traffic streaming both from and to downtown San Diego.

To take advantage of this view, the Stranges plan to add a big living room at the rear of their house with a glass wall overlooking the valley. But this is a future project. Already they have started on a patio with brick barbecue, which also takes advantage of this view.

Compared with prices other view sites are commanding in San Diego, their land alone is probably worth more than the Stranges paid for the entire property.

Mrs. Faye Hartman, special field representative of the Public Housing Administration in San Diego, said the agency hoped to close out the sale of all permanent dwelling units in Linda Vista by the end of this calendar year.

For the purposes of the sale, Linda Vista was subdivided in six separate units. Four of these subdivisions have been sold and only 200 buildings in the last two remain, most of them multiple-unit buildings of 4 and 6 units each.

Most of the 1,077 single-family houses and the 503 duplexes have already been sold. In the project are 103 4-unit buildings with a total of 412 dwelling units, and 84 6-unit buildings, adding 504 more dwelling units. Qualified veteran occupants may buy the 4-unit buildings for investment purposes, but the 6-unit buildings are available only to mutuals or private investors who submit sealed bids.

Holding first priority in buying the Linda Vista homes are veteran occupants. The second priority goes to nonveteran occupants. Third on the list are veterans living in Linda Vista who wish to buy homes other than the one they occupied or who lost out in the draw with another veteran in the same duplex or 4-unit building.

Veterans who reside outside of Linda Vista make up the fourth class on the priority list and it was these veterans who recently formed lines at the Linda Vista PHA office, awaiting their turns to buy the limited number of dwelling units that remained available.

Dedication of Historical Marker at the Eisenhower Ancestral Home, Elizabethville, Pa., on October 23, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER M. MUMMA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, last October 23 it was my privilege to attend the dedication of a historical marker at the ancestral home of the Eisenhower family at Elizabethville, Dauphin County, Pa., in the 16th Congressional District, which I represent.

The dedication address was given by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, of Temple University, Philadelphia. It was entirely worthy of the occasion, and gives a good insight into the background of our beloved President. I am sure you will enjoy reading it.

Pursuant to the privilege granted me, I include Dr. Johnson's address in these remarks. It is as follows:

We are met on a site that marks an important stage in the development of an American heritage. It is a heritage not of accumulated wealth, nor social position, nor intellectual genius. What was planted in this beautiful valley of the Susquehanna long ago was the seed of a family line which in its flowering perpetuated a name to represent to the world in troubled times the best hopes of mankind. It is this little community's legacy to all people of all times.

Every man is the product of his environmental and biological inheritance. When that inheritance brings into being one with singular capacity for understanding and serving the people of his day, then his inheritance belongs to them, too. The qualities that made him great become a built-in feature of national pride and tradition. That's why we are here.

You may remember when you played ball as a boy how you had to come back at certain times and tag up or touch base again in order to proceed without penalty. Visiting sources of greatness is for me semething like returning to touch base again. We are establishing contact with fundamentals.

One of the fundamentals suggested to me by this occasion today is that in a democracy, greatness comes out of everywhere when it is left free to come. The history of those who first brought the Eisenhower name to Pennsylvania contains little that would set them apart from hundreds of others in the stream of migration that came to America more than two centuries ago. Their ancestors lived in the Palatinate of Bavaria. Like Puritans, Quakers, and others, they came to the New World to escape unending wars and persecutions and to worship God in the way that they thought was right. Pennsylvania, with its guarantee of religious freedom, was their haven.

The first of the family line, Nicholas Eisenhower, stepped from a sailing vessel in the Port of Philadelphia one day in 1741. He had a son Peter, who in turn had a son Frederick. Frederick was the father of Jacob F. Eisenhower who, with his wife Rebecca Mather, was to establish the family in this pleasant valley, build the ancestral home where we are gathered, and become the grandfather of the 34th President of the United States.

Jacob Eisenhower built the homestead on a parcel of 100 acres. The deed in the Dauphin County Courthouse shows he and Rebecca paid $3,698.46 for the land. The exactness of the figure, down to a fraction of a cent, indicates the acute sense of money values characteristic of the Pennsylvania Dutch.

Neither the family of Jacob Eisenhower nor that of his son David knew the comforts of soft living, but they were rich in sturdy bodies, intelligent minds, and strong bonds of family affection. They were self-sufficient, God-fearing, and freedom-loving. The young people assumed responsibilities early in life, and these families asked nothing more of the county to which they had come than the modest rewards that accure to those who work hard and live by a code of strict but simple virtue.

Jacob Eisenhower was a farmer. He also equipped himself with a cobbler's workshop in the attic of his home where he mended shoes for all his family. Besides his temporal tasks, he was a spiritual leader in the community. To members of the sect known as Brothers in Christ, he was Pastor Eisenhower. He built this dwelling both as a home for his family and a meeting place where his neighbors could worship. His ministry was practical. He preached the word to those who would come to hear, and he kept the home open at all times to give freely of his hospitality to strangers and travelers passing his way.

This was a home, as I interpret the historical accounts, which was essentially temperate in character—temperate in the sense that frugality mingled happily with the spirit of liberality, duty found place for pleasure, and discipline was part and parcel of loving kindness. Thus we see the shape which this Pennsylvania home gave to the family heritage. It was the heritage that David Eisenhower, son of Jacob and Rebecca, took with him to Kansas where he went to college and met and married Ida Stover. It was the heritage to which Ida added so much from the rich store of her own character. It was the heritage they both bequeathed to their six sons, Arthur, the banker; Edgar, the lawyer; Dwight, the general of the Army and President of the United States; Roy, the pharmacist; Earl the electrical engineer, and Milton, the educator and public servant. It was the inheritance that enabled these men, each in his own way, to make his community better and his Nation greater by reason of his being part of it.

This homestead symbolizes something that went into the lives of all these men.

Perhaps you have read, as did I, the episode once related by Edgar about his father. It is a touching and eloquent recognition of filial heritage.

The boys had come back to the little white house in Abilene, Kans., where they had been reared. Their father David, in his 79th year, was dying. In his last hours, he asked Edgar to come to his bedside. Falteringly, he told his son that something was bothering him. He knew his sons had been helping out, he said, and now he had to go and he had nothing to leave them. His possessions were few. He had nothing of value to turn over to them. It didn't seem right.

Edgar was deeply touched. He knew his father had never been as communicative as some members of the family. To reveal his deeper feelings was always a hard thing for him to do.

"Dad," said Edgar gently, "you probably don't know what you're leaving us. You're really leaving us a very great heritage. We all have good clean, healthy bodies. We all have good, clean, healthy minds. We all have a deep feeling of appreciation and gratitude for the inheritance which we have already enjoyed from you and mother."

The old gentleman still seemed not satisfied. It was as though he was oppressed by something more than his physical illness, so Edgar tried again.

"Look, dad, I happen to sit on a number of boards of directors in Tacoma, and one of the greatest satisfactions I get as a director comes in voting dividends to the stockholders, because this indicates to them that we have managed the business successfully. Did you ever consider your six boys as an investment you made? Well, these boys are now paying dividends. Each one, whenever he can contribute anything to your comfort and your welfare, is showing he has managed so well the things you gave him that he is in a position now to pay you the things we call dividends."

David Eisenhower looked up at his son and smiled, blinked his eyes, then turned his face to the wall to hide the tears that Edgar knew were rolling down his cheeks.

As I said in the beginning, the Eisenhower heritage that Edgar speaks of is not unique. It is as typically American as anything I know. The only thing unusual about it is that it has been used so well by so many for the benefit of so many others. Yet that heritage by itself does not explain all that we know about these brothers.

What, for instance, is the ingredient, and where did it come from, that produced a leader so beloved at home and abroad as Dwight D. Eisenhower? That is a matter about which we may wonder but never know. In a democracy, destiny has a way of going down among the common people, tapping the shoulder of a youth and by a transmutation too wonderful for human understanding, making him ready to become the champion of his people in times of trial yet undreamed of.

What is the magical element in a man that can draw trustingly to him other men of many minds, contrary interests, varied fortunes, diverse backgrounds, and contrasting temperments? I asked myself that question just a month ago on that cheerless Saturday that gave to the country the news that the President was seriously ill. Never have I seen such genuine outpouring of concern and good will for any public figure. It came from all levels of society—big people and little people, Democrats and Republicans, the poor and the prosperous, the cynical and the sentimental, the godless and the devout. I remember the stricken look that swept the faces of people when they heard the news. It was as though this was something that was happening to a kinsman or an intimate friend.

"What is it that can do this to people?" I asked. "Is it the profundity of a man's knowledge? the sureness of his judgment? his organizational ability? the eloquence of his utterances?" I have known men having all these qualities in varying combinations and degrees but without the slightest ability to command the respect and affection of people in the mass.

I have been thinking it over for a long time. I think I have the answer.

What is it that everybody wants more than anything else? Is it money? health? security? No; he only thinks he does. These are conventional, surface desires. Satisfy them all and the universal yearning, the deeper dissatisfactions, still exist. What everybody wants fundamentally is to establish identity with what I may call, for lack of a better term, the spirit of man.

What I mean is this. We can be surrounded by family, friends, and neighbors and be as lonely as a hermit. Many are in that plight, as any psychologist knows. A man may be known to hundreds, yet be known by none. The ego, the psyche, whatever it is that is the real person is held apart from that element in everybody else. It is encased by walls of selfishness, layers of lethargy, barriers of timidity and reserve, barricades of inhibition, introversion, and all kinds of mental and spiritual blocks. More than anything else, we want to break from these shackles in an effort to find understanding and true communion with other human beings.

If we could do it, that would be, of course, the ideal state. We may never find this condition outside Utopia. But once in a while, once in a long while, a man comes along with those rare personal gifts that enable him to penetrate the barricades. His presence melts the walls. He has an uncommon power of understanding and of making others feel they are understood. Such a man is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Like every man who has ever had personal contact with the President, I have felt that power and seen it in action. The instances I am thinking of are little, unimportant, everyday episodes, but they are examples of the power that Krushchev felt at Geneva, the power that prompted Bulganin to say: "Your President we can talk to. We trust him." That's one proposition, anyway, on which the Russians can get a majority vote from the American people any time.

A man who is a world figure and another who is not known beyond the street where he lives have a common quality for Mr. Eisenhower. They are both people. Four or five years ago, Temple University honored itself by granting degrees to Gen. Dwight Eisenhower and to his distinguished brother, Milton, who has been the president of two of America's great institutions of higher learning and who has spent more years of his life in Washington in the public service than has Dwight himself. To present the brothers for their degrees we had selected two fellow Kansans, Ben Hibbs, editor of the Saturday Evening Post, and Bob Reed, editor of the Country Gentleman.

On that morning before the exercises, my office and my reception room were filled with persons of prominence who wanted to greet our guests of honor. Public officials, university trustees, administrative officers, and faculty members came and left. The lady who manages my office so efficiently came in while I was occupied seeing to it that everybody had a chance to meet the Eisenhowers. This was her busy day. She was getting out academic regalia and checking guest lists, seating arrangements, luncheon reservations. I had not noticed her come in. That is the way it is with efficient people. You forget about them because you know they are always where they are supposed to be. General Eisenhower was more observant. After a few moments he excused himself from the group clustered about him, walked across the room to Betty Reid with extended hand and warm smile and said: "I'm Ike Eisenhower. I just want to meet the lady who is running the show."

Yes, that was Dwight Eisenhower. In a room full of people or in a country full of people, he tries to see to it that nobody is left out. To him, everybody is important.

That quality was apparent so many times 2 years later in Chicago where he was nominated for the presidency. Early one morning he was walking briskly through the lobby of the Conrad Hilton Hotel with 2 or 3 aides. Not many people were about yet, but a young GI with a camera spotted him and tried to get a picture. Because the General was walking fast, the youth could not quite get the focus. As Mr. Eisenhower was about to pass, the boy reached out impulsively and touched his sleeve. "Please, sir," he said, "could you wait just a second?"

One man in the party tried to brush off the young soldier.

"You have only 10 minutes to make your appointment," he said to Mr. Eisenhower as the General paused. "That's all right," the boss said. "This won't take long." He reached for the GI's camera and looked at it. Passing it to another of his attendants, he

said, "Do you know how to work this thing? Get over there and take a picture of both of us—this soldier and me together." The picture taken, he said to the boy, "Thanks, son, and good luck," and went his busy way.

Somewhere in America there is a young man who will never forget that act of kindness, and the picture of himself standing alongside the General of the Army will always be his most prized possession.

Some of Mr. Eisenhower's political foes have spoken of such incidents as play-acting. Well, the old timers in Abilene will tell you that whatever it is, it isn't play-acting. They say that Ike was never worth shucks at acting. When he was in high school he could do everything else—he could ride and box and play ball—but in dramatics, the only role he could play was that of Ike Eisenhower. That's the way its always been.

Thinking of it that way, I guess that's why we love him. He's always just himself. He never shuts us out with barriers of pretense, and so, when we look at him, we find just the plain man, a man who resembles the kind of person that each of us feels himself to be. Trusting him, then, is just like trusting our own best selves. As someone once said of Abraham Lincoln, he's everybody, grown a little taller.

James Reston, now the chief of the New York Times Washington Bureau, summarized it well one day in Chicago during the 1952 convention. The Times had assigned him to cover Mr. Eisenhower's activities after the General returned from Europe. He followed him on his trips, went with him to Denver before the convention, and rode with him on the train that brought him by slow stages back to Chicago. After breakfast on the morning of his arrival, Mr. Reston sat down with a group of other correspondents covering the convention. They wanted to know what he thought of the candidate. He had seen more of him than any of them.

In substance, what Mr. Reston said was this:

Mr. Eisenhower is not a genius. He does not impress people by cleverness and brilliance. At present, he does not pretend to be an expert on civil government. He has been out of the country for a long time, and he is not even well-informed on some of the things that might become campaign issues. He answers many questions, some think too many, with a frank "I don't know." But somehow that does not seem important. He has plenty of experts around him now who can supply him with the information that he needs. What impressed me is that Mr. Eisenhower—you may smile at the old-fashioned word but I can't describe him any other way—Mr. Eisenhower is a "good" man. You can't be around him long without feeling that goodness. It is a positive power, instilling confidence. Frankly, I have reached a conviction in these weeks that this goodness is something that America needs right now more than anything else.

This was the verdict not of a partisan but of an astute observer of the political scene.

The history of the last 3 years is the validation of Mr. Reston's judgment. May I express the hope that the memory of those years will shape standards by which we judge the fitness of all men for public service. America from this point on is going to need more than anything else a leadership of goodness—not goodness of a sticky, sentimental kind but the goodness symbolized by this homestead, the goodness inherent in simplicity, honesty, and courage, the goodness passed on to us in the lives of those whose roots reach back to these acres.

Fort Worth: 100 Years of Progress or When the West Began Beginning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on the banks of the Trinity River in Texas, a city rises out of the open prairie. It is Fort Worth, where the West begins. It is the capital and queen city of west Texas, a 120,000 square mile domain.

Down the canyon of West Seventh Street the wind whistles off the plain at 45 miles an hour between tall buildings that stab at the sky as if pointing the direction of Fort Worth's future. It is a friendly, big, garrulous, open-hearted town. Here live 350,000 people in this year 1956.

All of this began 100 years ago with four events noted at the time by only a handful of interested and determined settlers. In 1856, the first general school was created by community action. The first industry was launched. A post office was established. And in that fateful year, by dint of undaunted determination, Fort Worth became the county seat.

The future was pregnant with promise. Fort Worth's hour of destiny had not yet struck, but the wheels of history had been set in motion.

Only 6 years earlier, the United States Army had founded here on the untamed prairie a fort, charged with the mission of protecting the increasing wagonloads of settlers from the ravages of the savage Indian tribes which roamed the area.

In 1853, with the thin edge of settlement pushing westward, the fort had been abandoned and in its place had sprung up a tough-rooted little civilian community on a bluff overlooking the Trinity Valley and the southward tilt of the rolling plain.

Other settlements, to be sure, had clawed a tenuous foothold in this new frontier. Others opened schools and post offices, hopefully started infant industries, became county seats.

But there was, even then, something about the spirit of this frontier village which marked it for permanency. It was like a hardy little prairie flower, determined not to wither on its vine under the scorching southwestern sun.

Wagon trains of settlers were rolling westward, looking for a place to get a new start and stake the family future. Some 30 miles to the east lay Dallas, already established, like a roadblock across the trail.

When the wagons rumbled through on the westward track, Dallas men would stop them with lurid tales of danger to the west. "The Indians will surely scalp you if you venture to Fort Worth," they warned. Here, perhaps, began Fort Worth's much vaunted early reputation as a wild and woolly place.

Here, too, began an intense rivalry which has raged for a hundred years. Picking up the challenge, the Fort Worth settlement sent riders to intercept the wagons east of Dallas and escort them to Fort Worth along a trail that bypassed the neighboring village.

And here, also, was born a tradition of resourcefulness in building a city. Fort Worth had no doctor. When Julian Field, a leading community figure, became ill, it was necessary to send to Dallas for young Dr. Carroll Peak. The townspeople immediately set upon him with blandishments. They would not hear of his leaving. He and his wife were put up in an abandoned barracks, and he stayed in Fort Worth.

Unwilling to trust the schooling of the children to the erratic comings and goings of wandering tutors, the infant community in 1856 called an election, chose a school board, imported two regular teachers, and erected a crude school building.

The first industry, appropriately enough, was milling. Julian Field, R. S. Mauk, and David Man built a gristmill to make flour from the wheat brought in from neighboring farms.

The nearest post office was Dallas. Dr. Peak hired a horseman to ride over semiweekly and bring back all missiles addressed to Fort Worth's residents, and for this service he charged a dime a letter. In 1856, President Franklin Pierce recognized the new community carved out of the frontier by appointing Julian Field as the postmaster, and Fort Worth built its own post office.

The dauntless tradition then aborning was most dramatically portrayed, however, in the circumstances surrounding the removal of the county seat to Fort Worth from Birdville, then a separate village some 5 miles to the east.

A delegation went to Austin, buttonholed lawmakers, finally prevailing upon the legislature to call an election in which Tarrant County's settlers could choose between the two villages for their seat of justice.

The competition was keen, if not entirely clean. As an added lure to voters, Birdville leaders cached a big barrel of whisky in an oak grove at the edge of town. Fort Worth merchants, with less propriety but not to be outdone, stationed huge barrels of free whisky on the public square. Adding insult to injury, an overzealous group of Fort Worthers stealthily made their way into Birdville's grove and siphoned away their neighbors' liquor, leaving the adversary dispirited in more ways than one.

Riders went out from both cities in all directions to round up voters. It was afterward contended that the total vote far outnumbered the aggregate male population of the county, but a precise census was virtually impossible.

Sam Woody, of Decatur, told in later years of having brought in 14 men from Wise County to vote for Fort Worth that day in 1856. When all ballots were in, Fort Worth had carried the election by seven votes.

That night a torchlight procession gleefully made its way to Birdville and physically removed the courthouse effects, then and there conveying them to their new and permanent home.

This same instant resourcefulness and unashamed partisanship have characterized every step of Fort Worth's ascent up the ladder to eminence.

Two decades later, the Civil War-disrupted Texas economy was pulled out of the doldrums by the cattle drives which took bawling herds of rangy longhorns up the long, dusty trail to Abilene, Kans. It was in this era that Fort Worth, still a drowsy hamlet of but a few hundred people, seized upon opportunity and became the base of supply for West Texas stockmen.

Adjusting its pace to the trail-driving age, the town provided a welcome release for the pent-up energies and appetites of the cowhands after long, dull months on the range. It was a noisy, lusty, brawling place, but nobody cared. The cowboy was king; and this was Cowtown.

The open sesame for any aspiring township of the day was a railroad, and Fort Worth set out to have one. In the 1870's B. B. Paddock, editor of the Fort Worth Democrat, displayed the town's unrestrained ambition when he published a drawing that he called the Tarantula Map. Its center was a heavy blob denoting Fort Worth, while lines, like the hairy legs of the huge Southwestern spider, reached out in 9 directions to represent the 9 railroads which the editor prophesied would 1 day serve the town. Although rival towns scoffed, his prediction eventually came to pass.

With enthusiasm, Fort Worth leaders set out to promote their first railroad. An agreement was struck whereby the Texas & Pacific would be given large land grants from the State of Texas and 320 acres at Fort Worth, donated by such local enthusiasts as Van Zandt and Daggett, upon the condition the road reached Fort Worth by January 1, 1874. Work was begun, and the town danced with excitement over the prospects.

Catastrophe loomed when the powerful northern financial house of Jay Cook & Co. went broke. Risk capital froze in panic throughout the Nation, and the twin rails were halted in the middle of nowhere, several miles east of town.

Not to be denied, Fort Worthers determined they would have the road completed, if they had to build it themselves, foot by painful foot. They organized the Tarrant County Construction Co., subscribing its stock with cash, materials, labor, supplies—whatever they had. A bargain was driven with the T. & P., whereby the local company agreed to prepare the roadbed, the railroad to lay the track.

In a dramatic night-and-day race against time, with townswomen bringing food and coffee to the perspiring workmen and section crews resorting to the most unorthodox improvisations, the tracks were laid and an old wood-burning engine puffed into town to beat the second deadline set by the State legislature.

A churning cauldron of activity then erupted upon the prairie. Oliver Knight in his excellent work, Fort Worth, Outpost Upon the Trinity, from which most of this information was derived, has said that this was "by all odds the greatest day in the history of Fort Worth," pointing out that within a few weeks after the first train rolled into town 59 new busineses had opened, and that within 4 years there were no less than 460.

Now joined to the East by railroads, the rapidly growing city attracted a web of stagecoach lines, becoming in 1878 the eastern terminal for the world's longest stage route which stretched for 1,500 aching miles to the California border at Fort Yuma, Ariz.

The Fort Worth story is one of vision, and of a community's ability to adapt to changing circumstances. While money flowed into town on the wings of transportation and cattle drives, Fort Worth was not content to soak up this boon with the impassivity of a sponge. Why not capitalize permanently upon these two advantages?

On Fort Worth's old North Side, where all the accoutrements of the early West are still much in evidence, a group of farsighted leaders founded the Texas Dressed Beef & Packing Co. A stockyard and slaughtering pens were built. Meat was dressed and shipped under refrigeration to the eastern markets, and the plant paid ranchmen 50 cents a head above the prevailing Kansas City price.

The taproot was driven deeper into the bruised soil upon the Trinity's banks. Fort Worth had industry.

It was then, near the turn of the century, that an air of real permanence began to settle upon the ebullient Cowtown. Other industries slowly took hold. Municipal improvements came in a wave—a dependable water system, sanitary sewers, street paving and a modern fire department. Law and order took firmer grasp, churches thrived and women's clubs burst upon the scene.

The boisterous, rough-neck town was growing up. Like a self-conscious overgrown farm youngster in the city, the seam-splitting prairie colossus developed a newfound interest in higher education.

The Methodists in 1881 founded Polytechnic College on the present Texas Weslyan site, then some 4 miles southwest of Fort Worth.

The Christian church in 1889 took over Add-Ran Institute, began in Fort Worth as early as 1869 but moved by its founders to Thorp Springs to avoid "the alluring vices of the city." The Church transplanted the Institution for a time in Waco, then brought it home to Fort Worth in 1910 as Texas Christian University.

In that same year, the Baptists opened Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary which has flourished ever since.

But even with the stabilizing influences of culture, the spontaneity of fierce community pride continued. With the new century came the automobile, and Fort Worth took up the craze.

In their penchant for new horizons, the town's civil leaders forsaw that highways would one day be the new arteries of commerce. The State adopted a constitutional amendment in 1904 permitting counties to issue road bonds, and with characteristic vision Tarrant County became the very first in the entire Southwest to approve road and bridges bonds for $1,600,000.

Aviation evoked immediate enthusiasm in Fort Worth. The first daredevils to schedule a barnstorming tour through this part of the country made the mistake—or perhaps it was not a mistake for them, as it turned out—of booking an exhibition in Dallas but none in Fort Worth. This would not do. Amon Carter raised a public subscription and paid the four-man troupe $5,000 to demonstrate their talents in Fort Worth.

Fort Worth became an early aviation center at the outset of World War I. The Canadian Government established three flying fields near the city—Hicks Everman, and Benbrook—where pilots were trained for the Royal Canadian Flying Corps.

In recent years, Fort Worth has carved itself a permanent niche in the history of aviation. During World War II, its Convair plant performed the impossible in production of our B–24 Liberator bombers. And in 1949 a new epoch in world history may even have come into being with the very first nonstop flight around the earth, originating and ending at Fort Worth's Carswell Air Force Base.

It is today the home of one of the world's most thoroughly modern international airports, known as Amon Carter Field.

As it had become the capital of the cattle industry, Fort Worth in the 1920's again grasped the elusive figure of opportunity and gambled on oil. With the throbbing exhilaration of west Texas boomtowns, Fort Worth girded itself as the gateway and supply base for the oil kingdom.

Just bring out something new, and it will find a home in Fort Worth. In 1921, Harold Hough held the torch of vision which had lighted the wilderness for Cowtown's early planners when he pioneered radio with WBAP. Twenty-seven years later, Fort Worth had the first television station in Texas.

The most recent sales management survey indicates that during the decade just ended. Fort Worth was the fourteenth fastest-growing city in the Nation. In the latest census of manufactures, Fort Worth's rate of industrial growth is shown to outstrip that of any other industrial center in the United States.

Today, the city's skyline glistens in the bright Texas sunlight. The rather tired old courthouse overlooks the Trinity in the same spot where the Army dragoons built their fort more than a hundred years ago. But in the city's heart pulsates the rhythm of change, of growth, of still untamed ambition. It dreams new dreams and still believes in a better tomorrow.

Appendix

Atomic Energy and Its Future Effects in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech entitled "Atomic Energy and Its Future Effects in Industry," which I delivered on September 24, 1955, before the executives' industrial relations conference, sponsored at Valley Forge, Pa., by the Past Presidents Association of the Pennsylvania Industrial Management Clubs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY AND ITS FUTURE EFFECTS IN INDUSTRY

(Address by Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland, before the executives' industrial relations conference, sponsored by the Past Presidents Association of the Pennsylvania Industrial Management Clubs, September 24, 1955, Valley Forge Military Academy, Wayne, Pa.)

It is my intention today to discuss some aspects of the industrial future of atomic energy. This great new source of power and varied tool for industrial applications has received much attention recently. I may be able to suggest very few new uses to a group of informed men who have followed the public press and listened to the radio. But I do have fresh impressions to offer you, based upon my experiences at the Atoms-for-Peace Conference in Geneva. I also can offer some thoughts on the future of the atom from the vantage of the Senate, as I have studied these problems in Washington.

I think it is safe to say that no one can really know what exciting new developments will come from atomic research already completed or underway today. It does seem certain that it is destined to bring about great changes, improving our lives and creating fresh business opportunities. Although life will go on much as it always has, with many serious economic problems remaining to be solved, nonetheless the atomic future shows greater promise than the so-called realists were conceding not so long ago. And these changes are coming sooner than many expected.

We can recall the first announcements of our conquest of nuclear fission made at the close of World War II. Public speculation ran all the way from fearing the world would blow up in some chain reaction carried beyond human control to stories of a world with all goods virtually free. Our automobiles were to run for a year on a small pill dropped in a tank of water. Both the military hazards, great though they may be, and the peacetime uses, promising as they are, were exaggerated in that first flush of excitement.

Then it became popular to debunk the atom. The bombs were shown to do little damage to many types of targets, and to be insignificant as compared with the power of nature on a rampage in a hurricane or a flood. Power costs were demonstrated to be very high and shielding problems of radiation too great to warrant the use of mobile powerplants. While the public debunking became more scientific and conclusive, the secret work in our laboratories and those of other countries continued.

Now a large number of the debunking claims are clearly obsolete just as were the first stories which went to the other extreme. The so-called little bombs which were dropped on two Japanese cities have been superseded by giant fusion weapons of many megaton yields. Their radioactive fallout can destroy great nations. These weapons at first were also "debunked" as nondeliverable, but that has changed, too. There are aircraft in being that can deliver such weapons. We all know these things, and one of the adjustments of our life, economic and political, must be to these realities.

But fortunately, the understanding of the atom has brought great promise of good as well. If we have faith in man's future, and in the future of America, we must believe that its potential for good is even greater than its potential for destruction. Mankind must develop the wisdom to make this true, for it is in his power to do so.

Developments in the laboratories are coming so fast that we cannot now see all the applications which will be made of this new knowledge. It is most important that we sustain our effort in research, to push back the frontiers of the unknown in the basic sciences. This is necessary if we are to achieve the practical applications of the atom which seem to rest in it. For example, one of the most exciting discussions at Geneva involved the possibilities of harnessing the fusion method of the so-called hydrogen bomb to create controlled release of energy. This would be a tremendous step forward. But much hard work will be required to make it a reality, if it can be done. New basic research will have to aid this effort.

But while we are waiting for this kind of development, and others still more startling, there is already available for the taking a tremendous business future in the atomic field. For convenience of discussion, let me suggest by categories some of the opportunities which confront businessmen.

ATOMIC POWER

Large power plants now being built in this country, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union will not deliver power at very low cost. This is because they are based upon simple and tested designs of a rather primitive nature. Our first of this type is, of course, here in Pennsylvania at Shippingport. The British equivalent is the plant at Calder Hall which will probably be in operation sooner. The presently operating Soviet plant outside Moscow is only a tenth the size of our plant. But the Russians also seem to be in the preliminary steps of developing some large plants, quite possibly as soon or sooner than this country.

Such plants, whatever their delivered power cost, will give an invaluable amount of experience so necessary to the lowered cost revolution which can be expected. Presently published data indicate that improved breeder and homogeneous reactors offer power prospects whose costs will rival the lowest of modern thermal or hydroplants. We can expect additional powerplant construction to come at an accelerated pace. This may rival the great railway boom of a century ago.

The significance of these developments is at least threefold. In the first place, there is the promise of tremendous capital expenditures which will help to expand our whole national economy. In the second place, the location of new industries will be oriented less by bodies of coal or oil or gas, than by markets and other resources. In the third place, the threat of rising power costs caused by the exhaustion of the most accessible chemical fuels will not be the danger it was.

But probably it is necessary to add one qualification to this very happy outlook. It is apparent that power will not be free. The capital investment in facilities for the preparation of atomic fuels, for the operation of the pile, and for the recycling of spent fuels will be very great. There is also the normal investment cost for turbines and for electric generating and distribution systems. The future is glorious enough without asking the impossible. This means that exploitation of our present knowledge of the atom will guarantee us fresh new supplies of power, soon at competitive costs. But there will not be any revolutionary cost reduction for those areas which already enjoy the advantage of moderate cost chemical fuels or good hydro sources.

One distinct impression I bring back from Geneva is the necessity for speedy development of moderate-sized atomic powerplants which operate with good efficiency. In the United States, our hope for making atomic power costs competitive has been to build much larger plants, in the range of from 50,000 to 250,000 kilowatts. This promises to bring us economies per kilowatt of capacity. Plants of such size at so early a stage of development of the science run the risk of becoming obsolete almost as fast as they can be completed. But we must build them for the invaluable experience they will give us. Only a rich country with very large supplies of both private and public capital can afford this kind of developmental risk.

The many delegates from the smaller countries of the world who came to Geneva were greatly impressed by what they saw and heard. Yet they knew, in many instances, that they will have only limited opportunities to share immediately in this new source of power. This is because they cannot afford to build very large atomic powerplants, and their needs are not yet for such concentrations of power output. They want experimental reactors, which our Government is prepared in the interest of world peace to help them construct.

They also would like moderate-sized plants which will produce usable power at a cost which is lower than they now pay in conventional plants.

It is important to recognize that one reason commercial atomic power in this country may have lagged, if indeed it has, behind that

of the United Kingdom and possibly the Soviet Union, is that most of our country already has available fairly cheap power from conventional sources. The business realities of breakeven costs have tended to rule out any rush to build atomic power plants on a purely commercial basis in competition with modern thermal plants or with favorably situated hydro sources. The only hope of breaking even, as I have suggested, has been with very large plants.

In many of these foreign countries, however, the problems are different. The British for example have faced many years of declining availability of cheap coal and rising needs for imported oil. The Japanese will face similar problems. The Russians are notably short of good fuel near their largest industrial cities of Moscow and Leningrad. Many other countries have been held back in their development by either a lack of fuel or by its very high cost. Some of these, then, are places where even a fairly primitive atomic power source which we would not consider competitive would be a great aid to the users. It is for this reason that some of the first spurts of construction in plants may come in foreign countries rather than in our own.

But we cannot afford to sit back, or to play a passive role in the development of these more modest power plants which other countries could use. We must apply ourselves to increasing the efficiency and lowering the costs of such plants, for they can be useful to us in several ways.

In the first place, such power plants developed by our know-how and our manufacturing companies will keep us in the atomic lead. We must do this in a rapidly changing world, where American strength is so important to our survival. In the second place, unless we demonstrate this kind of progressive cooperation, we are likely to find that foreign rivals both friendly and otherwise, will be taking the orders for equipment, supplying the technicians; controlling the fuel sources. This would isolate us from other peoples with whom we should maintain close relations in the interest of peace and prosperity.

In the third place, we must not neglect the advantages which can accrue to our own country if we develop competitive modest-sized power plants. We know that once electricity has been generated, there are great losses of that power if it must be transmitted any considerable distance. There are many parts of the United States which would enjoy a better development and be able to bring into full use their other resources if they were able to generate power at moderate cost without either long hauls of heavy fuel or long distance transmission of electric power. The established areas of our country should not worry about new home rivals brought by cheaper local power. The whole country can expect to go forward with the general growth and prosperity which is within our reach if we show the right wisdom in ordering our affairs.

For the future, we are faced with more speculative conclusions than the ones I have emphasized. Perhaps we will learn to convert on a large scale, atomic energy directly into electricity without having to go through a steam-turbine, heat-transfer cycle. Perhaps we will learn to control the fusion process. Perhaps there are other even more economical methods waiting to yield to determined research.

RADIOISOTOPES

I am sure that most of you are aware that the byproducts of atomic fission are more than a radiological hazard. These byproducts are some of the most surprisingly important consequences of the new peacetime use of the atom. After all, uranium, thorium, and plutonium are today only different fuels which are used to generate heat to create conventional power no less in cost than that available many places already. But the radio isotopes created in atomic piles have opened up a host of new applications limited only by the ingenuity and inventiveness of our people. There are almost certain to be many new uses for such isotopes in the years ahead; we have barely scratched the surface.

Among my listeners, almost certainly there are some who are making applications of these new tools for research and for production. In manufacturing we see how the introduction of small amounts of radioactive materials into a product can create the means for measuring the thickness of materials with great ease. The uniformity and thickness of coatings can be measured on a production line without taking time out for laborious analyses. With tracer elements it is possible to test the effectiveness of designs, such as internal friction and wear in engine parts. In the chemical industry the movement of catalysts, the travel and behavior of many elements can be identified for the first time.

Biology and medicine are making similar new aplications. Some of these are in basic research, particularly as tracer elements. But, also, anyone of us here may have a better chance to stay alive because of the availability of new tracer elements which can identify the functioning of parts of our bodies and locate troubles within them. An illustration of the dual use of isotopes is the ability of one of these materials to locate a brain tumor if present, and for another radioisotope to serve as a directed source of energy. It can selectively destroy cancerous cells which might be almost impossible to reach through surgery. Our supplies of these isotopes have been the equivalent of an almost unbelievable increase in the amount of radium available to hospitals everywhere. Radium is expensive, and only very small amounts are available. Now, for the same purpose, radio-cobalt can be used with much greater freedom from limitations in cost or quantity.

In the field of agriculture the isotopes are providing much help to research. Serving as tracer elements, it is possible to determine the effectiveness of fertilizers and methods of their use, the importance of specific elements in plant growth, and even to probe the secrets of photosynthesis. If we solve all the mysteries of how plants can create food from sunlight, carbon dioxide, and water we may change the problems of food shortage for those parts of the world which are feeling population pressure. We may be able to create new synthetic foods, industrial raw materials, and chemical fuels which will mean a more abundant life for our people. Many problems promise to yield to research made possible by the new applications of radioisotopes. Controlled exposure of foods to radiation may serve as an efficient substitute for refrigeration.

Some of you probably recall another application of isotopes which is both simple and effective, although one of the surprise bonuses of the new age. Now we control the movement of different batches of petroleum products through pipelines by introducing tracer elements which can be monitored along the way to identify the beginning and end of a particular shipment.

The opportunities for further applications are a matter of individual ingenuity, and many a small business in this country has as much chance to think up and apply these new uses as do the larger corporations. The size of the investment is often not a serious obstacle to success.

MOBILE SOURCES OF ENERGY

Although the day of the atomic-powered automobile is not here yet, there has been significant progress in learning how to use atomic energy to move vehicles. This, of course, has had its initial impetus under the pressures of military rivalry.

The *Nautilus* is now an operating reality, and the *Sea Wolf* will presently join the fleet, too. Not only do these submarines represent a significant advance in naval power to safeguard America, but they have immensely speeded the development of the land-based powerplants which I have discussed earlier. A larger seagoing reactor is likely to be installed in some of the big aircraft carriers of the *Forrestal* class. Not many people doubt that our country leads the world in military applications of mobile powerplants.

But our position as first partner in a world of friendly nations requires that we demonstrate leadership in peacetime use of atomic-powered ships. The President's dramatic plan to build an atomic-powered merchant ship which could tour the world as a floating exhibit of our peacetime atomic progress was a very important proposal.

I was the cosponsor of a bill this year introduced into the Senate to undertake the construction of such a ship. It was a simple and direct plan to give the President the authority he required to accomplish the construction of such a vessel at the earliest practical date. I hope very much that the Congress will again take up this bill and make it law. Such a ship, carrying an atomic powerplant would allow it to cruise for months at high speed without the necessity of refueling. It could give us invaluable experience for the day when perhaps most ships will carry such powerplants and do so with economy. Further, the kind of wonderful exhibits which I saw at Geneva, instead of being limited to the few people who can reach Switzerland would enable millions near the great seaports of the world to share in a glimpse of the new age we are entering so rapidly.

The nuclear-powered aircraft seems destined to come first in a military version, and our step-up of funds for research and prototype building suggests important breakthroughs in our attack on what had seemed like insurmountable problems. One of the most critical has been how to reduce the weight of shielding the airborne atomic pile required for the protection of the human beings in the craft. This problem is being solved, and we should see an atomic-powered plane in the air within a very few years. But here, too, conventionally-powered turbine planes are likely to have a long future, for passenger transports are not yet ready to shift to the newly designed atomic engines.

On land, it is likely that the first practical application of mobile atomic power will be in a railway locomotive. Because shielding is still a problem, few other vehicles are immediately ready to carry the weight that will be involved. Detailed plans for an atomic-powered locomotive have been offered publicly in engineering circles. These designs may be further improved by new principles which allow the moderator-coolant-heat exchanger part of the pile also to serve as its shielding agent. If the concepts proposed for this advance prove successful, the day of both airborne and land-carried atomic power-plants will be greatly speeded.

The exhibits at Geneva were an eye-opener even to the most blase observer. The great variety of applications, the number of firms prepared to manufacture components were a revelation that the atomic age which has been hidden by security is about ready to burst forth with revolutionary swiftness. I have told you I think the atomic-powered ship with its traveling exhibit is a very necessary move in our world relations. I am of the opinion that the American people, even with the splendid coverage our press and radio give the news cannot be fully aware of these great changes until they see such exhibits first hand. For this reason when the Congress convenes again in January, I am going to offer a new bill to authorize the speedy construction of an atomic-powered railway locomotive. This forced development of a vital new device will speed the revolution

in domestic transportation, and will also serve the same purposes as the atomic-powered floating museum on the seas.

Such a locomotive could tour the United States pulling an exhibit train which would dramatize the changes coming. Every American could experience the thrill, and gain the vital knowledge good citizenship requires, of the atomic wonders which we can have. Almost certainly such an exhibit train as a result of its tour would stimulate new applications of atomic methods, and increase interest in capital expenditure for new atomic power sources. Thus it could do as much as any single act to spark our expansion in a new economic age.

CONCLUSIONS

Our Government has spent vast sums of money in creating its atomic industry, its nuclear weapons, and its prototype power sources. This has been necessary to launch so revolutionary a change. Government control was necessary, too, because there was a period where a major attempt to maintain security of information was important in a world torn by dissention.

But conditions have changed, and Geneva was living proof of this change. On the one hand, we have learned enough about the workings of the atom to be ready for aggressive development of the science and its engineering applications. Private capital, with opportunities unlimited for both large corporations and many small businesses, must find its own future in this field. It is only as we can make information available, and license more broadly the processes and materials of atomic energy that this American ingenuity can come into play on a broad front. This, it is most important that we do.

On the other hand, Geneva revealed that although our policies were wise at the earlier stage to maintain security of information, conditions in this respect have changed, too. Some of our secrets were stolen by rival powers. But in their own right, drawing upon a common fund of worldwide scientific knowledge and upon the resourcefulness of their own scientists and engineers, other countries are moving rapidly into applications of this atomic know-how. We can no longer pretend to any monopoly of such knowledge. This we must accept, and adjust our policies and our laws accordingly. For it is in our interest not only to share our information on peacetime uses of atomic energy, but to learn from other countries, too. Scientific knowledge has never been the monopoly of any one country, and the exhibits and the technical papers at Geneva certainly made this clear.

Of course, judgment must be used as to what we are to disclose, and we must show commonsense in knowing what is to be left hidden by security rules. We must decide what is to be licensed, and what is to be freely exchanged with other countries for mutual advantage. The reasons for this exchange are many, and some of them I have suggested already in my talk. They are partly military, partly political, and partly technical. Others are a matter of good business. Freedom of access to markets, of availability of fuels, of design competition, offer us the best hopes for rapid atomic development. Such development in turn will help to create a world in which all men including our own people will be more prosperous and contented.

Valley Forge is a name famous in American history. It combines for us memories of our own political revolution and military struggle against heavy odds and great hardships to create the country we love and serve today. It also suggests the industrial beginnings of our country. Now with the passage of time this region is part of the great industrial concentration of the Delaware Valley. In this part of the country, we know that a good future lies ahead, with proper effort made to develop our potentialities.

The facts now are different because we live in another age, but we must have the same spirit of faith in the future of our country and in our own ability to meet the challenges of today. Valley Forge is a fit symbol of the force which must motivate us to continue our development and to take in stride the industrial and political changes which the new atomic era will bring us.

Admiral Burke's Address at "Add" Wagner Homecoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Battle Creek, Mich., located in the Third Congressional District of Michigan, which I have the honor to represent, takes deep pride in the fact that a fellow-townsman, J. Addington Wagner, is the new national commander of the American Legion. Commander Wagner was elected to that post at the Legion's 37th national convention in Miami, Fla., last October 13.

Expressive of the pride felt by Battle Creek and the entire State of Michigan, was the Add Wagner homecoming ceremonies held in Battle Creek November 11 and 12.

Principal speaker at the dinner honoring Commander Wagner and his charming wife was Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy—a fitting recognition of Commander Wagner's own distinguished service in the Navy during the Second World War.

Under permission granted by this House, I include the text of the able address delivered on this occasion by Admiral Burke:

It is a welcome pleasure to be in Battle Creek today to attend the homecoming of the new national commander of the American Legion, Commander J. Addington Wagner.

It is a great honor and privilege to help pay tribute to this man who has contributed so much to his community, to his State, to the American Legion, to the United States Navy, and to the security of the United States.

The Navy is especially proud of Commander Wagner's contributions to his fellow citizens. We are proud of his work as a citizen and as a naval reserve officer. We are proud that the American Legion has placed great responsibilities on his shoulders. But more than anything else, we are proud of his fine World War II record as a fighting captain of a fighting man-of-war. Commander Wagner commanded a rocket ship off Okinawa until he was seriously wounded in action. After recovering from his wounds, he returned to command his ship ready to fight again, and then victory came. The Navy is grateful for his contribution to our combat record; and consequently, it is an honor to render to him the Navy's traditional salute today.

There is yet another reason why the Navy is happy to be in Battle Creek today. It offers the opportunity to visit the home port and honor the memory of a truly great American, the late Congressman Paul Shafer. Few people understood, loved, and supported the Navy and the Marine Corps as did Congressman Shafer. He was a keen student of military strategy. He made a lasting contribution to our national security. Our country is fortunate to have as his worthy successor Congressman JOHANSEN, who had the good fortune of long association with Mr. Shafer, and who is carrying forward in the same excellent manner as did his predecessor.

Battle Creek's record of progress is well known. It is the home of the healthy. Its advanced educational system, its wonderful churches and church attendance, dependable banking institutions, expanding industries, beautiful recreational facilities all testify to the achievements of the people of Battle Creek and the reasons why Battle Creek is one of the best-known cities of its size in the world.

Naturally, all of us are hoping for peace. But, we all know, too, that if war should come, either a limited war or an all-out global war, we must be prepared to win it. We must prepare for the worst kind of war and hope for the sake of humanity that it never happens.

In order to prepare for the future, a large measure of our country's national security depends upon the Navy's ability to do its job, on its ability to control and exploit the seas, on its ability to protect our own convoys and the convoys of our friends and allies. The Navy must be prepared to protect ships which carry our troops, our men, and the vital cargoes to United States forces deployed overseas. We must be prepared to make amphibious landings. We must be prepared both to lay and sweep mines. We must be prepared to attack with submarines and we must be able to kill enemy submarines as well. We must be able to destroy enemy surface raiders, to detect, intercept, and destroy enemy aircraft and missiles. We must be able to launch aircraft and missiles from the sea against seaborne targets and against land-based targets. In short, the United States Navy must retain its championship of the oceans. We must be able to threaten the enemy's entire periphery. We must be prepared to defeat any threat to our sea supremacy regardless of what the threat may be, regardless of when or from where it may originate. If the day ever comes when the United States Navy cannot do this, our country will be at the mercy of an enemy who can control the sea.

Let us now take a closer look at the progress currently being made in the art of naval warfare. First, I would like to take up amphibious warfare because that is the type of warfare in which Commander Wagner distinguished himself.

In amphibious warfare we are improving our capability to project our combat power across the seas. The material needs of modern armies and tactical air forces are greater than they have ever been before. Their equipment is bulky and heavy. To sustain them in combat requires tremendous quantities of fuel, ammunition, and other supplies. The transport of such vast quantities of men, equipment, and supplies can be accomplished only with ships, and if these forces and their equipment must be landed on hostile shores, this can be done only by employing the amphibious assault.

This does not mean, however, that we will use the same amphibious techniques that were employed during World War II. In fact, in the 10 years since the end of World War II, the Navy and the Marine Corps have developed an entirely new concept of amphibious assault—the vertical envelopment.

Speed, mobility, and flexibility are the essence of the new concept. We have increased

our speed in many ways. We are building faster ships to reduce the time en route to the landing area. We are developing faster methods of loading and unloading ships. We are testing landing craft equipped with hydrofoils which show great promise. We are employing helicopters in increasing numbers to speed up the initial assault and to provide tactical mobility for the troops. The helicopter permits us to launch an initial assault while our ships are still well out at sea. It enables us to project naval power, through the marines, deeply ashore. The helicopter permits the marines to concentrate and disperse rapidly once ashore. It permits us to keep our ships well dispersed as a passive defense measure against atomic attack. Its speed and mobility will facilitate the rapid concentration of marines to knock out enemy beach defenses and other strong points. It makes virtually any point of the enemy coastline vulnerable to amphibious assault. No longer are we compelled to use only the sandy beaches which can be strongly defended.

All types of Navy weapons will come into play during such an amphibious operation. We will need the fighters and bombers from our aircraft carriers. We will need the guns, rockets, and missiles from our cruisers, destroyers, and rocket and missile ships. All the research and effort that went into development of guided missiles over the last 10 years has now begun to pay dividends. Many members of the missile family have reached voting age.

Regulus, a surface-to-surface bombardment guided missile, is now ready for use against both land targets and sea targets. Regulus is a powerful and hard-hitting offensive weapon which greatly increases the striking power of the fleet. It is currently operational in some of our submarines, cruisers, and carriers.

The cruiser *Los Angeles* has had a Regulus capability for over a year. Carriers can launch this missile with their steam catapults. Some fleet submarines have been modified to carry and launch Regulus. This new bombardment missile gives the American naval task forces deployed overseas the ability to launch atomic attacks at a range of several hundred miles. Although the present Regulus missile travels at just slightly less than the speed of sound, an improved Regulus is now on the way. It will be used by the same ships as the current missile.

The Navy entered the nuclear propulsion stage in 1955 with the commissioning of the submarine *Nautilus*. We have entered the guided missile age with the commissioning of our first missile cruiser, the *Boston*.

The United States Navy is not the only navy interested in submarine-launched guided missiles. A Soviet admiral, Adm. L. Vladimirskiy, has strongly implied recently that Soviet submarines either have or will be equipped with guided missiles and atomic torpedoes. He laid great stress on the ability of submarines to attack enemy bases and coastal targets. The Soviet admiral put it this way: "One must realize that a submarine equipped with rocket weapons can be extremely dangerous for naval bases and other enemy targets. * * * Submarines which previously were provided with torpedoes and which operated with these weapons against enemy sea communications inflicted terrific losses to the Anglo-American merchant marine during both the First and Second World Wars. * * * The new rocket weapons which can be installed in submarines undoubtedly increase the submarines' striking power. They cannot only carry out traditional war activity against communication lines, but can also attack targets along the coasts. * * * The submarines' main weapon, the torpedo, can be provided with atomic explosives. This increases the striking power of the submarine to an extraordinarily high degree."

The Soviet admiral goes on to say, "In order to sink a battleship, 8 to 10 normal torpedoes are required, and to sink a cruiser, 3 to 4 are needed. These ships can be sunk or made useless by only 1 atomic torpedo, and it is not necessary for the torpedo to hit the ship."

The Soviet admiral made mention of mines, also. He said that, "during the years after the war (World War II) the mine has been developed and improved. It is known that the most serious threat to ships is the influence mine. That is to say, mines that will explode without touching the ship's hull. They will explode my magnetic, acoustic, hydrodynamics, or other effects which are generated by the ship. Such mines can be used advantageously for the defense of one's coast or to blockade ports and straits and disrupt the enemy's communications. Combatting such mines is very difficult, as the mines can be provided with different firing arrangements."

This Soviet admiral is not speaking idly, and unfortuantely, he is correct in this case.

It is true that submarine-launched missiles and submarine-launched mines could constitute a serious threat to our ports and to our coastal cities.

The United States has more than 6,000 miles of coastline exposed to attack from the sea. More than half of the major cities of the United States lie within 100 miles of the coastline.

The submarine at sea is the weapon of stealth. It is the weapon that even small navies can use effectively. A handful of submarines at sea, forces an opposing power to take many types of defensive precautions. A few submarines will force an opponent to protect his shipping, to provide harbor defense both for his continental and his overseas bases. They force him to establish antisubmarine patrols, to maintain hunter-killer forces, and naval air attack forces.

But the Soviet Navy has more than a handful of submarines. Latest published reports indicate they already have around 400 and they are currently building many more. Hitler started World War II with 57 submarines. On top of this, the Soviets have, since World War II, built more cruisers and destroyers than all the rest of the world combined. Their navy now ranks second in the world, and it's coming up fast—too fast.

Our Navy views the Soviet navy building program with grave concern. We have been building some new ships, too, although not nearly as many as the Soviets. We have built some new destroyers that have better seakeeping qualities, better armament, and better equipment than their World War II predecessors. These ships have better means of finding and killing the submarine. We are placing more submarine countermeasures aboard our ships and aircraft. We are building more intelligent and deadly torpedoes. We are building rocket-propelled antisubmarine weapons. We are building submarines to kill other submarines.

But one of the best ways to stop the submarine-launched missile and the mine is to kill the launcher before he gets to sea. That is where naval air striking power comes into the picture. We have improved our capability to strike retaliatory blows at enemy ports both with missiles and with supersonic aircraft. We can strike with supersonic aircraft from ships like the newly commissioned *Forrestal*. We have naval aircraft, such as the *Skywarrior* and the *Skyhawk*, that are capable of carrying any one of many types of atomic weapons. Last week it was my pleasure to witness the flight of our new *Seamaster*, an aircraft which has great promise in projecting our naval power from the sea. She performs beautifully in takeoff, in landing, and in flight. She has tremendous speed at low altitudes. In fact, she is the fastest low-altitude attack aircraft in existence today. She is the first of our naval seaplanes that will add much versatility, flexibility, and power to the Navy's ability to exploit the seas.

You will notice that all naval weapons have two things in common: They are mutually supporting and they are multipurpose. The submarine's guided missiles can destroy enemy naval bases or neutralize hostile beach areas. The submarine can launch mines or project marines on raids ashore. She can refuel and rearm the seaplane.

Our new destroyers are the nemesis of enemy submarines. They can destroy enemy surface raiders. They can shoot down enemy aircraft with guided missiles. They can provide early warning for the fast carrier task forces. They can defend convoys.

The aircraft carrier can launch missiles or supersonic aircraft.

The new seaplanes that are coming along can lay mines. They can do low-level reconnaissance. They will supplement the atomic wallop of the carrier task forces. And so it goes.

The Navy of today is a versatile, hard-hitting outfit. Tomorrow it promises to be even more versatile and it will hit harder.

As I mentioned earlier, it is to be devoutly hoped that wars will no longer be necessary, and one of the best deterrents to another war is for our country to remain strong—strong enough to win on the ground, in the air, and on the seas. To this philosophy our Navy is making concentrated effort.

A Tribute to Hon. John D. Dingell, of Michigan

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other Members of the House in expressing a tribute to an honored and esteemed colleague, JOHN D. DINGELL, of the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, who passed away on September 19, 1955.

The details of my beloved friend's distinguished career, his long record of accomplishments, have been recalled to mind by those who have preceded me this afternoon. I would like to join in the remarks of those members of the House who have so ably lauded the record that our departed colleague left as a stirring monument to his long and creative service in Congress. To their remarks I would like to add the view that the influence of JOHN DINGELL will be reflected in forward-looking social and economic legislation that may pass the Congress in the decades ahead.

I would not give this sad occasion appropriate recognition if I were not to express my great feeling of personal loss over the passing of my beloved and distinguished friend. The years of our mutual service in the House of Representatives, on the Committee on Ways and Means, and on the other groups on which we mutually served resulted in a warm personal friendship between us. During our association I learned not only to recognize his great foresight as a legislator and statesman but I also learned to esteem him as a friend and be honored by his friendship.

The people of America, his beloved family, and his colleagues in the Congress have sustained a great loss in the passing of JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, but we have each gained an inspiring record of achievement to use as a personal goal.

Mental Problems of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 14 million persons in the United States today who are over 65 years of age. Their number is increasing at the rate of 400,000 a year.

In view of the growing number of senior citizens in the Nation a symposium on gerontology in Cincinnati today takes on added importance.

The meeting, titled "Constructive Medicine in Aging: Problems of the Mind in Later Life," is the second annual symposium on gerontology sponsored by the Wm. S. Merrell Co., of Cincinnati. Producer of medicines since 1828, Merrell is recognized as a leader in gerontological research. It is directing currently over 50 percent of its research activities toward the development of new and better drugs for our older citizens.

Although gerontological research is comparatively new, several drug discoveries already have been made possible through research activities at Merrell.

The first drug, meratran, was released early in 1955. Dr. Howard Fabing, of Cincinnati, has reported it is highly effective in combating mild depression and emotional fatigue. Since these are often complaints of the older patient, the drug is valuable for geriatric use.

Frenquel, the second drug, was made available in December 1955. It is anticipated that this drug may provide new hope and a return to normal life for many mentally ill patients suffering from acute schizophrenic hallucinations.

Merrell also has produced tace, a unique type of estrogen valuable for treatment of certain ailments striking chiefly our older men and women. The Journal of the American Medical Association recently editorialized on the properties of the ideal estrogen and compared tace favorably with the ideal standards.

Merrell is aiding the medical profession's attempts to meet an impending challenge to our social stability. It is accepted generally that medicine has been largely responsible for prolonging life and now is gravely concerned with finding ways and means to make these extra years productive and enjoyable. Through the combined efforts of the medical and allied professions it is hoped that later years will become golden years.

Thus, this increasingly important challenge of medicine—the search for ways to make the sunset years productive and useful—is bringing several hundred doctors to Cincinnati to hear eight experts tell of the most recent developments in the field of mental problems of the aging.

Hon. Lamar Fleming, Jr.—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on December 14 the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas initiated what is hoped to be the first of a series of student conferences on national affairs. At this first meeting, aside from the distinguished guests, representatives from 47 colleges and universities were in attendance.

The keynote address was made by the Honorable Lamar Fleming, Jr., who, along with other influential men in Texas, urged and assisted the students in conducting this conference. Mr. Fleming is chairman of the board of Anderson, Clayton Co., of Houston. In 1953 he was appointed by President Eisenhower as Vice Chairman of the Randall Commission, which explored the foreign economic policy; and in 1954 he was a member of the United States delegation to Geneva to review and revise the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert herewith the text of Mr. Fleming's keynote speech which I commend to every Member of this body:

ADDRESS BY HON. LAMAR FLEMING, JR., BEFORE THE STUDENT CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS, AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE OF TEXAS, COLLEGE STATION, TEX., DECEMBER 14, 1955

I always appreciate being invited to College Station and feel at home and happy when I am here. Like many Texans, I am an immigrant from another State; but during my 31 years in Texas I have seen a great deal of A. and M. College, students, and faculty and of the fine people of the experiment station and extension service, largely because of the many interests held in common by a dealer and processor of farm products and by people who are dedicated to teaching and improving the science of agriculture. All of us in my company feel we owe a great deal to College Station.

If I say I like everything I have seen of A. and M., it does not signify disloyalty to Rice, of which I am a trustee. The fact is I had to leave the recent football game 4 minutes before its conclusion, when the score was Rice 12, A. and M. 0; so I didn't see the 4 minutes that changed the score to A. and M. 20, Rice 12.

I am especially happy and proud to be here at the first meeting of the first student conference on national affairs. I remember when four smart-looking cadet officers called on Norman Ness and me some months ago and told us of their plans for a conference on national affairs, for students from southern and southwestern States, which they hoped would develop into a regular annual event. I was fresh from a conference on agriculture held by the national assembly, an institution which President Eisenhower started when he was president of Columbia; and I was confident of the merit of carrying the American assembly plan into the undergraduate field. I did not know much then of the success which West Point has accomplished in that field, but later have learned that its experience provides not only a splendid guide but also vast encouragement for similar activities elsewhere in the country. So I was enthusiastic then and I am enthusiastic today; and Dr. Ness was no less so, which means more, since his judgment has the benefit of years of teaching in college and of dealing with international matters in the Treasury and the State Department. And I hope I am not in bad taste in adding that those young men made a lasting impression on us both and have made a complete Aggie of Ness.

I believe great problems are being solved for better and for worse and will be so solved, some of them in the remainder of my lifetime, and more of them during the lives of those who now are undergraduates. Their generation will inherit most of them, since mine approaches the age when they put old horses out to pasture. I envy the younger generation for the great opportunity it will have for good and for what I expect will be the greatest adventure in man's experience to date. I don't think it is extravagant to expect this adventure to be greater than any heretofore, having in mind that the speeds of communication and the amounts of energy which men command today must endow or curse their acts with impacts greater and more farflung than were possible at any earlier time.

And the place of the United States in the decisions and the adventure is greater than ever before; because the rapid growth of our economic power, while the economies of the other principal nations were being depleted by war upon their own soils, has created a situation in which civilization can look nowhere for leadership except to us. Ours is the responsibility to furnish that leadership and to point it in directions that will bring betterment of man's lot.

The responsibility is made greater by a menace to civilization that has spawned in the frustration and misery of peoples whom war and destitution had deprived of faith and hope. False prophets sold them the agelong fallacy that their relief lay in taking away from others and in a general sharing of everything as common property. It has not taken long for experience to prove that common property is state property, and that the actual beneficial owners of state property, and that the actual beneficial owners of state property are the men who run the state; so that the end result of what is falsely called communism is that those who can grasp the position of rulers own everything, including the rest of the people. The beautiful name of communism turns out to be a misnomer for totalitarian despotism.

There is something about this outlaw type of order which makes it incompatible with types of government and society where the individual really owns himself and owns the things that he produces and saves and where government and order are administered in accord with the will of the majority. The outlaw rulers, having achieved their pinnacles by violence, fear violence from below and maintain a regime of terror to suppress it; and they fear violence from outside and feel not only that they must keep their peoples on something approximating a perpetual war footing but also must maintain assiduous campaigns to subvert, undermine, and eventually bring about the collapse of the more orthodox orders and governments of other countries, particularly neighboring countries and countries strategically located. On the one hand, the burden of perpetual

military preparation overtaxes the resources and energy of their subjects, at the expense of the productivity that is left for satisfaction of human needs and desires. On the other hand, the unceasing buildup of military might and of subversive forces presents a menace to all who are determined to maintain and cherish faith and hope.

It will be the awesome responsibility of the younger men who will have the guardianship of human destiny in the years ahead to dissolve this dragon with the solvents of wisdom and virtue, which we pray will be the outcome, or else to vanquish him. That responsibility will be not just to their generation but to all generations to come.

I don't mean to imply that any generation will complete the whole task. Impatient or frantic action, or insistence on getting everything done at once, is one of the easiest ways to failure. Success comes a step at a time, with the objective of each step limited to the means of accomplishment available at the time.

The American people were slow to recognize the leadership responsibility which destiny had placed upon them through the First War's upsets to the previous power equilibrium. They do not yet recognize generally how greatly this responsibility now has increased, after the Second War left such vacuums of power and then as the Russian rulers forged their power from the subjugation and misery of Russians and other subjected or subverted peoples.

To discharge our responsibilities, we need understanding of the forces that govern phenomena in the relations between people and in those between peoples and that affect the course of their happiness, welfare, and safety. In the physical sciences, we study the forces that govern physical phenomena, seeking scientificaly to find the laws that determine the effect which will follow a given cause. So we learn and make use of the immutable laws of physics and chemistry—and those of biology, botany, and agriculture, which seem less immutable because we cannot always discern all the collateral causes. We can be less satisfied with our studies of human phenomena, through philosophy, economics, government, and, above all, history. History is the record of all human experience. A thorough study of that experience certainly can reveal sequences of cause and effect that are invariable. Many of these sequences stand out so clearly that we can be sure they are immutable laws; but nation after nation and generation after generation have committed over and over again the acts that history advertises as causes leading inevitably to disaster.

We know we must produce more physicists, chemists, and engineers. But it seems to me even more important that we undertake ourselves to become and to induce the rest of our countrymen to become more enlightened scholars in history, the experience of man, so that we may learn to find and read the signposts of destiny. And we must go about it with mental honesty and objectivity, seeking through history to learn the true laws of human phenomena, rather than reading it for the interest of the story or to find support for our national self-satisfaction or for preconceived predilections. This conference and those that will follow it through the years have the opportunity to show men how to pursue this search with greater effort and objectivity.

I have touched upon the outstanding present power of the United States and Russia. Economic strength is the principal base of our power. The principal base of the Russian power appears to be the regimented strength of hordes of Russians and subject peoples, maintained continually on a war footing regardless of the cost in denial of human satisfactions, complemented by the subversion weapon, to undermine other nations from within.

The contrast between the power of the United States or Russia and the power of any other country is so great that the statesmen of other countries must look to one or the other if seeking an association to improve their country's security. In some countries of Asia and perhaps of Africa, where the people's emotions are stirred by recent emancipation from European rule or by ardent aspiration for emancipation from it, and where inexperienced new native rulers have not been able to cope with poverty and disorder, many of the leaders lean toward Russia and Communist China and many among the people are gullible to the false promises of communism. In the countries where the individual's free possession of himself and of the products of his labor and savings are an inherited principle, the peoples regard Russia with loathing and fear, the more so the closer they are to her. The statesmen of these countries aspire to no alliance except with us; although some of them, in countries close to Russia, dare not form alliances with us for fear of Russian reprisals. And in some of the countries generally favorable to partnership with us, there are difficult economic conditions and consequent chronic unemployment and want, which tend to make some of the population susceptible to the subversive blandishments at which the Russians are so skilled.

Generally speaking, the peoples who look to us as friend-in-need are those with ingrained traditions of individual freedom and property rights and those who have progressed most economically. Generally speaking, the peoples most susceptible to Russian blandishments are those who feel themselves captives of another power, or who but recently have emerged from that kind of captivity, or who suffer the greatest economic want.

From this, I think we can see which nations logically want association with us. In England, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, France, the Lowlands, and Germany, the traditions of individual freedom and personal property are fundamental, and the material conditions of the people are far above the average for the world (though not equal to ours). These nations clearly belong on our team, provided we have the wisdom and capacity to make it and keep it a winning team and provided we keep it the kind of team in which all concerned see hope of betterment of their lots.

Hon. Lamar Fleming, Jr.—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, herewith the second portion of the speech of the Honorable Lamar Fleming, Jr., before the student conference on national affairs at the A. and M. College of Texas follows:

There are other countries, where the traditions of individual rights are less ingrained or less generally conceived and where poverty is more extensive, which nevertheless logically belong on our team, provided the team, and particularly the United States, is clearly committed to sincere and steadfast cooperation in the betterment of the lots of all its members. I do not mean do-goodism for charity's sweet sake, which is a field that might best be left to private generosity; I mean the kind of cooperation that will benefit customers and partners and benefit us in the long run.

Then there are the countries, previously mentioned, recently emancipated from foreign rule, where the economies and public order are handicapped by political ineptitude or immaturity, the countries where the inhabitants are stirred by desire for emancipation from rule by other races, and finally what we might call the aboriginal countries, whose peoples have not attained to a level of civilization at which order is conceivable unless administered by people of more advanced races. In all these countries, there are the elements of frustration or discontent and of resentment of the gulf between their standards of welfare and those of the more fortunate nations, which are the materials that Russian subversion works upon. On the other hand, this gulf between standards breeds also an ardent desire among these peoples for improvement in their material lot; and this aspiration is a material which we can work upon. Some of the first group of countries lie close to Russia or China and so are particularly vulnerable to subversion or invasion; and this introduces an element of fear of the Communists, which can draw them to the Red fold if the fear becomes paramount, but on the other hand can draw them our way if we can give them the conviction that our team can assure their security.

The degree of success of our adventure will depend to a very great extent upon the number of countries of these various categories that will be attracted to our team and upon the degree of wholeheartedness of their teamwork. That in turn will depend largely on us, on our wholehearted dedication to maintaining a joint military power that will justify nations in risking their security with our team and to developing and maintaining an economic teamwork that will afford the prospect of greater welfare and abundance for the peoples of all the members of the team. And of course it will depend greatly upon the wisdom, reasonableness, and humility with which we play our part. I would stress this word "humility"; for we come as amateurs to a major role in world affairs, in which it will be wise to respect the wisdom of partners of longer experience and also to respect the sensitivity of those whom circumstances have moved from leadership to secondary status. And perhaps humility and patience are needed even more in our relations with the races of other colors, where great gulfs in understanding have still to be crossed by both sides and where low material standards and political immaturity enlarge the problems of sensitivity.

The military and strategic angles of our task are of paramount importance; but I have no competence to discuss them. I will talk only about the economic phases.

Our opportunity in this field is to develop and maintain a system of economic relations between the members of the team that will make it clearly the interest of their nationals to continue within the team, and the interest of the nationals of other countries that their countries should join the team, or else maintain friendly and cooperative relationship with it if and so long as special circumstances deter them from full membership.

How can this be done? It becomes a question of how we and those of our partner nations who enjoy the greatest relative economic strength can facilitate and expedite improvement in the material lot of the peoples that we want to attract to our team or win to friendly cooperation.

Before attempting to deal with this question, I think we should review the ways in which human beings have improved their lots in the past. I ask your indulgence in case my review of this appears to be very elementary.

There are two ways a person can improve his material lot. One is to take away from

someone else, if he can. The other is to work hard and efficiently and produce more, making the best of the resources and talents available.

According to the story, Robinson Crusoe made the best use he could of the resources that he found on his lonely island, with only 1 brain and 2 hands at his command, until Man Friday entered the scene. After he and Friday found each other, 2 brains and 4 hands worked in unison, to accomplish things that half the number could not accomplish. This was possible because the two men respected each other and avoided the waste of time and effort that might have been consumed in thieving from each other and fighting each other. So they produced more and enjoyed more. And they did not merely double the production of which one alone would have been capable; because, by dividing tasks, each was able to specialize on the tasks at which he was most adept, so that the product was multiplied by much more than two.

This is a rudimentary illustration of what classically is called division of labor. In any community of persons who understand and bear good will toward each other, it develops naturally that different members of the community specialize on tasks at which they are or can become singularly adept, to then exchange products and services with one another through trade. Such a development, once begun, goes on progressively to an ever more specialized specialization. And, of course, with the successive steps of specialization, the products multiply progressively, in variety, quantity, and quality; so that the result is progressive increase and imprvement of the things and services which all enjoy.

At an early stage, some members of the community applied themselves to invention and creation of useful things that were not destined for consumption. Among the early examples of such things were primitive clothing and housing, to help maintain the health necessary for effective work, and primitive tools, commencing with such things as a wooden spear and a rock fastened to the end of a stick for hunting, and a forked limb for use as a grub hoe and later for use as a plow after man had domesticated draft animals. These things, created for subsequent use, had the nature of savings, because the labor of fashioning them was devoted not to the satisfaction of immediate wants but to the facilitation and enhancement of future production. Except for surpluses of directly consumable goods produced for later consumption, they were the only useful kind of savings before the institution of money evolved. They were the capital of primitive times.

Division of labor started in the family community and then expanded into larger communities. Prerequisites were the development of understanding between members of the community, which could not advance far except as a language was developed so that they could communicate with each other, and the development of mutual trust and good will, which could not grow faster than the progress of mutual understanding. So the earliest specialized economic cooperation was within the family, then the clan, and then the tribe—within the circle of those who had a common language. Generally it was confined to small areas, because of absence of long-distance communication and contact, except where rivers, seas, or unforested plains facilitated the mobility of man and broadened the contacts of a community with other communities.

By degrees, as men learned to move about on rivers, seas, horses, and camels, contacts were multiplied and tribes and communities began to learn the languages of others with whom they came in contact and to merge local or tribal languages into new languages that were more widely used.

As man's ability to transport goods by water, pack animals, and later by roads expanded, the exchange of the surplus products of specialized individuals, groups, and communities with other specialized individuals, groups, and communities expanded into an extensive commerce through barter. But barter is a limited instrument, because it is based on the swapping of a given value of one article for an equal value of another article. For instance, a merchant from a camel-breeding community, learning that a hundred camels were needed in a grain-growing community, would make the entire swap if his community wanted a quantity of grain of the value of a hundred camels, but not if his community wanted less grain than that. So someone conceived of the introduction of a new kind of article of exchange—things generally precious, imperishable, and easily transportable, outside the realm of consumable things—which a man in the position of this camel dealer would accept, because he knew that someone would accept them at full value from him later on. This started the institution of money, the balancer of temporary imbalances of trade.

Many kinds of articles served as the early moneys for commercial exchange in different parts of the world. Precious stones enjoyed the greatest acceptability until gold and silver were introduced and eventually coined.

Hon. Lamar Fleming, Jr.—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following is the third portion of Mr. Fleming's remarks:

This was a great step in the advancement of division of labor. Up to then the only forms of savings useful to production, that is capital, were land and physical improvements, and tools that the individual could fashion or obtain by barter for his surplus products; and the individuals and communities that became rich through surplus production were inclined to put much of the proceeds of their surplus into land and unproductive things, like splendid buildings and the Pyramids. The invention of money provided a vehicle for savings in a readily exchangeable medium. The thrifty thus could convert their surplus production over a period of time into money, with a view to ultimate use of it for purchase of tools to multiply their productivities. The especially successful might accumulate enough to provide tools and equipment to multiply the production of others, for use under arrangements varying from slavery in some societies to wage-employment in others. And gradually systems were developed of using saved money in ways involving more complex cooperation—loans for interest to help others to buy and benefit by tools and equipment, and investment in shares of the enterprises of others—both of which enabled others to produce more than they could have on their own resources.

Division of labor also made possible specializations in study, exploration, and invention, without which we would enjoy but a fraction of the knowledge, resources, and enjoyable products that we enjoy today. It made possible the general services which we enjoy today—maintenance of order for the protection of all of us; transportation, from the humblest country road to the finest rail, air, and ocean lines; communication services; light and power; banking and insurance; services of education and health; and countless advantages that multiply the productivity of our hours of effort and minimize the wastage of them through time lost in thieving and defense against thieving, in getting to and from our work, in sickness, in misguided endeavors, and in many other ways.

It is estimated that our 65 million American workers have the use of privately owned plant and equipment of a value of some $700 billion to multiply their productivity, together with $160 billion of publicly owned facilities like roads, schools, hospitals, and other public plants that serve their production directly and indirectly. Taken together, these multipliers of productivity amount to $13,000 per worker. It is largely due to this wealth of machines and facilities that the American economy has achieved a level measurable by full employment, by over $1,850 gross earnings per man, woman, and child before taxes, equal to $1,640 of disposable income, and by 61 million automobiles and 55 million telephones in use, together with fabulous numbers of radio and television sets and of the many new appliances to save effort in household work. Despite the taxes we are paying to support enormous budgets for the Armed Forces and for foreign aid, we are living infinitely better than we or any other people ever lived, and much better than the present living scale of any other people except our Canadian neighbors.

Let us seek the reasons for this contrast between our present and past conditions and between our conditions and those of other peoples.

One obvious reason is that our country was spared the invasions and bombings that were visited upon other nations during the last two wars; so that the expansion of our productive plant was accelerated during both of them, while the plant of some of the other leading nations was losing more through destruction than it was gaining through new construction. This is a very important difference, but it is only a partial explanation of the contrasts in welfare. We have to look farther back for more fundamental explanations.

The American Colonies were settled by people who came from European countries that had long been under a politico-economic regime which history calls mercantilism. The feudalism of Western Europe, in which the baron substantially owned the land and people of his community, under a tenuous allegiance to the remote monarch, had given way to relatively absolute monarchy, as the development of road systems gave the king's forces the mobility to assert their power over the barons. Having established supremacy over the barons, the kings directed their ambitions to enlargement of their kingdoms, at the expense of neighboring kings and princes, and toward a race for preemption of the new lands which navigators had discovered in the Western and Southern Hemispheres and in the Orient. This was a contest through centuries cluttered with wars and intervening periods of cold war that was at least as hot as our cold war today. The monarchs and their ministers, seeking every resource and weapon that could be devoted to the contest, soon recognized the importance of a productive economy as source of supplies and funds and they organized step by step the regimentation of their national economies under their control. They developed their overseas colonies as tributary dependencies, designed to contribute supplies and funds to the mother country. Having appreciated the importance of supplies and trade to themselves, they developed blockade and privateering as a means of denying supplies and trade to their antagonists; and they sought by all means to confine the trade of their colonies to themselves and keep it away from their antagonists. These interferences with trade put a premium upon economic self-suffi-

ciency for all the governments involved, with the result that all kinds of protective measures were introduced to foster the development of national productions of articles regarded as essential and reduce dependence upon imports.

The effect of mercantilism was a regimentation which paralyzed initiative and a compartmentalization of trade that tended to frustrate division of labor. Another effect was that too much of the proceeds of production was channeled into warlike expense and royal palaces, away from expansion of productive plant.

The early American Colonists probably had no more antipathy for mercantilism than their cousins who remained in Europe; but they were confronted with a very seamy side of it. They were its instruments, far away from the mother country's center of power to protect them. Tribute was demanded of them, freedom to trade with others was denied them, and help in time of adversity and protection against Indians and other Europeans was so far away that it often came too late and in insufficient measure. To survive, they had to learn self-reliance rather than reliance on the mother country. To prosper, they had to resist the demands and prohibitions from the mother country. So a new concept of the relation of the individual to sovereign authority gradually incubated in the Colonies. It appears in the emphasis on individual rights in the constitutions and charters of several of the Colonies. It finally took a more finished form in the Declaration of Independence, the Revolution, and the Federal Constitution.

I think the point is that the people of the newly born American Republic were a people conditioned to self-reliance and individual independence, embittered against the regimentation and restrictions that they had known under the mercantilist regime.

Another significant development was that the authors of the Constitution incorporated in it a ban upon import and export duties between the States. This gave us a greater area than ever before had enjoyed free trade between all its parts, hence the largest area in the world in which division of trade could be practiced without restriction.

Skipping down to today, it is to the freedom of trade between the States that we owe the fact that each of our 65 million workers can reach 165 million men, women, and children as his customers free of any customs toll, and conversely that each of the 165 million can enjoy anything that the 65 million produce, free of customs toll.

This tremendous free market has permitted us to go further with division of labor than any other people, because none of them enjoy so big a free market. It has permitted us to go further than any other country in mass production, because our home free market is big enough to absorb the products of mass production. Through this circumstance, we, and we alone, have the buying power for the products of a General Motors Corp. and so we alone can enjoy the full benefit of its economies in efficient and varied production.

Another advantage has to do with the savings funds that financed the erection of our great plants, the development of our agricultural and mineral resources, and the creation of all the public services that add to the efficiency of our division of labor. We recognize that we have been helped in this by the absence of war on our soil since the Civil War. But partly for that reason, partly because of our forefathers' tradition of self-reliance, and mostly because our currency has been for some decades the most trusted of all currencies, Americans and foreigners look up savings in dollars as reliable provision for future needs. So our banks and insurance companies have become the repositories of unprecedented sums, with which they finance industry and trade for interest; and our people, insurance companies, and pension funds provide a ready market for the bonds of our Federal and local governments and our private companies. And the greater part of these savings, seeking a higher return or the prospect of enhancement in value, provides the market for the stocks of our private companies.

It seems to me that these are our two principal advantages: a greater domestic free market than any other people enjoys and a great flow of savings to furnish the tools of production than any other people enjoys. They have combined to give us the greatest scope of any people for division of labor and the benefits which accrue from it.

If we are seeking ways by which other peoples can achieve standards of living better than they now enjoy and closer to ours, I believe we should look for means of enlarging their opportunities to make use of division of labor, particularly through greater freedom of markets for their sales and purchases, and for ways toward a greater integrity of and confidence in their currencies, to make thrift and investment at home more attractive to their own nationals, and toward conditions that will attract American investment for the development of their resources.

This has been a constant preoccupation of our Federal administrations since the war, of whichever party. We contributed vast sums in the years immediately following the war to the war-torn countries to help offset the deficits between their imports and exports until their productions could be restored and their currencies again could become convertible. When we recognized the buildup of the Russian threat to them and to us, in 1947, we found that this kind of aid would have to continue longer; and we did continue it under the Marshall plan. As the threat sharpened in 1949 and with the developments in Korea, we supplemented economic assistance with military assistance.

At the same time we continued the policy of negotiating agreements with other nations for reciprocal abatements of rates of import duties, under the Trade Agreements Act, which had been adopted before the war. And we enlisted with other countries in the so-called general agreement on tariffs and trade, through which the nations that are parties to the agreement meet periodically to negotiate customs abatements, removal of restrictions on trade and on currency transfers as the emergencies which dictated the imposition of them are brought under control, and on other measures conducive to mutually beneficial enlargement of trade relations. The goal is to relieve world trade so far as can be agreed from high customs rates, from quantitative quotas on imports, and from exchange restrictions with the effect of import quotas; to promote general abandonment of import quotas and exchange restrictions as instruments of protectionism; and to arrive as generally and early as possible at what we loosely call convertibility of currencies, by which we mean release of international trade from quantitative restrictions and from restrictions through the administration of exchange controls.

Our actions under the Trade Agreements Act and in conjunction with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade have contributed to a very appreciable lowering of tariff rates here and in other countries, and to great progress toward broader convertibility. Advances in prices have reduced the percentage of value of all rates that are not on an ad valorem basis. In the last years, England has restored the freedom of her principal commodity markets and has removed most of the restrictions upon transfers arising from current commercial transfers. The Netherlands, Belgium, and West Germany have moved right along with England, in some particulars ahead of her.

Additional progress has been made toward convertibility on a regional scale among the countries of Western Europe through the European Payments Union, which acts as a clearinghouse among them and provides for a more rapid removal of controls as between its members than they yet feel strong enough to make on a worldwide scale.

Our policies under the Trade Agreements Act and the general agreement and our cooperation with the European Payments Union all are designed toward enlargement of international trade for everybody, through reduction of tolls upon it and of obstacles to it. By this we seek to promote the worldwide extension of division of labor, more trade for everybody, and more earnings for everybody.

A serious limitation is the scarcity of funds for development of resources, plant investment, and working capital in most of the countries of the world. This stems from scarcity of savings entrusted to the currencies. In some cases scarcity of production and earnings is sufficient explanation of the scarcity of savings. In many countries, indeed in most countries, although production and earnings afford savings, the owners of them do not entrust them to the local currency, so that the savings do not appear in local bank deposits or fiduciary funds. Those who have saved hurry to get rid of the currency, to convert it into things that they trust more, like land and buildings, or into American and Swiss bank deposits or American stocks and bonds. In these latter instances, we see the paradox that nationals of countries poor in capital are furnishing working capital to two of the countries that have the greatest abundance of it.

A part of our policy has been to furnish capital to countries that need it. Much of this has been taxpayers' money—granted, invested, or loaned by Government agencies, including the Export-Import Bank. Some of it has been loans through the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, of each of which our Government is the principal stockholder.

The question arises: Why should our tax money be sent to these capital-poor countries, instead of private American investors' money? A partial answer is suggested by the way the savings of nationals of those countries flee into dollars and Swiss francs, real estate and bricks and mortar, depriving their local economies of capital that could go into productive use there. If the judgment of these people is right, it is understandable that many Americans reach the conclusion that they had rather have an investment at home.

The hesitation of the private investor is not due alone to fears as to the value of the currencies. In many of the countries in question, the demands for rehabilitation or for development of natural resources and public works and for improvement in standards of living have been allowed to run ahead of the fiscal means to meet them; and this has brought on price controls and other controls that have been very hurtful to private business and controls and manipulations of exchange transfers that discourage investors from abroad as to the prospects of realizing

Hon. Lamar Fleming, Jr.—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, herewith follows the fourth portion of the speech of Mr. Lamar Fleming, Jr.:

in their own currencies the earnings and amortization of their investments.

I do not mean to convey that there is not a great movement of private American investment abroad. American industries anxious about adequate future supplies of raw materials, even current supplies in some cases, are investing great sums abroad; and so also are other Americans who do not have that reason. But it would be idle to deny that this flow of private investment is much smaller in some of the countries whose development needs our money than it would be if the governments and economies could return to more orthodox policies that would permit our investors to move in with greater confidence and would encourage their own citizens to invest their earnings at home.

This part of the subject cannot be passed without mentioning also the discouragement that comes from ultranationalistic trends in some of the countries. I believe the man who invests outside his own country should accept the full obligations of a national in the country of his investment. If he accepts these obligations, I believe the government of the country should recognize the obligation to assure him a treatment equal to that of its own nationals. If a government does not accept that commitment or establishes a record of not fulfilling it, wise investors from other countries are deterred. This is a difficult matter to cope with.

Reviewing these aspects of our postwar policies and looking beyond, it is my feeling that grants or precarious loans or investments of taxpayers' funds are a form of help to the foreign economies that is objectionable, of course, to us as taxpayers and objectionable in many respects to the beneficiary country, except as the help may be absolutely indispensable. If you give chronically to a man, you finish by corrupting him. If you give chronically to a government, you finish by corrupting it, in that you put it into business and start it along the road to mercantilism and that you mortify the national pride. So, while I do not complain that we have been doing too much as taxpayers, I hope we gradually will reduce and abandon this form of helpfulness.

I draw a distinction between economic grants and grants for strictly military purpose. If a country wants to be on the team and does not have the means of providing the equipment which membership on it requires, I am glad to see us provide it for them judiciously.

In my judgment, the most valuable cooperation which we can offer is a continuous, steadfast, and not half-hearted, cooperation in enlargement of trade with the other countries and of their trade with one another. The principal ways that we can contribute to this, I believe, are to pursue constantly the goal of low tariff rates here and everywhere and of removal of restrictions like import quotas and exchange controls as rapidly as is practicable. To make this policy work, we must commit ourselves to it very definitely; for the benefits of it will not accrue if the outside world fears that our adherence to it is an on-again-off-again affair.

If the world knows this is our enduring policy, I believe the natural profit-and-loss stimuli will give a worldwide acceleration to the development of resources and expansion of production, and that a general increase in earnings will ensue automatically. I believe that this improvement would more than offset the decline and eventual discontinuance of the flow of American taxpayers' money through grants and precarious investments and loans. I believe the improvements in national economies would be such as to permit governments, that not now are able to do so, to lift controls, return to more orthodox fiscal and currency practices, and provide conditions conducive to the inflow of investment capital that their internal development requires. Out of all this, I confidently would expect a widespread uplift in material welfare and in general goodwill.

Some of our countrymen fear that a low tariff policy would bring on serious dislocations in the United States economy. They point to our high hourly rates for labor and say that many of our lines of production cannot survive if exposed to the competition of the much cheaper labor of some other countries.

Dislocations would result; in fact, I am sure that dislocations will occur regardless what we do. For healthy economies are never static. With every invention, a new line of production emerges, and those whose products capture the public fancy take their place among the leaders so far as profits are concerned. Likewise, changes in what the consumer wants or in economic conditions constantly are causing shifts of relative usefulness and prosperity from one line of production to another. These shifts, or dislocations, benefit our economy if the effect is to increase our useful production and to make it higher in quality, wider in variety, and of lower cost in terms of manhours per unit.

Production is the fruit of combination of natural resources, labor, and capital, using this last word to cover plant, equipment, and all the public services that add to the productivity of labor.

We are very fortunate in our endowment of natural resources. The advantages which we enjoy in capital, including particularly our splendid transportation facilities, not only help us to bring our own resources in raw materials cheaply to our sites of conversion, they also enable us to do the same with materials that are available only abroad, or that are available there more abundantly, more cheaply, or in better quality. A trade policy that permits our production to make the most of the available resources, foreign together with domestic, is the policy that will serve our production best in the matter of needed materials.

The wage for an hour of labor is higher here and in Canada than elsewhere. It always is higher where capital makes the greater contribution to the multiplication of the product of a man-hour of labor. Our relative abundance of capital gives our labor great advantages in education, health, and mobility through our wealth of public services; and backs it with plants, machines, and implements to a degree unknown elsewhere, which multiplies its productivity prodigiously. We are far in advance of the rest of the world in substitution of mechanical energy for human sweat. This reaches its culmination in the great mass-production lines which our mass domestic market makes possible in a degree not possible today in other countries.

Related to our whole economy, what we have the least of is human hands, and what we have the most of is the means to multiply the product of each human hand and to provide conditions favorable to the use of them to best advantage. Under these conditions, we are at an advantage in production cost in those lines in which our means of multiplying the productivity of the human hand outweigh our scarcity of them and our consequently high wage scale; and we are at a disadvantage in the lines in which the means of multiplication of individual productivity cannot make up for our high wage scale. This means that the profitable lines of production for Americans naturally are the lines in which capital in all its aspects can multiply most the productivity of the individual, and hence that we will prosper most to the extent that our new investments of men and capital follow toward the lines of production most susceptible of labor-saving through mechaniaztion and other technological improvements. Of course, we can resist and delay this natural evolution by artificial means like tariffs, quotas, and subsidies in one form or another, and keep some uneconomic productions alive for the time being. But this only can be done at the expense of all of us as taxpayers and consumers; and the subsidized existence of those maintained in the uneconomic occupations will be what a subsidized existence of those is—a second-rate existence. There is not a doubt in my mind that people who need public help to stay in their occupations would benefit, and particularly that their next generation would benefit, by shifting into other occupations which, due to nature and national circumstances, are profitable without help.

Hon. Lamar Fleming, Jr.—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, herewith follows the concluding portion of Mr. Fleming's speech:

I live close to an example of this. For a combination of political, social, and sentimental reasons, we have been following for many years a farm policy which subsidizes agriculture through the Government supporting domestic farm prices. During this period a revolution has come about in farming efficiency through substitution of tractors for mules, and of larger and more efficient kinds of implements that tractors can haul for those that a mule could pull. At the same time, we have advanced greatly in seed varieties, fertilization, insect control, irrigation, and farming knowledge; and new roads and automobiles have increased the accessibility of farms and potential farms. So we now have a condition in which one man, with the present labor-saving equipment, can farm, say, three times as much land as he used to farm, and farm it better, provided he uses land that is flat enough for the tractor-drawn equipment, and in some cases for irrigation, and that is fertile enough to amortize the cost of the equipment and, where irrigation is used, to pay the water costs. All those conditions being right, the farmer using the new equipment can outproduce and undersell the farmers on lands which, due to sharp contours or other reasons, are unsuitable for mechanized farming. But, with the prices supported by Government, the cottongrowers have not had to undersell each other; the new type of cottongrower increased his production, and fewer of the old type shifted to other callings, which had become attractive due to our industrial expansion, than would have shifted if the price of cotton had not been guaranteed. The result has been the accumulation of a great surplus of cotton and the imposition of acreage controls, as an alternative to reduction of the price-support levels. Among the effects of this are: that uneconomical cotton farming has continued in some places, with benefit to no one; that economical cotton farming has been rendered less economical by curtailment of the efficient farms below the acreage at which their unit cost would be lowest; and that exports of American cotton have declined because our Government pays more for it through the price-support program than it costs the foreigner to grow it. In the end, somehow or other, our farmers will regain the free use of their land; and I am sure that our efficient cotton-growing operations will show that they can compete with the foreign growers, who pay more than we do for tractors and equipment, if they have them, and for almost all the

materials used; pay heavy export taxes on their cotton, pay much higher interest; and suffer generally from lack of roads, communications, and general services which we just take for granted. I am sure it will turn out in the end that the people of the South are worse off for this experiment in subsidization and will be better off when we return to a free market and to freedom of the citizen to use his land according to his best judgment.

You have noticed, I am sure, that leaders in both the parties are talking now about what they call a soil bank, which is a name for paying farmers to take land out of production. In the particular circumstances of the moment, I believe this strange idea has some merit. If there are occupations in this country that cannot survive without unreasonable protection, I am sure it would cost the American people less money to pay the individuals involved for not working in those occupations than to continue, as taxpayers and consumers, to pay the price of unreasonable protection for them. This is not a suggestion.

Another way to look at the matter is to compare the conditions under which the protectionist movement originated and grew in the United States with the conditions today. Our Nation was born of an ardent aspiration for independence from a then mercantilist Europe and for freedom from its wars and blockades. Men like Hamilton wanted to see us as independent as possible of Europe, economically as well as politically; and for this reason they thought it worth while to subsidize the birth and infancy of industries whose products were essential to us.

Our economy until World War I was in a stage of rapid development of the resources of our continent, requiring loans and investments from Europe; and we needed an excess of exports over imports to service these loans and investments, which need had been compounded by the costs of the Civil War. Because for so many generations we had to maintain an excess of exports over imports, we called this excess a favorable balance of trade, and we came to regard it as something always to be desired, regardless of circumstances. Hence imports were not a favored child; and pleas for protection against them received a hearing colored by this circumstance.

The circumstances changed with World War I, although our public and political opinion was slow to grasp how fundamental the change was. No one could ignore the revolutionary dimensions of the change as it confronted us after World War II. Almost all countries now owe us money, and we are investors in all countries. The debt and investment service of the foreseeable future will be a net of international payments to us, if the service occurs, instead of payments by us. In these conditions, we will have to reverse the old terms: the only "favorable balance of trade" for us will be an excess of imports over exports; for that will be the only way in which we, as international creditor and investor, can receive service upon our loans and investments. Of course, we can narrow the gap in certain periods by lending more and investing more abroad; but the effect of that will be to increase the total of the annual debt and investment service to be collected later on.

However, I am sure we will lend more abroad and invest more abroad over the years to come, particularly as the Government agencies withdraw from this function in favor of the citizens. When England was the money center of the world, her economy was the world's principal banker and investor, not because the role was virtuous but because it was profitable. Now that we are the money center of the world, we will become the principal banker and investor for the world, not out of virtue, but because of profit-and-loss considerations.

When England assumed this role after the defeat of Napoleon, she moved from mercantilism and extreme protectionism to complete free trade, so that her then outstanding industry could enjoy cheap materials and her people cheap food, and so that she could collect the service charges on her loans and investments abroad. Our circumstances inevitably will lead us in that same direction.

These developments will make us better customers for the rest of the world. They will increase foreign earnings, and these increased earnings, together with our loans and investments, will help to cure many foreign problems. They will make it possible for other countries to become more liberal in their import policies, to everyone's advantage, and will promote the flow of credit and investment from other countries, to supplement our help in the countries most in need of developing their natural resources. As the resources of the presently underdeveloped countries become more fully developed, better earnings and living standards should tend to dissipate the frustrations which today stand in the way of better understanding and greater good will. And as the earnings in the low-income countries increase, wages should increase also, and the great contrast should be lessened between wages from country to country, which should reduce the demands for protection, here and in other countries.

I do not regard our ultimate course as a matter for argument, or even as a matter of choice in the last analysis. To me the pattern of historical cause and effect is definite, and our course is a matter of inevitable destiny. I regard our choice as one of whether to swim gladly in the smooth middle of the stream of destiny, or to wait for the flood to wash us in, with bruising bumps against the rocky banks.

The course available to us lends itself to teamwork and partnership among peoples, toward betterment for all. We have the opportunity to make life in the community of civilized nations so attractive that all who have free choice will join it. I even am naive enough to believe that it is the way toward ultimate solution of the East-West conflict; for I do not believe that Russia and China will be ruled forever by men utterly indifferent to the sacrifices of their countrymen. In this faith lies my hope that our children and theirs will be spared a supernuclear cataclysm.

In this talk I deliberately and too often have applied the first person to Americans; because we here are Americans and are discussing the responsibilities and opportunities of Americans. But I think we must avoid confining our conception of the words "we" and "us" to Americans when thinking about world affairs, just as a duly humble and wise individual seeks to use rarely the word "I" when he can say "we."

On the team of international cooperation, no country is more wholeheartedly dedicated than Canada. England and several other European countries are as earnest members as we are, in spite of the disabilities of battered survivors of a recent grueling fight. As they recover, their contributions to the partnership in all its phases will become more substantial; and the burdens of it will be spread more equally among the partners. So, in this field of thought and endeavor, not only the amenities among partners but also realism call for deemphasis of our "I" as Americans and emphasis of the "we" 'that includes all the responsible partners who are dedicated with us to betterment of the human lot.

The Reece Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, at my request the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has prepared the following reply to certain statements made on the floor of the House January 5 and 9, 1956:

You have asked about the speeches by Congressman LANHAM and others concerning the FBI's investigation of the selection of jurors in Cobb County, Ga.

As the speeches indicate the investigation has come out of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Reece* v. *Georgia* (100 L. ed. (Adv. 111)). In fact the Court's decision in the Reece case received perhaps the greatest amount of the Georgia Congressman's attention.

At the outset we should note that the speeches all completely misrepresent the Reece case. Congressman LANHAM on page 158 of the RECORD states:

"The Supreme Court of the United States granted a writ of certiorari and reversed the Georgia Supreme Court in its affirmance of the conviction upon the ground that the judge of the Cobb superior court had not appointed counsel for the accused until after he had been indicted by the grand jury. It was suggested in the decision also that he might have been denied a fair trial in the absence of proof that there were Negroes on the panel which tried him."

Congressman FORRESTER on page 160 of the RECORD states:

"They should join with us and say to the Department of Justice, say even to the Supreme Court, 'We simply will not tolerate a decision holding that a person must be granted a new trial because he had no attorney furnished him before the indictment.'

"Mr. Speaker, after 30 years in the practice of the law, I know it was not uncommon for defendants not to have an attorney until after they were indicted. If there was no indictment, they hired no attorney. It is in contrast with the law, in contrast with order, and in contrast to public decency; and shame, shame it is how low the Supreme Court of the United States and the Department of Justice have fallen."

The Reece case did not hold that a defendant must have a lawyer before indictment or else his conviction will be reversed for denial of due process. Georgia law required that one my object to the constitution of the grand jury only before the indictment is returned. Grand juries are often assembled and are in being long before a defendant is indicted and it is hard to think of a case in which one could object to a grand jury before an indictment against him is returned. Negroes have been systematically excluded from grand juries in Cobb County, Ga. The evidence in the Reece case reveals the following:

"In the hearing on his motion to quash before the first trial he presented uncontradicted evidence to support the following facts: No Negro had served on the grand jury in Cobb County for the previous 18 years; the 1950 census showed that the county had a white population of 55,606 and a Negro population of 6,224; the same census showed a population of 16,201 male white

citizens over 21 years of age, and 1,710 male Negro citizens over 21 years of age. Petitioner's motion alleged, and this was not contradicted, that there were 534 names on the grand jury list and of this number only 6 were Negroes. Of the 6 Negroes, 1 did not reside in the county and the other 5 testified in this proceeding. Two were over 80 years of age; 1 was partially deaf and the other in poor health. The remaining 3 were 62 years of age. Each of the witnesses had lived in the county for at least 30 years. None had ever served on a grand jury nor heard of any other Negro serving on a grand jury in the county. The clerk and deputy clerk of the court testified that the jury boxes had been revised in 1952, that there was no discrimination or systematic exclusion of Negroes from the grand jury list, that six Negroes were on the list, and that neither had ever known a Negro to serve on a grand jury in Cobb County."

Nevertheless, despite the obvious discrimination against Reece he was unable to object to the composition of the grand jury because under Georgia law he did not make his objection before the indictment was returned. In fact Reece did not have knowledge of the grand jury nor benefit of counsel before his indictment so he could not have objected to it.

The Supreme Court's holding was that Georgia procedure denied due process of law because Reece had no opportunity to object to the grand jury which was constituted in a discriminatory manner. The Court did not hold that Georgia is required to furnish counsel in criminal cases prior to indictment. Furnishing counsel prior to indictment might, in some cases, afford an opportunity to object to a discriminatorily constituted grand jury and thereby afford due process of law. But the Supreme Court's holding appears merely to be that some reasonable opportunity must be given to object to the composition of a jury from which Negroes are systematically excluded.

The FBI's investigation of court officials connected with jury selection in Cobb County is being conducted entirely pursuant to the law. The record and the Supreme Court's decision in the Reece case make clear that Negroes have been systematically excluded from grand juries in Cobb County. Title 18, United States Code, section 243, makes this a crime:

"Exclusion of jurors on account of race or color.—No citizen possessing all other qualifications which are or may be prescribed by law shall be disqualified for service as grand or petit juror in any court of the United States, or of any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; and whoever, being an officer or other person charged with any duty in the selection or summoning of jurors, excludes or fails to summon any citizen for such cause, shall be fined not more than $5,000. (June 25, 1948, c. 645, sec. 1, 62 Stat. 696)."

It is certainly necessary and proper that the investigative Department of Justice look into whether a crime has been committed, especially where evidence of crime is as clear as it is here.

The speeches make some other points which call for a comment. This will be taken up in the order in which they are made.

1. On page 158 it is stated that the solicitor was asked whether or not he intended to again prosecute Reece. From my experience this question is sometimes asked to determine whether the offending officials should be prosecuted. I believe that it is sometimes felt that if a defendant is to be prosecuted once more it may be unwise to prosecute county officials or perhaps to defer their prosecution for the reason that it may prejudice defendant's defense. There is nothing official on this which I know, but I have gathered this impression from other cases.

On page 158 the statement is made that 2 Negroes served on a grand jury in 1955 and 1 in 1956, and the service of other Negroes is mentioned. This is, of course, something new and is a salutary result of the Reece case and perhaps threatened prosecution under title 18, section 243. These small numbers of Negroes, however, surely do not absolve any past crimes and do not foreclose investigation of whether other Negroes are still being systematically excluded.

On page 156, six points are made concerning the current investigation in Cobb County: (1) It is stated that it can be used as threat of prosecution against local court officials. This is true; (2) That it was taken to deter the prosecution from taking further action in the case. I would really doubt that the FBI would have any interest in this at all; (3) That the information obtained may be used as a matter of defense. As I understand it, information given to the FBI is confidential and cannot be obtained in any way; (4) That there has been no race hatred despite the nature of the crime (which was rape). This is good, but appears to be irrelevant; (5) That the right of the State to proceed against crimes against its own laws has been violated. This is, of course, not true. The investigation is merely concerned with violations of Federal laws; (6) That this is a gestapo proceeding, etc., etc. This does not merit any reply. If anything, the Federal Government should investigate deprivations of civil rights—which are crimes—more frequently and thoroughly.

Today's Prosperity: Accidental

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from a recent issue of the San Diego Union:

TODAY'S PROSPERITY: ACCIDENTAL

Three major factors underlie the prosperity the Nation enjoys today:

1. Inflation has been curbed.
2. Deflation has been avoided.
3. Initiative and expansion have been encouraged.

The result is what Treasury Secretary Humphrey calls "the greatest period of prosperity that our fast-growing, now unhobbled economy has ever known."

All three factors stem from the Republican approach to government. At least two of them would have been totally unlikely under a Democratic administration.

Inflation was part and parcel of the previous Democratic administration. And the candidacy of Adlai Stevenson offered no hope of a change.

The end of Democratic controls, the return to sound fiscal policies, and the encouragement of individual initiative have been behind the record expansion of business and industry. This, too, has been a direct result of Republican policies. It logically must be given credit for the record high in local and national employment and with the new peak in take-home pay.

The proof of these contentions can best be found in comparing the records of the Democratic and Republican administrations.

Between 1940 and 1953 inflation became the greatest economic threat to high living standards. Pay raises were accompanied by price raises and tax increases. The result was little net gain and sometimes a distinct loss.

A $1,000 saved in 1939, if left untouched, was worth only $522 in 1953. Inflation, often encouraged by the Democratic administrations, had stolen $478 from the thrifty person.

Between 1939 and 1953 the cost of living index rose from 60 to 116. Only 18 of these points came as a result of wartime inflation. The remaining 70 percent of the inflationary spiral was the direct result of a total failure of the Democratic administration in handling postwar domestic economics.

The 3 years of the Republican administration have seen the dollar stabilized. Inflation no longer is robbing the thrifty or the family on a pension. A pay raise can now have real economic meaning.

During 1956 the Democrats will claim that they, too, could have given the Nation greater prosperity. But the answer lies in the facts. They had the opportunity and failed. The policies they now propose are the same ones with which they went out of office.

It would be a serious mistake to regard present prosperity as accidental. Without the sound fiscal policies of the Republican administration it would not have been possible.

The Anniversary of President Wilson's 14 Points

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place into the RECORD a statement on the 14 points of President Wilson, whose birth we celebrate this year.

The hundredth birthday anniversary of one of our greatest Presidents, Woodrow Wilson, will be celebrated this year all over the United States. During his Presidency, at the turning point of American history, the ideals of the American Declaration of Independence spread all over the world.

At that time the United States made a colossal effort to establish a just peace among nations, and for these efforts President Wilson, still in the White House, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1919.

President Wilson's idea of a just peace was based on the principle of every nation's self-determination and full independence, notwithstanding the size of the country, or the number of people, or their importance in the world. The most powerful expression of President Wilson's ideas was his attitude toward Poland. During the First World War the international situation put the problem of Poland into the foreground. Even before the United States entered the First World War, President Woodrow Wilson said in his message of January 22, 1917:

Statesmen everywhere agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland.

Now it is fitting to remember, that on January 8, 1918, President Wilson announced his famous 14 points, which expressed fully his peace program. And it is also fitting to remember that his

peace terms announced on January 8, 1918, were fully accepted by the defeated Germans on November 11, 1918.

President Wilson's 13th point, concerning Poland, made the greatest impression of all. This point reads as follows:

An independent Polish state should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputable Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

At that time the message of the President made it clear to all, that the regaining of independence of Poland is one of the main aims for which the war was fought by the Allies.

When Poland regained her freedom and independent after the First World War, the Polish nation never failed to express its gratitude for President Wilson. His message of January 8, 1918, strengthened and deepened the traditional ties of friendship between the American and Polish nations.

The fundamental principles of the American foreign policy still follow the tradition of American ideals: The ideals of every nation's self-determination, their full independence in a just and lasting peace—these ideals are still alive. This policy was reaffirmed by Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman. They were expressed in the declaration of December 30, 1955, on behalf and with the approval of President Eisenhower:

The peaceful liberation of captive peoples has been, is, and until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of the United States foreign policy.

Soldier and Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation mourns the passing of Lt. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis, who died January 9, 1956, at Walter Reed Hospital. A native of Zanesville, Ohio, in the 15th Congressional District, General Van Voorhis is remembered with deep affection by his host of friends in Zanesville and Nashport, where he resided since his retirement from active duty. Among those who served with him in the Army he is revered for his vision and his contributions to the fighting power of the Army and to our national security through his long career of service. This service spanned the tumultuous period of our history from the outbreak of the Spanish-American War through 1942.

Among his many signal achievements in the Army, General Van Voorhis became known as the grandfather of mechanization, having developed and carried out the first concepts of mechanized warfare utilizing mobile armored forces.

I wish to commend to the House the following editorial published in the January 11 Zanesville (Ohio) Times-Recorder honoring this man of great stature who has passed from us:

SOLDIER AND PATRIOT

It is the American custom to assess the value of a man by four standards of measurement. Listed in the ascending order of their importance, they are: First, what he has; second, what he knows; third, what he does, and fourth, what he is.

Some men are important as measured by one standard, some by another, but it was the distinction of Lt. Gen. Daniel Van Voorhis that he was an exceptional man measured by all four.

True, he was not a wealthy man, but had amassed a comfortable competence, and while he was not the heir to great fortune, he did inherit the immensely valuable tradition of an American gentleman.

In the second, his experiences had given him vast knowledge of diverse subjects, plus an education gained at Ohio Wesleyan University and Washington and Jefferson College. All his life he was a student, and was still learning at an age when most men's intellectual development has come to a standstill.

In the third, what he has done, we cannot go into detail, since even a short account of all his activities would demand great space. For almost a half century he served his country in its Armed Forces, taking part in three wars, much of the time in posts of high military command. He served in the war with Spain, in the Philippines, in Mexico, and France, and was known as the grandfather of the armored forces. He had received numerous decorations from his own and foreign governments, indicative of valorous and meritorious service.

But the fourth measure of man, what he is, counts in the final analysis. And throughout his life he remained a gentleman, a friendly gentleman, who retained the respect of his subordinates, the regard of his superiors and the friendship of his neighbors. He had received many honors, he had associated with the great and the near-great, without losing the capacity to understand and enjoy the companionship of the man on the street. He was never one to erect an invisible wall around himself, retiring within to hold the mass of mankind at arm's length.

General Van Voorhis was definitely one of the notable men of Ohio, a credit to his native Zanesville and Muskingum County.

He will be buried Thursday with full military honors in Memorial Park. And as the riflemen fire the final salute, as the bugler sounds the final taps, we will say goodby to a man whose life was full of honors, who spent that life in his country's service, and in so doing gained the respect and admiration of us all. His memory will be enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people.

Persecution of the Church in the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following memorandum, which was prepared by members of the Church of the Ukraine in the United States, protesting the persecution of their church in the Ukraine and citing numerous cases of persecution to members of the clergy in that country.

It will be noted that these constituents of mine request that the Congress inquire into this antichristian terror and that a special committee be created to hold hearings on the subject.

That this persecution is permitted to continue without the Congress of the United States raising its voice in protest is not in the American spirit. I therefore protest publicly this persecution and urge both the Congress of the United States and the administration to take whatever steps it may be possible to bring an end to the persecution of the church, in the Ukraine and elsewhere. The memorandum follows:

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December 1917, Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the eastern provinces of this country. The Soviets were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terrorized the people with threats of exile, torture and death.

First, the Communists attacked the Church in Eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their Faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as for example the Golden Domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity.

Though article 123 of the Soviet Constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U. S. S. R., explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of Western Ukraine (1939–41), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This anti-Christian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christianity in Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1946, the Soviets arrested the Metropolitan of Halych and Archbishop of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. SS. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops' term expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops

Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic Bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the Church of the Catacombs, as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to acknowledge the Patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—this church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave labor camps. The Reds exterminated all 5 dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,440 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church and faith.

Therefore, I respectfully request to present to Congress the dreadful situation of the religious persecution in Ukraine and ask to propose that Congress inquire into this anti-Christian terror, and that a special designated congressional committee hold hearings of witnesses of the aforesaid situation.

I, also, request that the Secretary of State propose to the American Delegation in the United Nations that the condition of the persecuted church in Ukraine be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly.

Niagara Stalemate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, in March of last year, I introduced one of the most important bills which it has ever been my privilege to sponsor, a measure which would authorize immediate construction of power development works on the Niagara River while present difficulties which have stymied this project for almost 6 years are being ironed out.

This bill is the only solution, to the costly deadlock, now before this Congress. In further support, I offer the following editorial which recently appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y.:

NIAGARA STALEMATE

Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, of Lockport, coauthor and chief congressional promoter of the bill to develop Niagara Falls power under private auspices, has glumly concluded that the chances of getting any Niagara bill through this session of Congress are slim.

The Senate's complexion, he says, is such that "I can't see it passing" a private-enterprise bill. Likewise, he says, "I can't see the House, in view of the almost 2 to 1 margin it gave my bill in 1953, making an about face and handing the project over to the public-power advocates." So he predicts another year of stalemate.

From the standpoint of the Niagara Frontier's economic progress, that is a sour prospect indeed. The congressional deadlock is already in its fifth year, and Canada, meanwhile, has begun to use its share of the Niagara power and has started to use ours too, as the 1950 treaty gives it every right to do until Congress makes up our mind what to do with it.

We do not question Mr. MILLER'S realistic estimate of the congressional temper. What we do urge—if it turns out that this Congress is just as deadlocked as previous ones have been, and as he anticipates—is that a start on the construction at least be salvaged out of the deadlock. If Congress can't agree this year on the ultimate ownership and operation of the Niagara development, it should at least recognize that there is no basic disagreement on the engineering details of what kind of development it should be. That being so, there is no good reason why it could not commission the United States Army engineers to start the project at once, and leave it to the next Congress—or the next—to decide who will take over from there.

This is the course Representative EDMUND P. RADWAN, of Buffalo, has been urging for the last year. And the longer the stalemate over ultimate operation continues, the more realistic his proposal for immediate construction by the United States engineers becomes. The hard fact that everybody should bear in mind is that the Niagara development will take about 5 years to complete from the time the project is authorized. If it's going to take that long for Congress to make up its mind, at least we might as well have a finished project for it to dispose of, instead of merely a set of blueprints.

We still prefer the private-enterprise to the public-power approach. But more important than who develops it is getting it developed by someone. Let the proponents of the rival plans lock horns once more this year, if they must. But if the result is another stalemate, let them then, for heaven's sake, rally to the Radwan banner and get the project under construction while the debate over ultimate control drags wearily on.

Paint Mixing Facility at Mare Island Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a statement which I made on Tuesday, January 10, 1956, before the House Appropriations Committee in opposition to the proposed closing of the paint-mixing facility at Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my understanding that the Defense Department has provided notice to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that certain activities of the Navy and Army will be terminated unless an objection is received from the House Appropriations Committee or the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is my further understanding that one of the activities which the Defense Department proposes to terminate is the Navy's paint mixing facility at Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif.

I should like to register a strong protest against the proposed closing of this paint mixing facility, and I hope that this committee will disapprove this proposal. In my opinion the closing of this paint mixing facility would be most unfortunate, and would be against the best interests of our national defense.

During World War II the Mare Island paint mixing facility was an essential operation in manufacturing paint for naval use, much of it a special plastic paint for ships' bottoms. This special plastic paint had been developed at Mare Island after more than 7 years of laboratory work and field testing. It is important to note that the paint industry did not develop this formula—the Navy Department did at Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

This bottom paint permits ships to remain at sea in war areas for years without having to leave their station to proceed to a drydock, which may be many days' sailing, and hundreds, or even thousands, of miles away. Before the successful development of this formula, ships had to drydock frequently, as a clean bottom, as you well know, is an important factor in making maximum speed. A foul bottom also means that ships use more bunker fuel per mile, which means more frequent fuelings. The logistics supply of fuel to a fleet at sea over great distances is always a serious problem, as tankers can be sunk.

With the extension of our sea frontiers to far horizons as an implementation of national policy, bases are often inaccessible, and anything which can be done to extend the sea-keeping days of a fleet is vitally important, as I see it. Thus it is important that the bottom paint furnished the fleet be of impeccable quality and in exact conformity to the formula. The Navy's manufacture of its own paint under its own formula has met all service tests. We should not tamper, in my opinion, with a proven system and a proven product. The paint industry, although it has had every opportunity to conduct a similar laboratory and testing program, was never able to develop this bottom paint. The Navy, on the contrary, is consistently experimenting in laboratory and testing facilities to improve paint for the Navy's peculiar need. This was the reason why the Navy established the paint-mixing facility at Mare Island Naval Shipyard. This facility meets special requirements which industry cannot, or at least has not, met.

At the present time, the Mare Island paint-mixing facility is limiting its production to the special plastic paints solely for Government use. If this work were transferred to commercial plants, it would be necessary for the Navy to establish a costly inspection corps at each commercial plant involved, as it is vital to national defense that this paint be manufactured exactly to formula. In addition, such a transfer would mean that the expenditure and investment that the Government has already made for the equipment and buildings occupied by the Mare Island Paint Mixing Facility would lie idle. It would certainly appear that using plastic paint produced commercially would add to the Navy's costs, rather than being an economy.

I fully understand that it is the Defense Department's desire to stop Government competition with private industry whenever there is no harm to the national defense involved. However, in this case, I am convinced there would be harm to the national defense.

Another factor which to me seems important to national defense is that if the Mare Island paint-mixing facility be closed, the skills of the group of employees which grew up with the development of this paint would be dissipated and lost. Without these skilled men, the paint-mixing facility will be an empty shell when the next national emergency requires its reopening.

It seems to me of essential importance to the Nation that the Mare Island paint-mixing facility be allowed to continue to operate in the modest way in which it is now operating in the manufacturing of special plastic paints, and be allowed to continue its research and tests looking toward the further betterment of this product. It would seem most important that the research and testing which has been in progress for many years be continued.

Of extreme importance is the complete flexibility of this paint-mixing facility. Production of urgently needed paint can be started immediately on reecipt of even a dispatch order, with no lead time as commonly required in commercial practice for special type paint.

The Mare Island paint-mixing facility now employs only approximately 50 people, and specializes in this special antifouling and anticorrosion bottom paints and vinyl system paints specifically designed for the Navy's own use. The continuation of this specialized operation certainly can have no great adverse impact on our country's huge paint industry, and yet could have a most unfortunate result on our readiness for the expansion of production of this most essential naval paint in time of war.

In view of these facts, I should like to recommend strongly that the House Appropriations Committee disapprove the proposed closing of this paint-mixing facility. I believe this closing would be a false economy and a definite disadvantage to the Nation's defense.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the crux of the recent White House Conference on Education was whether or not the Federal Government should grant more Federal Aid to public education. The central question of all the discussions was, "Shall or shall not the Federal Government launch out on a broader basis than at present in giving Federal Aid to schools?"

One of the pertinent factors in the problem of Federal Aid is the way Federal Aid is being distributed to the schools at the present time. Federal grants-in-aid to schools today are distributed not on the basis of need, not even on the basis of the average pupil daily attendance, as one would expect. It is distributed today in direct contradiction to these three basic criteria.

For example, Federal grants-in-aid to schools during the fiscal year 1954 shows the following inconsistencies:

State	Rank according to State effort	Number of pupils enrolled	Federal grants-in-aid	Average grant per pupil
West Virginia	17	448, 280	544, 963	1. 21
Nevada	39	42, 187	1, 664, 385	39. 45
Virginia	28	702, 671	14, 950, 285	21. 27
Mississippi	16	540, 157	2, 551, 600	4. 73
Illinois	43	1, 490, 000	4, 170, 345	2. 79
Wisconsin	35	561, 000	1, 150, 359	2. 05
Washington	23	490, 184	8, 522, 481	17. 39
Wyoming	1	63, 837	1, 257, 060	19. 69
New Mexico	2	187, 480	5, 003, 917	26. 68
Kansas	20	386, 915	5, 498, 760	14. 21

Mr. Speaker, anyone can readily see from the above table that there is little rhyme or reason in the present method of granting aid. For instance, Nevada, a State that stands high on the basis of per capita income and ability to finance her own schools, stands 39th in her effort to support her schools, yet she receives $39.45 per pupil Federal aid; while West Virginia, a State that stands quite low on the basis of per capita income and ability to finance her schools—her coal mines, potteries, and glass factories being very hard hit—although she ranks high in effort, receives only $1.21 per pupil in Federal aid. Wyoming, the State that ranks No. 1 in her effort to support her schools, gets less than half the aid given Nevada, the State ranking 39th in effort. If this is a sample of the way Federal aid to education is being distributed today, do we want to extend these basic inequities? What guaranty will there be that the present inequitable method of distribution will be improved or corrected?

Mr. Speaker, three other real factors enter into the problem of extending Federal aid to schools, if Federal aid is for the purpose of equalizing educational opportunities between the States as claimed by its advocates:

First. The problem of segregation in the schools of the South. Will Federal aid accentuate this problem or diminish it?

Second. The problem of Federal aid for our parochial schools. Will Federal aid to education be provided for parochial schools in order to create equal educational opportunities? If not, why not?

Third. The problem of Federal supervision and Federal control of schools that are subsidized by Federal taxes. Federal supervision and control always accompany Federal aid. The present United States Commissioner of Education has said:

> If Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control.

Mr. Speaker, Federal aid to equalize educational opportunities is not as simple as it appears on the surface. It is both complicated and controversial. Cautious exploration and consideration are required before a proper solution can be found under our Constitution.

I have been, and still am—because of the above reasons—opposed to Federal aid for schools.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

Congressman JOE HOLT, Republican, from California, author of the legislation which created the White House Conference on Education, today issued the following statement:

"President Eisenhower's special message on education fulfills his promise to the White House Conference on Education to give careful consideration to their findings. In almost every instance, his school-construction proposals jibe with the White House Conference recommendations.

"Those who charged that the White House Conference on Education was an administration device for avoiding action have been proven wrong. President Eisenhower has translated the will of the people into a positive, sound program of action.

"The President's school-construction proposals embodies the following principles expressed by the White House Conference on Education:

"1. Federal aid 'Should be granted only on the basis of demonstrated needs.'

"2. 'Federal aid should never be permitted to become a deterrent to State and local initiative in education.'

"3. 'State aid should be increased.'

"4. 'The administration of Federal funds should be through the appropriate State agencies for education.'

"5. 'These State agencies should determine the relative needs of local school districts.'

"6. There should be no 'Federal control or educational use of funds in local school districts.'

"7. 'All States and Territories and the District of Columbia should be eligible.'

"The President's recommendations provides the foundation for much sounder and safer education legislation than the Kelley bill, now before the Rules Committee.

"The need for Federal aid to education, State by State, has not yet been proven to me personally, either by the hearings held before our committee or by the newspaper and oral reports I have heard on the results of the White House Conference on Education. For that reason I have requested the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee to have the officials in charge of the White House conference come before the full committee and give a report on the manner in which the conference was held, delegates selected, the results, and how they were reached.

"As a Representative in Congress from the State of California, there is doubt in my mind whether any Federal-aid legislation will be proven beneficial to our community and State in the long run. We are doing a very good job of solving our own problems. The amount of effort being put forth by other States and the taxes their people are paying for their schools in comparison to the high taxes our people pay for schools must be taken into consideration before any definite conclusions are reached."

Make Their Services Available

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Retired Officer of November-December 1955:

MAKE THEIR SERVICES AVAILABLE

Gerontologists uniformly agree that man's usefulness to society is not necessarily limited by age alone. Another obvious fact is that advances in medical science in recent years have served to extend man's productive capacity, particularly in our country.

In this era of danger to the preservation of our ideals and institutions, all our human

assets and talents must be kept available and put to use where needed, especially by the Federal Government.

Requirements of the military profession necessitate much earlier retirements than in any other calling of which we are aware. This is to insure youth and vigor in command positions where the highest physical attainments are essential. Consequently, thousands of able officers are retired at the peak of their proficiency and at ages after which men in other fields make the greatest measure of contribution. Further, these men have been trained by the Government at great cost and many are expert in new applications of science through study and experience. They are men, too, whose loyalty and devotion to their country have been established in military service.

One would conclude that the Government would immediately put these men to use or at least insure the availability of their services like those of other citizens. But what do we find? Under the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894 (U. S. C. 1940 edition, title 5, sec. 62), and section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932 (U. S. C. 1940 edition, title 5, sec. 59a), retired officers of the military services are severely restricted in accepting civilian positions under the Federal Government.

Retired officers cannot hold civilian positions under the Federal Government where either the rate of retired pay or the rate of compensation fixed for the civilian position amounts to $2,500 per annum unless (1) elected thereto, or (2) appointed by the President with Senate confirmation, or (3) retired because of battle injuries or incapacities incurred in line of duty (5 U. S. C. sec. 62; 13 Comptroller General 60; 21 Comptroller General 1129). Retired officers who receive more than $2,500 per annum may not even avoid the application of this statutory provision by waiving their retired pay during the occupancy of the civilian position (14 Comptroller General 289).

Thus, with the minor exceptions noted, we have a situation under which our Government actually has barred itself from utilizing its own trained loyal officer personnel.

Another curious thing is that officers retired for physical disability are employable while those retired for other reasons and presumably the best fitted from the standpoint of physical condition are not employable.

When a retired officer is eligible for employment in a civilian position under the Federal Government, he is subject to the dual compensation statute (5 U. S. C. sec. 59a), which limits the aggregate income from such a position and his retired pay to $10,000 per annum. Although this amount covers adequately the rank and file of cases, it does not permit the employment with appropriate compensation of the most talented in the higher paying Government positions.

More than 8 years ago (March 1947), our president, the late Adm. David Foote Sellers, United States Navy, retired, pointed all this out to the then Secretary of the Navy Forrestal who replied in part:

"I recognize the need for clarification of the subject, as pointed out in your letter, and have instructed the chief of industrial relations to confer with officials of the Civil Service Commission with request that consideration be expedited in order that Congress may consider the specific recommendations made."

After elaborate studies, a recommendation was made to Congress in 1948 which would have repealed the 1894 dual employment statute but the proposed legislation, although it was passed by both Houses of the 81st Congress, failed of enactment because of a small amendment by the House which was not reconciled during the closing days of that Congress.

The subject is again under study and one would conclude that, although it is somewhat complicated, the time should come when the study should cease and action should take place. What is needed and needed promptly is the repeal of both laws. Retired officers should be rendered as available for Federal employment as anyone else. In effect, they should have their citizenship restored to them in this respect. In other words, career service in the military should not result in loss of opportunity to serve.

The executive branch of the Government should lose no time in this matter. It should recommend to the Congress that consideration be given to removing the present restrictions so that the Federal Government may have the benefit of the services of experienced retired military officers and to afford to these officers the same opportunity of service in Government open to all other citizens. Failing the prompt receipt of such a recommendation, Congress, itself, should take the initiative.

An Answer to the Unsubstantiated Charge of Giveaway of Our Natural Resources Levied Against the Eisenhower Administration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of the traditional American spirit of justice and fair play I have been greatly disturbed over the unsubstantiated charges of giveaway that are being frequently and recklessly hurled about our natural resources. These politically inspired charges are directed at the record of the Eisenhower administration and as a result of my inquiries I am pleased to furnish the "answer" which in my opinion will permit any fair-minded American to point with pride to the record of the Eisenhower administration in strengthening and advancing the cause of resource conservation. Here is what the record of the Eisenhower administration actually shows:

National park system: the national park system today is larger, more adequately staffed and more efficiently administered than it ever has been. In 1953, the year this administration entered office, 65,000 acres were added to our national park system. The boundaries of the Everglades National Park were extended to take in an additional 271,000 acres. Last year 40,400 acres were acquired. In the first 9 months of 1955, 29,560 acres were added to the park system.

Two new and historically important areas were added to the system with the establishment of Fort Vancouver National Monument in 1954 and Cumberland Gap National Historical Park in 1955. Establishment of Fort Union National Memorial in New Mexico was authorized last year and the National Park Service now is in the process of acquiring necessary lands. The West Virginia portion of the Harpers Ferry National Monument has been accepted for administration pending formal establishment of the area upon tender of the Maryland portion.

Establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in Hawaii, was authorized in legislation approved by the President in July 1955, and the Department of the Interior has recommended that the Congress authorize establishment of a Virgin Islands National Park. Moreover, the Department has signified its willingness to designate Chimney Rock, Nebr., and Promontory Point, Utah, as national historic sites in non-Federal ownership.

Important progress has been made toward fulfillment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area project and all but 5,000 of the 28,500 acres within the project boundaries have been acquired. Negotiations for the majority of tracts needed for the Independence National Historical Park are in their final stages.

The integrity of the national park system has been maintained under this administration. Not only have park boundaries been protected and extended but vigorous support has been given the National Park Service in resisting developments which would unjustifiably intrude upon the natural beauty of park areas. Among such proposals which the administration rejected were:

An effort to obtain authority to construct a dam at Glacier View which, if built, would flood 20,000 acres of Glacier National Park. Rejected.

Efforts to obtain permits for construction of tramways at Mount Rainier National Park, Rocky Mountain National Park, Crater Lake National Park, and Grand Canyon National Park. Rejected.

Efforts to modify the newly extended boundaries of Olympic National Park. Rejected.

Efforts to construct a TV transmission tower in Scotts Bluff National Monument. Rejected

Efforts to open Joshua Tree National Monument to mineral prospecting and mining, or to abolish it altogether. Rejected.

Protection of Joshua Tree National Monument was strengthened when 10,000 acres inside the monument boundaries were acquired in exchange for 10,000 acres of federally owned grazing land outside the park.

One of the first acts of this administration was to reverse the unfortunate 15-year cycle of neglect of our parks which was touched off by World War II and prolonged by the Korean conflict. An administration program calling for substantial increases in parks appropriations has been approved by the Congress.

In January 1953 the National Park Service was operating under a fiscal-year budget of $33,162,330.

For the current fiscal year the park budget is $45,029,300—an increase of some 40 percent.

The new budget provides for 4,650 man-years employment in the parks system, an increase of 25 percent over the man years provided in the 1952–53 budget. One result has been to raise the park ranger force to its greatest strength in history.

Increased appropriations have enabled the National Park Service to make a

good start on reducing the accumulated backlog of uncompleted and projected projects for road and trail construction and improvement of public facilities and park housing. Working cooperatively, the Park Service and concession operators have made great strides in development of a more realistic program for the modernization of privately operated facilities in the parks. For instance, in Grand Teton National Park, where travel has increased more than 500 percent over 1946, public use facilities are being developed in a program calling for an investment of more than $5 million in private capital; a building and expansion program under way at Grand Canyon National Park calls for expenditure of about $1 million by the concessioner; and similar forward looking programs are either under way or contemplated in other areas.

Gratifying progress is being made in the task of catching up with the demands being made upon the parks today. But that is not enough. The increasing number of visitors to national park areas—21 million in 1946—about 50 million in 1955—demands action on a dynamic program which will place the Park Service in a position to cope with an expected visitor load of 80 million a decade hence.

Such a program is now being formulated by the National Park Service. Its preparation already has revitalized the Service. Called Mission 66, its objective is to fully equip the national park system to carry out its basic purposes by 1966, the 50th anniversary of the Service.

It is the sincere belief that Mission 66 will prove to be the finest contribution to our national parks since the Service was established as a Bureau of the Department of the Interior in 1916.

Sport fishing: Funds for financing the program of Federal aid to the States for fish restoration have been available at record levels under the Eisenhower administration. Under this nationwide program significant progress has been made in Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania Fish Commission has emphasized the creation and purchase of public fishing waters. Federal funds have been used to defray 75 percent of the cost of the following projects:

Project:	Cost
Somerset Lake and Dam	$127,042
Glade Run Lake and Dam	66,647
Glade Run Lake and Dam site (Butler County)	21,614
Ice Dale Lake (Chester County)	21,000
Virgin Run Dam and Lake (Fayette County)	68,166
Somerset Lake site (Somerset County)	75,682
Total	380,151

In addition to the foregoing, project plans have been approved for 2 additional projects, which, when completed, will cost an additional $66,300, as follows:

Goldsboro Lake (Wayne and Monroe Counties)	$30,000
Lower Woods Pond (Wayne County)	36,300
Total	66,300

When completed, the work which has been approved to date will have added materially to the recreational opportunities available to Pennsylvania's anglers.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is conducting a nationwide survey to determine the amount of money and time spent annually by American sportsmen afield and on the water. This survey is being undertaken to determine what help the sportsman needs in the form of legislation. It is hoped by this survey to make the public better aware of the sizable contribution of sportsmen to our national income so that greater attention might be focused on their needs.

Wildlife protection: False rumors of a giveaway of wildlife refuges and a land grab of refuge areas by the military have caused sincere conservationists much undue concern. Again, let us examine such rumors in the light of hard facts on the public records.

Not one acre of wildlife refuge area under the primary jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service has been transferred to the military since the Eisenhower administration took office.

Since January 1953 the Department of the Interior has established 8 new wildlife refuges and 3 more are in the process of being established. During that period the Department acquired 79,946 additional acres for wildlife preservation through purchase, lease, or transfer of federally owned lands.

Under the Eisenhower administration Federal wildlife refuges have been established for the first time in Kansas and Colorado and new lands have been added to the Federal refuge program in Louisiana, North Dakota, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Florida, Maine, Oregon, Idaho, Michigan, and New York.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, wildlife refuges received the largest allocation ever made for acquisition, development, and maintenance. This totaled $6,614,200 and was $2 million more than the refuges had been allocated in the annual budget when this administration assumed office.

It is gratifying to know that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission approved purchase of 30,189 acres of refuge lands at a cost of some $645,000—the largest expenditure of duck-stamp funds for refuge acquisition since 1945.

In administration of a national wildlife-refuge program that has been carried out over a period of 52 years, it must be expected that some refuge areas would outlive their usefulness, especially where they were established to meet temporary emergencies until more efficient areas could be acquired.

In the 6 years preceding the Eisenhower administration, for instance, 36 wildlife refuges were abolished. The total Federal wildlife reserves were reduced by 408,527 acres.

The Eisenhower administration has dropped 7 refuges totaling 6,226 acres, made up of small units of low productivity, where administrative costs were not justified.

Secondary use for wildlife of the 56,954-acre Fort Keogh Refuge in Montana, administered by the Department of Agriculture, was relinquished by the Fish and Wildlife Service because of administrative duplication and limited wildlife values. Wildlife potentials of this area will continue to be maintained by the Department of Agriculture.

The Eisenhower administration has not and will not voluntarily surrender any refuge of proven value to wildlife as long as it continues to meet wildlife conservation needs. Wildlife refuges, as well as national parks and forests, are regarded by the administration as irreplaceable national assets whose value is clearly established.

A refuge of proven value is the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge. Currently, the Department of the Interior is negotiating with the Department of the Army in an effort to maintain the refuge boundaries intact. In 1953, the Department of the Interior, of which the Fish and Wildlife Service is a part, made known its strong opposition to any reduction in the size of the Wichita refuge, and Secretary McKay has reiterated this position.

In the last session of Congress, legislation was enacted authorizing the expansion of Fort Sill, which adjoins the Wichita refuge. The Army's plans, as outlined before congressional committees, called for the acquisition of some 20,000 acres of privately owned lands and the transfer of some 10,700 acres of the Wichita refuge.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has proposed an alternative plan under which the refuge boundaries would remain intact while the Army would be permitted to set up areas within the refuge from which projectiles could be fired to land on target areas within the military reservation.

The Military Establishments have been cooperative in allowing large areas over which they hold primary jurisdiction to be used as wildlife refuges. It is the hope that a mutually satisfactory solution of the problem at Wichita can be found.

In this connection, a significant agreement between the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Corps of Engineers was completed in August 1954. Under this plan, the transfer of wildlife lands to the Service and to the State conservation departments has been expedited. The Service now assists the Corps of Engineers in conducting hearings at which there is full public consideration of the importance of integrating fish and wildlife protection measures into planning for flood control and navigation developments.

The national wildlife refuges, under the programs of this administration, are contributing importantly to the Nation's recreational needs without interfering with the paramount conservation objectives for which the refuges were established. Last year over 5,200,000 persons visited the refuge areas, an increase of more than 11 percent over the 1953 record of visitors.

Public lands and forests: One of the most important conservation measures in many years—Public Law 167—was signed by President Eisenhower on July 23, 1955.

A major provision of this law gives the Department of the Interior authority to control surface resources on mining claims. This is a conservation tool for which the administration worked ever since taking office.

Another major provision, removed commonly occurring minerals such as sand, gravel, and cinders from the general mining laws and placed them under jurisdiction of the Materials Act of 1947.

Now, at long last, the Government has authority to end many of the abuses which had developed over the years under the old mining laws. Prior to enactment of Public Law 167, location of a mining claim conferred upon the locator rights of exclusive possession of the surface. It was possible to establish claims for low-value minerals and acquire far more valuable surface resources, such as rich timber stands, or a summer home or business site, or a water hole on grazing land. Many such claims were established in our national forests and under the law the Government was required to honor them.

The Government now has the authority, prior to issuance of a patent on a mining claim, to manage the surface resources of the claim. This includes, of course, the cutting and sale of timber, grazing of livestock, and use of the surface of the claim for access to adjacent lands.

Important measures for the conservation of the open public rangelands of the West have been taken by the Eisenhower administration. The Department of the Interior's new 20-year program for soil and moisture conservation is but one of the progressive steps that have been taken to conserve our important natural resources. Under this program, the Federal range is being reseeded and effective measures are being taken to halt heretofore unchecked erosion of the soil.

Good conservation calls for wise use without abuse of the vast expanses of public domain land beyond the boundaries of national park and wildlife refuge areas. Many citizens do not realize that the Federal Government still retains control of about 1 out of every 4 acres in the United States. As our population expands, so do public demands for use of undeveloped Federal acres. A number of laws provide that public domain lands must be transferred to private ownership when all requirements of those laws are met. The Department of the Interior has the responsibility of so classifying the vacant public land that it is put to its highest use possible under the law. Often when the administration complies with the law—and I am sure that no citizen would want it to do otherwise—the cry of giveaway is raised in some political quarters. It is significant that not one allegation of giveaway has been, or can be, substantiated.

Water resources: Regarding the problem of water as a diminishing resource, the Eisenhower administration has also been moving forward on that front. Realizing the importance of the Nation's water resources and that the conservation and use which we make of them may in large measure determine our future progress, President Eisenhower last year established a Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy.

The President realized that policies in this field have been modified repeatedly and that unfortunately the Government has often relied on piecemeal or stopgap measures. Accordingly, he charged the committee with the task of undertaking a comprehensive review looking toward strengthening and modernizing Federal policies and programs in the field of water resources.

The Presidential Advisory Committee's report is now nearing completion and will provide the administration with a sound basis on which to make recommendations for the solution of these tremendously important and complicated problems.

In conclusion this report of progress will do much to convince the American people that the Republican administration is faithfully exercising its stewardship of the Nation's natural resources. Our record is ineed creditable and it is up to us to bring it to the attention of the people thus revealing that the charges of giveaway are wholly unsubstantiated.

Now Retired Officers Are Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal of January 7, 1956:

NOW RETIRED OFFICERS ARE SOUGHT

The Department of Labor's action in having its Bureau of Employment Security undertake a program for seeking out retired officers and other former Armed Forces personnel to fill some of the hundreds of vacant teaching positions in the Nation's secondary schools is most commendable.

There must be literally thousands of retired service personnel skilled in mathematics and sciences who would make excellent teachers. Certainly, anyone who has served a career in one of the military services must have attended a number of service schools and many of them have had experience teaching in them.

The ironical twist is that here we have an agency of the Federal Government recognizing the special qualifications of retired service officers and actively working to get them placed in the school systems of the various States. Yet the Federal Government itself has erected formidable barriers to keep the majority of such officers from its own employment.

The act of 1894 says that retired officers may not accept Federal civilian jobs where the retired pay or the civilian position amounts to $2,500 or more unless it is an elected office or appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate or unless the officer was retired for battle injuries or disability incurred in line of duty. Furthermore, the Economy Act of 1932, as amended last year, provides that even those permitted Federal employment by the 1894 act may not draw more than $10,000 in combined retired and civilian pay.

The result is that hundreds of qualified officers are kept from Federal jobs they could fill efficiently and honorably. They are barred by the same Federal Government which is now seeking to find them jobs in the States.

Both the House Armed Services Committee and the Civil Service Commission are studying this problem. Some action may be expected at this session. We hope both of these restrictive laws will be repealed and retired officers placed on a par with others in the matter of filling Federal Government positions.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Civil Rights Rally of the Conference on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of remarks I made at a civil rights rally held at the Manhattan Center, in New York City, on Thursday, December 15, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my pleasure and privilege to be here tonight at this rally sponsored by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, in a cause to which I am committed with all my heart.

I began fighting for Federal civil rights legislation 7 years ago, as soon as I became a Member of the Senate. Your organization, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, was brought into being at about the same time. Our efforts, mine in the Senate, and yours, within the framework of this leadership conference, have been both contemporaneous and collaborative.

In these 7 years, marked progress has been made toward the goal of equal human rights for all our citizens. Indeed, we have moved steadily forward during the past 30 years.

One redoubt after another has been captured in the assault against the destructive institutions of discrimination and segregation. One area of activity after another has been liberated, or partly so, from these degrading practices. This progress has been made, and continues to be made, as a result of action by State and local law-making bodies, administrative agencies and officials, and by the courts of the land.

This progress has been made possible—indeed it has been forced—by the militancy of the groups you represent, armed with the massive support of public opinion. And to you, and the groups you represent, will belong an important share of the credit for the future progress that will and must be made.

But in giving credit, let us not forget to name one individual—one very dear to me, and to many of you—the founding and driving spirit of the leadership conference from its inception until his untimely death—a rare spirit with a dream in his heart and unquenchable courage in his soul—the late, beloved Walter White.

Yes, there has been progress. But the distance left to go is farther—much farther—than that which we have already come.

I believe, with all my heart, that the fight for equal human rights must be pressed, in full vigor, and at all levels—in the executive branch of Government, in the courts, and in every law-making body throughout the land. And I mean to include not only the State legislatures, the city councils, and the school boards, but also, and even primarily, the Congress of the United States.

I believe that the whole struggle for civil rights—for equal treatment under law and equal opportunity for every man, woman, and child, regardless of race, creed, or national origin—must be carried forward relentlessly and tirelessly until victory is won. There must be no delay in this struggle for reasons of political expediency—or any other.

The demand by one-eighth of our population for the full minimum rights of citizenship—and for all the protections which our Constitution affords to each and all—cannot be postponed, denied, or repressed.

The electric shock which passed through a major section of our people as a result of the shameful murder of Emmet Till and the acquittal of his assailants has given new meaning to the demand for equal justice under law for every American.

We must and will demand action in the months ahead, including, as I have said, in the Congress of the United States. That is my forum of action—the Senate. I pledge you my efforts, for what they are worth, up and down the line, on this front.

I have referred to the progress that has been made in the past. Congress has played a role in this progress. Its role has been to supply pressure and to exert, through the threat of national FEP legislation, for instance, a strong impetus for action at other levels and on other fronts.

But it is an astounding fact that Congress has not passed one single piece of major civil rights legislation—not one—not only in the last 30 years, but in the last 78 years. Think of that.

You all know the reason for that—the filibuster, and the threat of the filibuster—in the Senate.

That weapon is still available to those who desperately oppose civil rights legislation.

The only cure for the filibuster is a change in the rules of the Senate—an antifilibuster or cloture rule—a change in rule 22. For the past 5 years we have concentrated on getting such a change in the rules—but, thus far, in vain.

There wasn't much of an effort last year, in the first session of the Congress. I doubt whether there will be much more of an effort in the next session.

I hope that in 1956 a Congress will be elected which will make such an effort, and succeed. But that is up to you and to all the voters of the United States. The civil-rights issue must be framed in 1956, and the voters must give a clear mandate for action by the Senate on, among other things, its own rules of procedure. If such a mandate is given, an effective antifilibuster cloture rule can and will be adopted.

But I want to say a few words about the session of Congress that will meet, not in 1957, but next year—in fact, in about 3 weeks from tonight.

A great number of civil rights bills were introduced in the first session of this Congress which ended last August. These bills are pigeonholed in committee. With some exceptions and modifications, these are the same civil rights bills which have been before the Congress for a number of years. Included among them are FEP bills, anti-poll tax bills, and antilynch bills.

I doubt if any substantial legislation on these subjects will get very far, or even be given much genuine consideration. I hope that my prediction will turn out to be wrong; I will do my best to prove it wrong, but I'm afraid it is going to be sadly right.

There are, however, some less controversial civil rights measures which might be favorably acted on. One is a bill I have introduced to make it a Federal offense for a civilian or group of civilians to attack or assault a GI while on duty. This is a common occurrence in some parts of our country, especially if the GI is of a minority race or national origin. Local sheriffs and police officers are frequent offenders in this regard, and the bill I have introduced would provide GI's with the protection of Federal law. There is some prospect that such a bill might pass since the Defense Department has been in favor of it.

A second measure which might pass is a constitutional amendment prohibiting poll taxes. The majority leader of the Senate, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, has announced has announced that he will use his influence in behalf of such a measure.

With his support, and that of the majority policy committee, such a constitutional amendment might well pass the Senate, and the House, too. Such an amendment would then require the approval of the legislatures of 36 of the 43 States of the Union. Whether ratification by such an overwhelming number of State legislatures is practically possible, I do not know. It would, of course, be much easier for Congress to pass a simple law outlawing the poll tax. I, myself, would prefer such a course of action, but there is not much chance of that in this session.

But even approval of a constitutional amendment would represent some action on this front by the Congress. As such, I will vote for such a constitutional amendment, if it is, in fact, brought up for a vote. But let me make myself clear.

I am not going to be content—and I don't think you are going to be content—with congressional action on a constitutional poll-tax amendment if such action is offered in satisfaction of our demands for substantial and significant civil-rights legislation.

The time has come for Congress to take some real action on civil-rights legislation, and this Congress, at this forthcoming session beginning in January, is going to be faced, whether some like it or not, with some meaningful honest-to-goodness civil-rights issues.

There is going to be a demand, I am sure, for a strenghening of the civil-rights section of the Justice Department, so that there can be no doubt of the right of the Federal Government to act in such cases as the Emmet Till tragedy.

I favor such legislation, and am a sponsor of a bill to this effect.

There is also the matter of an antisegregation amendmnet to the school-construction bill.

There are pending in Congress several measures for Federal grants of money to the States to help build more public schools. There is nationwide support for this legislation. We are, indeed, in critical need of more and better public schools for our children.

I strongly favor this legislation, in the version proposed by Senator HILL.

Yes; I favor the principle of Federal aid to help build more and better schools for all our children. But it seems almost elementary to me that for the very purpose of improving and expanding our public-school facilities, it is essential to carry out the decision and decrees of the Supreme Court with regard to school segregation.

The question is: Shall we distribute tax money, raised by taxation of all the people, to States which are trying to avoid, evade, and defy the Supreme Court decree? Shall we help some States and school districts perpetuate segregation and defy the law of the land? Shall we in Congress say that school segregation is not our concern but only the business of the courts? Shall we in Congress stand above the battle and let the issue be fought out exclusively in the courts?

To these questions, I, personally, answer with all the fervor at my command, "No."

I am going to propose an antisegregation amendment to the Federal school construction bill, even if I am the only one in the Senate to support it. I shall offer such an amendment, although I reserve decision as to the time and place for offering this amendment, whether in committee or on the floor of the Senate. And I shall fight for it, with all the strength I have.

But believing with equal fervor in the cause of Federal aid to education, I shall vote for and support a Federal aid to education bill, even if, despite my efforts, the anti-segregation amendment is defeated. I want to be frank with you about that.

Now I said a few moments ago that the kind of Congress that is elected in 1956 will determine the kind of action that is to be expected on major civil rights legislation in the Congress that convenes in January, 1957. And I indicated that the voters and citizens have it in their power to determine the kind of Congress that is elected and the kind of mandate that is given to that Congress.

But I am well aware that in some parts of our country there are large groups of potential voters who are denied the right to register and vote—not by the poll tax, but by naked intimidation—moral, physical or economic.

Among the areas in which this is true are some in the North, but mostly in the South.

This is not democracy. It is a subversion of democracy.

I propose that we remedy this situation. I propose that we establish Federal machinery to insure to every citizen protection against intimidation, direct or indirect, physical or moral, in exercising his constitutional right of voting and participating in the political life of community, state, and nation.

I propose that a Federal electoral commission with enforcement powers be established for this purpose. I am going to introduce legislation to accomplish this purpose. I have been working on a draft bill. As soon as I perfect it, I am going to introduce it. I don't know how far it will get in the coming session, but such a bill must be passed eventually. I commend this measure to you. I hope that the organizations represented here tonight will consider such a proposal worthy of support.

My friends, I have not given you an optimistic report on the prospects of major legislative action on civil rights in the coming session of Congress. But I have not meant to be discouraging, only realistic. I offer no counsel of despair, but I believe we should see the situation for what it is and commit our forces and energies accordingly.

Speaking for myself, I believe the struggle has got to be waged—not sometime in the distant future, but next year, now, beginning tonight. I believe, and strongly feel, that we need to offer full-scale battle in this good cause, no matter how great the odds, nor how bleak the prospect.

The greater the difficulty, the greater the challenge. Let us hereby resolve with sober and measured determination, that we will not give up, nor diminish our effort nor lose hope, nor surrender—until victory is ours.

In these efforts, we know we are on the side of right. We know that we are animated by high moral purpose. We know that much of the world watches what we do, and measures our country by the dedication we show in this cause. Let us not flag nor fail.

Postal Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. KERR SCOTT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a speech on postal policy made during the recess by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed also an editorial from this month's Progressive Farmer, Dr. Clarence Poe's great southern farm journal, complimenting the Senator on his forthright stand regarding the so-called postal deficit.

There being no objection, the address and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, DELIVERED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATED THIRD CLASS MAIL USERS, THE MORRISON HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., SEPTEMBER 13, 1955

Ladies and gentlemen, your association was kind enough to invite me to be its speaker at Milwaukee in October 1952. I looked forward to that meeting, but unforeseen developments made it impossible for me to join you. I understand my very able colleague, Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, addressed you on that occasion.

When you met in Detroit in 1953, you were fortunate to have Senator FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, as your speaker. I read the fine address he delivered on that occasion. Although Senator CARLSON and I belong to different political parties, we hold similar views regarding the need for an improved postal establishment. I can assure you that the members of our Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee will continue their efforts to achieve a realistic, modern postal policy for the United States.

Your association's practice of inviting to its annual meetings speakers from the legislative and executive branches of Government is a wise one. I know of no more complex or more misunderstood subjects than the creation of a modern postal establishment and the continuing request for higher postal rates. More often than not the prepondenance of pressure on these issues is exerted by appointees in the executive branch. Since all wisdom does not repose in these public servants, the Congress is extremely anxious to recruit the ideas, the thinking and the cooperation of persons and business firms whose own livlihood, plus that of their millions of employees, depends on what we legislators do in Washington.

The Congress has refused to be stampeded into hasty and ill-advised action. It has stood firm in the face of the severest pressures by the administration to have legislation enacted divesting Congress of the ratemaking power and hiking mail rates to ruinous levels.

The Constitution clearly directs that the Congress shall have full responsibility for United States postal policy.

You have my personal assurance that I will fight to the limit of my endurance to protect that prerogative.

Both major political parties are anxious that post office operations be modernized, that improvements long overdue be inaugurated. Unless we agree in the beginning that there are broad areas where economies can be achieved through modern business practices, it will be impossible to tackle the problem intelligently. Certainly we cannot legislate on postal rate legislation wisely until a sound course has been set for the Department. If, as many qualified observers believe, $250 million can be saved by elimination of waste in the postal establishment, it is unfair to the taxpayer to do nothing about it and then require the users of the mails to pay for such waste through increased rates.

The keystone of the Administration's present program is what they choose to call "temporary" rate increases. The enactment of this rate bill would only compound the ills which plague our postal service. There would be a declining volume of mail and, at the same time, a spiraling of postal costs. If Congress should relax its inquiry into postal problems, top officials would continue to ignore defects which are so costly and make for poor postal service.

A complete overhaul of the Department is in order. Like Barkis in David Copperfield, Congress is willing, yet all attempts to get underway have met with the firmest resistance by the present Postmaster General.

This is not simply political talk. It is not the natural aversion for one who foully characterizes my political party as "the party of treason." Testimony from all sides is available to show that Mr. Summerfield has played fast and loose with the facts to trick the public into believing that the postal establishment, under his guidance, has achieved almost revolutionary improvement.

There came a time a year or so ago when the Post Office Department was issuing press releases designed to convince the unwary that their management policies had produced savings of $1 million each working day. I took them to task on that one. I simply pionted out that they had conveniently neglected to show that $70 million of airmail subsidies had been transferred from Post Office accounts to the Civil Aeronautics Board, that $36 million of franked and penalty mail, in a bookkeeping transaction, had been moved elsewhere. He neglected further to state that postal rate increases totaling over $200 million ordered by the 82d Congress are also included in the million dollar a day savings.

In a speech at Buffalo on August 17, Mr. Summerfield stated: "You will recall that earlier I stated that the postal deficit was $727 million for the fiscal year 1952, the last full year before we assumed responsibility.

"In 1954, when the effects of new management policies were first reflected, the deficit was reduced to $399 million. This is a 45 percent reduction in 2 years."

He never seems to be bored with claiming that his policies have reduced the postal deficit.

Sometimes I feel like taking him at his own word. I am inclined to say, "Mr. Summerfield, you are an amazing administrator. In only 2 short years you have lopped $328 million off the postal deficit. Why, give you another 2 years to work your wonders and we will have this deficit licked."

In one of their first official appearances before a congressional committee, post-office spokesmen assured the House appropriations group they could achieve savings of $200 million within 2 years. They have a very neat formula for postal economies. They ask the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate for a certain amount of money to operate the Department, based on a predicted volume of mail in the ensuing year. Invariably the estimates of the volume of mail have been too high. Since the Department gets more money than it needs, it always has funds to turn back to the Treasury—although never quite equal to the overestimate of volume.

The most ridiculous waste of postal funds is the way the Nation is presently being bombarded with press releases.

But publicity will not solve the postal troubles.

Let me tell you of some things we have done about the postal problems and what we propose to do in the months ahead.

You will recall that the last Congress approved Senate Resolution 49. That measure provided for an investigation of the postal establishment under the guidance of a Citizens Advisory Council. The Advisory Council came up with some startling findings. They urged many reforms. They set the groundwork for a realistic, modern, business-like, efficient postal service. That report was severely criticized by the Department. Many of the suggestions have been adopted. On the major issues, however, the Department has refused to act. I was shocked when the work of the very fine Advisory Council under Senate Resolution 49 met wtih such strong opposition from the Department. If the major recommendations had been adopted, we would now have a sound postal policy.

As I have said, this is not a partisan issue. There have been Democratic Postmasters General, too, who failed to inaugurate needed reforms.

That the issue is bipartisan is best evidenced by the unanimous approval given both House and Senate resolutions in the last session of Congress to further investigate the potsal service. Our Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee is operating under Senate Resolution 33. I can assure you that we are not taking our task lightly. As agents of the United States Senate, we are expected to do as complete a job as possible and to make recommendations for the permanent improvement of the postal service . The Congress is anxious to dispose of this issue once and for all.

Here are some of the questions we will try to answer:

1. Is the manpower of the Department—500,000 employees in all—being utilized efficiently?

We know that postal workers are hard working and loyal Federal employees. For too long a period they were denied a rightful increase in their salaries. In spite of two presidential vetoes of pay bills, they finally had their salaries hiked. I am as sure of this as anything: If we give them the tools, better supervision, more modern working conditions, they will outproduce anybody. Their morale has necessarily been low. Their top boss has managed to convince a large segment of the public that the Post Office Department is the least important of Government agencies. The contrary, of course, is true.

That postal workers have continued working on so loyally in the face of the inability of Department officials to assess their true worth and the wonders performed by the postal establishment for the American economy is tribute to their tenacity.

2. Is the potsal service purely a business, or is it a service to all the people?

In this area, we have got to pin-point those services performed by the Department under legislative mandate at a calculated loss in the public welfare. We know, for instance, that only about 2,000 of the 40,000 offices take in sufficient revenue to meet their overhead.

We know that rural free delivery was established to serve millions of people remotely situated throughout America. The Congress knows that this service will never be able to show a profit. We should stop calling the cost of these needed services a deficit. Rural delivery is no different from the lighthouses operated by the Treasury Department. Shipowners do not pay a fee every time they pass one of them. They are operated at a calculated loss in the interest of better, safer shipping. The benefits of the postal service to the people are every bit as

direct as is the lighthouse service to the ship owner and the sailor, and they do exist.

The Congress has established low rates on many categories of mail. In these instances the question of profit has been shoved aside. I refer, of course, to free mail for the blind, free-in-county newspapers, philanthropic, educational and religious mail.

Under our agreements with the Universal Postal Union, the United States knowingly takes a calculated loss.

There are many, many more such items. Added up, they cost many millions of dollars. They are worth-while services. They will be continued by the Congress. I enjoyed reading in one of your trade magazines, the Reporter, a short list of nonpostal services performed by the Post Office Department. Permit me to read from the article:

"The Armed Forces ask that relatives of deceased men be located.

"The Housing Administration asks that former tenants be found.

"The Treasury pressures the sale of savings stamps and documentary stamps.

"The Department of the Interior depends upon the post offices to sell bird-hunting stamps.

"The Veterans Administration asks that we deliver flags for veterans' funerals.

"The Civil Service requests that we supply blanks and information on every vocation from lens grinders to linguists.

"Charitable organizations ask that money be received and transmitted for Heart, Polio, and Cancer.

"We count doves for the Agricultural Department.

"We answer inquiries from Selective Service.

"We give applicants blanks for alien registrations and their changes of address for the State Department.

"Even the Federal Bureau of Investigation enlists our aid and the 1040's we give away for Uncle Sam.

"What would happen to the revenues, if every post office didn't have income-tax blanks available on January 1 to April 15?

"Widows and children are certified in January and July for continued pension benefits.

"The Post Office Department operates the biggest savings bank in the world. Money orders are sold and cashed in the most remote places. The big mail-order houses look impressive, and they are, but the little people in the little places, using the money-order and parcel-post services, make them possible and big.

"The Post Office Department is the Government agency which deals most closely with every American citizen."

The only difficulty is that when the Post Office Department incurs these expenses on behalf of the people, the term "deficit" is used. With respect to expenditures for all other Government agencies, the nicer word "appropriation" is employed.

Post Office Department officials have made a bogeyman of the postal deficit. If they would only announce—as they should—that their Department creates more in wealth, taxes, and employment than any other Federal agency, people would realize that for millions spent, billions are earned.

3. In the dull realm of accounting, statistics, regional management, classification, etc., our committee expects to uncover many glaring deficiencies.

4. The controversy over parcel post is another of the many questions our committee will examine.

The Hoover Commission hints that parcel post should be discontinued. The Railway Express people contend that parcel post competes with private enterprise. The Postmaster General, in effect, recommends repeal of Public Law 199.

Representatives and Senators, snowed under by the pros and cons of the fourth-class issue, are looking to our committee for some sound recommendations.

Our committee will be calling on many of you for help and guidance. We feel confident you will give us all-out cooperation.

These are just a few of the matters our committee and the House committee will look into. We fully expect that any recommendations we make to the Senate and House will be favorably received.

I suppose your own industry is the best evidence of how much good can be created by Government acting wisely in the people's interest.

Direct mail has been the subject of attack in the press and, sometimes, in the halls of Congress. For the most part, these attacks have been unfair. Your very success has probably stimulated many of them.

I should like to outline some of the facts regarding third-class mail, not necessarily for your own edification but rather for those outside the industry who at some future time may read these remarks.

Many people have been led to believe that you are taking a free ride. They assume that it costs as much to handle a third-class letter as it does a first-class mailing. They fail to realize that the factors which prompted the creation of this category of mail warrant charging a lower rate of postage for it.

Back in the depression-ridden thirties someone figured out that there wasn't a sufficient volume of mail to keep each postal employee fully occupied for an 8-hour period. It was recognized that first-class mail doesn't flow in evenly all day. At certain peak periods it floods in. This first-class mail properly receives preferred treatment. During peak periods, every clerk was needed to speed first-class mail on its way. The job was usually completed in several hours. How to keep these clerks profitably occupied during slack periods?—whoever answered that question would raise revenues for the Department not otherwise obtainable. Lower rates during the evening hours paid off for the telephone and telegraph companies. Why not for the Post Office Department? The charge for a 50-word telegram at straight rates from Washington to San Francisco is $3.45. The same 50 words at night rates, which received deferred service, cost only $1.30. Why the lower rate? Overhead remains the same, and employees get higher rates of pay.

The answer was, of course, obvious. It was better to use these expensive facilities at a lower rate than not at all.

The same thing applies in other fields. You pay less to see a movie in the afternoon than at night. Natural gas companies often contract on the basis of lower rates during slack periods.

The reverse principle is sometimes applied. Barbers may charge more for children's haircuts on Saturdays. They figure the youngsters can come in after school any day when other customers are scarce.

It was this economic principle which prompted Congress to lower the minimum piece rate on bulk third-class mail to 1 cent. In order to qualify for the special rate, the mailer had to sort the mail into State and city bundles, face the letters on either side of the bundle, tie the bundles, use printed indicia or precanceled stamps (this eliminated the canceling indicia expense), place the bundles in mail sacks, and deliver them to the post office. All that was left to be done was to put the sacks on an outgoing train. In other words, the mailer himself had to do 7 of 11 expensive handling operations. These rules still apply to third-class mail. In addition, third-class mail is not handled until all other mail is out of the way. This category of mail is sort of a byproduct of the postal service, a fill-in operation, if you please, to keep valuable clerks busy in periods when they might otherwise be idle.

The results of this congressional action have been fantastic. The volume of third-class mail has increased from 4½ billion pieces in 1944 to 13 billion pieces in 1954. Direct mail today is the second largest advertising medium, surpassed only by newspapers.

This phenomenal growth of direct mail undoubtedly stems largely from the fact that countless small-business men have been able to use it profitably.

Large corporations have advertising budgets which permit nationwide television, radio, and magazine coverage. Direct mail permits the smallest company to market its goods in any or every part of the Nation on a small budget.

In this era of big-business mergers, it is essential that small-business men be encouraged and protected. A Democrat-controlled Congress will, as it has in the past, be always on the alert against efforts to destroy our Nation's greatest asset, its small-business men.

Only in the aggregate may it be said that you are big business. The vast outpouring of direct mail by the 250,000 bulk permit holders means millions of jobs for those creating the advertising and those Americans who produce the goods and services sold.

In 1944 the Post Office received $62 million in revenue from third-class mailers. By fiscal 1955 the figure had reached $250 million.

If we were to further raise the rate for third-class mail, we might very well set off a disastrous chain of events which would cause a reduced volume of such mail, unemployment, and lower taxpayments. As recently as July 1952, we raised the rate on third-class mail by 50 percent. I tried in that particular Congress to hold the increase to 25 percent, but without success. I am certainly opposed to increasing it the full 100 percent over the original 1-cent rate, as the Postmaster General wants to do.

It is highly doubtful that the overhead of the Department would be reduced to any extent if third-class mail were legislated out of the service entirely. The only sure result would be the loss of one-quarter billion dollars in revenue to the Department, aside from the economic hardships you businessmen would endure. Postal rates should not be changed until a sound postal policy has been established by Congress.

It has been a pleasure being here today. I only wish other Members of Congress had an opportunity to meet with you in person, to learn of your business operations. Since all of you cannot get to Washington, you are well advised to continue your trade association there. When the advisory council was functioning during the last Congress, your director, Mr. Jack Tillotson, was a source of unending information. He worked as hard as anyone on the advisory council. He deserves a vote of thanks from all.

Your executive manager, Harry Maginnis, has cooperated fully with the House and Senate Post Office Committees. His testimony before the House group in July 1953 was a gem of logic presented in your behalf.

Senators and Representatives are busy considering many problems. It is particularly important, therefore, that associations such as yours continue to exist. We are constantly bombarded with propaganda from the executive branch of Government, and it is essential that we hear from you.

If ever the time comes when we hear only one side of the postal picture, I am afraid it will be a sad day for small-business men like yourselves.

I wish you a successful meeting. Keep the mail rolling. We will do all we can in Washington to keep you in business.

Post Office Department: Service or Business?

The Post Office Department costs the Federal Government several hundred million

dollars a year more than it receives from those who use the mails. The postal deficit has led to a demand for increased postal rates on the first-class mail, such as letters; on second-class material, such as magazines; and on circular letters and other third-class mail. You have also heard it claimed that present rates give a huge subsidy to those magazine publishers that deliver their publications to subscribers through the mail. Farm organizations have taken certain publishers to task for opposing subsidies to farmers, claiming publishers themselves are the recipients of millions of dollars in postal rate subsidies.

All this leads to some very pertinent questions that should be earnestly considered by all users of the mails, including Progressive Farmer subscribers.

Is the postal service purely a business, or is it a service to all the people?

If it is purely a business, then the logical thing to do is to insist that the Post Office Department put into effect every possible economy consistent with good service. Then charge the users of the mail what it costs to deliver it. But before you decide that the postal service is purely a business, let's see what services it gives, to whom they are rendered, and why they cost so much.

First off, Progressive Farmer readers should know that there are 40,000 post offices in the United States. And only about 2,000 of them take in enough revenue to meet their overhead costs. Perhaps your own post office is one that does not pay its way. Why then is it kept open? Certainly, not as a service to magazines, such as the Progressive Farmer. Monthly magazines can be delivered from 20,000 post offices just about as effectively as from 40,000. If you have a post office that costs the Government money, it is not as a favor to magazines. It is because the people in your community want it. It renders services they would not willingly give up.

The rural free delivery was established to serve millions of people living a good way out from town. Congress knows that it would be out of the question to raise rates enough for this service to show a profit. Yet, if the postal service is purely a business, shouldn't rural free delivery show a profit?

As Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, so aptly illustrates, "We should stop calling the cost of these needed services deficit. Rural delivery is no different from the lighthouses operated by the Treasury Department. Ship owners do not pay a fee every time they pass one of them. They are operated as a calculated loss in interest of better, safer shipping. The benefits of postal service to the people are every bit as direct."

There are a number of categories of mail that are either carried free of charge or at very low rates. An enormous volume of official Government mail—correspondence and publications of Congress and all Government agencies, and organizations—is carried free. Other such mail carried free of charge or at low rates includes free-mail-for-the-blind, free-in-county newspapers, charity, educational, and religious mail. And there are many other nonpostal services performed by the Post Office Department from which it receives no revenue. Here are just a few of them; as listed by Senator JOHNSTON:

1. Relatives of deceased men in Armed Forces are located.

2. Former tenants are located for the Housing Authority.

3. Doves are counted for the USDA.

4. Post offices receive and transmit money for heart, polio, and cancer organizations.

All these services cost money. If they were rendered by any other department of the Government, their cost would be taken care of by congressional appropriations. But when the Post Office Department incurs them, they become deficits. And those who use the mails are held responsible.

There is nothing wrong in the Federal Government spending money for these good services. And it is entirely proper for the Government to have 38,000 money-losing post offices, if they are a service to poeple and the people want them and are willing to pay for them. But it is decidedly unfair to say that the cost of these services to all the people should be charged largely against the comparatively few concerns that must use the mails to conduct their business.

Is the postal service purely a business, or is it a service to all the people? Until this question is answered by Congress, there can be no sound basis on which to establish postal rates. If the Post Office Department is a service to all the people, it does not follow that publications such as the Progressive Farmer should be carried free of charge. But it should mean rates somewhat lower than are necessary for the Post Office Department to show a profit. And it would also be recognized that the deficits of the Department are not a subsidy to publishers, but rather a service to the people that creates more in wealth, taxes, and employment than any other Federal agency.

Insofar as the Progressive Farmer is concerned in postal rates, we can say this: If we have been subsidized by low postal rates, it has not gone into the pockets of Progressive Farmer owners. If we have received a subsidy, then that subsidy has been passed on to our subscribers in low subscription rates. We give 60 big issues of from 100 to 200 pages an issue for the low cost of $2. That's 3⅓ cents an issue. To send a 176-page issue to a subscriber costs the Progressive Farmer 20 cents.

Three increases of 10 percent each were made in second-class postage rates in 1952, 1953, and 1954. The Progressive Farmer does not oppose further increases, if they are found necessary after Congress has established a sound fiscal and postal policy for the Post Office Department. But we do object to the continual agitation of the rate question by the Postmaster General and his attempt to make it appear that publishers are the recipients of huge Government subsidies.

Japan's Garment Worker Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am sure many Members of the Senate are aware of the problem resulting from the large-scale importation into the United States of Japanese blouses in recent months. This situation has given great concern to many citizens of my State, including members of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

In connection with this problem, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a reprint of an article dealing with this matter, which appeared in the December 20 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS HORIZONS: JAPAN'S GARMENT WORKER PROBLEM

(By Gordon Walker)

TOKYO.—Fumiko Tamashita, age 17 and just out of high school, is a worker in what is known as Japan's garment industry.

Like hundreds of other young girls in the smoky outskirts of Osaka, she races through a breakfast of cold rice and then takes a crowded tram to her factory. It really isn't a factory; it is a poorly heated and poorly lighted shed in which 28 girls gather each day to sew, cut, and pattern cotton blouses.

One might also say that there really isn't any garment industry, either. It is really only an adjunct to the textile-producing industry—a sort of cottage industry to which contracts are let out by the big spinning mills.

Unlike employees of the big textile mills with their labor standards laws, their company mess halls, and dormitories, the garment workers of Japan are in a different class. There are no such things as labor standards, no unions, no wage levels except very low ones, and no such thing as fringe benefits.

Fumiko gets an average wage—$9.25 a month for working 6 days a week at an average of 10 hours a day. She is a sewer in the establishment of a small enterpriser who manufactures cotton blouses on contract for one of the Big Ten textile manufacturers. When the blouses are finished, they are delivered to the textile firm which in turn processes them, packages them, and exports them.

Even with a liberal markup for local profit, the American importer gets the blouses at a ridiculously low cost, based upon the fact that Fumiko and others like her work for what amounts to slave-labor wages.

Women who work in the big textile mills make an average monthly wage of $34 for an 8-hour day. But in the subcontracted garment shops, a girl may make as low as $7 a month, and a maximum of $20. With thousands of young girls pouring out of the schools of Japan each year, the cottage-industry employer has little difficulty finding girls who are willing to lash themselves to his machines.

The problem which this poses, meanwhile, is only too obvious. American garment industry representatives are now protesting vigorously over what they consider to be Japanese dumping. And they have a case. They are justifiably concerned over the fact that there are American importers who are willing and eager to accept Japanese blouses, manufactured under repressive labor conditions, and who in some cases put on American labels as a means of disguise for otherwise discriminating buyers.

The fact that the Japanese have voluntarily cut down on textile exports to the United States in recent weeks is not enough. And the claim, made here, that Japan is not dumping but merely engaging in free trade based upon an advantageous wage structure, is also unlikely to make for better international understanding.

What appears to be happening is that by pushing its garment exports to the United States, Japan is building up protectionist sentiments not only among American textile organizations, but over a much larger cross section of American industry.

It is too much to expect that the benevolence of Japanese garment manufacturers will result in Fumiko and her fellow workers receiving a substantial raise. That will come only through pressure from trade unions which so far have not penetrated into the dismal back streets of Osaka's industrial metropolis.

It is possible for the Japanese Government to move in, as it has in other industries, and impose a series of controls. Government interference is not something which private

manufacturers normally welcome. And yet in Japan today there appears to be little alternative. A refusal on the part of the Japanese to recognize the damage they are doing to their own export program in the matter of large-scale garment sales abroad may result in injury to a wide range of other sales ranging from toys to cargo freighters.

Shipbuilding Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the importance of the American merchant marine to our national economy and our national security is no less today than it was last year, or for that matter, during the last decade. For the sake of the future, our fourth arm of defense must be preserved, and all of its supporting industries must be encouraged. In this regard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting editorial on the subject of Shipbuilding Report, which appeared on November 17, 1955, in the Pilot, a fine weekly newspaper published at Union Bridge, Md.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHIPBUILDING REPORT

A short time ago the Federal Maritime Board, along with a group of members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, visited European shipbuilding centers. The Board's Chairman, Clarence G. Morse, has made a significant report in a speech entitled "An Adequate American Merchant Marine."

Early in this talk Mr. Morse said: "The worldwide potential of shipping business continues to increase—and we, as a nation, have got to have our fair share of it. Foreign-flag operators will offer tough competition in worldwide shipping experience as well as with new, fast, and efficient cargo ships." Then Mr. Morse described the beehive of activity he saw in the yards and machinery works of Scotland, Germany, and other countries. With few exceptions "every major shipyard we visited employed more workers than are presently employed in all of the major American shipyards turning out seagoing merchant vessels." These yards are efficient, excellently equipped, and are well organized. For the most part, there is plenty of skilled labor and it works hard. The ships they produce are of good quality. As Mr. Morse put it, "True, our ships are built to what we feel are higher standards—of safety and comfort for passengers and crew. But their ships are designed for the purpose of making money, and in that they are eminently successful."

Then Mr. Morse went into some of the problems that confront the United States merchant marine in this intensely competitive situation and what is being done to solve them—both by Government agencies and by the shipping and shipbuilding companies.

In a short time we must replace some 300 of the ships in that important part of our merchant fleet which receives Government subsidies, provided to help offset the very great differences in both building and operating costs as between foreign and United States lines. Schedules for replacements have been worked out. As an example, Mr. Morse cited one of these schedules, which has been finalized, made for a company with 31 ships to be replaced. The job will be completed, over a 12-year period, at a cost of $313 million.

He also dealt with what is being done to "develop and maintain an American shipbuilding industry capable of filling our commercial needs and at the same time provide a basic, ever-ready nucleus of shipbuilding skills and facilities which can be expanded in time of national need." The figures are certainly impressive—contracts placed by private operators, along with Government programs placed through the Maritime Board, now total many hundreds of millions of dollars.

Space precludes coverage of many other important points brought up by Mr. Morse. He does not, it should be emphasized, intimate that all the problems involved have been licked. These are problems of a complex and long-range nature—and it is vital that they be continuously reviewed and dealt with in the interest of the national security and the economic welfare alike.

Finally, Mr. Morse said of the laws providing Government aid to our merchant marine: "These laws are designed for one thing alone—to put our private shipping business on a basis of parity with our foreign competition; from then on out it is up to them to successfully compete. I have every confidence that they can and will do so."

Address Delivered by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before the American Mining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the American Mining Congress convention, at Las Vegas, Nev., on October 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Gentlemen, it's a privilege and a pleasure for me to be here, and to have this opportunity of discussing with you the problem of public relations.

I must admit when I received your gracious invitation, my immediate reaction was: "Who, me?"

This is an opportunity I cherish and shall try to deal with honestly and objectively.

I am not an expert at public relations. There is an old definition that an expert is someone who knows more and more about less and less. But I have lived all my life in a State where mining is a basic industry. During my boyhood, mining was the major source of income. Every student of American history knows that gold and silver and copper built and populated the West.

I am reminded of the experience of a friend of mine who, while driving to work one Friday morning realized he had a scratchy throat. He decided to stop by his doctor's office and get a shot of a new antibiotic and insure his ability to enjoy the upcoming weekend.

In the doctor's wating room he said to the receptionist: "I'd like to see Joe for just a minute. He knows me and * * * well * * * I'm not very sick. I'd just like to see him for a minute or two if I may."

The receptionist demanded to know his name and all the items they put on the case history sheet.

My friend reluctantly complied with her request. Then she ushered him into a small waiting room. A moment later a nurse came in, told him to stand on the scales, jabbed a thermometer in his mouth, and made her notations on the chart.

When my friend could speak again, he said, "Look, I'm not sick. There is really nothing wrong with me. I know Joe, he knows me, and I just want to see him for a minute. Well, to tell the truth, I have a little scratchy throat and I just want a shot of penicillin or some aureomycin or one of those things to keep me in shape for my golf game tomorrow."

The nurse nodded and ushered him into a second room, and after 4 or 5 minutes a second nurse came in bearing one of those ridiculous little smocks they sometimes give you in a doctor's office.

"Hang your clothes in the closet and put this on," she said and ducked out the door before my friend could object.

He stared at the smock and he stared at the closet and he stared at the door and, finally, he surrendered. He hung his clothes in the closet and put on the smock and stood there feeling quite naked and inadequate.

The nurse returned and ushered him into a third waiting room. Here he found three other men attired in the same smocks. After a moment or two my friend said, "Look, fellows, I'm not really sick. I * * * I shouldn't be here. I * * * I'm kind of embarrassed to be here with you."

Over in the corner of the room a little fellow looked at him, grinned, and said, "You're embarrassed! I just came in to deliver a telegram."

May we consider that I am here to deliver a telegram, a message from one concerned individual to a group of industrial leaders who are also concerned.

This concern of ours must not stop within the limits of our own particular industry or our own job or our own State. You and I are involved in a process far bigger than mining or department stores or politics or the United States Senate. We are involved in the destiny of man, and man is more than just an economic unit or a physical unit or a political unit. Man is also a spiritual entity, destined by Almighty God to enjoy the blessings and the responsibilities of economic, physical, political, and spiritual freedom.

If we are to approach the problem of public relations with any chance of finding a successful solution, we must begin with a clear and basic concept of man.

Public relations is one of those $64 phrases developed by professionals to confuse the layman.

Public relations is not radio or television or newspaper editorials or newspaper news stories or newspaper advertising. Public relations is not gifts to the community chest or to the boys club or scholarships to the university. Public relations is not putting a key man from your industry in every service club, or making sure that your men control the board of directors of the chamber of commerce.

Public relations is a person to person acceptance.

And acceptance exists only where there is mutual understanding, mutual respect, and mutual confidence.

Radio, TV, newspapers, service clubs, community organizations, are the tools available with which you can do this job, but they aren't to be used as weapons to force your opinions down someone else's throat.

Every man in this room knows a great deal more than I know about the basic contribu-

tions your mining industry has made to the political, economic, social, moral, and cultural development of our society. And I suspect most of you are more keenly aware of the failures of your industry.

For more than 20 years during the great experiment of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, big business was used as a whipping boy by the demogogues and the opportunists.

Following the great depression and under the pressure of political, economic and social change, there was and continues to be a planned program designed to divert the attention of the average American citizen away from the goals and objectives of those men of vision who "dedicated their lives, their properties, and their sacred honor" to the creation of this Republic, and away from the concept of a free society where all men should stand equal, where all men should be free.

Many of these advocates of security from womb to tomb are well motivated individuals, men and women who, recognizing the imperfections in our economy and our society, are attempting to do something about it. And there is little to be gained by dismissing their activities with harsh names and anger.

As you and I grow older we resist change. We cling firmly to the practices of the past. We are inherently suspicious of innovation. Yet in business we constantly contradict ourselves by adopting new production practices, new processes which were completely visionary just a few years ago.

May I suggest that if and when this attitude of eagerness to learn, this willingness to listen, inspect and consider is applied to the problem of public relations, true progress will commence.

Acceptance is a two way street, and when a busines or an industry becomes big and important and successful by following a prescribed program, it is dangerously easy for that busines or industry to forget to listen. And when we forget to listen we build a wall around ourselves.

If we want the general public, and this includes our employees, our customers, and our stockholders, to listen to us and to respect our problems, we must break down and destroy every barrier which serves to separate us from them and their problems.

A great many men with more background and more qualifications than I offer you have devoted time and effort to an examination of this problem which confronts us. Immediately upon accepting your invitation to appear here, I directed my Washington staff to make a study of public relations in the mining industry. That study lasted the better part of 4 months and produced a lot of encouraging and inspiring information.

The editorial staff of Fortune magazine addressed itself to this problem. In September 1950, Fortune stated bluntly that American industry was failing to sell free enterprise and to be intelligently and consistently concerned that free enterprise be forever accepted as the only system under which the people of this Republic can prosper.

Fortune said the root of the trouble was a lack of the feeling of participation and the need for self-expression both on the part of the worker and of management.

If you will forgive me, I should like to quarrel with that word "sell" as used by Fortune. It has a connotation which offends me. We think of the supersalesman as a man who persuades you to buy some article, idea, or process which results primarily in a profit for the salesman.

Successful public relations must produce a profit for all participants. Far too many public-relations programs are little more than high-pressure, selling campaigns. You and I know that unless the product itself justifies the purchase, there will be no repeat orders.

In our survey of public relations in the mining industry, we solicited opinions and information from all the major producers and operators. As might be expected, we found the leaders and the laggards. Many of your companies have instituted complete programs with all the outward trappings and a careful exploitation of all the tools available. But we failed to find a united effort equal to the programs of such comparable industries as the railroads and the oil companies.

Everywhere in our world today there is evidence of a desire for political self-determination, a desire for independence. This trend is partially economic, partially political. It provides good use for a word coined by one of my staff members, polynomics, which describes the practical wedding of politics and economics.

You gentlemen are dedicated to free enterprise, to individual opportunity, and to independent action. This is both a political and an economic problem. May I suggest that as free men and women dedicated to the concept of man as a child of God, with an important, individual, immortal soul, it is up to us to preach what we practice as well as to practice what we preach.

In my own State the mining industry has long been interested in politics. And while these political activities may actually be no more than necessary self-protection, the manifest politicial strength of the industry, coupled with its economic importance, has made it a bigger target for those who preach a planned economic and social state. Because of its size, some of the wildest shots have had a telling effect on some portion of that target.

The mining industry has been politically conscious of taxes for a long time, and necessarily so, because the mining industry pays a substantial portion of the total cost of government in the State in which they operate.

It is quite natural that this political interest should have as its first concern the protection of its sponsor. But I have discovered big companies, contrary to popular conception, are not totally selfish and, in many cases, the mining industry has urged and sponsored development of schools, roads, and local governments with full knowledge that a large proportion of the cost of these improvements will be paid by the industry. For sure industry polices government against harebrained fiscal policies which would result in damage not only to industry but to the economy as a whole. Many times a policeman is not very popular, particularly with vociferous self-seeking minorities.

May I suggest there is no reason for American big business, the mining industry or any other facet of our economic life, to be on the defensive just because it is big.

Certainly you are the target for the demagog, the opportunist who seeks to use envy and discouragement to gain his personal objectives.

Let's get off the defense. Let's put in the first team. Let's tell the story of free enterprise and free political government to all the world, and most especially to our own friends and neighbors, our employees and customers and stockholders.

You and I know the American system of free enterprise has created the greatest opportunity for the individual known to history. We know the American free enterprise has made possible a higher standard of living for the average American than has ever been possible anywhere else on the face of the earth. You and I know the American system of free enterprise is the only social, political, and economic system which can meet the challenge of tomorrow and still preserve the basic freedoms of the individual.

We know that with all the progress and growth of our Nation, there is still room for improvement and that improvement will never come from the social planners who seek to regiment the lives of men.

Let us forget about defending freedom and begin to proclaim freedom.

Mankind was not destined to be called a class, a collective, or a group. And what we seek is a basic person to person understanding and acceptance, and the place to begin is with the individual.

Let's look at this American citizen for a moment, this individual human unit in the multitude of customers, employees, and stockholders we are trying to serve and whose understanding and acceptance we seek.

I promise you this is going to be the most convenient study we have ever undertaken because our subject is here in this room, a fellow who is already pretty well known to us. He is the engineer, he is the office manager, he is the mucker, he is the shift foreman, he is the clerk, he is the office boy.

This fellow is concerned first of all with his own problems. His own wife and his own kids are most important to him. He'd like to have a little better home than mom and dad had. He wants to advance in his work.

This fellow glows with pride when the boss appreciates him. He wants you to accept and respect him, and in turn he will accept and respect you.

Oh, he's cantankerous at times, at times he's lazy. Sometimes he just doesn't have the ability to do the job the way it should be done. Envy and self-pity will give his thinking a quick twist in the wrong direction. He's more apt to be vocal about his dislikes than his likes.

And when he fails at something, he finds it pretty easy to blame the other fellow.

He has lived long enough to discover that life is a pretty grim struggle, but he has been able to conquer some disappointments.

He may not exactly wear a chip on his shoulder, but he is determined that nobody is going to sell him a bill of goods, and when he listens to you, if he does listen to you, you can bet that behind the appearance of outward attentiveness, he is saying to himself, "What's his angle? What does this guy want from me?"

A proper public-relations program must begin at home with your fellow workers, your own employees. Let them have a share in your problems. Let them work with you and not for you. Let them know you on a person-to-person basis, and take the trouble to know them in the same way.

And when they become convinced that you are concerned with their problems, they will, in turn, be concerned with yours.

By all means participate in community projects and undertakings. But do it on an individual, personal basis. Forget the notion that you are to be treated with respect just because you are the representative of the big XYZ company.

Use radio and TV and newspapers, but don't think you can buy understanding or overpower opposition by the size of your ad or the editorial comment of a company-owned newspaper.

Be willing to listen, to accept suggestions, to make changes, to eliminate company practices which make you vulnerable to the sniper.

When the mining industry developed the West, it was necessary for many companies to build company-owned towns, to operate stores, to provide medical dispensaries and hospital services.

We are all familiar with the company town of 50 years ago with its rows of identical houses, the company store where the mining employee was always in debt, the company doctor whose office bore the stamp of socialized impersonal medicine, the frequently well-intentioned paternal policies which provided a lot of the security the social planners think is a new idea today, but at the same time robbed the individual of his feeling of independence and in some instances of his self-respect.

This human being you are dealing with is an independent creature. He wants and deserves to experience the pride of ownership. He may let his house go to rack and ruin but still it's his. He may be unwilling to provide the same standard of medical care offered by the company, but still he wants and deserves the right of independence in his family living.

This man may buy his groceries from a merchant and pay higher prices for an inferior quality, but his wails of complaint will never match his resentment against the company store and the compulsion implied in that feudal arrangement.

You gentlemen represent a fascinating, dynamic industry. Your investments, your technological know-how, and your management skills have materially contributed to man's progress.

You transform unusable raw material from mother nature into items of utility and beauty to satisfy man's longing for a better world. You have a story of romance and ingenuity and devotion unequalled in history. And the 20th century, with our methods of mass communication gives you the opoprtunity to make all men everywhere partners in your progress. Begin your public relations programs by granting to all men, to the janitor and the boss, to the stockholder and the customer, the respect you would like to receive.

Dedicate yourself to defending the right of every individual to be free, to cherish ambition, to struggle for advancement and to control his own life. Proclaim your devotion to the concept of man as a child of God, endowed by his Creator with freedom of choice. Demonstrate your willingness to accept every individual on a person-to-person basis.

Our world today is joined in mortal combat which can only end in total victory for one side or the other. The issue is simple: Shall men be slaves or free. The basic premise of communism views man as an economic animal, a social animal, and a physical animal incapable of thinking for himself, or exercising independent judgment, of guiding his own destiny.

Every voice in our Nation today which speaks out in favor of the regimentation of men, every political demagog who denies man the right to think for himself is echoing the thinking of Karl Marx who said: "The democratic concept holds that each man is a sovereign being. This is the illusion, dream and postulate of Christianity."

In this time of peril and crisis let us rededicate our lives, our fortunes, our sacred honor to the perpetuation of the integrity of the individual.

Let us use the skill and the resources and all the technological gains of the 20th century to reaffirm the truth that man's destiny is freedom and that man's obligation is fully expressed in that ancient law:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind, and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

I thank you.

One Hundred and Sixty Years of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the Christmas season the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily marked two important anniversaries—its 160th year of publication and the 40th year of publication under the direction of Josiah W. Gitt, editor and publisher.

This newspaper started life as a German-language newspaper 160 years ago and, up until just before the turn of the century, continued to publish both English and German editions. It has built a reputation for independence and outspokenness.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include two tributes from other newspapers. One was published on October 13, 1955, by Labor, and the other was published on December 25 by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The editorials follow:

[From Labor of October 13, 1955]

TRIBUTE TO A DAILY PAPER

Labor has often called most daily newspapers one-sided and reactionary, but it has mentioned shining exceptions—among them, the crusading Madison (Wis.) Capital Times. This week Labor wants to cite another, the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily, which is something of a modern miracle.

Like the Capital Times, it is proving that a city daily can be both liberal and successful—that its news and editorial columns can be honest and enlightening—without losing the advertisers upon whom publishers must depend for their bread and butter.

The success of the York paper in holding readers and advertisers is largely due to its wide and thorough reporting of local news. But there may well be another reason—that most Americans like a truthful and crusading newspaper, when they have a chance to get it.

If there were more papers like the York Gazette and Daily and the few other similar liberal newspapers, this would be a different and better country.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 25, 1955]

TWO FREE MEN

Two of the truly courageous editors in the United States—and unhappily there are very few in that vital company—have just celebrated notable milestones. Josiah W. Gitt, editor and publisher of the Gazette and Daily at York, Pa., has observed the 40th anniversary of his direction of that 160-year-old newspaper. In Madison, Wis., William T. Evjue, editor and publisher of the Capital Times, has completed his 50th year in the journalism of his State.

Each is a brave, free man. Each has been unshakeable in standing for honesty, integrity, intelligence, and information. Each has seen from experience that where these prevail there will be progress and growth and high standards in political and social affairs.

Mr. Evjue, who grew up in the great tradition of the elder LaFollette, has exposed and battled against McCarthyism from the beginning. It is his satisfaction to have been right all along and now to see others belatedly trying to catch up with him. His newspaper is a daily application of his motto, "Let the people have the truth and freedom to discuss it and all will go well." Thanks in large part to Editor Evjue and his fearless staff, Madison stands high among the best-informed, most forward-looking communities in the country.

Similarly the people of York, Pa., can be grateful for the unswerving attachment of J. W. Gitt to constitutional principles and particularly to the civil liberties guaranteed in the bill of righs. No influence peddler, high or low, in politics or out, has ever pushed around York's staunch editor. His slogan is "Print the truth and let it speak." And that is just what he has been doing—enabling truth to speak—for four decades. No editor need do more than that.

If there were even a dozen William T. Evjues and Josiah W. Gitts in American journalism, the American people would be infinitely better informed. Our people would be less inclined to listen to demogagues, quacks, and self-servers. They would be far quicker to recognize and support leaders in the tradition of freedom and free men. May the Gitt and Evjue examples wax and multiply.

The Polish Daily News of Detroit, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most familiar objects in the majority of American homes today is a newspaper, either one from the hometown or one from the local area in which one lives. Without a morning or evening paper a family would be lost for complete news of the world or the locality. And in these days it is important that we, as citizens of the greatest nation in the world, keep informed about world and local happenings. I realize, of course, that radio and TV provide a source of news, but this is more or less of an outline coverage. We must depend on newspapers for the more complete details of current events and also for some of the news that is not deemed of sufficient importance to be included in a news broadcast over radio or TV. I believe we are all the more impressed with the part a newspaper plays in our daily lives when suddenly we have no local paper to read.

The majority of the people of Detroit and the vicinity have almost found themselves in such a situation. For over 42 days, since December 1, 1955, the three major newspapers serving the Detroit area, the morning Free Press and the afternoon News and Times have not been issued because of a strike. However, because of the ingenuity of one of the smaller local newspapers, the citizens of the area are still being served. Within 24 hours after the announcement of the strike of the workers on the major dailies in Detroit, the Dziennik Polski, the Polish Daily News, started printing a limited edition in English. Ordinarily, the paper is printed in the Polish language, as it has been since 1904, to serve the Americans of Polish descent. In its English edition, it carries stories of local and national importance and includes a sports page and the radio and TV programs, as well as some advertisements and the funnies.

I want to take this occasion to commend the publisher of the Polish Daily News, Stephanie Januszewski, and her staff for the wonderful public service they are rendering to the people of their community. They are doing a magnificent job in this emergency. They have stepped up at a time of need, as is characteristic of Americans of Polish descent,

to lend a helping hand to their fellow citizens. The publisher and staff of the Polish Daily News can, I am sure, take justifiable pride in their accomplishments. I am sure that the people of Detroit are most grateful to them for their efforts.

Peace With Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following speech delivered by Edward "Skip" Suchocki, 12th district commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, at the annual celebration in Mount Carmel, Pa.:

SPEECH AT VETERANS DAY, MOUNT CARMEL, PA., BY EDWARD "SKIP" SUCHOCKI, 12TH DISTRICT COMMANDER, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, POST 2110, MOUNT CARMEL, PA.

This year and every year—by act of Congress—we observe the 11th day of November as Veterans Day. In the past it was called Armistice Day, but that is no longer so. It now is—and will continue to be—Veterans Day.

Wherever citizens gather on November 11—Veterans Day—we salute our fellow Americans who have exemplified the highest tradition of citizenship by wearing the uniform of our country.

Twenty-two million living veterans, men and women, young and old, merit our salute.

Few of us can match their personal knowledge of the ugly face of modern war. Few can match veterans in their experienced understanding of what America truly seeks in the determined effort to achieve peace with honor.

Our President has made peace with honor a noble crusade throughout the world. Nothing could be more truly American than our insistence that peace without honor is unthinkable.

It lies at the very heart of our American creed. It is older than the entire lifespan of our Republic. It goes back to ancient days when there were Americans—but not a United States of America.

Americans always have wanted peace. But we never have been willing to accept it when the price was dishonor to ourselves.

They proved it anew—our fighting men, our veterans—on land, on sea, and in the air—when the challenge to peace with honor was flung down, even more brutally than before, by enemies of mankind who made good their mad promise to engulf the world in the blood bath of World War II.

They proved it—our fighting men, our veterans—on the bare and zero-cold mountains of Korea. They proved it, when to have hesitated in the will to oppose aggression would have been to betray the deepest qualities that make us Americans.

What are we to say about men like that on this solemn 11th day of November? Nothing that has not been said before. Nothing that will not be repeated proudly as we continue to salute our veterans in the years to come. On Veterans Day we say this:

Veterans are the best we've got in manhood.

Veterans have led the way to victory in war and security in peace.

Veterans have used their well-earned benefits wisely. Our Nation is better and stronger as the direct result of the work of veterans in the schoolroom, at the office and factory, and on the farm.

Never once have our veterans failed us in our determination to achieve peace with honor.

These are solid certainties to remember on the 11th day of November—on Veterans Day.

They are solid certainties to make all of us proud of our American past, and confident of our American future in freedom.

They are our surest certainty that the safest, best way to freedom and security is to continue along the straight, open, courageous road that leads to peace with honor.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. DONOVAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, arguments pro and con on the amount of foreign aid to be appropriated during this session of the Congress may develop into the biggest debate of the session. Mr. Harold Callender, one of the great foreign correspondents of our time, under his byline dated Paris, January 8, 1956, appearing in the New York Times on Monday, January 9, 1956, analyzed the Red vote in France in the January elections as follows:

THE RED VOTE IN FRANCE—AN ANALYSIS OF THE FACTORS THAT IMPEL MANY NON-COMMUNISTS TO BACK PARTY

(By Harold Callender)

PARIS, January 8.—The national election last Monday took place at a time of general prosperity and full employment after 4 years of fairly stable prices and rising real wages.

Yet the vote polled by the Communist Party in metropolitan France was higher than that polled in the corresponding election of 1951, when the worker's purchasing power was much lower and more uncertain.

A DIVERGENCE FROM MARX

In other words, the economic interpretation of history, a Marxian doctrine attributing all social phenomena to the economic condition of the peoples involved, does not seem to apply to the advance of the Communist Party in Western Europe, or at least in France.

If this is a point against Communist dogma, it seems also a blow at the theory that a sure cure for the Communist infection is to raise the standards of living.

The theory that higher living standards should cut the ground from under the Communist involves the same error as that of the economists a century ago who based their economic laws upon an economic man who existed only as a working hypothesis. Man is economic, but much else besides.

Mr. Speaker, of significant coincidence were the remarks of Mr. George Meany, head of the labor movement in the United States of the combined American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, in an address at Seton Hall University, South Orange, N. J., responding to the honorary degree just conferred on him as reported by the New York Times in the January 9, 1956, issue as follows:

MEANY CAUTIONS ON VYING IN AID—LABOR CHIEF, AT SETON HALL, DECRIES MATCHING SOVIET, URGES PIONEERING ABROAD

SOUTH ORANGE, N. J., January 8.—George Meany, head of the new united labor movement, warned here today against a "panicky rush to drown rubles with dollars" in foreign aid spending.

Rather than merely react to Communist programs, he declared, the United States should devote its skills and ideals to a pioneering program to save peoples from hunger and disease.

Mr. Meany asserted that "the time has come for our Government to re-examine and study our country's last decade of experience in foreign aid."

Deploring what he called a tendency of the United States merely to counter Communist maneuvers, he said:

"We should never say we will merely match Moscow's aid to others. At best, that would mean that we would do next to nothing. That would mean turning our back on needy nations.

"We Americans have much experience in pioneering. We are rightly proud of this creative spirit. Let us infuse our efforts to aid other peoples now menaced by Communist subversion and Soviet aggression with the spirit of the American pioneer."

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that the points made by Messrs. Meany and Callender are fundamental, fuzzy thinkers and bleeding hearts and demogogues to the contrary notwithstanding. Both gentlemen are eminently correct.

Rural Mail Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 3655, which would extend rural mail delivery to the homes of all persons living on improved highways. Since then I have noted interest in this problem on the part of various farm organizations. At its national convention in Chicago in December 1955 the American Farm Bureau Federation included extension of rural mail delivery among its resolutions. The following was taken from the American Farm Bureau Official News Letter of December 19, 1955:

Rural mail delivery should be made available to every accessible farmstead. We urge that legislation be enacted or administrative action taken to accomplish this. This may necessitate consolidation, extension, or relocation of routes. In some instances it may be advisable to eliminate post offices and replace them with rural routes. It is apparent that many of these changes will come more quickly if rural people take an interest in this problem in their own communities.

The Ohio Farm Bureau endorsed the same policy at its convention in Columbus in November 1955. The following resolution, as adopted by their organization, appeared in the Ohio Farm Bureau News of January 1956:

RURAL POSTAL SERVICE

We insist that rural mail delivery be made available to every farm home on a passable

highway. Since direct-to-farm rural mail service is vital to every farm family, we recommend that county farm bureaus give such assistance to farm families as is necessary to bring their problems to the attention of proper postal authorities.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that such actions as these will stimulate interest in H. R. 3655.

Boom Is Not for Everybody

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the pollyannish optimism—to be kindly—of the President's state of the Union message has been the subject of much pointed criticism. Perhaps the keenest analysis was made on Sunday last by the syndicated financial writer, Sylvia Porter, whose column, Your Money's Worth, was published by the Washington Star.

Miss Porter has done an excellent job of painting, in human terms, the meaning of the dangerous soft spots in our economy—soft spots that administration politicians are apt to brush off all too lightly.

The article follows:

BOOM IS NOT FOR EVERYBODY

Who are you? What do you do?

How you answer these questions will determine whether 1956 will be a boomy or a bumpy year for you—just as the answers determined whether 1955 was a top or tough year for you.

All but lost in the millions of bouncy words now being written and spoken about the new year's outlook—and that goes for the President's state of the Union message, too—is this vital point:

It was not boom for everybody in 1955, not by a long shot. It will not be boom for everybody in 1956, also not by a long shot.

For instance:

If you are a high official in a big corporation in most industries, the tide is running strongly with you. You will be the exception if your income isn't increased this year.

FIERCE COMPETITION SEEN

But if you're part of a small firm in most industries, you're in for fierce and quite possibly cut-throat competition. Your expenses will be rising, your big competitors will be after your business, and you may find it as rough a year as you've ever had.

If you're a wage earner in the heavily unionized steel industry, your prospects are bright. Your industry is making fabulous profits, your union leaders are set to ask for a sensational wage package this summer and you're certain to achieve fat gains.

But if you're a wage earner in the equally unionized auto industry, your prospects are mixed. Your industry is facing a slowdown in production and sales. You well may be working a shorter week as the months roll on; layoffs in Detroit are by no means out of the question. It'll be astounding if 1956 is as good a year as 1955 was for many who work in the automobile and allied industries.

If you're a salaried worker in a prospering industry you'll move up the scale this year. Salaries will rise as wages generally rise. You should be able to keep ahead of the increases in your cost of living.

But if you're a farmer—particularly a small farmer—well, what's going on is hardly a secret. Despite the plethora of programs being prepared to improve your position, the Agriculture Department forecast is that farmers' net income will sink another 5 percent in 1956—on top of a 30-percent slump just since 1951.

EXPANDING INDUSTRIES

If you're a skilled worker or executive in such expanding industries as electronics or chemicals, you should continue to climb the income and living standard ladder in 1956.

But if you're a similarly skilled worker or executive in the textile or apparel industries, the signals are flying that by mid-1956 you'll be into what the experts call the "definite downswing of the cycle"—which is another way of saying you'll be operating in a declining, increasingly competitive market.

If you're a professional or in one of the service fields, you'll make out fine. You'll be able to raise your fees and to still count on plenty of eager customers.

So it goes—big business will prosper more than small business; some industries will soar, others will sink; industry generally will move ahead of agriculture.

It is perilous to fall for the delusion that we're into a boom that has no bumps. It already has plenty and will develop more.

Whether you'll be on the boomy or the bumpy side of the economic road in 1956 goes back to those first crucial questions: Who are you? What do you do?

Proposed Declaration of Minerals Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the proposed declaration of minerals policy presented by the Arizona delegation to the Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED DECLARATION OF MINERALS POLICY

The Arizona delegation of the Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council introduced the following resolution at the November 9, 1955, meeting in Sacramento. Since it was beyond the authority of the Western Governors' Mining Advisory Council to approve such a resolution, the council referred the resolution to the western governors conference presumably to be held in Reno in early 1956 with the council's unanimous recommendation that the governors give this resolution favorable consideration:

Whereas the mineral industry of the United States is vital to the welfare of the Nation both in war and peace, ours being essentially a minerals and metals economy; and

Whereas for the above and other reasons it is essential that the United States be as nearly self-sufficient as possible in both the minerals and metals commonly used as well as those classified by the Government as strategic and critical; and

Whereas dependence upon foreign sources of supply for our minerals and metals needs, in this atomic age, would invite possible national suicide; and

Whereas only by constant exploration, development, research and production can our minerals industry maintain its reserves and its supply position in a healthy condition: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the western governors conference ask the Congress of the United States to declare a national minerals policy recognizing the aforementioned basic facts, and implement its declaration of policy with appropriate legislation to make our Nation self-sufficient insofar as possible in respect to our tremendous minerals and metals requirements.

Government and Education—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following fine statement entitled Government and Education was given in the great issues course at Dartmouth College on November 14, 1955, by Dr. Earl J. McGrath, the outstandingly able president of the University of Kansas City. Dr. McGrath, a distinguished educator was formerly United States Commissioner of Education:

GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

(Earl J. McGrath, president, the University of Kansas City)

That there is a close relationship between Government and education has been evident from the earliest days of the Republic. Political theorists of the 18th century, as well as the practical statesmen who founded the new Nation on this continent, were well aware that the quality of government in a democracy would be largely determined by the general enlightenment of the citizenry. The latter would in turn depend on the character and the general availability of education. When George Washington said, "Promote then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion, as the structure of Government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened," he was stating the practical implications of this democratic social philosophy. His bequest of funds for the establishment of a national university and his views expressed at that time give palpable evidence of his conviction that the Federal Government itself had a direct responsibility to foster and support the cause of education. The foundation upon which the development of the public school system in the United States has rested has been the acceptance by our people generally of this view of the relationship between Government and education.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that our early statesmen intended that the Federal Government itself should to a large extent determine the character of, or control, education, as has been customary elsewhere in the world. On the contrary, the Constitution was silent on the subject of education. It has been assumed by some that, since the Constitution of the United States provides that all powers not specifically conferred upon the Federal Government are retained by the States, and since education was not mentioned, the drafters of the Constitution must therefore have considered education a function of State government. This assumption is doubtless false. The evidence suggests on the contrary that these early Americans believed that not even the States themselves, but rather the local communities, should establish

schools and determine the character of education.

This interpretation is borne out by the fact that for three-quarters of a century after the birth of the Nation, State education authorities were either nonexistent or without significant force. In the early years, therefore, the education of children was clearly considered to be a local concern.

It is very important to observe, however, that even in the first years of the Republic, the Government gave consideration to the general support of education. Congress in 1785, in arranging to dispose of the land ceded to the Federal Government by the States, adopted a rectangular survey providing townships of 36 sections, the 16th section of each being reserved for the support of education. Beginning with the admission of Ohio to the Union in 1802, each State has been granted land for the support of public schools. In many States the funds thus provided formed the basis of a permanent school fund and encouraged additional support out of all proportion to the value of the original grant.

In 1862 the Federal Government again acknowledged its responsibility to support education in the States, when the Congress passed and President Lincoln signed the Morrill Act. This Federal legislation provided financial assistance to the States in the establishment and maintenance of colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts. Acts passed by the Congress in later years increased these grants. They continue today to be an important source of revenue for many State colleges and universities.

Again in 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act supplied Federal financial aid to the States for the support and promotion of vocational education. These funds, too, have been considerably increased through later legislation. During this fiscal period over $33 million of Federal money will be spent for vocational education.

The most tangible evidence of the Federal Government's concern for the education of children in the several States appeared only in recent years. On the basis of studies and recommendations made by the staff of the United States Office of Education and by legislative study groups, the 81st Congress enacted Public Laws 815 and 874 providing substantial financial assistance to local school districts. This aid for both the erection of school facilities and for the maintenance of the educational program is given to those communities in which the activities of the Federal Government, such as military and atomic energy installations, have materially increased the educational burden. Since the passage of these bills in September 1950, $962 million have been appropriated for this purpose.

This brief review of the activities of the Federal Government in the field of education, which has made no mention of the billions of dollars of Federal money spent indirectly for the support of education, such as the so-called GI benefit bills, the vast expenditures for research in the colleges and universities, and the school-lunch program, reveals the fact that the Federal Government has from the beginning substantially supported education and the amount and variety of support has increased through the years. The question before the American people today is not, therefore, whether the Government has any responsibility for education. That question has been decided long since. The question for decision today is, "To what extent shall the Federal Government aid the States in providing an adequate education for this generation, and how can this aid be provided within the traditional relationships between the Government and State and local educational authorities?"

As the present and future responsibilities of the Federal Government for education are considered, therefore, it is very important to focus attention on the latter part of this question. The activities of Government in the field of education, which have been of such great benefit to individuals and to society as a whole, have been carried out within the traditional pattern of State and local control of education.

As we have seen, the control of education was in the beginning in the hands of local school officers, with no supervision or control either from the National or State Governments. Through the years, however, each State created an educational office, which assumed responsibility for establishing standards and services for local school districts. Later many States developed school-aid programs from State tax revenues to equalize educational opportunities for all children, regardless of their place of residence. At no time has the Federal Government attempted to assume responsibility for the operation, supervision, or control of American education. There has been an understanding among our legislators that relationships with the schools should be through established authorities in the States.

My principal thesis in this discussion is that the participation of the Federal Government in the financial support of education within the several States has been sound national policy; that the Federal Government's participation should be extended without delay; and that in the absence of assistance from the Federal Government the deterioration which has already begun in the educational system of many communities will continue apace, with a consequent weakening of the entire fabric of our democratic society. It is urgently necessary that legislation providing some type of Federal aid to education be enacted by the Congress in the next session.

I shall attempt to show why Federal assistance is justified and necessary. One of the strongest arguments for increased Federal financial support of education is related to basic changes which have occurred during recent years in the structure of American society. Especially since the turn of the century, advances in transportation and communication and the concentration of industrial activities in urban centers have caused a rapid increase in the mobility of our people. There was a time in our national history when a large percentage of our citizens either stayed in the communities in which they were born or joined a westward movement toward a frontier settlement, where they then remained for the rest of their lives. Now, however, this pattern has radically changed. The urbanization of our population has been swift and steady. The growth of great corporations with establishments throughout the Nation have caused families to move from one section to another. The results of these social forces are clearly evident in the census statistics for 1950. In that year 25.2 percent of native-born Americans lived in some State other than the one in which they were born.

Government and Education—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Dr. McGrath's speech continues:

If there ever was a time in our national history when the citizens of one community or State could be unconcerned about the education of fellow citizens in other sections of the country, that time has surely passed. The welfare of the Nation demands that all children regardless of their place of residence receive a minimum basic education for the responsibilities of citizenship, for productive economic life, and for personal happiness. But the fact is that an increasing percentage of our future citizens are not receiving such an education. The citizens of many States in recent years have recognized that economic differences in the constituent communities were responsible for undesirable differences in the quality of local education. Programs of State financial aid were inaugurated to erase, or at least minimize, these differences on the ground that all the citizens of a commonwealth had a right to a satisfactory basic education, and it was in the interest of the State as a whole to provide such an education, in part at least, at State expense. In my judgment our society has now evolved to a stage which justifies the application of this same principle to the national economy and to the National Government.

Concrete evidence exists showing that differences among the citizens of various States in the amount and quality of their education are already creating problems of national scope and significance. During the Second World War, for example, when the industrial activities of the Nation accelerated and expanded so swiftly, thousands of additional workers were needed in urban centers. Most of the new workers required in large industrial establishments moved from rural sections to cities and large masses migrated from the southern States to the North. Thousands of workers, for example, came from Mississippi and Alabama to Detroit and Cleveland. Many of the migrants had far less education than their fellow workers who were native. A considerable percentage had less than 5 years schooling and could, therefore, be classed as functionally illiterate. An intensive educational program was established within industry to fit these new workers for their occupational duties. In a time when their technical skills were urgently needed in the successful prosecution of the war, naturally little or nothing was done to extend their basic general education. Yet, after the war was over, many of these new residents stayed in their new places of residence. They have, on the average, less education than their neighbors. They constitute a depressed economic and social group. Such a group dramatizes the evils which in the modern world flow from inadequate education. It also gives weight to the argument that, with an increasingly mobile population, the citizens of one State cannot be unconcerned about the quality of education in other States. All Americans now have a stake in the education of all America's children regardless of place of residence or condition of life.

A second example is even more convincing, especially to members of the younger generation who, in recent years, have had to serve in the military forces. As men were being selected for service, their physical and mental fitness were thoroughly investigated. With regard to the physical disabilities discovered among selectees, it is enough to point out that many who were rejected suffered from disabilities directly related to a lack of education, such as faulty diet, uncorrected minor physical ailments, or undetected chronic disease. The most disturbing revelation of these examinations, however, was the fact that hundreds of thousands of men had to be declared ineligible for military service because they could not read or write, or because they had failed to master the other basic intellectual skills required even in the most rudimentary activities of military life. When the percentages of rejection for mental unfitness on the basis of scores on the Armed Forces qualification test are studied, it is

clear that they correspond very closely to the amount and quality of education. These found to be educationally deficient in the Korean war varied from 2.2 percent in Minnesota to 48.7 percent in Georgia. Such a barrier to the discharge of the duties, and the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship in a democratic society should be struck down. The solution of this problem of national scope will, however, require national attention and national effort.

Federal aid can also be justified on economic grounds. Our continued social well-being is closely connected with a constantly expanding economy. The efficiency of our free enterprise economy and our prosperity as a people are closely related to the general availability and the quality of education throughout the country. The United States Chamber of Commerce in a recent publication, Education—An Investment in People, reveals that the general conditions of life and the expansibility of the American economic system are determined by the amount and character of education among our citizens. Since the better educated live at a higher level of production and consumption, the health of our domestic economy is clearly related to the education of our people. Moreover, as the chamber of commerce study shows, there is a close relationship between the level of education and international prosperity, and understanding among the nations. This dependence of our economy in general and industry and commerce in particular on education is responsible for the demand among employers that the school system of the Nation provide an extension of both general and specialized education for occupational activities.

But the various units in our political system are not bearing their proportionate share of the cost of the educational program which supports the national economy. In fact, many States and communities under present tax policies and practices cannot hope to be able to pay for the extended education required in the country at large. In the past, public education has been largely supported by taxes on real property. The largest sources of taxable wealth are, however, no longer in real property, but rather in income. Because of the expansion of our industrial society, enormous differences in taxable wealth have been created in and among the several States. School communities with little industrial and commercial activity have relatively small taxable wealth to provide the funds for school purposes, while districts with considerable industrial activities can provide a high quality educational program with little financial effort. These differences in the ability of the States to support an adequate educational program account for arresting differences in educational opportunity among our people.

If the present inequalities in educational opportunity, and the attendant social inequities are to be abolished, the practices of the several States in distributing tax money to local school districts in accordance with their varied needs, ought to be extended to the Federal level. The taxing power of the Government must be used to distribute school funds regardless of their source where they are needed to provide a minimum foundation program for all children. The same argument which has been used to support the use of State funds for equalizing educational opportunity within the States applies in my judgment with equal force to the Nation as a whole. In terms of the general welfare, it seems to me just as logical to argue that the wealth of New York or Illinois should be taxed to support education in South Carolina or Mississippi as to argue that the wealth of one county in a State should be used to support education in other counties less well favored economically. If the social benefits of education are to be enjoyed by all citizens without regard to place of residence, the tax burden should properly be distributed among the States in terms of their financial resources.

One of America's most thoughtful statesmen, the late Senator Taft, after having studied the question of Federal aid for several years, came to the conclusion that the rights of the individual and the welfare of the Nation argued for such a program. In its defense he stated that:

"Without question, the primary obligation to educate children under our constitutional system falls on the States and local districts. But I believe very strongly that the Federal Government has a proper function in the field. We are a great and wealthy Nation. I believe the people of this country feel that our productive ability is so great that we can prevent not only illiteracy but hardship and poverty in the United States. * * *

"The Federal Government is authorized to levy taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States, and under that constitutional grant has the right to dispense money to the States and local districts for purposes not within the constitutional power of the United States to control or regulate. * * *

"I believe, therefore, that the Federal Government should undertake a system of extending financial aid to the States with the objective of enabling the States to provide a basic minimum education to every child, to the end that equal opportunity shall not be interfered with by the financial condition of the State or district of the child's residence." [1]

As they have examined these facts, many thoughtful Americans have with Senator Taft been irresitably driven to the conclusion that equal educational opportunity for all, regardless of economic or social status or place of residence, cannot be realized without Federal financial aid to States and communities. In the conviction that such educational opportunity is not only the right of the individual but also a necessity for national prosperity and survival, many are now urging the immediate enactment of legislation by the Congress for the support of education within the several States. Though the estimates of need for the country at large vary, the figure $500 million a year has been mentioned by several students of the subject and for the period of the next 5 or 6 years. This figure appears to me to be modest and justified. Help of this proportion can be provided without excessive strain on our financial resources and without violence to our political traditions which place the control of education in State and local authorities.

[1] Official report, the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City convention, March 1947, pp. 168–169.

Government and Education—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Dr. McGrath's speech continues:

In weighing the merits of a program of Federal aid of this magnitude, three basic questions deserve serious consideration:

The first question has to do with the traditional relationships between the States and the Federal Government in the field of education. We have rightly believed that education in the United States should be controlled by the States and the local communities. This social policy has had many beneficial effects on our educational system, the leading of which are the greater interest among our citizens in their schools, a greater adaptability of the school program to local needs, more widespread experimentation with the content of instruction and the methods of teaching, and, most important of all, greater protection of local educational authorities against the possible domination of a dictatorial and remote Federal Government. The preservation of our free democratic political institutions will in large measure be determined by our ability to preserve local initiative and control in education. In many years of conversation on this subject with both laymen and members of the profession alike, I have yet to find a single American citizen who advocated the transfer of educational control from State and local authorities to the Federal Government. Those who favor, and those who do not favor Federal financial aid to education, are united in this common purpose. The very consistency and intensity with which Americans generally oppose any domination of our educational system by the Federal Government is in my view the best guaranty that such domination cannot occur in this country.

On the other hand, as I have shown, the Federal Government has made grants to the States for general and specific educational purposes, and the evidence from these experiences indicates that Federal money can flow into States and local communities without carrying with it Federal domination of local educational policies and practices. As a student of American educational history, and as the former educational officer of the United States Government, who over a period of years was responsible for the distribution of several hundred million dollars to the States in support of education, I see no reason to believe that further Federal aid will inaugurate Federal control. Every piece of educational legislation introduced into the Congress in recent years, and in 1 year there were more than 500 such acts, has included an express prohibition against Federal interference in local educational policy and practice. Moreover, one of the most reliable protections against the encroachment of the Federal Government is the very attitude of the members of the profession itself. Educators differ widely in their views on nearly every aspect of our educational system, but on the matter of State and local control of education, they stand as one man. All the evidence seems to me to indicate that though the argument about Federal control may not be irrelevant, it is certainly immaterial and inconsequential. For informed persons to continue to raise this issue is to confuse the discussion of a very pressing social problem, mislead our people, and deprive many of our children of their educational birthright.

Even those who have no fear of Federal control raise a second question as to whether the several States could not bear the expenses of providing an adequate program of education out of their own financial resources. As I have said, there is, in my judgment, a moral reason why they should not be reqiured to do so, but neglecting that reason we ought to inquire whether, even with maximum effort, all States could, out of their own resources, provide an educational program adequate to the needs of modern life. The most convincing evidence on the financial ability of the several States to support education is provided in statistical studies made by the National Education Association. These studies show that the financial burden involved in providing education for children between 5 and 17 years of age varies considerably from State to State, as measured by the number of children per thousand in relation to wage-earning adults. The United States census for 1952 shows that for the country at large there were 390 chil-

dren 5 to 17 years of age for each 1,000 wage-earning adults. In 1 State, however, South Carolina, there were 600 children 5 to 17, while in New York at the opposite extreme, there were only 303 children. It is clear, therefore, that even if the income per capita were equal in the various States, the amount of money available for each schoolchild would vary considerably.

The income per capita, one of the best measures of a State's ability to support the functions of government, however, is by no means uniform from State to State. In fact in 1953 estimated income payments per capita averaged $1,709 for the entire United States, but they ranged from $834 in Mississippi to $2,304 in Delaware. And unfortunately the State with the fewest children per wage earner, New York, was near the top in per capita income, $2,158, while South Carolina, the State with the highest number of children per thousand wage earners, was nearly at the bottom with $1,095. On the whole, States which are poor in dollars are rich in children. It is not surprising, therefore, that the amount of money spent on each pupil in an academic year varies tremendously. The United States Office of Education several years ago made an analysis of the cost of operating schools in terms of the median expenses per classroom unit of 27 pupils in the elementary school and 25 in the secondary school. The highest median expenditure was found in New York, $7,627, and the lowest in Mississippi, $1,451, a variation of more than 500 percent from one State to another. The evidence is clear that the educational burden in some States is much heavier than in others, and the amount spent for education far less.

Are these differences in the support of education within the several States, and the consequent differences in the quality of education a result of the unwillingness of citizens to make the necessary financial sacrifice to educate their children? Here again, statistical evidence is illuminating. One measure of effort is the percentage which total current school expenditures from State and local sources is of average income payments. For 1950–51, the average percentage for the Nation as a whole was 2.27, but in 5 States the school expenditure was less than 1.90 percent of the average income, whereas in 7 others it exceeded 3 percent. In 16 Southern States where as we have seen the educational burden is much above the average for the country, and the income much below the average, 13 made a much greater effort than the average to support the school program. It is clear that some of America's children are being denied an adequate education not because their parents are unwilling, but rather because they are unable to meet the bill. In some of the wealthier States, the effort made to support education in terms of available resources is a pathetic commentary on our values.

It has been stated by some that there is no State in the Union which could not afford the best types of education now available in the States with the greatest wealth. In an absurd sense, this statement is true. If some of the poorer States were to close their State hospitals, discontinue the State police force, stop public services to agriculture, labor, and industry, and halt the present large expenditures for the maintenance of public highways, the cost of a superior program of education could be met. But the social disorder and the rapid degeneration that would immediately ensue in the quality of life within those States would be not only an unberable privation for the citizens immediately concerned, but a positive danger to the entire American body politic. As a practical matter, of course, none of the States, even those which are now making the greatest efforts to supply an adequate education for their children, can be expected to make these sacrifices of other public services; nor will they do so. If, therefore, children in these States are to have a proper education for a productive life and the responsibilities of citizenship, the Federal Government must come to their aid.

Government and Education—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, Dr. McGrath's speech continues:

One more major question concerning Federal aid to education needs to be examined. Some of our fellow citizens have asked the question, "As a Nation, can we afford it?" Here again, a few figures can be helpful in reaching a conclusion. The gross national product in the United States this year will according to the most reliable estimates be the largest in our history; the New York Times for November 14, 1955 placed the figure at $391 billion. This figure covering the total value of goods and services produced in our economic system has been rising steadily for the past 25 years. Walter Lippman, however, in commenting on the deficiencies in our educational system points out that while expenditures in most other phases of our national life have risen materially in recent years, expenditures for education in terms of dollar value have dropped perceptibly. A rough indication of our ability to pay for additional education can be gained by an analysis of the other things for which Americans spend their money. Two years ago, the American people spent over $13 billion for automobiles and accessories, approximately twice the amount spent for all types of education. In that same year, the expenditures for liquor, cigarets, and cosmetics exceeded the cost of operating the entire educational system both public and private. It is paradoxical that in these days when almost every phase of our society is flourishing, education, the one social service on which the long run well-being of our entire national life depends is languishing.

The condition of education in the United States today, though better than that in most other nations, is a sad commentary on our system of values. This is not the occasion to attempt a comprehensive appraisal of American public education. It is enough to point out two of the major causes of the present deterioration in the quality of American education. Last September there was a shortage of teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of approximately 150,000. Though low salaries are not the only factors driving young people away from the profession into more lucrative vocations, the relatively low compensation in teaching is unquestionably an important factor in the present shortage. It is hard to believe that in one State the average salary of all public school teachers in 1953–54 was only $1,740, but it is true, and it is not surprising that this is the State with the lowest per capita income, and one of the States making the greatest financial effort to provide education for its children.

There is likewise an alarming shortage of school facilities. From 8 to $10 billion would have had to be spent for school construction to have accommodated all children in a proper classroom last September. Thought the building program has accelerated materially in recent years, hundreds of thousands of American children are now being educated under makeshift conditions. Half day sessions, and increasingly large classes, factories, churches, and other non-educational structures are being used to absorb increased enrollments. The evidence is clear that the inadequate supply of teachers and schools is going to become much worse before it can become better. Though it is true that many States could and should spend more for education before going to the Government for help, without a program of Federal aid to education there is no likelihood in the visible future that there will be sufficient teachers or classrooms to provide the kind of education urgently needed by the children of this and succeeding generations if the Nation is to remain strong, prosperous, and a leader of the free world.

Our economic system can provide the necessary revenue from taxes for financial assistance to the States. As the National Citizens Commission for the Public School says: The financing problem is a problem of policy and not of resources. Few Americans want to increase the already heavy burden of taxation. All will agree that it is desirable as rapidly as possible to reduce the Federal budget and the public debt. Most would likewise agree that deficit spending of Federal funds ought to be discontinued as rapidly as domestic well-being and current military exigencies permit.

If, however, to provide the Federal aid to education which I consider absolutely essential, it is necessary to increase the annual Federal budget or even to increase deficit spending and thus increase the Federal debt, I would favor either or both courses of action. There are groups in the United States vigorously opposed to any further subsidy of education from Federal funds. Some of these groups, strangely, are the very ones who are already benefiting either directly or indirectly by substantial Federal financial assistance or advocating additional expenditures for purposes other than education. Before listening very attentively to the objections of these opponents of Federal aid to education, our citizens should examine the major items of expenditure in the Federal budget. If they do this, they will find that the Government has subsidized, and continues to subsidize, many branches of our economy through such organizations as the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Maritime Administration, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other substantial indirect benefits have been provided by Government financial assistance, such as, high tariffs, sales of surplus Federal property, and the postal deficit on second class mail. There is no need in this discussion to try to make fine discriminations as to which of these expenditures constitutes a real subsidy and which does not. The fact is that the Federal Government assists various groups in our society with large financial support.

I do not wish to engage in debate concerning the merits of subsidies in general, nor do I wish to create the assumption that past subsidies have necessarily been undesirable or bad public policy. I do wish to raise a question of good faith with regard to organizations and special interest groups in our society which denounce Federal support for such an important thing as education, while urging the Federal Government to increase already large expenditures for other purposes. As an example, consider the proponents of Federal financial aid to States for the construction of highways. It may be true as one of the advocates of highway legislation has said that ours is literally a society traveling on wheels and that, therefore, the Government would be justified in expending large sums to keep our roads in good conditions. It seems to me to follow with equal force that large expenditures of Federal funds for education can be justified on the ground that as a people we ought to know where we are going. Without reflecting in any sense

on the present programs of Federal aid, I would suggest that all items now in the Federal budget, even those related to our military activities, be examined with respect to the contribution they are now making to the welfare of our people and to the preservation of our prosperity and our democratic institutions. After more than 4 years as head of one of the branches of the Federal Government, I have the deep-seated conviction that such an examination would show that the American people could afford to add several hundred million dollars annually to the Federal budget for the support of education within the States. I have an equally firm conviction that the expenditure of such funds would do more to advance the interests of the Nation than any other single activity of Government except the military defense of our country against foreign attack.

Two weeks from today, the White House Conference on Education will begin its deliberations in Washington. Over 2,000 citizens, educators, and laymen will assemble to discuss the most pressing educational problems now before the American people. This conference can be one of the most significant in the history of the Nation. In its general form, it follows the American tradition of bringing together citizens of widely differing interests, background, political persuasion, and social status to deliberate upon a matter of common concern. These citizens, through preliminary conferences in the several States, have become familiar with a vast body of information bearing on the educational problems of our day. They have had before them reliable information on such matters as the present and growing teacher and classroom shortages. There can be no doubt in the mind of any thoughtful person who examines this material objectively that the American educational system has already begun to deteriorate in quality and unless drastic steps are taken immediately, this degenerative process will not be reversed for many years. As is proper in a democratic society many solutions will be offered to these problems which now beset us. It is of the utmost importance that the matter of Federal financial aid to education be presented to this body, that the subject be thoroughly debated, and action taken. My own judgment on this matter is clear, as I have attempted to show. I believe that unless the White House Conference urges immediate legislative action on Federal aid, it will have forfeited a unique opportunity to rally our people to the support of a program without which the quality of American education will surely be in doubt, and the future of American society placed in jeopardy.

Gov. George M. Leader at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the following text of a speech delivered by my distinguished constituent and friend, the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, at San Francisco, on September 14, 1955:

SPEECH OF HON. GEORGE M. LEADER, GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE FAIRMOUNT HOTEL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 14, 1955

It seems to be my enduring good fortune to be fated to come to San Francisco under the best of auspices.

My first visit came when Mary Jane and I decided it was the ideal place to spend our first wedding anniversary—and we were not disappointed. I was then here in the role of husband, junior grade.

My next trip was in wartime, when I came here as a naval lieutenant, junior grade, to get my eagerly awaited sailing orders to join the U. S. S. *Randolph*, a carrier, out in the western Pacific.

And now, for the third time that binds the charm, I am here as a governor—still perhaps junior grade—at your invitation and that of the Democratic National Committee.

I must confess I had a doubt or two before I accepted the invitation. There are so many notable Democrats, more experienced and more distinguished than myself. And we have a very serious set of problems in our State government of Pennsylvania, problems that require and have been getting the constant daily attention of the governor.

But my hesitations were resolved as I reflected how important it is that we elect a Democratic President and Congress in 1956—how such a President and such a Congress are vitally necessary to the solution of many of these very problems that so concern us now.

We are supposed to have a partnership of the States and the Federal Government. But since the Eisenhower administration took office in 1953, the senior partner, the Federal establishment, has been edging away, holding back, running out on its responsibilities in all those areas where our need is greatest. My Pennsylvania list would include flood control, housing, declining farm income, school construction, specific areas of chronic unemployment. Your Western list would add the special problems of the Mountain and Pacific Coast States.

The Democratic Congress which the people elected in 1954 has been able to prevent the Eisenhower retreat from developing into a complete and shameful abandonment of the field. But a legislative body, no matter how hard it tries, cannot put heart into the craven, put faith into the doubtful, put belief and zeal into men who have no real devotion to the programs they are supposed to execute.

The Eisenhower administration has plenty of lipservice for all good causes. The phrases are intentionally fuzzy and the performance is intentionally weak.

Charles P. Taft, brother of the late Senator and a recent Republican candidate for Governor of Ohio in his own right, summed it all up the other day.

Taft was talking about the administration's weak-kneed policy on foreign trade, but he put the finger on the whole Eisenhower Republican administration.

This is what Charlie Taft said:

"Nobody at the top of the administration stands up and fights."

There you have it. That's the difference between them and us, between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, between the successful leadership of a Franklin D. Roosevelt and a Harry Truman as Democratic Presidents and the failure of leadership in Dwight D. Eisenhower as a Republican President.

As a Democratic Governor, I feel that my place is with the fighting men. I am sure that I can best serve the people of my State by enlisting in the campaign to change the National administration. I am sure that my party service is also my public service.

It is time that all Democrats, everywhere, made it clear to the President that the honeymoon is over; that he and no one else is responsible for the administration which he heads; that Talbott and Hobby and Benson and Dixon-Yates are not individual failures—they are Eisenhower failures.

It should be made absolutely clear that it is a matter of indifference to the Democratic Party whether Eisenhower runs again or not. We are very happy to take him on as the best the Republican Party has.

To defeat a RICHARD NIXON for the Presidency would be like taking candy from a baby's hot, sticky little hand.

Even in the election of 1952, the American people showed they had no confidence in the Republican Party. They elected General Eisenhower—the greatest military hero—but they held the Republican majorities in the Congress down to the thinnest possible margin. As soon as they had the chance, they turned even that razor-edge margin around, in spite of the most aggressive campaign that any President had ever made for his party in a midterm election.

All along the line, in almost every test, the Democratic Party has gained strength and the Republican Party has lost support since Eisenhower took office.

The trend is still there.

In Pennsylvania, we are in the process of field registrations for local elections in November. In the city of Pittsburgh, new Democrats have out-registered new Republicans 8 to 1. In traditionally Republican Philadelphia, new Democrats have out-registered Republicans by almost 2 to 1.

If Dwight Eisenhower has any political magic, he keeps it to himself. It doesn't rub off on the Republican Party.

And, strange are the paradoxes of our political life, it was the election of a Democratic Congress in 1954 which rescued the Eisenhower Administration from sickening dissension and public out-in-the-open collapse.

The world is enjoying a summer in the sun. For the first time in many years, there is hope that war is not of the instant; that powerful nations may restrain their power; that the great weapons of destruction will not fall from the skies to kill scores of millions of people and wreck our civilization which has been so marvelously wrought.

Tangibly, nothing much has changed.

Russian farmers eat fried chicken in Iowa and American farmers eat cabbage soup in the Ukraine. The secretary-general of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union turns out to be a 2-fisted drinking man, and Molotov puts on a 10-gallon hat. Eisenhower becomes a pen pal of Marshal Zhukov and the American President gives a wedding present to the Soviet Marshal's daughter. The Chancellor of the West German Republic is feted in Moscow. There is some kind of a vague agreement that the foreign ministers will get together and discuss things. Senator MCCARTHY is unhappy with the turn of events, and Senator KNOWLAND is preparing for the role of Cassandra.

But all around the world, there is at last hope that man's reason will somehow prevail—in spite of the shooting on the Gaza strip, in spite of the massacres and countermassacres in Morocco, in spite of new trouble between Greeks and Turks, in spite of the lamentations of those Asiatic darlings of the Republican right wing, Chiang Kai-Shek and Syngman Rhee.

The Republican National Committee already feels so relaxed that it orders up a brand new slogan from the Madison Avenue copy mills—"Everything is booming but the guns."

And all of this in a few brief months since the Stevens-McCarthy hearings were tearing at the vitals of the Republican Party and the Nation; since the Republican Senators were publicly hand-cuffing Secretary Dulles before they'd let him go abroad; since Admiral Carney was leaking imminent war to the whole Washington press crops; since Vice President NIXON was making tentative air strikes at Dien Bien Phu; and Senator KNOWLAND was building another Gibraltar at Quemoy and Matsu.

Peace, it's wonderful, especially with a campaign coming up.

I do not pretend to be an expert in foreign affairs.

Like anyone else with a sense of responsibility, I try as much as my work permits me to read the newspapers, to follow the commentators, to absorb something of the content of the journals of opinion.

Necessarily, I have learned something of politics, as a county chairman, as a State senator, as a candidate for statewide office in Pennsylvania.

Not that it requires a special gift, or intensive training, to see the flagrant and unashamed political distortion the Republican Party strategists are always ready to give to America's foreign policy.

The preservation of peace, together with freedom, is the single great and overriding issue of our times. Searching our hearts, we know that nothing else really counts. If the peace is broken in a war of massive retaliation, to use Secretary Dulles' unfortunate phrase, everything that we have labored to build is lost, even if we survive as individuals.

Properly, therefore, the issue of who can best lead the Nation and the world into an era of peace may be the principal issue of the 1956 campaign.

As they have been doing for 15 years, the Republicans will attempt to rewrite history and create a special mythology of their own. All the foolish words about unleashing Chiang against the Chinese mainland will be forgotten. Dulles will no longer testify that Russia is on the brink of collapse.

In his new role NIXON will concentrate on the physical education of young America. KNOWLAND will glumly smother his doubts for his party's sake. Admiral Radford, the politically selected Chief of Staff, will be under tight restraint.

Eisenhower, the great soldier of World War II, will be paraded as the great President who kept us out of world war III.

It will be smart politics, and it may be effective.

It will be effective unless we Democrats are able to drive home the truth to the people.

The truth is that the Republican Party leadership has never hesitated to put politics first and America last; to risk all-out war for domestic political consistency; to sacrifice their country's for their party's good in every consideration of American policy and world leadership.

Eisenhower, Bricker, Dulles, Nixon—the whole lot of them—were shameless demagogues in 1952. They exploited the hardships and the losses of the Korean war as President Truman's private police action undertaken, by some strange quirk of logic, because Secretary Acheson was soft on communism. The country had seen nothing like it since the campaign against Lincoln and the Union in 1864.

Then, as we all know, the Eisenhower administration proceeded to make a peace in Korea on terms for which a Republican Congress would have undertaken the impeachment of Harry Truman.

By the very skin of our teeth, we avoided involvement in the war in Indochina because the President, after all the bluffs had failed, vetoed the policy that was urged by Radford and Nixon; and because Premier Mendes-France and Foreign Minister Anthony Eden exercised the leadership which failed to come from Dulles and from Eisenhower.

We saw another bluff come close to a deadly ending in the Formosa Straits when the issue of the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu heated up, and as suddenly, cooled off.

We saw the reluctance, the timidity, with which the administration regarded the shift in Soviet policy; we saw the persistent brushoff that was given Winston Churchill as for years he sought the meeting at the summit.

It was a sad thing to see the President of the American Republic—the greatest and most powerful of Nations—so lacking in self-confidence as to be fearful of a meeting with the heads of other states. The man was a prisoner of Republican campaign oratory; he was constrained by the Republican right-wing Senators with their constant threat to attack any semblance of "coexistence" as "appeasement."

The Geneva Conference, now shining as a star in the administration's crown, was only made possible by the shift in control of the Senate to the Democratic Party. Dulles remained reluctant; the President was still bashful. It was Senator WALTER GEORGE, Democratic chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who gave them the impetus—and it was a rather sharp kick in the right place.

The Democratic Senate leadership—WALTER GEORGE, LYNDON JOHNSON, and their colleagues—gave the country and the world a lesson in responsibility. They resisted the temptation to play politics with foreign policy; they gave Eisenhower and Dulles the freedom of action which had been denied them by their own Republican Party; they made possible the approval of the Formosa resolution which the President asked and the foreign aid appropriations which the President asked. They extended the Reciprocal Trade Act for 3 years, killed off the Bricker amendment, and pounded down the McCarthy influence in the Senate until the Wisconsin Senator could only muster four votes for his anti-Geneva resolution.

Of course, we all know how Eisenhower requited the Democratic leadership in Congress.

He gave them the back of his hand.

I do not think we need fear that the Democratic Congress will abandon bipartisanship in foreign policy because of the President's bad manners and ingratitude.

I do think, perhaps, we will all be strengthened in our conviction that only the Democratic Party can direct the foreign affairs of this Nation toward the painful, ceaseless, enduring, age-long struggle it will take to establish peace.

It is a sad, hard world where little things make us hopeful.

The Russian leaders smile and act like human beings. The world is relieved.

The American leaders stop the foolish rattling of atomic bombs. The world breathes easier.

And yet, we all know that unnumbered crises lie ahead.

Nothing has really changed on the frontiers which divide the world. Germany is still divided; the satellite countries are still satellites; the Communist parties are still immensely strong in France and Italy; the artificial lines in Korea and Indo-China are still danger spots for the free world; Japan edges toward the East for economic survival; the Russian and the Chinese regimes are obviously strong and unshaken.

Wishful thinking alone will not bring us peace.

Nor will a foreign policy tempered to the needs of each election.

In our time, only the Democratic Party has contained the vigor, the statesmanship, the imagination, to prosecute a world policy for the United States will give us a reasonable chance of success.

It was the Democratic Party which built the Marshall plan which saved Western Europe.

It was the Democratic Party which set the Truman doctrine which saved Greece and Turkey.

It was the Democratic Party which built the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and sent a man named Eisenhower to preside over its forces.

It was the Democratic Party which stopped aggression in Korea, established the principle of collective security, maintained the United Nations, and kept communism from Japan.

It is the Democratic Party which has restored a proper freedom of action to President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles.

It was the Democratic Party which is willing to vote the necessary appropriations for foreign aid and our own armaments.

It is the Democratic Party which stands for the elimination of trade barriers, and a policy of mutual prosperity among the nations.

There is no secret right-wing war party among Democrats. There is no group in the Democratic Party which in its heart of hearts believes in a so-called preventive atomic war—now.

Let the issue be peace, and who can best preserve it.

On that issue, the Democratic Party need fear no man and no campaign. The Republican right wing, the Hoovers, the Nixons, the Knowlands, have been wrong—dead wrong—invariably wrong—through all these tragic years.

John Foster Dulles has been weak, a compromiser, a man who trimmed his course for each expedient wind.

Eisenhower has drifted and vacillated. He seems capable of a clear sense of purpose only when directed by a democratic administration or pushed forward by a Democratic Congress.

He is the best the Republicans have; he is their indispensable man.

But Dwight D. Eisenhower is not the Nation's indispensable man; he is not the best man for the country, not the best man to seek and keep the peace.

For Dwight Eisenhower, with all his admitted services to America and to the world, with all the honors that are due him, with all his amiability and good will, is not a great president. He is not a leader.

He reigns, but he does not govern.

Were he to win the office once again, carrying with him a Republican Congress, the hard and ugly underworld in the Republican Party would again reveal its measure of control, again make the President and the Nation their captive. They fawn on Eisenhower now because they need him desperately. As a President serving his second and final term, they would wear him down; shatter him; if need be, destroy him.

There would be dangerous eyes peering through the bomb sights; dangerous men playing reckless politics with armies, with atoms, with the survival of humanity.

This hard struggle, this great hope, for enduring peace will be pressed hardest, will be best attained when you and I and 35 million of our fellow Americans elect in 1956 the nominee of the Democratic National Convention.

And, as Governor of Pennsylvania, a very real pleasure will come to me. I will have the honor of welcoming as a permanent resident of our State, for 7 days a week, and 52 weeks a year, a former President and a general of the Armies of the United States—a man who longs, as we all know, for the comforts of a handsome farmstead on the fertile soil of Adams County, near Gettysburg, in Pennsylvania.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several ad-

dresses I delivered on the subject of the Communist conspiracy.

The first was an address I delivered at the Boston Arena, in Boston, Mass., on October 30, 1955.

The second was an address at the annual fall meeting of Sertoma International, in Chicago, Ill., on December 5, 1955.

The third was an address delivered in Tulsa, Okla., on December 7, 1955.

The final one was an address I broadcast on January 8, 1956.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOE MCCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN, BOSTON ARENA, BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 30, 1955

My fellow Americans, I always like to come to Boston because we don't have to spend our time discussing elementary things. I always feel that Bostonians—unlike some of the people in Washington—have a pretty good understanding of what the Communist fight is all about.

There is no need, for example, to tell a Boston audience that the spirit of Geneva is the spirit of illusion, folly, and appeasement.

In Boston, it is unnecessary to explain that when you propose friendship with tyrants and murderers—however good your intentions—you advance the cause of tyranny and murder.

There is no hesitation in this audience, I am sure, to refer to Communists as the eternal enemies of God and the human race, and to the Soviet Union as an unregenerate international bandit—even though the Paul Hoffmans and the Milton Eisenhowers tell us that the use of such words is a serious breach of coexistence etiquette.

I trust that you good Americans will never lose sight of, or minimize, the central fact of this struggle—namely, that whatever be the current twist of Soviet diplomacy, international communism is irrevocably committed to destroy this Nation and our way of life.

We cannot do business, we can never make friends, with that sort of enemy.

Creating the spirit of Geneva was, of course, a great triumph for Communist diplomacy, and the Kremlin leaders are still exploiting that triumph to the hilt. But we must not suppose the Communists have placed all their bets on their ability to outguess us in the diplomatic chess game. In case they fail to defeat us in this way, they are plotting our military defeat.

It is this aspect of the struggle that I want to discuss with you tonight. Tonight I shall discuss the life-and-death race between the United States and Russia in the intercontinental guided ballistic missile field, and whether at our end of the race we are being sabotaged.

A vital part of the job of destroying us militarily has been assigned to the Soviet Union's undercover agents in this country. The mission of the Soviet fifth column is twofold: Communist espionage agents are ordered to steal our secrets, and Communist policy-subversion experts are instructed to cause disastrous slow-downs in the development and production of vital military weapons.

We are most familiar with the first type of sabotage—that of stealing our secrets—and most Americans realize how it has jeopardized our national security. We know that had it not been for Communist agents turning over our most valuable secrets to the Soviet Union, the danger to this country today would not be nearly as great as it is. Take, for example, what happened to our atom bomb monopoly.

In the years immediately following World War II—while we had exclusive possession of the atom bomb—it was inconceivable that the Soviet Union would attack the United States. But in 4 short years this magnificent balance of power in our favor evaporated and our own country was in very great peril. And why? Because Klaus Fuchs, the British scientist, and American spies, such as the Rosenbergs, gave the Russians the vital secrets of the atom bomb. The Communists were thus able to produce an atom bomb in 1949, a full 4 years ahead of schedule.

You might think, after the great A-bomb treason, that those who had pooh-poohed the internal Communist threat through the late forties would have learned their lesson. But no: Irresponsible individuals—who pose as intellectuals—started making jokes about hunting Communists in the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries, and, at the same time, renewed their smear campaign against those who were trying to tighten up our security system. Those left-wingers are responsible—those scoffing, sneering pseudo-intellectuals, supported by wealthy, tax-exempt anti-anti-Communist organizations such as the Ford Foundation—they are responsible, no less than the Communists themselves for the fact that many Soviet agents remain unexposed, and to this day have access to our newest military secrets.

According to testimony of former Communist spies, a number of unidentified Communist espionage rings are still operating in the United States Government. Because they are not identified, it is only prudent to assume that Communist agents are gathering information every day about our Military Establishment and sending it to the Soviet Union.

Let me say, in passing, with regard to that fantastic suggestion that we give the Communists blueprints of our Military Establishment, that one likely reason the Communists did not at first accept the plan is that copies of our blueprints are already in Kremlin safes.

But important as it is to protect ourselves against spies, we must not lose sight of the other, and even more important assignment of the Soviet fifth column. If Communists are successful in slowing down the development of new weapons, and the production of already-developed weapons, it won't matter much whether the spies are successful in stealing secrets.

For remember: the Russians have a highly trained scientific establishment of their own, and they employ some of the most efficient methods of mass production. If, through policy sabotage, we are held back in the race to develop and produce a decisive weapon, the Communists can beat us on the strength of their own knowledge and skills.

Today the decisive weapon is the hydrogen bomb; yesterday, it was the atom bomb. Tomorrow—and by tomorrow I mean possibly within the next year—the decisive weapon with be the intercontinental ballistic missile. The race to produce this weapon could well determine the fate of Western civilization. Yet tonight I must report to you that the available evidence is (1) that the Soviet Union is winning that race, and (2) that it is possible that the Soviet Union is winning the race because well-concealed Communists in the United States government are putting the brakes on our own guided missile program. The Killian report is to the effect that within a short time the Communists will be ahead in the ICBM race.

The subject of the intercontinental missle race is both interesting and frightening, and I want to discuss it with you in some detail. But first, it would be well to square off to that type of thinking that says it is inconceivable that Communists are in such elevated and strategic positions as to effect slowdowns in our secret-weapons program. Nothing could be more dangerous than to rule out the possibility that Communist agents have infiltrated the uppermost echelons in our Defense Establishment—and nothing demonstrates so well an ignorance of very recent history.

In the fall of 1953, you may remember, I was viciously attacked by the left-wing press for stating that certain highly placed individuals in our Government had deliberately caused a slowdown—and for awhile, a complete cessation—of the American hydrogen bomb program. You remember the reaction: "MCCARTHY makes a wild charge"; "a baseless accusation"; "an unfounded smear," and so on. But the truth was known in high places, and the administration, through fear of exposure, was forced to act.

In a matter of weeks, my charge that a slowdown had occurred was verified and the American people finally learned that the man who was primarily responsible for the slowdown—had paid according to his own admission over $1,000 per year to Communist causes up until the very week he was asked to participate in our top secret atom bomb development program. This man was J. Robert Oppenheimer.

Oppenheimer persuaded Harry Truman that it was immoral for the United States to develop the hydrogen bomb—when, as an expert in the field, he knew full well that it would only be a matter of time before the Communists had a hydrogen bomb of their own.

I shudder to think what would have happened had Oppenheimer had his way for another 5 years. The Communists would then have had an H-bomb stockpile, before we had produced a single hydrogen bomb—which means that in 1954, or possibly this year, the Communists could have annihilated the United States.

Of course, today J. Robert Oppenheimer, like Alger Hiss and Owen Latimore before him, is the darling of the leftwing. Books are written about Oppenheimer's persecution. Edward R. Murrow made Oppenheimer the hero of one of his "unbiased objective" television shows. The Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic is distributing this Murrow film, free of charge, throughout the country. And, to round out the picture, it has recently been brought to my attention that Murrow's film, eulogizing this man Oppenheimer, was included in an employees' training program in a department of the United States Government—to be exact, the General Services Administration.

The Oppenheimer case is worth keeping in mind on two counts. It shows how easy it has been for men even with the most flagrant Communist backgrounds to rise to the top in our secret-weapons program; and it holds out the prospect, moreover, that the man who deliberately sandbags the development of a weapon on which the survival of this Nation depends will be treated, not as a criminal, not even as a rascal—but as a serious candidate for national sainthood.

When the liberals say that sabotage of the new weapon is inconceivable, my answer to them is that I consider such sabotage not only conceivable but likely because I realize the power and influence of the liberals, and because the manifest purpose of the liberals' pro-Oppenheimer propaganda is to see to it that the next J. Robert Oppenheimer keeps his job.

Now, what about this new decisive weapon—the intercontinental ballistic missile? Most of you have heard vague and mysterious references to the ICBM—and you may have gotten the impression that intercontinental missiles, like spaceships to the moon, are something of the distant future, a Buck Rogers' fantasy. But this is a dangerous illusion. For the scientists have nearly caught up with the science-fiction writers. The development, production, and use of the ICBM as a weapon of war may be—as I indicated earlier—just around the corner.

Work on the ICBM began in Germany during he Second World War. The German

V–2 rocket, which was used with devastating, though erratic, effect during the closing months of the war, was an adolescent ICBM. The V–2 lacked the necessary range and accuracy for effective use in intercontinental warfare—and, of course, it did not have a nuclear warhead. But the V–2 rocket embodied the basic principles of the weapon that may decide all of our futures.

The intercontinental ballistic missile will revolutionize warfare in our day—as, in the past, warfare was revolutionized by the invention of gunpowder, later by the airplane, and, more recently, by the atom and hydrogen bombs. And, as always—when one side has the revolutionary weapon and the other does not—the latter is at the absolute mercy of its enemies. If the Communists develop a long-range guided missile before we do, the balance of world power will shift completely, and this country will face the alternative of surrender to the Communists, or utter destruction.

The long-range guided missile will be "the" decisive weapon because there is no known way of defending against it. This is due to the terrific speed that can be generated in a rocket-propelled missile. We tend to think of our present jet planes that travel at or near the speed of sound, as just about the fastest things that man can make. But present estimates indicate that the first intercontinental missiles will travel at least 8,000 miles an hour—or 12 times the speed of sound!

At the present time we are developing means of defending ourselves against hydrogen bombs delivered by planes. Our defenses against bombing attacks are by no means foolproof, but guided missile antiaircraft fire will be able to knock down many—perhaps most—enemy planes before they reach the United States.

For defense against H-bomb attacks, we are now relying most heavily on the Army's famous Nike missile. Should enemy planes approach this country, a Nike installation in the area of the enemy approach will launch a missile into a radar beam with which our plane-spotters are tracking the oncoming aircraft. After the missile has reached the center of the radar beam, an electronic mechanism inside the missile will cause it to "ride" the beam until finally the missile reaches the plane and destroys it. This is not as easy as it sounds because the Communists may have ways of distorting or deflecting the radar beam, and also may be able to concentrate their bombers so heavily as to make it impossible for Nike to knock down all the planes.

Others, and possibly more effective, defensive missile systems are being put into operation. For example, the Air Force has developed an aircraft-to-aircraft guided missile, called the Falcon—which is launched by fighter planes. Air Force detachments in the Arctic are being supplied with the Falcon, so that we will have a fair chance of stopping Communist bombers before they reach continental United States.

We thus have some defense against aircraft-delivered bombs. But against superspeed guided missiles, that can make the trip from Russia in less than half an hour, defense is practically impossible.

The question is often asked: will Russian missiles, traveling at such speeds, be able to hit American cities and other strategic points with any degree of accuracy? The answer here is, unfortunately, yes. Russian intercontinental missiles will have self-contained guidance mechanisms that will guarantee a hit within 2 to 10 miles of the center of the target area. With hydrogen bomb war heads, the missiles will thus be accurate enough to knock out any metropolitan area at which they are aimed.

The guided mechanism of the Russian missile is a tremendously intricate piece of machinery—but marvelously simple in concept. The guidance mechanism will give the missile a "brain" of its own. By means of an accelerometer, which will tell the missile how far it has traveled, and a gyrocompass which, when corrected by automatic star sights, will "inform" the missile of its course, the missile will "know" where it is at every moment of its flight from Russia to the United States. The missile will also have been "told" by prelaunching instrument settings, the total distance it has to go and the course it must follow in order to reach a given American city. By putting these two pieces of information together—namely, where the missile ultimately has to go, and where it is at the moment—the guidance mechanism "figures out" the direction and distance left to travel, and automatically sets the missile at the proper speed and course.

The grave danger to every American city is, thus, self-evident. As soon as the Russians perfect this guidance mechanism, and develop sufficient range for their rockets, Milwaukee or Washington or Boston can be wiped out by pushing a button.

But the peril is even more imminent than that. American cities may be in mortal danger, even before the era of push-button warfare, because the Russians are now working on an aircraft-to-ground missile that will not require the four to five thousand mile intercontinental range. If this relatively short-range air-to-ground missile is perfected, the Communists will be able to fly their jet bombers up to the outer range of our Nike defenses—say, somewhere off our Atlantic coast—and launch guided missiles from that point. Such missiles will probably have the 8,000 mile per hour speed we mentioned earlier, and thus would be unstoppable before they reach American cities.

Now, my good friends, the best and the only known defense against a Communist guided missile attack is an intercontinental guided missile arsenal of our own. If we get to the finish line in the race to develop this weapon by the time, or before, the Communists do, the fear of retaliation may discourage the Soviet Union from launching such an attack. But if the Communists win the race, it is "curtains" for us all.

How is the race developing? The Communists were given a handicap at the opening gun. In the closing days of the war, two V-2 plants located in Eastern Germany, and 160 German scientists, who had been working on the rocket, fell into the hands of the Red Army. The important machinery from the plants, and the scientists were promptly toted off to Russia, and put to work for the Soviet Union. Consequently, the Communists got a huge head start in the race to build the intercontinental guided missile. Our most reliable intelligence reports indicate that the Russians have given top priority to their guided missile program ever since, and with the invaluable aid of the German scientists, have taken huge strides toward perfection of the weapon.

But just as top priority has been given to the Russian ICBM program, just so, the slow-down of the American program is the top priority mission of Communist agents in this country. That is their most important job. Has the Communist fifth column been successful?

We know this much: Ever since the war, our guided-missile program has been a relatively low-priority project. The program got off to a slow start at the end of the war, and in 1949—just at the time, you will recall, that Oppenheimer was convincing President Truman that the H-bomb was "immoral"—the guided-missile program was cut back even further. Why? That question must be answered—and until it is answered, and until those who were responsible have been apprehended, the security of this country remains in the gravest peril.

Since 1949 the guided-missile program, as a whole, has been stepped up slightly. Guided missiles for defense against jet attack—like Nike, Falcon, and the Navy's Terrier—have finally been developed. But very little, if any, progress has been made in developing the all-important intercontinental ballistic missile.

The American people have a right to know why this aspect of our guided-missile program is moving at a snail's pace. Is it because our scientists are inferior to the Russians? Is it because of innocent bureaucratic bungling? Or is it because highly placed Communist agents have been successful in sabotaging the program?

I doubt that American scientists are inferior. I find it hard to believe that any amount of bureaucratic inefficiency could, alone, and over a long period of time, be responsible for the neglect of our single most important defense weapon. I therefore find frighteningly compelling the alternative that Communist agents are making good on their assignment.

Back in 1950, the leftwingers told us, in effect, that Alger Hiss had been the last Communist in Government. Hiss was gone, they said, so there was no need to continue the so-called witch hunts—we could let down our guard. But the American people, in their wisdom, demanded and got, relentless investigations by congressional committees. One traitor after another was exposed, until we began to get some picture of the extent of Communist infiltration. Today, the leftwingers are saying, once again, that all the Communists are gone.

This is an assumption that Americans can never afford to make if they are to remain free. Especially, can we not afford to make it when, for some curious and unexplained reason, some person—or persons—is giving low priority to the weapon on whose rapid and successful development the fate of America rests.

We live in a time of great tension, my good friends, and of great anxiety. We all want to relax the tensions and remove the anxieties. We thus may be tempted to "play along" when wily Communist diplomats turn on the charm. We may be tempted to roll out the carpet when Communist bureaucrats, disguised as "farmers," pay a "goodwill visit to Iowa. We may be tempted to listen to those who tell us we cannot expose and prosecute Communists in Government because this would violate the "spirit of Geneva" and offend the Soviet Union. But nothing could be more foolhardy. If there were no other reason to puncture and deflate the spirt of Geneva, it is enough that this spurious love fest is causing us to let up in our efforts to expose subversion. Since we are losing the race to produce the decisive weapon, the guided missile slowdown must be investigated exhaustively and relentlessly until the culprits are uncovered.

We simply cannot afford to play the game of being "nice" to Communists.

However much we want peace, we must not lose sight of the hard truth that there will be no lasting peace so long as the Communist conspiracy survives.

We must not buy tranquillity today at the price of slavery tomorrow.

We must not forget our solemn duty to leave for our children the blessings that God has given us.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOE MCCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN, ANNUAL FALL MEETING OF SERTOMA INTERNATIONAL, ALLGAUER'S RESTAURANT, CHICAGO, ILL., DECEMBER 5, 1955

My fellow Americans, a little over a month ago, a remarkable event occurred in the city of Milwaukee. In a small, dingy auditorium, known as Wetzel's Hall, some 40 persons gathered to hear an announcement. The 40 shifted in their seats somewhat nervously, as the speaker arose behind a rickety, make-

shift rostrum. Many of those in the audience had not seen this man for 5 years.

"I went away," the speaker began, "to carry on the struggle for the rights of the people, for democracy and peace. Where I went and what I did is not important. But what is important is what is happening today at Geneva. I decided to come back."

Who was the speaker? He was Mr. Fred Bassett Blair, chairman of the Communist Party of Wisconsin. And the audience? The 40 persons in the audience were the hard core of a Communist Party unit, who had responded to the party's call to come out into the open again.

"We disappeared," Mr. Blair went on, "because of the people who fostered the menace of McCarthyism. They made it impossible for us to carry on our work."

But now, said Blair triumphantly, with a smile as big as Khrushchev's, there have been wonderful changes. "We are no longer political exiles in our own country. Since the Geneva Conference of the Big Four powers, people are waking up because they realize there is no such thing as a Communist conspiracy. This thinking makes it possible for us to return."

This scene I have just described to you, my good friends, was reenacted in numerous American cities last month, possibly right here in Chicago, as the Communist underground decided to crawl up from under the planks, and renew a public campaign to overthrow our Government. The spirit of Geneva, and the supposed defeat of McCarthyism—these are the things that, according to the Communists, make it possible for them to show their faces again.

The local party leaders did not, of course, make their decisions independently—they were operating under direct instructions from Moscow—instructions that were revealed recently by Mr. Herbert Philbrick, a former FBI undercover agent who still has contacts in the Communist underground. Here is what Mr. Philbrick wrote just a few days before the public meeting in Milwaukee:

"The Cominform, world headquarters of the Communist International, has ordered top Red agents here to bring the Red network in the United States above ground, and to reinstate the American Communist Party as a 'legitimate national political party.' The new instructions, obviously part of the Red pattern, since the Geneva Conference, signals a major and abrupt shift for the Communist movement in the United States, which, for the last 4 years, has operated almost entirely as an underground apparatus."

"Couriers from national headquarters"—and I am still quoting—"are now being assigned to go into some 21 specific areas in the United States. Among the cities pinpointed for district Communist headquarters are Boston, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, Seattle, and Denver. A target city for a forthcoming party building effort will be Houston, Tex."

The Communists are optimistic about the success of open party activities because they believe—and now Mr. Philbrick is quoting from the Cominform instructions that "* * * 'attacks and persecution' of party members will come only from 'Fascist and war-mongering reactionary elements,' who are clearly attempting to sabotage President Eisenhower's policies and program for world peace." These "savages," according to the Communist instructions, "are to be 'condemned' as 'enemies of the United States'."

I trust you realize that one such "savage" is speaking to you right now. This point was driven home by the chairman of the Wisconsin Communist Party at the Milwaukee meeting. In explaining the Communists' mission, Blair said: "We are back here to fight against the rise of McCarthyism."

Now, my good friends, I have no desire to exploit the implications of personal flattery contained in that statement. The Communists use the term "McCarthyism"—a word they coined—to describe everything they don't like. They mean by it, not only Senator McCarthy, but also Congressional investigating committees. They mean the FBI and the Government security program. They mean patriotic organizations who have been striving valiantly over the years to alert the American people to the dangers of communism. They mean those who favor a realistic foreign policy that recognizes the Soviet Government for what it is—a ruthless tyranny whose ultimate aim is the conquest of the United States. It is these people the Communists are going to fight against—and now, fight against in the open.

I first learned of the Milwaukee Communist meeting from a news clipping sent to me by one of my constituents. Across the top of the story I read this note from the sender: "How can they have the nerve?"

How can they have the nerve? What makes the Communists think they can pull off this new campaign to deceive the American people?

Part of the answer is painfully clear. The Communists are bound to be optimistic as long as we try to keep alive the spirit of Geneva—as long as the administration nourishes the myth that the Soviet Union is a peace-loving nation. Why shouldn't the Communists be optimistic when our own Government endorses the principal plank of their propaganda platform?

But there is a further reason for the Communists' optimism, namely, the increasingly successful anti-anti-Communist campaign here at home. This is the matter I want to discuss with you tonight—the efforts to reduce awareness of the Communist menace, to destroy our security program, to whip up public hysteria against anti-Communist measures. This campaign is being waged by the Communists, to be sure; but the heaviest blows are being struck by their numerous, and influential and very wealthy liberal allies, who, I insist, are doing as much damage to this country as the Reds themselves.

Take, for example, the Ford Foundation's notorious Fund for the Republic. Three years ago the Ford Foundation gave $15 million tax-exempt funds to a group of allegedly respectable, and distinguished liberals, and told them to conduct a number of study projects that would advance understanding of civil liberties. After 3 years' performance, it is now plain that this so-called research organization is nothing of the sort: it is a vicious anti-anti-Communist propaganda machine.

Many Americans have by now caught on to the fund's real purposes; but with its tax-exempt millions, and with the unanimous backing of the liberal press, this false-front organization is bound to have a profound influence in creating an atmosphere conducive to a Communist revival.

One of the reasons the fund is so helpful to the Communists is its president, Dr. Robert Hutchins. This so-called scholar, the former head of Chicago University—whose organization is now advising the American people that our security program is too tough—has some rather interesting ideas about those against whom the program is directed.

Let's listen to Dr. Hutchins' views on Communists, as he related them in 1949 to a committee of the Illinois Legislature. This testimony was given under oath.

Question: "So far as those who have stated they are Communists are concerned, do you not assume that their purpose must be subversive by definition?"

Dr. Hutchins' answer: "It is not yet established that it is subversive to be a Communist."

Next question: "There is no doubt in your mind about the Communist Party, itself, being a subversive organization, is there, Doctor?"

Hutchins' answer: "Well, I can't believe that that is true here, or the Communist Party would long since be illegal."

In other words, the man, whose organization is passing judgment on our security program, says that he doubts that the Communist Party is a subversive organization.

I think we should listen to one more observation by Dr. Hutchins.

Question: "Is there any doubt that the Communist Party is a conspiratorial fifth column operating in the interest of a foreign state?"

Hutchins 'answer: "I am not instructed on this subject. I understand many Communists say they do not operate under instructions of a foreign state."

Thus, the former chancellor of one of our leading universities, the "boy wonder," as you may recall, of the academic world during the thirties, says he is "not instructed" as to whether the Communist Party is a Moscow-directed conspiracy.

Now, my good friends, let's compare this statement with the recent claim of the Wisconsin Communist chairman that we mentioned a moment ago. Remember: He said the American people "realize there is no such thing as a Communist conspiracy?" This judgment might be a little premature, but why shouldn't they be optimistic when they can count on the Hutchins and organizations like the Fund for the Republic to peddle their line for them?

Incidentally, Hutchins hasn't changed his views a whit since 1949. Last month, at a press conference in New York, he said he would be glad to hire Communists to work for the Fund for the Republic—an organition that is supposed to be fighting communism; also he said that he had no objection to those who take the fifth amendment and refuse to tell whether they are Communists on the ground that the truth might tend to incriminate them.

Another reason the fund can be counted on to give the Communists a helping hand is in the person of its vice president, Mr. W. H. Ferry. "Ping" Ferry, as he is known, used to be director of public relations of the infamous CIO Political Action Committee. The CIO–PAC, as you will recall, spearheaded a Communist-inspired attempt to take over the Democrat Party in the middle forties—and was itself riddled by Communist Party members.

This former PAC propaganda chief, now second in command at the fund for the Republic, still, evidently, likes the same kind of company. Last year, for example, he joined a host of notorious Communist fronters to protest the holding of hearings by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on the Southern Conference Educational Fund. The subcommittee found that the Southern Conference Educational Fund was, in effect, simply a new name for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was "conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1938 as a mass organization to promote communism through the Southern States."

We get an even better idea of the fund's bias by taking a close look at some of its activities over the past year—activities which betray a single underlying purpose: to belittle the Communist menace and to create a fantastically distorted picture of the civil-liberties issue.

Take, for example, the fund's famous study of the Government loyalty-security program. The results of this investigation have now been published in a book entitled "Case Studies in Personnel Security"—a case-by-case story of how harshly our security program deals with suspected Communists.

Now, do you know how the fund went about making this survey? First, it appointed one Adam Yarmolinsky to head up the project.

Yarmolinsky then enlisted members of unsuspecting law firms throughout the country to interview the defense attorneys of Government employees who had been fired as security risks, so as to get the defense version of each case. These tales of woe were forwarded, unevaluated, to Mr. Yarmolinsky and his staff. The Yarmolinsky crew then culled from the field reports—still representing only the empolyee's side of the story—what appeared to be the worst cases, and prepared them for publication. The book is now palmed off to the American people as a balanced study of the Government security program.

It is interesting to note one method by which the fund's propaganda machine accomplishes its mission. In his introduction to the book, Mr. Yarmolinsky is careful—lest the fund be caught with its red underwear showing—not to call these cases typical. However, the claim is made that the cases are representative, in a highly charged emotional article on the Yarmolinsky collection appearing in the Saturday Review of Literature. Copies of this Saturday Review article are now being distributed throughout the country by, guess who?—the fund for the Republic.

Let's look at another of the fund's projects. Two years ago, the fund appropriated $185,500 for a study of attitudes toward communism and civil liberties. This study eventually begot a book called Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, published this year—the main themes of which are (1) that Communists are merely a "nonconformist" "minority"; and (2) that this country has a distressingly small number of "tolerant" people, as the book describes them, who are willing to let avowed Communists spread Red propaganda in their communities. Incidentally, one of the professors who helped put this book together has a record of 15 Communist-front affiliations.

Take another of the fund's projects. A year ago this month the fund appropriated $75,000 of its tax-exempt money for "awards for outstanding original drama and documentary scripts on civil liberties themes." In September of this year the fund selected 19 prize-winning scripts and offered them to the television industry. As might be predicted, not a single dealt with the threat to civil liberties from communism. Instead, the dramas ridiculed the fight against communism, depicting situations that even the most imaginative Communist would be proud to have dreamed up. Here are some typical award-winners, described in the fund's own language.

"The invisible accuser: The fight of a woman surgeon to clear herself of malicious loyalty charges.

"The burden of the day: A prominent lawyer takes on the defense of a former Communist knowing his act will end his political hopes.

"The claws in the cat's paw: The smear of a teacher as a Communist by economy-minded citizens to forestall spending for school improvements.

"The inner curtain: A practical joke involving communism at a large industrial plant ultimately forces the perpetrator of the joke to resign."

Perhaps, the Communists didn't write these scripts, but they know a good thing when they see it. The Daily Worker devoted several columns in its September 16 issue, to a laudatory discussion of the prize-winning scripts.

Another project of the Fund for the Republic is its financing of the so-called freedom agenda. The freedom agenda has published a series of pamphlets designed to show that Communists are operating in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson, and that measures for protecting our Government against Communist subversion are a violation of Constittuional safeguards for "dissenters."

Still another fund project is its distribution of 35,000 copies of a book called the Fifth Amendment Today, by Erwin Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School. Dean Griswold attempts through highly selective legal arguments to prove that one may not infer Communist leanings from the fact that a man refuses to answer questions about alleged Communist connections on the ground that a truthful answer might incriminate him. This book is being energetically promoted by Communist Party publications and Communist-front organizations and, of course, by the Fund for the Republic.

One more example: In a recent president's report, Dr. Hutchins states that the Fund for the Republic "has made an expanded version of the television film of Edward R. Murrow's interview with J. Robert Oppenheimer available to educational institutions and groups concerned with public affairs."

This Murrow film, as you may recall, is a thinly disguised attempt to elevate to national martyrdom one of the most dangerous security risks this country has ever known.

I don't think it necessary to go into Oppenheimer's record tonight: suffice it to say that this man admittedly contributed money to the Communist Party right up until the time he was asked to serve in our top-secret atomic-energy program—and then, after he had achieved unrivaled influence in the atomic-weapons field, told Harry Truman it would be immoral for us to produce a hydrogen bomb, knowing full well that the Soviet Union would soon produce an H-bomb of its own. The Fund for the Republic is now spending tax-exempt funds to make this man a hero.

I am sure that you in this audience have as much contempt for the work of the Fund for the Republic as I do. I am sure you are as outraged as I am that the United States Government—through its tax-exemption regulations—is, in effect, subsidizing this brazen campaign to belittle the Communist menace and undermine our security program. Don't you agree that the least we can ask of the "Fund to Destroy the Republic" is that it pay its taxes like everybody else?

Even the Communist Party has to pay an income tax.

I could go on and on, citing examples of how the spirit of Geneva is being implemented here at home—of how liberals are giving aid and comfort to the Communists. If there were time, for example, I would like to discuss the activities of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights—so-called—headed by Missouri's contribution to the leftwing bleeding-hearts club, Senator HENNINGS. HENNINGS is operating hand in hand with the Fund To Destroy the Republic in trying to persuade Congress to rip the guts out of the Government security program. No wonder the Communists are rejoicing, no wonder the Kremlin leaders are congratulating themselves on their smashing diplomatic victories, no wonder the Communist Party in the United States is coming above ground again. I suggest, my good friends, that it is time the American people start fighting back.

Tonight I want to mention three ways in which we can combat this new offensive by the Communists and leftwingers.

No. 1: We must rise to the defense of an effective security program, and insist that effective security standards be vigorously enforced. We must reaffirm the principle that working for the United States is a privilege and a trust—that it is not a "right," as the Communists and leftwingers claim, that is available to persons who have played ball with the Communists, and thus for all we know may be members of the conspiracy.

If a man has compromised himself in the past by joining Communist fronts and associating with known party members, he must suffer the consequences. If there is reasonable doubt that a man's loyalty is, four-square, to the United States, the benefit of that doubt must go to the Government and to the American people.

But we cannot save our security system unless we come to grips with those who are attempting to destroy it. We must therefore recognize that our enemies are not only the Communists but their leftwing allies—the Fund for the Republic, the ADA, the anti-anti-Communists in Congress and the executive branch—who are trying to whip up public sentiment against measures that will protect our country.

Some persons say, "Oh, MCCARTHY, aren't you being a little hard on the leftwingers? Isn't it true," I am sometimes asked, "that the lefties are good Americans, misguided perhaps, but who have been genuinely taken in by the 'civil liberties' red-herring?" My answer is yes, this may be true. But I have neither the patience nor the resources to attempt to find out the inner motivations of every person who helps peddle Communist propaganda. I say, don't call them Communists. Let's concede they are well-meaning people who have been "taken in" by Communist propaganda; but let's also be very clear about what team they are playing on. In terms of the damage they do, they are every bit as dangerous to this Nation as the Communists themselves. This Republic will not last one day longer by being able to say that its destroyers had good intentions.

No. 2, we must show those arrogant, gloating Communists—who say the American people are ready to welcome them back as just another political party—that they are dead wrong. The Communists are hopefully getting under steam a massive propaganda campaign, and a vigorous drive to recruit new party members. Our answer to them should be sharp and decisive. We should outlaw the Communist Party.

I submit that a criminal, conspiratorial fifth column, under instructions by a foreign power to try to overthrow our Government, has no legitimate claim to the protection of our laws. No nation that has any intention of surviving can afford to give legal license to those who, by intrigue, sabotage and lies, seek to destroy its institutions and way of life.

I am aware of the argument that outlawing the party would drive the Communists underground. This argument forgets, however, that the Communists need and desire an open party—as well as an underground. They want to maintain both, an underground of secret party members who do the the party's conspiratorial work of sabotage, espionage and policy subversion; and an open party that conducts propaganda and recruiting activities. One effect of outlawing the party would be to block overt efforts to sell to the American people under false and deceptive colors, the Communist package of lies.

And please don't let me hear that old canard about free speech. For one thing, a Communist does not engage in free speech and free thought: He is told what to say and think. For another, Communists are not just carriers of a political ideology: They are criminal conspirators, dedicated to the overthrow of our Government, and must be dealt with as such.

When a man commits a murder you don't, in the name of free speech, present him with a soapbox and invite him to try to win converts to the cause of murder.

No. 3—and this is most important of all—we must puncture and deflate the illusory and farcical spirit of Geneva. This means getting our foreign policy back on a realistic and moral footing—acknowledging that international communism is our implacable enemy, and that world communism will either destroy us or be destroyed.

The spirit of Geneva is the natural consequence of our having taken as our own policy guide the Communist line of peaceful coexistence. I hold that coexistence with

communism is neither desirable nor possible nor honorable.

As I said to the Senate on August 1—just 3 days after the Geneva Summit meeting, when most of the Senators were gushingly congratulating the President for having made friends with the Kremlin leaders—"Is it not still self-evident that hostility to communism—overt, articulate, unyielding hostility—is both necessary and desirable? We must be hostile to communism for the same reason that good is hostile to evil. Good cannot clasp the hand of evil without becoming evil, and without inviting destruction by evil. You cannot offer friendship to tyrants and murderers without advancing the cause of tyranny and murder."

God gave us these great United States and inlaid on our broad land the peerless gem of freedom. We owe it to God and to ourselves to guard that freedom today against the most monstrous tyranny in history. Let us ask God to give our generation that strength and courage and wisdom with which He has never failed to grace the American people in time of great trial.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOE MCCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN, MUNICIPAL THEATER, TULSA, OKLA., DECEMBER 7, 1955

My fellow Americans, I always like to speak in the Midwest, here in the heart of the United States, because we don't have to spend our time discussing elementary things. You people in Oklahoma—unlike some of the persons I know in Washington—don't need a grade-school education on what the Communist fight is all about.

There is no need, for example, to tell a Tulsa audience that the so-called spirit of Geneva is the spirit of illusion, folly, and appeasement.

In Tulsa, it is unnecessary to explain that when you propose friendship with tyrants and murderers—however good your intentions—you advance the cause of tyranny and murder.

There is no hesitation in this audience, I am sure, to refer to Communists as the eternal enemies of God and the human race, and to the Soviet Union as an unregenerate international bandit—even though the Paul Hoffmans and the Milton Eisenhowers tell us that such words constitute a serious breach of coexistence etiquete.

I trust that you good Americans will never lose sight of, nor minimize, the central fact of this struggle—namely, that however broad the smiles of the Kremlin leaders become, international communism is irrevocably commited to destroy this Nation and our way of life.

We cannot do business, we can never make friends, with that sort of enemy.

Creating the spirit of Geneva was, of course, a great triumph for Communist diplomacy, and the Kremlin leaders are still exploiting that triumph to the hilt. But the spirit of Geneva was not only a diplomatic victory for the Communists, it has had repercussions here at home.

A little over a month ago, an event occurred in the city of Milwaukee that gives some idea of why the Communists were so anxious to create the spirit of Geneva. In a small, dingy, auditorium, known as Wetzel's hall, some 40 persons gathered to hear an announcement. The 40 shifted in their seats somewhat nervously, as the speaker arose behind his rostrum. Many of those in the audience had not seen this man for 5 years.

"I went away," the speaker began, "to carry on the struggle for the rights of the people, for democracy, and peace. Where I went and what I did is not important. But what is important is what is happening today at Geneva. I decided to come back.

Who was the speaker? Who was the man who decided to come back? He was Mr. Fred Bassett Blair, chairman of the Communist Party of Wisconsin. And the audience? The 40 persons in the audience were the hard core of a Communist Party unit, who had responded to the party's call to come out into the open again.

"We disappeared," Mr. Blair went on, "because of the people who fostered the menace of McCarthyism. They made it impossible for us to carry on our work."

"But now," said Blair triumphantly, with a smile as big as Khrushchev's, "there have been wonderful changes. We are no longer political exiles in our own country. Since the Geneva Conference of the Big Four powers, people are waking up because they realize there is no such thing as a Communist conspiracy. This thinking makes it possible for us to return."

This scene I have just described to you, my good friends, was reenacted in numerous American cities last month, possibly right here in Tulsa, as the Communist underground decided to crawl up from under the planks, and renew a public campaign to overthrow our Government. The spirit of Geneva, and the supposed defeat of McCarthyism, these are the things that, according to the Communists, make it possible for them to show their faces again.

The local party leaders did not, of course, make their decisions independently: they were operating under direct instructions from Moscow, instructions that were revealed recently by Mr. Herbert Philbrick, a former FBI undercover agent who still has contacts in the Communist underground. Here is what Mr. Philbrick wrote just a few days before the public meeting in Milwaukee:

"The Cominform, world headquarters of the Communist International has ordered top Red agents here to bring the Red network in the United States above ground, and to reinstate the American Communist Party as a 'legitimate national political party.'"

Philbrick went on to say "the new instructions, obviously part of the Red pattern * * * since the Geneva conference, signals a major and abrupt shift for the Communist movement in the United States, which, for the last 4 years has operated almost entirely as an underground * * * apparatus."

"Couriers from national headquarters"—and I am still quoting from Philbrick—"are now being assigned to go into some 21 specific areas in the United States * * * among the cities pin-pointed for district Communist headquarters are Boston, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, Seattle, and Denver. A target city for a forthcoming 'party building' effort will be Houston, Tex."

The Communists are optimistic about the success of open party activities because they believe—and now Mr. Philbrick is quoting from the Cominform instructions—that "* * * 'attacks and persecution' of party members will come only from 'Fascist and war-mongering reactionary elements,' who are 'clearly attempting to sabotage President Eisenhower's policies and program for world peace'." These "savages," according to the Communist instructions, "are to be 'condemned' as 'enemies of the United States'."

I trust you realize that one such "savage" is speaking to you right now. This point was driven home by the chairman of the Wisconsin Communist Party at the Milwaukee meeting. In explaining the Communists' mission, Blair said: "We are back here to fight against the rise of McCarthyism."

Now, my good friends, I have no desire to exploit the implications of personal flattery contained in that statement. The Communists use the term "McCarthyism"—a word they coined—to describe everything they don't like. They mean by it, not only Senator MCCARTHY, but also congressional investigating committees. They mean the FBI and the Government security program. They mean patriotic organizations, and people, who have been striving valiantly over the years to alert the American people to the dangers of communism. They mean those who favor a realistic foreign policy that recognizes the Soviet Government for what it is—a ruthless tyranny whose ultimate aim is the conquest of the United States. It is these people the Communists are going to fight against—and fight against in the open.

This new Communist declaration of war is one reason that no politician—whether he be Republican or Democrat—can come before the American people in 1956 and, in good conscience claim to have brought peace to the world. There will never be real peace so long as the Communists own one-half of the earth and are determined to enslave the other.

I first learned of the Milwaukee Communist meeting from a news clipping sent to me by one of my constituents. Across the top of the story I read this note from the sender: "How can they have the nerve?"

How can they have the nerve? What makes the Communists think they can succeed in this new campaign to deceive the American people? This is the subject I want to deal with tonight. I want to talk about some recent events that make it all too clear why the Communists are optimistic about the future.

On November 7, just 1 month ago today, a message was sent from Denver, under the signature of President Eisenhower, to Klementi Voroshilov, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. Before reading it, let me say I am reluctant to attribute the inspiration for this message to the President. He was on his sick bed and was probably under the influence of the "palace guard," that shadowy left-wing cabal consisting of the Paul Hoffmans, Harold Stassens, and Milton Eisenhower—men who are masterminding our foreign policy even though they were not elected to office and will surely be repudiated by the American people if they ever become candidates.

Here is what the Eisenhower message said: "On this national anniversary of the Soviet Union, I am happy to convey to your Excellency and the people of the Soviet Union the best wishes of the people of the United States for progress toward a permanent and just peace."

And what was this "national anniversary" that we helped the Communists commemorate? It was the day of the Russian revolution—the day that marks the beginning of slave labor camps, of collectivized farms, of the closing of the churches, of the enthronement of the worst tyranny the world has ever known.

No wonder the Communists are cocky about the future, when our President, in effect, congratulates the Communist leaders on the anniversary of the day they managed to enslave 200 million people.

The incredible thing about this message is that it was sent on behalf of the people of the United States. How many of you people in Tulsa were consulted about it? How many in this audience thought it proper to congratulate the peoples of Russia on the anniversary of the day they were put in chains. Yet this is exactly what was done in your name—and in mine.

The fact that we keep making degrading overtures to the Kremlin is one of the reasons the Communists think they have a rosy future ahead. But there are others. Most important are the increasingly successful attempts to whip up public hysteria against anti-Communists and any effective efforts to protect our Government against Communist subversion. This campaign was inspired by the Communists; but the heaviest blows are being struck by their numerous, and influential, and wealthy liberal allies who, let me assure you, are doing as much

damage to this country as the Reds themselves.

Take, for example, the Ford Foundation's notorious Fund for the Republic which claims to be conducting an objective study of the Communist menace and of the Government security program. The other night in Chicago I discussed the activities of this organization in some detail—activities that show it is an anti-anti-Communist propaganda machine.

I wish I had the time tonight to go into the full story of an organization that is spending $15 million of tax-exempt money to help spread the Communist line. But we can get some valuable insights into the Fund for the Republic by taking a quick look at its president, Dr. Robert Hutchins.

In 1949, Dr. Hutchins was asked about his views on communism by a committee of the Illinois Legislature. Here is his testimony given under oath:

Question. "So far as those who have stated they are Communists are concerned, do you not assume that their purpose must be subversive by definition?"

Dr. Hutchins' answer: "It is not yet established that it is subversive to be a Communist." (This was in 1949.)

Next question: "There is no doubt in your mind about the Communist Party itself being a subversive organization is there Doctor?"

Hutchins' answer: "Well, I can't believe that that is true here, or the Communist Party would long since be illegal."

In other words, the man, whose organization is passing judgment on our security program, says that he doubts that the Communist Party is a subversive organization.

Let's listen to one more observation by Dr. Hutchins.

Question: "Is there any doubt that the Communist Party is a conspiratorial fifth column operating in the interests of a foreign state"?

Hutchins' answer: "I am not instructed on this subject. I understand many Communists say they do not operate under instructions of a foreign state."

Thus, the former head of one of our leading universities, the "boy wonder" as you may recall, of the academic world during the thirties, says he is "not instructed" as to whether the Communist Party is a Moscow-directed conspiracy.

Now let's compare this statement with the recent claim of the Wisconsin Communist leader that we mentioned a moment ago. Remember: Blair said the American people "realize there is no such thing as a Communist conspiracy." This judgment might be a little premature, but why shouldn't the Communists be optimistic when they can count on the Dr. Hutchinses and organizations like the Fund for the Republic to peddle their line for them?

With Hutchins feeling the way he does about communism, is it any wonder that the Fund for the Republic's method of "investigating" the security program was to gather together the complaints of discharged Communist suspects, and then palm them off to the American people as an objective account of how the program works.

Is it any wonder that the fund sponsored a book on communism the main themes of which are (1) Communists are merely a "nonconformity minority," and (2) that this country has a distressingly small number of "tolerant" people who are willing to let avowed Communists spread Red propaganda in their communities.

Is it any wonder that the fund appropriated $75,000 in prizes for television scripts that ridicule and dsparage the efforts of those who are attempting to oppose Communists?

Is it any wonder that the fund distributed a book by the dean of the Harvard Law School, who tells his readers they may not infer Communist leanings when a man refuses to answer questions about alleged Communist connections on the ground that a truthful answer might incriminate him?

Is it any wonder that the fund financed the distribution of Edward R. Murrow's television film on J. Robert Oppenhimer—which attempts to elevate to national martyrdom a man who admittedly gave money to the Communist Party right up until the time he was asked to serve in our top secret atomic-energy program, and after that, was responsible for the disastrous postponement of our hydrogen-bomb program?

I am sure that you people in Tulsa have as much contempt for the work of the Fund for the Republic as I do. I am sure you are as outraged as I am that the United States Government—through its tax-exemption policies is, in effect, subsidizing a brazen campaign to belittle the Communist menace and undermine our security program. Don't you people in this audience agree that the least we can ask of the "Fund to Destroy the Republic" is that it pay its taxes like everybody else?

Even the Communist Party has to pay an income tax.

Unfortunately, however, the heaviest blows on the Communists' behalf are being struck in the halls of the United States Congress. Last May, the Democrat-controlled Senate set up a committee, headed by Missouri's special contribution to the "leftwing bleeding hearts club," Senator HENNINGS, to investigate the alleged threat to civil liberties. The Communist Party had been calling for such an investigation for many months. Ever since then Senator HENNINGS has used all the power of a Senate committee in an attempt to wreck the Government security program.

Recently I issued a public statement, pointing out that HENNINGS was waging jungle warfare against the security system, and was making it easier for the Communists to infiltrate our Government. HENNINGS replied the next day and said, in effect, McCARTHY doesn't understand what we are trying to do when we attack the security program: we are trying to "strengthen the security program."

For hypocrisy and doubletalk, I have seen few equals to that statement. Let's look at the record. A little over a month ago in St. Louis, Mo., HENNINGS demanded three changes in our security program. He said (1) we can no longer utilize the doctrine of "guilt by association." This is leftwing gobbledygook for saying that the fact a man has belonged to 5 or 15 or 30 Communists fronts, and regularly associates with espionage agents and members of the Communist Party, must not even be taken into account in deciding whether he should be given a sensitive Government job.

Then (2) HENNINGS insisted we must do away with a "system of secret informers." This is leftwing gobbledygook for saying that FBI undercover agents cannot disclose the treasonous activities of Government employees, unless they reveal their own identity—which would, of course, destroy our counter-espionage system overnight.

But HENNINGS was not satisfied with that. He also contended (3) that we should get rid of the "reasonable doubt" loyalty standard. This means—as HENNINGS well knows—that John Stewart Service, John Patton Davies, Esther Brunauer, and dozens of others suspected of Communist activities would be back behind their desks in the State Department. These proposals are not exactly what I would call "strengthening our security program."

Senator HENNINGS is no fool. He knows that if these recommendations were put into effect, the security program would be left in shambles. He is bright enough to realize that this would open the floodgates to wholesale Communist infiltration of our Government. HENNINGS, of course, is playing politics. He is trying to prove—although he knows better—that Republicans are unmindful of civil rights. But this kind of cheap politics cannot be tolerated when the life or death of this country is at stake.

Another aspect of the security program about which HENNINGS has raised a great hue and cry is what he and the leftwingers call "built-by-kinship." This issue has been so misrepresented and distorted by the leftwing press that the public has very little idea of how family relationships actually figure in a security determination. Actually, of course, a security decision does not involve the question of guilt at all—the question is whether a person is suitable for a sensitive job, whether he is a good security risk. So the term is, to begin with, a deceptive misnomer. But beyond that, it is not the policy of the Government—contrary to what the leftwingers allege—to make an adverse finding on the basis of family relationships alone; this is just one of the factors to be taken into account.

Now: Does it make sense, as HENNINGS says, to pay no attention whatever to the fact a man's relatives are Communists? Let's test HENNINGS' theory by an actual case, the facts of which have now been documented. Let's suppose that, several years ago, a man named Harold Ware applied for a job in the State Department. Assuming the State Department was operating as it should, it would have called for an investigation and the FBI would have reported as follows: This man Ware's mother was a member of the central committee of the Communist Party, was Communist candidate for Governor of Pennsylvania in 1938 and for Congress in 1940; his mother's first husband was the Communist candidate for Governor of North Dakota in 1932; his brother was a Communist organizer and was the Communist candidate for Governor of Minnesota in 1930; his first wife was a Communist pamphleteer; and his sister conducted a music studio at which Communist meetings were held.

Now, according to HENNINGS, the State Department should not have taken these factors into account because that would have been endorsing the doctrine of guilt by kinship. I suggest, however, that the Department would have been wise to look a little further into the case of Mr. Harold Ware. A further look might have been rewarding, for the Department might have found that this man with the highly suggestive family tree was, himself, the organizer of one of the Washington cells of the Communist Party later exposed by Whittaker Chambers.

Now, does the fact his relatives were Communists prove that Harold Ware was a Communist? Of course not. But it should raise a flag, a warning to security officers and be considered as part of the whole picture. HENNINGS would have us ignore this information altogether—indeed, it seems he would have us ignore every type of circumstantial evidence of treason.

The thing we must remember is that the Communist conspiracy is a covert operation, and that Communist agents are usually successful in covering up their tracks. Clues of disloyalty are few and hard to find. HENNINGS must know that we cannot rule out, one by one, every method of spotting Communists and still hope to catch them.

Yet this is exactly what he is attempting to do. Three weeks ago, the Hennings committee began attacking the Army for trying to correct lax security practices that had been exposed by the Senate Investigations Subcommittee under my chairmanship. You will recall that we discovered in the Peress and Belsky cases (incidentally, has anybody discovered who did promote Peress?) that the Army was giving honorable discharges to soldiers who took the fifth amendment when asked about their Communist connections. After the Peress case,

the Army corrected that particular situation—corrected it, that is, until HENNINGS arrived on the scene. Last month the Hennings committee, day after day, hammered away at Army officials for refusing to grant honorable discharges to fifth-amendment Communists.

At one point in the barrage, HENNINGS berated the Army for merely including as one of the items to be taken into account in deciding a security case the fact that the man took the fifth amendment. HENNINGS' counsel said: "How can you justify that, either on the constitutional basis, or on just the basis of morals? If a man is entitled to rely upon his constitutional privilege, how can the Army hold that against him?" Now do you get this picture? The Army, as part of a routine security investigation, makes a list of all of the information about a man that might possibly be considered derogatory—that is before any decision is made about the man—and it includes in this list the fact that the soldier says "I refuse to tell whether I am a Communist on the grounds that the truth might tend to incriminate me." But the Hennings committee says, "No, you can't do that; that's immoral."

There is, however, a sequel to this story. Due to Hennings' daily browbeating of Army officials, the Army changed its regulations and they are now worse than they were before the Peress case. The other day, the Army issued an amazing new directive. In effect, the new directive says to Communists and Communist party-liners who are drafted into the Army: All you have to do is take the fifth amendment, and then you will be able to avoid military service altogether, and go back to civilian life with no disgrace or stigma attached to your name.

I simply cannot understand the topsy-turvy moral standard that prevails in some quarters. How can we, in good conscience, ask loyal American boys to give several years of their lives to their country's service, when we allow Communists and Communist party-liners—by pleading the fifth amendment—to go scot free, neither drafted nor disgraced?

After this directive was issued, Hennings said, "We are making progress. I look forward to further improvements in the regulations as the subcommittee prosecutes this inquiry."

If what Hennings is doing represents an improvement to our security system, then I suggest we need some improvement in the type of men who conduct congressional investigations, and we need it as fast as we can get it.

I have no desire to get into politics tonight but I feel we must talk some now about Hennings, the Democrat. There is no way in the world of divorcing responsibility for the activities of a Senate committee from the political party which has control of the Senate. Moreover, the activities of Hennings' committee are the responsibility of the national leaders of the Democrat Party—who, anytime they choose, can find ways to call off the dogs, to stop the efforts to destroy our security program.

Several days ago I addressed a letter to the three leading candidates for the Democrat presidential nomination—Adlai Stevenson, Estes Kefauver, and Averell Harriman—asking them to repudiate Senator HENNINGS and his committee. None of them has done so. As a matter of fact, I am unaware that a single Democrat leader has spoken up and condemned HENNINGS on the grounds that the proper concern of the United States Senate is with exposing Communists and not with protecting them.

Therefore, we must face facts and start talking about the qualifications of the two major political parties to lead our country. I would like to be able to tell the American people that the Democrat Party is alert to the dangers of the Communist menace—for I know that millions of rank and file Democrats throughout the country abhor communism. But I cannot and I will not overlook the demonstrable fact that the Roosevelt-Truman-Stevenson leadership of the Democrat Party has, for the past 23 years, made life easier for the Communist Party-liners.

Most of that record is well-known. Let's look, however, at the most recent chapters. A year ago this month, Democrat Senators, en bloc, voted to censure me—and why? Was it because I had tried to cover-up a tax delinquency? That question was pretty well settled when the Government admitted it owed me $1,056.75 for overpayment of taxes. Was it because General Zwicker was mistreated? As of this moment, General Zwicker's case is being examined by the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, on the recommendation of the McClellan committee, for possible perjury prosecution. No, these things—as everybody knew—were window dressing. The real crime was McCarthyism—i e., tough anticommunism.

But after that the Democrats were anxious to cover their tracks. So on January 10th of this year, after they had obtained control of the Senate, a resolution was introduced and passed which said: "it is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees should continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose, and combat * * * [the Communist] conspiracy and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith." Now, this resolution was manifestly an attempt to offset the impression that the Democrats' censure vote was a vote in favor of letting up on prosecution and exposure of Communists. Nonetheless, I though we should give the Democrats a chance to make good on their promise. So I said at that time on the Senate floor that I would give the Democrats 1 year to prove they meant what they had said about exposing Communists.

That year is now almost up. What do the Democrats have to show for that year? What is the box score? During the course of this past year not a single Communist in Government has been exposed by the Democrat-controlled Congress—not a single one. But worse than that: instead of trying to expose Communists, Democrats have concentrated their efforts on trying to emasculate our security program.

First, there was the Johnston committee that spent its time parading discharged Communist suspects before the public to tell their tales of woe. Then came the Hennings committee with its stepped-up assault on efforts to rid the Government of Communist influence. Such is the record for the Democrat Congress. In the light of that record, it is to imperil the safety of this country to say that communism should not be a political issue in 1956.

After 20 years of being soft on communism, there are no signs that the Democrat leadership has improved—not the slightest hint of repentance or acknowledgement of past errors. Yet have the American people not a right to demand some evidence of repentance and improvement if communism is to be dropped as a political issue? Did Harry Truman repent when he lied about his actions protecting Harry Dexter White, and then tried to defend those actions? Has Adlai Stevenson ever indicated a change of heart after his wisecracks in the 1952 campaign about Communists in the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries? Do the activities of the Hennings committee suggest that Democrats are ready to stop following the party line on the subversion issue?

Political leaders must learn that they cannot dance to every tune the Communists play and then expect to be entrusted with the conduct of our national affairs. Until they do learn this—whether they be Democrats or Republicans—they must answer to the American people at the ballot box.

The Communists are gloating today. They are congratulating themselves on their smashing diplomatic victories, and on their remarkable success in getting non-Communist Americans to wage their propaganda war for them. Of course, they have good reason to rejoice.

At the same time, I am convinced the Communist victory celebration is a little premature. The Communists may have the majority of the Nation's press, and tax-exempt foundations, and Senate committees doing their leg work for them. But if they think this means that victory is theirs, they have not reckoned with the ordinary American when he gets aroused and decides to fight back.

We are still, thank God, a Republic. By the power of the vote, the American people can see to it that their own wholehearted, unconfused, militant opposition to communism becomes the policy of the United States Government. We have our work cut out for us in 1956. Let's do a job for America.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOE MCCARTHY, OF WISCONSIN, MANION FORUM OF OPINION, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM, JANUARY 8, 1956

My fellow Americans, tonight I want to talk about the most serious problem confronting us: Our losing battle against international communism; and I want to discuss what I believe to be the basic cause of our continuing defeats, namely, that we have permitted the Communists to write our foreign policy, as well as their own.

Any man who is honest and who views the situation objectively will admit that, since the Communist-inspired Geneva summit meeting, America's world position has progressively deteriorated. In Western Europe, instead of honoring their commitments to NATO, our allies are decreasing their armed forces. The West Germans are losing faith in us and are in danger of being forced into a neutralization deal with the Communists. A Comunists arsenal is being established in Egypt. The Near East is torn with anti-American riots. In North Africa, anti-Western feeling is at a fever pitch. Millions in India cheer the Communist leaders. Communist enslavement of eastern Europe has, in effect, been ratified by the United Nations by its admission of Soviet puppets in the infamous package deal.

Our fighting allies in Asia have been abandoned and one of them, Free China, has been threatened with blackmail for taking a moral position on the package deal. Indeed, President Eisenhower personally sent three cables to Chiang Kai-shek, urging him not to veto the admission of Outer Mongolia to the U. N.

Now, what has happened since that proud day in 1952 when the American people endorsed a militant, realistic foreign policy, grounded firmly on moral principle; when we told the world that we would not only oppose further Communist advances, but would seek to roll back the Communist tide? On November 4, 1952, we elected a President whose party platform had said: "We shall again make liberty into a beacon light of hope that will penetrate the dark places. * * * (We will) end * * * the negative, futile, and immoral policy of containment which abandons countless human beings to a despotism and godless terrorism, which, in turn, enables the rulers to forge the captives into a weapon for our destruction."

That statement in the Republican platform of 1952, and its overwhelming endorsement by the American people, struck terror into Communist hearts; and that terror was redoubled in the first few months of the Eisenhower regime by deeds—when, for example, President Eisenhower wisely revoked Truman's orders to the Seventh Fleet to protect Communist China. The Communists feared that if this new policy continued, their plans for world conquest would be frustrated.

It was therefore essential for the Communists to persuade the Eisenhower administration to get back on the road of cringing appeasement that had been traveled for 20 years under Democrat rule. This was to be their supreme mission in the months ahead.

Let us see how the Communists went about their task. On August 8, 1953, the then dictator of the Soviet Union, Georgi Malenkov, made a major foreign policy speech which laid down the line for a dramatic switch in Communist international tactics. The world situation, according to Malenkov, required the easing of international tensions. (How many times, incidentally, have we heard that Communist phrase parroted by Western statesmen during the past year?) Malenkov then went on to explain that the easing of international tensions could be accomplished by great power negotiations. This, then, was the Kremlin's strategy.

The job of undermining America's new moral position was assigned to the international Communist apparatus. In the fall of 1953, the Communist Party of the United States called a secret national conference. Let me read from the main report delivered at that conference. These were Moscow's instructions to the American Communist Party in 1953: "Both the needs and the possibilities of the present moment call for the development of a veritable crusade for peaceful negotiations, for a top-level meeting of the big powers. * * * It is to this end that we must turn all our energies, our utmost skill, tenacity and resourcefulness * * * We must develop a full-throated demand for peaceful negotiations that will ring from one end of the country to the other."

We all know that this Communist propaganda drive, like so many others in the past, was completely successful. Last spring, a year and a half later, the administration reversed its policy and agreed to a meeting at the summit. A black headline in the Communist Daily Worker screamed: "Geneva: A peoples' victory." And well the Communists might have rejoiced, for when officials of the United States Government shook hands, smiled and drank vodka with the Kremlin despots, our moral position had been smashed beyond recognition. We had adopted a foreign policy that had been devised in Moscow. Thereafter, the spirit of Geneva became the keystone of American policy, and concrete Soviet political victories began to pile up, one after the other.

Today, many people are saying, "Yes, Geneva was a mistake, but we know this only through hindsight." But I say this knowledge does not come to us through hindsight. The tragic consequences of falling for the Communist coexistence line were, I believe, foreseen by the majority of the American people—as, indeed, they must have been by anyone who possessed the most rudimentary knowledge of Communist teachings.

On June 16 of last year, just a few days after the President first announced that he was going to meet with the Kremlin leaders, I advised the Senate that the Soviet peace offensive was a fraud, and that we were falling for a Communist ruse. I reminded the Senators of a speech delivered by Dmitry Manuilsky in 1930 to the Lenin School of Political Warfare—which is just one example of traditional Communist teaching. Here is what Manuilsky said 26 years ago: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. The capitalist countries, stupid, and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist."

I warned the Senate that by acceding to Communist demands for the summit meeting, we were helping to fulfill Manuilsky's prediction.

On June 20, when it was apparent that the administration was determined to go through with the conference, I urged the Senate to recommend that the subject of the Communist satellites be put on the Big Four agenda. It was, after all, ludicrous to attempt to ease world tensions without so much as discussing the real cause of those tensions—namely, the Communist slave empire. But the Senate refused to so advise the President because—the argument ran—that would be tying the President's hands.

Because the Senate was too timid to exercise its constitutional right to advise the President on matters of foreign policy, the Communist slave empire was never discussed by the Big Four; and, as a result, the hopes of the captive peoples for obtaining their freedom were dealt a death blow.

By thus abandoning our liberation policy and substituting for it the Communist inspired spirit of Geneva, we courted the disastrous events of recent months.

The overriding fact of the present situation is this. There is not a single square mile in the entire Communist empire that is threatened by, or under pressure from, the free world. Thanks to our policy of peaceful coexistence—which we dutifully observe and the Communists do not—the Communists have absolute freedom to maneuver in any direction they choose. They are therefore on the offensive everywhere in the world. The free world, on the other hand, has denied to itself the right to try to liberate Communist territory, and is thus completely on the defensive. The result is that we are frantically trying to plug the holes and build up the dikes in a hundred places on the globe. We spend millions of dollars in one area, only to find that the Communists have advanced in another area. We then discover, several months later, that the millions we spent produced only more anti-Americanism.

I am not one of those who believe that the world situation can be repaired by the American taxpayer handing out more money. This is the argument of the Democrat leaders and the administration, which now wants to double our foreign-aid bill from two and one-half to five billion dollars. Handouts are no substitute for a foreign policy. We received startling evidence of this fact when the most enthusiastic welcome in India for Khrushchev and Bulganin occurred in a town built with American money.

What is really needed today is a return to the principles of the Republican platform of 1952. We must give all the aid we can spare, not in bribes to the neutralists, but to our fighting allies, the Free Chinese, the South Koreans, the South Vietnamese. Above all: We must give hope to the enslaved peoples all over the world by refusing to recognize their Communist rulers and by encouraging them to throw off their chains.

Now, it goes without saying, I think, that we cannot restore a liberation policy by returning the Democrat Party to power in 1956. Under the Roosevelt-Truman leadership, the Democrats appeased the Communists for 20 years; and they took the lead last spring in insisting that we accept Communist demands for top-level negotiations. (In fact, it was WALTER GEORGE, Democrat, chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who first urged the President to agree to the meeting.) Moreover, the definitive answer as to how the Democrat Party feels about communism was provided a year ago when, without a dissenting vote, Senate Democrats fell into line and carried out Democrat Party orders to censure a man who had fought Communists too vigorously and too successfully. At the same time, a majority of Republicans voted against condemning hard anticommunism.

We will get the kind of foreign policy we need only by electing those Republicans who, over the years have proved they understand that America will never defeat communism by appeasing communism.

We must all work for a rejuvenated foreign policy in the months ahead. I trust that you, my fellow Americans, will lend to this fight the time, energy, and devotion that are necessary to save our country.

Address Delivered by Hon. Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, Before the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at Tucson, Ariz., on October 12, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Three years ago, I met with this organization in Tucson, I answered specific questions as to my position in regards to governmental policies that effected the Negroes of America, and my answers to these questions indicated to you, I believe, that I was wholeheartedly in sympathy with the program outlined, at that time, by our candidate for President, Mr. Eisenhower.

I believed then, and I believe now, in the equal dignities of all our people, whatever their racial origin or background may be. I believe in their equal right to freedom and opportunity and benefits of our common citizenship.

I am happy to be able to stand here tonight and report to you the accomplishments of this administration, in the field of what we might call civil rights. Actually though, it is a report on what has been accomplished for all Americans, because I don't think we should continue to look on Americans as a nation of minorities and majorities, but rather as a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that among these, are life, liberty, and pursuit of freedom. I believe that we should recognize in these words of Jefferson, the source of our freedom and the fact that freedom given by God is given to all people whether they be white or black, or Catholic, Protestant, or Jew.

These accomplishments have been American accomplishments and I am proud to have participated in bringing them about. In these accomplishments we find the fulfillment of promises made to all American people in 1952 and I would like to indulge you for a few moments in a recitation of these accomplishments.

1. A Republican administration will win an honorable and just peace.

The Korean war ended shortly after President Eisenhower was inaugurated. Service-

men who had been prisoners of war for as much as 3 years were brought home to their families. Not since that time has it been necessary for mothers and wives to send their sons or husbands to war.

2. A Republican administration will end segregation in the Nation's Capital.

By agreement with the administration, racial restrictions were lifted in theaters, hotels, and all other public places during Inauguration Week, beginning January 19, 1953. Most places of business cooperated. It was understood that while it would not be advertised (even after the inauguration), if Negroes presented themselves they would be accepted. With few exceptions, this plan of action was carried out. In August 1953 racial bars were dropped officially. Negroes now attend theaters, restaurants, and other public places, as well as public schools, in the District of Columbia. There has not been one reported incident as a result of the general integration. The Bell Telephone Co., Capital Transit, and other private industries are hiring colored employees on all levels. This is the result of the work of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, which has worked quietly but diligently to eliminate the evils of segregation and discrimination in hiring.

All recreational facilities are now operated on a nonsegregated basis.

Segregation among District of Columbia employees has been eliminated, even to the controversial Fire Department, which was an issue for so many years.

The District of Columbia public housing (National Capital Housing Authority) program is now operating on an integrated basis.

Civilian as well as uniform personnel are included in the integration program on all bases and in all departments of the District of Columbia government.

3. A Republican administration will stop bias and Jim Crow in Federal departments and bureaus, which the Democrats have not done.

On January 18, 1955, the President created, by Executive order, the President's Committee on Employment Policy, which automatically abolished the old Fair Employment Board. This Committee has increased in stature and reports directly to the President. Its purpose is to look into and straighten out problems on racial discrimination in the various executive departments.

When this administration took office there were many areas in which Negroes were not employed above a messenger; in some few there were none whatsoever. These inequities have been practically eliminated—opening up unlimited opportunities to youth—men and women all over America. No longer can it be said that our great sacrifices for education and preparation for participation in the American way of life are futile.

When President Eisenhower took office nearly half of the Negro units were still intact in the Army. Today, there are none. Over three-fourths of the Negroes in the Navy were in mess halls as servants when President Eisenhower took office. This system has been eliminated, and they are now serving in all branches of the Navy on an integrated basis.

All segregated schools at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations had been eliminated by the administration long before the Supreme Court handed down its decision against segregated schools.

There is no segregation in naval installations in the South; cafeterias, restrooms, and drinking fountains were all separate when the Republicans took over our Government in 1953.

Racial segregation has been eliminated from all the veterans' hospitals in the South, a feat said to have been impossible whenever this subject was discussed.

4. A Republican administration will make Negro Federal appointments of real importance, commensurate with the demonstrated ability of Negroes, as it did when in power before.

This is one of the brightest spots of this entire administration. Negroes are serving in administrative positions in practically every department of Government—many on a policymaking level, such as:

J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor, the first Negro subcabinet officer. Wilkins was first appointed Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Government Contracts, and as a result of his outstanding ability was chosen by Secretary of Labor Mitchell to be one of his assistants;

Scovel Richardson, Chairman of the Federal Parole Board—the first and only Negro ever to be appointed to the Board;

E. Frederic Morrow, Administrative Officer for the Special Projects Group in the Executive Office of President Eisenhower, promoted from Adviser on Business Affairs in the Department of Commerce;

Hon. Charles H. Mahoney, lawyer and insurance executive, first full delegate to the United Nations;

Marron W. Fort, Light Chemical Engineer in Israel under the Foreign Operations Administration (International Cooperation Administration) program, first to have ever served in such capacity;

Archie Alexander, Governor of the Virgin Islands;

Richard L. Jones, Ambassador to Liberia, who was first appointed Chief of Mission for Foreign Operations Administration (ICA);

Joseph H. Douglass, Special Representative of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

John W. Roxborough II, Consultant to the Secretary of State;

Dr. Frank Snowden, Cultural Attaché, United States Embassy, Rome, Italy;

Samuel Pearce, Assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor;

Joseph Clark, Special Assistant to the Assistant Postmaster General;

Vernon Greene, Assistant General Counsel, Post Office Department;

Joseph Birch, member of the legal staff in the Fraud Division, Post Office Department;

Hon. Archibald J. Carey, Alternate Delegate to United Nations—and now Vice Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment Policy.

Attorney Julia Cooper, member of the legal staff of the Justice Department—was transferred and promoted from the legal staff of the General Services Administration. She was the first Negro to serve in the Legal Division of the General Services Administration, and is the first woman to serve in the Criminal Division of the Justice Department;

Brig. Gen. B. O. Davis, Jr., United States Air Force, is the first colored brigadier in the Air Force;

Alexander Laneuville, Special Assistant in the Office of Veterans' Administrator stationed in New Orleans—the first Negro to serve in such a capacity in the South;

Dr. Francis Hammond, Information Specialist, United States Information Agency;

Frank Walker, Administrative Aid in Postal Transportation in New Orleans—the first to serve in such a capacity in the South;

Attorney George E. C. Hayes, Chairman of Public Utilities Commission for the District of Columbia, is the first Negro to receive a Presidential appointment on any commission in the District of Columbia;

Joseph Ray, Racial Relations Adviser to the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency;

Philip Sadler, Racial Relations Adviser, Public Housing Administration;

Joseph Rainey, information specialist, Housing and Home Finance Agency—this is a first;

Carmel Carrington Marr, area advisor on the staff of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., the first and only Negro ever to serve in such a capacity;

L. B. Toomer, Register of the Treasury, the first to be so appointed since the administration of President William Howard Taft, also a Republican.

5. A Republican administration will appoint a Negro to an administrative office in the White House.

With the appointment of E. Frederic Morrow to the White House staff the 14-point program of campaign promises to minorities has been fulfilled. With still a year and a half to go in his first term, President Eisenhower will move on from here to attain greater rights and freedoms for all of us. A continuing program for the good of our great country and all its citizens can be expected as long as President Dwight D. Eisenhower, with his high religious and democratic concepts of the dignity of man, remains in the White House.

6. A Republican administration will make it possible for Negroes—not just one Negro, as now—to be placed in policymaking jobs in governmental agencies.

Of the more than 250 appointments by the Republican administration, such men and women as J. Ernest Wilkins, E. Frederic Morrow, Joseph Ray, Scovel Richardson, Joseph Douglass, Samuel Pierce, Richard L. Jones, George Maceo Jones, Charles Mahoney, Archibald J. Carey, Jr., Roberta Church, Carmel Carrington Marr, and others are on a policymaking level. This is a positive unmistakable demonstration by President Eisenhower and the Republican Party that the qualifications and ability of men and women of all races is the yardstick by which appointments are made. The color of the skin no longer is a barrier.

7. A Republican administration will strengthen the civil-rights section of the Justice Department.

In this particular field the administration has been outstanding. The Justice Department has been relentless in its attacks on the offenders of the civil rights of others; for example:

(a) In 1954 prosecution of the Ku Klux Klan in Florida and the Carolinas resulted in the conviction of nine North Carolina klansmen under the Lindbergh kidnap law. This brought a total of 40 convictions for floggings of citizens by lawless Kluxers who were taking many of their victims across State lines.

(b) In Alabama, Fred and Oscar Dial were convicted of peonage and sentenced to 18 months in prison. They would buy prisoners out of jail, then hold and work them for nothing on their plantation. One victim died after a beating inflicted upon him by one of the brothers.

(c) The courts upheld the Justice Deparment's contention that flogging is a crime under the Federal civil-rights laws in all State institutions. Thus there can be no more flogging of prisoners.

(d) The courts upheld the Justice Department's contention that civil-rights statutes pertain to Federal officers as well as those of States and municipalities. This resulted in the first conviction of a Federal employee for brutal treatment of a member of a minority race.

One of the most effective measures on the civil-rights front instituted by the Justice Department has been the inauguration of a program of indoctrination and preliminary training of all United States attorneys appointed by President Eisenhower. This was followed up by close liaison and direct supervision in civil-rights cases.

The new procedures have been very valuable in eliminating many of the misunderstandings and problems which existed in the civil-rights field in the past.

8. A Republican administration will not be tied down by a southern anti-Negro bloc in control of Congress and committees.

The 83d Congress was headed by Republican leaders. The committees were chaired

by northern and western Republicans. We saw no such disgraceful performance as in the present Democratic Congress, when the chairman of a District of Columbia Subcommittee, Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, of Georgia, conducted hearings for the sole purpose of ending the integration program in the Fire Department, which had been placed in operation by the Eisenhower administration; nor the disgraceful spectacle of one Democratic Congressman, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, being attacked physically by a southern Democrat, Congressman CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, in a committee meeting just because he insisted that the constitutional rights of Negroes be protected in the school-building program.

9. A Republican administration will be able to better enforce the antibias laws already on the books, but seldom invoked by prejudiced white officers.

All instances of encroachment on constitutional rights of Negro citizens anywhere in the United States have been investigated by the Justice Department and action taken to correct these abuses; for example, the quick action and fervor with which the FBI is investigating the murder of Rev. George Lee in Belzoni, Miss., has seldom been equaled in its history.

10. A Republican administration will really enforce the nondiscriminatory clauses of the Taft-Hartley Act which will break the grip of negrophobic labor unions.

A magnificent job has been done in this field; slowly but surely Negroes are being employed in all occupations. This has been done through the President's Committee on Government Contracts. The Capital Transit, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and many others are now hiring Negroes. The Armour Meat Packing Co. is now hiring colored white-collar workers. Many labor unions that formerly barred Negroes now include them as members.

11. A Republican administration will reduce taxes.

Taxes were reduced by the Republican Congress nearly $7½ billion. This is the largest tax cut ever given. This is the first substantial cut made by our Federal Government since 1948 when the 80th Congress, also Republican led, cut taxes $5 billion.

12. A Republican administration will protect the basic freedom of all people and stop the trend toward all powerful and costly centralized government.

This administration has reversed the 20-year trend toward centralization of power in Washington. Free enterprise is again operating full steam ahead, and we now have the greatest prosperity in the history of our country. More people are working than ever before, over 64 million workers are averaging over $70 per week take home pay. Thus more people benefit from this great prosperity than in any other period of history.

13. A Republican administration will not arouse false hopes of Negroes by promising what it never intends to deliver.

Candidate Eisenhower made no wild promises on civil rights. His approach has been one of action, not words. Every move has been directed toward the complete elimination of every vestige of segregation and discrimination in American life with first-class citizenship for all as a goal.

It would be an easy matter for me to stand here tonight and give the Republican Party full credit for these achievements, but in effect the people of America deserve an equal share in this instance. Inherently, an American has a sense of fair play and they realize that all of us are bound in a common destiny, namely, our spiritual faith in the dignity of all men under God. The achievement of this dignity rests with the individual and not with a bureaucratic Federal Government. Given the opportunity, all Americans who possess initiative and courage and a faith in our fundamental strength can achieve and maintain the dignity of material success, but more importantly he can retain that dignity granted him as a free child of God if he but does unto others as he would have them do unto himself.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following letters and press releases regarding the Communist conspiracy:

Letter from me to the President of the United States dated August 24, 1955.

Letter from me to the President dated September 21, 1955.

Letter from me to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCELLAN] dated November 2, 1955.

Press release from my office dated November 9, 1955.

Another release dated November 13, 1955.

Another release dated November 25, 1955.

Letter from me to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] dated November 29, 1955.

Letter from me to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] dated December 2, 1955, copies of which were sent to Governor Averell Harriman of New York and Hon. Adlai Stevenson.

Letter from me to the Attorney General dated December 16, 1955.

Letter from me to the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] dated December 16, 1955.

There being no objection, the letters and releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 24, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your administration claims to have brought prosperity to the country. I think there is an important sense in which this is untrue.

Some areas of the economy are, thanks to huge Government expenditures on our defense and foreign-aid programs, quite prosperous. But the prosperous times being enjoyed by industry and labor are not being shared by the farm community. A boom in industry exists side by side with a depression in agriculture.

In such circumstances it is difficult for the farmer to take your administration's prosperity claims seriously; before long the falacy will be brought home to the whole country. For prosperity in America is indivisible: we cannot have an unhealthy farm community without the disease soon spreading to the rest of the economy. As you know, the great depression of 1929–39 was preceded by a depression on the farms, and was caused in large measure by depressed farm prices with consequent loss in farmers' purchasing power.

The current farm depression is not only being tolerated by your administration; it is a direct and predictable result of your administration's farm program, which I can only describe as one of persecution of the farmer. Although I cannot imagine why this should be the case, it seems to me that your administration is engaged in open war against the farm community.

My feelings might be considerably different if your administration's farm program reflected a general economic policy, consistently applied to all segments of our economy. I would, that is to say, understand—and to a large extent sympathize with—a determination by your administration to reestablish throughout the economy the free-enterprise system, and to restore, gradually, to all aspects of our economic life the sovereignty of the free market place.

But your administration has shown no such inclination, except with respect to the farmers. As you well know, the Federal Government continues to give subsidies, directly or indirectly to industry and labor—so that there is probably not a major industry existing today that would not suffer serious dislocation if the Government were to single it out and force it to compete in an otherwise subsidized economy. The various subsidies to the nonagricultural elements of the economy have resulted in incomes to these elements, that have, in nearly every case, kept pace with national income trends. But under the Benson farm program of lower commodity loans and Government selling at depressed price levels, the farmer is experiencing economic hardships that have not been visited upon any other segment of the economy. The farmer is asked to compete for economic survival where his costs and taxes are as high as those of other elements of the economy but where his wages—i. e., farm prices—are deliberately being forced downward.

The parity concept suggests nothing more nor less than that farm prices should advance or retreat in unison with prices received for nonagricultural goods. When farm prices are at 100 percent of parity, the farmer is getting his fair share of the national income. But the farmer can never get prices at 100 percent of parity when the Government is in a position to establish the market price, and then goes on to buy and sell farm products at less than parity prices.

I simply cannot understand why your administration should want to work an injustice on the farmer. The Wisconsin dairy farmer—for an example—whose prices are now supported at 75 percent of parity—is asked to receive less for his labor than heretofore, while he continues to face the same taxes and the same costs of production.

The farmer is constantly assured by Mr. Benson and his lieutenants that he is better off than ever before. The farmer knows this to be untrue, and he can cite no less an authority than your own Department of Agriculture. Let me remind you of the statistics recently issued by the Department of Agriculture comparing the farmer's income of the past 4 years with that of the rest of the economy.

Date	Gross farm income	National income	Percentage
	Billion	*Billion*	
1951	$36.4	$277.0	13.1
1952	36.9	291.0	12.6
1953	35.5	305.0	11.6
1954	33.9	300.0	11.3
Average, 1946–50	32.2	211.0	15.2

In the light of these figures—which show not only that farm income itself is dropping, but that the farm community's relative share of the national income is steadily dropping—it is hard to deny that the farmer is getting a raw deal. I can assure you that your administration's claim of bringing prosperity to the country is a huge and tragic

joke to the Wisconsin dairy farmer—and, of course, to other members of the farm community.

If your administration is willing to put the country back on a free-enterprise footing, with no subsidies to anybody, that would create an entirely different situation. But a policy of favoritism in subsidies will never wash with the American people's sense of justice.

At one point in your political career, Mr. President, you apparently appreciated the farmer's claim to justice. On Ocober 4, 1952, at Brookings, S. Dak., you told the American farmers:

"The Republican Party is pledged to the sustaining of the 90 percent parity price support and it is pledged even more than that to helping the farmer obtain his full parity, 100 percent parity, with the guaranty in the price supports of 90."

You may have forgotten that solemn pledge, Mr. President, but I assure you that the farmer has not. I earnestly urge you to reexamine the position you took then, and see if it was not based on principles of justice and fair play.

A year ago, about this time, I asked you to honor your campaign pledge by urging Congress to enact such a farm program, and by instructing your subordinates to administer it in such a fashion, as would result in 100 percent of parity in prices at the market place. I predicted that if you administration failed in this, our party would lose the 1954 congressional elections. The experts seem to agree that the Republican Party's defeat in 1954 was caused primarily by the vote of an alienated, betrayed, and disillusioned farm community. There is every reason to suppose that the farmers will return precisely the same verdict in 1956 if your administration continues to press its war against agriculture throughout the next year.

I hope the Republican Party can honestly campaign under the "prosperity" banner in 1956. But we cannot do so unless your administration adopts a farm program that gives justice to the farmer and real prosperity to the country. May I suggest, Mr. President, that the problem is urgent, and deserves your earliest consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply concerned, as I am sure you are, over the mounting assault on the administration's security program. Left-wing Democrats, in alliance with liberal-front organizations, have launched a full-scale attempt to discredit the Government security system. The current attack is, in part, politically inspired by men who desperately seek an "issue" for 1956; but it is also the fruit of an unrelenting Communist and left-wing propaganda campaign that for many years has sought to undermine public confidence in security measures—and, ultimately, to bring about the dismantling of the security system itself. The attackers are scoring new successes every day, and I predict they will continue to do so until the administration stands up on its hind legs and fights back.

Those who would keep Communists and security risks in Government have become so drunk with their successful attack on the security program, that in the case of the Communist Party of the United States versus the Security Control Board, even a United States Senator joined with the Communist Party in their demand that our security laws be declared unconstitutional.

The left-wing Democrats and the "civil liberties" cultists have hit upon a remarkably effective formula for discrediting the security program; thanks to the executive secrecy policy inaugurated by President Truman—which prevents the Government from telling its side of the story—the left-wingers have only to publicize the alleged grievances of discharged Government workers in order to make their point that we are back in the days of the star chamber.

With the deck thus safely stacked against the administration, Democrat-led committees parade before the public one ex-employee after the other to recount his "ordeal." The Democrat committee members and counsel express profound shock at what, in the absence of evidence in support of the Government's case, appears to be a terrible injustice to the employee. The Liberal press then gleefully retells the employee's story as though it were the whole story, and the public is led to believe that the administration of the security program is arbitrary, brutal, and unintelligent.

The Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic, of which your personal friend and adviser, Mr. Paul Hoffman, is chairman of the board, has followed a similar approach. The fund's method of "evaluating the security program" is to compile alleged employee grievances, supplied by defense counsel of discharged security risks, and on the basis of such data, to publicize selected "cases" that seem to prove the Communist and liberal contention that the security program is a guise for a political witchhunt.

So far, the left-wing Democrats and the liberal fronts have had a free hand. So far, responsible administration officials have been unwilling, or unable, to stand up against the attacks and effectively defend the program. As a result, the vicious anti-security propaganda campaign—originally inspired by the Communists—is making headway and we are in serious danger of losing any semblance of the sort of security program that is needed to protect the Government against Communist subversion.

The dilemma of the administration is, of course, very real: as long as security officers are forbidden to discuss security cases, they are hard put to defend their actions before congressional committees. But in the interests of the Nation's security, a way must be found, and soon, to combat the new left-wing offensive.

In my judgment, the best way to protect the security program is to revoke Executive secrecy orders, insofar as they prevent security information from being divulged to United States Senators and Congressmen. I have, of course, always been opposed to the "blackout," and continue to regard it as a violation of legislative prerogatives. The Executive branch defies both the Constitution and principles of sound government when it denies to Congress information it needs to discharge its responsibilities. And now the evil has returned to plague its creators.

During the Truman regime, the blackout order was issued for the purpose of keeping from Congress data that would have exposed criminal negligence in the administration of the security program. But now by keeping the Truman order in force, the executive branch has been hoisted by its own petard. The secrecy order prevents the administration from showing that the program has improved, and from defending itself against the charge of overtoughness.

Congressional investigating committees should be given access to security files so that they may properly evaluate critcism of the program—whether the charge be that the program is too tough, or that it is not tough enough. Should you decide to divulge to committees the information to which they are entitled, I shall, for my part, urge the Congress to provide that no member of a committee or its staff be permitted to examine the files until he has received top security clearance, and that no specific information be divulged to the public that would, in the judgment of the Executive, endanger national security. Security would thus be protected, and congressional committees would be in a position to present to the American people a balanced, informed report on the administration's program.

Another possible consequence of the secrecy order should be noted—namely, that those responsible for the administration of the program may become demoralized by the sort of attack the left-wing is now waging. On several occasions, security officers have been hauled before Democrat-led committees, and asked to justify discharges or suspensions that appeared to be unwarranted on the basis of employees' complaints. The security officers were not, of course, at liberty to explain their actions. But knowledge of this fact did not prevent the committee or its staff from berating and ridiculing men who had been denied the means of defending themselves. In one case, Mr. Derrell Peterson, a Veterans' Administration security officer, was severely browbeaten by interrogators who showed little sympathy for his claim that silence had been imposed on him by Presidential directive. It is easy to see that such incidents can hamper sound administration of the program, for a security officer is certainly less likely, in a close case, to apply strict standards when he may be required to justify his decision publicly without being permitted to give his reasons.

If, however, you are unwilling to revoke the secrecy order, I suggest that you take the next best step—namely, commence a vigorous educational campaign to inform the public about the security program. If the executive secrecy order is to remain in force, administration spokesmen should make it absolutely clear to the American people that, for security reasons, they are getting, and can get, only one side of the story.

The public must be told that the "letter of charges" made public by the employee is at times incomplete and that the Government's evidence in support of the charges is either withheld entirely or disclosed in miniscule fragments.

In addition, the administration can, without violating the secrecy order, explain certain security practices that are now under attack.

Take, for example, the "suspension" issue: the left-wingers falsely claim that the fact a suspended employee is subsequently cleared proves he was dealt with unjustly in the first instance. The public should be informed that a case of reinstatement after suspension does not demonstrate a miscarriage of justice. Security officers are required to suspend an employee when derogatory information appears in his file, pending more extensive evaluation of the information and further investigation. The fact an employee is later cleared means only that he was able to explain the derogatory information to the satisfaction of the security board or of his department head; it most definitely does not mean the employee should not have been suspended, pending such explanation or the development of additional evidence. I believe, as I am sure you do, that mandatory suspension on the receipt of derogatory information is absolutely essential if our country is to be given adequate protection against the Communist conspiracy.

Or take the charge that too many jobs are considered "sensitive": the liberals contend for a security system that would recognize the sensitivity of a few select (but always unidentified) positions, and their argument is invariably made at the level of Adlai Stevenson's crack about spies in the Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries. Administration spokesmen should make it clear that the great majority of Government jobs are sensitive in varying degrees—and should explain, with some examples, why this is so,

and let them make the further point that while there may be some positions that would be utterly useless to the Communists, it is practically impossible to draw a hard and fast line that will separate sensitive from nonsensitive jobs.

Even more important is the need for the public to appreciate the wide differences between the demonstrable Communist and the "security risk," that is, between the traitor and the potential traitor—and to understand that neither type can be entrusted with a Government job. The public should understand that a security officer is not required to make out a case of treason that would stand up in a court of law—is not even required to show that the employee is, more likely than not, a Communist. If the department head or his representative entertains a reasonable doubt about the man's allegiance, he must order that man to leave the Government service. Those who quarrel with this strict standard entirely miss the point about the covert nature of the Communist conspiracy and the difficulties of obtaining legal evidence of treason.

Unfortunately, the security net will inevitably catch some persons who are not Communists. This is one of the prices of national safety. But the public must realize that the personal injustice allegedly involved in such cases is much less than the disgruntled employee or his lawyer may claim. Every Government employee is aware that working for the Government is a privilege, and is on notice that the Government may at any moment—and at its discretion—revoke that privilege. The employee is thus forewarned that associations, past or present—or, indeed, the associations and circumstances of relatives who are susceptible to Communist pressures—may cost him his job. If a man believes that the well-advertised risks of placing his economic bets on a Government job are too great, he is free to seek employment elsewhere.

These and other aspects of the security program should be emphasized vigorously and often. The leftwing attack is proceeding with increasing viciousness and irresponsibility. We must fight back. And I believe that you, Mr. President, should assume personal leadership of the defense. May I suggest that you devote a major speech to this subject in the very near future. Republican leaders throughout the country should then be urged to take their positions in the line. We should also attempt to enlist conservative Democrats in the fight, for our national security is surely an issue that transcends party lines.

We should not claim that the security program is beyond reproach. It has improved, but it is far from perfect. For example, recent investigations have disclosed delays in the handling of security cases that appear unreasonable. That situation ought to be remedied. Much more important: an impartial investigation would reveal that certain Government departments are still too lax in the application of security standards, and that potential traitors are still in Government.

We can undertake to remedy these defects and, at the same time, restore and maintain public confidence in the basic ideas of the program. We will have taken a firm step in the right direction, should you see fit to repeat your excellent speech on the Communist menace made at Milwaukee, Wis., on October 3, 1952, in the course of which you said that:

"To work for the United States Government is a privilege, not a right. And it is the prerogative of the Government to set the strictest tasks upon the loyalty and the patriotism of those entrusted with our Nation's safety."

The leftwingers are having a field day at the expense of the Nation's safety. It is our imperative duty to the American people to resist their unprincipled campaign—a campaign that, if successful, will open the door once again to large-scale Communist infiltration of our Government.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

NOVEMBER 2, 1955.

Hon. JOHN MCCLELLAN,
United States Senator, Chairman, Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: After an intensive investigation which dates back to nearly a year ago, I have succeeded in uncovering facts which, if true, establish the existence of a currently functioning Communist cell in one of the Federal agencies.

Since I am no longer chairman of the investigations subcommittee, and do not have the power of subpena, the job of tracking down and verifying the leads that have been given to me over this period has been extremely difficult. Nevertheless, sufficient information has now accumulated to convince me of the existence of a grave and present threat to the security of this country.

My information indicates that the National Labor Relations Board is literally honeycombed with individuals identified either as members of the Communist Party, or as having had years of constant and close association with know and/or suspected Communists and Soviet agents. Moreover, it appears that this shocking situation has been condoned by the responsible NLRB authorities for many years.

I am now prepared to turn over to you, as chairman of the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, the results of my investigation so that the Committee's staff of investigators with its power of subpena may prepare the individual cases for public hearings. I should therefore like to urge that you immediately call an executive session of the Committee so that I may furnish you and the other members with the information I have gathered.

May I emphasize that my information incriminates a large number of individuals who at this very moment hold top-level jobs in this Government agency. I understand that another congressional group is in possession of information concerning past subversive activity in the NLRB. While it is of great importance that such evidence of past subversion be brought to light, the present situation appears to be so critical that, in my opinion, the investigations subcommittee must immediately undertake an inquiry of the facts I am prepared to present.

With a limited staff and no public funds, it has been impossible for me to follow up every lead and double-check every datum that has been brought to my attention. I can, however, assure you that all of my information has been furnished by informants of high reliability and with indisputable access to the pertinent facts. I am sure that, after you have heard the evidence, you will agree that it constitutes a cogent and alarming prima facie case against the adequacy of security enforcement in this Government agency.

Undoubtedly, powerful and bi-partisan pressures will be exerted upon you and the committee to prevent an investigation. For the evidence reflects not only upon the past Democrat administration of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman but also upon the present administration of Mr. Eisenhower.

The Nation is well aware that the Communists successfully infiltrated the Government during the 20 years of Democrat rule. Many Americans, however, have been led to believe that since January 1953 the Republican administration has dislodged most, if not all, subversives. I was among those in 1952 who were sure that this would be done if the Republican ticket were elected, and I campaigned for the Republican candidate on the basis of the pledge that Communists and security risks would be eliminated from the Government. Consequently, no one can be more distressed than I by the realization that the well-meaning efforts of the present administration in that direction have at least partially failed.

Both parties stand to be embarrassed by an exposé of the NLRB situation; yet I am confident you will frustrate any politically inspired attempts to prevent the Committee from performing its clear duty. I know you agree that partisan considerations must pale in the face of a common threat to us all.

As you know, no Federal agency during the last 20 years has had more influence upon the economic and social structure of the Nation than the National Labor Relations Board. The subversion of the Board is consequently a prime goal for those whose mission is to destroy our way of life.

With its network of branch offices—in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Buffalo, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Detroit, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, and other large cities—and in the light of its tremendous daily impact on labor-management relations, the NLRB, from its inception in 1935, presented an ideal target for Communist infiltration. The record is replete with evidence that the Communists were very successful in placing their agents in top-level jobs. In 1940, when the nature of the Communist conspiracy was only vaguely understood in Congress, a House committee headed by Representative SMITH of Virginia reported that the NLRB was heavily infiltrated. My information is that the conspirators still wield a powerful influence in the Board's operations.

To give you an idea of the situation now existing in the NLRB, I am herewith setting forth some of the data in eight of the cases, as an indication of the nature of the evidence gathered in my investigation. You will note that one of the cases, No. 8, is a Truman presidential appointee, a member of the five-man National Labor Relations Board. I shall, of course, mention no names here since these individuals are entitled to testify under oath at executive committee sessions and furnish whatever explanations are available. However, I shall be glad to give the committee full details on the names, dates and circumstances surrounding these and the other cases.

Case No. 1: This National Labor Relations Board official enjoys high connections both on Capitol Hill and in the Washington office of the Board. He was fired from the Labor Board in 1954 after a hearing during which he admitted under oath that he had been a Communist Party member. He admitted that he had made false statements in denying this fact when he applied for employment, attempting to justify this position by asserting that he had never been an American Communist—only a British Communist.

Despite his denying having been a member of the Communist Party of the United States, the evidence is that this man taught in a Communist Workers school in this country. He also supported the campaign of a western Congressman who has since invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about his Communist connections.

This man was properly dismissed on grounds of questionable loyalty. The almost incredible fact is that he was rehired a short time later, reportedly on the intervention of a member of the NLRB itself, by the NLRB, which had discharged him as a potential traitor. He is presently employed by the NLRB.

Case No. 2: This woman was a secretary to the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board. She was fired in 1954 after a loyalty hearing on the basis of past and

present association with known Communists and subversives. She was rehired a few weeks later and given back pay upon the reported intercession of the same Board official. She is an employee today.

Case No. 3: This individual was fired in 1953 after a Loyalty-Security Board had unanimously recommended his separation upon hearing the record of his Communist activities. He was rehired 8 months later, in 1954, again upon the reported intercession of the same high official.

Case No. 4: This individual, an ex-convict, was a reported close associate of a foreign atomic scientist who fled behind the Iron Curtain. He was identified as a member of the Communist Party in a western State. He was given a clearance, despite these facts. Even though he remains employed in the office of the Chairman of the NLRB in Washington, D. C., his case has been referred to the Department of Justice for possible perjury prosecution.

Case No. 5: This employee was identified as a member of the Communist Party. At a loyalty board hearing in 1949, he at first denied, then admitted that he may have been a Communist. He was given a second loyalty hearing in 1955 and cleared because the confidential informants of the FBI could not be produced. A recommendation for perjury action against him has been sent to the Justice Department. Nevertheless, he remains presently employed by the NLRB.

Case No. 6: This young woman admitted in applying for employment that she had been a member of the Young Communist League. She was nevertheless hired. Investigative reports show that she has continued extensive Communist Party activities, and that her husband was also a member of the Young Communist League. Recommended loyalty board hearings on this person have not been held. She is presently employed as a field examiner with access to classified defense installations.

Case No. 7: This man is currently a regional director of the National Labor Relations Board. He was appointed to that position by Nathan Witt. This regional director was a lecturer at the Philadelphia School of Social Sciences and Art which was cited by the Attorney General as "an adjunct of the Communist Party." Recommended loyalty board hearings on this man have not been held.

Case No. 8: This individual is a prominent member of the National Labor Relations Board. The evidence relative to this case is sufficiently alarming to justify an immediate investigation. The derogatory information on him was so extensive and his position so important that his case was submitted to the White House. His complete file is reported to have been taken to Independence, Mo., by President Truman when he retired from office. Yet he remains in his high office with the National Labor Relations Board.

The American people have been told that communism in the United States is an exaggerated menace. As you know, this is a myth propagated by the Red leaders and the left-wingers. Communism is still an ugly, evil, and powerful threat to our Government and to our liberties. The American people have a right to know that men devoted to a godless ideology have been installed in high office in our Government, have successfully run the gauntlet of the loyalty security system, and remain in positions where they are able to influence policy and shape the destiny of our Nation. This fact will be brought home to the public if this investigation is pressed with vigor and determination. I am confident you and the committee will do just that.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

PRESS RELEASE, NOVEMBER 9, 1955

Mr. Molotov's vigorous restatement yesterday of the Soviet Union's intention to communize Germany leaves Secretary Dulles with no alternative but to break off the Geneva negotiations. To continue the conference in the teeth of this reaffirmation of Soviet imperialistic designs would serve no useful purpose, and would create still further dangers to the western position.

On August 1, I told the Senate that, despite all the smiles and handshakes, the Geneva summit meeting produced not the slightest change in the traditional Soviet position on German unification and European security, and that it was thus inviting disaster for us to play the Communists' friendship game. Some of my colleagues advised postponing judgment until the October Foreign Ministers' meeting. That meeting has been held, and with it has disappeared even the most visionary basis for hoping for a Soviet change of heart.

Obviously, there is nothing more to be said at Geneva, by either the Communists or ourselves, on the questions of Germany and European security. This means the conference will dribble off on the subjects of East-West trade and cultural contacts. It approaches insanity, in the light of Molotov's reaffirmations of Communist objectives, for our diplomats to try to work out agreements that will strengthen the Russian economy, and that will further facilitate the sending of Communist cultural delegations to the United States and other western countries.

The deceptive and farcical spirit of Geneva was at the outset, and remains, the chief propaganda tool of our admittedly implacable enemy. Any attempt to keep it alive is fraught with perils for the free world.

Mr. Dulles deserves credit for standing firm at Geneva for the American policy of a free and unified Germany. It is his duty now to return to the United States, to advise the American people that the recent Communist peace offensive has been root-and-center fraudulent, and to set about restoring our Soviet policy to a realistic basis.

PRESS RRLEASE, NOVEMBER 13, 1955

There is a pressing need for the administration to correct an absurd situation that deprived the country of the invaluable services of one of its greatest sons. Ever since 1951 when President Truman, for partisan reasons, relieved him of his far eastern commands, Gen. Douglas MacArthur has been compelled to sit on the sidelines of the free-world's struggle against communism. This has been an extraordinary exile inasmuch as General MacArthur is a world statesman of unchallenged stature, and unquestionably one of our foremost experts on the Far East—the area where the fight against communism will probably be won or lost.

But today there is an additional reason for summoning General MacArthur's services. Due to his unfortunate illness, President Eisenhower is not now able to carry, personally, the full burdens of his office. In view of the continuing crisis in the Far East, the President's task would be immensely facilitated if he and his advisers had the benefit of the daily counsel of this wise man and seasoned area expert.

I therefore urge that General MacArthur be asked to serve as special Presidential adviser on far east affairs. The appointment would considerably lighten the President's workload and worries, and would assure the American people that their affairs are in capable hands.

PRESS RELEASE

The leadership of the Democrat Party should immediately call a halt to the disgraceful and dangerous activities of the Democrat-controlled committee under the chairmanship of Senator HENNINGS, of Missouri. Under HENNINGS all the power of a Senate committee is being used to wage jungle warfare against the Government security system on the argument that it is too tough on Communist suspects. The Hennings committee is being used as a "front" for leftwing organizations such as the Fund for the Republic and the ADA, whose principle objective is to torpedo any effective security program.

The Hennings committee activities are not only a disgrace to the Senate and to the Democrat Party, they pose a grave threat to the security of the United States. I note that not one Democrat leader has come forward to condemn the Hennings spectacle—which indicates that the national Democrat leadership is as soft as ever on the Communist issue.

The Communists-in-government question should not be an issue between America's two political parties. They should be united in efforts to fight Communist infiltration. However, unless the Democrat leadership does something to curb the activities of the Hennings committee, Communist subversion will be a major issue in the 1956 campaign. If the Democrat leadership does not remedy the situation then the millions of Democrats throughout the country, who abhor communism, will have no alternative but to put Republicans in control of the congressional committees.

When I was chairman of a committee that was attempting to expose Communists in government and in defense plants, there was a great hue and cry by the Democrat leaders and the leftwing press against one-man committee hearings. I note that now—when HENNINGS is conducting one-man hearings to "protect the rights" of Communist Party-liners in government—not a single objection is to be heard from the Democrat leaders or from the leftwing press.

NOVEMBER 29, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENNINGS: Last Friday I commenated on the activities of your one-man committee, pointing out that you were making it easier for Communists to infiltrate our Government. Your reply to that statement has been brought to my attention, and let me say that the Sir Galahad pose you attempted to strike did not quite come off. The only people who can reasonably call you their hero are the Communist Party liners whose antisecurity propaganda campaign your one-man committee is so energetically promoting.

You stated that you are attempting to strengthen our security program. This claim was double-talk and hypocrisy at its worst: One November 3d at St. Louis, you demanded three changes in security procedures which, if adopted, would leave the security program in shambles. You urged, in effect, that we get rid of the reasonable doubt standard under which the benefit of the doubt in loyalty cases is given to the Government. You contended that the facts that a man's associates are Communists and that he has joined Communist organizations should not even be taken into account in determining his security status. Finally, you insisted that the Government be forbidden to make use of derogatory information gathered by undercover FBI agents. Far from strengthening the security program, these changes would open the floodgates to wholesale Communist infiltration of our Government.

Most recently, you brought the Army under attack for trying to correct lax security practices that were exposed by the Senate

committee under my chairmanship in the Peress and Belsky cases. Day after day, your committee hammered away at the Army for refusing to grant honorable discharges to soldiers who take the fifth amendment when asked about their Communist connections. During one of the sessions (vol. 7, pp. 1049–1065), your chief counsel, supported by you, berated the Army for merely including as one of the charges against a soldier the fact he had taken the fifth amendment when asked about Communist activities. Mr. Hocker said: "How can you justify that, on either a constitutional basis, or on just the basis of morals? If a man is entitled to rely upon his constitutional privilege, how can the Army hold that against him?"

The result of this daily browbeating of Army officials was the promulgation of an amazing Defense Department directive. In effect, the new directive says to Communists and Communist Party liners who are drafted into the Army: "All you have to do is take the fifth amendment, and you will be able to avoid military service and go back to civilian life with no disgrace or stigma attached to your name." In other words, loyal American youths must give several years of their lives to their country's service, but Communists and Communist Party liners go scot-free—neither drafted nor disgraced.

After that directive was issued, you commented: "We are making progress. I look forward to further improvements in the regulations as the subcommittee prosecutes this inquiry." Progress for whom, improvement in whose behalf, Senator?

The frightening thing about your efforts to wreck the security program is that they apparently have the support of national Democrat leaders—none of whom have yet repudiated you or your committee. It is a sad commentary on Democrat leadership that the only Senate Committee now holding hearings on the Communist issue is waging jungle warfare against our security system instead of attempting to expose and get rid of Communists and Communist Party liners. For this choice of objectives the Democrat Party bears full responsibility. I do not want Communist subversion to be an issue in the next campaign, but I assure you it will be an issue, unless your committee desists from activities that give aid and comfort to this country's enemies.

I am sure that the millions of Democrats throughout the Nation who abhor communism join me in this protest against your committee's activities.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

LETTER WRITTEN TO SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER, GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN, HON. ADLAI STEVENSON

DECEMBER 2, 1955.

DEAR SIR: It is evident that you are being seriously considered for the Democrat presidential nomination in 1956. Therefore, I think it proper that at this time you take a stand on one of the major issues that will confront the American people in the coming election, namely, how to deal with the never-ceasing Communist attempts to infiltrate our Government. I think it is important that the public, and especially the delegates who select the Democrat nominee, know your views on this vital question.

On January 10, 1955, after the McCarthy censure, and after the Democrat Party had obtained control of the Senate, a resolution was introduced and unanimously passed which said, in part:

"It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees shall continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose and combat * * * (the Communist) conspiracy, and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith."

That resolution was admittedly designed to counter the impression that the unanimous vote of the Democrat Party on the censure issue meant that "the Senate would terminate or soften its investigation of communism and subversion."

Although I voted for the resolution, I commented at the time that the resolution amounted to a declaration against sin, and that the Democrat Party would have to prove by deeds that it had ceased to be soft on the Communist issue. I added that I would give the Democrats 1 year to demonstrate that they had meant what they said.

That year is now nearly up. So far, under Democrat leadership, congressional investigating committees have not exposed a single Communist in Government. But this is not the most serious indictment of the Democrat Party. Instead of exposing Communists, the Democrat leadership has seen fit to join in the Communist-inspired campaign to discredit existing measures for combating subversion. While I did not expect any progress to be made in exposing Communists, I could hardly anticipate this development: That the Democrat Party would flagrantly and unabashedly expose its softness toward communism by attempting to destroy the security measures now in force.

First, the Johnston committee attempted to whip up hysteria against the security program by parading before the public a long line of discharged Communist suspects and inviting them to relate how badly they had been treated. No attempt was made to evaluate the complaints or to present the Government's side of the cases.

But the most serious threat to the safety of this country is the activities of the Democrat-controlled subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator HENNINGS. The manifest objective of the Hennings subcommittee is nothing less than the total emasculation of the security system.

Under the guise of protecting constitutional rights, HENNINGS has brought under attack practically every security procedure that is useful in detecting Communists and getting rid of them. If HENNINGS has his way the only person who would be caught in the security net is the man who announces "I am a present member of the Communist Party, and here is my party card to prove it." The procedure changes urged by the Hennings subcommittee would open the floodgates to wholesale Communist infiltration of our Government.

Inasmuch as the Democrat Party now controls the Senate, the activities of the Hennings subcommittee are the direct responsibility of the Democrat Party. The Democrat Party therefore has been put on record as being more concerned with protecting Communists than with exposing them. As things stand now, this is the record upon which the Democrat Party will have to campaign in 1956.

I have often said that it is not my wish for Communist subversion to be an issue between our two political parties. But the American people will make this an issue, unless the Democrat national leadership repudiates activities that give aid and comfort to our country's enemies. The public is fast losing patience with politicians who dance to every tune the Communists play and then ask to be entrusted with the conduct of the Nation's affairs.

I therefore call upon you to repudiate the antisecurity vendetta being conducted by Senator HENNINGS and to condemn all other attempts to weaken our national security. If you fail to take this action then you have no right to ask the American people, either in the primaries or in the national election, to endorse your candidacy.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

DECEMBER 16, 1955.

Hon. HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,
Attorney General, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNELL: I make reference to a letter addressed to you on November 14, 1955, by Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which reads:

"Reference is made to my letter of April 12, 1955, wherein I referred to you various material concerning Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker. At that time, I requested that your office advise whether there appeared to be a violation of the perjury statute and what action your Department intended to pursue.

"It would be appreciated if you would advise me as to the status of the case."

I am informed that your office has replied to this letter to the effect that the Zwicker case has been referred to the Criminal Division, but that no action has, as yet, been taken.

As the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, I feel obliged to remind you that continued delays in the disposition of this case may reflect adversely on the present administration. The case was originally referred to your Department 8 months ago, because this subcommittee was of the opinion that General Zwicker's testimony might constitute the basis of a perjury prosecution. I submit that any further delay will arouse suspicions that the Department is permitting political considerations to interfere with the administration of justice.

May I be advised at the earliest possible moment of what action is to be taken.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

DECEMBER 16, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am deeply concerned over the attacks by the Johnston and Hennings committees on the Government security program. In my opinion, these committees have consciously sought to discredit anti-Communist security measures by means of ridicule, unfair emphases and downright misrepresentation. The committees are deliberately portraying the security program as a ruthless, bungling Gestapo-like operation and this distorted picture is being passed on to the public with great gusto by the left-wing press. The result is that the Communist Party is winning a stupendous propaganda victory and may soon achieve its objective of destroying the security system altogether.

I enclose for your careful reading a photostat of an article published in the Washington Star of December 11, 1955—one of literally hundreds of the same tendency—which shows the kind of games the left-wingers are playing with the security issue. This article deals with the Hennings committee's so-called investigation of the Army's policy of assigning to "controlled duties," and refusing to grant honorable discharges to, inductees who take the fifth amendment when questioned about their loyalty to the United States.

I have read in their entirety the relevant transcripts of the Hennings committee hearings, and let me say that this story faithfully records the distorted version of security procedures developed by that committee. This team of clever publicists so twists the facts as to make the Army's position look ridiculous. The article, for example, "proves" that the Army compels an inductee to exercise his constitutional privilege, then punishes him for doing so.

When considered step by step by anyone who is acquainted with the security prob-

lem, and who takes a realistic view of the measures that are necessary to protect our country, the Army procedures that are under fire are utterly reasonable. To begin with the Army asks the inductee, in effect, whether he is loyal to the United States. (Do Hennings and left-wingers want the Army to induct persons without obtaining this information?) It then tells the inductee that if he chooses not to disclose whether he is loyal to the United States, the way to avoid such disclosure is to invoke his constitutional privilege. (Do left-wingers have in mind some other way in which an inductee can justify refusing to assert his loyalty?) The Army then must determine what bearing the invocation of the fifth amendment has on the inductee's security status; it usually decides against giving him full security clearance and an honorable discharge. (Are the left-wingers saying that the Army should completely ignore the implications of an inductee saying, "I cannot tell the truth about Communist connections because the truth might tend to incriminate me?")

Of course, the left-wingers never commit themselves on just what step in the process is wrong. Their purpose is to whip up public sentiment against a caricature of the whole—and thus to pressure the Army into emasculating its program or dismantling it altogether.

Daily browbeating of security officers by the Hennings committee has forced the Army to revise its procedures for dealing with fifth-amendment cases, and the new regulation creates a situation more absurd and more dangerous than existed when our committee went into the Peress case. The new regulations call for a loyalty investigation prior to induction. The result is that a Communist or Communist Party liner—or, for that matter, anyone who wants to dodge the draft—can, by merely invoking the fifth amendment, avoid the draft and return to civilian life with no mark or stigma attached to his name.

I am informed that ridicule and intimidation by Senate committees and the press has caused a general relaxation of efforts by the executive departments to expose and get rid of Communist suspects. My purpose in writing you is to suggest that our committee, which is charged with overseeing the operations of the executive branch of the Government, has a clear duty to attempt to repair the damage done by the Hennings and Johnston committees. First, we should give the Defense Department and the other Government agencies an opportunity to explain the operation of the security program in an atmosphere other than that of a "kangaroo court." We should make it clear to the executive officials that our interest is in strengthening the security program, not in weakening it.

Second, our committee should resume efforts to expose the Communists who are still in our Government. It is truly a sad commentary on the political leadership of the Senate that the only committees dealing with the Communists-in-Government issue are directing their fire at those who are attempting to prevent Communist infiltration, instead of at those who are doing the infiltrating.

This gets me over to a subject to which I hope you will give the most careful consideration. Unless Senate committees—all of which are Democrat-controlled—start fighting Communists instead of helping them, there is no way on earth to prevent the Communists-in-Government problem from becoming a political issue in 1956. The two parties should be united in their determination to fight Communist subversion, but on the basis of the Democrat Party's Senate performance to date, they are not united; and unless this situation changes, it will be the duty of Republican candidates to point out the differences to the electorate.

On January 10 of this year, the Democrat-controlled Senate passed a resolution that provided, in part:

"It is the sense of the Senate that its appropriate committees shall continue diligently and vigorously to investigate, expose and combat . . . [the Communist] conspiracy, and all subversive elements and persons connected therewith."

I voted for that resolution, though I felt that its real purpose was to offset a widespread impression that the unanimous Democrat vote on the censure issue foreshadowed a letup in efforts to expose and get rid of Communists in Government. I stated at that time that I would give the Democrat leadership 1 year to prove that it had meant what it said.

That year is now nearly up and so far, not a single Communist in Government has been exposed by a Senate committee. Moreover, so far as I have been able to discover, no attempts to uncover subversives in Government are being made by a Senate committee. Instead, Democrat-controlled committees have concentrated on discrediting the security program. The responsibility for this strange choice of objectives must be laid directly to the Senate Democrat leadership and to Democrat committee chairmen.

I believe that you personally, along with many other Senate Democrats, are anxious to expose Communists; but I also believe you have been hamstrung by the left-wing leadership of the Democrat Party. The interests of the country require that good Democrats emancipate themselves from left-wing domination. Unless this is done, unless the Senate starts providing some opposition to the Communist-inspired anti-security campaign, instead of abetting it, Republicans in 1956 will have no choice but to cite the Communist issue as reason for restoring to them the chairmanships of Senate committees.

Sincerely yours,

JOE MCCARTHY.

Unless Nonessential Spending Is Trimmed and Budget Is Balanced, Congress May Fritter Away Chance To Give People Some Honest Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, if this Congress wants to do it, the American people can be given some badly needed tax relief this year. And it can now be done on a sound basis. Indeed it is possible, if we set our minds to it, to have moderate tax reduction and also pay a billion or so dollars on the mounting public debt.

But we all know that we cannot have honest tax reduction that really means something unless at the same time the budget is balanced. Otherwise the Congress would find itself in a position of borrowing money, adding it to the public debt, and of in effect paying that borrowed money to ourselves as taxpayers.

In other words, if the Federal Government spends more than it takes in it engages in deficit financing to that extent. That deficit is made up by the Government borrowing that amount and adding it to the public debt. We now pay nearly $7 billion annually in interest on that debt.

It is an unsound business practice, under present conditions, to borrow money for tax-relief purposes. That is not really tax relief—it is tax postponement. In a way it is a fraud because it unloads that much more on future generations to pay, while leading the people to think we have really down something for them.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that as we approach this subject of tax reduction this year we keep these basic considerations in mind.

TAX REDUCTION IS CONDITIONED ON REDUCED SPENDING

If we do that, if we really want to take advantage of this opportunity to give some tax relief on a sound basis, we will start looking right now for ways to cut down on nonessential spending. That is the only approach to honest—not phony—tax reduction.

Now, how can we reduce spending? There are many ways. We can, for example, take the fat out of foreign aid and limit it in the main to necessary military assistance, with economic aid going only to those countries that are on the side of the Free World, that are strategic and cooperative, and which without our help are in danger of falling into Communist hands—thereby further endangering our own security and world peace.

END OF PUBLIC HOUSING WOULD HELP TAXPAYERS

Another obvious saving would be to discontinue the expensive public housing which each year is becoming increasingly burdensome to American taxpayers. It will be recalled that this House last summer reversed an earlier position and at the end of the session voted to continue public housing—a billion dollars worth of it having been committed at that time. Those who support that sort of reckless spending should be the last to talk about tax reduction unless and until the budget is balanced.

Indeed, the Congress should begin steps now to liquidate socialized housing and get out of this business that private enterprise can handle so much better. About $10 billion is involved in outstanding commitments, loss of revenue to local communities in foregoing local taxes on such housing projects, and other factors. Let us get the Government out of that kind of business and give the taxpayers a break.

TO HAVE TAX AND DEBT REDUCTION WE MUST FOLLOW CONSISTENT POLICIES FROM YEAR TO YEAR

Mr. Speaker, it should be evident to everyone that our approach to these problems should be consistent from year to year; planning for a sound fiscal policy should be projected into the future and not be haphazard. Such policies should be the same—the objectives should be the same—on nonelection years as they are on election years. The same basic principles of economy should be practiced every year—not just occasionally.

It happens that I have been one of those who in the past has tried to follow that rule of consistency. I have consistently opposed nonessential spending and phony tax cut proposals. I was constrained to vote against the big package foreign aid bills the past 3 years because they contained, in my judgment, too much fat, too much waste, along with the desirable features. We are told, for example, that Denmark was given $100 million last year to be used in helping balance its budget. And it was reported that $200 million was handed as a gift to Great Britain shortly before their last general election.

We simply cannot go on with irresponsible spending if we are to have responsible tax reduction and debt retirement. It is just that simple.

MORE PEOPLE NOW REALIZING THAT TAX CUT IS MEANINGLESS UNLESS BUDGET IS BALANCED

As I said at the beginning, we now have a chance to give the people some honest tax relief because we are within sight of a balanced budget. But that possibility can be frittered away by excessive spending.

There is another encouraging sign: many who last year and the year before insisted upon additional tax cuts despite the unbalanced condition of the budget are now, according to press reports, realizing the fallacy of that position and are calling for caution in applying similar tax cuts at this time unless the budget is brought into balance. That change in attitude is commendable.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that those who now admit that honest tax relief can be had only with a balanced budget, will join with those of us who make annual fights for reduction in nonessential spending. Let us bear in mind that 10 percent of all taxes now collected is used just to pay annual interest on the public debt. Even if we paid a billion dollars a year on that debt it would require 280 years to retire it. The use of commonsense economy is the key to prospects for tax relief this year—and for a sound fiscal policy throughout the foreseeable future.

The Outlook for Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of a very fine address, entitled "The Outlook for Business," which was delivered by one of Wisconsin's great sons, Harry A. Bullis, who is now living in Minneapolis, and who is president of General Mills, Inc. He made an address in Des Moines, Iowa, on January 5, 1956. I think the address is worthy of anyone's perusal, and would prove to be profitable and enjoyable reading. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OUTLOOK FOR BUSINESS

(Address of Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board, General Mills, Inc., at annual dinner meeting of the Des Moines Chamber of Commerce, Des Moines, Iowa, January 5, 1956)

The future of the American economy depends first of all upon certain facts, but it is also related to one's point of view.

Over in Moscow, U. S. S. R., they hope that 1956 will be the year of the great American depression. They believe a shattering business panic here is inevitable. Stalin didn't live long enough to see it. His successors are as confident as ever that it will come to pass. They view the American economy as a gasoline engine, its tank just emptied, but spinning madly on in a last burst of speed before it chugs to a halt.

Here in America, as we survey the business scene, we are reminded that this is a political year. Before 1956 is out we will elect—perhaps I should say that we may re-elect—a President of the United States. We will pass upon the entire membership of the House of Representatives. A good third of the United States Senate will risk its political future.

There is one platform that both political parties are agreed upon. They are in favor of prosperity. For the party in power it may be called continued prosperity. For the outs it may be called genuine prosperity. And for both it is sincere concern for the sick members of the moment in our economic family—the American farmer. But agreed they are that the United States shall and must have prosperity.

So here we have the picture—the Kremlin hang-dogging under its domes, wishing the worst; the political drums beating out the presidential election year; all parties agreed on prosperity—and the state of American business good—in fact, never better at any time in the history of these United States.

HOW GOOD ARE WE?

Just how good business is today, is hardly appreciated. Consider with me that our gross national product—the production of all goods and services in this country—is nearing the rate of $400 billion per year.

Just before the war the annual rate was $100 billion.

In other words, we are doing 4 times what we did in 1940.

To be sure, we must allow for the lessened purchasing power of the dollar compared with the prewar years. But after this allowance the rate is fabulous.

Now all this logically leads to a basic question. How much further can this thing go? Is it possible to sustain this pace? Can we keep our economic footpedal pressed down to the floorboards? Can we race our engine as we are—and possibly get still more speed and mileage?

The United States businessman has already expressed himself on this question. His answer is a resounding yes. But he did not reply just that way. In fact, he has acted an affirmative in the form of commitments for capital-goods expenditures during the year 1956. These expenditures cover the cost of new plants and equipment, in other words the creation of new means of production by which we can push higher our flow of goods and services that contribute to a higher standard of living for all Americans. The known total of all planned capital expenditures for 1956 is $33.4 billion. This is 13 percent more than the $29.4 billions invested by industry in capital goods during the past year. We all know that this supplies jobs. Consider that the Bell System alone will spend $2 billion for new plant facilities.

Other major expenditures are planned by iron and steel, light metals, autos, chemicals, paper, rubber and synthetic fabrics.

So looking at the economic picture through the American brand of eyeglass, we can say that beginning with politicians, right down through the businessman, and for that matter including the man on the street—the future looks good. It looks good because the nation is determined to work and invest to make it good. I think that is an important point to remember. A heavy volume economy doesn't just happen—it is created as the result of the joint actions of millions of human being who invent, create, invest, manage and govern so that it shall be that way.

Now, since we have practically attained a 400 billion dollar Gross Product, where do we go from here?

THE JOB AHEAD

At this moment, our major concern is to keep a balance between the expanding growth in output and our ability to finance all the producing machines and the consumers of all the end products they turn out. Fortunately, our Government's fiscal condition is sound with the budget presently indicating a cash surplus. Therefore our basic problem is to keep the output of our gigantic machine in which business has invested, such as houses and their equipment, appliances, radios, TV's, and automobiles—the things that make American life good—moving into consumer hands. The list includes food, clothing, tobacco, oil products, rubber tires, and other products destined for consumer dollars and which consumers need. What then is the job ahead?

We know that our national productivity grows at the rate of almost 4 percent a year. Better techniques in management and production, a more highly skilled labor supply, greater efficiency in farming and coal mining, plus increase in population, are the forces behind this growth. Also our labor supply of about 800,000 a year is an addition of one percent to our production potential. Improved technology, so strikingly observable on any Iowa farm, adds about 3 percent more per man and per farmer. All this increase in productivity means we have to find ways to market some 10 to 15 billion dollars more in goods and services in 1956 than we did in 1955. Can we do it? My answer to that one is—I am an optimist.

A LOOK BACKWARD

Let's look back a little. In 1954, after the truce in Korea, the administration cut defense expenditures 14 billion dollars. There followed a reduction in stockpiles of all goods accumulated for defense, excepting, of course, our "strategic stockpiles." Also our exports were a little greater, thanks to the recovery we had helped produce in Europe. But it was the consumer who spent $18 billion more on consumer goods and almost $3 billion more for new houses. It was the consumer, remember, who started the economy on the upward trend again. To meet his demands, industry had to start building more factories, more machines, and buying more inventories to fabricate into the consumer goods he wanted to own. In addition to this consumer pressure, our State and local governments carried on a large construction program.

The final outcome of all these favorable upward forces was to elevate total gross national product from its low of less than $360 billion to the $392 billion annual rate attained in the third quarter of 1955. It is that rate of national product which is reasonably expected to reach $400 billion—some predict more—in the early part of 1956.

WHERE DID THE MONEY COME FROM?

Now we come to the all important question: "Where's the money coming from?" First, we must ask where did the consumer

get his money last year? We know that business got its money from retained earnings, increased depreciation, and new financing. We know also that during 1955 consumers increased their spending by 7 percent, and at the same time paid $1 billion more in income taxes. The plain fact is the worker consumer got a part of the money he needed from greater earnings. Wage boosts for the total labor force averaged about 4 percent, without considering increased compensation from overtime. The factory worker enjoyed a total increase of about 8 percent in average weekly pay. This increase was transmitted, in many industries, to the white collar workers. The overall result was that the annual rate of personal disposable income rose by about $17 billion between the third quarter of 1954, and the third quarter of 1955, and undoubtedly increased further in the fourth quarter.

THE FARM PROBLEM

In all the long and tragic history of the world, the periods of man's hunger and lack of adequate food supply have been measured in ages and centuries—and the bright days of his plenty have been known as decades, or fewer years. Even today, our economists and social scientists tell us that 77 percent of the world's population has less than enough to eat.

All of this makes all the more paradoxical our overabundance of agricultural products. And it points a serious indictment at our inability to create satisfactory markets for the products of the farmer's toil, and to see to it that he as well as organized labor is given an opportunity to grow and prosper with an expanding standard of living geared to the fortunes of our great Nation.

Although consumers generally spent 25 percent more dollars for all durable goods, 5 percent more for all services, and 17 percent more for new houses—the farmer found himself with fewer dollars. A larger farm output brought no larger gross receipts, and a somewhat smaller net farm income. Of course, we know that the number of people living on farms is down several million in the last 10 years. And yet the 1955 crop was the biggest harvest ever made in the United States.

It is heartening to note that the farm problem is receiving consideration now at the place where the remedy must be applied. I refer to the rate of production. It is only prudent conservation of soil and resources to gear production to demand. A fairly priced market for farm products is a part of that picture. And all the while that this temporary limitation—for such it is—is operating, we may be confident that the value of the land will continue to grow in economic importance and prestige as it always has through all history. The farmer is the primary producer. Without the efforts of his toil, all other production ceases. Food production is a source of great national strength. It is well to remember this law of nature, and respect the farmer's place in our economic progress.

THE DEBT PROBLEM

To return to our study of where consumers got the money they spent, of course, much of it came from increased earnings. But, as to the rest, the plain fact is "they borrowed it." Yes, borrow it they did. But at the same time they also increased their holdings of liquid assets. Incidentally, this is something our farmers have done very well during the past 15 years. It is significant that consumers' holdings of liquid assets grew more than twice as much as their debts.

We learn from economists that the debt pattern runs something this way:

Most of the younger married couples buy new houses. Sometimes their parents help them make a small downpayment. Then the youngsters move into a new house. After that they are on their own. The parents like that.

Children come along. The young parents get ahead and their income grows. They begin to think about a better house. Soon they do something about it. Records show that though we make mortgages of 18, 20, 25, and 30 years maturity, the average life of all of them is only 7½ years. Those smart kids of yours seem to move into a better house very fast—and don't their fathers and mothers like that.

The pattern continues this way. While the children are doing this, we oldsters are paying off our debts and we are also continuing to pay on our life insurance. This gives financing institutions larger resources from which loans are made to those younger families. Actually, if we save more, some other groups must go into debt to use our savings; otherwise, there would be no investment. That is why debts must increase in a growing society. Some people are always paying off old debts, while others are incurring more debts. The instant anyone pays off a debt, he becomes an individual who saves. All the new houses I see around the outskirts of Des Moines gives evidence that we are certainly training a lot of people to save these days. The combination of debt and saving and more debt and more saving is resulting in the growth of this distinguished city of yours.

OUR PROBLEM

Nevertheless, because some people are becoming nervous about this accelerated debt pattern, I do not think our total debt will rise as much in this year of 1956 as it did last year. That is the general feeling.

Nor should we expect the total earnings of workers to go up as much in 1956 as they did last year, especially from more overtime.

So here is our problem. We expect $10 billion to $15 billion more in total output this year. Yet our debt pattern will not accelerate as much as it did last year; nor will the total earnings of workers go up as rapidly as in 1955, because overtime will not increase much more. But we must move our extra $10 billion to $15 billion in output into consumer hands. How can we do this?

TAX REDUCTION

I think a very sound and tested way is to lower taxes. That will leave more money in consumers' hands.

How will this work out, you ask? Something like this:

The lowered taxes will enlarge the consumers disposable income. That in turn will encourage spending, thereby moving products and services. All that is good.

Have we ever tried this before? The answer is, "Yes."

In January 1954 total taxes were reduced by $7.4 billion. This reduction came just at the beginning of the 1954 recession. This released spending money helped to stop that recession. The resulting increase in production, business activity, and incomes caused tax revenues to go up at a substantial rate. The total increase was perhaps $7 billion, and for that reason our national cash budget changed from a state of deficit to one of surplus. This is one type of surplus no one complains about.

ECONOMIC POLICY

We have a national talent for bold thinking. Today, the bold policy is to plan for continuing economic growth, to plan to finance it, and to buttress this growth with a favorable Government fiscal policy. To say that another way, we can determine the amount of prosperity we shall have in 1956 by wise management of our money supply, realistic extension and management of debt, and sound decisions about our taxes in the area of fiscal policy.

The final question is the issue of proper timing. In government, as in football, a sharp play fails if it is badly timed. Well timed, even the old Statute of Liberty play works.

As an example of good timing, between 12 to 18 months ago the leaders of the Eisenhower administration announced the fiscal policies which are responsible for our strong economic position today. It is time now for us to look ahead to the latter part of 1956 and 1957 and make decisions that will carry our prosperity into and beyond that period.

At the moment, some men believe that we should be more concerned with possible inflation than with planning for economic stimulants. But that type of unbold thinking will not dictate policies to sustain our economic vigor in the days ahead of us.

We have every reason to assume that the administration and Congress jointly, which have not acted with untimely speed, neither with carelessness in these matters, will adopt sound policies to meet any economic problems which may arise in the year ahead of us.

CONCLUSION

What does all this add up to? You and I will agree it adds up to a lot of things, most of them good. We know that our American economy is remarkably strong—that it is increasingly stable. Business has tangibly expressed its confidence in continued progress by the huge commitments for capital goods expenditures in the year ahead. At the same time, it is fully aware of the necessity of avoiding excesses, of not getting winded. In my opinion, we shall continue to have a steady growth in business. I am convinced we have the financial means to accommodate it. The wisdom which we need is not so much as to whether we can continue our economic expansion, as it is to determine the rate at which the expansion can proceed without danger of inflation and excessive boom.

During the past 10 years we have lifted our imports by more than $6 billion a year. We have thus helped the rest of the world keep busy and prosperous. Our own prosperity enables us to purchase needed raw materials from foreign countries and that in turn helps to bring prosperity to all the world.

The continuation of our progress will require the increasing cooperation of the various elements of the economy. Business management will need the full support of labor and farmers, as well as of the general consuming public of which we are all a part. Only with the responsibilities shared and with a mutual awareness of the needs and desires of all members of society can the overall goal be reached.

By boldness and faith, with everyone cooperating and working together intelligently, we can continue to have an expanding economy under freedom that is producing 24 hours a day for all the people of America, and for all the people of the world.

And therein lies the greatest promise, the hope and the unlimited future of America.

The University of Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, at the 57th annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Society, which was held in New York City on December 10 last, the principal address was delivered

by the distinguished scholar and educator, Dr. Gaylord P. Harnwell, president of the University of Pennsylvania.

I commend Dr. Harnwell's notable address to the attention of my colleagues, because it sets for the problems that must be met to safeguard the freedom and independence of higher education in the United States.

In his remarks Dr. Harnwell traced the history of the University of Pennsylvania since it was founded 215 years ago by Pennsylvania's foremost citizen and statesman, Benjamin Franklin.

This year we are celebrating the 250th birthday anniversary of Dr. Franklin, and we are proud that the University of Pennsylvania is outstanding today among the many living and enduring monuments to the vision and wisdom of that great American patriot.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Harnwell's address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE COMMONWEALTH

During the decade between the birth of George Washington and that of Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia was the most rapidly growing city in the Colonies. It had inherited a religious but nonsectarian tradition from William Penn which attracted a wider variety of racial stocks, more tradesmen and skilled artisans, more professional men and philosophers than any of its rivals along the narrow strip of seacoast which was the western beachhead of advancing empire. English and Germans, Quakers and Lutherans were establishing a sturdy bastion of tolerance and independence which gave Philadelphia and its institutions a character which they have never lost.

Among the occasional visitors during this decade was a gifted evangelist, George Whitefield, who drew thousands of people to his open-air meetings. His magnetism, however, won him no invitation to an established pulpit so his following of tradesmen and artisans, in 1740, built a plain one-room building on Fourth Street below Arch, one of their purposes being to accommodate the congregation during Whitefield's visits. Moved also by a pressing need for schooling in the growing city, which was to be the cradle of liberty 34 years later, they designated the building not only as a "House of Publick Worship" but also as a charity school. This was the beginning of the University of Pennsylvania.

Use of the structure for educational purposes lagged, however, until the movement was given life and vision by an enterprising young citizen who was later to become the leading statesman and philosopher of a new nation. Benjamin Franklin, who served as a trustee of the unversity for nearly 40 years, exerted his rising influence to promote the welfare of the charity school and his great wisdom to guide its early years; his pamphlet, "Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania," stimulated interest in its growth and revitalization as The Academy; and he secured for it gifts from his fellow citizens; the city of Philadelphia; Thomas Penn, the governor of the province; and from the king himself. Franklin engaged as the academy's first provost, William Smith, recently arrived from Scotland, who found the spirit of religious tolerance and emphasis on practical learning greatly to his liking. He instituted the first liberal curriculum in the Colonies which provided instruction in modern languages, physics, mathematics, and economics in addition to the classics which had previously formed the sole area of instruction.

Pennsylvania was the first institution on this side of the Atlantic to grow into a university. The spirit of Franklin and the distinguished faculty assembled by Provost Smith attracted to the university students of all classes from up and down the seaboard, and from these groups 10 were later to be signers of the Declaration of Independence. George Washington, who was a frequent attender at college functions during his residence in Philadelphia, was awarded an honorary degree in 1783. A tradition of freedom of thought and speculation, of liberality in its educational philosophy, and of catholicity of welcome to scholars of all races, creeds, and nations was established, which has characterized Pennsylvania for over 200 years.

When the constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was adopted in 1776 it stated that "* * * all useful learning shall be duly encouraged and promoted in one or more universities." In 1779 the general asembly amended the charters of the various early foundations to be "* * * conformable to the revolution and to the constitution and government of this Commonwealth and to erect the same into a university. * * *" The supreme executive council was directed "to create a certain fund for the maintenance of the provost, vice provost, masters, and assistants, and to uphold and preserve the charitable school of the said university." The first State aid of 1,381 pounds, 5 shillings, and 7 pence ha'penny was received in 1785. In 1791 the governor became president of the board, and continuing interest and responsibility was implied by the requirement that the university should periodically lay a statement of its accounts before the general assembly.

The university has grown in size, in educational maturity, in area of academic interest, and in service to the Commonwealth and to the Nation during the 215 years since the founding of the charity school. We are this year celebrating the 100th anniversary of the establishment of an engineering curriculum, and next year will be the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Nation's first school of business and public administration. We note with pride that Pennsylvania is among the leading institutions in the proportion of its engineering graduates who appear in the professional reference, "Who's Who in Engineering." Graduates of the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce occupy positions of responsibility in almost every large business enterprise, and, according to the International City Managers Association, our Institute of Local and State Government has trained more men for the civic managerial field than any other university educational program of like nature.

While these are important anniversaries, I am sure you will agree that one which will be celebrated in 1965 is of unique significance—that marking the 200th year since the founding at Pennsylvania of the first medical school in the Colonies. Graduates of this school have received many honors during this period of time, but perhaps none is quite so meaningful as the one accorded recently to Dr. E. Roger Samuel, of Mount Carmel, of the class of 1913, who was chosen by the American Medical Association as "General Practitioner of the Year 1955."

There are only 33 universities in the United States which are independent of church or State, and we find satisfaction in the fact that the University of Pennsylvania is 1 of the 6 of these having a student-teacher ratio of less than 10 to 1 and granting 40 percent or more of its degrees for graduate or professional study. Certainly the whole tale of the university cannot be told in an evening, but it is a distinguished story of education in a free society of which our 82,000 graduates, including 44,000 who now reside in the Commonwealth, can be justly proud.

Now the University of Pennsylvania, while possessing the oldest tradition, is only one member institution of a broad and diversified system of higher education in the Commonwealth. Pennsylvania stands among the leading States in terms of the number of colleges and universities within its borders. In addition to Pennsylvania State University, which is a land-grant college, there are great urban units, such as the University of Pittsburgh at one end of the State and Temple University at the other. There are more private liberal arts colleges and public teachers colleges in Pennsylvania than in any other State. On the other hand, higher education is not one of the major expenses of the Commonwealth. In relation to its population, its wealth, or its other expenditures Pennsylvania stands among the lowest 10th of all the States in its support of higher education. The State spends less than half as much per capita as Michigan, Indiana, or Illinois, and less than a third as much as Iowa or Minnesota. How are these facts to be reconciled with a distinguished tradition for learning extending back to Colonial days and with the strong system of institutions which exist today?

Part of the answer is that the State is indeed not subject to the accusation of profligacy in its support of higher education. In part the answer is also to be found in a strong desire for independence among the individual citizens who have established and maintained the excellent institutions for higher education throughout the State. Outstanding among the smaller colleges are those with which the Quaker tradition of thinking otherwise has enriched our principles of education. Also, in part, the answer rests in the unique system of State aid to private independent institutions like the University of Pennsylvania which, by assuming their own initiative and responsibility, stretch the State's dollar to the uttermost. The Commonwealth can be proud that this aid to the great universities at each end of the State has entailed no measure of control or privilege.

At the University of Pennsylvania our yearly income totals some $30 million. One quarter comes from the students' tuition and fees, a third from the sale of services as in hospitals and clinics, a sixth from endowment income and gifts, and an eighth each from the Federal Government for services and from the State as an apropriation in aid. We acknowledge with deep appreciation our obligations to all sources of support, and we strive to maintain that excellence in the performance of our educational function that will merit the assistance and justify the independence which we enjoy.

A university is a nursery of ideas. In it freedom of inquiry and investigation must be protected from the infections of bigotry and prejudice, the periodic epidemics of demagoguery, and the blight of pressure groups, by courage of conviction and by independence of operation. The touchstone of the true university is the liberalism of its outlook. The distinguished scholar, scientist, or teacher is the man upon whom occasional partial glimpses of the truth he seeks confer the humility of wisdom rather than the arrogance of conviction. In universities the way must be kept open to flexibility of learning through a recognition both of present ignorance and of the necessity of freedom in intellectual investigation.

In an address delivered at the Westminster College Centennial, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State University, spoke as follows:

"Private institutions established and now maintain our vital traditions of academic freedom and the freedom of academic bodies from partisan interference and control—and on these freedoms, above all else, is based

the ability of colleges and universities to contribute to the advancement of human knowledge. Private institutions have implanted these traditions of freedom so firmly that the publicly supported institutions are able also to enjoy them, in spite of recurring pressures which would uproot them. We of the public colleges and universities are constantly in your debt."

What of the future of the University of Pennsylvania which, like its sister institutions, must match from its own resources the sum brought in by tuition in order that it may offer its opportunities within the means of the ablest of the Nation's students and which is also to be faced within the next 2 decades by an application rate rising about 3 percent a year to a potential doubling of our present student population?

In the first place, we must be true to the tradition which we have inherited from our Founding Fathers and maintain those standards of freedom, liberalism, and educational excellence which constitute our reason for existence. Ten times the fraction of college-age people go to college now as did at the turn of the century. The private colleges have not grown nearly so fast and the increase has been made possible by the rise of excellent State universities and city colleges. We cannot, however, if our principles of independence are sound, accept complacently a situation in which a continuously decreasing fraction of young Americans are enabled to experience the educational opportunities at private universities like Pennsylvania.

The question then is: How may we conduct our affairs and, in particular, enhance our resources to the end that we may most effectively perform our traditional and appropriate functions in the educational program of the Nation? It is a vital question for all of us here this evening for, as Thomas Jefferson wrote to Jarvis in 1820: "I know of no safe disposition of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves: And if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take from them, but to inform their discretion by education."

It appears to me that the University of Pennsylvania must concentrate upon the solution of this problem during the coming years by following three separate lines of endeavor. First, we must survey our present facilities, resources, and methods with the view to insuring their most efficient and effective employment in our appropriate educational function. This will entail a careful and scrupulous study by the faculty and administration of the economy of our methods, the balance of our facilities, and the priority of employment of our resources. With the assistance of the Fund for the Advancement of Education of the Ford Foundation, we are already engaged in a searching self-survey and evaluation of our educational procedures and objectives in order that we may have clearly before us the course that we should follow.

Secondly, in recognition of our probable inability to increase our resources at a rate which will enable us to respond in any significant measure to the pressures of numbers, we must study the educational pattern in accordance with which we should evolve if we are to maintain the position of leadership in educational excellence which will be expected of us. The growth of 2-year junior colleges, the strong system of small 4-year colleges throughout the Nation, and the observation that, whereas in our fathers' days a small percentage of the population went to college, in our sons' days a small percentage of the population continues on to graduate and professional degrees suggest that a changing pattern might be appropriate at Pennsylvania. Our undergraduate mission must be carried on and with increasing standards of excellence, but possibly a greater proportion of our new resources must be allocated to the work of the later undergraduate years and to the years of graduate, professional, and research activities if we are to maintain the closest match we may between our resources and the students of outstanding ability to whom their fellow citizens will look for leadership in the future. Here again the faculties and administrative officers of the university must conduct some broad and searching studies and grapple with hard human and educational problems.

Thirdly, we must make every effort to enhance our financial resources in order that the university may continue to perform its mission on a scale that is as nearly as possible commensurate with the opportunities presented by the rising generation of students.

Our present and foreseeable funds come from six sources. The first of these is the tuition paid by the students for their education. Tuition will rise in the future as in the past, but it would be regrettable if private independent education were to price itself out of the market to which able students come. The second is endowment, representing the gifts of past generations of benefactors; the current economic climate suggests this source will be of lesser proportionate significance in the generations ahead. The third source is that of individual gifts, and here friends and alumni are responding ever more generously; the University of the future will be greatly indebted to this source for its continuing growth. The fourth source is the private foundation; the older ones have well understood patterns of interest which have been of immeasurable help to education, and the newer ones are establishing their own patterns, many of which may be in accord with the University's purposes. It is unlikely, however, that these foundations will represent any considerable proportional increase in the resources with which universities may meet their future responsibilities. The fifth source, which is the business foundations and businesses themselves, represents one of the most promising factors in our future growth. Here the pattern of policy is barely emerging, but the resources are vast and the fractional support may increase manyfold without assuming a magnitude which would be of concern to the Internal Revenue Service or would raise questions of policy dominance within the universities themselves. Sixthly, one comes to Government subsidies where again considerable increases are possible within appropriate safeguards. The White House Conference on Education will probably eventually be extended to explore the Federal policy in regard to the support of higher education, and here quite new principles may ultimately emerge. At the State level, I have already indicated the well established pattern in Pennsylvania in which there is no present sign of any radical change. Finally local civic interest and support may develop as the pressure of population mounts. So long as the principles of independence are not subverted by the terms of magnitude of the support, our way should be clear.

Next year is the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. We at the University of Pennsylvania are holding an academic birthday party in his honor on the 14th of January. On this occasion we are inviting the heads of the 5 institutions, which during Franklin's lifetime honored him with degrees—Oxford, St. Andrews, Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary—to be with us and in turn to join our body of honorary alumni. The benign spirit of our founder will be very much with us on that occasion. We trust that he would be pleased with the success of the custodians of his institution in carrying out his Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania and in establishing that uniquely American institution—the independent university. He would surely be greatly heartened by the vast growth in useful learning which has marked his country during a quarter of a millenium. And we know that he would commend our confidence that the citizens of his nation and of his Commonwealth will continue to support the University of Pennsylvania in the traditions which he established.

Address by Charles H. Silver at Annual Scholarship Dinner of Yeshiva University

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address by the president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, the Hon. Charles H. Silver. This address was delivered on the occasion of the annual scholarship dinner of Yeshiva University, at which time Mr. Silver was honored with a degree of doctor of humane letters.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT THE YESHIVA UNIVERSITY DINNER, HOTEL WALDORF-ASTORIA, DECEMBER 11, 1955

In the years of my life, I have been blessed with many moments of happiness and gratitude. As I humbly thank you, Dr. Belkin, for the great honor you have done me tonight, I know that this is the happiest of all. Through you, I want to express my gratitude to our great university, but the joy and pride I feel in my heart are too vast for any words to convey.

Let me only say that I shall not wear this honor as a laurel. I shall carry it as a torch. The degree you have bestowed on me, from this school I love, is not accepted in token of a task accomplished. Rather, I shall hold it before me to blaze a path into the challenging days ahead, dedicating myself anew to the cause of Yeshiva, until I must pass this torch to other hands eager to carry it forward.

Tonight is all the more rewarding because you have granted me the privilege of sharing your accolade with a notably great American, Abe Ribicoff, the first of our faith to be named by the people of Connecticut as Governor of their sovereign State. You could not have placed me in better company. Governor, I know your heroic efforts in these days when Connecticut looks to you for leadership out of crises and disaster. We are proud that you are here * * * and I am proud to stand beside you.

This is a period of fulfillment for Yeshiva University. We have seen much of our founders' dream come true as the small academy of a few decades ago has grown into a mighty citadel of learning—a sanctuary for youth in quest of knowledge—a beacon to banish the gathering darkness and bring light to the soul and mind of man.

How fortunate we are to have been able to witness the steady development of Yeshiva and enjoy the culmination that has come within the last 12 months! The Stern College for women has become a reality through the initial gift of a half million dollars by Max Stern, vice president of our board of trustees. The Albert Ein-

stein College of Medicine, that mammoth project to promote the divine art of healing, has welcomed its first students as the only medical school to open its doors in this city since 1898 and the first medical college under Jewish auspices in America.

In my day to day work as president of the Board of Education of the City of New York, I am no stranger to the wonder that attends the birth of a new school. There is a deep sense of the sacred in creating a place where men and women may study to build a better world. It is like the planting of a tree where none grew before; the sowing of a seed in ground that never knew so rich a harvest.

You who did breathe life into Yeshiva University and sustained that life to its present maturity and distinction among the foremost schools of our age—you have wrought 1 of the 2 great miracles of our people in the 20th century. Look to the old world and you see the banner of a new land, the flag of Israel bravely flying against the threatening skies. Look to the new world and take heart to see the towers of Yeshiva soaring toward the stars.

Each day's headlines tell of fresh jeopardy to that fertile infant commonwealth which our people have carved out of the barren desert. This is a time of terrible crisis for Israel. The Communist world has boldly pushed its way into the seething politics of the Middle East. This has not been done with the diplomatic pressure we have come to regard too complacently as the cold war. I am talking about the hot muzzle of a Czech gun leveled at Israel's heart.

If there is one country in all the world which, in 7 short years of precarious existence, without fixed boundaries, with few friends around her and not a day of peace, has shown a zeal for creative effort and constructive work, that land is Israel. Like Yeshiva, she has thrived on adversity, striving, building with hands and hearts, groping toward recognition and security. Can we afford to let her down? Can the world afford to let her down?

I like to think that our people, hounded and beaten about the globe for centuries, extended little compassion and less protection by law, have survived their trials as a sword survives the flame in which it is tempered. I like to think that we have emerged at last from our endless wanderings as a people resolved to preserve its own nation and deserving of the armed assistance of every other freedom-loving people in defending our borders against attack.

If a long history of anguish and torment must leave its mark upon the Jew of today, let this be the mark it leaves: A burning ambition to find security by preserving that hard-won land where the Torah shall be our law, the man of peace our lawmaker and Almighty God our king. In this way we can realize our ancient prayers for a Zion that will be a model for all nations. In this way we can keep the faith with that Jew who died in the Brown House of Munich, who burned in the ovens of Buchenwald, who starved in the blood-stained ghettos of Poland. This, we owe—this, the world owes to the million Jews who perished as they cried the alarm while most of humanity preached appeasement or slept in false safety.

We cannot forsake them now; civilization cannot forsake them. If Israel goes down, then you and I go down—and so does honor and decency.

Israel with its proud but paltry one and a half million population faces the encircling hate of 40 million potential foes. All right, you can repeat a comforting phrase like, "One with God is a majority." You can say this tiny land is fortified by men and women that walk in the flame of their new-found freedom—and they will fight that way. But, let us not put these truths to an unequal test against the overwhelming force of Soviet tanks, jet planes and submarines. Israel merits more from mankind than reassuring words.

This is a moment of tremendous impact upon the progress of humanity and the preservation of liberty. There is more than the future of Israel at stake. "Tomorrow" is in your hands. It is not a question of who sells guns to Egypt or who sells ammunition to Israel. It is a question of how long our reputedly civilized community of nations intends to stand idly by while these merchants of death are permitted to barter and bargain for human lives anywhere under the sun.

And the human lives I speak of are not alone those of our brothers in the Middle East, but may very well be our own or our children's if we blind ourselves to the peril of this decisive hour. We must show all nations by our example here in this most blessed stronghold of man's dignity, this God-loved land of America, that the material and spiritual benefits of the democratic way of life are worth striving for wherever they are assailed. We must let the assailant know that Israel does not stand alone, and we shall not let her fight alone.

Let us leave the troubled scene where we pledge ourselves never to let triumph crumble into ruin and return to that other miracle to whose support we are also pledged. Civilization, of late, has been too busy devising means of exterminating itself to dabble extensively with intellectual or spiritual pursuits. And yet, here on our shores, the Jew continues to nourish the mind and the spirit. He succeeds—you succeed, you, Dr. Belkin, practical visionary, inspired teacher—you, Max Etra—all of you here tonight and all who have helped everywhere, and our many Christian friends, also, you succeed in the mingling of knowledge, art, science, and faith which is Yeshiva. This, too, is worth defending; this, too, is worth nourishing.

A dweller among many lands and cultures, the Jew has always been able to reach into his heart and tear forth his complaint against oppression, to fling it on the pages of a book, or on canvas or into notes of music. In the Jew there is a creative power found in few other people. From him came the scriptures and the law; of his blood are Hillel, Spinoza, Rashi, Halevi. Who can discriminate against genius? There are great books yet to come, great songs, great thoughts long awaited. The Jew's very faith is a religion of literature; our existence an endless quest for learning.

Traditional wanderer of history, the Jew has led the typical student's life on a cosmic scale. Hounded from garret to garret of the world, segregated, shunned, spurned, and misunderstood, he has gleaned a portion of the soul and spirit of every land in his endless rovings. Possessing his own inherent culture, he possesses a world's. Does travel lend wings to the artist? Who has traveled more widely than the Jew? Does suffering give tongue to the writer? Who has endured it longer than the Jew?

How tragic it is that, for so many generations, our young people have had to batter stubbornly and in vain against the closed doors of institutions of higher education. Their hands were pushed from the engineer's plumb-line, torn from the surgeon's scalpel. Ability was not enough. Money was not enough. There were other insurmountable obstacles.

Well, the world is slowly changing in this respect—and for the better. This miracle of Yeshiva, that has multiplied into so many magnificent schools in so many branches of learning is a significant part of that change. And you have made it all possible, and you will make possible even greater things to come in Yeshiva's world of tomorrow.

Like Israel, Yeshiva was brought into being not only by Jews alone and it has meaning not merely for Jews alone. Like Israel, Yeshiva is young, Yeshiva is small, but, with your help, it is growing larger and stronger with every passing day.

There is a bridge between them, between the Old World with our new country and the New World with our old love of learning living again in Yeshiva. Over this bridge, intangible, invisable, but real, must course the mighty pulsing purpose of your devotion and your solemn decision that Yeshiva is another Zion—and, like Israel, it must endure.

Let it be our prayer, in this fateful hour, that destiny shall stand sentinel over these symbols of our faith—that Yeshiva, like Israel, shall survive eternally, imperishably—citadels of mind and spirit, shrines of liberty and justice, where man may walk with God, and think and speak.

Dixon-Yates in Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Dixon-Yates in Court," which was published in the Washington Evening Star of November 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIXON-YATES IN COURT

The controversial Dixon-Yates power contract case appears headed now for its day in court. It is appropriate, perhaps, in the mixed-up background of this now-canceled contract, that there should be a judicial ruling on its settlement. The Atomic Energy Commission has decided the Government has no financial obligations—on grounds that probable violation of the conflict of interest laws made the basic agreement invalid. Spokesmen for the Dixon-Yates utility combine, the second party to the contract, have indicated they are not accepting this finding and that they are going to court in pursuit of the settlement costs.

Actually, the several million dollars involved are not particularly important and a court's determination of who is to bear this expense will not be the last word on this ill-starred venture. It was, from the beginning, an unusual arrangement. As the contracting agency, the AEC arranged with the Dixon-Yates company to build a new plant in Arkansas for supplying power to Memphis, Tenn.—this power compensating for electrical energy which the Tennessee Valley Authority would supply to the AEC. Certain technical details of the contract were worked out by Adolphe H. Wenzell, special consultant to the Budget Director, on leave from his association with First Boston Corp., an investment banking firm. Later, after Mr. Wenzell had severed all relations with the First Boston, the investment concern emerged as financial agent for the Dixon-Yates enterprise. Unfortunately, despite a "full disclosure" of the background of the case by the Budget Bureau, Mr. Wenzell's role was not revealed until a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee investigated circumstances of the contract. Meanwhile, the city of Memphis had decided to build its own plant and the contract was canceled.

It is easy, in a partisan political atmosphere, to read sinister implications into this

background. Public power proponents considered it an effort to undermine the TVA. Democratic spokesmen are charging now that the deal was a "fraud." It is unlikely that the courts will make such a finding, or that they need to in ruling on liability for the contract settlement. It is clear, however, that the Government agencies involved were either naive or injudicious in their whole labored approach—including the use of Mr. Wenzell—to the problem of adding to the power supply of the area affected. Chairman KEFAUVER of the Senate subcommittee, who has more than one reason for being interested in the matter, is calling some of the principals before his group this week. They should not be surprised to hear more about it during the 1956 campaign.

Water Resource Development on the National Scale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Where We Stand" delivered by Maj. Gen. Charles G. Holle, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, before the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, at New Orleans, La., on December 1, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE WE STAND

(Remarks by Maj. Gen. Chas. G. Holle, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Construction, before the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, New Orleans, La., December 1, 1955)

An annual meeting is a time for taking stock, reviewing the past, trying to look into the future; in short, taking a look at "where we stand." Each of the several speakers at the meeting will undoubtedly address the subject from the viewpoint of his particular field of interest. The Members of Congress from their vantage point in the Congress; General Hardin, following the usual custom, will make an annual report as president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division. I propose to offer you some observations on water-resource development on the national scale, based on how it looks to us in the Office of the Chief of Engineers.

First, a few remarks about the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. As my jobs and assignments, and field inspection trips, have taken me to a number of civil-works projects in different parts of the country—I naturally, in my own mind, make comparisons. I have observed that the projects which advance faster, more uniformly and orderly and effectively are those supported by strong, well organized, voluntary, nongovernmental organizations such as this one. In my opinion, the people of the lower Mississippi Valley are greatly indebted to this association, its founders and members during the years who have so wisely fostered and furthered its successful continuation, and the association merits recognition and appreciation of that public service.

In publicly praising the association I include not only the members and officers but especially the series of able executive vice presidents—Fred Benecke, Bobby Crawford, and your present one, Bruce Tucker.

The coordinating part played by this association in the development and furtherance of the lower valley programs has become a pattern and guide in other areas. The principles of comprehensive, cooperative, and integrated water-resource development formulated here in the valley have been a sustaining force nationwide during years of ups and downs in the fortunes of water resources.

You will recall General Sturgis' discussion last year of the difficulties which beset all of those interested in water-resource development during the years following World War II. The strained international situation demanded our attention. The costs of the cold war and national defense and foreign aid have been tremendous. Naturally, there was constant hope and effort toward reduction of Federal expenditures, balancing the budget, and reduction of taxes. In the circumstances, the important development of water resources lagged. You may remember the statistics General Sturgis cited: a backlog of $400 million of civil-works projects in 1927 as compared to a current backlog of $8½ billion. Fortunately, the trend has changed.

Among the events of the past year has been a nationwide reawakening to the reality that the use and control of water are vital to our lives and livelihoods. The Congress, led by those farsighted members who have always advocated development of water resources, has responded to that demand and urgent need.

For the first time in 6 years the appropriation for the Mississippi River and tributaries project went up instead of down; the $52 million appropriation for fiscal year 1956 was 14 percent higher than the $45 million appropriation for the previous year. Since last year's meeting the Congress has appropriated funds for and has authorized the start of, or resumption of work on, 102 civil works projects of the Corps of Engineers. Work has begun on the Old River control structures, and provision was made for the commencement of work on the Reelfoot Lake area and Atchafalaya River dredging, and resumption of work on the Big Sunflower and Yazoo tributaries. Figuratively, we can now see some sunshine through the clouds, both regionally and nationally.

In the Northeast—in recent months—in an area paralleling the coast, in the States of Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts, we have had two grim demonstrations of the need for flood control. In August, Hurricane Diane dumped rains of unprecedented volume and intensity on the narrow river valleys. The resulting high stages and high velocities did tremendous damage. In October, while the people of the area were still staggering from that blow, another hurricane-borne rain brought new floods. The amount of direct damage still has not been accurately estimated, but the floods caused a loss of life of close to 200 persons, and caused untold loss and suffering in wrecked homes, lost jobs, and disrupted business, and wrought serious dislocations in the economy of the region. Perhaps a description of the disasters of flood are unnecessary and even inappropriate before a group of the Mississippi Valley, but those of you who have seen pictures of the New England floods will appreciate the vastness of the damage caused by the velocity of the water. They didn't just get wet—structures were demolished and literally washed away by the current.

The 1927 Mississippi flood is almost 30 years in the past and incomplete flood-control works protected the valley in the '37, '45, and '50 high waters of the Mississippi but you dare not relax your vigilance. I trust that my 4 years in New Orleans gives me some license to comment on the destructiveness of floods and to decry complacency.

Of course, in the August and October floods of the Northeast there was prompt response from many sources and the immediate and urgent needs for food, medicine, clothing, and shelter were promptly taken care of. The need for replacement of bridges over relatively narrow streams to restore communications, especially for fire protection, and access to hospitals and similar essential resources, was promptly met by the Army through the supply of portable Bailey bridges from Corps of Engineer depots and installed by Regular Army, National Guard, or Corps of Engineers personnel or contractors. In addition, a relatively new type of assistance came into action through the application of Public Law 875, on a more extensive scale than ever before required. That law provides for the establishment of the Federal Civil Defense Administration and authorizes Federal action, in cases of disaster, for the removal of debris which is hazardous to life and public welfare, and for the temporary repair or restoration of publicly owned essential facilities. Pursuant to the recommendation of the Federal Civil Defense Administration the Corps of Engineers was charged with the accomplishment of that Federal mission in the Northeast-New England flood area.

However, all of those emergency relief actions did not and could not restore loved ones who perished, homes that were swept away, nor businesses that were ruined. And now there is much talk of flood insurance to partially reimburse those who must undergo the tragedy of loss of life and property by floods. As commendable as that thought may be, money cannot compensate for loss of life, wretchedness, and heartbreak; and although individuals can be reimbursed, the overall economic loss is not eliminated. The most effective flood insurance is flood-control structures completed and in operation to control the floods.

The lessons in preparedness taught by this year's floods have had considerable impact in many areas where the residents have not always been persuaded of the value and urgency of extensive flood-control programs. The experiences in the Northeast and New England this summer have convinced many a doubter, and we now find—as we do after every great flood—that some of those who were most skeptical and obstructive are now among those who are shouting loudest for action.

But even so, before these floods, there was an increasing concern over water resources throughout the country. The 102 new starts or resumptions of projects provided by the Congress in its appropriations to the Corps of Engineers last July is a manifestation of the conviction that urgently needed work has been too long put off, and that determined efforts must be made to regain lost ground. Because of this determination and effort, the past year or so has seen a number of long-deferred and badly needed developments pushed vigorously into the construction stage. They include the St. Lawrence seaway, the modern Calumet-Sag Channel linking the Mississippi River system with the Great Lakes, and the long-postponed modernization of the Ohio and Warrior River Waterways—all great developments which will have direct and far-reaching effects upon the welfare of this region, even though they lie outside the limits of the alluvial valley.

Looking beyond work underway, we find recommendations for enlarging the connecting channels between the Great Lakes, and for constructing the Mississippi River Gulf Outlet—the so-called Tidewater Channel—conceived and supported by the late Lester Alexander. Both of these proposals have been submitted to the Congres, where it is expected they will receive attention early in the next session.

We in the Corps of Engineers view these events as manifestations of a general awakening of the public to the significance of our water resources. We earnestly hope that this interest or concern is not transitory but rather is rooted deeply in the public consciousness. This national reaction logically results from basic national needs which have been accumulating ever since the war. For a time, these needs have been obscured by postwar excitements and a series of international crises. But it would appear now that the American people have had more opportunity to take stock of our domestic situation, and they have found few problems more critical than those of our water resources.

There are a number of other manifestations of a renaissance in water resources development. For example, during the past 7 or 8 years there have been at least that many high-level surveys of national water problems, and each study has resulted in the conclusion that there is serious need of stepped-up construction to meet growing water needs. The President of the United States within the past year has appointed two different commissions to study Federal water policies and programs, in addition to the Hoover Commission which has considered water topics prominently in its study of the organization of the executive branch of the Government. These studies both reflect and contribute to the general public awareness of the importance of water resources and development programs.

Concurrently, the irristible pressure of the Nation's accelerating growth is driving home the same lesson of the importance of water resources. Municipalities are reaching farther and farther, and sometimes coming into conflict with one another, in their search for water supplies. Some of our foremost industrial regions are discovering that their future growth is threatened by the lack of an expansible supply of industrial water. Pollution of one kind or another is increasingly impairing the usefulness of whole rivers for both domestic and recreational purposes. These problems have arisen as local problems, and for a long time the people looked only for local solutions. Now they are coming to realize that local water-related problems have become so general, widespread, and interlocking that they have grown into truly national problems—problems bearing with increasing urgency upon their own towns, jobs, and livelihoods.

Meanwhile, we have become more aware of the enormous benefits that ensue from water-resources development, and of the great potentialities offered by such regions as the lower Mississippi Valley—potentialities which can be fully realized only with well-conceived river-development programs. We have seen how the gulf coast and the Pacific Northwest boomed and flourished with the construction of water-resource programs properly designed to utilize the water-related advantages of each region—navigation on the gulf—power and irrigation in the Northwest. There is general appreciation of the contributions of those regions to national strength for defense and national prosperity for peace. We know that as the Nation's population grows and its responsibilities increase, we will need more creative and productive developments of the same sort. We know that in regions like this valley, great opportunities are still untapped, awaiting only adequate development and use of water resources to make them available to American enterprise; and we must realize that such development is not just a regional desire, but a national need.

In many respects, river-development work has proceeded both farther and faster in the lower Mississippi region than in any other basin. Dollarwise the authorized MR & T project has passed the two-thirds mark; no other river-basin program has yet reached the half-way mark. It is true that the flood-control system is not yet finished, and it is only through hard work and the unpredictable favor of fortune that such flood stages as have so far occurred have been within the capacity of uncompleted works. Nevertheless, the fact of not having suffered a disastrous flood since 1927, and the knowledge that flood-control construction is proceeding at a steady if not spectacular rate, are most reassuring to prospective investors in the Mississippi Valley.

The growth of the inland-waterway system and completion of the Calumet-Sag, Ohio, and Missouri River and other waterways will multiply the water-transportation advantages of this area. And sharing in importance with flood protection and navigation are the many industrial sites with an abundant supply of fresh water. This latter resource is becoming more important each year. For example some authorities have predicted that by 1975 American industry will require more than twice as much water as it now uses; that in the 10 largest water-using States it will be difficult (and in some cases impossible) to economically double the present rate of water withdrawal; and that in years to come, water supply will be perhaps the most important single factor in determining the locations of industrial plants.

Thus, it is apparent that the lower Mississippi River Valley is in as good as, or better, position today than at any time in the past to develop its potentialities and expand its economy. The faster the river work can be accomplished, the stronger become the inducements to enterprise; and the more enterprise attracted to the valley, the greater will be the justification for still more acceleration of the river work.

However, a review of the past will demonstrate that the fortunes of flood control and other waterway improvement in this valley are directly related to the national attitude on water resources development. A strong, nationwide resurgence of interest in water resources, such as we are experiencing today, provides by far the best atmosphere for the advancement of regional prospects and programs. Hence, it is the best form of self-interest to cooperate with the people of other American river valleys in helping to shape and to advance our national water-resource programs as a whole. We may be confident of continued progress if we work together in the future as we have in the past.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in expressing the sadness of this House on the passing of Representative VERA BUCHANAN. The House has lost an able and distinguished Member, and we have lost a vivacious and winsome friend.

VERA BUCHANAN succeeded her husband, Representative Frank Buchanan, who had served long in this House with marked ability. She soon made her own place in this body and her devotion to the interests of her constituents and to the public welfare twice won her reelection.

No matter how heavy the duties became, she never lost the pleasantness and genuine sweetness of character which she brought to all her relationships. Her untimely passing is the greater sorrow to those of us who knew her for the reason that she herself was so vital, so full of the goodness of life. She truly made an art of friendship and all those here who knew her are the better for it.

In our own loss of a useful Member and friend, we extend condolences to her family to whom she gave much love and to her constituents to whom she rendered great service.

I believe it will be appropriate to quote here the lines of Henrietta Huxley:

"Be not afraid, ye waiting hearts that weep,
For God still 'giveth his beloved sleep',
And if an endless sleep He wills, so best."

Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Call to Liberalism," written by David Lawrence and published in the January 13, 1956, issue of U. S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL TO LIBERALISM
(By David Lawrence)

Liberalism has been undergoing a steady erosion. The so-called liberalism of today is a philosophy of coercionism in conflict with the spirit and letter of the Constitution. It is not true liberalism.

Time was when liberalism meant freedom from excessive government—freedom from encroachment upon the rights of the people.

Time was when the 10th amendment to the Constitution was as sacred as any other provision of the Bill of Rights about which we hear so much from today's liberals. This amendment says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Control of education, of course, was one of the powers reserved to the States and to the people. No power of the Federal judiciary has until recently been exercised to set forth standards of education or to examine and rule upon the psychological influences that may or may not prevail in the classroom.

Today the Supreme Court has proclaimed that the Federal judiciary has the right to determine who shall or shall not attend public schools. This disregards the wishes of the States as expressed in their laws and respective constitutions. It is a short step now to the selection of teachers and to the designation of a curriculum by Federal authority.

Today's liberal acquiesces in this usurpation of Federal power.

Control of employment has hitherto been a right reserved to the people—the right of the individual to work or to refrain from working, and the right of the employer to hire or to refrain from hiring. Neither the States nor the Federal Government were ever given the right to interfere with the freedom of individuals to contract for goods or services.

The Federal Government, under the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, has undertaken to supervise the operations of labor unions and management where the employer-employee relationship is involved. No such power was ever delegated to Government, Federal or State, by the Constitution. It is plain usurpation.

Today the liberal enthusiastically champions these enlargements of govermental authority over the people.

Discrimination in economic opportunity because of race or creed or color is a shameful thing anywhere—but nothing in the Constitution grants the Federal Government or the States the power to punish employers or union officials who practice such discrimination. If the people want to abolish discrimination—economic or social—and desire to legislate morals, why not let the people adopt a constitutional provision to accomplish such a purpose? The 18th amendment legislated on morals, but at least it was written into and taken out of the Constitution by the methods specified in the Constitution itself.

Today, without the slightest shred of constitutional power, a Presidential commission coerces employers by threatening to deprive them of their right to contract with the Federal Government unless they obey its decrees on who shall or shall not be employed. This is a usurpation of power.

Granted that these objectives are desirable, shall they be achieved by usurpation? Do we really believe any more in that clause of the Constitution which prescribes the proper way to amend the Constitution, or do we believe that nine Justices may rewrite the Constitution as they please?

It was Thomas Jefferson, the greatest of the true liberals of America, who first inveighed against the power of the judiciary to emasculate the Constitution. He complained that the judges could make the Constitution "a mere thing of wax" which they "may twist and shape into any form they please."

It was Thomas Jefferson who first protested against the centralized state.

Today's liberal believes in the mastery of the State. He wants the Government to own public-power enterprises and believes that the Federal Government is authorized to own or control every line of business.

True liberalism must be revived in America. It means a government of laws under a written constitution—not a government by the caprice of men who temporarily hold public office.

True liberalism is today being ignored by so-called liberals who by their tactics are involuntarily enlarging the forces of reaction and stimulating extremist groups of the right which are as unprincipled as those of the left.

There is only one course for the true liberal—to oppose the ideology of those who, in the name of emergency, expediency, convenience, or profit, would forsake both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

For it is the written Constitution—the whole of it and not just a few selected provisions—which we as citizens take an oath of allegiance to preserve, protect, and defend.

Revise Polish History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader-Evening News on January 5, 1956, in which the paper comments on the current program of the Communist regime in Poland of preparing the history of Poland from the Marxist viewpoint:

REVISE POLISH HISTORY

One of the goals of the Communist regime in Poland is to transform the ideas of the Polish people concerning their history and culture. The attitude of the Polish people toward their past is considered by the Communists as obsolete and bourgeois-inspired, and they seek to impose their own opinion on the people. For the last 10 years, the Communist regime spared no efforts to attain that goal. But all its exertions have had little effect.

Now the regime is printing a large History of Poland, consisting of several volumes and prepared from the Marxist point of view. The publication is to become the basis for all future monographies and fragmentary compositions on the history of Poland. It is to be based on the history prepared in Russia by Soviet scholars. The first volume of the publication, which will have 1,200 pages, is still being examined by the censors.

The Warsaw daily, "Trybuna Ludu," main organ of the Communist Party in Poland, announced the publication, saying in part: "The closing of the work on the first volume of the 'History of Poland' conducted for the past 3 years by a group of outstanding Polish historians is an important event in our world of science. It is the first stage in a broad work on a synthesis of Poland's history, a publication 'The History of Poland,' which will have about 4,000 pages. The work is scheduled to be finished during the next 5 years."

The daily adds that "The aim of the authors of 'The History of Poland' is to carry out the first Marxist analysis of our history and to purge the teaching of Polish history of all those mistakes, concealments and even frequent lies with which it has been burdened by bourgeois historians."

Everything is clear. The publication is aimed at distorting the history of Poland in accordance wtih pseudo-scientific Marxist theses. There is little likelihood that it will change the attitude of the people toward their past.

The Sorry Cyprus Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT P. MORANO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a very fine article which appeared in the current Time magazine entitled "Too Much Death."

This article dramatically points up the tragic situation in Cyprus, a situation which calls for settlement before it erupts into a major trouble spot. It is becoming more and more evident that United Nations action is called for in this dispute between the Cypriots and the British. The longer such action is deferred, the longer communism has a perfect situation for exploitation.

From authoritative sources which in the past have been utterly reliable I learn of one error in this otherwise accurate article. The EOKA described by the writer as a "Communist terror group" is, according to my information actually a nationalist patriotic group which is opposed to communism.

The Cyprus situation has been smoldering for some time. Further delay in effecting a just solution is certain to result in an explosion that will rock the foundation of the free world's peace effort. Further delay but fosters increased disunity among our friends, to the utter delight of our enemies.

I have introduced two concurrent resolutions—House Concurrent Resolution 26, January 6, 1955, and House Concurrent Resolution 100 on March 24, 1955—dealing with the Cyprus situation. Both ask for immediate exploration of ways and means to bring to the beleaguered Cypriots the principles of self-determination advocated by the United Nations.

The Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts has introduced and the House has passed House Concurrent Resolution 149 calling for United States support and influence in behalf of peoples desiring to achieve self-determination or independence.

The time for action is now.

The article from Time magazine follows:

TOO MUCH DEATH

It is dark at last in the Kyrenia Mountains of Cyprus and the British commando officer has no appetite for the task he must now perform. He assembles his squad for a patrol, but his mind is on another night like this, 14 years ago. Then he was the hunted, a fugitive from the Nazis who had poured into Greece. Three young Greeks sheltered him, then carried him in a tiny caique away from Greece to safety. Now the officer is the hunter, and it is time to hunt down Greeks as brave and as passionate for freedom as those who saved his life. "Things have certainly changed," the officer sighs. He slaps a clip into his Sten gun and orders his men forward.

It is time for divine services in the small Protestant church in Nicosia. Sir John Harding, a brave soldier and brilliant commander has fought two wars, led whole armies—including thousands of Cypriots who fought in British uniforms. But he dares not worship alone. A squad of British soldiers precedes him and examines the altar, the Bible, the pews, and chancel for planted explosives. Harding arrives in a bulletproof sedan. Armored cars bristle outside as Sir John, Governor General of the Crown Colony of Cyprus is at his devotions.

The authorities have at last found the Cypriot whose paintbrush adorned a wall with a slogan offensive to the governor. Such scenes at police headquarters suggest a boys' game gone terribly wrong—the young, pink-faced British soldier looks almost as scared as the culprit he drags in, squirming and nauseated with fear. This criminal is a schoolboy of 14; the message he painted was, "Harding come down from your helicopter." The punishment for the boy's crime: 3 months in prison.

A handsome British major of 34 is decorated with the coveted George Medal for his bravery in breaking up an ambush of terrorists. But Major Brian Coombe has killed a man and he is not proud. "My driver was killed by one of them and it was my duty to bring to justice the people who murdered him," he says softly. "As a result, one frightened, pathetic young Cypriot was

killed. It is tragic. The Cypriots now are acclaiming the dead man as their hero, and the British press is acclaiming me as theirs. You may think I am talking like a grandmother, but there is far too much hatred here. There is already too much death, pain, and tears in Cyprus."

History may place the death, pain, and tears as but passing stages in the 20th century's long funeral procession of British colonialism. There came Ireland, India, Palestine, Kenya, Malaya, and now Cyprus. But the special tragedy of Cyprus is that it involves friends, and that the suffering should be so simply avoidable. A clear statement from the British Government promising the right of self-determination at a definite time in the near future to Cyprus' 520,000 people could halt overnight a conflict that daily grows more violent and more dangerous. Week by week it becomes more apparent that Britain's release of control of Cyprus to its inhabitants is not only the just solution, but the inevitable one. "One wonders," wrote the conservative London Daily Telegraph's Cyprus correspondent last week, "if we have not arrived at a point of no return."

TURNING BACK THE MEDALS

For a century, the partnership of Britain and Greece was one of history's warmest. By last week, hatred for the British was the chief preoccupation among Greeks. In many cities and villages, streets once named in gratitude for Winston Churchill were being renamed. Scores of Greeks decorated for valor with British forces in the war have recently sent back their medals to the British Embassy in Athens.

It was not always thus. Modern Greece was born to the accompaniment of Lord Byron's odes against the hated Turks. British diplomats gathered gratitude by helping Greece get back the Ionian Islands and Corfu. Gladstone hoped before he died (in 1898) to see Cyprus and Greece joined in enosis (union), and early in the century a political comer named Winston Churchill eloquently reminded Cypriots of their destiny to be joined with Greece. For a time, early in World War I, Britain dangled the promise of Cyprus as an inducement for Greece's entry on the side of the Allies. Said one of Cyprus' governors, the late Sir Ronald Storrs: "The Greekness of Cypriots is * * * indisputable. No sensible person will deny that the Cypriot is Greek-speaking, Greek-thinking, Greek-feeling, Greek."

Sixteen months ago, Britain's Minister of State for Colonial Affairs Henry Hopkinson used a word that British diplomats are said never to use. His word for enosis was "Never." Fortnight ago Hopkinson passed on to his reward: he was promoted to the House of Lords and ceased to be Minister. To the patriotism of Cypriots and the passion of Greeks, his indiscretion was a signal that diplomatic pleading would not be enough. At the front of the Cypriot agitation appeared the youthful face of black-bearded Makarios III, who studied theology at Boston University and at 42 is spiritual and temporal leader—the Archbishop and Ethnarch of Cyprus—to the island's overwhelmingly (80 percent) Greek population. A small but dangerous Communist terror group, the EOKA joined in. Lean and warwise Sir John Harding found Makarios a tough man to deal with, but he has also found him the man to deal with.

A TWOFOLD CASE

The British case for holding on in Cyprus is twofold.

First, it is strategic. Since abandoning the Suez Canal, Britain has made Cyprus its Middle East command post, has begun building a massive base at the bay of Episkopi. It maintains that loss of Cyprus as a base would endanger not only British but NATO defense. The Greeks have publicly promised that in return for self-determination and enosis, the British can get ironclad terms for staying in their Cyprus military installations.

Second, it is concerned for Cyprus' Turkish minority (about 93,600 people) and for Cyprus' proximity to Turkey. Any settlement would have to guarantee the Cyprus Turks their rights. The hatred that divided Greeks and Turks during the time of the Ottomans and the terrors of the early 1920's was in recent years subdued by their working partnership in NATO and the Balkan Pact. The Cyprus issue has uncovered old scars.

Slowly, too slowly to win any credit for good will, the British have begun beating a retreat. Archbishop Makarios made known that he would be happy to settle for an unconditional British pledge of self-determination and prompt steps toward arranging it; enosis, if that is the will of the people, would come later. After much gulping and shooting of cuffs, Sir Anthony Eden's government took back Henry Hopkinson's never, and 3 weeks ago accepted Cyprus' right to self-determination—but still would not say when. The United States, ally and friend of all three nations involved, thought it expedient not to say in public what the State Department believes in private—that the British must give in on self-determination.

In Athens for a visit, an old soldier with profound experience in that part of the world felt impelled to warn that Britain's "when" had better come very soon. Retired United States General James Van Fleet, who organized the Greeks' victory over the Communists in 1947–49, was alarmed by United States policy of "adhering to antiquated British-French colonial policies * * * instead of taking an independent, clear-cut road, consistent with our own statements and principles." The United States, said Van Fleet, had hurt itself seriously in Greece by appearing to support Britain and the status quo on Cyprus. Soldier Van Fleet saw no hope for a British policy of rule by force. No military base, no matter how powerful or well guarded, said he, is of much use if it stands "as an island surrounded by a hostile sea."

This Year and Years To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled, "This Year and Years To Come," which was published in the Evening Herald of Rock Hill, S. C., dated January 4, 1956. The Evening Herald is one of our prominent daily newspapers, and is ably edited.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS YEAR AND YEARS TO COME

As we start this new year, two statements are being repeated in a number of ways:

Russia and world communism have been gaining;

America and the free nations of the world have been slipping.

So, many Americans, like people in other free nations and probably like people in nations under Communist dictatorship, are asking questions about the future which reflect worry and even fear:

What will Russia do next? And after that?

What will world communism do this year and in the years to follow?

And it is after such questions that we ask ourselves,

What can we do to try to stop the Russians? To try to block communism's long-term program to take over the whole world?

Such thinking is wrong. All wrong.

For example, look at a football game. Which team wins, the one that just plays a defense, or the one that carries the ball?

To win, your team has to get the ball across the goal line. Carry it. Pass it. Kick it. But hold on to the ball, advance, keep the other team on the defensive.

Part of last year, we carried the ball against the Russians. That was done by President Eisenhower's address to the United Nations—by President Eisenhower taking the top position of world leadership at the first Geneva meeting, the meeting of heads of nations.

Then Russia got the ball. Maybe we fumbled.

We can recover.

We are still the stronger team.

We are stronger in our moral position. (Although we have been weaker in our propaganda about it.) Stronger in the honesty of our desire for peace in the world. Stronger in combination with the other free nations in industry, in the initiative of freemen.

Stronger because we want for human beings around the whole world those freedoms which their instincts cry for.

Let's carry the ball again. Carry it this year. Plan to carry it for many long years to come; for that is the only way we can expect our way to win.

President Eisenhower, we hope, is regaining the strength to reenter the struggle. Meanwhile, we of the American people can encourage others of our team to really carry the ball.

We can encourage the men in our Government. Those in the executive branch. And particularly those in the Congress. For us South Carolinians, that means Senators JOHNSTON and THURMOND. For us in the Fifth District, it means Representative RICHARDS in his highly important position of chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Above all, we can ourselves start thinking, and talking, constructively instead of defensively. For what is thought and talked by the people across the United States in time determines not only the talking and thinking in Washington but also the actions of our Government throughout the world.

We can win the long struggle for a free world.

We must win.

Science Lag Cited in Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written by governmental officials, educators, and industrial leaders of the vital and necessary part that science has played and will play in the progress and wellbeing of this great country of ours.

There is no question in my mind that were it not for the invaluable contributions made by our scientists, especially in the military field, we would find ourselves in a very percarious position.

With that thought in mind, I would like to call your attention to an article which recently appeared in the New York Times of January 8, 1955, which stated "that the State Department's science program, launched on an ambitious scale 5½ years ago, appears to have collapsed."

This program was designed to provide information and assistance, both inside the Government and to science in general, and scientists were also appointed as attaches to our embassies abroad in order to assist friendly countries.

The embassy personnel, it has been said, "dispelled any suspicion of being espionage agents and had been the only representatives with access to influential foreign scientists."

This latter point should be well considered. We most certainly do not live in vacuums or ivory towers. We have friends, and we need more friends abroad. Coordination in the field of science among friendly nations is a must. Let us not permit this vital program to go down the drain. It should be continued. An explanation by the State Department for its termination is most definitely in order.

The New York Times article follows:

SCIENCE LAG CITED IN FOREIGN POLICY—STATE DEPARTMENT ACCUSED BY CHEMIST UNIT OF LETTING TECHNICAL OFFICE COLLAPSE

WASHINGTON, January 8.—The American Chemical Society asserted today that "the State Department's science program, launched on an ambitious scale 5½ years ago, appears to have collapsed."

The chemists said the Department's scientific corps "has deteriorated to the point where it will have no representatives overseas after January 15, and no scientists in the home office."

They noted that the post of Science Adviser in Washington had been vacant since Joseph B. Koepfli, an organic chemist, left in January 1954, and his deputy, James W. Joyce, a geophysicist, departed 6 months later.

A career departmental economist, Walter M. Rudolph, now carries on the work with two secretaries, but "has done an outstanding job of keeping the office going," the chemists added.

ENORMOUS WASTE FEARED

The society's comments were based on a report in its weekly Chemical and Engineering News. This reported both the United States and other countries had benefited from the science corps. Former State Department scientists were quoted as saying in mystification that "to let the science function die now would be next to criminal and an enormous waste" of time and money.

As one example of gains, the report cited an agreement worked out by Walter W. Greulich, as scientific attaché in Bonn, on recruiting German scientists for work in the United States for industry and Government. Mr. Greulich also warned against danger to the West of losing the rapidly recovering German scientific resources.

Citing congressional approval for both State and Navy Department science work abroad, the report suggested that "if money is the problem, it stems from within the Department." The State Department, it added, "hasn't made up its mind about what kind of pattern it wants, if any."

The Science Office, the report said, started after recommendations by the State Department's International Science Steering Committee under Lloyd V. Berkner in 1949. This had followed experience in disseminating wartime developments and problems in coordinating science in Government, as well as success of the Department's London office on science and technology, taken over from the Commerce Department in 1946.

PROFESSIONAL AID URGED

A departmental reorganization task force had reported foreign policy being handled "without adequate scientific evaluation," and had called for "top policy consideration and the aid of professional scientific judgment."

The Science Office was set up at the policy level, with the science adviser ranking as a special assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Administration. His task has been to provide information and assistance both inside the Government and to science in general, on occasion representing the Department in scientific meetings. Scientists were also appointed as attachés to embassies.

Since the Berkner recommendations, 19 scientists have served as embassy attachés in London, Stockholm, Bern, Bonn, Paris, and Tokyo. The peak was 10 in 5 European embassies in the summer of 1952. Last year there were four. By next Sunday, all will have returned without replacements named, the chemists' report said.

The report terms lack of a scientist in the Science Office "harmful." Curtailment of the attachés was described as regarded by foreigners as "a slap at their science" and an indication that "Americans are vacillating and unreliable."

The former attachés were quoted as contending they had dispelled any suspicion of being "espionage agents," and had been the only officers with "access to influential foreign scientists." They were reported alarmed by a Hoover Commission recommendation that science attachés be put under the Central Intelligence Agency.

Address by Mr. Justice Samuel H. Hofstadter, of New York, Before the New York City Association of the Bar on November 22, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Mr. Justice Samuel H. Hofstadter, of New York, before the New York City Association of the Bar on November 22, 1955. Judge Hofstadter is one of our ablest jurists and a distinguished legal scholar:

Edmund Burke, warning Britain of the qualities which made the Colonies dangerous, listed among them their love of the legal profession. The admonition seems well taken when we consider how many of the Founding Fathers were lawyers. The love held by the legal profession for liberty is equally notable. It is altogether fitting, therefore, that we, as lawyers, should concern ourselves greatly with these matters.

There are many thoughtful men and women who differ about the fifth amendment and an immunity act. But they are not as vocal as the extremists whose raucous recriminations obscure their real purposes. The radicals of the right deride the fifth amendment; and their opposite numbers of the left repel an immunity act. Both exploit our national dilemma. Both use the same words to express contradictory ideas to suit opposite ends, calculated to hide the same ultimate purpose—to destroy the American ideal.

The man of good will, however, perceives that one of the most urgent problems of our time arises from the apparent contradiction between two of our most pressing needs—the need to maintain a level of security adequate to our present dangerous situation, and the need to protect individual rights essential to our ordered society.

With the passage of the Immunity Act of 1954, there is reason to hope that the competing claims of public good and private right have been synthesized. The act contains important safeguards which protect both the witness and the Government from ill-considered use of its provisions. It deals with inquiries involving the national security. A witness compelled to testify after having claimed his privilege, may not be prosecuted in regard to any transaction about which he testified; nor may his testimony be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding against him in any court. This immunity is as broad as the privilege; it satisfies the test of validity established by the courts.

Under the act the compulsion of the witness and his immunity must be grounded on a direction by a United States district court, after compliance with a prescribed procedure. If the proceeding is before a congressional committee, the grant of immunity must first have been authorized affirmatively by the vote of two-thirds of the full committee. The Attorney General must have been notified and the court's direction given only after hearing the Attorney General. In court and grand jury proceedings the application for the direction must be made by the United States attorney in charge, upon the approval of the Attorney General.

The act will enable the Government to secure the testimony of those who now hold back, whether they be those willing to talk but genuinely apprehensive of prosecution, those reluctant because perplexed, or those who are definitely recalcitrant. The first two groups should be encourged; the third group compelled to disclose facts requisite to the national welfare.

The act, too, steers a sensible middle course between the extremes espoused by the doctrinaires on both sides: those who, fearful of any erosion of the privilege as a peril to liberty or resentful of the excesses of certain investigating committees, equate the privilege with the right to remain silent, even in the absence of self-incrimination; and those who, incensed by the abuse of the privilege, would abolish it altogether.

Contrary to general assumption, the privilege, though found in the Bill of Rights, is of comparatively recent origin in the development of Anglo-American law. In terms the clause speaks only of self-incrimination in any criminal case; but by decision the privilege is held applicable to civil cases and to virtually every form of official inquiry. It embraces not alone testimony directly incriminatory, but also that forming a link through which guilt of crime may be established. The witness himself is the judge, free to withhold testimony which he in good faith believes may pave the way to possible prosecution.

Broad as the privilege is, it is not unlimited. Traditionally and historically the privilege has always been personal to the witness. He may not invoke it to shield others from punishment. It does not protect from unpleasant consequences to the witness or to others. Unless the testimony may tend to incriminate the witness, the right of the public to know is paramount to his preference for silence.

In theory the privilege runs counter to the duty everyone owes society to give testimony of any facts known to him, and its exercise may hamper search for needed facts. This conflict between the public interest and private right has always been resolved by the enactment of immunity laws. These laws follow a general pattern; the compulsion to testify accompanied by a grant of immunity from prosecution. Immunity has

been made available to witnesses testifying to violations of almost every Federal regulatory statute. The States, too, have many immunity laws. The privilege has not thereby lost any of its vitality. For what the fifth amendment protects is non-self-incrimination, not silence.

The principle of the right to avoid compulsory self-incrimination has not been accepted without reservation.

Legal philosophers and scholars contest not only its intrinsic validity but its pragmatic justification. Cardozo, speaking for the Court, boldly observes that though it may have value, it is "not of the very essence of a scheme of ordered liberty." It is noteworthy that the bench in this case included Justices Hughes, Stone, Brandeis, Roberts and Black; Mr. Justice Butler dissented.

On the other hand, the Supreme Court has called the privilege "a wise and beneficent rule of evidence" and the New York Court of Appeals has said: "While the guilty may use the privilege as a shield it may be the main protection of the innocent."

It is incongruous that some lovers of liberty have condoned interposing the bar against self-incrimination, not for its intrinsic purpose of self protection but as a makeshift shield against the excesses of certain investigating committees. It is questionable from a moral point of view; it is of doubtful expedience; it is intellectually inadmissible. Such a course tends to pervert "due process"—to vitiate its force and disparage its significance. Correct procedure must be underlined; it is expedient as well as valid to do so.

The essence of "due process" is the legal imperative, based on a moral one, that good ends must be secured only by good means—desirable results by honest expedients, otherwise the means contaminate the ends. The thesis that the end justifies any means is rejected by all right-thinking men. Though disguised as the friend of freedom, or security, or piety, it is hostile to them all; it is a philosophy implemented only by authoritarian techniques.

The fifth amendment is too important to be improperly used; any use for which it was not intended is an abuse. It is a great constitutional canon forged as a shield of protection, and it must not be inverted. It is a "barrier between the obligation to give evidence and the injustice of inquisition;" "a protection to the innocent though a shelter to the guilty." For the innocent or guilty—the intention is to afford a refuge against oppression in any form or degree.

Generally speaking, I would divide those who are affected by the privilege into six groups. At one extreme are the innocent; at the other, the guilty; there are those who are probably innocent but may be implicated—they, themselves, are not always sure—and conversely, those who are probably guilty, but honestly or otherwise claim innocence. Then there are those who unwittingly or thoughtlessly lent their names or money, if not themselves to doubtful causes. There is a sixth category—probably it was the most important if not preponderant, when the privilege originated in Puritan England—those who infringed against laws which public conscience condemned as odious or mischievous or even downright evil.

Doubtless at some time the privilege was more in use by the innocent and at other times more so by the implicated. Very likely—at least in the beginning—in England it was invoked more frequently by the innocent; in our own courts, I would hazard the guess that it has more frequently been invoked by the guilty. But the fact remains, the imponderable is, that this is exactly what we intended.

The privilege is enshrined in our constitutional system and I believe most Americans want it to rest there securely. Dean Griswold summed it up: "* * * the privilege against self-incrimination is one of the great landmarks in man's struggle to make himself civilized."

To obtain the testimony of a witness who claims the privilege, a pardon before testifying is a traditional device, both here and in the British Commonwealth. When the state has granted him a full pardon, it may not be denied his evidence. In the give and take of our society, these are the ultimate guide lines: No man may be forced to help convict himself of crime. But when fully freed of potential danger, the community may call upon him to speak.

When Holmes said: "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing panic," he was speaking in limitation and not preclusion. The obverse bears equal weight. There may be a clear and present duty to shout "Fire" if there is, in fact, danger—when the proclamation is not fraught with danger to the person making it. What is protected and guaranteed in the fifth amendment is not silence but non-self-incrimination.

It is as much a distortion to equate the privilege against self-incrimination with the right to remain silent, as it is to identify dissent with disloyalty.

Indeed, in an ultimate view, an immunity statute, relieving the rigidity of the privilege, conserves it. For the statute insulates the right against disrepute, and perhaps discontinuance, at the instance of those who deride its use or as a reaction against those who use it improperly.

The protagonists of repeal of the fifth amendment and the antagonists of an immunity statute have lost sight of controlling considerations. The privilege is a basic safeguard against governmental power—its repeal would do violence to our tradition of individual freedom. And it is morally expedient to confer immunity when necessary to secure information needed for national security.

There is a right to speak; there is a right to silence—when self-injurious. There is, too, the duty to speak.

The stress of rights must be balanced by insistence on obligation. There are important things which must take the place of personal considerations, or there could be no human society. The progress of humanity has resulted more from the concept of duty than that of right.

With the passage of this legislation, balancing of public weal and individual right enters a more refined area. What is philosophically possible is often pragmatically unwise. Owing to recent events, many are concerned about the authorization of immunity grants to congressional committees. I share their antipathy to the incontinent behavior of certain of these committees, and, indeed, publicly have protested their methods.

But the statute itself will tend to minimize the excesses. The area of disparagement and indecorum will be narrowed, if not occluded, when witnesses can no longer decline to testify.

To seal the mouth of pertinent witnesses is not to resolve the problem but rather to evade it. And that evasion deflects attention from the primary purpose of the congressional power to investigate, to a manifestation of its misuse.

The power of Congress to seek information through investigation has long been regarded as one of the greatest it possesses. In their role as aids to the formulation of legislation, congressional committees are vital to the national welfare. But investigation cannot be lawful except for the purpose of gathering information for legislation contemplated; it must bear a reasonable relation to the lawmaking functions of Congress.

The Supreme Court has been disposed to uphold the widest possible legitimate use of such investigatory powers. But, on occasion, these powers have ben distended by abuse beyond matters that fall rightly within their competency. And the conduct of inquired, at times, has been a violation of propriety and contrary to fair play.

The House and Senate must adopt a mandatory Uniform Code of Fair Procedure for their respective committees; weasel words are not acceptable as a substitute. Congressional leadership, Democratic and Republican alike, has persistently defaulted in discharging its obligation in this critical matter. It is to be hoped that they will not delay any longer. For, despite the apparently improved motivation and temper with which recent inquiries have been conducted, reliance must rest on fixed principles and not on the vagaries of individuals.

But even the adoption of, and adherence to, such a code will not suffice. Better rules will avail little, if the spirits of using them does not also improve. Legislative bodies that make the law, and their subsidiary agents, charged with lawful investigation to further this end, must give cognizance not only to rule and statute, but also to self-discipline. Self-imposed restraints, by code and by mood, encouraged by right public attitudes, will go far to hold legislative investigations within bounds not only of wisdom, but of necessity and decorum. When these have been exceeded, the courts are available.

Lawyers can differ as to what are the limits of the power to investigate, but would certainly agree that there are limits. The line is not always clear, but when the line between the permissible and the illegal is not merely blurred but obliterated, when all safe and proper limits of committees' powers and conduct have been exceeded, the judicial arm of the Government may be successfully invoked to stay further aggression. For the legitimacy of all power is a matter of degree. Referring to Chief Justice Marshall's dictum that the power to tax is the power to destroy, Holmes said, "In those days, it was not recognized as it is today that most of the distinctions of the law are distinctions of degree. The power to tax is not the power to destroy while this Court sits."

The authority to investigate is indispensible to the sovereign power that resides in Congress to make laws. Incident to it is the right to grant amnesty to those witnesses from whom a full and free disclosure would not be otherwise obtainable. For an effective means of obtaining essential information is a prerequisite to responsible government. No state can endure upon volunteered evidence alone. To assure its survival, inquiry—judicial or legislative—may not be thwarted by recalcitrant witnesses.

Honorable accommodation is cardinal to ordered freedom. It was easier to phrase the Declaration of Independence than to frame the Constitution. It is easier to initiate a revolution than to organize a stable society.

It was the political genius and prophetic wisdom of the Founding Fathers which fashioned the Constitution—but it is "the strong and diverse heart of America"—in Stephen Vincent Benet's phrase—which vivified it. The virtue of the American system evolves from the fact that the United States is a vast area of diversified interests—it requires the art of rational compromise.

Because of a genius for honorable compromise 160 million souls derived from races of every background, have been able to forge a bond of fellowship, in a common peoplehood. This has been possible not despite the fact but because we are not homogeneous—something those who struggle for conformity as the supreme end should ponder. We have achieved unity in diversity.

The golden mean, distillate of generous spirit and heroic will, is our rule. At times, rights of the individual are dominant; at

other times, the need of the Nation prevails; always the two remain in balance. Legislation within normal limits representing the preponderant view of the people is vindicated, morally as well as legally, by the good temper in which all accept it; extremism does not prevail. In the existing crisis we are called upon to make difficult adjustments to assure national security and yet to maintain the basic freedoms which are the very fiber and fabric of our being. If we surrender the right to think and speak freely, we shall have lost our free society; the right extends to the unpopular as well as the popular cause. In his essay On Liberty, John Stuart Mill said: "The mere example of nonconformity is itself a service." On the other hand, the primacy of a nation's right to protect itself is inherent in the life of social order. Zealous to appraise justly the relative spheres of individual right and public interest, we must maintain an exacting balance between them. It is such an accommodation which the American people have made in complementing—I may even say, implementing—the privilege of the fifth amendment by the Immunity Act of 1954.

The privilege of not being compelled to testify against one's self has been caught up in the ideological tensions of our time, with resultant distortion of perspective. The problem of security has been merged with the fifth amendment. A primarily procedural device, designed to shield the witness in legal proceedings, has been transformed, for the doctrinaire of the left into a shibboleth of secular martyrdom; for the doctrinaire of the right, a rallying cry of subversion.

It is time that we surrounded the concept of nonincrimination with a cordon sanitaire and recognized it for what it is. It exists on its own terms apart from any immediate fact, situation, or emotional reaction. It is not a political canon nor a philosophic abstraction—but a concrete response to the need of the individual for protection against authority—any authority, however benevolent. The privilege is a limited one; it should not be debased by disparagement nor enhanced with a borrowed radiance. Viewed in its historic context it was intended to operate in a climate of controversy and should not be suspended whatever the frame of reference—any more than it may be expanded. A right that is effective only when not needed is scarely a right at all.

The importance of the safety of the Nation must not be underestimated; equally important is the more inclusive safety of a way of life which is based on principle and not expedience. Those who take the fifth amendment in vain for any purpose adulterate the moral integrity that is our birthright.

The privileges and immunities of our individual citizens have been weighed against the needs of the people as a whole. It has been the genius of our Anglo-American legal tradition that it has been able to achieve the synthesis of personal liberty and public order under the sovereignty of law.

Grand Island, Nebr., the All-America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following remarks about one of America's all-America cities, and to extend the same in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

GRAND ISLAND, NEBR., THE ALL-AMERICAN CITY

Last Thursday, January 5, 1956, the largest city in my congressional district celebrated a well-deserved honor. The occasion, high-lighted by national celebrities who are proud to claim Nebraska's third city as their home town, marked Grand Island's recognition as a Look magazine all-America city for 1955.

The idea that Grand Island might compete for this honor was suggested by the city manager. The chamber of commerce gave it impetus. An all-out community effort sold it.

The comprehensiveness of the community improvement program was remarkable, but most significant were these projects developed or realized in 1955: A $4 million school bond issues; a Community Lutheran Hospital fund drive that brought in contributions exceeding $400,000; a vigorous and expended youth recreation program, emphasizing little league baseball, a concerted drive to increase religious and church activity; and a new home for the Hall County Fair, pari-mutual horse racing, 4–H shows, and farm youth activities.

These accomplishments were the backbone of the case presented on May 5, 1955, to the National Municipal League in New York City by Walter P. Lauritsen, chamber of commerce president, and Chamber Secretary William E. Dauer.

Grand Island can be justifiably proud to receive the coveted Look magazine award, to be recognized as one of the 10 outstanding cities in the United States in 1955. More deeply, however, they can be proud of the people and the forward-looking community of individuals who made this recognition possible.

The mark of a good home town is its emphasis on the church, the school, and the home. Grand Island is a city of 25,000 people. There are 36 churches providing places of worship for their congregations. In the past 10 years, these churches have spent nearly $2 million on new buildings, additions, and schools, and their membership has increased by nearly 10,000.

Grand Island, no different in this respect from many other cities and towns in America, was faced with a serious classroom shortage. The citizens rescued themselves. First, a campaign was conducted that led to a special building fund in 1947. Out of this fund came the wherewithal for urgent and immediate building. The long-range program was then agreed upon by a citizens planning committee, their campaign was started and, with the untiring effort of an organized community, a $4 million school-bond issue was approved by a near-record number of Grand Island voters. The $2.7 million spent to date from this fund has gone a long way toward solving the third city's classroom problems, but these forward-looking people say "it has not completed the job," and pledge fulfillment.

New and beautiful homes have sprouted on practically every one of the hundreds of vacant lots that existed before World War II. In 1953 alone more than $5 million was spent on new home and dwelling construction, and in the 10 years following World War II, nearly 2,000 homes have come into being at a cost of more than $20 million. This home-growth record undeniably influenced the selection of Grand Island as an all-America city.

Many other community projects deserve praise: Beautiful new Fonner Park, internal improvements to streets, water and sewer systems, outstanding hospitals, commercial air service, and many others. It was this atmosphere of progress and achievement that induced at least six large industries to take notice of the prospecting in 1955 campaign of the chamber of commerce, and locate plants in Grand Island. This, and the inherent assurance that in Nebraska there is a labor supply of men and women who will do a day's work for a day's pay.

Grand Island's beauty is not confined to its homes, churches, or schools, or even the community spirit that evolves from a united and common campaign. The ethereal qualities of two daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Ritchie, of that city, last year received national recognition. Sharon Kay Ritchie is Miss America for 1956; her sister, Mrs. Donna Jo Strever, was a finalist in last year's Miss Universe contest.

No wonder its splendid citizens say "It's grand to live in Grand Island."

Highway Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made at the 23d annual meeting of the American Bridge, Tunnel, and Turnpike Association, by Mr. D. Louis Tonti, on October 14, 1955. Mr. Tonti, who is executive director of the New Jersey Highway Authority—Garden State Parkway—is conversant with the problem of highways. I submit his remarks, Mr. Speaker, purely for the information of the Members of the Congress on this all-important issue. However, the views expressed therein do not reflect my own opinion on the subject since I am presently considering and studying various proposals which have been referred to my attention.

Mr. Tonti's remarks follow:

The national highway program, as outlined by the President's Committee, headed by General Clay, can be partly financed by a direct assessment on every vehicle produced in the next 10-year period.

This would be a special excise tax, earmarked for the 40,000-mile interstate system that the Clay committee says is essential in solving the nationwide highway problem. If we take the total needs as outlined by that committee; namely, $100 billion over a 10-year period, and assume that 85 million vehicles will be produced in the same period, it is obvious that each vehicle requires $1,185 to pay for the required highway system. Of

course, I do not propose that each vehicle be taxed this amount, but a tax of $100 per vehicle produced during this period would provide some $8½ to $9 billion. Naturally, this tax could be graduated for different types of vehicles and adjusted in amount to increase the total revenues from this source as high as it were deemed necessary. I leave the arithmetic to the experts, but the important point I would like to emphasize is that our greatest defection in our transportation economy is the absence of a tie-in between the production of vehicles and the construction of highways. Both factors are important and inseparable.

The automobile industry cannot continue bragging about new production records, while no adequate provision exists for the highways needed for such vehicles. By imposing a realistic tax on each vehicle and earmarking it for highway construction, we will be forcing the manufacturers to incorporate in their price structure, the inseparable factor of highway costs. This will have a number of beneficial effects. First, it will inhibit the overproduction of vehicles and "under" construction of roads. If the present unbalance continues, we are faced with the ridiculous prospect of all cars coming to a standstill.

Secondly, by including this added tax in the cost of making the vehicle, it will force the manufacturer to stop thinking of cars solely in terms of horsepower and fancy trimming and give some attention to the highway needs essential to carry the vehicles they produce. Consumer resistance will discourage price increases, with the result that in most cases the consumer won't feel the tax. He will merely get a substitution; a "piece" of highway instead of some chrome and push-button gadgets.

Finally, this will encourage the auto makers to demonstrate their industrial statesmanship by furthering research in new materials and methods in highway construction with the objective of reducing costs. A cheaper, more durable road surface becomes just as important as a plastic substitute for a steel body. Furthermore, I have faith that private enterprise can do this pioneering more effectively than our State agencies with inadequate facilities and underpaid engineering personnel.

In summary, I believe the principle of combining the cost of highways and vehicles all under the same hood is sound. In the operation of our free economy, we will avoid the unbalance that now prevails in our transportation economy.

Radio Reports by Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD daily radio reports, dated January 2, 1956, and January 6, 1956, prepared by the Public Relations Department of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONDAY, JANUARY 2, 1956.

Starting out a brand new year is always a thrill for us. We get the feeling that it's time to hitch up our belts, square our shoulders, and tackle afresh the problems that last year seemed unsolvable. That's why we'd like to repeat for you today a few lines from a "forward to '56," printed in the 1955 annual report of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association. It is by M. W. Thatcher, the general manager of GTA. For more than a quarter of a century, he has been a leader in the struggle for decent incomes and living standards on the farms of the Nation.

"The year ahead is packed with momentous decisions for the American farmers," Mr. Thatcher states in this "forward to '56." "Developments today are alarmingly similar to the period preceding the tragic business collapse of 25 years ago. There is need for a new, a bold, and a positive approach to the whole problem of farm prices and production. The farmer must be ready in 1956 with the kind of a program that will do the Nation the most good."

And, Mr. Thatcher continues: "That is why cooperatives like GTA will be even more important to the farmer in the difficult year ahead. The cooperative that is aware of its obligations and conscious of its responsibilities will not measure its true worth by its financial statement, volume of business or total membership. It must be prepared to do all it can to help the farmer plan now for a better tomorrow. At no time in history has GTA had at its command such strength of finances, physical assets, and encouraging prospects for the future.

"So it is only natural," Mr. Thatcher points out, "for patrons to expect GTA to use its power and prestige to press for decent farm legislation. The farmer looks to his farm organization and his cooperatives for direction and leadership." And he will find them, Mr. Thatcher promises, for here is a new opportunity for cooperatives to prove their worth.

"GTA," he predicts, "will measure its success in 1956 by how much it can do—in Washington and everywhere else—to help farmers get back on their feet economically, and move ahead in the American tradition to better living, peace, and security."

That is the promise for 1956, because farmers are organized and working together, GTA, the co-op way.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 6, 1956.

Here at GTA office building, we're honored today by a special group of visitors. They're members of the Farmers Union, and they are Washington-bound. They'll be off for the Nation's capitol, bright and early tomorrow morning. Each year, Farmers Union locals select certain members to take this Washington trip. They travel in buses, and are scheduled to arrive in Washington Sunday afternoon or evening, depending on driving conditions, of course.

Washington Caravaners here today are from Minnesota, North and South Dakota, and the Rocky Mountain area. The group totals about 125 in all. They've got a busy schedule ahead and will be back in St. Paul a week from tomorrow. Next Friday another group will be at GTA and ready to start off on the trip to Washington. In fact, we'll have Washington Caravaners visiting GTA for five successive Fridays. Altogether, it's expected that about 1,200 farm men and women from some 14 States will go to Washington on these bus trips in the first 3 months of the new year.

North Dakota will have eight bus loads. Minnesota, as we've said, will have five—with Max Larson, GTA director and farmer from Beltrami, Minn., in charge of that State's groups. South Dakota, the Rocky Mountain area, and Indiana will send 4 bus loads. From Montana and Illinois will come 3 loads each. Texas will have 2, and Ohio, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Arkansas will send 1 load apiece.

The Northwest Caravaners organize here in St. Paul. On the group's schedule for today is a tour of GTA headquarters to give them a chance to learn more about the operations of their regional grain marketing co-op. They'll have lunch here, too, and get acquainted with one another. From here, they'll go to the Farmers Union Central Exchange and the Farmers Union Marketing Association, their supply co-op and their livestock marketing co-op. So, you see that today they are studying the work of their regional cooperatives, giving them a chance to see more clearly the importance of these services, so they'll be able to discuss the role of their co-ops when they get to Washington.

When they get to the Capital City will come the most important part of the whole tour. That's visiting their Congressmen and Senators. They'll make appointments with these elected officials—go to their office and discuss the problems of family-type farming. They'll outline what they feel is needed in the way of farm legislation. These meetings will give farmers a chance to ask questions, and Congressmen and Senators to do the same.

This is democracy in action—citizens expressing their views to their elected officials. It's an opportunity for farm people to speak their minds on farm policy, in Washington, where farm prices are made.

The Caravaners will attend sessions of the House and Senate, visit the Department of Agriculture and talk to officials who administer farm laws, and tour points of historical interest. They'll express their views on farm legislation, and they'll come back with a keener interest in Government and public affairs than ever before. This is GTA, the co-op way.

Gas Fight in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Gas Fight in the Senate," published in the Kansas City Star for January 7.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GAS FIGHT IN THE SENATE

LYNDON JOHNSON, the Senate Democratic majority leader, expects the natural gas bill to reach the Senate floor in a couple of weeks. Then the chips will be down on the measure that would exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal price regulation.

The bill passed the House by a narrow margin last summer. The present strategy of the oil and gas Senators apparently is to push the identical measure through in a hurry. That would avoid compromises and conference committees that would send it back to the House where the margin of victory was only six votes.

Generally, the gas-producing States and the consumer States are the opponents with both political parties sharply divided. Recently, however, there have been indications that consumers in the Southwest aren't so sure that their interests lie with a free market for natural gas. Naturally that area has produced the most vociferous antiregulation legislators.

Kansas City's direct interests lie with reasonable controls to bolster the rather ineffective Federal jurisdiction over the ultimate cost of gas. The producers may argue that no great increases would come without regulation. But the current Cities Service rate request—which we are now paying—is based to a large extent on the fair-field formula. That method, which allows the pipeline to figure rates on the basis of market price instead of costs, recently was overturned by the courts. The natural gas bill would write the fair-field formula into the law and it would cost the consumers a great deal of money.

Why Public Law 875 Should Be Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this distinguished body knows of the devastating flood disasters that occurred along the eastern seaboard last August and October when the boundless might of nature destroyed human lives and caused untold destruction to property.

It was my district, Mr. Speaker—the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut—that suffered worst of all from those two successive floods; and during those tragic hours of the August flood, I was a constant observer of the illimitable courage and heroism of those whom I was born amid, grew from youth to manhood with, and for whom I established an everlasting admiration and love.

However, Mr. Speaker, during the aftermath of those horrible tragedies of August and October of last year, I also observed the execution of a law of the land that this great body had enacted—Public Law 875. But it soon became clear, Mr. Speaker, that despite the many good provisions of this law, it was still inadequate to meet the impact occasioned by such a natural disaster as that which struck the State of Connecticut and five other States and afford immediate relief to victims in such disaster areas, as the Congress had expressly intended this bill to do. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am introducing amendments to Public Law 875, and also for the following reasons:

When sudden disasters strike homes, farms, and factories, the American people plead for greater opportunities to help those in need. They realize that earthquakes, fires, floods, tornadoes, and hurricanes sweep asunder the lives, possessions, hopes, and dreams of many persons. They know that even creeping disasters cut away coastlines, alter rivers' courses, cause droughts, and take their tolls regardless of a person's race or color, religion, amount or lack of money, political affiliation, or where he lives.

The people respond gladly to public subscriptions and other forms of relief, but these efforts are usually insufficient. Many people feel that their eagerness to help has been frustrated.

Rivers once flowed unhampered to the sea. But streams are being increasingly constricted by bridge piers, bridges, transportation, rights-of-way, pipelines, factories, and other obstructions. Consequently, the dangers and damages of floods grow.

Even the well-intentioned efforts of our Government officials are too slow, too meager, and too cumbersome, mainly because of inadequate Federal disaster laws.

PUBLIC LAW 875

The principal authority for Federal disaster relief is Public Law 875, approved on September 30, 1950. This act authorizes the President to coordinate the disaster assistance activities of the National Government and to direct Federal agencies to utilize their available personnel, equipment, supplies, facilities, and other resources. This act has been amended to permit greater Federal assistance, by Public Law 107, 82d Congress, approved August 3, 1951, which authorizes housing relief in major disasters; and Public Law 134, 83d Congress, approved July 17, 1953, which authorizes Federal surplus property use in major disasters.

Basic statutory authority of the United States Department of Agriculture was amended by Public Law 115, 83d Congress. This amendment assists particularly in relief of drought areas.

Authority to administer Public Law 875 is lodged in the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Before Federal disaster assistance can be given the governor of the affected State must formally certify the need for Federal help and assure the expenditure of a reasonable amount of funds for relief purposes by the State or local governments. Then the President has to determine that the catastrophe is serious enough to be classified as a major disaster. This has been done 51 times up to June 30, 1954.

THE NEED TO IMPROVE PUBLIC LAW 875

Public Law 875 needs to be improved so that help can be more direct and more financial assistance can easily be made available. At present the officials charged with administration of the law have virtually no guidance for how much the State and local governments must spend. This should be made more definite, and the act should recognize differences in fiscal capacity among the States. Recognition should also be given to the disaster's crippling effect upon an area's ability to pay.

The specification that $5 million be appropriated to the President for purposes of the act is much too small and restrictive. It should be omitted and terms such as "whatever funds are necessary" should be substituted. It is difficult to specify an exact amount. Actual appropriations for Public Law 875 purposes through the fiscal year 1955 amounted to $59.3 million——28 million of these funds were advanced to the USDA for drought relief and subsequently the USDA reimbursed Civil Defense from its appropriated funds. This is to be contrasted with property losses from major disasters during the same period of about $4 billion.

Apparently the total amount of public money spent to recover from disasters is small compared to the total damage. The Federal investment—$59.3 million—since its enactment has averaged only 14 percent of the total public funds spent for disaster relief. The local authorities have furnished about 73 percent of these payments and the States have paid about 13 percent. In other words, those areas hit by the floods, hurricanes, earthquakes, and other disasters were the very ones which were least able to pay but they furnished three-fourths of the money. These people realize that we spent over $21 billion for foreign aid in the last 4 years. They know that the money for foreign aid comes out of the pockets of all the taxpayers, including those in disaster areas—to help outsiders. Regardless of the merits of foreign aid it is shocking to note that during the last 5 years Congress appropirated only $59.3 million for natural disaster sufferers in our country.

Evidently private insurance did not and probably could not fill the gap between total public expenditures—somewhat over $400 million—and total disaster losses of about $4 billion in the last 5 years. For example, of the 1951 Kansas-Missouri $1 billion flood loss, only 5 percent was covered by insurance—United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Federal disaster insurance, staff study, 84th Congress, 1st session, committee print, November 30, 1955, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1955: 14. Floods, whether caused by hurricanes or other factors, do the most damage, are hardest to insure and are apparently the least covered by any type of insurance. Insurance is scarce also for tidal waves, certain water damage from hurricanes, and air pollution.

The authority of the President and the several agencies to act quickly should be more definite and less restrictive. For example, the disaster in New England in the fall of 1955 required a decision as to whether or not a special session of Congress was necessary. Fortunately, that was not demanded. The chairmen of the congressional Appropriations Committees approved the emergency expenditure of additional Federal funds. This was admirable action but for a while a condition of uncertainty existed and valuable time was taken to get a decision. In contrast, if the law permitted more automatic and direct authority by the President to pledge the credit of the United States to necessary amounts, then private funds would be more quickly available and many frustrations and uncertainties would be avoided. More direct authority for the President to pledge credit would put less of a burden on the Small Business Administration which is empowered to make disaster loans, but naturally many safeguards are applied and the approv-

als of loan applications take considerable time.

Public Law 875 does relatively nothing to stimulate pre-disaster planning or post-disaster permanent reconstruction. To cite another example, numerous factories located in or near streams are damaged or washed away by floods, but they relocate at or near their original, dangerous sites. The Office of Area Development, United States Department of Commerce, has some specialists who could help advise businessmen on new locations. However, this agency has only about 15 employees and its services to distressed areas are thus quite limited.

Public Law 875 generally confines Federal agencies' aid to temporary, emergency assistance, and authorizes permanent restoration work only for Federal structures. This is a great hardship in some cases. There should be some provisions to explain Federal assistance on certain types of permanent restoration work.

It is sometimes said that some people will save taxes on disaster losses, but those individual savings will not be as large as is generally supposed. Such losses have to be applied first to the year's pretax income. It is only if the loss exceeds income that the excess can be "carried back" against the income of the preceding 2 years, with a possible tax refund.

The following table shows estimated losses from major disasters in the United States during 1951–55. It should be noted that it is difficult, if not impossible, to segregate hurricane and flood losses:

Major disaster losses in the United States, 1951–54, 1955 preliminary

[Not counting droughts]

[Property damage in millions of dollars] [1]

	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955 [2]	1951–55
Property damages:						
Floods and hurricanes (tropical storms)	$1,031	$257	$128	$755	[3] $1,776	[3] $3,947
Tornadoes	30	35	224	28	31	348
Earthquakes	3	60	----------	1	----------	64
Total damages	1,064	352	352	784	[3] 1,807	[3] 4,359
Lives lost:						
Floods and hurricanes (tropical storms)	51	57	42	193	231	574
Tornadoes	34	230	516	35	123	938
Major earthquakes	----------	13	----------	----------	----------	13
Total	85	300	558	228	354	1,525

[1] Figures rounded.
[2] 1955 estimates are preliminary and partly estimated. Large flood damages occurred in December 1955.
[3] Hurricanes often cause floods. In attempting to avoid duplication, the costs of these 2 disasters were combined for 1951–53 when hurricane damages were reported as small and flood losses large. For 1954 and 1955 the reported damages from hurricanes which included large flood losses were used.

Source: U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Banking and Currency. Federal disaster insurance. Staff study, 84th Cong., 1st sess. Committee print. Nov. 30, 1955. Washington, D. C., GPO. 1955. pp. 5, 37, 124, 133, 149.

Disasters hurt more people than their direct victims. By causing losses in incomes they reduce taxes collectible and by destroying factories, homes, and lives they weaken the strength of the whole Nation. It is high time the Congress enact legislation to provide broader, more direct, and more permanent relief from natural disasters.

Four Chaplains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in a war that produced great feats of heroism, self sacrifice, and examples of great faith in God, no World War II incident has inspired America more than the courage and faith of four chaplains when the steamship *Dorchester* was torpedoed and sunk on February 3, 1943.

The story of the four chaplains is well known. One of these four men of God was Rabbi Alexander D. Goode of York, Pa. His fellow townsmen have seen fit to honor him in many ways. The most recent memorial to him is an elementary school bearing his name, decorated with murals which will present the message of great faith to generations of children who will attend that school.

I had the high privilege to attend the dedicatory services on November 13. The listed principal speaker was Dr. Daniel A. Poling, whose late son, Clark Vandusell Poling, was 1 of the 4 chaplains who gave his life aboard the *Dorchester*. Dr. Poling was unable to attend, so another son, the Reverend Dr. Daniel K. Poling, read his inspiring speech.

I include Dr. Poling's speech as a part of my remarks:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY DR. DANIEL A. POLING AT THE DEDICATION OF THE ALEXANDER D. GOODE HIGH SCHOOL, YORK, PA., SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1955

On the morning of February 3, 1943, shortly before 1 o'clock, the steamship *Dorchester*, a converted passenger freighter of less than 6,000 tons, entirely inadequate for transport service, was torpedoed and sunk by enemy action off the tip of Greenland. Of the 906 men on board, only 229 survived, but there were eyewitnesses to tell an epic story of courage that America will never forget.

In those freezing days and nights of January and February, the iceberg waters of the north were the hunting ground of enemy undersea wolf packs. Hundreds of ships went down and thousands of brave men died. But the *Dorchester* story has significance beyond all other brave tales of that tragic winter.

Four chaplains on board, chaplains of our three great faiths—John P. Washington, a priest who entered the service from Arlington, N. J.; Alexander D. Goode, a rabbi whose congregation was in York, Pa.; George L. Fox, a Methodist minister who reported for duty from Gilman, Vt.; and our son, Clark Vandersall Poling, minister on leave from the First Dutch Reformed Church of Schenectady, N. Y.

As another has written, "Day after day, as the ship plowed on, the chaplains talked to the men, joked with them, sang with them * * * The men knew they were heading out into torpedo junction and they were scared. That made things tougher for the chaplains * * *" Then 2 torpedoes tore into the heart of the little ship, ripped her wide open. Within minutes she listed sharply. There was panic on the slippery decks. A man couldn't live long in those waters. The chaplains moved among the confused and frightened men, encouraged them, prayed with them.

Let it never be charged that there were insufficient lifejackets on board. There was an ample supply—every man had one and he had been ordered to sleep in it. But the *Dorchester* was less than 100 miles from port. Accompanied by 1 destroyer, she had moved out from the convoy and was at the top of the fiord. That last night untrained and undisciplined boys and men relaxed. Hundreds of them laid aside their gear to get a real rest. Hundreds died below the decks and others came up half dressed and without their life preservers. From the spares in the chests, the chaplains distributed Mae Wests until all were gone and then, when 4 men appeared without jackets, each of the chaplains took off his own belt and forced it upon an unwilling serviceman. That serviceman knew what it meant to the man who gave it to him.

One of the survivors, a young engineer, Grady Clark, told me how he watched the chaplains as they distributed their belts. I saw him in the Valley Forge Hospital at Phoenixville immediately after he came down from Greenland with badly frozen legs. He was one of the last men picked up—and few there were who survived that frantic bath.

"But," said he, "I got to the deck fully equipped—how, I don't know—and watched, fascinated, while the chaplains worked. I forgot myself. I saw one of the four men of God force his belt over a man who cried hysterically, 'I don't want it. I don't want it.' He knew what that belt meant to the chaplain. But the chaplain pulled his rank and said, 'Get into that belt, soldier, and move fast.' And then they spun 'round and crashed down on the rail together. The chaplain lifted him up, helped him over, and shouted, 'Swim out, soldier; swim out.' He turned then and came sloshing up the deck toward me. He saw me. He knew me. He said, 'Soldier, what are you doing there? Get over the rail.' And he spun me round with his open hand and we slid together. The rail was awash now and over I went. 'Swim out,' he said, 'swim out.' And he laughed a nervous laugh. I swam out—fast and far as I could. Then I turned and looked back. The flares lighted everything. The chaplains stood braced against the rail, their arms locked. I knew that they were praying for the safety of the men. They had done everything they could."

And Grady Clark concluded his staccato story: "The bow came up high and she slid under. I never saw the chaplains again."

Each of the chaplains was awarded the Purple Heart and the DSC—the Distinguished Service Cross. Also the Government issued a memorial stamp. This then is the story.

This afternoon as I listen, listen with you and for you, I hear what I think the four chaplains have to say to their fellow Americans of all faiths, of all races, and of all economic conditions:

"Ours was a unity that transcended all differences. Ours was a unity that was not uniformity. Ours was a unity that strengthened within each of us every worthy individual loyalty of family and of faith. Ours was a unity that, at its highest and its best, is the United States of America. To this unity, in which we died together, we call upon you of all faiths, of all racial strains, and of all economic conditions, to live together—to live together, that those who died shall not have died in vain."

For me, these are the words of the chaplains, as I stand before this, another memorial—a memorial to 1 of those immortal 4 men of God, Alexander D. Goode, of whom I shall speak even more intimately in closing my address.

Freedom is at once both an inheritance and an achievement. We have it from the past and we save and hold it; we strengthen and enrich it for ourselves and for the future.

The Founding Fathers laid the firm foundations of church and school, of home and state, upon which we built. They pioneered the wilderness. They conquered the West and made the continent into a Nation. The Pilgrims in New England, the Dutch and the Jews on Manhattan Island, the Swedes and Quakers in Philadelphia, the Catholics in Maryland, the Cavaliers in Virginia, the Scotch-Irish in the Carolinas—these and all the mingled racial strains converge to make the mighty river of America.

But clearly that figure of speech is inadequate. Rather, this Nation is the product of a forge heated white—the fused and welded faiths and races of the earth. It is by no accident that "united" is the first word of our name—the United States. Out of suspicions and dissensions, acrimonious debates and long delay, that word came. It rose at last above selfishness and fear, and from a federation of weakness into a union of power. The story of our past is the record of men and women who brought us from Plymouth Rock and Yorktown, Belleau Woods and Iwo Jima. It is the history we should read and teach. Read first to have our own hearts quickened and teach then to our children and children's children, that it shall instruct their minds and inspire their souls for the tasks that lie ahead.

But within the genius of liberty, as of the uniqueness of the American union, freedom must be rewon in each generation and in some measure reborn in each citizen. Freedom is never static. It is never finished and it must march or die. That it may march, that it may press toward the far-off goal, that its voice, however discordant at times, is never silenced, has set America apart from dictatorships and makes her today the hope and inspiration of all free peoples and of all who would be free.

In our time it is not difficult to make a case for defeatism. Surely, by all economic tests, the world is now in a worse state than it was when the Kaiser launched his gray hordes against Liege, or when Hitler broke his evil treaty and crossed into Poland.

"What did your boy get by dying?" was a question flung at the father of 1 of the 4 chaplains. Yes, what did he and all the others get? They got tortured living and strangled dying—but they got infinitely more. They got for us the chance—the fighting chance—to win the peace. And this is everything. This they got for us—the immortal dead whom we remember today. They and all the others who also gave themselves but who, in God's providence, returned to serve their country in the peace, got for us the warrior's chance to pay again the price of freedom.

Winning the war and winning the peace are one and the war has not been lost and our dead have not died in vain unless we live in vain.

Today ours is the heavy task of carrying freedom forward to new heights of "liberty and justice for all."

But it was easier for the Nation's sons to die together in World War II than it is for us to live together in the present qualified and uncertain peace. But live together we must, and in the spirit of their dying, or we, too—and all we hold dear—shall die. Yes, surely die, but without their glory.

The irreducible minimum for an adequate defense of America is American unity. Not uniformity. All races and faiths, all colors and economic degrees, living together and working together as Americans all.

Unity can only be achieved where there are differences and in the presence of an event or in the service of a cause transcending all differences. And it is the uniqueness of unity that it strengthens and enriches the particular loyalty of the individuals and groups that have achieved it. Here, too, is the genius and uniqueness of America.

"Lo every people here has sent
Its sons to answer freedom's call.
Their living blood is the strong cement
That builds and binds the Nation's wall.
Then let us purge of poisoned thought
That service to the state we give,
And so be worthy as we ought,
Of this great land in which we live."

Yes, here is the uniqueness of our freedom and the genius of our way of life. Unity is in going together the length of our common agreements and, in peace as in war, "united we stand, divided we fall." Unity is without prejudice to particular loyalties of individuals, of groups and faiths. Unity strengthens and enriches every worthy loyalty. Unity is dynamic and has propagating power. Unity is the ultimate achievement and can only be achieved in support of a worthy cause. Unity is America on the march.

Even as American unity is the irreducible minimum for national defense, so the unity of free peoples and of all who would be free is the irreducible minimum for world security and peace. Geographically and by all tests of time and space, this is one world, but ideologically, politically and spiritually, it is a divided and subdivided world.

We have learned in sweat and blood and tears that wars cannot be isolated. Shall we fail to learn before it is too late that peace and security can never be isolated? That these must be for all if presently they are to be at all? Build well today the structure of the state. Beat back the foes within that shame her cities, corrupt her youth and exploit liberty into evil license.

Now again patriotism must come alive in deeds and the ideal must be reconciled with the real. The Nation's preparedness must be comprehensive and complete—moral, spiritual and physical. But the irresducible minimum of that defense—the minimum without which the barricades will be breached and freedom will die within before she succumbs to any foe from without—the irreducible minimum is unity. And it was in the unity that the four *Dorchester* chaplains lived and served and died, but live on forever in such memorials as this which we dedicate today.

Now mankind is engaged in a spiritual Armageddon. The godless state challenges the faith of our fathers and moves with ruthless disregard of human rights toward a world revolution that would displace democracy with dictatorship and all the freedoms with atheism, excluding both God and the free man. Here the issue joins and nowhere else. And here may be achieved the unity of a billion human beings who believe in one God. Against this unity all the tides of dictatorship would rise and beat in vain.

It is altogether fitting that this new and beautiful building, erected for the intellectual and moral guidance of the youth of York, Pa., should be dedicated as a memorial to one of the immortal four chaplains, Rabbi Alexander D. Goode, who went from this Pennsylvania city into the uniform of his country, to serve young men in uniform and to be their spiritual companion and guide. In this city is the congregation that he served, where he will be forever well remembered.

Mrs. Insall, national president of the Story Tellers League, speaking at a memorial service of her organization which was held in the Chapel of Four Chaplains—another memorial to these four men of God—paid the following poignant tribute to the man we honor this afternoon:

"Alexander Goode was too young for World War I. While George Fox was winning medals on the battlefield of France, Alexander Goode was receiving medals in Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., for tennis, swimming, and track. He led his class in scholarship, too. He planned to follow in his father's footsteps and become a rabbi, but that did not kep him from having a laughing, shouting, hail-fellow-well-met boyhood with all the Protestant and Catholic boys in the neighborhood.

"When the body of the Unknown Soldier was brought to Arlington Cemetery, Alexander Goode attended the ceremonies. He could just as well have ridden that 15 miles, for, after all, there were trolleys and buses in Washington, and the Goode family had a family car, but he thought it showed more respect to walk—and walk he did, all the way to Arlington and all the way back—30 miles. That's how he felt about the Unknown Soldier. Even while training for his calling he joined the National Guard and kept up an active membership.

"He married his childhood sweetheart. After he got his synagogue, he felt he still was not worthy. He would know better how to heal men's souls if he knew how to heal their bodies, too, and so for 3 years he drove every day to Johns Hopkins University, 45 miles away, until he won his medical degree.

"One day in 1943 Mrs. Goode received a telegram from her husband: 'Having a wonderful experience,' it read, and then Mrs. Goode knew that her husband had found a warm companionship with the men with whom he could share his faith and his laughter."

But let my final tribute be the words of the citation won by Alexander Goode, as he received posthumously the Distinguished Service Cross:

"Chaplain (1st Lt.) Alexander D. Goode, Army of the United States. For extraordinary heroism in connection with military operations against an enemy of the United States. On the night of February 3, 1943, a loaded troop transport was torpedoed, without warning, by an enemy submarine in the North Atlantic and began to sink rapidly. In the resulting confusion and darkness some men found themselves without life jackets and others became helpless through fear and the dread of plunging into the freezing water. Chaplain Goode heroically and calmly moved about the deck encouraging the men and assisting them to abandon ship. After the available supply of life jackets was exhausted, he gave up his own. He remained aboard ship and went down with it offering words of encouragement and prayers to the last."

Above the entrance of the unique Interfaith Memorial in Philadelphia, the Chapel of Four Chaplains, beyond the eternal light burning above its entrance and the bronze plaque which bears the names of all chaplains who died in World War II, these 10 words have been chiseled into the stone:

"Here is sanctuary for brotherhood
Let it never be violated."

God grant that these words shall be written now upon our hearts to come alive in deeds that shall make America stronger yet. God grant that in them and through us, all nations shall be enriched and all men blessed. To this high task in this high hour, as we would be worthy of Chaplain Alexander D. Goode and of his comrades, let us pledge our faith, our lives and our sacred honor.

Status of Forces and International Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I want to insert an article in the RECORD which discusses the NATO status of forces agreement and international law. I consider this article as the most thorough treatment and analysis of this problem and commend it highly to the attention of all my colleagues.

The author of the article is Dr. Edward D. Re, professor of law at St. John's University in Brooklyn, N. Y., and a very close personal friend of mine. This article is based on a lecture delivered by the author at a forum on jurisdiction over United States Armed Forces serving abroad, held in New York under the auspices of the Bar Association of New York City and the New York County Lawyers Association. The article was published in the July-August 1955 issue of the Northwestern University Law Review, where it extended over 46 pages. A shorter version of this article was published earlier in the May 1955 issue of Phi Delta Delta magazine of the legal fraternity of the same name.

Col. F. W. Schweikhardt, staff judge advocate of the Continental Air Command, Mitchell Air Force Base, New York, republished the short version in the August 1 issue of JAG Reserve News Letter. It is the latter version that I am today inserting into the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the space generally allotted.

Professor Re received B. S. and LL. B. degrees from St. John's University and J. S. D. degree from New York University. He is the author of Foreign Confiscations in Anglo-American Law and Brief Writing and Oral Argument. From 1943 to 1947 he served as legal officer and instructor at AAF Officer Candidate School. He is chairman of the committee of civil procedure and practice, American Bar Association.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the article by Professor Re:

THE NATO STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT

(By Dr. Edward D. Re)

I

Since, as part of our country's collective defense efforts under the North Atlantic Treaty, American servicemen are stationed in other countries, it has become necessary to determine the rights and duties of these Americans while they are stationed in the territory of another NATO country. Hence, the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. It may be added that the agreement is not limited to servicemen, but includes civilian employees and dependents.

It should be noted at the outset that the NATO Status of Forces Agreement is not, as one might infer from its title, an executive agreement or some informal understanding among the heads of states or military commanders of the NATO countries. Rather, it is a solemn treaty signed at London on June 19, 1951, and duly ratified by the Senate of the United States on July 15, 1953, by a vote of 72 to 15.[1] From a legal standpoint it is a multilateral reciprocal treaty designed to implement the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. Its exact title is "Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces." It express purpose is to establish and set forth the terms and conditions which will determine the rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of the forces of one country that is a party to the agreement sent or stationed in the territory of another country that is also a party to the agreement.

Before discussing the relevant portions of international law and the specific jurisdictional provisions of the agreement that have been subjected to severe criticism, a few preliminary observations should be made to place the specific topic to be treated in its accurate factual and legal framework.

First, since the treaty is reciprocal in nature, whatever duties and rights are spelled out for the troops and personnel of nation A stationed in the territory of nation B will also determine the legal status of the troops and personnel of nation B stationed in the territory of nation A. The tenor of the agreement, therefore, is clearly one of partnership and equality whereby one party to the agreement does not exact or expect what it does not itself concede or grant.

Secondly, the agreement is not limited to what has traditionally been referred to as passage of troops going from nation A to nation C and passing through the territory of nation B. The agreement, rather, is designed to give effect to what is actually a more or less permanent stationing of the troops and personnel of one country in the territory of another.

Thirdly, the NATO status of forces agreement, for the first time in our history, permits the stationing of American troops on foreign territory in times of peace. The agreement is not a wartime agreement between Allies. It expressly provides for modification and suspension of the jurisdictional provisions in the event of hostilities.

These preliminary matters are of particular importance in determining the principles of international law that would govern such a situation because most of the precedents and authorities that have been urged in all discussions of this topic dealt with either the privileges and immunities of troops passing through a neutral country, invasion of enemy territory, or military occupation of enemy soil.

II

The provisions of the agreement that have been subjected to the severest criticism deal with the jurisdiction of a receiving state to try and to punish offenders for criminal offenses committed by personnel of a sending state within the territory of the receiving state. The agreement defines "sending" state as "the contracting party to which the force belongs." By "receiving" state is meant "the contracting party in the territory of which the force or civilian component is located, whether it be stationed there or passing in transit."

Article VII of the agreement prescribes the circumstances under which the sending or receiving states will have either exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction to try offenders. In those situations where both states have concurrent jurisdiction article VII prescribes which state shall have the "primary" jurisdiction. Exclusive jurisdiction implies that only one State has the right to try an offender as in a case, for example, of security offenses which are against the laws of one country but not of another. If an offense violates the laws of both states, both states may have jurisdiction. However, the state that has the right to try the offender in the first instance, and in this sense may be said to have the prior or superior right to try the offender, is deemed to be the state having the "primary" jurisdiction. This does not imply, however, that in the ordinary case a person may twice be in jeopardy. Paragraph 8 of article VII expressly provides: "Where an accused has been tried in accordance with the provisions of this article by the authorities of one contracting party and has been acquitted or has been convicted and is serving, or has served, his sentence or has been pardoned, he may not be tried again for the same offense within the same territory by the authorities of another contracting party." This section safeguards an accused against double jeopardy. This, however, is subject to what may be deemed a military exception to double jeopardy which does not prevent the military authorities of a sending state from trying a member of its force for a violation of rules of discipline arising from an act or omission which constituted an offense for which he was tried by the receiving state.

Article VII sets forth the respective criminal jurisdiction of the sending and receiving States. Paragraph 2 of article VII, which deals with exclusive jurisdiction, in effect, provides that each State shall have the sole right to try offenders for "security offenses such as treason, sabotage, and espionage which are punishable by the law of the State having exclusive jurisdiction and not by the law of the other State." As can be imagined problems involving the exclusive jurisdiction of a State will not be numerous and hence have not evoked undue criticism.

Article VII gives the sending State primary jurisdiction over two types of offenses committed by its armed forces. The first relates to offenses solely against the property or security of the sending State, or against the person or property of personnel of the sending State. The second relates to offenses arising out of any act or omission done in the performance of official duty. An American soldier in France, therefore, who commits an offense against another American soldier or his property comes within the primary jurisdiction of the American military authorities. If the American soldier were to commit an offense while in the line of duty, such an offense also would come within the primary jurisdiction of the American authorities.

Most of the criticisms that have been heaped upon the NATO Status of Forces Agreement stem from that provision of article VII that "in the case of any other offense the authorities of the receiving state shall have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction." This includes the greater majority of the off-duty offenses. It includes, for example, the case of the American soldier in France, who may commit an asault upon a Frenchman, or who may be driving an automobile while under the influence of intoxicants and all of the other offenses that are usually punishable by a civilian community.

A provision that is very important from the standpoint of the practical administration of the agreement deals with the waiver of jurisdiction by the state having the primary jurisdiction. First, in the event that the state having the primary jurisdiction does not desire to exercise jurisdiction, it shall notify the authorities of the other state for a waiver of its right in cases where that other state considers such waiver to be of particular importance."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Pursuant to this provision, when the giving of sympathetic consideration to a request for a waiver of a state's jurisdiction results in a waiver of its jurisdiction, many problems are neatly avoided. Actually, experience indicates that it is only in the exceptional case that the receiving State will wish to exercise its primary jurisdiction to try a member of the force of the sending State and not grant the request for a waiver of its jurisdiction. It is unquestionably true that "the experience of the Armed Forces has been that the countries in which the United States Forces are stationed give waivers of this jurisdiction in the great majority of cases." [2]

III

The question, nevertheless, remains whether under international law the receiving State would have the right to try members of a force that it has invited or which has otherwise entered its territory with its consent. Certain cases where the receiving State has actually tried American soldiers for off-duty offenses committed on the territory of the receiving State have received a great deal of publicity and as a result the question may very well be asked why under the agreement the United States has agreed to subject American soldiers to the criminal jurisdiction of the foreign country where he may be stationed. Based upon the firm belief that the rule of international law as laid down by Chief Justice John Marshall and many other later authorities is that troops of a friendly nation stationed within the territory of another are not subject to the local laws of the other country, but are subject only to their own country's laws and regulations for the government of the armed services,[3] many patriotic Americans have vehemently objected to the approval of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement.

The view that the receiving State under international law would have no jurisdiction to try American soldiers for off-duty offenses has led Senator BRICKER to state that to approve the criminal jurisdiction provisions of this treaty would amount to penalizing the American soldier in an effort to please our NATO allies.[4] In the sincere belief that this unprecendented agreement reflects a callous disregard of the rights of American Armed Forces personnel, Senator BRICKER proposed a reservation to the agreement [5] intended to withhold from the receiving state all jurisdiction over criminal offenses commited by members of the United States forces. At the same time the reservation would have had the result of depriving the United States of jurisdiction over offenses by foreign forces in United States territory if the foreign State requested a waiver of American jurisdiction. The end result of such a reservation, had it been adopted, would have been to deprive the receiving state of jurisdiction over all offenses commited within its territory regardless of whether in the line of duty or the nature of the offense. Thus, an American soldier while off-duty in Paris could not be tried by the French authorities for an assault and battery upon a Frenchman, or for any other crime. Under the agreement, since its provisions are applicable to the political subdivisions of contracting parties, a French soldier who commits a crime while off-duty in New York City can be tried by the appropriate court of the city or State of New York. If the reservation proposed by Senator BRICKER would have been effective, such a French soldier could not be tried by the local authorities, if a request were made by the French authorities for a waiver of jurisdiction. The Bricker Reservation, together with the criminal jurisdiction provisions of the agreement, were thoroughly considered by the Senate.

Footnotes at end of speech.

IV

If a member of the force of a sending state is to be tried by a receiving state for a criminal offense committed within the receiving state, the offender, naturally, will be tried according to the law of the receiving state and, hence, will receive whatever benefits and protections are afforded by that law. However, apart from rights existing under local national law, paragraph 9 of article VII of the agreement sets forth certain specific rights that must be accorded to an offender.

In addition to these safeguards, prior to the ratification of the agreement, the Senate adopted a statement or reservation proposed by its Committee on Foreign Relations. This statement declared that it was the understanding of the Senate which was inherent in its advice and consent to the ratification of the agreement that nothing in the agreement diminished or otherwise altered the right of the United States to safeguard its security by excluding or removing from the United States persons whose presence is deemed prejudicial to its safety and security. This statement was amended so as to include additional matters which expressed the sense of the Senate [6] that:

1. The criminal jurisdiction provisions of article VII of the agreement were not to be deemed a precedent for future agreements.

2. Where a member of the Armed Forces of the United States is to be tried by a receiving state, his commanding officer shall examine the laws of such state with particular reference to the procedural safeguards contained in the Constitution of the United States.

3. If the commanding officer is of the opinion that there is danger that the accused will not be protected because of the absence or denial of constitutional rights he would enjoy in the United States, the commanding officer shall request a waiver of jurisdiction in accordance with the provisions of the agreement. If the receiving state refuses to waive its jurisdiction, the commanding officer shall request the Department of State to press such request through diplomatic channels.

4. When a member of the Armed Forces is tried by the receiving state a representative of the United States "will attend the trial" and will report any noncompliance with the procedural safeguards enumerated in paragraph 9 of article VII of the agreement to the commanding officer of the Armed Forces of the United States in the receiving state who, in turn, will request the Department of State to take appropriate action to protect the rights of the accused.

The late Senator McCarran, who opposed the ratification of the agreement, chiefly because in his opinion it was "violative of the rights of American nationals," indicated that, although paragraph 9 of article VII "looks like a pretty good list," upon analysis "it becomes apparent that some of the most important guaranties under our own Bill of Rights have been omitted from this list." [7] He observed, among other things, that there were no provisions guaranteeing a public trial, the privilege against self-incrimination, freedom from cruel and unusual punishments, the right to appeal or review a decision, freedom of religion, freedom of speech and of the press, right of free assembly and petition, freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and the right to trial by jury. Apart from the wisdom of inserting a Bill of Rights in an international treaty of this nature, it should be noted that some of the rights referred to, such as trial by jury, would have no application to a serviceman who would otherwise be tried by military court-martial. It also could be shown that some of the remarks, such as the one that there is no presumption of innocence under the law of France and other European nations, are factually incorrect. Actually, the more valid answer to Senator McCarran's criticism would probably not be one dealing with technical principles of constitutional law and the administration of criminal justice, but rather, would deal with the highly developed system of jurisprudence that prevails in the NATO countries. This fact was pointed out by Senator WILEY, who added that "our experience with these countries with respect to this problem has been good." Of course, the Senator referred to our experience under the temporary bilateral arrangements that existed subsequent to World War II and prior to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. Senator McCarran, however, was fully justified in observing that the accused's right "to communicate with a representative of the Government of the sending state" differed from the right "to have such a representative present at his trial," and this latter right, according to subdivision (g) of paragraph 9 or article VII, would only exist "when the rules of the court permit." To be deprived of the right to have a representative of the government of the sending State present at the trial might very well be more important than a so-called public trial. Furthermore, this limitation upon the right of an accused is contrary to one of the requirements enumerated in the statement of the Committee on Foreign Relations that a representative of the United States attend the trial of an American serviceman being tried in the courts of a receiving state. Although the statement does not have legal effect, it does, nevertheless, declare and make known to the commanding officer in the foreign country, and through the Department of State to the foreign country itself, the policy of the United States.

Footnotes at end of speech.

V

It is entirely justified to regard the case of the schooner *Exchange* as the convenient and authoritative point of beginning in a discussion of this subject. This celebrated case involved a libel filed in the United States District Court for the District of Pennsylvania by American citizens who claimed to be the former owners of the schooner *Exchange*.[8] They alleged that the vessel had been seized outside the United States by orders of the Emperor of France, and was subsequently commissioned as a man-of-war by the French Government. After referring to the "perfect equality and absolute independence of sovereigns" Chief Justice Marshall stated that the "common interest impelling them to mutual intercourse, and an interchange of good offices with each other * * * have given rise to a class of cases in which every sovereign is understood to waive the exercise of a part of that complete exclusive territorial jurisdiction, which has been stated to be the attribute of every nation." In enumerating this class of cases, Mr. Chief Justice Marshall first mentioned "the exemption of the person of the sovereign from arrest or detention within a foreign territory"; secondly, "the immunity which all civilized nations allow to foreign ministers" and then added: "A third case in which a sovereign is understood to cede a portion of his territorial jurisdiction is, where he allows the troops of a foreign prince to pass through his dominions."

The celebrated jurist stated that the consent for foreign troops to enter a friendly country is not presumed but must be expressed. In relation to vessels, however, he stated that the situation was different in

Footnotes at end of speech.

that unless a particular port was closed to a foreign naval vessel and notice of such fact was given "the ports of a friendly nation are considered as open to the public ships of all powers with whom it is at peace." The libel was therefore dismissed and the vessel was released.

Even if it be assumed that a judicial decision of a national tribunal can authoritatively expound principles of international law, and that concepts analogous to stare decisis are also applicable to international law,[9] it is manifest that the remarks of Chief Justice Marshall dealing with the immunity of troops were dicta. These remarks, 67 years later, again in dicta were expanded to read as follows in *Coleman* v. *Tennessee:*

"It is well settled that a foreign army, permitted to search through friendly country or to be stationed in it, by permission of its government or sovereign, is exempt from the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place." [10]

The Coleman case dealt with a criminal offense committed on enemy territory. It involved a military occupation of "hostile country," and consequently "soldiers of the Army of the United States in Tennessee during the war * * * were not subject to the laws nor amenable to the tribunals of the hostile country." Hence the defendant was to be "delivered up to the military authorities of the United States to be dealt with as required by law."

Although the Coleman case dealt with a criminal offense committed by a member of an occupying force over enemy territory, the Court spoke of an exemption from the "civil and criminal jurisdiction of the place."

The dictum of the Coleman case became the holding of *Dow* v. *Johnson* decided the following year by the Supreme Court of the United States.[11] In this case, General Dow was sued in a State court of Louisiana for certain property that he, in his military capacity, had ordered to be taken from a plantation owned by the plaintiff Johnson. Judgment was given against the general by default and an action was brought upon the Louisiana judgment in the Circuit Court of the United States for the District of Maine. Mr. Justice Field, who wrote the majority opinion for the Supreme Court of the United States, held that General Dow was not subject to the civil jurisdiction of the local court and, hence, it had no jurisdiction to render the judgment upon which the plaintiff brought suit.

The three cases just discussed are the American judicial decisions principally relied upon to establish the immunity or exemption of troops from the jurisdiction of the territorial sovereign.

Another Supreme Court decision also relied upon is *Tucker* v. *Alexandroff*.[12] In the Tucker case, a detachment of the Russian Navy with the consent of the United States entered the United States for the purpose of manning a vessel that had been built in this country for the Russian Navy. Pursuant to the specific provisions of a treaty between the United States and Russia, the Supreme Court held that the commanding officer of the Russian detachment was entitled to have a deserter arrested and returned to his control. The Tucker case is generally cited for its statement concerning the holding of Schooner Exchange case. It reads: "This case, the Schooner Exchange, however, only holds that the public armed vessels of a foreign nation may, upon principles of comity, enter our harbors with the presumed license of the Government, and while there are exempt from the jurisdiction of the local courts; and by parity of reasoning, that if foreign troops are permitted to enter or cross our territory, they are still subject to the control of their officers and exempt from local jurisdiction." Although the preceding cases are not the only ones decided by American courts that had some bearing on the subject, they are the most relevant and the most cited precedents. Yet as can be gleaned even from the terse factual discussions contained herein, they fall far short of the mark surrounding the stationing of troops abroad pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty.

VI

The true foundation and basis of the case of the Schooner Exchange, however, is not found in its discussion of the three classes of cases "in which every sovereign is understood to waive the exercise of a part of that complete exclusive territorial jurisdiction," which has been stated to be "the attribute of every nation," but in the statement that declares categorically:

"The jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. * * * All exceptions, therefore, to the full and complete power of a nation within its own territories must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. They can flow from no other legitimate service."

Clearly, therefore, the rule is one of territorial supremacy and all exceptions thereto must be traced to the consent of the territorial sovereign. The exceptions involve situations where the territorial sovereign has waived the jurisdiction that would normally attach. These situations do not involve any extraterritoriality but are referred to as exemptions from the territorial jurisdiction. In such cases the person or thing is exempt or immune from the jurisdiction. The important question that persists deals with the scope or extent of the immunity or exemption.

As indicated in *Cheng Chi Cheung* v. *The King*,[13] some immunities are well settled while others are more uncertain. The immunity of the sovereign himself, his envoy, and his property, including his public armed ships, from the local or territorial jurisdiction is clear. The applicability and extent of the immunity over friendly foreign armed forces is not clear. Although it is clear that a certain immunity exists, it is equally clear that such an immunity is not unlimited and complete. As to troops, as distinguished from naval vessels, there does not even exist a presumed or implied consent to enter a friendly country. The consent must be expressed, and as indicated by many of the writers the conditions of the movement are arranged * * * in a preliminary treaty or agreement.[14] In other words the permission to enter the territory will also contain the conditions, privileges, and limitations upon which the permission is granted. Clearly, therefore, the matter of entry or passage of a force through foreign friendly territory is strictly a matter of consent.

A survey of the sources examined reveals that the granting of consent does not ipso facto imply a complete exemption or immunity from the jurisdiction of the territorial sovereign. Even those authors who favor the existence of such an exemption indicate that in the absence of a special agreement the immunity is subject to limitations. Following the lead of Mr. Chief Justice Marshall, most authors concede that the immunity is limited to the passage of troops. The limitations are expressed in varying language. Lawrence speaks of the limitation within their own lines or were away on duty.[15] Oppenheim similarly limits the immunity to the rayon of the fortress and to offenses committed on duty.[16]

The most extensive discussion of this subject is found in an article written by an English scholar, G. P. Barton.[17] After a treatment of the international agreements concluded in World War I, the interwar period, World War II, the relevant municipal legislation, and the existing judicial decisions, the author concludes that even though the military courts of a foreign friendly force are entitled to exercise jurisdiction over its members, which includes the right to try a member for offenses against the local law, "it has not yet been established that this right carries with it the right to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over members of those forces who commit offenses against the local law." He adds:

"On the contrary, it has been shown that there exists a rule of international law according to which members of visiting forces are, in principle, subject to the exercise of criminal jurisdiction by the local courts and that any exceptions to that general and far-reaching principle must be traced to express privilege or concession."

It cannot be seriously questioned or disputed that all authors recognize and agree that the scope and extent of the immunity is really a matter of agreement between the interested States. This view is fully justified by a survey of the practice of States. The various bilateral conventions, agreements, and arrangements actually entered into reflect the particular needs of the parties with regard to a specific situation to be dealt with. Some granted complete immunity whereas others granted none. Not only was no single type of agreement used, but those agreements granting a complete exemption from the local jurisdiction were wartime agreements considered to be temporary and exceptional and dictated by the conditions of war.[18] The only existing multilateral treaties on the subject do not recognize any unqualified immunity.[19] Moreover those who insist that there exists a principle of complete exemption in the absence of agreement can find no support in the decided cases apart from the dictum in the Schooner Exchange case which, again in dicta, was expanded in the Coleman and Dow cases. The oft-cited Cheng Chi Cheung case involved the commission of a crime committed on board a naval vessel and the other cases were decided pursuant to a specific agreement.

Sound legal analysis, therefore, would require the conclusion that although a certain immunity exists for foreign visiting forces, the extent of the immunity is strictly a matter of agreement. It is for the territorial sovereign to determine the extent to which he wishes to waive the exercise of his jurisdiction. The agreements actually entered into by the nations of the world, and the decided cases clearly demonstrate that the problem has always involved reconciling "the practical necessities of the situation with a proper respect for national sovereignty." [20]

Predicated upon the foregoing legal analysis, it is apparent that the contention that, in the absence of the agreement, the NATO countries would have no jurisdiction over American forces stationed there is completely untenable. The agreement not only concedes the primary jurisdiction to the sending state in offenses arising out of the performance of official duty, but also in offenses solely against the property or security of the sending state or against the person or property of the personnel of the sending state. In the remaining cases when the receiving state shall have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction, the agreement expressly provides for the giving of sympathetic consideration to a request for a waiver of such jurisdiction. It is in this area that a great deal can be done in the actual implementation of the agreement. Surely, if an American serviceman about to be tried by a local court expresses the desire to be tried by an American court martial, everything

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

diplomatically possible should be done by the American authorities to see to it that the receiving state waive its primary jurisdiction. In this connection one is in accord with certain statements of Senator BRICKER,[21] that "* * * judge advocates should try to obtain a waiver of jurisdiction for every American serviceman in foreign custody." This seems to be in line with the resolution made by the Committee of Military Justice of the New York County Lawyers' Association pursuant to which the Defense Department was requested "to adopt a procedure whereby in all cases of United States Military Personnel involved with the civil authorities in Japan as well as in the NATO countries, efforts be made to have the personnel returned to United States military custody for appropriate disciplinary action by the military authorities."[22] This resolution would also strengthen the procedural safeguards provided by paragraph 9 of article VII of the NATO agreement in those cases where the receiving state refuses to honor the request for a waiver of jurisdiction, by guaranteeing to every American serviceman "adequate legal representation not only by local counsel versed in local procedures, but in addition * * * military counsel to aid in the defense of such person."

These suggestions seem to possess great merit and would justify legislation to authorize making available the necessary funds to engage the personnel required to achieve the desired purpose. They are sound suggestions, since they impliedly admit the wisdom of the American collective security plan. The alternative of abandoning NATO or the agreement is hardly a solution that warrants, in the view of our military leaders, serious consideration at this time. In view of the fact that the agreement is reciprocal, it seems difficult to speak of its terms as being unfair or unjust. Rather they tend to prove a statement made by Chief Justice Marshall in another famous case that "no principle of general law is more universally acknowledged than the perfect equality of nations." As indicated at the very beginning of the article, America is dealing with partners and Allies, not with conquered nations. After such deliberation, the NATO Status of Forces Agreement represents the solemn compact that has been agreed to by sovereign nations. If it is to be changed or modified, it must be done so freely and willingly. It is earnestly hoped that the modification or supervision of its terms will not be made necessary by those provisions dealing with the dreaded "event of hostilities."

1. Exercise of criminal jurisdiction by foreign tribunals over persons subject to United States military law: During the period January 1, 1954, through November 30, 1954, 7,416 (3,987) [23] persons subject to the United States military law were accused of offenses subject to the jurisdiction of foreign courts throughout the world. Jurisdiction was waived by foreign courts in 5,424 cases, and trial was had in 1,475 (793) cases. Charges were dropped as to 255 individuals, and 123 were acquitted. Confinement was imposed in 178 (38) cases but was suspended in all but 77 (16) cases. In 1,164 (693) cases, fines only were imposed. These figures include statistics under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization status of forces agreement, which is applicable to United States forces in Belgium, Canada, France, Greece, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, the United Kingdom, and Turkey. Of the 1,475 cases tried by foreign courts, 815 (452) were subject to the status of forces agreement.

Partial statistics of cases tried by countries include: France 283 (117), The United Kingdom 271 (208), Canada 249 (125), Panama 216 (104), Iceland 116 (25), and Japan 107 (36).

As of February 10, 1955, 58 United States citizens subject to military law were serving sentences to confinement in foreign institutions pursuant to sentences of foreign courts. Of course, 32 were for robbery and larceny, 15 for rape and related offenses, 6 for assault-type offenses, 4 for murder, and 1 for negligent homicide.

Footnotes at end of speech.

[1] See 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9088 (July 15, 1953). See also hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 83d Cong., 1st sess., on Status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Armed Forces and Military Headquarters, April 7 and 8, 1953.

[2] See statement of Maj. Gen. Claude B. Michelwait, Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Army in The NATO Status of Forces Agreement, 18 The Judge Advocate Journal 15, 16 (1954).

[3] 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4818, 4819 (May 7, 1953).

[4] 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 4818 (May 7, 1953).

[5] Ibid.

[6] 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9080 (July 14, 1953).

[7] 99 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9032 (July 14, 1953).

[8] 7 Cranch 116 (U. S. 1812).

[9] Cf. Bishop, Jr., International Law Cases and Materials 33 (1953). "One trained in the common law must be constantly on guard against assuming that precedents are regarded as binding authorities in international law. It is clear that there is no rule of stare decisis in international law."

[10] *Coleman* v. *Tennessee* (97 U. S. 509, 616 (1879)). The authority for this statement was the case of the schooner exchange.

[11] 100 U. S. 158 (1880).

[12] 183 U. S. 424.

[13] 1939 A. C. 160.

[14] Davis, The Elements of International Law 83 (4th ed. 1916).

[15] Lawrence, International Law 225 (7th ed. 1923).

[16] 1 Oppenheim, International Law 759–760 (7th ed. Lauterpacht 1948). The footnote to the statement cites *Malero Manuel* v. *Ministere Public*, decided by the Court of Cassation of the Mixed Courts in Egypt in 1943. 30 AJIL 349 (1945).

[17] Barton, Foreign Armed Forces: Immunity from Criminal Jurisdiction, 27 Brit. YBIL 186 (1950).

[18] Id. at 206.

[19] See Resolution of the Institute of International Law 147–148 (1916).

[20] "On the whole judicial decisions during the war lend little support to a claim for immunity in the case of offenses unrelated to the military duties of the offender. The question is a controversial one, inviting, as it has received, diplomatic solution in accord with the particular and special situation presented. There are certainly numerous and highly respectable authorities in support of the solutions adopted by the Mixed Courts of Egypt. Indeed it may be asked whether their decisions do not, after all, represent an eminently fair and reasonable interpretation of the principle of 'implied consent' which lies at the basis of the classic decision of Chief Justice Marshall, an interpretation which reconciles the practical necessities of the situation with a proper respect for national sovereignty." Brinton, The Egyptian Mixed Courts and Foreign Armed Forces, 40 A. J. I. L. 737, 741 (1946).

[21] Bricker, Safe-Guarding the Rights of American Servicemen Abroad, 15 The Judge Advocate Journal 1, 3 (1953). The Senator suggests that if it is ascertained that in a given country or area a serviceman cannot obtain a fair trial because a "Communist judge or one who is violently anti-American cannot be trusted to give an American" a fair trial, the "territorial jurisdiction of any such judge should be declared off-limits for all armed forces personnel." Id. at 4.

[22] 12 Bar Bulletins 39 (1954).

[23] Figures in parentheses indicate the number of traffic cases included in adjacent figures.

Unemployment in Economically Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I introduced H. R. 7902, a bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas.

It is of the utmost importance to all the people of southern Illinois that this bill become law in this session of the Congress. I hope we will be able to hold early hearings on this bill and that it may be passed without undue delay in order to alleviate human suffering.

Under unanimous consent request, I wish to have inserted the following statement by me made before the United States Senate Labor Subcommittee on January 6, 1956:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE KENNETH J. GRAY, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS, 25TH DISTRICT, ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE LABOR COMMITTEE, ON JANUARY 6, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman and members of this fine committee, I am indeed grateful for the invitation and opportunity to appear before your committee which is studying the economic conditions in depressed areas of our country.

I have the honor of representing the 15 southernmost counties in the great State of Illinois and before settling down to specific facts concerning our true economic conditions as they now exist in southern Illinois, please let me first preface my remarks by saying that due to coal and fluorspar mine closures and other factors, the economy of southern Illinois has been slipping for the past 10 years. The people of this region, through their chambers of commerce, Southern Illinois, Inc., community development programs, and other groups have done an outstanding job in trying to promote private industry to our region to take up some of the unemployment slack; however, the economic decline has been so great that the results of their endeavors have not been fast enough to prevent an economic recession in which we find ourselves at the present time.

Southern Illinois is made up of fine people, good schools, churches and bounded on both sides by two of the greatest navigable streams in the world, the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, but is severely hurt economically and if Federal help is not forthcoming, thousands of additional people will be forced to leave the area to seek employment. There are 31,000 able-bodied men and women in my congressional district unemployed and according to the latest figures from the Illinois Public Aid Commission there are 51,876 persons receiving Government surplus food in the 15 lower counties of southern Illinois. In an effort to spotlight the needs of Southern Illinois and to give each community a chance to stand up and speak out in behalf

of their wants and needs, I called a nonpolitical factfinding forum for December 31, 1955, and urged every man, woman, and child in southern Illinois to attend. I invited every State and Federal official, concerned with this type of problem, from President Eisenhower on down. I was indeed gratified by the huge success of the meeting which was made possible by the attendance of 35 southern Illinois mayors, an estimated 5,000 private citizens and a score of various chambers of commerce and other spokemen who came to the "sink or swim" meeting to tell their story and every word uttered received the utmost attention of the following State and Federal officials who were in attendance:

LIST OF STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS ATTENDING "SINK OR SWIM" MEETING HELD AT WEST FRANKFORT, ILL., DECEMBER 31, 1955

PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator, chairman, Joint Committee on Economic Report.

Bert Baker, State representative, Illinois.

Russel Travis, representing Illinois State Director of Labor.

Lester E. Leigh, representing Ezra T. Benson, Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture.

Harry P. Raymond, Interstate Commerce Commission.

J. M. Ballard, representing Administrator Wendell Barnes, Small Business Administration.

Charles S. Green, representing Illinois Department of Labor.

Paul Dorris, representing Illinois Industrial and Planning Commission.

CHARLES W. VURSEL, Member of Congress, 23d District of Illinois.

G. R. "Bob" Beckmeyer, State representative, Illinois.

Dean Hammick, State representative, Illinois.

Clyde Miller, United States Department of Commerce, personal representative of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

A. L. Rascher, Jr., United States Department of Commerce, personal representative of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Paul Zeigler, State representative, Illinois.

Clyde Choate, State representative, Illinois.

V. O. Verhines, State representative, Illinois.

E. Bishop Hill, representing United States Health, Education, and Welfare.

L. D. Norman, representing Department of Public Welfare.

Clyde W. Campbell, representing Interstate Commerce Commission.

John M. Darr, representing Wendell Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

Ralph Warnack, representing Wendell Barnes, Administrator, Small Business Administration.

Russell L. Kelly, representing Illinois Department of Labor.

H. K. Olds, representing State of Illinois auditor's office.

E. E. Crawford, representing United States Department of Interior.

H. E. Stiles, representing United States Department of Interior.

I expended months of hard work in organizing such a factfinding forum and I believe it was well worth the effort because it accomplished at least three specific things: (1) It gave the people of southern Illinois a chance to tell of the true economic conditions existing in their respective communities; (2) through questionnaires an opportunity was provided to list projects needed to stimulate the local economy; and (3) focused State and Federal attention on our plight with a view that the information derived from each community will be helpful in setting up a distressed-areas program. Speakers came from every walk of life—rich man and poor man, banker and coal miner, and each one reiterated a common plea to officials in attendance that "we don't want charity or doles, we want to work"—but they pointed out they had no chance to work. No jobs were to be found, they said, unless they left their homes and went to some other place.

It was brought out in the meeting that the people are very disgruntled with the Government for sending billions of dollars overseas in foreign aid while communities in the United States could be utilizing these funds to alleviate human suffering in this country.

We were privileged to have Senator DOUGLAS at our meeting to discuss some of our problems and offer ways of improving conditions and have him explain the provisions of his depressed-areas bill, S. 2663.

President Eisenhower personally directed that Mr. Clyde Miller and Mr. A. L. Rascher, of the United States Department of Commerce, report back to him their findings of the forum. They summed up conditions in southern Illinois by including in their report that the "area is economically depressed and needs Federal assistance."

Gentlemen, I call these facts to your attention because they reflect the opinion of unbiased individuals who were sent into our area to review our economic plight. Similar reports will be forthcoming from other State and Federal officials in attendance.

In addition to our industrial plight, our farmers are also experiencing undue hardship. In a survey that I conducted in my district in cooperation with the Bureau of Census, it was determined that there has been a net loss of 4,000 farms in my congressional district since 1951. This means only one thing—the small farmer is being forced out of business and has been selling his acreage to the larger farmer. This can be substantiated by the fact that the average acreage per farm has increased. We have also lost over 25,000 people in the past 5 years who have moved to other sections of the country to find work.

I think I have expounded long enough as to our need. The main concern of mine at this time is what can we do about it. I believe it is incumbent upon the Congress to pass some type of depressed areas bill in this session so we may go about the task of stimulating the economy of our communities without further delay. I have read thousands of questionnaires that have been filled out by individuals, organizations, and cities. I am thoroughly convinced that a program designed merely to loan money will not be sufficient to cope with the problem. In addition to loans to communities with which to induce new industry, other things will be needed—public works projects such as new highways and streets, city halls, new schools and additions to old ones, improved water and sewerage systems, artificial lakes to insure an adequate water supply, increased dredging projects for navigation and flood control, and new sources of electrical power. To help carry out some of the aims of area development, I have just introduced H. R. 7902 which is similar to S. 2663 introduced by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS in the Senate. I expect to have some slight changes in my bill after completion of the study of the thousands of suggestions contained in the questionnaires I circulated in conjunction with the "sink or swim" meeting held last week.

On behalf of all the fine people of southern Illinois, may I urge upon you very strongly to take drastic action in an effort to alleviate the critical unemployment situation existing not only in southern Illinois but the other economic sore spots in the country. We do not ask for handouts, but merely be given some projects and tools with which to work so that we may make our area more attractive to private industry.

Thank you very kindly for your attention and for this opportunity to testify before this committee.

Senator DOUGLAS (chairman of Subcommittee on Labor, presiding). May I interrupt a moment? You know, of course, that section 9 of S. 2663 authorizes the appropriation of an additional $100 million for public works and public facilities outside the sums carried in other appropriation bills?

Mr. GRAY. That is exactly right. As I have said, I have had the honor of introducing a companion measure to your bill in the House, H. R. 7902, and I realize that. I merely mention this because I think some of the supporters of depressed areas bills will merely want to make money available to lend to these various communities. I don't think that is going to do the job by itself. I don't think the economy of some of these communities will allow them to put up the necessary capital to obtain a loan. I think there are going to have to be types of projects other than just lending money to these various communities. That is the reason I pinpoint and mention this.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes. May I ask this question? It is not true that though the averag rainfall over a period of years in southern Illinois has in the past been adequate, though not in certain years, that nevertheless there is something connected with the soil so that there are not natural lakes in the region, and it would be necessary probably in order to build up the region to have a series of artificial lakes or reservoirs both for the use of the community and to provide industrial water for new industry which may come there? It would be, therefore, necessary to have a public-works and public-facilities program to go along with loans to new industries.

Mr. GRAY. That is exactly right, Mr. Chairman; not only for possible irrigation farming and industry, but in the past 3 years almost every city reservoir in southern Illinois has dried up, and they have had to pump water from as far as 30 miles away to supply their local communities.

I might say that after looking over thousands of these questionnaires I may have some additional recommendations to make to this committee. There is some wonderful testimony in the questionnaires, both from individuals and groups, and due to the fact that the meeting was only last Saturday, I haven't had a chance to go over all of them.

Every person who came to the microphone to speak at the meeting told that we didn't want doles, but we would like to have some things to raise our economy up with the economy of the rest of the country, and to provide these people with a decent living.

As I say, there are 31,000 unemployed in my district, plus the 25,000 who have had to move off to other places, including the potash mines of New Mexico. Many own their homes, and would like to come back to them. So if you added that figure, we probably would have 50,000 or 75,000 unemployed if they all could come back home. This is a matter that has been discussed pro and con as to whether or not the Government should help these areas, and in my opinion, after listening to this nonpolitical fact-finding forum, it is a must, for some Federal action if these communities are to survive. My home town of West Frankfort, Ill., in 1940 had a population of 15,800. Today it has an estimated population of 9,000. Imagine such a loss in population when most cities have grown considerably since the war.

Last week, on the very day that I called the fact-finding forum, we had a very large department store on Main Street, one of the largest in town, close after 35 years of operation, because of economic conditions. Thirty-five years in the same spot, and it closed the very day we had this forum.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is the same thing that happened in Johnson City.

Mr. GRAY. That is right. All those towns.

I again say I certainly appreciate this opportunity. I am at the disposal of this

committee any time that I can give information that I have derived from these questionnaires or from personal knowledge of the problem. The questionnaires contain the unbiased opinions of the people of southern Illinois, regardless of political affiliations, and we are at your command at any time.

The American Legion's Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. J. Addington Wagner, in which he presented the legislative program of the American Legion to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

STATEMENT OF J. ADDINGTON WAGNER, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION. BEFORE THE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 12, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as national commander of the American Legion, I shall have no assignment more important than my appearance here today. I thank you for the opportunity to present, on behalf of veterans of three wars, the American Legion's requests and views on the subject of veterans' legislation.

The members of this distinguished committee assume an enormous responsibility in serving the welfare of veterans along with that of all citizens. We acknowledge your responsibility; we admire and are grateful for your dedicated diligence. We are particularly mindful that your committee in the past has presented and supported a vast amount of legislation benefiting veterans.

I should like to express our appreciation for the beneficial legislation enacted in the present Congress since my predecessor appeared before you, approximately 1 year ago.

Through Public Law 84, 84th Congress, you have provided veterans living on farms with loan-guaranty entitlement equal to that given veterans in the city under the GI bill of rights. Our national economic commission feels that this measure has materially improved the home-loan guaranty provisions.

HOSPITAL MAINTENANCE

A year ago, your committee was deeply concerned with the physical condition of many Veterans' Administration hospitals. You have given significant emphasis to the importance of maintaining these properties so that they will meet the needs of modern medicine.

Members of your committee played an important part in securing an increased appropriation for the improvement of this hospital system. Your continued interest in this field gives the best possible assurance that the number of hospital beds, already inadequate as to the mentally ill, will not be further reduced. We are intensely interested in the reports you will receive as to the manner in which this program is administered.

There are still three hospital projects on the Veterans' Administration construction program which have not been completed. They are at Washington, D. C. (GM 500 beds); Cleveland, Ohio (GM 500 beds); and San Francisco, Calif. (NP 1000 beds). Those at Washington and Cleveland are replacements for old institutions, and the one at San Francisco a long-needed hospital for the mentally ill. They were approved in the 1947 and 1948 fiscal year schedule. The American Legion is intent upon seeing that these projects are completed as promptly as possible.

SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

Your attention to the work of the House Select Committee on Survivor Benefits has been most helpful. You may know that our 1955 national convention placed the American Legion on record approving H. R. 7089 with the proviso that we seek amendments to the measure in the Senate.

Should this bill be approved, experience will show whether further amendments will be needed to provide adequately for those with whom it is concerned. To your committee, we will bring such recommendations as we may have for remedial legislation in those areas in which jurisdiction is vested in you.

Another item of real importance to us in the field of survivors' benefits is a change in the present law to provide awards of death pension to widows and children of World War II and Korean conflict veterans on the same basis as now provided for those of World War I. Our organization has expressed itself many times on this subject. We have testified in favor of pending legislation designed to bring this about. We sincerely urge its enactment.

SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION

The American Legion has given attention to the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission. The Second Hoover Commission made 314 recommendations. Some may be accomplished by legislation. Some may be accepted through Executive or administrative orders. Reorganization plans may be submitted to give effect to others.

The American Legion analysis of all of these recommendations indicates there are 77 which will affect veterans' benefits and services. Of this number, we favor 31 and we oppose 46. An analysis giving the reasons for the American Legion's position on these recommendations will be furnished the committee in the near future.

You are aware that there is a big backlog of bills which have been introduced to give effect to some of the Second Hoover Commission recommendations. Not all of them are within the jurisdiction of your committee.

We anticipate that we will be permitted to testify before the appropriate committees when hearings are held on Hoover Commission bills and reorganization plans. We are making our position known to those charged with considering executive and administrative steps to give effect to the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Members of your committee, we believe, will want to give careful attention to the nature and progress of the legislation proposed in the Congress. Certainly your committee will assert its right to be fully informed of any executive and administrative plans to carry out the recommendations. We are confident that, in evaluating these proposals, you will be mindful of the harmful effects that may be done to existing veterans' benefits and services. We are particularly fearful of some of the Hoover Commission recommendations affecting Federal medical services, compensation and pensions, veterans' preference and civil service.

BRADLEY COMMISSION

We attach equal importance to the operations of the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions. We have maintained liaison with the Commission and its staff. Meanwhile, a special American Legion committee is appraising the existing structure of veterans compensation and pension laws. Through this committee's work we shall be better prepared to consider the recommendations of the President's Commission.

Since the findings of the President's Commission have not been released, we do not know what they contain. We have endeavored to be alert to any trend adverse to veterans programs. We have authority in national convention action to take whatever steps are necessary when the President's Commission releases its findings.

We continue to study the budgetary needs of the Veterans' Administration and other agencies conducting veterans programs. Last November a VA official testified before the Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management (House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) on whether or not the Veterans' Administration could set an additional numerical goal for personnel reduction by June 30, 1956. It was pointed out then that during the period from June 30, 1953 to August 31, 1955, the VA had effected reduction of 9,206 employees in veterans benefits, insurance, central and field offices in the Washington area. At the same time, there was an addition of 6,436 employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. This latter was due to the increase in the number of authorized beds from 109,035 to approximately 120,000.

The net of all this, according to reports received from American Legion department service officers and field representatives, is that the Veterans' Administration workforce is down to the bone. Under the circumstances, there is no way consistent with good service for the VA to guarantee further personnel reduction as of any certain date. Moreover, the agency may have to come to Congress for supplementl funds in order to overcome backlogs of work which our representatives report are causing delays and dissatisfaction among VA beneficiaries.

This situation is particularly urgent and dangerous in Department of Veterans' Benefits and the Department of Medicine and Surgery.

The disabled veteran is the victim when production-line tactics are applied in rating agencies. That is precisely what is happening today. We believe that this problem should be resolved before it causes widespread and irreparable hardship.

In the Veterans' Administration Department of Medicine and Surgery, the allocations of funds to hospitals and Regional Offices for medical purposes are pared so fine, and apparently are so inflexible that managers are hard put to maintain the quality of medical service. The morale of professional staff members is lowered. The hard-won supremacy of veterans medicine is being jeopardized.

Sometimes the American Legion is able to intervene to save a service. This happened recently in the Boston-Worcester area. Due to lack of funds for outpatient care for service-connected veterans, a field office was about to be closed. The American Legion was able to assist in securing a new allocation and the office is being maintained.

In Minneapolis, a new unit of the VA hospital is to be activiated at the beginning of 1956. Due to shortage of funds for equipment and personnel, 16 of the beds will not be put in operation before next June 30. This situation may be corrected, but the immediate shortage reduces the number of beds for the benefit of sick veterans.

In the Minneapolis regional office a situation exists where, because of the immediate shortage of funds, outpatient care for service-connected is seriously impaired. Funds to employ available and urgently needed medical personnel are not in the hands of the Chief Medical Offices.

Also in Minneapolis, a long-time VA pharmacist is being retired for physical disability. On retirement this employee will take title to an extended period of sick and annual leave. Funds at this facility are so short that, until the sick and annual leave

has been paid, a replacement may not be employed. This, too, may be corrected, but the condition of such a tight allocation should not exist.

At the Fargo VA hospital, authorized beds were about to be closed due to the shortage of funds. The American Legion intervened and was helpful in securing a new $25,000 allocation which prevented this closing of beds.

HOME LOAN EXTENSION

This is a year of decision for the home loan guaranty program.

Originally, World War II veterans were entitled to this benefit for 2 years after discharge, or the termination of war, whichever was the later date. In no event was the privilege granted for more than 5 years after termination of the war.

Subsequently, to make the period of entitlement more realistic, there was an amendment granting an extension. This brought the termination date to 10 years after the official termination of the war. Also, Korean conflict veterans were granted entitlement to the same benefits.

As it stands now, this law calls for termination of entitlement for World War II veterans on July 25, 1957. Our organization has given considerable thought to the impact this termination date may have on the program. It is our considered opinion that the date should be further extended until July 25, 1960, or a period of 3 years.

Approximatey 4 million veterans have availed themselves of this benefit. Among the millions who have not applied are many who now have, for the first time, the means and the need for home ownership. We believe that the present termination date would in effect encourage not only veterans, but lenders and builders, to act with haste in order to meet the program deadline. Such haste would, in our opinion, create an unhealthy economic situation and tend to nullify the purpose of the program.

The American Legion advocates a 3-year extension to permit more orderly termination of a program which has recorded excellent results.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

The American Legion has a deep interest in the protection of the rights granted under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. While we realize that this is not a matter coming within the jurisdiction of your committee, we believe it merits attention at this time. Certainly, as individual Members of Congress, you share our concern for this basic benefit.

DISABILITY AND DEATH PAYMENTS

In the field of disability and death compensation and pension awards, we seek legislation to provide increases in all monthly rates. This is a part of the compensation and pension legislative program adopted by our 1955 national convention. The increase sought is an effort to keep such payments in line with the increased cost of living.

VETERANS PENSION

The matters I have mentioned pertain directly to the welfare of veterans and their dependents. Many of them reflect the American Legion's intense concern for the welfare of war-disabled veterans who certainly have first claim on the Government's responsibility. Without in any way minimizing the needs of those veterans, I respectfully call your attention to another proposal which, in our judgment, is most important in terms both of need and of national obligation.

We ask your committee and your colleagues of the Congress to liberalize the existing veterans' disability pension law so that every war veteran meeting other requirements who needs a pension shall have it. We suggest that you do this by amending regulation 1 (a), part III, of Veterans Regulations.

It is our belief that the war-veterans pension system, to be fair and practicable, must include all war veterans who meet the basic requirements. A considerable number of World War I veterans have passed the age of 65. Some veterans of World War II have reached that mark. Many more veterans, including a growing number of those from the Korean conflict, have been made invalids for life through accident or illness.

Let me emphasize that we are not seeking a so-called general pension based on age alone. Our 1955 national convention considered, debated, and, by a decisive vote, rejected that proposal. We do not ask pensions for veterans regardless of income. We do ask, urgently, and as a matter of simple justice, modest support for every veteran who, by reason of age or physical disability, cannot support himself.

May I stress this again. Our organization submits this as a measure based upon existing law. It is not a departure in any sense of the word. We are not entering into the field of general pensions, that is those payable without regard to qualification, other than service and age.

We think the pension program we propose is of value to the military establishment. We are constantly getting reports that there is difficulty in maintaining the strength of the Armed Forces. In large degree this difficulty is based upon the difference between the earnings from military and from civilian life. If our program were accepted it would add one more morale builder to those already existing. The assurance of added security that such a program would give to the man who must be on active duty before he becomes a veteran is well worthwhile, whatever it costs.

THREE CHANGES URGED

We submit that this objective can be reached if the Congress will direct three changes in the pension system already in force.

1. The current monthly pension award is inadequate in the light of today's living costs. The rates now paid are $66.15, $78.75 and a maximum of $135.45 for the small number of veterans who are blind or helpless and need attendance. We ask that these rates be increased to $85, $105 and $150 respectively. These increases are modest. We believe they are realistic. We hope that your committee and the Congress will agree.

2. Presently the veteran applying for part III benefits is limited to a yearly income of $1,400 if he has no dependents, and of $2,700 if he has dependents. We request that these income limitations be increased to $1,800 and $3,000.

3. By commonly accepted standards, a veteran at age 65 is classed as having negligible employment potential. Federal Government benefits are granted those who retire from the work force at age 65 and are denied those who do not. In private employment, 65 is generally accepted retirement age. We therefore ask that the veterans pension law recognize age 65 as the statutory age of unemployability. This means that a veteran reaching that age, and meeting income and service requirements, will qualify for a pension.

NO. 1 OBJECTIVE

Our national executive committee, meeting after the national convention, assigned this pension legislation the No. 1 priority in our legislative program for 1956. At the direction of the national executive committee, I have appointed a special American Legion committee to coordinate our pension effort.

Serving as members of this new committee—and I am identifying these individuals for the first time here this morning—are the following:

John Stelle, of Illinois, past national commander of the American Legion, and former Governor of Illinois.

Herman F. Luhrs, of Michigan, chairman of the national legislative commission of the American Legion.

George N. Craig, Governor of Indiana, and past national commander of the American Legion.

Erle Cocke, of Georgia, past national commander of the American Legion.

Maurice Stember, of New York, adjutant of the Department of New York, the American Legion.

Michael M. Markowitz, of Pennsylvania, director of rehabilitation of the Department of Pennsylvania, the American Legion.

The first two named are cochairmen.

This committee, together with our standing legislative and rehabilitation commissions, is available and eager to contribute in every helpful way to your consideration of the matter.

Obviously, we attach tremendous importance to revision of the pension system. The changes we seek may appear slight in relation to the entire veterans benefit program. For thousands of veterans, however, they spell the difference between existing and living—between despair and hope.

Like your committee, we are cognizant of a responsibility to equate the welfare of veterans with the welfare of the country. We believe this is a thoroughly responsible approach to the needs of the aged and unemployable veteran. We solicit your active leadership and we trust your good judgment to legislate fair and sound assistance this year for a group of war veterans who sorely need it.

COST CONSIDERED

We are aware of the importance of considering the cost of legislation to amend and liberalize pension and compensation laws. We have no final estimates available. However, we do have a tentative estimate of the first year's additional cost—$528,000,000. We shall be dependent, to a great extent, upon official reports and projections. Experience in the past indicates that initial or tentative estimates of this character have exceeded actual expenditures. In considering the equity of our requests and the nation's obligation to the war veterans, we ask that you evaluate all such cost estimates in their relation to the national income and other pertinent factors.

In the past those who have been critical of the dollar cost of veterans benefits and services have sought to isolate such costs without relation to any other factor. It is our belief that the cost of all veterans benefits and services should be considered in terms of increases in all other fields. Past estimates have shown that the 1955 costs of veterans programs are approximately 1 percent of the national income. Virtually the same percentage applied in the period 1890–1900.

We believe that the Nation's expanded and expanding economy must be reckoned with when veterans legislation is considered.

In my presentation thus far, my remarks have been limited to those features of our legislative program which have the most compelling general interest. I believe you know there are many other important items where we seek modification and adjustment of existing law.

With your permission, the detailed report of our legislative program will be filed with the committee.

In conclusion, may I say that we stand ready to serve your committee to the very best of our ability. Our Washington and other national headquarters staff personnel are ready and willing to supply data which you may need before taking final action on our requests. Personally, I shall make myself available to your committee at any time when, in your judgment, I can make a further contribution to your work.

Selection of Claude Garvin as Most Popular Boy at Washington High School, Portland, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, all of us stand in awe before the courage and valor of people who are afflicted by blindness. In my home city of Portland, Oreg., we are proud and humble because of the splendid achievements of 18-year-old Claude Garvin, who was born blind but has just been voted the most popular student at a great high school, Washington High.

Claude is an honor student, and 1 of 10 children of Mr. and Mrs. John W. Garvin. His seeing-eye dog, Penny, guides Claude to and from school and on the many activities in which Claude is outstanding, such as his membership in the Young Democratic Club of Multnomah County.

I am happy to present for the RECORD a fine tribute to Claude Garvin which appeared in the Oregonian of Portland, on Sunday, January 8, 1955, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON HIGH'S POPULAR STUDENT PROVES BLIND, ABLE, OUTSTANDING

(By Red Hurd)

Washington High School's vote for the "most popular" boy wouldn't go to an outstanding athlete.

If the school took such a vote, it would undoubtedly go to a courageous 18-year-old senior who has never played football or basketball—and never will.

He is Claude Garvin, a blind boy.

Young Claude, one of 10 children of Mr. and Mrs. John Wesley Garvin, 3730 SE, Alder Street, has been blind since birth.

Garvin is an honor student and president of his class and he is scheduled to speak to the Optimist Club Wednesday on the 18-year-old vote issue.

It just seems to follow that a boy such as Claude would earn these honors.

BOY PROVES CHEERFUL

His cheerful philosophy on life and his sharp sense of humor make everyone sit up and take notice—and feel a little ashamed.

He shows not one speck of reticence in discussing his handicap—although it's not easy to realize he is handicapped.

He hopes someday to be a lawyer and is planning to attend Willamette University after graduation in June.

An expert in the Braille system for the blind, young Claude chuckled when discussing the so-called pocket edition of the Braille dictionary. The pocket edition includes four volumes, Claude explained, each three inches thick and 12 inches square. "Imagine putting all that in your pocket," Claude remarked with a grin.

Rather than feeling sorry for himself, Claude has a sincere desire to help other blind persons. His best friend and constant companion is "Penny," a seeing-eye dog Claude obtained a year and a half ago at Guide Dogs for the Blind, Inc., San Rafael, Calif., after a month's training with the dog.

Claude attended the Oregon State School for the Blind in Salem through seven grades, then enrolled at Washington High as a freshman.

STUDENT PROVES SPEEDY

He was born July 10, 1937, in Henryetta, Okla. The Garvin family moved to Oregon in 1944, in time for Claude to enter the Salem school as a first-grader.

He has 4 brothers and 5 sisters. They are all married now except Claude and his youngest sister, 14-year-old Carolyn, a freshman at Washington.

Claude would make a fast typist look slower than a freight train crossing Portland's Powell Boulevard the way he operates his Braille slate and stylus, an instrument he uses to take notes in class, including shorthand.

"Penny gets along fine in school," Claude said, "except in an assembly.

"Then she puts up a howl when there's too much applause," he went on to explain.

Dean Hazel Ohmert said a move is underway to present Penny with a diploma, too. "After all," she explained, "Penny has helped Claude through school."

"But, please, Miss Ohmert, no applause," Claude laughed.

Speech of the Honorable George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, at the Biltmore Bowl, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the text of a speech delivered by Pennsylvania's great young Governor, the Honorable George M. Leader, at Los Angeles on September 15, 1955:

We each of us came here tonight as men and women interested in the success of the Democratic Party.

We came to strengthen our party; we came to talk politics; we came to plan our way back to victory in 1956.

And, if we can carry Pennsylvania, where I come from, and California, where most of you come from, we very nearly have it made. It's that simple, if you include the South.

That's what is nice about being a Democrat. We are always hopeful, always optimistic, good and sore if we lose, ready to bounce back, sure of ourselves and sure of the country.

That song in Damn Yankees—You Got To Have Heart—ought to be our theme. The other fellows have most of the money, almost all of the newspapers, all of the slick magazines, all the respectability, and an odor of sanctity they spray about themselves.

All we have is heart—and about 20 million more Americans who think of themselves as Democrats, rather than Republicans.

We also have the habit of producing great men—great-hearted men—the Franklin Roosevelts, the Harry Trumans, the Adlai Stevensons. And we have the habit of winning elections, as we have been steadily doing before and since the abnormal election of 1952.

That election of 1952 was abnormal because the minority party—the conservative party—despairing of its own dull creatures went Hollywood and got itself a box-office name. It nominated a military hero with a folksy nickname and a wide smile.

The country did not vote Republican.

It voted Eisenhower.

The Republicans, being human and reacting to victory, will nominate him again. It is reasonable to expect that Eisenhower, being human, will accept the nomination.

History shows no record of a voluntary surrender of the Presidency of the United States, except as tradition or party discipline enforced it.

Consequently, the next presidential election will be the Democratic Party and the Democratic nominee against Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We will win it or lose it on that basis.

Certainly we are not going to settle for a holding action to keep control of Congress, vital though that has proved to be for the welfare of this Nation and the world.

In almost 3 years in office, the President has enjoyed a tenderness of approach that is unique in America's political history. Even George Washington, who became President by acclamation, before the days of political parties, enjoyed no such protection in press or politics.

Skilled and seasoned politicians obviously have been in grave doubt as to how they should grapple with such a political freak.

Now I am neither skilled nor seasoned, but it seems to me that there is no choice in the matter. Eisenhower has not chosen to put himself above party. He campaigned as hard and as shabbily as he knew how for a Republican Congress in 1954—and was rebuffed by the people. He has enlisted no genuine Democrats in such supposedly nonpartisan areas as national defense and foreign policy. He repaid the Democratic leadership in the 84th Congress for its numerous rescues of administration measures with words of churlish ingratitude.

Dwight Eisenhower is no constitutional monarch, a symbol of the state removed from party contention.

He is a Republican partisan President, and except where the best interests of America and of world peace are involved, he should be so recognized and treated.

He is the responsible executive of our National Government, and the policies of his department heads are his policies.

There is no Benson farm policy that is creating an agricultural depression in this country. It is an Eisenhower policy.

There is no Brownell security policy in this country that has built up a shocking crew of Government paid informers and perjurers. It is an Eisenhower policy.

There was no Hobby snafu on the polio vaccine. It was the Eisenhower administration's snafu.

The Humphrey blooper that cost the Treasury a billion dollars in corporate taxes, the Humphrey hard money policy that gave us a quickie recession, are misnamed. They were Eisenhower's responsibilities. Eisenhower's blooper, Eisenhower's handout to the banks.

There is a simple piece of logic here.

Either the President doesn't know what is happening in his administration, in which case a Dwight Eisenhower Slept Here sign should be ordered for the White House, for the Doud House in Denver, and for the Gettysburg farm, and perhaps even the Burning Tree Country Club.

Or he does know what is happening, approves of it, and supports it.

In either case, he is legitimately subject to legitimate criticism.

Before a single editorial writer has a chance to jump down my throat, I want to make it clear that I am not calling for a smear campaign, for personal abuse, or a Democratic policy of congressional obstruction.

I am calling for a normal exercise of the two party system, to which the same editorial writers gave such consistent adulation when the Democrats held the Presidency and Congress.

If Mr Eisenhower is a candidate, he will be running on a record he himself will point to with all of a candidate's pride.

Our duty will be to review that record as we see it—to point to its failures as well as its successes—to illuminate these places where Dwight D. Eisenhower has been a less than perfect President of the United States.

To do so, to penetrate the screen of protective armor that has been put around Dwight Eisenhower, we are going to need sharp weapons, well laid on.

Harry Truman's broadax alone won't do it. Neither will Adlai Stevenson's rapier thrusts. Every Democrat who is active in the party, from the election district to the statehouse, from the town council to the Halls of Congress, has a part to play in this work.

And the avenue of attack is wide and beckoning.

For, under the Eisenhower administration tion, the Republican Party has violated a basic principle of American public life. These men do not understand the genius of our political institutions. The American people, through their history, have expected their major parties to be cross sections of the Nation. They have never, even in the most industrial of our States and cities, adopted and supported a labor party. They have never, even in the Wheat Belt or in the cotton districts of the South, established and preserved a farm party.

They instinctively reject a political organization based on class and economic lines.

They expect their parties to maintain a balance, to provide for the interplay of forces, to equalize pressures—so that our whole society may achieve harmony and progress.

Today's Republican Party, this Eisenhower administration, has thrown all of this overboard.

The Eisenhower administration is building something that is really unique—a millionaires' party.

It's hard to see how they hope to make it a majority even in the oilfields of Texas.

Every influence that counts in this national administration is the influence of wealth, of corporate power.

I think this should be made clear. Business and corporate enterprise are not evil forces. They are making an immense contribution to the material progress of this country. Men of great ability and unquestioned integrity are active in the management of banks and corporations. I hope that business enterprise in my own State will actively participate in our commonwealth's affairs. President Roosevelt and President Truman called upon many business executives to serve their administrations and our country.

But men of great wealth, and men who control great wealth through their corporate power, tend to represent only one set of values, one outlook on our problems, one force in our society.

To turn the vast machinery of the Federal Government—its great economic influence—its power to enrich or to impoverish—over to one group of our people is as dangerous as it is unjust.

I am not now thinking of such surface manifestations as the Dixon-Yates case, with all its grimy undertones, nor of Air Secretary Talbot, driven from office because of ethical insensibility where a dollar is concerned.

The root of this matter is something far more deep than these personal involvements of people in the Eisenhower administration. It is the direction of the American economy; the distribution of income; the impact of taxation; the management of money and the interest rate; the vast complexities of our economic system.

This Eisenhower administration, because of its exclusive orientation toward what we classify as "big business" and "Wall Street," is incapable of sympathy for the farmer, the workingman, and the small businessman.

It is an attitude, a habit of mind, a frame of reference—and it cannot be eradicated so long as this Eisenhower administration remains in office. It is stacked, packed, and philosophically loaded. And it cannot shake loose its thought patterns.

Ever so often a chance phrase comes through; a natural thought, naturally expressed, without benefit of public-relations counsel.

Last year it was the Defense Secretary and his comparison of factory workers to bird dogs and kennel dogs.

This year the slip comes from the Department of Agriculture. Don Paarlberg, the principal economic adviser to the Secretary of Agriculture, said a few weeks ago that the farmer who expects to share equally in our booming economy is living in a dream world.

Fifteen percent of the American people live on farms.

Their share of the national income, relatively and absolutely, has been dropping, dropping, dropping.

Three years ago, under a Democratic administration, the farm families in this country had an annual income that came to $13,-500,000,000. This year, under the Eisenhower administration, farm income will be down to $11,400,000,000.

In 1947 farm families received 10.3 percent of the total national income. In 1955 this figure is down to 6 percent.

To the men who do the thinking in agricultural economics for Eisenhower this is nothing to worry about. Anything better would be the stuff of dreams.

What's wrong here, of course, is that farm families are not listed on the New York Stock Exchange. Not much in the way of dividend or investment income comes from farms. Farmers aren't big business. Farmers don't count. The business philosophy which dominates the Eisenhower administration simply doesn't function in this area. Their real thought is that too many people are farming; that too many inefficient farmers exist; the law of survival should apply, and the weak should get out of the business.

Their solution would be an economic shakeout, as the corporate mind would expect if the problem were in automobiles or oil. That's the way that business thinks, instinctively.

And that is the way this Eisenhower administration thinks.

There may be some gesture toward the farmer as election day comes closer and the Republican politicians from the Farm Belt cry the blues. They may decide to sacrifice Benson, but they will never, in their hearts or in their actions, concede that the farmer has a true right to parity in the American economic system.

The Republican advertising men are getting them to chant that everything is booming but the guns.

If they chant it too loud in the farm country, they are liable to hear the boom of the farmer's traditional shotgun.

In this same boom, with corporate profits so satisfactory in the great companies, there are some accumulating symptoms that small business is having its troubles. And I don't mean the unsold cars on the dealers' lots. In the first 6 months of this year, more than 5,600 businesses went broke. That is the largest number of business failures in 14 years.

In the same boom, we still must recognize that we have more unemployment than we had in 1953. The Nation is turning out steel at full capacity, but it is doing it with 50,000 less people employed in the industry, turning out the same tonnage just 2 years ago.

With that exception, labor is doing well in this economy.

But it owes its participation to its own strength, and not to the economic philosophy of the Eisenhower regime.

Corporate profits are rising faster than employee income. So are dividends. But labor has not been helpless, as the farmer has been helpless, in an economic squeeze.

The balance of forces that was achieved in 20 years of Democratic government has protected the organized workingman and woman. George Meany and Walter Reuther, David J. McDonald and John L. Lewis know what to do with economic power.

They have used it, and they have protected their people.

In so doing, they have protected the rest of us.

The business philosophy that would relegate the farmer to a second-class economic citizenship would also give the industrial worker no real consideration, except as the needs of production dictated.

It is the fact that labor can exert its strength to gain a share of this expanding economy which keeps this economy expanding. Otherwise, the economy would contract as purchasing power diminished. It is an ominous thing for our prosperity that labor has no representation in the Eisenhower Republican administration.

As Democrats, as an opposition party, we are looking for neither gloom nor doom.

After all, you cannot tell the voter whether he is prosperous or not. He knows. You can suggest to him the basis of his prosperity and how long he may expect it to endure.

You can examine with him how the cards are falling, whether or not he's betting against loaded dice.

If he is convinced that the direction of the country's affairs is concentrated in a group of men who have no essential concern for his welfare, who by training and associations are incapable of understanding his problems and acting sympathetically toward them, he is not likely to maintain that crowd in office.

He will want an administration which is a fair composite of the American people, instead of a selection from the blue chip corporations of America.

There are lots of symptoms, lots of illustrations.

The White House is so sensitive that it will no longer publish the guest list of those comfortable little dinners where the President feels the pulse of the country.

Dixon-Yates has become a symbol of the intrusion of special interests into public life.

The Federal regulatory commissions have been packed with lobbyists for the interests they are supposed to regulate.

Federal services, in every field from the National Parks to the housing agencies, are withering because of nonsupport.

A Robert Stevens, drawn from business, is an abject, pitiful, public failure as Secretary of the Army.

A Harold Talbott, drawn from business, uses the Air Force to advance his private partnership.

Singly, these things are incidents.

Together, they make a pattern of behavior.

They illustrate the fatal weakness of the Eisenhower administration.

This country has a great, and expanding economy. The safeguards built into it by the Democratic administrations have proved their worth. The protections thrust into the economy by organized labor are helping to maintain our advance. American business has unequalled resourcefulness and technical skill. American agriculture's only weakness is its strength—its unparalleled abundance.

These are the elements of enduring prosperity, of great advances still to come in living standards for all Americans.

The present has much that is good; the potential for the future is enormous.

All the country needs is leadership to see that our advances and our progress fall across the board to all Americans, a leadership that will make sure that all Americans have their even chance to participate in the good things that are ahead.

The Eisenhower administration does not furnish such leadership.

It does not have the wisdom; it does not have the imagination; it has invited and joyfully accepted its captivity.

And in that acceptance, it has invited its rejection by the broad masses of the American people.

There will be nothing abnormal about the election next year, nothing freakish, nothing strange.

The American people, by the tens of millions, will once more vote themselves into control of their own Government, once more elect a Democratic president.

The American Legion's Stand on UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM A. PURTELL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, explaining the American Legion's stand on UNESCO.

Commander Wagner's address was delivered to the American Legion Department of the District of Columbia at the Shoreham Hotel on November 10, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chairman Hill, Commander Zindel, distinguished guests and my fellow-Legionnaires, this annual banquet of the Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, on the eve of Veterans Day, is an event to which I have looked forward eagerly.

You are kind enough to salute the national commander in this very generous and significant way. I appreciate that more than I can say. I appreciate, too, that the object of your respect here tonight is, in fact, the office of national commander and the ideals of leadership and service which it represents.

It is now my duty and my opportunity, given me by you and your fellow Legionnaires in all of the departments, to occupy that office in a manner befitting its responsibility and honor. I shall try, sincerely and vigorously, to do just that.

In anticipating this gathering several weeks ago, I intended to discuss with you some of the general aspects of the new American Legion program adopted at our national convention in Miami. I had hoped to describe our major objectives, particularly in the fields of veteran rehabilitation and community service activities. It seemed to me then, as it does now, that these matters must assume a very special relevance on the eve of the second annual observance of Veterans Day.

However, developments since the Convention have dictated a different course. I feel that in fairness to you and to the requirements of my office I must report to you tonight on a national issue of serious import to The American Legion and to all Americans.

I want to talk to you about the American Legion and UNESCO.

Thousands of words have been printed and broadcast on this subject during the past few months, and particularly since our national convention in Miami last month. Yet, the American people still don't have a clear, accurate understanding of how the American Legion stands with respect to UNESCO. They are not sure why we oppose UNESCO.

This is no mere assumption. The questions which I have been asked and the letters which I have received since our convention make it clear that the American Legion convention's action on UNESCO is not well enough understood. These questions and letters also demonstrate the sincere interest of the American people in learning our position on this most important issue.

Certainly the American people are entitled to an honest, accurate and complete explanation by the American Legion of its views on UNESCO. I hope to furnish such an explanation tonight.

That is my only purpose in discussing the subject of UNESCO. I have no desire or intention of keeping the UNESCO pot boiling by adding fuel to the fire through speeches on this issue to American Legion audiences throughout the country. On the contrary, I hope that my remarks tonight finally will answer the questions and resolve the doubts about the American Legion's stand on UNESCO.

There are three principal objectives which must be reached if we are to answer finally the earnest questions of an increasing number of our fellow citizens, concerning UNESCO.

The first is to explain briefly the largely unreported, fundamental and historical philosophies and principles of the American Legion which are the foundation of our position on UNESCO and on every other national and international issue.

The second is to correct certain distorted versions of the American Legion's carefully considered national convention action on UNESCO.

And the last is to make it clear that the American Legion has more than enough reason to consider UNESCO as the international sanctuary of impractical one-worlders, red-tinged radicals, and apparently deserters from the ranks of loyal Americans.

What are the philosophies and principles underlying the American Legion's approach to UNESCO and to every other national and international issue?

They can be summed up in these five words: What is best for America.

In some quarters, this concept is considered old-fashioned and out of date As far as the American Legion is concerned, however, this principle is as valid and essential at this very moment as it was when our Nation was born, and as it has been throughout our history.

To whom can we look besides ourselves to preserve America as the hope and strength of the free world in its struggle against the evil, Godless tyranny of communism?

We can look to no one but ourselves.

What other nation could accept America's destiny as the leader of the free world, if our Nation should fail its trust because we failed our trust to do what is best for America?

There is none.

If doing what is best for America is synonymous with nationalism, then it is an enlightened and constructive form of nationalism. For it inspired the American Legion to be first among the Nation's great veteran, patriotic, civic, fraternal, and business organizations to support the Marshall plan, to fight for the establishment of NATO, to endorse former President Truman's action in committing American forces to the defense of the Republic of Korea, to call for a security force in the Pacific similar to NATO, to support President Eisenhower's decision to defend Formosa.

These actions are part of the record—record which clearly shows the American Legion's awareness that collective security agreements, economic and military aid to our allies, and continued United States participation in the United Nations are in America's best interest.

To some, the American Legion's convention approval of continued United States participation in the United Nations is in direct contradiction to our action on UNESCO. It is not, of course.

It is, instead, but another example of the American Legion's policy of supporting organizations, policies, and programs which contribute to our Nation's best interest, and of opposing those which do not.

You understand this, just as you appreciate that the American Legion's convention action on UNESCO climaxed the most extensive study, debate, and discussion ever given to any subject by Legionnaires.

Unfortunately, some segments of the press created the impression that the UNESCO resolution was passed without sufficient study and discussion. Nothing could be further from the truth. Aside from the 2 days of discussion and debate given the subject by the members of the joint foreign relations-Americanism convention committee and by witnesses who appeared before it, UNESCO was considered by delegates to many of our department conventions this year. As a matter of fact, 10 department conventions adopted resolutions on the subject. All 10 supported existing American Legion policy in opposition to UNESCO.

It's a matter of record, of course, that this subject has also been thoroughly studied and discussed by the national executive committee of the American Legion.

On every hand is evidence refuting completely the charge that we acted hastily and without sufficient study on UNESCO.

Before citing the specific provision of the UNESCO resolution passed by our 37th annual national convention, which have been the subject of widespread editorial reaction, let me assure you that many of America's most influential and widely circulated daily newspapers strongly support our action on UNESCO. I mention this to correct any impresion you may have gained that the Nation's press is critical of our action.

I need not add that the American Legion is deeply grateful to the many papers which have given us such magnificent editorial support. And we are especially grateful for the complete and accurate manner in which they reported the action of our convention with respect to UNESCO. It would be unnecesary for me to talk about UNESCO tonight if all the Nation's papers had been as accurate in their reports.

After reaffirming the action of the national executive committee in May 1953, the 37th convention then resolved, and I quote:

"That the American Legion will not name a delegate to the United States National Commission for UNESCO.

"That the American Legion urges Congress to repeal the laws creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO and its Secretariat; and that Congress deliver mandates to all Administrative Departments of the United States Government to desist from further dissemination of UNESCO and United States National Commission for UNESCO materials, reports and programs within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

"That Congress be urged to make a complete current investigation of the operations of UNESCO to determine whether or not that agency has complied and is complying with the terms and conditions of Resolution 215

of the House of Representatives and Resolution 122 of the United States Senate, 79th Congress; said resolutions being the basis of the United States participation in UNESCO; provided further, that investigation be especially made to ascertain 'explicitly whether there has been violation of the provision' of the final portion (which reads): 'provided, however, that such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration'."

Continuing to quote the convention resolution: "And if, upon investigation, it is determined that UNESCO has violated any of the conditions as set forth in the resolutions, that Congress be urged to take appropriate action to enforce compliance therewith."

I fail to find in any of this language any suggestion whatsoever, as has been charged, that the American Legion urges United States withdrawal from UNESCO. We urge only that Congress repeal the laws creating the United States Commission for UNESCO.

In effect, we ask only that the channel for the distribution of UNESCO world government propaganda in the United States be abolished.

To those who may think that this request amounts to the same thing as urging that the United States pull out of UNESCO, let me say this:

If the American Legion intended the result which UNESCO apologists misrepresent as having occurred, we would have asked that the Congress appropriate no further funds as the United States contribution to UNESCO. Not only would this pull the United States out of UNESCO, it would pull the foundation out from under UNESCO itself.

Uncle Sam each year foots one-third of UNESCO's eight to nine million dollar annual bill. We do so despite the fact that only a fraction more than 1 percent of the total number of UNESCO's representatives are American citizens.

The American Legion doesn't object to this contribution, but we do object to the fact that, despite this contribution, the United States Government has no control over UNESCO's hiring or firing of American employees. Any disloyal Americans employed by UNESCO could flout the authority of the United States Government, and there's nothing we can do about it.

This isn't just an opinion. It's an undeniable fact, deplored by America's highest representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

In a statement on the loyalty problem among United States employees of UNESCO, released a little more than a year ago on October 16, 1954, Ambassador Lodge stated, and I quote:

"It is now clear that eight United States citizens employed by UNESCO have had adverse loyalty reports from the United States International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board. Concerning these eight persons the Board found reasonable doubt as to their loyalty to the United States. Only 1 of these 8 persons condescended to accept the Board's invitation merely to meet with it when it was in Paris last summer. The seven others were in such contempt of the whole procedure that they did not bother to appear at the Board's meeting.

"Although Dr. Luther Evans, the Director-General of UNESCO, after a long period of consideration, has stated he will not renew the contracts of 4 of these persons when their contracts eventually expire, he has taken no action to separate these 8 United States citizens now. The failure of Dr. Evans to act on these cases actually frustrates the efforts of the United States, conducted in close collaboration with the heads of the other international organizations, to insure the highest standards of integrity on the part of those United States citizens who are members of the staff of these organizations.

"Although UNESCO is a specialized agency and is, therefore, outside of my jurisdiction, I have a responsibility as United States representative to the United Nations to see that fair play exists. It should, therefore, be crystal clear that there have been no such problems in the United Nations itself.

"The other international organizations, particularly the United Nations (with which I have personal familiarity) have dealt with the problem in a fine way. In all fairness, therefore, public opinion should distinguish between the policies which are being followed by the Director-General of UNESCO and the policies which are being followed by the United Nations and the other international organizations."

I need not remind you that Dr. Luther Evans, the Director-General of UNESCO, is an American citizen.

The record on this problem of loyalty among United States employees of UNESCO, and the very recent record at that, reveals another galling fact.

On October 29, 1955, 2 weeks after the American Legion convention, the highest tribunal of the United Nations ordered UNESCO to reinstate four United States citizen employees of UNESCO who had been discharged for failure to cooperate with a United States Loyalty Board. When UNESCO finally felt compelled to refuse to reinstate these employees, the tribunal ordered UNESCO to pay each of them 2 years' salary plus legal costs. These indemnities amounted to more than $30,000.

Thus we have the situation where the United States, based on its one-third contribution to UNESCO, had the questionable privilege of paying $10,000 to American citizens fired because they refused to cooperate with a United States Loyalty Board.

And this is no isolated instance. Last April the same tribunal awarded three American employees of UNESCO $43,000 after they had been dismissed for refusal to face the United States Loyalty Board. The American taxpayers' share of this award was nearly $15,000.

The moral to be drawn from these examples would seem to me to be: If you want to ignore or flaunt the authority of legally constituted United States loyalty boards, get a job with UNESCO and be paid by Uncle Sam for the privilege of kicking him in the teeth.

There can be no question that just the small part of UNESCO's record which I have read to you more than justifies the American Legion's opposition to this specialized agency of the United Nations. I am confident that this record also inspired many of America's greatest patriotic organizations to join with the American Legion in this fight.

You know, of course, that the American Legion's opposition to UNESCO is not based exclusively on the facts I have cited, damaging and conclusive as they are.

We are strongly opposed to UNESCO because of its propaganda in this country for world government.

The record clearly shows that from its inception UNESCO has been identified with the idea of world government. And the record also shows that UNESCO has tried to peddle its global-minded concepts to the one group in America most likely to be persuaded by its propaganda—our school children.

They are likely targets only because they have not yet acquired the maturity and experience to understand the true danger of world government.

These world-government propaganda efforts are in direct violation of the act of Congress authorizing United States participation in UNESCO. Congress specifically prohibited UNESCO interference in America's educational system.

It is not surprising, in view of this complete lack of respect for the sovereign laws of the United States, that UNESCO should state in its publication entitled "In the Classroom with Children under Thirteen Years of Age" that "as long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world mindedness can produce only rather precarious results."

This same publication further states that "education for world-mindedness at present encounters obstacles outside the school. The principal one certainly is nationalism."

This is only one example of UNESCO's world-government advocacy. Another can be found in UNESCO's publication the United Nations and World Citizenship. In discussing world citizenship, this publication states:

"World-wide organization for the conduct of human affairs is, therefore, essential. No teacher with a sense of realism and even elementary knowledge of world affairs will ignore this basic need or be indifferent to its consequences for education. World machinery is required; and human beings with the right outlook are required to utilize it or to insist that it be utilized. The educator thus has a double task; to teach about the machinery of world cooperation and to foster the growth of the spirit that will make it function. Education has, in short, the urgent duty to develop informed and competent world citizens."

There are some who contend the UNESCO did not publish these documents or that UNESCO no longer is endeavoring to peddle these ideas. They have seriously deceived themselves, for here is the record:

The publications, In the Classroom With Children Under Thirteen Years of Age and The United Nations and World Citizenship are listed on page 26 of UNESCO's own catalog of available English language publications in the field of education issued by UNESCO up to September, 1955.

Incidentally, the cover of this catalog proves rather conclusively that UNESCO does intend to get its material into our school system in violation of the prohibition by Congress. It reads, and I quote:

"Education of interest to primary school, secondary school and university teachers, students, teachers training colleges, education officials, adult education instructors and fundamental educators."

It is not necessary to examine each and every one of the UNESCO's publications to determine whether this agency is not only propagandizing for world government, but seems also to be the sanctuary for red-tinged radicals.

We need only follow that famous axiom: "Consider the source."

The list of authors of UNESCO publications who have been identified with organizations listed as subversive by the Attorney General or the House Un-American Activities Committee is too long to read tonight. So that there can be no question, however, that there are such individuals, let me read you the names of just a few of these UNESCO authors.

Frederich L. Schuman, coauthor of UNESCO Contemporary Political Science, has been identified as affiliated with 16 organizations listed as subversive by the Attorney General or the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Dr. Linus Pauling, author of The Importance of Chemistry in the Life of Modern Man, has been identified as affiliated with 10 organizations listed as subversive by the Attorney General or the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Leslie C. Dunn, author of Race and Biology," has been identified as affiliated with nine organizations listed as subversive by

the Attorney General or the House Un-American Activities Committee.

I hardly think in the light of their records that the American Legion has misjudged these individuals.

UNESCO is also active in the field of visual education. And so are some of its left-wing representatives.

Let me cite just one example. For a number of years the UNESCO Film Section was headed by John Grierson. This individual resigned as head of the National Film Board of Canada at the time of the Canadian espionage hearings. Denied a visa to this country, he came in through UNESCO and headed the film section of that organization.

There are many others, of course, whose identification with UNESCO gives the American Legion more than sufficient cause to oppose this agency. The most prominent of these were Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White.

The American Legion's conclusion based on official congressional reports, that Hiss and White were, in fact, associated with the formulation of UNESCO has been denied or discounted in some quarters. Let me again cite the record so you can judge for yourself whether we are right.

In its January 3, 1955, report, the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws concluded, and I quote:

"1. Alger Hiss, Harry Dexter White, and their confederates in the Communist underground in Government had power to exercise profound influence on American foreign policy and the policies of international organizations during World War II and the years immediately thereafter.

"2. They had power to exercise profound influence on the creation and operation of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

"3. This power was not limited to their officially designated authority. It was inherent in their access to and influence over higher officials, and the opportunities they had to present or withhold information on which the policies of their superiors might be based.

"4. Hiss, White, and a considerable number of their colleagues who helped make American foreign policy and the policies of international organizations during crucial years have been exposed as secret Communist agents."

In the second report on activities of United States citizens employed by the United Nations of the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws is this statement, and again I quote:

"Harry Dexter White was the Treasury's representative at the United Nations San Francisco Conference where he gave particular attention to the establishment of UNESCO."

There is one final question which I would like to answer.

I have been asked, and I'm sure that many of you have also been asked: Why can't Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, America's representative to the United Nations, do something to clean up UNESCO so that it will be acceptable to the American Legion and the American people?

Ambassador Lodge best answered this question in his testimony before a House subcommittee on appropriations on January 27, 1954, when he said, and I quote:

"I think the lack of an administrative framework for the specialized agencies is something that has proved very baffling. UNESCO and all these other agencies are more or less laws unto themselves. They are entirely outside of my jurisdiction. The Secretary-General of the United Nations cannot touch them. It is a constant source of confusion and embarrassment.

"I think that is something that the Congress might do well to look into."

The American Legion thinks so, too. We have asked the Congress to make a complete current investigation of UNESCO to determine whether or not that agency has complied with and is complying with the terms and conditions set down by Congress in authorizing United States participation in UNESCO.

We sincerely hope that the Congress will act upon this request contained in the UNESCO resolution passed overwhelmingly at our convention last month in Miami. We are certain that such an investigation will confirm the American Legion's findings with respect to UNESCO.

I regret the length necessitated by this report tonight. However, I believe that the issue I have discussed is important to the American Legion and to our Nation, and justified the time required. I hope you agree.

Thank you for your courtesy and patience. It has been a privilege being with you tonight.

Memorandum on the Spirit of Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the mythical character of "the spirit of Geneva" is by now appreciated by most Americans and many nations in the free world. There were many, however, who perceived it even before the Big Four Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva. The following memorandum submitted to the Secretary of State on the spirit of Geneva in true application to Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. is one example of a well-founded national skepticism toward what most had accepted as a real spirit of Geneva.

This carefully thought out memorandum, which was prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of economics in the Graduate School of Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, becomes more practical with each passing day in its primary proposal that we begin to exploit through our various psychological media the tremendous area of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism, namely the non-Russian countries in the Soviet Union itself. While skillful Russian Communist propaganda capitalizes on the issues of imperialism and colonialism in southern Asia, the most tyrannical colonial empire in the pages of human history, now in the guise of the Soviet Union, goes relatively unnoticed in the free world.

This sad condition is a most ironical one. We have at our disposal the great opportunity to undo the terrible evil caused by the lies of Bulganin and Khrushchev, but we have failed to take full advantage of it. In the earnest hope that we may be stirred to seize this opportunity, and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the memorandum for the RECORD:

MEMORANDUM ON THE SPIRIT OF GENEVA IN TRUE APPLICATION TO UKRAINE AND OTHER CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.

(Submitted to the Secretary of State by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, relative to the Big Four Foreign Ministers' Conference, in Geneva, Switzerland, October 1955)

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
United States Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MR. SECRETARY: Since the summit conference in Geneva this past summer the phrase, "the spirit of Geneva," has received through divers media worldwide circulation and, in many quarters, uncritical and even readied acceptance. This spirit is generally interpreted to materialize progressively or, as some put it, through evolutionary change in lessened tensions between the free world and the Russian Communist Empire, in some sort of peaceful coexistence between these broad areas, indeed, in the very culmination of the cold war itself. As a procedural effect of the spirit of diplomatic cordiality that prevailed at the summit, the Big Four Foreign Ministers' Conference is evidently purposed to translate this spirit into concrete agreements and courses of action aimed at the eventual elimination of the basic causes of conflict between Moscow and the West.

On this occasion the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in its united representation of all non-Communist American organizations of Ukrainian background, expresses its most fervent hopes for the success of your mission at this crucially important meeting. We wish also, on the basis of a direct reflection of the views and thoughts of 1,500,000 citizens regarding the relations of our country with the Soviet Union, to take the opportunity of this occasion to present several founded observations on "the spirit of Geneva" in its true application to Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. Unless the phrase is to bear only hollow significance and to serve as a barren utterance for the frustrated hopes of millions throughout the world, in our judgment, as well as in the grounded opinion of all informed observers of the Soviet Union, it is unthinkable that "the spirit of Geneva" could be repressed from any direct application to one of the most fundamental and certainly efficient causes of conflict, namely the original captivity of 120 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union.

APPLIED PRESSURES FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

At the time of the summit Conference it was our privilege to set forth in systematic exposition the just cause of national freedom for Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. in a detailed memorandum presented to the President on the Summit of Freedom: Its Indivisibility, a copy of which was transmitted to the Department for studied analysis. It is surely not our purpose here to reiterate the views and reasoned interpretations contained in that memorandum or to reproduce much of the historical evidence and contemporary experiences upon which they are firmly based. Instead, in line with the permanent contents of the preceding memorandum, our paramount aim in this instance is to focus attention on the real possibilities and opportunities that "the spirit of Geneva" might invite in behalf of the advancement of freedom and national independence in the slave half of the world. In short, this memorandum supplements the previous one in calling for applied pressures at this conference

and subsequent ones for the freedom and independence of all nations, including the large and populous non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, as was stated by our President in his illuminating address to the American Bar Association August 24, 1955.

Nothing that has occurred on the international scene since the summit Conference causes us to alter in any way the analytic contents provided in the original memorandum. In point of fact, the outstanding events and developments of this period brilliantly confirm the generalizations and conclusions drawn in it on such essential subjects as the necessary abolishment of the Russian Iron Curtain, controlled relative disarmament, and the wholesale exploitation of the anticolonial challenge, directed especially at the Russian Communist Empire. The skillful Russian exploitation of the weapon of nationalism in Africa and Asia, the preferred shipment of Communist arms to Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere in Africa and Asia, the further penetration of conspiratorial Communist influence into Indochina and Indonesia, and deceitful Russian sponsorship of the anticolonial challenge in the United Nations, leading to the withdrawal of France from the current sessions of the assembly as well as to a pronounced depreciation in the overt power of our moral and political leadership in the world, clearly constitute stubborn facts of recent occurrence that fully justify our stated position on the trained chicanery of Moscow and now, more than ever, necessitate positive American action poised on certain applied pressures for national freedom and independence.

The prodigious irony of Communist Russia successfully pretending to be the defender of dependent and colonial nations in their struggle for national freedom and independence is in itself serious cause for grave concern to all informed Americans. In the face of a long and bloody record of Russian Communist conquest and imperialist colonialism since 1917, destroying the independence of Ukraine, Beyelorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossackia and a series of other non-Russian nations down to present date, Mr. Khrushchev freely exercises an unopposed mendacity in declaring lately that "the position of the Soviet people is the position of moral support and sympathy for the aspirations of the national liberation movement of the peoples. This has long been known throughout the world." (New York Times, October 4, 1955.) Unfortunately, this fiction has made significant inroads in the thinking of countless freemen and in great measure we are responsible for this by our relative inactivity to take full advantage of the unsurpassed record of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism since 1917. During the recent Algerian issue in the United Nation, once again our delegate missed a golden opportunity in failing to press debate on this complete Russian Communist record and to persuade France to retaliate with us in a maneuver that bears all the earmarks of a cold war phenomenon and one in which our success would be guaranteed by the factual record itself. This would have magnificently exemplified positive American action generating pressures for national freedom and independence which, after all, form the kernel of the American democratic tradition and the very negation of traditional Russian totalitarianism.

Briefly, these several major developments since Geneva in July point unmistakably to the predominant fact that the spirit of Geneva, instead of becoming the dissolvent of the cold war, has itself been transmuted by unchangeable Russian Communist intentions and objectives into a deceptive tool of the cold war. The present phase of the cold war represents, as a consequence, the most perilous one yet. It places Moscow in a most advantageous position to wage behind the facade of good will frills, staged to the tune of the spirit of Geneva, an intensified psychological warfare campaign which capitalizes on the problems harassing the free nations and, as on the issue of colonialism, produces almost paralyzing dilemmas for the United States. Also, as we stressed in our previous memorandum, it enables Moscow to purchase the necessary element of time to overcome the known weakness and problems in its consolidation of empire and own political structure, to advance further its armament buildup, to realine and strengthen its world conspiratorial network, and in deflecting moves to undermine the structure of allied unity. There is no substantial evidence of Russian sincerity in the spirit of Geneva nor is there likely to be any while time works in their favor. Unless our passivity is also to be permitted to work in their favor, Geneva in October should with all urgency provide strong expression for pressures for freedom and independence consonant with the tenets of our policy of peaceful liberation and its dynamic force of innovation as against wishful evolution.

THE FREEDOM FORCE OF NATIONAL SELF-DETERMINATION

Undoubtedly the most powerful pressure for freedom in the context of this century is the moral and political force of national self-determination, a product of American spirituality, defined by President Woodrow Wilson. The Congress recently underscored this truth by its unanimous passage of House Concurrent Resolution 149, opposing colonialism and Communist imperialism, and of Senate Resolution 127 which supports the right of once independent nations to self-determination again. It is highly significant and of creditable importance that both of these carefully prepared resolutions do not restrict the compass of national freedom and independence, insofar as concerns Europe, to the poorly classified satellite countries. They accommodate, and properly so, the once independent non-Russian nations now enslaved within the nominal framework of the Soviet Union. They accurately reflect in thought and meaning the indivisibility of freedom.

In fact and principle, the freedom force of national self-determination, which logically means the exercise of independence and principled opposition to empire, cannot possibly be circumscribed within the limits or area of any single sector of the present Russian Communist empire. Formerly independent non-Russian nations now in the Soviet Union are as much the proper object of this force, in several respects even more so, as the countries loosely referred to as satellites. All unhappily share an essential captivity under the yoke of imperialist Moscow and, in historical truth, all are by nature captive states and countries, despite the nominal and legal sham of the framework of the Soviet Union. Thus, as many commentators and journalists are notoriously wont to do, to speak or write of any real distinction between the two captive groupings of non-Russian nations evinces either a striking lack of historical understanding or an inadequate grasp of the meaning of indivisible freedom as expressed by the force of national self-determination.

This intrinsic quality of indivisibility and universal scope has been effectively underlined by our President in several of his recent addresses. Speaking to the West Point graduating class of 1955, for example, he stressed that "militarily and materially we are strong. More important, we are strong in the partnership of many allies. But above all, our Nation is strong in the support of principle: We espouse the cause of freedom and justice and peace for all peoples, regardless of race or flag or political ideology" (New York Times, June 8, 1955). Mr. Secretary, your own address before the United Nations this past June gives eloquent expression to this prime quality in these words: "The peace of the Charter is a peace of justice: It is a peace which will assure all nations, great and small, the right to be genuinely independent * * *" (New York Times, June 25, 1955). It is therefore evident, in the light of these statements and the known facts of Central-Eastern and East Europe and Central Asia, that any publicized attempt to seek the freedom of only the so-called satellite countries is patently inconsistent with both objective fact and declared principle.

The freedom force of national self-determination finds its most fertile ground in the areas of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. For most of them, despite 35 years of Russian Communist domination and genocidal oppression, the ineradicable mark of national consciousness shows itself persistently in their unbroken resistance, both passive and armed, against the alien despotism of Moscow. The monumental reports and hearings of the Select House Committee on Communist Aggression, particularly its official record on the Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the non-Russian Nations of the U. S. S. R., brilliantly relate the relentless drive of these captive nations and peoples for the restoration of their national freedom and independence. In the most authoritative and finest official account yet, they demonstrate the series of imperialist aggressions upon which the Soviet Union itself was founded and the thoroughly illegitimate character of this spurious voluntary union of states. In what is really an empire built upon acts of imperialist aggression and characterized by the worst colonialism in history, constitutional terms, such as secession and separation, become only additional instruments of characteristic Russian Communist deception serving to delude the Western mind with suggested but unfounded parallels elsewhere.

Both scholarship and official experience attest to the fundamental truth that the real enemy behind the mask of Communist ideology is traditional Russian imperialism, an autocratic phenomenon that for centuries has deprived the Russian Nation itself of opportunities for democratic growth, economic advancement, and amicable relations with neighboring non-Russian nations. The compatible ease with which the grandiosity of Communist ideology has been fitted into the psychological pattern of traditional Russian imperialism may readily be reduced from a typical account furnished by a close witness of this institutional phenomenon in the last century. Our Minister to the Russian Empire, Mr. Neill S. Brown, observed in 1852 that "a strange superstition prevails among the Russians, that they are destined to conquer the world, and the prayers of the priests in the church are mingled with requests to hasten and consummate this 'divine mission,' while appeals to the soldiery founded on this idea of fatality and its glorious rewards are seldom made in vain." Many knowledgeable and perceptive witnesses at close hand have followed since, and also have attested to this in similar vein. To quote a contemporary one, Admiral William H. Standley could not help but observe that "over the ancient skeleton of Russian imperialism, Lenin and Stalin threw a cloak of Communist ideology, but the bones of the skeleton show through. Even as in Czarist times, when the Russian Bear stands on its hind feet with its front paws held up as if in prayer, we must 'beware of the Bear that walks like a Man'" (Ambassador to Russia, p. 508).

UNITED STATES UTILIZATION OF UKRAINIAN AND BYELORUSSIAN MEMBERSHIP IN THE U. N.

It is obviously one thing to understand, to resolve and to witness, but it is another to apply, to implement and to utilize, as steps in pressures for freedom and independence would demand. At this stage the channels

for prudent action are open to us and, fortunately, they are being increasingly recognized by many observers. As one analyst described it subsequently to the Summit Conference, "Serious American thought also must be given to the nationally conscious Soviet components such as the Ukraine and Byelorussia. The fact that these two nations have their own representatives in the U. N. has never been properly utilized by the United States. To encourage their independence and to strive for the decentralization of the Soviet Union into its separate though not necessarily unfriendly components is likely to become one of the chief United States objectives" (Edward Weintal, Newsweek, August 29, 1955). Most appropriately, this objective might well now be reflected in the discussion at Geneva.

Numerous measures utilizing these representations may be taken directly in the United Nations, such as we have advocated in a number of Congressional testimonies (e. g. Review of the United Nations Charter, 1955). However, the Foreign Ministers' Conference affords an excellent occasion for certain concrete steps that would give ample evidence of our intention to translate "the Spirit of Geneva" into a reality for all peoples and nations. These steps may now be pitched to the classic statements made by Molotov and Stalin at the Yalta Conference. As reported by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., "The Soviet Union, Molotov announced also for the first time, would be satisfied with the admission of 3 or at least 2 of the Soviet Republics as original members. The 3 were the Ukraine, White Russia, and Lithuania. The Soviet attitude, Molotov explained, was based on constitutional changes of February 1944, whereby, he said, the Soviet Republics have achieved control of their own foreign policy. Furthermore, not only were these 3 republics heavily populated, but, he said, they had borne the greatest sacrifices of the war, particularly the Ukraine" (Roosevelt and the Russians, p. 161). Reporting on Stalin's significant observations, Stettinius writes, "In reviewing the entire matter of additional seats for the Soviet Union, the President told me that evening at Yalta that Stalin felt his position in the Ukraine was difficult and insecure. A vote for Ukraine was essential, the Marshal had declared, for Soviet unity" (p. 169).

In view of the obvious importance of Ukraine—the largest and richest non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe—not only to the maintenance of empire by Moscow but more so to the advancement of peace with freedom by the United States, we strongly recommend for your studied consideration at this time the following steps in peaceful pressures for freedom and independence: (1) a demonstrated interest by our delegation to Geneva in the progress achieved by Ukraine, Byelorussia and others in "the control of their own foreign policy" since the reported statement made by Mr. Molotov over a decade ago. Implying overt sovereignty, this alleged condition of national control should prompt very significant inquiries into the existence of distinct Ukrainian and Byelorussian military forces, their diplomatic establishments in other countries, and the means by which such control of foreign policy reflects the will of the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peoples; (2) as a demonstration of the true spirit of Geneva, transporting peace with freedom and justice, the submission of a proposal by our delegation for free elections not only in the so-called satellite countries but also, of logical necessity, in countries such as Ukraine and Buelorussia which are recognized by all members of the United Nations and which, as Mr. Molotov reportedly argued, enjoy "control of their own foreign policy." It is crystal clear, on Mr. Molotov's terms, that this proposal cannot be construed as a contravention of the legal norm of noninterference in the internal affairs of any state; (3) in the true spirit of Geneva, promoting friendship and understanding between nations, the proposal by our delegation for American publication and distribution of newspapers and periodicals in the native languages of Ukraine, Byelorussia and others to be read by the peoples of these nations; and (4) in the peaceful interest of understanding Russian communist institutions, an open request by our delegation to send an official mission, headed perhaps by Mr. George Meany of the American Federation of Labor, to visit freely chosen parts of the forced labor system in both the European and Asiatic regions of the Soviet Union and "particularly the great cultural center at Vorkuta."

NO TRADE WITHOUT POLITICAL EXTRACTIONS

Related to these recommendations is our vigorous support of the foreign economic policy of no trade without political extractions in connection with the Soviet Union and other parts of the present Russian Communist Empire. Utterly naive statements made this past summer by individuals who should know better impel us to place great emphasis on this formula in dealing with Moscow. Business as usual, aimed at pecuniary gain and spuriously rationalized as a medium of international amity and understanding, is completely inapplicable to the Soviet Union and the framework of the Russian Communist Empire. The ethics of behaving with relative passivity toward an avowed enemy gaining time to implement his designs for our destruction as a nation is questionable in itself, but to assist him in this in the delusion of furthering peace through normal trade borders on criminality. Moscow needs expanded trade in order to overcome its present economic weaknesses and to keep its empire intact. As was stressed by this committee in testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means early this year, considerable volumes of even consumer goods traded to the Russian Communist Empire are of strategic significance in a warlike totalitarian economy (Trade Agreements Extension, part 2, 1955). We must preserve our economic leverage for political gains in behalf of peace with justice and freedom. Calculated trade may be had but not without compounded political concessions from Moscow.

Once again we are confronted by politically naive utterances on the shipment of American surplus foodstuffs as a gift to the Soviet Union. Variously motivated, this proposal is likewise garnished with superficial slogans. Once again we wish to repeat the necessary conditions for such an offer as stated in our letter of March 8 to the President: "(1) a verbal stipulation of our desire to witness an equitable distribution of the gift among all the affected nations in the U. S. S. R., (2) in the effectuation of this desire, the admission of carefully selected neutral distribution teams, and (3) the offer of a limited supply measured according to terms not offsetting the basic effects of resistance in the U. S. S. R. and not overlooking the needs of many impoverished areas in the free world itself." America is known for its warm humanitarianism, but even this can be prevented by Russian Communist duplicity.

UNITED STATES INITIATIVE FOR TRUE SPIRIT OF GENEVA

The spirit of Geneva, as conceived by the summit conference will remain only a hollow phrase for those who sincerely have placed their faith and hopes in the possibility of a historic turn of events. It will continue to be a successful instrument of the cold war for Moscow, aimed at the psychological isolation and paralysis of the United States. These are the logical results of the current situation unless the United States, unbeguiled by the perilous doctrine of evolution concerning the conversion of imperialist Russian communism to civilized norms of political existence, commences now to exercise dynamic initiative for a true spirit of Geneva in application to the whole world and especially to the entire Russian Communist empire, including Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R.

Such initiative now requires applied pressures for freedom and independence. Truly expressive of our policy of liberation through peaceful means, it would harness the freedom force of national self-determination in application to all enslaved nations in the Russian Communist empire and in splendid vindication of the principle of indivisible freedom. Such initiative can only be based on the secure doctrine of innovation and its dynamic processes of creative development in the expansion of freedom and the positive encouragement of national independence in the captive areas of this empire.

It is in the great hope cherished by the extensive membership of this national body in the supremacy of American idealism and its realistic defense of the innovating principle of national self-determination for all peoples and nations, as well as in a true translation at this meeting of the spirit of Geneva that the undersigned respectfully submits this memorandum.

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTE OF AMERICA,
LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, *Chairman,*
Professor, Georgetown University.

Results of McGregor Poll on National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD the results of a questionnaire I sent to the citizens in the 17th Ohio District of whom it is my proud honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. The questions were concerned with pertinent national and international problems facing Congress today.

I regret I could not send a questionnaire to each of my constituents in the district but it is my belief that the replies received represent the opinions of a cross section of those I represent. In the questionnaire I ask them to list their occupation or profession, this gives me the opportunity to tabulate them as separate groups, which in turn, helps me obtain a more complete analysis of their thinking. Especially gratifying to me is the large percentage of the completed forms which contain comments on the questions and proves to me that the average constituent of my district is interested in the important issues now before this legislative body and is anxious to express his views on them.

The population of my district is composed of about half rural and half urban with nearly all of the labor and farm organizations represented as well as large and small business. Included also are 2 colleges and 2 universities. Through the medium of this questionnaire I feel that I have gained the majority opinion of those I represent.

The questionnaire and the results are as follows:

A QUESTIONNAIRE

In an endeavor to learn the views of the "folks back home" relative to several subjects of national importance that will be before the next session of the Congress, may we have your considered opinion?

THE FARM PROGRAM

Which plan do you favor?

(a) 100 percent price support with acreage control. Yes, 0.7 percent; no, 99.3 percent.

(b) Flexible price support with acreage control. Yes, 37 percent; no, 63 percent.

(c) Elimination of all price supports and acreage controls. Yes, 54 percent; no, 46 percent.

THE TAX REDUCTION PLAN

Which plan do you favor?

(a) A uniform (percentage) tax reduction for all. Yes, 50 percent; no, 50 percent.

(b) An increase in the amount allowed for each dependent. Yes, 47 percent; no, 53 percent.

TARIFF ON IMPORTS

Do you favor?

(a) Tariff rates be increased on manufactured items brought into this country. Yes, 48 percent; no, 52 percent.

(b) Tariff rates be increased on agricultural products brought into this country. Yes, 60 percent; no, 40 percent.

Signature _____

Street _____

City and State _____

Occupation _____

Please fill out and return this questionnaire to: J. HARRY MCGREGOR, Member of Congress, 1434 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire

THE FARM PROGRAM: WHICH PLAN DO YOU FAVOR?

[Percent]

	Yes	No
(a) 100 percent price support with acreage control:		
Total replies	0.7	99.3
Attorneys	.7	99.3
Business, industry, and salesmen	.1	99.9
Farmers	23.0	77.0
Housewives	.4	99.6
Labor	.7	99.3
Ministers	0	100.0
Occupation not given and organizations	.5	99.5
Professionals	.4	99.6
Public office holders and Federal employees	.6	99.4
Retired	.2	99.8
Teachers	.5	99.5
Students	26.0	74.0
(b) Flexible price support with acreage control:		
Total replies	37	63
Attorneys	38	62
Business, industry, and salesmen	41	59
Farmers	17	83
Housewives	15	85
Labor	35	65
Ministers	50	50
Occupation not given and organizations	20	80
Professionals	42	58
Public officeholders and Federal employees	40	60
Retired	33	67
Teachers	64	36
Students	66	34
(c) Elimination of all price supports and acreage controls:		
Total replies	54	46
Attorneys	56	44
Business, industry, and salesmen	60	40
Farmers	63	37
Housewives	77	23
Laborer	60	40
Ministers	37	63
Occupation not given and organizations	60	40
Professionals	50	50
Public officeholders and Federal employees	61	39
Retired	64	36
Teachers	24	76
Students	19	81

Percentage distribution of replies to questionnaire—Continued

THE TAX REDUCTION PLAN: WHICH PLAN DO YOU FAVOR?

	Yes	No
(a) A uniform (percentage) tax reduction for all:		
Total replies	50	50
Attorneys	56	44
Business, industry, and salesmen	55	45
Farmers	60	40
Housewives	48	52
Labor	60	40
Ministers	52	48
Occupation not given and organizations	75	25
Professionals	66	34
Public office holders and Federal employees	33	67
Retired	58	42
Teachers	34	66
Students	72	28
(b) An increase in the amount allowed for each dependent:		
Total replies	47	53
Attorneys	46	54
Business, industry, and salesmen	52	48
Farmers	51	49
Housewives	43	57
Labor	52	48
Ministers	34	66
Occupation not given and organizations	18	82
Professional	37	63
Public office holders and Federal employees	66	34
Retired	41	59
Teachers	64	36
Students	48	52

TARIFF ON IMPORTS: DO YOU FAVOR?

	Yes	No
(a) Tariff rates be increased on manufactured items brought into this country.		
Total replies	48	52
Attorneys	30	70
Business, industry, and salesmen	45	55
Farmers	50	50
Housewives	43	57
Labor	80	20
Ministers	36	64
Occupation not given and organizations	40	60
Professional	46	54
Public office holders and Federal employees	50	50
Retired	46	54
Teachers	33	67
Students	76	24
(b) Tariff rates be increased on agricultural products brought into this country.		
Total replies	60	40
Attorneys	50	50
Business, industry, and salesmen	60	40
Farmers	63	37
Housewives	63	37
Labor	69	31
Ministers	43	57
Occupation not given and organizations	65	35
Professional	60	40
Public office holders and Federal employees	84	16
Retired	72	28
Teachers	58	42
Students	51	49

Junkets Should Provide Badly Needed Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Pioneer-Republican, of Marengo, Iowa, carried an editorial in its December 8, 1955, issue on the junkets Congressmen take and I commend it to the Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this editorial:

JUNKETS SHOULD PROVIDE BADLY NEEDED INFORMATION

Occasionally one notes in the press some comment regarding the junkets various Congressmen engage in during the summer months, accompanied now and then by laments about the cost of the project to the Federal Government and almost always by the inference that the practice is a somewhat questionable one.

Sometimes we wonder if maybe we form our conclusions about these trips too hurriedly and too thoughtlessly. We doubt not that such trips are sometimes taken more for the sake of pleasure than for congressional study and we are aware that it should not be too necessary always to include the wife on the jaunt when only official business is the objective. We understand, however, that the wives do not ride at Federal expense—at least not often.

Personally we'd have less enthusiasm for a Congressman who doesn't have enough initiative to take such a trip when it is possible to become better informed on a subject within the scope of a committee, of which he is a member. We think he owes it to his job to be as well posted as possible. The Congressman who merely beats it for home when Congress adjourns and stays holed up there until the next begins will never be a very valuable Representative.

Not many Representatives are supermen. When a Congressman is elected the first time we can usually think of a dozen men in our own county that are equally well qualified for the job. A few Congressmen are counterfeits and would be liabilities if they worked without pay. The worthwhile official loses little time in getting informed, but the duties of a Representative in Congress are so varied and so important that the fellow who holds the office cannot afford to pass up an opportunity to learn more about the project at hand.

Sometimes there is nothing like a journey abroad, or even to other points in our own country, to provide the knowledge that a good lawmaker should have. The Nation already has so much money invested in the officer's salary and the salaries of those on his staff that it cannot afford to wince at a little carfare or hotel bills when he goes away from home to learn more about some subject on which he must pass judgment when the roll is called.

You can't really do much investigating sitting in a chair on your front porch.

We Underestimate the Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph Alsop and Mr. Stewart Alsop are continuing their brilliant series of articles on the growing air-atomic power of the Soviets. I consider it my privilege to continue to insert these articles in the RECORD as they appear. As the Alsops say, in our present national prosperity, most people are inclined to think that facts which prove anything unpleasant are really not facts after all. And the most unpleasant fact of all is that in every case where there has been a test to date, the result has shown, alas, that Soviet capabilities had been sadly underestimated.

Most of our intelligence about Soviet capabilities has been produced by the

National Security Council, headed by Mr. Sherman Kent, and consisting of experts from the CIA, the armed services, and the State Department. It is assessed by the National Intelligence Advisory Committee, on which sit high-level representatives of the armed services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the FBI. As the Alsops say, "Any national estimate which emerges from the committee is a synthesis of the best opinion from all the different sources listed." I mean it as no criticism of this committee that all national estimates of future Soviet-military industrial achievements have always turned out to be far too conservative when finally tested by events. I do mean it as criticism of the planners of our military buildup and of our budget makers, that no allowance has been made for this error in the planning of our military programs. The true situation in which we find ourselves today is serious indeed. It will grow immeasurably worse if we continue consistently to underestimate the Soviets.

Mr. Speaker, with the consent of my colleagues I shall insert the article by the Alsop brothers from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 8, 1956.

The article follows:

WE UNDERESTIMATE THE RUSSIANS

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Every so often nowadays, anyone who still bothers to report the life-and-death facts of the American national situation gets a very peculiar feeling. It is the feeling of being suddenly transformed into one of those super-super bores who insist on reciting last night's bad dream at next morning's sunny breakfast table.

These reporters must confess to having this feeling at the moment. The last three reports in this space have been filled with an admittedly ugly and repellent mass of facts. Those facts were not printed because it is enjoyable to deal in what is repellent and ugly. They were printed because they unfortunately but all too conclusively prove a point of vital national importance.

The point is simple. The American air-atomic superiority which has served so long as the free world's sole defense is now rapidly melting away. The Soviet Union, by making vastly greater efforts than this country is now making, is beginning to surpass us in the one area of strength that used to be exclusively our own.

It might be supposed that the merest suggestion that this could happen would stir things up a bit. The knowledge that it is happening, and the virtual certainty that nothing is going to be done about it, sometimes fills these reporters with an almost irresistible impulse to run around in circles barking like dogs. But in our present national condition of prosperous euphoria, most people are inclined to think that facts which prove anything unpleasant are really not facts after all.

So there is one further thing that needs to be said before this painful subject can be finally dropped. The facts are facts (one is almost inclined to shout it), or at least they are as near to facts as any information about the Soviet Union can ever be.

What then is the origin of these facts concerning Soviet output of advanced aircraft types, Soviet missile development, and the like which we have been publishing? The answer is simple. They are squarely based on undoubted information concerning the national estimates which are, or at least ought to be, the basic building blocks of American policymaking.

A complex machinery to produce these national estimates has been set up under our highest policymaking body, the National Security Council. There is first of all an estimates board, composed of brilliant specialists from the Central Intelligence Agency, the armed services and the State Department and headed by the author of the most important postwar book on strategic intelligence, Sherman Kent. The board has the task of making what may be called staff studies of special problems, such as the rate of Soviet aircraft output, for example.

But the process by no means ends there. The output of the estimates board, or any intelligence from other sources for that matter, cannot be accepted as official and therefore national until the problem has been examined by the National Intelligence Advisory Committee.

The committee is called advisory because the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Allen W. Dulles, has the exclusive statutory duty of providing intelligence to the National Security Council. Dulles serves as chairman of the committee, which in theory advises him. But the committee exists so that the final opinion offered to the Security Council by Allen Dulles may be fully agreed and approved by all interested parties.

High-level representatives of the three armed services, the office of the Secretary of Defense, the State Department and the FBI sit on this committee. Unanimity of opinion is required. Any national estimate which emerges from the committee is a synthesis of the best opinion from all the different sources listed.

Experience has proved, however, that the national estimates can be safely relied on except in one important way. Perhaps because the unanimity requirement works in favor of the lowest common denominator, all national estimates of future Soviet military-industrial achievements have always turned out to be far too conservative when finally tested by events. It was true with the Soviet A-bomb and the Soviet H-bomb. It was true with the MIG–15 and the TU–4. It was true again with the Badger and Bison bombers and the Farmer and Flashlight fighters.

In every case where there has been a test to date, the official American intelligence forecast indicated that the Soviets could not do the job so soon, or that they could not do it on such a large scale, or that they could not do it really well. And in every case where there has been a test to date, the result has shown, alas, that Soviet capabilities had been sadly underestimated.

No allowance has been made for this built-in error in the facts and figures which have been printed in this space to show the massively growing air-atomic power of the Soviets. Most probably the true situation is measurably worse than we have represented it. In any case—to revert to our original image—it is the bad dream that is likely to turn out to be reality and the sunny breakfast table that will prove to be a dream.

Frank D. Merrill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHESTER E. MERROW

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, New Hampshire and the Nation recently suffered a great loss in the untimely passing of Maj. Gen. Frank D. Merrill, who was serving as the highway commissioner of New Hampshire at the time of his death. General Merrill won national fame as a great courageous leader of the famous Merrill's Marauders in World War II. His outstanding military record is an imperishable monument of his great service to our country.

Over a period of years under his leadership, New Hampshire made most significant advances in road building. General Merrill's contribution to his country in both war and peace constitutes an unparalleled record. As Governor Lane Dwinell of New Hampshire so aptly said:

New Hampshire and the whole Nation have lost a devoted, courageous public servant who gave unsparingly of himself when other men might have chosen to retire.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article which appeared in the New Hampshire Highways Magazine, Concord, N. H., December 1955, paying tribute to the late Maj. Gen. Frank D. Merrill, New Hampshire Highway Commissioner:

FRANK D. MERRILL

A heart attack has taken the life of Maj. Gen. Frank D. Merrill, 52, New Hampshire highway commissioner and leader of a famed band of World War II jungle fighters. The commissioner was stricken in Florida on December 11 while returning to New Hampsire after attending the annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials in New Orleans where he had been elected president.

General Merrill, whose three battalions of specially trained jungle fighters in the Burma campaign called themselves Merrill's Marauders, was a graduate of the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y. In accordance with his wish, his body was sent there for funeral services. Memorial services were held at St. Andrew Episcopal Church in Hopkinton, N. H., where he was a member.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Lucy Wright Merrill; two sons, Frank D., Jr., a student at New England College, Henniker, N. H.; and Thomas, a preparatory school student in Lebanon, N. Y.; and a sister, Mrs. Stanley Fifield of Hoosick Falls, N. Y.

General Merrill was a native of Hopkinton, Mass., entered West Point from the Regular Army on his sixth attempt. Five times the doctors termed him physically unfit. Upon graduation from West Point, he went to Massachusetts Institute of Technology where he earned a degree in engineering.

Later, he went to Japan as a language student, and remained in Tokyo as a military attaché for 3 years. In 1941 he went to Manila as an intelligence officer on the staff of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and at the time of the Pearl Harbor attack he was on a flying mission to Rangoon, remaining there with the British forces until his assignment to Stillwell's command.

Twice during World War II he was forced to retire from active command in Burma because of ill health. During the early stages he suffered a heart ailment but refused to be evacuated. He finally accepted a liaison assignment for the China-Burma-India theater. Later he was deputy United States Army commander in the India-Burma theater. In July 1945, he became chief of staff in the Pacific theater and in 1947 deputy chief of the American Military Mission of the Philippine Government.

When Japanese troops drove allied forces out of Burma, General Merrill was on the staff

of Lt. Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell, who picked him to lead an advance raider force which spearheaded a Chinese-American attack on northern Burma to redeem Stilwell's pledge to recapture it. Merrill's Marauders was a 3,000-man volunteer unit that fought some of the toughest close-quarter battles of the war, many of them behind Japanese lines where they revolutionized jungle fighting. The unit was officially designated the 5307th Composite unit, and informally it included a little of everything—all of it tough.

The Marauders, fighting for 5 months early in 1944, played an important role in reopening the Burma road, former lifeline of Nationalist China to Burmese ports and railroads. The specially trained fighters engaged in 5 major and 30 minor engagements, winning them all. The Marauders climaxed their operations by moving secretly across an 8,000-foot range to capture the vital Mytkyina airfield and secure a way to move supplies over the Lido Road to China.

He was chief of staff of the Tenth Army which took Okinawa, and of the Sixth Army which took the Philippines, and he was aboard the battleship Missouri when the Japanese surrendered there.

His decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit, Purple Heart, Bronze Star, Pacific campaign medal and other campaign medals. He was commander of the Legion of Honor (French), a member of the Order of the Indian Empire (British), and a member of the Order of the Cloud Banner (Chinese).

After the war he served as special assistant to the Secretary of State. He was a member of the Commission on Intergovernment Relations, and served on its highway committee.

General Merrill's training at West Point and at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, along with his Army experience, well equipped him for his subsequent appointment of Public Works and Highways Commissioner in August 1949 by the then Governor Sherman Adams, now presidential assistant in the White House.

Under General Merrill New Hampshire's move into a toll road program began with the State building the 15-mile eastern New Hampshire Turnpike, which runs from the Massachusetts border at Seabrook to Portsmouth, and the 20-mile central New Hampshire Turnpike which runs from Nashua to Manchester. A 20-mile extension of the Eastern Turnpike to Dover and Rochester is scheduled for completion next year. And a 20-mile extension of the Central Turnpike to Concord is now under construction. Both are toll roads built and administered by the State.

John O. Morton, deputy commissioner and chief engineer of the department of public works and highways, said: "In the passing of Commissioner Merrill the department of public works and highways and the State of New Hampshire have suffered a severe loss.

Commissioner Merrill was in every way an outstanding public servant. His life was colorful and dynamic. He was unsparing in his demands for more and better work from his subordinates; at the same time he was particularly kind and considerate of their welfare.

After assuming office in the summer of 1949, General Merrill's first action was to initiate the development of a 15-year-highway construction program. The facelifting which New Hampshire's roads have received under General Merrill affords concrete physical evidence of Frank Merrill's vision and thinking. His works are a fitting monument to the memory of one of New Hampshire's most distinguished citizens.

Gov. Lane Dwinell said, "General Merrill was a leader whose passing will be mourned in all parts of the world.

"New Hampshire and the whole Nation have lost a devoted, courageous public servant who gave unsparingly of himself when other men might have chosen to retire. It is particularly significant that General Merrill was returning from a meeting of the National Association of Highway Executives of which he had just been elected president.

"General Merrill's brilliant record as a combat soldier is legend, and our State was indeed fortunate to have the services of this man. As a result of his comparatively short time among us, he endeared himself to those with whom he worked, and his imagination, initiative and foresight certainly have made our State a better place. His contribution to the development of better highways was not limited to the State of New Hampshire as he played a leading part in the development of a national highway program which will be actively under consideration in the next session of the Congress.

"General Merrill was loyal to any undertaking in which he had a hand and his integrity was an example to those of us who had planned the future of New Hampshire with him. We have lost an invaluable friend and coworker and my own sense of loss is the greater because General Merrill was one upon whom I had come to rely for advice and help.

"Although he had been in failing health in recent years and this was known to him, he continued to vigorously apply himself to the work to which he was dedicated. Surely, this is the mark of a man of courage with a true spirit of sacrifice."

Clayton W. Chase, president of the New Hampshire Good Roads Association, stated, "With the passing of Commissioner Merrill the Nation and the State of New Hampshire have lost a great leader. His peacetime leadership in the improvement of our highways was carried on with the same energetic and dynamic strength that he exhibited in his work as a wartime general.

"Since his appointment as highway commissioner he has incorporated many important principles into highway practices of New Hampshire. Among them were the development of a 15-year program which intended to put the highway system in order in a reasonable time and within the financial means of its citizens. He then supplemented this program with the beginning of an expressway system of highways which greatly boosted our economic life.

"These accomplishments will remain as a monument to a truly great leader."

The Shocking Story of Approved Killing in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following article from Look magazine, dated January 24, 1956, relives the infamous Emmett Till case of last year. The stunning revelations are so detailed and stated so positively, the magazine's journalistic integrity and knowledge of libel law is so well established there is no doubt in my mind that the information came directly from the killers themselves, J. W. Milam and Roy Bryant. Safe within the legal confines of immunity from another trial for the same offense provided by the very Constitution which they and others of their breed have challenged, these men apparently grasped at the opportunity of selling this exclusive story for an undoubtedly handsome financial reward.

Their revolting attempt to justify the murder of the Till boy by emphasizing his alleged familiarity with Mrs. Milam and other white women is the product of incurably prejudiced minds.

The substance of this unsigned confession confirms the observations and investigations I made during my attendance at the trial for the defendants last September. I said, following their acquittal, that in my judgment the testimony of the defense witnesses was replete with perjury. The case itself had become obscured by obvious efforts to defy any criticism of Mississippi racial custom. Nothing more graphically illustrates the immediate need for corrective legislation by the Congress of the United States. Negroes must be guaranteed the right to vote without interference, intimidation, or unwarranted restrictions so they may qualify to serve on juries and exercise influence in the election of fair-minded public officials. Armed with this weapon, considering their numerical strength in Mississippi, the problems which confront them could probably be resolved on a local level, which is not inconsistent with the position of those who support the theory of States rights. The Attorney General must be granted sufficient power to intervene in those cases where individual States refuse to provide equal protection of the law to all citizens. This should not preclude, however, such action as he can pursue under present statutes. We are pleased to see our interpretation of this article shared in an excellent editorial in the New York Post, dated January 11, 1956, which we also herewith submit for the RECORD:

[From the New York Post of January 11, 1956]

BOMBSHELL IN THE TILL CASE

The current issue of Look magazine publishes what amounts to nothing less than a confession by J. W. Milam that he and his codefendant in the Emmett Till trial were guilty of the murder of which they were acquitted by a Mississippi jury.

In what are presented as direct quotations from Milam the magazine prints his version of the circumstances of the murder and the alleged self-justification.

The Look article isn't a conventional piece of journalism. Signed by William Bradford Huie, it does not tell the reader whether Milam's statements were made directly to the writer or obtained in some other fashion. But the magazine says flatly that it is prepared to document the story in the event of legal challenge.

It isn't every day of the week that a responsible national publication quotes a freed defendant as confessing—even boasting about—a killing, and freely invites a legal test of the validity of its story. In the light of the issues stirred by the Till case the publication of such a story itself constitutes big news.

It is hard to believe that either the defendants or the State of Mississippi can let the record stand uncontested unless the defendants are guilty as quoted and the State is officially prepared to condone the crime.

Many of the quotations attributed to Milam in this article offer the picture of Emmett Till that Milam would like the country to accept. It is a portrait of provocation and arrogance. Needless to say, this portrait is unsubstantiated, and the article should be read with that in mind.

But that is not the crucial point. The point is that a killing has gone unpunished and that there is nothing in Milam's pur-

ported recital of Till's sins, self-serving as it is, that justifies the crime.

Both Milam and Bryant have denied the authenticity of the article. Their recourse is obvious if their denials mean anything.

As for Mississippi, there can, of course, be no reopening of the murder charge. But surely the Look article provides the basis for reconvening of the grand jury which has so far refused to return a kidnaping indictment.

It also underlines the need for a sweeping Justice Department investigation of the breakdown of law and order in Mississippi. For if a slaying cannot only be committed but proclaimed—and that is what the Look report suggests—there is no longer any semblance of protection for the civil rights of Negroes in that State.

Certainly the Look article cannot be ignored or dismissed. The Till case haunts the national conscience, and this article, until or unless successfully disputed, is a sensational and decisive exhibit.

[From Look magazine of January 24, 1956]

THE SHOCKING STORY OF APPROVED KILLING IN MISSISSIPPI

(By William Bradford Huie)

(EDITORS' NOTE.—In the long history of man's inhumanity to man, racial conflict has produced some of the most horrible examples of brutality. The recent slayings of Emmett Till in Mississippi is a case in point. The editors of Look are convinced that they are presenting here, for the first time, the real story of that killing; the story no jury heard and no newspaper reader saw.)

Disclosed here is the true account of the slaying in Mississippi of a Negro youth named Emmett Till.

Last September, in Sumner, Miss., a petit jury found the youth's admitted abductors not guilty of murder. In November, in Greenwood, a grand jury declined to indict them for kidnaping.

Of the murder trial, the Memphis Commercial Appeal said: "Evidence necessary for convicting on a murder charge was lacking." But with truth absent, hypocrisy and myth have flourished. Now, hypocrisy can be exposed; myth dispelled. Here are the facts: Carolyn Holloway Bryant is 21, 5 feet tall, weighs 103 pounds. An Irish girl, with black hair and black eyes, she is a small farmer's daughter who, at 17, quit high school at Indianola, Miss., to marry a soldier, Roy Bryant, then 20, now 24. The couple have 2 boys, 3 and 2; and they operate a store at a dusty crossroads called Money: Post office, filling station, and three stores clustered around a school and a gin, and set in the vast, lonely cotton patch that is the Mississippi Delta.

Carolyn and Roy Bryant are poor; No car, no TV. They live in the back of the store which Roy's brothers helped set up when he got out of the 82d Airborne in 1953. They sell snuff and fatback to Negro field hands on credit; and they earn little because, for one reason, the Government has begun giving the Negroes food they formerly bought. Carolyn and Roy Bryant's social life is visits to their families, to the Baptist church and, whenever they can borrow a car, to a drive-in, with the kids sleeping in the back seat. They call Shane the best picture they ever saw.

For extra money, Carolyn tends store when Roy works outside—like truck driving for a brother. And he has many brothers. His mother had 2 husbands, 11 children. The first 5—all boys—were "Milam children"; the next 6—three boys, three girls—were "Bryant children."

This is a lusty and devoted clan. They work, fight, vote and play as a family. The 'half" in their fraternity is forgotten. For years, they have operated a chain of cotton-field stores, as well as trucks and mechanical cotton pickers. In relation to the Negroes, they are somewhat like white traders in portions of Africa today; and they are determined to resist the revolt of colored men against white rule.

On Wednesday evening, August 24, 1955, Roy was in Texas, on a brother's truck. He had carted shrimp from New Orleans to San Antonio, proceeded to Brownsville. Carolyn was alone in the store. But back in the living quarters was her sister-in-law Juanita Milam, 27, with her own two small sons and Carolyn's two. The store was kept open until 9 on week nights, 11 on Saturday.

When her husband was away, Carolyn Bryant never slept in the store, never stayed there alone after dark. Moreover, in the Delta, no white woman or group of white women ever travels country roads after dark unattended by a man.

This meant that during Roy's absences—particularly since he had no car—there was family inconvenience. Each afternoon, a sister-in-law arrived to stay with Carolyn until closing time. Then, the two women, with their children, waited for a brother-in-law to convoy them to his home. Next morning, the sister-in-law drove Carolyn back.

Juanita Milam had driven from her home in Glendora. She had parked in front of the store and to the left; and under the front seat of this car was Roy Bryant's pistol, a .38 Colt automatic. Carolyn knew it was there. After 9, Juanita's husband, J. W. Milam, would arrive in his pickup to shepherd them to his home for the night.

About 7:30 p. m., 8 young Negroes—7 boys and a girl—in a '46 Ford had stopped outside. They included sons, grandsons, and a nephew of Moses (Preacher) Wright, 64, a sharecropper. They were between 13 and 19 years old. Four were natives of the Delta, and others, including the nephew, Emmett (Bobo) Till, were visiting from the Chicago area.

Bobo Till was 14 years old; born on July 25, 1941. He was stocky, muscular, weighing about 160, 5 feet 4 or 5. Preacher later testified: "He looked like a man."

Bobo's party joined a dozen other young Negroes, including two other girls, in front of the store. Bryant had built checkerboards there. Some were playing checkers, others were wrestling and "kiddin' about girls."

Bobo bragged about his white girl. He showed the boys a picture of a white girl in his wallet; and, to their jeers of disbelief; he boasted of his success with her.

"You talkin' mighty big, Bo," one youth said. "There's a pretty little white woman in the store. Since you know how to handle white girls, let's see you go in and get a date with her?"

"You ain't chicken, are yuh, Bo?" another youth taunted him.

Bobo had to fire or fall back. He entered the store, alone, stopped at the candy case. Carolyn was behind the counter; Bobo in front. He asked for 2 cents' worth of bubble gum. She handed it to him. He squeezed her hand and said: "How about a date, Baby?"

She jerked away and started for Juanita Milam. At the break between counters, Bobo jumped in front of her, perhaps caught her at the waist, and said: "You needn't be afraid o' me, Baby, I been with white girls before."

At this point, a cousin ran in, grabbed Bobo and began pulling him out of the store. Carolyn now ran, not for Juanita, but out the front, and got the pistol from the Milam car.

Outside, with Bobo being ushered off by his cousins, and with Carolyn getting the gun, Bobo executed the "wolf whistle" which gave the case its name: The Wolf-Whistle Murder: A Negro "Child" or "Boy" Whistled at Her and They Killed Him.

That was the sum of the facts on which most newspaper readers based an opinion.

The Negroes drove away; and Carolyn shaken, told Juanita. The two women determined to keep the incident from their "menfolks." They didn't tell J. W. Milam when he came to escort them home.

By Thursday afternoon, Carolyn Bryant could see the story was getting around. She spent Thursday night at the Milams, where at 4 a. m. (Friday) Roy got back from Texas. Since he had slept little for five nights, he went to bed at the Milams' while Carolyn returned to the store.

During Friday afternoon, Roy reached the store, and shortly thereafter a Negro told him what "the talk" was, and told him that the "Chicago boy" was "visitin' Preacher." Carolyn then told Roy what had happened.

Once Roy Bryant knew, in his environment, in the opinion of most white people around him, for him to have done nothing would have marked him a coward and a fool.

On Friday night, he couldn't do anything. He and Carolyn were alone, and he had no car. Saturday was collection day, their busy day in the store. About 10:30 Saturday night, J. W. Milam drove by. Roy took him aside.

"I want you to come over early in the morning," he said. "I need a little transportation."

J. W. protested: "Sunday's the only morning I can sleep. Can't we make it around noon?"

Roy then told him.

"I'll be here," he said. "Early."

J. W. drove to another brother's store at Minter City, where he was working. He closed that store about 12:30 a. m., drove home to Glendora. Juanita was away, visiting her folks at Greenville. J. W. had been thinking. He decided not to go to bed. He pumped the pickup—a half-ton 1955 Chevrolet—full of gas and headed for Money.

J. W. "Big Milam" is 36; 6 feet 2, 235 pounds; an extrovert. Short boots accentuate his height; khaki trousers; red sport shirt; sun helmet. Dark-visaged; his lower lip curls when he chuckles; and though bald, his remaining hair is jet black.

He is slavery's plantation overseer. Today, he rents Negro-driven mechanical cotton pickers to plantation owners. Those who know him say he can handle Negroes better than anybody in the county.

Big Milam soldiered in the Patton manner. With a ninth-grade education, he was commissioned in battle by the 75th Division. He was an expert platoon leader, expert street fighter, expert in night patrol, expert with the "grease gun," with every device for close-range killing. A German bullet tore clear through his chest; his body bears multiple shrapnel wounds. Of his medals, he cherishes one: Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Big Milam, like many soldiers, brought home his favorite gun, the .45 Colt automatic pistol.

"Best weapon the Army's got," he says. "Either for shootin' or sluggin'."

Two hours after Big Milam got the word—the instant minute he could close the store—he was looking for the Chicago Negro.

Big Milam reached Money a few minutes shy of 2 a. m., Sunday, August 28. The Bryants were asleep; the store was dark but for the all-night light. He rapped at the back door, and when Roy came, he said: "Let's go. Let's make that trip now."

Roy dressed, brought a gun: this one was a .45 Colt. Both men were—and remained—cold sober. Big Milam had drunk a beer at Minter City around 9; Roy had had nothing.

There was no moon as they drove to Preacher's house: 2.8 miles east of Money.

Preacher's house stands 50 feet right of the gravel road, with cedar and persimmon trees in the yard. Big Milam drove the pickup in under the trees. He was bareheaded, carrying a 5-cell flashlight in his left hand, the .45 in his right.

Roy Bryant pounded on the door.

PREACHER. "Who's that?"

BRYANT. "Mr. Bryant, from Money, Preacher."

PREACHER. "All right, sir. Just a minute."

Preacher came out on the screened-in porch.

BRYANT. "Preacher, you got a boy from Chicago here?"

PREACHER. "Yes, sir."

BRYANT. "I want to talk to him."

PREACHER. "Yes, sir. I'll get him."

Preacher led them to a back bedroom where 4 youths were sleeping in 2 beds. In one was Bobo Till and Simeon Wright, Preacher's youngest son. Bryant had told Preacher to turn on the lights; Preacher had said they were out of order. So only the flashlight was used.

The visit was not a complete surprise. Preacher testified that he had heard of the "trouble," that he "sho' had" talked to his nephew about it. Bobo himself had been afraid; he had wanted to go home the day after the incident. The Negro girl in the party had urged that he leave. "They'll kill him," she had warned. But Preacher's wife, Elizabeth Wright, had decided that the danger was being magnified; she had urged Bobo to "finish yo' visit."

"I thought they might say something to him, but I didn't think they'd kill a boy," Preacher said.

Big Milam shined the light in Bobo's face, said: "You the nigger who did the talking?"

"Yeah," Bobo replied.

MILAM. "Don't say 'Yeah' to me; I'll blow your head off. Get your clothes on."

Bobo had been sleeping in his shorts. He pulled on a shirt and trousers, then reached for his socks.

"Just the shoes," Milam hurried him.

"I don't wear shoes without socks," Bobo said; and he kept the gun-bearers waiting while he put on his socks, then a pair of canvas shoes with thick crepe soles.

Preacher and his wife tried two arguments in the boy's behalf.

"He ain't got good sense," Preacher begged. "He didn't know what he was doing. Don't take him."

"I'll pay you gentlemen for the damages," Elizabeth Wright said.

"You niggers go back to sleep," Milam replied.

They marched him into the yard, told him to get in the back of the pickup and lie down. He obeyed. They drove toward Money.

Elizabeth Wright rushed to the home of a white neighbor, who got up, looked around, but decided he could do nothing. Then, she and Preacher drove to the home of her brother, Crosby Smith, at Sumner; and Crosby Smith, on Sunday morning, went to the sheriff's office at Greenwood.

The other young Negroes stayed at Preacher's house until daylight, when Wheeler Parker telephoned his mother in Chicago, who in turn notified Bobo's mother, Mamie Bradley, 33, 6427 South St. Lawrence.

Had there been any doubt as to the identity of the "Chicago boy who done the talking," Milam and Bryant would have stopped at the store for Carolyn to identify him. But there had been no denial. So they didn't stop at the store. At Money, they crossed the Tallahatchie River and drove west.

Their intention was to "just whip him * * * and scare some sense into him." And for this chore, Big Milam knew "the scariest place in the Delta." He had come upon it last year hunting wild geese. Over close to Rosedale, the Big River bends around under a bluff. "Brother, she's a 100-foot sheer drop, and she's a 100 feet deep after you hit."

Big Milam's idea was to stand him up there on that bluff, "whip" him with the .45, and then shine the light off down there toward that water and make him think you're gonna knock him in.

"Brother, if that won't scare the Chicago ———, hell won't."

Searching for this bluff, they drove close to 75 miles. Through Shellmound, Schlater, Doddsville, Ruleville, Cleveland, to the intersection south of Rosedale. There they turned south on Hississippi No. 1, toward the entrance to Beulah Lake. They tried several dirt and gravel roads, drove along the levee. Finally, they gave up: in the darkness, Big Milam couldn't find his bluff.

They drove back to Milam's house at Glendora, and by now it was 5 a. m. They had been driving nearly 3 hours, with Milam and Bryant in the cab and Bobo lying in the back.

At some point when the truck slowed down, why hadn't Bobo jumped and run? He wasn't tied; nobody was holding him. A partial answer is that those Chevrolet pickups have a wraparound rear window the size of a windshield. Bryant could watch him. But the real answer is the remarkable part of the story.

Bobo wasn't afraid of them! He was tough as they were. He didn't think they had the guts to kill him.

Milam: "We never were able to scare him. They had just filled him so full of that poison he was hopeless."

Back of Milam's home is a tool house, with two rooms each about 12 feet square. They took him there and began "whipping" him, first Milam, then Bryant smashing him across the head with those .45's. Pistol-whipping: a court-martial offense in the Army * * * but MP's have been known to do it * * * and Milam got information out of German prisoners this way.

But under these blows Bobo never hollered—and he kept making the perfect speeches to insure martyrdom.

Bobo: "You bastards, I'm not afraid of you. I'm as good as you are. I've 'had' white women. My grandmother was a white woman."

Milam: "Well, what else could we do? He was hopeless. I'm no bully; I never hurt a nigger in my life. I like niggers—in their place—I know how to work 'em. But I just decided it was time a few people got put on notice. As long as I live and can do anything about it, niggers are gonna stay in their place. Niggers ain't gonna vote where I live. If they did, they'd control the Government. They ain't gonna go to school with my kids. And when a nigger even gets close to mentioning sex with a white woman, he's tired o' living. I'm likely to kill him. Me and my folks fought for this country, and we've got some rights. I stood there in that shed and listened to that nigger throw that poison at me, and I just made up my mind. 'Chicago boy,' I said, 'I'm tired of 'em sending your kind down here to stir up trouble. Goddamn you, I'm going to make an example of you—just so everybody can know how me and my folks stand.'"

So big Milam decided to act. He needed a weight. He tried to think where he could get an anvil. Then he remembered a gin which had installed new equipment. He had seen two men lifting a discarded fan, a metal fan 3 feet high and circular, used in ginning cotton.

Bobo wasn't bleeding much. Pistol-whipping bruises more than it cuts. They ordered him back in the truck and headed west again. They passed through Doddsville, went to the Progressive Ginning Co. This gin is 3.4 miles east of Boyle: Boyle is 2 miles south of Cleveland. The road to this gin turns left off U. S. 61, after you cross the bayou bridge south of Boyle.

Milam: "When we got to that gin, it was daylight, and I was worried for the first time. Somebody might see us and accuse us of stealing the fan."

Bryant and Big Milam stood aside while Bobo loaded the fan. Weight: 74 pounds. The youth still thought they were bluffing.

They drove back to Glendora, then north toward Swan Lake and crossed the new bridge over the Tallahatchie. At the east end of this bridge, they turned right, along a dirt road which parallels the river. After about 2 miles, they crossed the property of L. W. Boyce, passing near his house.

About 1.5 miles southeast of the Boyce home is a lonely spot where Big Milam has hunted squirrels. The river bank is steep. The truck stopped 30 yards from the water.

Big Milam ordered Bobo to pick up the fan.

He staggered under its weight—carried it to the river bank. They stood silently—just hating one another.

Milam: "Take off your clothes."

Slowly, Bobo sat down, pulled off his shoes, his socks. He stood up, unbuttoned his shirt, dropped his pants, his shorts.

He stood there naked.

It was Sunday morning, a little before 7.

Milam: "You still as good as I am?"

Bobo: "Yeah."

Milam: "You've still 'had' white women?"

Bobo: "Yeah."

That big .45 jumped in Big Milam's hand. The youth turned to catch that big, expanding bullet at his right ear. He dropped.

They barb-wired the gin fan to his neck, rolled him into 20 feet of water.

For 3 hours that morning, there was a fire in Big Milam's back yard: Bobo's crepe-soled shoes were hard to burn.

Seventy-two hours later—8 miles downstream—boys were fishing. They saw feet sticking out of the water. Bobo.

The majority—by no means all, but the majority—of the white people in Mississippi (1) either approve Big Milam's action or else (2) they don't disapprove enough to risk giving their "enemies" the satisfaction of a conviction.

Ice Cream and Milk Demonstrations at International Fairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the milk and ice cream demonstrations at the Bogota International Fair.

This is the sort of thing I had hoped would develop at the time we started the idea of the United States participating in international trade affairs. It was accomplished first by a Presidential letter addressed to the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations took action by appropriating $5 million. We are now getting results. We are getting excellent reports on accomplishments at international trade affairs which indicate that America is being shown in its very best light at these international trade fairs.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMONSTRATION OF ICE CREAM AND MILK RECOMBINING AT BOGOTÁ FAIR HUGE SUCCESS

Operation Crush, the first United States exhibit at one of the great International Trade Fairs to feature milk and dairy products, was labeled a smashing success at the close early in December of the International Fair in Bogotá, Colombia. The exhibit, de-

veloped by Dairy Industries Society, International at the request of the United States Departments of Commerce and Agriculture, literally stole the show as Colombians pressed through the aisles to watch the making of soft-serve ice cream and recombining of milk from United States dry components and to receive samples of the product.

Cooperating in this demonstration of how milk and dairy products can reach a public thousands of miles from the producing cows were the dairy industries of Colombia and the United States, as represented by DISI, and the Governments of the two republics. Almost all of the full scale recombining and ice-cream-making equipment used in the demonstration and much of the supplies for the ice cream and for the dispensing of the two products were loaned or donated to the society by United States or Colombian firms. Colombian dairy processing members of the society, notably El Rodeo and Heladeria California, placed their plants and their trucks at the society's disposal to supplement the production of the recombined milk and ice cream mix possible on the exhibit floor. Industry members of DISI, from both the United States and Colombia, temporarily abandoned their private careers to help William M. Taylor, DISI secretary, install and man the booth.

Dry non-fat milk solids and anhydrous butterfat from the United States Government's Commodity Credit Corporation's surplus stocks were used for the recombining and as a basis for the ice cream. Funds for the exhibit were made available in Colombian pesos under a United States Public Law 480 market development agreement signed between the two countries.

American Dairy Association sent its dairy princess, Miss Ruth Peterson of Austin, Minn., and her chaperone to the fair, and National Dairy Council, a month before the opening of the exhibit, loaned E. J. Rowell to the society to help in developing literature and visual material for the exhibit. In charge of the United States pavilion at the fair was Frank Schull of the Department of Commerce. J. Grant Lyons of the Department of Agriculture was manager of the United States agricultural exhibits.

DISI, an industry-spearheaded group with members in nearly 50 countries, is concerned with stimulating the use of milk throughout the world. Officials of the society, represented by Mr. Taylor, recommended to the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture that a demonstration of recombining and of ice cream making should be introduced at one of the international trade fairs. Bogotá was selected as the test fair, and the society was asked to develop the exhibit and install and manage the booth.

Background for the recombining and ice cream equipment was a series of photographs donated by United States dairy groups and magazines, telling the story of milk from the cow to the consumer. A fence of pipe bent along one frontage of the area into milk-bottle shapes and along another frontage into ice-cream-cone shapes helped keep the exhibit from being overrun by the pressing crowds, some 170,000 persons 1 day alone, which surged through the United States pavilion to watch the demonstrations, and, 3 times a day, receive 4-ounce cups of milk and filled ice cream cones. For many Colombians this was the first taste of fluid milk and the first real ice cream.

"What I will always retain as the most vivid memory of this great fair," Mr. Taylor said on his return to Washington, "is the reaching of hands and the appealing eyes of the people who came up to our dispensers or our ice cream machines. I do not forget, either, the people who came to our tables where we had our spread of literature, our simple locally printed pamphlet telling the story of milk, and our little cutout cows which the children called quitos (pronounced keetos), this being short for vanquitos, meaning "little cows." They would reach out with their hands, their eager fingertips almost, but not quite, touching these pamphlets and these little cows, but never did they snatch; never did they grab, unless one of our girls or ourselves gave the word. We passed out about 70,000 of these little cows, and over 60,000 pamphlets, and every night I made it my business to walk around to look for discards. One day we had 170,000 people at that fair. I walked around the exhibits and through the door to the great plaza outside. I found 9 pamphlets and 2 broken cows. The literature was going home.

"We served over 40,000 ice cream cones and over 40,000 cups of milk, and never once did we have an unpleasant incident. It is true that the crush of the crowds was sometimes frightening, and there were occasions when we had to haul little children bodily out of their mothers' arms as a preventive measure, but no one was rude; no one snatched."

Absent, too, Mr. Taylor reported, was the usual pilfering which accompanies a big exhibition. The only explanation given by the Colombians was that the dairy exhibit had been adopted as their own by the people of Bogotá. Colombian officials of the fair credited the dairy exhibit and the DISI and other people who had made it possible, with being the biggest factor in making the fair a success.

"This is because you have been so good to our mothers and our children," the Fair's manager, Sr. Jorge Reyes G., added.

Later Sr. Reyes sent the society a letter of commendation for the magnificent cooperation of the dairy industries of the two nations in making the fair an outstanding success and expressed the hope that the society would participate in the Third International Fair in Bogotá to be held in November and December of 1956.

From the standpoint of the development of recombining or ice cream manufacturing operations in Colombia, DISI officials report, the fair showed great promise. Numerous requests for quotations on equipment and supplies came to both DISI and the Foreign Agricultural Service's representative at the fair, D. R. Strobel. The public constantly asked where this milk and ice cream could be bought.

"It is our belief that the experience at the Bogotá Fair demonstrates that there exists in many areas not now consuming large quantities of dairy products, a consumer demand for milk and dairy products, particularly for ice cream," a DISI spokesman said. "We also believe that we demonstrated there that a good product can be made from the easily shipable dry milk components. We believe that, with the cooperation of the local dairy industries, such as we received so overwhelmingly in Colombia, the dairy producing nations can develop entirely new markets throughout the world which might absorb all—or at least almost all—of the dairy surpluses and serve as a supplement to the local dairy industries."

The team of industry men, characterized by Mr. Taylor as "magnificent," which worked night and day to process the milk and ice cream, under difficult conditions; to dispense it to the pressing crowds; and to tell the story of milk, were, with one exception, DSI volunteers. They were Frank Thomas, president of General Equipment Sales of Indianapolis, who spent almost 2 weeks there; John McCracken of the Department of Commerce, who handled the ice cream machine, and helped out wherever help was needed; Dr. Elmer Thomas of the University of Minnesota, who made the mix and the milk; and Phil Hanapole, manager of Ideal Dairy Farms, of Union, N. J., all from the United States.

Among the many Colombian firms and individuals who helped make the dairy exhibit a success were, in addition to El Rodeo, owned by the Pradilla family, and Heladeria California, DISI area director Dr. Joaquin Molano-Campuzano, who arranged for translations of the United States Department of Agriculture's pamphlet on recombining and other materials for the booth and for radio appearances for dairy people; Eduardo Moreno of Rimo; the men of Refrigeracion Praco and of Ancira de Colombia, Guzman Hnos, Ltda.; J. Sinistera; Jorge Herrera of Herrera y Hijos, and Jorge and Jaime Pradilla. Colombian officialdom was most helpful, in particular Minister of Agriculture Juan Restrepo J.; Dr. Jean Rogier and his wife, who enlisted the interest of the Women's Club of Bogotá and of the various charitable organizations.

"We all scrubbed floors, cleaned vats, operated equipment, served ice cream, served milk, distributed literature, chased around for supplies, told the story of milk thousands of times, and did everything that had to be done when it had to be done," Mr. Taylor said.

"At no time during the show did we fail to serve either milk or ice cream on time, although there were times when we had to stop serving because of the terriffic pressure of the crowds. Even with police assistance there were times when the demand was so great that in order to keep from crushing people in the rush for these dairy products we cut off the supply.

"We gave numerous special demonstrations, also. We demonstrated recombining to the Governor of the province of Antiochia and his party, together with representatives from the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, UNICEF of the United Nations, the Rockefeller Institute, and a delegation from 'Sendas.' 'Sendas' is a charitable organization headed by Senora Dona Eugenia R. de Moreno, the daughter of the President of the Republic.

"We demonstrated to the United States Ambassador and his people. Another time to the Colombian Minister of Agriculture, and on several occasions to the Colombian Minister of Health and Welfare, and to the local board of Health for the City of Bogotá. We discussed with all official guests the benefits from milk and dairy products to be had by the people of Colombia."

Pearl Harbor Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, December 7, 1955, was a memorable day in naval history because it marked the dedication of the first public memorial to the men who died in the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941.

This memorial was made possible through the efforts of the Navy Club of the United States of America under the leadership of its national commandant, Charles R. Topp, of Davenport, Iowa, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Navy, Charles Thomas.

Because of the significance of the memorial and what it means to all of us, I commend to my colleagues the dedicatory messages which were delivered at the ceremony.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Alton G. Meyer, chairman, Pearl Harbor Memorial Commission, Navy Club of the

Navy Club of the United States of America; the dedication speech by Charles R. Topp, commandant of the Navy Club of the United States of America; and the reply and acceptance of Rear Adm. C. E. Olsen, United States Navy, Commandant, Fourteenth Naval District:

REMARKS BY MR. ALTON G. MEYER, CHAIRMAN, PEARL HABROR MEMORIAL COMMISSION, NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AT MEMORIAL DEDICATION CEREMONIES, FORD ISLAND, PEARL HARBOR, DECEMBER 7, 1955

Mr. Gratz, Mr. Farrant Turner, Admiral Olsen, Commandant Charles R. Topp, distinguished guests, and friends. On behalf of the Navy Club of the United States of America, we humbly accept your most gracious welcome. To you Mr. Turner, we wish to express our sincere appreciation of the warm hospitality shown us by the citizens of your great territorial islands. Our wholehearted thanks go to the Navy whose cooperation has made this solemn occasion possible.

The preamble to the constitution of the Navy Club of the United States of America exemplifies the solemnity of this occasion. Quote: "In reverent recognition of divine guidance, we associate ourselves together, pledging ourselves to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws.

"The objects of this association are to further, encourage, promote and maintain comradeship among our members; to revere, honor and perpetuate the memory of our departed shipmates; and to promote and encourage further public interest in the United States Navy and its history and to uphold the spirit and ideals of our Navy."

We have just passed through the national observance of Thanksgiving and we Americans have every reason to be thankful, thankful not only for the system of Government, under which its people are privileged to live in freedom—

Not only for the ideals which grip the imagination and attention of our citizens everywhere;

Not only for the keen appreciation which all true Americans have for the laws of our land guaranteeing the freedoms of which we boast;

Although we have every reason to be thankful for the opportunity to so live, we must never forget that such privilege carries with it the obligation to defend and preserve these liberties against those who would foist upon our way of living those insidious ideologies which are inimical to the best interests of our well being. Let us be strong, possessed of broad minds and expanded intellect, and let us hold no brief for intolerance, national or personal greed, bigotry or hate.

We are now entering upon the season of peace on earth and good will toward all men. So let us be men of good will, that the influence of our Nation, expressed through the will of our people, and through the voices of their servants may bring to this troubled world that measure of peace which will place all peoples upon a basis calculated to stabilize, strengthen, and to support.

It has been 14 long years since Sunday morning, December 7, 1941, when, while their emissaries were negotiating with our Government, the Japanese came streaking in over Oahu from the west at 7:40 a. m. They caught us alseep. Japanese planes struck at Schofield Barracks and adjoining Wheeler Field. Then they swung eastward, struck Bellows Field and Kaneohe Naval Air Station. The attacking wave of aircraft was then split to hit, simultaneously, grounded aircraft at the naval air station here on Ford Island, Hickam Field, the Army's airbase bordering the naval shipyard, and the Marine Air Corps station at Ewa, adjacent to the present Barbers Point Naval Air Station.

We are here to place a memorial to the memory of our men who died as a result of that insidious attack.

What purpose can such a memorial serve? It can only serve to remind us of the men who gave up their lives in the first hour of World War II. Those men fought back nobly and died heroically. The lessons of Pearl Harbor are obvious. They indelibly stamp the necessity for preparedness and serve as a clear reminder that vigilance must be maintained. The tactics and techniques of modern warfare are most effectively employed in a sneak surprise attack. Let us consider for a moment, being not unmindful of the terrible destruction that was wreaked upon Pearl Harbor in 1941 with so-called conventional bombs, what might today happen with nuclear weapons.

That Sunday, 14 years ago, spells out for all to see what our roles as American citizens must be as we face a larger adversary today.

On December 7, 1951, a group of Navy Club of United States of America officials were guests here of the Navy Department in observance of the 10th anniversary of the bombing of Pearl Harbor. This monument is the culmination of the ideas and thoughts of those men. It is with great pride that the Navy Club Pearl Harbor Memorial Commission presents to the Navy Club of the United States of America this memorial monument erected in memory of those who have so gallantly given their lives in defense of democracy and freedom.

REMARKS BY MR. CHARLES R. TOPP, NATIONAL COMMANDANT, NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AT MEMORIAL DEDICATION CEREMONIES, FORD ISLAND, PEARL HARBOR, DECEMBER 7, 1955

Mr. Gratz, Admiral Olsen, distinguished guests, and fellow Americans, we meet here today to remember—to pay a debt.

We meet here as beneficiaries of a great inheritance—one of freedom and liberty.

In our Nation, government exists as a servant of the people. A man is not a tool of the state. His liberties are guaranteed and he lives in an environment where his freedom may be exercised.

It is in that type of inheritance that we gather on an occasion such as this.

In opposition to that American pattern is the despotic type of state such as the coalition or axis that attacked Pearl Harbor 14 years ago. They held to the idea that a man was subservient to the state—that he existed to be used by the government—and that he had no inherent dignity and self-respect himself as an individual.

If that pattern had been successful in their attack upon our Nation throughout the period of World War II and since then in Korea, the freedoms we enjoy would have gone by the board and slavery would have been the order of the day.

Our opponents' attack came on a quiet Sabbath day—14 years ago almost at this hour—a day that will always live in infamy.

All of a sudden we were included among the nations marked for conquest.

It is to our credit as a nation that we take up the sword reluctantly and only under extreme provocation. It is only in utter necessity that we fight. We never have been and we never will be a warlike people, but when our freedom is jeopardized and there is no choice between liberty and slavery, then our citizens flock to the colors.

The purpose of our World War II effort was not alone the defeat of the Axis nations, not alone the preservation of our Nation, but rather the continuation in the world of the idea that a man's freedom is inviolate. We were dedicated to that principle because it is a foundation stone in our Republic.

It was a terrific struggle. Many heartaches—blood, sweat, and tears—and to that struggle came men and women from every walk of life, answering the call of their country in her hour of need.

We paid a high price along a rough way and at a cost that staggers the imagination, but it meant our survival as a nation, and it meant survival of the dignity of a man, to have freedom of speech, press, and religious worship.

Today it remains for us to do something further in advancing this cause for which our shipmates gave their lives. Your job and ours today is to see that the freedom that they worked, labored, and died for is not only retained but has an opportunity to grow and advance.

Isn't it a tragedy that after a great war, in which we fought to abolish bigotry and dictatorial methods—that those same things are still very much with us? The idea that a man is a tool of a state is still a paramount issue in the world today.

We are confronting those issues—and in doing so we must remember the service and sacrifice of each and every one who gave his life that our freedom might live.

We have a tendency—all too soon—to forget our heroes—and what is even worse—to forget the principles of which they dreamed and for which they died.

We recognize their service and their sacrifice—we appreciate it—but that is not enough. We must pay our debt by meeting their obligation and carrying on their crusade—by dedicating ourselves—each and everyone—as citizens—to those principles of freedom on which our Nation is established. And only as those principles are maintained and practiced can they be cherished and kept inviolate.

Peace is an expensive proposition—and just how high, we are realizing more and more as time passes. It takes just as much intelligence, dedication and devotion as does a war effort. Our business today and tomorrow—yours and ours—is to so live and serve that the service and sacrifice of our shipmates in arms shall not have been in vain.

Today—as a Nation—we confront the multiple problem of a chaotic and confused world. We are trying to find the path to a just and lasting peace. On this Pearl Harbor Day let us determine—each and every one of us—that we are going to meet these problems courageously—that we are going to deal with them intelligently to the end that our Nation under God shall continue increasingly to be the custodian of moral leadership in the world and provide a guarantee to the world that men must be free.

We are going to meet these problems—and achieve these goals only as we—individually—meet them and achieve them—because in this Nation of ours—we are America. We are its citizens and we determine its policies and guard and guide its destinies.

We are going to pay this debt we owe and recognize today—to our hero dead—by doing something as citizens for our Nation to the end that there may never be a second Pearl Harbor—any repetition of the tragedy that we commemorate on this day and with this memorial.

As we face this future and meet these problems we have the confidence that back of it is an Almighty God who never sounds retreat. His truth is marching on through life, through our Nation, and under His banner and benediction we cannot and will not fail.

Let us never forget this day what this observance signifies. Here today we have dedicated the first memorial to be erected by a veterans' group at Pearl Harbor which becomes a part of the Pacific War Memorial system. We know the price of negligence; we know the cost of not being prepared.

We are the custodians of a great heritage; of freedom and independence. We must keep

faith with those who fought and died to uphold it; who sacrificed to maintain it. How do we do it? By resolutely facing the unfinished problems that are connected and associated with what they fought to prevent. We can never deserve the honored and cherished title of Americans unless we assume our responsibilities as citizens of a nation that is destined to direct the world into channels of freedom and of goodwill.

That is a solemn obligation. It is ours.

That thought we face up to today, as a pledge, throughout our Nation by all our citizens; a pledge to those we honor this day and with this memorial who died that we might have the opportunity to make this pledge anew and to work to bring it to pass. God help us in meeting such an obligation.

It is with these thoughts, Admiral Olsen, that we present this humble memoiral bearing our solemn tribute to our shipmates and to the Navy Department, to guard and maintain in their behalf, as they did, and as we will throughout the ages.

REMARKS BY REAR ADM. C. E. OLSEN, USN, COMMANDANT, 14TH NAVAL DISTRICT, AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PEARL HARBOR MEMORIAL, DECEMBER 7, 1955, AT FORD ISLAND

Mr. Gratz, Secretary Turner, Commandant Topp, Judge Meyer, members of the Navy Club Pearl Harbor Memorial Commission, and distinguished guests:

The Navy has many friends. From all over the world, by instances large and small, this is unfolded to us daily.

Quite naturally, the closest members of our Navy family are the alumni, particularly when they are grouped together in strong and influential organizations such as the Navy Club of the United States of America.

The loyalty and devotion of the Navy Club has been of invaluable importance to the Naval Establishment. It is therefore supremely fitting that the memorial being dedicated here today has been conceived and executed by the members of the Navy Club, who by experience, conviction, and action have become an integral part of naval tradition.

We are here in a humble gesture of remembrance. Along battleship row before you—about a mile of now-placid water—more than 2,000 members of the naval service died on that Sunday morning 14 years ago.

Our debt to those who died here has not been discharged. It will never be discharged until a firm, just, lasting peace can give meaning to their passing.

It is therefore well for us to constantly recall the events of the past 14 years and remember that we still have much to accomplish.

I think the people of the United States do realize today, as never before in their history, that they are confronted with a powerful force which hates freedom and democracy and which seeks to conquer the world. To meet the threat, they are moving through sound leadership and technological progress to make their Armed Forces stronger and stronger.

They know this is the one means of keeping peace—and their democratic way of life.

In his remarks a few moments ago Judge Meyer enumerated the objectives of the Navy Club of the United States of America. One objective was to "perpetuate the memory of departed shipmates." This is being magnificently met here today with this fine memorial.

Another objective, Judge Meyer said, was to "encourage further public interest in the United States Navy and its history and to uphold the spirit and ideals of the Navy."

A powerful and mobile air and surface Navy, properly balanced with Air Force and Army components, is absolutely essential to our national well being.

By furthering public interest in the Navy, its capabilities and its traditions, the Navy Club can therefore continue to make important payments toward that solemn debt we all owe to the gallant dead of December 7, 1941.

With these things in mind, Commandant Topp, I gratefully accept this Pearl Harbor Memorial for the United States Navy—for its living members, who are dedicated to the search for a lasting peace, and for its heroes who made the supreme sacrifice here in defense of our freedoms.

Federal Regulation of Independent Natural Gas Producers Is Essential

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which I wrote for the October issue of the Public Utilities Fortnightly. The article is entitled "Federal Regulation of Independent Natural Gas Producers Is Essential," and contains my general views on this question.

I wish to point out, however, that because of its length, I was not able to include all the supporting data which I shall later present to the Senate when the gas bill is debated. In addition, we now have figures for 1954 and, in some cases, for 1955, which have been provided to me by the Federal Power Commission since the article was published. In every case the new figures strengthen the position against exempting from Federal regulation the sales for resale of natural gas in interstate commerce. In fact, new figures for the price of gas, the domination of supplies by a few, and the ultimate costs to consumers involved if the bill is passed, all fortify the case against exemption.

The Public Utilities Fortnightly deserves credit for making available to its readers various views on the natural gas bill, and I wish to commend them for the fairness with which they have presented divergent views to their readers and the public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL REGULATION OF INDEPENDENT NATURAL GAS PRODUCERS IS ESSENTIAL

(By the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator from Illinois)

The United States Senate will have before it in January the Fullbright bill to exempt sales of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce by the so-called independent nontransporting producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The bill would also provide large windfall profits to interstate pipeline companies owning natural gas reserves. I have opposed similar legislation in the past. And I am opposed to this bill and its counterpart, the Harris bill, which passed the House of Representatives by a very narrow margin at the end of the 1st session of the 84th Congress.

I

Historically, the legislative efforts to win exemption for these producers' sales and to provide bonanzas for pipeline companies began with the Moore-Rizley bill in 1947–48. This bill was too extreme even for the Republican 80th Congress. It was shelved. An exemption measure (the Kerr bill) was unfortunately passed in 1950, but President Truman courageously vetoed it.

A majority of the Federal Power Commission in 1951 held in the Phillips Petroleum Co. case that the Commission did not possess jurisdiction over sales of natural gas in interstate commerce which were related to the activities of production and gathering.

The Supreme Court in 1954 reversed this self-denial of jurisdiction. The Court held that the Natural Gas Act gave the Commission power to regulate the interstate sales of producers and indicated that it should get on with the job of protecting the consuming public against exploitation at the hands of natural gas companies. Now the oil and gas producers are back again seeking clarification of the Natural Gas Act or—more precisely—exemption therefrom.

At the present time, then, the Federal Power Commission has the legal power to regulate the rates charged for natural gas sold in interstate commerce for resale at all points in its interstate journey, commencing at the wellhead. The various State regulatory commissions have the authority to regulate the sales to ultimate consumers. The regulatory scheme is complete, and no regulatory gap exists.

The effect of the Fulbright Bill would be to reopen the gap and permit producers to charge all that the traffic will bear for this much-sought-after-fuel. Whatever is charged would be passed along by the pipeline companies and the distributing utilities, and included as a legitimate cost in determining the final price to consumers.

I oppose this legislation because it would exempt from Federal regulation a vital segment of an industry engaged in interstate commerce which is affected with a public interest just as much as electricity, water, public transportation, or the telephone industry. This fact was established legally by Congress in 1938. The decisions of the Supreme Court have confirmed it.

Basically, however, it was neither Congress nor the Supreme Court which made the industry one affected with a public interest and therefore subject to reasonable regulation. This is due instead to the fundamental nature of the industry itself. An examination of the industry structure and its business methods and operations led me, and many of my colleagues, to the view that continued regulation by the Federal Power Commission of the type of sales covered by the Phillips decision is clearly in the public interest.

Natural gas is a necessity in the daily lives of millions of Americans just the same as electricity, telephones, and water. These services are furnished by utilities. If a householder needs such services, there is only one place where they may be obtained on a practical or economical basis, and that is from the local utilities. In the economic sense, these householders are captive customers of the utilities.

It is true that there are alternatives. Candles and oil lamps may be used for light in place of electricity. Water may be bought in bottles, or one can dig one's own private well. However, the investment made by the American consumer in appliances negatives the opportunity afforded by such alternatives. Once the consumer has purchased a gas furnace, gas range, gas water heater, gas refrigerator, or gas clothes dryer, or other gas-burning appliance, he has no real alternative to gas as fuel.

Americans have now invested upwards of $10 billion in gas furnaces and appliances

which cannot be economically or physically converted to electricity, coal, oil, or wood. Even if the conversion were practical, few consumers would shift because gas is cleaner, more convenient, and its utilization requires little physical labor. But the conversion is impractical: The costs would be prohibitive for the consumer to junk his existing gas-burning equipment and replace it by electric appliances or by coal- or oil-burning furnaces.

The argument that the residential consumer has an effective alternative to the continued use of natural gas and can switch to another fuel if he objects to high gas rates is pure sophistry.

II

A phenomenal increase in the prices of natural gas in the producing fields has taken place since the close of World War II, and, more particularly, in the last 2 or 3 years. This rising cost of gas in the field has had a pronounced effect upon the rates of the interstate pipeline companies and has likewise been reflected in the natural gas retail rates in many sections of the country. These increases have been so drastic that many distributing utilities actively participated in the hearings on the Fulbright bill in the Senate and the Harris bill in the House, strongly opposing this give-away legislation. Likewise, State regulatory commissions and State and municipal officials joined in opposition to these measures.

The magnitude of the increases in the field cost of gas is demonstrated by the experience of 17 major pipeline companies, which in 1953 acquired 96 percent of the total volume of gas purchased from independent producers by companies reporting to the Federal Power Commission. In 1946 the weighted average price paid by these companies was 4.4 cents per thousand cubic feet. In 1953 the average cost had risen to 8.857 cents per thousand cubic feet. Based on filings for rate increases in the year 1954, the weighted average price had reached 9.723 cents per thousand cubic feet, an increase of 120 percent above the 1946 level. Almost two-thirds of this increase has occurred since 1951. The increased cost of natural gas in the field to the 17 major pipeline companies when placed upon an annual basis amounts to $196 million. This is no small sum, even in our billion-dollar economy.

In turn, these increases in the field cost of gas have meant higher resale rates. Between July 1, 1949, and March 1, 1955, natural gas pipeline companies filed 163 requests with the Federal Power Commission for increases in their resale rates aggregating more than $505 milion on an annual basis. Of this amonnt, $157 million was disallowed or withdrawn; $199 million was placed in effect; and $149 million was pending as of March 1, 1955.

Natural gas distributing utilities have been forced to pass on the higher cost of gas purchased from the pipeline companies to their customers. This fact is reflected clearly in the statistics published by the American Gas Association. On a nationwide basis the average unit cost of natural gas to residential consumers increased during the period 1945–54 from 6.32 cents to 8.06 cents per therm; for commercial customers the increase was from 4.16 cents to 6.19 cents per therm; and for industrial users from 1.65 cents to 2.37 cents per therm. In some States the increases are even more striking.

At the same time that the cost of natural gas has been going up, the unit cost of electricity to the residential consumers has been declining. In fact, between 1945 and 1954 the residential unit cost of electricity dropped from 3.47 cents to 2.79 cents per kilowatt-hour, a decrease of 24.3 percent. The residential cost of natural gas, however, increased 27.5 percent.

Convincing evidence was presented by representatives of distributing utilities before the congressional committees to the effect that the increased cost of natural gas was seriously hampering their efforts to expand natural gas sales, that in some areas they were being priced out of the market, and that if the upward trend in field prices continued, they would meet with financial disaster. The difficulties faced by the distributing utilities are evidenced not only by the statements made before the congressional committees, but are to be found in testimony in rate proceedings before the State utility commissions and before the Federal Power Commission and in articles in trade magazines.

The problem of distributing utilities in coping with the rising cost of gas is not confined to those companies in the consuming States of the North. The problem is being faced by distributors in the producing States as well. Illustrative is the following statement made by Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. in its annual report to stockholders for the year 1954:

The serious problem of increasing costs of purchased gas discussed in the annual report of 1953, became even more severe in 1954. These increased prices, together with increasing volumes required from purchased sources, have been a major factor in the decrease of the company's earnings. The system-wide average price paid by the company for purchased gas has increased from 4 cents per thousand cubic feet in 1949 to 9 cents per thousand cubic feet in 1953, and in 1954 increased to 10 cents per thousand cubic feet. The cause of this upward spiral is the tremendous competition for new gas reserves by the many long-line transmission companies serving other sections of the country, compounded by the fact that the development of gas reserves has not kept pace proportionately with the increased demand for natural gas throughout the United States. Competing companies are presently paying more for large gas reserves in the field under new long-term contracts than our company is receiving as a retail price from large industrial customers. This is a dramatic illustration of the company's inability to maintain adequate reserves with its present rate structure.

Now the big oil and gas producers are making an allout effort to explain away these increases in the retail prices of natural gas and to shift the blame for such increases from their own shoulders. The producers' representatives, in their congressional appearances and through the so-called educational campaign which they have conducted in the press and by other means, have sought to show that the drastic increases in the field price of gas have had only a small percentage effect on the bills of the ultimate consumers and further that the field cost of gas itself is a small percentage of the total bill. It was implied that consumers were being gouged by the local gas utilities with the acquiescence of the State regulatory commissions.

These sorry diversions were part of a none-too-subtle scheme to turn public opinion into channels favorable for the exemption legislation being demanded of Congress. It was repeated over and over again that since these increases in retail gas rates were authorized by regulatory agencies, further increases in natural gas rates would surely be forthcoming if the producers were placed under regulation. In other words, rate increases according to them were the natural product of regulation.

Industry spokesmen cast the Federal Power Commission (which I, too, have had some occasion to criticize), the State regulatory commissions, and the distributing utilities in the role of the principal villains who were responsible for the increasing cost of gas to the ultimate consumer. Regulation of producer rates was described on the other hand as confiscatory and therefore destructive of our free-enterprise system, socialistic, and very close to communism.

Efforts were even made to cause a congressional investigation to be made of the transmission and distribution segments of the industry. It was charged by proponents of the legislation that interlocking relationships and combinations in these segments of the industry were responsible for the increases in gas rates, and not the producers.

They have cast aspersions on the cost of operations and profits of the regulated pipeline and distributing companies, which are a matter of public record. But no producers have come forward to reveal their own profits from gas-producing operations or furnish any comparison with pipeline and distributing profits which would clearly reveal the responsibility for rising retail gas costs.

Whether these unfair and diversionary tactics will pay off, of course, remains to be seen. I doubt, however, if the producing segment of the industry won any friends among the marketeers of their product or shed any real light on the picture by such machinations.

III

Spokesman for the producers pitch their plea for exemption from regulation upon the proposition that the producing segment of the industry is intensely competitive and thus regulation is not necessary to maintain reasonable prices for natural gas.

If the industry really were as competitive as claimed, and if one could depend upon the natural processes of supply and demand to keep prices to the consumer at reasonable levels, neither I nor my colleagues could reasonably oppose the exemption. That is why the industry has worked so hard in its efforts to argue the slogan of "free enterprise" while ignoring the facts about the concentration of power within the industry. But competition of the nature claimed is not present, and an examination of the facts concerning the so-called independent producers and the conduct of their business of producing and selling gas will show that competition cannot be depended upon to protect the consumer against exploitation.

The latest available figures compiled by the Federal Power Commission show that in 1953 a total of 4,365 nontransporting producers sold natural gas to interstate pipeline companies reporting to the Federal Power Commission. These producers sold 4.249 trillion cubic feet to the pipeline companies. Abundant evidence of concentration in the production phase of the industry is found in the fact that of the 4,365 producers, 85.59 percent of the number, or 3,736, sold only 2.1 percent of the total gas purchased by the pipeline companies. Thus, only 629 producers, accounting for 14.41 percent of the total volume purchased.

Broken down even further, 90.7 percent of the sales were made by 174 producers. Twenty-nine producers—whose sales exceeded 35 million thousand-cubic-feet in 1953—produced almost two-thirds of the natural gas sold to interstate pipeline companies. The 29 largest producers who sell two-thirds of the natural gas are not a poor or impecunious group. Over half of them are on the most recent list of America's 100 largest industrial corporations. The argument used by industry spokesmen, that intense competition exists in the producing fields between many thousands of producers and that reasonable prices of natural gas are thus assured, is not borne out by the facts.

The producing segment of the natural-gas industry, although not necessarily monopolistic in the legal sense, is certainly monopolistic in the economic sense. Natural-gas transmission lines are expensive. Their cost is estimated at from $40,000 to $100,000 per mile. They are not easily moved. Once they have been laid the interstate pipeline

company is practically at the mercy of the producers. For these lines cannot be picked up and relaid to other fields to escape an increase in the price of gas or to secure gas at a lesser cost. Thus, the pipeline company buyer is a captive customer of the relatively few nontransporting independent producers who provide the overwhelming share of natural gas for the utility market.

There are other reasons why competition among the so-called independent producers is ineffective and furnishes no protection to consumers against unreasonable prices. The first is that there now appears to be a diminishing supply of natural gas and an expanding market. With demand exceeding supply, the result is a seller's market.

As evidenced by the testimony before the congressional committees and in the certificate and rate proceedings before the Federal Power Commission, the competition for natural gas is between buyers seeking a supply rather than between sellers seeking a market for their product. We have then a natural resource which is diminishing in relation to annual use and which is a necessity to most users, and, on the other hand, a demand which is increasing. Fair and reasonable regulation in such circumstances is necessary to protect the consumer against skyrocketing prices. Competition among producers cannot be depended upon to do so.

Second, because the large blocks of reserves which must be secured in order to make feasible any major expansion of transmisson line capacity are held by the major oil companies who control most of the gas reserves in the Southwest, it is necessary for the pipeline companies to deal with these relatively few large producers. This also limits competition. Thus, if a pipeline company desires a large block of reserves it has no practical alternative but to go to the major producers and accept the prices which they dictate. The many thousands of small producers have been and will continue to be an ineffective source of competition in such circumstances. Moreover, while the southwest region supplies more than 95 percent of the gas supply of the interstate pipeline companies, more than 60 percent of the 4,365 producers are located in the Appalachian area which produces only 3.4 percent of the total gas supply.

The competitive situation in the gas fields in nowise resembles the normal competition involved in the buying and selling of commodities on the open market. If producers of coal or fuel oil raise their prices, buyers can use several transportation media to obtain supplies from other sources. Because of the high-cost fixed investment in gas transmission lines, the expense of tearing up a pipeline and laying a new one prevents the pipeline company from shopping around for lower prices. Thus, the type of competition which is resent today in the gas fields does not and cannot operate to maintain reasonable prices of natural gas.

The almost universal inclusion of escalation clauses of one or more types in gas purchase contracts entered into in the last few years is conclusive demonstration of the lack of bargaining power on the part of pipeline companies. These clauses, which provide for future increases in the price of gas, many of them by reason of actions over which the buyer has no control, place burdens upon pipeline buyers which anyone having a free choice of suppliers would refuse to accept. The evidence is clear that the pipeline companies had no choice. If they wanted natural gas they were compelled to accede to the demands of producers that such clauses be inserted in the gas purchase contracts.

The existence of such clauses in gas purchase contracts belies assertions by producer representatives that there is free and open competition in the purchase and sale of natural gas in the producing fields of the Southwest.

IV

It has been asserted time and time again by proponents of this legislation that the regulation of independent producers is not feasible, that the cost of regulation will be staggering and the benefits, negative. I do not believe there is any merit to these assertions. Regulation of natural-gas companies—pipeline companies—who are engaged in exploration, development, and production of natural gas in most of the fields in which the nontransporting producers conduct their operations has been conducted by the Federal Power Commission since 1938. As a matter of fact, approximately 50 percent of the total number of gas wells in the United States are owned by pipeline companies reporting to the Federal Power Commission. Thus, the Commission has had considerable experience in dealing with a major producing segment of the industry and has successfully regulated that segment.

Since the Phillips decision by the Supreme Court, the Commission has been going forward with the regulation of the so-called independent producers. It has adopted rules and regulations. It has required the compliance filing of rate schedules and of applications for certificates. According to a press release of the Commission issued on March 10 of this year, 10,000 rate schedules of producers had been processed, and the situation was current.

While the certificate applications had not been processed quite so rapidly since each application requires a mandatory hearing, remarkable progress is being made in clearing up the backlog. Thus, there is no substance to the charge that regulation of producers is an impossible task which will bog down the Commission.

Some of us are quite willing, however, to reduce the regulatory burden very substantially by exempting the interstate sales of all those producers who sell for resale less than 2 billion cubic feet of gas a year. The 174 producers whose sales would be thus kept subject to Federal regulation sell more than 90 percent of the gas purchased for interstate commerce by the pipelines. I am confident that adequate protection can be afforded the consumers and distributing companies if regulation is concentrated on this major segment of the nontransporting producers.

No one expects the commission to handle this regulatory task without some turmoil and strife. With less than a year of actual experience in processing rate and certificate applications filed by nontransporting producers, it would be too much to expect that all of the regulatory bugs have been eliminated and the problems solved. But these problems do not appear to be any more insurmountable than the problems and legal attacks which the commission experienced after the Natural Gas Act became law in 1938. The road ahead may not be smooth, but at least the commission has started on a task which, if it is permitted to complete the job, would be of immeasurable value to the people of the United States.

V

The sponsors and proponents of the Fulbright bill and the Harris bill point to certain provisions of these bills as furnishing all the protection necessary to save natural gas consumers from unreasonable rates. I have examined these alleged protections. My analysis shows they are ineffective, futile, and of doubtful legality, and will not work to protect the natural gas consumers. They were not designed to do so and are mere sugar-coating which has been applied to give the appearance of regulation without providing its substance.

One provision of the bill purports to give the commission authority to disallow as an operating expense of the pipeline company that part of the price paid for natural gas in a new or renegotiated contract which is in excess of the reasonable market price. Aside from the doubtful legality of this provision (which would deny recovery through rates of payments made by a pipeline company in good faith under contracts entered into at arm's length), it is incomprehensible to me that the Federal Power Commission would require the regulated utility to suffer losses through the disallowance of payments in excess of the reasonable market price while the producers selling the gas were able to secure excessive profits under the contract arrangement. Such a proposal is illogical, unfair, and completely contrary to regulatory purposes. The results would be inevitable. Contract prices would be accepted as the reasonable market price. The proposed control is of no help whatsoever to the consumer.

Another section of the bill dealing with certain types of escalation clauses in existing contracts purports to relieve the pipeline company from paying producers any amount for gas which is in excess of the reasonable market price as determined by the Commission. This proposal flies directly in the face of section 1 of the Fulbright bill, which defines such sales as not being in interstate commerce. The validity of such proposal is very much in doubt, since it would appear impossible for the Federal Power Commission to regulate a sale by a producer to a pipeline company which Congress has declared not to be a sale in interstate commerce.

The reasonable-market-price standard, as it is defined in the bills and in the reports of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the Senate and House, is of no practical benefit in providing reasonable natural-gas prices. This is so because as the standard is defined it can mean only the contract price which has been agreed upon by the buyer and seller. The reasonable-market-price standard is contrary to utility regulatory principles. Its adoption would result in no effective control being imposed on field prices of natural gas.

Moreover, these alleged consumer protections apply only where the pipeline company is seeking a rate increase from the Federal Power Commission. They do not apply to the pending rate increases or to the excessive contract prices which have already become eeffctive. In my opinion, it would be far better to repeal the Natural Gas Act in its entirety than to give the natural-gas consumer the illusion that he would be protected by Federal regulation of the character proposed in the bills.

VI

The provision in the Fulbright bill requiring the Federal Power Commission to allow natural-gas pipeline companies owning gas reserves to include in operating expenses the reasonable market price of the gas produced from their own leases is nothing less than an invitation to the pipeline companies to pay higher and higher prices to the independent producers for the gas which they purchase, since such higher prices can be passed on to the consumer and at the same time act as a basis for increases in their profits from their own produced gas.

What possible justification can there be for this windfall to the pipeline companies? As the pipeline companies and producing affiliates own more than 28 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, they stand to gain huge profits over and above a fair return under this section of the Fullbright bill. The values of their reserves will increase as the prices rise. An indication of the bonanza which will come their way is to be found in the 1954 annual report of Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. to its stockholders. The report states that the company's owned reserves are carried at a book cost aggregating less than $3 million, which the company estimates is approximately 1 percent

of their replacement cost under present conditions.

In other words, natural gas reserves which cost $3 million and the costs of exploration, acquisition, and development, of which the customers of the company paid through rates, would under the Fullbright bill be sold to their customers for 100 times that cost or $300 million. Under these circumstances, how is it that the pipeline companies can be counted upon as guardians of the consumer interest in the purchase of natural gas from producers as some propaganda argues?

As a matter of fact, 7 of the major pipeline companies already have pending or have received rate increases from the Federal Power Commission based in part on the substitution of the commodity value or average field price of gas in the field, for their cost of production plus a fair return on producing properties devoted to the public interest. These requested or allowed increases cost consumers approximately $40 million annually. The Fullbright bill would make this method of regulation mandatory. Thus the reasonable gas rates which consumers have secured over the years through regulation under the Natural Gas Act would be obliterated.

VII

What will be the effect on natural gas consumers if the oil and gas industry is successful in its campaign against fair and reasonable regulation? To answer this question we need only to look at the trend of gas prices in recent times and to statements by industry spokesmen that higher gas prices are anticipated.

We have seen that the average cost of natural gas at the wellhead in the Southwest has increased from about 5 cents to 10 cents per thousand cubic feet between 1947 and 1953. Prices in new contracts range from 15 cents to 24 cents per thousand cubic feet. These increases in the field cost of natural gas occurred in the absence of effective Federal regulation because of the Commission's self-denial of jurisdiction. In 1954 utilities sold approximately 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to ultimate consumers, an increase of approximately one-half trillion cubic feet over the volume sold in 1953. However, using a volume of 5 trillion cubic feet, a modest 5 cents per thousand cubic feet increase in the average cost of natural gas at the wellhead—a rise from 10 cents to 15 cents—would cost consumers and additional $200 million a year. If the average cost of gas rises to 25 cents per thousand cubic feet, and this price has been indicated by industry spokesmen to be in range of what may be expected in the future, the consumer would be hit for $600 million a year above present gas costs. This is the kind of bonanza which motivates the $1,500,000 war chest which the industry has gathered to finance its campaign.

The attempt to minimize the impact of higher prices on gas consumers by saying "it will cost each family only a few pennies a day" is a shocking argument. Pennies extracted from the many will mean millions for the few. The whole purpose of rate regulation is to save modest sums for the users of utility services by restricting profits to a reasonable level.

Much of the industry propoganda also argues that with no regulation there will be more exploration and more gas for consumers, the implication being that reasonable regulation will stifle discovery of natural-gas reserves. No reasonable person can believe, however, that the mammoth oil industry, whose discovery and marketing of gas is incidental to its exploration and development of oil, will ever stop or slow down or speed up its primary oil exploration work because the sideline, natural gas, is subjected to fair regulation. The exploration for oil and gas will not subside in any case.

This argument then gets down to an implied threat by the oil industry that it will waste or flare the gas rather than let it come to the consumers outside of the producing States under fair regulation. I just do not believe that the industry would be guilty of such a holdup, and I do not feel that Congress should fix national policy on the basis of such implied intimidation.

One final point should be noted: If the industry succeeds in gaining exemption from Federal regulation and the average prices at the wellhead increase from the present 10 cents to 15 cents or 20 cents or 25 cents, the industry stands to gain enormous windfalls from the increased value of the natural-gas reserves which they own. At the present time such reserves amount to about 210 trillion cubic feet of gas. An increase of only 5 cents per thousand cubic feet would result in an increase in the value of the gas reserves of over $10 billion. If the prices go to 20 cents or 25 cents this windfall would be doubled or tripled. These are the vast sums which the industry stands to gain from exemption, and no one should be fooled by claims made in the name of free enterprise, freeing the small producer from Federal red tape, States' rights, or the sanctity of contracts.

Free enterprise is an essential part of our national welfare. It should by all means be preserved. But freedom of private enterprise and of contract cannot be allowed, nor has it ever been allowed, to supersede the public interest and justify exploitation of captive consumers by a noncompetitive supply system of a basic necessity. Wherever there is a conflict, it has been our traditional national policy to establish reasonable regulation to protect the public interest. That policy with respect to interstate sales of natural gas was established in 1938, and it should be preserved.

VIII

In summary, competition cannot be relied on to protect the consumer against exorbitant prices for natural gas. The industry is not really competitive at the production, transmission, or distribution levels. Once the pipelines and the gas mains are laid and the consumers have invested in appliances, a natural monopoly with captive customers is created. The natural gas industry is an industry affected with the public interest, and regulation has been and should continue to be applied. The industry has grown to the sixth largest in the Nation and has become extremely profitable. It will gain billions of dollars in windfall profits if it is exempted from regulation. It is an industry which already receives special tax treatment through the 27½ percent depletion allowance.

The industry seeks protection against loss by way of tax policy, escalation clauses, minimum wellhead prices, and conservation agreements, and at the same time complete freedom to charge what the traffic will bear to captive customers. It is my considered judgment that legislation should not be passed by this Congress, the effect of which will be complete nullification of the Natural Gas Act as an effective regulatory instrument.

Farmers Should Be Relieved From Federal Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill which carries out President Eisenhower's recommendation that farmers be relieved of the burden of the present Federal excise taxes on gasoline and lubricating oil when used in tractors, trucks, and other farm equipment for agricultural purposes. I predict that Congress will act promptly and favorably on this proposal.

I do not consider this to be a tax-reduction measure but an act of simple equity designed to correct a long-standing injustice against the American farmer. These Federal excises merely serve to increase the farmer's production costs. In so doing, they add materially to the severe price-cost squeeze from which, in the words of President Eisenhower, "our farm people, with the help of Government, must be relieved."

Of course, it is true that the farmer today can deduct, in computing his income taxes, these Federal excises to the extent that they are business expenses. By this means, he is partially relieved of their burden. Unfortunately, this relief varies widely between different taxpayers. The average small farmer with only a small taxable income gets very little benefit from the deduction. The farmer who does not have enough income to be subject to the income tax at all gets absolutely no benefit whatsoever. My bill will correct this discrimination and will relieve all farmers of this burden.

Congress will again consider this session a highway program. It has been widely proposed that the cost of this program be met, at least in part, by increased taxes on gasoline. In my opinion, it would be unconscionable for nonhighway farm operations to be forced to share this burden when such operations would receive no benefit from the program. I consider this to be an important reason for prompt action on my bill.

Congressman Jackson Urges Continued Policy of Strength in Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook for January 6, 1956. This editorial discusses the sound views expressed by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] upon his return from the Far East. I also wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the same newspaper which discusses President Eisenhower's state of the Union message.

The editorials follow:

WHAT THE PACIFIC OCEAN MEANS TO US

Back from a tour of active duty in the Pacific area with the Marine Corps, Representative DONALD L. JACKSON brought a message which should be heard by all Americans and not merely those on our west coast. It is: Any retreat from the United States' position of strength in the Pacific would

insure the complete domination of Asia and the Western Pacific by the Soviet Union and their Red Chinese allies.

"As a Nation we are confronted with 1 or 2 alternatives in the Far East," JACKSON said. "Either we maintain a posture of strength as contemplated under the resolution passed by the Congress last year, expressing our determination not to retreat further in that portion of the world; or we must withdraw to a new defense line running from the Aleutians to Pearl Harbor, and thence to the Panama Canal."

Should this Nation ever let the Chinese Reds take Formosa, we would find it immensely difficult to hold our present line of naval and air defense protecting the Philippines, Okinawa, Japan, and South Korea. The Reds would not stop with Formosa but would be on their way to attack all those vital bastions of the free world. Our friends and allies, the Filipinos, the Japanese, the Koreans—all present defenders of freedom and targets for communism—would be in mortal danger.

From 1945 down through 1952 our record in the Far East was one of tragic blundering, which began with the monumental error of begging Soviet Russia to enter the war against Japan in its final weeks, and then permitting her to walk off with the major spoils in that area. There followed the loss of mainland China, largely caused by the muddle-headed policy of General Marshall and Secretary of State Acheson; the Korean war, which we were prevented by our allies from winning, after 30,000 Americans had died and 130,000 were wounded; the uncalled for and shameful dismissal of Gen. Douglas MacArthur by Truman, marking our acceptance of a truce which in effect was a defeat. Considering this record, it is a wonder we have any friends left in Asian nations still resisting communism.

Yet we do have such friends who want no part of communism, and we have a solemn moral obligation to stand back of them. As Representative JACKSON says: "Any sign of weakness or any indication of a lack of determination on our part will cause widespread fear and hopeless resignation among millions in the Far East who see the United States as their only hope of delivery from Communist tyranny or the prevention of further conquests."

The question of whether we will stand firm in the Far East will soon be revived by the expected visit of British Prime Minister Anthony Eden to Washington. He will likely urge that the United States agree to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and to a relaxation of trade with the Reds. In any such enterprise he should be promptly rebuffed, and our answer should include a continuous buildup of American forces in the Pacific theater. Only that will discourage further Communist aggression in this most vital area, where any further retreat on our part would invite disaster.

THE STATE OF THE UNION

President Eisenhower's State of the Union message to Congress emphasizes the "peace, prosperity—and prudence" which have been the keynotes of the first 3 years of his successful administration. There is the promise that the budget will be balanced, come June and the new fiscal year. That means a start then can be made toward reducing the $280 billion debt.

But in the same breath—and here his prudence is exemplified—the President cautions that this balancing of the budget justifies a tax reduction only if it will not put the Government in the red again. And looking forward to protecting the rights of oncoming generations, he wisely holds that "taxes should be reduced when we prudently can, but under the conditions of high peacetime prosperity such as now exist, we can never justify going further into debt to give ourselves a tax cut at the expense of our children."

This is just sound common sense, the advocacy of a financial policy which will redound to the greatest benefit for the largest number of people and make our ship of state seaworthy for the years of rough "cold war" water ahead.

Likewise, all Americans will be interested in Mr. Eisenhower's statement that his administration has cut Government spending by $10 billion and abolished 300,000 Federal jobs. This bespeaks the financial care which his administration has manifested in our governmental operations.

At this time he warns the Nation that we must be prepared to meet current Soviet tactics of "division, enticement and duplicity," instead of the old formula of violence and threats of violence, with dynamic and flexible policies, yet persevere in seeking a general reduction of armaments under effective inspection and control. For Asia, in which we of the Pacific Coast are vitally interested, he promises that we shall continue to help those nations struggling to maintain their freedom against the threat of Communist coercion and subversion.

The President's proposal for a 25-billion-dollar Federal aid to highways program is minus his former plan that it should be financed by long-term borrowing instead of short-term money raising. With this change it should receive quick approval by Congress.

The farm problem, including the Administration's "soil bank" proposal, as well as water conservation, slum clearance, statehood for Hawaii and possibly Alaska, and changes in immigration quotas will be dealt with specifically in later messages, starting next week.

Summed up, the State of the Union paper is a noteworthy demonstration of Eisenhower moderation and sound achievement, as when he said that "our country is at peace and our economy approaching the 400-billion-dollar mark finds us at an unparalleled level of prosperity. The national income is more widely and fairly distributed than ever before. The number of Americans employed has reached a new all-time high. As a people we are achieving even higher standards of living—earning more, building more and investing more than ever before."

This all-American message leaves little politically for Adlai Stevenson to stand on in this year's campaign.

Illicit Stills Brew Economic Poison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the following article which appeared in the Hearst papers called Illicit Stills Brew Economic Poison:

ILLICIT STILLS BREW ECONOMIC POISON

Moonshine is big business—and it's getting bigger.

Across the United States, illicit stills are cooking overtime, heated by the highest Federal excise tax on record, averaging $2.10 per fifth of 100-proof whisky, 6 times higher than in the repeal year, 1933.

As a result, legitimate distillers are being hurt, Uncle Sam is losing hundreds of millions in yearly revenue and the bottle you nip from is being taxed right off your bar or kitchen shelf.

The moonshiner no longer is the traditional southern hillbilly running a little pot still.

Today he is boss of a well-organized business that has spread to all sections of the country. He has technical know-how, modern equipment, counterfeit bottles and labels.

But sometimes he poisons you. Since 1951 there have been at least 70 deaths attributed to bad moonshine.

A survey just completed by the authoritative Licensed Beverage Industries, Inc., among local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers and agencies, clearly demonstrates how the moonshine racket is booming.

In 1954 the law seized 22,913 illegal stills, 14.5 percent more than in 1953.

These stills produced an estimated 36 million gallons of moonshine. Mash seizures totaled over 7 million gallons.

On the premise that at least 1 still kept operating for every 1 seized, possibly as much as 72 million gallons of moonshine flooded the country last year. This means that over 25 percent of all distilled spirits consumed in the United States in 1954 was illegally made and sold.

Over the same 12-month period the legal liquor industry sold 189 million gallons of its product.

According to LBI reports, only 15 percent of southern homemade whisky now stays put. The rest is shipped over States lines, largely to the East.

Biggest increase in moonshine production is in the Northeast. One still recently seized at Coney Island on New York City's edge had a daily capacity of 2,000 gallons.

An estimated 85 million Americans drink spirituous liquors in one form or another, far more than during the war years. Yet consumption of legally distilled liquor is declining. Per capita consumption in 1942 was 1.42 gallons. Last year it was 1.18 gallons.

What is the explanation? Moonshine reflects a "tax rebellion" in the average-income class. Illegal booze, doctored to look and taste like legitimate stuff now costs about $1 less a bottle.

Translated in terms of revenue loss, the Government is being clipped by the moonshiner—who pays no taxes—at the rate of approximately $700 million a year.

In the face of this, the Treasury Department's enforcement agency, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, had only 812 investigators in the field last year, compared to 1,022 in 1946.

Can the moonshine racket be broken?

The LBI study says it can, by tightening up enforcement procedures, removing the moonshiner's profit incentive and bringing down taxes to a fair level that will enable the consumer to buy good legal liquor at a price he can afford. Says the LBI:

"Tax reduction will make it unprofitable for the moonshiner to operate. More rigid enforcement with stiffer penalties will drive him out of business."

Oscar Johnston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on October 3, 1955, Oscar Goodbar Johnston, the greatest leader our American cotton industry has ever produced, died at his home in Greenville, Miss. Under unanimous consent, I include tributes paid to Mr. Johnston by W. T. Wynn, president of the National

Cotton Council, and Walter Sillers, speaker of the Mississippi House of Representatives, as well as editorials from the Progressive Farmer, the Memphis Commercial Appeal, and the Greenville Democrat-Times:

OSCAR JOHNSTON

The happiness of this occasion has been clouded by the passing on October 3 of the cotton industry's most beloved leader and stanchest champion—Oscar Johnston. It was for Oscar that this fine building was named. And it is for Oscar that we are here today.

I thank all of you for joining with us in honoring a man whose name for many years was synonymous with cotton and whose contribution to the industry's welfare has exceeded that of any other individual of his generation. The rich heritage of service and leadership that he left us will be a constant source of inspiration in the years ahead.

I was privileged to know Oscar Johnston for many years. I knew him as an attorney in Clarksdale, Miss., as a bank president, as the head of the 50,000-acre Delta & Pine Land Co. in Scott, Miss., as director of finance of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, as vice president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as manager of the Government cotton pool, and as assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury. I knew him as a friend, as a forthright leader, as a man of great principle, and as the ardent champion of the cotton industry.

There are numerous monuments to the life of Oscar Johnston. But the greatest of these, I think all will agree, is the National Cotton Council of America—the central organization of the raw cotton industry. It is to dedicate the permanent home of that organization that we are gathered here today.

The real significance of this occasion is that Oscar's idea of a united industry fighting its own battles for increased consumption through hard-hitting programs of research, education, and sales effort has been almost universally accepted as the ultimate true answer to cotton's problems. These are the programs that Oscar envisioned; in their total they have been the program of the council throughout its 16 years of existence.

It was in 1938 that Oscar brought together the leaders of the raw cotton industry to found an organization dedicated to the goal of increasing consumption. May I recall for you the circumstances that prevailed at that time? There was a carryover of approximately 11.5 million bales; we had produced the largest crop in our history the year before, and no one wanted it or had the money to pay for it. Farm mortgages were at a burdensome level; the farmer was receiving not quite 9 cents per pound for his cotton; exports had fallen to less than 3.5 million bales; our domestic market of 6 million bales was being challenged as never before by rayon and other synthetics. We stood to lose a great part of our existing markets. Few dreamed of developing new ones.

Fear of what the future held had the industry in a state of jitters. There was despair in several million homes from Virginia to California, and for good reason—the principal source of income for 1.5 million cotton farmers, for all the business serving them, for all those processing and marketing cotton and cottonseed, was in danger of being permanently reduced or swept away.

It was in such an atmosphere that Oscar Johnston sounded his call for the industry to fight its own battle for survival—not separately as farmers, or ginners, or warehousemen, or merchants, or spinners, or cottonseed crushers—but all together with a united voice. Only with the weight of the entire industry behind a central program, he said, could real success be achieved. Men of vision and courage responded to the logic of Oscar's message and the power of his personality. They rallied around him.

One had to believe in cotton as strongly as Oscar did to take the step he took. One had to know the versatility of cotton as Oscar knew it. One had to have the working heart that Oscar brought to this tremendous job. For the organization had to be strong or it would fail completely. It had to have the support of all branches of the industry, or it could not claim to represent cotton. Its program had to be developed with care, and carried out with effectiveness.

There were many who hoped for success. There were fewer who really believed it would succeed. That it not only survived the early years, but rapidly grew in prestige and effective power was the genius of Oscar Johnston. It was Oscar who supplied the leadership that a discouraged and disorganized industry had to have. He engendered the hope that made the council possible. He found financial support for it from an industry heavily mortgaged. He breathed spirit and life into it—all because he believed, because he had the faculties of leadership and of courage, and because he had a great cause.

It was at a Delta Council meeting in Cleveland, Miss., in June 1938 that Oscar proposed the council. It was in November of that year here in Memphis that industry leaders met with him to organize. And it was in January 1939 that cotton producers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, and cottonseed crushers formally united to fight cotton's battles for consumption. The sixth interest, the cotton spinners, joined with the original five in 1941 to complete Oscar's dream of all branches of the raw cotton industry working under one banner.

In the beginning, with a staff of 3, and a $9,000 appropriation from the State of Mississippi to be expended, according to Governor White, "as Oscar Johnston saw fit," this infant organization tackled the biggest job that any like group, I dare say, has ever been called upon to do.

Thus, the council was born. That it has succeeded, we all agree. The six segments of the industry have had their differences, to be sure, but Oscar's wisdom provided again the force to hold the council together despite these differences. He caused to be incorporated into the bylaws of the council a provision that requires two-thirds of each segment of the council to approve a position before it becomes council policy. While this provision has kept the organization from taking some positions, it has meant, over the years, that when the council moves, it moves with the support of a substantial proportion of the entire industry behind it. This provision has been the source of our greatest strength.

Oscar's hope for increased consumption lay in a hard-hitting program of research and promotion. He recognized in the beginning that to meet its competition, the cotton industry must reduce costs of producing, processing, marketing, and manufacturing; that it must improve quality; that it must increase sales pressure. Four program divisions, therefore, were established: Production and marketing and utilization research—our research and educational divisions—that work at the job of reducing costs and improving quality; our sales-promotion division, that works at the job of increasing sales effort; and our foreign-trade division that works at the job of increasing consumption of American cotton and cotton products abroad. Four service units support the divisions—the office of public relations, field service, the office of economic information, and accounting service. Overall administrative responsibility is centered in the office of the executive vice president.

This building houses the office of our executive vice president, all of 1 division, major parts of 2 others, and all of our service units. Memphis, in short, is headquarters. Memphis is the home of the council. This is fitting, for Memphis is synonymous with cotton wherever spindles turn. More actual bales of cotton are bought and sold here than in any other city in the world.

It was logical then that Memphis was selected by the industry as the council headquarters, and that the Oscar Johnston Cotton Foundation build this structure here to house the council and its own staff. As I look upon the building and its tree-shaded lawn, and as I think of Oscar Johnston, the reality of his great vision becomes increasingly apparent. And I think, as I'm sure he would of the future—the future of cotton and the future of the council, for the future of one is the future of the other.

W. T. WYNN,
President, National Cotton Council.

OSCAR GOODBAR JOHNSTON

Oscar Johnston was first of all a Mississippian. He loved Mississippi, its soil, and its people, his own delta country and the great river which courses down its western border.

His life was spent working, in many capacities, for the betterment of his State and his people. But it was in the field of agriculture, specifically cotton, that he reached his highest distinction.

It is to his achievements as one of the founders of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association and as a man of high integrity, brilliant mind, vision, and force of character that we pay tribute.

He was one of the organizing directors of the association and attended the first meeting on May 25, 1921. He was appointed one of a 5-member executive committee to perfect the organization and solicit members.

On June 14, 1921, he was elected to the permanent and regular board of directors, officially set up to function from this date.

From the day of its organization until he retired from all active duties because of ill health, he served as an active member of the board of directors of this association.

His was a loyal and brilliant service and he gave of his wisdom and energies with the full realization that he was doing it for the good of all of the people who depended upon cotton for a livelihood.

He was a member of the policy and procedure committee of the board of directors of the association during the entire time of his activity as a board member. He attended the monthly meetings faithfully and regularly, and though a man of wide interests and great responsibilities, he never lost interest in the administration, work, and welfare of the association.

He was a man of constructive ideas. It was at his suggestion and upon his recommendation that the board of directors voted to take a membership in the New York Cotton Exchange, which was effected in June 1936.

From 1927, when he became president of the Delta & Pine Land Co., until his retirement, he delivered to the association every bale of cotton produced on the 50,000-acre plantation operation, even though Delta & Pine Land Co. is owned by an English mill interest.

In the early part of his presidency of the large cotton producing operation he experienced the disastrous flood of 1927 when the levee gave way on this property; and, in the 1930's the depression which saw cotton drop almost overnight to 4 cents and 5 cents a pound. But he never lost heart. He was a fighter. And through it all he never lost interest in the association. A few years ago, after he became completely inactive in business, he was named director emeritus of the organization he had served so long and well.

On January 8, 1934, he was appointed Director of Finance in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and went to Washington to direct the program. It was in this office, as manager of the Government Cotton Pool, that he sold the tremendous supply of Government-owned cotton acquired through the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In this crisis his faith in and his allegiance to the association never faltered. As soon as he received authority, he appointed the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association as the agency through which all the better staple cotton was to be sold. The association performed this selling service to his complete satisfaction and with much saving and dollar benefit to the Government.

It was through him as director of finance that the program of acreage control and support funds for cotton was inaugurated.

A native son, Oscar Johnston was born in Jackson, Miss., on January 27, 1880, the son of John Calvin and Emma Goodbar Johnston. He was graduated from Kentucky Military Institute in 1899, and received his bachelor of laws degree from Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1901. In 1905 he was married to the former Miss Martha Anderson, of Lebanon, who survives him.

And here we must mention the tender, faithful ministrations of his wife, Martha, in the late years of his life. When the shadows lengthened and the sands were running low, the loving care of a woman knows no bounds and he was blessed in abundance with the comforting hand and the devotion of a wife who seemed dedicated to his service. This was, and is, a tribute to the man which is greater than all the words penned or all the plaudits of the world, and he must have known it in his heart.

Oscar Johnston first practiced law at Friars Point, Miss., in 1901, and made his home there. He later moved to Clarksdale where he continued to practice until 1920, as a member of the firm of Cutrer and Johnston, the senior member, J. W. Cutrer, being one of Mississippi's great lawyers.

In 1918 he entered the service as a private in the army, was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Tank Corps, and served until January 1919.

He became president of the Planters National Bank of Clarksdale in 1926 and resigned to head the Delta & Pine Land Co. in 1927.

This writer was closely associated with Oscar Johnston through most of his active years and served with him in the State legislature from 1916–18. The first public speech the writer ever made was his nominating speech for Oscar Johnston for speaker of the house of representatives. As a public man Oscar Johnston stood firmly on principle. Back in 1919 when he was a candidate for Governor of Mississippi the matter of maintaining a State tax commission was one fo the principal issues. Oscar Johnston opposed this measure while south Mississippi favored it. He was told if he would support the State tax commission he would get south Mississippi's votes. He refused. They urged him to straddle the issue, to compromise; he said "No"; he could not and would not compromise with principle. He lost south Mississippi's vote and was defeated for governor by 7,000 votes.

This is indicative of the character of the man. He was a wise legislator and business man and often made compromises in order to go forward, but never when a principle was involved.

In the last 20 years of his active life he was a leader in cotton and helped to build the industry in the mid-South, and indeed in the Nation. He organized the National Cotton Council in 1938, when cotton was in a decline, and was president until his retirement. He saw the Council through its formative years and then saw it grow into the great and effective organization it is today.

Oscar Johnston, lawyer, statesman, planter, his was a career of great distinction as a leader. When others faltered, he moved forward with firm resolute and determination. He blazed trails and pointed out the way, always lending a helping hand to those less capable than he.

A wise counsellor and courageous leader, he placed principle above all else, his name is synonymous with character. His contribution to Mississippi, the Delta, to cotton and its industry, is unexcelled, and from his deeds long shall live his name high upon the scroll of famous Mississippi Deltans, a great honor which he so richly deserved.

The people of Mississippi, the Cotton South, and the members, officers and directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association have every reason to be proud of and thankful to Oscar Goodbar Johnston, whose good works will live on so long as a cotton stalk grows in Mississippi soil.

WALTER SILLERS.

[From the Progressive Farmer of November 1955]

OSCAR JOHNSTON DIES

It is with deep regret that we note the passing away on October 3 of Oscar Johnston. He organized the National Cotton Council, was president for 8 years, and honorary chairman of the board at the time of his death.

Mr. Johnston was recognized by the Progressive Farmer as man of the year in service to southern agriculture in 1941. In the early thirties he was in and out of Washington on various appointments helping fight the battles of Dixie cotton farmers. An early philosophy of his, often proclaimed, was: "Parity prices without parity consumption will never bring the cotton farmer parity income." To this end, he headed up the National Cotton Council which brought farmers, ginners, warehousemen, merchants, cottonseed crushers, spinners, and others together into one great campaign to find new uses and markets for cotton. The success of this venture stands as a magnificent tribute to his leadership.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of October 5, 1955]

OSCAR JOHNSTON

Oscar Johnston's contributions to the South's economic progress and to modernization of the cotton industry were of such magnitude as to almost beggar evaluation. His death therefore is an event which touches the whole South and all of its people.

His activities, born of extraordinary vision and energy, made his Mississippi home almost the geopolitical and geoeconomic heart of cotton. He was "Mister Cotton" so far as this vast and rich mid-South was concerned.

He was essentially a builder and he devoted the major part of his life building with and for the commodity on which the South's development is founded. He was one of the great pioneers—probably the foremost—in seeking new cotton usages, for he was among the first to recognize that unless the field of usage was greatly and constantly expanded the industry and the region which nurtured it would stagnate and wither.

It was out of that realization that the National Cotton Council, today's great directing and dynamic force behind the American cotton industry, was conceived. Oscar Johnston was its father. It was his vision and mind which fashioned it, and his the leadership which gave it being.

Betterment of the industry was a driving passion with Oscar Johnston, and when the National Cotton Council decided to erect a living monument to his achievements it very properly created a means for carrying on his great work and named it The Oscar Johnston Cotton Foundation. Its fine Memphis headquarters are to be dedicated in a fortnight.

As Gerald Dearing, the Commercial Appeal's cotton columnist expressed it: "The miracle of the National Cotton Council is that six divisions of the industry, each with its suspicions of all others, each with its individual ambitions, should be able to unite in fostering the betterment of all."

When Oscar Johnston retired from the presidency of that organization in 1948, he expressed the philosophy which had guided him and had made his brainchild, the National Cotton Council, what it is, in this manner:

"There is no reason why any group of men or any group of people cannot get along together by compromising a little bit. All they need to do to get along is for each to make some sacrifices." He made that his own golden rule for living. He was willing to give more than the other fellow. He knew how to bend—how to avoid adamancy when it served no useful purpose.

Whatever Oscar Johnston did was well done. He enlisted as a private for World War I service and earned a commission. He went into banking and became the institution's president. He studied law and became a distinguished member of the Mississippi bar. He was one of cotton's most successful theorists and, equally, one of its greatest practical planters, as his management of the 50,000-acre Delta & Pine Land Co. plantation attested.

Oscar Johnston's life was ever full and rich. His friendships were international in scope. His loyalties were impregnable and his a warm and earthy kindliness. Death intervened in a marital companionship which had endured beyond a half century. Such constancy alone was index to the man.

The good works which he set in motion will live on and redound to the benefit of the homeland into which he had set his roots so deeply, so usefully. When that can be written of a man, he has not died. For such a man there is no death.

[From the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat-Times of October 5, 1955]

OSCAR JOHNSTON

Rare and needed is the man whose energy and intellect are such that he can serve Nation, State, and fellowman in a single capacity. Far more rare is he whose talents and enterprise make him appear not one but many men.

Such a citizen was Oscar Johnston, whose death Monday night removed from personal usefulness a giant among Mississippians and a peer of any American whom we can measure in terms of creative force. But as is the happy case with those who dream nobly and then make the dream a rich reality, the usefulness of Oscar Johnston will last for generations to come. It will endure primarily because of the National Cotton Council, the powerful voice of all the cotton interests, which Oscar Johnston conceived and guided to incredible success.

The council was his greatest triumph. But Oscar Johnston was also adviser and confidant to the National Government in the most difficult peacetime years of our Nation's history. He was a stalwart political figure, making years ago a lonely fight for decency in Mississippi's public life. He was as skilled in law and in finance as he was in agriculture.

And he had an infectious love of life, whose good things he enjoyed and whose laughable aspects delighted him. When Oscar Johnston was amused, the amusement touched all who were near him. When he was serious and purposeful, his determination could likewise affect his associates, as

all who had a part in the Cotton Council's formation know. And for those who take joy in a magnificent intellect, the performance of his incisive, penetrating mind, so scornful of sham and fuzziness, was a wondrous and memorable thing.

His friends share with his widow her pride in such memories and to her goes our admiration for the courage which in these latter years matched his own.

Upper Colorado River Water Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles published in the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, for December 14, 1955, all relating to the upper Colorado River water-storage project.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETY-NINE PERCENT REPAYMENT—WATER USERS WILL PAY THE COST OF THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER WATER STORAGE PROJECT

"Who is going to pay for it?"

That is the question many thinking United States taxpayers are asking about the Colorado River storage project.

Upper basin residents are very anxious that these United States taxpayers get the answer. For the answer is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the project.

WILL PAY FOR SELF

Fact of the matter is the project will pay for itself.

It is not a pork-barrel raid, or a boondoggle. It is a practical businesslike enterprise, which will pay its own way, with interest and dividends to the Government according to George D. Clyde, chairman of Utah's Water and Power Board.

"Actual costs will be fully repaid by the water users and the power users of the project," says Mr. Clyde.

All that is asked is that the Federal Government (the only governmental unit able to finance a program of this scope involving an entire river system) loan the money needed for construction.

DON'T WANT HANDOUTS

That is the way the residents of the upper basin want it. They do not want any handouts. They want to maintain their traditional independence.

Unfortunately, opponents of the project have confused this issue by propagating misleading information about the project's cost. Most-used techniques have been to inflate the total cost by tossing in all past, present or future planned units or by compounding the interest charge. Such estimates vary from 3 to 15-fold above the actual cost.

The actual cost of the project will depend, of course, upon the nature of the bill passed by Congress. The Senate version of the bill, for example, totaled $1,100,000,000. However, House committees deleted three major dams, Echo Park, Curecanti and Cross Mountain (an alternate to Juniper), and pared the cost to $760 million.

CURECANTI RESOLUTION

The recent Denver Governors' Conference of Upper Basin States passed a resolution urging the inclusion of Curecanti unit, or whichever of the proposed dams Colorado preferred. So the House bill may be increased by the addition of this additional unit. Curecanti, for example, would cost about $80 million. This unit also would have to win the formal approval of the Secretary of the Interior before it could be authorized by Congress.

Report No. 1087 on the bill provides for construction of three major storage units and 11 smaller participating projects.

To provide a factual basis for estimating the total cost of the project, a breakdown of the project's cost as provided by the House bill follows:

Projects listed

Storage units:	
Glen Canyon Dam	$379,143,000
Flaming Gorge Dam	74,648,000
Navaho Dam	32,933,000
Total storage units	486,724,000
Participating projects:	
LaBarge, Wyo	1,506,000
Seedskadee, Wyo	20,944,800
Lyman, Wyo	9,507,600
Silt, Colo	3,020,400
Smith Fork, Colo	3,030,300
Paonia, Colo	4,418,100
Florida, Colo	6,247,400
Pine River Extension Colorado-New Mexico	4,524,300
Emery County, Utah	8,879,000
Central Utah	207,939,600
Hammond, New Mexico	2,071,800
Total participating projects	272,089,300
Total all projects	758,813,300

This figure of $758,813,300 set by the House committees includes 10 percent for contingency reserves.

NINETY-NINE PERCENT REPAYMENT

Mr. Clyde, a former dean of engineering at Utah State Agricultural College and Utah's representative on the Upper Colorado River Commission, points out that water and power users will pay back more than 99 percent of the project's cost.

For example, revenues from sale of water to irrigators and municipalities and power producer by power features of the Central Utah project will pay 65 percent of the allocated costs. The balance will be paid from power revenues of the main stem-power units.

"Power revenues will be applied directly to repayment of the costs of building the power facilities. When these are paid for, excess power revenues will assist in repaying construction costs for irrigation features so that all costs will be repaid within the 60-year contract limit," Mr. Clyde said.

"While doing this, power revenues will pay all operation and maintenance costs, and will return standard 2½ percent interest to the Government on money used for power and municipal water features. During the repayment period, the United States Treasury will receive $310,712,000 in interest," Mr. Clyde pointed out.

Present studies not only confirm the feasibility and soundness of the plan but indicate that surplus power revenues will accumulate to over $261,862,000 in 78 years, he added.

Water users—both municipal and farm—will be charged for the water they use, Mr. Clyde said, and these revenues will be applied toward repayment of the cost of the project.

In addition, the Government will continue to net a substantial profit from the project long after it has been paid for, because the power facilities will continue to turn out substantial profits long after all costs have been repaid.

ROAD TO THE RAINBOW LAND—COLORADO RIVER PROJECT WOULD OPEN UP AREAS IN UPPER BASIN COUNTRY—NATURAL BRIDGES, CANYONS AND HISTORIC SITES

The Colorado River storage project would do more than multiply existing facilities for boating, fishing, camping and other outdoor sports.

It would open up whole new areas in the upper basin now largely inaccessible.

Take for example the spectacular rainbow land of southeastern Utah. Its natural bridges, vari-hued canyons, fabulous formations and historic sites now are reached only by a long trek over rough trails or a costly boat trip down the Colorado.

With the construction of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam, a beautiful scenic waterway, stretching 257 miles up the Colorado and the San Juan Rivers, would provide easy access by boat to the most remote areas.

Also, roads would be constructed to the dam site and to recreational developments in the area, making it possible for the average American citizen to enjoy the fabulous scenic attractions of the area—and to take his family along if he desired.

PATTERN AT HOOVER

A pattern for this highly successful recreational development is to be found in the widespread use of the popular Lake Mead recreational area behind Hoover Dam. Even Utahans from as far away as Salt Lake City periodically make the lengthy journey to Nevada to enjoy the fine bass fishing and boating.

The importance of the Glen Canyon recreational area to Salt Lake City is obvious when it is noted that Glen Canyon Reservoir would be only 250 airline miles away, compared with Lake Mead's 400 airline miles distance.

And even closer would be Flaming Gorge Reservoir, at only 125 airline miles.

Complete recreational development plans for the Glen Canyon area have not been drawn.

However the most recent National Parks Service study of the area (interim report on the Colorado River, July 1947) charts the possibilities in enhusiastic language, as follows:

HIGH RECREATION VALUE

"Much of the country bordering the Colorado and Green Rivers through this section of Utah is of high recreational value.

"It is a region of great colorful spaces, mountains, plateaus, canyons, desert, forest, and weird formations, probably the greatest display of erosional effects in the United States other than the Grand Canyon, and equally grand, though different in character."

The United States Bureau of Reclamation, in its planning study of the Colorado River storage project, recommended recreational development of the Glen Canyon area and concluded that "rather striking advantages could result from the creation of an extensive reservoir in this scenic area."

The Bureau's official report on the recreational development of Glen Canyon Dam noted that "the situation would be somewhat similar to that at Hoover Dam and Lake Mead, where actual access to the reservoir for general recreational purposes is not in the gorge at the dam, but at various points above the dam where short areas are suitable for access and related development.

DESIRABLE PLACES

"At this reservoir, the great bay formed where Wahweep and War Creek Valleys enter the Colorado could function in this way. In general, the Wahweep and Warm Creek areas appear to be the logical and desirable places for recreational boating operations and parties wishing to explore this section of Glen Canyon by land or water."

The new reservoirs and waterways of the Colorado River storage project would open up

many new historical and scenic points of interest.

Take, for example, again, Glen Canyon Reservoir. Moving upstream by boat from the huge concrete structure, you would enjoy easy access to the bold, stark, gigantic scenery of the spectacular Glen Canyon stretch of river. Included would be the following:

AREAS LISTED

1. The Crossing of the Fathers, where Escalante made his arduous river crossing in 1776.

2. The Rainbow Bridge National Monument area, with its Navaho Mountain 7,015 feet above the river, its many natural bridges, the weird and unforgettable Music Temple.

3. The historic Hole-in-the-Rock, where Mormon settlers bound for San Juan Valley made their heroic crossing of the 1,400-foot-deep canyon on the Colorado in 1890, a crossing so difficult it was used only once.

This Glen Canyon area is so highly regarded for its scenic assets that it is officially logged as an area of national importance for parks and recreation by the National Parks Service in its most recent survey of the area.

Also sharing this top billing by the NPS is the upper section of the Glen Canyon and adjoining Cataract Canyon leading up to the junction of the Green and Colorado Rivers.

RECOMMENDED AREAS

Both are recommended for major development, and the Glen Canyon Reservoir offers the most feasible way to provide easy access to this fabulous country.

Made accessible by the upper section of Glen Canyon Reservoir, in this Glen Canyon-Cataract Canyon area would be the following:

1. The Hite area, with its nearby historic Dandy Crossing, the White Canyon, Dirty Devil, and Dark Canyon scenic areas.

2. Natural Bridges National Monument, and the nearby memorable Elk Ridge, Fable Valley, Beef Basin, and Gypsum Canyon.

3. Lands End area, with its French Seep, Observation Rock, Cleopatras Chair and beautifully weird "Land of Standing Rocks."

4. Cataract Canyon, sheer walled and 2,000 feet deep, and its neighboring fantastic section of curiously eroded and faulted red, buff, white, pink, green and yellow rock labyrinth of the Needles.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This quick tour along the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir gives only a glimpse of the scenic wealth which this dam would open up. There are other considerations.

Besides spectacular scenery, facilities for boating, camping, swimming, water-skiing, fishing, hiking, and horseback riding would be provided. In fact, whatever the vacationing public desired.

TO REDRESS OLD WRONG—IN 1864 THE UNITED STATES ARMY DESTROYED NAVAHOS' FARMS—COLORADO PROJECT WOULD HELP INDIANS

Navaho Dam—one of the four major dams included in the Colorado River storage project now before the United States House of Representatives—aims to redress a long-standing wrong.

The story behind this project involves the history of the proud Navaho Tribe and the shameful way they have been treated by their white brothers.

It involves the slowly awakening conscience of the white man, and the opportunity he now has to help right a century-old grievance.

The story goes back 100 years. At that time, the Navaho Tribe was fighting a losing struggle to protect its rapidly shrinking hunting ground from the encroaching white man.

PUT ON RESERVATION

The United States Army finally moved against the Navahos in 1864 and subdued them by destroying their orchards, farms, and primitive irrigation systems. The Indians were taken to Fort Sumter, where they were held until 1868. That year the Government and the tribe entered into treaty placing the Indians on a reservation.

In exchange, the Government made many promises to the Navaho people. It promised them a schoolroom and a teacher for every 30 children. It promised them a chance to farm with a reasonable acreage for each family.

The Government was not able to keep its promises.

As a result, the plight of the Navahos has worsened every year. Now many members of the tribe live in abject poverty. Average cash income is down to $150 a year as the Navahos attempt to scratch a living out of the barren reservation land. Without farming and educational opportunities, the Navaho faces a gloomy future.

ATTEMPTED HELP

Some Government and private agencies have attempted to alleviate the plight of the tribe. Missions and some schools and clinics have been established.

Just this fall, Utah's Gov. J. Bracken Lee and Highway Commissioner Harley J. Corleissen quietly gathered clothing, medical and food supplies from friends and associates to help the Indians through their period of greatest suffering—the winter.

But most of these efforts treated the symptoms, not the cause, if he is to provide his own livelihood in a white man's world, the Navaho must have better educational and farming opportunities.

That is the aim of Navaho Dam and the anticipated Navaho project. They would help the Navaho to help himself.

This is the way Paul Jones, chairman of the Navaho Tribal Council, phrase it:

"We know that the Navaho Dam and the entire Navaho project will cost a great deal of money. But we feel it will be money well spent for all the taxpayers of this country. It will be less than may be spent, if the project is not built, to support and maintain us over the years. And in addition, it will enable us to support ourselves with the dignity and human satisfaction to which every citizen is entitled. It will enable us to take our rightful place in society," Mr. Jones says.

The Navaho project is the product of a unique joint endeavor of two Federal agencies, the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Reclamation.

It is designed to provide needed culinary and irrigation water for the tribe, so that the barren but fertile reservation acres will provide adequate livelihoods for the 80,000 Navahos making their homes there.

First—and basic—unit of the Navaho project is the Navaho Dam. A $32,933,000 structure, it would be built on the San Juan River and would bring into being a $1,450,000-acre-foot reservoir.

After this dam is built, then the way would be clear for the construction of two projects which would actually put the stored water to work—the Navaho project and the San Juan-Chama project.

Funds for these two projects would be sought under the Levitt Act, or similar legislation providing for assistance to the Indians.

The Navaho project (formerly called the Shiprock and South San Juan projects) would provide for the irrigation of about 137,250 acres of arable dry land lying along the south side of the San Juan River, a principal tributary of the Colorado River, near the towns of Bloomfield, Farmington, and Shiprock in northwestern New Mexico.

Of the lands that would be irrigated, 109,000 acres are located in the Navaho Reservation and 28,250 acres are outside the reservation. All the lands within the reservation and 1,660 acres outside the reservation are Indian-owned. Much of the remaining land is publicly owned.

The proposed San Juan-Chama project, which would be considered later when needed, also would use water from the Navaho Dam. This project involves a transmountain diversion of San Juan River headwaters into the nearby parched Rio Grande Basin.

The Saga of Billy Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter, I am including in my statement an article from a new magazine, which appears very interesting, called Saga. The article that I am including concerns Gen. Billy Mitchell and the trial to which he was subjected in the 1920's in his effort to be given an opportunity to prove that planes of that date could make a successful attack on a first-class battleship.

I wish that everyone who obtains the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would read this article. It shows you the struggle made by General Mitchell, Carl Spaatz, Eddie Rickenbacker, H. H. Arnold, Tom Milling, and other noted fliers of that period to get recognition of the fact that airpower was something to be reckoned with in the future as a weapon of war.

The development from the days of 1915 when Mitchell learned to fly up to the time when he had his controversy and his military court martial trial, should indicate to thoughtful persons who are interested in national defense that airpower had a distinct future. In 1920, two Englishmen by the name of Alcock and Brown flew from Newfoundland to Ireland in an open plane. Later the meteoric flight of Charles Lindbergh who crossed the ocean alone and landed at Orly Airport, still in existence.

I hope that those who read this article will not think that I am presumptuous in mentioning the fact that I also had a very humble part in flying on the front in World War I. General Mitchell was the first man who staged a mass raid of airplanes. It happened that our group did not participate in that raid. The purpose of it was to drop pamphlets behind the enemy lines through the device of a favorable wind, which would find their way behind the enemy's lines. The pamphlets contained the menu of the American doughboy and we felt that that would break their morale, as our troops were much better fed than the German soldiers were, whose spirit was beginning to weaken.

In the article is also mentioned the matter of the St. Mihiel drive. It was my pleasure to participate in this drive, flying a Salmson plane in five missions.

As some people may remember, the battle opened on Pershing's birthday, September 12, 1918. I was flying for the Fifth Army Corps, one of the divisions of which was the Yankee Division, or as we called it, the "Yankee Devils." Then later we switched over to the Meuse-Argonne drive where I flew many missions. The same type of plane in a similar squadron as mine was flown by a young man by the name of SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, now a distinguished Member of the United States Senate. Also, the same type plane in a similar squadron was flown by Gen. George Kenney, who was the head airman in the Pacific where he performed a remarkable job. I have heard that the Salmson was the first plane with a radial motor, as distinguished from a rotary motor. Some of us who had that experience look back now and wonder how we came out alive.

The article follows:

THE SAGA OF BILLY MITCHELL

(By Jack Pearl)

Silhouetted against the slate-blue sky, the 27,000-ton dreadnaught looked in the distance like a rhinoceros; her forward turret jutted up like a huge horn and her superstructure rose humplike out of her massive hull. Layer upon layer of steel armor caused her to wallow low in the water. Then thousand feet overhead, the planes buzzed around her in circles like a swarm of mosquitoes—mosquitoes with TNT in their stingers. One by one, they peeled off.

It sounds like something that happened on a quiet Sunday afternoon in December 1941, but the tragedy of Pearl Harbor was the end of the story. It began on a quiet afternoon 20 years earlier.

It all strated because a headstrong young general by the name of Billy Mitchell had the fantastic notion that an airplane could sink a battleship. His Army superiors laughed at him; it was inconceivable to them that anyone could seriously believe that a flimsy flying crate of wood and fabric held together by wire and glue would ever pose a serious threat to an armor-plated queen of the seas. But Mitchell was not a man to be put off easily. When the Army and the Navy refused to listen to him, he took his case to the people in the magazines and newspapers, flouting one of the service's most inflexible traditions. His speeches and articles caused an uproar. For centuries, the public had regarded the Navy as the backbone of the national defense—the proudest institution of the United States. It was unnerving to be told that the battlewagons had lost their value as our first line of defense, that the Navy was obsolete. Even the most spirited West Point freshman would have bitten off his tongue before he called the Navy obsolete.

The people were worried. With the objectivity of laymen, they clamored: "Let's find out whether Mitchell is right or wrong." So, in 1921, Congress passed a resolution to make a test.

According to the terms of the armistice, the Germans, in 1918, had delivered into United States hands the pride of the Kaiser's Navy, the battleship *Ostfriesland*. International law said that she was to be scuttled within 3 years, and the deadline was almost up. The Navy was all set to do the job when Congress suddenly changed the plans in July of 1921. "Mitchell says his planes can sink a battleship," they told the Navy. "Let's see him sink the *Ostfriesland*."

All around Washington that night naval officers toasted each other gleefully in the service clubs. They felt they couldn't have asked for anything more. In their opinion, the *Ostfriesland* was unsinkable. She had weathered 18 direct hits by the biggest British naval guns in the Battle of Jutland, had struck a mine and had still managed to escape under her own power. She had a triple hull composed of 85 separate watertight compartments. It was the Navy's private opinion that the only way to sink her would be to fix demolition charges at strategic places inside her hull. To the admirals, the idea of Mitchell pitting his puny bombers against this monster was almost ridiculous.

The tests, covering a period of three days, were to be conducted under joint Army and Navy supervision with a team of naval referees calling the plays. When the Navy released its "rules," even the most ardent Mitchell supporters shook their heads. This was the old con game at its worst—or best, depending upon which side you were rooting for. The Navy stipulated that a maximum of six planes could be used in any one raid, specified their types and the weight of the bombs they could carry. They set what seemed like a ridiculously high altitude from which the bombs were to be dropped, and further ruled that the tests would be held off the Spanish Capes in Virginia, 100 miles out to sea. Inasmuch as the land-based Martin bombers that were to be used in the tests had a maximum flying range of two hours, this allowed them only the slimmest margin of time to accomplish their mission. They would have to unload their bombs as quickly as possible and run for home or risk exhausting their fuel and crashing into the sea. To complicate this danger, the Navy added a subtle clause that the referees could halt the demonstration whenever they pleased (and as often as they pleased) to send inspection teams aboard the target ships.

After reading the rules under which the tests were to be conducted, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels boasted to the newspapers that he would willingly stand bareheaded on the bridge of the *Ostfriesland* while she was being bombarded.

In the warm-up event, the planes were to try to sink the light cruiser *Frankfurt*, another captured German vessel, with 600-pound bombs. No sooner had the first bomb landed about 100 yards off her bow than there was a spurt of smoke from the funnels of the small tender which carried the referees, the prearranged signal to halt the tests. While an inspection team motored over to the *Frankfurt* and began a leisurely inspection of the obviously undamaged cruiser, the frustrated pilots circled idly overhead, wasting precious gasoline. Time and time again, they had to abandon the site and return to their base for refueling. If it had not been for the months of exhaustive drilling which Mitchell had put his boys through, the Navy might have walked off with the honors on the first day. But in spite of the obstacles and restrictions that hampered them, the tenacious airmen managed to drop two bombs close to the *Frankfurt's* bows. The terrific concussion split open her seams, and in less than 20 minutes she sank gracefully beneath the waves.

There was a faint swell of excitement among the observers aboard the transport *Henderson*, anchored at a safe distance from the target ship, but it died quickly. The *Frankfurt*, after all, was not a first-line fighting ship. Lightly armored, she was designed to hit and run. The real test—the only test—would be the *Ostfriesland*.

The second day of the tests was a good one for the Navy. Mitchell's bombers mussed up the dreadnaught's decks with a couple of 600 pounders, but they might as well have tried to sink her with pea-shooters. The newspapers heralded the results as a great victory for the Navy. Coming into the final round, the honors were about evenly divided with the big test yet to come.

Thursday, July 24, 1921, dawned bright and clear. The *Ostfriesland* tugged gently at her anchor in a calm sea. Already mottled with rust, her hull had been splotched with red paint to clearly distinguish her as the target ship. She looked particularly ugly and indestructible. Stretching across the horizon to the east of her, the ships of the Atlantic fleet were lined up like grim sentinels at an execution. At a safe distance from the German dreadnaught, the transport *Henderson* rolled gently in the slight swell, her rails crowded with Army and Navy officers, Congressmen, Cabinet members, foreign diplomats, and reporters, all waiting for the big show to get under way. The atmosphere aboard her was that of a picnic boat. The Navy men laughed confidently; the Army men stood about sheepishly, making self-conscious jokes about Mitchell, like an embarrassed mother trying to gloss over the behavior of an impudent child. There was a good deal of interested but not too spirited discussion among the civilian observers. But the truth was that no one was taking the affair too seriously. It was a strictly hypothetical problem, much the same as space travel is today, and the spectators weren't anticipating spectacular results any more than an audience at the rocket proving grounds at White Sands expects to see a test rocket make a round trip to the moon.

At a few minutes after 12, the lookout spotted seven specks on the western horizon. To the observers on the *Henderson*, they looked like a wedge of flying ducks. Gradually they materialized—six Martin bombers dwarfing a sleek little Handley-Page that was flying at the head of the formation. The sight of the Handley-Page with a gaily colored pennant streaming out from its tail evoked mixed comment on the *Henderson* from the Navy men and the civilians.

The Army was moody and silent. Why couldn't Mitchell stay on the sidelines the way a dignified general is expected to? And that pennant. Well, there was no telling what the rebel would do next. They hoped for the best and expected the worst.

Then the little Handley dipped its wings in a salute, and with its pennant curling in the wind, began to climb up and away from the formation at a tangent to the circle the Martins were describing around the target.

The big bombers began to climb slowly with the painful laboriousness of pregnant women ascending a long flight of stairs. Fixed on the belly of each ship was a single, giant, 2,000-pound bomb, to date the biggest bomb in military history. Up and up they circled above the *Ostfriesland* until they had reached the altitude prescribed by the Navy. The squadron leader peeled out of the formation, and when he was directly over the ship, let go with a small 25-pound ranging bomb. It sent up a slim column of water about 100 yards off the dreadnought's stern.

The second Martin went into a sideslip and then suddenly the bomb she had been carrying was suspended in space and the plane, free of her 1-ton burden, seemed to bounce high in the air as an updraft caught her. The slim cylinder of TNT fell slowly and majestically, arching away from the battleship in a graceful trajectory. It knifed the water cleanly like a high diver about 200 yards off the *Ostfriesland's* bow. There was a terrific explosion that sent a geyser of water and smoke over a hundred feet into the air. As the concussion reached the *Henderson*, men skidded about her decks cursing and grabbing for the rails and other handholds. The *Ostfriesland* trembled; she pitched and strained at her anchor as tons of water rained down on her.

She was still obscured by smoke when the second bomb disappeared into the waves, closer than the first but still far from a direct hit. One by one, the bombs fell at regular intervals, churning up the Atlantic with the fury of a hurricane; their thunder

still rang in the ears of the spectators aboard the *Henderson* long after the Martins had regrouped and were circling the area to see whether or not their mission had been successful.

As the smokescreen that cloaked the *Ostfriesland* was drawn away by the stiff easterly winds, a cheer went up from the Navy side. The big dreadnought was fighting her way free of the tons of water that had cascaded down on her decks. At last she shook herself proudly and came to rest on an even keel. She appeared to be unmarked.

"They didn't even come close," an admiral cried gleefully, and like a small boy he thumbed his nose at the bombers circling overhead.

A reporter shouted, "Look again."

The admiral's mouth fell open as the *Ostfriesland* began to list to the port side. A profound silence settled over the *Henderson*. The admiral rubbed his eyes. "But there's not a mark on her," he said wonderingly.

Then her bow lifted out of the sea, revealing the gaping holes in her hull beneath the waterline. Higher and higher went the bow as the big ship rolled over on her side. Not a word was spoken aboard the *Henderson*. The spectacle had the kind of awe-inspiring majesty you associate with the death of giants.

At 12:33 p. m., her stern was completely under. Five minutes later, she settled upright in the water, nose in the air, her funnels submerged. At 12:40, her bow slipped under the waves, and the only evidence that she had ever existed was a series of concentric rings spreading out over the calm sea in a big bull's-eye.

Stunned by what they had seen, the spectators watched in fascination as the silver Handley-Page plummeted out of the sky. Down she came, faster and faster, diving at the spot where the *Ostfriesland* had gone down. At about 1,500 feet, she pulled out of the dive and let go a small bomb. It landed directly in the center of the bull's-eye.

Now the wave of emotion that had washed silently through the ranks of the observers broke like the roar of the surf. Whistles, cheers, screams and applause saluted the little plane.

There were tears, too. A white-haired admiral shook his fist at the Handley-Page as it roared across the *Henderson's* bow, so low that some spectators claimed they could see Mitchell's toothy grin of triumph: "You bastard" the admiral muttered through clenched teeth. As it receded in the distance, the flapping banner seemed to mock him.

William Lendrum Mitchell was not always an outspoken champion of air power as a separate military weapon. At first he visualized the airplane as a valuable adjunct to ground operations, a potential eye for the Army. But when war broke out in Europe in 1914, and he saw what the French, British and Germans were doing with their planes, he developed an entirely new concept of air power that would some day revolutionize all military thinking. In 1916, he took flying lessons, and from that time on he began to think in the air. A new dimension had been added to war. In 1917, Mitchell requested a leave of absence to observe the war in Europe. By the time he got off the boat, America was in it, too. In France, Billy attached himself to another great air pioneer, Maj. Gen. Hugh Trenchard, the chief of the Royal Flying Corps. It was a relationship that conditioned his thinking for years to come.

In the early years of the war, there had been a few dogfights, between English and German pilots taking shots at one another with rifles and pistols, and an occasional haphazard bombing raid. But the primary function of aircraft was observation. Trenchard, however, foresaw squadrons of planes sailing through the air in formation like battleships, carrying great loads of bombs to be dropped on enemy cities and installations; he saw smaller, faster, lighter ships escorting the big bombers and attacking enemy planes.

Even before the first American forces landed in France, Mitchell had made a name for himself. He learned to fly the British and French planes, and accompanied the Allied aviators on missions over German territory. He even got into a couple of dogfights. For his achievements he was awarded the Croix de Guerre by the French and was promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Later appointed Commander of the Army Air Service in the Zone of the Advance, he worked tirelessly with the young American pilots, teaching them all the tricks he had learned from the French and British.

At first, there was harmony between the Air Service and the Army High Command and the brass left Mitchell alone. General Pershing listened attentively to his plans for coordination between ground troops and air forces, and, in the fall of 1918, gave him his first real chance to show what the Air Service could do.

For 3 years the Allied armies in the field had pounded away at the formidable German salient at St.-Mihiel without appreciable success. In the final year of the war, Billy Mitchell assembled the first air armada in history with the purpose of wiping out this huge thorn in the Allied lines—2 attack brigades of 400 planes and a fleet of bombers. To the old-line officers it seemed like a crazy scheme.

On the morning of September 12, 1918, 1 of the 2 American air brigades hit the left flank of the salient. Every available German airplane in the sector was sent up to fend them off. Then, while the first brigade refueled and rested, Mitchell sent his second attack wave to the right flank of the salient. The poor German pilots scarcely had landed when they had to take off again. Meanwhile, a third wave of planes, bombers, flew unopposed across the mouth of the salient, blasting roads, troops, supply trucks, and communications. Shuttling back and forth from one flank to the other, the German planes were squeezed neatly within the diminishing boundaries of their own lines. Cut off from their rear by the bombers, the German troops within the wedge were disorganized and terrorized. Inside of 2 days, the Americans captured 16,000 prisoners, and the St.-Mihiel salient, a Geramn strongpoint since 1915, was wiped out. It was a bitter lesson to the Germans—one they remembered long after the Americans had forgotten it: An army cut off from its homeland, thwarted in both advance and retreat and covered from above, is an army lost indeed. It was a lesson the Germans were to teach the French 25 years later as the poilus sat foolishly entrenched behind their impregnable Maginot Line. Like the Battle of the Bulge in World War II, the destruction of the St.-Mihiel salient marked the beginning of the death throes of the German armies in the field.

For his brilliant achievement Billy Mitchell was promoted to brigadier general and put in command of the Air Service of the Group of Armies. He had great plans for the Army Air Service, and at this point, with the St.-Mihiel victory still vividly in mind, the brass was with him all the way. General Pershing even approved a fantastic plan for dropping paratroopers behind the German front in a big offensive proposed for the spring of 1919. But, ironically, the war ended too soon, before Mitchell was able to consolidate his position with other decisive shows of air strength. When the common enemy was whipped, the Army and the Navy began to look at each other suspiciously again—petty rivalries were revived—and both fixed a malevolent eye on the Air Service. Here was an upstart that was challenging the supremacy of both.

Gen. Billy Mitchell knew what he was up against when he returned to the States in mid-February of 1919. He was ready to do battle for the future of aviation, and he had a few bitter recriminations about the past that he wanted to get off his chest. At the start of the war, the United States had boasted that it would have 100,000 planes in the air by the end of 1918. As it turned out, there were only 740 American-manufactured ships in France at the time of the armistice, and less than 30 percent of these were actually used. None were combat planes. All of the American ships were De Havilland–4s, designed for observation and photography. The DH–4 was nicknamed "the flying coffin" because it had a bad habit of exploding in flames if it crashlanded, or if a bullet pierced its gas tank. Nine men in Mitchell's squadron had been cremated in DH–4s in 1 week. That such structural and mechanical defects should exist in a machine built by the greatest industrial nation in the world was inconceivable to Mitchell. There could be no excuse for mistakes that cost lives.

It was like building a house. You have an architect draw the plans, you have carpenters do the construction work, an electrician do the wiring, and a plumber install the plumbing—who would think of letting a plumber do the plastering or draw the plans? But this was exactly what was happening in the air service; it was being run by a lot of men who knew absolutely nothing about airplanes.

In 1919, Mitchell outlined his views before a naval investigation board exploring the potentialities of the airplane. "In the future," he told them, "there will be a Ministry of Defense, combining Army, Navy, and Air Force under one command."

"Preposterous!" said the admirals.

He went on to tell them that there would be a separate Air Force which would work independently, but in coordination with the Army and the Navy.

"What possible advantage could there be in a separate Air Force?" he was asked guardedly.

"Why, it could destroy enemy installations hundreds of miles behind the front lines; it could bomb factories, depots, railroads. War is decided by getting at the vitals of an enemy. An independent Air Force can do all these things before an army has a chance to mobilize. Why, some day, there might not even be any need for the Navy."

It is not too hard to picture the expressions that came over the faces of those salty old seadogs when Mitchell said that. When the doors finally closed behind him, there was considerable mopping of brows and shaking of heads. "Somebody's got to stop that young maniac!" one grim-faced admiral said.

Despite the heavy odds lined up against him, Billy Mitchell crusaded confidently and diligently for the cause of airpower. Not only did he work long hours as Assistant Chief of Army Air Service, but he spent his own time plotting out airways over the United States for commercial air lines. He campaigned in Congress for support of his ideas and carried the fight to the public by writing hundreds of magazine and newspaper articles. He was a picturesque figure in his flashy, unauthorized uniforms—pink riding breeches and Sam Browne belt—and, notwithstanding his controversial opinions, he made good copy.

In fact, Billy was becoming much too popular a figure to suit the Army and the Navy. And what was worse, he was "going over the heads of his superiors" to the people. Even the most patient of the old order could no longer deny the threat he posed when, in 1921, after much public agitation, Congress passed the resolution to set up the bombing tests with the captured German ships and the experiment ended so disastrously for the Navy diehards.

Now, more than ever, Mitchell was determined to prove that some of the money spent

on battleships could be spent to better advantage on aircraft. His aim was to build up an air force for coastal defense that would keep any invading enemy navy at bay. In 1923, in another series of Navy-controlled tests, Mitchell's fliers bolstered his claim by sinking the scrapped battleships *New Jersey* and *Virginia*. This clinched the case as far the the public was concerned. "Don't spend our money on obsolete battleships," was the cry. The Navy was outraged. "We can't let him do this to us oldtimers," they appealed to the Army. The Army, loyal to the tried and true traditions of generations, was stampeded. "If this Mitchell has his way," a few generals fretted, "all of us will be polishing his boots before long." So now there was a solid front against Billy Mitchell.

When the war was over, Mitchell normally would have reverted to the rank of colonel, but he had retained the rank of brigadier general because of his appointment as Assistant Chief of Army Air Service in the United States. However, when his term was up, he would be reduced to colonel unless he was reappointed. Here was the perfect answer to the dilemma which faced the Army and the Navy. The pressure was put on Secretary of War Weeks. Mitchell was not reappointed. As an added precaution, he was "exiled" to Texas to take up the duties of air officer, VIII Corps, at Fort Sam Houston. The big brass sighed with relief. If you couldn't lose a man in Texas, where could you lose him? But they were wrong. That may have been an effective way to exile a troublesome officer back in the time of the Indian wars before the days of radio, press, and news services, but it wouldn't work in 1925. Shorn of the star on his shoulder, Colonel Mitchell cheerfully applied himself to his new job and kept up his incessant barrage of criticism against the Navy and the Army with as much vigor (and gaining as much public attention) as he had in Washington.

The crisis came in September 1925. To combat some of the uncomplimentary propaganda that had been flying its way as a result of Mitchell's crusade, the Navy decided to venture into the field of public relations and show the public just how wrong his charges were; that the Navy actually was enthusiastically exploring the potentialities of air power. In September of 1925, it was decided to send 1 of the 2 Navy dirigibles, the *Shenandoah*, on a good-will flight through the Middle West. It was the season for State fairs, and the powers-that-be reasoned that by hovering over the sites of these fairs, they could reach thousands of people with their message. Even President Coolidge smiled on the venture. Not only would the spectacular show boost the Navy's stock, but it would also create a feeling of good will toward the Republican administration. The commander of the *Shenandoah*, Commander Zachary Lansdowne, was given his orders. The flight was set for September 2.

The Navy was also planning another show to take place simultaneously with this one. On August 31, 3 Navy seaplanes—2 PN–9's and a Boeing PB–1—were scheduled to take off from San Francisco on a nonstop flight to Hawaii. It was destined to be a bad week for the Navy.

On September 1, the newspaper and radio announced that the PB–1 had developed engine trouble even before it took off. The following day, they reported that one of the PN–9's had broken down only 300 miles off the coast, and that the other one was missing. On September 4, headlines screamed that the *Shenandoah* had broken into 3 parts during a violent electric storm and that 14 of her crew, including Commander Lansdowne, were dead. By a miracle, a forward section with 28 men had floated down to safety in the mountains.

Making the most of a bad situation, the Navy pulled off one of the neatest dodges in political history. Assuming an attitude of pious self-righteousness, Secretary of the Navy Wilbur wrote off the calamity with this statement: "In view of the failure of the Hawaiian flight and the *Shenandoah* disaster, we have come to the conclusion that the Atlantic and the Pacific are still our best defenses. We have nothing to fear from enemy aircraft that is not on this continent."

Billy Mitchell hit the ceiling. For 2 days he shut himself up in his San Antonio office. On the 5th of September, he came out of seclusion and handed the reporters an 8,000-word statement that began:

"I have been asked from all parts of the country to give my opinion about the reasons for the frightful aeronautical accidents and loss of life, equipment, and treasure that have occurred during the last few days. This statement is therefore given out publicly by me after mature deliberation and after a sufficient time has elapsed since the terrible accidents to our naval aircraft to find out something about what happened.

About what happened, my opinion is as follows: These accidents are the direct result of the incompetency, criminal negligence and almost treasonable administration of the national defense by the Navy and War Departments * * *."

Mitchell backed up this accusation with specific charges regarding the *Shenandoah* disaster and the Hawaiian flights. He leveled charges of incompetent administration of the air services against both the Army and the Navy. He stated: "All aviation schemes and systems are dictated by the non-flying officers of the Army and Navy who know practically nothing about it. The lives of the airmen are being used merely as pawns in their hands. * * * The airmen themselves are blinded and bulldozed so that they dare not tell the truth * * *. The conduct of affairs by these two departments, as far as aviation is concerned, has been so disgusting in the last few years as to make any self-respecting person ashamed of the clothes he wears. Were it not for the patriotism of our air officers and their absolute confidence in the institution of the United States, knowing that sooner or later existing conditions would be changed, I doubt if one of them would remain with the colors * * *."

He went back to the day the Army bought its first plane from the Wright brothers in 1908 and traced the management—or mismanagement—of the Air service by the Army and Navy through World War I up to the present. He concluded with this scathing indictment: "As a patriotic American citizen, I can no longer stand by and see these disgusting performances by the Navy and War Departments at the expense of the lives of our people and the delusion of the American public."

"This is then what I have to say on this subject and I hope that every American will hear it."

Mitchell's San Antonio blast touched off a nationwide storm. The Army and the Navy dismissed it as nonsense, but the President was worried. There was too much public pressure being brought to bear through Congress to ignore the charges. The only way to appease the people would be to launch an investigation. Congress had already backed Mitchell's views in an exhaustive investigation into the air services before the accidents. This time, the President appointed a board composed of civilians. On September 22, Colonel Mitchell was relieved of his duties at Fort Sam Houston and ordered to Washington to testify before the President's Aircraft Board.

In the meantime, the missing PN–9 of the Hawaiian flight had been found. She had run out of gas and had drifted around the Pacific for 9 days until a submarine had spotted her and towed her to port. Commander Rodgers and his crew were all safe, and absolved the Navy of any blame for the accident. The official clamor for Mitchell's "head" grew louder and louder. "* * * entering a wedge for military dictatorship with himself as dictator," the brass said * * * "He's a Communist!" * * * and on the most ridiculous side * * * "It couldn't have happened if he had been a West Pointer."

On September 8, the newspapers of the country carried the headlines, "Court-martial for Colonel Mitchell."

This is the 96th Article of War:

" * * * Though not mentioned in these articles, all disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and military discipline, all conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the military service * * * shall be taken cognizance of by a * * * court-martial and punished at the discretion of such court."

It covers everything from kicking an army mule to spitting in the Commander in Chief's eye.

At a quarter to ten on the cloudy morning of October 28, 1925, Colonel Mitchell pushed through the milling crowd in front of the War Department's old Munition Building. His wife Betty and his sister Harriet were with him. It is still a matter of conjecture why the War Department chose this dilapidated structure for the trial. The roof leaked, the plaster was falling off the walls; it had even been abandoned as a warehouse. It took an army of workmen a full week to mop up the water that lay in stagnant pools on the mildewed floor. There was no central heating. Many thought it was an attempt to degrade the accused, but it seems more logical that the Government wanted to discourage the public from attending the trial. Camp chairs had been set up in the tiny courtroom on the second floor to accommodate a handful of spectators. There was standing room for a few more.

Normally, in court-martial procedure, it is the custom for spectators to file out of the room whenever any point arises which the judges must determine in private conference. But in the Mitchell trial, it was impossible to clear the court because of the limited space in the hall outside the courtroom. Instead, it was decided that the members of the court would retire to a small anteroom to settle such issues.

The atmosphere was colder and gloomier inside the building than it was outside. The judges stood around, smoking and shivering, saying very little to each other or anyone else. In fact, the only person connected with the trial who was smiling was Billy Mitchell himself. At 10 minutes to 10, he marched jauntily into the small courtroom. It was a madhouse. An army of reporters and photographers was ensconced in the center of the floor together with a mountain of equipment. Spectators were shoving and pushing for coveted seats. The air was fetid. It was a bad place for anyone with claustrophobia.

Billy and his wife took seats at a small table at the front of the room with his 3 lawyers: Frank Reid, a Congressman from Wisconsin; Judge Plain of Aurora, Ill.; and Col. Herbert A. White, his military counsel. He talked and joked with his friends in the first row of seats and seemed genuinely cheerful and at ease.

At exactly 10 o'clock, the sergeant at arms stood up at the front of the room and gave the command. "Stand up." Everyone in the room got to his feet with a great scraping of chairs and scuffling of feet. The 13 judges filed solemnly into the room and took their places at a big, curved table at the front of the room. This was the highest court-martial ever convened in the history of the United States.

The president of the court was Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former Chief of the Hawaiian Command, and at the time Chief of the Army General Staff. The members of the court were Maj Gens. R. L. Howze, F. W.

Sladen, W. S. Graves, B. A. Poore, and Douglas MacArthur; Brig. Gens. A. L. Bowley, E. L. King, F. R. McCoy, E. B. Winans, G. LeRoy Irwin, and E. E. Booth. Col. B. Winship was the law officer who would settle points of procedure and other legal matters. The fact that there was not a single air officer on the court led Congressman Fiorello LaGuardia to observe: "Billy Mitchell isn't being tried by a board of his peers, but by a pack of be-ribboned dog-robbers of the General Staff."

They were an impressive looking tribunal with their campaign ribbons and stars flashing on their khaki uniforms. There was a ripple of laughter at the rear of the courtroom as someone was heard to remark that "Billy has more medals than all of them put together."

When the judges were seated and the spectators had settled down again, Col. Sherman Moreland, the trial judge advocate, took a sheet of paper from his assistant, Lt. Col. Joseph McMullen, and read a statement: "The Government is ready to proceed with the prosecution of the case of the *United States* v. *Col. William Mitchell.*" He asked the judges whether or not they had ever expressed any opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused; whether any of them were to appear as witnesses before the court; whether any of them would be promoted if Mitchell were to be dismissed from the service and whether or not they had any prejudices or biases against the defendant. As their names were called, each judge answered with a decisive "No."

Colonel Moreland then turned to Congressman Reid. "Does the defense wish to challenge any member of this court?"

"We do," Reid said. "We challenge the right of Brig. Gen. Albert L. Bowley to sit on this court on the basis of bias and prejudice." He went on to cite excerpts from a speech which General Bowley had made at an American Legion convention in South Carolina, in which he had said that the infantry was the backbone of the United States Army and had expressed uncomplimentary views about the Air Service. The judges filed out into an anteroom to deliberate the charge. A short time later they returned, and General Summerall announced that they had allowed the charge. General Bowley went quietly.

"Are there any more challenges?" Colonel Moreland inquired.

"Yes," Reid replied. "We also challenge Gen. Fred Sladen, on the basis of bias and prejudice." The judges filed out again to formally deliberate the point. It was upheld.

When the court was settled once more, Colonel Moreland issued the final invitation to challenge—only three challenges are allowed in an Army court martial. There was a half smile on Reid's face as he rose to his feet. "We also challenge the propriety of Maj. Gen. Charles P. Summerall to preside over this court-martial board." There was a buzz of excitement among the spectators. All eyes focused on the rapidly reddening face of General Summerall. Reid continued: "In a speech before the Morrow Air Service Investigation Board, General Summerall spoke against the establishment of a separate Air Force, and stated that 'there was nothing to support the extravagant claims of Colonel Mitchell.' General Summerall has also indicated his prejudices in other public utterances since the present air controversy." Reid paused for a second. "He has also expressed a strong personal dislike for Colonel Mitchell ever since Colonel Mitchell had occasion to point out that General Summerall's administration of the Hawaiian Command in 1923 was both ignorant and inefficient, and * * *" he coughed delicately, "that General Summerall's personal controversy with the Admiral of the Navy in Hawaii at that time as to who was superior in rank made Army and Navy cooperation impossible during the Pacific maneuvers." A burst of laughter greeted this statement.

Fuming with indignation, General Summerall upset the dignity and decorum of the court by jumping to his feet and shouting, "Although Colonel Mitchell's report was unfair, untrue, and ignorant, I have never entertained any hostility toward him." Then, emphasizing the absurdity of his claim, he shook his fist at Mitchell and growled, "But we're enemies now, Mitchell and I. Under no circumstances would I continue as president of this court-martial."

The spectators groaned as the judges filed out again to formalize Summerall's withdrawal, for each time the judges rose, they had to stand up, too. When the court returned, it was announced that the challenge had been upheld and that Maj. Gen. R. L. Howze had been installed as the new president. The board was now reduced to 10 members; the law was that the ousted members would not be replaced. A two-thirds vote was required for a conviction.

Defense Counsel Reid was an unimpressive looking figure as he stood up to deliver his opening address, surrounded as he was by all this brass with their crisp uniforms, polished buttons and military bearing. A stooped, rangy man with sandy hair and a thin, bland face, he spoke slowly and with a trace of midwestern drawl. Even the illustrious members of the court permitted themselves a dignified smile as he proceeded to address them as "You people," instead of the time-honored "May it please the Honorable Court."

"With the permission of you people," he said, "I'd like to read something." He picked up a volume from the table beside him, stacked high with books, and flicked through the pages. He began to read slowly:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of sepech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for redress of grievances."

He looked up at the judges. "You gentlemen recognize that, of course. It is article I of the Bill of Rights, the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States." He glanced sideways at the prosecution table. "Any schoolboy knows that." He ambled slowly over to the table where the judges sat. "Does a man lose the rights and privileges guaranteed to him as a citizen of the United States when he becomes a soldier?" He walked the length of the table, fixing each of the eminent jurists with an inquiring eye. "If any of you fellows say 'yes' to that, I'm afraid you're going to have quite a time filling your enlistment quotas next year.

"As a loyal citizen and servant of the United States, Colonel Mitchell felt it was his duty to tell the people of a situation and to help bring about an adequate and well-balanced national defense. It is the duty of everyone to do as Mitchell is doing, that is to get the facts before the country in a matter vital to our national defense * * *, I'm sure you people believe that. I think even the prosecution must agree * * *." Reid paused dramatically and then he dropped a bombshell. "I know the President of the United States believes it!" He walked back to his table and took a sheet of paper from a pile of assorted documents. "Let me read you an excerpt from President Coolidge's speech, given before the graduating class at the Naval Academy just this past June: 'The officers of the Navy are given the fullest latitude in expressing their views before their fellow citizens, subject, of course, to the requirements of not betraying those confidential affairs which would be detrimental to the service * * *'." He looked up. "I think it's reasonable to infer that that latitude extends to the Army."

There was a spontaneous burst of applause from the onlookers and the cadence of typewriters leaped into high gear in the news section. A battery of photographers blazed away recording the discomfort of the prosecutors and the surprise of the judges. General Howze rapped sharply with his gavel. "Order in the court!"

When quiet had been restored, Reid smiled and continued. "It is not charged, alleged or contended that the statements of the defendant are false, slanderous, libelous, blasphemous or obscene, immoral or any of the other things inimical to public welfare, or that they tend to incite warfare or rebellion. It is not charged that they corrupt the public morals, disturb the peace, create anarchy, impede or hinder the government in its function * * *." He addressed himself to the president of the court-martial. "What jurisdiction do you people have to try him?"

If Congressman Reid had failed to make his point with the court, he had nevertheless, more than convinced the audience. People strained forward anxiously in their seats, their attention glued on the judges' faces. As Reid sat down, Judge Advocate Moreland got to his feet almost reluctantly. "Counsel for the defense has an interesting argument. At this time I am not prepared to rebut it. I make a motion for an adjournment."

The judges filed out into the anteroom to consider the motion and were back almost at once. "This court will adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning," General Howze said. It was hard to say who looked the most relieved, the prosecution or the judges themselves. But it is a safe bet that President Coolidge wasn't the most popular man in the Army and Navy camp that night.

Later, Reid told Mitchell, "Now we've got them right where we want them, Billy. The last thing the Government wanted to do was to make a public issue out of the charges you leveled at the Army and Navy. They figured the very fact that you said these things was enough to railroad you into a conviction for insubordination. Now they've got no case unless they can prove that what you said wasn't and isn't true."

Mitchell's face, lined with strain and weariness, relaxed a little. "Does that mean I'll get a chance to prove that it is true?"

"Exactly," Reid gloated. "They stepped into their own trap. This trial will be a sounding board for every accusation you made in the San Antonio statement, with this big difference. Before, it was only your words. Now the public is going to see and hear the facts for themselves. Yes, sir, we're going to sink the Navy, and the Army, too. * * * There's only one thing that bothers me." He squeezed Billy's elbow affectionately. "You'll probably go down with the ship."

Mitchell smiled wanly. "I knew that when I stuck my neck out down in Texas."

There was a great deal of speculation, private and in the newspapers, about the new twist the Mitchell courtmartial had taken. Even the conservative New York Times, which had branded Mitchell's San Antonio statement "both insubordination and folly—this is not language becoming an officer and a gentleman," went so far as to comment, "Mitchell's defense will get fullest latitude, because of Coolidge's utterance and 'freedom of speech' guaranteed in the Constitution."

As soon as court was officially in session the next day, Prosecutor Moreland answered the argument which the defense had advanced "* * * counsel for the defense maintains that there is no distinction between a citizen in civilian life and a citizen who is a soldier. This is not true. When a man enters the service, his civil status ceases and his military status begins. This is a change of considerable consequence. Sol-

diers must obey the rules laid down by military law. * * * In any case," he walked over to the defense table and stood over Mitchell, "* * * the Constitution does not protect a man who shouts, 'Fire!' in a crowded theater, be he civilian or soldier."

Mitchell flushed and Congressman Reid shot back scornfully. "But suppose the theater is on fire, Colonel? What happens then?"

There was scattered clapping in the courtroom. General Howze rapped with his gavel. "Gentlemen! Gentlemen! Counsel for defense will kindly save his remarks until he has the floor."

From the looks exchanged between the opposing chief counsel, it was evident that the controversy was taking on personal overtones. Regaining his composure, Colonel Moreland continued. "If the argument advanced on behalf of the accused should stand, it would mean that a private could berate his captain and a major could lampoon his colonel, with the result that discipline would vanish and the Army would become a mob. Yesterday, Mr. Reid quoted a paragraph from a speech that President Coolidge made to the graduating class at Annapolis last June and distorted its meaning to provide justification for the insidious accusations Colonel Mitchell made in his San Antonio statement. I think it goes without saying that when the President said that officers are given the fullest latitude in expressing their views before their fellow citizens, he did not mean to imply that an officer could denounce some innocent man as a criminal."

As Colonel Moreland returned to his chair, Congressman Reid popped up from his. "Colonel Moreland seems to be under a misapprehension. The issue in this case is not discipline. Colonel Mitchell never has, and never would, disobey a direct order from a superior. There is no question of insubordination here. Colonel Mitchell's statements were made in good faith, the good faith of a man doing his duty for his country. The judge advocate speaks self-righteously of denouncing an innocent man as a criminal. I suggest that this is exactly what he is doing at this trial. Colonel Mitchell is an innocent man. He did not attack an individual; he merely spoke out against a public policy, and I defy the prosecutor to find a single case on record where a man has ever been tried for making statements about public policies. The crime exists only in the minds of his accusers. Gentlemen, are we going to lynch a truth-teller?"

Reid jammed his hands deep into his pants pockets and walked slowly over to the judges' table. "The judge advocate has intimated that when a man becomes a soldier he sacrifices his civil liberties—the right to think and speak his own mind. I don't believe that. If it is true that a soldier isn't entitled to voice a personal opinion, then you judges are mere automatons." Hands still in his pockets, Reid shuffled back to his chair.

The judges looked anything but happy as they prepared to decide the pleas to jurisdiction by specification. As each of the charges was read, defense counsel challenged as to jurisdiction. After each challenge, Colonel Winship advised the court that in his opinion defense should be overruled. Inasmuch as each plea had to be deliberated in secret session, the judges marched in and out of the room eight times. Each time the judges got up, everyone else in the courtroom rose, too. The proceedings took on the farcical air of a game of musical chairs. Near the end of the session, the crowd was convulsed with laughter, and even some of the judges had trouble restraining a smile. But eight times the members of the court got up to leave the room, and eight times Reid was overruled.

Undismayed, Reid then made a motion to strike out all charges on the grounds that the court-martial procedure had been violated. "The laws of court-martial procedure," he said, "state that before an officer can be charged with a breach of regulations, said charges must first be referred to his commanding officer for investigation. General Hinds is the commanding officer in Texas. He did not investigate nor did he recommend a court-martial for Colonel Mitchell at any time."

There was a flurry of excitement in the courtroom. The judges were looking at one another dumbly.

Colonel Winship addressed the judge advocate, "Who did investigate the charges, Colonel Moreland?"

Moreland squirmed uncomfortably in his chair. "Col. John Nugent of the inspector general's office made the investigation."

"By what authority?" Mr. Reid demanded.

"Yes, Colonel Moreland," the law officer echoed weakly, "by what authority?"

For some minutes, there was a potent silence. The judge advocate went into a huddle with his assistants, the spectators strained forward in their chairs, reporters held their pencils poised expectantly above their pads; this was a question that had been puzzling those close to the case for some time. When Colonel Moreland faced the court again, his face was flushed. "Secretary of War Davis directed the investigation be made."

Reid was on his feet again. "I repeat, by what authority? Secretary Davis is not Colonel Mitchell's commanding officer."

Colonel Moreland cast one final resigned look at his assistant. "Secretary Davis ordered the investigation at the direction of President Coolidge, and the President is the commanding office of every soldier and officer in the United States military and naval services."

Mr. Reid's face lit up triumphantly. "Thank you," he said and sat down.

The press grinned admiringly. There would be moaning aplenty on Capitol Hill this night. The administration had calculated to keep this case localized in the Army's backyard. With Billy Mitchell the popular public figure that he was, the last thing they had wanted was to have the President's hand forced on the very eve of a national election. On this dramatic note, a recess was called.

In an interview with the press later that afternoon, Congressman Reid fanned the hot coals on which he already had the administration dancing, by vowing that he was going to subpena both Secretary of War Davis and President Coolidge as witnesses. "After all," he said grimly, "it's a man's constitutional right to face his accusers."

The next morning, Colonel Mitchell was officially arraigned. Colonel Winship ordered the defendant to stand up as the judge advocate read the 96th article of war. Colonel Winship then proceeded to read the charges. Mitchell was pale and there were deep circles under his eyes, but he was erect and defiant and there was no trace of nervousness in his voice as he pleaded not guilty to each of the eight charges, and once to the specifications charge and to the general issue.

The session that followed was a stormy one, in which many technical points of procedure had to be unknotted; it included numerous bitter exchanges between opposing counsel. On several occasions, the president of the court warned both Reid and Moreland to restrain themselves. Finally, the judge advocate, in a rather dubiously conciliatory gesture, turned to Reid with a nasty grin and said, "If I had a son who was guilty of a crime, I could wish for him no more able or more gracious advocate than the chief counsel for the defense."

"I am glad to return the compliment," said Reid slyly. "If my boy was in trouble, I'd hate to have you prosecute him."

As the session progressed it was becoming more and more apparent that the defendant was becoming the accuser, and that if the defense was allowed to try to substantiate its charges, the trial would become the very thing which the Government had hoped to prevent by bringing Mitchell to trial—a wide-open, public investigation into the aircraft controversy. The Government began its case officially that afternoon with a preliminary move to establish the authorship of the San Antonio statement. The first three witnesses were reporters from Texas newspapers, all of whom verified that Colonel Mitchell had given them the text in question. Lt. Col. George L. Hicks, adjutant general of the Eighth Corps Area in Texas, was the fourth witness.

Congressman Reid waived examination of the first three witnesses but said very offhandedly that he would like to ask Colonel Hicks a few questions. Addressing himself to the colonel in his most disarming manner, Reid inquired "Are you on duty in Texas, Colonel?"

"Yes, sir," Hicks replied. "At headquarters of the Corps Area in San Antonio."

Reid grinned, "Tell the truth, Colonel, has the issuance of the Mitchell statement led to any insubordination or breakdown of discipline in Texas?"

"I object." Colonel Moreland exploded. "That question is completely irrelevant."

"Not at all," Reid said affably. "The prosecution charges that Colonel Mitchell made statements that prejudice good order and military discipline. If the question of discipline is irrelevant, then the charge is ridiculous."

Colonel Winship, the law officer, gazed appealingly at Colonel Moreland. "Objection overruled."

Reid smiled. "Thank you. Now, Colonel Hicks, will you please answer my question? Did Colonel Mitchell's statement lead to any insubordination or breakdown of discipline?"

"No, sir," Hicks said firmly. "In my judgment it did not."

When the witness had stepped down, Reid made a motion to end the proceedings on the grounds that none of the charges had been proved and a reasonable doubt existed as to every allegation made by the prosecution. There was a chorus of "Ahs" and "Ohs' as Colonel Winship advised the court to reject the motion and the judges upheld him. Reid shrugged and sat down.

At this point, Lieutenant Colonel McMullen, assistant trial judge advocate, stood up in a state of consternation, waving a list as long as his arm. "I have here a list of 73 witnesses for the defense just submitted to me by Mr. Reid. Some are stationed in Hawaii, practically all of them in some remote part of the world or the United States. It will be impossible to round them up. Consider the time, the money * * *" he trailed off with a helpless gesture of his hands.

Colonel Winship handed over a copy of the list to the president of the court. As General Howze studied the proposed list of defense witnesses, his eyebrows arched higher and higher. Included were three Cabinet officers, the secretary to the President, and an impressive array of retired and active officers of the Army and Navy, living, as Colonel McMullen had said, all over the globe. General Howze took out a handkerchief and patted his brow. There was one bright note—President Coolidge's name was not on the list. Once again, the weary judges plodded into the wings like a group of tired chorus girls. When they returned a few minutes later, General Howze turned on counsel Reid with a desperate belligerence. "Mr. Reid, if the court allows you to call up all the people, there's no telling how long these proceedings will be prolonged. * * *"

"May it please the court," Reid cut in. "The prosecution charges that Colonel Mitchell's statements were false, slanderous and libelous. Our purpose in calling these witnesses is to corroborate Colonel Mitchell's charges. The court can only decide

whether he told the truth on the evidence it will hear. There can be no middle ground on the admission of any and all evidence."

Reid was putting the pressure on from all sides now, and the judges as well as the prosecution were caught in the squeeze. As the Nation later summed it up: "Holding a bear by the tail is a pleasant pastime compared with trying Col. William Mitchell by court-martial. That energetic officer and his able counsel carried off all the honors in the first week of the trial. How the War Department must be kicking themselves that they did not ask Mr. Coolidge to issue a sharp Presidential reprimand and station the Colonel in the remotest part of Moroland."

As Reid had prophesied, the court had been maneuvered into a delicate predicament. If it allowed the defense to try to substantiate its charges, the War and Navy Departments would be smeared in the public's eyes; but if they refused to hear all the evidence in the face of the unassailable case which Counsel Reid had built up to support this contention, then they would sacrifice personal integrity and honor in a clear admission that the trial was fixed.

Looking anything but happy the judges postponed their decision and adjourned court until the following Monday morning—a 5-day intermission occasioned by the elections.

"Until Monday?" one reporter was heard to remarks, "All that dancing in and out of the room must have tired the old boys out."

Picking up the remark, General Howze growled, "Don't you worry about the physical endurance of the court," and stomped out of the room.

There was cautious optimism among the Mitchell supporters during that week, and some of the newspapers speculated wildly that Mitchell's acquittal was practically a certainty if he could prove his charges. The temperate New York Times, ridiculed such extravagance. In a shrewd analysis of the situation, the Times said: "Regardless of whether or not the charges are true, they will in no way affect the case. An officer may be a scoundrel, but if he is called a scoundrel by an inferior, this is still insubordination."

When court reconvened the following Monday, Defense Counsel Reid and Judge Advocate Moreland spent most of the day hotly debating the legality of the defense's list of witnesses. Fuel was added to the fire when Reid brazenly tacked on 24 more names to bring the total to 97.

Once again, the judges had to get on their merry-go-round, marching in and out of secret sessions the remainder of the afternoon. To the surprise of almost everyone, all the prosecution's objections were overruled 1 by 1. On November 9, the grim tribunal announced that the court was opening its door to all evidence.

Before he called his first witness, Congressman Reid told the court exactly what the defense intended to prove: "* * * We will show that the *Shenandoah* was not a modern dirigible. She was overweight. She was designed for hydrogen, yet helium was substituted without making the necessary changes in her structure. This oversight greatly reduced her safety factor. In addition, her valves were reduced to save helium. Six of her engines were removed and, due to a lack of care, even the gas cells in her skin had deteriorated. The calcium chloride used in her radiator as a nonfreezing agent is well known to have a destructive effect on duraluminum. Shortly before she left on her disastrous voyage, her frame had been weakened by an accident that had occurred in the hangar.

"Her commanding officer, Zachary Lansdowne, knew all these things and expressed his disapproval of the proposed voyage in a report to the Chief of Naval Operations. In addition to the physical defects of the ship, he knew, too, that there were inadequate fueling facilities along the route. The Chief of Naval Operations answered Commander Lansdowne in an insulting manner and refused to cancel the voyage or even postpone it until more favorable conditions existed. The Navy wouldn't even provide parachutes for the men and rejected a Signal Corps offer to set up weather stations along the route because it would mean paying the men employed an extra $1.90 a day.

"We will prove that a Navy officer tried to persuade Mrs. Landsdowne to perjure herself before the *Shenandoah* Investigation Board and to retract her testimony that her husband had made the flight under protest."

He went on to itemize the flagrant mismanagement of the Hawaii flight and the MacMillan Arctic flight. On the subject of our inadequate defenses in the Pacific, he said, "We will prove that the War Department is guilty of almost treasonable administration in that there are in Hawaii or the Philippines no plans for the employment of the Air Service in the protection of the islands * * *. We will prove that the bulk of the Army Air Service equipment is obsolete.

"We will prove that Colonel Mitchell made numerous recommendations looking toward the improvement and full development of aviation, very few of which, if any, were ever acted upon."

In conclusion, he said, "We will prove by evidence that Colonel Mitchell, after exhausting every usual means to safeguard the aerial defense of the United States without result, took the only way possible that would cause a study of the true conditions of the national defense to be made."

For 3 weeks, witness after witness took the stand and hammered home every point that Reid had made.

Maj. Carl Spaatz, one of the outstanding heroes of World War I, was a key witness.

"Major Spaatz," Mr. Reid began, "you are the chief of the Tactical Unit section of the Training Division of the Air Service, is that true?"

"Yes."

"How many airplanes would you say we had in the Air Service?"

"About 1,800."

"How many of these ships would you say are standard machines?"

"Well, about 237 of them are inherited from the war. I'd say about 69 are modern machines."

"And how many of these are in the training service?" Reid asked.

"Sixty," was the quick reply.

"In other words, Major Spaatz, that leaves about nine planes to be used against the enemy in case of an air attack."

"Yes, sir."

Reid shot a triumphant glance at the judges, "Now tell me, Major Spaatz, just what in your opinion is the state of the equipment in the Air Service?"

"The condition of the Air Force is such that it is difficult to figure out how we can continue flying. Our equipment is obsolete or obsolescent and is not adapted for the purposes intended."

"Do you believe the organization of the Air Service is being retarded by the War Department?" Reid snapped.

Instantly, Colonel Moreland was on his feet roaring, "I object!" But before the court could take any action, Major Spaatz shot back, "I do." There was hearty laughter in the courtroom as the fuming judge advocate hurled himself back into his chair.

When the uproar had quieted down, Reid continued, "The War Department tells us that antiaircraft ground fire could successfully repel enemy air attack in a far more efficient manner than airplanes could. Their gunners must practice constantly. Tell us, Major Spaatz, when was the last time the Army held aerial gunnery practice?"

"About 2 years ago," Spaatz said.

At this point, the president of the court leaned forward and said incredulously, "Two years ago! Who is responsible for that?"

Spaatz smiled wryly. "A while back, when the Government was looking for a spot for gunnery practice, they found a good location in Michigan that could have been leased for a dollar—but it seems that the War Department was loath to let the dollar go." General Howze pulled his neck in like a turtle.

Under further examination, Spaatz said that air personnel was 70 percent short of men, and that there were only two officers with any air service on the general staff. When Reid asked him about the recent deaths of Captain Sheel and Lieutenant Pierson in racing airplanes, Spaatz replied that a high-speed racing machine should be junked after 1 year. The planes used by the dead fliers had been over 2 years old.

Captain Olds, another war ace, was also a key witness.

"Captain Olds," Reid asked, "did you know Major Harley Wheeler?"

"I knew him well. He was a squadron commander in Hawaii."

"Were you present when he was killed?"

"Yes," Olds said. "I was there when he crashed on July 13, 1921."

"What do you know about his death?"

Colonel Moreland objected strenuously. "What is counsel seeking to prove by this line of questioning?"

Ignoring Moreland, Reid said to the court, "The night before his death, Wheeler was called into Colonel Chamberlain's office—Colonel Chamberlain was Chief of Staff of the Hawaiian Department—and was told that he would be held personally responsible, and if necessary, the pilots would be held financially responsible, for any damage to planes incurred in forced landings."

Colonel Winship suggested that the objection be overruled, and the court upheld him. Reid continued with his questioning of the witness.

"Captain Olds, did you talk to Wheeler before he was killed?"

"Yes, sir," Olds replied. "About 20 minutes before he took off, Wheeler and I walked to headquarters together. After he picked up his equipment, we proceeded to Luke Field. He said that Chamberlain had put him on the carpet and complained that there were too many forced landings lately. Wheeler asked me to help him locate the trouble we were having with the Liberty motors. They were always stalling."

"Just what caused Major Wheeler's plane to crash?"

Olds took a deep breath before answering. "His motor stalled as he was taking off. In trying to save the plane, he went into a tailspin."

"Who was in command of the Hawaiian Department at that time?" Reid concluded.

"Maj. Gen. George Summerall."

The next witness for the defense was Maj. Hap Arnold, a wartime pilot and an original pupil of Wilbur Wright. Taking up the matter of the Lassiter Aircraft Report, Reid asked Major Arnold about the statistics of aircraft fatalities. Arnold replied that 517 officers and men had been killed from January 1, 1919, to July 30, 1925. Only 12 of these men had been killed in modern, up-to-date airplanes. Reid then brought up the report of the Agamemnon tests, a series of land-based bombing tests, the results of which were believed to be detrimental to Mitchell's case.

"Major Arnold," said Reid, "Admiral Straus reports that 114 flights of planes failed to make a single hit in the Agamemnon tests."

Arnold smiled. "That's a slight exaggeration. In the first place, there were only 11 flights. Then, instead of Martin bombers, the Navy made us use DH–4s, completely unsuited for bombing, and they only let us use miniature bombs."

Another witness, Lieutenant Colonel Schauffler, the commanding officer of the Air Force Reserves in the Third Corps Area, said: "The Reserve Air Force could not be in worse condition. Under existing conditions, I would not go back in if you made me a major general."

Other top Air Service personnel testified that they were operating with equipment that should have been condemned, and that they had begged for appropriations time and time again and had been refused. Lieutenant Colonel Gilmore, Chief of the Supply Division in the Air Service, said that at the present rate of casualties, there would be a complete turnover in the Air Service every 20 years. With each new witness who took the stand, the position of the Navy and War Department was becoming more tenuous.

The judge advocate made one last frantic appeal to the court to stem the tide of damning evidence. Colonel Winship, the law officer, who, no doubt, was feeling the pressure from above, reproached counsel Reid, but without much conviction. "Mr. Reid," he said, "the court is beginning to doubt your position in this testimony now being produced before the court. The court has stated its willingness in extenuation and mitigation to hear the evidence, but now there seems to be some doubt as to whether your purpose is a defensive one or a vindictive one."

For the first time, Congressman Reid lost his temper. "We expect to prove the truth of Colonel Mitchell's statements, and in bringing this testimony before the court, our purpose is one of absolute defense. If the Government doesn't want to pay the carfare of our witnesses, we will do it at our own expense." That ended the matter.

On the morning of November 12, the courtroom was packed to capacity and crowds jammed the entrance of the Emory Building. This was the day that the star witness for the defense, Mrs. Margaret Rose Lansdowne, widow of the deceased commander of the *Shenandoah*, was due to appear.

There was a flurry of excitement as Mrs. Lansdowne, dressed in mourning, took the stand. Breaking all the formal rules of court-martial procedure, the judges rose and stood stiffly at attention. General Howze bowed and said, "Good morning, madam."

As soon as the witness was sworn in, Reid wasted little time in getting to the point. "Mrs. Lansdowne," he began, "did Capt. Paul Foley of the United States Navy, who is judge advocate of the *Shenandoah* Investigation Board, call on you previous to the time that you were called as a witness in that inquiry?"

"He did."

"Was a paper delivered to you before you appeared as a witness before that court?"

"There was," Mrs. Lansdowne stated emphatically. "Captain Foley wanted me to sign it, but I refused."

"Are you able to state in substance what was in that paper?"

Colonel Moreland leaped out of his chair and began pounding the table with his fist. "I object! At the time Colonel Mitchell gave out his San Antonio statement, he couldn't possibly have known about any such paper or of Captain Foley's visit."

Reid pounced right back. "The trial judge advocate does not understand the purpose of the testimony. I will inform him. Colonel Mitchell charged that the Navy would proceed with a "whitewash" board in the *Shenandoah* case and that an effort would be made to get Mrs. Lansdowne to give false testimony."

"That's a prophecy."

Reid laughed. "You seem to forget that we are being tried in part on things that we said would happen." He turned to the law officer, "Isn't that right?"

"That's right," Colonel Winship mumbled weakly. "Objection overruled."

"Tell us what was written on that paper, Mrs. Lansdowne," Reid said.

"Well," the woman began, "the paper was brought to me by a friend, the wife of a prominent Navy officer. There were three paragraphs. The first paragraph had me saying that when I first accepted to appear before the investigation board, it was because I felt my husband needed defense, but that now I had changed my mind and would not appear. The second had me saying that my husband was always ready to use the *Shenandoah* for military purposes regardless of weather or landing conditions. In the third paragraph I was to thank the court and leave the matter up to them."

"Was this your attitude," Reid inquired quietly.

"It was not."

"Who was the writer of that statement?"

"Captain Paul Foley!" Mrs. Lansdowne's voice trembled with emotion now. "It was an insult to my husband's memory that he would take the *Shenandoah* any place, and time, regardless of the weather." She went on to tell how vigorously her husband had protested the trip, but that he had been overruled by the Chief of Naval Operations, who had also disapproved Lansdowne's recommendation to postpone it to a later date when weather would be more favorable 'because the State fairs do not occur at that time.'"

"Did Captain Foley call on you before you testified?"

"Yes, he did," Mrs. Lansdowne replied. "Two days before. I was at the home of my uncle. He wanted to know what I was going to tell the board and tried to impress me with the importance of this investigation. I told him that I was going to show that the voyage of the *Shenandoah* was a political one. Captain Foley said I was wrong, that the taxpayers had a right to see their property. I told him then that I had never heard of a battleship being sent to the Great Lakes."

On that note, Reid concluded his examination as the audience howled. The prosecution then made a determined effort to trip up Mrs. Lansdowne. With fire in his eye, Colonel Moreland commenced a rapid-fire cross-examination. "Did Capt. Walter Gerhardy (Secretary of War Wilbur's personal aide) ever call on you?"

"Yes."

"Didn't you say that statements credited to you by the papers were lies?"

"I did not. I said those who quoted me as saying that I held Secretary Wilbur personally responsible, were not correct."

Moreland smiled patronizingly. "Isn't it true, Mrs. Lansdowne, that you told the papers your husband had a premonition that this would be his last trip?"

"My husband said that if he was lucky enough to get out of this one alive he'd certainly never make another trip."

Red about the ears now, Moreland struck out in another direction. "Did you know Captain Foley before he called on you?"

"No," Mrs. Lansdowne admitted. "That was the first time I had ever met him."

"How did you know this paper came from Captain Foley?"

Mrs. Lansdowne looked flustered. "The woman who gave it to me said so."

"Who was she?" Moreland demanded.

Mrs. Lansdowne hung her head. "I'd rather not say."

Colonel Moreland turned a pained expression toward the judges. "It appears that what we have is a nonexistent paper brought by a mysterious woman." All the judges looked relieved at having some reasonable doubt to cling to.

During the next few days an impressive array of experts took the stand to testify to the ineffectiveness of antiaircraft fire against planes. One gunner admitted it was like "scratching his head with one hand and rubbing his stomach with the other" to keep a gun on an airplane. Lt. H. L. George of the Army Air Service testified to the accuracy of bombs dropped on a target the size and shape of the gun deck of the battleship *California*. "At 3,000," he said, "75 percent of the bombs hit the target; at 8,000 feet 50 percent of the bombs hit the target."

Things were going so badly for the prosecution by the middle of November that Colonel Moreland was relieved as chief judge advocate. Taking his place, was the legal pride of the General Staff, a lanky, thin-faced young major named Allen Gullion who was noted as the shrewdest, most eloquent legal brain in the Army. Reid countered this move by pulling an ace out of his own sleeve in the person of retired Rear Adm. William Sims. The Secretary of the Navy must have groaned to hear an important and distinguished member of the home team rooting for the opposition. Admiral Sims emphasized the value of aircraft carriers to the modern fleet and lamented the fact that the only carrier in the United States Navy was a converted collier. He said that in the naval warfare of the future, control of the air would be an absolute essential, and that in his opinion, any naval vessel would be at the mercy of an enemy who controlled the air. Admiral sims also testified that he knew of cases where officers were afraid to speak their minds before Congressional committees because of the fear that it would put a black mark on their records. When Reid asked him what the United States Navy air policy was, he replied, "It has none. Just bumps along from day to day." Admiral Sims expressed equally uncomplimentary views about the *Shenandoah* disaster.

"From your experience as Commander-in-Chief of American Forces in European waters during the war," Reid asked, "what is your opinion of the efficiency of anti-aircraft fire?"

"I can give you actual figures," the admiral replied promptly. "Anti-aircraft gunners average one hit in 12,000 to one in 65,000."

In regard to Navy administration of the air service, Sims declared, "It's like a man learning how to play golf by reading a book."

In the cross-examination, Major Gullion slashed away at the old admiral viciously. Once he backed Sims into a corner by getting him to say that many naval officers were "too hidebound, unfitted and uneducated" to judge the value of airpower. Twisting the statement in an attempt to rattle the admiral, Gullion read the names of seven high-ranking admirals who took a dim view of airplanes. Many of them were good friends of Sims. Gullion asked slyly if the witness considered them to be "hidebound, unfitted and uneducated." To the consternation of the judge advocate and the court, and to the delight of the spectators, Sims replied promptly, "I most certainly do."

Maj. Eddie Rickenbacker, the outstanding ace of the AEF, scoffed at the idea that antiaircraft was any protection against air attack. He was especially vehement about the Army Air Service Reserve program. "My God," he said. "The very least a pilot should have is 1 hour's flying time a week."

"Is it proper to send them up without parachutes?" Reid asked.

"It's like sending men to sea without lifeboats. Fire is always a great hazard in aircraft and a man without a 'chute is without hope."

"What is your opinion of this program of training our men in World War I planes?"

Rickenbacker growled, "Just take a look at the graveyards around our flying fields."

Before he began his cross-examination, Major Gullion swaggered back and forth in front of the witness, regarding him as a policeman might a criminal. Suddenly he shot a question at Rickenbacker, punching the words home like the staccato of a machinegun. "Did you know that Baron Von Richthofen, the German war ace, was killed

by ground fire?" He laughed. "The whole French, British, and American air force couldn't shoot him down; it took an anti-aircraft gunner to do it."

Rickenbacker said contemptuously, "I understood he was killed in a dogfight during the German drive on Paris."

Gullion shook his head, as if to say, "Oh, those airmen." Then he continued, "Would you be surprised if I told you that one American antiaircraft battery had shot down 9 enemy planes?"

"I wouldn't be surprised at anything you told me," Rickenbacker said. "I'd just be surprised if anyone believed it."

Gullion's jaw dropped as the courtroom went into an uproar. General Howze had to pound for order several times. At this point Major Gullion decided that he had had enough of Major Rickenbacker.

There were violent objections when Reid called to the stand Lt. H. W. Sheridan, who had been an Army observer aboard the carried *Langley* during the Hawaiian maneuvers. "This is outrageous," Colonel Moreland fumed. "Any information this man gathered as a military observer is top secret."

An outspoken young man, Sheridan commented wryly, "There's nothing secret about my testimony unless you want to suppress the condition of the Navy." Major Gullion and Colonel Moreland leaped to their feet shouting simultaneously.

Reid laughed. "I object to tandem objections." Even the judges lost some of their austerity in the howl that went up from the crowd. Concealing a grin behind his hand, Colonel Winship mumbled, "Yes, gentlemen, please, one at a time."

The story Sheridan told had all the farcical aspects of a Keystone comedy, or would have had, if it had not been so tragic. He told how there had been no coordination in command, during the maneuvers; how even the captain of the *Langley* had no idea when his men were to take off, where they were to go, or what they were to do once they got there; how the landing operation was fantastic beyond description. He told how two planes had approached the runway from different directions and tried to land at the same time; swerving to avoid a head-on collision, they had plowed into three other planes that were standing on the deck.

Major Gullion tore into Sheridan angrily. "Do you know the depth of the water in San Francisco Harbor?"

"I am not familiar with the contours of the harbor's bottom," Sheridan answered.

Thrusting his face almost against the witness, Gullion demanded, "Are you a graduate of the War College?"

"I am not."

"Do you think you're qualified to exercise a high command?"

"No, but I could command an airplane squadron at least," Sheridan said dryly.

Gullion sputtered. "Would you be surprised to know that those 'terribly damaged planes' you mentioned were back in action the next day?"

"I wouldn't believe it."

Gullion took another slant. "Do you think you're qualified to criticize the Navy aviators?"

Sheridan said, with dignity, "I have never criticized the Navy aviators. They are as fine a group of pilots as you can find anywhere."

"You realize, of course, Lieutenant Sheridan, that the *Langley* is just an experimental carrier. She wasn't meant to be an efficient ship."

Sheridan grinned. "Well, she sure wasn't."

Gullion exploded. Stamping up and down before the judges' table, he fumed, "I move that all this man's testimony be stricken from the record. He has shown that he is clearly unqualified to testify." From his chair, Congressman Reid commented calmly, "He's a good deal more qualified than the counsel for the prosecution." The audience cheered.

On November 23, the moment arrived that everyone had been waiting for. Billy Mitchell took the stand in his own defense. In the face of constant badgering and objecting by Major Gullion, Counsel Reid reviewed the accused's brilliant Army record and faithful service to his country. All the many recommendations he had made to the War Department for the improvement of the country's air defense were brought forth, and it was pointed out they had all been shelved or tossed into the wastebasket. All the honors and citations he had received from foreign governments were read, including a letter from General Pershing, the tone of which was almost embarrassing in its praise. It was emphasized how the world's leading aeronautical experts concurred almost unanimously with Mitchell's opinions. On the stand, the tense, pale-faced Mitchell repeated every one of his charges. But he made it a point to stipulate that he had always said "in my opinion," and had accused "the system," not a specific man or men.

After this, Mitchell faced a 4-hour cross-examination by Major Gullion which has seldom had its equal in vehemence and vituperation in a courtroom. Its only purpose seemed to be to discredit the witness and defame his character. Typical of Gullion's tactics is the following sequence: "Colonel Mitchell, do you know what the estimated wealth of the United States is?"

"No, sir."

Gullion opened a copy of the World Almanac. "The World Almanac says it is $302,803,862,000. Keep that in mind."

There was a titter from the spectators. Gullion then proceeded to read a statement by Mitchell in which he had warned that in the event of a war in the Pacific, mines and submarines would pose a severe threat to the fleet. "Who did you have in mind when you wrote that?" Gullion demanded.

"Japan," Mitchell replied.

"Japan." Gullion turned and laughed at the court as though this was the biggest joke in the world. He then read another statement by Mitchell that said: "* * * The Pacific could be blocked off in squares of 900 square miles, by the enemy, each square an operating base for a sub * * *." Gullion turned on Mitchell viciously. "Do you know, Colonel Mitchell, that that would mean blocking off 10 million square miles? An enemy would need 12,500 subs to do that. At $5 million a sub, that would come to $624 billion. That's almost twice the wealth of the United States, and you say Japan could do that?"

Attacking a statement that Mitchell had made about the Pacific maneuvers, Gullion asked, "Where did you get the information that the Pacific maneuvers were a big parade?"

"In my opinion, they were," Mitchell replied calmly.

"The San Antonio statement is an opinion?"

"That's what it says."

"Tell me," Gullion snarled, "if all those statements were opinions, could you state the source of your information so we can differentiate between your opinions and your imagination?" Without giving the witness a chance to reply, he continued, "Where did you get the information that the Pacific maneuvers cost $40 to $80 million?"

"From the newspapers."

Gullion flashed the judges a horsey smile. "So, he gets all his information from the newspapers."

"Where the Navy is concerned, that's the only place anyone can get it," Mitchell interjected dryly.

Turning to Mitchell's criticisms of the Navy's Hawaiian flight, Gullion tried to feint him into making a direct accusation against an individual. "You claim that the preparations for the Hawaiian flight were inadequate. Yet these same plans were approved by Commander Rogers, who was in command of the flight. Do you think you are a better judge than he is?"

Mitchell smiled. "If Commander Rogers believed that flying back and forth across the Delaware River was proof that his planes could reach Hawaii, then I can only answer 'Yes.'"

Gullion said that Mitchell's charge of criminal negligence and treasonable conduct in the management of the Air Service was preposterous. Treason is the act of giving aid to an enemy in time of war, he declared.

"That's the obvious definition," Mitchell said quickly, "But there is another one, and that is to betray a trust or a confidence. The people put their trust in the War and Navy Departments to give them adequate defense; this has not been done."

Suddenly, Gullion dashed across the room and began shaking his first under Congressman Reid's nose. "You stop signaling him the right answers," he howled. This outburst greeted with hoots and hisses. Reid leaped to his feet and for a time it seemed that the session was sure to end in a free-for-all between the opposing counsel. Trembling like a leaf, the president of the court called a recess.

For 3 harrowing days, Mitchell remained on the stand, parrying every attempt of the judge advocate to shatter his composure. Gullion's frenzied efforts to malign him knew no limits. He attacked Mitchell's sanity, his morals, his truthfulness, and even his personal life. Through it all, Billy remained aloof, although the strain showed in his haggard face and sunken eyes. Only once did he seem on the point of cracking up, and that was when Gullion accused him of plagiarism in the writing of his book Winged Defense. In a surprise move, the trial judge advocate produced a lecture given before a War College class a few years before. He shook the manuscript in Mitchell's face. "Isn't it true that you cribbed page after page of this report in your rotten book?"

Mitchell gripped the arms of his chair and tensed forward as if he were about to leap at his tormentor, but Congressman Reid intervened soothingly. "The court is not trying the defendant on a copyright charge, I believe." But the spectators were not shy about expressing their opinion of the prosecution's tactics. Someone in the back of the courtroom yelled, "I'd paste that guy in the kisser, Billy."

Sensing that he had made some small chink in Mitchell's armor, Gullion followed up with what he thought would be a vital thrust. Holding up another paper, he said, "Colonel Mitchell, I have here a record of testimony given by you in 1913 before a congressional committee in which you expressed the opinion that there should not be a separate air force." There was a tense silence as the trial judge advocate sneered out over the sea of faces in the courtroom.

Mitchell settled back in the chair with the placid smile of reminiscence with which a mature man regards a folly of his youth. "I said it, all right," he admitted genially, "and I was never more wrong in my life. I said a good many foolish things when I was young, and before the war."

When he stepped down from the stand at the end of his ordeal, the spectators rose in silent tribute.

A light note relieved the tension that had built up during Mitchell's ordeal when Congressman Fiorella H. La Guardia, of New York, took the stand. La Guardia, who had served with the Air Service in Italy during the war, had on numerous occasions risen publicly to Mitchell's defense. Under examination by Reid, La Guardia reported his observations of aerial gunnery at the Fort

Tilden exercises. "It was a regular panic," he said in his squeaky voice. "The planes were flying back and forth towing the targets right under the noses of the artillery, and they couldn't make one single hit. Then the artillery officers got together in a big football huddle and sent a radio message to the planes. 'Please come in closer,' they begged. 'Would you please repeat your course again? Would you wait a few minutes, please?' " La Guardia laughed. "Those guys couldn't hit a sitting duck."

La Guardia testified that he had personally talked to many officers, both Army and Navy, who were afraid to disagree with their superiors. "Why," he said seriously, "I knew a quartermaster officer who had to testify to the value of a self-greasing axle because the guy who invented it was a relative of his captain's."

To discredit the little Congressman before the court, Gullion asked maliciously, "Is it true that you made a statement that Colonel Mitchell was being tried by officers who were prepared to find him guilty."

La Guardia looked up and down the line of cold faces arrayed behind the bar, then he winked at his old friend, Douglas MacArthur, and said, "That was before I knew that General Mac was going to sit on the court."

At this point, the defense rested.

The remaining days of the trial were anticlimactic. The prosecution paraded a troupe of Navy experts in and out of the witness chair. All of them disputed lamely the contentions which the defense had already proved to the satisfaction of most observers. Defense counsel Reid had a gay time picking their testimony apart at will. One of the key witnesses for the prosecution was an ex-airman who had served inauspiciously under Colonel Mitchell in World War I. Reciting an obviously memorized speech, he testified in glowing terms to the bull's-eye accuracy of the German antiaircraft gunners.

"I see," said Mr. Reid blandly. "Did the German antiaircraft often keep you from carrying out your missions?"

"Well, you had to be careful," the witness hedged.

"You were afraid of them?"

"I object." Gullion was indignant.

Colonel Winship, the law officer, coughed delicately. "Is counsel for the defense suggesting that the witness is a coward?"

"His direct testimony makes me think he was very much afraid."

Unable to restrain himself, the witness leaped to his feet, his face flaming, and shouted, "I am not afraid of antiaircraft fire and I never was."

"And it never interfered with any of your missions?" Mr. Reid shot back.

"Never," thundered the witness, as the horrified Gullion buried his face in his hands.

On the morning of December 17, Reid was due to make a final rebuttal summing up the defense. Everyone in the room stirred excitedly as Billy Mitchell unexpectedly got to his feet. "May it please the court," he said, "I desire to make a statement. My trial before this court-martial is the culmination of the efforts of the General Staff of the Army and the General Board of the Navy to depreciate the value of airpower and keep it in an auxiliary position which absolutely compromises our whole system of national defense. These efforts were begun as soon as the sound of the cannon had ceased on the western front in 1919. When we sank the battleships off the Virginia capes in 1921, and again in 1923, and proved to the world that airpower had revolutionized all schemes of national defense, these efforts were redoubled and have continued to this day. The truth of every statement which I have made has been proved by good and sufficient evidence before this court, not by men who gained their knowledge of aviation by staying on the ground and having their statements prepared by numerous staffs to bolster up their predetermined ideas, but by actual fliers who have gained their knowledge first-hand in war and peace. To proceed further with the case would serve no useful purpose. I have therefore directed my counsel to entirely close our part of the proceedings without further argument."

A hush came over the room as Billy sat down. There was much clearing of throats and blowing of noses. Mitchell felt a touch on his shoulder. Turning around, he was surprised to see his old friend Will Rogers sitting in the first row of the courtroom directly behind him. Blinking back his tears, Rogers threw his arm around Mitchell's shoulders, "Keep punching, Billy," he cried, "the people are with you."

In her fine biography of Billy Mitchell, My Brother Bill, his sister Ruth reports: "That almost broke Bill down as no slander or invective could. He said years later, 'It was a moment of tenderness—the one moment of all that nightmare that I shall never forget.' "

It was now Major Gullion's turn to sum up. Eternally fixing himself as the villain in the place, Gullion denounced not only Mitchell but every witness who had appeared for the defense. His language was so intemperate that even the judges and his own associates must have winched with shame. Of the witnesses, he dismissed Admiral Sims as "opinionated, narrow minded, egomaniacal, his eyes fixed in selfish stare upon his own career." He brushed aside Sheridan as "the half-truth type," Capt. Robert Olds as "the memory expert who waited 4 years to tell his story until Chamberlain, as well as Wheeler, was dead." Of LaGuardia, he said, "That congressional expert is beyond my description." But he really warmed up to his subject when he got to Billy Mitchell: "On September 5, the accused broadcast throughout the land charges of incompetence, criminal negligence, and treasonable administration against the War Department. At the same time, he charged fellow officers with gross ignorance and falsehood. Barely 3 days had elapsed after the *Shenandoah* was destroyed, yet this self-appointed prophet presumed to explain her loss. If that is his idea of mature deliberation and sufficient time, what credit can be given to his judgment in other matters? * * *

"Is this man a Moses fitted to lead the people out of a wilderness that is his own creation only? Is he the George Washington type, as counsel would have you believe? Is he not rather the all-too-familiar charlatan and demagog type like Alcibiades, Catiline, and, except for a decided difference in poise and mental power in Burr's favor, like Aaron Burr?

"He is a good flier, a fair writer, a good shot, flamboyant, self-advertising, widely imaginative, destructive, never constructive except in wild, nonfeasible schemes, and never overly careful as to the ethics of his methods.

"This court has had an opportunity to study those methods not only as revealed in his statements of December 5 but also in his former statements which counsel has had the gall to read into the record. * * *"

His eyes wild, his hair hanging over his eyes, Gullion pointed a bony finger at Mitchell and shrieked in an almost hysterical voice, "We ask the dismissal of the accused for the sake of the Army whose discipline he has endangered and whose fair name he has attempted to discredit. We ask his dismissal for the sake of the young officers of the Air Service whose ideals he has shattered and whose loyalty he has corrupted. We ask his dismissal in the name of the truth under whose aegis he has sought protection but whose face he does not know." He hung his head and placed his hand across his heart. After a pause for wind, he drew himself up to full height again. "And finally," he screamed, "we ask it in the name of the American people whose fears he has played upon, whose hysteria he has fermented, whose confidence he has beguiled, and whose faith he has betrayed." Guillion then bowed deeply, like a ham actor, and walked to his chair.

The hush that fell over the court was the kind that usually precedes a lynching. General Howze glanced nervously around the fringes of the room to make sure that all the guards were in place. Then he called a 5-minute recess. After the recess, the president of the court rose and said in a solemn voice, "The court will now be cleared and closed."

At 3:40 p. m. the judges filed solemnly out of the room to consider their verdict. At 6:34, they returned and took their seats. As General Howze stood up to read the verdict, it seemed that all pride and dignity had left these eminent men. They slouched in their chairs like small boys, gazing down in their laps at their folded hands.

"The court is ready to make an announcement and it is desired that there be no demonstration of any kind." Mowze's face was stoic. "The court, upon secret written ballot, two-thirds of the members present at the time the vote was taken, concurring in each finding of guilt, finds the accused guilty of all specifications and of the general charge. * * *"

The sentence was, on the surface, surprisingly lenient: Mitchell was to be suspended from rank, command, and duty, with forfeiture of pay and allowances for 5 years. A closer look revealed that it was a last desperate attempt by the War Department to strike a bargain with the rebel: "'Keep quiet for 5 years and we'll forget the whole thing," was the interpretation most people gave to the sentence. President Coolidge even offered to restore his pay during that period, an obvious gesture that would have been better if it had not been made. As far as Mitchell was concerned, the whole setup was unthinkable. On January 27, he resigned from the Army.

The aftermath of the Mitchell court-martial was explosive and gave the Government some bad moments for months after. Newspaper headlines screamed of "fix" and "crucifixion." The New York Sun ran a mock advertisement: "Wanted—man for colonel in the United States air service. Must be a good listener. Willing to overlook anything. One with no flying experience preferred. Apply court-martial board, Washington, D. C."

The repercussions in Congress were unprecedented. Scores of bills were introduced that ranged from impeaching the President and court-martialing the judges who had convicted Mitchell, to overriding the verdict of the court, making Mitchell a four-star general, and immediately putting in force all of his recommendations. In flowery bursts of oratory, he was compared to Savonarola, Joan of Arc, Galileo, Columbus, and Socrates—"they made him drink poison too." All over the country people were gathering to form "fair deal for Mitchell" committees. But as is so often the case when people talk too loud and too long, nothing actually was done. The sentence stood, and other matters of more immediate concern pushed Billy Mitchell out of the limelight—but not out of the news.

Like the fighting man that he was, Billy Mitchell carried on his crusade for airpower from his home in Virginia. He started a campaign to found an Air Force Academy, on a par with West Point and Annapolis, with public contributions. But just at the point when the goal was in reach, he changed his mind. "It's no good this way," he told his friends. "The Government has to be in back of it or it can never mean anything."

His flow of articles preaching the gospel of airpower continued unabated throughout his retirement—all the court-martial had actually succeeded in doing was to increase his output of words and argument. In 1928, when his article, Will Japan Try To Conquer

the United States, appeared in Liberty magazine—outlining a hypothetical design for Japanese aggression which included a surprise attack in the Pacific, capture of the Philippines, Dutch Harbor, and a drive through Alaska—the forerunners of the "America firsters" charged him with being a warmonger.

Ironically, while the United States was turning a deaf ear to his pleas, the Japs and the Nazis were hanging on every word he said, translating his theories into action, lending ironic truth to Major Gullion's tongue-in-cheek charge that he was a prophet.

Thirty years have passed since the court-martial of Billy Mitchell. Today, even the stodgiest admiral will happily admit that the only crime Billy was guilty of was being born too soon. In 1945, 9 years after he died peacefully in his sleep, Col. William (Billy) Mitchell was promoted, posthumously, to the rank of major general and awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. In 1947, Congress gave the Air Force its independence—not quite as he had envisioned it, but a big step in the right direction. The 1950's saw his fondest dreams of the United Defense Department realized in the inauguration of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Just this year, the last of his hopes materialized with the establishment of an Air Force Academy on a par with West Point and Annapolis. There is even a move under way in Congress to make Billy the Air Force's first five-star general.

History is writing a Hollywood ending to the saga of Billy Mitchell. A grateful and enlightened Nation, humble in its remorse, heaps belated praise and glory on the grave of the hero whose cause was recognized too late. But, in the end, the medals and honors and the remorse mean little. The vindication of Billy Mitchell and the Nation's own bloody absolution were accomplished in one fiery day of reckoning at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. But it's a safe bet that Billy wouldn't have wanted to be around to collect his last laugh.

The Late John D. Dingell

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the beautiful hymn of tribute paid to the late JOHN DINGELL by his colleagues in the Congress.

JOHN DINGELL was an honorable and courageous man who was thoroughly dedicated to the needs and desires of the average American. In his 23 years of distinguished service in the House of Representatives he provided outstanding leadership in the fight for social security, the National Labor Relations Act, national health insurance, and other New and Fair Deal reform measures.

He carried on the fight for liberal legislation despite a lingering illness which caused him untold pain and suffering. But JOHN DINGELL never permitted his own suffering to interfere with his legislative goals. I was always proud to have him as a friend as well as a brother member of the International Typographical Union.

JOHN DINGELL was a true statesman, endowed with the ability of relating complex legislation to the needs of people which he so sympathetically understood. His high ideals and sincerity of purpose were a source of inspiration to his fellow Members who respected and admired him. He will be sorely missed in the crucial days ahead.

We welcome his son, JOHN D. DINGELL, who has been chosen to carry on the work so nobly advanced by his distinguished father. To our late colleague's wife and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Our Military Personnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article from Iron Age entitled "Are We Unfair to Our Military?" has just been called to my attention. It is filled with truisms and is a strong reminder that those upon whom we depend in war and national emergency often are forgotten in the lethargic and comfortable periods of peace. Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I reproduce this article by Tom Campbell, editor, in full:

ARE WE UNFAIR TO OUR MILITARY?
(By Tom Campbell)

We as Americans blow hot and cold. Hardly ever do we strike a nice balance. Usually this doesn't hurt us too much. But sometimes it does. Even then we are slow to admit it.

For almost 3 years we have been tough on our military people. The morale of the Armed Forces has been declining steadily.

You can't fight a war—hot or cold—with Univacs alone. You can't expect officers and enlisted men to feel deeply the need for patriotism and service in the midst of a cold, cut-and-dried atmosphere almost completely dominated by civilians. You can't have a spirit of sacrifice with accountants and efficiency experts breathing down your neck—all of the time.

The exodus of trained personnel from the services after costly training is something that should frighten us. We can't stop this trend by adding another Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The longing looks which some top-level officers aim toward their retirement is not healthy. And the speed with which they join industry is not the best testimonial for choosing the services as a career.

Military people who live for their country do not engage in public debate unless the principle and the stakes for freedom are great. Such a disciplined attitude covers up the long steady accumulation of frustrations shouldered by military people.

You can do something about this. As businessmen, through your organizations, friends, and other groups you can call for better morale and a changed attitude toward the military. This is not a passing fancy. It is known that many top-level military people are upset over the treatment accorded the services at various times in the past few years.

Furthermore, we have placed a terrible burden upon President Eisenhower because he is an outstanding military leader. We expect him to settle the disagreements between the civilians in the Pentagon and those whose whole life and training is tied up with the security of our country.

No one expects the military to run our country. But in making sure they don't, it isn't necessary to degrade the services.

The Celebrated Heyer Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the November 1955 issue of the Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. This article is of interest to all of us who are concerned with the welfare of small business. The article points up in particular some of the difficulties which a smaller company experiences in connection with the effort to obtain a Government contract.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CELEBRATED HEYER CASE

(By Carl L. Shipley, Esq., special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States)

The small businessman[1] who submits the lowest responsible bid on Federal Government military contracts not infrequently finds he has entered a chamber of administrative horrors from which he finally emerges dazed and shaken, and without the contract. The experience of the Heyer Products Co.[2] of Belleville, N. J., is a hair-raising example of what can happen but should not. It is a laboratory specimen of bad procurement practices as it affects a small business, and calls inexorably for legislative correction.

DOLLAR VALUE OF MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Federal Government awards about $15 billion of military prime contracts each year. Of this vast sum, only 20 percent of the dollar value is placed with small businesses.[3] When a small manufacturer undertakes the expense of preparing a bid, he is entitled to a reasonable expectation that he will obtain the contract if he is the low bidder.

PHILOSOPHY UNDERLYING MILITARY PROCUREMENT

The Members of Congress have always insisted that the Government follow free enterprise principles in its military purchases. Procurement officials must advertise their requirements and award contracts to the lowest responsible bidder who can supply the product. This policy lets the military get what it wants when it wants it, while at the same time protecting the taxpayers' dollars by compelling purchases at

[1] There are 4 million small businesses in America, representing 96 percent of all business. "Nation's Business," April 1954, p. 57. See Second Semi-Annual Report, Small Business Administration, July 31, 1954.

[2] Heyer, manufacturers of automotive test equipment. Transcript of hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, March 5–May 15, 1953.

[3] Second Semi-Annual Report, Small Business Administration, July 31, 1954.

the lowest bid.[4] In short, Congress has elected to rely on the time-tested method of competitive bidding. And the courts have confirmed and insisted upon that policy:

"The agents of the Government stand upon a different footing from private individuals in the matter of advertising for the letting of contracts in behalf of the United States. They have no discretion. * * * They must accept the lowest bid * * *."[5]

Moreover, the Supreme Court of the United States has inferentially made it clear that the lowest responsible bidder has a legal right to have the contract awarded to him:

"There must be a point of time at which discretion is exhausted. The procedure for the advertising for bids for supplies * * * to the Government would else be a mockery—a procedure, we may say, that is not permissible, but required. * * * By it the Government is given the benefit of the competition of the market and each bidder is given the chance for a bargain. It is a provision, therefore, in the interest of both the Government and the bidder, necessarily giving rights to both and placing obligations on both. And it is not out of place to say that the Government should be animated by a justice as anxious to consider the rights of the bidder as to insist upon its own."[6]

Apart from the actual requirements of the law, the Comptroller General of the United States has ruled that the public interest requires awarding of contracts to the lowest bidder:

"It would not normally appear to be in the public interest for the military departments to make awards of contracts to firms when it is known at the time that the supplies are obtainable elsewhere at a lower price."[7]

The legislative and judicial policy as to military procurement is restated in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947,[8] the statute currently governing military purchases. Section 3 (b) of the act provides as to advertised contracts that "Award shall be made * * * to that responsible bidder whose bid * * * will be most advantageous, price and other factors considered." The legislative history of the act leaves no doubt but that Congress had a clear purpose to require the Pentagon to make its purchases from the lowest bidder.[9] The "other factors" referred to in the section simply comprehends the bidder's experience and financial ability.[10] In short, if a bidder is competent and reputable, the act leaves no choice but award to the lowest bidder.[11]

APPLICATION OF THE ACT

However, as the Heyer case shows, there is sometimes a wide gap between the commandment of the act and the actual procurement policy followed by the Pentagon.

The story begins on November 3, 1950, when Heyer submitted a bid of $134,000 in response to an invitation by the military to bid on a contract to manufacture 3,000 low voltage circuit testers, an uncomplicated electrical device widely used in industry. Heyer had built thousands of similar units for commercial use, and over 52,000 of them for military use during World War II. His company had been a well known manufacturer of such test equipment for over a quarter of a century, supplying such enterprises as Ford, Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, Willard, Exide, Atlas, and Autolite.[12] In short, no rational mind could reasonably question his experience, reputation, or competence.[13]

Nonetheless, the contract was awarded to a large business concern which was seventh highest bidder at almost double the Heyer low bid price, at an additional cost to the taxpayer of $116,000. A committee of the Senate investigated the transaction and concluded:

"The representatives of Army Ordnance who appeared before your committee to explain * * * why the Heyer bid had been rejected did not give convincing explanations."[14]

However, by the time the Senate had made its findings it was too late to correct the error, so Heyer was deprived of his legal right to the contract as low bidder, plus the expense of preparing the bid, and the taxpayer was saddled with a $116,000 unnecessary increased cost.

In the course of events the same military procuring agency on March 17, 1952, issued another invitation for bids on a contract to manufacture 5,500 more of the self-same low voltage circuit testers.[15] Heyer, ever hopeful, submitted a bid of $205,000, accompanied by a sample, a letter of explanation, and a schematic diagram with specifications.[16] He left nothing to chance. Despite the fact that Heyer was again the lowest bidder, the contract was again awarded to the seventh high bidder, at an additional cost to the taxpayer of $190,000. Oddly enough, the seventh highest bidder was the same large company which had been the successful but seventh highest bidder on the first contract. In speaking of this matter, the Senate Small Business Committee said:

"Heyer was low bidder on a low-voltage circuit tester contract wihch OTAC awarded in both instances to the Weidenhoff Co., in each case the 7th high bidder. This incredible coincidence would seem to indicate that the officials in charge at OTAC have no wish or will to abide by the spirit and purpose of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947."[17]

The Senate scheduled a second hearing to inquire into the matter with the observation that "* * * the experience of the Hyer Co. on the second low-voltage cricuit tester procurement would indicate that the officer in command at OTAC either flagrantly and wilfully or negligently disregarded the findings and recommendations of your committee * * *."[18]

During the course of the Senate hearing Heyer expressed the thought that the action of the procurement officials might be retaliation against him for testifying before the committee in the first hearing. The committee was unable to obtain any factual substantiation of the charge, but was forced to concede:

"Your committee can only conclude that for some reason unknown to it, OTAC wished to favor Weidenhoff, or to eliminate Heyer. The evidence adduced permits no other inference, unless it be attributed to gross incompetence."[19]

The Senate committee did obtain irrefutable proof that a crucial engineering report had been rewritten to mislead certain military officers, and reported:

"This committee is gravely concerned that such a situation can exist at OTAC. Again, the committee cannot guess at motives, but can only recognize it as highly irregular, and as an indication of discrimination against Heyer * * *."[20]

Among other somewhat strange developments, the Senate committee discovered a behind-the-scenes administrative breakdown wherein the Under Secretary of the Army had been overruled in cancelling the improper award of this contract by his subordinate deputy.[21] The committee was unable to learn just why the deputy arrogated to himself such authority, and could only conclude, "It comes close to arbitrary action and leaves much to be desired if the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is to have any meaning and purpose."[22]

The most astonishing development of the Senate hearing was the revelation that the executive vice president of the company, which, despite the fact its bid was seventh highest, was awarded the contract, had engaged in giving expensive gifts to Government procurement officials handling its business.[23]

After taking extensive testimony, the Sen-

---

[4] The original statute requiring advertising was passed in 1861 (Rev. Stat. 3709).

[5] *Scott* v. *U. S.* (44 Ct. Cl. 524, 527).

[6] *U. S.* v. *Purcell Co.* (249 U. S. 313, 318).

[7] 31 Comp. Gen. 279, 282.

[8] 41 U. S. C. A. 151, et seq.

[9] P. 530, hearing No. 51, February 4, 1947, House of Representatives, Subcommittee No. 6, Committee on Armed Services:

"By section 3 (b) the principles that contracts shall be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder * * * are reiterated."

See also Senate Report No. 571, July 16, 1947, 80th Cong., 2d sess.:

"Section 3 (b) states that contracts shall be wardeded to the lowest responsible bidder * * *. In virtually all cases this will result in an award to the lowest responsible bidder."

And in the same report:

"It (the act) restates the rules governing advertising."

During hearings in the House of Representatives (No. 51, subcommittee hearings on H. R. 1366, To Facilitate Procurement of Supplies and Services by the War and Navy Departments, and for Other Purposes, Subcommittee No. 6 of Committee on Armed Services, February 4, 1947) the following statement was made:

"Mr. VINSON. Is there any departure from the law today with reference to advertisements as set out in section 3? Are you following the same principles?

"Mr. HILL. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

"Mr. VINSON. There are no new standards in section 3 other than what has been in the law to date?

Mr. HILL. That is right."

[10] As defined by the Comptroller General of the United States (28 Comp. Gen. 662): "* * * while the term 'other factors' as thus used is not expressly defined it seems clear that such term was not intended to be given other than its customary or usual meaning, i. e., it comprehends such factors as an evaluation of the bidder's experience, reputation, financial stability, and ability to perform the contract."

[11] "The question as to whether a particular bidder is a responsible bidder is one of sound business judgment, depending upon evaluation of the bidder's experience, reputation, financial resources, and other factors." Page 431, subcommittee hearings on H. R. 1366, No. 51, Subcommittee No. 6, Committee on Armed Services, February 4, 1947.

[12] Senate Rept. No. 1092. Select Committee on Small Business, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 14; Senate Rept. 2070, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 13.

[13] The Government conceded as much, "No question has been raised * * * of the responsibility of the Heyer Co." Hearings, Senate Small Business Committee, March 5, 1953, p. 49.

[14] Senate Rept. 2070, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 13.

[15] (IFB) ORD. 20–113–52–2633, Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Detroit, Mich.

[16] It cost Heyer $7,000 to prepare the bid and sample. Senate Rept. 1092, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 17.

[17] S. Rept. 1092, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 15.

[18] The officer involved was Brig. Gen. Carroll H. Deitrick. See S. Rept. 1092, 83d Cong., 2d sess., p. 15.

[19] S. Rept. 1092, supra, p. 18.

[20] S. Rept. 1092, supra, p. 19.

[21] S. Rept. 1092, supra, p. 16.

[22] S. Rept. 1092, supra, p. 17.

[23] See pp. 38 and 76, transcript of hearings, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, Mar. 5, 1953. The vice president of the

ate committee concluded that Heyer should have been awarded the contract in the second case, as it should have in the first. If the act had been applied as intended by Congress the taxpayer would have been saved over $300 million. Just as importantly, the Heyer Co. would have obtained the contracts which it was legally entitled to have. Again, however, by the time the Senate investigation was completed, the contract had been completed by the high bidder and no practical remedy was available. The injustice was beyond correction. In the words of the Senate committee, "All in all, this is a shameful story." [24]

CONCLUSION

The Heyer case, as set forth above, is only important because, as the Senate committee pointed out, it is "symptomatic of the general situation existing * * *." [25] As suggested by the Heyer Co., the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 should be amended to prohibit the award of military procurement contracts to any but the low bidder unless a hearing is held at which the lowest bidder can appear and protest the award.[26] This would protect the taxpayer's purse by making the low bidder the watchdoy of the public interest. Certainly the Heyer case, as an example of what is happening, is warning enough that competitive bidding is no longer the rule in military procurement.

Weidenhoff Co. gave an Army employee a $50 watch.

[24] S. Rept. 1092, supra, p. 20.

[25] S. Rept. 1092, supra, p. 13.

[26] See p. 459, transcript of hearings, Senate Small Business Committee, March 5, 1953.

New Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in the January 6, 1956, issue of Collier's Weekly, there appeared an article entitled "Where Are Those New Roads?" written by Theodore H. White, an editor of Collier's Weekly, and incidentally the author of the very excellent book entitled "Fire in the Ashes," an analysis of the political situation in Western Europe in the 1940's, as it appeared to him.

The article about the roads makes an excellent case for the pressing need for a national system of interstate highways, and points out some of the difficulties which the President's program encountered in the last session of Congress. Mr. White suggests that another very strong attempt should be made to solve the great problem of our inadequate highway system.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. White may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing this article is $340. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD, notwithstanding the estimate of cost.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE ARE THOSE NEW ROADS?

(By Theodore H. White)

One year ago, in January 1955, the American people were invited by the President to embark on an adventure for which nothing in the history of man offered any precedent. It was, in name, a road-building program, but a road program of such stupendous engineering magnitude as to make the works of man in any other age seem almost aimless scratchings of the ground. It was a proposal to build such a system of roads in the United States as would make the Great Wall of China seem no more than a welt on the earth's surface and the pyramids of Egypt no more than warts. Calling for combined State-and-Federal road outlays of $101 billion over 10 years, President Eisenhower's highway program dwarfed any other enterprise ever undertaken or projected by our Government, with the sole exception of World War II.

Whatever became of it?

The great highway program of 1955 expired in the Congress of the United States. It died in an extraordinary convulsion of contending interests which paralyzed congressional action. Hardly a murmur, however, was heard from the ordinary motorist behind the wheel, although his interests are just as intimately, and far more tragically, involved inthe inadequacy of our present road net as the big battalions of open pressure.

In January 1956, the second session of the 84th Congress must again begin grappling with the problem of the Nation's highways, the slaughter and waste forced on us by a road system no longer able to match the needs of a growing country. Who will be heard from in 1956?

The highway battle will almost certainly explode in Congress in the same clash of interests (all, curiously enough, recorded in favor of better roads). Equally certain, it will end again in paralysis, unless the public bestirs itself as it did not during the great roadblock of 1955.

Deep somewhere in the origins of this new national highway program lurk the strains and nightmare fears of the average American motorist. Though historians of the future may someday write that the Americans were a race of killers who slaughtered one another in public places with the casual indifference of a tribe of rubber-wheeled Huns, the everyday carnage does not leave ordinary Americans unmoved. Daily, we mangle one another, ripping limb from limb, hurling two-ton missiles against the frail bodies of unprotected citizens, lacerating our nerves with instantaneous gambles on what may be approaching at the hidden corner or speeding down the other lane beyond the masking truck.

The current Christmas-New Year's holidays, for example, will suddenly terminate the lives of more than 1,000 Americans journeying happily by car. Last year we killed 36,000 citizens on our public roads and wounded or crippled 1,000,000 more. Since 1945, we have killed off as many Ameircans on our streets and highways as did Nazis, Japs and Communists on every field of battle of World War II and Korea combined. All this, moreover, will go on and on until we get highways of modern design. These, say the experts, can reduce our annual death toll by 25 to 35 percent, or save a staggering 10,000 American lives each year by engineering alone.

The great highway program of 1955, however, was proposed not so much out of pity and compassion as out of simple need.

We in America are stranglig on our own prosperity. Our country is approaching an age and level of development where the problems that face us are of a kind no other civilization has ever known before. We confront an entirely new order of anxities—and among the foremost of these is the problem of the automobile on our streets and highways.

For it is the automobile, as much as any other single phenomenon, that sets our way of life apart from the rest of the world. Everywhere else, common people have always been separated from their betters by the simple distinction of whether they walked or rode. In times past, people who rode were "cavaliers," hence aristocrats. In America today, every man is a cavalier.

Seventy million Americans—so says the American Automobile Association—take their annual vacation in the family car. Every year their appetite and their range of travel broadens so that, today, it is difficult to remember or recognize how fresh and novel even in our own country this revolutionary impulse is.

It was only yesterday—in 1911, the year that Dwight D. Eisenhower entered West Point—that a commercial automobile first managed the road trip from coast to coast. The expedition from Denver to Los Angeles alont took 66 days; tomorrow, if Dwight D. Eisenhower's road program becomes fact, that same trip will be little more than a weekend run.

Today, every perspective of our country and times leads us to believe that we are only at the beginning of the automobile age, the era of complete mobility. Today, we have an automobile industry that turns out 8,000,000 new vehicles a year. This industry has already equipped our highways with 61 million cars and trucks; in 10 years there will be some 81 million in use, and in another decade the total will be almost 100 million.

What makes these figures ache is their relationship to our roads. At the outbreak of the Second World War, we had about 3,300,000 miles of road in this country; since then we have added about 1 percent in new road mileage. The present length of our roads is almost permanently frozen. As we add new automobiles, the existing lanes must, therefore, be broadened continuously. Since the war, we have worked energetically but sporadically on bits of superhighway; but in the same period the number of vehicle-miles driven in this country has doubled, and even with the new roads our traffic lanes are totally inadequate. If, at present, every registered automobile in the country took the road at the same time, we would have one car spotted every 700 feet on every street, every country road, every lane of every highway. And in 20 years their numbers may nearly double. Now, to any American who has let his throttle out as he turned off the cloverleaf onto one of our great new superhighways, denunciation of these great lanes must seem like nonsense. We Americans are people who thrill to road building and engineering; each new overpass, each great split-lane seems to have added dimension to our power and imagination as individuals.

Our newest State highways—the majestic Ohio Turnpike, the crowded New Jersey Turnpike, the imperial New York Thruway—are superb thoroughfares, the best of all time. But they are only stumps and pieces of a highway net. They are not a system. They are built only in and through limited areas where the engineers gamble that the toll fees of normal driving will repay in precisely calculated and collectible sums the enormous investment of private bondholders. They are not enough, and they dump the traffic they collect on the outskirts of our big cities in chaos and confusion.

The real problem of road building in America is new, and peculiar to our kind of democracy. In a country where every man is equally privileged and equally mobile, no citizen can be prevented from using the roads when and how he wants—even if everyone wants to use them at the same time. And, just as the arteries of our blood must be prepared to handle the emergencies of physical exertion or let us die, so the arteries of our public communication must be able

to handle the convulsions of seasonal or weekly peaks in traffic or let anarchy prevail.

This is why our engineers figure that every highway must be designed to carry all normally predictable congestion (except for those 30 busiest hours of the year—the summer weekends and Labor Day and Fourth of July hegiras—whose peaks cannot be handled except by astronomic expenditures.) This is why, too, our highways must be designed to handle any legitimate truck load.

Our roads today, fine as they may feel under the tread of normal week-day traffic, no longer meet these standards. Certain sections of our Nation's choking road net are already killer belts—the Boston Post Road between New England and New York, the old Suicide Alley out of Baltimore to Washington which engineers call "Bloody One," the southern leg of the same U. S. 1 as it stretches down Florida from Jacksonville to Miami, the "Grapevine" along U. S. 99 dropping into California's San Joaquin Valley * * * these are already notorious murder lanes.

As fast as we build, we create traffic jams. The New Jersey Turnpike, opened in 1952, is already carrying a traffic load not predicted until the early 1980s. Already, even with its new avenues of access, New York City's approaches are so congested that on a summer Monday morning when returning weekenders mingle with the truck peak, the traffic backs up so fast at the mouth of the Holland Tunnel that an athlete, running as fast as he can, could not keep up with the tail of the jam once it begins to clot backward.

All this is costing incalculable sums of money. It costs us, in addition to the cold valuation of $4.3 billion annually in accidents, another $5 billion in wastage of labor time, gasoline, rubber and equipment. It literally costs less to ship a crate of apples all the way from Oregon to the Hudson River than to get it across the Hudson to New York's East Side.

This road shortage may finally, if war comes, cost us our national life. For none of the great metropolitan areas possesses anywhere near adequate road facilities to evacuate swiftly the more than 70 million people our Civil Defense authorities estimate will have to flee.

The crisis has been swelling for a long time. But up to now our highways and roads have been in the domain of State and local governments, with the Federal Government appropriating a modest annual sum to subsidize them in their work. Last year, finally, we arrived at a stage when it was obvious that the local resources and local programs could no longer meet what is now a national emergency. Which is why, 1 year and 3 months ago, Dwight D. Eisenhower asked a group of 5 distinguished citizens, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, to devise a program for meeting the crisis head on.

The Clay report that issued from their labors was hailed editorially almost unanimously, and in a few weeks, now renamed the President's highway program, was delivered to Congress for action. Whereupon nothing further happened except debate. For suddenly our lawmakers found themselves engaged, at the supreme level of national politics, with those forces and groups which have always, in every statehouse, made highway politics synonymous with bitterest controversy.

The Clay proposals were not, of course, born simply out of the amateur ruminations of a number of civic-minded gentlemen enthusiastically exploring our needs over a period of a few weeks. They were, as a matter of fact, only the polished form of a dream that had slowly been maturing in Washington for 20 years.

For Washington, among other things, is a city of dreamers. Among the boldest of these dreamers have always been the engineers of our Bureau of Public Roads. And the dreams that emerged in finished form in the Clay report were born at the Bureau in the darkness of the depression. At that time, some now unremembered Congressman pushed through Congress a resolution calling on the Bureau to scheme up a major road-building program to soak up depression unemployment. What the Congressman wanted, however, was a geometrical grid across the Nation—3 multilane highways running east to west, 3 more running north to south, all of them darting up hill and down dale, straight as an arrow, with little or no relationship to the needs of the country.

The engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads soon pointed out how phenomenally uneconomic and expensive such a grid would be. But they suggested an alternate plan, called the National System of Interstate Highways, which would be something entirely different. Through the years, the dream system gradually won official recognition. Franklin D. Roosevelt blessed it as a measure to pick up postwar economic slack; Congress, in 1947, formally made its map tracings official as the outline of our future in public communications.

The interstate system will be based on existing roads. In its improved form, as it lies on the planning boards of the engineers, it is still a dream—a spectacular in concrete, asphalt and steel. Forty thousand miles of multiple-lane highway, running between major cities, will stretch across the Nation in a road net distinguished from any previous conception of engineers in capacity, durability grandeur and sweep.

Men will be able to drive from New York to San Francisco, scarcely, if ever, slowing at a traffic light. Truckmen will grind on hour after hour, without shifting gear or slowing to the agony crawl of the upgrade. Passenger cars will sweep by them in other lanes without ever once having to poke their noses out into the perilous stream of opposing traffic. Hills will melt away and distances will evaporate.

Not only that. The interstate recognizes the tragic plight of our strangling big cities. It is the first serious plan to cleave through the tangled approaches of our great metropolitan areas and clear broad avenues of entrance and exit through the choking metropolitan jungle and its sprawling suburban fringes. Where our present new highways stop at city limits, the interstate will slice directly through the urban jungle of streets in spectacular expressways that will take people through the heart of metropolis and out to the open road on the other side. It will be a system.

The Clay program—the President's highway program—made the interstate system the crownpiece of a simple three-point program.

First, it proposed that the Federal Government raise some $25 billion to spend on the great interstate to finish it in 10 years—this sum to represent 90 percent of the total cost, the balance to be raised in the States. Thirteen billion of this would be spent on urban approaches alone. Where modern toll roads were up to the dream standards of the interstate—some 2,500 miles of such roads exist, mainly in the North—the States which had built them would be reimbursed.

Second, it proposed that current routine Federal appropriations for highway aid to secondary and feeder roads of the great Interstate be continued at $600 million a year, or slightly less than their present total.

Third, it proposed a way for paying for the great new Interstate—that the Federal Government would set up a Federal Highway Corporation which would sell $20 billion worth of bonds, the bonds to be paid for out of current gasoline taxes, which would bring in ever more income as the new roads were built. The bonds, it was estimated, would take 30 years to pay off.

It was this third proposal that triggered off the fight. For the politics of American highways has always been dominated by one overwhelming truth: everyone loves roads, but no one wants to pay for them.

Once the great highway program reached Congress last February, all the complications of this truth began to unfold. The 1955 battle of the highways, as fought in Congress, proceeded in three main stages, each illuminating a separate area of uncompromising conflict.

Both of the first two stages of battle unrolled in the Senate—and each had a partisan champion. One was the freshman Senator from Connecticut, PRESCOTT BUSH, an able and distinguished man making his mark for the first time upon the Senate and Nation in an issue of national significance. In the absence of senior Republican leadership, he emerged as the captain of the administration's road program to raise 20 billion Federal dollars immediately by bond issue, as proposed in the Clay program. The other was the freshman Senator from Tennessee, the shrewd and eloquent ALBERT GORE, who questioned not only the wisdom of so huge and inflexible a national commitment to roads, but, even more, the sweeping powers the Federal Government would arrogate under the Clay proposals over a domain that had always hitherto been under the States.

The first of the two Senate struggles raged over the bond-financing provisions of the administration's highway bill.

For 20 years the Senate had listened to Republicans denouncing Democrats as borrowers and spenders, recklessly saddling the Nation with debt and burden down through all the unborn generations of time. And the Democrats had always replied that this was a healthy, growing country whose children could well afford to pay for the benefits we, their fathers, were so wisely preparing for them.

Now the sides switched. The Republican bond corporation proposal, said the Democrats, was trickery, fraudulent evasion of the legal debt limit of the Nation. The bonds would eat up $11 billion of interest in addition to their principal; only bankers would profit.

It was as if, they implied, the huge $280 billion official national debt were about to spin off a satellite corporate debt into space, perhaps followed by others, until we had a whole constellation of satellite debts whirling about the economy, all exerting an irresistible inflationary pull.

"I for one," summed up Senator GORE, "think that the need for highways must be considered along with, and balanced with, the need for other programs, such as schools and hospitals. It doesn't make sense to me to segregate the highway problem by excluding highway expenditures from the budget and from the public debt. It doesn't make it any easier to pay for them. In my opinion, no financial legerdemain can isolate the highway expenditures or eliminate their impact upon our economy and upon the Treasury of the United States."

To all of which arguments, the Republicans replied as if the mantle of Franklin D. Roosevelt and all the ghosts of the New Deal had descended on them. Nothing great or creative is ever done, they said, unless one reasonably finances the present out of the future. This is what a homeowner does when he raises a mortgage or a new home, what a corporation does when it issues debentures for a new plant, what the Nation must do to finance expansion in time of need.

They argued that if money were available immediately, through the bonds, to build the system now, highway use would increase so rapidly that gasoline taxes would rise enough to pay off the entire debt burden within 30 years without a single extra tax. Roads would be built, said the Republicans—and it would be painless.

"The importance of the Interstate Highway System is so great that it has to be provided for now," said Senator BUSH, who led the Republican defense. "It must be completed within 10 years and must be put in effect as a whole, and not piecemeal * * * The plan contained in * * * the Clay bill * * * is a pay-as-you-use plan. Nobody who has been in business would say that it is not good business to borrow money to build productive assets. That is the only purpose of borrowing money in the field of commerce and industry. It should be likewise in Government."

The Senate gravely listened to both sides, then by a resounding 2-to-1 vote rejected the President's bond plan. It then turned to phase two of the fight—the argument over the alterative plan brought in by Senator GORE for the Democrats. The Gore bill was quite different from the President's original proposal. It carefully omitted any financing provision at all, thus dodging that fight; the money for the highways it proposed would be found, said its proponents, by the House—where, constitutionally, all bills taxing American citizens must arise.

Deep and basic to the thinking of the Gore bill were several convictions—that the secondary and country roads would be shortchanged if the Clay proposals for pouring money into the Interstate went through; that the Nation had too many other needs to commit itself irrevocably to so large a program at once; that control of the money it appropriated must rest with Congress, not with any centralized Federal agency.

Instead of biting off a 10-year chunk of the future, therefore, it limited its commitments to $7.7 billion over a 5-year period, after which Congress could take another look at the problem. Another $4.5 billion would go to the lesser local roads that would feed the interstate.

The Gore bill represented the best thinking of Senate Democratic leadership. And the Republicans, led by BUSH again, denounced this thinking as pitifully inadequate. It was a horse-and-buggy bill, they said, as they went on to open up another continuous area of American highway debate—the everlasting struggle between metropolitan and rural Americans about where and how roads should be built.

What the Republicans objected to most was the way the Gore bill shared the enormous funds for the Interstate among the individual States. The Clay proposal had advocated that $25 billion be spent by the highway corporation where needed—largely in the congested population centers of the north and east. But the Gore bill instead insisted that at least half the money be divided among the States by the traditional formula of highway aid.

This Congressional formula, first invented in the Road Act of 1916, still quaintly reflects the era of the model T Ford and the Stanley Steamer. By this old formula, all Federal highway aid is divided in thirds. One third is shared by States according to their population; another third is divided among States according to area; the final third is distributed in proportion to their mileage of rural free delivery routes. This, of course, penalizes the heavily congested States of the Midwest and the Northeast and favors the wide-open range and farming States.

Senator GORE said he did not want money appropriated by Congress to be cut up by anybody except Congress. "I just do not believe," he said later, "it would be consistent with the public interest to place this much authority in the hands of any one person. * * * As Gov. Hugh White, of Mississippi, has said, 'Those people in Washington might wake up with indigestion some morning and decide not to give my State any money.' I am confident that Congress . . . will never agree to make a permanent appropriation of such huge sums, with the money to go into a kitty to be doled out on the basis of what the Secretary of Commerce considers to be the needs of the various States."

The Republicans called the Gore bill a "blunderbuss bill." Said BUSH. "After he has read the analysis of the distribution of the fund, I will leave it to every Senator to say whether he does not agree that that is a good term to apply to the proposed legislation. The fact is that 30 States are given less than they say they need to complete the interstate system and 18 States are given far more than they need and more than they can use. I say [it] * * * scatters dollars and does not build roads where the roads are needed."

Once again, as debate rolled on, the Senate sat in witness of a switch. The Democrats, normally as sensitive as sandpapered skin to big-city votes, voted solidly for the bill. Republicans, normally suspicious of big-city needs, voted solidly against it. But the Democrats had the votes and the Gore bill passed. It passed, to be shelved almost immediately. For while the long hearings and debates had dragged on in the Senate through March, April, and May, the Members of the House had begun to draw up their own plan—the so-called Fallon bill.

Now the Fallon bill—named for Democratic Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, of Baltimore, a long-time road enthusiasm—was offered as a work of courage and forethought. Long before the Senate had finished consideration of the bills before it, House Democrats had decided that their road bill would be one of real statemanship—which is to say that since roads have to be paid for, they would undertake to find the money. The Democrats of the Public Works' Subcommittee drawing up the road bill conferred with SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker, who praised their inclination and then, in a total breach with House tradition, told them to go ahead and write the taxes themselves.

The Fallon bill accepted the dream plan of the Interstate System, and the continuing Federal support of lesser roads as embodied in the President's program, altering them chiefly by spreading out the expenditures over 13 years instead of 10. But it flatly rejected setting up any Federal corporation to borrow the money by bonds. Instead, it bracketed the appropriations it demanded with precise tax measures to meet them.

It insisted that the burden of paying for roads must fall most heavily on those who profit most by them. It called for raising the tax on every gallon of gasoline burned in our automobiles by an additional cent (at a cost to the average motorist of about $5.56 a year). Not only that. The architects of the Fallon bill were convinced that the ponderous, pounding heavy rigs of the trucking industry are the villains that beat our roads to bits. Consequently, they proposed that heavy trucks should pay a sort of supertax—a 50-cents-a-pound tax on every truck tire over 8.5 by 18, a special 4-cent tax on each gallon of fuel for the extremely heavy diesel trucks, a new and heavier excise tax on a new truck when purchased. Such taxes meant that the normal five-axle heavy rig would be hit by what the truckmen claimed would be an additional tax bill of some $1,031 in the first year.

Well before news of these tax provisions had leaked, however, and as soon as the House Democratic leadership had made known that its roads subcommittee was writing a pay-as-you-go tax bill, every economic interest in our country with any direct or remote connection with highways girded its loins for battle in a lobbying fray rarely matched in recent history. All of them wanted highways, but all believed their very survival hung on the way Congress chose to pay for them.

Under our system of government, lobbying is a clearly legitimate and constitutional right of every citizen and group. But it is up to Congress to weigh the legitimate pleas of every group against the common good, balance off their contentions and come up with a judgment. And rarely, if ever, has Congress been under greater pressure in making a judgment between the broad but diffuse needs of a common citizenry and the sharpened needs of men whose livelihood hung on their decisions.

Two giant camps soon developed in the struggle over the bill. One was led by the railways, supported by the American Automobile Association and backed by most of the State highway officials of the country. They supported the Fallon bill. In the other were the truckmen, the tire dealers, the independent oil dealers, the diesel manufacturers—led in the grand strategy of opposition by the truckmen.

It is easiest to begin the story of the fight over the Fallon bill with the story of the railwaymen. Now, the railways have an acute and continuing interest in highways. In modern America, truckmen and railwaymen have been as bitter and unforgiving enemies as sheepmen and cattlemen on the open range of Wyoming, 80 years ago. In the past 30 years the trucking industry has grown to be a giant that grosses over $5 billion a year for freight haulage (against the railways' $8 billion).

If the great interstate system goes through, with its near-level grades, its limited accesses, its numerous and heavy-paved lanes, the truckers—now engaged principally in short-run transport—will have a chance to gnaw away as successfully at the railways' long-haul freight business as the airlines have at the railways' long-haul passenger business, and the commuters' automobiles at their suburban passenger business.

Any kind of legislation on the interstate system thus placed the railways in a delicate position. They could not, in a nation that loves highways, simply come out and flatly denounce better roads. Yet they could scarcely watch with blithe unconcern as the Nation proposed to build this spectacular roadbed for their competitive rivals. They had to present their views skillfully—by supporting the highways the Nation wanted, yet making sure their competitive rivals, the truckers, gained no advantage out of them. Which, in essence, is why the railways threw all the influence they could behind the Fallon bill.

Robert S. Henry, who is a vice president of the Association of American Railroads in Washington and a cherubic old man with a twinkle in his eye, explained the railways' position to me thus:

"Highways? Why, of course we're in favor of good highways. But we want a sound highway program and any sound highway program has to include user charges—people who benefit from it should pay, and that's particularly true of people who use these facilities to carry on commercial business. We railways pay in taxes 11.9 cents of every dollar we take in; we pay 19.7 cents more of every dollar to maintain our roadbeds and tracks. The truckers pay only 7 cents of their dollar for taxes and they get their roadbeds free. That makes 31 cents out of our dollar against their 7 cents. That's just not fair—and that's why we think the Fallon bill is such a good bill."

Exactly how much influence the railways brought to bear in the drafting of the tax features of the Fallon bill no one knows. The American Trucking Associations, of course, holds the railways directly responsible for the taxing of big trucks. According to John Lawrence, ATA managing director, "They have intervened in the highway program, attempting to promote punitive taxes on big trucks which will cripple truck competition with their own freight operations. * * * Congressmen have evidence

of that on their desks in the form of a barrage of letters, wires, and calls inspired by railroad interests, and often indeed sent to their offices in railroad envelopes. No such railroad lobby has descended on Washington in the history of the Republic as that which is now operating in support of the soak-the-truck proposals. It is this wrecking crew which is mainly responsible for throwing the highway situation out of perspective."

This bitter statement must be balanced by other facts, for the truckmen, when they finally mobilized, easly matched the railway men in power and skill of influence. Their open bitterness reflects, mostly, the fact that the railways were informed of the tax measures on trucks weeks before the truckmen realized what was happening in committee. And by the time the truckmen had become aware of what was happening they found themselves trapped as if by political jujitsu.

The railways had already taken up the position of virtue; they were supporting the Fallon bill, the boldest highway program ever proposed. But the truckmen were faced with Hobson's choice. They could accept the Fallon bill, giving them the great interstate system they so desperately wanted—yet if they did so they would have to accept a tax burden on their industry which they claimed added another $375 million a year. Or they could elect to torpedo the Fallon bill and accept the blame for sabotaging the highway program.

The truckmen elected to mobilize against the bill. And their emergency mobilization dramatically outweighed anything the railways had previously been able to muster.

"Yes," says Walter Belson of the American Trucking Associations, "we had considerable influence in killing the Fallon bill. But don't confuse the Fallon bill with the highway program. We're not such stupid idiots as to be opposed to a road program we need as much as anyone else. We were about the first group to support the highway program from the beginning. We supported it before both Senate and House, we agreed to accept increased taxes to pay for it—we'll pay our fair share, the same tax rate on fuel, tires, and equipment everyone else pays. Don't misunderstand what this means in dollars. The same rate of tax will make the big truck pay five times as much as the average passenger car in gas tax every mile it runs, 18 times as much in tire tax and 13 times as much in equipment. This is not per company, but on every individual 5-axle truck owned as against a passenger vehicle. And our State taxes run up to 40 times as much per truck as per the average passenger car."

Desperately and doggedly, all through the months of June and July, the truckmen and their allies fought to pull the tax teeth from the Fallon bill. The committee members compromised with the truckmen by moderating their original bill until the additional diesel tax was lowered by 2 cents a gallon and the tax on large truck tires reduced from 50 cents a pound to 15 cents a pound. But the lawmakers could not be moved from their conviction that it was heavy trucks that profited most from the new roads, that heavy trucks required most of the extra-cost features of the roads—the wider lanes, the sturdier bridges, the pavings of 12 inches rather than the 6 or 8 that might handle normal passenger traffic. A principle was involved, they said—a user charge was being imposed for the first time on a Federal level and special users had to pay special taxes. The truckmen could not accept this principle.

By the time Congress got around to voting on the revised version of the Fallon bill at the end of July, the final push against the bill was operating in high. An array of eloquent interests had all convened on Capitol Hill to protest its tax features.

The diesel manufacturers implied their industry would be so hobbled that it might die, thereby jeopardizing the entire national-defense program, which requires diesel engines.

The big oil companies and big time companies protested, in the orthodox tradition, that they could not see why their products should be made into patricular and peculiar tax-collecting agencies of governments—as Robert H. Scholl, of Esso, speaking for the American Petroleum Institute, pointed out, State and Federal Governments were already collecting in taxes some 35 percent of what filling stations received for each gallon of gasoline.

Independent oil companies and independent tire jobbers protested at the taxes because, they said, it would manacle them in competition with the giants of the industry, whose capital structure could more easily afford to bear the amount of additional capital frozen into the inventory of every tire or oil outlet by the new taxes. Their lobbyists painted a somber picture before the Fallon committee of thousands and thousands of little businessmen squeezed out of business because they could not carry the taxes for their customers.

"I feel," said one of their spokesmen, "like I am representing a plucked chicken with two feathers left in his tail, and there is a hand reaching out for the last feathers."

Each of the trade associations joined in battle against the bill had roots in a thousand small towns and neighborhoods of America. Now these too began to be heard from in a lobbying campaign unmatched, say many Congresmen, since the days of the Taft-Hartley bill. Telegrams began to snow on Congress—an estimated 100,000 in all, 10,000 on Congressman FALLON'S desk alone.

The telegrams were accompanied by letters. They came not only on stiff white paper under the letterheads of great firms or associations but in the grease-stained handwritten letters that worry Congressmen much more—under letterheads of "Art's Filling Station," of "Alf's Friendly Service," of "Lone Star Sales and Service."

In the final days of the fray, the AFL Teamsters Union, perhaps the most powerful influence of all, got to work, as Dave Beck decided that his truckers should back up the truckmen who employed them. Dave Beck made a personal call on SAM RAYBURN to press the truckmen's point of view as that of the Teamsters Union, whose resources are so important to Democrats in doubtful congressional districts.

Some congressmen claim they could even trace a trucker's day at the wheel by following the date lines of telegrams that would arrive. A driver might send his first wire from, say, Philadelphia at eight in the morning, his second from Harrisburg two hours later, his third from Pittsburgh that afternoon, his fourth from Toledo in the early morning.

By the time, on the afternoon of July 27, that the final roll call on the Fallon bill took place, the House and its members were adrift under impulses and pressures they could not fathom. The drive against the bill was sharp, pointed and overwhelming; but the support for the bill, which should have come from the average motorist, was conspicuously absent.

Even though experts say that modern highways would save him $100 a year in car expenses, the average motorist was silent. Though Andrew Sordoni, the president of the American Automobile Association (himself a commercial truckman), told the House that his members supported the bill and would accept it, he could deliver few votes.

Some congressmen were deeply upset by the breach of tradition which had let a new committee write the taxes that had always previously been the sole prerogative of the august Ways and Means Committee. Even more important, many of them dimly sensed (and some were sharply informed) that the new bill, by increasing gasoline and tire taxes, was extending the taxing power of the federal government into the domain which the individual states had always considered as one of the reserved areas of their authority. Old-line State righters bridled.

And, finally, party discipline and control on both sides collapsed. The Fallon bill was a Democratic bill. SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker, convinced of his authority and prestige, felt certain down to the last minute that party discipline would rouse the necessary votes; when, at last, he realized it could not, it was too late to improvise the tactics or counterpressures to whip his errant Democrats into line.

The Republicans erred as badly. The White House, which had always wanted to pay for the roads by bond borrowing, came at the last minute to the conclusion that the Fallon pay-as-you-go measure was better than none. But by the time Sherman Adams had phoned this eleventh-hour decision to Republican Congressman DEWITT HYDE, of Maryland, voting had begun. By the time HYDE got the message to Republican floor leaders, a House colleague later recounted, the Republicans were voting almost solidly against the bill and it was too late to switch. By the resounding margin of 292 (mostly Republican) to 123 (mostly Democratic), the House had rejected the Fallon bill, and with it any hope of a start on the new highways in 1955.

What of the new session of Congress that opens in January? Will it give America any start on a modern highway system?

At this writing, it is certain that every Congressman will vie with his neighbor in his love, devotion and dedication to better highways. After all, 1956 is a Presidential year and neither major party wishes to be stuck, in the voter's mind, as the mossback outfit that was blind to this growing country's needs for better roads.

What kind of legislation we will get is, however, an open question—and one dependent more than anything else on the politicians' assessment of the public temper. It was the conspicuous silence of the average motorist in last year's Donnybrook that left Congress without that directional magnetic fielld by which it normally guides its actions among contending interests.

It would be naive to hold the big lobbies of Washington either solely or chiefly responsible for destroying a program the Nation needs by pursuing their legitimate, if individual, interests. True responsibility rests with Congress. This changing and dynamic country, in this age of vast physical and social transformation, needs an enormous range of expensive facilities without which it cannot thrive and for which everyone will have to pay.

The price tag on our growth will, when it is presented, be as high as anything else in this age of prosperity and somehow Congress must see to it that it is paid properly and justly.

It is this fundamental obligation of congressional judgment that—at present writing—the administration hopes to pinpoint in the coming months. A new highway program stands high on the list of administration priorities for 1956; indeed, in the first business visit permitted Sherman Adams at President Eisenhower's bedside in Denver, the highway program was one of the chief concerns of the ailing Chief Executive. Since then, the Cabinet has passed responsibility for a new approach on to the Department of Commerce. There, administration leaders have been trying to define their attitude toward all the complex problems involved, yet leave it to Congress to come up with a hard bill in terms of specifics.

On phase 1 of last year's battle (financing), the administration has decided to yield to the Democratic point of view in an effort

to get a program passed—it will not accept a pay-as-you-go measure in place of its original bond-financing proposal. But phase 1 was a partisan struggle that could be compromised, as it appears to have been now, by responsible party leaders. On phase 2 (the conflict of urban and rural needs) and phase 3 (the clash of rival transportation lobbies) unbridgeable differences of opinion seem to promise a new highway battle of 1956. In these phases, the differences cut through and across both major parties, for here Congress is struggling to decide on the shape of a new America which neither party sees clearly. In this struggle, the decisive voices will be those who understand the complicated issues best. But 1956 is an election year and the voices Congress aches most to hear are those of the voters. Do they understand? Will they make themselves heard? The kind of highways we get in 1956 and the years to follow depends on the answers.

PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM (DEFEATED)

1. The interstate system to be built within 10 years.

2. Price tag: $27 billion; $20 billion to be raised immediately by bonds of the Federal Highway Corporation. Money to be spent as needed to complete the system, the Federal Government paying 90 percent of the costs, or a total of $25 billion.

3. Routine Federal aid to the States for other lesser roads to be continued at something less than the present level, or approximately $600 million a year.

GORE BILL (PASSED IN SENATE ONLY)

1. The interstate program to begin with only a 5-year authorization; Congress to take another look in 5 years.

2. Price tag over the 5 years: $7.7 billion. Financing of this sum to be left to the decision of the House.

3. Routine Federal aid to other lesser roads to continue, but at a higher figure than at present, or approximately $800 million a year.

4. Half of all the money appropriated for the interstate to be shared by the traditional formula of State distribution, the other half to be distributed according to engineering costs.

FALLON BILL (DEFEATED)

1. The interstate system to be built within 13 years.

2. Price tag: $27 billion to be raised by immediate taxation. All motorists to pay 1 cent more a gallon on gasoline, heavy truckers to pay an additional 2 cents on a gallon of diesel fuel and an additional 10-cent tax per pound of rubber in tires, besides additional Federal excises on new trucks.

3. Routine Federal aid to lesser roads across the country, to start at the present level (approximately $725 million a year) and rise by $25 million each year.

Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with great regret that the pressure of personal affairs has led Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose to resign effective January 31, 1956. The administration is losing one of its most able members and the Nation a devoted public servant.

Mr. Rose came to Washington as Asistant Secretary of the Treasury in January 1953 and was appointed Under Secretary last July.

As Assistant Secretary, Mr. Rose supervised the operations of the Bureau of Customs, United States Coast Guard, Bureau of the Mint, United States Secret Service, Bureau of Narcotics, Information Service, and Law Enforcement within the Treasury Department.

As an Under Secretary, Mr. Rose has exercised general supervision over the Internal Revenue Service. In related activities Mr. Rose has represented the Treasury as a member of the Planning Board of the National Security Council and in the proceedings of the Defense Mobilization Board and the Air Coordinating Committee. In addition he has carried out many special assignments for the Treasury Secretary.

As Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and more recently as Under Secretary, Mr. Rose has worked closely with the Committee on Ways and Means on many important legislative matters. Throughout this association, Mr. Rose's great ability, his fine personality, his integrity, and his thorough knowledge of the intricate problems before us, earned for him the friendship and admiration of us all. I know that every Member of the House, irrespective of party, who has known or worked with Mr. Rose, shares these sentiments and joins with me in expressing to him our appreciation and gratitude for his splendid service to the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following copies of the exchange of letters between Under Secretary Rose and the Secretary of the Treasury and the President, relating to Mr. Rose's decision to return to private life:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
January 10, 1956.

The Honorable H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

DEAR CHAPPIE: As you so very well know, I hate to see you leave the Treasury. We are going to feel just lost around here without you. As you also know, I am fully aware of your personal situation and responsibilities, so that I know it is right for you to leave notwithstanding the great void you will leave here.

Your help to me personally right from the first day that I agreed to take this job has meant more to me than I can ever tell you. Nor can I ever adequately express my appreciation for it. You have made a tremendous contribution to the progress this administration has made in the fields of Treasury activity. Your selection of associates and chiefs for bureaus and divisions here in the Treasury leaves us with strength in many places to carry on, for which we will be continually grateful. You are entitled to the gratitude and admiration of the citizens of this country.

I speak for the entire personnel of the Treasury when I tell you: Thanks for all you have done and good luck to you in your return to private life. Come back occasionally to cheer us on our way.

Sincerely,

GEORGE.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
January 10, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This month will see the completion of my third year in the Treasury. When you asked me to come to Washington with you, it was understood between us that my stay could not be for an indefinite period. Both before you asked me to succeed Mr. Folsom when he took Mrs. Hobby's place as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and again in recent months we have discussed the longer range aspect of my personal situation and responsibilities which have made it increasingly necessary with the passage of time for me to bring my present tour of duty to an end. We have agreed that, with the President's return to Washington and the completion of the Treasury's initial part in preparing programs for presentation to the congressional session now beginning, this was the most convenient time for my resignation. Accordingly, I enclose it herewith, with the request that you transmit it to the President. In line with our discussion, I have asked that it become effective at the end of this month.

I am wholly unable to put into words the very deep regret I feel at leaving an assignment that has been more absorbing than any other I have ever had, or at interrupting my association with you and the group around you, which has been one of the warmest and most satisfying of my experience. I shall always be grateful to you for giving me the chance to help as much as I could in the magnificent work you have done and are doing for the country. You will of course let me know if there is anything further I can do at any time.

With warmest good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 10, 1956.

The Honorable H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Under Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROSE: I share the great regret of Secretary Humphrey in accepting your resignation as Under Secretary of the Treasury, effective January 31. However, I understand the personal responsibilities that make it necessary that you return to private life.

As you leave the Treasury, you have my personal appreciation of the fine contribution you have made during the past 3 years in furthering the objectives and daily work of this administration. You also have earned the thanks of the Nation for your counsel and assistance in a key role at the Treasury in helping to promote the growth and security of our country.

I appreciate very much your kind offer to serve in the future, in time of need, in such ways as you are able.

With my most earnest wishes for the greatest of success in your endeavors in private life, and with warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JANUARY 10, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For the reasons relating to my personal situation and responsibilities described in my enclosed letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, I must with great regret submit to you my resignation as Under Secretary of the Treasury. Subject to your approval, I should like to make it effective on January 31.

I cannot leave without expressing to you my very deep sense of appreciation of the privilege of serving under your inspiring leadership, and of helping in some small way to forward the great aims that you have formulated and are so effectively advancing. The past 3 years have been the most unforgettable experience of my life. I hope that you will call upon me if any situation arises in which I might be able to be of further service.

With great respect and every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE.

Atom No Immediate Threat to Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Plain Speaker, Hazelton, Pa., on Friday, January 6, 1956, which states that atomic energy will not threaten the coal industry's hold on the electric power market for at least 20 years:

SEE INCREASED DEMAND FOR COAL WITH ATOM NO IMMEDIATE THREAT

Atomic energy will not threaten the coal industry's grip on the electric power market for at least 20 years, and possibly never will Coal Age, McGraw-Hill publication states in its January issue, out this week.

The coal industry goes into 1956 gearing to meet the rapidly expanding power need of a fast-growing population and a steadily rising standard of living.

If the country's electric power needs are to be met in 1975, the publication states that annual coal use for power alone by that time must climb to 430 million tons. This will be 3 times current use for electric power and 43 percent of a projected billion-ton market for all coal uses in 1975.

Coal's grip on the 1975 power market is based on a prediction that the Nation will have to triple its generating capacity to 395 million kilowatts by that time. Of this amount, hydro plants will supply about 70 million kilowatts, and nuclear plants perhaps 40 million kilowatts. This leaves a big gap of 285 million kilowatts to be filled by fossil fuels, coal, oil and gas. And coal will retain at least its present 69 percent of the total fossil-fuel electric power market.

ATOMIC STARDUST

The following factors cut through the atomic stardust clouding the real impact of atomic power on the coal industry, according to the magazine:

1. The amount of nuclear power likely to enter the commercial market during the next decade is virtually negligible. But present development programs, if and when they solve the knotty problems involved, could provide the springboard to greater quantities of nuclear power later.

2. No true picture of nuclear power costs exist now. Even when such becomes available, perhaps 10 to 15 years hence, the prospect is slim that nuclear power will be cheaper than fossil-fuel power. The best bets for use will be in high-cost fuel or power-short areas.

3. Utilities have joined reactor-development programs to insure ample supplies of fuel to meet the country's long-range power needs. They cannot afford to pass up a supplementary heat source, particularly when talk persists about possible depletion of oil and gas reserves.

4. The critical period for evaluation of nuclear power should come during 1956 to 1970. And what the coal and other fossil-fuel industries do between now and then to fortify their competitive position will be the biggest factor in determining if and how far nuclear power spreads after 1970.

COAL HAS ADVANTAGES

5. In improving its competitive position, coal, compared to gas and oil, has unique advantages in its huge backlog of reserves and in its big potential for reducing mining and delivery costs.

6. Atomic energy may never be competitive with coal and other fossil fuels. An increasing number of analysts see the country's energy demands rising to such magnitude that there will be (a) more energy tasks than fuel supplies, and (b) increasing use; specialization and mutual dependence among all fuels.

Since atomic energy is virtually a freightless fuel, the publication urges the coal industry to put special emphasis on developing new methods or substitutes for transporting coal. Overland pipelines, coal gasification, and the location of industrial plants near mines are cited by the magazine as examples of ways that coal can minimize nuclear power's transport advantage.

Classics of American Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include an article by Van Allen Bradley, literary editor of the Daily News. The editorial from the Chicago Daily News of January 10, 1956, follows:

CONGRESS URGED TO OFFSET RED LEAD—OPEN NEW DRIVE TO SPREAD DEMOCRATIC IDEAS BY BOOKS—LEADERS OF OPINION BACK O'HARA PROGRAM ABROAD

(By Van Allen Bradley)

Armed with endorsements from leaders of opinion in many fields of American life, Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Democrat, of Chicago's second district, is opening a new congressional drive in Washington this week to spread the basic books of democratic political theory around the world.

His immediate goal is enabling legislation to direct the cast United States Information Agency to publish a small library of the democratic classics in the world's principal languages and to distribute them in inexpensive editions in areas where they are not available.

The aim of such an effort would be to counted the heavily subsidized worldwide book distribution program of Communist Russia.

An attempt to get such a project under way was made by O'HARA last year and reported on last June 6 in an extensive article on this page entitled "United States Losing Battle of Books."

The article, based in part on reports from the worldwide Chicago Daily News Foreign Service, disclosed the extent to which the United States is lagging behind Russia in the battle of the books.

It also told of the studies made by a group of Chicagoans interested in combating the flood of Red literature in the uncommitted countries and of O'HARA's espousement of their cause.

The proponents of the plan include Dr. Harold Fey, editor of the Christian Century; Drs. Richard McKeon and Jerome Kerwin, of the University of Chicago; Emery T. Filbey, vice president emeritus at the university; John McGinnis, president of Pennsylvania Lodge No. 225 of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen; Thomas B. Stauffer, instructor in the humanities at Wilson Junior College, and Leland G. Stauber, an undergraduate student at the university.

Between the congressional sessions, O'HARA and the Chicago group mailed to 3,500 representative leaders of American life and thought an outline of their book program and a tentative list of books to be included.

The suggested works included:

Bryce, The American Commonwealth and Modern Democracies; Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France; Dewey, The Public and Its Problems; Emerson, moral and political essays (which?); Hamilton and Madison, The Federalist; Hand, The Spirit of Liberty.

Also, Von Humboldt, The Sphere and Duties of Government; Jefferson, selected writings; Locke, Letters on Toleration and On Civil Government, Book II; Mazzini, The Duties of Man; Mill, On Liberty and Representative Government; Rousseau, The Social Contract; Thoreau, Walden and Civil Disobedience; De Tocqueville, Democracy in America, and Wilson, The New Freedom.

O'HARA and the Chicago group point out that Russia floods the world's book markets with cheap editions of Marx, Lenin, and other classic Communist philosophers.

The United States book translation program, on the other hand, includes only a little of Jefferson and selections from The Federalist as representative of the basic philosophy on which the American concept of freedom is built.

The enthusiastic response to the program as presented by O'HARA in his mailing has been described by the Congressman as "astonishing."

Among the comments, which will shortly be presented to a congressional committee, are the following, excerpted in most cases from longer messages:

Ralph R. Shaw, Rutgers University, president-elect of the American Library Association: "I think the idea is exceedingly important. There is little question that these would be well received if subsidized to sell at a competitive price in the local bookstores in foreign lands.

"Everyone I know who has looked at bookstands in troubled areas of the Middle East and Far East, in particular, reports finding beautifully produced and inexpensive editions of Russian materials in the local languages in all the bookstores, but substantially none of the classics of our way of life."

Cass Canfield, chairman of the board, Harper & Bros., book publishers: "It seems to me that your objective is an important one, and I would very much like to see your plan carried out."

Erwin D. Canham, editor, Christian Science Monitor: "As you may know, I am thoroughly in favor of a project to translate and publish in the most useful foreign languages a group of our basic documents * * *. I very much hope a practical outcome for this project may be achieved."

G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop of the Methodist church, Washington: "I think your proposal an excellent one. I have believed for a long time that we have been remiss in not making available at a reasonable price the basic statements of democratic philosophy."

Lynn U. Stambaugh, past national commander, American Legion: "I certainly feel that dissemination of the type of works described would be of considerable benefit, assuming that they are not already available in other countries of the world."

Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary, United Nations: "Your plan strikes me as very worthy. The suggested list of books is a good selection which, I think, is representative of the best in democratic thought."

J. R. Wiggins, executive editor, Washington Post: "I know nothing about the practical aspects of this problem, but I should think it would be extremely valuable to have available, in many languages, the books you list."

William R. Baker, Jr., chairman of the board, Benton & Bowles, New York advertis-

ing agency: "I am completely in favor of this plan for presenting to the world a truer picture of our fundamental democratic ideals and culture."

Rabbi Herbert A. Friedman, executive vice chairman, United Jewish Appeal: "I think it is a splendid idea. I have traveled abroad enough to know that such a thing as this is terribly important and valuable."

Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, New York: "I think it is a wonderful idea * * * To make it valuable, however, in competing with the Russians we will have to give them some modern statements that apply to contemporary situations."

Gardner Cowles, publisher and editor, Look magazine: "I favor the plan. * * * I think this plan should be tried in a few selected areas at least, and then later expanded if the demand for these books proves to be large."

E. E. Phelps, educational director, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, CIO: "I think your suggested plan * * * is excellent. * * * Within the last 5 years I have spent nearly 18 months in the various countries of free Europe. In many countries people do considerable reading, and the response to books on political science is always in evidence."

Ben Hibbs, editor, Saturday Evening Post: "The plan strikes me as a good one, and I endorse it most heartily. * * * The list of books which you enclosed seems admirable."

H. W. Prentis, Jr., chairman of the board, Armstrong Cork Co., and chairman of the international relations committee of the National Association of Manufacturers: "Excellent. * * * I am very glad that you have undertaken this project and I sincerely hope that you will be successful in getting the enabling legislation through Congress."

Many of the letter writers offered further book titles for inclusion on the list. Some criticized some of the titles as being on the heavy side. Only a very small percentage expressed any doubt as to the basic soundness of the proposals, O'Hara said.

Industrial Pirating—The Luring of Plants to New Locations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, shortly following the adjournment of the last session of Congress an important report was submitted to the executive council of the American Federation of Labor by the subcommittee on migration and subsidization of the AFL's national legislative committee. The documented report deals with the subject of industrial pirating of established industrial plants, which has resulted in serious economic distress in many areas of the country. Since many Members had already left Washington before the report was released, I would like to call attention to this continuing problem by including the statement of the AFL summarizing this report and recommendations.

The statement follows:

The American Federation of Labor has made public a documented report on one of the Nation's growing economic headaches—the pirating of industrial plants from established locations and the resulting spread of blight and unemployment in abandoned areas.

Submitted to the executive council of the AFL, which meets in Chicago, the report recommends a four-point legislative program to cope with the problem, including a sweeping investigation by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report. The other recommendations are:

1. That Federal income-tax exemption should be lifted from municipal bonds issued to finance industrial construction, and that firms enjoying subsidized rentals be required by legislation to disallow as business expense an amount equal to the reasonable full rental value of the facilities provided.

2. That steps be taken, by increasing the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, by amending the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act and by the enactment of effective State minimum wage laws, to reduce and gradually eliminate wage differentials existing between various sections of the country.

3. That other unwarranted differentials in labor standards among the States be eliminated by enactment of nationwide unemployment compensation standards, by repeal of section 14 (b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, by also repealing State right-to-work laws and by denying Government contracts to firms found in violation of orders of the National Labor Relations Board.

The report concluded that "the ruthless manner in which industrial firms have abandoned their employees in a particular location in order to establish operations at another site has seriously jeopardized the welfare of American workers."

It found that in many instances such moves have resulted not so much from the cost problems of continuing operation in existing plants, but because of special financial inductments offered by a different community together with other lures such as antiunion restrictions, low wages, and inferior working conditions.

"These are not the ingredients of lasting prosperity for any section of the country," the report said. "Certainly elimination or correction of the legislation which fosters regional competition based on such factors would be greatly in the national interest."

The recommendations for legislative action were submitted to the executive council by the subcommittee on migration and subsidization of the AFL's national legislative committee on the basis of a detailed report on industrial migration since the end of World War II prepared by the AFL department of research. The entire document is included in an 85-page pamphlet entitled "Subsidized Industrial Migration—the Luring of Plants to New Locations."

AFL President George Meany, in a foreword to the pamphlet declared:

"This report simply presents the facts. It is not motivated by bias against any particular section of the country.

"It is my hope that this report will serve to focus necessary attention on this disturbing development in our economy, and will help develop effective action to protect American workers against this growing menace."

The report declared industrial migration, largely from New England and Middle Atlantic States to the South, "represents a phenomenon that has developed with increasing intensity during the past 7 years" and that much of the migration "has not been based on traditional economic reasons * * * it has occurred as a result of various types of financial subsidies offered with the specific objective of prying firms loose from their existing plant locations to settle in new communities."

The report includes a listing of communities that have offered financial and other inducements, firms that moved their locations and examples of the letters and advertising material offering special inducements to northern plants.

Of vital importance to labor is another type of lure—substandard wage rates, a submissive work force, antiunion and low-standard State labor legislation and an atmosphere openly hostile to unionism.

"Each of these," the report said, "provides just as much a financial subsidy as outright tax concessions or the free construction of a new plant. To some short-sighted firms lower wages, fewer fringe benefits, and an absence of unionism may prove more attractive than the savings which result from the construction without cost of a new plant."

In four specific manufacturing industries examined in the report—textile, apparel, furniture, and paper—older manufacturing regions have lost ground to the South and the Pacific States. The report declared the shift to the Pacific represents a natural growth but a goodly part of the shift to the South results from special subsidies.

"In no way has this study been prepared with any bias or animosity against the South or against southern industry," the pamphlet said. "It is merely a simple fact that these subsidies have largely been offered in the Southern States."

The raiding of established communities for their industry involves far more than regional and local consideration, the pamphlet said. "It is a problem which has now gone beyond the bounds of a single State or section of the country. It demands national attention and a national solution."

The subcommittee which submitted the legislative recommendations is composed of Chairman Arthur G. McDowell, upholsterers; Francis J. Gorman, textile workers; William A. Leader, hosiery workers; George R. Nelson, machinists; and George D. Riley, AFL National Legislative Committee.

Benjamin Franklin—Godfather of Our Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial printed in the East Side News, a publication widely read in my congressional district, entitled "Benjamin Franklin—Godfather of Our Country":

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—GODFATHER OF OUR COUNTRY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Benjamin Franklin—a crown would have lost its splendor upon his brow, for it was adorned with the wreath of freedom. On January 13 America will celebrate his birthday. America clasps his hand in loving memory. He was the godfather of our country.

His name is a sound whose charm was borrowed from his thoughts and deeds that gave it immortality. No high-raised marble marks his birthplace. No pilgrims kneel before his dust or offer incense on his golden shrine. His life is one of the world's treasures.

In whatever light we contemplate his character, it is full of instruction. In whatever attitude we survey him, it is a beautiful picture—noble and majestic. He was the

father of the American commonwealth. He was the incarnation of our democracy. He was the master builder.

Franklin stands second only to George Washington in the list of the heroic personalities of our Nation. He was a member of the Continental Congress. He was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was a framer of the United States Constitution. To have been so closely associated with both of these sacred documents is equal in our history to the highest pattern of nobility.

The world was his school. Necessity was his teacher. Franklin rose from nothing. He owed nothing to parentage or orphanage. He enjoyed no early education, but he lived to stand before kings. He died to leave a name bathed in the hale of immortality. He never wasted time and time never wasted him.

He won his place in the front ranks of the world's scientists and diplomats, of the world's statement and men of letters. He knew how to stand humbly and happily alike on the lowliest ground of obscurity and of the loftiest pinnacle of fame. His writings are still widely read after two centuries. His utterances are engraved in our hearts as it is stamped on his soul. They are known around the world. They are the passports to posterity.

We may not be able to achieve his greatness, but we may strive to imitate his goodness. Franklin's great genius may fade away before a more splendid luminary; his philosophy may be lost in the brighter achievements of future discovery, but his labors as a patriot, in the establishment of free institutions, have enrolled his name with that bright galaxy whose sainted memory no time will dim.

What a glorious legacy to the youth of America is the history of his unequaled patriotism, of his faith and firmness and of his self-sacrifice in the service of humanity. Let young and old read his writings. Let us all refresh our minds with the recollections of his wise maxims and of his virtuous deeds.

May his spirit shield us from foreign isms. May his spirit shelter us from oppression. May his spirit preserve inviolate our liberty and the glories of our Americanism.

Highway Deaths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following articles: "The Passing Scene," from the Talladega Daily Home, December 29, 1955, and an editorial which appeared in the Selma Times-Journal, December 29, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and horrified by the number of unnecessary lives the American public is sacrificing upon its highways. This recent Christmas 3-day weekend took its bloodiest toll, a total of 609 lives. The previous record was held by the 4-day Christmas holiday in 1952 which ended 556 lives. I am concerned that a country which considers itself highly civilized would continue to indulge in such mass suicide. I hope that the public seeing these statistics will slow down and live instead of speeding into the arms of death.

The articles follow:

[From the Talladega Daily Home of December 29, 1955]

PASSING SCENE

(By J. L. Wallis)

AMERICA'S DEMON GOD, SPEED

American motorists have used the most sacred season of the year, a time of peace and love for their fellowman ,to comimt wholesale murder on the highways of the Nation. We wonder if these useless deaths would not come under the classification of premeditated murder. The National Safety Council told the public that some 560 citizens would most likely be killed during the Christmas holidays by automobiles.

With this warning, the car drivers of the United States went forth and killed over 600 good citizens, and set new records for holiday slaughter. If some foreign enemy had killed so many innocent Americans, this powerful Nation would most likely have gone to war over the murderous insult. Will anything be done to avenge the holiday dead, or to prevent more innocent people from the same bloody, crashing death? If the future can be judged from the past, we all know that little if anything will be done to correct the disgraceful situation. At least, there is no indication that any real action will be taken to halt the growing highway death lists at this time.

Car manufacturers can not be blamed, for they only build machines which are demanded by the great American public. The highway builders work for the American taxpayers to build the thoroughfares. However, when the death toll grows and grows with no end in sight, it seems that someone is to blame.

We like to think of ourselves as being the highest civilized people in all history, but, are we? We consider the pagan tribes as being savages, when we study their rites, in which they sacrificed human lives to appease their heathen gods. Yet we, to satisfy the urge of the demon god, speed, sacrifice far more thousands of human beings every year, than did any pagan tribe. We seem to worship a most cruel god, one that no amount of human blood can appease. That god, without any question, is speed.

Speed, more and more speed, uncontrolled speed is the killer. Two parked, motionless vehicles have never been known to cause fatal accidents. There are many causes for death-dealing speed. Alcohol often figures prominently as a cause, but pure rank carelessness can create as much deathly speed. Proper law enforcement, heavy court sentences for traffic law violators will aid in cutting down speed, but the deep concern of the entire American public is needed before any real solution can be found.

Car manufacturers are beginning to stress safety features in the new cars. Unless some way is devised to make automobiles safer, the time will come and probably soon, when people who do not want to die will shun the bloody highways and high-powered automobiles. Automobiles can be built safer, if the public will stop demanding power and speed. Unless something is done, it must be expected, that sooner or later, Federal legislation requiring governors and some devices to hold down automobile speeds will be required by Federal law.

All of us who have driven the highways know that many motorists, and trucks as as well, maintain high speeds far above the legal limits. We also know of glaring traffic violations which can and often do cause split-second deaths. If our legal processes cannot bring some sane and sober practices to our highways, then it will become necessary to take the means of creating the death dealing speeds from the hands of those who use it to kill themselves and others who are innocent.

Surely most all Americans regret the terrible slaughter that continues on our highways unabated. The death toll is terrible. Thousands of hospital beds are constantly filled with the crippled, maimed, and injured. The suffering is endless all because of the careless excessive speeds on our highways. The property damage runs into the hundreds of millions.

Most thinking Americans, further know that something can be done to stop the slaughter and devastation. It is beyond explanation why the public is so apathetically calm in face of this growing catastrophe. Of course, an aroused public opinion can bring an end to this mounting highway disaster.

There has already been new record highway death forecasts for the New Year's weekend. It seems it is far past time for Americans to do something to make our highways safe. The blame rests solidly on all of us until firm action is taken by the people in this Nation to stop our sacrifices to the demon god—speed.

[From the Selma Times-Journal of December 29, 1955]

DRASTIC MEASURES

American motorists, who persist in killing themselves at a record rate on almost any or every occasion, may be inviting traffic controls as dictatorial as can be imposed in a free country.

Consider, for instance, Illinois Gov. William G. Stratton's reaction to news that his State led the Nation in Christmas holiday highway deaths.

He said he may use National Guard troops to help patrol highways over the New Year holiday weekend as a means of forcing safety practices.

At Chicago, Mayor Richard Daley said he was studying plans for setting up roadblocks so police could make spot checks for drunk drivers.

These precautions would be drastic, but they are justified by the growing toll of traffic deaths. When free people let loose in powerful motor vehicles are unable to avoid maiming and killing, methods should be devised to control them.

Help Farmers, Not Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News of January 4, 1956. This editorial is a very fine tribute to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and his program for solving the farm problem.

The editorial follows:

HELP FARMERS, NOT POLITICIANS

With the 2d session of the 84th Congress now started, both Republican and Democratic leaders agree the farm issue is foremost.

It would be fine if the agreement could extend into solutions. This situation needs a better treatment than election-year politics.

Objective consideration breaks down the farm problem into three parts:

1. Produce prices are below what they should be because the very presence of huge surpluses depresses them.

2. Things the farmer buys have gone up in price.

3. The "big company farmer" has been getting Government assistance all out of proportion to that given the little producer.

If Congress could only restrain politics long enough to keep its eye on getting these wrongs righted, everybody would benefit.

Since the government is the big holder of the food surpluses it ought, first, to get rid of what it has. Indiana's Senator CAPEHART rightly says farm income will never rise until the Government gets rid of its $7 billion hoard. He advocates channeling this into consumption by the needy both abroad and at home. That sounds sensible.

Return to high-rigid 90 percent Government price supports would only cause more unwanted production and depress prices further.

The only logical way to cut production is to take acres out of production. To date, the most feasible plan suggested to get that done, without penalizing the farmer, is the soil-bank plan supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation. If that idea catches on in Congress, it should be thoroughly safeguarded to prevent the government from fastening anything like permanent control over farm acreage. That could lead to collectivization after the Soviet pattern.

The disparity between the price the farmer gets and that the consumer has to pay for the same food has a direct bearing on the gap between what the farmer gets and what he has to pay for machinery and clothing. Added costs of services are blamed. Congress should inquire into which of the services are genuine and which are profit featherbedding.

Farm supports, as to price, should be kept flexible. But that does not mean that there should not be a major change in farm policy. That shift should be toward helping the little farmer instead of the big commercial farmer.

Taken together, these measures would tend to solve the farm problem on a national, not a partisan, basis. After all, that is the smartest politics for Congressmen.

Retirement of Tom Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of retirement of a good friend always brings a tinge of sadness to me, and when I read that Tom Spellman was retiring from the position which he has held for 30 years, my reaction was that it could not be true.

Tom has been my good friend for many years, and I know that the veteran has no greater champion than Tom Spellman, for many is the veteran whom Tom has helped over the years.

Always interested in his community, his time and his talents were always available for any community project. Tom has been the friend and adviser of many people prominent in the State of Minnesota and his friendship extends across political lines.

In the Hastings Gazette of January 5, 1956, under the byline of Bob Bradt, is an excellent and factual tribute to Tom Spellman which I am happy to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

GENIAL LINOTYPER SAYS "30"—TOM SPELLMAN, ON GAZETTE STAFF 30 YEARS, RETIRES

(The following tribute to a person well-known not only to thousands of persons in this area, but throughout the State and Nation as a devoted promoter of all that is humanitarian and right to be done, is penned by Robert Bradt, former city editor of the Hastings (Minn.) Gazette, who joined the newspaper shortly after 1925. Mr. Bradt, noted in his way for a brilliance in writing, accuracy in observing, and a pungency in statement said in a letter to this newspaper that "writing becomes a little more difficult with the passing of years," but he seems to have still a curve or two left that he can throw, and he has done pretty well. Mr. Bradt holds a responsible position with the State Railroad and Warehouse Commission in Duluth, Minn.)

(By Bob Bradt)

To most newspaper men, "30" means another edition is ready for the press.

To a genial, red-headed linotype operator at the office of the Hastings Gazette it means much more than that this week, December 29, 1955. It means his last edition is ready to roll. It means the end of the line after 30 years of enviable service to his newspaper and his community.

In Tom Spellman's case it can truthfully be said that a lot of water has gone over the dam since he and his bride, the former Vivian Smith of Minneapolis, first came to Hastings in 1925. As a matter of fact, there was no dam here when he walked into the office of the Gazette, then published by the late S. W. Isham, to take up his duties as linotype operator. It was a much smaller news and printing plant in those days than it is now. But, for that matter, Hastings was also a much smaller community.

In his 30 years, Tom has seen the Gazette grow from a 4- or 8-page country weekly with limited equipment to the flourishing 16- to 24-page editions which the present publisher, Frank A. Muirhead, is now presenting to his readers. He has seen the construction of a $3 million dam here; the replacement of the historic Hastings spiral bridge with a modern one, and the arrival of many new industries and an entire new generation of citizens.

But it has not been in the role of an idle bystander that Tom Spellman has watched this transformation. Perhaps no other citizen of Hastings has given so of his time and energy to civic development for so little personal reward.

It was Tom Spellman who played the leading role in the organization of Lyle Russell Post No. 1210 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in 1927. It was he who helped to secure such civic improvements as the beautiful Memorial Park and Todd Field and to organize a home defense company here during World War II and an active and influential Kiwanis Club in later years. And it was Tom Spellman who conceived the idea of an annual Eminent Citizen award in Hastings and has made this an event of wide and impressive significance.

These are but a few of the civic services this impulsive red-headed friend of yours and mine has given to the city of his adoption. Even greater has been his contribution to the personal welfare of his friends and neighbors.

Wherever there has been sickness or hardship in a family he knew, Tom has been one of the first to volunteer his help and encouragement. Wherever there has been tragedy, he has done his best to comfort those affected. Countless Hastings veterans of both World Wars, and their families, are indebted to him personally for getting prompt hospital attention or recognition of their compensation claims. Countless other Hastings citizens have benefited, to some degree, from his intensely human philosophy and kindness of heart.

In his acquaintance and friendship with eminent Minnesotans, Tom Spellman has few if any rivals in Hastings. He has had access to, and a personal acquaintance with, nearly every governor of Minnesota for the past three decades. On many occasions he has been instrumental in bringing the State's chief executive to Hastings for some outstanding civic event.

He was an intimate friend of the late "Larry Ho" Hodgson, illustrious Minnesota statesman and writer. He has been a lifelong friend of former Gov. Luther Youngdahl, of Minnesota, now a United States Federal judge in Washington, D. C.

JUDGE YOUNGDAHL'S TRIBUTE

"I know of no private citizen who has labored more unselfishly for others than has Tom Spellman. Without fanfare or desire for publicity, he has given of himself to help his fellow man. I am proud to consider him one of my best friends.

"His reward will come from his satisfaction of knowing in retirement that he has been a friend to man. What Edwin Markham has said aptly applies to Tom Spellman:

'"There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
None goes his way alone;
All that we send into the lives of others
Comes back into our own.'

"LUTHER YOUNGDAHL."

Besides these eminent Minnesotans, Tom has had the respect and friendship for many years of such outstanding statesmen and public officials as Senator Hubert Humphrey, Congressmen August H. Andresen and Joseph O'Hara, State railroad and warehouse commissioner Hjalmer Peterson, and many, many others. He is one of those rare individuals among us who can claim long and lasting friendships in both political parties. And this is only because men of both political parties have long realized that it is not for himself that Tom Spellman has played so active a part in politics. It is because, through political avenues, he could best be of service to his fellow veterans and friends who might be in need of assistance. Seldom, if ever, has he asked a purely personal favor of any public official.

It is possible, following his retirement, that Tom may leave Hastings. Whether he does or not, he should have a standing ovation from this community to which he has given so much, and of which he has asked so little, in 30 years.

And sometimes, when a candidate for the title of Hastings' most eminent citizen is being considered, the name of Tom Spellman should be first on the list. For if any man has richly earned this recognition from his fellow townsmen, that man is a hustling and intensely human linotype operator by the name of Thomas L. Spellman.

Address of Hon. Carmine G. De Sapio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the address delivered by the secretary of state of New York, the Honorable Carmine G. De Sapio, on the occasion of the National Press Club luncheon in Washington on November 30, 1955.

Mr. De Sapio is one of this country's outstanding Democratic leaders. In addition to his position as secretary of state for the great State of New York, he is also the Democratic national committeeman from New York, as well as Democratic leader of the county of New York.

Those of us who were privileged to attend the luncheon and hear Mr. De Sapio were much impressed by his remarks. I commend them to the Members of this body.

The address follows:

Senator SPARKMAN, Governor Hogg, Congressmen, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure for me to visit with the members of the National Press Club and I very much appreciate this opportunity to join you today. I always enjoy my visits to Washington. It is such a beautiful city, so alive with the pulse of history. And the good Lord and the American voters willing, I hope to have occasion to visit here much more frequently in the period commencing January 20, 1957.

Now I know that you ladies and gentlemen of the working press are in the business of gathering news. I don't know what particular contribution I can make in this direction today, but it occurs to me that one question has proven to be quite newsworthy during the past 3 years and particularly in the last 48 hours—the question of security risks. So I would like to talk to you about what I consider to be the greatest security risk in our Nation, the hazard which is posed by governmental hypocrisy.

It is very easy to equate issues with slogans, and with ominous and dire sounding admonitions. It takes very little effort, for example, for Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, to charge the American labor leaders with "using violence and coercion in a conspiracy of national proportions aimed at controlling the 1956 election results."

And I suppose it was just as easy for Frederick C. Crawford, the national chairman of the soon-to-be-held, salute to Eisenhower dinners, to compare these same labor leaders with what he called the minority which installed the Nazi Party in power in Germany. He observed, and I quote him, "the Nazi rise developed at about the same time that labor was becoming a potent political force in this country."

It takes very little energy—and certainly even less thoughtfulness—for the Vice President of the United States to label as "demagogues" those Americans who express concern with the fact that our farmers face an awesome depression.

And I suppose that the words, "peace and prosperity" can be made to roll off the tongue and the printing press with the same alacrity and ease with which Geneva was cited to us just a few short weeks ago by the Secretary of State, who declared: "I can say with confidence that the conference was a good conference. We went there with limited objectives and we achieved them all and perhaps a little more."

It isn't very difficult—in the name of security—to impose a news blackout on the operations of Government. Nor is it at all hard to challenge the patriotism of those citizens who presume to exercise their right to question the actions of public officials.

I think we can all agree that it takes no great genius to give expression to the illusion that the operation of our Government by a clique of industrial giants makes for greater efficiency, and even I will admit that in a free America, anyone is entitled to the opinion that what is good for General Motors, is good for the country.

But to me, my friends, all of this evidences a desperate, but happily, a futile attempt to retain and perpetuate power by deluding and confusing the American people.

This is a real—a very real—security risk.

Our Nation is a strong, a great and a powerful country. There are as many reasons for this as there are opinions and beliefs. We have been blessed with all of the magical wonders which a beneficent Creator can bestow. What we are, is a result of the toil, the vision, the genius and the faith of generations of people from all corners of the earth, of all nationality, racial, and religious antecedencies. Our might is the result of our courage, and our courage stems from the conviction that our heritage as free men and women is probably our most precious possession. We have a national intelligence which is undeniable, and when that national intelligence is insulted, the people rebel. And when this simple lesson is learned, by all of those who have accepted the responsibility and the obligation of public life and public activity, we will have abolished hypocrisy in government * * * and we will have established an ethical standard whereby the American people could devote their toil, vision, genius, and faith exclusively to the task of building our security and our standards—unburdened by the diverting necessity for dispelling myths and piercing smokescreens.

Let us take a few moments—you and I—to examine the news of our times in terms of its historic implications and, more specifically, in terms of how what happens today affects the lives of our children and of future generations of our children.

I would be the last person in the world to take the view that politics should be abandoned. But I insist that unless politics-as-usual is abandoned, the orderly process of government will become a tragic farce, and the search for a better world, a forlorn and hopeless failure.

It is this simple: The American people want to be told the truth. They are equipped to cope with the truth. They are not afraid of the truth. They deserve and demand the truth.

What thinking citizen will accept the fierce and ugly charge that American labor is engaged in a conspiracy of violence and coercion, or that our labor leaders constitute a Nazi-like minority? Is this the Republican answer to its promise to amend Taft-Hartley—one of so many promises which were never intended to be kept? Is this the Republican answer to the spiralling cost of living; to the frightful fact that millions of American workers live in slums, while the national housing program is at a complete standstill?

It is no answer. It is nothing more—nothing less—than political hypocrisy.

Then there is that other claim: The charge that it is demagogic to decry the existence of a farm problem. Demagogic, indeed. We may well paraphrase what children have been chanting for generations "sticks and stones may break some bones, but name-calling will never feed the American farmer."

Is the cry of demagoguery the Republican answer to the fact that farm income has decreased by some four billion dollars in the period of 1 year? Is this the Republican answer to the fact that farm mortgages have increased to a frightening degree at the same time that higher interest rates have autocratically been imposed? Is this the Republican answer to the specter of a new and terrifying depression which today confronts the American farmer who finds his income dwindling, at the same time that the costs of his products to the consumer rises with unyielding consistency?

This is no answer. This, too, my friends, is nothing more—nothing less—than political hypocrisy.

Now the sloganeers are busily at work again, and the medicine men so expert—they think—in the art of public relations, are subjecting the American people to a forced feeding of a new, smooth-sounding salutation—peace and prosperity.

The intention clearly is to gorge the American voter on this charming metaphoric morsel—peace and prosperity. But does it tell us the truth about peace? And does it tell us prosperity for whom?

The Republicans talk of peace as if it were something which they invented and as if it were something which only they could safeguard. They blissfully ignore the fact that such peace as it exists today is the direct result of the bipartisan foreign policy worked out by the previous Democratic administration. Nobody—nobody—has the moral or ethical right to claim individual credit for the collective work of both parties, under the leadership of the Truman administration over a period of many years.

Can the Republicans claim credit for the United Nations? Can the Republicans claim credit for the prevention of a third world war by the decisive and prompt action taken in Korea? Can the Republicans claim credit for the plan, for the mutual security program, and for the strong alliance which was developed with the democracies of the West? Can the Republicans take credit for the establishment of Israel as a bulwark for freedom in the Middle East? Or can they claim that they are responsible for checking the spread of communism in Europe?

The fact is that the Republican Party has scuttled bi-partisan foreign planning, with the resultant dangerous belief that the Geneva picture should be misrepresented to the American people. And now, slowly, and gradually, the truth is being doled out—drop by drop—to prime us for the inevitable evaluation of Geneva's complete failure.

The Republican Party can take credit for a number of things, and I think we should give them the credit which is their due. They can take credit for the fact that India is being wooed into the Communist orbit. They can take credit for the new understanding between Yugoslavia and the Soviet. They can take credit for the Russian final success in penetrating the Middle East by bartering with the Arab States. They can take credit for the delivery of a large portion of Indochina to Red Russia, because they can point to the fact that Vice President NIXON so clearly misled the French into believing that they could depend on us for help when he boldly announced that, if necessary, we would send American troops into Indochina.

Instead of charging, as Harold Stassen had the temerity to suggest, that speeches by Democrats were undermining the prestige of this country abroad, let them appraise, rather, their own talk-tough, do-nothing attitude, and reflect on the penetrating truth that there was no foreign policy whatever until the Democrats took over the Congress in 1954.

And what about this great prosperity—this repetitious chant which is being drummed into the minds of the American people? Is there prosperity for the small businessman who, in greater number every day, is forced into bankruptcy or swallowed up in monopoly mergers? Is there prosperity for the white collar worker whose fixed salary makes it increasingly difficult for him to make ends meet?

My friends, is there prosperity for the American farmer?

You and I know who has the prosperity: the large corporations, the dozen or so industrial empires which control the destinies of 165 million people. They have been given virtually complete freedom from governmental control. Their officers and directors comprise the very Cabinet of the Government. Their representatives constitute the powerful army of dollar-a-year men in Washington who form, mold, and enforce our national economic policy.

Prosperity is a very nice sounding word. But, in terms of security, there is a great deal needed and a great deal wanting. And, if there are 65 million jobs in America as a

result of the economic program fostered in the Roosevelt-Truman administrations, let us, in the tradition of America, strive for 70 million jobs, instead of proudly resting on elusive laurels.

Do the Republicans really think that by proclaiming the word prosperity often enough, they will get the American people to think that the GOP inherited a depression from the Democrats in 1952? Do they really think the American people will ever forget that a Democratic administration took the reins of government from its Republican predecessors in 1932 at a time when our Nation was in the abyss of despair, and that it lifted our country from the depths of the mont dreadful depression in history, to heights of unprecedented economic achievement and progress?

But those advertising specialists, who are versed in the hatchings of slick and catchy phrases, know from their experience that you can't successfully market deodorants and soft soap without employing a variety of sales techniques. And so they offered the American people yet another myth * * * that of the efficient Washington team. Now it is pretty hard to determine by looking at this so-called team, who plays varsity and who plays scrub * * * who is really on the team and who constitutes the cheering section.

Is Senator KNOWLAND on the team? If so, his position isn't very clear although he certainly has proved himself quite adept at blocking.

Is RICHARD NIXON on the team? It is hard to tell, although he is a very talented buck passer.

And how about those members of the team who were benched by this very efficient administration? People like Air Secretary Harold Talbott; Commerce Under Secretary Craig Shaefer, Interstate Commerce Commission Chairman Hugh Cross; Health, Welfare, and Education Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby; Special Adviser Adolph Wenzell; Budget Director Joseph M. Dodge; Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens, and quite a few others.

Do the reasons—depending on the particular case—for their replacement on the team represent particular efficiency, or great integrity, or dedicated zeal? You know the answer as well as I do. And the American people know the answer to this and to most of the other facts of Washington life today. They remember the GOP campaign pitch that leaders of Government are responsible for the conduct of their subordinates. That is why, since 1952—despite high-sounding slogans and low-sounding slanders, the American voters have methodically and meticuously gone about their business * * * the business of voting Republicans out of office.

In Oregon the unbelievable happened. A Democratic candidate for United States Senator defeated the Republican candidate.

In Maine the impossible happened. A Democratic candidate for governor defeated the Republican incumbent.

In New Jersey the improbable happened, and a Democratic governor was elected.

In Pennsylvania the unlikely happened, and a Democrat was elected governor.

In Connecticut the incredible happened, and a Democratic governor turned the Republicans out of office.

And in my own State of New York the inevitable happened, and we defeated the invincible Republican machine, a machine which offered its most popular vote-getter and brought into our State all of the important Republican brass—including the President himself. They campaigned for a mandate of approval for 12 years of Thomas Dewey's administration, as well as for their program in Washington. They talked of cold wars if Democrats were elected, and even had the temerity to tell the people of New York that Averell Harriman couldn't take office even if he were elected, because he wasn't a citizen of the State. But, most of all, they raised the cry of Tammany, that weather beaten, meaningless, old-hat charge which has lost for the Republicans more elections than any other single issue in the history of my State. They just never learn that the people won't be fooled. And apparently, they just don't ever want to learn. The Tammany cry is as crass as would be a suggestion by and ridiculous Democrats that President Eisenhower is responsible for Teapot Dome. The people of my city and State are not concerned with ancient history. They think in terms of issues and candidates and programs, and facts. And they elect Democrats.

And this feat has been duplicated in elections all over the country—the same story, the same results—Republicans defeated and Democrats voted into office.

And not the least of these phenomena, was the election of a Democratic Congress.

Now, these elections were waged on the issue of the administration's program; on the issue of the administration's record. And that program and that record, rejected by the people, in election after election, will finally be repudiated next year, when they will send a Democrat to the White House.

I do not know who that Democrat will be. At this point, I do not think anybody knows. It is nothing less than folly to try to predict today what will be the state of national and world affairs next August, when the nominating conventions will select their candidates. It is foolhardy to try to guess what the people will think or want in the way of a candidate more than 8 months from now. And it is unrealistic to try to pledge or commit delegates who haven't, themselves, even been nominated and elected.

But one thing is certain, and that is that the Democratic Party has a wealth of qualified candidates—anyone of whom could administer the office of President with intelligence, with humanity, with understanding and with integrity, as distinguished from the Republican surrender to the hazardous concept of the indispensability of one man.

My own State again, as it did with Al Smith and Franklin Roosevelt, will offer to the Democratic Party and to the people of America, a candidate of unsurpassed experience, of unmatched ability, and of outstanding character.

Averell Harriman had the courage to warn the world about Soviet treachery when it was not very fashionable to do so, just as he had the courage to warn America about the Geneva debacle when it was not very popular to do so. He understands the needs of the world, and he understands the soul of America. His has been a profound dedication to public service during almost all of his adult life. And his has been a record of accomplishment and achievement unmatched in our generation. He knows business; he respects labor; and is as expert in the various areas of government—both foreign and domestic—as any living American.

New York will present the name of its governor to the nominating convention with the same pride and enthusiasm with which it will support whoever the Democratic candidate is, because we believe that no individual is greater than his party and that the public welfare transcends everything else!

We have no party lines—no totalitarian dogma which precludes open and free discussion of issues or even wholesome and constructive disagreement among ourselves. But we do have a party philosophy, a philosophy which holds that the responsibility of government is to all of the people and that it is the solemn obligation of those who govern to protect, advance and secure the people's well-being.

This we believe! And on this we will once again—next year—assume the mantle of national leadership—and, with the help of God, we will help lead our country and the free world toward a new era of real meaningful and lasting peace and prosperity.

Thank you very much.

Disaster Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include for the RECORD an editorial from the January 9 Christian Science Monitor dealing with the bills introduced this session for a flood indemnity and reinsurance program. The tragic devestation of millions of dollars worth of personal property in the Northeast and west coast this past year focused national attention on the immediate need for some sort of Government program. President Eisenhower has clearly indicated his intentions to see a workable program enacted, and I am pleased to have introduced legislation this week in accordance with the recommendations of the administration.

The editorial follows:

A TRY AT DISASTER INSURANCE

Insuring communities of people against losses from "natural" disasters and insuring individuals against isolated adversity are two quite different problems. The Red Cross years ago defined a disaster as a catastrophe striking so many people so suddenly that the ordinary resources and institutions of the community cannot cope with it.

Nor have private insurance companies been able to cope completely with the problems raised by any kind of group calmfty. Even with disasters caused by fire or windstorm (which risks insurance companies "write" and against which property owners commonly carry policies), it is found that the people with the smallest resources are ipso facto, the very ones who carry the least insurance or none at all. Relatives and friends are likely hit, too.

Disasters caused by floods present an even tougher problem. And it is to make a substantial start toward finding an answer that the President mentioned it in his state of the Union message and the administration has now sponsored a bill.

Where private insurance companies write this risk at all they feel they must charge high premiums. For they know that the only ones who would seek such protection must be especially vulnerable to deluges—and many to the same potential flood. Insurance, to be sound insurance, must spread the cost among high and low risks both.

Here is a situation which only Government can handle. Yet, it faces politically some of the same difficulties as the insurance companies. No one wishes by way of either his taxes or his premiums to encourage another to remain in a hazardous location or to subsidize, for instance, the farmer who calculatingly takes the risks of farming rich bottom land. Yet, usually what turns a flood into a disaster is inundation of areas never before, or almost never, reached by rising waters.

However, the "climate of opinion" seems to favor a Federal endeavor to cut this Gordian knot. Now that both the Atlantic and Pa-

cific seaboards have suffered major devastations, the sadly experienced Mississippi Valley no longer stands alone. California's Senator KNOWLAND's expressed support gives notice also that some conservatives who usually pull back from extending Federal functions may make an exception here.

This much at this early date can be said about the administration's bill: To the extent it would reinsure private companies on the peculiar and excessive risks of flood it would require the companies to carry some of the load and avoid going into the insurance agency business itself. To the extent it requires States to help pay the premiums it could bring about a more substantial and uniform assumption of local responsibility. To the extent it requires the individual to pay most of the premium and to shoulder some of the risk (through a deductible clause) it would preserve the vital element of self-help.

There is still the problem of those of minimum income whose insurance coverage, if any, will have to be supplemented by straight relief. And one can foresee problems of policy and administration that loom large. But they are not insurmountable. The Government has had considerable experience with war risk and crop insurance. Much of what it has learned surely can be applied to the "natural" disaster field.

Hon. Carter L. Burgess—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of a speech made by the Honorable Carter L. Burgess, Assistant Secretary of Defense, at the occasion of the annual fall Military Day at the A. & M. College of Texas.

Mr. Burgess, as you know, is the Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Personnel and has done and is doing a splendid job within the Department of Defense. He is a man of much vitality, not content to sit at his desk and review written reports but rather to secure at first hand for himself the answers from the field. I feel the college was very fortunate in having Mr. Burgess as a guest, who went into some detail in setting forth the Department of Defense policies with respect to personnel.

Mr. Burgess' address follows:

I am very happy to be here in College Station, particularly at this auspicious time of the year. It is an honor to address this Texas A and M assemblage.

I want to offer a special word of gratitude to Dr. and Mrs. Morgan for their hospitality, and state that your president has been of immeasurable assistance to many of our important programs in Washington.

I also want to take this occasion to express both thanks and appreciation to 2 of our finest Congressmen, Paul Kilday and Olin Teague, both of these Texans have the National respect and regard when they rise in the House of Representatives to speak and act on great issues. They have been unstinting in their creation and support of a sound and fair defense and veteran's program for this country.

If I were a quite a few years younger, and a member of your student body, I have a good notion of what I would consider the No. 1 great issue of the moment.

It would be tomorrow night's football game with Southern Methodist, when A and M goes out for its sixth victory. You have made a most impressive record this year. You have a great team, and I am looking forward to the game.

OUR WORLD LEADERSHIP

I've been asked to talk to you about the American defense program.

You each have a personal and requisite part to play in it, and every indication is that we shall be forced to maintain such a program for a good many years to come.

The great issue of this age is the survival of a system of human freedom which took centuries of struggle and sacrifice to perfect, in the face of a now advancing, now receding, but always present threat by expansionist-minded forces of an authoritarian ideology.

The American people have become the principal deterrent to that expansion.

The fact is we have been firmly shoved into the center of the world stage, no longer an "extra" or a spectator in the wings. We must play the role which has been assigned us, and do it with all the vigorous self-reliance and spirit of enterprise which built America from a frontier settlement to the most powerful nation in the world. We have no other choice.

CONDITIONS OVERSEAS

Our defense forces today are spread worldwide. We are not, as some have suggested, the Romans of the 20th century, but we are determined to bolster our own security by standing firmly alongside our allies.

I have just returned from an extended inspection tour of our installations in Europe and North Africa, and I can report to you that the spirit and readiness of our forces in those areas are uniformly high.

I was particularly struck by two things in my travels—first, the leveled areas in London and in Germany that continue to speak with grim eloquence of the terrible destructive power of war, and second, the tremendous strides in reconstruction and economic progress which the people of western Europe have made since I last saw them in 1945.

The evidences of reconstruction stand as living proof of what a people can do when they have to. Surely if there was ever a near miracle it has been in devastated Europe where a determined and courageous population have put to use every scrap of help given them—and for the rest have literally pulled themselves up by sheer effort from ruin to recovery. America has helped materially in this forward march.

These are people who have been constantly surrounded by intimidation and danger—but they have never failed to see the opportunity for their future which lies beyond such danger.

Here, it seems to me, there is inspiration and a significant lesson for each individual in all lands, who may sometimes feel that the conflicts and turmoils of this age are becoming unbearable, and that man himself may be losing out.

Danger we shall doubtless continue to find confronting us. But let us never be so blind that we fail to see the rich land of opportunity that lies ahead.

That, in my estimation, is something we need to bear in mind in connection with any and all personal sacrifices that may be required of us.

SOME PRINCIPAL QUESTIONS

The American defense program is our answer to lawlessness and aggression.

I want to discuss a number of pertinent aspects of this program with you tonight, dealing with the following questions:

What do we have in the way of strength-in-being today?

What do we expect to have tomorrow?

How does the new Reserve program fit into our overall requirements? and lastly

What is the significance of the recently approved Code of Conduct for members of the Armed Forces?

LESSON OF THE PAST

Somebody has said that those who will not learn from history are condemned to repeat it.

I think we all are aware of the fact that we were taught a severe lesson after World War II.

In our rush to disarm, we ignored a number of clearly visible warning signals and stripped ourselves of a necessary protective force.

Once the forces of aggression struck in Korea, we rushed to mobilize and rearm. We had everything to do over again, and in a limited amount of time.

Somehow we survived the entire Korean ordeal, but we had written one more chapter in our story of a national military philosophy based on expediency and short-sighted considerations. We had again paid a terrible price.

DEFENSE CONCEPTS TODAY

Today we are following a radically different and far more realistic philosophy. We have to. We recognize that we can no longer gamble with our security by blowing hot and cold on military preparedness and by refusing to maintain a stable and balanced military program.

We are aware of the advances in technological warfare, and the advent of time and space obliterating speeds. We can no longer base our military plans on the comfortable assurance of a "grace period" afforded by geographical location, nor can we think in terms of any particular year of crisis or period of maximum danger.

Instead, we require a long-term defense, and a long-term retaliatory strength as well.

THE ACTIVE FORCES PICTURE

Early in 1953, therefore, the President called for a far-reaching national-defense program adequate for all foreseeable needs. This meant a program that achieved maximum efficiency and protective contribution from our manpower and material resources—without placing an oppressive burden on our economy in the process.

The result has been a shakedown and tightening of the entire defense structure, keeping proven essentials, making increases where strategic considerations dictate necessity, and making reductions where less essential considerations apply.

In terms of ready strength, we have achieved a taut and efficient Military Establishment as a consequence.

Our Active Forces will number around 2,850,000 men by the end of fiscal year 1956—a figure which represents the best military judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the National Security Council, the Cabinet, and the President.

A great deal of controversy has developed around this figure. Most of the controversy resulted from the reduction from around 3 million men that took place in the past year or so.

We must not put such faith in mere numbers. In evaluating the effectiveness of this force, we must multiply numbers of men times the weapons to be employed. A host of men with bows and arrows is hardly equal to one man with a jet plane or an atomic land weapon.

THE NEW WEAPONS

The entire science of warfare has changed and is changing more each day—giving us weapons of a type which have increased both firepower and mobility tremendously.

The Air Defense Command has now been completely modernized with all-weather jets. The Strategic Air Command has re-

placed its entire medium bomber and reconnaissance force with B–47 jets, as compared with only 2 such wings in 1952. Replacement of the B–36 heavy bomber with the B–52 is now under way—and will be rapidly accelerated. In total, the Air Force with 124 wings at present is continuing its buildup toward a total of 137 wings and around 25,000 planes by 1957.

Add together such factors as the 280-millimeter gun, the guided "corporal" missile and the "Honest John" rocket—and add the increased striking power of supporting armor and aircraft—and you get a keen awareness that any comparison of today's army with that of World War II, and even Korea, is a comparison of different things. We calculate the destructive fire power of today's division to be about 80 percent greater than its World War II counterpart.

The Army chief of research and development, Gen. James M. Gavin, underlined this fact in a recent speech at Fort Benning when he said:

"The United States Army is developing modern techniques to take full advantage of the military innovations introduced by modern technology. * * * The traditional artillery gun may well be on the way to obsolescence, for the new missiles have almost unbelievable possibilities, both for anti-aircraft purposes and for all other kinds of enemy targets.

"The potentialities of such missiles, if or when equipped with nuclear warheads of various sizes, stagger the imagination."

Hon. Carter L. Burgess—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following is the second portion of Mr. Burgess' address before the student body of the A. & M. College of Texas:

Developments of this nature, in my opinion, place the current military strength adjustments in a proper perspective.

We are certainly not attempting to reduce our Armed Forces fighting strength. We are stabilizing it at planned levels and we are shifting some emphasis from men to machines, but we are gaining new strength in the process.

RESERVE—THE LONG HAUL

This whole subject, of course, ties in with the question of what sort of military-defense program our country will maintain from now on.

Here I wish to give special attention to a factor of tremendous and growing importance, namely, our organized Reserves.

Let me quote what the President said on this overall subject last January. He stated:

"Because scientific progress exerts a constantly increasing influence upon the character and conduct of war, and because America's most precious possession is the lives of her citizens, we should base our security upon military formations which make maximum use of science and technology in order to minimize numbers of men. For the remainder, we may look primarily to our Reserves and our mobilization base, including our stockpile of critical materials."

This statement by the President, it seems to me, clearly suggests the kind of defense program we shall be able to maintain in the future.

The Reserve Forces Act of 1955, which became law last August, has become intensely important in this connection. It has set in motion a program which will permit a more realistic build-up and the combat and front-line status of our Federal Reserve and National Guard.

Where today we have around 800,000 Reservists taking part in drill, by 1959 we aim to have approximately 2,900,000—trained, organized in units, and ready to move out in support of the active forces in the event of attack from D–day on up to D–plus–6 months.

While the new law requires a period of Reserve services of all men who enter the Armed Forces today, it offers a wide range of choices and predictable electives as well as sensible means for critically skilled workers, scientists, engineers, and men highly essential to research to discharge their military obligation.

Of special interest to you gentlemen here at A and M, it provides that all qualified ROTC graduates will receive their commissions, with some taking a regular 2-year tour of duty with the active forces, with subsequent Reserve obligation, and giving the opportunity to others to serve 6 months of active duty for training—in the status of commissioned officers—and the remainder of their longer enforceable obligation in a Reserve unit.

Lastly, this program gives us the means whereby trained units of Reserve manpower could swiftly be thrown into the support of the civil authority in the event of an all-out assault upon us. Here the President has again underlined the essential point when he said at the conclusion of Operation Alert last June:

"We must remember that in the kind of disaster of which I am speaking one trained Reserve battalion in the proper place would be worth five divisions located a thousand miles away. Trained men will be needed on the spot at the time the disaster occurs to respond to the calls of the mayors * * * governors and the Federal Government."

The new law gives the President authority to call up to 1 million of the Ready Reserve in an emergency without prior congressional action.

Not a part of the Reserve Forces Act, but a direct result of efforts spent in its passage, is Public Law 364, which gives the States themselves the authority to form State Defense forces separate from the National Guard, and not subject to Federal call.

The State of Texas, I might say, has taken a commanding lead in the organization of such State forces, and you are rapidly building up an organization of top quality.

SELLING THE RESERVE IDEA

And so, in terms of our defense needs for today and tomorrow, Reserves have come to occupy a commanding position in all of our planning. They unquestionably provide the key for holding down the size and tremendous costs of our Military Establishment. They afford the very maximum of protection to our democratic concepts and liberties. And they are the means whereby today's citizen can help insure his own and his family's future, with minimum disruption of his career and life plans.

The strange paradox in this situation, however, is just this:

Although the Reserve program offers all these things, too few people are showing interest in it. In connection with the volunteer choices which it affords, the response of young men of military age has thus far proved negligible.

The Department of Defense is doing its level best through its own publicity media and throughout the country to get clear and factual information to the public concerning this Reserve program. It is plain, however, that in addition to this effort—and despite the clear existence of need—we shall require far greater assistance from the public itself if the program is to do all that it can. We expect improvements.

Here, it seems to me, there is a job for all of us.

Every student of this great institution will play an important part in the protection of his country, because the ROTC program is our largest source of command leadership.

But you can do more—you and all the other people who want to see this country have a ready protection at all times. You can support and advance the Reserve concept and the Reserve program—at every opportunity which presents itself. Just think what would happen if each ROTC man in America could encourage one young man apiece to enter the new Reserve program by spring—we would be over our 1956 quota. Officers and ministers have the duty of keeping their units and congregations up to strength.

In the end, our Reserve program will be what our citizens make it. No argument, no legislation, no policy can substitute for the understanding on the part of the citizens, young and old, of the basic need for a Reserve and the willingness of each citizen to do unstintingly his full share in its support.

Pass the word along and awaken young men to get about their obligation at the earliest possible age.

CODE OF CONDUCT

With all elements of this defense picture in mind—the nature of the world situation, the responsibilities of civilians and military, and the ordeal which our men faced in Korea, there has been a need for a simple but effective means of defining the action principles on which we proceed.

The code of conduct recently approved by the President fills this need. While primarily for the serviceman, it contains precepts and values for us all.

During the spring of 1953, when the first prisoner exchanges were arranged we received a clear idea of the nature of Communist treatment of captives. During the subsequent "Big Switch" exchange it was learned that 2,730 Americans had died in captivity in North Korea. This death toll—38 percent—spoke with ugly eloquence of conditions along the death marches and in the enemy's camps.

There were 20 prison camps in North Korea. All were substandard, as might be expected in a remote corner of Asia. But some of the camps were inexcusably below par. For instance, a camp called "The Caves" with no latrine facilities or where the food was garbage. In another atrocious camp—Death Valley—POW's were punished by confinment in pits and mudholes.

Winter marches from the front to the North Korean interior became death marches for wounded or exhausted prisoners. On one such march about 500 perished. Brutality was the rule with the North Korean soldiery.

Then came rough interrogation—and a particularly high-pressure brain-washing process.

All of the 4,428 American prisoners who survived were screened by military intelligence. By this process the chaff was separated from the wheat. There was very little chaff.

An insignificant 21 decided to try life in the Communist "people's democracy," and of these 3 have since returned—bearing word that all of the others now regret their decision.

Of the 4,428 American prisoners, only 129 were subsequently held for alleged misconduct. Roughly 1 out of 27. Compared with FBI statistics that 1 in 15 Americans has been arrested for alleged commission of crime, this speaks eloquently for the quality of our Armed Forces.

But many came to the razor's edge of falling. And some of those who died might have made it with better survival training. Returnees reported a lack of discipline, and occasional failure on the part of some officers to assume command responsibility in the camps. Many of our men were unable to answer the Communist line with American arguments. They felt hampered by an ignorance of American history and national traditions.

Reviewing the situation, Secretary of Defense Wilson organized a special Advisory Committee on the POW Problem, and directed it to make appropriate recommendations, including a code of conduct that would be standard in the United States Armed Forces.

By Executive order of the President, the code of conduct went into effect in August 1955. It was drawn up by a distinguished panel of veteran officers and civilian service secretaries after weeks of consultation with educators, churchmen, statesmen, labor leaders, and medical and legal authorities. And with former prisoners of war—the men who know.

The sights of this code are purposely high. Its aim is top-level conduct, but its demands are not unrealistic. Its principles are based on hard experience. The first article states:

"I am an American fighting man. I serve in the forces which guard my country and our way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense."

The last article says:

"I will never forget that I am an American fighting man, responsible for my actions, and dedicated to the principles which made my country free. I will trust in my God and in the United States of America."

I recognize, and I know you do as well, that this is nothing more than a courageous creed for each of us in this difficult and dangerous age.

Its purpose is to strengthen and fortify the soldier in whatever adversity he might be called upon to endure.

It could serve equally well for the civilian in the unhappy event that warfare ever came to our own main streets.

Hon. Carter L. Burgess—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, herewith the concluding portion of the remarks by the Honorable Carter L. Burgess:

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The letter which I received from the chairman of your great issues committee suggested that I provide you with answers to three principal questions. These were:

1. What are Americans' attitudes, past and present, toward military service?

2. What about future generations, and their obligations to military service?

3. What is the significance of the recent cases of war prisoners succumbing to Communist brainwashing?

I'd like to answer each of these briefly, in the light of what I have discussed here this evening, and by way of conclusion.

The American attitude toward military service in the past has all too often been to avoid it, and to accept it only in times of direct peril.

Today there are still those who would rather let somebody else shoulder the defense responsibility, while they wait until the clouds roll by. And there are still those, as I mentioned in connection with the Reserve program, who need to be given a greater awareness of what is at stake.

But as a nation we have made some great changes in our attitude toward the role of the military, and this change is apparent in a more complete support by the public for an adequate defense program.

In the last session the Congress acted vigorously in support of our objective of a strong and ready Nation. It approved a defense budget taking about 60 percent of all the money the Government will spend in 1956, continued selective service until 1959, enacted new Reserve legislation, and launched a sound program of career incentives and benefits for members of the Armed Forces.

These actions provide concrete evidence that America has no intention of going back to the days of mothball fleets, wooden training rifles, and token-sized forces. They reflect the serious and realistic determination of the American people to protect their liberties.

What about the military obligation of future generations?

At the risk of sounding facetious, I would say that the question might better be directed at the Kremlin—for the decision actually lies there.

If the concern is whether we are some day going to develop a kind of lockstep military conformity in this country, turning all our people into robots in uniform, I would say—forget it. The constitutional liberties of this Nation will not be impaired through the continuation of an effective Military Establishment, but they could well be lost entirely without it. So long as we retain our system of checks and balances, with proper concern for our productive economy and our social structure, we will have no regimentation.

The strain of a protracted defense effort will be felt, but it can be handled—through the proper recognition of our respective obligations, the wise use of Reserves, through the splendid efforts of volunteers of such as you gentlemen here at A. and M., and through a constant demand for the highest efficiency and contribution from our defense forces.

In these times of change, our defenses cannot be built up today and then laid away in cold storage to save some future generations. We can put money in the bank so our grandsons will not have to work, but we cannot promise that our grandsons will not have to fight.

Our hope is that we can create a lasting and favorable peace, but if we cannot we must educate each succeeding generation to the obligations of a freeman in a dangerous world.

The situation which developed in connection with American captives in Korea was given the most intensive consideration by the Department of Defense. There were some failures, a tiny minority. Only 1 out of 27 suspected of misconduct is not a figure calculated to cause grave alarm.

When one realizes that the Armed Forces comes from a cross-section of the national population, the record seems fine indeed. It seems better than that when one weighs in the balance the tremendous pressures the American POW's were under. Weighed in that balance, they cannot be found wanting.

One way to look at the prisoner of war experience was to assume that something was seriously wrong with our military and social system today.

The other was to put the whole thing in perspective, recognizing what needed to be given emphasis, but rejecting any assumptions of decadence and decline.

The Department of Defense preferred the latter course, and as a consequence formulated the Code of Conduct and a more realistic training program.

The conscience and heart of all America are needed in the support of the code, and the best of training that can be provided in our homes, by our schools and churches and by the Armed Forces will be required for all who undertake to live by this code.

The United States must constantly be aware of her high position of world leadership and the code, therefore, considers the standard of the Ten Commandments and of our Constitution, as well as our pledge to the United Nations.

CONCLUSION

In discussing the American defense program, I have attempted to give you a quick picture of our existing elements of strength, our need for Reserves, and some idea of the general philosophy of readiness which we require for the future.

We are opposed by a system which does not share our concern for the rights of the individual. It is both armed and dangerous. We can either defy this system with all our vigor and all our resources, or we can submit.

But while we recognize this fact, we need not go overboard on the side of gloom. Earlier I cited the example of the people of Europe who not only knew danger, but destruction as well, and who have risen from the ruins of their cities and homes to build a new and vibrant life of opportunity for themselves.

We need to keep this lesson in mind—that although there is danger there is always opportunity. In the heart, in the mind, and in the spirit, we must support our way of life for today and for our children tomorrow, and in so doing we hold out a bright promise to the entire world. This is the Texas way.

Our liberty, as one writer has expressed it, is not something we can purchase in a bargain basement, nor can it be paid for in a lump sum. It must be bought on the installment plan—and each generation must pay a part of the price.

The American defense program is part of the price we are paying. It is our determined answer to those who have a habit of attacking the weak.

Is this in conflict with any of the basic precepts of our democracy?

I submit that it is 100 percent in support of our democracy, and that it will continue to reinforce our vital stand in defense of liberty before the entire world.

Just remember we all live in a time of opportunity and danger and that America's freedom is not free.

Let's Not Give Up a Farm Program That Is Working

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, an article on the farm program by Dr. Herrell F. DeGraff, of Cornell University, appeared in the American Agriculturist of November 5, 1955. Dr. DeGraff speaks with authority and points out once more the utter folly of scrapping a program that is only just getting started and returning to one that has already been proved unworkable and supremely impractical.

Let us remember, politics and vote-getting aside, that Dr. DeGraff is a thousand times right when he says:

The flexible price-support program we now have is no doubt the best we can get. And because I believe it is working, I am not panicked and I do not want to dilute it, compromise it, or retreat from it. American agriculture is not going to the dogs.

The article follows:

LET'S NOT GIVE UP A FARM PROGRAM THAT IS WORKING

(By Herrell F. Degraff)

I am not a politician. I am an economist, but as a citizen I have the right to certain opinions. I do not believe that the 1956 election will be won or lost on the farm vote. I doubt that the farm vote can be bought, and even if it can be bought, I do not believe that it will stay bought.

As an economist, I think I can see certain long-time effects of some of the programs that are being seriously suggested. It seems to me that it would be tragic if, in an attempt to win an election, sound programs should be abandoned and in their place something should be adopted which, in the long run, would lose farmers the freedom to run their own business.

The farm income situation has deteriorated, but has not deteriorated any more than is to be expected from (1) the general economic stability following the Korean war inflation; (2) the high level of Government-owned stocks of farm products accumulated as a result of the too-long-continued wartime levels of price support; and (3) our reduced ability to export (in part because of the high prices at which Government-stored stocks are held).

As a matter of fact, farmers are worried, but they are not panicked as some politicians are. Farmers are rightfully resentful that agriculture is not sharing in the prosperous times which other businesses are enjoying. However, in my opinion, the worst of the farm adjustment is now behind us. My reasons for thinking so are:

1. The assumption that reasonable stability at the present high price level will be maintained in the general economy.

2. That domestic use and exports of agricultural products are more likely to increase moderately than they are to decline.

3. That present production and use of all major farm products are now in close balance.

RENTED ACRES

There is much talk of the proposition that government pay farmers a rental for diverting cultivated acres to grass. Because much will be said in favor of it, I like to raise some questions that seem to me to be fundamental.

1. If the program is put into effect, will it not be difficult to stop it?

2. Can it be extended to the point where it will remove enough acres to significantly reduce production of cultivated crops? Certainly, the poorest acres, farm by farm, will be taken out of production and the balance of each farm will be used still more intensively. As a result, farmers can and will boost acre yields so there will be little or no reduction in total output.

3. Won't livestock growers object seriously over being a further dumping ground for diverted acres?

4. Won't the money cost of diverting these acres be prohibitive if expressed in terms of cost per bushel or bale?

5. If acres are government-rented and taken out of production, and if yields increase within a couple of years, could those acres ever be returned to production?

At least we can say it would be economically difficult and perhaps politically impossible.

6. What would our Northeastern farmers say to this further subsidy of Government-rented acres made to feed producers whom they already consider to be highly subsidized?

This rented acres plan is not even a logical way of trying to reduce wheat, cotton, and corn production because it would cost too much for this purpose; and, even if the cost were not prohibitive, all sorts of pressures would interefere with pulling a lot of acres out of production. If this plan is to be adopted strictly for political purposes, someone should analyze whether the votes it would be supposed to buy will be worth the cost.

COMPENSATORY PAYMENTS

From many quarters I am hearing increased support of direct Government payments to farmers (the so-called compensatory payments) in the form of a Treasury check. These suggestions are coming not only from the Democratic Party, but from staunch supporters of the present administration. In fact, support is coming from quarters usually considered conservative.

Compensatory payments, broadly applied, would result in a frankly socialized agriculture. Payments above the market level obviously could be paid only upon limited quantities of production rather than upon all that farmers would like to produce with such payments.

This means the necessity for annual quotas (probably quantity of product rather than acres) for each commodity covered. National quotas would have to be divided by States, counties, and down to the individual farms. Thus, for the price of a Treasury check, each farmer would surrender to central authority much of his freedom of decision in managing his farm.

I do not know how farm families could more easily, or quickly, become wards of the State—nor do I know how compensatory payments could be put into effect without the provisions that would have these results. I certainly would not want to be a party to establishing this kind of future for agriculture. Once established, such a system would continue more or less indefinitely, simply because of the difficulties—or impossibility—of termination.

FLEXIBLE SUPPORTS

Some influential people are now saying the flexible price-support program has failed and they are saying it before flexible supports have had a chance to prove their worth.

The most serious immediate problem on the agricultural scene is still the accumulated stocks in Government storage. They are burdensome in many ways—not the least of which is their price-depressing influence. But I have long thought they could be lived with and slowly worked off if only the continued flow into the stockpiles could be stopped. This year we will almost see that stoppage become a reality.

The truly hopeful situation under the flexible support program is how nearly in balance we now are, even with wheat, cotton, and the feed grains. The flexibles, under the superb work and accomplishments of Secretary Benson's team, are showing results now. When a considerable measure of success is so clearly visible, this is no time either to dump or to weaken the program.

The poultry situation (12 percent of gross farm income) is looking up. Dairying (15 percent of gross farm income from milk alone) is looking up. Cattle and calves (15 percent) are doing all right. Hogs (12 percent) are headed for lower prices during the rush of marketing this fall, but will average about $16 for the year.

Secretary Benson is entitled to a good deal of righteous wrath over the political pummeling he has been taking—particularly during his recent absence from the country. He inherited the surplus mess that has been so considerably responsible for price softness in farm staples. But real progress has already been made in a return to balance of production and use.

The flexible price-support program we now have is no doubt the best we can get, for the present. And because I believe it is working, I am not panicked and I do not want to dilute it, compromise it, or retreat from it. American agriculture is not going to the dogs.

President Ramon Magsaysay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the recent adjournment of the Congress it was my pleasure to attend and participate in the dedication of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in Manila, P. I.

Accepting this hospital for the Philippine Government was President Ramon Magsaysay, one of the best friends the free people of the world have in the far Pacific. President Magsaysay's party recently won a political victory by an overwhelming vote of the Philippine people, thereby voicing confidence in him as a leader, and I might add that I share that confidence with the Philippine people.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the speech made by President Magsaysay on this occasion.

The speech follows:

This occasion brings to a close a week-long celebration of a rare relationship between the people of two nations. It has been our custom to devote a day each year to the celebration of more than 50 years of friendship between Filipinos and Americans. This year, Philippine-American Day was extended for an entire week so that this ceremony might serve as a fitting climax.

The gift being turned over to the Philippine government today is a magnificant one. It is probably the finest and most modern hospital of its kind in this part of the world. Just completed at a cost of 18 million pesos, it is a gift of the American people to Filipino veterans, as assurance that their health and rehabilitation will enjoy the best care that medical science can offer.

In this event we have a contrete demonstration of the warm and generous friendship that characterizes the Philippine-American relationship. To each of us, veterans or not, it carries a very special message, a hopeful and encouraging message in terms of the future of humanity. It gives us reason to believe that, in this troubled world, human goodness still outweighs evil.

To me this day has a very special and personal significance. It was my privilege and good fortune to play a part in the very beginnings of this splendid memorial. I recall vividly the feeling of inadequacy and uncertainty with which I undertook a mission, with Congressman Cinco and Father Haggerty, at the behest of President Roxas, to Washington in 1948. I felt very deeply that the mission was a necessary one, that our veterans needed and deserved far more assistance than their own government was able to afford. And I felt that the only place to look for that assistance was in America.

It was clear to me, however, that I had no special qualifications for the task I had un-

dertaken—except a thorough understanding of the problems and needs of the veterans and a strong determination to get something done about it. I realized that the name of Magsaysay was relatively unknown in Washington and that the Government of the United States at the time was faced by the many problems and the heavy burdens of restoring a war-stricken world. But personal experience with Americans sustained me in the conviction that somewhere in Washington I would find sympathetic ears for our story and sympathetic hearts to respond to the needs of the Filipino heroes who had fought so gallantly at the side of their American comrades.

In Washington I found that I had not been wrong in my appraisal of the situation. An entire world wrecked by war was clamoring for America's attention and America's aid. The face of a new enemy, world communism, was already recognized and it was desperately urgent for America to act quickly if millions of freemen were not to slip behind the Iron Curtain. But I found also that my hopes were justified. I found in the American Congress friends of the Philippines who responded quickly and effectively once the need of our veterans became known. Their enthusiasm and their efforts made possible the passage of the Rogers bill which has meant so much to our veterans and their dependents and which is responsible for the splendid hospital we are dedicating here today.

As I have said, the significance of this event has meaning for each of us. What it means to the veteran is clear not only from the point of view of these new medical facilities made available for his care, but also from the fact that American friendship has brought the Filipino veterans since the end of the war more than 1 billion pesos in cash payments, payments which continue to flow into our country quietly and without benefit of publicity. The benefits of this steady flow of income into the economy of our Nation are felt by every Filipino man, woman, and child.

There is another significant aspect of this occasion which must not escape notice. Perhaps better than anything else it emphasizes the wholesome nature of the Philippine American relationship over the past half century. This great scientific institution is being turned over today to the Philippine Government. It will be administered and staffed entirely by Filipinos. Our own doctors and surgeons will utilize these facilities. Our own skilled technicians will maintain all necessary functions. That we as a people are in a position to do this is in sharp contrast with the experience of our Asian neighbors. It is not only a credit to our people and a source of great national pride but a tribute to the farsighted and enlightened stewardship of America during the period of her sovereignty here.

These are only a few of the thoughts which occur to the thoughtful observer on this occasion, but they are sufficient to explain why we feel as we do about Philippine American friendship. Out of the years of our relationship there has come the realization that our people share the same ideals of freedom and justice, that we subscribe in common to the concept of a world in which the individual and his rights are superior to the State, a democratic world in which peace and human dignity rather than lust for power are paramount. It was in defense of these common principles and ideals that Americans and Filipinos fought side by side in the last war. And out of our experience since that war has come the realization that there are even closer bonds, closer in the sense that they go beyond the mere sharing of ideas. Such bonds can exist between casual acquaintances, but it is only between true and loyal friends that we find the bonds of loyalty, the bonds of quick and willing response of each to the other's need.

The Filipino who is today's veteran fought at the side of Americans not because he was ordered to do so but because he deeply believed in the ideals which America was then fighting to preserve, and because he had faith in America as a trustworthy ally. He and his younger brother who might be tomorrow's veteran, feel even more strongly that their cause is just and that their judgment is sound. Since they have known the horrors of war they would spare no effort in seeking peace, but having grown up in a democracy and having known its blessings, they will not hesitate if the need arises once more to defend it with their lives. Whether for peace or war they will continue to look toward America as a friend and ally worthy of their trust.

Let Us End American Colonialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following keynote address by Hon. Ernest Gruening to Alaska Constitutional Convention entitled "Let Us End American Colonialism":

We meet to validate the most basic of American principles, the principle of "government by consent of the governed." We take this historic step because the people of Alaska who elected you, have come to see that their long standing and unceasing protests against the restrictions, discriminations, and exclusions to which we are subject have been unheeded by the colonialism that has ruled Alaska for 88 years. The people of Alaska have never ceased to object to these impositions even though they may not have realized that such were part and parcel of their colonial status. Indeed, the full realization that Alaska is a Colony may not yet have come to many Alaskans, nor may it be even faintly appreciated by those in power who perpetuate our colonial servitude.

Half a century ago, a Governor of Alaska, John Green Brady, contemplating the vain efforts of Alaskans for nearly 40 years to secure even a modicum of workable self-government, declared:

"We are graduates of the school of patience."

Since that time Alaskans have continued to take postgraduate courses. Today, in 1955, sorely tried through 88 years of stepchildhood, and matured to step-adulthood, Alaskans have come to the time when patience has ceased to be a virtue. But our faith in American institutions, our reverence for American traditions, are not only undimmed but intensified by our continuing deprivation of them. Our cause is not merely Alaskans; it is the cause of all Americans. So, we are gathered here, following action by our elected representatives who provided this constitutional convention, to do our part to show the world that America practices what it preaches. (In a public address at Denver, September 16, 1950, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower declared: "Quick admission of Alaska and Hawaii to statehood will show the world that America practices what it preaches.")

These words are not original with me. But they remain as valued and as valid as when they were uttered 5 years ago. They remain no less valid even if their noble purpose is as yet unfulfilled. We are here to do what lies within our power to hasten their fulfillment.

We meet in a time singularly appropriate. Not that there is ever a greater or lesser timeliness for the application by Americans of American principles. Those principles are as enduring and as eternally timely as the Golden Rule. Indeed democracy is nothing less than the application of the Golden Rule to the great society. I mean, of course, democracy of deeds, not of lip-service; democracy that is faithful to its professions; democracy that matches its pledges with its performance. But there is, nevertheless, a peculiar timeliness to this Alaskans' enterprise to keep our Nation's democracy true to its ideals. For right now that the United States has assumed world leadership, it has shown through the expressions of its leaders its distaste for colonialism. And this antipathy to colonialism—wherever such colonialism may be found—reflects a deep-seated sentiment among Americans.

For our Nation was born of revolt against colonialism. Our charters of liberty—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—embody America's opposition to colonialism and to colonialism's inevitable abuses. It is therefore natural and proper that American leadership should set its face against the absenteeism, the discriminations, and the oppressions of colonialism. It is natural and proper that American leadership should lend such aid and comfort as it may to other peoples striving for self-determination and for that universally applicable tenet of American faith—government by consent of the governed. Indeed, as we shall see, we are pledged to do this by recent treaty commitments.

What more ironical, than, what more paradoxical, than that that very same leadership maintains Alaska as a colony?

What could be more destructive of American purpose in the world? And what could be more helpful to that mission of our Nation than to rid America of its last blot of colonialism by admitting our only two incorporated Territories—Alaska and Hawaii—to the equality they seek, the equality provided by the long-establish and only possible formula, namely statehood?

America does not, alas, practice what it preaches, as long as it retains Alaska in colonial vassalage.

Is there any doubt that Alaska is a colony? Is there any question that in its maintenance of Alaska as a Territory against the expressed will of its inhabitants, and subject to the accompanying political and economic disadvantages, the United States has been and is guilty of colonialism?

Lest there be such doubt, lest there be those who would deny this indictment, let the facts be submitted to a candid world.

You will note that this last sentence is borrowed from that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence. It is wholly appropriate to do this. For, in relation to their time, viewed in the light of mankind's progress in the 180 years since the revolt of the 13 original American colonies, the "abuses and usurpations"—to use again the language of the Declaration—against which we protest today, are as great, if not greater, than those our Revolutionary forbears suffered and against which they revolted.

Let us recall the first item of grievance in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has refused assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good."

"He," of course, was King George the Third. Put in his place, in place of the "he," his contemporary equivalent, our ruler, the Federal Government.

Has it, or has it not, "refused assent to laws most wholesome and necessary for the public good?"

We Alaskans know that the answer is emphatically, "Yes, it has."

He, or for the purpose of 1955, it, the Federal Government, has "refused assent," although requested to do so for some 40 years, to the following "most wholesome and necessary laws":

First. A law transferring the control and management of Alaska's greatest natural resource, the fisheries, to the Territory of Alaska, as it transferred the corresponding resources to all other Territories in the past.

2. It has refused assent to a law repealing the 35-year-old discrimination in the Maritime Law of 1920, the Jones Act, a discrimination uniquely against Alaska.

3. It has refused assent to a reform of our obsolete and unworkable land laws, which would assist and speed population growth, settlement and development of Alaska. It alone is responsible for over 99 percent of Alaska being still public domain.

4. It has refused assent to a law including Alaska in Federal-aid highway legislation.

5. It has refused assent to a law abolishing the barbarous commitment procedure of Alaska's insane which treats them like criminals and confines them in a distant institution in the States.

6. It has refused assent to placing our Federal lower court judges, the United States commissioners, on salary, and paying them a living wage.

One could cite other examples of such refusal of assent to laws most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

But let us instead pass on to the second item of complaint, which is similar to the first, in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and growing importance * * *"

Substitute for the "He' 'then the British royal executive, the present American Federal executive, and substitute for "his governors," his party leaders in Congress, and recall their vote in the House of Representatives last May 10, killing a law "of immediate and growing importance"—the statehood bill.

Let us go still further down the list of our revolutionary forefathers' expressed grievances, again quoting the Declaration of Independence:

"He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws establishing judiciary powers."

"He," is today the whole Federal Government. It has for a decade obstructed the administration of justice in Alaska by refusing assent to establishing additional judiciary powers, where they were needed, namely in the Third Judicial Division, while repeatedly increasing the number of judges in the mother country, the 48 States. And although the population of Alaska has more than tripled in the last 46 years, the number of Federal judges established in Alaska in 1909 remains unchanged. And Federal judges are the only judges this colony is permitted to have.

Let us look still further in the Declaration of Independence:

"He has affected to render the military independent and superior to the civil power."

Is there much difference between this and the recent presidential declaration that the defense of Alaska, that is to say the rule of the military here, could be better carried out if Alaska remains a Territory?

One could go on at length drawing the deadly parallels which caused our revolutionary forefathers to raise the standard of freedom, although, clearly, some of the other abuses complained of in that distant day no longer exist.

But Alaska is no less a colony than were those 13 colonies along the Atlantic seaboard in 1775. The colonialism which the United States imposes on us and which we have suffered for 88 years, is no less burdensome, no less unjust, than that against which they poured out their blood and treasure. And while most Alaskans know that full well, we repeat:

"To prove this let the facts be submitted to a candid world."

To begin at the beginning, the Treaty of Cession by which Alaska was annexed, contained a solemn and specific commitment:

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory * * * shall be admitted to all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States * * *."

That was the pledge. The United States has not kept that pledge. Yet a treaty is the highest law of the land. And it is made in the clear view of all mankind.

The United States has broken that pledge for 88 years. It has not admitted the inhabitants of Alaska to "all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States."

"All the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States" would entitle us to vote for President and Vice-President, to representation in the Congress by two Senators and a Representative with a vote, and would free us from the restrictions imposed by the Organic Act of 1912, and the act of Congress of July 30, 1886. Obviously we have neither the vote, nor the representation, nor the freedom from restrictions.

We suffer taxation without representation, which is no less "tyranny" in 1955 than it was in 1775. Actually it is much worse in 1955 than in 1775 because the idea that it was "tyranny" was then new. Since the revolutionaries abolished it for the States a century and three-quarters ago, it has become a national synonym for something repulsive and intolerable.

We are subject to military service for the Nation—a privilege and obligation we accept gladly—yet have no voice in the making and ending of the wars into which our young men are drafted.

In this respect we are worse off than our colonial forefathers. King George III did not impose conscription upon them. They were not drafted to fight for the mother country. Therefore there was no revolutionary slogan "no conscription without representation." But it is a valid slogan for Alaskans today.

The treaty obligation of 1867 is an obligation to grant us the full equality of statehood, for which Alaskans did not press in the first 80 years of their subordination, but which now, overdue, they demand as their right.

But that is only a small part of the evidence of our colonialism under the American flag. Let us submit more facts to a candid world.

1. Let us ask, what is a colony? And let us answer that question.

A colony has been defined in a standard college textbook by a Columbia University professor as "a geographic area held for political, strategic, and economic advantage."

That, as the facts will show, is precisely what the Territory of Alaska is—"a geographic area held for political, strategic, and economic advantage."

The maintenance and exploitation of those political, strategic, and economic advantages by the holding power is colonialism.

The United States is that holding power.

Inherent in colonialism is an inferior political status.

Inherent in colonialism is an inferior economic status.

The inferior economic status is a consequence of the inferior political status.

The inferior economic status results from discriminatory laws and practices imposed upon the colonials through the superior political strength of the colonial power in the interest of its own noncolonial citizens.

The economic disadvantages of Alaskans which in consequence of such laws and practices redound to the advantage of others living in the States who prosper at the expense of Alaskans—these are the hallmarks of colonialism.

Let us take a look at these hallmarks of colonialism deeply engraved on the policies of the United States in Alaska in the field of transportation. Transportation is the key to almost all development. None have demonstrated this better than have the Americans within the noncolonial areas of their 48 States where transportation of every kind—railways, highways, airways—have linked, built and developed a dynamic domain of continental dimensions.

First, let us scrutinize seaborne transportation. It was, for 73 years, until 1940, the only form of transportation between Alaska and the States. Alaska suffers a unique discrimination in maritime law.

Thirty-five years ago the Congress passed a merchant marine act which is known officially as the Maritime Act of 1920. In Alaska it is referred to as the Jones Act, after its sponsor, the late Senator Wesley L. Jones of the State of Washington. The act embodied a substantial modification of existing maritime law. It provided that goods shipped across the United States, destined either for the coastal ports of the Atlantic or Pacific or for shipment across those oceans to Europe or to Asia, could use either American or foreign carriers. The foreign carriers principally involved were Canadian.

For example, a shipper from the Atlantic seaboard or from the industrial cities of the Middle West of products destined for points to the West could ship these across the country wholly on American railroads or on Canadian railroads, or partly on either.

And when these goods arrived at their coast destination, he could send them across the Pacific in either American or foreign vessels, or southward in either. But as that point in the legislation, creating this new beneficial arrangement two words had been inserted in article 27 of the act. Those two words were, "excluding Alaska."

Now what did those two words signify? They signified that Alaska, alone among the nations, or possessions of nations, on earth, was denied the advantages afforded all other areas. The same discrimination, obviously, applies to products shipped from Alaska.

What was the purpose of this discrimination? Its purpose was to subject Alaska to steamship service owned in the city of Seattle. Senator Jones no doubt assumed, and correctly, that this would be most helpful to some of his constituents there, as indeed it proved to be, but at the expense, the heavy expense, from that time on, of our voteless citizens of Alaska.

This was in 1920. Under the limited self-government which Congress had granted Alaska through the Organic Act of 1912, more limited than had been granted any other Territory, Alaska was still a youngster. Nevertheless, the fifth Territorial legislature meeting the next year, 1921, protested strenuously against this specific and flagrant discrimination, and ordered the Territorial attorney general to take the matter to court. The Territorial legislators believed, and so expressed themselves, that this new legislation enacted by Congress at the behest of Senator Jones, of Seattle, was in violation of the commerce clause of the Constitution, which forbids discrimination against any port of the United States.

The case came to the Supreme Court of the United States on an appeal from a de-

cree of the United States District Court dismissing the suit brought by the Territory and by an Alaskan shipper, the Juneau Hardware Co., which sought to restrain the Collector of Customs in Alaska from confiscating merchandise ordered by the hardware company and others in Alaska from points in the United States shipped over Canadian railroads, through Canadian ports and thence to Alaska by Canadian vessels, or merchandise to be shipped from Alaska to the United States in like manner.

In pleading the cause of the Territory, Alaska's attorney general John Rustgard argued that both the treaty provisions and the specific extension of the Constitution to Alaska by the Organic Act of 1912 rendered the discriminatory clause unconstitutional. It looked like a clear case.

The government—our government—which was defending this discriminatory maritime act, was represented by the Solicitor General of the United States, the Honorable James M. Beck, of Pennsylvania.

Let the candid world note well the language of his argument:

"The immunity from discrimination is a reserved right on the part of the constituent States. * * * The clear distinction of governmental power between States and Territories must be constantly borne in mind. * * * If the Fathers had anticipated the control of the United States over the far-distant Philippine Islands, would they, who concern was the reserved rights of the States, have considered for a moment a project that any special privilege which the interests of the United States might require for the ports of entry of the several States should by compulsion be extended to the ports of entry of the colonial dependencies * * *?"

Let the candid world note that the case for the United States was presented on the basis that discrimination against a colonial dependency was proper and legitimate and that any special privilege required in the United States would supersede any obligation to a colonial dependency. The colonial dependency involved was and is Alaska.

Mr. Justice McReynolds, in rendering the decision of the Court, declared:

"The act does give preference to the ports of the States over those of the Territories," but, he added, the Court could "find nothing in the Constitution itself or its history which compels the conclusion that it was intended to deprive Congress of the power so to act."

So it was definitively established by the highest Court of the land that Congress had discriminated against Alaska, but that, since Alaska was a colonial dependency, such discrimination was permissible and legal.

Every plea by our Alaska Legislatures over a period of 35 years to rectify this grave and unjust discrimination has been ignored by successive Congresses. They have refused assent to every attempt by Alaska's delegates to secure remedial legislation.

Now the question naturally arises whether this discrimination imposed by the legislative branch of the Federal Government, approved by the executive branch, and sanctified by the judicial branch, was to prove to be more than a mere statement of the legality of such discrimination. Was it more than a mere affirmation of the subordinate and inferior status of Alaska's colonials as compared with the dominating and superior status of the American citizens of the States? Did this discrimination also carry with it economic disadvantages? Indeed it did.

Several private enterprises in Alaska were immediately put out of business by the action of Congress in 1920 even before the Supreme Court upheld the legality of that congressional action.

A resident of Juneau had established a mill to process Sitka spruce. He was paying the required fees to the Forest Service and had developed a market for his product in the Middle West where it was used in airplane manufacture. He was shipping it through Vancouver, where it cost him $5 a thousand to ship by rail to his customers.

The Jones Act automatically compelled him to ship his spruce boards by way of Seattle. Here he was charged $11 a thousand, as against the $5 he had been paying, plus some additional charges, which totaled more than his profit. In consequence his mill was shut down and a promising infant industry, utilizing an abundant but little used Alaskan resource was extinguished. Not only did the Jones Act destroy this and other enterprises, but prevented still others from starting and has prevented them ever since. If anyone doubts that political control of the Territory through remote forces and absentee interests does not cause economic damage to the people of Alaska he need but look at the workings of the maritime legislation directed against Alaska and Alaska only.

Its immediate effects were to more than triple the cost of handling Alaska freight in Seattle on purchases made in Seattle, as compared with Seattle-bought cargoes destined for the Orient. Alaska's delegate, at that time, the late Dan Sutherland, testified that the Seattle terminal charges on shipments to Hawaii or Asia were only 30 cents a ton, and all handling charges were absorbed by the steamship lines, the result of competition between Canadian and American railways and steamship lines. But for Alaska, where congressional legislation had eliminated competition, the Seattle terminal charges on local shipments, that is to say, on goods bought in Seattle destined for Alaska, were 100 percent higher, or 60 cents a ton against 30 cents a ton, plus 50 cents a ton wharfage. So Alaskans paid $1.10 a ton for what cost Hawaiians and Asiatics 30 cents a ton—nearly four times as much.

This was by no means all. On shipments anywhere in the United States through Seattle, and destined for points in the Pacific other than Alaska, the total handling charges were only 30 cents a ton wharfage, and all other costs were absorbed by railroad and steamship lines. But for identical shipments consigned to Alaska, an unloading charge of 65 cents a ton was imposed, plus a wharfage charge of 50 cents a ton, plus a handling charge from wharf to ship of 60 cents a ton. These charges aggregated over 5 times the cost to a shipper to other points in the Pacific, and had to be paid by the Alaska consignee or shipper, and of course ultimately by the Alaska consumer.

These damaging figures were presented by Delegate Sutherland at a public congressional committee hearing and made part of the official printed record. No attempt was made by the representatives of the benefiting stateside interests, either then or later, to explain, to justify, to palliate, to challenge, to refute, or to deny his facts.

If there is a clearer and cruder example of colonialism anywhere let it be produced. Here is a clear case where the Government of the United States—through its legislative branch which enacted the legislation, the executive branch, through the President, who signed it, and the judicial branch, which through its courts, upheld it—imposed a heavy financial burden on Alaskans exclusively, for the advantage of private business interests in the mother country.

Nor is even this by any means all on the subject of railroad and steamship discrimination against Alaska, and Alaska alone. In addition to all the above extortions against Alaska's shippers, suppliers, and consumers—the direct result of discriminatory legislation—all the railroads of the United States charge a higher rate, sometimes as much as 100 percent higher for shipping goods across the continent, if these goods are destined for Alaska.

There is a so-called rail export tariff and a rail import tariff, which apply to a defined geographic area with exceptions made for other areas, which penalizes Alaska and Alaska alone.

Please note that the service rendered by those railroads, for the same articles transported, and for the same distance, is exactly the same, whether the article to be shipped goes ultimately to Alaska or elsewhere in the Pacific or whether it stays on the mainland of the United States. But the charges for Alaska, and Alaska only, on that identical article, for identical mileage, and indentical service, are specifically higher, sometimes up to 100 percent higher.

This abuse, as well as the others dating from the Jones Act have been the subject of unceasing protest from Alaskans. Alaska's legislatures have repeatedly memorialized the Congress and the Federal executive agencies asking for equal treatment. Again and again have Alaska's delegates sought to have the discriminatory clause in the maritime law repealed. But each time the lobbies of the benefitting stateside interests have been successful in preventing any relief action.

How powerful these lobbies are and how successful they have been in maintaining these burdensome manifestations of colonialism may be judged from the unsuccessful efforts of the late Senator Hugh Butler, of Nebraska, to get the discriminatory words "excluding Alaska" stricken from the act. He introduced a bill for that purpose.

In a speech on the Senate floor on December 4, 1947, he denounced "the discrimination against the Territory in the present law", that is the Maritime Act of 1920, and urged that there was "need for the prompt removal of that discrimination if we are to demonstrate that we are in earnest in our determination to promote the development of Alaska."

In a subsequent communication to Senator HOMER CAPEHART, who was then chairman of a subcommittee on Alaska matters of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to which Senator Butler's bill was referred, Senator Butler specified the character and extent of the abuse which Alaska was suffering, saying:

"Today, after 27 years of operation under the Jones Act of 1920, the carriers have failed to establish satisfactory service. * * * The Territory is still without adequate transportation to meet its needs. * * * Most Alaskan coastal towns are not connected with the continental United States, or with each other, by highway or rail. Accordingly they have been at the mercy of a steamship monopoly of long duration. There could be no competition from rail or bus lines which would compel better services or lower rates. American steamship lines have not been able or willing to meet Alaska's transportation requirements. The service has been infrequent and the rates exorbitant."

This caustic language was Senator Butler's. And his testimony and vigorous denunciation are highly significant, not merely because he was very conservative, but because for the first 14 years of his senatorial service he was a bitter opponent of statehood for Alaska, a stand which made him the beau ideal of the antistatehood elements within and without the Territory. He professed conversion to statehood for Alaska in 1954 only a few months before his death. He was still an unqualified opponent of Alaskan statehood when he issued this devastating indictment of the maritime transportation in 1947 and 1948.

After going into further detail on the injurious effects on Alaska of the Jones Act, and the fact that most of the "merchandise * * * food products * * * and other commodities" shipped to Alaska were "an exclusive Seattle prerogative," Senator Butler continued:

"The passage of this amendment to the Jones Act could well mean the difference between the slow, continued strangulation of Alaska's economy, and the full develop-

ment of the Territory's vast potentialities."

Senator Butler then spoke of the discriminatory rates in favor of canned salmon, which industry, he pointed out, likewise centered in and around Seattle, saying:

"The people of Alaska have long been subject to higher rates than has the salmon industry, for general cargo. These higher rates are, in fact, a decree penalizing the resident Alaskan for living in Alaska; the lower rates are, in effect, a decree requiring the Alaska resident to make up for whatever deficits accrue from the costs of shipping canned salmon and salmon-cannery needs. * * * The strangling provisions of the present laws would be eliminated by the enactment of S. 1834."

S. 1834 was Senator Butler's bill to remove this manifestation of colonialism.

And Senator Butler concluded:

"The development of Alaska would be accelerated, and justice would be done to those permanent residents of our northwestern frontier, who have, for so many years, struggled valiantly against discouraging circumstances to develop that area."

Despite Senator Butler's powerful position as the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs when his party controlled the Congress, this legislation failed. It did not even come out of committee. Eight more years have passed since that time; the tragic situation as far as Alaska is concerned, in its key transportation, has further deteriorated. Steamship freight rates have continued to go up and up, far above the levels that Senator Butler termed "exorbitant."

Invariably, whenever the operators announced another rate increase, the Alaska Territorial authorities used to request the maritime regulatory agency to secure an audit of the company's books in order to demonstrate that the increases requested were justified. But almost invariably, the increases were granted without such audit and often without question. It may well be asked whether, if Alaska were not a colony, but a State, its two Senators might not be reasonably effective in at least securing a demonstration from the carrier that its financial situation justified the rate increases demanded and promptly acceded to by the Federal Maritime Bureau.

But actually, if Alaska were a State, the whole discrimination in the Jones Act would go out of the porthole. Aalska would then get the same treatment in the transportation of freight that is accorded to every other area under the flag and to foreign countries. But as a colony it gets no consideration in this matter either from the legislative branch, the Congress, or from the executive branch, in this instance the Federal Maritime Board, successor to other agencies similarly subservient to the vested interests within the colonial power.

The net result of those cumulative charges—50 to 100 percent higher railroad freight rates to Seattle, higher unloading and transfer charges in Seattle, higher wharfage and higher longshoring charges, and finally higher maritime freight rates to Alaska ports—all higher than anywhere else for any but Alaskans, has been and is greatly to increase the cost of living in Alaska. This in itself has been and continues to be a great hindrance to settlement and permanent residence in Alaska, a heavy burden on private enterprise in Alaska, a forecloser of new enterprise, and obviously a great obstacle to development.

How absurd in the light of these facts—and others similar to be submitted to our candid world—is the allegation of the small minority of Alaskans and of others "outside" that we are not ready for statehood. How shall be get readier with these handicaps? How can we cope with what conservative Senator Butler described as "the slow, continued strangulation of Alaska's economy," if the throttling grip of colonialism is not loosened?

To complete the maritime picture, beginning last year all passenger travel on American boats has ceased. The Alaska Steamship Line has eliminated it. This is a blow to an infant and potentially great industry in Alaska, the tourist industry, which 4 years ago the Alaska 1951 Legislature sought to develop by establishing the Alaska Visitors' Association, financed jointly by Territorially appropriated and publicly subscribed funds.

One postscript remains on the subject of maritime transportation before we pass on to other of Alaska's colonial disadvantages. Though it is invariably pointed out by congressional opponents of statehood that Alaska is a noncontiguous area, separated from the main body of the 48 States by some 700 miles of foreign territory, or 700 miles of either international or foreign coastal waters, the United States persist in maintaining the coastwise shipping laws against Alaska. Their removal would make a steamship line eligible for the subsidies which American-flag ships in the European, African, or Asiatic trade receive. That might, were Congress sufficiently interested, induce some competition in the Alaska steamship trade from other American carriers. That the imposition of the coastwise shipping laws is not a necessary corallary to being a colony is proved by the fact that the United States has suspended the coastwise shipping laws for the Virgin Islands. But it has declined to do so for Alaska.

Let us now turn to a third form of transportation: highways. These catchwords of colonialism, "excluding Alaska," likewise apply to our highway transportation. For Alaska is denied inclusion in the Federal Aid Highway Act. From this beneficent legislation enacted in 1916, and repeatedly amended and amplified, Alaska, alone among the States and incorporated Territories, is excluded. Even Puerto Rico, which pays no Federal taxes whatever, is included. Yet Alaskans pay all taxes, including the Federal gas tax.

The congressionally wrought substitute—annual appropriation—is a witness to colonialism expressed in cold figures. The results are visible in the lack of an adequate Alaskan highway system. After 88 years of colonialism and 40 years after the enactment by Congress of the joint Federal aid and State highway program, Alaska has only some 3,500 miles of highway. This is a negligible amount for an area one-fifth as large as the 48 States and with only one railroad.

For the first 38 years after the cession of Alaska no roads were built by any Government agency. With Alaska almost totally public domain, highway construction was clearly a Federal responsibility. In the next 36 years beginning with the first Federal construction in 1905 and the outbreak of World War II, in 1941, the Federal Government appropriated about $19½ million, an average of a trifle over half a million dollars a year—a pittance. During that same period Alaska contributed some $9 million. Thus the Federal contribution was 68.4 percent of the total of $28½ million, and Alaska's was 31.6 percent, a far greater proportion than Alaska with its virtual totality of public domain would have had to pay under the Federal Aid Highway Act. It is fair to say, however, that under the highway act, Federal funds go for construction and not for maintenance.

After road construction had been transferred from the War Department to the Department of the Interior in 1930, for the next decade or more throughout the 1930's, when the Federal Government and the States were jointly expanding the national highway network, Alaska was given no new highway construction. Maintenance only was granted. Military requirements brought the Alaska Highway and the Glenn Highway, and in the later 1940's a highway program to satisfy defense needs was begun and carried out for 5 years. But even that has been brought to a virtual halt. For the past 3 years the Federal program has contained no new highway project. This year a token appropriation was included for the desirable Fairbanks-Nenana road, but at the price of halting construction of the important Copper River Highway. In fact the present greatly reduced program spells little more than slow completion and paving of the military highways begun 8 years ago. The Federal Government seems to be heading us back to mere maintenance.

In contrast the Federal-aid program in the mother country is being handsomely increased, reaching the largest sums in its history in the current biennial appropriation enacted in the 2d session of the 83d Congress.

If Alaska were a State it would be automatically included in the expanding highway program. But as a colony it continues to be discriminated against, and that discrimination, instead of lessening is being aggravated.

By the same token Alaska has been excluded from the administration's $101 billion Federal-highway program. One of its principal justifications, perhaps the principal justification, for this lavish, yet important and valuable proposal, is that it is in part a civilian defense measure to aid evacuation and dispersal in the event of a shooting war with atomic weapons. Yet the same administration that excludes Alaska from this defense measure wishes to keep Alaska in colonial bondage because of alleged national-defense reasons.

The enactment of this multibillion-dollar program was deferred in the last session of Congress because of differences of opinion on how to finance it. But in one respect there was no difference of opinion: Alaska would be taxed for the program even if not included in it. The Eisenhower program, presented by Gen. Lucius Clay, called for long-term bonding to be repaid out of general funds. Congressional substitutes, on a more nearly "pay-as-you-go" basis, called for increased taxes on gasoline, tires, and other automobile accessories. Efforts to include Alaska in both programs failed, as did subsequent efforts to exclude Alaska from the tax provisions. So Alaskans will be taxed for benefits accruing solely to the residents of the mother country. What else is this but colonialism, crude, stark, undisguised, and unashamed?

When both the Presidential and congressional drafts failed of passage, President Eisenhower declared he was deeply disappointed" and added:

"The Nation badly needs good roads. The good of our people, of our economy, and of our defense requires that the construction of these highways be undertaken at once."

As colonials we can merely note that Alaskans are, in the consideration of our President, apparently not part of "our people, our economy, and our defense."

There is yet more of humiliating disregard. The Federal administration while patently uninterested in developing Alaska through its highways is strongly in favor of completing the Inter-American Highway.

On March 31, last, President Eisenhower in a letter to Vice President Nixon requested an increase in the current appropriation for the Central American portion from $5 million to $75 million, a more than 13-fold increase. The President gave several reasons for this massive amplification. Three of them emphasized the important economic contribution to the countries through which this highway passes, and a fourth stressed the security aspects of the road.

We may applaud the purpose to complete the inter-American highway, with its economic benefits to Guatemala, Honduras, Salvador, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and Panama. We may even enjoy our participation in this philanthropy to these good neighbors remembering that it is more blessed to give than to receive, and that every Alaskan is paying his share of that $75 million. Still, some of us may wonder why similar consideration is not vouchsafed to Alaska, whose highway and economic needs are great, whose trade is almost exclusively with the United States, and whose relation to national security is certainly much closer than that of the Central American republics. This wonder on our part would be particularly natural since President Eisenhower seems to exhibit concern about Alaska's defense in connection with statehood.

We have now viewed 3 flagrant examples of colonialism in 3 of the major means of transportation, shipping, railways and highways. Let us now look at the fourth—airways.

It is superfluous to signalize our air-mindedness to any group of Alaskans. But the candid world should know that Alaskans fly 30 to 40 times more than other Americans, and starting with our bush pilots, early developed a fine system of intra-Alaskan aviation. It was almost wholly an Alaskan enterprise—flown and financed by Alaskans—though for a time without airports, aids to navigation and other assistance provided in the mother country. The Air Commerce Act of 1926—a sort of Federal-aid act for air—did not supply any of these aids to Alaska, although Alaska was included in the legislation. Nevertheless Alaska again suffered the penalty of being a colony, this time at the hands of the Federal executive agency entrusted with administration of the act. This time it was the bureaucrats who excluded Alaska. But the Alaskan bush pilots flew anyhow and what we have in the way of airways in Alaska is largely due to their courageous and skillful pioneering.

However, air service between Alaska and the States, which required the approval of Federal bureaus and investment of outside capital, lagged far behind. The first commercial service connecting Alaska with the mother country did not take place till 1940, long after American commercial air carriers had spanned the rest of the hemisphere and had established regular service across the Pacific.

Meanwhile the newly created bureaucracies of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration moved into Alaska. They began restricting local enterprise. In the late 1940's, over the widespread protests of Alaskans, the CAB began cracking down on nonscheduled operations, and finally eliminated the nonscheds completely. It did not do so in the 48 States. Alaska was again the victim of its colonial status. We had no Senators or voting Representatives to fend for us.

The successive certification cases which for over a decade have dealt with transportation between the States and Alaska, have been desperate, and not wholly successful, struggles by Alaskans to overcome the inadequate understanding of the Civil Aeronautics Board that air transportation is relatively much more important in Alaska than in the States with their well-established alternative forms of transportation, by railways and highways. Five years ago interior Alaska was saved from insufficient service only by President Truman's overruling the Board and granting certification to one of the two Alaskan carriers which the Board had denied.

For the last 2 years our 2 Alaskan carriers, in the fact of steadily mounting traffic, have managed by heroic, all-out effort at least to retain what they had. But it is noteworthy that while the 2 international carriers serving Alaska, both mother country enterprises, have been granted permanent certificates, the certificates for our 2 Alaskan carriers are only temporary—a handicap to their financing and to their ability to expand.

Alaska's statehood case could rest here. Yet no account of its 88 years of territorialism would be complete without some notice of the salmon fishery. It comes, this year, pretty close to being an obituary notice.

Here was Alaska's greatest natural resource.

Here was the Nation's greatest fishery resource.

For nearly half a century, the Federal Government has totally ignored, has "refused assent" to the petitions, pleas, prayers, memorials, of legislatures, delegates, governors, and of the whole Alaskan people for measures that would conserve that resource.

The result is written in figures that spell tragedy for Alaska's fishermen and for many others in Alaska's coastal communities whose economy has long depended on the fisheries. The tragedy has deepened year after year. So grave has become the plight that the administration found it necessary to proclaim the fishing villages to be disaster areas. It is a disaster caused by colonialism, and the Federal Government may charge the costs of disaster relief and loss of Federal tax income to its own policies.

From over 8 million cases 20 years ago the salmon pack has fallen year by year until in 1955 it has reached the incredible low of 2,382,131 cases, the lowest in 46 years.

Nowhere, as in the Alaska fisheries fiasco, is the lesson clearer or the superiority, in purely material terms, of self-government to colonialism. In neighboring British Columbia and Washington State, where the fisheries are under home rule, and where the fish traps have been abolished, the identical resource has not only been conserved but augmented.

It is colonialism that has both disregarded the interest of the Alaskan people and caused the failure of the prescribed Federal conservation function. Colonialism has preferred to conserve the power and perquisites of a distant bureaucracy and the control and special privileges—the fish traps—of a politically potent absentee industry. Alaska has been the victim, but the entire Nation has also lost heavily.

Let us by way of a footnote make crystal clear how and why this is colonialism—because some defenders of the status quo may deny it is, and we don't want the candid world to be confused.

The people of Alaska have repeatedly and unchangingly manifested their overwhelming opposition to fish traps. It isn't necessary to rehearse all their reasons—the results have amply justified the Alaskans' position. But fish trap beneficiaries, residents of the mother country, want to retain their Alaska traps. So the traps are retained. And it is the power and authority of the Federal Government which retains them. In a clear-cut issue between the few, profiting, noncolonial Americans and the many, seriously damaged, colonial Alaskans, the stateside interest wins hands down. And it wins because the Government, which is also supposed to be our Government, throws its full weight on their side and against us. That is colonialism.

It would be impossible in any one address, even one that assumed the length of a Senate filibuster, to list all the wrongs, disadvantages, and lack of immunities that Alaska has endured in its 88 years as a Territory. They constitute an incredible story. Even for those who know it, it is hard to believe. It is hard for us as Americans who long ago established our faith in American intelligence, competence, good sense, and above all in American fair play, to contemplate the story of American colonialism in Alaska. It has been part of our faih, an abiding faith, that to right deep-seated wrongs in America, one but had to make them sufficiently widely known. And our best hope, does lie, I am convinced, in making the facts known widely—and especially the overshadowing fact of our colonialism—to our fellow-Americans and to the rest of the candid world. They should know that what progress has been made in Alaska, and it has been substantial and praiseworthy, has been made in spite of these colonial impositions, and largely because of the character and fiber of the colonials themselves. Coming here from the 48 States, following the most cherished American trend, the westward march in search of greater freedom and greater opportunity, they brought to the last frontier and to its friendly native population, the very qualities that have made America. Only distantly man-made problems, the problems created by a remote, often unseen officialdom and its bneficiaries in the mother country, have remained unresolved.

Alaskans have striven consistently to resolve them. Let it be recorded that for 43 years, since the first legislature, and before that by individuals and groups, they have pleaded for relief from the abuses a part of which have been detailed.

Yet after two generations not a single one of these pleas, all of them fair and reasonable has been granted.

How applicable ot Alaska's plight the words of the Declaration of Independence: "In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated petitions have been answered by repeated injury."

Lest these frequent citations from the Declaration of Independence lead anyone to the conclusion that there are any among us who now desire our independence, let such a totally erroneous assumption be promptly corrected. We desire and demand an end to our colonialism. But we seek it through a reaffirmation in deeds for Alaska of the principles which launced the American experiment, and reapplication of the practice that has been followed in 35 States.

We Alaskans believe—passionately—that American citizenship is the most precious possession in the world. Hence we want it in full measure; full citizenship instead of half citizenship; first-class instead of second-class citizenship. We demand equality with all other Americans, and the liberties, long denied us, that go with it. To adapt Daniel Webster's famous phrase uttered as a peroration against impending separatism, we Alaskans want "liberty and union, one and inseparable, now and forever."

But the keepers of Alaska's colonial status should be reminded that the 18th century colonials for long years sought merely to obtain relief from abuses, for which they—like us—vainly pleaded, before finally resolving that only independence would secure for them the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness," which they felt was their natural right.

We trust that the United States will not by similar blindness to our rights and deafness to our pleas drive Alaskans from patient hope to desperation.

We have been challenged in the course of congressional debates to show as a prerequisite that admission of Alaska to statehood would be beneficial to the Nation. That test was never applied to earlier Territories seeking and securing statehood. But we gladly accept that challenge and willingly subscribe to it as a condition.

The development of Alaska, the fulfillment of its great destiny, cannot be achieved under colonialism. The whole Nation will profit by an Alaska that is populous, prosperous, strong, self-reliant—a great northern and western citadel of the American idea. Statehood would automatically bring us far along that high road.

Nothing could more pathetically reveal the lack of understanding regarding Alaska, and the poor advice concerning Alaska that is

given and accepted in the highest places, than the Presidential pronouncement in the last state of the Union message:

"As the complex problems of Alaska are resolved that Territory should expect to achieve statehood."

Bless us. The complex problems of Alaska are inherent in its territorial status; they are derived from its colonial status; they will be largely resolved by statehood and only by statehood.

As was promptly called to President Eisenhower's attention this was like the old story of telling a youngster he must learn to swim before going into the water.

So we return to the proposition that America can scarcely afford to perpetuate its colonialism. Our Nation is attempting to lead the world into the pathway of peace. No goal could be more worthy. But to lead effectively, it must not only practice what it preaches. It must carry out its solemn commitments. It can scarcely be critical of nations that break their pledges and break its own. It must first cast the beam out of its own eye before attempting to pull the motes of its neighbors' eyes.

For the United States has pledged its good name and good faith in treaties and agreements far more recent than the Treaty of Cession of 1867. Not that our Nation's responsibility for not carrying out those original pledges in regard to Alaska is diminished by the passage of time. But there are recent and even contemporary commitments which demand fulfillment.

Article 73 of the United Nations Charter, dealing with non-self-governing territories and that includes Alaska which must make annual reports to the UN, pledges the signatories:

"To the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories is paramount," and further pledges them.

"To insure * * * their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses," and, finally, and this is most pertinent, it pledges them.

"To develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions * * *."

The United States pledged itself to that 10 years ago. If the English language has not lost its meaning and the United States its integrity, it should some time ago have, and should now, in any event, "take due account of the political aspirations" of Alaskans and enable them to develop the self-government which they seek.

There is an even more recent commitment—the Pacific charter—signed a year ago, in which the signatory nations, including the United States, pledged themselves "to uphold the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples," and to reenforce that principle the signatories further pledged that they were "prepared to continue taking effective practical measures to insure conditions favorable to orderly achievement of the foregoing purposes," namely self-government.

We are agreed that there is only one form of self-government that is possible for Alaska. And so we are drawing up the constitution for the State that we feverently hope will soon come to be. That hope, it is encouraging to note, is shared by the great majority of Americans. If our 88-year experience inevitably leads to strictures of the colonialism that has ruled us, let us remember that it is a course not sanctioned by American public opinion. The Gallup polls, which last recorded an 82 percent support of Alaskan statehood, the endorsement of virtually every important national organization, demonstrate clearly that the forces in and out of government which would deny Alaska statehood—in fact the Government itself—do not represent prevailing American sentiment.

But while we may derive satisfaction and hope therefrom, let us not delude ourselves that victory is at hand. It ought to be. But too many solemn pledges to Alaska have been honored in the breach to assure that what ought to be will be.

It may be regrettable—or not—but every generation must fight to preserve its freedom. We have twice in a lifetime participated in our Nation's fight to preserve them. In Alaska we still have to win them.

This constitutional convention is an important mobilization. But the battle still lies ahead, and it will require all our fortitude, audacity, resoluteness—and maybe something more—to achieve victory. When the need for that something more comes, if we have the courage—the guts—to do whatever is necessary, we shall not fail. That the victory will be the Nation's as well as Alaska's—and the world's—should deepen our determination to end American colonialism.

Capt. Billy Marler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend by remarks, I include for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a highly interesting article by the Honorable William C. Pryor, a distinguished citizen, of Fort Walton Beach, Fla. His article deals with the life and leadership of Capt. Billy Marler, an outstanding figure on Florida's beautiful gulf coast. The article appeared in the Reader's Digest for December 1955:

THE MOST UNFORGETTABLE CHARACTER I'VE MET

(By William Columbia Pryor)

One of the mightiest men I know couldn't weigh more than 110 pounds now with his shoes on—and he seldom wears them. At 90, he usually stays tucked away in his snug old house near East Pass, where the green breakers of the Gulf of Mexico crash into the quieter, bluer waters of Choctawhatchee Bay 40 miles each of Pensacola, Fla.

What few dollars Captain Billy Marler gets, beyond a tiny pension, he squeezes from making fine cast-nets for dude fishermen. But the way he stands, with his bare feet set wide apart as if to balance himself on a pitching prow, the way his blue eyes twinkle from his weather-seamed face, let you know he is still ready to meet the squalls of life head-on.

I was 17 the day in 1890 that I first saw Captain Billy. I had just moved down to the Bay to help my uncle run his sawmill and to begin teaching the one-room school at Brooks Landing (now Fort Walton). There were no roads down through the pine-woods to the gulf, not even a sand trail; the only way to reach the Bay area was by boat; a last few of the Choctaw Indians who named the Bay were still around.

In my skiff I was exploring the lonely, almost uninhabited shoreline when I saw the black silhouette of a long, thick object crawling torturously up the dazzling white beach. I rowed in closer and discovered that the object was a stout tree trunk being shouldered and dragged by a stocky, leather-tanned little man about 10 years older than myself.

"Come aboard, stranger," he cried in a voice as piercing as a sea gull's.

To snake such logs to the sawmill, I had mules. Even half the weight of the timber this barefoot, dungareed fellow was dragging would have crushed me. "Can't you haul things like that mule-back?" I asked.

"Ain't got no mule," he grunted. "I haul things like this my-back."

Hauling things like that "his-back," Billy Marler had just completed for his young bride the eight-room house in which he lives to this day. When I met him he was building a colossus of a pier that would stretch from his front door to the channel half a mile out in the bay. Clambering and swinging among the big 8x8-inch pilings he was wedge-shaping into the sand, he looked like a busy spider.

"Going to build a store here, too," he told me.

I was startled by this frenzied energy on a barren, empty beach. The nearest neighbor was Capt. Leonard Destin, who ran a fish camp more than a mile away on the other side of the peninsula. Marler told me he had worked there as a fishing hand since he had wandered down from Georgia at the age of 13.

That night, after a supper of fried mullet, we were enjoying our pipes and the flapping breeze when Marler said, "You know, they tell there's a treasure buried over there under those stooping oaks." He pointed at a cluster of wind-gnarled trees at the head of a small cove across the bay. "Joe, the old Choctaw trapper who used to live there, told me that the captain of a 2-masted schooner out of New Orleans hid $60,000 at the foot of those trees over 50 years ago; just before his crew killed him in a mutiny."

Stories of buried treasure were about as rampant then as they are now, and just as unreliable. For here among the sugar-white dunes the pirate ghosts of history were said to walk on moonlight nights—the cutlassed figures of Jean Lafitte and Jesse (Billy Bowlegs) Rogers. We joked about such foolishness, and over the unlikelihood that a Choctaw trapper would have neglected to dig up $60,000 if he had known where it was. Then we forgot the treasure of Joe's Bayou, and neither of us thought of it again for 7 years.

In those years I watched Billy Marler wrest his living and his dreams from the bare strip of sand he had chosen for a home. For a salary of $3.50 a week as skipper of Captain Destin's 30-ton fishing schooner, *Jack 'a Don't Care*, he performed near-impossible feats. I would hear his shouts as, on nights black as the inside of a whale's belly, he eased his hulking vessel past Brooks Landing and up through the twisting Narrows.

There were no channel lights or markers then, no auxiliary engines to fall back on when white squalls lashed the sails or dead calms left them hanging limp. Still, somehow Billy needle-eyed his schooner up to Pensacola before his fish cargo could spoil. And when the boat was becalmed he and his crew would shove it along by giant "push poles"—full-grown pine trees carried for the purpose.

In his spare time Captain Billy finished his pier, a large general store, a warehouse, and a boatworks. He built his own schooner, *The Bernice* and in it sailed groceries and supplies down from Pensacola. Gradually other families began to settle near his establishment.

Captain Billy had had just 2 days' schooling, but he was the first to urge a school for Destin Point. Moreover, he built most of it himself. In the one-room structure, which doubled as a church on Sundays, he was the community's lay preacher and Sunday-school teacher.

In 1896 Captain Billy set up a post office in the parlor of his home and became Destin's first postmaster—a job he held for 43 years. Three times a week, sun or squall, he would "sail the mail" to a tiny settlement 10 miles away, often with only 1 or 2 letters. His profit for the entire operation was less than $10 every 3 months.

As if all that activity weren't enough, he built most of the small boats on the bay—everything from skiffs to 50-foot launches. He made most of his own furniture and many pieces for his neighbors. He became the village's self-appointed undertaker and coffin-maker, rendering both services free. Once when I asked him how he could afford to give away so many fine juniper-wood caskets, he looked at me in surprise. "Why, I couldn't take money from anyone in that kind of trouble."

It was clear to me from the start that Captain Billy would never be a successful businessman. If there were 30 people on the dock when he sailed up with the mail, he invited them all to dinner. Credit at his store was to everyone, and he never kept a bill or any other kind of record of a debt to him.

"Let 'em keep up with their own bills," he would growl when I cautioned him. "It's all I can do to keep 'em in groceries."

To relieve the monotonous fish diet of his rapidly growing family, Captain Billy often took me and his small sons out into the gulf on a turtle hunt. Diving into 15 feet of emerald-green water, Billy would bring a shell-turreted, 600-pound monster scrambling to the surface. "Turtles are God's banquet for pore folks," he would say. "There's seven kinds of meat in 'em—beef, pork, mutton, goat, chicken, fish, and—oh, yes, turtle meat."

A fellow fisherman once said of him, "Captain Billy's gonna supply everybody around him till he supplies hisself out."

More and more well-to-do vacationers set up tents on the beach, and many were interested in pirate treasure. Especially they asked about Jesse Rogers. This buccaneer was believed to have scuttled his ship in Choctawhatchee Bay in 1844 with $4 million in gold aboard after British men-of-war chased him through East Pass.

"Did I know Jesse Rogers?" Captain Billy would say when anyone asked him. "Sure I knew him in his old age, right up to the time he died in 1888. What about him? Well, he was bowlegged, mostly—that's why we called him Billy Bowlegs. Did I ask him where he sank that four million?" Billy would frown in mock distaste. "Why, gentlemen, wouldn't that've been an embarrassin' question to've asked a poor old bowlegged, half-Indian pirate?"

Naturally, what happened in 1897 was a shock to both of us. One day in the early spring a schooner sailed into Choctawhatchee Bay and put in at Destin Point for supplies. The stranger was closemouthed about his business, but he had an old map and he sailed straight over and anchored off "Joe's Bayou."

That night Billy got back from fishing just in time to see the schooner weigh anchor and slip swiftly away toward Pensacola. For the first time Billy thought seriously of what the old Indian had told him about the treasure. He hurried over to the bayou. Under the stooping oaks was a hole 6 feet deep and 8 feet square—and in it were rusted iron crumblings and rotten mahogany.

When Billy told me about it, we sat looking at each other for a long time, thinking about how we could have dug that hole ourselves, and all the things we could have done with $60,000.

In 1902 Captain Billy took on still another task: tending the new lighthouses that were set up around treacherous East Pass. This meant he had to walk and row another 3 miles a day to keep the oil lamps burning and polished. After serving the Coast Guard in this capacity for 34 years, he finally worked up to a top salary of $29.50 a month.

Tragedy was an almost expected visitor in our wilderness, and Billy Marler became a frequent host to it. Ten of his 19 children died in infancy. His wife died, and the first son by his second marriage was a 2-year-old infant when he slipped unnoticed over the side of Billy's boat and drowned in the bay. Later, his oldest son, Ernest, was brutally murdered at the Cape San Blas Lighthouse shortly after he became its keeper.

Billy found relief from his sorrows by helping anyone he heard of who was in trouble along the beach. "Willy," he often told me, "if every man had the privilege of throwing all his troubles into one big pile with everybody else's and could pick up any burden he chose, 9 out of 10 would take up their own troubles again. Because they'd know better how to handle 'em."

By the age of 50 Captain Billy had become a patriarchal little giant of a man even among the steel-muscled, barrel-chested fisherfolk of his village. In 1915 he became a legend.

It was about 3 o'clock of a roaring March afternoon when a boatman burst into the boardinghouse I had opened at Fort Walton. "There's a pleasure schooner gone on the bar outside East Pass," he yelled. "She's foundering, and the crew's out there drowning."

By the time I reached the pass, a crowd had gathered on the piers. We were watching the 20-foot breakers thundering through the pass, convinced that the exit of a rescue launch would be impossible, when Captain Billy came running. There was no accusation in his voice, just a question: "Ain't none of you men gonna try it?"

Weathered seamen, younger than Billy, avoided the captain's eyes. Finally one spoke up: "If them city folks out there are bent on making their wives widows, I ain't. I got six children to feed. I say it's suicide."

"And I say we can't sit by and watch men drown," said Billy. As he ran for his launch, a tough, rangy fisherman named George Destin joined him. We watched as the big launch leaped and plunged out through the pass, at times disappearing between the boiling breakers.

Billy anchored his launch 500 yards from the wrecked schooner. Then, to a skiff they had towed out, he and George tied one end of a long line; they tied the other end to the launch. They boarded the skiff and dug their oars into the steep walls of water until they finally came crashing down on top of the wreck. The crew of the wreck had been washed overboard and scooped up in the submerged mainsail. From it Billy and Destin plucked five men and fought their way back with them to the launch. Then they made a second trip and picked up four. They saved every one of the nine men aboard!

At 70, when Billy began to retire from some of his more strenuous activities "because of failing strength," he could still squash a beer can between his thumb and forefinger so quickly and easily that the escaping air made a soft whoosh. At 85 he fell 30 feet from the top of a tree he had climbed to rescue a freightened cat. The fall shook him up a bit.

Billy used to say he wanted to live out his old age in peace and quiet, but I don't think either of us ever believed it. Today he seems quite happy that his old house has turned out to sit smack in the flight pattern of the main take-off strip of the Air Force Proving Ground at Eglin Field across the bay. When jet formations and guided missiles rattle the timbers of his house, Billy grins. "Anybody who can sail ships like that in the sky" he says, "I don't mind if they shake me a little when they pull up anchor."

Billy still presides over the same Sunday-school class he has taught since 1890. In this time he has arrived at his own neatly simplified analysis of all people. "There's just three kinds," he says, "The robbers, who say, 'The world owes me a living, and if you got something I'm agonna take it.' The keepers, who say, 'What I got is mine and I'm agonna keep it.' And the givers, who say, 'What I got is yours, and if you need it you can have it.'"

The treasure hunters have gotten thicker every year. They've dug up the grave of Billy Bowlegs until the land around looks like a bomb crater. There's no telling how many expensive rigs they've lost dragging the bay for Rogers' ship.

These diggers remind me of the empty hole left under the oaks of Joe's Bayou 58 years ago. I think of the $60,000 that might have come out of that hole, and how little difference it would have meant to a life like Billy Marler's. I think of all the good boats he has built, the mail he has carried, the lights he has kept burning along the reefs, the lives he has saved from the sea, the flourishing community he has done more thany any other man to build.

Captain Billy knows what he's talking about when he advises today's treasure hunters. "Why, sure, there's treasure out there," he tells them. "Where? Why, right out there."

He waves in the general direction of the bay—or, perhaps, of the entire world. "All you got to do is find it."

Let's Not Quit While Winning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On December 5, 1955, there appeared in Life magazine an editorial entitled "Let's Not Quit While Winning." It states persuasively the case for reinvigorating, rather than watering down, our overseas aid and technical assistance programs. Members of Congress realize by now that the spirit of Geneva was a Russian invention, not a genuine fact of life, and in seeking ways to fill the vacuum which now exists in our foreign policy, I believe Members would do well to ponder this editorial:

LET'S NOT QUIT WHILE WINNING

In Washington, among the bureaus most keenly attuned to the ups and downs of the cold peace, the horrible suspicion is dawning that the slippery Russians are turning against us our own strategy of economic aid and technical assistance.

Khrushchev and Bulganin, those traveling salesmen of Communist point 4 and good will, helped the dismal feeling with their baby-kissing tour of India and their lavish-sounding promises of ruble loans and technical scholarships. Even more alarming was Egypt, which the West had assumed was safely anchored. Instead, the Communist bloc, in a series of brilliant maneuvers, has gathered Egypt into its trade orbit, swapping guns, planes, kerosene and locomotives for cotton and lime. Result: Egypt's exports to the Communist bloc, normally only 20 percent of its total trade, this year are running at the rate of 53 percent. Not only that; the Soviets have just made a well-timed offer to provide Colonel Nasser with $200 million and the engineers he needs to start the project closest to his heart—the Aswan Dam to make the world's biggest power and irrigation project on the upper Nile.

Such examples are multiplying. Soviet aid technicians have reared huge new grain elevators on the skyline of Kabul, capital of Afghanistan; others are building flour mills and paving streets. Czech trucks are sold in Jordan and Czech tractors in the Sudan. Ceylon is getting Soviet-made carpenter tools; Red China is swapping rice for Cey-

lon's rubber. The Soviet has offered Turkey long-term loans to finance three cotton-textile mills, and Czechoslovakia is offering to provide the textile equipment; Hungary, a powerplant. East Germany is swapping shoddy pseudo-Volkswagens for Norwegian fish. A startling statistic: the Soviet Union is now turning out 53,000 engineers a year versus 23,000 in the United States. Ours study 5 days a week for 4 years; theirs, 6 days a week for 5 years—the extra studying being devoted to the language and culture of lands marked for Soviet economic penetration.

All such facts are cause for sober concern but hardly for distress. What they show is an implied victory for the strategy the United States has followed since World War II's end, a decade in which we have staked the staggering sum of $35.7 billion in the hope of fending off communism in non-Communist countries by helping them build prosperous free economies. While we were doing this, the Communists were trying unsuccessfully to wreck these same economies through strikes, subversion and sabotage. Their attempts to seize power by insurrection in India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Burma failed. Their decision to try technicians instead of truncheons is an admission of this failure. As imitation, it is the sincerest form of flattery for the wisdom of our own strategy.

A good poker player, who has staked big bets on strong cards, increases his bets still more when he discovers he has a winning hand. The United States, with its $35.7 billion bet on the ability of the world's greatest productive machine to enlarge the free world's trading area by priming its pumps of production, ought to be increasing its own stakes in this showdown game. Incredibly, it is doing just the opposite. Two weeks ago International Cooperation Administrator John B. Hollister announced a plan to withhold 20 percent of all foreign-aid appropriations, as a sort of kitty for future emergencies.

This is dollar wisdom and million-dollar foolishness. It is a serious flaw in the administration's otherwise sound approach to foreign policy. The flaw is in a tendency to tackle economic problems singly, in a tactic of putting out individual brush fires instead of evolving a coherent, long-range world economic policy. In such a policy economic aid, technical assistance, and increasingly liberalized trade, with a minimum of tariff and other restrictions, would all be meshed into a master strategy of enlarging everyone's trade, production, and consumption.

To attempt this is neither philanthropy, charity, nor sentimentalism, but harsh necessity. It agrees with the expansive dynamic of United States capitalism—the belief in bigger pieces for everybody out of bigger pies. Only the United States, whose 6 percent of the world's people use up 50 percent of the free world's production of raw materials, has the resources and the know-how to do the job. Experts who have studied the Asian-African investment problem believe that $3 billion a year—of which the United States Government would need to put up no more than $2 billion on top of the $1 billion a year it is now spending in that area—could in a 10-year period achieve the desired end. Such an investment could plant the seeds of economic progress in the world's underdeveloped areas (where three-fifths of mankind live) and get them well started toward modern, self-sustaining economic health. As to whether the United States can afford it, our national income in the current year alone is rising by $26.5 billion. As to whether we can afford not to do it, it cost us $22 billion—and nearly 34,000 lives—to keep communism out of just one tiny country—South Korea.

Unless the world's foremost industrial power does meet the need, these people will inevitably turn to the Soviets, now the world's second industrial power. Its income is increasing at the rate of $8 billion a year; if only one-fourth of that should be devoted to Communist point 4, it could cause us severe losses. Many of the Communist promises are undoubtedly phony—e. g., for a fraction of the promised sum to Egypt they could probably gain entry for their technicians. By the same token we should not be blackmailed into taking on any projects which don't make economic sense. But the danger is that Soviet lures will enmesh some of these countries before they discover the emptiness of the promises. And in the case of Red China, at least, they are delivering the real thing—economic aid of $1.6 billion a year and the help of thousands of expert technicians.

The ultimate fate of Asia may depend upon the outcome of the competition between India's democratic economy and Red China's slave system. In this competition Red China already has the immense advantage of this Soviet subsidy. India, on the other hand, has to find an assurance of $1.7 billion in order to carry out its second 5-year plan of industrialization. We will do well to keep this disparity in mind in our own plans.

With nuclear war tacitly outlawed, this problem is probably the greatest that will confront us in our lifetime. On its solution undoubtedly the alternative of peaceful development or bloody and unpredictable world upheaval likely depend. We can nobly save or meanly lose. We shall fail most miserably of all if we seek to meet it only halfway, in pinch-penny and isolated gestures. Let us hope that President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message will unfold a policy to meet the problem with a boldness and imagination which not only will inspire the world but unite all Americans, and all parties, in true bipartisan purpose—to complete a victory already partly won.

Congressman's Chores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from The Times-Picayune, New Orleans, La., of January 5, 1956:

CONGRESSMAN'S CHORES

The second and last session of the 84th Congress began Tuesday.

It probably will be a more turbulent meeting than the first session. Expedients of an election year tend to produce contention, and there are definite points of cleavage between the leadership of the two parties on some domestic and foreign policies.

What the public might properly most wish is that Members of Congress will find more time to devote to important legislation. A Member of the House said recently that the situation was such that about 90 percent of a Member's time was taken up with serving, running errands for, and entertaining constituents individually or by groups, leaving only 10 percent for legislation. Even if that is an exaggeration, a Member cannot properly do his duty as a legislator if most of his time must be devoted to nonlegislative chores.

Maybe Congress needs a committee to look into effects of these growing service demands. Since the legislative branch investigates, up to a point, the conduct of the executive branch, maybe Congress ought to ask the executive department to make an impartial survey.

Anyway it cannot be imagined that the public wants its Representatives' time so taken up with errands, and so forth, that Congress must resort to legislating almost exclusively by committee and pass legislation without reasonable House or Senate deliberation.

We Are Awake, Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, in this morning's New York Times, I saw the headlines "Dulles Spurs United States in Economic War with Soviet Union." Our Secretary of State is quoted to the effect that in the cold war, he saw new emphasis on economic and social problems as the major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. He has asked the country to wake up to this very important new aspect of the foreign-aid program which he said our citizens had not yet sufficiently appreciated.

In a statement issued by the Secretary, he pointed out that the way to counter Soviet's efforts is "not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid" but by making the newly independent nations of Asia feel that their needs can best be satisfied if they become and remain part of the free world. The importance of Mr. Dulles' observation is indicated by the statement "defeat in this contest would be as disastrous as a defeat in an armaments race." He characterized certain aspects of the Geneva talks as disappointing. He says, "We could lose this economic contest unless the country as a whole wakes up to all its implications."

Wake up indeed. I am glad that the Secretary has at last awakened to this shift of tactics by the Communists which I warned about in a speech in Congress exactly 6 months ago today. It was on July 12, 1955, that I tried to call attention to the new phase of the cold war, namely, the economic phase which Mr. Dulles now for the first time seems to be concerned with. Fortunately, it is not too late. But Mr. Dulles should know that some segments of our people have been awake for a long time. I take the liberty of inserting at this point in the RECORD my speech of July 12, 1955:

THE BIG FOUR CONFERENCE—NEW SOVIET PRESSURE

(Speech of Hon. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, of New York, in the House of Representatives, Tuesday, July 12, 1955)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleagues in praying that the imminent conference at the summit which will be participated in by the Big Four may serve to encourage the recent seeming trend toward a reduction in the cold-war tensions. Our goal is peace. To achieve it, we shall and we must strive with all the strength and energy which, in the

past, we have used to build America and to make it great.

The historic worldwide disregard for the Biblical commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," has brought us now to the point where if once again we take up the arms of war, we shall surely kill ourselves. And yet our President must go to Geneva fortified and backed by strength. There can be no relaxation of our preparedness. It has undoubtedly been our relentless struggle to maintain a sound military posture which has finally brought this first glimmer of hope in the cold war. To relent now would be to make those years of sacrifice count for naught. Make no mistake, the cold war has been costly, and we have sacrificed much in the waging of it. Our schools and children have suffered as a result. Economic and technical assistance here at home and abroad have taken second place to military preparedness.

The proof of this is the new Soviet approach. They have failed to frighten us by bluster and calculated military gambits. They were stopped in Korea because President Truman had the courage and foresight to see that failure to respond to the invasion of South Korea would mean the eventual fall of one friendly nation after another into the Soviet orbit. He saw also that it would spell the end of the United Nations. We won a round on points, but the struggle is far from over. This is one of those old-time, no-holds-barred affairs and we are now entering another round.

Among the mail which I received yesterday were appeals from natives of 2 captive countries now dominated by Russia. The Committee for Hungarian Liberation wrote calling attention to a provision of the Hungarian Treaty of Paris which provides for the withdrawal of the Russians from Hungary within 90 days after the evacuation of Soviet troops from Austria. Here it would seem exists a sterling opportunity for Russia to give evidence of its sincerity at the Geneva Conference in the light of the recent Austrian Treaty. I also received a copy of the plea for Polish freedom which was sent to the President.

The liberation of enslaved peoples must continue to be a basic objective of American policy.

In yesterday's mail, we received the next to last report to Congress of the operations under the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951. This report emphasized the new sphere of attention in the cold war and reverts to the course which was staked out by General Marshall and President Truman. In this report, we read of the recent developments in Soviet-bloc foreign economic activities, especially in underdeveloped countries. The report graphically describes the Soviet attempts at economic penetration so we see that where the way to military expansion is barred, Communist Russia switches to conquests through economics. The goal is the same. The targets are the same, conquest and enslavement of the world, starting with the most susceptible areas.

The Marshall and Truman plans outlined our defense in this field. We have recently approved a new foreign-aid program. As I said when the bill was before us, its primary emphasis was on defense support, and I felt that the development assistance and economic and technical aid portions were not large enough. These should be increased and our efforts directed toward the new arena in which the world struggle is now patently being waged. Please do not misunderstand. I do not mean that we can in any reduce our military preparedness. The Russians will maneuver to strike in whichever field they think there is the most chance of success. They are shifting to the economic field now and we must move with them. In fact, I urge that we move ahead of them and beat them at their own game.

The underdeveloped areas of the world are ripe for subversion and subtle economic pressure. Japan needs markets for her goods. Britain, France, and Germany likewise. As do Israel and Egypt. The Arab States, Asian countries, and the South American republics need to import and export many goods. The smaller countries need aid in building up their lands. They need technical advisers on modern methods of farming and construction. They need schools, books, and most of the commodities which we have come to regard as necessities. To them these commodities are luxuries, enjoyed only by the very rich. Unless we help them to help themselves, we will lose this next round, and if we do, the loss is just as efficacious as if an army of Soviet troops had marched into these underdeveoped areas of the world.

We may view this in a sense of enlightened self-interest for if these depressed and possibly envious countries cannot support an adequate standard of living, they will be unable to buy the goods we produce and which we must sell for our own well-being. This country is not self-sufficient. We must import many essential supplies. We must export much to sustain our industry and continue a high level of employment. In short, we need friendly free nations throughout the world with which we can trade. If we fail to help these countries now, the Russians well see to it that they drop into the Communist field of influence and become lost to us as friends and economic partners forever.

At Geneva we must be prepared to deal with the Soviets in language they understand. We must be strong militarily and we must be strong economically. We can expect a concerted effort by the Communists to expand their program of conquest by economic subversion. I believe that that will be the base strategy of their participation in the conference at the summit.

We can win this phase of the cold war in a walk if we try. We are world champions in the economic field. We have the know-how, the ability, and the wherewithal, which the Russians cannot acquire in a hundred years regardless of what the Pravda propaganda machine might say. The important thing is that we must understand what the Russians are trying to do. We must at all times keep our attention fixed upon their motivation notwithstanding sweet talk, lessening of tension, or even a few good deeds. We must be willing to be fair, but not fooled. We must be kindly, but not kidded. We are justified in having faith in ourselves, albeit our trust must repose with the Almighty.

We are awake, Mr. Dulles; who do you really believe has been asleep at the switch?

Creative Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, last August 24 Clarence Francis, national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, delivered a magnificent address entitled "Creative Citizenship." His speech was delivered before the convention of the National Association of Life Underwriters. Not only is the message particularly pertinent to this Congress, but it also allows me to pay a tribute to Mr. Julian S. Myrick. As Mr. Francis pointed out, Mr. Myrick has been one of the energetic fighters for reorganization long before the birth of the Hoover Commission. In many ways this speech is a tribute to him:

CREATIVE CITIZENSHIP

When Julian Myrick conveyed your cordial invitation to meet with you here, I accepted readily. For one thing I feel that the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report owes special thanks to Julian and to all of you who have taken such a keen interest in Federal reorganization since the days of the first Hoover Commission in 1949.

Further, I find the theme of this, your 66th annual meeting, an exciting and challenging one. "Creative salesmanship" is certainly, as you put it, a "dynamic factor" in business today. Frankly, I don't believe such terms as "creative" or "dynamic" were generally used or understood by businessmen in the days when I started out as a salesman. But in my several decades as a "prune peddler," I have seen some striking changes. We have all learned many new things. We have accepted new views of many old things.

There will be nothing new or strange to you, therefore, in the fact that I have chosen "creative citizenship" as my topic and that I regard it as a definite part of your discussion of creative salesmanship. The two go hand in hand.

Let us go back for a moment to the period, not so very long ago, when salesmanship itself was a fairly new thing. Its real potential as an economic and social force was just beginning to be understood. The faithful drummer, going his rounds, the butt of many jokes and the author of many more, was deemed to be a useful fellow in his way but that was about all.

As a matter of fact, some of my family and friends were pretty dubious about my vocational choice. They considered it a waste of a college education to go into selling, especially in the grocery business. And they had a point. If you've ever seen the typical old-fashioned grocery store, with its barrels of molasses, crackers, and pickles, its flypaper in summer and pot-bellied stove in winter, you will know what I mean. It was no shining symbol of progress.

Since then, of course, in mine as in all businesses, breathtaking gains have been made. A vital factor behind these gains has been the creative power of our sales mechanism—and back of that a new spirit, a new concept of the purposes of salesmanship.

To be perfectly hardheaded about it, let us begin by stating clearly that salesmen work primarily to make a living. Of couse, but is that all? No, every salesman worth his salt is helping to create and satisfy the American urge for better products, better services, and better living.

You, for example, are engaged primarily in the sale of life insurance. But that is only the starting point in the great story of the service you perform. You sell something that no one can eat or wear, or ride in. Few people consciously realize the need for life insurance. So you must first of all be educators. You must awaken others to the need. And you must also be visionaries. You have to open people's eyes to the possibilities and the opportunities which life insurance offers.

The policy you hand over to your client is just a token, a symbol. What you actually sell is security, thrift, health, education, recreation, and peace of mind. Life insurance makes an enormous contribution to the continuity and stability of millions of families and many business enterprises. It aids in the strength and growth of our national economy.

You deal with the individual American. You teach him to save, to plan, to use his resources wisely for the protection of his family, the improvement of his circum-

stances, and the happiness of his old age. You spread before him a constantly widening variety of opportunities to make the most of life in his own way.

What you sell to Americans is something no Russian can buy. The very concept of individually-purchased and individually-planned security is abhorrent to the Communist philosophy. Statism, the Marxist ideal, no more permits the citizen any opinion with respect to his economic destiny than it tolerates his participation in the affairs of government.

This brings us to "the other side of the medal." One of the deep, distinguishing differences between freedom and totalitarianism centers around the relationship of the individual to his Government. In the Marxist state, the citizen has no right to interest himself in the conduct of governmental affairs; in America he has no right to refrain.

Perhaps what I am saying is just too obvious. But is it really? We expound and accept the doctrine of responsible citizenship without question. But has our thinking as to its meaning kept pace with the whirlwind developments of the times? Or are we still largely content with the one-horse attitudes of the past.

In those earlier days, as I recall it, most people were reasonably conscientious about voting. They paid their taxes, such as they were. They followed the doings of William Jennings Bryan, Teddy Roosevelt, and Bob LaFollette in much the same way that they noted the exploits of Tinker, Evers, and Chance. Once in awhile they got fairly excited about an election.

Perhaps that was good enough for those times. Government then, the Federal Govment especially, had relatively little real meaning to the citizen in terms of his everyday life. In 1910 the dollar cost of running the whole Federal establishment, Army, Navy, and all, was $694 million. The budget of New York City is more than twice as big as that today.

Now I don't need to bother you with statistics. You probably know that Federal costs amounted to about $38 per average American family per year in 1910 and that they come to $1,600 per family today, just 42 times as much. The interest on the visible national debt (and I use the word "visible" advisedly) is five and one-half times today what the whole debt was then.

I need not remind you either that, as citizens and businessmen, we have to take the Government into consideration with every move we make. Not only taxes but regulations, ordinances, guaranties, subsidies, and controls pervade our daily lives.

For that matter I don't need to point out to you, of all people, that the whole structure of your great insurance industry is founded on confidence in the future of the United States as a free Nation. Obviously private insurance cannot exist in a collectivist economy. Quite as obviously, there are certain clear dangers in the trends of recent years to which you are peculiarly sensitive.

Huge taxes, debts, and deficits must be met from the profits of industry and the earnings and savings of the citizen. Every cent of extravagance or waste adds to the danger of further inflation and threatens to cut deeper into the value of the dollar which your companies have promised to pay. Every bit of needless Government competition with industry reduces revenues and adds to the tax burden.

No, you realize full well what a great stake you have in the stability of our economy and the prudent management of our Government. You are thinking ahead to 1975 when there will be nearly 21 million persons over 65 years of age in America and you are properly concerned with the safety of their savings.

Finally, you know as well as anyone that the Government has grown so big so fast in recent years that it can literally topple over on us at any time. Thanks to the phenomenal expansion of our industries we have so far kept our balance. But we must face the fact that "Big Government," the product of an astounding succession of wars and emergencies to which there seems no end, will be a constant problem of the future.

We will conquer that problem exactly to the extent that we, as citizens, address ourselves to it. To the exact extent that we neglect it, it will tend eventually to overwhelm us.

Well, once we agree on that point, where do we begin? How do we get hold of this ponderous and complicated problem? We would have no answer to that question were it not for the Hoover Commissions.

Something new, something big, something terribly important happened in America in 1947. That was the year in which Congress, by unanimous vote, created the first bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. And it seems to me fully as much an act of Providence as it was an act of Congress which brought former President Herbert Hoover to the helm of that venture.

You recall that the first Commission labored for 2 long years, with the aid of 300 devoted specialists called task-force workers, to give us our first clear view of modern government in all its magnitude and complexity. The Commission also filed a series of specific recommendations for cutting out waste and duplication and improving efficiency in the executive branch.

Against all precedent, and despite considerable opposition, some 75 percent of the Commission's recommendations were adopted with savings that today run well into the billions. This was the result of a significant reawakening of citizen interest in governmental affairs. It showed that something can be done when party lines are brushed aside. And it paved the way for the second Hoover Commission.

Also created unanimously by Congress, in 1953, and set up along the same lines under the same leadership, the new Commission likewise labored for 2 years. This time it had a broader assignment. It was authorized to go into matters of policy. It questioned not only whether a governmental function is being properly conducted but whether it should be conducted by Government at all.

You have seen the headlines which accompanied the publication of each of the 19 sections of the new Hoover report in the period from February until June 30 of this year when the Commission's official existence ended. Let me mention just a few of the findings.

The Government's $9 billion-a-year payroll suffers from a turnover of close to 25 percent per year. If we could reduce this turnover to 20 percent, we would save nearly $50 million a year in training and replacement costs. And a true career senior civil service would repay the Nation more than can ever be reckoned in dollars and cents.

The Government creates and handles some 25 billion pieces of paper a year which engages the efforts of 750,000 full-time employees and costs more than the whole Federal budget in the Taft administration. Most of the endless letters and questionnaires which flow back and forth between Washington and industry are too complicated and many of them are utterly needless. The commission found ways of simplifying or eliminating much paperwork which might save as much as $255 million a year.

Waste and duplication abound in the management of the 26 Federal agencies which engage in medical activities. In its efforts to meet the needs of the 30 million citizens for whom it has assumed some degree of responsibility for medical care, the Government wastes money through ill-coordinated hospital construction (new beds here, empty ones there) and, worse still, fails to utilize wisely the scarce skills and talents of medical and technical personnel.

I spoke before of the visible national debt. This refers to the $274 billion of direct obligations which we all know about. The Commission found huge additional moral obligations of more than $240 billion to which the Government is committed through loans, guaranties, or insuring activities carried on by 104 different lending agencies." And this is exclusive of the unfunded liabilities of the retirement program which are estimated at $265 billion. The true total of our Nation's obligations, therefore, is more like $780 billion than $274 billion.

The Commission further found a "tendency to create activities which could be undertaken by private agencies" * * * "concealed subsidies" * * * "inadequate equities" * * * and the always great danger that "where easy money is obtainable from the Government, financial integrity tends to deteriorate and windfalls and corruption frequently flourish." The Commission had no difficulty in uncovering potential savings of $200 million a year in this field. It found, moreover, that nearly $5 billion could be returned to the Treasury by mutualizing certain funds and liquidating others.

As you might well suppose, tremendous opportunities for economy reside in other Hoover Commission reports. Government-owned storage space occupies an acreage twice the size of Manhattan Island. The Government carries personal property inventories of about $115 billion. Stocks on hand of some items sometimes represent the advance supplies of 9, 21, and even 79 years. As a real-estate man, Uncle Sam owns one-fourth of the acreage of the 48 States and 2,500,000,000 square feet of floorspace, the equivalent of 1,250 Empire State Buildings. In the Defense Department alone there are 2,500 business-type establishments at least 1,000 of which, the Commission said, are in needless competition with private enterprise.

And these are just a few samples from the 3,300,000 words of research findings which the Commission left as its legacy. On its way out the Commission concluded a series of 314 recommendations which, if fully applied, would lead to savings of not less than $5 billion a year, possibly more. Additionally there is between $5 billion and $6 billion of returnable capital which could be brought back to the Treasury from agencies and other Government business enterprises.

We thus have a clear-cut opportunity to balance the Federal budget and make a substantial reduction in the national debt. Think of that.

And whose job is it to see the recommendations through? As before, responsibility rests in part with the administration and in part with the Congress. Some 45 percent of the recommendations can be accomplished by administrative action within the executive branch. Most of the remainder will require congressional approval.

Real progress, I am happy to say, is being made in the realm of executive branch action. Presumably Congress, having created the Commission, will in the fullness of time take the initiative with respect to some of the recommendations. But this we know with certainty: Scores of previous reorganization commissions have labored in vain and died forgotten for lack of the one factor which made a success of the first Hoover Commission and without which there can be small hope for substantial achievement by the new one.

That factor is citizen support. That's the American pattern after all. In a bipartisan program of this scope, both the Executive and the Congress need to feel that the public is interested in seeing something done. Heavy pressures, both within and without the Government, are already forming against certain sections of the Hoover Report. To offset these, there must be a means by which disinterested citizens can applaud, encourage, and, if need be, prod official Washington.

This is a task for the citizen who recognizes the importance of the problem with respect to all his other concerns and is willing to give time, thought, and good hard work to its solution. This is, in fact, a wonderful opportunity and a great challenge to the citizen who sees his responsibilities in modern, jet-age terms, not in the one-horse terms that were perhaps good enough when the Government was less than a tenth of its present size.

When events bring a great Nation like ours to the crossroads, the decision to turn in either direction isn't made overnight. The one way in which we can insure the preservation of that great, basic difference between our society and the totalitarian state is to assert the difference by our own deeds. Creative citizenship is active citizenship, not just once a year or once every 6 months, but day by day the year round. And any citizen can vote for better government every day of his life, if he has a 3-cent stamp, by getting back of the Hoover Commission.

In you and the 60,00 articulate, active, intelligent creative salesmen whom you represent, I see a potential army of creative citizens. I hope you will seize the opportunity contained in the Hoover report and act upon it in your own way. I grant that the report requires study but I don't think an alert citizen can afford to be ignorant of its contents.

I grant, too, that there will be opposition, strong opposition, to some of the Commission's recommendations. Let me warn you now, in fact, that well-directed efforts are being made by powerful groups to discredit the Commission and attack its facts. Many of these attacks will prove, on examination, to be based on misinterpretations of the Commission's actual recommendations or outright distortions. One national organization of veterans issued an 11-point series of allegations against the report, 5 of which turned out to have no basis in anything the Commission said, 2 of which lacked any factual explanation, 3 of which were matters of opinion, and 1 of which was redundant.

One of the Nation's great newspapers went off half-cocked before the report was even issued and condemned the Commission and all its work on the basis of a recommendation which it never did make and had no intention of making. I mention these things merely to illustrate the fact that the citizen who supports the Hoover Commission must prepare to join in a good, lively, healthy national Town Meeting.

At the same time, I want to make it plain that the controversial aspects of the report can easily be exaggerated. We have just completed an analysis of the Commission's 314 recommendations. There is very general support for, and no known opposition to, 194.5 of them. There is general support for, and mild opposition to, another 71.5. The remaining 48 have drawn strong opposition but they are also warmly supported in other quarters.

At all events, let us not lose sight of the big goals in pursuit of small quarrels. There is too much at stake for all of us.

To sum up, I make these points: If only for good, sound dollars-and-cents reasons, creative citizenship is a definite part of the creative salesman's job. It is the way in which he contributes to the preservation of te environment in which he earns his daily bread. But remember, "create" means "make" and the truly creative man, in any walk of life, is the man who wants to bring new things into being or improve existing things, who is never satisfied with simple self-preservation as a goal in itself. There is more, far more, than dollars-and-cents satisfaction, great as that may be, for the citizen who works in support of the Hoover Commission.

In closing I can do no better than remind you of the Hoover Commission's own view of its objectives. This was set forth in the Commission's final report to the Congress and was signed by every member including, of course, those who dissented from sections of the report itself.

"The problems before the Commission have by no means been purely financial," the Commission said. "In our recommendations we have sought six objectives:

"First. To preserve the full security of the Nation in a disturbed world.

"Second. To maintain the functioning of all necessary agencies which make for the common welfare.

"Third. To stimulate the fundamental research upon which national security and progress are based.

"Fourth. To improve efficiency and eliminate waste in the executive agencies.

"Fifth. To eliminate or reduce Government competition with private enterprise.

"Sixth, and perhaps most important of all—to strengthen the economic, social, and governmental structure which has brought us, now for 166 years, constant blessings and progress."

And I ask you: Is that not worth working and, if need be, fighting for?

Statement by William G. Zetzmann, Chairman, Board of Public Works, State of Louisiana, and Member of the Executive Committee of the Mississippi Valley Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by William G. Zetzmann:

Last week, I attended a meeting of the Mississippi Valley Association, in Omaha, Nebr. And, accompanying United States Army engineers, I flew 500 miles up the valley of the Missouri River to Pierre, S. Dak., where I got firsthand information about the Oahe Dam and Reservoir. This is one of a series of dams and reservoirs being constructed in connection with a $900 million flood-control and public- and private-power projects that ultimately will control 75 percent of the water which comes down the Missouri River, and, therefore, is of vital importance to the city of New Orleans, not only from the viewpoint of flood control, but also navigation, commerce, industry, and even our drinking-water supply.

The valley of the Missouri River, one of the Nation's great rivers, comprises 529,000 square miles, one-sixth of the total area of the United States. In this vast inland empire, included in the Louisiana Purchase that Thomas Jefferson bought from France for a few cents per acre, I saw a working demonstration of unified public action, which in a decade has literally changed the face of the earth. I saw a system of great Missouri River dams which rival the greatest engineering works the world has ever seen.

Water in that region is being impounded in huge, man-made reservoirs, on a gargantuan scale, through a basin-wide, multiple-purpose water program which is nearly 50 percent completed. I saw two of these great dams and reservoirs from the air; and, inspected a third on the ground. Two other massive structures on the upper river, which are also now in operation, were beyond the scope of our tour.

All told, today, the Corps of Engineers, working with the 10 Missouri Basin States and 6 cooperating Federal agencies, has 4 main-stem dams and reservoirs completed, or sufficiently near completion so that all are in operation. They are functioning to prevent destructive floods, to facilitate Missouri River and Mississippi River navigation, to assure adequate water supply for 2 million people who take their water from the river; for power development, and expansion of irrigation.

They have stopped major floods on the upper and middle Missouri River for some 1,000 river miles. They have now in storage nearly 15 million acre-feet of water, the equivalent of about two-thirds the average annual flow of the Missouri River at Sioux City, Iowa. For three successive drought years, this new reservoir system has been able to maintain a steady, adequate flow of water in the river to meet the peak summer demands of cities, industries, and a growing navigation business of the Missouri below Omaha. In addition, they are producing over 1 billion kilowatt hours of electrical energy and will double that production in another year.

What does this mean to New Orleans and the lower Mississippi? It means water in the "bank" which will help us to meet our demands of the future. Actually, that system of controls far up the Missouri Valley has already made, and will continue to make, important contributions to our welfare.

I learned from Brig. Gen. W. E. Potter, the corps' Missouri River division engineer, that, during the drought months of the past fall and summer, fully 75 percent of the flow of the Missouri River, all the way from Sioux City to St. Louis, was provided by water from these reservoirs—water which had been saved from floods of previous years and skimmed off during high spring flows. This bonus water accounted for 40 percent of the flow in our own Mississippi River for several critical months last summer and fall. It helped us with our local salt-wedge problem, and it assured sufficient channel depths at St. Louis and below to maintain 9-foot depth loading of our river barges, at a time when the Mississippi was too low to do this job alone.

This service to us on the Mississippi was incidental to the major purposes of the comprehensive Missouri Basin water control program, which was authorized by Congress in 1944 and is now in its tenth construction year. But, we did benefit and will continue to benefit year after year, because of the vision and foresight of our neighbors to the north and west. I was assured by the Governors of Nebraska and South Dakota, and other citizens of the Missouri Valley, that the Mississippi Valley Association and Members of Congress from our own region had contributed very helpfully to the success of this project.

I saw another refreshing thing up there in the Missouri Basin, which generates a lot of the water on which we live. I flew over a snow-blanketed countryside for more than 500 miles. The snow ranged in depth up to 12 inches at Pierre, the capital of South Dakota. This early winter snow augers well for next summer's water supply and holds some promise of relief from the dry cycle of the past several years.

The hopeful part of this picture is that we have the solid assurance now that these Corps of Engineers dams and reservoirs will store every gallon of the snow-melt and the spring and summer rains, so that it can be released—as man needs it—all the way down the Missouri, and hence into our own Mississippi.

I had the privilege of inspecting the great Oahe Dam, which is now in the major construction stage. I walked hundreds of feet into a concrete tunnel 20 feet in diameter, 1 of 6 which, in the future, will carry the Missouri under the 240-foot high dam that extends 2 miles across the Missouri Valley.

I cannot begin to describe the size of this project—the world's largest rolled-fill dam. You would have to see it to believe it. The dam will require 75-million cubic yards of earth fill; and, the concrete outlet structures, powerhouse and spillway, over a million and a half cubic yards of concrete. In 1958 this structure will be completed and another mighty control added to the Missouri system.

But equally interesting and inspiring to me was the meeting we attended with Governor Joe Foss, of South Dakota; members of the greater South Dakota Development Association, and other directors of the Mississippi Valley Association. There, I caught the spirit of drive and unity of purpose which has enabled these people of the Missouri Basin to set a river development record in a decade—a record which is a challenge to the entire country.

In Omaha, Nebr., and Pierre, S. Dak., the work of International Trade Mart and International House are well known. Our port—New Orleans—is their port. The splendid cooperation of delegates from those States, in matters pertaining to the Tidewater Channel at New Orleans, the control of Old River, and the prevention of the capture of the Mississippi River by the Atchafalaya—all evidence their feeling that what is good for New Orleans is also good for Omaha and Pierre. Likewise, we should always keep in mind that what is good for the Mississippi Valley, as a whole, is good for New Orleans.

After the Spree Comes the Hangover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article written by James Reston, of the New York Times, appearing in its issue of January 1, 1956. The year 1955 might well go down in history as a year of wishful thinking by the administration, and creating such thinking in the minds of too large a percentage of our people.

The article follows:

AFTER THE SPREE COMES THE HANGOVER

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, December 31.—The administration has made its New Year's resolutions, like all the rest of us, and now all it has to do is carry them out.

This will not be easy, for the state of the Nation at the beginning of 1956 is a little like the state of many of its citizens this weekend. It has been on a lovely spree and is now facing the inevitable hangover.

Nineteen fifty-five was fun: A year of wishful thinking about the Russians, the Chinese, the boom, the schools, the roads, Quemoy and Matsu, the Middle East, the Germans, the French, disarmament, and the President's health.

Nineteen fifty-six will be more difficult, for the bills are coming in, and they are coming in during a presidential election year, when they will be hard to pay.

PLEASE REMIT

In 1955 a large part of the foreign military and economic aid program was taken out of reserves; in 1956, almost $5 billion will have to be appropriated just to keep the program going at the same rate.

In 1955, the administration offered the country a do-it-yourself school building program which required the appropriation of very little money and got hopelessly involved in the old controversies over segregation and aid to parochial schools.

In 1956, a new and imaginative effort will be made to persuade the Congress to authorize Federal grants of over $1 billion in the next 5 years.

In 1955, the disarmament problem was met with a gimmick—the President's limited aerial inspection proposal—but in 1956 the United States will have to come forward with a serious plan.

In 1955, the administration has asked the Nation to believe that the vast and critical battle for the world depends for its success on the continued service of one wounded soldier; in 1956, this proposition will have to be put to a decision.

In the foreign field, the assumptions of 1955—that the Arab States would look only to the West for military and political aid; that the Chinese Communists would make no moves toward the conquest of Quemoy and Matsu; that the Russians would stay out of the Middle East, and agree to the unification of Germany—are no longer valid.

The cold war is now changing. It is as if two football teams, slogging it out between the tackles in straight power plunges, suddenly shifted into spread formation, requiring new offenses and new defenses, and opening up vast new opportunities for attack.

The administration is resolved to do something about these things. It knows that the time for temporizing with the school and road problems, for dreaming about the end of foreign aid, and for hoping that the Communists would be reasonable in Europe and Asia is over, and it has made some bold New Year's resolutions to deal with the new situation.

THE NEW PROGRAMS

This is what all the Cabinet and National Security Council meetings here and at Camp David have been about. They have resolved to put foreign aid on a more or less permanent basis; to dig into the Treasury for the schools and roads; to grapple with the immensely complex problem of modernizing the obsolescent defenses of Western Europe; to compensate the farmers for their losses; to shift strategy in the Middle East and south Asia; to hold the line on taxes, and to deal more urgently with the soaring volume of consumer credit.

As every citizen knows, however, it is easier to say what you want to do in the new year than to do it, and this is particulary true of this time and this administration.

The time calls for radical changes when everything on the surface looks pretty good and there is no widespread demand for changes. The administration has said publicly—what it knows privately is not true—that "everything's booming but the guns," and the people who do not live on farms have tended to believe it.

No conservative party really wants to make changes in a program it likes when it is enjoying a general immunity from criticism and the electorate is reasonably content. This administration likes its farm program and its foreign policy, its school program and its road program about as they are.

Indeed, one of the critical aspects of the situation in the days before the opening of Congress is that the new programs it will introduce in the coming weeks already outrun the convictions of many of the leaders of the administration.

They will suport these programs because the political and economic facts at home and abroad require them to do so, and the President, who is more enthusiastic about changes than some members of the Cabinet, has decided for change.

But if the administration's New Year's resolutions are to be written into law in an election year, somebody is going to have to fight for them every day with great enthusiasm, and this fight must be carried to a large extent by some men who are not eager for the battle.

Consumer Gas Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's newspapers I was dismayed to learn of the introduction of legislation by Senators MONRONEY, FULBRIGHT, ANDERSON, and DANIEL which would require the Washington Gas Light Co. to print on its monthly consumer bills a breakdown statement to show how much of the bill goes to the distributing company, the pipeline and the producer. This legislation is propounded in part to point up the smaller portion of the bill representing production.

The obvious purpose of this legislation is more sinister than sincere and purports to take punitive action against this company for joining the Council of Local Gas Companies in a legitimate protest against the Harris-Fulbright gas steal bill.

The technique is completely in keeping with the resolution to investigate the distributors of natural gas because of their opposition to the Harris bill in the House last summer.

The Congress of the United States is no place for vindication and recriminations—it is a place for sober and conscientious deliberation.

I am proud of the forthright courage of the gas distribution industries to resist the efforts of the oil and gas industry to run roughshod over the interests of the gas-consuming public.

The records and cost figures of the distribution of natural gas in the Washington area as well as the other gas consuming areas are public records—open for public scrutiny. The gas-consuming public in any given area has the right to inquire, investigate and dispute a gas rate before its utility commission and in the courts. It is that very right which the Harris-Fulbright bill seeks to take away from the public with respect to gas production. The measure is no giveaway—it is the "takeaway" of 1956.

It is my earnest hope that the Senate will exercise more wisdom than the House on this measure and defeat it for all time.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Investment Opportunities in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled "Investment Opportunities in Latin America," delivered at the finance conference of the American Management Association by Dr. Luis Machado, Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, New York, December 2, 1955:

If I had to describe in one single phrase the opportunities for investment in Latin America, I would say that, in her economic development, Latin America is today where the United States of America was a hundred years ago.

You probably would understand much better what I have to say if, by a twist of our imagination, we would turn back the hands of the clock and the leaves of the calendar a full century; something—I am sure—many in the audience would not object to, if it could be done. Let us imagine that a century ago the American Management Association, at its finance conference, had asked someone to talk briefly on the opportunities for investment in that part of the United States that lies west of the Mississippi River.

By 1855 the United States had already become an important nation. It had reached a population of 25 million people. It had just finished assimilating the large area of land bought at 4 cents an acre from France under the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. It had pushed its frontiers west of the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean by annexing California and what is now Oregon and Washington. Texas had just joined the Union. Gold had recently been discovered in California.

It is true that most of the newly acquired area was still unexplored; that there were no roads to reach the new lands; that there was not much law and order prevailing at the time; that men had to fight the Indians, the bandits and the forces of nature to survive; that a gun had to be carried on the hip, ready to be used; that sanitation and comfort did not exist; that living conditions were hard and difficult; that political conditions were unstable; and that the question of the abolition of slavery was boiling and heading the country toward a cruel and bloody civil war.

All that was true. But no one—not even the most conservative banker—would have questioned the opportunities for investment that existed a hundred years ago in that area. In fact, the most enthusiastic orator at a finance conference like this, speaking a century ago on the opportunities for investment west of the Mississippi River—even resorting to the wildest dreams—could not have possibly foreseen the fantastic development of the teeming cities, the bumper crops, the herds of cattle, the oil production, the prosperous mining enterprises, including all ores, from iron, copper and zinc to precious metals and uranium; the booming industries, the gigantic aviation factories, the vacation lands, the movie colonies, the hydroelectric generating plants, the growth in population, and the many other factors that have contributed to make this country the most advanced and richest Nation in the history of the world. How could anyone predict that the population of the United States in a century was going to jump from 25 million to 160 million?

I repeat that in 1855 no one could have doubted the wisdom of investing west of the Mississippi River, because the necessary ingredients for a good investment were all present there at the time.

Let us see if we all agree on what is a good investment. An investment is the application of capital to a new venture for a productive purpose. The object of an investment is to produce; and the success of an investment is determined by its production. If an investment grows, that is, if it produces, it is a good investment. If it fails to grow, it is a poor investment. Growth is the measure of success of an investment.

In 1855 the United States was a growing Nation; growing in area, in physical resources, in population, in commerce, in domestic production. The opportunity for investment was there, and the seed could not fail to ripen in such favorable soil. Growth is the ideal climate for investments.

Now, let's get back to our conference and to our year of grace 1955. Let us take a long look from this great city of New York, the financial center of the world, to that large and distant area, a thousand miles away, little known and less understood, that is called Latin America.

Let me first remind you that Latin America is not a country, but a continent; a continent where 20 independent Republics and a few territories still under European colonial domination live peacefully side by side. I do not know how many of you have visited Latin America, or how many of you have business there. But for the benefit of those of you that have never visited our shores, let me explain that Latin America occupies an area two-and-a-half times the size of the United States. In this very large area, you will find the longest and the second highest mountain range in the world, the Andes; the largest river in the world, the Amazon; the highest navigable lake, the Titicaca; one of the largest waterfalls bounding on three countries, the Iguazu; and the highest watefalls in the world, Angel's Falls in Venezuela.

This large continent to the south of you is the largest producer in the world of beef, coffee, sugar, cocoa, tropical fruits, silver, copper, and manganese. It is also one of the largest producers of wheat, corn, cotton, wool, fibers, timber, iron, aluminum, sulfur, zinc, lead, chromium, nickel, mica, and petroleum. It is the largest customer of the United States, from whom we purchased and paid for goods in 1954 in the amount of $3,286,300,000; and its total international trade last year exceeded $14,500,000,000.

And yet, despite these impressive figures, one-third of our continent is still virgin and unexplored; and less than one-half of our land is in actual production. What the natural resources of Latin America might amount to when fully developed, simply escapes the wildest imagination.

But the most important thing about Latin America is that it is a growing continent. Latin America is growing at a rate not equaled by another area in the world. For the first time in history, in 1950 our population exceeded the population of the United States, and today it has reached 180 million inhabitants; that is, more than the United States and Canada combined. Population is growing at the unprecedented net rate of 2.5 percent per year. At this rate, we should have 300 million people in Latin America by 1975, and 500 million by the turn of the century; doubling, by then, the estimated population of the United States and Canada.

Our production has been increasing at the rate of 5 percent per year. Thus, despite the rapid growth of population, an overall increase of 2.5 percent in per capita output has been achieved. This compares with an average annual per capita growth of 2.1 percent in the United States during the period of 1869–1952. A long-sustained production increase at the present rate will simply accomplish wonders in Latin America.

The economic development taking place in Latin America is really spectacular. It should be so, because we have in 1955 at our disposal means and facilities that did not exist in 1855, when the Americans started to develop the West. We can today use for development steam, electricity, automobiles and trucks, agricultural machinery, radio, telegraph, and telephone. Our technological progress permits us to apply to production, conservation, and distribution scientific techniques and processes unknown a century ago. And we can count, in addition, on the financial resources and facilities of institutions like the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and the new International Finance Corporation now in process of organization, whose purpose is to assist precisely in the economic development of the world. The development of Latin America is going so fast, that we are shortcircuiting the traditional process. We are jumping directly from the burro to the airplane.

Cities like Buenos Aires, Rio, Mexico City, Habana, Montevideo, Santiago, Sao Paulo, and Lima, with millions of inhabitants, would hardly be recognized by anyone who has been away from them a few years. Two hundred new houses are being built every day in Sao Paulo alone, in an effort to meet the acute housing shortage. How Caracas has miraculously emerged from the jungle as a modern city with skyscrapers, office buildings, apartment houses, magnificent hotels, golf clubs, wide boulevards, and superspeedways like New York, Chicago, and Detroit, is a story that amazes architects and engineers all over the world.

Sanitation, preventive medicine and better nourishment have eradicated yellow fever, malaria and tropical diseases from our lands. An intensive educational system, coupled with our excellent colleges and our universities, some of them older than Harvard, is preparing the new generations to take their place and do their duty in the common task of developing our natural resources and maintaining our democratic institutions.

It is impossible to describe in a short talk like this what an enormous market Latin America will become within the next few years. Not only our population is increasing in numbers at a very high rate; but the remarkable improvement in the economic level of the people tends to further increase consumption of all kinds of goods and service, and to enlarge the Latin American market of the future.

Within the next few years, the beautiful isolated cities of Latin America will be interconnected by modern highways, roads, and railroads. These new means of communication will open up for production new virgin territories. Hotels, motels, restaurants, playgrounds and vacation resorts will sprinkle along their routes. The growing population will require millions of new homes. More people with more money in their pockets will need more food, more clothes, more shoes and more of all the necessities of life. More children will demand more new schools, more colleges and more universities. With the standard of living constantly improving housewives in Latin America, as elsewhere, will insist on having all of the modern labor-saving household appliances and conveniences. Everyone who can afford it, will want an automobile, and quite a few, a private airplane. Air conditioning will become a common building requirement. These needs will give rise to new industries, to new trades, to new employments, to new developments. Cities will need more water, more sewage disposal systems, more power, more telephones, more recreational facilities. It has been estimated that Brazil alone would need in the next 20 years a billion dollars expansion in electric generation.

Why—someone may ask—with so many attractive opportunities, investments have been rather slow in going to Latin America? I am inclined to believe that, aside from the fact that there have been many opportunities for good investments at home, the slowness of investments in Latin America is largely due to ignorance about our countries and lack of information on our real investment possibilities.

I often run into people who are scared to deal with Latin America. Latin America, they say, is a land of physical and political instability, of revolutions, of recurring crisis, where no one can be sure that a loan will be ever paid back.

Latin America is no exception to the rules of nature. Anyone afraid of hurricanes, earthquakes, floods, droughts, lightning, and volcanoes, better say out of Latin America, because we have, like all other areas of the world, our fair share of these natural phenomena.

And revolutions are part of the climate of Latin America. Not that I advocate them; but they are the growing pains of the democratic process, one of the several ways we have to change an unpopular government; just like the French change their Cabinets whenever they get tired of them.

But neither acts of God nor revolutions seriously affect private investments. People, after an earthquake, a flood, a hurricane, or a military coup, keep on eating and dressing and going to the movies. Life goes on just the same. Cattle keep on breeding. Crops keep on growing and must be consumed or exported. The economic cycle goes on, regardless of who signs the decrees in any government. And foreign debts are paid, whether they were contracted by the party in power or by their deposed predecessors. In this respect Latin America is unique in the world.

This point is important enough for me to stop for a minute and cite a few figures, even at the risk of taxing your tired attention. Let me tell you what our experience in the World Bank has been. During its 10 years of operation, the World Bank has made 55 loans to 12 Latin American countries for development purposes, aggregating a total of $642,405,000. I am pleased to report that there has not been a single default on any of these loans, either as to principal or interest. The Expert-Import Bank, since its creation in 1934 has made loans to practically every one of the Latin American Republics for an aggregate of $2,500,000,000; and they can report a similar experience.

According to the statistics compiled by the economic staff of the World Bank, the total outstanding public foreign debt of Latin America in dollars and other currencies, at the beginning of the Second World War in 1939, amounted in round figures to $3 billion. From 1939 to date Latin America received, in the form of public loans from the Export-Import Bank and from the World Bank, nearly $2,750,000,000 additional. Of that great total indebtedness of $5,750,000,000 a very large part has been repaid; and, as of today, only one country, out of twenty republics, is in default on its old prewar debt for a total of less than $59 million. Consequently, the public debt risk of Latin America, according to the records, is 1 percent. In fact, our debt record, as a whole, is so good that there are countries in Latin America, like the Dominican Republic, Honduras and Venezuela, that can boast of not having at the present time any public foreign debt. What other geographical area in the world—may I ask you—can show today a similar performance record?

There are among the 20 Latin American Republics, like in any large family, natural differences in size, in population, in degree of economic development, and in commercial and trade practices. Some countries maintain certain monetary controls, while others, like Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Panama, Perú, Guatemala, Honduras, Venezuela, El Salvador, and Haiti, have no foreign exchange controls. But everywhere in Latin America, the process of growth is present. Everywhere, economic development is progressing at an accelerated pace. And consequently, everywhere there are excellent opportunities for sound and profitable investment.

Some day the enterprising American, who has been pouring billions of dollars into other areas, will take a serious look at the great family backyard lying to the south, just like a century ago he took a look at the great expanse of virgin territory west of the Mississippi River. When he does, I am sure that we will not have to wait a hundred years to show results; and any other future speaker before the American Management Association will be able to recite and praise what an excellent opportunity for investment this generation had in Latin America.

A century ago, the American's motto to the new generation was: Go west, young man, go west. I suggest that our motto today should be: Look south, investor, look south.

Mrs. Nell Bohannon Vaughan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, on November 24, 1955, Glasgow, Barren County, and Kentucky lost one of the sweetest little ladies that ever lived. She was Mrs. Nell Bohannon Vaughan, the mother of William (Bill) Vaughan, who for years served as acting superintendent of the House Radio Gallery.

"Miss Nellie" as she was affectionately known by all of her friends, first began in politics when she was only 14 years old. Her father, the late Judge G. M. Bohannon, had announced for reelection and his little girl, Nellie, got busy in order to help him. From that day on until her death, "Miss Nellie" was the Democratic wheelhorse of all Kentucky. This good woman was loved and respected by all people. She was so considerate of her fellowman that even in a heated political campaign, the opposition admired her methods. I was proud to call "Miss Nellie" as my personal friend.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article that appeared on November 25, 1955, in the Evening Star, of Washington, D. C.:

MRS. NELL BOHANNON VAUGHAN, LONG IN KENTUCKY POLITICS

Mrs. Nell Bohannon Vaughan, mother of William W. Vaughan, of Arlington, who was an aid to former Vice President BARKLEY, and Robert M. Vaughan, a Washington attorney, died Wednesday night in Glasgow, Ky., after a political career that began when she was only 14.

Mrs. Vaughan's first statewide campaign job was Democratic woman's chairman in Senator BARKLEY's first race for the Senate in 1928. Her son William, who served Mr. BARKLEY when he was Vice President, is now custodian of records in the office of the secretary of the Senate, and lives at Arlington Village, 2700 13th Road, Arlington. Her other son, Robert M. Vaughan, 5713 Overlea Road, Sumner, Md., is an attorney with King, Noble & Sonosky here.

The late G. M. Bohannon, Mrs. Vaughan's father, was elected county judge in the campaign she managed when she was 14, and retained that office for 40 years. Mrs. Vaughan held public office herself only once. She served as State parks director during Gov. Keen Johnson's administration from 1939 to 1943.

Mrs. Vaughan had been a delegate to all Democratic National Conventions since 1940. Also surviving, besides her sons, is her husband, R. H. Vaughan.

The funeral service will be held tomorrow morning, according to the AP.

The Fallacy in Soaking the Rich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the upcoming "hassle" over tax cuts there will be a welter of demagogry from those who bleed for the so-called little people, and there will be few of us who will be inclined to ignore the interests of that vast group which embraces the most voters.

The fact remains, however, that if we literally confiscated the total income of all those whose annual income starts with $10,000, we would not get enough to run this Government for three months. It is also approximately correct to say that this upper 10 percent already pay nearly half our total take in taxes on income.

Another fallacy is the idea that so-called surtax provides a large share of the income levy. As a matter of fact, while this surtax, when added to the regular 20 percent, reaches the outlandish total of 91 percent, it still only sup-

plies 16 percent of all the moneys received from the income levy.

An excellent case has been made against this punitive and unrealistic system of taxation and for a 35 percent limitation on income taxes. The article by Graham Patterson, the able publisher of Town Journal, entitled "Strangling the Golden Goose" is extended with these remarks and ably supports the case of the big taxpayer—and the middle income group as well:

STRANGLING THE GOLDEN GOOSE

A serious threat to the continuance of our Nation's growth and prosperity lies in our present outmoded and destructive system of taxation. Our so-called progressive system of taxation says in effect to the ambitious individual, "You're free to work hard to advance yourself, but if you succeed, you will have to pay most of it in taxes," and to the businessman trying to build his business, it says, "Try to make your business grow and thus create jobs for more people, but if you do, you will be penalized severely."

This is an amazing and incomprehensible attitude, for it is directly contrary to the very things upon which our Nation's growth has been built—industry, self-reliance, thrift, the willingness to risk one's savings. It discourages and represses those very virtues that made millions of people from other lands flock to our shores.

Under our present tax laws, there is a basic tax rate of 20 percent paid by all those who pay taxes. In addition, there is a "surtax" paid by everybody with more than $2,000 of taxable income. This surtax starts at 2 percent but progresses rapidly until it finally reaches 71 percent. This is on top of the 20 percent basic tax—a total of 91 percent.

Some will say that such high rates are necessary because it takes a lot of money to operate our Government. But they are usually amazed when they learn that of the entire $29.4 billion derived from the individual income tax, only 16 percent comes from the surtax, which involves everyone with more than $2,000 taxable income. The remaining $24.7 billion—84 percent—comes from the basic 20 percent tax rate. In other words, millions of taxpayers are unfairly overtaxed for the sake of a relatively small part of the total tax revenue. So the high rates are actually more destructive of income than productive of revenue.

The increasing rates fall with especial severity on the middle income groups—small-business men, lawyers, accountants, many farmers, salesmen, technicians, and skilled craftsmen.

Economists know that lower taxes actually produce more revenue for the Government. Let us say the individual and corporate surtax were reduced gradually each year for 5 years, until both were down to a 35-percent maximum. These reductions would not only mean lower taxes for all income groups, even as low as $2,000—but should also prove an effective stimulus to our whole economy, because of the greater amount of money available for spending by individuals and industry. And this greater prosperity would in turn produce greater tax revenues for the Government.

It is interesting to note that a recent Gallup poll showed that 53 percent of the public favors this 35 percent limitation on income taxation. And it is certain that even more people would favor it if they realized the small amount of revenue that today's excessive rates produce and the bad effect they have on investment and job-making. Truly, the power to tax is the power to destroy.

GRAHAM PATTERSON.

America Is Truly a Fabulous Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article by a fellow West Virginian, Mr. John Hamric, 100 Park Avenue, Charleston, W. Va., on the greatness of America—"land that I love."

Mr. Hamric is quite generous in his praise of Americans in general and his tribute to them and the American way of life is unique and interesting:

This country, this people, America is truly a fabulous land. A wonderful country. Realm of opportunities unlimited. Degree of limitation on success and accomplishment being in direct proportion to desire to grow and attain. A domain wherein failure hardly need occur. This system, our American economy, probably better known as the "American way of life," based largely on a "free market" is blessed with abundance of material resources. Great creative power, imagination and "know how" translate the American way into the most effective economy yet devised for the common good of mankind.

It was not built entirely on all this, however, because the character of this people was and is, founded upon great faith and trust. Faith in God and the trust, honesty, decency and freedom of its citizens. It endures in great measure in fulfilling the obligation to pass on to each new generation the heritage of liberty and freedom established by its founders.

Americans are a hopeful and optimistic people, accustomed to bringing their dreams to quick reality—tackling a job and getting on to the next one. Therein lies the velocity of their progress and achievement. The American way is dedicated to the premise of doing more—better—quicker as the national goal for its people and because of the overall benefits afforded stands to be upheld and defended by all Americans with their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honors.

Americans hold and believe that their way of life is in harmony with the will of God whom they recognize in the Declaration of Independence as the Giver of their basic rights, liberties and freedoms. Liberty and freedom are precious and their cost and anchorage is high—yet Americans have never failed to pay the price to sustain them at home and abroad. They are a hospitable people generally who appear at their best when entertaining company, friend or stranger. Good neighbors, too. Neighbor to neighbor and nation to nation.

A land of great beauty, of ribbon-like highways, heavenly skies, majestic mountains, rolling plains, waving grain, placid lakes, rivers, flowers, birds and beautiful sunsets. Farms, factories, forests, villages, towns and cities cover the land. Homes, shops, stores, schools and great institutions of learning are fruits of the economy.

A land of babies, adventurous and vigorous youth, grownups, grandmas and grandpas, and the revered aged. A land filled with automobiles, trains, ships and commerce, industry and agriculture—bulwarks of the economy. A land of sports and festivity, of Thanksgiving and Christmas, of baseball and football. A land of culture and arts and sciences, of music and painting and medicine, of research and discovery. A land of love of joy and romance and adventure—endowed with food, raiment and shelter in abundance, yet America surmounts the hazards of storm and loss and sorrow with much mercy and succor to the injured and unfortunate.

Lowly and magnificent places of worship attest to faith and trust in Almighty God. The leading nation of earth. Not by choice or force but by the stature of a way of life which places first value on human life and is looked upon by millions as the ultimate hope of mankind. A way of life worthy of emulation, assuring every citizen the God-given right to full expression and development of personality as such relates to the mental, physical, social and spiritual without limitation. Freedom of speech, assembly and worship are established in the Constitution of this people and gains toward freedom from want and fear point to continued growth and betterment.

Such is this land—and more. America is truly a fabulous land.

Desperate Outlook of a Farm Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just received access to information that shows distinct contradiction to implied feelings of sympathy for the poor farmer in the President's farm message. The years of this administration have shown lack of sympathy under the present program. In fact, this carries over to the recent boost in rediscount rates under the Federal Reserve System which has already increased loan interest rates for farmers. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to submit this letter as evidence of the clear-cut and desperate outlook of one farm family:

ARRIBA, COLO., *January 4, 1956.*

Mr. JAMES PATTON,
President of National Farmers Union,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR SIR: We read the National Farmers Union paper and you seem to get things done. We are writing to you for help or something.

We have 2,080 acres half grass and half cultivated, in Lincoln County, Colo., 8 miles south of Arriba and 2 miles west. We secured a loan on it for $14,000 of which $4,000 has been paid. (Benton & Wingfield, Norton, Kans.) We have the land leased for oil for $1 per acre on 1,760 acres and $1 per acre on two-fifths of the other 320 acres. We have 72 head registered and purebred Angus cows and heifers on which the First National Bank of Limon has a mortgage of $10,616 plus interest. Also the machinery to farm with.

Beginning in the spring of 1954 we borrowed operating money from the FHA. We owe FHA $3,607. Mr. John Tiffany, of Limon, was the administrator we started with. Mr. Tiffany is very courteous and would sit down and discuss plans pro and con. He understands what the farmer is up against in this territory as he lives here and has a farm also. He was so bothered by changing rules and everything in an upset state most of the time, he resigned in December.

Now we have a Mr. Watrous from Denver or nearby, doing the work and breaking in a man. Mr. Watrous tells us over and over again that he is going to show us we are poor people. We know we are poor or we wouldn't have to ask for FHA funds but I didn't know we'd have to be ground in the dirt too.

We have no money at all now and in a short time we will need feed (forage) for the cattle, especially if it storms. Mr. Watrous says that's our hard luck which it is, I guess. Mr Watrous thinks we got into this by mismanagement but the main reason is drought and falling prices and attractive wheat prices which caused so many acres of grass to be broken up and put to wheat which wasn't needed and left such wide areas to be blown. We should be in emergency feed area but they cut that off because feed was raised near Karval. For 3 solid years we haven't raised anything. The calf crop had been taking care of expenses but now they won't. The papers keep printing that the United States Government has loosened credit to the farmers but our experience doesn't show it. If we can get credit to weather this drought, we are sure we can come out OK. We did in the thirties, but of course prices and expenses were more in line. We need some unbiased advice in a hurry, and help. Is there anything you could do to help? Mr. Tiffany told us we had one of the best units to work on if the weather breaks. We think we have too much in it to just sit down and let it go. There is no market for land right now.

I probably haven't written this so you can understand it but we need help desperately at once, not next summer. There are more near here in the same boat.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. MARTIN CLAUSSEN.

The Vision of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my extension the text of the Reparation Day sermon entitled "The Vision of Faith," the logic, strength, and force of which is undeniable and which should be as widely read as possible; delivered on Sunday, January 1, 1956, by his excellency, most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, at St. Matthews Cathedral in Washington, D. C.

In my extension I also include an editorial, Vision of Faith, appearing in the Catholic Standard of January 6, 1956.

The sermon and editorial follows:

"Be on the watch, stand fast in the faith, be full of courage." (1 Corinthians, xvi: 13–16.)

Last week you may have seen in the newspapers the pictures of two medical missionaries released from Communist China. I can still see the emaciated features, the dull, staring eyes telling of agonies that are beyond our power to imagine. These kindly souls had left America on a mission of Christian mercy. They went thousands of miles overseas to a country that was strange in language, customs, and outlook on life. They took this journey as a gesture of faith, bringing religious truth as they saw it to those who knew not Christ.

Now they are coming home, broken in body and wounded in spirit. They gave kindness; in return they were imprisoned. They sought to win the souls of men; they were accused of being agents of a foreign political power. Their mission was one of mercy and healing; their reward was a charge of treason. Surely we see in this story a capsule picture of the challenge that our age faces. When mercy is considered treason, truth is classed as a lie, and good is called evil, we are indeed faced with a monstrous perversion of human nature, a denial of every ideal that civilized man has cherished.

On this Sunday, dedicated as a day of reparation for the evils caused by godless communism, it is fitting that we examine once again the bitter realities of our time. What happened to the two kindly souls released last week is not an isolated incident. Over a billion human beings, our brothers and sisters under God, are in danger of a similar fate.

ROLL OF HEROES

We must never forget the names of Cardinals Mindszenty, Stepinac, and Wyszynski, of Archibishop Beran, and of our own Bishop Byrne of Washington and Bishop Ford of New York, and of thousands of other bishops and priests, religious and lay people, too numerous to list here. We should never overlook the millions of silent martyrs, some slain, others imprisoned or sent to slave-labor camps—all because they believed in God and stood steadfast for their religion. When we think of these sufferings, we should be shocked by the prancing and posturing of Communist leaders at they tour the world, receiving heroes' welcomes. What has happened to the world today when such monstrous evils are so easily forgotten and so readily overlooked?

The leaders of the Communist world are not trying to deceive us in regard to their attitude toward religion. They state openly that the conflict with religious faith is a war to death. They are cynical enough to practice some toleration at certain times, to cultivate some church leaders while persecuting others, and even to seek to use religion as a tool for imperialist gains. But they do not hide their long-range plans. Those who are deceived about the essential conflict between communism and religion are self-deceived.

I think that most of my fellow Americans will agree with this analysis of the true nature of communism. Yet it is possible that some may think that this is no concern of ours. They may express their views in this way: We grant that it is deplorable that hundreds of millions have been deprived of their basic human rights under this evil system. It is indeed tragic that churches have been closed, the clergy exiled or imprisoned, the teaching of religion prohibited, and even private practice of religion made dangerous and akin to treason. We do not condone these evils, but at the same time it is not our mission to right all the wrongs in the world. We may reject the racism of the Union of South Africa, but as a nation we must admit that it is the internal problem of another sovereign power. We know that economic injustice prevails in many areas of the world. Yet we dare not tell other countries how to manage their own economies. So likewise we must consider the civil liberties of Communist subjects as an internal problem of these regimes.

WRONG TERMS

Now such persons would not contend that communism is not a problem for Americans. But they visualize the problem in terms of economic, military, and political factors. Our proper concern, they say, is only with matters of our own national security. We trespass beyond this field at our peril. Meddling nations, no matter what their good intentions, are greeted with resentment and often with contempt by fellow sovereign powers. Indeed, one analyst, formerly high in the councils of our Nation, considers the "moralizing trend" one of the great weaknesses of American diplomacy.

It is not my intention to comment from the pulpit on matters of diplomacy or to seek to define the proper scope of political action. Rather than discuss these issues here, we might accept for the moment the idea that national security is our only proper concern in dealing with other nations. Even with this concession, it is still not true that we must consider only the economic, military, and political menace of communism. To look at the struggle in these narrow terms is to miss the real conflict of our day. The real war today has well been described as a war for the minds of men. It is a clash of beliefs, of allegiances, and, in a certain sense, of ideals. The use of the term "ideal" in reference to communism may seem strange. Yet such a keen observer as the late Pope Pius XI did not hesitate to say that "the Communist ideal wins over many of the better minded members of the community" (On Atheistic Communism, March 19, 1937, No. 15).

We have noted before how timely is the analysis of communism written by this great Pontiff. Although the document is nearly 20 years old, it can still be read with immense profit today. And one of its finest features is the study of the appeal of communism in terms of idealism. The Pope noted some of the arguments of the Communists in regard to social reforms. He then stated: "And as every error contains its element of truth, the partial truths to which we have referred are astutely presented according to the needs of time and place, to conceal, when convenient, the repulsive crudity and inhumanity of Communist principles and tactics. * * * The preachers of communism are also proficient in exploiting racial antagonisms and political divisions and oppositions. They take advantage of the lack of orientation characteristics of modern agnostic science in order to burrow into the universities where they bolster up the principles of their doctrine with pseudo-scientific arguments." (Same citation.)

Although these words were written nearly 20 years ago, they could be a description of Communist tactics today in great nations of Asia, Europe, Africa, and Latin America. We must remember that the appeal of communism is not only to the disgruntled, the bitter, and the neurotic members of a community. It has been able to convince men of sensitive natures and of high ideals. The world was shocked when spy rings were uncovered in our own country, in Canada, in Great Britain, and in Australia—not only because of the gravity of the secrets betrayed, but also because of the respectable nature of those who preferred communism to their own country. These men were scientists, university professors, and others of real standing in their communities.

The process of winning over misguided idealists still continues. And it is far more dangerous to the security of the world than most of us realize. Our country is inclined to underestimate the power of the intellectual. We call such persons eggheads, or ivory tower professors. But in the brains of such scientists was born the fearful weapons of modern war—the ultimate weapons of fission and fusion. In wide areas of the world, men of learning are the real leaders of their nations. This is particularly true in nations newly freed from colonial status. It is in these very areas that the power of communism is growing with sobering speed.

By concentrating almost exclusively on the economic, military, and political menace of communism, we have been able to counter its threats of this type. We have reached a stalemate, with the result that our fears of

war have lessened. Yet at the same time we feel that somehow we are losing in the struggle with the Communist world. While we patch a leak here and a trickle there, a flood wave of sympathy for communism is sweeping many parts of Asia and Africa. We are baffled and bewildered as our best efforts seem to fail.

Could it be that we are failing because we have conceived the struggle too narrowly? Are we fighting with nineteenth-century weapons of diplomacy a twentieth-century battle of ideology? Do we talk in terms of material wealth and military power, while our opponents monopolize the powerful slogans of justice, of peace, and of equality? Are we addicted to showing power, letting the Communists speak of ideals? The answer to all these questions, I fear, is yes. And therein lies the secret of our frustration today. We are outmaneuvered and outgunned in the very area where our strength should be the greatest. By default, we have permitted the enemy to use our choicest weapons.

NEED REAPPRAISAL

If the real war today is the struggle for men's minds, we need badly an agonizing reappraisal of our policy and tactics. We face a total conflict between two ways of life. In such a conflict, the old distinctions between the internal policy of a nation and its foreign conduct are completely unreal. The leaders of communism are offering a total package. It is true that their advertising is deceptive. The contents of the package are quite different from the promises of of the label. But, in this case, by the time that the purchaser knows the truth, it is usually too late. He can no longer return the package and regain his freedom.

What must be our policy in this struggle? It seems simple enough—to tell the whole truth again and again about communism and compare it with the whole truth again and again about the free world. Yet it is not so simple as it seems. Why? Because we have not yet dared, as a people, to speak frankly and openly the truth about communism. We do not hesitate to build a powerful Army, Navy, and Air Force. We have ringed the world with alliances, formed for the sole purpose of containing the Communist orbit. We spend millions for propaganda. Yet, at the same time, we are strangely quiet about the purpose of all these activities. We engage in a form of pretense, as if it were not proper to mention the subject of communism in polite company.

Pussyfooting on such issues plays directly into the hands of the enemy. They utter their lies bluntly and fearlessly, while we leave the truth muted and gagged. Let me return to the story I told you at the beginning of this discourse. The peoples of the world are deeply religious. They respect the mercy and humanity of the medical profession. Most of them acknowledge and respect the basic rights of man. Yet all these ideals are trampled into the dust by communism, and we treat it as a private affair.

Have we lost our sense of indignation? Are we so self-satisfied, so complacent, so preoccupied with enjoying our ever-mounting standards of living that we blind ourselves to cruelty and bitter slavery visited upon our fellowman? Is this the America that fought for the ideals of freedom and independence in 1776, the Nation that endured the War Between the States, the people who generously responded in the recent World War when millions died to overthrow the tyranny of a Hitler? Have we been hypnotized into a moral slumber? Let us all examine our consciences and face our duty honestly and openly.

NOT POLITICAL

Please do not misunderstand me. I am not pleading that we use religion, or medicine, or law as propaganda weapons in a political struggle. We do not ask governments to speak for the church or the medical or legal professions. But I do believe that the American people should speak out, through their proper organizations and representatives, on the real nature of communism. We should realize that the struggle is total, and not merely a matter for governmental action only. And our political authorities in turn can report, in a proper way, the sentiments of the American people.

Permit me to give an example of the leader of a great organization facing up to the challenge of the day and speaking his mind on Communist activities. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, addressing the National Religion and Labor Foundation in New York, on December 13, did not hesitate to picture vividly the heartless inhumanity of the slave labor camps and the depths of degradation to which Communist brutalities have brought the opponents of the Soviet system. We need more Americans to speak openly, fearlessly, and honestly the truth, the whole truth, without any apology.

But there is another side to the picture. If we ask the uncommitted peoples of the world to choose between our way of life and life under communism, we must be sure that we can stand the comparison. It is easy to say that the Communists are out and out materialists and that we honor God and respect our fellowman. But are we prepared to prove our point? Suppose that the charge is made that our films show that we are a degraded and sensual people. What if we are portrayed as money mad, seeking only material comforts and wealth, and blind to the riches of the spirit? Have we an answer if a visitor who differs from us in race is subject to insults because of the color of his skin? Can we say for sure that others regard us as more idealistic than the Communists? Unfortunately, the answer is that many peoples think that there is little choice between the two systems.

OUR DEDICATION

Today, then, as in our Christian charity we pray for the victims of communism, let us dedicate ourselves to a total struggle to help our bruised and wounded fellowmen, lying by the roadside. First, let us storm the gates of heaven with prayer and with penance, asking that God give them strength to endure their persecution, and that the day of deliverance be not too far off.

In the spirit of our Saviour, let us also pray for the persecutors. Today their hearts are blackened with hate. May God give them the light to see the truth, and the grace to love their fellow man. Let us make this prayer a definite and regular part of our lives, so that we will not forget our brethren in need. We should not overlook the other powerful spiritual weapon: penance. Let us gladly embrace the sacrifice involved in living blameless lives. In addition, we might at some set time, perhaps once a week, offer to the Almighty some real act of penance and reparation—giving up something that pleases us, or offering our help to some unfortunate person. Here is something that each of us can do, no matter what may be our positions in life.

At the same time, let us not neglect the human means that God has put at our disposal. Above all, we should speak out fearlessly and portray the struggle for men's minds in its true terms. It is more than the political or the military or the economic. It is a struggle between those who acknowledge God and reverence His name, and as a consequence respect the rights of their fellow man—and those who deny God and despise man. But if we presume to fight under the banners of the Almighty, let us be worthy of this honor. May our lives and conduct shine from the vision of faith. Truth is great, and it shall prevail. May this truth be in us and in our actions, so that we may be instruments in the hands of God, shaped to bring peace and justice in the world once again. Stand fast in the faith, be full of courage, and let everything you do, be done in a spirit of charity.

[From the Catholic Standard of January 6, 1956]

VISION OF FAITH

Man is born to look upward. He is dominated by his free spirit endowed with a mind and will. His perfection or his perversion is determined by his free spirit which therefore is the prime target of communism. Karl Marx, in teaching communism, did not just propose a new theory of economics; he proposed a new theory of the nature of man. The archbishop's eloquent sermon last Sunday was a sharp and timely reminder of this elementary fact about the nature of man and the nature of communism.

A society that constantly downgrades the spiritual side of man is constantly inclined to miss, or underrate, the real nature of the appeal of communism as a perverted religion. They conceive it as a longing for bread or for power—as if it comes only from hungry mouths or frustrated colonials. They try to fight it by an abundance of wheat and an abundance of weapons. The real battleground is the soul of man and the religious beliefs of man.

Fortunately, there is a growing cognizance of the nature of communism in Government circles. A Senate subcommittee recently discounted the theory, on the basis of a study of individual Communists, that "misery" and "inequalities under our social system" make Communists.

Of course, the Communists take advantage of misery and inequalities to sow their doctrine, but the presence of so many rich professional people, university graduates, movie actors among the Communists shows that its primary appeal is to a starved soul and not a starved mouth.

The projected trip of the Secretary of State to the East is another heartening evidence of his continued appreciation of the real nature and threat of communism, as well as his continued herculean efforts to combat it.

But as the archbishop pointed out in his sermon, there must be plain, blunt talk about the threat of Communism from all groups (not simply the Government) in our country and from all who have a public voice. We need such plain, blunt talk and we need it contantly, as long as the menace persists. The solid proof that such talk is badly needed—even where one would not expect such need—is the very cool reception given to the recent talk by Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, on the threat of communism to the country before the National Religion and Labor Foundation.

The threat of communism extends to every citizen who treasures his rights and those of our country. It is the concern of every soul in this country with a consequent obligation, proportionate to his responsibility, of everyone in a position of influence. It is time for all those with such influence, wherever they may be, to meet their responsibilities.

Highway Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRADY GENTRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address made by me to the annual convention of the American

Automobile Association in the city of Washington on September 21, 1955:

President Sordoni, members of the American Automobile Association, ladies and gentlemen, it is unfortunate that the highways needed by today's traffic will cost so much money. It can hardly be denied that most of our main highways are grossly inadequate and are causing our motorists great losses in time, deaths, injuries, and destruction to property. While we are told by eminent authorities that it will cost motorists more in actual dollars and cents to continue using our present roads than to pay the taxes necessary to modernize and then enjoy good thoroughfares, recent happenings in the Congress are proof that modern highways are no early certainty.

Several points of difference on this problem seem to divide us. A few say that our 40,000 miles of most important highways comprising the interstate system do not need the major treatment outlined in the Highway Advisory Committee plan. Others contend that the interstate system deserves no better treatment than the remaining 700,000 miles of the Federal-aid system. While these group helped defeat highway legislation, they constituted a minority of the opposition.

There is little question that the problem of financing caused the major opposition to this legislation or served as an excuse for such opposition. Since that problem must be resolved if we are to secure favorable results, let us proceed to its discussion.

The President, speaking through Vice President NIXON at a Governors' Conference in July 1954, called public notice to the need of a modernized system of highways. Subsequently the President appointed an advisory committee and named General Clay as chairman.

The advisory committee forthwith appointed a staff, comprised of highway and financial experts. Characteristic of the committee approach to this problem was the instruction to the staff that it evolve a plan that would spend 25 billion on highways without increasing taxes or debt.

Just think for a moment! Spend 25 billion without increasing taxes or debt! Your reaction must be that that simply could not be done. It would seem to be an utter impossibility. That a solution was even claimed is a credit to man's ingenuity.

Generally, what would the Advisory plan, as formulated by the staff and committee, and recommended by the President, have done? It established a Federal Highway Corporation with a board of 5 members, 2 of whom were the Secretaries of Commerce and Treasury, or their representatives, the other 3 being public members. In the event of dispute this board, instead of the Bureau of Public Roads, would have final authority in road location, kind of roads, etc.

The board would issue $20½ billion in bonds, with interest of $11½ billion or 55 percent of the principal. Each bond would disclaim Government responsibility for its payment. The bonds finally would be retired in 1987 from a 32-year dedication and so-called capitalization of the Federal gas, diesel and lubricating oil taxes, taxes now levied as general revenue.

No revenues from these taxes would be available for construction between 1965 and 1987, all revenues in that lengthy period being pledged for payment of the $20½ billion in bonds and their $11½ billion interest.

The money derived from these bonds, plus $4½ billion, would pay the Federal Government's $25 billion share of construction in 1955 to 1965 of the interstate system.

In addition, regular Federal-aid, now $700 million, would be set at $600 million, and frozen at that yearly figure for the next 32 years.

Up to the present, every dollar expended by the Government on roads has been subject to authorizing legislation by Congress, full budgetary control, complete appropriation procedure, has been paid out of general revenue, and accounted for within the statutory debt limit. Such is the pattern of present Federal financing.

The advisory plan would discard each and every one of these safeguards of responsible financing. It would effectuate a complete and revolutionary departure from fiscal fundamentals and long recognized principles in government practices.

If we dedicate to highway purposes taxes heretofore levied as general revenue, it could be adopted for a host of other purposes and finally result in the complete destruction of congressional authority over the appropriation of public funds. Actually the revenues from these particular taxes, in effect, have already been capitalized. They were capitalized, along with all other revenues from present Federal taxes, by the issuance of $280 billion in obligations by the Government with such tax revenues as security. What is being attempted here could result in stripping these $280 billion in obligations held by our people of every bit of security by reason of which they purchased them.

This Highway Advisory Committee or Clay plan would create a dummy corporation—one without assets but with authority to issue $20½ billion in bonds. And, although an entirely Government-owned corporation, it would recite in each bond that it was not a Government debt. Regardless of the facts, including contrary language in the bill incorporating the plan, it was claimed that this recital in the bonds eliminated their having to be shown as a part of the public debt, necessitating debt increase legislation by Congress. Yet, Government witnesses appearing before our committee, while disclaiming the bonds as Government debts, immediately hastened to add that the Government would have to pay them. But why, since we must pay them, should we say in the bonds that they are not debts of the Government when it causes our taxpayers to have to pay hundreds of millions of dollars in needless interest? Mr. Humphrey testified that this recital alone would increase their interest from one-eighth to one-half percent, or by $475 million to $1,900,000,000.

Just what does the legislation incorporating the advisory plan provide regarding the debt character of the bonds? It first stated that each bond must contain a recitation that it was not guaranteed by the United States and that it was not a debt or obligation of the United States. This recital of itself would restrict the bondholders to the revenues dedicated to bond poyment.

In the very next section of the bill, however, it recited that the Corporation could call on the Treasury for $5 billion when tax revenues were insufficient for debt service. That positively and irrevocably guaranteed $5 billion of the bonds and made them a debt of our taxpayers, regardless of the prior provision. But that is not all.

In the following section, it made the entire bond issue a lawful investment for fiduciary trust and public funds of any officer of the United States, including the Secretary of the Treasury. That meant that any Government funds, including social security and unemployment insurance funds, could buy these bonds. There was no restriction as to when they could buy them. Seemingly, it could be when offered by the Highway Corporation or when offered by some bond house originally purchasing them.

Even though it is contradictory, if not questionable, for bonds reciting that they are not Government obligations to be made eligible for investment in all Government funds, was not this an assurance to bond buyers that these bonds were recognized as Government obligations and would be paid by the Government? Was not this meaning made clear by Mr. Humphrey's public assurance that the Government would pay them if the tax revenues were insufficient? Under this provision, the Treasury's purchase of these bonds would, in effect, constitute a payment of them by the Government.

What was the testimony of Government witnesses concerning this? In effect, here is what they said:

"These bonds are not debts or obligations of the Government, but they are moral obligations, and the Government will, of course, have to pay them. It will have to do that to protect its credit."

Doesn't it seem unusual that anyone would question classifying as debt something which they say the Government must pay?

Just why would the Government have to pay them to protect its credit? Both because they are issued by a solely Government-owned corporation and because it obligated itself not only in the $5 billion provision of the bill but in the succeeding provision making them eligible for investment in all Government funds.

What was the result of all this mumbo-jumbo of the committee plan? Everybody got what they wanted. The Treasury could rely on the recital in the bonds that they were not Government debts and thus say that neither the debt nor debt limit would be increased. The bond buyers, regardless of the bond recital, could rely not only on the further provisions of the legislation which did obligate the Government but also on the assurances of the Secretary of the Treasury that the Government would pay them. Who was losing by all this financial word-juggling? You taxpayers were losing and so was responsible fiscal policy.

If the Government is to do further major deficit spending, there should be no question of its true character and it should mean the same thing to all people. Mr. Humphrey, as Secretary of the Treasury, can issue these bonds in the same number, of the same denomination, of the same maturities, at the same time, just as he can as the guiding member of the Highway Corporation Board. He can pay each bond of the same number, same denomination, same maturity, with the same funds from the same bank, and on the same date, just as he can as a Board member. Whether done by him as Corporation Board Member or as Secretary of the Treasury, it is deficit financing, pure and simple.

The great difference would be that our taxpayers would pay a penalty up to $1,900,000,000 in additional interest if it is done through the Highway Corporation. But the greatest loss would not be this large sum in unnecessary interest, great as it is, but the deadly precedent it sets in fiscal policy. In passing, it seems worth noting that before announcement to the public was made of the advisory plan, a convocation of investment bankers from New York and Chicago was held in Washington to consider the unusual language of its bond provisions.

The idea of the Federal Highway Corporation is represented as the easy way. It is the painless solution. It would have us believe we are getting something for nothing—billions in highways, without debt and without taxes. What could be more vicious in its evil potentiality for a government's fiscal soundness? It could be the beginning of a chain of Federal corporations, each nibbling away a portion of the Government's general revenues which, even during the boom time of the last few years, still have been insufficient for us to live within our income. The danger is illustrated by the fact that a newspaper of the integrity of the Christian Science Monitor suggested in a front-page article a few days after the ad-

visory financing plan was publicized that the billions needed to correct the schoolroom shortage might also be solved through the organization of a Federal School Corporation and assigning to it part of the present general revenue of the Treasury for dedication and capitalization. No specific taxes were suggested to be taken from the Treasury for this purpose. It could be the cigarette tax, or 5 percent of the income tax, or 10 percent of the corporation tax, or all or part of any tax now levied for general-revenue purposes. Just what will happen to the present manifold obligations of the Government if a great portion of its revenues are assigned to newly organized Federal corporations in order to secure new or greatly enlarged services? If this precedent is established, there is no earthly reason to doubt that other Congresses might utilize it to effect possible demoralization in Government financing.

Has the Congress ever passed legislation disclaiming the obligations of its corporations, while Government officials insisted the Government would pay them? In a recent release Senator BYRD, Senate Finance Committee chairman and long experienced in Government finance, said:

"I have searched the records and never before has such a proposal as this been seriously considered by the Congress."

The Senator aptly characterized the advisory plan when he said:

"We must remember that we cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain nor can we evade debt by definition."

Comptroller General Campbell was appointed by President Eisenhower only last year. It is a duty of the Comptroller to prevent irregular action by Congress and the executive department. Testifying before the Senate committee considering highway legislation, Comptroller Campbell, with understandable restraint, said:

"We feel that the proposed method of financing is objectionable because the result would be that the borrowings would not be included in the public debt obligations of the United States.

"The total amount of borrowings by the corporation would amount to the very substantial sum of $20½ billion and, in our opinion, would be borrowings of the United States Government, irrespective of the terminology applied.

"It is our opinion that the Government should not enter into financing arrangements which have the effect of obscuring the financial facts of the Government's debt position."

The President appointed a Commission on Intergovermental Relations in 1953. Composed of many of America's ablest minds, it was directed to examine the roll of the National Government in relation to the States. Making its report last June, after long and careful study of the advisory committee plan, it said:

"The Commission recommends that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor-fuel taxes.

"The effect of our recommendation on highway aids will be to increase Federal expenditures. An increase in taxes is preferable to deficit financing as a means of supporting major highway outlays by the National Government. The latter method would result in high interest charges and would shift the burden to citizens of future generations, who will have continuing highway and other governmental responsibilities of their own to finance."

You are told to accept the advisory plan, pay as you use, and your days of worry are over. It is presented as solving the problems of the interstate system and regular Federal aid, with no additional taxes and no additional debt.

I should now like to try to show you that in addition to all its dangers to sound fiscal policy, it is fatally defective for a second reason, the basic one that it does not solve the problems of the interstate system and Federal aid for 32 years but actually will involve us in an even more difficult position than we are in today.

Regular Federal aid for the current year is $700 million. Considering the great traffic problem and the Government's responsibility as prescribed by our Constitution, I doubt if this sum is reasonably sufficient for the Government's contribution to the 700,000 miles of the regular Federal-aid system. But, granting that it is reasonable today, what would be reasonable Federal aid in 1987, one-third of a century hence, a year in which the advisory committee tells us that traffic on the highways will be more than twice as great as that today. Based on these figures, would not $1,500,000,000 be modest Federal aid in that faraway year. Starting with $700 million in 1955 and increasing Federal aid $25 million yearly would attain the figure of $1,500,000,000 in 1987, which was a provision of the Fallon bill.

What does the advisory plan do on regular Federal aid? It sets Federal aid at $600 million for 1955 and freezes it at that figure through 1987, decades after it would be a mere pittance. Why does it do that? It had to because its plan for capitalization of the gas, diesel, and lubricating taxes would not permit more after meeting bond and almost $12 billion interest payments. How much deficiency, then, is created in construction on the regular Federal-aid system by reason of insufficient aid from 1955 to 1987 under the facts here outlined? The answer is $16,700,000,000.

Now, let's revert to the interstate system, also supposedly solved for 32 years. Not one cent would be available from the capitalized revenues with which to do additional construction on the interstate system during the period 1965 to 1987, almost a quarter of a century. Remember that some of these roads because four lanes are not now rebefore, and that all of them would be constructed by 1965.

On the interstate system 7,000 of the 40,000 miles will be constructed as two-lane roads because four-lanes are not now required. What does the advisory plan do for that portion of these 7,000 miles on which the impact of more than doubled traffic will necessitate four-lane highways before 1987? Much of these 7,000 miles will need to be four-laned before that time.

What about the four-lane roads on which mounting traffic before 1987 necessitates six-lane highways? Thousands of miles will fall into this category.

What about those interstate routes where tremendous traffic increases necessitate additional parallel highways before 1987? There will be many of these. The advisory plan would leave traffic in a complete state of strangulation on four-lane highways falling in this category.

What would the advisory plan provide for interstate roads constructed between 1955 and 1965 which will have to be newly constructed long before 1987? Actually, how many miles of interstate highways constructed in the year 1955 would have to be reconstructed before 1987? Certainly many of them. What about those that would be constructed in 1956? In 1957? In 1958? The advisory plan does not meet this serious problem. If not met by the Congress, much of the traffic on the interstate system in 1987 will be traveling on jagged, broken concrete.

Do I exaggerate the insufficiency of the advisory plan as to the interstate system? I have here House Document 120 entitled "Needs of the Highway Systems, 1965–84," a report from the Bureau of Public Roads.

On page 14 it shows that if the interstate system is constructed between 1955 and 1965, additional construction, not maintenance, will be needed thereon between 1965 and 1984—not 1987—of $9,700,000,000. The advisory plan makes no provision whatever for that. Its revenues in that period are paying bonds and interest.

Let's estimate that construction deficits on the interstate system up to 1987 are $11 billion, probably an underestimate. The two deficiencies, therefore, that on the interstate of $11 billion and that of $16,700,000,000 on the Federal-aid system, total $27,700,000,000. But that is what it would have cost had it been done as the need materialized. Based on experience, what would it cost in 1987 to then build the roads which could and should have been constructed for almost $28 billion during the previous 32 years? It would be quite a sum, probably not less than $35 billion.

But, that is not all. What about the losses suffered by motorists in time, deaths, injuries, and property destruction solely because $28 billion in needed highway construction is left undone over a 32-year period? That would be many, many additional billions.

So, how do we stand in 1987 under the advisory plan? Will we not have woefully failed to meet the problem that was so obvious back in 1955?

What do these facts mean? They mean that we have never had enough available tax revenue to build the highways we needed; that we don't have enough available tax revenue today; and, that we delude ourselves if we think we will solve this problem by deficit spending through bond issues. If we do this, we simply compound our problem by using a part of insufficient and greatly needed revenue in paying interest.

In seeking an answer to our problem, let's consider recent statements by two men distinguished in the automotive field.

James J. Nance, president, Automobile Manufacturer's Association, appeared before the House Public Works Committee. He showed that the losses of motorists occasioned by inadequate roads amount to $5,300,000,000 yearly. $2,600,000,000 of this loss is on the interstate system. The Fallon bill, the last highway measure to be voted on recently, would have imposed taxes of three-quarters of $1 billion annually, only one-quarter of the yearly loss being suffered on the system which it would have modernized, a modernization that would have eliminated all labor, gas, brake, and tire losses due to inadequacies, and a major portion of the thousands of deaths and hundreds of thousands of injuries occurring each year on that system.

In a New York City address last February 14 before the Switzerland Road Commission, Karl M. Richards, head of the motor truck division of the Automobile Manufacturer's Association and secretary of its highway policy committee, said that the commercial trucking industry would save $1,450,000,000 yearly in labor, gasoline, tire and brake economy by the construction of the interstate system. This yearly saving would have been twice the amount of yearly taxes imposed in the Fallon bill, not on just the commercial trucking industry but on the entire 60 million automobile, small truck, and commercial truck owners. The Fallon bill not only would have modernized the interstate system in less than 16 years, it would also have provided reasonable Federal aid for the regular Federal aid system.

It seems material in this connection not only that Mr. Richards and Mr. Nance both stated that motor transport income is now over $50 billion annually, but that the commercial trucking industry can pass on increased tax charges, a privilege not available to a majority of other motorists.

If we do not build these roads, our motorists must continue suffering losses each year of several times what it would cost to construct ,within a relatively short time, a modern Interstate System that would, if reconstruction and expansion is provided for, eliminate further inadequacy losses forever.

Nothing would seem more unjust to the automobile and small truck owner than to have road construction financed almost solely by a gas tax, now that the Government for the first time contemplates major highway expenditures. The fact that a heavy vehicle derives more than four times as many ton-miles from a gallon of gas than does an automobile makes a gas tax a very highly inadequate measure of road use for the former. This disparity is further emphasized by the fact that the heavy truck carries an axle load of approximately 10 times that of the automobile and its weight is 18 times as great. This disparity is multiplied many times in related damage to highways.

Wouldn't it therefore, seem that the course which we should follow was charted in the Fallon bill which was rejected? Surely we will not at this late date take the easy road by yielding to fear and political expediency. That will never get us the highways our motorists need and should have. Certainly we ought to do that which will neither involve us in deadly precedent nor lead us into fiscal irresponsibility. Neither should we accept a plan that is wholly insufficient and can only result in growing highway inadequacies and greater financial losses. We need legislation that is not only fiscally responsible, but also equitable as between various road-user groups. It should not be sufficient for a season only, but that which will give us the highway system required today and permit expansion as it is needed on tomorrow. Then and only then can we say that we are on the high road to solving our highway problem.

Friday 13th Lucky Day for Dr. Townsend, 89, More Active Than Most at 50

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 13, one of my highly respected constituents will celebrate the 89th anniversary of his birth and enter upon the 90th year of his life with a vigor and energy a great many men half his age could hardly help but envy. He is Dr. Francis E. Townsend.

Dr. Townsend is known throughout the Nation for his leadership in fighting for a better social security system for the benefit of the elderly citizens as well as those who are incapacitated under the age of 60. The tireless efforts of Dr. Townsend have charted a course of action toward solving the social security problem. No one has come forward with a better solution than that which the good doctor offered over 20 years ago. Today he is able to see many of the principles offered in his program being accepted.

Dr. Townsend has devoted his life in unselfish service to his fellowman dating back to his horse and buggy country doctor days in the Dakotas, through the First World War, through the depression of the thirties when the Townsend plan was born. He has stayed at the helm fighting tirelessly for better living conditions and a better way of life for our elderly citizens and to end poverty in these United States.

I am proud to be included among the large number of my fellow colleagues who have worked with this great American, and to take this occasion to wish him many more years of vigorous health.

Following is an article by Dr. Townsend published by the Modesto Journal of Modesto, Calif., on the Townsend plan and social security:

WHY ALL AMERICANS SHOULD NOW ACTIVELY SUPPORT THE TOWNSEND PLAN

From the time of the adoption of the Social Security Act in 1935, no basic changes have been made in the act.

In the 1956 session of Congress, further revision of the Social Security Act will be considered. The present minimum benefit of $30 per month is so inadequate. To pay this low minimum benefit, the employee and the employer each are required to pay 2 percent on wages up to a total annual wage of $4,200. In the future, the rate will be much higher.

This tax is spent by the Government for other current expenses. In the future, as the money in the reserve fund is needed to pay the benefits, the Government will have to tax the people to repay the reserve fund. This procedure amounts to a plan for increasing borrowing and expanding the national debt.

During the last session Congress, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was ordered to prepare an estimate of the cost of increasing the minimum benefit to as much as $75 per month. This report recently released shows that to pay $75 per month, as a minimum social-security benefit, the rate of contribution to be made by each the employee and the employer would have to reach approximately 7 percent. This report clearly shows how inadequate the contributory plan of financing would be to meet even a low benefit of $75 per month.

It is so clear that a much wider tax base will be required to have a social security program that is to cover all who qualify; that is adequate to maintain a decent standard of living and to keep our economy functioning successfully without "booms" and "busts," surpluses, unemployment and dire poverty for many of our people.

H. R. 4471 and H. R. 4472, represent the fundamentals of the Townsend plan. These bills are cosponsored by 60 Members of Congress on a nonpartisan basis. During the last session of Congress, 196 Members signed a discharge petition to the House Ways and Means Committee, asking that these bills be brought out for a hearing and a vote.

These bills, offered as amendments to the Social Security Act, contain the solution to these problems for all Americans and will provide security that is adequate, on a pay-as-we-go basis geared to the fluctuating price levels and financed by a simple and equitable tax system. Under these bills, a 2-percent gross income tax will be levied on all goods and services sold, except that wages would be exempt from tax on the first $250 per month of earnings. That would be similar to our present gasoline tax. As we use the travel highways, we pay accordingly. In addition, we would be on a pay-as-we-go basis and thereby would eliminate the dangers of the reserve fund running our national debt higher and higher.

A 2 percent gross income tax is estimated to produce approximately $135 per month to each aged, blind or disabled person, and to each widow with dependent children, as proposed by H. R. 4471 and 4472. This benefit, tied to price levels, certainly would be more realistic than the average social security benefit now paid which approximates $59 per month.

We invite all Americans to carefully study this proposal and join in an effort to help make these important bills amendments to our Social Security Act, to give the American people what they all need, want, and should have.

Dr. F. E. TOWNSEND.

Iowa Businessmen Demand Economic Justice for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, more and more businessmen in Iowa cities and towns are feeling the affects of the serious and unwarranted economic punishment that has been visited upon Iowa farmers. The merchant on Main Street realizes that the success or failure of his business depends to an important degree on the financial well-being of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, there is a job to be done, and immediately. The time is long overdue for emergency, remedial action to assist the farmers of this Nation. Early last fall I urged the Secretary of Agriculture to use his authority to put an emergency floor under livestock prices. His only response has been a too-little and too-late pork buying scheme which has been a dismal failure. To that, thousands of hard-pressed Iowa farmers can attest.

If the Secretary of Agriculture persists in his steadfast refusal to take effective action on his own, this Congress must act. Without regard to politics, immediate passage of legislation may be necessary to put an emergency floor of $18 under top hogs and $25 under choice cattle at Chicago. We simply cannot permit another crop of hogs to go to market this spring at the bankrupt prices paid in the fall.

This must be followed with long range legislation to provide the farmer cost of production prices for his products in the market place. In this regard, I have introduced a cost of production farm bill (H. R. 8128) which I commend to the attention of all Members interested in the economic welfare of agriculture and our Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I want to include an excellent resolution approved by the board of directors of the Clear Lake (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce. Clear Lake is a progressive community in the heart of an important agricultural section of my district. The resolution, which clearly recognizes the seriousness of the present situation on Iowa farms, is as follows:

Whereas the board of directors of the Clear Lake Chamber of Commerce fully realizes the great importance of the farmers in the Clear Lake trade area to Clear Lake merchants, and

Whereas the directors note with concern the continued downward trend of farm prices which is taking place while the prices of the articles the farmer has to purchase is rising; and

Whereas recent predictions by some leading economists indicate a further drop in farm income in 1956, but a continuing increase in other business; and

Whereas no evidence is noted that anything concrete has been done in Washington to alleviate and correct the above discrepancies; be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the said board of directors of the Clear Lake Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled in Clear Lake this third day of January 1956, do hereby urge the administration and Congress to immediately put into effect such temporary measures as may be necessary to assure farmers of fair hog and cattle prices during the present emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration and Congress to prepare, pass, and put into effect with as much celerity as circumstances will permit, legislation that will assure farmers of equitable prices for their products in times of maladjustment without instituting any permanent controls that would limit their freedom of operations and opportunity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Senators Hickenlooper and Martin, to Congressman Gross, to Governor Leo Hoegh, to Cerro Gordo County Farm Bureau officials and to Clear Lake and Mason City newspapers.

In witness whereof, the following officers of the said organization hereto attach their signatures.

S. T. THOMPSON,
President.
G. W. WILCOX,
Vice President.
JAMES R. SMITH,
Managing Secretary.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I want to include as part of my remarks an explanation of the cost of production farm bill which I have introduced:

PROVISIONS OF COST OF PRODUCTION FARM BILL INTRODUCED IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON JANUARY 5, 1956, BY CONGRESSMAN H. R. GROSS

1. Cost of production plus a reasonable profit to farmers on that portion of crops consumed domestically. Cost of production prices, to be established for each farm product by the Secretary of Agriculture following public hearings by farm organizations and other interested parties, will account for all production expenses, including hired and family labor, interest, taxes, depreciation, soil depletion, 4 percent on investments, and compensation to average farm operator equivalent to average weekly earnings of the industrial worker as found and determined by Secretary of Labor.

2. Cost of Production prices to be paid at and by the market place, not by the Federal Government.

3. No acreage allotments. Each farmer shall determine his own acreage and what he wants to plant, and shall have a chance to sell his surplus, if any, on world market at world price, but cost of production prices to farmers will be high enough to insure a good income without having to produce back-breaking surpluses.

4. Cost of production prices and amounts of each crop needed for total domestic consumption, a reasonable reserve, and export, to be announced by the Secretary of Agriculture once a year in advance of planting season, and will apply farm-by-farm. For example, if the Secretary announced that five-sixths of the nation's corn crop will be needed for domestic consumption, each farmer will be allowed the cost of production price for five-sixths of his corn crop.

5. Competing foreign farm products can be imported into the United States only if importer pays 5 percent above prevailing United States cost of production prices. (Department of Agriculture figures show that for the first nine months of 1955 only, foreigners shipped into this country 90,700,000 pounds of beef and 124,148,000 pounds of pork products or a total of 214,848,000 pounds of meat. To this must be added 240,135 head of live cattle, mostly from Mexico. A substantial share of foreign canned ham came from Communist Poland. Aside from the live animals, every pound of these imported meat products displaced a market for United States feed grains. This is a fantastic situation and must be stopped).

6. Commercial buyers of farm products to be licensed and must pay, under penalty of law, cost of production prices on products needed for domestic consumption.

7. This bill covers any and all kinds of poultry, livestock, and any product of the soil, and any product or byproduct thereof, produced in the United States, in an unmanufactured or unprocessed state, which have a farm value in excess of $30 million during the preceding marketing year.

It is difficult to believe that farmers, assured cost of production for the major portion of their crops, would wear out machinery, themselves and their families to produce unmanageable surpluses which they would be compelled to market at world prices. It is the conviction of many that this cost of production bill, translated into income to the farmer, would go far towards stabilizing the economy of the Nation because it would assure farmers buying power for products of industry, creating more income for industry and more jobs for those who in turn could buy more of the products of agriculture. A dollar of farm income generates approximately $7 in national income. Agriculture is the Nation's basic economy. Every depression or period of prosperity has begun on the farm.

The cost of production bill I have introduced (H. R. 8128), is a long-range program. It in no way obviates the absolute necessity for immediate emergency action on the part of President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson, who have always had administrative authority and ample money available to stabilize livestock prices at levels which would have prevented a farm depression pending the establishment of machinery that would provide economic justice to agriculture.

Freedom of Travel Isn't for Red Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of January 14, 1956:

FREEDOM OF TRAVEL ISN'T FOR RED AGENTS

Perhaps the most important objective in the Communist effort to break down the United States security system is the passport office of the State Department. Our regulations deny passports to persons, who are members of the Communist Party, or who engage in activities to support the Communist movement, or of whom there is reason to believe that they are going abroad to engage in activities which will advance the Communist movement.

This is naturally an inconvenience to the Communist conspirators, who, true to form, are spewing forth a dense propaganda smoke screen designed to persuade the American people that the State Department is under the domination of reactionaries and McCarthyites whose purpose is to prevent liberal scientists, economists and sweet singers from going abroad.

Actually, the number of would-be travelers who have been refused passports is very small. In the first 10 months of 1955, a total of 478,059 applications had been received and 473,703 passports issued. Thus there were 4,356 persons who did not get passports. Of these, about 3,900 failed to complete application forms, which were returned for further information. This leaves 456 actual rejections. Some of the unsuccessful applicants were insane, others had a record of discreditable conduct, such as passing bad checks abroad or making it necessary for Uncle Sam to bail them out. Still others were habitual criminals.

The number turned down under the regulation denying passports to Communists or fellow travelers during this period of almost a year was 13. So far as numbers go, it does not appear that the State Department is carrying on a vendetta against liberals or intellectuals. In any event, the actions of the Department in this regard are not a caprice of John Foster Dulles or his minions, but are stipulated in an Executive order issued in 1951 during the incumbency of former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.

The right of the State Department to regulate the issuance of passports in general has not been seriously challenged. But Judge Luther Youngdahl, of the Federal District Court for the District of Columbia, has asserted that, to comply with "due process," the State Department must support its denial of a passport with "all evidence upon which the Office may rely for its decision." His Honor mentioned the harm done by "the secret informer and the faceless talebearer whose indentity and testimony remain locked in confidential files." This is about how any American would react to use of informers if he knew nothing of how the Communist apparatus operates.

But if the identity of those who expose Red applicants for passports must be revealed, the best way to get a passport would be to become a Communist secret agent. For the State Department insists that it cannot disclose the source of its information regarding the activities of Communist conspirators without smashing whatever defense we have against the Red conspiracy. The phrase "secret informer and faceless talebearer" in Judge Youngdahl's decision suggests busybodies who write poison-pen letters. Usually these "informers" are carefully trained FBI agents who have infiltrated the Communist apparatus and enable the Government to keep a check on what the Communist Party is up to. When the identity of these men is disclosed, their usefulness is at an end.

The destruction of this security apparatus is the real objective of many Communists who apply for passports. They have no intention of going abroad, but they hope to force disclosure by the State Department of the names of our secret counteragents. In recent months a considerable increase in passport applications by the Red brethren has been noted. Even if the passport authorities cannot be blackmailed into exposing our undercover men, the Reds hope to embarrass the Government by constant hue and cry over new "outrages."

Undoubtedly there is a problem—for security officers, judges, and ordinary citizens in their thinking—how to square our traditional American jealousy of infringements on human freedom and our distrust of "in-

formers" with the necessity to protect this country from an active conspiracy to destroy every freedom. But surely "freedom to travel" is not compromised by regulations necessary for national safety—any more than freedom to drive a car down Main Street is violated by regulations which attempt to keep automobiles out of the hands of morons and homicidal maniacs.

Anyway, it is time to think of the subject in terms of what is going on, and not be misled by the Communist effort to call the whole Nation to arms whenever a Communist or a dupe thereof is denied a passport.

White House Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a letter which was addressed to the editor of the St. Louis Globe Democrat—and which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on January 10, 1956—regarding the White House Conference:

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE

To the EDITOR:

"Was the White House Conference as bad as some of the papers and commentators said it was?" We, the undersigned delegates to the conference from the St. Louis area, upon our return find this question confronting us repeatedly. Our answer to the question is that we believe the conference was well conducted and useful.

We suppose the answer depends largely upon one's expectations. Our expectations were high in regard to the value of exchange of ideas between laymen and professionals, all with a real concern for education. We were not disappointed. The discussions at our tables were serious, thoughtful, animated, uninhibited, and, we believe, useful.

Educators did not dominate the discussions. The ideas agreed upon at our tables, where they had substantial support at other tables, found their ways into the final reports. Moreover, the exchange of ideas did not begin nor end with this single, nationwide conference. It involved over 400,000 persons, lay and professional, who participated in preliminary discussions all over the country and in the Territories. Now the 1,800 delegates, representatives of the 48 States, the Territories, and 300 national organizations, have returned to their communities. The exchange of ideas continues and it is reasonable to expect action.

Though we did not believe that a conference of 1,800 could come to specific conclusions on detail, we did anticipate general areas of agreement. There was a definite conclusion favoring Federal aid for school buildings. This we believe to be important. Other conclusions of real interest to Missouri, well worth consideration, were forthcoming.

For example, the placing at the top of the list of school goals of the teaching of "fundamental skills of communication—reading, writing, spelling, the arithmetical and mathematical skills, including problem solving," together with the statement that in teaching these skills "continuous improvement is desirable and necessary" should furnish material for serious consideration. In which direction does improvement lie?

Missouri's assessment practices might be open to improvement in view of the conference recommendation that, "each State should base its taxing power on property through an equalized assessed evaluation and on the basis of statewide, uniform standards. * * * Better trained people, better administrative processes, and more scientific methods are needed to insure fairness in assessment procedures and practices."

There will be a printed report of the State meetings, national meeting, and national committee decisions. It can be used as a springboard for those who want to utilize the weight of decisions arrived at now on a nationwide basis where it applies to improvement in our own schools in Missouri. We delegates stand ready to help and we believe that all the publicity which has come out of this conference has generated enough concern to give further impetus to the survival and development of general education in a free society.

Mr. Milton Bierbaum, Senator Hartwell G. Crain, Mrs. C. W. Detjen, Mr. L. J. Dierker, Mr. Oscar Ehrhardt, Mrs. Aaron Fischer, Dr. Philip Hickey, Senator Michael Kinney, Mr. F. W. Mitchell, The Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, Mr. John I. Rollings, Dean Benjamin E. Youngdahl.

Resolution No. 243, Adopted by the American Legion at Its 1955 National Convention in Miami, Fla., October 10-13, 1955, Commending Congressional Committees Investigating Subversive Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Whereas for over 25 years the American Legion has supported congressional committees investigating un-American activities, insisting upon active ones with adequate appropriations; and

Whereas the information collected by congressional investigating committees has been of immeasurable value in providing the citizens of this Nation with information as to how subversion constantly infiltrates our social, political, and religious activities; and

Whereas this information has provided the incentive on which a number of our laws are based, and provides knowledge which influences our domestic and foreign policies; and

Whereas those members of Congress serving on such committees are rendering invaluable service to their country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Miami, Fla., October 10–13, 1955, That we commend the Un-American Activities Investigating Committee of the House of Representatives, the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee, the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the Special House Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations, 83d Congress for their praiseworthy, efficient, and patriotic service in the defense and security of America, and we urge that these committees be firmly supported by the Congress of the United States through appropriations of ample funds.

European Observations Report of Hon. Leon H. Gavin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to authority granted me by the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and invitational orders issued by the Department of the Army, I visited Germany, Austria, Italy, Spain, and France during the period September 18 through October 16, 1955. As you know, I have followed carefully since the end of World War II the industrial, economic, military and political development of the various peoples of Europe who are allied with us in the so-called Western bloc. My visit was brief; however, I met and conferred with a variety of United States officials who represent us in this important area and I was given detailed briefings covering events which occured subsequent to my last visit. More important, it was my privilege to visit our military installations and with the soldiers and officers of several of our combat units. Of the youth of America and their leaders now in Europe we can be justly proud. Accordingly, I trust that the comments which follow may be of assistance to the members of this committee who have been unable to observe our far-flung activities in Europe.

I. BERLIN

On September 19 at Berlin I conferred with Ambassador Conant. I was gratified by the calm confidence displayed by the Ambassador concerning the overall situation in Western Berlin and the Federal Government. Also I conferred with Maj. Gen. Charles H. Dasher, the United States commander, Berlin, and Brig. Gen. Francis T. Pachler, commanding general, Berlin Command. My observations concerning West Berlin are:

(a) Economic: West Berlin has continued to make strides toward full recovery. In June production reached 100 on the basis of the 1936 index. There is an air of prosperity throughout the free city. Construction of housing and business facilities is booming. Consumer goods are abundant and are being purchased. As evidence of private enterprise's confidence in the future one may observe the site cleared for construction of a Hilton Hotel in Berlin. Prior to the war Berlin was primarily a capital city and a finance and transportation center. The loss of these functions has forced Berlin to revise the basis of its economy and postwar Berlin has developed its economy along industrial lines of endeavor. Unemployment is pres-

ent, principally because many "white collared" workers have not been absorbed into the industrial atmosphere now present. It is reported that the unemployed in Berlin currently numbers approximately 118,000, or approximately 12 percent of the work force. In 1950, 20 percent of the work force was unemployed. At the present time Berlin is experiencing little or no difficulty in moving manufactured orders to the West and to the free world. Even in the face of a potential blockade, orders for goods maintain a satisfactory level. Regardless, Berlin will continue to rely on the strength of the market in the West and on a high level of direct assistance from the Federal Government. I remarked previously concerning the housing construction program in Berlin. Observers estimate that 18,000 dwelling units will be completed during the year 1955, and that 20,000 units are planned for the year 1956. Further expansion of new housing is in the program for 1957. The people of West Berlin look good. They are on the move. They appear well-dressed, well-fed, and confident. This appearance of well-being is reflected everywhere—by store windows, by parks, and by the municipal facilities. In contrast the Eastern Zone of Berlin seems to be covered by a thick, murky cloud of doom. Its people move in an air of purposelessness. Building lags, streets are in need of repair, municipal transportation facilities are run down and shabby. People queue for basic necessities. No greater contrast exists which displays free enterprise at its best than that shown between Free and East Berlin.

(b) Political: Refugees from the East are still streaming into Berlin. During each of the months of June and July 1955 some 13,000 sought the haven of the West. During August 1955, 17,000 sought and found similar refuge. I could find little optimism regarding the reunification of Germany. I am told that governmental officials and the free German press continually counsel the public toward patience. Whether their patience and conditioning can withstand the onslaughts of propaganda blasts and diplomatic maneuvering emanating from the East remains to be seen.

(c) Military: There has been little change in status of the United States forces in Berlin since 1954. No evidence is in sight that Russia and its satellite have decreased their forces in the Berlin area. If the pattern in the past means anything the Reds are improving upon their military potential in all respects in this area. The 6th Infantry Regiment is the major combat-ready unit stationed in the Berlin area. This organization has a splendid and glorious combat record. A continuous combat training program is in operation for various elements which travel to the Grafenwohr-Hohenfels-Vilsek area northeast of Nuremberg for maneuvers and weapons firing. The 6th Regiment is ready; it is not an occupation-type organization.

II. GERMANY

During the period September 21 through October 2, 1955 I consulted with United States military and diplomatic officials and inspected troop units in the Federal Republic of Germany. At Heidelberg I conferred with General McAuliffe who commands the United States Army element in Europe. At Wiesbaden I had lengthy discussions with Lieutenant General Tunner and staff who lead the United States Air Forces in Europe. Included in my itinerary were visits with Lieutenant General Hodes, Commanding General, 7th United States Army; Lieutenant General Hart, Commanding General, 5th United States Corps; Lieutenant General Decker, Commanding General, 7th United States Corps, Major General Ruffner, Commanding General, 2d Armored Division; Major General Van Brunt, Commanding General 4th Infantry Division; Major General Sexton, Commanding General, 5th Infantry Division; Major General Reber, Commanding General, Western Area Command; Major General Watson, Commanding General, Southern Area Command; and Major General Bradley, Chief of European Command's Planning Group at Bonn. Apart from the 6th Infantry Regiment in Berlin I inspected training activities and facilities of the following: Headquarters, 4th Infantry Division; the 12th Infantry Regiment; the 40th Tank Battalion, the 29th Field Artillery Battalion; Headquarters 2d Armored Division, Combat Command A, 2d Armored Division; the 2d Infantry Regiment; 47th AAA Battalion, 7th Engineer Battalion, 5th Medical Battalion and 759th Tank Battalion.

(a) Economic: It is my belief that the Federal Republic of Germany has attained a satisfactory level of economic recovery. The agricultural industry has experienced a full-measure of recovery and crop and foodstuff production is well above pre-war levels. Prices and wages present a formidable problem to the Federal Government, and, as in any rapidly expanding economy, the threat of inflation exists. In Germany there are shortages of skilled and semi-skilled laborers, particularly in the accelerated building trades. Effort has been made to import laborers, from Italy in this regard. The Germans apparently have confidence in the stability of their currency as savings continue at a relatively high level from the previous year. I feel that the German economy can sustain itself at current levels provided the existing markets, domestic and foreign, can be maintained. Insofar as any further United States monetary aid to Germany is concerned I feel that we should consider only military assistance and aid in the support of the Berlin situation.

(B) Political: Since 1945 the free German has been preoccupied largely with finding enough food for bare sustenance, providing himself with shelter and clothing, and finding a means of livelihood. Now that he has attained these basic wants he may devote a part of his time to the politics of the world in which he lives. After having visited Western Germany frequently since the end of World War II, I am convinced that there is little danger of a rebirth of national socialism or a trend toward communism in the foreseeable future. At this time I believe the average German's interest in politics is not intense. It may be stated that the German can be stimulated politically when national issues become clear and contain an element of symbolism with which he may identify himself. In the younger adult generation in Western Germany there may be a certain amount of pessimism toward the political future. Unless the political leadership of the nation can create and sustain the political interest of the youth, a form of nihilism may arise. I am confident, however, that the leadership of Germany will do everything within its power to prevent the growth of such a political attitude and climate. The creation of a military force within the Federal German Government is so closely keyed to the political situation that I deem it appropriate to discuss German national defense at this point. The German parliament has not yet scratched the surface toward the enactment of basic national defense legislation. As an example, when I was in Bonn there had been committee-type discussion and debate concerning the pay structure for future members of the German armed services. At that time the matter had not been resolved, even to the point of bringing it to a vote. External pressure from the Russians may play the larger role in delaying the development of a new Germany military force. The issue of reunification of the country is certainly a factor to be considered in the matter of developing the military and Russian diplomacy may be expected to play upon this factor in the Russian effort to block, delay, and stall the rearmament of Western Germany. Once the defense legislation is enacted fully, however, I am sure that Western Germany will proceed with great skill, energy, and intelligence to develop its military force. Concerning this, I believe that it is incumbent upon the leadership of the United States to convince the Germans that the arms they raise will be so raised to prevent world war III. Should we allow them to entertain the slightest belief that their military forces are destined for retrograde action in the event of a communistic attack, I fear that things will be slow in building. An additional political issue involves governmental expenditures toward national defense. I am told that budget estimates for rearmament of Western Germany have been geared to the gross national product. Expenditures will, of course, depend upon the sums the parliament will ultimately approve. At any rate, I estimate that Western Germany's defense expenditures, when approved, will comprise as large a percentage of its gross national product as that allocated defensewise by many other members of NATO. I am in favor of a generous contribution to the development of a Western German defense force which can take its place in the community of free nations and become a deterrent to aggression from the East.

(c) Military: Everywhere in Germany I found a keen awareness of the situation on the part of our own military leaders and their subordinates. All echelons are on the alert, ready to move,

and understand completely their missions. I repeat that I was most impressed with the appearance of our troops. They are truly representative of our great Nation. The condition of our military equipment evidences good care and economy of supply. Housing and recreational facilities for our troops and their dependents are excellent. Training of troops in Germany poses a real problem. Maneuver areas are limited. Land is so precious that there are few unproductive areas where troops may train without regard to damage to crops or timber. Large unit training is conducted in the Grafenwohr-Hohenfels-Vilsek area. Small unit training is conducted on a limited scale in home-station areas. Our heavy vehicles, particularly tracked vehicles, inflict considerable damage on roadways, rights-of-way shoulders and bridges. Regardless of painstaking care, damage ensues when field training is conducted. Military officials in Germany are confronted with a considerable problem in providing realistic training while being mindful of damage claims which may arise as well as being aware of the limitations of funds to settle legitimate claims for damages. It is my belief that we should not quibble over moneys requested by the military where appropriations for maneuver damage payments are concerned. Many Members of Congress have expressed a concern over the Status of Forces Agreement, the Forces Convention, and other matters involving civil and criminal jurisdiction of our troops in the NATO countries and Germany. During my discussions relating to these conventions, as they apply to Germany, I found no apprehension on the part of responsible officials. I gained the impressions that the Germans will be overly fair in the application of the conventions and that should military personnel become civil offenders the Germans will remand them to military custody for such remedial action necessary. Under the terms of current agreements, the Germans do not have jurisdiction where criminal violations are involved. It remains to be seen whether the Germans will insist upon claiming jurisdiction in the field of criminal violations of law in the future. Of further concern to United States Army authorities in Germany is the reduction of deutschemark financial support for operations as a result of the return of sovereignty to West Germany. In the past dollars were used in Germany only for expenses toward which deutschemarks could not be applied; for example, the pay of our own civilian employees and the procurement of subsistence. Transportation, rents and utilities, solid fuels, repair and maintenance, communications, and construction costs were paid out of deutschemark funds. Following the ratification of the Paris Accords, a reduction in deutschemark support commenced. In effect, any further loss of deutschemark support in West Germany will result in a retrenchment program and the release of German employees, a lowering of standards of maintenance, and modifying standards of living. Collaterally it may be expected that the costs of maintaining our forces in Europe will increase in the future because of the expanding German economy and the resultant spiral increases in wages and prices.

III. AUSTRIA

On October 1, 1955, I conferred with Lt. Gen. William H. Arnold at Salzburg, Austria. For all intents and purposes the mission of United States forces in Austria was complete and the last of our troops had been withdrawn. I was gratified to learn that we leave Austria with a clean bill of health. As the result of careful negotiations, General Arnold and his staff were able to conclude a series of agreements which preclude the accrual of any further claims against our Government arising from the tenancy of our forces in Austria. It was reported to me that an excellent return was realized on the disposal of surplus and salvage military equipment remaining after the termination of our activities in Austria. My visit to Austria out of necessity was brief. Therefore, I did not inquire into its economic and political situation. It appears, however, that the political climate in Austria remains favorable to the West and that the Austrians, as a whole, are oriented toward the West at this time.

IV. ITALY

During the period of October 3 through October 7, 1955, I conferred with United States military and diplomatic officials in Italy. Included were discussions with Ambassador Luce, Maj. Gen. Frank A. Allen, Jr., Chief of our military advisory group and his staff in Italy; Brig. Gen. John H. Michaelis, Commanding General, Southern Europe Task Force; and Col. Charles L. Williams, commander of support activities in Leghorn.

(a) Economic: On the surface, Italy appears to be maintaining expansion of her economy. On the whole we have granted her some $4.5 billion since the end of World War II. If this staggering sum has failed to revitalize and stabilize the economy of Italy for a long time to come, then any future grants, I feel, would prove absolutely futile. Italy's heavy and other diversified industries are busy. New construction is gradually erasing evidences of wartime damage. Fields, once war-torn, have been completely returned to productive uses. Approximately 1.5 million acres, once part of large landed estates and, in some cases, unproductive for hundreds of years, have been purchased by the Government in connection with the land reformation program. The current land reformation program is scheduled for expansion. Legislation is now being prepared for this purpose. Foreign aid type funds provided by the United States will assist in the support of further reformation programs. Today Italy is almost self-sustaining on wheat. She has exportable quantities of fruits and vegetables. She still has a deficit in cotton, however.

(b) Political: The Christian Democratic Party continues to hold the larger number of seats in the Chamber. Insofar as internal reforms are concerned, I refer you to my remarks in the RECORD of January 22, 1951. The Italian tax system has yet to receive the overhaul I feel is due it. In 1949, a tax reform bill was placed high on the government's legislative program. In 1951 I was informed that surely during that year the overhaul was imminent. Last year—1954—I was again told that tax reform legislation was in the offing. Some progress has been made in minor areas of the Italian tax structure, yet the sweeping reforms needed remain a vision. Tax proposals made in 1954 providing for penalties for failure to comply with the tax laws are making little headway. We in America have been generous toward Italy. Our taxpayers have tolerated deficit spending on the part of our Government by way of providing foreign aid. The Italian Government, in my opinion, fails to collect a satisfactory percentage of its potential revenues. Since this report was compiled tax reformation laws, I understand, have been enacted.

(c) Military: Our forces in Italy are commanded by General Michaelis, whose record needs no review here. These forces were recently a part of our garrison in Austria and they are readying themselves for a NATO role. I am satisfied that good progress is being made in this area and that the Italian Government will render excellent cooperation in the many problems involved. As a result of the rollup in Austria, a considerable amount of military supplies have been shipped to Leghorn for storage and/or further disposition. There are problems arising in connection with segregation and classifying various items of supply and there are labor and storage problems to be found; however, our officials are proceeding to resolve these problems as best and as rapidly as possible. It was gratifying to observe the port and depot area at Leghorn. At the time of my visit the area reflected good management and careful storage procedures, both covered and outdoor.

Italy, with our aid, is on its way toward developing an effective defense establishment. It is my opinion that the roles, missions, and objectives assigned to Italy within the NATO framework are realistic and can be met. This also applies to the amount of United States assistance programed for Italy. Progress is slow in some areas of the defense assistance program; but earnest effort is being made by United States and Italian authorities to achieve the aims of the program. The Italian Air Force is receiving modern United States aircraft. Our Air Force representatives are striving to insure that maximum benefits can be derived by the Italians in utilization of aircraft and in training. Difficulty may be found from time to time because of the peculiar structure of the Italian Air Force High Command. The line of authority in the Italian Air Force seems to be split between the Secretary General and the Chief of Staff. As an example, I was informed that the air force chief of staff's authority is limited to matters of operations and training and that he is kept apart from matters such as fiscal management, logistics, and personnel. This arrangement is apparently traditional within the Italian Defense Ministry, and I am not prepared to advise whether we should press upon the sovereignty of

Italy for a reform in this regard. Endeavors to develop, modernize, and integrate the Italian Navy within the NATO sphere are progressing satisfactorily. The major problems lie in providing technicians to operate and maintain complex equipment to be found in a modern navy. The Italian Army at the present is comprised of some 15½ divisions of various stages in strength. Prior to World War II the Italians were able to field some 30 divisions. When comparing prewar divisions with those currently active one must consider strength, firepower, and operating costs. United States military officials in Italy report that the prewar divisions had only 60 percent strengthwise of the present divisions, and had about 15 percent of the firepower potential of the present divisions. Italy now allocates 5 percent of its gross national produce to defense. The army receives approximately 48 percent of the total moneys allocated for defense. It could not be determined what percent of the prewar gross national product was devoted to Italy's military machine. Conscription in Italy is universal. The army draftee serves 18 months. I was encouraged to hear reports on the status of training and combat potential of the Italian Army. An observer, whose military judgment is that in which I have the utmost confidence, told me that the Alpine troops in the Italian Army are as capable as any troops anywhere.

V. SPAIN

In Spain it was my pleasure to confer with Ambassador Lodge; Mr. Richard Rubottom, Chief of the United States Operations Mission and staff; Maj. Gen. August Kissner, USAF, Chief of the Joint United States Military Group and staff; and Maj. Gen. Verdie B. Barnes, United States Army, and the Military Assistance Advisory Group staff. It was indeed encouraging to visit Spain and our authorities there. For in Spain, United States officials and their counterparts meet in an atmosphere of cooperation and on a clear quid pro quo basis. In the past Spain asked nothing from us and received nothing. Basic negotiations relating to the base construction program and the military defense assistance program in Spain are probably the best and most sound ever entered into by our Government and a foreign sovereign power. The use of counterpart of grant-defense support assistance for Spain per a 1953 agreement is as follows: 30 percent of the local currency counterpart funds generated by defense support dollar grants are for Spanish projects involving revitalization and expansion of strategic roads and railways and munitions programs; 60 percent of the local counterpart funds are being used by the United States for administrative and operating costs.

(a) Economic: United States economic experts in Spain report that Spain's situation during 1955 has been characterized by mixed trends. Developments thus far in 1955 have been reported relatively encouraging. Spain's general economic weakness, however, is reflected in her foreign trade and payments situation. Spain's foreign trade is the smallest per capita in Europe. Oil, cotton, wheat, and coal, so highly essential to her economy, for the most part, must be imported. On the other hand Spain has little to offer to foreign exchange excepting olive oil, olives, nuts, wines, and tomatoes. Production in various areas of the economy is up in comparison with levels achieved in recent years. Steel output is on the increase. The outlook for the citrus crop and citrus export in 1955–56 is that production will rise. The tourist industry has encouraging prospects. In 1954 tourism earnings amounted to the equivalent of $100 million in all currencies of which $30 million were in dollar exchange. It is difficult for me, and I rather suggest difficult for the experts, to predict any sort of a high degree of prosperity for Spain in the near future. Her per capita gross national income is roughly one-half of the average for western Europe. The climate is the driest in Europe; the soil is poor and eroded. Basically an agricultural country, 60 percent of her people are employed in agriculture. Spain is most receptive to our technical-exchange program. Our experts are assisting her in many phases of her economy. Reforestation is underway. Some 200,000 acres of a potential 100 million acres have already been reforested. Soil and resources conservation programs have been instituted. Land reform and reclamation projects have been programed. Water-distribution problems are under scrutiny. All of these programs are long overdue and must be resolved with imagination and vigor. I feel that the motivation exists within Spain to proceed on these vitally needed projects.

(b) Military: Spain's defense establishment is currently receiving support through the means of the mutual defense assistance program. The cost of the program will be cumulative to the amount of $351.8 million as scheduled through fiscal years 1956–57. I have long advocated recognition of Spain's military potential and strategic position. My recent visit to Spain left me with an even firmer conviction that it is in Spain where we may make wise and increasing investments in mutual defense. Currently programed support of Spain's army appears to be on a sound basis. Our authorities and their Spanish counterparts have agreed to concentrate the assistance toward equipping a fewer number of units to the maximum rather than spreading the assistance thinly over a greater number. End items of equipment are arriving in Spain on a good schedule. The Spaniard's grasp of the technicalities of operation and maintenance of our equipment is excellent. They are appreciative of the support and take superior care of the equipment furnished. On October 11, 1955, I inspected the activities of the 61st Armored Regiment of the Acorazada Division. United States Army technicians were present and assisting in maintenance instructions. I was informed that of the 68 tanks furnished this unit, only two were deadlined at the time for mechanical repairs. To me this is an amazing demonstration of equipment care in view of the fact that these tanks are in constant use for training purposes and that our tank is a relatively new item in the Spanish family of military vehicles. I also witnessed a tactical training problem involving a company of tanks in support of an infantry attack. The problem was well planned, realistically conceived and smartly executed. Col. Warren H. Hoover, United States Army, accompanied me during my visit to the 61st Regiment. Colonel Hoover was enthusiastic in his praise of this organization, and other units of the Spanish Army. Colonel Hoover is a mature and experienced officer and I have confidence in his judgment. I regret that time limitations prevented me from visiting more activities of the Spanish Army. Spanish military personnel are proud of the United States equipment furnished them and welcome the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to use it.

(c) Base construction program: The United States has embarked upon a construction program in Spain of a magnitude which is difficult for the ordinary layman to appreciate. To me the $327 million allocated for 1954 through 1957 for this construction are being wisely invested. The basic policies adopted for the construction program are: First, no crash; second, coordination and cooperation with Spain; third, utilize American prime contractors; fourth, utilize Spanish subcontractors; fifth, utilize Spanish materials and industry; sixth, utilize United States surplus equipment. The entire program has been characterized by fine working relationships between our representatives and the Spanish Government. The target date for completion of phase 1 is the fall of 1956 when construction is hoped to be far enough along to permit emergency operation of aircraft from the bases. It has been reported that there is an impatience on the part of the construction forces to get on with the work ahead. This is encouraging. At the time of my visit at Torrejon and Zaragoza it was extremely difficult to gage the degree of progress being made. Within the next 6 months, however, progress from a visual standpoint should be dramatic. In this connection it should be pointed out that one of the major tasks in the base program is the construction of concrete parking aprons. Construction of the aprons is time-consuming and presents a formidable task. At Torrejon, for example, the parking apron will measure some 7,500 feet in length and 1,100 feet in width when finally completed. The importance of the construction of port facilities at Rota should not be overlooked. Most of the emphasis on the program, however, has been given the air base phase. The port at Rota will probably be the key to the entire Spanish base complex and will become the largest construction project in the overall Spanish program. I believe that adequate progress is being made toward achieving our construction objectives in Spain. Many obstacles have been overcome through mutual understanding and an intense desire to cooperate on the part of our officials and their Spanish coworkers. No other country in Europe has offered the kind

of cooperation rendered by the Spanish Government. Spain must be kept strong economically and militarily if it is to be maintained as a bastion of defense in the free world. A large measure of credit for the achievements thus far obtained must be given General Kissner and his very able Air Force and Navy associates. Credit must also be given the American construction firms who have joined together in advancing this venture.

VI. FRANCE

During my visit to France I had a most cordial and informative visit with Gen. Orval Cook, of the United States European Command, and Maj. Gen. George Honnen, Chief of Staff of the United States European Command. General Gruenther, at the time, was ill in quarters and I trust at this writing that he has recovered from his illness without complication. Also during my stay in France I visited the headquarters of our communications zone in Orleans and conferred with Maj. Gen. Phillip Gallagher, the commander of the zone activities. In addition I conferred at the United States Embassy regarding France's economic outlook. This section of my report will deal with the current French economic picture and with a few of the problems confronting United States military personnel stationed in France.

(a) Economic: France today is more prosperous than at any other time since the end of World War II. France has benefited along with the general economic progress in Europe. She has enjoyed a high level of dollar receipts this year and has experienced good crop weather. In June 1955 the industrial production index—excluding building—reached an alltime high of 175—on the index basis of 100 for the year 1938. This represented an 11-percent increase over the reading taken in June 1954 and 19 percent above that of June 1953. Construction of dwellings is expanding. The year 1955 will be another record year in crop production. There has been a certain stability in prices for the last 3½ years. Observers report this to be the longest period of price stability in France since 1914. It is reported to me further that French saving habits are returning, the capital market is reviving, and there is hope that private investment will replace public investment as the prime factor in the French economy. In consideration of France's improved position in foreign exchange it must be remembered that she received payments of a military nature amounting to $515 million in 1953 and $933 million in 1954. When our support of France's military budget is terminated a reduction in her external surplus will ensue. However, France can count on sizable dollar earnings from our troops stationed in France. The picture of France's economic situation in the future is not clear to me. The stark possibility of runaway inflation is always present. Her budget represents a weak spot. The stability of the French Cabinet is recognized as a factor influencing France's economic life. Her troubles in North Africa represent a serious drain on her economy. We have poured in some $9 billion in aid to France since 1945 and I ask the question as to how long will we continue to support her economic position in the Western World.

(b) Military: The United States has invested heavily in establishing a supply line from the ports of France to the German borders. This supply line supplants the old one which ran from Bremerhaven to our forces in Western Germany. The old line ran parallel and almost touched upon the western perimeter of the Iron Curtain. No one will disagree that it was a sound proposition in establishing United States Army Europe's communication zone as it now exists. In this regard much work lies ahead, particularly in the construction of various supply complexes. Current concepts hold that there must be a duplication of supply depots, dispersed in order to reduce the vast destructive powers of modern weapons of warfare. Our authorities in France are proceeding to develop the planned facilities as rapidly as time and the availability of funds permit. I gained the impression that many of the frustrating delays being encountered are occasioned by the necessity of coordinating nearly every phase of construction activity with French officials. I did not gain the impression that the French were uncooperative, rather that there is an extraordinary amount of red-tape—French variety—to slice in proceeding with virtually everything we do in France. It is not my desire that we infringe upon the sovereignty of France, however, I do feel that we are entitled to a greater degree of freedom in our operations there than we now have.

I am somewhat disturbed over the lack of a realistic housing program for our Army personnel in France with particular emphasis on housing suitable for personnel who have dependents. If we have any intention of maintaining an active communication zone in France for an extended period, then I feel a review of the dependent housing situation is clearly indicated. Currently programed dependent housing construction will provide for only 40 percent of that actually required. More than 60 percent of our personnel with dependents in France are living in substandard accommodations.

VII. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

My conclusions, based on my observations, are as follows:

First. The economic recovery of Germany, Italy, and France is complete insofar as the need for further United States aid is concerned.

Second. The level of the economy in Spain must be raised to the extent that our economic aid and construction programs will provide.

Third. The rearmament of the Federal Republic of Germany will require patience and understanding by all interested nations and a speedy rearmament should not be anticipated with optimism.

Fourth. The integration of Spain into the NATO family of nations should be the subject of early representations on the part of the United States.

Fifth. The dependent housing program for Army personnel in France should be made the subject of a thorough review.

The Voice of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Virgina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal:

THE VOICE OF VIRGINIA

The other day the people of Virginia by a two-thirds majority, voted to change their State constitution rather than be compelled to comply with the United States Supreme Court's segregation decision. This, it seems to us, is a voice of protest that the rest of the country should not ignore.

The Virginia protest is noteworthy in a number of respects, not the least of which is the form that it took and the manner in which it was taken.

What the Virginia people said, in effect, is that they will consider abolishing their public school system for all practical purposes rather than submit to compulsory integration. The immediate question was whether to change their constitution so as to permit State funds to be allocated to private schools; the vote authorized the calling of a State constitutional convention for that purpose. This would not abolish the State school system. But it would permit it to be abolished in the extremity.

As a political act this may not seem as extreme as some of the other courses of action urged in the South since the Supreme Court's decision. Even in Virginia there has been a strong movement for the "defiance direct" to the Supreme Court's order, a declaration by the Virginia government that the court was without power to do what it did and that therefore its action was nullified. The constitutional crisis that would raise in the Nation can be imagined.

But there is nothing trivial about this protest. A community does not contemplate the abolition of its public school system except under great provocation. And it does not translate the protest of words into the protest of action unless it feels the provocation intolerable.

Nor is this Virginia protest simply the voice of some rabble-rousing demagogs hoisted to power upon one suspender. Neither the governor nor the legislature, as has happened in some places, presumed to speak for the citizens; they put the question to a referendum. There was a political campaign, but there was no passionate campaign with the red shirts flying. The preelection days were so quiet they were hardly noticed in the press of other areas.

To people in other parts of the country this overwhelming vote may seem extraordinary. The educational and cultural progress of the Negro people in the past century has been so great that elsewhere many find it inexplicable that anywhere others should see an educational or cultural gulf remaining.

But however difficult for others to understand, here is impressive testimony that the people who live closest to this ancient problem do not believe it can be resolved by a Supreme Court decree which overnight threw down a long line of Supreme Court decisions under which the separate schools were built.

These people do not say never; the South has narrowed the gulf in every generation. What they protest is the insistence that in every place, and without regard to circumstances, the whole burden of solving the most difficult of social and political prob-

lems should be thrust upon a single generation of schoolchildren.

And unless you are to say that the entire Commonwealth of Virginia is peopled in its majority by men of less character, integrity, and wisdom than the rest of us, then it is not a protest to go unheeded. It's a perilous business for a nation to thrust by force great social changes upon a part of it determined to resist.

Red China Pounding the Door for Admission to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal for Tuesday, January 10, written by Mr. William Henry Chamberlin, in which he points out that Red China is now seriously engaged in a campaign to secure admission to the United Nations. The so-called package deal, where certain Red nations were admitted, has provided the incentive for Red China to engage in its current campaign.

All House Members who are interested in opposing the admission of Red China to the U. N. should make their views known to the Department of State.

The article follows:

POUNDING THE DOOR—NOW THAT THE U. N. HAS ADMITTED MORE COMMUNIST STATES, THE CLAMOR FOR RED CHINA'S ENTRY GROWS NOISIER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The knocking at the United Nations door on behalf of the admission of Red China as a member is becoming louder and more insistent. There is a strong probability that this will become a major foreign policy issue before the end of 1956.

The question of Red Chinese membership was in the background of the complicated negotiations which finally led to the admission of 16 additional nations as members of the U. N., with a Soviet veto of Japan as an offset and reprisal for Nationalist China's veto of Outer Mongolia. Soviet diplomacy seems to be pursuing two aims in keeping Japan for the time being out of the U. N. There is, first, the chance of putting this bit of extra pressure on Japan to sign a peace treaty on terms desired by Moscow.

There is also the possibility that at some future U. N. session the Soviet representatives will place the United States before the disagreeable alternative of acquiescing in the seating of Red China or letting Japan cool its heels in the U. N. waiting room indefinitely. This would not be the first time that the Soviet government showed itself expert in the uses of diplomatic blackmail.

Psychologically the package deal method which brought about the enlargement of U. N. membership may have favored Red China's ultimate prospect of admission. Morality was frankly sacrificed to expediency. The goal of making U. N. membership more nearly universal was placed ahead of the ideal of examining closely the credentials for membership of such distinctly nonsovereign states as Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania, to say nothing of Outer Mongolia. This most shadowy of Soviet satellites, which actually took part in the war against U. N. forces in Korea, would have been admitted had it not been for Chiang Kai-shek's decision to use the veto right which his government enjoys as the still-recognized Chinese representative on the Security Council.

TERROR AND PROPAGANDA

It is easy to foresee the line of argument that will be heard in the coming months, on both sides of the Atlantic, in favor of admitting Mao Tse-tung's regime to the U. N. This government is in de facto possession and control of the mainland area of China. Its method of rule by a mixture of unlimited terrorism and pervasive propaganda has worked effectively in other countries; there is no reason to assume that it will not continue to work indefinitely in China.

Recognition or nonrecognition of Red China has been the biggest issue dividing the United States and Great Britain and it may be that Prime Minister Eden will touch on the desirability of removing this issue when he visits Washington later this month. The Soviet Union, for its part, never misses an opportunity to give an assist to its allied Communist dictatorship in Peiping by placing itself on record as convinced of Red China's right to U. N. membership; the Soviets did so again just recently in joint declarations with the heads of the governments of India, Burma, and Afghanistan.

So it would be unwise to underestimate the amount of pressure that is likely to be built up for the substitution of Red China for Nationalist China in the U. N. The enlargement of U. N. membership may intensify this pressure. To be sure, four Western powers, Italy, Eire, Spain, and Portugal, offset the four new Communist members. But the new Asian members may go along with the demand for Red China's admission. And now that the U. N. is bigger, the United States plus the 21 Latin American states no longer constitute a voting group capable of blocking a decision of the U. N. Assembly which would require a two-thirds majority.

Despite the mounting tide of pressure from outside, there are strong reasons, both moral and practical, why the United States should adhere to its policy of refusing to grant diplomatic recognition to Red China and of opposing the admission of the regime to the U. N.

While Red China may have temporarily desisted from acts of overt aggression and of barbarous maltreatment of foreigners in its territory, there are no signs of repentance for past acts of this kind, no assurance that present milder policies will not be put aside at the earliest convenient moment. Red Chinese troops are still in military occupation of North Korea and represent the principal obstacle to unification of Korea on the basis of free elections. The Chinese Communists would, therefore, have some reason to feel that they had succeeded in shooting their way into the U. N. if they obtained admission under present conditions.

BARBAROUS TREATMENT

There have been no apologies or indemnities for the outrageous manhandling, including several cases of actual murder, of American citizens in Red Chinese jails. The shocking physical and psychological condition of an elderly missionary couple recently released from these jails—a couple that brought to the Chinese people only good through their spiritual message and their medical knowledge—is only one of many proofs of the essentially barbarous character of the Red Chinese regime, of its unwillingness or inability to accord civilized treatment to foreigners in its power.

Finally, and this is certainly not the least of the considerations that should determine American policy in this important matter, there is the question of the Chinese Nationalis government on Formosa. We are linked to this government by a treaty of alliance. And this alliance is based on the sound principle of mutual advantage.

If Chiang Kai-shek's government could scarcely survive without American help, Formosa in friendly hands is of very great importance for our defensive strategy in the Pacific. And the significance of a free, anti-Communist Chinese government in Formosa is much more than strategic. It is a beacon of hope to millions of oppressed, pillaged and exploited Chinese on the mainland who hate the new Communist tyranny but are at present unable to act openly against it. Formosa could be a very painful thorn in the side of Red China if its rulers should launch aggression again.

POTENTIAL FIFTH COLUMNISTS

The existence of the Nationalist government in Formosa is also a main bulwark against the acceptance of the Peiping regime by the large and influential overseas Chinese communities in Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia and Malaya. These overseas Chinese communities, if Chiang Kai-shek's government were brushed aside by the United States, might well became ready-made fifth columns for Red Chinese expansion.

Is it either generous or safe, from the standpoint of American interests, to disavow an ally and favor an enemy by voting for Red Chinese admission to the United Nations or by opening up diplomatic relations? There is reason to believe that the answer of the great majority of the American people to this question would be an emphatic No, regardless of how loud the clamor for Red China's admission to the United Nations becomes this year.

Address by Hon. Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, of Michigan, at Butler County Democratic Committee Annual Dinner, Butler, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished and invited guests, my fellow Americans, and fellow Democrats, I am highly honored in your invitation to be with you tonight, and to participate in and address this gathering of fine Americans and Democrats.

I am happy to be in the district represented so ably in the Congress by my friend and colleague, Congressman FRANK CLARK. The people of the 25th Pennsylvania Congressional District are justified in being proud of Congressman CLARK. His ability, sincerity, and devotion to duty have already made him an outstanding Member of the national House of Representatives. He enjoys the respect and confidence of his colleagues and of the Democratic leadership; Speaker RAYBURN and myself.

It is in the best interest of a district to keep a public official like Congressman CLARK in office, giving him seniority and prestige, and enabling him to broaden his service for district, State, and Nation.

I am pleased to be again in Pennsylvania where I campaigned in 1952 for Governor Leader, the State ticket, and congressional candidates. In Governor Leader Pennsylvania has a chief executive of whom you can be proud. His leadership is outstanding.

He has already made a national name for himself, and it is growing rapidly. His ability, coupled with his humbleness and simplicity, is most noticeable.

I am so glad to see again and to pay proper tribute to one who, with her distinguished brother, has given a lifetime of service to the Democratic Party—your fighting national committeewoman, Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller. No tribute from anyone is too great for her.

All of us feel very sorry for the President and Mrs. Eisenhower in the President's illness, and we sincerely hope and pray for his rapid improvement and recovery to good health.

The President's illness is most unfortunate at this time in the world's history, because no one, under our constitutional setup, can decide and act as can the President. It is difficult to substitute anyone else, or a council, or a committee, or whatever a group might be termed, for the President. The battle for position—the conflict of interests—the ambition of individuals—human emotions—and efforts of groups within the administration and the Republican Party to gain control of the party machinery, and control the next convention, particularly if the President is not a candidate for reelection, comes into forceable operation with dividing results.

During the President's illness the Democratic Party will do everything possible to stabilize conditions, and particularly in the field of foreign affairs, to give strength to our policies and our position. We can and we will render, if consulted, outstanding service for our country, because particularly in the field of foreign affairs the Democratic Party is united, while the Republican Party, unfortunately, is sharply divided.

I look in the next several months for the GOP old guard and the Republican isolationists to come out of their political underground where they were driven by President Eisenhower.

The Democratic Party in Congress will continue its constructive attitude. However, the responsibility for policy and action will rest upon the Republican administration, which controls the machinery of our Government. While we will be a cooperative and stabilizing influence; that does not mean that we will not comment or constructively criticize the domestic and foreign policies of the present administration. Under our constitutional form of government it is our duty to do so, and we shall not fail in our duty to the people.

In 1952, the Republican candidates ran against the Democratic Party. They played upon every gripe and dissatisfaction possible, and some of their candidates for high office, and I refer particularly to Vice President NIXON, resorted to statements that were not only undignified and unfair, but false. If some person stated that some of his charges were comtemptible, I would not challenge such an assertion.

In 1956, the situation will be different. The Republican candidate for President, and other Republican candidates, will not be able to run against the Democrats—they will have to run on the record of their own administration. They will not be on the delivering end in 1956.

And the Republican record is one of broken promises.

Let me refresh your memory on some of their broken promises.

1. A balanced budget. They are now frantically, for campaign purposes, after 3 years, trying to balance the budget in this fiscal year, and it can only be done at the expense of our national defense and our national security.

2. To reduce the national debt. Instead, it has been increased.

3. To be fair to labor. We find instead the stacking of the National Labor Relations Board. A majority of which members have administratively made decisions adverse to labor. What about the promise made to labor to amend and remove the harsh provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act? The promise was made—amendments were drafted which labor would not oppose, and before the President sent his message to Congress, someone "leaked," and big interests immediately opposed. The message was never sent to Congress. You will remember that former Secretary of Labor, Martin Durkin, a great man, and the only Democrat in the Cabinet, resigned over this broken promise.

4. The promise to the farmers of our country. Everyone knows what has happened to our farming communities under the present Republican administration. It will be remembered that the Republicans promised to reduce farm surpluses and also to reduce losses to the farmer. Instead, under the Republicans, there is reduced farm income, and in the last fiscal year—the largest loss in the history of the farm program, in the sum of $799 million. And after nearly 3 years of Republican control, the only excuse they can offer is to still blame the Democrats.

5. The promise to give fair and equitable treatment to small and independent businesses. Instead, we find Government contracts sharply reduced; bankruptcy among this group sharply increasing; mergers; and the frantic desire for "bigness" running rampant, resulting in a "squeeze play" upon this important segment of our society. When the Republicans terminated the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was very helpful to this type of business, they established the Small Business Administration; but, by law, curtailed its ability to act effectively. I can say with pride that in the last session, the Democratic Congress, despite Republican opposition, extended this law, and in a manner where this important segment of American business can receive fair and effective consideration. One illustration is that we increased the maximum loan capacity from $150,000, under the Republican law, to $250,000, under the Democratic measure. We also struck out other restrictive provisions of the Republican law.

6. The promise made to help, through contracts, labor-distressed areas. Under the Democrats we allowed a certain differential in bid price to firms located in such areas; as well as to small and independent businesses. Under the Republicans, this was wiped away.

7. The new military look. Our Army and Navy and Marine Corps have been sharply reduced, particularly our Army. And the Communist leaders in the Kremlin smile and slap some of our officials on their backs and boast openly that they are still intent on world revolution and world domination—with the determination and hope of taking over by internal subversion nation after nation in an effort to try and have America alone in the world.

8. Massive retaliation. Do you remember that promise? There has been a constant retreat from that to "peaceful co-existence"; then, "peace through trade," later, "cooperative peace"; and now, we have reached the policy of "no force"—whatever that means. To other free countries that is construed as weakness, uncertainty, and even appeasement.

9. To unleash Chiang Kai-shek. Do you also remember that promise? Everyone was led to believe that this meant that forces of Nationalist China would invade Red China in an effort to defeat the Red Chinese and regain continental China. The present administration has retreated from that dynamic policy, widely proclaimed, and widely acclaimed. And now Chiang and his forces are tied to Formosa and the Pescadore Islands, and in fear of further restrictions.

I could talk of other policies such as agonizing reappraisal directed at the time it was uttered toward France. And as we view the evidence since the meeting at the summit, it is apparent that we should undergo an agonizing reappraisal of our present situation.

While the Democratic Party has shown great statesmanship in its bipartisan cooperation, it is the right and the duty of the Democrats—in fact, members of both parties—to speak out and to alert and warn the people.

It was only the other day that Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, called for the maintenance of great "military and moral strength" and that "for the time being"—and that may be for a very long time—"our job is to stay strong and help our allies to stay strong." And Admiral Radford said further, "Never has the need for unity among nations been so great. Now is not the time to relax our vigilance."

Both President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles have repeatedly said that the intent of the Communists for world revolution and world dominatoin has not changed.

Only a few days ago, Senator KNOWLAND, Republican leader in the United States Senate, in lashing out against the Soviet Union, said, "There is no reason to believe there is any change in the basic premise of the Kremlin. There has been no demonstration of a change by deeds. They lie, cheat, and violate agreements and other things."

And what better evidence can we get than from what recently came from the lips of Khruschev, the present No. 1 Communist leader in the Soviet Union, while speaking on September 17, 1955, only a few days ago, to the East German delegates to Moscow, in observing that since the Geneva Conference people in the West have talked about how the Soviet leaders now smile, said, "That smile is genuine, it is not artificial. We wish to live in peace, tranquilly." Then he warned, "If anyone believes that our smiles involve abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he deceives himself poorly. Those who wait for that must wait until the shrimp learns to whistle."

And yet, in the light of this fact, there are some persons in America who believe that the Communist leaders in the Kremlin are sincere in their desire for peace.

Yes, the Communist peace of submission to communism, of enslavement, persecution, imprisonment, and death—but that is not our peace, the peace of men and women who desire and are determined to be free under God and under law.

We read of the spirit of Geneva. What should concern us is not words, but deeds and results that flow from Geneva. And if we are frank with ourselves we can only view thte results to date with great concern. We should be greatly concerned about what is selfevident to anyone who is honest with himself:

1. The free world is being lulled into blissfulness, which is what the Communists want, and

2. The Communist leaders in the Kremlin are showing and convincing captive peoples—and even Russians who oppose communism—that they are forgotten by their western friends, and that they had better accept as final their fate under communism.

The policy of peace through strength, which the Democratic Party stands for, with a consistent policy of military strength and power, and firm diplomatic policies, is the best course for America and the free world—not frequent changes and shifts, or signs of weakness, such as "massive retaliation" of about 3 years ago, to "no force" of today.

The Democratic Party stands for constant vigilance—recognizing that the price we pay for military strength and power that will create fear through respect, and deter aggressive action or a sneak attack by Communist Russia, is the premium we pay for liberty and preservation.

The fact is the only thing the Communists respect is what they fear, and that is military strength and power greater than they possess—and that is just as true today as it was before "the summit" conference. And we should not forget that the effective instruments by and through which our national objectives are attained in the field of foreign affairs is our military strength and power. We must be realistic. There is too much involved if we are not.

It is all right to negotiate, but not to compromise ideals and principle and truth which we believe in. And successful negotiations with Communist Russia, as long as the Communist leaders adhere to the Lenin-Stalin intent of world revolution and domination, can only be on the basis of strength.

The Democratic Party has oposed the military cuts that have been made.

Under Roosevelt and Truman we stood for peace through strength. We kept our allies united with us through friendship.

We view with concern the weakening of NATO, the spread of neutralism, the situation at Cyprus, the sale of Communist arms to Egypt, the suspicions growing against us in South Korea and in Formosa—all of which have taken place since "the summit" conference, as well as the situation in South Vietnam and southeast Asia.

It seems to me that immediate consideration should be given by the administration to get back to the foreign policies of Roosevelt and Truman, which the present administration followed until the summit meeting—the sound policy of peace through strength.

This gathering is representative of the political life and history of America. How fortunate we are to be citizens of our beloved country in which free and untrammeled elections are held, the voters with complete freedom to exercise their judgment and conscience, and to vote for such candidates or party as they desire. It is our duty and obligation to preserve our institutions of government for ourselves and for future generations.

We are fortunate in having the two-party political system—bringing political stability and enabling responsibility to be placed on the party in power. We want this effective party system to continue, rather than a multiple party system of other democratic countries, which usually results in instability. Neither do we want the one party controlled system of dictatorial or totalitarian regimes.

While we oppose and criticize the political mistakes of our political opponents, we respect them. For over and above all, we are Americans, and our country comes "first, last, and always."

While we respect our political opponents, we feel that the Demorcratic Party in control of our Government is for the best interests of our people. Our policies and leadership have so impressed our people that, today, the Democratic Party is the stronger of our two great political organizations. During the past 25 years, in particular, our party has gained rapidly in strength throughout the Nation. And despite the temporary setback of 1952, the Democratic Party is steadily increasing in strength.

For the backbone of America—the workers, the farmers, the housewives, the small independent businessmen, the average American, are realizing more and more that the Democratic Party is their true friend, that the policies and leadership of our party are dedicated to the service and the best interests of all the people, and not of a select few. They realize that the Democratic Party is not dominated by a combination of certain big finance and big business interests, who are nonelected, and who meet in secrecy, and in the main, determine the politices of the Republican Party.

For there is one thought that is rapidly growing in the minds of average Americans, and that is that certain big finance and big business interests are in control of the present Republican administration and the evidence of the past 3 years justifies that thought.

The giveaways of the Republican 83d Congress, with the Dixon-Yates contract of ill repute, tax benefits for the few, the attempt to permit big business to exploit the great natural resources of our public domain, which, fortunately, the Democrats in Congress stopped; permitting the wave of mergers, many of them in violatiaon of our antitrust laws, and designed to eliminate competition and increase prices; the disregard of small and independent businesses; the tremendous influence exercised by representatives of the financial and business barons of our country as advisers on policy of this administration, and occupying positions of conflict, for no man can serve two masters; the bypassing of Congress through the stretched interpretation of some provisions of law, so that they will not have to go to Congress for necessary authorization, which would mean penetrating inquiry and public information; the Republican policy of private utility exploitation of our great natural resources, as evidenced by Hells Canyon and other administrative acts; the breaking of their promises to the workers and the farmers, and to the Government employees, are some illustrations of the extent to which big business thinking dominates and controls our Government.

But, fortunately, as a result of the election of a Democratic Congress in 1954, the Republicans cannot put through any more giveaways in the Congress. The big interests now look to administrative action by the executive branch, controlled by the Republicans, to accomplish their purposes.

As the 80th Republican Congres is remembered as the do-nothing Congress, so is the 83d Republican Congress remembered as the giveaway Congress.

It is due to the courageous fight made by the Democrats in Congress that some of the proposed giveaways of the Republican 83d Congress were defeated. One thing is certain, in the present 84th Democratic-controlled Congress giveaways by legislative action have been stopped.

The Democratic Party as the minority party in the 83d Congress, and as the majority party in the present 84th Congress, has been a constructive influence. Instead of being a party of "blind opposition," which the Republican Party was during the administrations of the late beloved Franklin D. Roosevelt and the fighting Harry S. Truman, our party has supported good measures and, when in disagreement with the President, we constructively criticized, constructively opposed, and constructively proposed. As an example, let me refer to the road bill. The plan of the administration would have meant an abdication on the part of Congress of its constitutional powers for a period of from 10 to 30 years. The road plan of the present administration in a period of 30 years would have cost the taxpayers $11,500,000,000 more than the Democratic plan. This bill was well termed "The Banker's Dream."

Our party has lived up to the highest ideals of a political party. There is every reason for every Democrat, or any person who voted Democratic, to be proud of the action of the Democratic Party. There is every reason for progressive-minded Republicans and Independents to vote for Democratic candidates in the future.

The $1 minimum wage bill is a great Democratic victory for the workers. You will remember that President Eisenhower recommended an increase only from 75 cents to 90 cents per hour. It was over the opposition of the great majority of the Republicans, who voted for a lesser amount—in the Commitee of the Whole—that we put this meritorious bill through.

The passage by the House, which the Senate will pass next year, of the expanded social security bill is further evidence of the constructive leadership of the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party has always been dedicated to the passage of legislation that will preserve and strengthen the family life of America. For the family life of a nation is the very basis of its strength or weakness. A strong family life means a strong America; a weak family life means a weak America. And the modern history of the Democratic Party under the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, and courageous Harry S. Truman, has been one of fighting for legislation that will preserve and strengthen the family life of our country. And what more noble motive and purpose can any political party have than this?

There are so many bills to which I could refer in support of this statement—among which would be included unemployment compensation, earned annuities, old-age assistance, aid to the sick and the blind, appropriations for medical research, minimum-wage legislation, developing the great natural resources of our country for the benefit of our people, the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, proper consideration for the farmers, just consideration for small and independent businessmen, protection of bank deposits, housing legislation, proper consideration of our Federal employees, and many other progressive measures, most of which were enacted into law over the bitter opposition of the great majority of Republican Members.

The Democratic Party of today is living up to the traditions and noble ideals of Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman. And I might also say that the few progressive measures recommended by President Eisenhower which have become law were passed only because of Democratic support.

During the past 3 years we have repeatedly read statements by economists and Republican leaders that we will never have another depression, due to "the cushions that exist in the law." Yes; but who put those cushions into the law? It was under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman that the Democratic Party, usually over the bitter opposition of the Republicans, put those cushions into the law.

Whether as a majority or a minority party in Congress—whether under a Democratic President or a Republican President—the Democratic Party in Congress has acted affirmatively and constructively.

So, with the record of broken promises of the present Republican administration, of its domination by certain big business interests, and with the other issues that we have, we can look forward to the 1956 elections with confidence of victory for the Democratic candidate for President, and an increased Democratic House and Senate in Congress, and of further Democratic gains on the State and local level.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, all of us who knew and worked

with Mrs. VERA BUCHANAN were deeply shocked at the news of her tragic and untimely passing. We counted her as both a friend and as an untiring worker for the principles in which she believed. Our hearts go out to her two lovely daughters, Joan and Jane, in their hour of bereavement.

Though we may have disagreed from time to time on various issues before this House, we respected VERA for her honesty of purpose and close attention to each detail of the complex job involved in representing the people of her district. Her conscientious and thorough-going approach to all matters was an example which each one of us would be well advised to emulate.

Those of us who represent the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in this House feel Mrs. BUCHANAN'S loss especially, inasmuch as she was one of our number. I was honored to be one of those selected by the Speaker to attend the memorial services for this gracious lady. It was a beautiful tribute to one who so richly earned and deserved the undying respect and admiration of her many friends and acquaintances.

National Printing Week Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial concerning National Printing Week. As you know, National Printing Week is being observed at the present time. The influence the American press has made in establishing and fostering of our freedoms cannot be measured. The impact on the people by the press is so strong that if every newspaper in this country were to shut down operations tomorrow, it would be difficult to describe the disastrous results that most certainly would follow.

Too often we minimize the value of something we take for granted, and observance of National Printing Week rightfully calls attention to the major role newspapers have played in upholding what we are proud to refer to as the American way of life. Still the presses of America, and you stop the heartbeat of the Nation. Today the American press represents one of the strongest institutions continually carrying on the struggle to protect the rights of the individual.

This applies to the smallest as well as the largest of newspapers, and is illustrated by the thoughtful comment of Mrs. Sid Davison, who assists her husband in publication of the weekly newspaper, the Miner County Pioneer, at Howard, S. Dak., Mrs. Davison's comment follows:

This newspaper is a personal diary of the life of our community. Throughout the columns of this paper are printed the interesting and important doings of our residents from year to year. This paper is free to express our opinions or your point of view on any issue or question of public interest, subject only to the reservations imposed by libel laws. This country's smaller newspapers are a tremendous asset on the side of freedom.

Excise Tax on Nonhighway Gasoline to Farmers Should Be Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I introduced a bill, which I think will be of great interest to the farmers of the country, and which I think will tend to relieve the complaints made by the farmers with reference to legislation heretofore passed that has been to their disadvantage. My bill, H. R. 8259, is a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from the payment of excise tax on gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively in farm tractors or farm machinery or for other agricultural purposes. A copy of this bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6416 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special cases in which taxpayments are considered overpayments) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and by adding after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph:

"(I) in the case of gasoline and lubricating oils, used or resold for use exclusively in farm tractors or farm machinery or for other agricultural purposes."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to gasoline and lubricating oils sold by the manufacturer, producer, or importer thereof on or after the first day of the first quarter which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

Immediately following the introduction of this bill I made a public statement, which is as follows:

I have just introduced a bill to carry out the recommendation of President Eisenhower that the Nation's farmers be relieved of the payment of Federal excise taxes on purchases of gasoline and lubricating oils used exclusively for agricultural purposes. This recommendation was contained in the President's farm message delivered to the Congress.

Many States already exempt farmers from their own gasoline tax. I believe that the time has come for the Federal Government to grant a similar exemption. The present Federal taxes on gasoline and lubricating oils simply go to increase the farmer's cost of production. As a result, these taxes contribute to the price-cost squeeze from which our farmers are suffering today.

I shall press for prompt and favorable consideration of my bill.

This legislation which I have proposed has met with the approval of practically all of the farm organizations and farmers of the country who know about it.

The American Farm Bureau was anxious to have this information sent out to its members all over the country and to accomplish this their representative, Mr. John F. Lewis, arranged for radio time, and, as a result, I made a statement for the radio which I hope was heard by farmers all over the country, because they are very much interested in this matter:

This is what I said over the radio:

For some years the farmers of this Nation have had to pay Federal taxes on the gasoline used on their farms.

Since the inception of this levy, it has been pointed out that this is unfair taxation since the revenues derived are usually utilized to finance the construction of highways and in no sense provide any direct benefit to the man who is running a tractor or other farm equipment on his farm.

I have been impressed lately by the efforts of the membership of the Farm Bureau in my State of Ohio and other farm organizations across the Nation in having taxes on non-highway-used gasoline repealed.

It was heartening to me to hear the President endorse the repeal of these unfair taxes in his farm message to the Congress.

In connection with this I have introduced, and will push to enactment, a bill, H. R. 8259, to carry out this recommendation of President Eisenhower.

Farmers use an estimated three billion gallons of gasoline on their farms and ranches in the United States each year.

If my bill becomes law, it will save the farmers of this Nation some $60 million annually in relief from the present 2-cent Federal gas tax. If, under pending proposals for financing an expanded Federal highway building program, the tax is increased to 3 cents, my bill will save farmers $90 million a year.

I am happy to have sponsored this bill which embodies recommendations strongly advocated by the farmers in Farm Bureau and other farm organizations in the country. This is something in legislation that they have long sought, long deserved, and should have.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will give immediate consideration to this very appropriate and very necessary legislation.

Southern California's Water Supply—A Struggle for Survival

SPEECH
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that the Members of Congress, most of the people of the Nation, and in fact, many of the people in southern California, fully realize the great importance of an adequate water supply to the 8 million people now living in southern California, and with the population increasing more rapidly than in any other section of the United States, the problems of protecting our water supply become more difficult daily. In the city of Los Angeles alone last year new water users increased at the rate of 3,730 every month.

Because water is now available when you turn on your hose to sprinkle your lawn, to take a shower, to wash your car,

or for any other purpose is no assurance that it will continue.

Our vital water supply is seriously threatened. We are fighting a two-front battle to protect and preserve our legal rights to Colorado River water. There is no issue of more immediate importance to the people of Los Angeles and the entire southern part of the State. It is a fight for survival.

On one front we are fighting in the United States Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California. On the other front we are fighting in the House of Representatives against legislation to build the upper Colorado project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, both of which would seriously damage our legitimate supplies of Colorado River water and power.

The outcome of these battles will affect every resident of Los Angeles and southern California. With our swiftly rising population we cannot afford to lose 1 gallon of Colorado River water or 1 kilowatt of power. In fact, we can already look ahead to the place where we must have more water and power to meet our demands. We cannot get it from the Colorado River, and we are not asking for more from that stream. What we are struggling to do is to protect and preserve what we already have under our legal contracts and our appropriative rights.

In the Supreme Court suit Arizona is seeking to limit our use of Colorado River water to an amount far below our present rights. The quantity of Colorado River water which Arizona seeks to limit California to would be less than our firm vested rights before Hoover Dam was built. If Arizona wins, California would be stripped of all the increase in water supply made possible by that dam, which California underwrote and Arizona opposed.

As I have done before, I shall vigorously oppose the proposed upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, both of which would be disastrous to California, and which would cost ultimately at least $4.5 billion.

These upper Colorado River Basin developments have been planned in almost total disregard of the interests of California. Both projects would materially decrease our vital Colorado River water and power. For instance, Hoover Dam power output would be cut at least 25 percent. We cannot stand such a reduction.

The truth of the matter is that the upper basin States are endeavoring to engineer a huge grab of Colorado River water in excess of their rightful share. At the same time, an attempt is being made to raid the Federal Treasury to the expense of the Nation's taxpayers in order to obtain the immense subsidies required to build these unsound irrigation projects.

It is a money grab to support a water grab.

The sponsors of these bills so detrimental to California were unable to get them through Congress last year. I am proud to say that I was among the Congressmen who voiced a firm "No" when the effort was made to call the bills before the House.

Our opposition prevailed, but once against we are faced with the same fight.

The upper Colorado River project is mainly a hydroelectric project. Power revenues are needed to pay for the irrigation units of the gigantic plan. These irrigation units the Bureau of Reclamation admits cannot pay for themselves.

The upper Colorado River project would:

Saddle an enormous new burden of more than $4 billion on all taxpayers.

Provide water for only a favored few who would pay only a minute fraction of the cost.

Furnish water to grow the kind of crops which are already in great surplus in this country, and which are already heavily subsidized by the taxpayers.

Cost the American taxpayers $5,000 an acre to subsidize the proposed irrigation units.

Cost the taxpayers $750,000 for each 150-acre farm in the project.

Require the State which benefit—Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, and New Mexico—to pay less than two percent of the great new tax burden. Taxpayers of the other 44 States, including California, second largest taxpaying State of the Union, to pay 98 percent.

Thus, California would be in the position of paying to have its own water stolen, should this project be approved.

The Fryingpan-Arkansas project would:

Take enormous amounts of the purest Colorado River water out of the river and transport it over the Rocky Mountains. Therefore, the quality of the water coming down to California would be seriously impaired. We would get water containing heavy concentrations of salts and minerals.

Inflict a concealed subsidy on the taxpayers of $500 million, or about $1,400 an acre to be irrigated on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains.

We must and we will continue to oppose these two projects. Every legitimate means will be used to defeat them.

Victory in this fight is vital to our present and future economy, and I pledge myself to make every effort to win it.

I am determined to be able to say to my constituents when this Congress is adjourned next summer: "The water and power upon which you depend for your homes and industries has been protected and preserved."

Mothballing Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hutchinson (Kans.) News Herald of September 23, 1955:

MOTHBALLING FARMS

Secretary Benson in a speech this week charged that the present administration inherited the farm problem from the Democratice one which preceded it. Of course it did. In fairness to Truman, however, it must be stated that he didn't create the problem.

Truman inherited the farm problem from Roosevelt. The line of inheritance traces back from that through Hoover, Coolidge, and Harding to Woodrow Wilson, who unwittingly started the whole thing by getting this country into World War I.

The real villain in the piece, however, is the automotive industry which, by mechanizing the farm, made surplus acreage of all the land which once was required to maintain horse power.

So the farm problem is now going on 40 years old and it can't be solved by replacing the tractors with teams. After 4 decades of experimentation, it isn't close to solution in a political way, either. That probably comes from failure to consider the problem as exactly what it is.

The problem is that of maintaining reserve productive facilities to meet emergency conditions. Between wars the Government mothballs battleships, factories, planes, and atomic weapons. It has an equal need to mothball farms, and that in some fashion it must do, if it ever is to eliminate the surpluses of certain agricultural products and still have the facilities for expanded food production which the stresses of hot or cold wars periodically produce.

If the Government does mothball farms to stockpile soil fertility, however, it equitably must provide their owner-custodians with income comparable to what other groups today enjoy.

Soil Banks Encourage Inefficiency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's city Cincinnati Enquirer carried Louis Bromfield's column dealing with some of the farm problems. To me it seemed to make sense. I am asking that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD so that my colleagues from the farm areas will have an opportunity to comment thereon for enlightenment of those of us who represent chiefly industrial areas.

The article follows:

SOIL BANKS ENCOURAGE INEFFICIENCY

(By Louis Bromfield)

This column contains things which probably no politician will ever say and which might well throw the fear of God into a good many of them. What is written here needs to be said. I hope that it will secure a circulation wide enough to help clear the air. A good deal of it will be unpalatable in many quarters, but I think all of it is true and needs saying.

The column concerns the so-called farm problem, which has largely been aggravated and even created by compromising political efforts of politicians to buy votes. All the efforts at a solution made up to now have failed and in many cases have served only to aggravate the general muddle.

The proposed soil-bank plan by which farmers are to be paid for not farming millions of acres of land is one of the silliest proposals yet evolved. Any practical, suc-

cessful modern farmer knows that. In his heart he knows that he can take a third of his land out of circulation, rest it, cut his costs, be paid by the taxpayer for not farming this land, and still raise just as much or more than he raised before. As the yield an acre goes up his costs decline, his potential profits increase. This is a fact known to any good farmer.

It is probable that at least 80 percent of American farmers could raise twice as much an acre on half as much land by better and more intensive farming.

There is only one real solution to the farm problem and that is to pull the carpet from under the whole of our agriculture, shake it down, and let it find its level. (I can already hear the politicians screaming in pain.)

Throughout our economy, the principle of business and of our enduring prosperity is competition and competition means efficiency. If you have a retail business of your own or are an automobile dealer or operate a small factory and are inefficient, you are in time eliminated by economics and go to work for somebody else or find a new business at which you do a more capable job.

That is the rule, and a very good one it is for everybody concerned—even the fellow who goes under may come up again somewhere else. He will be better off and so will the national economy, which means not only himself but all the rest of us.

But no such shakedown occurs in our agriculture or has occurred for almost two generations. The farmer, good and efficient or lazy and ignorant, has been coddled—and coddled into producing surpluses which we do not need and which cost the taxpayer over the years billions of dollars.

Two reasons are evident in this situation which no nation can afford in the long run. One is political—the myth of the "farm vote," which does not exist outside certain limited one-crop areas any more than the "labor vote" exists. And it exists less and less every day.

The other reason was the Government policy of attempting to increase production during the war years while at the same time attempting to force price control on the farmer—an idiotic Socialist idea which has cost you and me, whether we are farmers or nonfarmers, some billions of dollars.

Once war conditions vanished, and despite the fact that we no longer needed to feed half the world, price controls were abandoned but price guaranties and subsidies were not. So we are stuck—particularly in the single crop wheat, cotton, and corn areas—with a situation which can only be described in terms of sensible economy as "idiotic."

At the same time, the whole parity, price support, soil bank dodges merely tend to maintain in operation inefficient, unintelligent speculators and particularly "suitcase" wheat farmers, and marginal operators who would not be tolerated in any other field of American economy activity.

In open competition they would be squeezed out. Under present conditions, or those proposed by the politicians, we maintain in operation hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions of farmers, who should for the good of everyone concerned, including themselves, be economically liquidated.

Because of wheat support prices, some millions of good grazing land have been destroyed and dust storm conditions created by so-called "farmers" who are not farmers, but merely speculators who can make money at 15 bushels an acre production. Without support prices they would be economically liquidated overnight and wheat production left in the hands of honest, intelligent, efficient farmers who produce 3 or 4 times that yield per acre. Surpluses would vanish and the Al Capone "suitcase" wheat farmer-speculators would be eliminated.

Pull it out—this thick-piled carpet of protection—and the costly wheat surpluses and storage would vanish overnight to the benefit of the good farmer as well as the general taxpayer. The same is true largely of the cotton and corn support prices and surpluses which become increasingly a terrible burden to all of us, including the good farmer himself.

South Dakota Opinions on the Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD three articles from South Dakota weekly newspapers. During my fall visits in South Dakota, the farm problem was discussed more often than any other legislation facing Congress. The attitude of the people whom I represent can be summed up quite capably in the following articles. All three of the individuals responsible for the articles are highly respected in their communities, and have given a great deal of thought to the farm situation.

The first article is from the Clear Lake Courier and quotes Mr. A. G. Berger, president of the Deuel County National Bank of Clear Lake, from a talk he gave at the annual meeting of this bank.

The second article is an editorial by Ed Hofer, editor and publisher of the Lennox Independent.

The third article is an editorial by B. L. Farus, publisher of the Scotland Journal.

The articles follow:

[From the Clear Lake (S. Dak.) Courier]

In connection with the annual meeting, A. G. Berger, president, pointed out that Deuel County was favored with plentiful moisture in 1955 which produced an excellent crop with a few exceptions in the southwest section.

In connection with the agricultural outlook for the future Mr. Berger said: "The Department of Agriculture has come in for a lot of criticism for the instability of the price structure on pork and other products not under support. In this connection we should be aware of the fact that Congress enacts the legislation in this matter and unless and until they do, there is no alternative for the Department of Agriculture except to comply with the laws on the books. Our Congressmen in Washington of both parties are working on this important matter but as yet have not come up with a satisfactory solution—they are men of average intelligence and will come up with a solution if that is possible by legislation."

[From the Lennox (S. Dak.) Independent]

THE SMALL FARM

In a recent editorial we described the small farmer as unwilling to give up the fight to hold on to his land; as the land being something more than a means to make a living. And it is surely true as another writer has put it recently: "If farming wasn't a way of life several million would quit it now."

There appears to be important people in high places whose theory it is that the small farm must go. That would be like saying that there should be no small businesses in America, only big corporations. True, the farmer is a businessman, but like all small businesses and small towns, this is a way of life. When prices are low and costs of production are high, there are just about 3,500,000 American farmers who probably would abandon their farms for jobs in industry, that is, if farming wasn't the life they know and love and want to live. And lucky for the rest of us * * * if these farmers quit their farms because farming isn't paying what it should, the result would be chaos for the rest of the country. Small towns depend on the family-type farm economy. These are the industry of a small town.

But, of course, some of the big boys in agriculture, who maintain that farming is only a matter of business, with the dollar and the high standard of living as the only goals, don't want the change to come overnight, and they don't want all farmers to quit * * * just the small farmer. More farmers are buying more land these days. There is always land for sale because of retirement, death, and ill health. But no one man can farm 500, 1,000, or 4,000 acres alone. He has to hire help. And how many of the million or two who are forced out in this great agricultural revolution would be willing to work as hired men, living on their own farms as tenants, not owners. Can industry, cities, and towns absorb the influx? Powerful labor unions, no doubt, would become even more powerful.

Farm programs, subsidies, parities are expensive. But it would be even more expensive for the whole American economy to let agriculture go bankrupt. Farmers, not 3 million of them anyway, aren't going to quit because going gets rough. Wise legislators won't give up trying to find a way to solve the present agriculture problem.

[From the Scotland (S. Dak.) Journal]

As 1956 enters into the picture most of us are a little hesitant about predicting the future. How many of us will have our shingle out at the end of 1956, under the same management, may be uncertain. Sometimes the grass looks greener on the other side; but most often it is not.

The day for amassing a fortune in a short time appears to be a thing of the past, especially is it true in the agricultural section of this great country. One of our big concerns in this part of the northwest is whether we receive moisture to raise crops. I would say that farm prices are secondary when it comes to a choice of the two. If we raise corps, no matter how low they may go, most of our population and resources can be kept intact. Crop failures and low prices would mean a fatal blow to many and we could adjust ourselves to low prices much easier than crop failures.

In 1956 we will experience a presidential election, and the farmer, business, and labor will undoubtedly be painted a "rosy" picture, by both major political parties. Everyone has their own individual thinking power, but I for one take those promises with a grain of salt; I've heard too many of them, and they haven't materialized. Politics used to excite me but now it has the opposite effect. I've always had to battle for a living no matter which party was in power, and expect to continue doing so.

Business and financial statistics predict 1956 as one of the best years ever, and I hope they have some proof, rather than just assumption. With everything else on the boom and the farmer still in a daze over farm prices at its lowest ebb in years something looks out of line to us. When a record year is predicted for business, those making the predictions seem to have forgotten to include the prospect for the rural population of the Nation.

In Rome's Footsteps?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article by Mr. George Peck, chairman of the board of the National Labor-Management Foundation and executive editor of its official publication, Partners:

IN ROME'S FOOTSTEPS?

It is 165 years since Edward Gibbon, English historian, published the fifth volume of his celebrated work, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Gibbon listed five chief reasons as to why the Roman Empire, the greatest civilization of its era and up to that time in history, came to an ignominious and catastrophic end. It might be well for America, without doubt the greatest civilization of this era or any other, to ponder over those five reasons.

1. The rapid increase in divorce which undermined the sanctity and dignity of the home which is the basis of human society.

Let's take a look at the divorce statistics of the United States of America—they are certainly cause for alarm. In 1890, there was a divorce for every 17 marriages; in 1900, 1 marriage in every 14 ended in divorce; by 1910, 1 marriage in every 11 went on the rocks; in 1920, 1 in every 8; in 1930, 1 in every 6; and in 1952, the last year for which complete statistics are available, 1 marriage in every 4 foundered on the divorce shoals.

As Gibbon so truly stated, the home is the basis of human society. With 1 marriage out of every 4 now culminating in divorce, in many cases causing broken homes, the basis of our American society is being dangerously undermined. With so many disrupted homes, it is small wonder that juvenile delinquency is running rampant. On the divorce issue America follows the dangerous course pursued by Rome prior to its fall.

2. Higher and higher taxes—the spending of money for free bread and circuses.

It is hardly necessary for me to state that in this category, the United States is emulating the tax situation that existed in Rome's halcyon days before he bubble burst. Our Federal, State, and local governments have been on a spending binge that inevitably must end in a severe financial headache.

The Great White Father at Washington for the past 25 years has made the Roman emperors look like pikers, when it comes to free handouts. Paternalism, Roman style, is the order of the day along the banks of the Potomac. Initiative, self-reliance, and thrift are rapidly being replaced by sloth, dependence on government and waste. On the tax and wasteful spending issues, we are outdoing the worst efforts of the Romans.

3. The mad craze for pleasure; sports becoming every year more exciting and more brutal.

On this issue it can be said we follow the sad example of Rome only in part. As a nation we are fanatically pursuing pleasure. The shorter work week has given most of us an opportunity to indulge ourselves in that respect. However, we are not engaging in more brutal sports— the reverse is actually the case.

4. The building of gigantic armaments when the real enemy is within—the decadence of the people.

Well, America is building gigantic armaments to protect us from enemies abroad, the while we permit the enemies within—the Commies, the Fellow-Travelrs, the Socialists and the so-called "liberals" to undermine the American way which has been the chief source of our naitonal strength and well-being. Here again we follow closely the pattern set by Rome.

5. The decay of religion; fading into a mere form, losing touch with life and becoming impotent to guide the people.

Here, America seems not to be traveling the primrose pathway trod by Rome. During the past few years, there has been a reawakening to the spiritual values on which America was founded. Increased church membership and attendance are two evidences that our motto In God We Trust has been reinstated in the minds and hearts of the American people.

To sum up, America dangerously parallels the sad example of Rome on four of the five counts listed by Gibbon as having caused the decline and downfall of that once great Republic. This columnist hopes and prays that America, having started to reverse its course on the fifth count, this now great Republic will awaken to the grave danger inherent in the other four.

Bipartisan Approval

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cotton Trade Journal of Memphis, Tenn., of December 9, 1955:

BIPARTISAN APPROACH

For many years this country has followed a bipartisan foreign policy. This was based on the recognition by leaders of both political parties that our foreign policy was so vital to our safety that only united support could make it an effective instrument—especially in times of emergency. This practice was sound politics. More, it constituted statesmanship.

We need to apply the same caliber of statesmanship to our farm problems. The press is full of reports highlighting the controversial nature of the problem and emphasizing its prime importance as a campaign issue in 1956. Already the opening shots of the political cannonade have been fired, with everyone who orates on the subject—be he Republican or Democrat—striving to make a bigger noise than his predecessor.

Because of the fact that the farm problem has become a political football, candidates for office, potential candidates, and official spokesmen for the two parties are outpromising each other as to what they will do for the farmer if elected to or retained in office.

After all, we're dealing with a problem fundamental to the welfare not only of the Nation's farmers and farm families, but of the entire national economy. It is impossible that the farm situation should continue to deteriorate indefinitely while the rest of the economy remains at a high level. Wise and considered action is just as vital in this area as it is in foreign policy. Why not, then, apply the same bipartisan approach?

We suggest a national farm conference which would be attended by an equal number of Republican and Democratic legislators familiar with farm problems and representatives of farm organizations on a regional basis. To this gathering the administration would outline its proposed farm policy and invite discussion, criticism, and amendments. In this way a program might be hammered out which would be truly constructive.

With this approach, there certainly would be a far better chance for wise counsel to prevail. The objective of such a conference would be not to boost the prestige of either political party in the eyes of voting farmers, but rather to boost the farmers' income to where ti is more in line with the incomes of other segments of our national economy. Why not give this approach a try?

What's Right With America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress who attended the national transportation outlook conference dinner of the United States Chamber of Commerce on Thursday, January 12, told me that the address delivered by Boyd Campbell was one of the finest expressions of faith in the American system that they had ever heard. Mr. Campbell is making an outstanding record as president of the United States Chamber. I am pleased to include his speech in the RECORD, in order that all Members may have an opportunity to read this very vital message:

You have all had a long, hard day—pulling and hauling the issues that affect the transportation industry into the proper perspective, and I know that you are tired. So I want to set your minds at rest right now.

You are not going to hear any profound observations on transportation from me—personally or ghost-written.

I wonder why people ever do that? I mean to say, I wonder why public speakers who are recruited from the outside for gatherings like yours persist in telling an expert audience what the expert audience already knows? It seems to happen so often. So I just decided that I am going to stay away from transportation tonight—except for one little thing. I would like to ask you one little question.

I will tell you why I want to ask that question. Here's why. It is flattering to me to be surrounded by so many experts in one particular field. I said to myself, "Now, there's a bunch of experts who could swamp the $64,000 program in 5 minutes flat if the subject happened to be transportation. They know how many miles it is between Shualak, Miss., and Canistota, S. Dak. They know what it costs to ship a boxer dog from Vinegar Bend, Ala., to Meeteetse, Wyo.—but I also said to myself, "I wonder how many of them know where the Southern crosses the Dog?" I have a small prize in waiting for the man who can give me that answer. Who has the answer? Come now, you must know it. Going, going, going, gone.

No response? No answer?

Well, now gentlemen, that alters things. After all, the Southern is a railroad. So is the Dog. I said I wasn't going to talk about transportation, but it just so happens that Where the Southern Crosses the Dog is the title of an old southern folksong which is part of the lore of the Mississippi Delta

country. The name of the town where the Southern Crosses the Dog is Moorhead, Miss.

The point I want to make is that you in the transportation industry are engaged in one of the most romantic industries in the world, and I wonder if you are too close to it to appreciate it.

Our book publishers and critics are saying that they would like to see more novels and fiction stories based on business. And you remember that Executive Suite and the Man in the Gray Fannel Suit were both best sellers. But our publishers say that this is only scratching the surface, and not getting down into the basic metabolism of business.

Why don't you tell them how wrong they are? The transportation industry has been the setting for songs, poems, short stories, plays, and novels for years and years and years.

Where the Southern Crosses the Dog is just one of heaven only knows how many songs that have come from the hearts of those who are inspired by the drama—the ever-changing drama of transportation.

How about Waitin' for the Robert E. Lee, Show Boat, Steamboat Bill, and Sailing Down the River?

How about Casey Jones and Chattanooga Choo-Choo, the Atchison, Topeka and the Santa Fe, and I've Been Working on the Railroad, and 27 other railroad songs that I forget right now.

The oceangoing vessel—merchant ship or man-of-war—has been a setting for countless novels and stories. The airline is a current favorite for fiction—and at least three of our most popular comic strips are based on aviation—maybe more.

The trucking industry has been glorified in story—and the buslines—well, have you forgotten the movie in which Clark Gable starred, It Happened One Night, and it was all about a bus trip?

John Steinbeck has painted the truck driver as the 20th century counterpart of the errant knight of the middle ages—and the barge line—and even the old Erie Canal—are always right up in there as background material for romantic episodes. And what about Tug Boat Annie, that perennial character in the Saturday Evening Post?

All right—so I have taken care of everything except the pipe lines—and perhaps you think I can't do that. I admit that it would be difficult to wrap a fiction story or a song around a pipeline—but we don't have to.

The word "pipeline" has become part of the American language. People say today that "So and so has a pipeline into that meeting," and what do they mean? Why, all they mean is that he has a private source of information into a confidential gathering, and your industry has provided that word for the rest of us to use.

You know—it took me 2 days and 2 librarians to figure out this stuff—but I hope you like it. My research contributed nothing to the solution of problems with which you will always be confronted. My efforts, however, did reconfirm these convictions: Transportation is the most imaginative and inspiring of all our great industries and in America it is the greatest, the most diverse, and the most versatile in the world—and that is one of the things which is so right about our country.

We hear so much—I think, too much—about what is wrong with America.

So I have chosen to speak on what is right with this country.

These are paradoxical times. We have never known such lush prosperity—so much abundance—such high employment—so much general well-being—so many opportunities—so lofty a scale of living.

There probably never was a time when people looked to private enterprise with more trust and confidence.

But so many men of business dwell on negativism—as if we were possessed by the gloomy gremlins of disaster—so much so that we have earned the reputation of being always and inevitably against—instead of for.

We voice our worries about agricultural surpluses—and the echo of our voices translates our language as meaning that abundance is bad—and scarcities good. We know that there must be—there will have to be a solution to the plight of our farmers—but how strangely our voices must ring in the ears of the world. With half the globe on the brink of starvation, we fret because we have more food and fiber than we can store.

Some of us read the stock-market report as though it were a fever chart—and unpleasant memories of black Friday in Wall Street blot out the reasoning power that tells us that this is not 1929. At the very least, we should be able to worry in terms of 1956.

Some of us are concerned with the rise in private debt; others concentrate their fears on the guaranteed annual wage. The increasing wealth and power of our labor unions is dscribed in nightmare language, and there are those who wring their hands about demands for increased social-security benefits as if we tottered on the edge of chaos.

These are only samples of problems and situations that disturb us. A longer list could be developed. I would not for a moment minimize the difficulties inherent in any one or all of them—nor suggest that we sweep them under the rug—and yet it is difficult to be downcast about them as long as we are free to use the resources of mind and spirit that brought us to the summit of power and responsibility.

Our present prosperity is the almost perfect tribute to the workings of our democratic capitalism. This ought to be our shining opportunity to entrench an understanding, a loyalty, a devotion, an individual dedication to the free-enterprise system and to our freedoms which made that system possible.

That is why I believe with all my heart that this is the hour to talk about what's right with America. People want to know. People need to know.

We have a story to tell about America—and it should be told in a positive manner. America is not Utopia. But, as a way of life, it comes closer to being Utopia than any other living pattern ever before devised by man, and we can always strive to make it better.

But we must quit defining it and describing it solely in terms of gross national product—of automobiles, bathtubs, telephones, and butter.

When we do that, we then make the same terrible mistake as the followers of Karl Marx. We are playing their game and overlooking the intangible but much more powerful spiritual values which comprise the bedrock and the real strength of the American system.

On the deep-laid foundation of individual integrity, freedom of choice, and religious liberty our fabulous productivity has been built. Our material well-being is an end product of our freedoms—and let us never confuse the foundation with the superstructure.

We have a great construction boom going on today. It surpasses anything in history. We are building homes, office buildings, factories, auto barns, motels and hotels. And, as we read the construction reports, we discover that we are also building churches, synagogues and other religious structures on an unprecedented scale.

And we are continuing to build more and better schools. We are giving more education to more people than any other nation in history. In short, they are better citizens. We know that—here in America.

In the year 1955 there were over 1,200,000 home-building starts in America. This represents something more than man-hours, mortar, brick, lumber, and steel. It reflects a deep-seated attachment to the spiritual values that center around the fireside.

And look at the book market. One of our best-selling books for many, many months is the life story of a young minister. Another best seller is authored by a minister. One of the most popular of all television speakers is a Catholic clergyman. A Protestant evangelist draws capacity crowds all over the world.

There is a wholesome interest in history and biography—and whether Davy Crockett belongs to Tennessee, North Carolina, or Texas is of little consequence.

There is something very much right, however, with America when an uncounted number of small boys have as their ideal an honest, bold-hearted, self-reliant personality in buckskin leggings.

We are properly distressed about juvenile delinquency, but is there any reason to forget the mighty legion of Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, Cub Scouts, and Brownies, the 4-H Club members, and the Future Farmers of America—who outnumber the delinquents in the ratio of thousands to one?

A long list could be made of the things that are right with America, but one I like to think about is that our free-market economy—which means free labor and free management alike—has contributed in a large measure to the list.

We are developing a more enlightened perspective toward the age-old controversy as to poverty and wealth. Countless generations have been reared on the formula that poverty is a virtue and that wealth is a sin. With notable exceptions, such was the burden of thought among the ancient philosophers.

We know better today. While other nations may have rejected that half of the old formula which deals with poverty, it has remained for us to question both halves of it, to the infinite betterment of all mankind.

We are creating our own philosophy, that poverty is not of necessity a blessing, and that wealth is a public trust.

We say, in effect, that it is the use of men's means, material or otherwise, by which their value is measured.

The sin is the unused talent, personal or minted. We reject both the dollar and the man who refuses to rise to the opportunity for service to society.

A few weeks ago I had a letter from a little town in Texas, population 250. I should like to read it to you:

"DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: Perhaps this will seem like a strange request, but I am going to ask in the hope that you will see fit to fulfill it.

"I am a farm housewife, the mother of a 7-year-old daughter, Peggy.

"Since, in all probability, I will be unable to leave her anything much of this world's goods upon my death, I am making her a scrapbook of Americana.

"Mr. Campbell, would it be possible for you to send Peggy a letter about what you think of America, so that I can place it in her book

"If you can't do this, could you send your autograph and one of your busiess cards, as I do want you, as a representatives of American business, to be in my little girl's book.

"Thank you for your kindness, and may the Lord bless you.

"Sincerely."

I hope that letter challenges you as it does me. Do you want to help me write to Peggy? What would you say to her? How would you tell her about our country and its ideals and traditions—so that she would never forget?

There must be something terrifically right with this country when the mother of a 7-year-old daughter feels that the finest legacy

she can leave her little girl is a scrapbook of Americana.

It has been truly said and should be said repeatedly, that the American Revolution is one without end.

Here in America—not to the exclusion of other nations, but perhaps more than anywhere else—is the desire of the people to do justice, to love mercy and to walk humbly with God.

I am convinced that there is a reason for this. I firmly believe it is because we have enjoyed more liberty than other nations, more respect for the worth of the individual, less interference with private lives, less inclination to standardize the citizen.

Having all these things, it is a question of eternal vigilance to preserve them—not alone for ourselves, but—let us hope—for the sake of all who look to us to point the way to a better tomorrow.

The Wasteland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from the Wall Street Journal of January 1, 1956.

THE WASTELAND—HOOVER GROUP SURVEYS VAST EXPANSE OF NEEDLESS EXPENSE

(By John Chamberlain)

Whenever a Hoover Commission task force was preparing to make a test tunneling into an operation of big government, it set itself five questions.

They were: Is this activity being conducted within the framework of the separation of the powers? Is it impairing congressional control of the purse? Is it transgressing on civilian control? Is it competitive in an unjustified way with private enterprise? Is it wasteful?

In Herbert Hoover's own mind, there was no particular reason to subordinate one criterion to another; all are manifestly important to the maintenance of the Republic. But when a government has grown from 572,000 civilian employees to 2,345,000 (annual payroll; $9 billion) within a 20-year span; when its annual budget has leaped from $4 billion to more than $63 billion; when it has 3 million men in uniform; when it owns $115 billion worth of personal property; when it possesses land equal to 25 percent of the acreage in 48 States; when its debt is over $280 billion—when, in short, it is the most gigantic colossus ever built in recorded history, it is only natural that the fifth criterion, that of waste—should bulk somewhat larger in the popular mind than the rest.

The waste is obviously present in the operations of big government no matter how or where you cut into the 19 Commission reports. Take the details of Government transportation, for example. Federal expenditures for transporting persons and property run to approximately $3 billion a year.

TRAFFIC JAM

The Army, the Navy and the Air Force maintain their own transport systems. On the other hand, the Government subsidizes private sea and air carriers, and spends a certain amount of money regulating the railroads. But in spite of the fact that private shipping is available, the Military Sea Transport Service of the Department of Defense grew from 160 vessels in 1950 to 221 in 1954.

This comes under the heading of competition with private industry, which might or might not be wasteful on balance, depending on who could deliver the most for the least. The anomalies turned up by task force investigators, however, would seem to indicate extremely poor traffic management on the part of Government agencies.

Item: Air shipments of dog food to Okinawa, ping-pong balls to Berlin, and 25,000 pounds of cement to Bermuda. Item: Carloads of canned tomatoes shipped by the Army from west coast to east while the Navy was sending almost as many carloads of the same commodity from east to west. Item: Flying an Air Force band from Westover, Mass., to Bermuda every month by military aircraft when it could have gone more cheaply by commercial carrier. Item: Buying antifreeze in Philadelphia and sending it to Oakland, Calif., where it could have been purchased for just a little more in the first place. Item: The 10 separate traffic manuals used by civilian agencies of the Government.

Or cut into the reports on Government retentionof surplus property, for a second example. At Mechanicsburg, Pa., the Navy Ships Parts Control Center had a 128-year supply of gear drives. The Army Signal Corps had on hand an authorized stock level of 1.5 million dry-cell flash batteries, which amounts to an 8- or 9-year supply of an item that has a very short shelf-life.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Another prime example of wasteful duplication is to be found in the Government medical services. Twenty-six Federal departments and agencies engage in health activities, spending some $4 billion a year. Altogether the Government looks after the health of some 30 million people, either in whole or in part. Four million active Government employees, mostly in Army, Navy, and Air Force, get complete coverage. Twenty-one million veterans are entitled to some service, with 3.4 million who have service-connected disabilities receiving complete care. Three million dependents of active and retired military personnel are eligible for governmental hospitalization and 2.5 million Federal employees get on-the-job service.

Even with this fantastically elaborate commitment to what is in effect socialized medicine for almost one-fifth of the population, there is a startling state of overbuilding in the Federal hospitals. The cost of unused beds alone probably exceeds $1 billion. As for the used beds, 60 percent of the occupied bed space in Veterans' Administration hospitals is used for non-service-connected cases at an annual cost of $500 million a year.

No effort is being made to check on the finanical means of an applicant for any part of the 60 percent of bed space; indeed, questioning of sworn declarations of inability to pay is prohibited by law. An independent sampling of 336 non-service-connected patients in 1952 found that "1 had an income of $50,000; 25 had assets of $20,000 or more; 4 had assets of between $100,000 and $500,000." The proliferation of used and unused Government hospital bed space not only wastes money but ties up the time and energy of precious medical and technical manpower.

Much of the waste of bed space could be eliminated if some of the veterans' hospitals were turned over to civilian uses or leased to other Government agencies. (The civilian population, incidentally, needs at least 800,000 more hospital beds, according to the Commission's report.) And by applying a means test for non-service-connected veterans' hospital cases the Government might save some fairly prodigious sums.

STOCKING UP

Government purchases of food and clothing is also conducted in a wasteful way by the services and other agencies that neither cross check nor synchronize. The armed services provide some 10 million meals every day, and they buy at least 7 million complete sets of clothing each year while holding further amounts in reserve.

The 719 months' supply of canned hamburger in 14 Navy depots, the 79 months' supply of canned beef and gravy, and the 75 months' supply of canned ham chunks were some of the most heavily publicized items in the Commission task force's report on subsistence. Not so well known is the fact that the Army in 1954 had a 10.6-year supply of women's uniforms and a 9.9 year's supply of women's shirts.

The Commission task force estimated that the total $2.7 billion clothing inventory of the Department of Defense could be cut by more than $1.3 billion. The cut would save $3 million in annual warehousing charges. Central agency purchasing under business-like civilian control would obviously do much to eliminate the waste in handling the procurement of food and common-use articles by the military.

The Government spends $3.5 billion a year merely to store its own property, which is a sum almost equivalent to the entire Federal budget for 1930. The Army, Navy, and Air Force run their own independent storage systems, often in close proximity. Excess space is not reported in any orderly way, and cross-servicing is hampered by legalistic considerations. Some savings could be achieved by coordinating both the military and civilian agency storage systems, but as long as the Department of Agriculture has to buy and store price-controlled crops the annual storage bill will remain high.

Lending is another Government activity which has its wasteful aspects quite aside from the matter of competition with private banks and finance companies. For example, the Rural Electrification Administration lends money at 2 percent, whereas the Treasury pays 3 percent on long-term issues to provide the funds.

HIGH COST OF GOBBLEDYGOOK

The field of Government paperwork and bookkeeping is riddled with useless expenditures. The same information is often collected many times over. Government letters drip with "long words, long sentences * * * abstract nouns, passive verbs and dangling clauses." Government agencies use 55 style manuals where they might use 1. The task force investigating paperwork estimated that more than $22 million a year could be saved by removing a single line from a Government report filled out by employees. The line in question merely duplicated information which the Government was already receiving through other channels.

No doubt a certain amount of waste and duplication is inevitable in a Government as large as that of the United States. Good business management, however, could cut that waste to a minimum, and the Hoover Commission recommendations are eloquent with suggestions to accomplish this end. In the final analysis "big government" is in itself a waste when it attempts to do things which private citizens are perfectly capable of doing for themselves with less expenditure of total energy. But that is still another story.

Using Our Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of December 18, 1955:

USING OUR SURPLUSES

Secretary Benson's announcement that there will be a substantial expansion of shipments of American food surpluses to relieve hunger in needy countries is most welcome at this season. Wheat and corn are to be added to the list of commodities that have already come under this program. Eighteen private agencies will comprise the distributing machinery and the amounts to be given will be determined largely by their ability to get the products to those who need them.

There has always been an economic case against piling up surpluses through purchase in the effort to sustain a price level. But there can be no moral case in favor of hoarding food, anywhere in the world, when so many of the world's people go hungry.

At some time in the past food surpluses have actually been destroyed to sustain an artificial program. In the eyes of anyone who has not enough to eat such a course must seem wickedly hard-hearted. It should weigh on the conscience of any well-fed person.

The difficulty has been that of providing the right and adequate machinery for distribution. The agencies now in the field cannot hope to bring food to every person who needs it. But they are doing an inspired job. The fact that they will have more materials at their disposal should help them to work even harder, if that is possible. If they can help us to share our abundance we should be grateful, not for assistance in solving the surplus problem, but for the chance to make life a bit easier for those who are in want.

A New Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hutchinson (Kans.) News-Herald of September 12, 1955:

A NEW APPROACH

After 40 years of wrestling with the farm problem, the Government doesn't seem to be any closer to an effective solution than when it first began, but it is entitled to a T for still trying. And the most recent tentative solution takes such a different approach from all past efforts that at the least it is worth an exhaustive study.

Heretofore the Government's attempts to keep agriculture financially healthy have been largely in the form of purchase of the surplus production and disposition of it at a great loss. Hereafter, if the present thinking of the Department of Agriculture is acted upon, the Government may pay agriculture for not raising the surplus, by leasing the excess acres and keeping them out of production.

The first reaction to this new approach is favorable. It should cost the Government much less to insure agriculture its equitable income and the Nation an adequate food supply.

The fertility of the soil is as much of a natural resource as is the country's oil supply. It is wanton to drain this resource for the production of unusable crops. Retiring the rented acres from cultivation until such time as some disaster again required their use, would permit a certain part of the original fertility to be restored.

It might seem economic nonsense for the Government to pay a landowner for not farming his fields, but is it any more nonsense than paying a 65-year-old for not working?

Seton Hall University Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Morning Call of Paterson, N. J., December 8, 1955:

A hundred years ago in a frame farmhouse outside the village of Madison a new school opened its doors to six pupils. Today that school, now grown to a 10-school university with more than 8,000 pupils, launches the celebration of its centennial year.

Seton Hall University with its spacious South Orange campus and branches in Paterson, Newark, and Jersey City is a monument to the faith of its founder, the Most Reverend James R. Bayley, first bishop of Newark, who cherished a dream of service to humanity and envisioned a college to educate the laity and provide priests for the newly formed diocese of Newark.

THIRTEEN THOUSAND ALUMNI

Named in memory of Bishop Bayley's aunt, Mother Elizabeth Ann Seton, founder of the Sisters of Charity in the United States, Seton Hall numbers among her 13,000 alumni distinguished citizens in every field of endeavor.

It is no small source of pride to the university that four of her distinguished sons preside over the Catholic community in the year of her centennial. Archbishop Thomas A. Boland, of the archdiocese of Newark, and his auxiliary bishop, the Most Reverend Juston J. McCarthy, are both graduates of Seton Hall, as are the Most Reverend James A. McNulty, bishop of the see of Paterson, and the Most Reverend George W. Ahr, bishop of Trenton.

Famous Seton Hall alumni in the world of sports include Andrew Stanfield, Olympics champion, and Walter Dukes, all-American basketball champion.

In the entertainment world the university claimed as a son, John Barrymore.

The first Catholic college in New Jersey, Seton Hall added another to its list of firsts with the establishment on July 5, 1954, of a coeducational college at 151 Ellison Street in Paterson, the only coeducational Catholic college in New Jersey or the entire metropolitan area.

ENROLLMENT TRIPLED

In September of 1955, at the beginning of its second year, Paterson College enrolled 800 students, almost tripling the initial enrollment of 273.

Msgr. John L. McNulty, president of the university, predicts that within a period of 5 years the university in Paterson will approach in numbers the enrollment on the campus at South Orange. The remarkable increase in enrollment within the period of 1 year marks the need for the university in the city of Paterson," he added.

Offering day and night classes to men and women, the Paterson unit has proved a boon to teachers and other professional people within the area, making it possible for them to improve their professional status while remaining at their regular employment.

The Reverend Thomas J. Gillhooly, dean of Paterson College and secretary of the university, attributes the phenomenal growth of the local school in no small part to the reception given it by the people of Paterson. "We have been received by citizens most remarkably," he declared. "Everybody has pitched in to help, and the hospitality leaves nothing to be desired."

RECALLS FIRST CLASSES

Father Gillhooley recalls that the first classes of Paterson College met in September of 1954 in two temporary locations, where they held classes during the renovation of the Ellison Street building, formerly the Elks Club. Day sessions were held at the Paterson Community Center at 311 Main Street and afternoon and evening classes at St. John's Cathedral High School on Oliver Street.

Last January 3 classes were resumed at the newly renovated building on Ellison Street with facilities including 15 classrooms, the library, cafeteria, and student lounge.

The local unit is one of three urban units branching out from the mother school on the campus at South Orange, where the school was moved in 1860 after having outgrown the facilities of the Morris County location. The university has two large buildings in Newark housing University College in addition to its law school, opened in 1951. It leases facilities at the Jersey City Medical Center in addition to the facilities of University College in Jersey City.

The 10 schools of the university cover the field of higher education in the arts and sciences, education, business administration, divinity, nursing, law, medicine and dentistry.

RESEARCH CENTER

In keeping with its aims of service to humanity, Seton Hall has made its facilities available to scientific and medical groups. The school has become a research center for the study of cancer-causing compounds and alcoholism in relation to mental disorder. Since 1948 it has held more than 300 postgraduate courses attended by more than 3,000 doctors and dentists.

Seton Hall has met the growing demands of business and industry by enlarging the department of business administration and offering new courses as the need arises. It is the only college in the State with courses leading to recognition as a certified insurance underwriter.

Such a record of growth and service might indicate to the casual observer that Seton Hall's path to success had been unshadowed by obstacles. A look at the history of the young school, however, will reveal a story of struggle and endurance.

FIRE LEVELED BUILDINGS

Three times within its first 50 years fire levelled or damaged the main campus buildings. The college weathered the turbulent years of the Civil War to find itself with a debt of more than $180,000 by 1885, with the enrollment at the same time showing an alarming shrinkage. In 1887 only 4 bachelors and 6 masters degrees were awarded.

Under the administration of the Reverend William F. Marshall, who succeeded the Reverend James Corrigan as president in 1888, the debt dropped to less than $5,000 by 1895, and Seton Hall entered the 20th century with an enrollment varying between 50 and 100 students.

Under the leadership of the late Most Reverend Thomas J. Walsh, who became president of the board of trustees in 1928, the college entered upon a new era of growth. In 1932 it was accredited by the Middle States Association and later gained membership in

the Association of American Colleges and the American Council on Education.

With the surge of postwar enrollment, taxing facilities to the limit, Seton Hall in 1947 initiated a $14 million program of expansion, to be climaxed next September with the formal opening of the College of Medicine and Dentistry at the New Jersey Medical Center in Jersey City.

Seton Hall became a university in June 1950, under the guidance of its 12th and present president, Monsignor McNulty, who took the reins in 1949.

With a century of solid achievement behind her, Seton Hall University faces the challenge of the future with renewed energy—truly a monument to faith and to a dream.

If It's Too Much Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Oklahoma City Times of November 15, 1955:

IF IT'S TOO MUCH PRODUCTION

One of the President's economic advisers addresses the farm problem in a vein that's familiar but without much bearing in the circumstances.

Gabriel Hauge says the farmer, "in return for the prodigious and successful effort he is making in turning out food and fiber, is not getting a return for his work that is in line with what other people are getting for their efforts in America today."

This is a political rather than an economic approach, of course, and it appears with regularity in most of the discussions of the farmer's mounting woes. Its obvious flaw is that it contains the inference that production solely for production's sake is good and ought to be maintained.

More relevant is the fact that the farmer's present difficulties are attributable precisely to the "prodigious and successful" efforts that Hauge applauds.

The farmers themselves appear to be under no illusions concerning the root of their difficulties. Members of the touring Senate Agriculture Committee are finding midwestern farmers almost unanimous in blaming their price problems on overproduction and surpluses.

If the problem is one of overproduction an obvious snare and delusion would occur in any proposed solution entailing incentives for even greater production. Not only would such proposals perpetuate the present scandalous waste of the taxpayers' money but they would react to the eventual disadvantage of the farmers themselves by perpetuating the surpluses.

Exactly that effect could be anticipated from restoration of the high and inflexible price supports which were introduced in wartime for the specific purpose of stimulating production.

Concerning the none too promising alternatives the outlook is by no means clear. But the President suggested the other day that the problem isn't a static one, and farm policy must be adapted constantly to changing conditions.

Of these changing conditions the most conspicuous is the mechanical revolution that's occurring in agriculture. With the spread of mechanized farming there has been an increase in the size of individual farms and a corresponding reduction in the working population that each farm will support.

These revolutionary changes are occurring outside the realm of politics and it's reasonable to suppose that the eventual adjustment will occur also without regard for politics.

As a matter of fact the adjustment is occurring already and has been going on for the better part of a generation. The growth of the cities and the continuing decline in farm population is a direct reflection of the contraction of job opportunities in agriculture.

The States that will prosper in the future will be those which take heed of these basic economic trends.

God's Hand in Our History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a most dynamic sermon was delivered on board the U. S. S. *Upshur* on its return voyage to the United States in September 1955 by Chaplain Richmond Alfred Hancock. Since the address was most significant in title and composition, I felt that the membership of this House would enjoy reading it. God's Hand in Our History is presented concisely and chronologically by Chaplain Hancock. The full text follows:

GOD'S HAND IN OUR HISTORY

INTRODUCTION

Our God whom we know and serve today is a God of purpose. If ever a nation could point to the hand of God in its history, our United States is that nation. God's hand is seen in our history as clearly as in the story of the Hebrew nation many years ago. In the march of mankind God's hand is always in the guidance of human affairs. Notice the history of some nations. God raised up the Hebrew nation to give to the world true religion. God raised up the Greek nation to give to the world literature and language to express the religion. God raised up the Roman nation to give to the world law, order, and highways that religion might be carried to the ends of the earth. God surely raised up America for a high and glorious mission.

I. Discovery of America

We can find God's hand even in the very discovery of America. Out on the sea the prow of Columbus' ship was headed straight for Delaware Bay. Then flocks of birds were observed flying southwest. Pinzon persuaded Columbus to change the course of the ship and follow the birds. Hence, Columbus landed on the little island of San Salvador of the West Indies rather than Delaware Bay. Columbus took possession of San Salvador in the name of Ferdinand and Isabella for Spain.

According to many scholars of history, the Mohammedans in the early days came near the American coast. They would have landed had their boats not been destroyed. This country was not destined to have the Mohammedan religion, but Christianity.

The Chinese make special claims to have discovered America. Their claim is that New Mexico was visited in A. D. 499, nearly a thousand years before Columbus. But no permanent settlement was effected. Why? Not to the Chinese as followers of Confucius, but to the followers of Christ was this country to be given. Surely His hand can be seen in our country's discovery.

II. Divine deliverance of America

His hand can unmistakably be seen in our Nation's divine deliverances. Three years after the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth a severe drought burned the grass brown and threatened to destroy the crops. The stock of food was destroyed and none could be depended on from England. In that dark hour, when all expected to die of hunger, the Pilgrim Fathers took refuge in God. For almost 9 hours they sought God on a day of humiliation and prayer. They pleaded to the Almighty until He heard them. Before evening rain began to fall; the refreshing showers continued until the parched vegetation was revived and the harvest was spared. The Plymouth company was saved by God's intervention.

Similarly, a century later, in 1746 when the French in Nova Scotia equipped 40 warships to destroy New England, the churches in the territory sat aside a day of prayer. Even while they prayed, a wind arose and became almost a hurricane and wrecked the enemy ships.

Again, in the devastating winter of 1777 prayer prevailed. The American struggle for independence seemed lost, when, at Valley Forge, the ragged Continentals hungry, ill clothed, disorganized, stained the Pennsylvania snow with their lifeblood, while not far away in Philadelphia and New York the Tories enjoyed a smart social season and the atheist Tom Paine wrote vicious attacks on George Washington's character. In these gloomy hours Washington, according to an eyewitness, knelt down, as thousands of Christians knelt in their churches during that crisis, and pleaded with God to sustain the dying American cause. Then the light did begin to dawn and the prospects for victory became brighter from then on. Divine delivery had come.

Who can deny that divine deliverance saved our country early in 1863. In that day it seemed that the Union would be destroyed. In the time of testing Abraham Lincoln proclaimed a day of prayer and penance, requesting the Nation to ask of God, "pardon for our national sins and the restoration of our now divided and suffering country to its former condition of unity and peace." The plea was answered.

III. Development

God's hand is seen not only in our discovery and deliverance but also in our development. In our earliest development our Nation has been led by great men. Recall the Constitutional Convention which met at Philadelphia. No such convention has ever been held since in the annals of time. It was composed of 55 men—and what men they were. Giants in intellect and moral character. Twenty-nine of these men were college or university graduates. Those that were not were men of imperial intellect. There was Franklin, the great philosopher; Washington, the great patriot; Madison and Hamilton, two of the greatest minds of their day.

Each of our Thirteen Original Colonies had a religious foundation. Their leaders had very few books but they all had the Bible and they read it.

The Charter of Virginia assured its colonists the right to live together in Christian peace.

The Plymouth Charter specifies that the colony is established to "advance the enlargement of the Christian religion to the glory of God Almighty."

The Delaware Charter defines one purpose of settlement as the "further propagation of the Holy Gospel."

Maryland's Charter explains that its first settlers were moved by a "pious zeal for extending the Christian religion."

The Masachusetts Bay Charter emphasizes that Boston was founded by men who wanted to bring the new world "to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and the Saviour of mankind."

The early settlers of Pennsylvania came to America, according to their own declaration, for the spread of the Christian religion.

The Rhode Island Charter commits its people to the "true Christian faith and worship of God."

The Connecticut Constitution in its preamble pledges the settlers to help "preserve the liberty and purity of the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ."

IV. Our destiny

Here is the question of supreme importance for us today. What of God's hand in our destiny? "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord." (Psalm 33: 12) "Righteousness exalteth a nation but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14: 34). If America expects to survive without God, she is expecting what has never happened in the past and will never happen in the future. Many nations in past history have come and gone, but none have prospered without God on their side. Benjamin Franklin once said, "If it be true that a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice surely a nation cannot rise without His aid." America has had God's help yesterday and we need God's grace and guidance today. How may we have it? We may have it by using the recipe which God has given in His word. The Scripture reference is II Chronicles 7: 14 when God replied to Solomon by night. "If My people which are called by My name shall humble themselves and pray and seek by face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from Heaven, will forgive their sin and heal their land."

The highway to the presence of God is one thing that does not change.

The presence of God is determined by the attitude and activity of His people.

When we meet the conditions the promises of God become ours.

1. We need God in government.
2. We need God in business.
3. We need God in military circles.
4. We need God in our homes.

God is calling America today.

"And the Lord God whispered and said to me,
These things shall be, these things shall be;
Nor help shall come from the scarlet skies
Till the people rise.

"Till the people rise, My arm is weak,
I cannot speak till the people speak;
When men's voices are dumb, My voice is dumb;
I cannot come till My people come."

—*Angela Morgan.*

Alexander Hamilton's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Passaic Herald-News of January 11, 1956:

ALEXANDER HAMILTON'S BIRTHDAY

One of the great minds with which the United States was providentially blessed at its birth was born on this date 199 years ago. Alexander Hamilton overcame tremendous odds to become one of our Nation's greatest statesmen. He was born out of wedlock in the West Indies and had to go to work at 12 when his father went bankrupt. At 14 he was managing a counting house in St. Croix. Friends who recognized his genius sent him to the mainland to complete his education. He was an aide to Washington in the Revolution and his services afterward as financier and statesman were invaluable to the new nation. Hamilton is summed up thusly in the Encyclopedia Americana:

"He was not popular, nor did he strive after popularity, but his memory and achievements are imperishable. He lived for the public good. Eloquent and refined, able and brilliant, the embodiment of devotion, integrity, and courage, he has left as deep a mark upon our political institutions as any other statesman America has produced."

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, on the subject of the French elections and the resurgence of Western Germany. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

World history took a strange turn in the first week of the New Year. Just a few days ago the first uniformed German soldiers since World War II entered the United States to take training in modern arms and destructive weapons. The French elections have resolved themselves into a victory for no one. The chance of a stable government in that unhappy nation now seems more remote than before. These two events are very closely related, although one did not depend upon the other.

The facts are that, for better or worse, the hopes of the free world on the European Continent ride with the West German Republic. It is not a state of affairs that many people like, but the truth is, there is nothing anyone can do about it. While we must admire the great spirit of democracy that enables every Frenchman to vote for the party which reflects his own particular frame of mind, the tendency of the House of Deputies to be divided six ways from Sunday in all directions makes every French Government a temporary instrumentality that must depend upon the personalities of individuals rather than the will of the people. This is not to be construed as criticism of the Republic of France. It's their country and they can run it as they see fit. We wouldn't want them coming over here and trying to tell us what to do. We have no right to give them advice. However, when they step out into the arena of international relations, their position is considerably weakened by the inability of any government to stay in office long enough to effect a long range program. Cooperation of other nations with France is necessarily limited by this knowledge.

In Western Germany, there is no such problem. Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has built a mighty bulwark against the tide of communism. The continued growth of the German free enterprise system must be a source of great discomfort to the Soviet Union and their cronies in East Germany. I have heard some talk of the Germans as being unreliable in the face of a Russian offer to trade the eastern parts of Germany in exchange for the Bonn Government giving up its ties to the free nations. There is no sign that any such offer would be acceptable in any way to Mr. Adenauer or his political opponents, the Social Democrats. The talk in the Social Democratic Party a few months ago about neutralism and a co-existence policy with the Soviets has given ground to the realization that Russia's only interest in West Germany is to take it over. Of course, the German people still have a lot to answer for. The world has not forgotten the cruelties of World War II so soon, but the Germans are making a great effort to overcome this heritage from the years of the Nazis and it is to be hoped that, in time, they wil be able to sit down at the council table with all nations of the free world as a complete equal, made equal by their own effort. But this is a moral issue only and international politics is the great arena for the realist. The west Germans do not have to take a back seat to anyone in the fields of economics and politics. I can find only admiration for the splendid job they have done of rebuilding their nation. We can hope for them that soon their country will be united and free.

But even a divided Germany presents a more united front today than France. She has been weakened by her own sense of democracy, and democracy like all good things must be carefully administered and properly done, so that the voices of the erratic few do not drown out the wishes of the more sensible majority. And in France, I am afraid that is exactly what has happened.

The Milky Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 9, 1956:

THE MILKY WAY

Amid the general agricultural gloom, the dairy industry has come forth with a report of progress in 1955 and buoyant hopes for the future. The industry is not wailing over the reduction of the Government's support price for butter. On the contrary, the American Dairy Association shows that, under the lower support price, butter is regaining some of its lost market. Nor is the improved situation of dairy farmers due to larger Government purchases at lower prices. Federal buying of butter, cheese and nonfat dry milk solids in 1955 will amount to only about half what it was in 1954. Yet the prices of dairy products improved slightly during the year and were above the Government support level most of the time.

The dairy industry did not cut production to achieve these results. Its output this year increased by about one billion pounds of milk. The improvement seems to be due largely to the expansion of markets through an intense promotional campaign carried on by the American Dairy Association and the National Dairy Council in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture. In short, dairymen have adopted business methods of expanding their markets. They represent themselves as being determined

that their milk "will go into stomachs instead of warehouses." They are fully in accord with Secretary Benson's comment: "There is no substitute for a market."

It does not follow that what the dairymen have done can be applied to every other branch of agriculture. But their cooperation, self-reliance and progressive attitude ought to be contagious. Certainly the only long-range hope for agricultural prosperity lies in the development of markets, adjustment of supply to demand, and increased efficiency in farm production.

Record Supports Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of January 7, 1956:

WHAT MR. NIXON REALLY SAID—RECORD SUPPORTS VICE PRESIDENT

Ex-President Harry S. Truman recently made one of the most curious political comments in recent years.

In Seattle, Mr. Truman was asked a question regarding Vice President NIXON. His reply was:

"I don't like him, and I don't want to discuss him. He called me a traitor and if I was a traitor, then the country is in a fix." With some variations Mr. Truman repeated this in Los Angeles.

The statement was strange because the record shows no such comment by Mr. NIXON. It would appear that such an accusation would have been too big to go unreported. The former President deliberately twisted the facts perhaps to gain public sympathy or perhaps for his own political reasons.

Thorough search of the record shows the Vice President carefully stating on numerous occasions that he did not question Mr. Truman's loyalty, only his judgment.

Mr. NIXON'S typical analysis is found in a speech published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 26, 1950:

"Why was it that (Democratic) administration officials persisted in their refusal to act through the years, even when substantial evidence of espionage activities were brought to their attention? A number of reasons have been suggested for this failure. On the other extreme, there are some who claim that administration officials failed to act because they were Communist or pro-Communist. I do not accept this charge as a fair one * * *."

Early last year Democratic leaders claimed the Vice President had accused their party of 20 years of treason and of being a party of treason.

In an address in St. Louis in September 1954 Mr. NIXON stated his own opinion on the subject by saying:

"The great majority of Americans, the great majority of Democrats, independents, and Republicans, all, in America, are against communism."

This was enlarged upon a few weeks later in Los Angeles when the Vice President said the Reds opposed Republican candidates "not because there is any difference in the loyalty of Democrats or Republicans" but because of the administration campaign against Communists in Government.

The smears against Mr. NIXON cannot be charged to mistakes or misunderstanding. It is inconceivable that Mr. Truman and other Democratic Party leaders are not well aware of Mr. NIXON'S carefully stated position on loyalty.

The only conclusion possible is that this is part of a well-organized attempt to undermine the Vice President's hard-hitting campaigning in advance of the 1956 races. This appears to be an attempt to deceive the independent voters by twisting words and facts to make it appear that Mr. NIXON is reckless in his comments.

We doubt if Americans are as gullible as Mr. Truman and his cohorts seem to believe.

The Farm Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of January 10, 1956:

THE FARM MESSAGE

Our farms have been producing too much and, if the Government's agricultural policy is not changed, they will go on producing too much—which is bad for the farmers themselves as well as for the taxpayers and the national economy.

So the problem is (1) to get rid of the existing surpluses and (2) to prevent the accumulation of more surpluses without making the farmers' economic position any worse.

President Eisenhower in his farm message to Congress has offered a program designed to solve both aspects of the problem, at least partially.

He would permit present surpluses to be sold abroad, in barter or for cash, and to any country—Communist or friendly. Within the United States they could be sold for the support price plus carrying charges and, through the temporary acreage-reduction program, be certified to farmers themselves in return for taking an appropriate acreage out of production.

Through the soil bank approach the President would seek to take a portion of the present cropland out of production, to avoid the likelihood that acreage restrictions which reduce surpluses of one kind of crop simply would lead to surpluses of other crops. The farmer would be reimbursed, for putting poor land into timber, forage, or water storage and for permitting good land to lie idle.

The conservation involved in this is important, for as our population increases, our farms will be called on to produce more and presumably we will need more acres in cultivation.

There is no assurance that the program the President recommends will solve the farm problem. No one knows how much of the surpluses can be disposed of, here or abroad, under any kind of program beyond giving them away. Nor can we be certain, in the face of technological improvements, that surpluses will not recur even if crop acreage is reduced again and again.

But we do know what will happen if Congress should adopt the alternative some Members are advocating—a return to 90-percent price supports—because maintaining them after World War II is what got us into this mess in the first place.

The President's program offers some hope of progress toward adjusting farm production to the demands of the market. Hence it is worth trying.

Diversification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Boston Sunday Herald, Boston, Mass., Sunday, November 20, 1955, which I find to be a most cogent column on a subject of vital interest in New England:

STABILIZING JOBS

The greatest single blow to the New England economy in recent years has been the decline of the textile industry.

In Massachusetts this backbone industry supported a payroll of 235,000 in 1923 and 96,000 in the recession year of 1938. It is now down to 70,000 with little prospect of recovering its former standing. Naturally the whole economy has felt the impact.

But to the extent that lost textile jobs have been replaced by higher paying, more stable ones in other industries, the net effect has not been too bad. In fact diversification of industry and employment here has had some distinct advantages.

This is pointed up by an article in the current quarterly statistical bulletin of the State division of employment security. For the past 8 years, the bulletin states, the textile industry has been drawing upon the State unemployment fund for anywhere from $1.3 million to $20.5 million a year more than it has contributed. No other industry has created such a drain. Except for it, the unemployment-tax rate would not have had to go up in 1950 or the law be revised in 1951.

But all this has happened. It is passed. And no such shakedown is apt to afflict us again.

"Much of the decline in recent years," explains the Bulletin, "has resulted from the transfer of operations to other States and/or the liquidation of Massachusetts mills. Over the last few years, most of the mills which operated under the job-rotation system have closed permanently, and most of their displaced employees have exhausted all benefit rights. It seems unlikely, therefore, that this industry at its present level could, even under the most adverse circumstances, represent so heavy a net charge to the fund in the years to come as it did in the 8-year period ending with 1954."

The loss of the textile jobs is still a tragedy. But the jobs which have replaced them are good jobs—in electronics, in the durable-goods industries, in services. And the new job pattern is undoubtedly more healthy.

Diversification means steadier overall employment. It means a stronger unemployment reserve fund. It means that the liberalization in unemployment benefits which Governor Herter has advocated can be enacted next year without danger to the fund. It may permit still further liberalization.

A human problem remains. Many of the individuals displaced by the decline in textiles have not found new jobs elsewhere. The Bulletin rightly points out that these people are everybody's problem. An effort must be made to absorb them again in the work stream or, failing that, to provide for their needs outside it.

But the overall picture is not unhopeful. At lease one of our toughest problems is beginning to solve itself.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 10, 1956:

THE FARM PROGRAM

Before the political skirmishing over the President's farm proposals get any heavier, both Republicans and Democrats would do well to pause and see if they cannot agree on two points. First, that any farm bill passed by Congress should give promise of reducing the huge, price-depressing surpluses of corn, cotton, and wheat now held by the Government. And, second, any such bill should seek to reduce the amount of land in production. Proposals which do not accomplish both these ends will be pure temporizing.

The great virtue of President Eisenhower's recommendations yesterday is that they are aimed at this dual goal. Under the short-term, voluntary acreage reduction proposal the Government would seek primarily to reduce the surpluses. Wheat farmers, for example, who voluntarily cut their planting even below the price-support quotas would be entitled to buy a comparable amount of Government-held wheat at prices attractive enough to insure them a reasonable profit. Or they could choose simply to take cash and the Government would market a corresponding amount of surplus wheat and thus reduce the Government holdings.

Under the long-term conservation reserve program the primary objective would be to reduce the total acreage now in price-depressing competitive production. Not only farmers with price-supported crops but all farmers would be entitled to cash payments for taking land out of cultivation and putting it into soil-preserving use. Here the double goal is to reduce the acreage now used for producing crops which are not needed and to enhance the value of the land so that it can produce more in the future when the growing population will need such farm products.

Whether the precise details of these proposals are the most desirable we do not presume to say. But it ought to be clear to both Republicans and Democrats that no votes will be lost and farmers will be helped—not just in an election year but in the long run—by application of the principles on which this program is based. Insistence upon rigid, 90 percent price supports would surely make the achievement of both goals more difficult. If the agriculture of this country is to be managed in broad outline by the Federal Government, and that seems an accepted fact now, those responsible for managing must have a reasonable degree of flexibility. If they are going to insist that farmers make certain voluntary choices then they must have the means of encouraging or discouraging the proper choices by a judicious control of the price-support level.

Resolution Favoring Proposed Amendments to the National Banking Act Adopted by City Council, Springfield, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a resolution adopted on December 27, 1955, by the city council of Springfield, Ill., favoring proposed amendments to the National Banking Act permitting commercial banks to deal and trade in municipal and other public revenue bonds.

The resolution follows:

A RESOLUTION FAVORING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL BANK ACT PERMITTING COMMERCIAL BANKS TO DEAL AND TRADE IN MUNICIPAL AND OTHER PUBLIC REVENUE BONDS

Whereas municipal governments and other public bodies now have the assistance of commercial banks in the underwriting and trading in general obligation bonds, but the National Banking Act now prohibits commercial banks from so participating in the trading and underwriting of municipal revenue bonds; and

Whereas authorization of commercial banks also to engage in the sale of and underwriting of municipal revenue bonds would broaden the market for such bonds and increase competition in their sale, and thus tend to lower the interest rate of such securities, all to the advantage of local governments and their citizens; and

Whereas it appears that proposed legislation will be introduced in the 84th Congress convening in January 1956 amending the National Banking Act so as to authorize commercial banks to underwrite and deal in municipal revenue bonds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Springfield, Ill., That it recommends passage of said proposed amendments to the National Banking Act so as to permit commercial banks to deal and trade in municipal revenue bonds; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Members of the United States Senate from the State of Illinois, and to the Honorable PETER MACK, Member of the House of Representatives from the 21st Congressional District of the State of Illinois, and to every other Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois.

Presented to the council this 27th day of December A. D. 1955.

Passed, December 27, 1955.
Signed, December 27, 1955.
Recorded, December 27, 1955.

NELSON O. HOWARTH,
Mayor.

Attest:

O. MACK WAGNER,
City Clerk.

Censorship—Washington Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., Saturday, September 17, 1955:

It is a strange state of affairs when the American Government is so fearful that its own people should know certain truths, that foreign governments often know more about our own national business than the American people do.

This might be described as "political censorship," to cover up shortcomings and blunders that would have an adverse effect on public opinion.

In any case, its puts the spotlight on the problem as to what should be withheld for the sake of national security, and what should be revealed under the fundamental right of Americans to know what their Government is doing, whether it is good or bad.

The most recent instance was the Dixon-Yates arrangement, where private power interests were trying to scuttle public power. When the news leaked about the cozy huddle between private banking interests and Government officials, that put the brakes on a sly maneuver. Dixon-Yates was quickly abandoned. A smokescreen was thrown up to cover the retreat.

Article 1 of the Bill of Rights guarantees freedom of the press, * * * among other freedoms.

This does not merely mean that the press shall be free to publish the facts that it gathers without censorship on the part of Government.

It implies as well, that the press shall have access to information concerning the operations of Government, within the limits of security.

That word "security" is sometimes used as an excuse for denying to the people, those facts that they have very right to know.

We have been led to expect, by constant reassurances from the Department of Defense, that our Air Force was substantially ahead of the Russians, not only in the performance of planes actually in use, but in research, development, and production time.

On May Day, however, the Soviets staged an air parade that revealed advanced models every bit as good as ours, and proved that they were able to develop them, from the blueprint stage, to actual flight, in much faster time than we have been doing.

Again, it was through private news sources, rather than the Government, that we learned of this success on the part of the Soviets. Perhaps this knowledge, now public, will prod the Department of Defense into getting better results for the vast sums we are appropriating in order to have an Air Force superior at all times to that of the Russian Communists.

We have not seen the end of this, for the cat is out of the bag.

There is a never-ending contest going on between the press and the presidency, no matter what administration is in power.

Newsmen have to dig up stories, as well as report routine events.

Oftentime, and with some justification, they believe that Government agencies hide the facts.

Government officials, on the other hand, would rather have the newsmen accept their

press releases, without embarrassing them with probing questions. They are very sensitive to criticism, and sometimes conduct themselves as if they were running a private business, instead of a public agency that should be accountable at all times to the people.

Insiders knew for a long time that Russian pilots and Russian tankmen were fighting against our forces in Korea, but this information, for reasons that no one could comprehend, was classified as secret, and was withheld from the American people.

In the meantime, Russian propaganda was blasting us around the world for intervening in Korea, while we had a comeback that we decided not to use.

A prime example of "dead-end" censorship.

The Washington Post and Times Herald said editorially on June 21 of this year, concerning the news policies of the Federal Government, and I quote: "But their philosophy, even in a period of cold war, is a dangerous one for a country in which the successful operation of government depends on public enlightenment. For the idea that information is something that belongs to the Government to use as it sees fit comes perilously close to the concept of government for government's sake."

When government wraps itself in a mantle of secrecy, there is no way of discovering incompetence, neglect, and corruption, of exposing such deterioration and correcting it.

Some people think that the strict censorship of a dictatorship gives it an advantage. This is not so. The bureaucrats in Soviet Russia have made many serious and continuing blunders that were covered up by censorship for too long. The breakdown in their agricultural program at last came to light because they had to admit it before disaster overtook them. Now, instead of criticizing everything in the United States as a failure, they want to send people over here to find out why our agricultural methods work to produce abundance, while theirs only produce scarcity. The Iron Curtain of secrecy they erected around their own empire, and its operations, has produced an economic crisis. If communism had given away to a free form of government, with an independent press, legislative body, and an informed public, the people of Russia would not be suffering as they are now.

There is in this a clear warning for the people of the United States. It is not enough for us to elect a National Government, and then lose ourselves in our own private lives until the next election rolls around. We must have a continuing flow of reliable information concerning the job our Government is doing. In between elections, this is the only opportunity we have to check up on our public stewards, and to prevent them from making the wrong decisions.

We can never afford to have a few men in high places decide what we shall know, or what we shall not know.

The security and the progress of our Nation is dependent upon the participation of all our people, utilizing the wisdom and the resources of the whole that we call public opinion.

In this connection, the press itself has a great responsibility.

In the transmission of news, it must avoid the temptation to feature those reports that fit its editorial policies, and to bury those that contradict it.

As long as we have thousands of news outlets, and laws to protect us from monopoly in the gathering and dissemination of news, there is little to fear from the press.

It is the Government that we must watch.

Washington is the news center of the world.

Here is the nerve center of a vast and powerful Government whose policies and actions have a bearing upon the lives and fortunes of every American.

As citizens, we are all shareholders in that Government, and we have the superior right to know how it is being managed, and what it is actually doing.

No one advocates the release of information concerning special weapons and their performance, which the experts believe are unknown to the Kremlin.

But the cult of secrecy is extended far beyond practical caution.

It is used as a pretext to conceal mismanagement, fraud, and injustice.

It becomes the tool of intolerance.

Officials, to hide their own mistakes, would like to classify everything as confidential, secret, or top secret, so that the words themselves cease to have any meaning.

A Senate investigation into military procurement reveals how corruption thrives in secrecy.

This has led to the proposal that the United States Government should establish an Office of Inspector General, with a staff of highly trained investigators to ferret out fraud and corruption in the Federal service.

This proposal, as well as other investigations of Government operations that have become epidemic in recent years, would be unnecessary if the Government did not try to hide so much.

A government with little to conceal from its own people would have no occasion to give evasive answers to the press.

Even today, for instance, we have no reliable information concerning the dangers of radioactive fallout, or what we should do to protect ourselves against it.

The bungling of the Salk vaccine program; and the mystery surrounding the peacetime uses of atomic energy; are as nothing compared with the secret diplomacy that has always been favored by our State Department.

Based on the assumption that the less people know about these matters, the less criticism there will be for those on the top.

A convenient policy for leaders who want to have their own way, but hardly an American policy.

The larger and more complex our Federal Government becomes, the greater the danger that it will consider itself to be more important than the people from whom it derives its powers and its responsibilities.

Newspapers, radio, TV—plus individual Senators and Representatives—are alert to this trend.

Whenever they seek the facts about Government policies and operations, they often find themselves stopped by the invisible wall of censorship. Buckpassing is the most convenient device. But Federal officials are relying more and more upon the excuse that the information sought is classified as secret, to stop the search in its tracks.

The solution?

We had a good system of voluntary censorship during World War II.

This did not depend on withholding information from the press, or clamping down on it. Instead, the press in this country (free from certain restrictions that were necessary in the combat areas) was given access to much information. It was then put upon its honor not to publish anything that might jeopardize the national security.

Perhaps we might develop a similar working arrangement between representatives of the press—and Government—today. So that there will be no barriers in the way of legitimate news.

The freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors is disturbed by this tightening up on news sources. As it stated, and I quote: "The criticism of some recently released material has left officials, the press, and the public without any standard of release upon which they can rely to defend the disclosure of technical information. Unless this attitude is clarified, it is bound to have a profound and paralyzing effect upon the flow of information to the American public.* * * Only the most strenuous exertions of those who understand the degree to which information is vital to our liberty will preserve it against those who think secrecy is vital to our safety."

The American people have the right to know, up to the highest limit consistent with genuine security, the facts about the operations of their Government. And without whitewash.

No administration is justified, on the basis of personal and political reasons, for keeping them in the dark.

Adequate Highways: How and When

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, may I quote from President Eisenhower's state of the Union message to Congress January 5, 1956:

In my message of February 22, 1955, I urged that measures be taken to complete the vital 40,000-mile interstate system over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of approximately $25 billion. No program was adopted.

Continuing my quote from the President's message, and I quote:

If we are ever to solve our mounting traffic problem, the whole interstate system must be authorized as one project to be completed approximately within the specified time. * * * Furthermore, as I pointed out last year, the pressing nature of this problem must not lead us to solutions outside the bounds of sound fiscal management. As in the case of other pressing problems, there must be an adequate plan of financing. To continue the drastically needed improvement in other national highway systems, I recommend the continuation of the Federal Highway Act.

That, ladies and gentlemen, was a statement of the President of the United States and I am in accord with it 100 percent. I want to make it perfectly clear that I favor and will do everything I can to put into a law an adequate highway program, both for the interstate and the intrastate and I will be for a reasonable program whether it goes into effect as a one-package bill; or the interstate and intrastate in separate pieces of legislation.

The 1954 Highway Act, which it was my privilege to author, is a biennial highway authorization and it expires June 30, 1956. This bill authorized $315 million primary; $210 million secondary; $175 million urban, and $175 million interstate plus various amounts for forest highways, roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads, and so forth. This total amount approximately equals the amount of revenue brought in by the 2-cent per gallon Federal gas tax.

This authorization is financed by taxes now in existence and no additional taxes would be necessary if the existing law, 1954 Highwy Act, Public Law 350, would be reenacted. Additional amounts or al-

locations could be added to each system, possibly $100 million total and we would still be within the limits of the revenue brought in by existing taxes. I am of the firm conviction that this law could be reenacted with very little opposition. You know the history of the Clay committee bill as well as the so-called Democrat or Fallon bill that was before the last session of Congress. Both bills were defeated and, in my opinion, because of the financing involved. Some refused to accept the Clay committee bond recommendation which called for $25 billion worth of bonds for highway purposes extending over a period of years. The Congress also defeated the so-called Democrat or Fallon bill because many felt that the revenue raising features or taxes were not equitable. Regardless of the arguments pro or con, the program was defeated. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the interstate-highway program, which is to be financed by an entirely new financial program, the question arises, Shall the interstate system, with a new financial program requiring additional taxes, be incorporated in the same legislation that includes the intrastate system primary, urban, and secondary roads when the financing is already established and no new taxes are necessary?

I hear the same arguments, and some new ones, on the floor of Congress and on the Hill that I heard last August. No one seems to object to the intrastate bill but most everyone seems to object to the interstate proposal financing program. Most everyone, with some exceptions, wants an interstate highway but they want the other person to pay for it. I hear some old arguments renewed, with more emphasis relative to financing the highway program and I am referring to the governor's conference group, and others, insisting that the roads, both interstate and intrastate, should be financed from revenue derived by the Federal Government from existing excise taxes on automotive products paid by highway users. A very fetching appeal. I would like, however, to point out some of the facts of life regarding this approach. Excise taxes levied by the Federal Government have been and are now levied and justified as a source of revenue for the general support of government. I know as well as you that while the Federal gas tax was never levied as a highway user charge, that developments over the past 10 years have more and more led to its being accepted as such and I think we all understand the reasons behind this acceptance. The excise-fuel tax yields approximately $1 billion a year. The total excise yield to the Government from this and related automotive excises now reaches $2.5 billion. I question seriously whether we are entitled to consider these excise taxes as highway user charges, certainly those taxes beyond the Federal fuel tax and lubricating oil taxes. I question the physical soundness of a move in this direction, at least beyond the Federal fuel tax. The other excises can, by no stretch of the imagination, be considered a fair measure of highway use. Congress at no time by legislative action has ever identified these excise taxes as highway user charges.

To earmark the total yield of the automotive excise taxes for highway purposes, as some are recommending, would deprive the general revenue now used for support of the Government of an additional $1½ to $2 billion over and above the fuel tax yield. This would unbalance our Federal budget to the tune of $1½ to 2 billion and would have to be made up from other tax sources if the budget is to be balanced and, ladies and gentlemen, the budget is balanced for the first time in many years. I am asking you would you deplete our existing general revenue fund by that amount of money to build highways? If you would, what tax would you recommend to take its place to make up this deficit? Would you want me to support or would you, if you were in my position, support an increase in the income tax, for example? Faced with this choice, it would seem to me—and I hope that you will agree—to be a sounder financial procedure to consider the levying of additional equitable charges on the highway users, who are the direct beneficiaries of a greatly expanded system, in some manner related to the benefits they derive.

May I again quote from the President, who has said on numerous occasions, and I quote:

> A sound Federal highway program, I believe, can and should stand on its own feet with highway users providing the total dollars necessary for improvements and new construction.

Another important factor should be considered when we are even thinking of depleting the general revenue fund. We all know that the general tax funds of all levels of our Government—Federal, State, and local—are presently drained nearly dry and with our tremendous increase of population, the burden placed on the revenues in the foreseeable future will require all the talent and ingenuity we have to prevent the complete destruction of our various government structures. The increasing demand for schools, hospitals, welfare, social security, sanitation, public buildings, and playgrounds presents us with a general revenue problem of staggering proportions. So, before your organizations or any of you individually proposes to deplete the revenue fund by $1½ to $2 billion for highway purposes, give consideration to the other urgent and, yes, vital needs.

It is never possible to devise a tax acceptable in full degree to those upon whom the tax is imposed. No tax that this Congress or any other Congress may devise will be completely painless to that individual or group upon whom the increase falls. I, personally, believe that there is equity and fairness in the theory that the highway user charge principle should be applied on the basis of benefits derived. I state positively and publicly that I do not believe that such a user charge should be punitive. The justification of levying a tax is to soundly finance an adequate highway program and not to exterminate or discriminate unfairly against a legitimate highway user.

I have endeavored to explain my position relative to a new financing program. You can readily see that it is controversial and subject to a great deal of discussion but remember, one thing ladies and gentlemen, if you are going to build highway somebody has to pay for them.

The controversial subject of financing the new program for the interstate system is not applicable to the existing law which was passed by nearly a unanimous vote of the Congress in 1954 and which I authored. It is known as the Highway Act of 1954. It expires June 30, 1956. I have previously given to you the amount of money that it spends for highways. It can be renewed and no new tax required over the existing taxes. I repeat, why jeopardize this new program now in effect by incorporating in the same legislation a 10- or 15-year highway construction program newly and entirely differently financed and which, in my opinion, will jeoepardize the passing of the existing law.

I firmly believe in an adequate highway program, including the interstate system as well as the intrastate system but I do not want the existing highway program destroyed and scuttled because of the insistence of some to incorporate into the legislation, soon to be before the Congress, new ideas including financing and distribution. I think the interstate system is strong enough to stand on its own merits in its own legislation and I think the proponents of the interstate system are weakening their position when they are attempting to have it carried in the program of the existing law. Let us not jeopardize the existing program that is working so well. Let us have a 10 year or 12 year interstate program in separate legislation and let us continue our intrastate highway program, bringing it before Congress once every 2 years for a look-see by the membership of Congress at that time.

Federal Aid for Flood Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from Labor which I am certain will be worthy of perusal and be profitable reading:

LAYS FLOODS AT DOOR OF POWER TRUST

Maybe no flood control works would have completely saved the New England States from their two dire flood disasters in recent weeks, but there would have been a lot less destruction and loss of life if that region had not surrendered to the private power trust. For many years Labor has been pointing out a situation which was well summed up this week in a Washington Post editorial. It says:

"New England has resisted the recommendations of the Army engineers and other flood control proposals—in large part out of a doctrinaire distaste for creeping socialism. Every suggestion of flood control by multipurpose dams, which would generate electric power, has encountered the adamant opposition of the private power companies.

"The whole New England river situation should receive fresh and unprejudiced scutiny. And it would be well to bear in mind that there is nothing more creepingly socialistic about Federal aid for flood prevention than about Federal aid for the victims of disaster."

If the New England States continue to bow to the power trust and pay its exorbitant rates, they can't blame New England industries for moving elsewhere to get cheap public power and safety from flood disasters.

Natural Gas Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 13, 1956, together with certain comments of mine on the editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRICE OF GAS

The attempt by Senators MONRONEY and FULBRIGHT to penalize the Washington Gas Light Co. for its opposition to the Harris-Fulbright natural gas bill is wholly unwarranted and assumes the nature of a punitive act. The gas company has every right to oppose the Harris-Fulbright bill without being subjected to special harassment by Congress. To single it out, as Senators MONRONEY and FULBRIGHT would do, and to require it to publish on its bill a breakdown of gas costs, would be to punish the company for acting in what it regards as the public interest.

The truth is that the company seems to be speaking more in the public interest than Messrs. MONRONEY and FULBRIGHT, who are asking Congress to exempt gas producers from utility-type regulation. Everett J. Boothby, president of the Washington Gas Light Co., said he opposed the exempting legislation because it would make it possible "for the few thousand gas producers to get substantial windfall profits from millions of gas users." He is supported in that contention by a good deal of evidence and by what appears to be nearly half the Senate.

When the Harris bill passed the House last year, it seemed to this newspaper that there were sufficient safeguards in it to protect the consumer from spiraling gas prices. At least it seemed worth taking a chance on the bill in the interest of limiting the domain of Federal power and permitting free competition to have its play. But because of certain technical amendments which permit escalator clauses in contracts and because of other features that insulate the producers from price regulation, the opponents of the measure now seem to have the stronger argument. In a matter so complicated we recognize that there is room for honest difference of opinion and that it is almost impossible to arrive at a completely clear picture of what would happen under the proposed legislation.

However, the argument that the bill does not adequately protect the consumer and ought to be strengthened is backed by impressive testimony. Senator DUFF of Pennsylvania, who has had great experience in the oil business, is persuaded, for example, that "excessive increases in the price of gas might occur as the result" of this legislation. He adds:

"While it is true that the nature of the natural-gas business makes it exceedingly difficult of equitable regulation by yardsticks normally used in utility regulation, it is also true that serious abuses have arisen as the result of favored-nation, escalation, and spiral-escalation clauses that have resulted in millions of dollars of increased prices to the consumers by private negotiations and renegotiations in which the ultimate consuming public has had no representation and no voice whatever."

The proposed bill would not exempt the gas producers from all regulation but would strictly limit the FPC in its regulatory function. For example, it would authorize the Power Commission to establish reasonable market price in future contracts without defining the term or setting any standards for the guidance of the commission. In a field in which real competition is limited by the physical difficulties of moving pipelines, reasonable market price might reflect more what the producers thought they should have than any relation to cost of production.

The language of the bill also is obscure with respect to the escalation clauses, which say, in effect, that if a pipeline has a contract with Producer A and then offers to pay Producer B a higher rate he must also pay the higher rate to Producer A. The Senate, at least, should satisfy itself that FPC has full power to prohibit unjustified increases as a result of the escalation clauses. Senator DUFF and other opponents of the measure—including the Washington Gas Light Co.—do not believe that the bill as written provides sufficient safeguards.

If there should be excessive price increases for natural gas, industrial users might turn to other fuels. But residential consumers who had invested in equipment to heat their homes and cook their food with gas could not easily switch. The pipeline operators and local gas distributors are carefully regulated by public utility commissions. Can this regulation be effective—in view of the talk among producers of prices double those of today and 10 times those of 1946—unless the consumer interest is protected in the bargain made at the well-head?

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

At the time of the House debate on the Harris bill last year, the Washington Post stated editorially that the bill was a compromise which seemed worth trying. The Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee, propaganda agency for the gas industry, welcomed what it regarded as an apostate from the ranks of the opponents of the bill. Thousands of reprints of the editorial were distributed across the country, with the word that this was from a newspaper that had "switched sides." Perhaps it was more than thousands of copies, for that committee says it has distributed more than 5 million pieces of printed material in the effort to secure passage of this legislation.

Actually the editorial support for the bill was rather equivocal. But last Friday, January 13, 1956, the Washington Post dispelled the doubts which had arisen concerning its vision and devotion to the public interest on this issue with an editorial unequivocally condemning the attack on the Washington Gas Light Co. for its opposition to the natural gas bill. In part the editorial stated:

"The truth is that the company seems to be speaking more in the public interest than Messrs. MONRONEY and FULBRIGHT, who are asking Congress to exempt gas producers from utility-type regulation."

The editorial goes ont to point out why the bill is against the interest of the consumers of gas. Mr. President, recognizing that the Natural Gas and Oil Resources Committee will not undertake to distribute copies of this editorial to correct the record, and knowing full well that the gas consumers of the Nation have no fund with which to do so, and wishing the people of the country to know that this distinguished newspaper has not forsaken the public interest in this issue, I have asked unanimous consent for the printing of Friday's editorial in the RECORD.

Mr. Salerno Exposes Trickery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Italian-American newspaper La Gazzetta, which appeared in the issue dated Friday, October 7, 1955:

MR. SALERNO EXPOSES TRICKERY

It is encouraging that Joseph A. Salerno, director of the Textile Workers of the CIO, and one of the most widely recognized of the talented and competent spokesmen for organized workers, has exposed the trickery of southern textile-millowners in a deliberate scheme to evade compliance with the Federal law which establishes $1 per hour as the minimum wage.

Mr. Salerno is far more than a representative of a labor organization. He is one of the best informed men in the United States upon both national and international affairs. He keeps informed of developments throughout the world. He understands their meaning. He has the faculty of foreseeing what these developments will eventually create.

Today, Mr. Salerno is generally accepted by both industrialists and workers as an articulate American citizen whose judgment is not restricted by prejudice of deliberate misconceptions. One indication is of his very accurate prediction of the inevitable end of Peron and his dictatorship in Argentina. He has similarly made comparable predictions about other equally as world-embracing situations.

That he has directed his attention to the greedy southern millowners has been inevitable. Upon facts, and not biased opinions, he has accused them of chicanery and deliberate deceit in circumventing the minimum wage law. True to the tradition of southerners they are nonconformists. They want to make their own laws and their own rules, applicable to the South.

Through trickery and inducements that time has revealed, have been financially disadvantageous to the South, they married northern textile mill owners who faced bankruptcy because they persisted in refusing to scrap obsolete machinery and equip their mills with modern inventions.

Notoriously low wage scales, typical of the South, were maintained by the enactment of local laws which virtually banned organizers of labor from certain areas.

Now, as Mr. Salerno, has very timely pointed out, they are refusing to do what Congress has ordered them to do—pay the same minimum wage of $1 per hour that is paid elsewhere in the Nation.

The method of evasion is typically southern. They set up a manufacturing corporation and a sales corporation. By claiming that the manufacturing company is engaged in intrastate business because they sell their

products only to the sales corporation, they are maintaining that they are not obligated to pay any attention to the national minimum wage law. The sales corporation which produces nothing and has only a limited number of persons on the payroll engages in interstate business and thereby comes under Federal regulation.

In other words the southern mill owners who are always bursting with false pride about this section of the Nation persist in wanting to pay their workers starvation wages. They are insistent upon retaining the very important wage advantage they possess over northern mill owners.

It is well that Mr. Salerno has exposed the deceit of these perpetual nonconformists. He has done the entire Nation a favor. He well deserves the prominence that he has for years held in the labor movement as well as the confidence and the friendship of industrialists. They know him for what he is, an intelligent, far sighted and particularly able man with ability to strike a satisfactory balance between two conflicting attitudes.

Constructive Medicine in Aging: Problems of the Mind in Later Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Nation's growing interest in problems of the aging, I would like to call attention to a conference which was held in Cincinnati last Friday.

The 1-day meeting, titled "Constructive Medicine in Aging: Problems of the Mind in Later Life," is the second annual symposium on gerontology sponsored by the William S. Merrell Co., of Cincinnati. Several hundred doctors heard eight of America's leading physicians tell of the most recent developments in mental problems of the aging.

The importance of this field of medicine is evidenced by the fact that there are approximately 14 million persons in the United States over 65 years of age. This number is currently increasing at the rate of about 400,000 a year. Of all new admissions to mental hospitals, 38 percent are in the 60-year and older group and 27 percent of all new admissions are older patients with senile psychoses and cerebral arteriosclerosis.

The general theme of the Merrell-sponsored symposium has as its primary objective the improvement of the state of health of persons who reach old age, and the improvement of the diagnosis and treatment of the infirmities of the old. The symposium will integrate basic research with its practical application to clinical medicine and will focus public and professional attention on the growing problems of our older citizens.

Merrell, producers of medicines since 1828, is recognized as a leader in the field of gerontological research, and is directing over 50 percent of its research activities toward the development of new and better drugs for our aging population.

Against a Mask for Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "Against a Mask for Stevenson," published in the Commonweal, and reprinted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 13, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGAINST A MASK FOR STEVENSON

Adlai Stevenson is doomed to defeat, thinks Columnist Stewart Alsop, unless he changes fast. One thing that bothers Mr. Alsop is Mr. Stevenson's inability to deliver himself of political cliches with all the gusto of a man who has just coined a new and valuable phrase.

Perhaps, thinks Mr. Alsop, there is a solution: Candidate Stevenson should practice saying meaningless sentences like "Most oranges are round" with great sincerity and feeling until he has the hang of it.

That out of the way, there is just one more thing Mr. Alsop sees as a handicap—Adlai Stevenson, he thinks, simply lacks the instinct for giving an audience what it wants to hear; he persists in saying what he thinks, and something will have to be done about this failing, too.

Along somewhat the same lines, former President Harry Truman has his complaints about Mr. Stevenson. Mr. Truman's contribution to history is undeniable, but there is no doubt that politically his style consists in sharpening differences, not in lessening them, in emphasizing grievances, not in conciliating.

On the basis of his own remarkable upset victory over Thomas Dewey in 1948, Mr. Truman is now dead set against having as a Democratic candidate any man who talks about moderation or in any way sounds less liberal than Mr. Truman himself. In recent weeks the former President has displayed an obvious coolness toward Mr. Stevenson on this score, and it now seems plain that a concerted effort is underway to turn Adlai Stevenson into Mr. Truman's image of a down-the-line New Deal-Fair Deal candidate.

What is happening, it seems to us, is that the professional party men have finally begun to listen seriously to what Adlai Stevenson actually says. He has not changed since 1952; if any change has taken place, it is they who have changed.

Mr. Stevenson dislikes easy political labels; as he said recently, it is impossible to do justice to a man's whole political philosophy with essentially meaningless tags like "dynamic moderation" or "moderate dynamism." And since he himself is one of the most complex men on the American political scene, he is doubly hard to label.

Yet if the attempt has to be made, it seems to us that it has never been possible to classify Mr. Stevenson as a liberal in quite the way Harry Truman uses the word. Essentially, he has always struck us as a man of moderation and, if it were not for the character of many who have claimed the title of conservative these days, a better case could be made for so labeling him than for considering him as a liberal in any doctrinaire sense of the word.

In the fifties, a man can still be called a liberal, simply by using the cliches of the thirties; for Adlai Stevenson such a course is temperamentally impossible. In the context of the political present, he must be called a liberal, for lack of a better term, but only in the sense that he applies his creative imagination to the problems of the present, rather than merely repeating the liberal dogmas of yesterday.

In the end, perhaps as close as one can get to labeling Mr. Stevenson is to call him a moderate liberal, and this is satisfactory only to the extent that it describes his spirit of conciliation and lack of sharp partisanship, as well as his rejection of a conservatism that defines the best course as standing still. Thus at the recent Democratic rally in Chicago he said:

"I agree that this is an age of abundance, as well as an age of anxiety. I agree that it is a time for catching our breath; I agree that moderation is the spirit of the times. But we must take care lest we confuse moderation with mediocrity, or settle for half answers to hard problems. A democratic society can't stand still, and the world won't stand still. * * * Moderation, Yes. Stagnation, No."

In recent weeks, Republican Chairman Hall has been referring to Mr. Stevenson as a "repudiated" candidate who will be repudiated again. Party chairmen are expected to be partisan, and Mr. Hall is only acting in character.

But Mr. Truman and all the other Democrats who want to remake Adlai Stevenson should remember that he polled 27 million votes in 1952, despite the widespread feeling that it was time for a change and the presence on the GOP ticket of the popular Dwight D. Eisenhower. This is hardly repudiation, nor does it indicate any inability to wage an effective campaign.

We like Mr. Stevenson as he is, being himself, and we dislike efforts to turn him into a Midwestern version of Harry Truman or into a cliche-mouthing time-server. Win, lose, or draw, the real Stevenson can make a genuine contribution to the Nation's political life and understanding. And, no matter what the other Democrats think, Adlai Stevenson's spirit of moderation and lack or narrow partisanship may very well win him the Presidency of the United States.

Impact of the French Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Impact of the French Elections," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPACT OF THE FRENCH ELECTIONS—VOTE PROVES POLICIES OF INDECISION AND TIMIDITY DON'T PAY DIVIDENDS

(By Constantine Brown)

The French elections have shown that the policies of timidity, sterility, indecision, or fear followed by the right-of-center governments in the free countries do not pay dividends. The rank and file of the people may be passive for a while. But they eventually get fed up, and when the time comes to cast their votes they favor direct action, as was

demonstrated in the large French vote for Communists and Poujadists.

In politically well-coordinated Britain we see the beginnings of a rebellion against wavering policies of Sir Anthony Eden, who is handicapped by the aftereffects of a serious illness followed by an operation in the United States nearly 2 years ago. Sir Anthony inherited from his dynamic predecessor, Sir Winston Churchill, a pretty good situation. This is now deteriorating. What irks the British Prime Minister's followers most is the unimaginative foreign policy which threatens whatever remaining prestige Great Britain may still possess in the Middle East.

There is an incipient rebellion in the West German Republic against the aged and ailing Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, who is being accused by the members of the coalition in power of being too tough domestically and sterile in his foreign policies. It is no use camouflaging the overwhelming desire of the German people for unity in Western Germany. Chancellor Adenauer's policy is wait and see and hope that the western political-military coalition will somehow, at some time in the indefinite future, effect the much-sought reunion.

Much as the Reds are hated in Western Germany, there is a growing sentiment among politicians as well as the general public that only by "going again to Moscow" could the Reich's unity be achieved. The results of the French elections have strengthened that sentiment. The new composition of the National Assembly is not encouraging for the NATO, which despite our efforts and our outpouring of more moneys is unlikely to become now the strong shield for the West.

Because of the weakness of France, one of the main links in the NATO chain, the Bundestag is even less inclined to vote appropriations for the new Germany army, which continues to remain a blueprint. The suggestion from Washington that we provide all the arms needed for the first year seems to leave the German parliamentaries cool. It is another solution in line with what Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, described last Tuesday to be the sterility of ideas and policies on the part of the State Department.

Senator RUSSELL may have erred in ascribing this sterility to the State Department. He might have been more accurate in laying it on the threshold of the Executive. Those who have followed the gyrations of our foreign policy since 1953 are aware that the State Department trio—Secretary Dulles, Under Secretary Herbert Hoover, Jr., and Assistant Secretary Walter Robertson—are not the Casper Milquetoasts they sometimes appear to be. But frequently when they suggested a policy more compatible with the moral and physical strength of the United States, they were overruled by President Eisenhower on advice of his intimate White House counselors.

Thus, the policies of agonizing reappraisal regarding France, massive retaliations concerning the Far East, especially at one time Indochina, and leading from strength all over the world had to be thrown into the junkheap. The substitute was a dollar policy tending to win friends and influence people by a continuation of lavish financial outlays abroad.

There are unquestionably some countries which need and deserve our financial assistance. But when we hear that tax moneys should be used in vast amounts to counter the phony promises of the Soviets in the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean area, the inevitable conclusion is that some of our policymakers are off the beam.

The French have indicated clearly by their protest vote against the do nothing politicians that they no longer want governments guided only by timidity and sterility. The attacks against Sir Anthony and the Conservative cabinet, not by the Laborites but by the Conservatives themselves, are an indication that the British, who in the past have favored wait-and-see policies, are also getting fed up. Similar trends are noticeable in Western Germany, where the Western Alliance begins to be regarded as a millstone around the Bonn government's neck. This is not prompted by any kind of sympathy for the Red regimes, but because the West gives the Germans the impression of timidity and fear.

Bicentennial of the Birth of Chief Justice John Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address delivered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] on September 22, 1955, at a convocation at the College of William and Mary marking the bicentennial of the birth of Chief Justice John Marshall.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT A CONVOCATION HELD AT THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY, WILLIAMSBURG, VA., MARKING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF CHIEF JUSTICE JOHN MARSHALL, SEPTEMBER 22, 1955

I deem it a great honor to address this distinguished convocation assembled at the historic College of William and Mary to honor the memory of the great Chief Justice, John Marshall.

It is always a pleasure to come to the great State so ably represented in the Senate by such outstanding statesmen as HARRY F. BYRD AND WILLIS A. ROBERTSON.

They are men of ability, courage and patriotism. Senator BYRD's resolute fight to reduce the size and cost of government, for sound fiscal policies, and the decentralization of governmental functions will long be remembered as a historic milestone in American legislative history.

In my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we recall with pride and gratitude the vast contribution made by our sister Commonwealth of Virginia to the growth and development of the American Republic.

In early Colonial times Virginians and Pennsylvanians worked and fought to uphold freedom and dignity of the individual. They fought side by side in the French and Indian Wars to establish British supremacy on the American Continent. They suffered and sacrificed together in the War for Independence.

In the War Between the States they gallantly opposed each other on many bloody battlefields. The endurance, bravery and skill of that terrible and tragic struggle have never been equaled. Both sides fought with sublime valor for the cause in which they believed.

Yes, there is patriotic inspiration for every American in the proud history of the Old Dominion State, for traditional love of individual freedom and her firm allegiance of the ideals of liberty and independence.

Those sacred principles were woven into the fabric of our national existence by Virginia's illustrious sons. They were preserved and strengthened by the blood and sacrifice of her heroes.

Here the first permanent English settlement was established. Here the first representative legislative body in the New World was convened.

Here were taken the first courageous steps by American colonists in defiance of tryanny.

Here at Yorktown the heroes and patriots of the Revolution achieved final triumph over the armed might of the greatest power of that day.

The glory of Virginia shines forth brilliantly in such honored and revered names as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Madison, James Monroe, George Mason, John Marshall, and those gallant soldiers, Robert E. Lee and Stonewall Jackson. Your many historic shrines and churches are rich in association with the glories of America.

Every American is proud of Virginia, today as always, a stronghold of self-reliance, a magnificent center of culture, and the home of deep religious devotion.

From the halls of this venerable college great leaders have gone forth to brilliant success in the service of their State and the Nation.

Three Presidents of the United States—Thomas Jefferson, James Monroe, and John Tyler—are among its distinguished alumni. It was here that John Marshall came to prepare for his outstanding legal career, attending a brief course of lectures given by the great scholar, jurist, and patriot, George Wythe.

Since it was established by royal charter in 1693, the College of William and Mary has made its influence felt in State and national history. How fortunate we are that it has survived numerous difficulties and stands today as a strong, vigorous, dynamic institution, combining the beloved traditions of its glorious past with the forward-looking, progressive spirit of these modern times.

In observing the bicentennial of the birth of John Marshall we pay tribute to a hero of war and peace.

As a soldier he placed his life in the balance in the cause of American independence. As a jurist he blazed a broad trail through the jungle of legal complexities so that succeeding generations might find the way to security and stability.

The enduring landmarks he erected will everlastingly guide Americans to a full measure of individual freedom under our system of constitutional government.

When John Marshall began his long and brilliant tenure as the fourth Chief Justice, the Supreme Court had been in existence 12 years.

Up to that time the Court had not yet advanced to its rightful place of importance in the system of government established by the Constitution. By 1791, when the Court moved from New York to Philadelphia, 2 of the 6 original Justices appointed by Washington had left the bench to take more attractive posts in their own States. Shortly thereafter, Chief Justice John Jay resigned to become Governor of New York.

So lightly was the Supreme Court regarded in relation to the other branches of the Government that John Jay refused the offer of President John Adams to return him to the Chief Justiceship. He declared that the Supreme Court lacked "the energy, weight, and dignity which are essential to its affording due support to the National Government."

The achievements of John Marshall stand out with dazzling brilliance because it was from this low point that he raised the Supreme Court to power and majesty as the guardian and interpreter of the Constitution. His invincible logic breathed life and vigor into the fundamental law and made it an unconquerable force for the protection of individual liberty.

The unparalleled growth and progress of the United States is proof of the wisdom of the Founding Fathers in establishing a government which placed the executive, legis-

lative, and judicial branches on an equal footing, limited in their powers to those specifically granted in the Constitution.

The men who framed the fundamental law were men of deep learning and broad experience. Of the 55 members of the Constitutional Convention, 38 were lawyers. Others had served as State governors and as chief justices in their State courts. They were familiar with the long struggle for human freedom. They had a thorough appreciation of the blessings of liberty which they sought to secure for themselves and their posterity. They knew from their profound study of history that government can become oppressive. They recognized that usurpation of power by the executive or the legislature could encroach upon the liberties of the people and could destroy freedom of the individual.

The experience of the American Colonies in that regard had been set forth in the Declaration of Independence as one of the grievances against King George III, which stated, and I quote:

"He has made judges dependent on his will alone for the tenure of their offices and the amount and payment of their salaries."

Therefore, they sought to erect safeguards against that danger by creating an independent judiciary that would stand as a bulwark of the citizen, protecting the rights granted to him by the Constitution against the power of government.

They wrote into the Constitution the provision that judges of the Supreme and inferior courts of the United States shall hold their offices during good behavior and that their compensation shall not be diminished during their continuance in office.

Thus the courts and the judges who composed them were placed beyond the reach of political pressure, free to guard the liberties of the people, to protect the constitutional rights of the humblest citizen against violation by the Government itself, by the Congress, or the Chief Executive.

John Marshall's fame will endure forever because he expounded the doctrine that the Supreme Court is the final interpreter of the Constitution, with complete authority to declare null and void any act of Congress which does not come within the powers granted by the Constitution.

Marshall's rule for testing the constitutionality of legislative enactment is well known, but I think it should be impressed upon the minds of every member of every law-making body.

In his decision on the case of *McCullough* v. *Maryland*, we find this formula, and I quote:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

It was in this case that the great Chief Justice gave expression to the observation which is perhaps more widely quoted than any other:

"The power to tax is the power to destroy."

Another quotation from John Marshall is worthy of everlasting preservation as expressing the supreme importance of an independent judiciary.

It is, of course, well known to this audience, but I feel it is worth repeating.

It came in debate during the Virginia convention, 1829–31, and I quote:

"Advert, sir, to the duties of a judge. He has to pass between the Government and the man whom the Government is prosecuting; between the most powerful individual in the community and the poorest and most unpopular.

"It is of the last importance that in the exercise of these duties, he should observe the utmost fairness. Need I press the necessity of this? Does not every man feel that his own personal security and the security of his property depends on that fairness?

"The judicial department," Marshall continued, "comes home in its effects to every man's fireside. It passes on his property, his reputation, his life, his all. Is it not to the last degree important that he should be rendered perfectly and completely independent, with nothing to influence or control him but God and his conscience?"

Let us review, in brief outline, the influences that shaped the career of John Marshall. His youth was spent in the wilderness of the Virginia frontier. His early home was a typical log cabin of the backwoodsman. There was little opportunity for him to gain an education, but he absorbed the few books that came into his hands.

For nearly 6 years he was a soldier in the Revolution, rising to the rank of captain. He fought at Brandywine, Germantown, Monmouth, and Stony Point. He endured the cruel hardships of Valley Forge in the bitter winter of 1777–78.

His experience in the War for Independence strengthened his patriotic love for America. It implanted deep into his consciousness the hope that out of the struggle and sacrifice of the Revolution there would emerge, not a mere collection of States, but a united nation, and a government "competent to its preservation."

This feeling he so well described many years later in his autobiographical letter to his good friend and associate, Joseph Story, in which he wrote:

"* * * I am disposed to ascribe my devotion to the Union, and to a government competent to its preservation, at least as much to casual circumstances as to judgment.

"I had grown up at a time when the love of the Union, and the resistance to the claims of Great Britain, were the inseparable inmates of the same bosom; when patriotism and a strong fellow feeling with our suffering fellow citizens of Boston were identical; when the maxim, 'United we stand, divided we fall,' was the maxim of every orthodox American.

"And I had imbibed these sentiments so thoroughly that they constituted a part of my being. I carried them with me into the army, where I found myself associated with brave men from different States, who were risking life and everything valuable in a common cause, believed by all to be most precious; and where I was confirmed in the habit of considering America as my country, and Congress as my Government."

Schooled in the stern realities of war Marshall entered upon his career at the law which was to contribute so greatly to the preservation of the Constitution and the greatness of the United States.

With no formal legal training except the course of law lectures which he attended here for a period of several months, he gained admission to the bar of Virginia.

His success was immediate, not only in the courts, but in political affairs. He served in the legislature and gave strong support to the ratification of the Federal Constitution.

The qualities of leadership which he possessed brought him into prominence as a champion of the Federalist cause in Virginia. He defended the policies of Federal Government under Washington and the strong financial measures of Alexander Hamilton.

A brief venture into diplomacy brought him a measure of national fame as a member of the XYZ mission to France.

It was at the urging of George Washington that Marshall agreed to become a candidate for Congress in 1798. He was elected, but before he had completed his term President John Adams appointed him Secretary of War, but Marshall declined. Adams then named him Secretary of State, which he accepted and continued in office for a month after he took the oath as Chief Justice.

He was then 45 years of age and had never filled a judicial office.

Thus it became his responsibility to expound the Constitution in the most critical period of its history. It was given to him to preside over the Supreme Court when it was called upon to decide four cases of vital importance: *Marbury* v. *Madison*, *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, *Cohens* v. *Virginia*, and *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*.

In each of these cases it was Chief Justice Marshall who wrote the opinion of the Court. In each case the continued existence of the Federal system, established by the Constitution, depended on the action of the Court. In each case the Court adopted a principle which is generally considered to be essential to the preservation of the United States as a Federal state.

Now for a moment let us consider some of the dangers that confront us as a Nation and some steps that we can take to defend America. Let us do this with the same unselfish courage that John Marshall met the fundamental issues of his day.

1. We have too much public and private debt. It now reaches the staggering figure of more than $600 billion.

2. Some taxes are almost at the level of confiscation. Thirty percent of gross income is a very high price to pay for self-government.

3. The rapid increase in the size of government is alarming. The payroll of Government employees is greater than all the steel mills of this Nation and twice that of the railroads. There is too much duplication in Government.

4. Local government is self-government. It is home rule. It should be preserved and strengthened. Local government should have adequate taxes under its own control to maintain its proper functions. Grants from the higher level of Government to the lower level mean some loss of local contol, which is not good or economical.

5. We must keep each of the three levels of Government in a sound fiscal position through balanced budgets, equitable taxation and honest service. Excessive debt destroys the purchasing power of the dollar.

6. Our people must realize that Government cannot assure security. That depends upon the individual. Government has nothing to give except that which is first given to it by the people.

7. A republic to survive must have a citizenship of high morals and a deep appreciation of the meaning of free government. The decay of character through dishonorable efforts, even within the bounds of law, can soon destroy the strongest republic.

A republic can be no stronger than the virtues of its people. Corruption in Government and the failure of people to take part in their Government are more dangerous than those who plot against the Government.

8. Unbridled emotionalism is destructive and means the end of orderly governmental procedure. John Milton said that order is "Heaven's first law". Unbridled emotionalism makes a republic an easy prey for designing demogogs. They operate by inflaming the masses and by organizing dangerous pressure groups. They promise things which can only be given by endangering the stability of the Government.

9. We must all appreciate the orderly procedure that the Founding Fathers conceived in our Constitution. The people themselves cannot legislate. In a republic they select their legislators but the legislator cannot administer. The administrator or executive cannot judge. This is left for the third branch of Government, the judicial. None but those strongly imbued with American ideals and principles should be given these places of honor and trust.

To avoid these dangers every American must be on guard and have the courage of John Marshall. He must understand Ameri-

canism and be proud to say: "I am an American."

In this day and age when human freedom is being blotted out in large areas of the world, every American should acknowledge, in praise and gratitude, our debt to John Marshall.

Because of his wisdom and courage generations far into the future will enjoy the blessings of government of laws and not of men.

No dictator will arise amongst us so long as we are guided by the philosophy of individual freedom expounded by the great Chief Justice.

Because of his strength and character every American, regardless of his station in life, will forever be secure in his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Founding Fathers, among whom Virginia was so ably represented, held these rights to be of Divine origin, the most precious gift bestowed upon mankind by Almighty God.

Let us live by that doctrine.

Let us be ever ready to uphold and defend the Constitution, as did John Marshall, and America will go on to a greater glory under God, true to its destiny as a free Nation of free men, with liberty and justice for all.

United States Aid for Russians and Chinese?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Aid for Russians and Chinese?" written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AID FOR RUSSIANS AND CHINESE?—UNDERWRITING MERE VICTIMS OF DICTATORS SEEMS TO BE COMING BACK INTO VOGUE

(By Constantine Brown)

The vision of politicians in Washington in this election year is necessarily obscured by what they think might appeal to their particular electors.

The voices of a handful of legislators who last spring and summer were loud in advocating some form of coexistence as a cure-all for our international troubles have been muted since the last Geneva meeting. There has been, however, a recent revival of their demands that the administration dip into the pockets of the taxpayers and give assistance to the wanting nations regardless of their government's attitude in the cold war.

In keeping with these views, Secretary of State Dulles this week overruled International Cooperation Administrator Hollister and restored $10 million in economic help to India which had been cut off as unnecessary.

The principle which is guiding the Secretary and a number of legislators in the matter of assistance to the so-called underdeveloped countries is that the peoples themselves cannot be made responsible for the actions of their political leaders.

Mr. Dulles knows better than anybody else how many headaches Prime Minister Nehru and his Ambassador at Large Krishna Menon have given us. But it is said that should not affect our moral obligation to help economically needy countries. The majority of Senators who intend to fight President Eisenhower's program of foreign assistance for an indefinite number of years describe this policy as cockeyed. On that basis, they say, we should help the Russian and Chinese Communist regimes because the overwhelming number of Russians and Chinese are mere victims of their dictators. Statistics prove this conclusively. Out of a population of 200 million people in Russia there are less than 2 million members of the ruling party. An even smaller number of party members are among the nearly 600 million Chinese.

If the claims of the Indian Government that it wants to remain neutral in the clash between freedom and communism are accurate there should be no reason indeed for us not to help its peoples. But the neautralism of Mr. Nehru and the government to whom he dictates is mere eyewash. There has not been a single instance in the last fateful years since the outbreak of the Korean war when the Indian Premier has not sided with the Communists.

When the Communist aggression in Korea occurred in 1950 and the Security Council of the U. N. decided to intervene militarily Pakistan offered to send a full division to South Korea. The only requirement of the Karachi government was an assurance from Mr. Nehru that India would not use force to settle the Kashmir question while the best Pakistani troops were fighting Communist aggression. This promise should have been easily given by the peace-minded Nehru. But he refused to do so and we were deprived at a crucial moment of the assistance of some 10,000 combat-ready troops.

If the proposed assistance program were to confine itself to sending agricultural surpluses out of the country there could be no objection. But the planners are thinking in terms of give-aways either in actual cash or materials with a strong marketable value.

The fact that a country prefers to be neutral in the present conflict of powers has not deterred us in the past and will not now deter us from giving needed economic help. When Marshal Tito was kicked out of the Comintern and was threatened by aggression from Communist satellites at his borders we rushed assistance although he told us frankly that we must not expect him to give up his Communist beliefs or his neutral position. More than $1.5 billion was invested in Yugoslavia. All the same we were made political suckers by the Red marshal. He is now throwing his weight around and is organizing so-called neutral blocs in the Arab areas. These blocs—momentarily neutral—will eventually be of utmost assistance to the plans of the men in Moscow and Peiping.

Discussions in the House and Senate cloakrooms indicate that the majority of the men in Congress believe that continued American foreign assistance is unavoidable. But they want the taxpayers' money to be dispensed for the best interests of the United States. This means a plan of selective assistance only to the countries which are our real friends or whose neutrality is beyond question. There are few in the latter category. Switzerland or Sweden are the only ones in Europe and they neither need nor ask American help. Indonesia might possibly qualify in southeast Asia although the Communists have made important strides in that former Dutch colony and the Jakarta Government has been reluctant in the past to accept our offerings.

Public Transit in the District of Columbia Faces Many Hurdles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the enclosed article entitled "Public Transit in the District of Columbia Faces Many Hurdles," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 15, 1956. I would like to state that this article proves exactly the point I have made an effort to prove to the Public Utilities Commission and the District Commissioners for the past 8 months.

I was absolutely opposed to the Senate bill which canceled the Capital Transit franchise and also the seizure feature that appeared in the Senate bill. The House conferees were successful in having the seizure feature of the bill deleted in conference; however, the cancellation feature was retained in the bill.

I personally believe that Congress should repeal the provisions of the act that passed during the last few minutes of the 1st session of the 84th Congress canceling the Capital Transit franchise in order to give the District Commissioner ample time to secure additional bids from private interests to operate the streetcars and buses here in the District of Columbia. It is extremely regrettable that certain parties of Capitol Hill, the Public Utilities Commission, and the District Commissioners opposed the bill which passed the House and accepted certain features of the Senate bill which is calculated to deprive the city of Washington of any public transportation after midnight, August 14.

The article follows:

PUBLIC TRANSIT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FACES MANY HURDLES

(By William Hines)

Publicly owned transit seems to be in the cards for the District of Columbia. The only questions now are what kind of public operation, when, and how much it will cost—both in first cost and later, when it gets rolling.

This primary fact and these questions gained the center of the stage a fortnight ago when District officials plumped for public operation of transit as the only practical possibility left.

They made their pitch in letters to Congress December 30 after a predicted queue of ready, willing, and able successors to Capital Transit failed to materialize outside the District Building door. They left the door open, of course, in case a prospect might come around, but this now appears a slim possibility indeed.

Meanwhile, District officials are working closely with Blyth & Co., a leading securities firm, to prepare legislation for a public transit authority which would initially finance itself either by a Government loan or by sale of bonds to private interests, or both, and would support itself by revenues out of the fare box.

Such a setup will require congressional enactment and Presidential approval.

If Congress does not act, and things remain as they are today, mass transit in Washington will cease at midnight, August 14, when Capital Transit dies.

Before Congress can act, there is a long legislative road ahead. And even if, by some miracle, Congress should pass a public transit law tomorrow and the President should sign it Tuesday, there is serious doubt whether the authority would be in shape to operate 8 months hence.

WHAT IS IN STORE FOR DISTRICT RIDERS?

What will Washingtonians do if August 14 passes without a new law?

The answer seems to be: The same thing they did between July 1 and August 22, 1955—walk.

Eventually, according to plan, there will be public operation of transit here. Public Utilities Commission Chairman George E. C. Hayes and District Commissioner Samuel Spencer urged Congress on December 30 to take steps creating a public transit authority. Mr. Spencer outlined the general nature of the authority and Mr. Hayes gave a specific hint about it by saying:

"In Cleveland, Chicago, and Toronto public authorities provide modern, efficient, progressive and financially sound mass transportation services."

Mr. Spencer told Congress that legislative spadework was being done by Blyth & Co. The commissioner explained that the new authority, if created, would "be financed through the sale of its own revenue bonds without pledging the credit of the United States or of the District of Columbia."

It is understood that the Blyth draft of legislation will be modeled on the statute creating and governing the Chicago Transit Authority, which Blyth also helped write.

To see how the transit systems of Cleveland, Chicago, and Toronto operate, the Star sent a representative to those cities. In summary, here is what he found:

When proponents of public transit speak of privately financed, publicly operated, completely self-sustaining systems, they are talking about the unicorn. There ain't no such animal. Cleveland, Chicago, and Toronto all are subsidized rather heavily. In the two United States cities the subsidy takes the form of substantial tax relief—meaning that the taxpayers make up to the city treasury what the transit authority does not pay in taxes. In Toronto, the subsidy is in the form of an outright grant of cash by the municipal government to defray transit's annual deficit.

When public operation comes, rapid transit is normally not far behind. One of the Nation's top public operators says frankly that as long as he was a private transit executive he never mentioned subways, but that when he entered public service he immediately started plumping for high-speed, off-street rail lines.

When rapid transit comes to town, the public authority is willing to operate it, but loath to pay for it. In all three cities, rapid transit expansion is contingent on public construction of lines out of general tax revenues.

Public authorities insist on complete authority to regulate fares and services, with no veto power by any other government agency. This is not just a personality quirk of public operators—it is something that lenders insist on before they will buy bonds, because the only real backing for the securities is the money dropped in the fare box by passengers. Even the United States Government, in the person of the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation, insisted on transit board autonomy.

Public operation does not necessarily mean improved service or cheaper service than a community can get under private operation. Except for the speed of rapid transit, the service in Cleveland and Chicago is no better than Capital Transit Co. offers in Washington. Toronto has superb service on all lines—and operates at a $2.5-million-a-year loss.

Public transit authorities tend to branch out into subsidiary endeavors, such as parking-lot operation. These frequently compete not only with private enterprise, but also with other municipal facilities.

Transit riding is falling off in public-authority cities just as it is here. Only in Toronto are riders increasing in number, and there the rise is only one-third of 1 percent over last year.

And finally, there is the danger that when a public authority gains autonomy, it becomes no more responsive to public demand than does a private corporation.

Here, in more detail, is what the Star found in each of the three cities:

Cleveland—"lowest fare in United States" is claimed, but this is misleading; vaunted new rapid transit line hasn't caught on as predicted; county will spend $32 million in tax money so the subway can "come to town"; vital statistics are concealed, but rising costs are plainly outstripping revenues; outright city subsidy is conceded to be an eventual possibility.

The Cleveland Transit System was the child of a private transit mess dating from depression times. The franchise of the Cleveland Railway Co. expired in 1935, and the city set about trying to take over the ill-equipped property. Almost 7 years later, on April 28, 1942, the city took over the company's properties.

The deal cost the city $14.5 million, which was obtained through a $17.5 million issue of 3¾ percent, 20-year mortgage revenue bonds marketed to private investors. As a municipal issue, these bonds were tax-free, but the faith and credit (taxing power) of Cleveland was not pledged as security.

First a city department and then a three-man board answerable to the mayor, CTS became a completely autonomous five-man authority in 1949. The changeover was required by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation before RFC would lend $29.5 million. RFC did not want a politician's veto power hanging over the fare-setting functions of CTS.

TWENTY-FOUR THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS FOR MANAGER

The system's five members are appointed by the mayor for staggered 5-year terms, one term expiring each year. The chairman receives $10,000 a year, other members, $7,500 each. Operations are under the general manager, Donald C. Hyde, who frequently comes to Washington as a public transportation consultant. He receives $24,500 a year, which is second only to the mayor's $25,000 among governmental salaries in Cleveland.

CTS employs a labor force of about 3,500, all under a civil-service type merit system administered exclusively by the transit board and entirely separate from the city civil service.

About 2,100 CTS employees are operators, organized under the same AFL union that has a contract in Washington. The top rate for operators is $2 an hour, the same as in Washington. This contract will expire July 1.

CTS and the union have an arbitration agreement, since workers are forbidden by State law to strike against public utilities. The last award, made by arbitration, was followed within 30 days by a fare increase.

Cleveland transit men say they have the lowest local fare of any big city in the United States. This is literally true, but misleading, because Cleveland's complicated fare structure forces most riders to pay more than the minimum. In 1954, when the basic local fare was 15 cents, the average rider seems to have paid 18.1 cents. An average ride today probably costs over 20 cents. Most passengers pay 21 cents a ride, and a large number pay even more.

Exact information about CTS traffic volume is difficult to obtain, because CTS does not report such basic vital statistics as the number of revenue passengers. Virtually all other big city transit systems make such reports, but there is no power in Cleveland to require this information from CTS.

The best figure on revenue passengers on CTS is 149 million riders in 1954—down 65 percent from 1947. The 1954 figure is about two-thirds the number carried by Capital Transit that year. The Cleveland and Washington systems serve populations of comparable size—about 1.2 million.

SURPLUS OR DEFICIT?

While CTS theoretically operates with a small surplus, this black-ink position is attributable to considerable tax relief. CTS exemption from State license plate fees, State sales tax, and Federal gas and excise taxes amounts to about $500,000 a year. If CTS had been saddled with these levies in 1954, as a private operator would have been, its balance sheet would have shown a $400,000 deficit instead of a $100,000 surplus.

Capital financing in the past has been by revenue bonds secured by mortgages on the property of the system. At the end of 1954—the last year for which a complete financial statement is available—CTS had a long-term debt of slightly over $31 million. The bulk of this was in 4 percent bonds.

Short-term financing (for the purchase of buses, etc.) is done with equipment trust certificates, paid for out of operating expenses, and therefore senior to the revenue bonds in point of servicing. In the past Cleveland has been able to obtain low rates, seven-eighths to 1¾ percent, on these certificates because of this method of servicing. Some financial men believe Cleveland would have to pay about 3 percent today.

Since March 15, 1955, CTS has had rapid transit. It stretches across town for 13 miles, much of the distance through railway yards remote from business and residential areas. An extension another 2 miles west is now planned.

RAPID TRANSIT EXPERIENCE

Originally projected to carry 100,000 passengers a day, the "Rapid" actually hauls somewhere between one-third (county engineer's estimate) to one-half (CTS' estimate) of that predicted number. This relatively light load appears due largely to the line's remoteness from the central business district. From the nearest "Rapid" stop, most downtown workers and shoppers are forced to travel on the surface from 9 to 20 blocks.

This shortcoming soon may be corrected. Voters of Cuyahoga County (roughly the metropolitan area of Cleveland) recently approved a bond issue to build a "distribution subway" in downtown Cleveland. It will carry the "Rapid" underground through the business district. The project will cost $32 million, and will be paid for not out of CTS fare boxes, but out of county taxpayers' pockets.

Cleveland transit officials are doing a high-powered and effective public relations job to lure riders out of private cars and into CTS vehicles. But, generally speaking, improvements in service at one point have been compensated for by cutbacks at other points—an absolute necessity if CTS is to break even. CTS has parking lots along the "Rapid" and offers downtown loop service from municipal lots at a 10-cent fare. But riders decrease in numbers, and fare hikes are imposed to improve the revenue position.

Costs are going up faster than revenues, however. CTS thinks there will have to be more fare increases or more tax relief. And some officials see the possibility that the city and county may eventually have to underwrite losses by direct subsidies from tax revenues. That time, however, has not yet come.

Chicago—Ninety-nine out of one hundred Chicagoans are within 3 blocks of transit—but what kind? Wages and other costs soar and riders disappear; more subways are

needed, but transit won't build them; tax-relief bag is about empty; fares are a uniform 20 cents; transit officials wonder where to go from here.

The Chicago Transit Authority has been variously described as the best of its kind in the United States and a "hydraheaded monster" with too many chiefs and too few Indians. Both descriptions have an element of truth.

Transit people, public and private, long have been trying to serve this tremendous city of 3.5 million people. They have had only lukewarm success at best. One of the predecessor companies of CTA set a bankruptcy record by staying in receivership for 21 years. By 1930, almost all Chicago's surface lines were broke. The Chicago Rapid Transit Co. was not much better off, and the only solvent operation in the city was an extra-fare bus company serving the plusher sections.

By 1945 things were so bad that the Illinois Legislature passed a law creating the Chicago Transit Authority as a "political subdivision, body politic, and municipal corporation" with authority to do virtually everything a city may do except levy taxes. In 1947 the authority bought the surface and rapid transit lines for $78 million, of which $24 million was represented by cash or new equipment bought by the predecessor companies during negotiations. This was about the only new equipment in town.

Later CTA bought out the solvent Chicago Motor Coach Co., and with minor exceptions thereby gained a monopoly on mass transportation within the city.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIVE MILLION DOLLAR BOND ISSUE

Initial purchase was made by means of $105 million in bonds secured only by farebox revenues without either public credit or CTA property being pledged. These securities, tax-free municipals like Cleveland's, paid interest at 3¼ to 3¾ percent and matured between 1953 and 1978.

New equipment has since been acquired on a tremendous scale with equipment trust certificates, of which $15 million may be outstanding at any one time. These 5-to-7-year securities pay an average of 4 percent interest, a far higher rate than Cleveland's. This is because Chicago's certificates cannot be handled as an operating expense (which they are generally conceded to be) bust must be deferred until after bonds are serviced. CTA estimates this gimmick—forced on the authority by the original lenders in 1947—costs the system one percentage point in interest, or $150,000 a year.

CTA is headed by a seven-man board appointed in a rather cocplicated way. Four members are named by the Governor of Illinois, subject to confirmation by the State senate, and three are appointed by the mayor of Chicago, subject to confirmation by city council. The Governor has the power to veto the mayor's appointments, and vice versa.

The 7 members served 7-year staggered terms, and may be reappointed. There is no political balance required by law. Six members receive $15,000 a year each and are not required to devote full time to CTA. The seventh, CTA's chairman, receives $35,000 and is prohibited from engaging in other business.

THIRTY-FIVE THOUSAND DOLLAR SALARY FOR MANAGER

Professional operating head of the system is General Manager Walter J. McCarter, who also receives $35,000 a year. Mr. McCarter, first general manager at Cleveland, joined CTA at its inception.

There is some criticism of the high-pay, full-time status of the chairman. Critics feel the system ends up with 2 heads, instead of 1 overall policy director and 1 chief executive officer.

By law, CTA is autonomous and self-governing. It may set its own fares without recourse to any other body, and acts as its own public utilities commission in establishing service schedules. It is prohibited by law from accumulating a profit or suffering a loss. If CTA starts going into the red, it must adjust fares and services; if it ends the year in the black, it must spend the money to modernize equipment.

Chicago's fares are the essence of simplicity. Adult riders pay 20 cents flat, with free transfers, for a ride anywhere inside the city limits.

To give service at actual cost, CTA has hiked its fares an average of 100 percent since the takeover in 1947.

CTA and the Amalgamated Union have an arbitration agreement which has averted strikes to date, though there is no anti-strike law in Illinois. Transit officials, however, are not overly enthusiastic about arbitration, contending that in general awards favor the union.

MOST WAGES TOP $2

There are four different hourly wage schedules for the 7,900-man operating force. Top rates on these schedules range from $1.97 to $2.10 an hour, including a 3-cent cost of living bonus. Next June 1 these rates will rise automatically to between $2.02 and $2.15.

While CTA's costs go up, surface riding is diminishing. A slight increase in rapid transit patronage fails to offset the surface decline, which means a net overall decrease. When CTA started operations in 1947, there were 1,120,000,000 dissatisfied riders on Chicago's obsolete transit vehicles. The equipment is newer now, and the riders are happier, but last year there were only 625 million of them.

CTA claims to have transit facilities within three standard blocks (⅜ mile) of 99 percent of Chicago's homes. The authority makes no claim for the excellence of all of its service, however. Quality varies from superb to practically nonexistent, and in many cases at night and on Sundays, to completely nonexistent.

MAKING ENDS MEET

Faced with rising costs and declining traffic, CTA has had to scratch to make ends meet. A direct subsidy being illegal, the alternative has been economy. These things have been done:

1. Change much of the surface equipment from 2-man to 1-man operation. Except for a couple of streetcar lines, this project has been completed.

2. Remodel rapid transit equipment so as to cut maximum operating crews from 8 men to 2. Most of this has been done.

3. Eliminate streetcars so as to free CTA from street paving and maintenance costs. Only three rail trolley lines remain.

4. Save capital outlay by drastically remodeling former streetcars for use on rapid transit lines. The bulk of this work is completed.

5. Alter service drastically at off-peak hours without actually eliminating routes. This has about reached the vanishing point.

6. Seek relief from taxes. This has now reached the stage where the tax-relief bag is about empty. CTA officials estimate that with the newest exemption, from State motor fuel taxes, the system escapes payment of about $5 million in levies each year.

COSTS HAVE BEEN CUT

So effective have been these economies that CTA officials say if they were operating today on the same basis as in 1947, costs would be about $35 million a year higher than they are.

CTA is convinced rapid transit is the cheapest and most effective way of moving people, and the authority wants to expand rapid transit services. But CTA does not intend to absorb the cost of building subways and other rights of way—and on future rapid transit lines is unwilling to pay even for the trackage and signal equipment.

Up to now, all CTA's securities have been retired on schedule or in advance, including $17 million worth of equipment trusts. What will happen if costs go up or revenues decerase further? CTA is not sure, but while there is no loud talk about city or State subsidies, it is evident that CTA officials fear conditions may some day come to that.

Arab Aid Faces Stiff Opposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Arab Aid Faces Stiff Opposition," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARAB AID FACES STIFF OPPOSITION—POLITICAL MOVES, NOT HUNGER, AT BASE OF MIDEAST PROBLEMS

(By Constantine Brown)

An American-British Marshall plan for the Arab countries to counteract the recent powerful inroads of Moscow and Peiping has been heartily indorsed by top policy advisers in the White House and State Department, where, other indications notwithstanding, it is still believed that communism takes root in economically hard-pressed countries.

Indications are, however, that the administration will have a hard fight to put over its point of view in Congress. This is despite the fact that two of the Democratic hopefuls, Adlai Stevenson and ESTES KEFAUVER, also advocate solving the world Communist problems by continued indiscriminate financial and economic support.

The reason a large number of Senators frown on the new scheme is that they doubt greatly that the spread of communism these days is due to bad economic conditions in the affected areas. They point to the spectacular victory of the Communists in France who have increased their seats in the National Assembly from 98 to 150. This was not due to economic conditions. France is today more prosperous than she was before the outbreak of World War II. Yet many of her citizens voted for the Moscow puppets.

On the other hand if the theory that communism thrives in countries where peoples are broke and desperate were accurate, Germany should have become Red in the days immediately after the war when Germans were homeless and starving. The armies of occupation were intent then on crushing naziism but they did not discourage Communist propaganda in the slightest. Yet communism made little headway either in Western or Eastern Germany.

The present conditions in the Arab countries are due to political developments and not to hunger. Egypt is better off than it was under the previous regimes. Saudi Arabia is a rich and prosperous country. Its oil resources exploited by the Arabian-American Oil Co., have helped develop the country in an unprecedented manner. Last week the Saudi Arabian government was able to lend Syria $10 million at nominal interest. Jordan is in equally good shape. And so is Syria. There is no lack of employment in

any of these countries. There is a need for technicians, which could be provided by the West to give the Arabs the necessary industrial and agricultural know-how.

The success of the Russians in the strategically vital Middle East is due to politics. The Arabs are dedicated to the eventual destruction of Israel, which they consider an alien body in Arab lands. Israel had been, until Russia injected herself into the Middle East, somewhat overconfident because it relied on Western backing and on the superior quality of its military forces.

The Soviet wedge in the Middle East was not obtained by economic but by military assistance. As soon as the U. S. S. R. announced that it was ready to provide Egypt, Syria, and all other neighbors of Israel with military equipment, these governments accepted the Kremlin's extended hand. It was from that time on that the anti-Western and especially anti-American waves began to spread.

Last week's disturbances in Jordan, when the American flag was trampled under the feet of the mob and American offices were stoned, were not the result of any economic distress. Jordan was until recently one of the staunchest supporters of the West.

The present tense situation was caused by the strong and positive foreign policy of the Soviet Union and not by her phony attempt to help economically her friends (actually the intended future victims). The rebellion against France in Morocco and Algeria is not the product of hunger and physical misery. It is definitely political. Russia injected herself skillfully among the freedom-seeking Arabs while we were passive onlookers for more than 3 years. We disavowed colonialism but did nothing to prove our disavowals. When the Moroccan nationalists, through the free Arabs, asked to present their case to the United Nations we abstained from voting lest we offend our French ally.

Despite these object lessons, from which we should have learned something, our policymakers still believe that economic and financial aid will help us solve the Middle Eastern situation which is definitely political. Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, described the State Department as sterile of ideas. And many other legislators in both parties believe with him that the giveaway policy which has cost the American taxpayers nearly $60 billion in the last 10 years is by no means the answer to our present troubles.

Ambassador John Sherman Cooper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cooper's Fine Job," published in the Washington Daily News on Thursday, January 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPER'S FINE JOB

The United States Ambassador to India, John Sherman Cooper, is coming home for consultations this month and we think he deserves a round of national applause for the job he's done the past year.

It would be hard to imagine a more difficult assignment than trying to be diplomatically and uncompromisingly nice to India's Premier Nehru in the face of his cynical attitude toward America.

But Ambassador Cooper has done that to a flawless degree. Objective reports from New Delhi, weeks after the visit of the Soviet showoffs, Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev, relate that Ambassador Cooper is as close to Mr. Nehru today as any other foreign diplomat in the Indian capital, not excluding Soviet or Red Chinese envoys.

This is all the more an agreeable surprise, considering the fact that Secretary of State John Foster Dulles made an unfortunate reference to Goa which roused Mr. Nehru at the time of the Russians' visit. And the fact that Mr. Cooper was preceded as Ambassador by the New Dealer Chester Bowles, who built up quite a reputation among the Indians by getting out among them and frequently patting Nehru on the back.

The soft-spoken Kentuckian, new to the profession of diplomacy, has carried off his task with dignity and courage. Americans can be proud of him. We never may be able to win over Mr. Nehru to anywhere near our position in the cold war. But we can be sure that under Ambassador Cooper's tenure our views will not be muted nor their exponent cowed. That, perhaps, is why Mr. Nehru respects him.

Egypt's High Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Egypt's High Dam," published in the San Francisco Chronicle of January 10, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EGYPT'S HIGH DAM

EDITOR: I have read with great care the article by Mr. Drew Pearson in the Chronicle (January 5) in which he says: "Western Congressmen plan a bitter drive against Eisenhower on the Nile dam. Their mottos is: 'What is good enough for the Nile is good enough for the Snake.' Southern Congressmen plan to oppose the Nile dam for another reason. They don't want the United States to irrigate 1,000,000 acres for competitive Egyptian cotton."

I hasten to give the following information to allay the fears expressed by Mr. Pearson:

The land to be reclaimed by the High Dam project would be largely sandy soil, not suitable for growing cotton economically. The area to be reclaimed would be less than one-third of the total Egyptian cultivated land at present.

Thus it will hardly provide for the increase in population which will take place in the 20 years required for the completion of the High Dam and the reclamation of the land.

Egyptian government policy is to encourage the production of food crops and to discourage cotton production, to avoid dependence on one crop. The area under cotton cultivation is restricted to 33 percent of the present arable land of Egypt, while the area under wheat cultivation must be at least 33 percent. The government supports wheat prices at higher levels than international wheat prices, while cotton support prices are lower than international cotton prices.

It is hoped that the fruit and vegetables to be grown on a large scale on the reclaimed land would cover not only local needs, but also provide exports to Europe. This will reduce Egypt's dependence on cotton for her foreign exchange.

The reclaimed land will ultimately be distributed to landless farmers in line with the policy which has been followed by the new regime since the adoption of the land reform program.

One cannot exaggerate the social benefits of such distribution. It is also (and this is very important for the American democracy) the only way to avoid the appearance of any subversive ideas in Egypt.

As you see, it is not true that "what is good enough for the Nile is good enough for the Snake." What is good for the Nile is good for the world.

ABDEL MONEIM EL-KHEDRY,
Consul General of Egypt, San Francisco.

Virginia's Voice on Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Virginia's Voice on Integration," which was published originally in the Wall Street Journal, and reprinted in the Greenville (S. C.) News of January 14, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA'S VOICE ON INTEGRATION

The other day the people of Virginia, by a two-thirds majority, voted to change their State constitution rather than be compelled to comply with the United States Supreme Court's segregation decision. This, it seems to us, is a voice of protest that the rest of the country should not ignore.

The Virginia protest is noteworthy in a number of respects, not the least of which is the form that it took and the manner in which it was taken.

What the Virginia people said, in effect, is that they will consider abolishing their public-school system for all practical purposes rather than submit to compulsory integration. The immediate question was whether to change their constitution so as to permit State funds to be allocated to private schools; the vote authorized the calling of a State constitutional convention for that purpose. This would not abolish the State school system. But it would permit it to be abolished in the extremity.

As a political act this may not seem as extreme as some of the other courses of action urged in the South since the Supreme Court's decision. Even in Virginia there has been a strong movement for the defiance direct to the Supreme Court's order, a declaration by the Virginia government that the Court was without power to do what it did and that therefore its action was nullified. The constitutional crisis that would rise in the Nation can be imagined.

But there is nothing trivial about this protest. A community does not contemplate the abolition of its public-school system except under great provocation. And it does not translate the protest of words

into the protest of action unless it feels the provocation intolerable.

Nor is this Virginia protest simply the voice of some rabble-rousing demagogues hoisted to power upon one suspender. Neither the governor nor the legislature, as has happened in some places, presumed to speak for the citizens; they put the question to a referendum. There was a political campaign, but there was no passionate campaign with the red shirts flying. The preelection days were so quiet they were hardly noticed in the press of other areas.

To people in other parts of the country this overwhelming vote may seem extraordinary. The educational and cultural progress of the Negro people in the past century has been so great that elsewhere many find it inexplicable that anywhere others should see an educational or cultural gulf remaining.

But however difficult for others to understand, here is impressive testimony that the people who live closest to this ancient problem do not believe it can be resolved by a Supreme Court decree which overnight threw down a long line of Supreme Court decisions under which the separate schools were built.

These people do not say "Never," the South has narrowed the gulf in every generation. What they protest is the insistence that in every place, and without regard to circumstances, the whole burden of solving the most difficult of social and political problems should be thrust upon a single generation of school children.

And unless you are to say that the entire Commonwealth of Virginia is peopled in its majority by men of less character, integrity and wisdom than the rest of us, then it is not a protest to go unheeded. It's a perilous business for a nation to thrust by force great social changes upon a part of it determined to resist.

Look Sinks to New Depths in Till Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of Look magazine contains the most unfair, vicious, vindictive, baseless, scurrilous, scathing, and libellous indictment ever labeled against a State of this Union. Its obvious purpose is to discredit the good people of the State of Mississippi and to prejudice the Nation against us.

This article, which appears under the byline of one William Bradford Huie, is a lie out of whole cloth, embellished with the products of a depraved imagination and is an act of journalistic prostitution of the lowest form. Under leave to extent my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Jackson (Miss.) State Times, under date of January 11, 1956, making reply to this deliberate and unwarranted assault on the integrity of the people of my State:

LOOK SINKS TO NEW DEPTHS IN TILL CASE

Look magazine hit new depths yesterday in the desegregation campaign being waged by certain elements.

What appears under the byline of William Bradford Huie in the current issue constitutes a flagrant, ill-founded indictment of Mississippians for the slaying of young Emmett Till last August.

The great majority of our white citizens deplore the Till murder and wanted to see justice done.

Without crediting any sources of information, Mr. Huie accuses J. W. Milam of the Till murder.

Insufficient evidence brought acquittals of Milam and his half-brother, Roy Bryant. And northern as well as southern newsmen at the trial were generally agreed the not guilty verdict was the only one possible under the law where a man is assumed innocent until proved otherwise.

Yet Mr. Huie makes the blanket assertion that the majority of Mississippi white people "either approve of big Milam's actions or else they don't disapprove enough to risk giving their enemies the satisfaction of a conviction."

By this example of opinionated, baseless reporting, Look itself pays scant recognition to the traditions of American justice it claims were ignored by Mississippians.

We're not trying to refight the Till case in all its ramifications. Moscow race progagandists are making enough of the issue now.

But the gall of any publication to imply the majority of Mississippians are barbarians must be totally and categorically condemned by fair-minded Americans of all races everywhere.

The Uncongested Friendship Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, many years have passed since it first became apparent that the Washington National Airport could not handle its enormous task as safely as it should.

When the fact was first discovered many persons began searching for another site which could be used to accommodate some of the ever-increasing traffic. The hunt has gone on and on and on. But still there is no new airstrip—only opposition from families who recoil in horror from the thought that added airplane flights or entirely new operations might be foisted upon their communities.

Now we have reached the point where we must act immediately. There is no longer time to argue. The congestion in the air, according to a recent study is critical. To keep discussing the matter would be literally to talk some unfortunate plane travelers to death.

While experts decry the overcrowded conditions here, Friendship Airport has modern facilities going unused. The situation, I feel, was summed up graphically in an editorial in the January 14 edition of the Baltimore Sun. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNCONGESTED FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT

Traffic congestion at some of the country's major airports is by now an old story. This story is repeated in part in the latest report from a special Federal Government advisory group. But there is added the warning that there is also critical congestion along some of the major airways.

The airways are the formally designated and clearly defined sky highways along which planes travel between airports. The advisory group reports planes passing within 100 feet of each other. Even a novice would readily agree that this is too close for comfort and safety.

We have no suggestions to offer on decongesting the airways. Here is a problem for the experts and those who chart the travel lanes and regulate their use. But, as to the initial question, airport congestion, we do have something to offer on the situation in the Baltimore-Washington area.

Washington's National Airport has all the traffic it can handle. Sometimes it has too much traffic. The number of scheduled flights is not static, but increasing. While this is going on, our own Friendship International Airport has traffic far short of its capacity.

The ready and easy answer to National's congestion problem is Friendship. There is no need to build a new Washington airport at Burke, Va. There is no need to intermingle armed services flights and public transportation at Andrews Field. Friendly Friendship is available with open arms, open lobby, and open runways; and it is close to both Washington and Baltimore, being just off the most modern Baltimore-Washington expressway.

Bright Spot in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial written by Mr. Herbert Lundy in the Portland Oregonian:

BRIGHT SPOT IN AGRICULTURE

Dairying was the one major branch of agriculture which showed an improvement during 1955, says the year-end report of the American Dairy Association. It is expected that when final estimates of per capita consumption of dairy foods are obtained some months hence it will be shown that the average American consumed between three and four more quarts last year than the year before.

If one more glass of milk per week had been drunk by every man, woman and child in the country there would have been no surplus at all. For that one glass per week is the equivalent of 1955 government purchases under the price-support program.

Total government buying of surplus dairy products dropped almost 50 percent below the 1954 levels despite an increase in milk production of a billion pounds. At the same time, the government disposed of more than it bought, cutting stocks to lowest levels in several years and relieving some of the downward pressure on prices.

During 1955 there was a slight improvement in prices paid for milk at the farm, and prices for milk and butterfat remained above the level set by the government for price-support purposes, says the report. What this strength in one major field means to agriculture generally can be seen when one considers that retail sales of dairy foods amounted to almost $10,000,000,000 of a total for all foods of some $66,500,000,000. The

$4,200,000,000 paid to dairy farmers was better than 14 percent of the total farm income from marketing of farm products.

If dairying had followed the general trend downward of farm prices, the farm income situation would have been much worse than it is.

What are the reasons for the improvement in this one major branch of agriculture? Vastly expanded sales promotion efforts, says the American Dairy Association. The association itself, financed entirely by dairy farmers, has greatly expanded its budget for market, nutrition and product research, for nonbrand advertising in newspapers, magazines, television and radio, and for merchandising and public relations. Brand distributors of dairy products also have expanded their promotion efforts.

The dairy industry is developing the market for its highly nutritive product which fortunately falls into the American dietary trend toward consumption of more high-protein foods. The dairy farmers have shown that they have business acumen and are not going to drag their feet.

One might ask, however, what made dairy farmers get out and sell so well in the last 2 years. It is in this period that the big effort has been made in sales promotion and it is in this period, too, that the dairy industry has moved upward out of the price-depressing accumulation of cheese, butter and dried milk surpluses.

It is significant that the change for the better came after Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson reduced the price-support level on dairy products from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. In the dairy industry record of the past two years the administration has a potent argument for the flexible support program as a stimulant for efficiency and salesmanship.

The President's Farm Message—Radio Broadcasts by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two recent radio broadcasts by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1956.

The administration yesterday rushed its farm message to Congress. It came there hurriedly even ahead of the all-important buget message and the President's economic report to the Congress. The special message contained some 8,000 words. The administration is sticking by flexible price supports, embellished with a nine-point program.

M. W. Thatcher, general manager of GTA, commented on the message in a statement appearing in this morning's newspapers. He said, first, that he found the message most encouraging in two respects: "At long last the President realizes there is a farm depression and that farm income is made in Washington. The President's message shows he also realizes that the only way to meet this problem is to increase net farm income."

Thatcher then added that, "He does not propose a single measure which would help the farm family increase its net income, as time will prove." When the President recognizes that there is a farm depression and publicly says so, there is, indeed, cause for encouragement. Just a few months ago, his advisers in the Department of Agriculture were denying this fact of life, and persisted in maintaining that it was just "a statistical depression" on the farm, and nothing more. But, now we've got the word of the President himself expressing concern over income troubles on the farm. And he has recognized the role of Washington in making farm income.

But, what's to be done about farm income? That's the crux of the situation. And, there the message is disappointingly weak. It refuses to recognize all the important relationships to farmers' income of specific farm protection measures at an adequate level. The message is designed to try to save the political hide of the President's sliding-scale price support policy. A reading of it shows the President has adopted the form and language of Farmers Union recommendations of many years standing—like the one on the soil bank—but has distorted both the purpose and proposals of most of these recommendations.

It seems apparent that this represents an attempt to use high pressure advertisting techniques on poltically popular language to obscure the real aims of the administration farm policy in this election year. It's trying to preserve sliding-scale farm policy against election year pressure. Not only does the message contain no promise of improving farm income, but it actually proposes further weakening of price-support programs. It would give a full flexing to two important basic crops—corn and rice—with their price supports reducible to zero. Now, these two crops are supported at a minimum of at least 75 percent of parity.

The President's only assurance to farmers in the all-important question of price is that after 3 or 4 more years, farmers may be able to get higher prices out of a free market—in which he intends to have no effective support program at work. Heart of the President's program is a soil bank and conservation reserve program, recommended by the Farmers Union for years, but the Farmers Union has never considered it more than a necessary supplement to a broader farm program of parity supports for farm families and a broad program of available, adequate low-cost credit.

Farm families are looking for a farm program that will bolster their sagging income, give them take-home pay that is fair in return for the contribution they make.

This is GTA, the co-op way.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1956.

The President's farm message came on Monday, and a real barrage of comment on it has been touched off all over the Nation. Farmer leaders and Washington lawmakers have been busy giving out their views. And, editorial writers have been analyzing and passing judgment. The Washington farm reporter of the Minneapolis Tribune wrote that the message received a mixed welcome in Congress, and not all the unfavorable comment came from Democrats.

"Farm-State Republicans joined," he said, "though to a lesser degree, in commenting that the programs proposed in the message would not be bold enough or big enough to cope with agriculture's immediate ills. Generally, of course, Republican Congressmen reacted more favorably than Democrats." This farm reporter then set forth what he found were prevailing impressions that could be attributed to most Midwestern Congressmen regardless of party. First impression he noted was a feeling that the amount of money which the President proposed to spend on a soil bank plan was not enough to get farmers into the plan. The President's proposed $350 million was simply too thin, and a figure of $500 to $750 million was advocated instead.

Another finding was that Members of Congress who have supported firm price supports were sticking by their guns, in spite of the President's refusal to budge from the price-flexing policies of the administration's farm law. A third impression noted had to do with the President's idea of removing corn from the list of basic commodities with supports fixed by law and permitting those supports to range right down to zero, at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. This idea found almost no favor, says the Washington reporter.

Congressman CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, is a veteran Republican lawmaker, with over 32 years of service. He's made his mark as an expert in farm legislation, and when the Republicans were in the majority in the House, he served as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. Commenting on the President's farm message, he noted that it reflected the President's "sincere, serious, and sympathetic concern with the problems confronting the farmers of this country." HOPE said he believed the President's plan for cutting surpluses were practical.

But, HOPE then put his finger on a weakness that he saw. "I am sorry," he said, "that there is nothing in the message which holds out any hope of increased farm income for 1956 when farmers need it so badly."

Another Republican, Senator THYE, of Minnesota, had some good words to say on behalf of the message, but he thought the soil bank proposal was too skimpy. THYE feels the President "has given us a tone of encouragement to be bold, where a year ago, we were threatened with a veto if we were bold."

Here's hoping that the Senator is right—that this is a call to boldness in dealing with the problems of sagging farm income. Then, let the Congress get to work and draft for the President's signature the kind of bold legislation that will do the job for the farm families of the Nation. The need is to shore up farm income right now in 1956, without further delay.

This is GTA, the co-op way.

Resolution Favoring Long-Range Highway Program Adopted by Central Illinois Section of American Society of Civil Engineers, Urbana, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the central Illinois section of the American Society of Civil Engineers at its annual meeting in Urbana, Ill., on December 20, 1955, favoring the enactment of legislation for an expanded long-range highway program, including provision for the complete construction of the national system of interstate highways in a period not to exceed 15 years.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the highway system of the United States has become increasingly vital to commerce, industry, agriculture, and mining, with more than one-seventh of the Nation's gainfully employed population engaged in highway transportation; and

Whereas an adequate highway system is vital to the national defense; and

Whereas highway inadequacies constitute a serious problem in the lives of our citizens, hampering transportation and bringing choking congestion to our towns and cities; and

Whereas these inadequacies are a prime contributing cause of traffic accidents with their toll of deaths, blighted lives and property loss; and

Whereas the highway network is now serving 61,300,000 registered vehicles compared with 30 million in 1946, with little or no increase in highway mileage and relatively little net improvement in highway conditions; and

Whereas because of mounting traffic volumes with consequent increased wear and tear on existing roads, and with long-range growth inevitable, time presses urgently; and

Whereas the present highway construction level throughout the Nation clearly has been proven inadequate in general for making a significant reductions in the accumulated highway deficiencies; and

Whereas authoritative data on highway needs and costs are available as a basis for devising sound Federal legislation in the public interest;

Whereas, with increasing traffic on all highways, the national system of interstate highways has emerged as the key network, carrying some 14 percent of all highway traffic on 1½ percent of the highway mileage and interconnecting the various regions and principal cities; and

Whereas while hitherto the States from their limited funds have contributed to the national system of interstate highways included in their highway networks, the possibility of greatly increased Federal participation both in amount and on a proportionate basis has created a state of indecision delaying further construction on this system: Be it therefore

Resolved by the central Illinois section of the American Society of Civil Engineers at its annual meeting in Urbana, Ill., on this 20th day of December 1955—

That the Congress of the United States enact legislation for an expanded long-range highway program, including provision for the complete construction of the national system of interstate highways in a period not to exceed 15 years;

That, in determining the details of this program and its financing, the problem be weighed in terms of the broad public interest, without regard to partisanship or self-seeking special interests, but rather boldly and with the knowledge that a direct and far-seeing approach is vital if a fair and equitable solution is to be found in the interest of all;

That a definite program of financing be enacted to permit orderly advance planning, preparation of necessary rights-of-way and construction;

That financing be on such a basis that complete rather than disconnected segments of needed new facilities can be brought to active construction and completion quickly, in order to provide the full benefit of efficient transportation;

That on determining the Federal highway program, special emphasis be given to the necessity of developing the national system of interstate highways to the highest engineering standards with full control of access to insure utmost transportation efficiency; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be supplied to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, representing the geographical area covered by the central Illinois section, American Society of Civil Engineers, in the State of Illinois.

Our Postal Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article in regard to post office operations, written by Hon. Arthur Summerfield, Postmaster General, and published in the January 1956 issue of Nation's Business.

The Post Office Department, with its over 500,000 employees, handles over 50 billion pieces of mail annually. Under the very able direction of Postmaster General Summerfield, much modernization has taken place and many improvements have been made. As a result of congressional action last year, through passage of the increased pay and reclassification act, morale among the employees has been greatly improved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States Post Office Department has a new look—and a new spirit.

The new look is dramatized by the eye-catching red, white, and blue colors which now modernize mail boxes and postal trucks.

But the improvements taking place in the postal establishment—which serves more of our citizens more intimately and more frequently than any other Government department—are far more fundamental and much more significant than this new color scheme.

Never before have the post offices of the United States handled so much mail volume, so quickly, so efficiently, so economically.

Deficits are lower. The postal deficit of $362,700,000 for the 1955 fiscal year is less than half of the alltime high reported deficit of $727 million for fiscal 1952.

When our team of executives recruited from industry assumed responsibility for the management of the Post Office Department January 20, 1953, we found:

The post office had no certified public accountants on its payroll although its financial transactions exceeded $20 billion a year.

There was no modern personnel department to meet the needs of 500,000 employees.

No training program was being used.

The salary structure contained innumerable inequities and offered no real incentives for advancement to supervisory positions.

Although the Post Office Department handled more than 50 billion pieces of mail annually, it had no materials-handling engineers.

The worst highway safety record in Government.

No public information services were being used to help the public help itself to better mail service or to provide communication channels between management and employees.

No basic review of its transportation policies and methods had been made in 25 years.

Nearly 40,000 postmasters reported directly to Washington on even the most trivial problems.

Management control tools and methods were so completely lacking that when I first called for a financial report on the previous months' operations, I was told that such data would not be available for 18 months; that such reports were considered historical documents and never intended for management control purposes.

In 3 years the Post Office Department has been overhauled and reorganization is nearly complete.

Tried and proven concepts of modern business management have been introduced and the results are becoming increasingly apparent to the public.

The faster, more efficient, and more economical mail service is due in part to these improvements.

Mailers and postal patrons benefit from more than 70 changes in procedures. Post offices in most major cities are open longer and mail is collected later. More than 5,000 city letter carrier routes are being added annually. Modern rural delivery service is being expanded constantly. New services are being added—and others simplified. The new certified mail provides important benefits of registered mail, including proof of delivery, at lower cost. A new money order procedure eliminates forms and reduces time spent in line. New pamphlets help the public help itself to better mail service.

The internal procedures of handling money, bookkeeping, and finanical reporting have been greatly streamlined. Payrolls are being handled by modern punchcard checks and equipment in 15 centralized locations. The daily task of processing and accounting for 1,500,000 paid money order forms is centralized in the new Kansas City Money Order Center which will ultimately use the most modern electronic equipment. Simpler financial procedures generally will achieve a total reduction of 5,000 positions from the overhead. This program relieves postmasters of unnecessary paper work, gives them modern business methods, and enables them to concentrate on the major job of moving the mail.

A nationwide safety program has already reduced motor vehicle accidents from 13 to 8 per 100,000 miles. Even better results are anticipated.

Broader and better use is being made of all types of transportation by employing the one best equipped to do the individual job speedily, efficiently, and economically. This means expanded use of trucks and tractor-trailers, bus lines, highway-post offices, and air cargo carriers; using the unused space on scheduled airliners for the experimental movement of 3-cent mail; a better coordination with railroad operations; and revision of schedules to deliver the mail on the day it arrives at destination-post offices.

With the opening soon of the Wichita, Kans., Regional Office, postal operations will be decentralized into 15 regions and 91 districts, and operated on a home-rule basis.

The first coordinated progressive personnel program in the Department's history has been established. The installation of a sound salary structure, based on position evaluation, provides 508,000 postal employees with fair wages, incentive to advance in the career service, and compensation related directly to duties performed.

The Department has leased more than 900 new postal buildings, valued at approximately $45,000,000, through its commercial leasing activities from January, 1953, to Nov. 15, 1955. The new lease-purchase program by which buildings are bought out of rent, includes 27 further projects approved as of Nov. 15, 1955. This will create $14,000,000 in new construction. Both programs use the financing and construction capacity of private industry.

Close cost control has been established over the 85,000 motor vehicles the Post Office Department uses (of which 25,000 are owned by the government). Postmasters are charged for the use of this equipment and personnel to make them cost-conscious. A Post Office Department fleet is being developed consisting of four basic standard production-line trucks which will do the same job better than the seven types of special built, often hand-made vehicles

formerly purchased. The estimated savings are 20 percent in purchase prices and 20 percent or more in operating cost.

Practical training programs aimed at improving personnel and mail service—involving ten courses of instruction ranging from tying bundles of letter mail to executive development—have been launched. The Suggestions and Incentive Awards program has been modernized, and the Department received, in 20 months ending Nov. 15, 1955, double the number of employe suggestions offered in the previous five years, with savings estimated at $2,261,000. Uniforms are being redesigned, standardized and brightened effective this month, although employes having garments of the previous design in good condition will be permitted to wear them until January, 1957.

Unnecessary service units are being eliminated. Approximately 3,000 small post offices have been closed, at a saving of more than $4,000,000, with the patrons generally getting better service through rural delivery.

Practical experiments and research are being carried on continuously. Those now under way include: 1, a variety of motorized conveyances for city carriers; 2, an automatic mail facing machine; 3, automatic sorting by electronic scanning; 4, self-service equipment for post office lobbies; and, 5, mechanical parcel post sorting.

The first nationwide effort to attract desirable new career employees into the postal service was launched in December 1955. Display posters in 10,000 post offices and on 16,000 Air Force recruitment billboards in 3,000 communities are being used for a 30-day period, outlining salaries and benefits of postal employment.

Despite the progress made in modernizing the mail service and reducing its cost, the Post Office Department faces two serious problems.

One is the inadequacy and the deterioration of its physical plant. Many post offices were built 50 or even more years ago. Far too many of our postal facilities are badly rundown, outgrown, outmoded.

In some larger cities, facilities are so inadequate that mail is sorted outside post office on the sidewalks or in the alleys, rain or shine. At numerous points, trucks cannot squeeze into the small post office loading and unloading areas. Many post offices and mail terminals are dingy, badly in need of renovation and better lighting, and completely lacking in modern equipment to speed mail distribution.

To correct these conditions will take time and money. We cannot continue to ignore these needs, particularly since they grow increasingly worse as the mail volume of this dynamic and growing country is constantly increasing. It is now 45 percent greater in volume that it was 10 years ago.

The other and more serious problem concerns the fiscal plight of the Post Office Department. The postal deficit accumulated since World War II—during a period of unprecedented prosperity—has now reached $4,600,000,000 and is costing taxpayers more than $100 million a year in interest alone.

Despite the efficiencies and economies we have been able to make, the Post Office Department now faces a yearly deficit of about $500 million. Nearly $200 million of this is the cost of the recently enacted pay raises and other employee benefits.

Basically, our failure to operate on a more nearly break-even basis is due to the fact that postage rates today are essentially the same as they were in 1932. Meanwhile, the cost of nearly everything the Department buys or uses has more than doubled, as have most household or business expenses.

That is why we are recommending moderate increases in postage rates on first-, second-, and third-class mail to Congress.

We believe Congress and the American people appreciate the need for reasonable rate increases so that their Post Office Department may improve its services and facilities and operate on a self-supporting basis as do the postal establishments of most major nations. Our neighbor, Canada, for example, has shown losses in only 3 of the past 20 years with an over-all surplus for these 2 decades of $89,523,932.

Many Members of Congress have polled their constituents on this question of postage rates. So has the Post Office Department. In all parts of the country, the people queried indicated that they favor, usually by margins of at least 3 to 1, increasing postal rates to make the Post Office Department self-supporting. Public opinion here is apparently no different than in Europe where competent observers state that a postal deficit would not be tolerated.

If these rate increases are granted, we can complete the job the Post Office Department set out to accomplish nearly 3 years ago—provide better service—lower costs—reduce the postal deficit—and operate on a break-even basis.

Then the Post Office Department can provide the most efficient service possible to meet the constantly expanding needs of this most prosperous Nation on earth.

Good Times: Can They Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the December 1955 issue of the National Voter, monthly publication of the League of Women Voters of the United States, contains the following explanatory article on league procedure. I am pleased to call it to the attention of our colleagues:

GOOD TIMES: CAN THEY LAST?

As you fight your way through crowds of Christmas shoppers, comfort yourself that you are enjoying the zenith of American prosperity. Never were the people of the United States, as a whole, better off than in 1955. More things have been produced and more have been bought by consumers than ever before—more food, more houses, more automobiles, more furniture, more clothing, more gadgets. Of course the population has increased, but incomes and spending have increased even more.

This spending is by individuals for things to enjoy here and now, in contrast to the two recent periods of high spending caused by Government demands in wartime and speculative building up of inventories after Korea. The persistent demand by consumers for all kinds of "the good things of life" has stimulated high industrial activity and, in turn, active industry has meant full employment, high earnings, and high profits. At the same time the cost of living has remained remarkably stable. Is it too good to be true? Can it last?

SOME INEQUALITIES

Unfortunately, not everybody is equally well off. Some regions have suffered from declining industries as well as from hurricanes and floods. Farmers as whole have done poorly. There are large farm surpluses and total farm income has declined steadily since 1951; in the third quarter of 1955 it was a billion dollars less than in the same period of 1954. Most of our fundamental industries, however, are booming and yielding high earnings both to employees and stockholders.

These contrasts are concealed in the averaging of prices of all kinds of products to measure the price level. While both retail and wholesale price levels have remained relatively stable at 10 percent above the 1947–49 level, the prices of farm products have been about 10 percent below that level and those of metals and metal products have risen to over 40 percent above. Rubber and rubber products are even higher, and lumber and paper products are far above the average relative to the early postwar period.

DEMAND NEXT YEAR

The pressure of demand seems to be exceeding the capacity to produce some of these materials. "Never can the mills seem to roll enough steel," says Business Week. Yet higher demands are forecast for next year. The plans of the automobile companies add up to about 9 million cars for 1956 compared with 8 million this year. While shortages of building materials are reported in many places, the volume of contracts for new construction remains close to the peak. There is still need for more housing for low-income groups, and the shortage of school buildings for all the little Johns and Marys is worrying parents everywhere. Business plans for new plants and equipment in 1956, meaning more demand for steel, lumber, and cement, are 13 percent higher than in 1955. Moreover, there is pressure for more defense spending by the Federal Government and for spending by local governments for public works of various kinds.

Will this pressure of demand not mean still higher prices for raw materials? Will this not be translated into higher retail prices? Will this, in turn, lead to a higher cost of living, higher wages, higher production costs, higher prices, until we are caught in the too-well-known inflationary spiral? This sort of inflation, whether slow or fast, is the permanent dread of those who live on relatively fixed incomes, and in fact of all those who look ahead to living on pensions, life insurance, and the interest on long-term bonds.

Financial and monetary authorities of the Government have responded to this threat of inflation. The Treasury has been cold to proposed tax reductions, which would mean more money to spend for things which are already in short supply. The use of Government and reserve bank credit to expand demand has been restrained.

CREDIT AND SAVINGS

Credit has been said to be the lifeblood of modern industry. People who need or want to buy things now borrow the savings of others who are building up a surplus for future needs. An easy flow of savings to borrowers through banks and other credit institutions has helped keep national income high. The greatly increased spending in 1955 seems to be particularly related to the growth of installment buying and of mortgage credit. It is estimated that consumers owed over $26 billion of installment loans in September 1955—double the amount in 1950. The amount of debt for the purchase of automobiles alone has increased $3 billion so far this year. The total volume of outstanding real-estate mortgages was $101 billion at thet end of 1953, $113 billion at the end of 1954, and $126 billion at the end of September 1955.

While these types of borrowing have increased at an unprecedented rate, the rate of accumulation of savings, which ultimately supply funds for borrowing, has declined. The figures compiled by the Department of Commerce indicate that while the total personal income of the people of the United States reached a peak in the third quarter of this year, their personal savings were actually less than the average in 1953, 1952, or even in 1951, when their level of income after taxes was $45 billion less than it is now. This, perhaps, helps to explain why mortgage money is hard to get and why

mortgageholders have been turning to the commercial banks for loans on their mortgages. Added to the increased demand for short-term credit from the banks, this has contributed to the growth of bank loans and higher interest rates.

ANTI-INFLATIONARY MOVES

Government authorities have reacted to this situation by discouraging increased resort to Government agencies for credit or the guaranties of credit. The Home Loan Bank Board, for example, has acted to restrain the borrowing of savings and loan associations from the home-loan banks. The Veterans' Administration has shortened the terms of mortgages which it will guarantee. Four times this year the Federal Reserve Board, sometimes called the "trustee of the purchasing power of the dollar," has approved the raising of the interest rate at which Federal Reserve banks lend to their member banks. The Reserve banks have cautioned member banks to be conservative in their loan policies.

It is yet to be seen how effective these measures may be. The ultimate decision as to whether demand will push prices further and further upward lies with the consuming public. Advertising, salesmanship, and easy credit terms are likely to obscure the actual course of prices. Intelligent adjustment of consumption and supply may make possible the continuation of high production together with stable prices, which are basic to a rising standard of living. The voter, too, will influence the economy, either by supporting a policy of balanced budgets or by clamoring for lower taxes.

Address by D. E. Woodman to Decatur, Ga., Civitan Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess I had the pleasure of listening to a splendid address delivered by Mr. D. E. Woodman, of Decatur, Ga., to the Decatur Civitan Club. Mr. Woodman is a successful businessman in the district which I represent. He is also a civic-minded citizen who is interested in good government.

One of the duties of a good citizen is to serve upon the grand juries and trial juries of his county and district. In performing this service Mr. Woodman learned first-hand that to serve as a member of a grand jury is one of the most important duties which a citizen can perform. The grand jury in America is one of the foundation stones of our system of justice. It is a protection which our form of Government affords against injustice and tyranny. In addition, the grand jury plays an important part in our local governments in a number of respects.

Mr. Woodman chose the grand jury as the subject of his talk to the Civitan Club. It was so well prepared and so interesting that I asked Mr. Woodman to provide me a copy so that I could insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address is as follows:

Mr. President and distinguished guests, after hearing those glowing words I began to wonder, indeed, if it were I who was to make the talk. Yes, overstatement is really a frailty of mankind. Truthfully, though, I enjoyed hearing those words and I am humbly grateful for them.

I was happy to respond to the invitation to speak before this group.

I may be "carrying coals to New Castle." Each of you may have a far greater comprehension of the grand jury, its history, its powers, and its duties than I. Nevertheless, I am unabashed, for I believe that by iteration and reiteration we can impress upon ourselves and our community the real value of the grand jury and the thanks it owes to the men who serve.

I am no lawyer nor have I had formal legal training. I have a high regard for their techniques and their learning. But I am unimpressed by some of their archaic phraseology, intricate documents, legal stratagems, and small print. They are, however, an honored profession helpful to the community as a whole and to the grand jury in particular. But we, laymen of the law, must remember in our deliberation, officially and unofficially, that the law is sometimes too precious a thing to leave entirely to lawyers.

As a layman of the law my remarks tonight will sound technical only when I quote the law. And it may be quoted frequently as it has been the lawyers who have formalized the grand-jury system. To this we give them our hats and undying credit.

As with many too many citizens I paid little attention to the grand jury until my hair began to turn gray, then to silver, and the responsibilities of community citizenship began to fall upon my shoulders. My early service on petit juries was accepted almost as a burden instead of a privilege. My first service, several years ago, on the grand jury left me with no real understanding of its power and place in society.

Then about 2 years ago, I was called again to serve on the jury here in De Kalb County. The service really meant something to me. I began to realize that I was serving on one of the most powerful groups in America. I began to feel strength in its unity and a kinship to all other juries all over America who had the same type of strength and outlook.

I knew something of the grand jury system but to remain intellectually honest I felt that I should know more about this group which wielded so much power.

I began to dig. I began to read. I began to ask questions. Many, many questions. Some foolish but all geared to one goal. I wanted to know more about the group on which I had just served:

In general terms I knew what the grand jury was. Reading with unlawlike eyes in Corpus Juris I found that "A grand jury is a body of men who, according to laws are selected and summoned to serve before a competent court and are by such court impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire with regard to crimes committed within its jurisdiction and to present all offenders against the law. It is an inquisitorial and accusatorial, rather than a trial body, and except in some States is not regarded a judicial body or tribunal." I learned, too, that in Georgia it has some civic responsibility.

Knowing that the the grand jury didn't just "combust," I looked into its history. I found no skeletons in its closet but romance in the law worthy to be told.

Some say the real origin of the grand jury is lost in antiquity. Others are very precise in their research. Rather than pose as an expert let me read with you in my research.

Raymond Moley in the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences informs that the grand jury as it is now known is directly derived from the ancient inquisitio brought into England by the Norms. It first appeared in England, according to Maitland, as "a body of neighbors summoned by some public officer to give, upon oath, a true answer to some question." The regular use of the grand jury to discover and present persons accused of serious crime, however, may be said to date from the Assize of Clarendon 1166. The use of this new piece of judicial machinery—presentment by a jury—came to be the most important function of the court known as "sheriff's tourn" which emerged as a distinct court at the end of the 13th century.

The most important function of the court known as "sheriff's tourn" which emerged as a distinct court at the end of the 13th century. The "sheriff's tourn" was the turn or circuit anciently made by the sheriff twice every year for the purpose of holding in each hundred the great leet of the county.

"This is the origin of the sheriff's tourn, which decided in all affairs, civil and crimial, of whatever importance, and from which there lay no appeal but to the Wittenagemote" (Burke: Abridgment English History, bk. ii, ch. vii).

"(Wittenagemote—an assembly of wise men, from witena, gen. pl. of wita—a wise man; witan—to know, and gemot—a meeting, an assembly, a moot.)

"English history: Among the Anglo-Saxons the great national or general assembly which met annually or oftener, whenever the King kept his Christmas, Easter, or Whitsuntide, as well to do private justice as to consult upon public business. It was composed of the athelings, or princes, ealdormen, or nobles, the large landowners, the principal ecclesiastics, etc. They formed the highest court of judicature in the kingdom, and their concurrance was necessary to give validity to laws, and treaties with foreign states. They had even power to elect the king and if the throne passed to the heir of the late king, the new sovereign had to be recognized formally by the witenagemot at a meeting assembled for that purpose." (International Encylopedia Dictionary, p. 4530.)

The presentments were made to a jury of 12 freemen of the 100, who had been chosen from a total of 100 freeman, said jury either accepting or rejecting them. Thus we learn of the origin of the "sheriff tourn." If they were accepted they were passed on to the sheriff, who sent those accused of more serious crimes to the itinerant justices after they had been taken into custody. The sheriff punished the lesser cases himself."

By the time America was settled according to 12 Ruling Case Law, page 1014, the grand jury was an informing and accusing body only, without whose previous action no person charged with a felony could, except in certain special cases, be put upon his trial. And in the struggle which in those times arose in England between the powers of the King and the rights of the subject, it often stood as a barrier against prosecution in his name." Thus it has grown up in America that the grand jury has supervision of the enforcement of law and order, the preservation and protection of morals, the supervision of public offices, and the inspection and examination of public records.

When I first served on the jury, I gave no thought as to why and how I was chosen. Interested, now, I learned.

A group known as the board of jury commissioners selected me as a person qualified to serve. This board is composed of upright, honorable, and discrete men, none of whom can be lawyers, county officers, or county commissioners. Fairness is the watchword in the selection of jurors. Names of the persons selected are written on a slip of paper and placed in compartment one of a jury box. The box is sealed and placed in custody of the clerk of the court. The key is given to the sheriff. The judge in open court then draws the jury and places those names in compartment 2 of the box. The drawn names make up the jury. The

box is then resealed and turned over to the proper authorities.

My name drawn, I wondered what qualifications caused me to be selected.

I read the Georgia code and learned that I had to be a citizen and over 21 years of age. I seemed to have those qualifications, all right. Residing in the county for the past 6 months, I passed satisfactorily. I was pleased to learn that I was not thought an idiot, lunatic, or insane, and that the commissioners believed me one of the most experienced, intelligent and upright persons in the county. This they could do for I was neither a county commissioner, a tax receiver, a tax collector, a member of the board of education, county school commissioner, ordinary, nor county treasurer. I was pleased that I did not have to meet the qualifications of 1788 which required "That all persons returned to serve as grand jurors at the said superior court shall every one of them have and be seized of not less than 250 acres of land, in their own right, in fee simple, feetail, or for the life of themselves or some other person, or shall be in commission of the peace"—cause I don't own that much land.

Selected to serve on such an old and honorable body, I was pleased to take the grand juryman's oath, now several hundred years old, to wit:

"You shall diligently inquire, and true presentments make of all such articles, matters, and things as shall come to your knowledge, touching this present service. The King's Council, your fellow's and your own, you shall keep secret; you shall present no person for hatred or malice; neither shall you leave anyone unpresented for favor, or affection, for love or gain, or any hopes thereof; but in all things you shall present the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, to the best of your knowledge; so help you God." To make this the oath that you once took, the only words changed were "King's Counsel" to "State."

Being a full-fledged member I looked around to see how many of my fellows were serving with me. I counted 23. I wondered the number. I am sure that at times it has varied but our rule of from 18–23 was passed on February 9, 1797. And talking of numbers I was told that to find a true bill or make a presentment at least 12 should vote for that purpose.

Remembering my remarks about the legal profession but realizing that their help is needed, the grand jury can ask instructions of the court and advice from the solicitor general. These are the only two sources from which the grand jury can receive instructions. All other counsel is completely verbotten. A good rule in these respects because the court and the solicitor general are guided by their oath of office and responsibility. Outsiders, in general would have no code of ethics to guide them in their counsel and ulterior motives would be suspect.

Receiving legal help from the bench—I wondered about our true relation to the court. I found that it was a very close relationship—and most of the time a very harmonious kinship. A former Chief Justice of our Supreme Court sums up this relationship, "A grand jury is a component, and a very important one, of the superior court, and the discharge of any duty which the law imposes upon the grand jury is one of the purposes for which a term of the superior court is held; for the grand jury has no existence apart from the court."

Now a full-fledged member of the grand jury, I wondered what power had been bestowed upon me.

I remembered the words accusatorial and inquisitorial. The grand jury had the power to accuse and investigate. It cannot judge. It cannot try.

As Corpus Juris says: The ordinary conception of the powers and duties of the grand jury is to guard the rights and liberties of the people, and the preservation and protection of moral and social order, the bringing to trial the proper persons, whose identity is established upon prima facie evidence of the proof of the commission of crime, and also in furnishing reasonable protection against malicious and unfounded prosecutions. Exercising its powers and duties involves all the powers necessary to complete inquiry to the subject matter in charge, without any limitations by acts of the court or a judge; but it is bound and limited by the proscription of the law under which it acts. Scope of its inquiry should not be limited narrowly by questions of propriety of the forecast, or the probable result of the investigation, or by doubts as to whether any particular individual will be found properly subject to accusation of crime."

In addition to this general instruction, the lawmakers have recited in the Georgia Code many special penal provisions that must be brought to the attention of the grand jury by the court.

Be it know, however, that the grand jury is not limited to the subject matter of special instructions from the court. The welfare of the people rests in the arms of the jury. And to protect that welfare and keep them safe from harm they can use their power in a way they see fit to keep the criminal from the borders of this county.

In many States, I have learned, the grand jury has no power in civil matters. Thank God this is not the case in Georgia. In *Kirby* v. *Long* (42 SE 386), it was settled that the jury has the power and is charged with the duty of inquiring into and reporting on conditions and management of the public prisons, and other public institutions within its jurisdiction. The bible of Georgia law—the Code—reports in detail the requirements of the grand jury in civil matters. There is no need to burden you with a recitation of these duties except to recount that tax lists, evaluation, jails, public buildings, county officers, records, to name a few, should be looked into periodically by the grand jury. Never overlook your city or township.

To me the real strength of the grand jury lies in its investigatory powers. I have learned this from my experience. I will say it now and I will say it again. The power of the grand jury to investigate is without limit, and no branch of Government (except Federal) located in the county is immune from such investigation.

I believe that the grand jury as an inquisitorial body has a wholesome effect upon the community. Its broad power to summon witnesses whose testimony is not confined to narrow legal questions, as in the case of a court of inquiry, makes it of inestimable value where a state of public corruption exists and widespread inquiry seems desirable.

I like this power of investigation. Under it, you and I, citizens of the community, are endowed with the right to investigate any potentially criminal situation, then find indictment or make a presentment—a statement to the court about the misconduct in the community.

This power gives us the right to defy judges—even the judge who charged us. He cannot cause the jury to be dismissed before the end of its term. I like the fact that our grand jury presentments are published in the daily press for all to see and read. We of the public who by virtue of being free citizens are really the grand jury, should deem it a privilege to study the grand jury presentments and then consider it a civil command to see to it that action is taken at once. Incoming grand jurors should have spot reference to previous presentments; should consider them summarily in the interest of saving time and thus be better able to effectively carry on. The presentments are of limited value without definite follow-through.

Don Wharton in a recent issue of the Readers Digest recounts a story that graphically illustrates how a grand jury can defy governors, sheriffs, police chiefs, even the President. "Some 75 years ago the Federal Grand Jury in Indiana was investigating a bank embezzlement. A United States attorney told the jury to cease because the President had so requested. The jury rushed to the court for instructions as any jury can when in doubt about its procedures. The judge told the jury that the President "has no more right to control your actions than the Tsar of Russia."

Neither can county politicians control the action of a duly sworn jury. A real function, I have found, of the grand jury is to keep tabs on county politicians and county government. By statute many items are listed which are required items for the grand jury to look into periodically. By examining these county offices, buildings, lands, and other county doings, criminal neglect sometime can be encountered.

In some States it has been held that a grand jury has a general inquisitorial power to inspect the books of officers, and to subject the officers themselves to examination for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not there has been any official misconduct in any public office, but in Georgia this power is granted by statute. (*Chatham* v. *Gaudry* (120 Ga. 121).) Let's use this power. And remember that Georgia does not limit the power of the grand jury investigating the acts of public officials to cases where there may be a prosecutor, and does not prohibit them from prosecuting by presentments on their own motion. (*Groves* v. *State* (73 Ga. 205).)

Yes, by digging. By studying. By asking questions I have learned a lot about the grand jury on which I once served.

I now know what it is. I glory in its history and the romance of the law. I know how I was chosen. I know the duties. I know the powers. I know the responsibilities. But does the public? And they should. The public is the grand jury. Are not our neighbors selected to serve? Do not they act on matters that concern the public? Although only 18 to 23 persons serve on the jury, does not the public have grand jury rights, too? Any citizen may present a bill of indictment to the grand jury and ask that it be acted upon, regardless of the wishes of the judge or the solicitor general.

Even on matters that might transcend county borders the grand jury has powers. Freedom is a big word. Many use it loosely and unknowingly. Yes gentlemen, freedom still remains, though heavily regulated and fast disappearing only because we as citizens are expediant, preoccupied with our own selfish gain and position—too busy to take time to defend what our forefathers paid for in blood. And in the talk of freedom, we have always placed too much emphasis on the big man in history. An event in the march of freedom that should be more than a footnote in the history books was the trial of the 11 Communist leaders several years ago. Judge Harold R. Median handled the case superbly but it would not have taken place without the painstaking investigation by the grand jury which handled the indictment. As Don Wharton has said, "Each time a grand jury exercises its powers it sharpens the weapon for other decent citizens to use in attacking the rottenness around us. It is the one weapon that can be fought effectively against corruption without blasting away freedom itself."

In brief, I have given to you my impression of the grand jury system and what it means to me. I have only one plea. The public should be better informed of the

nature of the grand jury. I would like to see a week set aside each year as grand jury week in which we would use all means possible to emphasize our work to the people—not forgetting that it is a day-to-day task too. To acquaint every person in DeKalb County with our objectives; (these are the Fulton County objectives):

1. To increase the effectiveness of the grand jury system by fostering, encouraging, and promoting a public demand for the serious consideration of meritorious grand jury recomendations by public officials empowered to act upon same.

2. To advocate such changes in criminal law and procedure of our courts as will more effectively provide for the acceleration of the trial of cases in order that the interest of justice, liberty, and public safety may be better served.

3. To influence legislative action for the purpose of improving and maintaining the grand jury system in Georgia.

4. To support and assist public officials in their proper plans for the prevention and suppression of crime and the treatment of criminals, and to criticize and oppose inefficiency and dishonesty in public office.

5. To enlighten the public on the importance of the grand jury and to acquaint prospective grand jurors with the powers and duties delegated to them by laws as grand jurors.

And as the public is enlightened, to utter a prayer for the Commonwealth in the selection of grand jurors, public officials, and yes, even private citizens:

"God give us men. The demands—
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands:
Men whom the lust of office does not kill.
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy.
Men who possess opinion and a will.
Men who have honor, men who will not lie.
Men who can stand before a demagog and dam his treacherous flatteries without winking.
Tall men, sun crowned, who live above the fog, in public duty and in private thinking."

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, the subject of Federal aid to education has been widely discussed and carefully considered in light of the recent White House Conference, the President's state of the Union message and his recent messages on education. Nowhere has the discussion been more vigorous than in my own district, both within the city of Indianapolis and in the adjoining suburbs and communities of Marion County. I have found no individual who was unwilling to spend money to the extent necessary to assure the best possible educational opportunity for our youngsters. Two critical questions have been raised in the discussion. The first question is whether States and localities or the Federal Government is in the best position to finance schools which everyone admits are needed. The second question is whether Federal aid to education also spells Federal control of education, similar to those controls tied to existing grant-in-aid programs.

On Saturday, January 14, 1956, all three metropolitan dailies of Indianapolis featured editorials on the subject of Federal aid to education. I believe their position represents a consensus of the voters of my district whose opinion favors continuation and expansion of State and local responsibilities for schools to be controlled by the community rather than by professional administrators or an agency of the Federal Government:

[From the Indianapolis Star of January 14, 1956]

AID FOR AID'S SAKE

It has been months since there was a change of Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Yet HEW has not permitted itself to be influenced for the better by the developing facts of the public-school classroom situation. Far from modifying its Federal-aid proposals in line with changing factual estimates of the situation, the Department has become more ambitious. Far from advancing more convincing facts and figures as to the necessity for Federal aid, it relies more heavily than ever on the simple supposition that the necessity should be taken for granted.

These things are evident from the special message on education which the President has transmitted to Congress.

The proposed program of Federal aid is the same in structure as that proposed last year. There is a significant difference in size and duration. The proposal of last year was for a 3-year program costing about $1 billion. The new proposal is for a 5-year program to cost twice that. This jump in the proposal has been made in the face of the fact that each new survey of the situation, made by the Department, shows construction already in progress to be alleviating the classroom shortage more rapidly than had been anticipated in the last survey.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has also looked to its own future in preparing the new proposal. Included is a recommendation for a major increase in funds—no amount specified—for the Office of Education. The purpose is to provide funds for research and to improve and expand other services. Educational research, it is said, has been a sorely neglected field. This in the face of widespread and intensive educational research in the last few years by both private and governmental bodies, such as we doubt has ever before been devoted to any single peaceful activity.

Moreover, the Federal aid promoters look to bigger things once public schools have been assimilated. The President has been persuaded, his message discloses, to appoint a commission to develop proposals in the field of higher education. Thus we are warned that colleges and universities are to be the next target.

In this message President Eisenhower again indicates his position that Federal aid is called for when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough. The first condition seems reasonable. As to the second, we wonder who is qualified to decide when a problem is being solved rapidly enough. But that is the philosophy of Federal aid. How does it apply in the classroom construction matter?

What is the extent of the full problem? Missing from this message are such figures on present and anticiptaed classroom deficits as were advanced last year in justification of the Federal-aid proposal. The figures offered last year have now, of course, been discredited by investigation of their source and by later figures gathered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself. If there are new figures summarizing the shortage, they have not been disclosed. So we don't know what the Department now thinks it to be.

Is the problem being solved rapidly enough by community and State action? Without knowledge of the total size of the problem, it would seem difficult to arrive at an answer of any sort to that question.

What is being done? Figures published last September by the Department showed that between 65,000 and 70,000 new classrooms were completed by public and private schools in the 1954–55 school year. This number exceeded by 12,000 to 17,000 rooms the added space needed to meet the enrollment increase which occurred in that year. The same report indicated that construction for the public schools alone now approaches the rate of 70,000 rooms a year.

How does this rate of building affect the problem? A report of the Department last November, summarizing enrollment figures for the present school year, concluded that school enrollment now includes almost 2,400,000 pupils in excess of normal capacity of accessible publicly owned school plants in use. The method of arriving at this figure has been challenged by some authorities. But suppose for the moment we assume that it is not exaggerated. The same departmental report pointed out that if 66,300 scheduled new public-school classrooms are completed during the present school year, they would take care of almost 2 million of those pupils at the commonly used ratio of 30 pupils per room. That would leave 400,000. If in the next 2 years the rate of building continued to be only as much as the minimum excess estimated for the 1954–55 year, the other 400,000 would be taken care of within those 2 years, entirely by local and State effort. Then excess construction could be devoted to the replacement of obsolete and otherwise unsatisfactory buildings.

In the face of this prospect, where is the need for a Federal aid program for even 1 year, much less 5 years?

The 5-year proposal is based on the proposition that it would enable communities to catch up with accumulated needs, both of enrollment increase and replacement, by the end of the 5 years. After that, said the President's message, the States and localities should meet their current and future needs without Federal help. "Present construction levels indicate their ability to do this," he said. In other words, the justification for Federal aid is supposed to be found only in helping to wipe out the backlog more quickly.

Those present levels of construction involve local spending of something over $2.5 billion a year. To this the proposed program would add $400 million a year, or over the 5 years, about $2 billion in grants and loans. That's less than the equivalent of a year's outlay. So the program would help to eliminate the backlog by no more than 1 year How can Federal intervention in the precious local management of our schools be justified for so small a gain?

The whole Federal aid argument assumes that some States and communities lack ability to provide adequate schools out of their own resources. But is this really a fact? Where are the figures, names, and places to prove it? They have never been offered.

Congress turned down the school aid proposal of last year. Certainly no reason has been advanced to impel it to do otherwise this year. The likelihood that the Department will be able to prove a need for it is more remote now than it was before.

[From the Indianapolis News of January 14, 1956]

AGAIN, THE SIREN SONG OF FEDERAL AID

In 1954 President Eisenhower advanced a 3-year $7 billion program of Federal aid for public schools. Congress rejected it.

In 1955 the President proposed a more modest 3-year $1,100,000,000 program. Congress rejected it.

In 1956 the President is seeking a 5-year $1,250,000,000 program.

We hope Congress will reject this one, too.

In an editorial entitled "The Siren Song of Federal Aid," the News said after last year's proposal: "We have seen no statistics to convince us that any State in the Union is without the resources to provide for its school-construction needs if it has the will to do so."

That still goes.

And our judgment embraces the nebulous findings of the recent White House Conference on Education—which was loaded in favor of a big Federal-aid program.

No State today is spending as high a percentage of its income for education as it spent in 1929 or even in depression 1933.

The States today, nonetheless, are building schools at a $2-billion-a-year rate, highest in history.

In the last 6 years the country has built some $9 billion worth of schools to house some 8,100,000 pupils. Yet the increase in pupil population has been only some 6,100,000.

So the States are keeping well ahead of the growth in school population.

To be sure, much more needs to be done. The building rate must be stepped up. Old, inadequate schools must be renovated or replaced. In some areas there are shameful shanty schools.

But we never have seen any figures to show that the situation anywhere amounts to a "crisis" that would justify a potentially dangerous new Federal intervention in local and State public-school affairs.

And, by the way, just where is the Federal Government going to get its proposed school-construction money other than from local taxpayers—money which never would be returned in full to States and communities?

We are 100 percent in favor of better and better public schools.

But the argument that the Potomac colossus somehow can provide the will that may be lacking in some localities is the argument of superstatism.

We shall be happy to publish contributions from readers who can cite, chapter and verse, exactly where in this country State and local resources absolutely cannot do the job that Federal aid proponents want to do.

[From the Indianapolis Times of January 14, 1956]

AID FOR SCHOOLS?

The only justification for Federal aid to the public schools is the inability of a community or a State to provide adequate schools for its children.

Previous efforts for an aid program on the basis of need have foundered because representatives of the wealthier States have been unwilling to vote money to help schools in the poorer States. The result has been legislation which simply would hand out a certain amount of money per pupil to all the States. No Congress ever has passed such a bill.

We hope this one will not.

The program outlined in President Eisenhower's message however, would limit Federal aid to States and districts which actually need it, and apply the test of whether a State is doing the best it can.

This test is important. Some States spend a large proportion of their tax revenues for schools, but do not collect enough taxes to make the school share what it should be even for a "poor" State.

This newspaper never has favored Federal aid for the public schools, because it is convinced that the schools are the responsibility of the communities and the States and because it remains to be demonstrated that there can be Federal aid without Federal control. At best it will establish a principle of real danger to the continued freedom of all Americans.

But many people in Congress think some kind of Federal aid bill will be passed in this election year and the choice will be between a program along the lines of President Eisenhower's message and a more expensive nationwide handout.

If that is true, the Eisenhower program is by far the more sensible alternative.

But even it will be another burden to the taxpayer, who should never forget that when a dollar goes to Washington, it never comes back whole.

Additional Editorial Support for Coyote Valley Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include an editorial from the January 11, 1956, issue of the Ukiah (Calif.) Daily Journal entitled "Back Coyote Valley Project."

On May 10, 1955, by a margin of 3 to 1, the voters of Sonoma County approved a bond issue providing local participating funds amounting to $5,598,000. Mendocino County, in which is located the dam site, will vote on January 24 to finance $630,000 in participation bonds for the proposed water district consisting of Sonoma and Mendocino Counties.

I have just returned from a survey of the flood areas in California with several members of the House Committees on Public Works and Interior and Insular Affairs. What we saw is convincing proof of the need for projects to prevent a reoccurrence of the dsiastrous floods in California's First Congressional District, as well as in other sectors of our State.

This editorial recognizes the need and points out that if the recent floods did not drive home the need for flood-control measures, then nothing else can. We hope the nuisance suit now pending to obstruct the construction of the Coyote Valley Dam will be dropped by the passage of H. R. 7930, which unanimously passed the House last Thursday, January 12, and is pending Senate action this week. As a further indication of local support of the project, I respectfully call your attention to the following editorial:

BACK COYOTE VALLEY PROJECT

If all the words that have been written about the Coyote Valley Dam in the past year could be turned into dollars the cost of the project would have been met long ago.

Almost all of these words have been in favor of the dam. And yet there is a small hard core of opposition that is determined to fight it out to the last ditch.

The Walter Robbins taxpayers' suit in Sonoma County to try to halt the delivery of the participation bonds is the most notable opposition of course. All the opposition's eggs are in that basket.

The finding of the superior court in throwing the case out of court and the subsequent ruling last week by the Third District Court of Appeals holding that the appeal was "devoid of merit" all point to the fact that any further higher court rulings will be the same. And yet the foot dragging goes on and on and new appeals will undoubtedly be filed.

No doubt these people feel they are right and the dam is being built in the wrong place. But they are fireside engineers who are disputing the word of the United States Army engineers, who just recently showed that the Coyote Dam would have saved millions in flood damage down river from here and even lowered the crest considerably up this far. We'll go along with that thinking.

Mendocino has to go to the polls January 24 to decide whether or not we will take part in the project to the tune of $630,000 in participation bonds for the proposed district.

The opposition recently sent out a letter in an attempt to frighten the taxpayer, hitting him in the pocketbook, so to speak. It's an old trick and doesn't tell the whole truth by a long shot.

If the recent floods didn't drive home the need for more and more flood-control measures in northern California then nothing else can. We think local voters share our views and will turn out to vote for the formation of a flood control district by a big majority.

We think the Coyote Dam is needed badly both by Mendocino County and by Sonoma County. We think other dams are also needed in this watershed, but for the present let's get this one job done and over with and stop the arguments. Get out and vote for it.

Retirement of Philip H. Parrish, Editor of Portland Oregonian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding editors and authors of the Pacific Northwest, Mr. Philip H. Parrish of the Portland Oregonian, retired from his position as editor of that newspaper on January 1, 1956.

Mr. Parrish and I have not always agreed on public issues. He is a Republican. I am a Democrat. But he is a man of wide intellectual attainments and of vast knowledge of the history, culture, and geography of a great American region. I believe his retirement should be taken note of in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I am happy to ask permission that there be included in the Appendix a tribute to Mr. Parrish written by Stewart Holbrook, of Portland, and published in the Northwest magazine of the Oregonian for January 8, 1956.

I should like to add that Philip H. Parrish was a close personal friend of one of the most distinguished men ever to serve in this body from my State, the late Senator Charles L. McNary, for many years Republican party spokesman on the Senate floor.

I ask unanimous consent that the article under the title "An Editor Gives Up the Reins," paying tribute to Philip H.

Parrish, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EDITOR GIVES UP THE REINS

Back in the days when railroads had steam locomotives and train robbers, Reporter Phil Parrish was one of a posse of deputies, newspapermen, and bloodhounds chasing three murderous holdup men in the high Siskiyous of southern Oregon.

After some 18 hours, with no rest and little food, young Parrish came out of the timber to find a telegram waiting for him at summit station. It was from his city editor, demanding to know the names of the fugitives. Nobody knew who they were, but the exhausted reporter was sufficiently irritated to reply.

From the telegraph hut he wired the god of the city room: "Bandits identified as Edgar B. Piper, Philip L. Jackson, Fred L. Boalt, and John E. Wheeler. Bloodhounds have them surrounded." The men named were editors of the four daily papers in Portland.

Such was the classic legend that attended the young reporter, Phil Parrish, who a bit later joined the staff of The Oregonian. And this week the retirement of Philip H. Parrish as editor of The Oregonian's editorial page marks the end of an era in the century-long history of the most distinguished editorial page in northwestern America. Only two other men had charge longer: The pioneer Harvey W. Scott, 40 years, who died in 1910, and his successor, Edgar B. Piper, 18 years, whose passing was in 1928.

Parrish took charge in January 1939, only a few days less than 17 years ago. He resigned the first of this month and now will serve as consulting editor. His difficulty has been from failing health, largely asthmatic.

His 17 years began when the world was approaching the end of an unruly peace—when it was about to go crumbling and smoking into what many believed to herald the true Armageddon of the Apocalypse. His stewardship carried through the 6 years of history's worst war and the first frightening decade of history's worst peace.

During this period he has advised his readers wisely and fearlessly on controversial matters. Yet his deep knowledge of history and his devotion to literature, painting, and the arts in general have shone through, and have kept a balance such as exists on only a rare handful of American papers.

What caused the man and the hour to get together? What was the background he brought to the job? This article is my personal testament rather than a biography, yet certain biographical facts will help.

Parrish was born in 1896 in Michigan, a son of Randall Parrish, a minister who later won fame as a popular novelist. Philip grew up in Boyd County, Nebr., where his mother's people were farmers. He came to Oregon in 1913 as a boy, intending to take horticulture at Corvallis and then operate the apple orchard his father was paying for "on tick."

However, such orchard projects soon were bailing out for a dime a dozen. And, meantime, 3 years at the college had found Parrish's interests turning more and more to history, sociology, and literature. So in 1916–17 he transferred to the University of Wisconsin, and was there when World War I ended his formal education.

Returning to the west coast, he found the recruiting sergeants unimpressed by his 118 pounds, his 5 feet 4 inches, and his limited eyesight.

He went looking for work, seeking a reporter's job because, as he says, he literally couldn't think of anything else. He reported for some months for the old Morning Olympian in Washington's capital city, and another few months for the Bellingham (Wash.) Herald.

Then while covering the draft board at Bellingham he memorized the eye chart and got past the board into the Army.

Out of the service, he took off immediately for Portland. He had loved the city from the first. There were then four general dailies—the News, the Telegram, the Oregonian, and the Journal—in booming competition. Young Parrish talked his way onto the Journal and remained for 8 years, from cub to star reporter.

By the time I met him, "Phil," as he was invariably known, was already one of the foremost reporters in the Northwest. He had covered disasters such as the Astoria fire and the Kelso bridge tragedy; crimes like the Bromfield affairs in Roseburg, which included the then novelty of wiring an automobile to a package of dynamite; and the alarms, trials, and floggings due to the activities of the Ku Klux Klan.

Some of the finest reporting of the decade was that done by Parrish during the hunt in the Siskiyous for the three d'Autremont brothers, killers, and would-be trainrobbers.

What set his stories apart from others was the contemplative attitude. One sensed, even while knowing they had to be written hurriedly, within sound of the bloodhounds, that they were done by a reflective person. He wrote from a "frame of reference."

I met Phil first in the old Portland Press club, then housed in a decaying Victorian mansion on N. W. Davis Street. This was quite a place. I fancy that no visitor failed to be impressed with the old structure's deep melancholy. Its facade surely presented the idea that though this House of Usher might still stand, it stood none too stoutly; yet within its high ceilined rooms young men of the press gathered to discuss newspapers, art, literature, and lesser subjects.

Our gatherings were animated and often noisy. Most of the time Phil sat like a somewhat morose owl, peering out from under the thickest and most unruly head of hair in town, impassibe save for his dark eyes that lighted or dimmed according to his interest in the matter before the house. When he chose to speak, however, he said something to the point. It mattered little whether the point was serious or ribald, he illuminated it.

YEAR SPENT AS OSC EDITOR

In 1927 he married Margaret Sheridan of Portland and by way of a honeymoon they moved to Corvallis where he became Oregon State alumni editor. A year later, however, he was back at the Portland Journal doing work on the rim during vacation period and asking to be returned to the regular staff.

At that time, though, the Journal had a policy of being displeased with anyone who had once left its employment, and the editor in charge told Phil a permanent job probably, but not certainly, would be opened up by the time the vacation work was ended.

Phil was irritated by the indefiniteness. He walked north along Broadway, turned down Alder and so to the eighth floor of the old Oregonian building, where George Pritchard put him to work within 10 minutes. It proved, in view of Portland's subsequent newspaper development, a historic walk.

In quick succession Parrish was reporter, copyreader, assistant city editor, Sunday editor, and editorial writer. In his spare time he began a book which was to run serially in the Sunday paper and to be published in 1931 as Before the Covered Wagon.

Here was notice of a new major writer in the Northwest, a man with poetry in his soul who had also a profound respect for historical fact. It is a combination of some rarity.

BOOK INFLUENCED M'NARY

The late Senator Charles McNary read Before the Covered Wagon, which deals in large part with the Columbia River, on his famous trip to Washington that resulted in getting Bonneville Dam for the Columbia. The Senator later described the volume as the greatest book ever written on the Pacific Northwest.

It is, in fact, a classic already, made so by the adults and the generations of youth who have been reading it continuously for a quarter of a century. They have read it because of the magic imparted to its narrative by the writer as artist.

The immediate though regional success of Before the Covered Wagon came at a time when Sunday Editor Parrish stood at a crossroads: He could remain with the Oregonian, hopeful of opportunity, or he could go freelancing on the national market.

Paul Kelty, who had become editor, determined the matter by offering him a full-time editorial post. So during half a dozen years, early in the depression, he was advancing on the staff which included, besides Kelty: R. G. Callvert, specialist in politics and taxation; Larry Hodges, foreign affairs; and Ben Hur Lampman, who many believe was America's greatest nature essayist.

Tige Reynolds, and then Quincy Scott, drew the cartoons during those early years.

It was a brilliant training school, and evidently Parrish learned well; for in 1939 when Palmer Hoyt as publisher and M. J. Frey as business manager took charge for the heirs of the Pittock and Scott families, he was named Kelty's successor. This in spite of his being the youngest of the editorial writers (associate editors).

All of the original group now are dead except for Quincy Scott, who is in retirement. (Another casualty has been the late beloved Ralph Lee, cartoonist.)

Asked to compare the staff which he inherited in 1939 with the staff he passes along in 1956, Parrish pointed out the difficulty of judging:

"When I went into the editorial end, none of the men there except for Quincy Scott had ever been near a college. They were newspapermen, and particularly editorial writers, through sheer love of it. One of them, Ben Hur Lampman, was, in my opinion, most certainly a genius, a printshop his training school.

"However I am very proud of the new staff members and the manner in which they have taken over. Most of them are university men and scholastically far better prepared than the old staff. With the support of Publisher Frey, they were chosen as much for their devotion to the page as for their superior training. Herbert Lundy as editor and Malcolm Bauer, Jalmar Johnson, and Albert McCready as associate editors, will carry on in the highest tradition, as will Cartoonist Art Bimrose.

"I am all the more confident in saying this because of the conditions of control the staff will inherit. In the 10 years since M. J. Frey, now publisher, took charge, he has shown a deep concern for editorial independence and problems. I do not recall that he has ever reversed a single editorial decision. I owe him an unpayable debt for his protection.

"So far as the owner, S. I. Newhouse, is concerned, he is the answer to an editor's dream. After these several years I still haven't the slightest idea what Mr. Newhouse's policy is on any subject whatever."

READERS GIVEN RESPECT

Perhaps this is the place to mention that Parrish has consistently refused to write down to readers of the Oregonian, being convinced that readers have a sixth sense which detects snobbery and dishonesty. He never has shortened words or sentences at the expense of meaning, and points out that pages which seek attention through typographical trickery, such as big type and piles of blackface, soon lose most of their influence.

He started out determined to be as bold on public issues as Editors Scott, Piper, and Kelty had been before him, but without calling his opponents nasty names simply because they disagreed with him.

Nor does the Oregonian appear to have suffered from this combination of forthrightness and erudite syntax. At the depth of the depression the daily press run was down to around 90,000. Today it tops 230,000.

Meanwhile, though diverted permanently from the library to the newspaper office, Phil needed one more book to round out his family. Before the Covered Wagon having been dedicated to Mrs. Parrish, he required one for their daughter, Pamela (now Mrs. John H. Davidson and the mother of two children of her own).

So he wrote a textbook, Historic Oregon, in competition. It was selected (1937) and at the expiration of the present 6-year contract will have been the official textbook for the schools of Oregon, outside of Portland, for 24 years.

Thus for a quarter of a century Mr. Parrish has been at the breakfast table of most of us in the form of the Oregonian's editorial page, and for at least a quarter of a century the youth of Oregon has grown up with his description of Oregon and its past foremost in mind through the textbook. I can hardly imagine a more extensive power than he has been exercising, or a more unobtrusive one. He has been doubtless one of the most influential men in the history of the State—yet comparatively little known.

To complete this piece about the end of one era of the Oregonian and the beginning of another, I should remark that my regard for Phil Parrish, a close friend of many years, is such that I may not judge his achievements with proper objectivity. Yet, he happens to be one of the outstanding men of my acquaintance. I doubt that in this article I have made him bigger than life size, and time may well prove I hardly did him justice.

Hon. Martin P. Durkin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's most outstanding labor leaders, Martin P. Durkin, died on November 13, 1955. His passing was a great loss to the labor movement, which he so ably represented, and to his legion of friends.

The parents of Martin P. Durkin were Irish immigrants, and his father was an ardent trade unionist and head of a large family.

Martin P. Durkin was born and reared in the back-of-the-yards district on the southwest side of Chicago, the district which it is my privilege to represent. After attending elementary school and high school, he then went to night school to further his education. He started to work as an apprentice steamfitter, a trade which he followed during his lifetime.

In 1933, during the dark days of the depression, Gov. Henry Horner appointed Martin Durkin as director of labor for the State of Illinois. At that time I was a member of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois and served on the labor committee in the house.

It was during that time that I really got to know Martin Durkin and his great work in recommending legislation for the benefit of the laboring man.

To Martin P. Durkin belongs a great deal of credit for the passage in the State of Illinois of the minimum-wage law—an 8-hour working day for women—a law establishing the public-employment service and providing for unemployment compensation. He assisted greatly in obtaining improvements to the State workmen's compensation law. Under his leadership the Department of Labor for the State of Illinois became a model and example for the rest of the country to follow.

In 1953 Martin Durkin was selected by President Eisenhower to become a member of his Cabinet as Secretary of Labor, a position which he filled with distinction.

Martin Durkin had many outstanding characteristics, but to me his greatest virtue was his deep humility. He was a very religious man, and would never sacrifice principle.

To his widow, Anne McNicholas, and their sons, Martin and William and John, I wish to extend my genuine and sincere sympathy.

Honorable Debtor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, while we do not always see eye to eye with the Government of Great Britain, it is fortunate that through the years we have been able to work together generally in a spirit of good will and cooperation. That has meant a great deal to our country and to Great Britain, and it has meant a great deal to the peace and security of the world.

Recently our Government received a payment from Great Britain on a British financial obligation to the United States. I was much pleased to read a couple of editorials in regard to this payment in newspapers from the State of Texas; and, having received unanimous consent to do so, I insert them in the RECORD:

[From the Houston Press of December 30, 1955]

HONORABLE DEBTOR

The United States Treasury will receive from Great Britain today a check for $138 million.

It will be the fifth annual repayment installment of principal and interest on the $4.3 billion loan in 1946 to Britain.

Forty-five annual payments remain—meaning the last one falls due in the year 2000.

It has not been easy for the British to make these annual payments in dollars. They could have defaulted or used the escape clause in the loan agreement.

It is to the credit of our British friends that they are paying.

This year's payment, for example, is equal to all of Britain's earnings from about 3 months' exports to the United States.

The real pinch comes because Britain still has to import more from the United States—and pay for it in dollars—than she exports to the United States to obtain dollars. In 1955 Britains dollar gap was about $320 million.

The British check, therefore, means drawing on Britain's gold and dollar reserves.

We can only hope that the economic situation will so improve that Britain's subsequent payments will be made with greater ease—not so much because of the actual money involved but because in this day and age of easy credit it is encouraging to know of an honorable debtor.

[From the Houston Post of January 7, 1956]

BRITAIN PAYS $138 MILLION ON UNITED STATES LOAN

When a foreign country repays money borrowed from the United States it's news, and that country should get a big hand. But it is not unusual for Britain. She has just paid the fifth annual installment of principal and interest due on the $4,372 million loan made to that country in 1946.

The $138 million payment is equal to Britain's earnings from about 3 months' exports to the United States, according to the British Information Service. The major part of the loan was to cover essential purchases by Britain from our country. Britain has tried to close her serious dollar gap by increasing exports to the United States. But she still buys more from us than she sells in return.

Forty-five more annual installments and Britain's loan will be paid in full. More power to her.

A New Blow to a Persistent Political Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the lead sentence of an editorial appearing in the December 14, 1955, issue of the New York Times reads:

A new blow has been struck at the persistent political myth that the way to the heart—and the vote—of the American farmer is by espousing a policy of high, rigid price supports.

Under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the editorial which is entitled "The Farm Vote."

The new blow theme on which it is based stems from a recent poll conducted by the American Farm Bureau Federation. This highly regarded organization, which has member bureaus in every one of the 48 States and which represents as estimated four-fifths of all the organized farmers in the country, polled its members on the question of rigid versus flexible farm price supports.

The result was overwhelming. Farmers of 33 States went on record clearly and unequivocally as favoring a system of flexible price supports. There is an apparent attempt being made by some individuals to the effect that farmers favor rigid supports, when there is ample evidence to the contrary.

The following editorial asks a question, and sets forth an answer which is worth considering:

THE FARM VOTE

A new blow has been struck at the persistent political myth that the way to the heart, and the vote, of the American farmer is by espousing a policy of high, rigid price supports. This was the poll taken of its membership by the biggest and most comprehensive of the Nation's farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation, which has member bureaus in every one of the 48 States, and which accounts for, roughly, four-fifths of all the organized farmers in the country. The Farm Bureau poll showed that only seven States favored a return to the fixed high-level supports which had been introduced originally for dealing with the war emergency. Thirty-three States went on record as clearly and unequivocally for a flexible price support system.

If this vote represents even an approximately fair cross-section of farm opinion on the moot issue of fixed, versus flexible, price supports then how did the idea get abroad, as it obviously has (judging from the haste with which two of the leading Democratic candidates for the presidential nomination plumped for that policy), that the farmer, despite the widespread evidence of their evil economic consequences, nourishes a deep and abiding affection for high and inflexible supports?

The origins of that myth are by no means obscure. Two elements went into its making. The first, and the positive element, was the sedulous cultivation and circulation by friends of high-level supports of what, on its face, had the appearance of a valid syllogism. This argument ran as follows:

(1) President Truman's surprise reelection in 1948 was made possible by the farm vote; (2) the President symbolized the issue of high price supports versus flexible supports; (3) therefore, the smart thing to do is to string along with rigid price supports if you want to be elected.

To understand how the advocates of rigid supports have got as much mileage as they have out of this argument it is necessary to bring in the second element referred to above. This is the obvious, if disillusioning, fact that political party platforms are not regarded by the general public as must reading. Otherwise the public would have known that, if Mr. Truman was running in 1948 as the proponent of high rigid price supports, then he must have been running on some other platform than that of the Democratic Party, since the very first commitment made by that platform in the field of agriculture was a commitment to a permanent system of flexible price supports.

That Mr. Truman conducted his 1948 campaign against a background of high farm prices is, of course, true (though, as we now know, they had already been receding from the crest of the postwar peak as early as June of that year). But it is a misstatement of the facts to suggest that the postwar farm prosperity derived from the high, rigid supports, which, though professedly disapproved of by Mr. Truman and his Council of Economic Advisers, still remained in the law at that time as a hangover from the war. The high farm prices of those days were a product of the free price system at work. They reflected the fact that not only was there no $8,400,000,000 Government-held surplus of farm commodities casting its depressing shadow over the market, but that there was an insufficient supply of American farm products to meet the overwhelming world demand. For proof of this one has only to consult the Government figures showing the behavior of farm prices in the war and immediate postwar years vis a vis that the nonfarm prices. Prices received by the farmers rose well above parity with nonfarm prices in 1942 and remained in that relationship through 1948. This means, of course, that they were even further above the 90 percent of parity support level, and completely out of touch with and independent of it.

If anyone doubts that the identity of high supports and political success is a political fiction, he might take a brief glimpse at the other side of the coin. We know that in the 1948 election, which they won, the Democrats didn't, as the high-price support advocates would like to have people believe, espouse rigid supports, but flexible supports. In 1952 the Democrats lost the election. Did they lose it because they were identified with flexible price supports The answer is on record in the 1952 Democratic platform. That statement of party policy read: "We applaud the recent congressional action in setting aside the sliding scale farm price supports * * * and we will continue to protect the producers of basic agricultural products under the terms of the mandatory price-support program at not less than 90 percent of parity."

Usurping Legislative Functions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I read with sincere interest an article by Columnist Joseph H. Baird in the January 12 issue of the DeKalb New Era, regarding the tumult and controversy which has resulted from the unwarranted attempt of the Federal Supreme Court to usurp legislative functions.

In his column, the Passing Scene, Mr. Baird has given us a thoughtful discussion regarding this important question. In the following paragraph he asks a very pertinent question:

We have heard much talk during the last 2 years of the 14th amendment, on which the Supreme Court presumably based its decision. But is any amendment to the Constitution more sacrosanct than any of the others? And what of the 10th amendment?

In the article Mr. Baird also emphasizes a fact which many of us have been pointing out in speeches and otherwise that the opinion of the Court is not based on law but on sociological arguments. On that point Mr. Baird's article states:

I am convinced by recent study that the United States Supreme Court's ruling in the segregation cases was based entirely on sociological arguments, and that it lacks any firm legal bases.

As a part of these remarks, I insert herewith the above-mentioned column in its entirety:

THE PASSING SCENE

(By Joseph H. Baird)

Not since the days of Reconstruction following the War Between the States has the Legislature of Georgia faced such solemn and dynamic problems as the body which convened in Atlanta Monday. It must decide whether the State of Georgia, acting within the limits of the Federal Constitution, shall defy the United States Supreme Court.

There are strong indications that it will.

Gov. Marvin Griffin and the Georgia Education Commission have urged the legislature to declare the Supreme Court's decision of May 1954 ordering the end of segregation in the public schools null and void.

The commission holds that the Supreme Court acted in violation of the solemn compact between the Federal Government and the several States. In this contest over power, the commission holds, only a constitutional amendment, proposed by Congress and passed upon by the States, can settle the issue.

It seems to me that the commission has taken a strong and defensible position, although I am aware that there will be shouts of "nullification" from the North if the legislature acts in accordance with the commission's recommendation.

We have heard much talk during the last 2 years of the 14th amendment, on which the Supreme Court presumably based its decision. But is any amendment to the Constitution more sacrosanct than any of the others? And what of the 10th amendment?

This amendment, a part of the Bill of Rights, provides:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Nowhere in the original Constitution is there any mention of the public-school system or of education generally as a province of the Federal Government. In the light of the 10th amendment, it seems obvious that the men who framed the Constitution intended that control of the schools should rest in the hands of the States or of the people.

Nothing in any of the latter amendments, including the 14th, was designed to extend the power of the Federal Government over education.

Unfortunately, the issue of segregation in the public schools has been so beclouded by emotionalism that clear and logical thinking has become difficult. Many people press to the conclusion that anyone who supports the Supreme Court decision is a friend and anyone who opposes it is an enemy of the Negro race.

Such thinking, or lack of thinking, is mental rubbish.

I believe I am typical of many southerners who ardently favor any reasonable measures to promote the political, economic and cultural advancement of the Negro race. I realize that progress in the South is partly dependent of ever-rising living standards for Negroes as well as Whites.

Yet at the same time I am convinced by recent study that the United States Supreme Court's ruling in the segregation cases was based entirely on sociological arguments, and that it lacks any firm legal bases.

We have here to consider not only the question of segregation in the schools. The Supreme Court's decision raises the even more basic question of whether that august body is not trying to usurp the powers granted to the co-equal executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government.

The role of the judiciary is to interpret the law—not to conceive it. As observed earlier, the Constitution gives the Federal Government no control over education. Congress has not seen fit to assert such control. Neither has the President of the United States. How, then, can the Supreme Court properly arrogate to itself such control, as it does by issuing directives to the States to end segregation?

Readers of this column may recall that I have not always agreed with ex-Gov. Herman E. Talmadge on racial issues. But this does not blind me to the worth of a recent book, You and Segregation, written by Governor Talmadge. While parts of it may have been written with an eye on the coming Senatorial elections, there remain large areas of the book where he has done excellent research work on the segregation problem and particularly on the Supreme Court's

encroachment into fields of power reserved to the States.

Those interested in the coming fight in the legislature will find the book well worth a judicious reading.

Mr. Dulles, Champion of Irresponsibility if He Did What He Claims He Did

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a very pertinent editorial entitled "The Dulles Self-Appraisal" which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Friday, January 13, 1956. The editorial follows:

Through the medium of an article in Life magazine, Secretary Dulles has published a fascinating encomium on the record of his 3 years in charge of the State Department. The issues he raises could be left for history to evaluate were it not that they have an important bearing upon the present conduct of foreign policy. For Mr. Dulles' praise of himself gives us a disturbing index of his attitude toward the problems American diplomacy faces today.

The Secretary does not quite claim to be "Superman," but he does modestly take credit for preserving the peace of the world on three occasions. It was his recommendations to President Eisenhower, he suggests, that averted world war over Korea in 1953, over Indochina in 1954, and over Formosa in 1955. On each occasion, Mr. Dulles says, the country "was brought to the verge of war. * * * We walked to the brink and looked it in the face. We took strong action." And this strong action he credits with compelling Communist retreats and saving the peace.

As to Korea, it is Mr. Dulles' contention that the Communists did not start to negotiate a truce seriously until he and President Eisenhower decided, while returning from their post-election trip to the Far East, that if the war continued in stalemate we would attack Manchuria with atomic weapons. This stand, Mr. Dulles argues, frightened the Communists so badly that they did not even dare break off truce talks when Rhee freed the war prisoners.

Obviously, nobody can know how scared the Communists really were in the absence of testimony from their side. Mr. Dulles' claim as to the motivations of the truce cannot, then, be finally evaluated. But this can be said: If he did counsel an atomic attack on Manchuria, at the risk of world war, he was guilty of an inexcusable gamble with the destiny of the human race.

In early 1953 the fighting had all but ended in Korea, with a de facto though not yet formalized cease-fire along the 38th parallel. To advise an expansion of the war in these circumstances—to invite Russian intervention under its China defense treaty and an atomic holocaust on a world scale—was unforgivable.

Mr. Dulles' claim that his "strong action" saved the peace in Indochina in 1954 conflicts directly with the facts as they have been brought out to date. These facts are that he failed in his attempt to organize collective intervention with British participation. His story now is that, nevertheless, Eden and Mendes-France were able at Geneva to negotiate from his "strength"; and that it was the possibility of combined intervention that frightened the Chinese Communists out of intervention of their own.

This is too tenuous a theory to be taken seriously without further evidence beyond Mr. Dulles's naturally biased interpretation. But again it can be said that if he did actually advise allied intervention in a colonial war, and did advise "massive retaliation" with atomic weapons in case China came in on the side of Ho Chi-minh, then he was guilty of a scandalous act of irresponsibility.

As the facts now appear, peace came to Indochina not by Mr. Dulles' show of strength, but by the patient perserverance in diplomatic negotiation of Eden and Mendes-France, again Mr. Dulles's will and at times his active opposition.

As to Formosa, Mr. Dulles argues that the Chinese Communists were deterred from attacking that island by the congressional resolution which he sponsored to authorize the President to use force in its defense. This resolution, he said, made American intentions clear and eliminated the possibility of Peiping miscalculation.

But the conspicuous fact about the resolution at the time was that it did not make our intentions clear. On the vital question as to whether we would fight for the coastal islands as well as Formosa, the Chinese and everybody else were left in a fog of doubt; and Mr. Dulles at the time, instead of making a virtue of clarity, argued that to "keep the enemy guessing" was the height of clever strategy.

So it is most difficult to agree with the Secretary's self-appraisal as an architect of peace. It seems to us that peace resulted not so much from his reckless brandishing of atomic weapons as from the restraint and caution of the British, the French, the American people and even the Communists.

Let history settle that controversy. The alarming fact remains that we now have as Secretary of State a man who still thinks that bluff and bluster and threat of force are the appropriate methods of diplomacy in this perilous age.

"The ability to get to the verge (of war) without getting into war is the necessary art," says Mr. Dulles. Does President Eisenhower fully understand that his Secretary of State has this concept of the aims of foreign policy?

Montana Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Montana Resources," appearing in a publication called Montana Business, issued by the School of Business Administration of Montana Statae University. The article indicates how great a State is Montana.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA RESOURCES

Montana has a total area of 147,148 square miles, making it the third largest State in the Union, and a population of some 640,000, ranking it 46th in population density, with an average of approximately 4 persons per square mile. Despite its areas of mountainous terrain and wasteland, the State obviously has space to spare—no overcrowded cities or miles of traffic jams in Montana. It is also generously endowed with natural resources, particularly mineral, timber, power, and agricultural resources, which could support a considerably larger population.

The statement is sometimes made that Montanans do not want to see their resources developed and new industries established. It is true that few Montanans would wish to see their State heavily industrialized and over-crowded, although this possibility appears remote at the present time. On the other hand, the need for additional industry to add diversification to the Montana economy and to provide adequate employment opportunities for the normal population growth is generally recognized. New industries are necessary merely to maintain the present level of prosperity and to provide opportunities for the growing numbers of young people who will soon be entering the labor force as a result of the high birth rates of the 1940's. The majority of Montanans recognize this and many are working actively toward the attraction of desirable new industries.

Montanans are generally good salesmen for their State. Some of the most taciturn can become eloquent in describing its scenic beauty and pleasant way of life; however, the extent of Montana's natural resources are not always so obvious. Since one of the first requisites of a good salesman is to know his product well, this brief survey may serve as a reminder of the scope of Montana's resources and production and the potentialities as yet undeveloped.

A quick inventory of resources reveals, for example, that the State can claim huge mineral reserves, including the largest known deposits of chromite, manganese, and vermiculite in the United States, hundreds of millions of tons of phosphate rock, and over 200 billion short tons of coal; an estimated 56 billion board feet of live saw timber; installed hydroelectric power capacity which places it ninth among the States, with huge resources as yet undeveloped; and approximately 14 million acres of cropland and 45 million acres of pasture.

Productionwise, in 1954 among the 48 States Montana ranked first in zinc, chromium, and vermiculite, second in manganese, fourth in phosphate rock, fifth in copper, ninth in hydroelectric power, second in wheat, third in barley.

HUGE MINERAL RESOURCES

The abundance of mineral resources makes "the treasure State" an apt description of Montana. Total value of mineral production in the State since 1951 has averaged over $125 million per year. (The March 1955 issue of Montana Business includes a table which gives production and value of minerals for 1950–54).

Copper, zinc, and oil currently make up about two-thirds of the total value of Montana's mineral production. Lead is produced as a byproduct of zinc mining. The production of gold, the discovery of which brought many settlers to the State, is relatively unimportant today. Silver also is declining in importance, being produced mostly as a byproduct from copper and lead-zinc ores. With the development of cheap underground block caving methods at Butte, the long-term outlook for copper and zinc production appears excellent. With tremendous reserves, Butte will be a leading mining center for many years to come, and earlier predictions of its deterioration into a deserted mining camp now seem ridiculous.

Varying estimates have been made of the extent of petroleum reserves in Montana. Most are in the nature of guesses, since exploration of the State's oilfields are not complete. Nevertheless, Montana is known to have large oil resources, perhaps in the neighborhood of a billion barrels.

Although most widely known for its copper, lead, zinc, gold, silver, and oil, the State has many other mineral resources. Some are already making important contributions to Montana's prosperity; others will no doubt see future development. The list which follows includes only some of the more prominent and promising minerals in the State. Many others are also present, although not necessarily in commercial quantities, and others will undoubtedly yet be discovered.

Barite: Barite occurs in several spots in Montana and is currently being mined near Greenough in Missoula County. A processing plant is located at the mine and both crushed and ground barite are produced. Barite is used in paint pigments, chemicals, and as an adulterant or filler in products such as rubber and paper.

Cement rock: Limestone and shales suitable for cement manufacture are present in vast quantities. Only one cement plant is located in the State, however, at Trident in Gallatin County.

Chromite: The Mouat mine in Stillwater County is producing chromite concentrates under a Government contract. Last year this mine produced over three-fourths of the total United States output. The United States Bureau of Mines estimates that chromite deposits in Stillwater County amount to 80 percent of all known reserves in North America. High production costs would make operation of the mines economically unjustifiable were it not for chrome's importance to national defense as an essential metal.

Coal: Tremendous reserves of coal, virtually untouched, are present in Montana. The United States Geological Survey estimated the State's coal resources at 222 billion tons in 1949. Practically all of this is located in eastern Montana and is subbituminous coal or lignite. Production in the State has been declining since the war, amounting to only 1.4 million tons in 1954.

Fluorspar: Fluorspar, used in the ceramic and steel industries, has been reported in several locations in Montana. Production at the present time comes only from the Crystal Mountain deposits near Darby in Ravalli County.

Gypsum: Very little gypsum is produced in Montana, although deposits run into millions of tons. The bulk of the gypsum produced comes from Fergus County and is used in the Trident cement plant.

Manganese: Until Nevada took over in 1954, Montana was the leading manganese producer in the United States. Battery manganese has been produced at Philipsburg since before World War II. During the war production of high grade manganese was begun at Butte and at Philipsburg. Government stockpile depots are still maintained at the two towns.

Phosphate rock: Enormous reserves of phosphate rock suitable for use by the fertilizer industry and additional huge reserves of lower grade material suitable for elemental phosphorus exist in the State. Phosphate rock is mined in the Garrison area for shipment to a Trail, B. C., fertilizer plant. Rock for the Anaconda fertilizer plant comes from Idaho. The Victor Chemical Works elemental phosphorus plant uses rock from Beaverhead County.

Talc: A large volume of readily available talc exists in Montana. In 1954 it was produced in the Beaverhead-Madison County area and shipped to out-of-State grinding plants.

Tungston: Montana became an important producer of tungsten in 1954, with the development of the Ivanhoe Mine in Beaverhead County.

Vermiculite: Montana is the leading producer of vermiculite in the United States by virtue of the Zonolite Company's operation at Libby. Other deposits are also known to be located in the State, in Ravalli, Madison, and Hill Counties.

Montana business indexes

[1935–39=100]

Year and month	Nonagricultural employment [1]	Carloadings [2]	Electric power consumption [3]	General store sales [4]	Bank debits [5]
1935	----------	110.0	93.7	92.0	92.4
1936	----------	96.6	105.2	100.0	99.4
1937	----------	105.0	109.3	102.6	106.5
1938	----------	85.9	85.5	99.7	95.5
1939	100.0	102.5	106.3	106.0	106.2
1940	105.6	109.8	133.8	111.7	115.4
1941	110.2	122.2	151.2	119.8	134.5
1942	113.8	135.0	165.8	126.5	141.8
1943	112.7	143.8	185.2	126.6	164.9
1944	111.3	150.5	175.4	147.1	178.6
1945	111.3	141.8	157.7	159.5	198.1
1946	123.7	119.9	155.3	215.3	252.2
1947	134.0	131.2	169.7	248.1	300.4
1948	140.9	125.0	178.4	270.9	337.5
1949	142.4	122.3	190.2	266.3	344.6
1950	144.4	130.9	201.9	272.5	381.4
1951	146.4	139.0	206.1	282.5	415.8
1952	150.5	142.6	229.4	298.5	423.7
1953	151.5	150.5	252.7	290.5	420.1
1954	150.1	146.0	220.1	293.4	441.0
1954—September	149.5	128.8	127.2	309.5	487.5
October	147.5	164.6	162.4	339.5	509.9
November	149.6	179.8	245.1	352.4	502.8
December	147.9	155.0	248.7	514.4	475.2
1955—January	141.1	151.0	253.6	200.9	483.1
February	140.7	140.9	269.0	194.3	424.3
March	141.7	133.3	246.6	226.5	432.2
April	145.7	136.1	256.1	303.8	425.2
May	151.4	152.2	257.5	306.9	466.0
June	157.8	142.7	267.8	292.0	474.0
July	159.5	152.1	258.0	305.5	452.0
August	161.1	164.7	300.0	328.2	491.9
September	159.8	179.7	350.2	353.4	536.6
October	157.6	----------	380.0	360.4	554.1

[1] Index numbers computed from estimates of Unemployment Compensation Commission of Montana. Estimates include all full- and part-time wage and salary workers who worked or received pay during the pay period ending nearest the 15th of the month. 1939=100.

[2] Index numbers computed from reports of Board of Railroad Commissioners of the State of Montana, comprising total carloadings of freight loaded at Montana points. Daily average.

[3] Index numbers computed from kilowatt-hour sales of Montana Power Co., Montana-Dakota Utilities Co., Pacific Power & Light Co., Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation to commercial and industrial users for consumption within Montana, reduced to hourly average kilowatt-hours per month. Figures from March 1955 revised, to include sales to Anaconda Aluminum Co.

[4] Index numbers computed from reports of Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, based on dollar sales of 80 to 89 department and general stores in Montana. Daily average.

[5] Index numbers computed from reports of Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, based on data from banks in 16 Montana communities. Daily average.

Retail food price index, Montana

[May 1950=100]

	All food	Meats, poultry, and fish	Dairy products
1954			
October	113.7	104.0	107.3
November	108.4	98.3	107.3
December	108.0	97.9	108.2
1955			
January	109.7	100.6	108.6
February	108.6	101.7	106.5
March	107.4	98.9	108.2
April	108.7	100.4	106.9
May	108.0	99.6	105.4
June	107.2	102.2	105.8
July	108.4	102.1	104.8
August	106.7	98.9	105.2
September	108.6	102.2	104.3
October	107.9	98.1	105.0
November	105.1	93.7	105.4

Source: Computed from reports of the Montana Department of Labor and Industry.

Daily average production of selected minerals in Montana, 1935–39 and 1st 10 months, 1954–55

	First 10 months—		
	1935–39	1954	1955
Copper [1] short tons	329.8	190.4	258.9
Zinc [1] do	121.9	196.1	222.6
Lead [1] do	51.1	47.4	53.7
Silver [1] fine ounces	31,398.0	16,520.5	18,713.2
Gold [1] do	651.7	72.7	80.4
Crude oil [2] thousands of barrels	14.9	38.1	42.4

[1] Daily average production computed from reports of U. S. Bureau of Mines.

[2] Daily average production computed from reports of the Oil and Gas Conservation Commission of Montana.

FIFTY-SIX BILLION BOARD-FEET OF SAWTIMBER

One-fourth of Montana (over 22 million acres) is classified as forest land. Seventy percent of the forest land is rated as "commercial"; that is, suitable and available, now or prospectively, for timber production for industrial use. Estimated total volume in Montana's commercial forests is 56 billion board-feet. About one-half of this is Douglas-fir and larch; other important species are ponderosa pine, spruce, and lodgepole pine. (Table 1.) The annual cut of lodgepole and spruce in the State could be substantially increased. In addition, there are large areas of dead timber which can be utilized and large amounts of wood residue from logging and milling operations suitable for various forest products. Recently, plans for a plywood plant which would utilize waste wood were announced for Missoula. A small plant of the same type is already in operation in Polson. Other lumber-products industries frequently mentioned as possibilities for Montana are hardwood, pulp, and paper.

TABLE 1.—*Volume of live saw timber, Montana, 1949*

Species	Millions of board-feet	Percent of total
Douglas fir	15,359	27.5
Western larch	11,760	21.0
Ponderosa pine	10,969	19.6
Spruce	6,953	12.4
Lodgepole pine	6,947	12.4
Western white pine	1,119	2.0
Cottonwood	677	1.2
White bark and limber pine	628	1.1
Alpine fir	610	1.1
Grand fir	393	.7
Western red cedar	356	.6
Miscellaneous [1]	189	.3
Total	55,960	100.0

[1] Includes aspen, birch, box elder, green ash, willow, elm, western hemlock.

Source: U. S. Forest Service, Northern Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Missoula, Mont.

VAST POWER POTENTIAL

The most superficial survey of Montana's resources would not be complete without mention of hydroelectric power. Practically all of the power generated in Montana is hydroelectric; the State has vast potentialities as yet undeveloped. Plans and proposals by both private and public agencies indicate that further development will take place in the near future. The availability of low-cost electric power has played an important role in attracting two new industries to the State—elemental phosphorus and aluminum.

FIFTY-NINE MILLION ACRES IN FARMS AND RANCHES

Altogether, Montana has approximately 59 million acres in farms and ranches, of which about 14 million acres are classified as cropland and 45 million acres as pasture. In 1954, the State produced 76.6 million bushels of wheat, slightly below the previous 10-year average but ranking second only to Kansas as the Nation's leading producer. (Table 2.) Preliminary estimates of the 1955 wheat crop are placed at 97.6 million bushels, second highest on record. Montana is also an important producer of barley (ranking third among the States in 1954); mustard seed, first; flaxseed, fifth; and sugar beets, eighth. The total value of all main crops produced in the State in 1954 is estimated at $279,700,000.

TABLE 2.—*Montana's major crops, 1944–53*

Crop	Unit	Average production	Production	1954 [1] value	Rank (production)
		Thousands	*Thousands*	*Thousands*	
All wheat	Bushel	80,013	76,557	$159,557	2
Winter wheat	do	28,107	33,605	67,210	9
Spring wheat	do	51,906	42,952	92,347	2
Barley	do	16,861	33,332	28,999	3
Oats	do	11,307	11,151	7,248	23
Corn	do	2,698	2,813	4,501	36
Flaxseed	do	728	670	1,876	5
Mustard seed	Pounds		11,510	570	1
Potatoes	Bushel	2,410	2,401	3,962	23
Sugar beets	Ton	709	687	7,900	8
All hay	do	2,574	2,863	58,692	14
Alfalfa hay	do	1,118	1,348		14
Wild hay	do	680	654		5

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

Montana is also widely known as a livestock State, ranking 9th in the number of beef cattle (2.4 million) behind several Midwestern corn States and Texas, Oklahoma, and South Dakota, and 4th in the number of sheep (1.7 million) on its ranches in 1955. The combined total value of sheep and cattle in Montana was estimated at $273.9 million on January 1, 1955.

Much progress has been made in methods of agricultural production in recent years, resulting in greater efficiency, higher yields, and increased ability to withstand the hazards of unfavorable weather conditions. Further advancement will undoubtedly be made. As a result, the agricultural sector of Montana's economy represents a growing market for such products as fertilizers and chemicals. Although fertilizer is now being produced in the State, there appear to be possibilities for expansion. It is also possible that some agricultural chemicals could be produced.

Food processing plants based on the State's agricultural industry currently make up an important segment of manufacturing in the State. With the exception of beet sugar and flour, however, most of the products are for local consumption only and further expansion will be largely dependent upon population growth.

AND AN ALERT AND ENERGETIC POPULATION

Natural resources are of little use unless combined with the most important of all resources—men and women and their skills and activities. Montana has only a small population and labor force, but its people are energetic, adaptable, and better educated (in terms of number of years of school completed) than the population of the United States as a whole. The proportion of Montanans over 25 years of age who have completed high school and of those who have had some college work is substantially above that of the total United States citizenry in the same age groups. (Table 3.)

TABLE 3.—*Education of Montana and United States population over 25 years of age, 1950*

Years of school completed	Percent of total	
	Montana	United States
Elementary school: 8 years or less	42.6	46.9
High school:		
1 to 3 years	15.1	16.9
4 years	23.0	20.2
College:		
1 to 3 years	10.7	7.2
4 years	6.1	6.0
Not reported	2.5	2.8
Median years completed	10.2	9.3

Source: U. S. Bureau of Census, 1950 census of population.

It is unfortunately true that Montana is losing a substantial portion of its human resources to other areas. Unlike natural resources, human beings are mobile and tend to move where their skills and abilities are most fully utilized. Thus in 3 short years, between 1950 and 1953, Montana's population in the productive age groups 18 to 64 declined 2.5 percent compared to a gain of 5.6 percent in those age groups in the 11 Western States as a whole. The answer, of course, is to provide more and better employment opportunities in Montana through development of resources and industry.

Construction of Powerplants Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, a most provocative article has been brought to my attention recently which I believe would provide food for thought to the Members of the Senate. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this article, entitled "America's Most Dangerous Experiment," written by David Shea Teeple, and published in the December 1955 Mercury magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S MOST DANGEROUS EXPERIMENT

(By David Shea Teeple)

The United States has gambled on many noble international experiments in recent years. For the most part they have been based on fantastic delusions about human behavior. They have resulted in fiascoes. Always communism has grown stronger and freedom weaker. Thus far, however, the strength and resources of our country have been sufficient to absorb the damage.

This year we launched a venture which could be disastrous and perhaps fatal to our existence as a nation. We are now advocating and assisting in a program to construct atomic powerplants in the so-called power starved areas of the world.

Ten years ago, in 1945, a special committee of the United States Senate was established to investigate problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy. By their own admission, an organized pressure group of eminent scientists appeared before that committee. Without exception they were dedicated to the belief that the atomic weapon which they had helped to create made war obsolete. They sincerely believed that the only solution was an international agency to prevent the manufacture of such weapons.

Since their thinking influenced the conduct of our legislators and our diplomats, it is no more than fair that we recall the statements they made at that time. We were told by Dr. Vannevar Bush, president of Carnegie Institution of Washington and the Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, that:

"Eight years ago there were two countries in the world whose people had been trained for over a generation to prepare for a war of aggression, Germany and Japan. The leaders of those countries had their peoples so propagandized and so under control that they did not know the world situation; and that was an enormous threat to the world and out of it came a great war.

"No such situation exists today, and those two nations are conquered and under control and should remain so. We have no nations in the world today that do not wish a long, fruitful period of peace; and, in my opinion, every country is anxious to bring that about, not only the peoples of every country but the rulers of every country. We have no situation such as then existed.

"I am quite sure that the Russians do not feel that we are a threat. We do not have interests which conflict seriously." [This and subsequent excerpts are from the official transcript, hearings before the Special Committee on Atomic Energy, 79th Cong., 1st sess.]

Dr. Irving Langmuir, at that time associate director of the research laboratory, General Electric Co., who had recently returned from an 18-day visit to Russia, said:

"When you go to Russia and you find that Kapitza, Fersman, Frenkel, and Joffe—all of those men who are working on problems that have nothing to do with atomic energy—when Joffe tells me and shows me the cyclotron started in 1938, work on which was discontinued during the war and is now just starting again, and tells me the cyclotron will be finished in December of this year—and he is the most prominent physicist that has had anything to do with nuclear

physics—when you see that, you are convinced they are not carrying through a Manhattan project."

Yet, as the world now knows, 4 years after Dr. Langmuir spoke, the Russians in 1949 detonated a nuclear device.

The wartime head of the Manhattan Engineer District, Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, stated that he believed we could keep ahead of any other nation in the world in atomic energy for all time to come provided that the rules were the same for everybody. He said:

"When I say that the rules are the same, if we have secrecy, and they have secrecy, we will be ahead. If we have free and open distribution of every bit of knowledge we have, and they have secrecy, they eventually are going ahead because they will finally find out something that we don't know and we won't find it out."

The rules weren't the same for everybody. We talked; the Soviets didn't. They engaged in espionage; we didn't. Where we stand today is anybody's guess.

The panacea for the world's problems in 1945 was to be international control and inspection of atomic energy. General Groves was very skeptical of the possibilities of such inspection.

Most of the scientists emphasized that inspection could only be feasible before a widespread atomic energy industry existed throughout the world. Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, then Professor of Physics, California Institute of Technology and the wartime Director of Los Alamos, said:

"Inspection must be based on a formal and open recognition on the part of the governments that they are not interested in making atomic weapons, that they are not interested in doing any of this work secretly. * * *

"It is my conviction that the easiest time, and, in fact, the only time when one might hope to discover that there were violations of the convention would be the time when it is started, when you are pulling in your technical people, when you are having the equipment manufactured, when you are building the plants. * * *

"I say if you are dealing with open plants, the problem of inspection is not so tough. If there is a powerplant some place and we are allowed—we, or the United Nations, or what have you—are allowed to maintain inspectors there, this problem does not look hopeless.

"The problem starts looking hopeless if you have a country where you do not know what is going on, a country where there are limitations of freedom and movement."

It was admitted by the scientific witnesses that once atomic weapons had been manufactured, they could be successfully hidden. Dr. Oppenheimer put it this way:

"There are no ingenious devices whereby one nation could detect or control atomic armament in another nation committed to sovereignty and secrecy in this field.

"If you hired me to walk through the cellars of Washington to see whether there were atomic bombs, I think my most important tool would be a screwdriver to open the crates and look. I think that just walking by, swinging a little gadget, would not give me the information."

All of the expert witnesses testified that in any atomic war a tremendous benefit accrued to the aggressor. Again Dr. Oppenheimer expressed the generally held viewpoint when he said:

"Although the fear of retaliation is a very serious one, the advantages of attack are enormous, the advantages of initiative are enormous.

"I believe, when the thing goes far enough and the stockpiles get bigger and bigger, that, at least, the advantages, the seeming advantages of the initiative will outweigh any possible disadvantages of having other powers gang up on them."

Dr. Alvin M. Weinberg, speaking as a representative of the Federation of Atomic Scientists, said: "My feeling is that the advantage which accrues to the aggressor is overwhelming."

There was another accepted concept advanced by our scientific fraternity—that any plants for peacetime applications of atomic energy could be readily converted to military use. Dr. Harold C. Urey, Nobel Prize winner, suggested that we have no such plants pending the time when we had really come to the agreement that guaranteed world security. Dr. Langmuir shared this view and stated:

"Much of the discussion of the human value of atomic energy has been based on the thought that such energy may displace coal and oil as sources of industrial power. This, I think, is a relatively trivial matter. Even if coal or oil cost nothing as fuels, this would not have a very great effect on our civilization: we would not use our automobiles much more and our electric power bills would not be cut as much as they already have been within the last 15 years by the improvements that have occurred in power production."

Pursuing this question as to whether or not there could be a reasonable separation of the manufacture of atomic energy for peace as differentiated from its manufacture for war, Dr. Oppenheimer stated:

"The manufacture of atomic energy for peace, in any plants that I have heard discussed, would make material latently which could be used for war. If you did this, if you made atomic energy and sold it in kilowatts and so on and definitely made no provision for military inspection of the products which you were making at the same time and did this on a large scale, you would have perhaps solved, let us say, more than 60 percent and less than 90 percent of the problem of making atomic weapons."

Senator TYDINGS pursued the question with Dr. Leo Szilard, then of the University of Chicago, as follows:

Senator TYDINGS. Therefore, I take it that your answer meant that unless there was an international climate created which would make the control of the bomb or the elimination of the bomb, whichever it might be, reasonably feasible with a promise of safety that, as an alternative it would be better if we could have an agreement that nobody would manufacture atomic energy even for peacetime purposes, because it would be so easy to slip over into the field of war purposes. Am I correct in what I have said?

"Dr. SZILARD. Yes; precisely."

Dr. Urey expressed it this way:

"In considering the problem of control there are two assumptions that might be made: First, that there would be no peacetime large-scale powerplants; and second, that peacetime powerplants would be permitted on a large scale. In order to secure power for industrial purposes from atomic energy, it is necessary to have very large-scale plants. If these large-scale plants were all in existence, as they might be some 10, 20, or 25 years in the future, they would contain considerable amounts of fisisonable material that could be used for bombs. It would then only be necessary to withdraw the material from these plants and manufacture this material into bombs."

The belligerence of our scientists as to what steps they would take in the event that nations would not cooperate in international control was very surprising. Dr. Oppenheimer stated, in reply to a question from Senator BYRD as to what he would recommend in the event any nation secretly and surreptitiously broke an agreement for international control:

"If this situation arose, and it is clear from what I have said that I don't think it needs to arise, I would use military measures of all kinds against the offending country."

On the subject of the reliability of international agreements, there was one scientist who differed with his colleagues. Dr. Ross Gunn, then technical adviser to the naval administration of the Naval Research Laboratory, stated that one of the basic principles of science was that if an experiment was performed a number of times and the same answer always resulted, that unless the fundamentals were changed, one could expect the same answer if the experiment was performed again. Translating this scientific principle into the realm of human conduct, Dr. Gunn stated:

"When people talk about international agreements, I would like to ask them to give me a quantitative figure of the probability of an international agreement lasting 25 years, 50 years, or 100 years. And if that probability isn't finite and of appreciable size, then I say we should not do the experiment over again. That is all I know about it, sir."

Another conclusion which was pretty firmly fixed in the minds of our scientists was that any atomic arms race would eventually result in atomic war. Dr. Oppenheimer bluntly stated: "I believe that if there is atomic armament there will be atomic war."

In reviewing the advice given in 1945 by our men of science it is clear that the future conduct of our atomic energy and diplomatic programs was to be based upon certain theses, as follows:

(1) That international control of atomic energy was a necessity.

(2) That a climate of peace existed in the world which would make such control possible.

(3) That fee and unlimited inspection was a necessary prerequisite to such control.

(4) That such inspection could only function prior to the manufacture of atomic weapons by any other nation since atomic weapons once manufactured could never be detected.

(5) That there was no defense against atomic weapons.

(6) That it would be extremely dangerous to allow the development of a worldwide atomic energy power program prior to the securing of reliable control safeguards.

(7) That in an atomic war the aggressor would have a tremendous advantage.

(8) That in an atomic war the United States must attack first.

All of the scientists testified that the possession of a power reactor would constitute from 60 to 90 percent of the possession of atomic weapons. They further stated that it would be impossible to prevent diversion of fissionable materials from a power reactor to a weapons program. In hammering this point home, it was the consensus that in view of the threat of diverting fissionable materials from peacetime applications to weapons, the peacetime benefits were trivial in comparison to the dangers involved.

In the 10 years since 1945 the rosy picture of cooperation painted by Dr. Bush has rapidly dissipated if it ever existed. We have been through the Korean war, we have witnessed the rise of Red China and the expansion of communism throughout the world.

We are now launched upon a full scale atoms-for-peace program which violates the technical advice given to us by our men of science.

(1) Another nation, the Soviet Union, did clandestinely manufacture not only fission devices but also fusion devices. No man of science has advocated preventive war as most of them in 1945 stated should be done if this situation arose.

(2) There are no reliable international control mechanisms. There are no present

prospects that there will ever be any reliable controls inasmuch as both the United States and Russia how have atomic stockpiles which the scientists say can never be detected by inspection.

(3) We have entered into 20 bilateral agreements for the exportation of fissionable material, uranium 235, to foreign countries. Thus far the material is in 6-kilogram lots, insufficient for weapons purposes, but there is no doubt that once the politicians are committed to the program it will snowball and within a few years accumulated stores of the material sufficient for weapons will be available in many countries.

It has been said on many occasions that the fissionable material which we are going to make available to foreign countries for power reactors is not "weapons grade." We are told that it is 20 percent enriched in the isotope U_{235}. The isotope 235 of uranium is the fissionable weapons material. Only 0.7 of 1 percent of 235 occurs in natural uranium.

An elementary student of nuclear physics and the uranium separation process knows that when uranium has been brought from .7 of 1 percent to an enrichment of 20 percent U_{235}, the remaining task to bring it to weapons grade is not difficult. The big task is to enrich the material from its natural state to 5 percent. From that point on any nation with an isotope separation process can bring the material to the proper enrichment for weapons very rapidly. Almost all of the costs of the preparation of weapons enriched material are expended in the first 2 percent of enrichment. To tell the American people that 20 percent enriched uranium 235 is not weapons grade, though technically correct, is a very dangerous half-truth.

No American is opposed to the rapid advancement of nuclear science insofar as it will assist in conquering disease, improving medicine, biology, agriculture, and industry. These humanitarian applications, however, are accomplished by radioisotopes which are produced in reactors. They have no relationship to the exportation of fissionable material. The present worldwide reactor program is designed for the production of power.

The power program needs U_{235}. This material can be used to make atomic bombs.

Despite the extravagant statements that have been made for atomic power, the McKinsey and Co. (consultants) reported to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in July 1955 that:

Present technology for the production of electric power is based simply on atomic energy replacing fossil fuels as a source of heat, with the balance of the process for the production of electric power remaining the same. Under this technology, authorities do not now anticipate that the cost of electric power in the United States will be substantially lowered through the use of atomic energy as a fuel. This fact limits the extent of the impact on the economy of the United States, but has real significance for other economies where the costs of fossil fuels are substantially higher. (Appraising the Impact of the Atom, McKinsey and Co., July 1955.)

If atomic power is developed, therefore, its benefits will accrue to foreign nations, not to the United States. In addition to increasing the industrial potential of foreign nations, we are placing in their hands material which in quantities will tremendously increase their war potential.

Once we sent scrap iron to Japan and later it rained from the skies at Pearl Harbor. The risks to the United States in the present program do not justify the possible benefits. The atom has no morals. "Atoms for Peace" can become Atoms for War. This, therefore, is truly America's most dangerous experiment.

Farmers Need Cash Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the January 11 issue of the Salina Journal. This is one of the large daily newspapers published in the Kansas wheat belt, and the editorial expresses concern that the proposed farm legislation does not provide sufficient immediate cash payments where they are badly needed.

The State of Kansas has suffered seriously from a severe drought during the past 3 years, and the immediate problem facing our farmers is some cash payments which will help them through this period until we produce another crop. Needless to state, it is a serious situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JOURNAL'S OPINION—FARMERS NEED CASH NOW

Drought-threatened, pocketbook-flattened Midwestern farmers will find scant consolation in President's Eisenhower's farm message.

With two exceptions, the benefits it proposes may not reach the farmers until the harvest of 1957 or later.

But the farmers need help in 1956. Particularly will they need it if the drought is not broken and if the new harvest is thin.

The purchase of beef and pork and the refund of gasoline taxes will help. But they are not enough.

Congress should put the loan price for the 1956 wheat crop at 100 percent of parity. For the 1956 crop only.

Wouldn't this be inconsistent? It would be, except that the whole plan is to be changed.

In proposing the soil-bank program, the administration in effect has scuttled the flexible support scheme—although it may not want to admit it. If the flexible scheme is not to be relied upon to reduce production, then the reason for lowering the loan price has ceased to exist.

The immediate question is a subsidy for ailing agriculture. Considering the need, the subsidy might as well be adequate.

And as long as full parity support would be only temporary relief, the Government might well apply some limit on the total amount any one farmer might receive.

These, of course, are "crash remedies," temporary, and not part of a long-range program.

President Eisenhower's message, quite properly, was mostly concerned with the long view. It was faulty only in failing to make immediate provision for an immediate situation.

With much of the 9-point program farm leaders will agree. There will be questions, however, about the soil bank that need to be answered in detail. For example, one wonders just what should be done with the acres to be removed from production and put in the bank.

This is as tough a puzzle as where and how our surplus stores of wheat should be dumped.

It is heartening to know that the President and the Congress are giving such emphatic attention to the farm problem. But farmers and all of us who depend upon them will be more cheered if Congress takes emergency action as well as provide a long-term solution.

Don't Make FBI Political Gestapo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the high-handed action of the Federal Justice Department which was denounced on the floor of the House by Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia, on January 5, has aroused great resentment among people who believe in law observance and law enforcement, and this resentment is justified. The brazen conduct in question has also affected the high regard in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation has been held in the past.

The action to which I refer was that in which an Assistant United States Attorney General ordered FBI agents to go into Cobb County, Ga., obstensibly for the purpose of investigating the question as to whether Negroes are prohibited from serving on a grand jury.

There was no justification for that action. It was reprehensible in the extreme. It is being resented by right-thinking people everywhere.

One of our excellent newspapers in Atlanta, the Metropolitan Herald, carried an editorial in its January 4 issue which voices the fears which are beginning to take shape that under the domination of a political-minded Attorney General and Justice Department, the FBI may degenerate into a political gestapo.

The editorial is as follows:

DON'T MAKE FBI POLITICAL GESTAPO

The extent to which the United States Supreme Court and the Department of Justice have both become pawns in the hands of power politics is clearly shown in the current investigation by FBI agents of Cobb County's method of selecting white and Negro jurors.

This investigation was ordered by an Assistant Attorney General, presumably on order of Attorney General Herbert Brownell, after the United States Supreme Court upset the conviction of a Negro in Cobb County on the grounds that his constitutional rights "may have been violated" (those are the exact words of the court) because no Negroes served on the grand jury which indicted him or on the trial jury which convicted him of rape.

Cobb County officials report that a number of Negroes have served on juries there and that names are in both the grand jury and trial jury boxes. There is no distinction as to race on the name slips in the jury boxes, in compliance with another United States Supreme Court edict, they state. Despite this fact, the Nation's highest Court and the Department of Justice are treating Cobb County as if it were the criminal in this case.

The United States Supreme Court evidently did not take into consideration that the conviction it upset was the second trial granted the defendant. The first conviction was overturned by the Georgia Supreme

Court because of a trial error, the Georgia court being determined that the Negro defendant should have every legal consideration. The fact that the defendant was under sentence as a sex offender when he was convicted of this latest crime seems to have made no difference to the Federal court or to Mr. Brownell.

It must be embarrassing to John Edgar Hoover to have his FBI agents snooping around trying to find a legal technicality to free a dangerous, twice convicted criminal because his superior, Mr. Brownell, and the United States Supreme Court bow before the powerful political force of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It is a dangerous situation when we find the Supreme Court and the Department of Justice practically always doing everything possible to free dangerous, convicted Negro criminals because their civil rights may have been violated. Thus the record of the United States Supreme Court and Brownell's Department of Justice.

We agree with Governor Griffin, Attorney General Cook, and Cobb Solicitor General Hames in their condemnation of the Department of Justice in its veiled threat against the courts of Georgia. It is a violation of our most basic laws for the FBI to be used as a political gestapo.

Address by Congressman John J. Flynt, Jr., to the National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1955, our distinguished colleague, Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr., of Georgia, delivered a memorable address to the National Association of County Officials at their annual meeting in Richmond, Va. Congressman Flynt's address emphasized the importance of local governments and stressed the very pressing need of our people for the right of local self-determination. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include the major portion of Congressman FLYNT's address:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY OFFICIALS ANNUAL MEETING IN RICHMOND, VA.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful to you and your executive committee for the invitation to meet with you today, and I am especially delighted to discuss with you our joint responsibility to the respective subdivisions of Government which we serve. In most instances you who serve your counties, districts, and parishes do so because of a genuine desire to be of public service. It matters not what capacity in which you serve. I believe I make a safe statement when I say that each of you put far more into the job you perform than you receive out of it in monetary compensation.

In the entire history of the American people of our Nation and of the States and local subdivisions of government which comprise our Nation, it has been a historical fact that the best public servants and the best public officials are those who serve out of a genuine and conscientious desire to improve the community, State and Nation in which they live.

The principle is well established that the responsibility of government under our law and Constitution rests with the people. The American people are the only sovereign power under our form of Government. We who in one form or another have been chosen to elective office have received from this sovereign power our commission and our mandate to be public servants in a representative form of Government. If ever we fail to realize that we are a part of a representative form of Government and if ever we fail to fulfill the commission entrusted to us, then we have failed in the basic concept of the form of Government which has made this Nation the greatest in the history of civilization.

There is a phrase in the State constitution of my own State of Georgia. In fact, it is paragraph 1 of article I of our State constitution. It reads:

"All government, of right, originates with the people, is founded upon their will only, and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. Public officers are the trustees and servants of the people, and, at all times, amenable to them."

Of the responsibilities which rest upon you as a governing official of the county in which you live, three of them stand out above all. First, there is a responsibility to your own local government of which you are a part to lend to it a dignity and stature so that all persons may have a genuine and deserved respect for constituted authority.

In this connection, it seems to me that the first responsibility of local officers, indeed the first responsibility of all public officials, is to maintain and preserve the principle of local self-government and local self-determination. This country of ours and our government on every level has become the great Government that it is and the great Nation which we are because of strong foundations on the local level.

We could no more have built a strong national government with weak local foundations that you could build a pyramid on its point or suspend this building in space without solid, genuine foundations.

It is for this basic, underlying reason that we who live in the South are so firm and so confident of the rightness of our position which the Supreme Court of the United States has recently sought to overturn and overthrow. If the Supreme Court of the United States, or any other tribunal by whatever name it may be known, can destroy the principle of local self-government and local self-determination on the issue of public schools, then it can also do it in every phase of local government. This decision of the Supreme Court to which I refer was aimed at the South, and under the guise of a legal decision it overturned every precedent known to legal minds. Those of you who have read the Supreme Court decision are well aware of the fact that it admitted that it was not based on law but was based on sociological and psychological factors.

Therefore, we urge and call upon you who live in other parts of the United States to join with us as we seek to preserve the principle of local self-government and local self-determination.

Don't say it can't happen to you, for just as surely as the principle of local self-government is destroyed in Georgia or Virginia or Alabama, then before you know it, even perhaps before the moon changes again, you will lose certain rights which you think are safe and secure to you today.

So, never send to know for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for you.

We have long believed that we enjoy more freedoms than any other people in the world, and yet by recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that Court has destroyed the most basic and fundamental freedom of all, the freedom of choice.

Secondly, a public official owes a responsibility to the citizens of the political subdivision he serves, whether it be on a municipal, county, State or national level. "A public office is a public trust." Any public official who undertakes to conduct the duties of his office in any spirit other than that he is performing a sacred trust is unworthy to hold the position to which he has been chosen.

The third of the three responsibilities which are enumerated here is the responsibility to one's self. "This above all: To thine own self be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, Thou canst not then be false to any man." If and when this thought becomes the guiding spirit which motivates each public official in the performance of his public duty then we shall be assured for all time of better and finer government on every level of government known to American people.

Public confidence in public officials and in local self-government is determined largely by the manner in which the duties of local public offices are conducted and carried out. Each and every public official is, and at all times should be, responsible for his every public action.

It is, of course, necessary on all levels of government to hold what are known as executive sessions, that is in certain phases of legislation and certain phases of carrying out administrative and executive duties, it is necessary that these sessions be conducted in relative privacy. But one indispensable part of our form of government is that the results and actions of these executive sessions, once they have been made, be made freely and openly available to inspection by the public generally. This is as it should be, because truth is a weapon of freedom; and conversely the suppression of truth is a weapon of dictatorship.

There are two essential characteristics which a successful public official must possess. One is a thick skin and the other is courage.

It is not necessarily right, but it is nevertheless true and correct that any public official, good or bad, is at all times subject to attacks sometimes minor and on the other hand sometimes extremely vicious. He, therefore, must at all times be ready, willing and able to withstand any attack which may be made upon him as an individual or as an office holder. He must be able to laugh at those which are made in either a joking or half-joking fashion, and at the same time, he must be able to repel by whatever means necessary those of a vicious and scurrilous nature.

The other characteristic which every public official must have is that of courage. He must be able to make decisions and to stand upon the decision he has made so long as he believes that decision to be right and just. He cannot vacillate and he cannot change his mind with each changing wind or each waxing moon.

There is a story told that during the reign of Henry VIII, of England, there was a bishop of Westminster by the name of Hugh Latimer. Whatever faults Henry VIII had, he was a regular attendant at worship services in Westminster Abbey Sunday in and Sunday out. One difference between him and other worshippers was that he didn't sit in the congregation as you or I do; Henry VIII sat in his royal box and looked down upon the pulpit and congregation alike. Whenever he disagreed with anything contained in one of Bishop Latimer's sermons, he would voice something akin to a negative amen. One day at the end of Bishop Latimer's sermon, Henry VIII rose in his royal box and said, "Bishop Latimer, your King is speaking to you. On next Sunday morning, you will return to this cathedral and renounce and

recant every word which you have spoken today." Needless to say, it was not necessary to send out notices to fill the pews the following Sunday. When next Sunday rolled around, the bishop was in his pulpit, the King was in his royal box, and every available pew and standing space was filled. After the prayer was prayed and after the hymns were sung, Bishop Latimer took his place. He first turned in the direction of the King and addressed himself: "Bishop Latimer, Bishop Latimer, understandest thou that thou are in the presence of the Sovereign King of England who has the power to sever thy head from thy shoulders?" Then Bishop Latimer lifted his eyes toward the sky and again addressed himself, saying, "Hugh, Hugh, knowest thou that thou comest from Almighty God who has the power to cast thy body and soul into everlasting hell. Speak the truth, man, speak it with all thy heart." And then he proceeded to preach the identical sermon he had preached the Sunday before. There wasn't a sound in the cathedral as he finished. Everyone was waiting for what would come next. Presently, Henry VIII rose, faced the bishop and faced the congregation, and said, "I thank God for one man in my kingdom with the wisdom to know what is right and the courage and strength to say it, even in the face of death."

A great many, perhaps most of you, are men and women who occupy positions charged with the building and maintenance of public roads and highways. In view of this, I am sure that you are vitally interested in the legislative deliberations in the United States Congress on the proposal known as the Federal highway program. I think that you might be interested to learn of the plans that have been advanced. The administration plan, oftentimes called the Clay plan, has not been passed and probably will not be passed by either House of Congress, and I am one of those who would have opposed it if the administration's plan had reached the floor of the House of Representatives. This particular plan had what I consider five basic defects which would render it unsound, ineffective and actually un-American legislation.

1. Under the pending proposal contemplated in the administration plan, every dollar's worth of road would eventually cost the taxpayers $1.55.

2. The average life of a road is 20 years. Under the administration plan, it would take our children 30 years or more to pay for the cost of roads which had long since been worn out.

3. The administration plan would completely unbalance our road program, by freezing all work on our regular primary and secondary systems at $622½ millions annually while spending $2 billion each year (three times as much) on an interstate network of super-highways. Three-fourths of all Federal road funds on a system which constitutes only about 2 percent of our highway mileage and carries only one-seventh of our traffic.

4. The increase the administration plan seeks to provide is too abrupt. During the fiscal year just ended, we've appropriated $25 million for this particular network. The administration bill would increase this to approximately $2 billion, or 80 times as much * * * an increase of 8,000 percent.

5. The administration plan would increase our national indebtedness by $31.5 billion and ultimately mean an unavoidable increase in taxes.

I hope that you and each of you can and will make your views on Federal highway legislation known to your respective Members of Congress, for I believe I speak the sentiments of my colleagues in the House of Representatives when I say that we have a great deal of confidence and faith in the county officials who serve the counties which comprise the districts we have the honor to represent.

I am confident that I speak the feelings and sentiments of all of us when I say we are truly living in a changing world. We are living in a world which perhaps stands on the brink of the greatest era of world progress in which the American Nation will naturally play a leading part, or we stand on the threshold of destruction and eternity.

There are many people who believe that the cold war is almost over and that that which will follow will be peace or destruction. Whichever comes, we will go through a considerable change—an era of transition.

Public officials are called upon to take the lead, to make decisions, and above all, to show courage in times of crisis and on days of decision.

If you and I, as public officers, are to serve our Nation, our States, our counties, our families, and ourselves, it is the solemn responsibility of each of us to accept the challenge which comes our way and to meet with courage and determination each decision which we have to make.

An Italian poet, Alighieri Dante, once said:

"There is one heaven and one hell, but there are many roads which lead to each."

To that he added:

"The hottest places in hell are reserved for those who in a period of moral crisis maintain their neutrality."

The United States of America, the youngest of the great nations of the world, has become the greatest economic, moral, and spiritual force in the history of civilization. This has been no accident; it has been because of the will and the determination of the American people. These people, even as you and I, who have carved out of the wilderness the greatest Nation in the history of mankind, have done so because of their intense desire for a way of life similar to that preached by the Man of Galilee 2,000 years ago. They have lived it in their daily lives; they have charted their course for the future in times of prosperity and times of adversity, and that course has been based upon the same principles and ideals which are expressed in a quotation on a statute on the capital grounds in Atlanta, Ga.:

"Give us the fortitude, which through the coluds, and gloom, and sorrow of apparent failure, can see the distant pinnacles upon which the everlasting sunlight rests."

Some time ago, I read a pamphlet in which a 10 or 12-year-old, barefoot boy dressed in overalls and a straw hat, freckled face with a fishing pole over one shoulder and a can of worms in his hand, was looking up to you and me. This boy, my friends, is typical of American boys all over, and this is (in essence) what he said:

"Why not hold off turning everything over to the Government, so that the Government can issue it back in the form of so-called 'security and welfare benefits?' How about giving me a chance at America the way you found it when you first came of age?"

We owe the greatest of all responsibilities to this boy who asks you and me that simple question. We owe it to him and to all others like him to fulfill our responsibilities and obligations to them as well as to the Nation we love and serve and thereby leave to him the kind of country he wants to live in and has a right to live in.

Our democratic institutions, and with them our American way of life, exist by reason of their very virtue. If ever they cease to exist, it will be when you and I have forgotten the past, have become indifferent to the present, utterly reckless as to the future.

Courage has been exemplified in the lives of four centuries of Americans who by their lives have kept up the installments on our contract with freedom, and the blood of American heroes who have given their lives in defense of our Nation has been the moisture content which has built the concrete structure we call America—this same America of which Oliver Wendell Holmes spoke when he said:

"The thing that sets America apart from the rest of the world is that we always sail on. Sometimes we sail with the wind, sometimes against the wind; but we always sail. We never drift or lie at anchor."

Opposition to the Appointment of Wesley D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some introductory material, including some editorials and resolutions, in opposition to the appointment of Wesley D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

There being no objection, the editorials and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the AFL News-Reporter, Washington, D. C., October 28, 1955]

GIVEAWAY PROTECTOR

First it was tidelands, then Dixon-Yates, Hells Canyon, and now it's Wesley D'Ewart.

The administration has nominated for the post of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Development, Mr. D'Ewart, who when he was Congressman from Montana supported legislative measures which infringed a sound public policy in respects to public lands. Here is a nominee whose legislative record shows that he favors turning over to special interests vested legal rights in our public domain and other natural resources.

Now he's been named by the President to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Development—a post in which he's supposed to protect our public lands.

[From the Oregonian of October 8, 1955]

MCKAY'S BAD CHOICE

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay's penchant for baring his neck on the political guillotine baffles us. The latest incident is his appointment of Wesley A. D'Ewart, of Montana, as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Public Land Management. The odds are that the Democratic Senate never will confirm this appointment when it meets in January. It should not.

As a Representatve in Congress Mr. D'Ewart was the warm friend and spokesman for a group of big-spread cattlemen who have been trying for years to rewrite the land acts to give them feudal rights in the public domain. In 1953 the bill he introduced at the request of the cattlemen, known as the D'Ewart bill, or the Stockmen's Grazing Act, aroused a nationwide storm of opposition from conservationists.

In defense of the rights of 30 million Americans who use the public domain annually, as well as in the interest of conserving watersheds on which urban life and cropland farmers depend for water and power, and in opposition to the demands of 14,830 ranchers who have permits to graze cattle and sheep in the national forests, the Oregonian said at that time:

"In brief, the bill would give ranchers a vested right to national-forest grazing lands which now they use as a public privilege. The right would be perpetual in virtually all cases. Grazing lands would become, in effect, a part of the rancher's property, without the cost of taxes and administration and for payment of a low fee. They could be sold with the home ranch to a new owner and handed down to descendants. Wealthy ranchers could buy other base property strategically located to give them a monopoly on all the grazing lands they could use. A reasonable supposition is that the result would be larger and larger ranches and fewer smaller ranches."

The D'Ewart bill was defeated by the Republican Congress and Representative D'Ewart himself was defeated in his race for the Senate against Montana's Democratic incumbent, JAMES E. MURRAY, by 1,728 votes. A new grazing bill was written by James E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, and introduced as the Hope-Aiken bill. The new proposal eliminated many of the bad features of the D'Ewart bill. But conservation interests divided on it, and the Democratic attacks carrying over from D'Ewart's efforts obscured its good features.

Democratic candidates in 1954 tried to paint the stockmen's bill as an administration raid on the public lands for private interests, treating the vicious D'Ewart bill and the reasonably fair Hope-Aiken bill as one and the same. What will they say now that Secretary McKay has turned over administration of Interior's public lands to Mr. D'Ewart? Politics aside, we cannot agree with the Secretary that Mr. D'Ewart is "a man of very, very good judgment." The sponsor of the infamous 1953 stockmen's bill cannot be expected to press for multiple use of the public domain.

RESOLUTION FROM ST. HELENS ROD AND GUN CLUB, ST. HELENS, OREG.

Whereas Wesley D'Ewart, former Congressman from the State of Montana, introduced legislation while in Congress, which would have adversely affected the interests of the majority of the States entitled to the use of public domain and the forest reserves of the United States; and

Whereas Mr. D'Ewart vigorously worked this legislation, as well as other legislation, detrimental to conservation interests; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Douglas McKay, has recently appointed Mr. D'Ewart to a position in control of the Range Management Division of the Department of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the St. Helens Rod and Gun Club, this 21st day of November 1955, That we recommend to the various clubs, and other interested parties, that we protest the appointment of Mr. D'Ewart; and be it further

Resolved, We request the withdrawal of the appointment of Mr. D'Ewart, in view of his known attitude with respect to conservation matters detrimental to the interests of the general public; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of such resolution be sent to Secretary Douglas McKay, Secretary of Interior, Washington 25, D. C.; to Senators Richard Neuberger and Wayne Morse, Congresswoman Edith Greene, the Oregon Game Commission, the Idaho Game Commission, and the Washington Game Commission.

NOVEMEER 29, 1955.

Mr. DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCKAY: The Powder River Sportsmen's Club, Inc., an organization of some 700 sportsmen in Baker County, Oreg., did, at their regular meeting on November 21, 1955, conclude that:

Whereas Wesley D'Ewart, former Congressman from Montana, while a member of Congress, introduced certain legislation which we believe would have adversely affected the interests of those entitled to use the Public Domain and the Forest Reserves of the United States; and

Whereas Mr. D'Ewart worked vigorously for this legislation which we consider detrimental to sound conservation, and;

Whereas Mr. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, has recently appointed Mr. D'Ewart to a position in charge of range management fo the Department of the Interior; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Powder River Sportsmen's Club, vigorously protest the appointment of Mr. D'Ewart to this position; and be it further

Rsolved, We request the withdrawal of this appointment in view of his known attitude in conservation matters, highly detrimental to the interests of the general public; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, New Fliedner Building, 1017 Southwest Washington Street, Portland, Oreg.; to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Postoffice Box 136, Eugene, Oreg.; to EDITH GREEN, Congresswoman, Portland, Oreg.; to the Oregon State Game Commission, Postoffice Box 4136, Portland 8, Oreg.

Sincerely,
POWDER RIVER SPORTSMEN'S CLUB,
F. J. MURPHY, *Secretary.*

MULTNOMAH ANGLERS & HUNTERS CLUB.
Portland, Oreg., December 28, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Room 402, Loyalty Building,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIR: I have been instructed by the board of directors of the Mutnomah Anglers & Hunters Club to send you a copy of a resolution passed on by the board of directors.

RESOLUTION

Whereas Wesley D'Ewart, former Congressman from the State of Montana, introduced legislation while in Congress which would have adversely affected the interest of the majority of the States entitled to use the public domain and forest reserves of the United States; and

Whereas the said W. D'Ewart, vigorously worked this legislation as well as other legislation detrimental to conservation interests; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, has recently appointed the said W. D'Ewart to the position in control of the Range Management Division of the Department of the Interior: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Multnomah Anglers & Hunters Club of Portland, Oreg, this 20th day of October 1955, That such appointment be, and the same is, hereby protested in view of his known attitude with respect to conservation matters detrimental to the general public.

MULTNOMAH ANGLERS & HUNTERS CLUB,
By WM. E. KNAUER, *Secretary.*

Commendation to Chairmen and Members of Aviation Subcommittees of Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have printed a resolution commending the chairmen and members of the Aviation Subcommittees of the Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees, which was adopted by the National Association of State Aviation Officials at their annual meeting held last year in Dallas:

Whereas the record of the 84th Congress is outstanding in the field of aviation legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the National Association of State Aviation Officials in convention assembled especially commends the chairmen and members of the Aviation Subcommittees of the Senate and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees for:

(a) Desirable amendments to the Federal Airport Act, Public Law 211;

(b) Recommending permanent certification of local carriers, Public Law 38;

(c) Not recommending enactment of the so-called omnibus aviation bills in their present form (S. 308, S. 1119).

County Commissioners Association Urges Fair Return for Farmers

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to convey to this Congress and to Congresses before it that farmers of this Nation are fighting mad about the sliding scale as their income continues to slide downward while the rest of the Nation enjoys prosperity. In this connection it is my pleasure to include with my remarks a resolution just passed by the County Commissioners Association of North Dakota. Represented are commissioners from every county in the State. I will not include all their names as all are written in longhand, but well over 100 are listed.

The resolution follows:

Whereas agriculture is the foundation of our national wealth, it is the basic industry of the entire world, along with forestry and mining the first link in our economic chain;

Whereas the economic structure of our township, county, State, and Federal Government is based on the existence and the purchasing power of the American farmer;

Whereas the family-type farm and the continuing existence of the family-type farm is contingent upon the prices received for the products produced; and

Whereas the prices received for farm commodities have greatly reduced compared to prices received for other basic commodities thus imperiling the standard of living of the American farmer; and

Whereas the standard of living established on the American farm must be maintained in order to preserve the very fundamentals of our American democracy; and

Whereas the average North Dakota farmer retained a net income of 49 cents from each cash dollar he received in 1950 compared to a net income of 27 cents per cash dollar received in 1954; and

Whereas from 1910 until 1949 farm income and national income rose and fell together, resulting in parity purchasing power for the American farmer; and

Whereas since 1949 the national income has risen steadily and the farm income has decreased steadily until it is a peril to eco-

nomic stability for all segments of the economy in America: Be it

Resolved, That, if the powers of our democracy can justifiably be used to stabilize the many major segments of our economy that those same powers be used to stabilize the most basic of all economic segments, the American agriculture; be it further

Resolved, That greater recognition be given family-type farm, that the economy and standard of living be maintained on a level deserving of our democracy; be it finally

Resolved, That the County Commissioners Association of North Dakota ask and petition the President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson, and the Congress, that immediate recognition be given the problems of agriculture and a positive program be initiated.

Dated at Minot, N. Dak., this 10th day of January 1956.

JACOB SWENSON,
President.
FRANK J. WANNER,
Vice President.
GILMAN WASTVEDT,
Secretary.

Why Congressmen Can't Do Their Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the January 8, 1956, issue of This Week magazine. The author, Mr. William L. Rivers, magazine writer and journalism instructor at the University of Miami, Miami, Fla., worked for 2 years in the offices of Members of Congress:

WHY CONGRESSMEN CAN'T DO THEIR JOBS—OUR LAWMAKERS ARE SO SWAMPED BY LETTERS, 100,000 A DAY, THEY CAN'T FIND TIME FOR THEIR WORK

(By William L. Rivers)

Question: With the new session of the 84th Congress now making headlines, a reader who wishes to remain anonymous, writes us, "I've read about how many Congressmen are missing from the floor during important sessions. Why is this? Are they letting their constituents down?"

Answer: It's an alarming truth that most of the day-to-day legislative work in Congress is done by a relatively small number of men. One Congressman estimated that as few as 100 "regulars" handled the work of the House of Representatives. "The rest," he said, "are busy answering letters from home."

This is probably an exaggeration, but not too much so. There is no doubt that the heavy flow of mail is the biggest single problem that keeps Senators and Representatives from their proper tasks.

Recently Dr. George Gallup's American Institute of Public Opinion discovered 21 million Americans have, at one time or another, written to Congress. Most Congressmen laughed incredulously when they heard the figure. They felt that Dr. Gallup had overlooked a hundred million or so.

I don't agree that Dr. Gallup made a mistake. I think that 21 million letterwriters might be the right figure, but these 21 million write in again and again.

Why do they write so much? Well, a friend of mine handles correspondence for a Senator from a far western State. This Senator regularly receives mail from an old prospector who walks 17 miles to the mailbox. By writing to his Senator, he can be sure the trek will not be in vain. The Senator will write back.

RSVP ALWAYS

For, if there is one certainty about Capitol Hill it is that letters are answered—on any imaginable subject. Some of them find their way into the "Crackpot File." These files mean work. They, too, must be answered.

Why? It's a matter of practical politics that not even the biggest statesmen in Congress can afford to forget. The late Representative William Bankhead, of Alabama, Speaker of the House, was asked by a freshman Representative what he should do to get reelected. Bankhead promptly replied: "Answer your mail. It's the way you handle your mail that determines your reelection."

Years ago, the burden was reasonably modest. From about 1910 to 1920, each Representative averaged 15 letters a week, Senators a little more. There is now a flood of more than 100,000 letters a day to all of Capitol Hill—an average of 188 for each Member every single day.

A freshman Senator, elected by a thinly populated State in November 1954, came to Washington on January 3, bringing with him a six-man staff that knew his State's problems intimately. On January 8, less than a week later, he reported that he and his helpers were hopelessly behind. "They elected me a Senator," he said, "but what they really wanted here was a business agent."

His constituents were asking for everything from seed packages to autographs of President Eisenhower—and the Senator is a Democrat.

HOMEWORK HELP?

Throughout the year, the lawmaker will receive a mountain of requests for visas that the Department of State could have handled directly, agricultural information that the Department of Agriculture would have sent without senatorial prodding, requests for an appropriation for a constituent who slipped on the post-office steps back home and appeals from high-school students for information on homework assignments.

He will get some even weirder communications. There have been at least two letters from recently arrived Japanese students asking if their military service to the Mikado in World War II entitled them to the benefits of the GI bill of rights.

And my former boss, Senator FULBRIGHT, once received a request from a beverage concern asking him to pose for an advertising picture with a glass of beer in his hand.

Some of the letters are of astonishing length. The unofficial record so far is held by an exserviceman requesting veteran aid. The letter ran to 90 dages, closely written on both sides. Veterans' appeals, in general, outnumber all other varieties. In nearly every case, the lawmaker must first get in touch with the Veterans' Administration office back home, which may be just around the corner from the constituent.

DEAR "SPARKY"

There are some correspondents who write letters so they can say they know a Senator on a first-name basis. The first letter is formal: "Dear Senators." The second runs: "Dear Senator SPARKMAN." The third is "Dear JOHN." A fourth received in Senator SPARKMAN's office started: "SPARKY."

To handle the flood of mail, Senators and Representatives may employ from 3 or 4 to 2 dozen office workers. A Representative from a small district may average as few as 30 letters a day during the session, while a Senator from a small State will get 70 to 150 a day, and a Senator like PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, 500 a day.

Now, it would be a mistake to suggest that constituents stop writing their Congressman altogether. Senators and Representatives won't even suggest that, both from fear of the consequences and because they don't want to work in that kind of a vacuum.

But a letter that asks the Congressman to list the Presidents of the United States in order is costing a great deal of money, comparatively. Such information could be found in the public library.

Petitions and resolutions might be cut down if people realized how little attention is paid them. Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, has said flatly: "No one reads them. They gather dust in Capitol files until carried away. They seldom influence legislation."

This seems to run counter to the first article in the Bill of Rights stating: "Congress shall make no law * * * abridging * * * the right of the people * * * to petition the government for a redress of grievances." However, the sad truth is that it is possible to get some people to sign anything, worthy request or otherwise.

JUST WANT TO SAY HELLO

The letters that often do count are those that represent quite obviously the honest convictions of the writer, however unimpressively they may be worded.

And the correspondence that probably does much to insure that your lawmaker will have a chance to do his job is the one that closes: "Please do not answer this letter."

Time-consuming correspondence is costly, both in money and ultravaluable time, but there are other ways that lawmakers are prevented from doing their proper work.

There are sometimes as many as 15 or 20 pepole in the reception rooms of Senators and Representatives from large States near Washington. About one tenth are on important business. Most of them just want to say hello.

It might be a good idea to remark to the neighbor who mentions that he "had a couple of hours with the Senator while I was in Washington" that the interlude may have been more profitable to one party than to the other.

Add to the drop-in visits those that require the Senator to do something and it's small wonder a Member of Congress sometimes when reaching the floor late, slides into his seat and asks a neighbor of like political faith: "What are we voting on and how should I vote?"

American Servicemen Entitled to Protections Guaranteed in Constitution, Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier has rightly spoken out against treaties and agreements which permit the trial of American servicemen in foreign civil courts and incarceration in foreign prisons. Two excellent editorials on the subject appeared in the Waterloo newspaper last year, but I received them too late for inclusion in the RECORD before adjournment of Congress, and I want to include them as part of my remarks at this time.

Resolutions to revise these thoroughly un-American treaties and agreements are still pending before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Included is one I introduced, House Joint Resolution 321. I am confident that an overwhelming majority of the Members of this body are opposed to the trial of American servicemen in foreign courts, and I hope the Foreign Affairs Committee will give all Members an opportunity to express themselves on the matter by reporting one of the resolution to the House floor without undue delay.

Mr. Speaker, the first editorial, which appeared in the Waterloo Courier on July 26, 1955, is as follows:

GIs DESERVE AMERICAN TRIALS

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is holding a hearing on what has been happening to American GIs being tried in foreign courts under the official status of forces treaty with NATO countries and under Executive agreements negotiated with other countries including Japan.

This treaty and the executive agreements provide that American servicemen abroad are tried in foreign courts for alleged offenses committed while off duty. Offenses committed while on duty bring a military court martial.

The Courier believes that, despite the need to minimize friction in areas where American troops are stationed, the trial of GIs in foreign courts is unfair and unnecessary.

In the first place, American boys are drafted and sent abroad involuntarily. Then they are denied their United States constitutional rights in foreign courts. While foreign judicial practices naturally vary widely, a GI in a foreign court could be denied such rights as presumption of innocence, right to bail, right of trial by jury, right of habeas corpus, protection against self-incrimination, protection against cruel and unusual punishments, the right of having the prosecution assume the burden of proof and numerous other rights.

In the second place, this practice is directly contrary to established international law and to United States Supreme Court decisions.

In the third place, the American military code specifically makes a violation of domestic law in the country where a soldier is stationed a violation against the military code. Since this permits courts-martial for offenses against foreign laws, there is no need whatever to turn the GIs over to foreign courts.

The stationing of American troops in foreign lands no doubt does create friction. But this friction is apt to prejudice the native population against the GIs and deny him an unprejudiced court trial.

These foreign trials of GIs have unfortunately become an issue between the internationalists and the isolationists, thus introducing an emotional element in debate of the subject. But we feel confident the average American father and mother would consider it desperately unfair for their son to be drafted, sent overseas, be accused of some crime, be thrown into some stinking foreign jail, be denied bail and then tried by former enemies (as in Japan) in a court proceeding conducted in a foreign language that he can't understand.

The Courier's second editorial, printed in the August 3, 1955, edition, follows:

GIs DESERVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Stationing large numbers of troops in the vicinity of civilan population centers is inevitably a cause of friction. That friction exists within the United States in the relationships between Army camps and nearby cities. It is not surprising, therefore, that it should exist to a greater degree when American troops are stationed near civilian centers abroad.

As a gesture of good will, the United States State Department, with the reluctant acquiesence of the Defense Department negotiated the Status of Forces Treaty with NATO countries which provides that American GIs may be tried in foreign courts for alleged offenses committed off duty. Executive agreements provide for a similar course in other nations, including Japan, where United States troops are stationed.

Questioned by congressional committees, United States officials have been unable to furnish evidence that this arrangement was requested by any of the countries where United States troops are stationed. The action was apparently a voluntary gesture by the American Government designed to prove that citizens of this country do not consider themselves superior to those of other countries.

Certainly Americans do not wish to adopt a jingoistic attitude on this question. Although the danger of prejudice against foreigners always exists, everyone concedes that an American GI would probably receive as good or better treatment in a British court as in an American judicial proceeding.

But whereas British and American justice is designed to give every protection to a possibly innocent man accused of a crime, the law in other countries is designed to give maximum protection to society when there is doubt of guilt. The accused is considered guilty unless he proves his innocence. It is not surprising that an American GI, accused in a foreign land where he does not speak the language and denied the guaranties of Anglo-Saxon law, could easily be convicted when completely innocent.

Representative FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, recently released a part of the official report of American observers at the trial of three Marines in a Japanese court:

"After careful consideration, taking into account the ramifications involved in a trial under foreign laws, and cognizant of the fact that the court, not the representatives of the United States, are the judges of credibility of witnesses and weight of the evidence, the United States representatives are of the opinion that the three accused were not afforded a fair trial. We are of the opinion further that the accused stand unjustly convicted * * *. We cannot in conscience overlook the paucity of evidence upon which the convictions were based."

A report from Time Magazine early this year gives an account of French justice:

"In the week when the French Assembly proved again its willful capacity for chaos, French justice also came in for well-deserved attack. 'What is wrong with our justice?' demanded France Dimanche. 'Henceforward,' added Paris' Paris-Presse, 'it is hard to see how we can have the nerve to give lessons to totalitarian police.'

"French justice, based on the Napoleonic code, has long been viewed with cynicism by its friends anl alarm by disciples of Anglo-Saxon procedures * * *. Last week the case of a Nantes stevedore, only the most recent of a series of setbacks of justice touched off a storm of indignation.

"Seven years ago, someone accused Stevedore Jean Deshays of killing an old man, beating his wife, and robbing them of $50. Police briskly beat a confession out of Deshays, and he was sentenced to 10 years' hard labor. Last year police discovered that three other men had committed the crime."

Such miscarriages of justice, of course, are not unknown in Britain and the United States; but no unbiased observer would claim that an American GI would have as much opportunity of proving his innocence in a French court as in a United States military court martial. In France, for example, the GI might be tried by a Communist judge with every incentive to find him guilty. In Japan, the GI might be tried by a judge who had lost relatives in American bombing during World War II. Perhaps this danger has been exaggerated by opponents of international cooperation; but it nevertheless exists.

The Courier approves most of the steps taken by our Government to create international understanding and to build good will among our allies. But it believes that in this case the State Department has gone too far. An American youth drafted into the Armed Forces and involuntarily sent abroad should be entitled to the constitutional protections which he was allegedly drafted to defend. Such a policy would be fully in accord with established concepts of international law.

God, Country, and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following timely statement of the basic concept and prime purpose of the American Legion, as prepared by Dean Manion for Post 558 Biennial Membership and Business Directory published November 1955, should be brought before the Members of Congress and called to the attention of other readers of the RECORD. It is followed by the preamble of the constitution of the American Legion, which embodies ideas and principles to which all good Americans can gladly subscribe.

The author of the statement, Dean Manion, conducts the Manion Forum of Opinion on which informative broadcasts of subjects of national importance may be heard, and transcripts of which are available on request.

TO LT. COL. JOHN HOWARD POST 558:

For God and country and the American Legion was originally assembled, and in that interest it has since been maintained.

In the next breath of its new life, the Legion logically took a pledge to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States.

GOD, COUNTRY, AND THE CONSTITUTION

To this ideal trinity, and to this trinity of ideals, everything else is subordinated.

In the official organization of our country, God is the basic supporting fact. The truth that all men are created and endowed by their Creator with an indestructible God-designed nature, was responsible for the birth of our country in the Declaration of Independence.

The necessity for holding Government in service to this God-given nature of man required establishment of the American Constitutional system, which was crowned and capped by the Constitution of the United States. For the protection of this trinity of ideals, every American soldier has been recruited from 1776 to the present day.

The Legion is the great association of these "Old Soldiers," still marching in the same cause and in the same spirit of patriotic resolution that:

A. The religious inspiration and motivation of America and Americanism shall not be destroyed or contaminated by atheistic communism or by dictatorship of any kind or name.

B. The Sovereign Independence declared in 1776 and preserved by the blood and sacrifice of all American servicemen since then, shall never be compromised by one-worldism, or superstateism.

C. American local, State and Federal Government shall never be freed from the divisions, checks and balances, and prohibitions placed upon it by our Constitution and Bill of Rights.

In this resolution, legionnaires carry out their individual community, State, and national obligation to "combat autocracy" and "make right the master of might." For these purposes the American Legion was born. To these ends its patriotic sentinels are posted in every hamlet in the land.

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

(From back of membership cards)

For God and country, we associate ourselves together in the following purposes:

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America;

To maintain law and order;

To foster and perpetuate a 100 percent Americanism;

To preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars;

To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation;

To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses;

To make right the master of might;

To promote peace and good will on earth;

To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy;

To consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

Crisis in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me, I am pleased to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the resolution adopted by a group of American Jews who met in Asbury Park, N. J. Those attending this meeting were American citizens who are disturbed about the developments in the Near East, particularly between the State of Israel and the various Arab nations. I know that our Government is well aware of the situation in that part of the world and I feel sure will cooperate with other peace-loving nations to maintain peace and the principles of justice and liberty. The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY AT THE BERKELEY CARTERET HOTEL, THURSDAY, JANUARY 12, 1956

This assembly of American citizens of Monmouth County, N. J., unites in calling the attention of the American Government and people to the grave crisis in the Middle East which threatens the peace and security of Israel and of the entire free world.

The State of Israel came into being May 1948, "by virtue of the natural and historic right of the Jewish people and of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations." Aided by the moral and material assistance of the Government and people of the United States and by the unstinting sacrifices of the Jewish people of all free lands, Israel has built and consolidated a democratic commonwealth in the Middle East. In addition, Israel has laid the foundations for a decent society and a sound economy.

Now this great achievement faces its greatest crises. Defeated in their attempts to destroy Israel at birth, its enemies have intensified their war against its existence. They are now aided by the Soviet Union, which is pouring into the Arab world heavy armaments in large quantities. These armaments have already been and are continuing to be used by Egyptian military forces for aggression against the territory of the State of Israel, thus increasing the danger of an outbreak of general hostilities between the Arab states and Israel which is unlikely to be confined to that area.

This assembly solemnly declares that the security of the State of Israel and the stability of the Middle East are vital to the defense of the free world against Communist aggression and are consequently American interests of the highest priority.

We therefore urge our Government to negotiate without delay, security treaties with the State of Israel and any other states of the Middle East which desire the preservation of peace, guaranteeing the frontiers and boundaries of such states against aggression from any quarter.

We further urge upon our Government that it make available to the State of Israel military means for its legitimate self-defense.

The highest interests of justice and the security of free democratic nations everywhere demand that America shall act today firmly and decisively before it is too late.

Let's Remove the Patronage Tumor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to do away with the outmoded and unattractive practice of political patronage appointments in the postal and classified civil service.

The terms of my proposal would place postmasters in the competitive civil service, and would bring to an end the prevalent practice of obtaining political clearance either from Congressmen or from political party committees for appointees to civil-service jobs.

I am convinced that the American people both desire and deserve this type of reform, and that it is long overdue.

The Government of the United States is undoubtedly one of the most immense employment organisms on earth. It employs a working force of 4½ million and hires approximately a half-million new people annually to fill job vacancies of one sort and another.

To maintain this Government in all of its operations costs the average taxpayer about $350 a year in taxes.

For his $350 investment he would like—and he has every reason to expect—the assurance that this Government which belongs to him will be operated with the maximum of efficiency and the minimum of political job making.

He has every reason to expect that the people employed to conduct his affairs for him will be selected on the basis of ability and not in payment of political obligations.

Admittedly, positions of Cabinet rank and top policymaking stature must be filled by people in harmony with the governmental philosophy of the administration in office. My bill, therefore, does not disturb the existing relationship of Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation for positions of this type.

Yet there can be no logical reason or defense for requiring the President to appoint and the Senate to confirm local postmasters in the 40,000 communities they serve, except it be to create or perpetuate a nationwide political machine founded upon patronage.

In this specific connection, the Hoover Commission Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service said:

The present system of selecting first-, second-, and third-class postmasters is a hybrid between political appointment and a true merit system. It is incompatible with a businesslike management of the largest civilian business that the Government operates. It does not invite genuine competition from well-qualified persons and offends the American ideal of equal opportunity on the basis of character and ability. By reserving the key posts for patronage, it limits the incentive to enter the postal service as a career, and discourages postal employees from trying to go ahead on their merits.

The average American has shown again and again that he has nothing but contempt for the spoils system and everything that distasteful term implies.

The sole purpose of public employment should be to promote the most efficient possible conduct of the affairs of our Government, not to provide jobs for members of any party machine.

Millions of Americans voted for General Eisenhower in 1952 because they were convinced that he would usher in an administration which would clean up what they regarded as a mess in Washington.

"The single choice, the single standard," he had assured the Nation in a speech at Duluth, Minn., "shall be merit and not political reward."

Granting the personal sincerity of the President, it must be disappointing to him as it is to many of us of both parties in the Congress that the administration which surrounds him has fallen considerably short of living up to that expectation.

Many public positions are today being filled with strictly partisan political appointments.

It would be unbecoming of me as a Democrat to say that the Republican Party is behaving more crassly in this regard than my own may have done in the past. I realize that decency and honor and integrity wear no partisan party label.

As a first-term Member, it would be presumptious of me to say that present practices are worse than they have formerly been, for I have never before enjoyed this vantage point of observation.

But I do think it is fair to say that I have been shocked and keenly disappointed by the very partisan political complexion of certain job-placement

policies presently in vogue in our Federal Government.

That it may have been going on for years makes it no less reprehensible. That the other party on occasion may have been guilty of the same objectionable practice is no defense.

Some of these practices display what appears to be a brazen contempt for the principles which motivated civil-service reform and the Hatch Act.

The Pennsylvania State Republican Committee last spring sent an official delegation to Washington to confer with the White House and the National Republican Committee on patronage jobs.

Writing at the time in the Washington Star, columnist Joseph Young quoted a spokesman for the group as saying:

> The situation is vital to our staying in political power. It is the precinct workers and the rank-and-file political aids back home who win elections for us, and we've got to take care of them as far as jobs are concerned.

Which brings up the question: What is the purpose of Federal employment—to perform necessary government functions? or to win elections?

A year or so ago, under what came to be known as the Willis order, Federal agencies were directed by the administration to cooperate with the Republican Party by finding jobs and winning promotions through government for people with GOP political backing. In its original form, the order applied to all jobs, without exception, including presumably under civil-service protection.

The order required Federal agencies to notify the Republican National Committee of job vacancies on forms to be supplied by the party committee. All jobs paying $9,600 or better were to be frozen for a period of 30 days, presumably to allow the Republican committee time to clear prospective appointees.

In a strongly worded statement of indignation over this policy, the 74-year-old, nonpartisan National Civil Service League stated:

> A career system of civil service by definition and by its nature cannot be part of a political spoils system or a reservoir of political patronage. The only means of keeping a career civil service permanently useful is to keep it scrupulously nonpartisan.

When the plan became publicly known, it aroused a storm of protest, and has since been modified.

But the pattern was made clear. It has also been made clear in the pronouncements of local party chairmen over the country who are openly stating that the first qualification they will consider in filling an opening is whether or not the applicant had a reliable record of Republican Party activity.

Let me make myself clear. Such party activity should certainly not mitigate against a person's being considered, but it is definitely not a qualification for handling difficult administrative duties.

Public employees are not paid by any political party; they are paid by the people of the United States.

Yet the present party, and some of its spokesmen in the administration, have not been content merely to fill the vacancies which normally arise with people to whom they owe patronage favors.

There is considerable evidence to indicate that they are feverishly trying to clear out as many career servants as they possibly can from present employment in order to make room for more political appointments.

One such disturbing development is the recent action in removing deputy United States marshals from the competitive service, against the strong recommendations of both the Hoover Commission and the nonpartisan National Civil Service League.

Another such development was brought to light during the last session by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD], who sounded the alarm on a move in the Treasury Department under which career Bureau of Customs employees, living and working for years in El Paso, had been given notice of transfer to such distant points as Vermont, Maine, and North Dakota.

Obviously, their long service and valuable experience with the customs problems of the Mexican border could not be expected to qualify them for any increased contribution to the service in any such distant points. We might as logically send an expert on far eastern customs procedures to Greenland.

Mr. Rutherford reported that one such employee, upon finally deciding to accept such an assignment, was quietly told that what was really expected was his resignation.

Senator MONRONEY has said that "Postmasters with years of truly distinguished service are being highballed out of office on the flimsiest of pretexts." The only conceivable explanation seems to be to clear another place at the pork barrel.

Some effective protection against these practices can be afforded for the conscientious career servant by abolishing the pork-barrel method of selecting his successor.

Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina has expressed concern over reports of job selling in the Post Office Department, involving appeals from party officials conveying the strong suggestion that applicants for local postmasterships contribute certain stipulated sums to the State political organizations.

As to these and similar disturbing reports from over the Nation, I cannot attest with any certain knowledge concerning the motivations behind them. This much, however, can be said with sure conviction:

The widespread use of public positions as political patronage to reward the faithful or punish the erstwhile opposition, by whatever party or individual it may be practiced, is inconsistent with our finest American ideals of clean government.

It is an unnecessary and unhealthy growth upon the body politic. Like a tumor, it serves no useful purpose, but can grow to grotesque proportions. The bill I have proposed would be the corrective surgery necessary to remove it.

Such surgery is long overdue. There can be no better time than now.

The Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the January 10, 1956, edition of the Washington (D. C.) Post. It is gratifying that President Eisenhower's soil-bank program is meeting with such universal approval.

THE SOIL BANK

President Eisenhower's soil-bank proposal is a remarkably persuasive and comprehensive approach to some of the country's major agricultural ills. Like his state of the Union message, it undoubtedly will be viewed by some persons as a campaign-year remedy. Quite irrespective of any political implications, however, it represents a sober and constructive effort to advance a number of desirable objectives in land conservation and control of farm surpluses. We hope Congress will regard it in this light. The disequilibrium of the agricultural segment of the economy is both serious and complex. Any attempt to play politics would be likely, not to relieve it, but to aggravate the causes.

Correct diagnosis is the first step in prescribing medicine. The President is right, in our opinion, in attributing the current problem of falling farm income and increasing surpluses to three principal factors: wartime production incentives too long continued; large harvests and livestock production compounding existing surpluses; and increasing farm costs. These factors have overshadowed the operation of the 1954 flexible-support law.

Flexible supports might have provided a satisfactory check if Congress had permitted them to take effect in 1948, before the huge glut of surpluses accumulated. Today they are plainly an inadequate remedy. Mr. Eisenhower wisely recognizes that none of the ordinary means of surplus disposal through domestic or foreign channels will suffice; and he will be applauded abroad particularly for emphasizing the injurious effects of dumping.

Already there has been considerable support for the principle of the soil bank, which is simply a plan to compensate farmers for withdrawal of acreage now in production. The first part would be what Mr. Eisenhower terms an acreage reserve, consisting of lands now allotted to production of staple crops in surplus. A farmer who agreed to reduce, say, his corn acreage and let the withdrawn acres lie fallow would receive in return either surplus corn or a negotiable certificate. The net effect would be to use up surpluses on hand and to reduce storage costs.

The second part would be a conservation reserve made up of marginal land that basically is not suited to tillage. Farmers who placed such land in grass or trees would be compensated on the basis of the time required to shift to new use. This latter proposal has much to commend it as a long-term investment in the restoration of land that has been abused and contributes to dust bowls. The emphasis on timber production is especially welcome as a conservation measure.

There is much sense to Mr. Eisenhower's plan to barter more surplus commodities for strategic materials. There likewise is sense in his suggestion that the law be amended to facilitate disposal of surpluses to

other than "friendly" countries. If the United States can trade surplus products to the Soviet bloc to net advantage, it ought to do so. For the first time, Mr. Eisenhower also suggests that Congress place a dollar limit on the amount any farm or farmer could receive in price support loans. This suggestion recognizes that the large, efficient operations generally are not in great need of help; indeed, in the past they sometimes abused the help given. By the same token, the marginal farmers who do not benefit much from price supports probably need more help in readjustment than either the administration or Congress has contemplated.

As in all approaches to the farm problem, the big question with the soil bank proposal is whether it is broad enough to provide a real remedy. Certainly, it should help; and certainly a return to the system of rigid supports that stimulated overproduction is not the answer. We wonder, however, whether the experience of the last decade does not warrant more exploration of the use of farm income instead of farm prices as a standard of support, with perhaps more adaptation of the production payment system used on sugar and wool. But irrespective of whether the soil bank provides a broad solution, it deserves to be received for what it is—a constructive plan to accomplish something that ought to be done anyhow, in the interest of the general public as well as of the farmer, to conserve land resources and move surpluses. It ought to be accepted in that spirit.

One Hundred Good Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, John J. Burkhard, Sr., of Monroe, Wis., has lived to be 100 years of age. I join with his many other friends in extending my sincere greetings. Anyone who can reach that age in life has achieved considerable.

Mr. Burkhard was one of the pioneer swiss cheese makers in Green County, Wis. He came to this country from Switzerland and brought his trade with him. For many years he has been an outstanding exponent of the swiss cheese industry and especially of the farmers who supply the milk for that wonderful Wisconsin swiss cheese.

Mr. Speaker, the contribution made by this grand old man upon the community in which he lives will remain forever. Many happy returns of the day, Mr. Burkhard.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Monroe Evening Times apropos Mr. Burkhard:

A HUNDRED GOOD YEARS

Attainment of 100 years in the span of life no longer is so unique in this modern age as to cause widespread acclaim. The legion of centenarians is pretty well filled over the country these days.

What an individual has done with those 100 years, what his life has meant to his community and to his family, however, are of very great interest to his fellowmen.

John J. Burkhard, Sr., we think, is one centenarian who can look back on his many, many years in this community with confidence that its residents respect him for this good life. We believe he is aware that they were happy to join in warm congratulations to him and his family on his 100th birthday yesterday.

Mr. Burkhard represents one of the last surviving links with the pioneer cheesemaking days in Green county. He is dean of the dwindling group of men who made swiss and limburger in those early years when this area was just beginning to feel its way along the road toward an entirely new farming economy.

Although he later switched to farming, Mr. Burkhard always championed the cause of the cheesemaker. He knew the problems from experience. He had an old world background of knowlege on foreign type cheeses, their flavor and their quality.

In his long retirement, Mr. Burkhard has enjoyed to the fullest his role as head of a large family, the successes of its members and each generation of new faces. He also has been blessed with a circle of old friends who in their own advanced years could join with him in frequent reunions and reminiscences on old Switzerland days.

We believe most people will agree with us that some of the colorful characteristics of this communiity remain strong because of men like John J. Burkhard, Sr. We are happy that he has stayed with us and that he starts his second century in such good spirits.

Total Incredulity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times, Friday, January 13, 1956, in which Mr. Krock criticizes Secretary Dulles for his statements which appeared in a recent edition of Life magazine:

ONE MORE VERY CURIOUS OFFICIAL INCIDENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—The article in the current issue of Life magazine in which Secretary of State Dulles is directly quoted as asserting that bold and timely warnings by this administration that it would use atomic weapons in the Far East had thrice forestalled war in that area "at the brink" bears all the familiar marks of high official cooperation and approval before publication. The leading detectors of these marks are the Washington reporters.

Therefore they heard with what can politely be termed total incredulity the replies Secretary Dulles made yesterday to questions about the Life article. For these invited 1 of 2 extraordinary inferences. The first was that a reporter and the editors of a mass-circulation magazine were reckless enough to put out such an article without checking it for approval in an authoritative quarter (for instance, Dulles' assistant in charge of his press and public relations, Assistant Secretary McCardle). The alternative inference was that the functionary who did the checking, though the article quoted Dulles extensively and was replete with foreign policy revelations and claims certain to be politically provocative, made slight mention of it (if any) to the Secretary.

He said specifically in answering questions about the article, that he had not read it, had not seen it, had no precise recollection of what he may have said to the author, and would hardly say it was an exclusive interview because he had talked to a great many reporters in one way or another at one time or another.

If he had not seen the publication (which, presumably, means it had not come under his eye in the mimeograph copy that Life distributed widely in Washington Monday or in the current issue of the magazine), of course he had not read it either when he met with the newsmen yesterday. Accepting those words as statements of technical fact did not, however, induce his audience also to accept the inference that the article had been published without authorized official imprimatur.

POSSIBLE ASSUMPTIONS

But the Secretary indicated such total unfamiliarity with the contents of an interview in which he was freely quoted as to leave for evaluation the second inference—that, though his public-relations aides knew the matter would certainly arise at the press conference, they took no steps to acquaint him with it. That is possible if it can be assumed that the Secretary was too busy recently to find time to be briefed on this particular subject, or simply declined to allow his aides to bring it up. But, considering his lively interest in what appears about him in print, considering the reaction this article was sure to evoke, and further considering the risk that would be taken by an aide who passed such an article without advising Dulles of its contents, both situations are difficult to conceive.

Mr. Dulles' responses to yesterday's questions, even before he dismissed the subject on learning that the article was not to be released until hours after the press conference was held, enter the category of official mysteries. It is known that the material was submitted to appointed checking authority in the State Department before it was circulated by mimeograph or published in the magazine. It is on the record that the Secretary had not "seen," and hence not "read," the interview before he was asked about it. But how and why are facts that remain in the realm of the curious and the unknown.

Dulles was virtually alone in unfamiliarity with the publication by the time his news conference assembled yesterday, so far as the political, press, and diplomatic communities in Washington are concerned. The Capitol buzzed with the public attribution to him that the President and he three times had averted war for the United States (a) by notice to the Communist powers that in certain aggressive circumstances we would attack Manchuria, and make aircraft carriers ready to bomb South China ports, and (b) through the Senate resolution drafted by Dulles that authorized the President to take any military course he thought necessary to defend Formosa. In two instances the use of nuclear weapons was specifically mentioned in the warnings; in the third it significantly was not excluded.

These revelations—or clarifications of what the executive department previously had but barely indicated—had atomic effects of their own. Diplomats of European nations were shocked and alarmed that the threat of nuclear war they dread had been revived, and in this casual way. Democrats in Congress, noting that Dulles was loaded with praise in an article (full of his quotes) as the boy on the burning deck whence all but he and the President had fled, resented his hero portraiture and angrily classified it as a 1956 Republican campaign document.

The shudders of the self-styled neutrals could be heard from New Delhi to Belgrade. And hard things were said about the timing, just before Eden's visit here, of an open complaint attributed to the Secretary that the British had reneged on the United States at a critical time.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Pure Food and Drug Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the first Federal Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act. Both of these acts were signed by President Theodore Roosevelt on June 30, 1906. In order to commemorate this important event, a 50th anniversary committee has been formed on which serve representatives of the food, drug, and cosmetic industries, Federal, State, and local food and drug control officials, and consumer organizations.

For the purpose of bringing to the attention of the American people the importance of these laws, the committee conceived the idea of celebrating the 50th anniversary year by holding appropriate meetings and other events from coast to coast through the year.

In launching this series of observances, the committee held a luncheon at which I was privileged to give a brief talk on the changes which have taken place in the legislative picture during the 50 years which have elapsed since the enactment in 1906 of the first Federal legislation in this field.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN J. PERCY PRIEST, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, AT LUNCHEON COMMEMORATING PASSAGE OF FIRST FEDERAL FOOD AND DRUG LAWS IN 1906, FEDERAL ROOM, HOTEL STATLER, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 11, 1956

The opening of this 50th anniversary year commemorating the passage of the first Federal Pure Food and Drugs Act is indeed a significant occasion. I am honored to speak at this luncheon and I accept that honor in behalf of my colleagues of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Our committee has had the primary responsibility through the years of drafting revisions and amendments to this important legislation, and the committee is very proud of this excellent opportunity to be of service to our people.

It is a particular pleasure to be here today because my friend Gene Holeman, Superintendent of the Food and Drug Division of Tennessee, is serving this year as president of the Food and Drug Officials of the United States. Gene Holeman is also the chairman of the 50th anniversary committee which is providing the information and inspiration for this luncheon and similar activities designed to bring to the attention of the country the importance of our food and drug laws.

Actually, June 30 will mark the birthday of both the Wiley Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat Inspection Act, which President Theodore Roosevelt signed on the same day. However, the idea of celebrating a 50th anniversary year instead of a birthday seems to me an excellent one. This law—the pure food and drug law—means so much to so many different people and organizations all over our country that a single anniversary observance would hardly do it justice. So today I am happy to join with you in launching a series of observances that will take place from coast to coast and last throughout the year.

Others are much better qualified than I am to talk about the enforcement of food and drug legislation. I would like to review with you very briefly how the legislative picture has changed since the year 1906 when the efforts to enact Federal legislation in this field finally succeeded after many years of hard campaigning. This legislative picture today reflects a basic change in the attitude of the public. The American public today has come to accept completely the need for consumer protection with regard to food and drugs.

When in 1890, Edgar Richards, a chemist in the Department of Agriculture, reported such practices as the watering of milk and butter, mixing of lard with cheese, adding cottonseed oil to olive oil, soapstone and sand to tea, and coloring of pickles with copper salts, he commented on the attitude of the public toward such things as follows: "The average American repudiates the idea of a paternal Government supervision over his affairs or anything trained with that idea. * * * We would * * * regard with apathy any general law that would guarantee to the public the liberty of purchasing pure food with a reasonable certainty that they were not imposed upon in their purchase."

It took another 16 years before Richards' chief, Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, finally succeeded in overcoming this general apathy. In the 27 years from 1879 to 1906, more than 100 food and drug bills were introduced in the Congress. One bill actually passed the Senate in 1890. However, the issues involved were very controversial. Many compromises had to be made.

In recommending the enactment of the Hepburn bill which became the 1906 act, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce stated frankly that the bill might be ineffective in some respects, that it might not go far enough in some particulars while in others it might go too far. The committee, however, was emphatic that the bill represented its earnest thought and work, that it was not drawn to aid any special interests, that it had not been framed by, or at the behest of, any class of trade which will be specifically benefited thereby.

However, the committee felt that enactment of this legislation was badly needed because, and I quote from the committee report, "The sand with which our forefathers are reputed to have adulterated their sugar, while a fraud upon the purchaser, was doubtless comparatively harmless. The adulterations of the present day are neither so clumsy nor, as a rule, so harmless.

In a strongly worded minority report, the dissenting members argued that the Federal Government was without power to enact this legislation and that the bill was an attempt of exercising police power within the States under the pretense and guise of regulating commerce. As a substitute for the Hepburn bill, the minority offered a bill which would have subjected food products or drugs shipped in interstate commerce to the police laws of the various States whenever they are transported into the States for sale or use in the same way that spirituous liquors and beer were made subject to the laws of the States by the act of August 8, 1890, when transported into the States for use or consumption.

The 1906 law established the basic principle that Government—the Federal Government as well as the State governments—should protect the consumer by barring from the channels of trade foods or drugs which are adulterated or misbranded.

The act of 1906 was a strong law for its times, but eventually it became obsolete and had to be replaced. Instead of a quarter of a century, however, it took 5 years this time to develop and enact the present law which was passed in 1938. Again, there were many controversial issues which had to be resolved, but most of these were issues of method, rather than of principle.

Interestingly enough, again we find minority views expressed signed by 6 members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. However, what a change since 1906. While the minority in 1906 argued vehemently against the constitutionality of the Wiley Act, the minority in 1938 was in complete agreement with the objective of the bill. The minority in 1938 merely disagreed with a particular feature of the bill reported by the majority. Thus, by 1938, the powers of the Federal Government to regulate interstate commerce in food and drugs had come to be accepted completely by the public and as a matter of law.

Since 1938 the law has been amended several times. I would like to mention just three of the most important of those amendments: First, the 1945 amendment to provide for the testing and certification of penicillin, followed by later amendments extending this requirement to several other antibiotics. Second, the Durham-Humphrey amendment of 1951 which defined the classes of drugs which require medical supervision for safe use and which under the law may only be sold upon a doctor's prescription. Third, the Miller Pesticide Amendment of 1954 which provides a procedure for establishing safe tolerances for residues of pesticide chemicals on raw food crops. All three of these important amendments have one thing in common—each of them was made necessary by the progress of science and industry in developing new products—products which presented new problems of regulation to protect the consumer.

Each of these amendments applied the basic principles of the law to a specific, highly technical problem, or to a set of problems. These amendments illustrate a point that I would like to emphasize—that our food and drug legislation today is no longer concerned with the basic principle of consumer protection, for this principle has been accepted. Instead, the writing of new food and drug legislation today is generally concerned with designing methods and procedures to deal with some new situation.

The design of such legislation requires expert knowledge. Members of our committee aided by its professional staff and the office of the legislative counsel have devoted endless time and effort to legislative problems such as those raised by the amendments I have mentioned. Even so, we could never have produced the legislation without the intimate knowledge and guidance of the experts from industry and the Food and Drug Administration.

Our contribution has often been to prod the representatives of industry and Government to compromise extreme positions—and to find solutions which will accomplish the desired objectives without sacrificing principle or causing unnecessary hardship. In such legislation we are engaged in a cooperative enterprise together with the executive branch and with industry representatives.

Some of the bills now pending before our committee fall into this class of bills designed to provide consumer protection in a special new area—the area of food additives. I, myself, have introduced several bills which would solve in different ways the procedural problems involved in determining what

chemical additives may safely be used and what additives shall be excluded as dangerous to the public health. The issues raised by these bills are of the kind which require a cooperative approach in order to bring about legislation which will give the consumer the protection to which he is entitled without imposing unnecessary hardships on the producers of the food additives and the food processors who are using these additives.

In closing, I would like to express to you the good wishes of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and our hope that this 50th anniversary year will contribute greatly to a better understanding of the significance of our pure food and drug laws, local, State, and national. We hope it will also emphasize the importance of adequate support for the administration of these laws.

Finally, we believe that this anniversary should help the American public to appreciate the achievements of our food, drug, and cosmetic industries, under the food and drug laws, in raising the quality of their products. Nowhere in the world is there such a standard of living as we have in the United States, and our food, drug, and cosmetic industries are surely making a great contribution to that standard of living.

Basic Science: A Field in Which We Cannot Afford To Be Bested

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard of Russia's new 5-year plan and been alerted to the part scientific research will play in the achievement which is designed to place Russia in a position of superiority. Last year the National Science Foundation requested an increased appropriation of $7 million for the promotion of basic research. The request was refused in the name of economy. In view of questions raised on the floor during the debate of March 30, 1955, and when it was my contention that the increased appropriation should have been made, seeking to point out the vital need for adding to our reservoir of basic science as differentiated from applied science, I am extending my remarks to include an article from the New York Times magazine of Sunday, January 15, 1956:

THE BASIC REASON FOR BASIC RESEARCH

(By Esther Everett Lape)

The President's current recommendation of significantly increased funds for medical research raises the question of how this research money can be most effectively spent. Will there be a greater return in projects aimed at some specific disease and its cure? Or in the fundamental research basic to solutions of all medical problems? The former approach is standard: a leading ophthalmologist observed the other day, "Congress seems quite willing to earmark funds for trachoma, which is no longer a problem in this country, but balks at specific requests concerned with basic physiology of the eye." Yet comprehensive knowledge of the physiology of the eye would undoubtedly throw light on a host of eye diseases.

Research showing results that are obviously practical (and not too long delayed) such as a new miracle drug or a new vaccine always commands support. Adequate support has not always been available, however, for research which may ultimately have a far greater "practical" value for medicine but which has not yet reached the stage when it can be directly applied by physicians and surgeons. Realization that, quite aside from phenomenal "discoveries, research in laboratories of biology, chemistry, physics and atomic energy is steadily remaking medicine certainly needs to be heightened in the public mind.

There have been many evidences of the practical value of work that may have appeared for years to be remote from medicine. In the second World War, heavy mortality from shock among men suffering the intensified wounds and burns of modern warfare could be combated only by blood transfusions, but supplies of whole blood for this purpose were desperately inadequate. In the Harvard laboratories of physical chemistry, intensive work had been going on for many years on fractionation of blood. This work had been described only a decade before the war by the foundation that was supporting it as "abstruse and likely only slowly to come to widespread recognition for its essential importance." Yet, this "abstruse" work was able, in the emergency, to produce the essential fractions that could substitute for whole blood. Deaths from shock were sharply decreased.

The Salk poliomyelitis vaccine was possible only because of a preceding half-century of fundamental work, some of it quite outside the virus field. The intervening phases were many, involving many workers. Of the earlier steps, one of the most important was development of a simple method of tissue culture by Harrison of Yale. Of the later steps, an essential one was cultivation of the poliomyelities virus in other than nerve tissue by Harvard workers, Enders, Robbins, and Weller. Virus cultivated in nerve tissue had been found to involve danger of paralysis, and therefore to be unsuitable for vaccines.

When a new drug for treating tuberculosis was found and justly acclaimed, perhaps a few stopped to think back to the research in optics that went into the microscopes that made it possible to see the germ—a visualization essential to understanding the disease. Fewer still perhaps thought of the chemical research on the glass that made possible the optics; or of the development of the stains that aided in visualization of the organism through the glass; or of the methods of culture or the fundamental studies in microbial nutrition that made possible the culture media. Yet these and literally thousands of other details constituted the basic research essential to the ultimate discovery of the drug.

Experience showed the entirely practical value of fundamental research to many of the national lay organizations established with the hope of swiftly finding the cause and cure of such diseases as cancer, heart disease, poliomyelitis, rheumatism and arthritis, multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, and other conditions that bring death or ruin life. Under the chastening influence of their developing work, these organizations inevitably learned that basic research has to be applied all down the line in order to get the facts that must be applied to the final achievement.

The American Cancer Society has put millions of dollars into fundamental studies of growth, essential to understanding cancer, which is abnormal cellular growth. The National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has spent millions in basic research on the nature of viruses. Better understanding of any one virus, among the approximately half-hundred viruses that cause human disease (ranging from fever blisters, warts, the common cold to influenza, "shingles" encephalitis, poliomyelitis, smallpox) might shed a degree of light on all viruses.

We have not reached the millennium. It may be a long time before all physicians and all the public fully realize that dealing with the end results of disease is an unsatisfactory business and may be a longer way around than dealing with fundamental problems of the cell and protoplasm, which is the essential substance of the cell.

All diseases are, in the last analysis, problems of protoplasm. Most of our present knowledge of biology and medicine is attributable to a century of work on the individual cell, its chemical composition and structure, its organization, the principles or substances that regulate or influence its activity. Since disease and the process of aging are merely alterations of the normal behavior of cells and tissues, understanding of the normal cell is the first line of approach to understanding disease.

It would be hard to forecast from just which type of laboratory will come the beam that will illumine some intractable medical problem. The cell physiologist, working on division and growth in normal cells of sea urchins, is making no prophecies as to how far, and when, his work will be applicable to the abnormal division and growth of human cancer cells. Yet it is from such work as this that promising vistas are being opened in cancer research.

The neurophysiologist, concentrating on the single axon of the squid, is not promising that his work will solve the problem of mental illness. He simply knows that all work on the structure and function of the nervous system is in some way related to mind and behavior. Sometimes, when no clue seems to exist in any particular direction, the only course open to the investigator is relentlessly to pursue basic research for its own sake.

Basic research is the safest and the most direct road to solution of the outstanding problems of medicine, from cancer to schizophrenia. The basic research involved is wide and varied. It includes, for instance, the whole field of biology.

Detlev Bronk once raised the question as to whether we are rigidly to continue calling the man who studies the mechanism of the heartbeat in the lobster a zoologist and the man who studies exactly the same thing in human beings a physiologist. "If it had not been for studies on peas and insects," the National Research Council's committee on problems of sex pointed out, "we should probably know little of the principles of determination and heredity of sex in man." Any fundamental discovery in biology, whether related to sea urchins, fruit flies, frog's eggs, squids, has reprecussions throughout the entire realm of the biological sciences, especially in the complex science that we call medicine.

The basic sciences of chemistry, physics, and mathematics (electronic brains) are continually making contributions to biology and medicine. So also is atomic energy research. From it the greatest benefit to medicine is probably the radioactive isotopes produced by the uranium chain-reacting pile. Istotopes have stimulated hope of understanding the nature of the cancerous cell and why and how it is able to spread to other parts of the body.

Thus—constantly drawing upon research in biology, chemistry, physics, atomic energy—medicine is a freewheeling eclectic. Some finding significant for medicine may come to pass in almost any laboratory. To survey, in easily comprehended terms, all the lines of basic research that may ultimately turn out to be important for medicine would be an ambitious project. Yet somehow the story needs to be made clear

if the basic research needed for medical progress is to be understood and adequately supported. At present, would the man who digs deep into his pocket for a contribution to the cancer campaign support a drive for more intensive work on a subject so far away sounding as, for instance, the structure of proteins?

To such a question, we can all furnish the answer. Yet, protein structure, a problem that has been called "equivalent to life itself," is actually an urgent medical problem. Almost all components of every tissue are either proteins or in a state of dynamic interaction with proteins. Proteins are important in the maintenance of tissues in the healing of wounds, in the integration of joints, in all vital processes. They are significant in the growth and division of the cancer cell, of the egg cell determining fertility.

The protein of the heart muscle, involved in every heartbeat, is significant in all heart conditions. Modified proteins ("antibodies") are significant in infection and immunity; "abnormal" proteins (viruses) are important in all virus diseases. And because the nature of proteins lies at the very root of health and diease, investigators (as Linus Pauling, Nobel laureate in chemistry) have said of the only partly solved problem of protein structure: "It must be solved; the future of medicine depends upon it."

Some of the connections between fundamental research of this kind and nine of medicine's present unsolved problems are illustrated in the current report of the American Foundation, Medical Research: A Midcentury Survey. While the nine diseases were selected merely to illustrate the need of basic research in each (and in all disease), all nine are also leading causes of mortality and morbidity. Three of them—arteriosclerosis, hypertension, rheumatism—are related to heart disease, the major killer in this country. Cancer ranks second among causes of death throughout the Nation. Tuberculosis, virus diseases, infertility, chronic alcoholism, schizophrenia are all among the gravest medical problems.

For some of these a degree of control has been achieved. For others, the responsible microorganism is known. But real understanding and rational instead of empirical treatment of them all is dependent upon further basic research.

Some of the conditions require research converging from several directions. But often they are not yet really converging. This is true, for instance, of schizophrenia, the No. 1 riddle in mental illness. One group (including the psychiatrists and psychoanalysts) holds that both the cause and cure are psychic. The other group (neurophysiologists, electrophysiologists, biochemists) holds that schizophrenia is as truly physiological as any other disease but simply too subtle for solution by research at its present stage. They, nevertheless, emphasize the physiological as against the psychiatric approach on the theory that there can be "no twisted thought without a twisted molecule." Yet in both camps perceptive leaders admit the need of combined attack.

"Let the biologists go as far as they can," said one psychiatrist, "and let us go as far as we can. Some day the two will meet." But the meeting will not take place until much more fundamental work has been done on both sides.

Every new discovery or achievement is a summons to further research. Salk was the first to say of his vaccine: "This is only a beginning." The current vaccine presents pressing questions which only further research can answer: can safer strains be found or developed; for how long can immunity be achieved; is live or killed vaccine the best hope; what principles can be established for developing effective vaccines for other virus diseases—measles, influenza, encephalitis, mumps, the common cold?

Only further research can place the powerful remedies, ACTH, cortisone, hydrocortisone, on a rational instead of the present empirical basis. In spite of their often dramatic effects, they do not change the disease processes themselves. Yet they are reported to be used in a hundred diseases and as the remedy of choice in 45. They dampen but do not extinguish the fire. They provide "an asbestos suit behind which the patient, like some biblical Shadrach, Meshach, or Abednego, protects his tissues from the fire. If this protection is removed prematurely, before the fire has spent itself, the patient and his tissues will react again to the burning. But if the protection is not discarded until the natural duration of the fire is over, the patient remains largely free of symptoms and apparently well."

One investigator said of these remedies a few years ago: "We are putting coins in the music box and out comes the music, but we have no idea of what we are doing." Further fundamental work must be done before physicians can rely on anything but inspired guesses to tell them with whom and for what to use these hormones.

Streptomycin research in tuberculosis has been described as having raised more problems than it has answered. These new problems (how the drug really acts, why resistance to it develops) can be solved only by further laboratory research.

Not only streptomycin but all the "mycins" now highlight the danger of application that is not oriented by continuous research. While accomplishing their miracles, the antibiotics have also raised fundamental biological questions. The present tendency to use them in all infections, minor as well as major, and to use them seriatim, "one on top of the other," is not, as pointed out by Finland of Harvard, based on any clear relation between the condition treated and the efficacy of the particular antibiotic.

Perhaps the greatest challenge the antibiotics present to basic research is the emergence of resistant strains of organisms in infections that had at first responded to one or several combinations of antibiotics. "As each antibiotic is introduced," observed Dowling in 1953, "we hear first of miraculous cures, secondly of deleterious reactions, and then of the appearance of resistant strains. There are no combinations of antibiotics, so far as I know, which will prevent the emergence of resistant strains; they merely delay their appearance or diminish their number."

The Salk vaccine, the antibiotics, ACTH are all epochal achievements in modern medicine. But "there is something curiously ephemeral," as Esmond Long once put it, "about a method of treatment or prevention. The one thing that lasts is the growth of knowledge and there is no end to that."

By way of endorsing basic research in principle, we as a Nation took a long step forward in 1950 when Congress established the National Science Foundation. Its function includes encouragement of a national policy for promotion of basic research in the sciences, including biological and medical science.

Public interest in the foundations' functioning—as translated into congressional action—was not, however, sufficient to provide the foundation with funds commensurate with its research mandate. The President's budgetary request for $14 million for the year 1951–52 was scaled down by Congress to $3,500,000. By June 1955, the foundation (since 1951) had made over 1,500 awards totaling $15,560,000 "for the support of basic research and related matters." Approximately half of this not very large sum for a 4-year period was directed to awards in biology and medicine.

Certainly there is need for enlarging the Nation's basic research, whether governmental or extragovernmental, bearing on biology and medicine. Those who want the fruits of research (antibiotics, vaccines) must appreciate, as Paul Weiss of the National Research Council once observed, the need of starting with the seed, the proper soil, and the need of tending the orchard. It is from scientific capital, from the backlog of research in the purest realms of science, that new products and new processes result.

Conflicts in History?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which was featured in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Saturday, January 14, 1956, in which the writer, Chalmers M. Roberts, discusses the story of Secretary Dulles which appeared in Life magazine recently. Specifically, Mr. Roberts discusses the situations which exist in Korea, Indochina, and Quemoy-Formosa.

DULLES STANDS FIRM ON VERGE-OF-WAR FACTS

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The Eisenhower administration has now at long last officially conceded that the United States was on three occasions on the verge of war—over Korea, Indochina and Quemoy-Formosa.

But in making such a statement, something neither President Eisenhower nor Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has ever directly told the American public, Dulles, through the medium of a friendly magazine writer, offered a version of history far different from that dug out, piece by piece, over many months, by various Washington newsmen.

Confirmation of the quotations attributed to Dulles in a Life magazine article came yesterday from State Department spokesman Lincoln White. He said Dulles had authorized him to say:

"The Secretary has now read the Life article. He feels that the statements specifically attributed to him do not require correction from the standpoint of their substance."

The article, entitled "How Dulles Averted War," has roused a storm in Britain—and partial denials—because of its criticism of British policies in the Indochina affair last year. It has brought criticism at home mainly because of a Dulles statement that "the ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art."

Dulles also said in the now-confirmed quotations:

"Of course, we were brought to the verge of war. * * * We've had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action. It took a lot more courage for the President than for me. His was the ultimate decision. * * * The President never flinched for a minute on any of these decisions. He came up taut."

Here is a run-down on the major facts as given in the Life article and as this reporter was able to find them in nearly 2 years of questioning dozens of persons here and in Europe connected with the events:

Korea: The Life story, written by James Shepley, chief of the Life-Time bureau here, says General Eisenhower as President-elect made the vital decision that if the Chinese

Reds tried to continue a stalemate, the United States would fight to win, including an air attack on Manchuria and the use of tactical atomic arms if hostilities were resumed.

Dulles, the story goes, on a visit to India, told Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that if the war continued "the United States would lift the self-imposed restrictions on its actions and hold back no effort or weapon to win." The earlier Eisenhower decision was reaffirmed later when South Korean President Syngman Rhee freed prisoners in defiance of the United Nations command. Dulles himself, incidentally, has frequently told the Nehru story in Washington with the added implication that he expected Nehru to pass his words on to Peiping.

A year and a half ago it was learned that the President had decided it was essential to win the Korean war and that he intended to attack Manchurian bases, using atomic bombs. A check of competent sources brought the report that the President, in exploring possible ways to carry out his campaign commitment to end the Korean war, had, indeed, ordered exploration of such a military move—as a possible alternative—but that he had never adopted such a policy.

PEIPING NOT TOLD

Nehru is known to have told a British correspondent that Dulles did tell him the United States might expand the war and might even use atomic bombs. Nehru told the correspondent he thought this was an obvious bluff and paid no attention to it and did not pass it on to Peiping; however, another check on the story in mid-1954 brought the report from New Delhi that Nehru did not recall any such Dulles statement and certainly told Peiping no such thing.

Indochina: The Life account says that after several National Security Council meetings, Dulles concluded that an American aircraft carrier strike to save the beseiged fortress of Dien Bien Phu, as requested by the French, was a poor way for the United States to get involved. Instead, on April 4, 1954, Dulles and Admiral Arthur W. Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, presented the President with a proposal for action. America, Britain, and France were to oppose the Communists on the ground in Indochina and, if the Chinese Reds intervened, to destroy with United States airpower their south China staging bases. The President, the story says, concurred and American carriers with planes armed with atomic weapons steamed toward the area. But a Dulles plan for an Allied meeting of nations "which would jointly take up the battle in Indochina" was frustrated because Britain had a change of heart.

But, the Life story goes on, since Dulles had seen to it that the Chinese and the Soviets knew that the United States was prepared to act decisively to prevent the fall of all of southeast Asia, the French and British at the Geneva Conference found themselves able to bargain from Dulles' strength and much of Indochina was saved by the truce.

As the story is pieced together, however, the President in March 1954, initiated an NSC decision that Indochina intervention should be undertaken by the United States if necessary to prevent its loss.

Such intervention was to be on the conditions that it (a) be Allied action, (b) at French request, (c) have congressional approval, and (d) that France grant Indochina's three states full independence. Congressional leaders, as revealed in detail in this newspaper on June 7, 1954, were sounded out on April 3 of that year on a joint resolution giving the President power to order intervention. Dulles was told to line up Allies—and given no commitment even if he did.

BRICK WALL

Dulles ran into a brick wall in the form of Winston Churchill, then British Prime Minister. (Churchill told the President during his Washington visit that June that "never will we allow a single British troop to go into Indochina." At this time Dulles was saying privately that the United States was "ready under decent conditions to go into Indochina and fight.")

Anthony Eden, then British Foreign Secretary, met in Paris on April 24 with Dulles and Radford. Radford proposed not only the Dien Bien Phu air strike but also dropping atomic bombs on China. Radford earlier had told congressional leaders that he alone of the Joint Chiefs approved intervention. Army Chief of Staff Matthew Ridgway completely opposed the so-called immaculate war idea and argued that at least 6 American divisions of ground troops would be needed. Eden took the position that ground troops would be called for within 48 hours of an air strike. There is no doubt that Radford had alerted the Navy for action. One officer aboard a carrier was prepared to parachute into Dien Bien Phu to instruct the French garrison on how to protect itself once the atomic bombs began to fall around the fort.

But intervenion collapsed the day before the Geneva Indochina Conference opened when the British Cabinet flatly refused to go along. Dulles covered up his intervention moves by confirming for an American newsman a French report that he had written Premier Georges Bidault that it was impossible because of American Constitutional limitations and because no allied plan had been worked out.

Thus the Geneva Conference began with the Western allies in disagreement and in a publicly exposed state of weakness rather than, as Life would have it, with Britain and France bargaining "from Dulles' strength." It should be added, however, that toward the end of the months-long conference the United States made some sort of offer, two Marine divisions one report had it, to the French if they would go on fighting. Nothing came of this if, in fact, that was the offer.

The conference outcome was taken in Washington as the best of a bad bargain or worse. The United States signed nothing. Now, however, the outcome is pictured as acceptable and due to Dulles planning.

Quemoy-Formosa: The Life account completely skips the September 1954 Quemoy affair and says that war was avoided mainly by the resolution drafted by Dulles and passed by Congress in January 1955, authorizing the President to use force to protect Formosa and Quemoy-Matsu if he thought necessary.

As was disclosed in this newspaper on November 8, 1954, 3 of the 4 Joint Chiefs—with Dulles initially concurring—approved a proposal in September 1954 that under certain conditions American planes should attack the Communist mainland in order to prevent a Red landing on Quemoy, then threatened. But President Eisenhower, at the now famous September 12 NSC meeting in Denver, refused to buy that proposal. Instead, he ordered a search for peace through the U. N.

When the Far East crisis recurred in January 1955, the Dulles-drafted resolution did pass Congress and, as Life says, the Chinese Reds "were publicly put on notice that Eisenhower was ready and authorized to retaliate at once." But the public has never yet—even in the Life article—been told by the administration itself the story of the long route which led to that congressional action.

The United States has, indeed, been brought by the Eisenhower administration to the verge of war. Many diplomats agree that American war talk and war moves—or deterrence may have in fact deterred the Communists. Dulles without doubt has consistently advocated deterrence both publicly and privately. But whether everything that has happened in the past 3 years was planned that way is something else again.

One Small Candle May Light a Thousand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address by the distinguished historian of South Carolina, the Honorable J. Harold Easterby. Mr. Easterby is regarded as one of the foremost authorities in his chosen field. To be sure, he speaks with authority on the instant question.

ONE SMALL CANDLE MAY LIGHT A THOUSAND

(Address by Hon. J. Harold Easterby)

Three hundred and thirty-five years ago a band of Englishmen landed at Plymouth, Mass., on the 4th day before Christmas. This day was called Forefathers' Day. It is the day we are celebrating here tonight.

The year after the landing of the Pilgrims, William Bradford, their principal chronicler, wrote the following words: "Thus out of small beginnings greater things have been produced by His hand that made all things of nothing, and gives being to all things that are; and as one small candle may light a thousand, so the light here kindled hath shone unto many, yea in some sort to our whole Nation; let the glorious name of Jehovah have all the praise."

In writing these words Governor Bradford had no other purpose than to give thanks for the news that certain Pilgrim ideas on the subject of church organization had been favorably received by others; but he may well have applied his metaphor to the Plymouth venture in general, because the sufferings of the Pilgrims for the sake of religion and the courage and resourcefulness with which they overcame almost insuperable obstacles have been a constant inspiration to the American people. In this sense their achievement was a candle from which many others were lighted, first in New England and then in every part of the country to which New Englanders migrated.

But I am not here to praise New England, however appropriate that would be on this occasion. My assignment is to speak to you about another candle—one that was lighted on the coast of South Carolina, at Old Charles Town, not far from the spot where we are now assembled, one that may be said, with a little stretch of the imagination, to have been kindled from the same original fire which, less than 50 years before, had set the Plymouth candle aflame, and one from which many others in the Southern States have been lighted.

I do not propose to deal directly with the first settlers of Charles Town or to trace succeeding events in great detail. I shall raise only three questions: First, were the South Carolinians who lived in the period when our traditions should have been formed worthy to light a candle in the sense that I am using the term; second, if they were, why does their candle burn so dimly for us today; and third, what can be done to make it the beacon it should be. To the answers that I shall give, I would like, in the historian's

cautious way, to add many footnotes qualifying this statement and explaining that. Obviously this cannot be done, but I am sure you will understand that broad generalizations can never be precisely accurate.

My first question may best be introduced by asking another. What do we expect of our forefathers; what tests would we like them to pass? I believe that we want the men and women who founded this State to have been typical pioneers—hardy, self-reliant, practical people, bent on making new and better homes for themselves. I also believe that we would like to know that, sooner or later, they created a social order in which rank was based on achievement rather than birth, that they made substantial progress toward acceptance of the ideal of religious freedom, that in some measure they practiced democracy in government, and that they subscribed in general to the belief that individual initiative is the mainspring of economic progress. I believe, in other words, that we want to have the assurance that they had a part in advancing the great principles on which this country is organized today.

In order to determine whether our forefathers were pioneers, or frontiersmen if that is the more accurate term, we will do well to remind ourselves that the South Carolina in which they played their parts was a vastly greater region than that embraced by our present boundaries. North Carolina was separated from the original Carolina Province early in the process of colonization but it was not until half a century later that Georgia was established, and the colonial period was almost at an end before this southern neighbor was able to do much more than guard a thin line of settlements on the Savannah River and its adjacent seacoast. It was therefore, in the main, South Carolina's problem to advance along a 700-mile frontier against two vigorous foes—the Spanish in Florida and the French on the Mississippi—who, more often than not, were united in their resistance; to win allies among the powerful Indian nations of the disputed zone; and to furnish for years to come the permanent settlers who would follow the paths marked by the soldier and the trader.

Though few in number and increasing only slowly in strength, the Charles Town colonists sent an expedition far into the interior before the end of their first summer. Three years later they opened a trade with the Catawba on the Wateree. In 1680 they broke the Westo barrier on the Savannah River and were soon penetrating deep into the Creek country of western Georgia; in 1685 they reached the Chattahoochee; by 1690 they were in contact with the Cherokee in the Carolina foothills, and 2 years before the close of the century they crossed the country of the Chickasaw and Cocktaw and emerged on the banks of the Mississippi. No one who has read even the meager accounts that have come down to us of these daring exploits can fail to be amazed; no one who has heard the fragmentary stories of the sack of Stuart Town, the Tuscarora campaign, the Yamasee War, the attacks on St. Augustine, the siege of Port Loudon, and the invasion, near the close of the colonial period, of the mountain towns of the Cherokee can doubt that the early South Carolinians were frontiersmen in the best American tradition. To say that their victories were indecisive is to look at them from the wrong point of view.

Long acustomed to thinking of our State as one which did not attract immigrants in later years, we are disposed to underestimate the number of nationalities represented among its early settlers. We have read of the French, and we are conscious of their contributions to our heritage. We remember the Scotch-Irish who settled Williamsburg and later stamped their character indelibly upon our upcountry, and we admire their hardihood. But we are less aware of the Scots, who came singly rather than in groups; the Swiss of Purrysburg, Orangeburg, and Saxe Gotha; the Welsh on the Peedee; and the Germans of the Dutch Fork. We have largely forgotten that these people often served as the shock troops on our advancing line of settlement. We too often overlook the highly significant fact that our ethnic heritage, insofar as it was developed in the colonial period, is as diverse as that of Pennsylvania.

Our forefathers were not Cavaliers. We gave up the hoary legend half a century ago. Some of the first colonists, to be sure, were of higher social standing than others. Some were men of means and influence, and a few had the distinction during the proprietary period of possessing titles of nobility, the only titles of the kind conferred in the American colonies. But the rank and file of early South Carolinians were plain men, many of them without money in their pockets to pay their passage who would have faced years in bondage if the provincial government had not discharged their debt, given them land, remitted their taxes for a number of years, and provided other benefits on a scale unequaled in any other of the Thirteen Colonies. It cannot be denied, however, that, instead of diminishing, class divisions actually increased as some men prospered and others failed to make the best of their opportunities; but, contrary to what we commonly believe, there was never a time in these early years when a man of ability could not climb to the topmost rung of the social ladder.

The oldest extant letter written in South Carolina is a petition to the proprietors from the Puritan Governor, William Sayle, asking for the services of a Puritan minister, which is not as surprising as it may seem if we bear in mind that the persecution of dissenters was revived in England after the Resoration and that some of these people sought refuge in the colonies where paradoxically toleration was being fostered by the home government. The Carolina charter undoubtedly required the establishment of the Church of England. It encouraged, however, in no uncertain terms the toleration of dissent. It was therefore forbidden in our early law that any man should "disturbe, molest, or persecute another for speculative opinions in religion or his way of worshipp." The few Catholics who came to the province and a notable Jewish community which developed in Charles Town lived under certain political disabilities; but Huguenot and Presbyterian, Congregationalist and Baptist, Lutheran and Quaker, and a large element who were not members of any denomination paid no penalty for their religious views other than that they were compelled to contribute through taxation to the support of the established church. A substantial part of the tax money came back to those dissenters who lived in the well-organized parishes in the form of public services performed by the church, such as the care of the poor and the management of the free schools. There were many, however, who disapproved this system, and they were quick to seize the opportunity presented by the Revolution to separate the state from the church and to adopt the principle of religious freedom.

Our first constitution has been called a monstrosity of medievalism and condemned because its preamble asserts that one of its purposes was to avoid the erection of a numerous democracy. This, however, is no reason for us to hang our heads in shame. It is true that the fundamental constitutions of Carolina reflect that curious blend of public and private law which characterized the feudal system, but so did the frames of government of other colonies. If certain provisions of the South Carolina constitution appear to the modern eye to be absurdly reactionary, it is due in some measure to the fact that they are written side by side with others that are startling anticipations of things to come. There is nothing strange or unnatural in this, for the ideas behind these provisions were adapted by John Locke from James Harrington's utopia, The Commonwealth of Oceana, and both of these men were groping their way toward the concepts of modern government.

Democracy, as the term was then applied, was not held in high esteem in the latter years of the 17th century. You will remember that it was Governor Winthrop, of Massachusetts, who described it as "the meanest and worst of all forms of government." But the people of all free countries have come to feel very differently about democracy, and they recall with particular pride the early stages of the struggle through which it was achieved. We may, I think, reasonably doubt that the advance of democratic government was slower in early South Carolina than it was in other parts of America. The contention that it lagged far behind is based mainly on the belief that high property qualifications kept the electorate small and excluded most citizens from membership in the popular branch of the legislature, but one can hardly believe that the requirement of possession of 50 acres was a serious impediment to a prospective voter who was entitled to claim that much land for himself and an equal amount for his wife, for each of his children, and for every one of his servants and slaves; or whether the alternative requirement of payment of a 3-shilling annual tax prevented men from voting who were liable to pay both poll and income taxes. The requirement that members must own 500 acres of land and 10 slaves was unquestionably responsible for keeping men out of the commons house of assembly. It should be noted, however, that there was an alternative also in this case permitting a man to qualify if he possessed property of any kind valued at £145. And it may be worth mentioning, too, that, while voters at elections in most countries of that day were expressing their preferences by a show of hands or by calling out the names of the candidates, South Carolinians were using the secret written ballot as prescribed in the fundamental constitutions.

Those of use who look to our forebears for arguments to support the laissez-faire doctrines with which we seek to curtail the functions of government will be disappointed on first acquaintance with their views. They did not fear government, and the evidence indicates that they wanted more, rather than less, of it. They resisted, to be sure, and in the end repudiated a distant imperial authority, but the provincial government was permitted, and even encouraged, if we may judge by the debates in the general assembly, to regulate commerce, to fix prices, to outlaw monopolistic practices, and to foster new enterprises by means of bounties and subsidies. Frequent changes in the laws on these subject show, however, that regulation was flexible, expanding, and contracting as the needs of the community required, and that it was thought to be, in the final analysis, the responsibility of the individual to stand on his own feet.

In the age before the advent of the machines the greatest need of the pioneer community was manpower. In order to supplement the supply of free labor in the American colonies white men were made indentured servants and Indians and Negroes were reduced to slavery. Laborers in each of these groups were to be found in all the colonies, but in none did the ratio of Negro slaves to white freemen exceed that in South Carolina. The claim that Negro labor was so highly esteemed by our forefathers that white immigration was deliberately discouraged is false. As a matter of fact, white men lived in such a constant state of dread of slave revolts that they did all they could to recruit their own numbers. But, in spite of their fears and contrary to their better judgment, they continued to import the

Negro and thereby to compel men of different races and different levels of civilization to live together. In so doing, despite the incidental good which may have been accomplished, they created such a problem for both races that its solution is still the greatest concern of their descendants.

This is the conclusion of the answer to my first question. I have tried to convince you that the founders of this State were fit to light a candle. If I have exalted them for their virtues, I have not failed to mention their faults; and I have dwelt at some length upon what, I believe, may justly be called their one great mistake.

Now this mistake lies close to the core of my next question, which in substance is this: Why are we so ill informed regarding our past; and why are there those among us who seem to feel at times that they must apologize for it? Some of us have put the blame on the national historians. We say that they follow a rigid pattern of interpretation to the effect that the southern States upheld slavery long after it came to be regarded elsewhere as a moral wrong, that in defending slavery the South brought about a war which not only cost the lives of thousands of men but also jeopardized the future of a country already marked for a great role in advancing the cause of democracy, and that South Carolina was the leader in this unholy conspiracy. The conclusion must therefore be that there was nothing in its record worthy of emulation, that its whole history was a contradiction of the American tradition.

There are others who say that this is only half the story. They contend that in forging his defense the South Carolinian has obscured his past instead of revealing it. He has driven out the pioneer, with the exception of two or three robust chracters who will not be denied; underestimated the non-English elements in his heritage; overemphasized the rigidity of the social system; hidden the ugly side of slavery; idealized the plantation; and neglected the substantial contributions of his forefathers in the fields of religion and government. In short, he has created a legendary past as little related to reality as that invented by the national historians.

There are, of course, elements of truth in both of these explanations. But there is a more important explanation—a simple and obvious one—one, in fact, which underlies both of the others. We have failed to comprehend our past because we have not preserved our records in sufficient number, because we have not made available all of those that have survived, and because we have not adequately interpreted the ones that are available.

If given a little time, everything that we create becomes a record—our houses, our machines, our printed books, and those handwritten private papers and public documents called manuscripts. It would not be desirable, even if it were possible, to preserve all of these things; but, far more than most of us realize, both our material and our spiritual welfare depend upon our success in saving and utilizing records. Fortunately some records—those, for example, which have intrinsic value—more or less automatically survive; but in the case of others a conscious and systematic effort must be made to prevent their destruction.

Circumstances have not been favorable to the preservation of records of any kind in South Carolina; they have been particularly unfavorable to the survival of written documents. Fire and storm and war have taken a heavy toll, but indifference and neglect are responsible for greater losses. A list prepared some years ago of books printed in this State between 1801 and 1820 contains 225 titles, but copies of only 97 of these titles are now to be found in our libraries. According to a list of newspapers published in the United States prior to 1821, South Carolina ranged 12th among the 29 States of that period in the number of papers published, but not a single issue of 27 of its 59 newspapers is in the possession of any institution in the State today. These figures show how careless we have been about our printed records.

The losses of private manuscripts have been even greater. Partly because our grandfathers were too impoverished and dispirited after the Confederate War to give more than the meagerest support to the institutions already established for the preservation of records and partly because we have been slow in these days of returning prosperity to strengthen our libraries and historical societies, the documents that would best enable us to understand our economic and social development have been allowed to perish or to be gathered up and taken away by collectors in other parts of the country. Out of all our forefathers who lighted the candle in 1670 and kept it burning during our first 100 years there is only one who is honored today by having a fairly complete set of his papers preserved by an institution within this State, and relatively few of the papers of the others are anywhere to be found.

When the State was occupied by the British during the Revolution, some of the public records, then almost entirely concentrated in Charleston, were successfully evacuated; others were protected by occupation officials. The losses seem therefore to have been comparatively light. Less than a century later, when a Federal army burned Columbia, our second capital, this story was repeated with variations. Prompt action on the part of the State officials saved the main collections, and, with the exception of the contents of the State Library, there was no wholesale destruction of records. We can say, then, that our State documents, in contrast to our private papers, are numerous and, it may be added, of exceptionally good quality.

In asserting that we have not made available all of our extant records I mean that large numbers are literally not physically accessible because we lack an adequate archives building. Many others are not available in the sense that they have been arranged for effective use. And still others are not within the reach of historians because they are of a kind that should be published, and publication is long overdue.

When I say that our available records have not been adequately interpreted, I am not forgetting the excellent studies made by our native scholars and those from other States and countries. I mean that, considering the great amount of research to be done, these studies are far too few in number and that not infrequently they are concluded without a complete examination of the sources. How little we know, for example, of the development of agriculture in this State, the rise of industry, the history of education, the evolution of our constitution, and the background of this problem of race relations that is troubling us so deeply just now. Perhaps we can get along without the inspirational values that other people find in their past, but I doubt that we can make proper use of the opportunities now crowding upon us if we persist in our refusal to draw upon our great treasury of experience.

What can be done to correct this situation? I would like to answer this, my last question, with a proposal. Fifteen years hence South Carolina will observe its tercentenary, the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the first permanent settlers. I suggest that we begin at once to prepare for a celebration. I want to propose:

First, that we build a State archives in which every part of our great collection of public documents may be arranged, made available for study, and exhibited on occasion.

Second, that we continue and greatly increase our support of the South Carolina Historical Society, the South Caroliniana Library, the Charleston Library Society, the Carolina Art Association, the Charleston Museum, the South Carolina Historical Association, the University of South Carolina Graduate School, the University of South Carolina Press, and similar organizations in their efforts to collect, to preserve, and to interpret our private records.

Third, that we seek to acquire, and to place where they may be most effectively used, photocopies of South Carolina documents now outside the State, particularly those in foreign countries.

Fourth, that we provide for the permanent services of an archeologist, either through one of our educational institutions or as a State official, in order that our early historic sites (especially that of Old Charles Town) and our rich prehistoric remains may be studied.

Fifth, that we complete the publication of our colonial and State public records in accordance with plans now in progress, that we provide the means to enable Clemson College and the University of South Carolina to publish the edition of the papers of John C. Calhoun which they have undertaken to sponsor, and that in the same manner we encourage the South Carolina Historical Society to publish the papers of Henry Laurens, and the Charleston Library Society to issue the microfilm edition of our colonial newspapers which has already been planned.

And sixth, that we furnish the necessary support for the writing and publishing of a history of the State to consist of several volumes, each volume to be written by that historian in the State best qualified to present the period with which it deals.

This is a plan which calls for the cooperation of the businessman and the leader in public affairs, of the amateur and the professional historian, of the patriotic society and the historical association, and of the private organization and the State government. It is one which should have the support of the low country and the up country. It is one from which lasting benefits could be derived—better textbooks for our schools, noble examples to be followed in shaping our personal lives, and the knowledge and understanding upon which to base our economic and political policies. It is, I believe, the only one that will make the candle lighted by our forefathers shine as a beacon now and in the future.

A Pension Doesn't Cancel Other Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., of January 15, 1956:

A PENSION DOESN'T CANCEL OTHER RIGHTS

The Veterans' Administration has now officially restored the disability pension of James Kutcher, a legless war veteran. Mr. Kutcher appears to be a free-speaking member of a small Trotskyite sect called the Socialist Workers' Party, which is solemnly

enrolled on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

A man who has lost his legs in the service of his country might seem to have earned the right to be as unorthodox and as cantankerous as he pleases. But this is not the case. Mr. Kutcher was fired for his politics in 1948 from a $45-a-week-job with the VA. His parents are now resisting eviction from a Federal housing project because their son cannot sign the loyalty form now required of subsidized tenants. His pension was suspended because, on the word of anonymous informants, he was accused of "rendering assistance to the enemy" by criticizing the Government and expressing the admittedly forlorn hope that some day the Socialist workers would control the Government of the United States.

Mr. Kutcher's pension is restored, according to the VA, because it does not feel it has proof that he really said these things and, "in order to support forfeiture, it must be established beyond a reasonable doubt that the veteran did knowingly and intentionally render assistance to an enemy of the United States."

Any person who knowingly and intentionally aids an enemy of his country would seem to be guilty of treason and should properly be charged with treason. Article 3, section 111, of the Constitution says that: "No persons shall be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or on confession in open court." For this reason, the attorneys who have been fighting Mr. Kutcher's long battle demanded an open hearing with his accusers present and testifying on oath.

The VA consented, under strong pressure, to an open hearing. But it produced no witnesses and no accusers, and now says, in effect, that the charges which constituted its evidence no longer carry conviction. It has evaded confrontation, preferring rather to discredit its nameless informers, thus following what has come to be standard policy among Government agencies called upon to justify security procedures based on anonymous accusation.

But there is a more important point even than confrontation in the case of James Kutcher. Suppose he said all that the informants said he said: Why shouldn't he say it? When did it become treasonous for any American to criticize the Government, to argue against it, to express a hope of changing it? Nobody professes to have heard Mr. Kutcher threatening to blow up the White House, or urging a march of his fellow-Socialist Workers. Nobody even accused him of conspiring to advance their cause. His sine seems to be a defiant adherence to a splinter party so small that most of us never heard of it.

He himself made the relevant point about his plight, back in 1949 when he was first beginning his struggle to live in the country he fought for: "I don't want any special sympathy or pity because I lost my legs; all I want are the rights that belong to any man or woman. The significant thing in my case is not that I lost my legs but that I lost my rights which are infinitely dearer and more precious to me." Among those rights would seem to be the one, clearly guaranteed by the First Amendment to the Constitution, which the Veterans' Administration has now charitably decided he didn't exercise, after all. But he has the right to exercise it, to go on criticizing his Government, to go on working for his obscure and unattractive little party. We might all have more reason to feel pleased by the restoration of James Kutcher's pension if the VA had admitted that nothing he says in criticism of his Government can alter that Government's duty to compensate him in part for the mutilation he suffered in fighting for it.

Dual Observance Marks the 50th Anniversary of the Organization of the Polish Citizens Club, Du Bois, Pa., and the 176th Anniversary of the Death of Count Casimir Pulaski, Who Commanded the Famous Pulaski Legion in the Revolutionary War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on October 9, 1955, to deliver the principal address at a banquet of the Polish Citizens Club, Du Bois, Pa., in my congressional district, at which time the 50th anniversary of the founding of the club was celebrated and the 176th anniversary of the death of the illustrious Polish patriot Casimir Pulaski was commemorated.

The Polish Citizens Club of Du Bois which was organized in 1905 with 30 charter members now has a total membership of 750 which indicates the growth and progress of this fine organization which plays such an important part in the fraternal and social life of Du Bois, Pa.

The anniversary banquet was held in Pulaski Hall, constructed by the Polish Citizens Club in 1929, and was attended by several hundred members.

The program for the occasion and my address follow:

PROGRAM

National anthem.
Introduction: Frank Kosempa, president, Polish Citizens' Club.
Invocation: Rev. Louis Kozlowski.
Master of ceremonies: Michael E. Nowak.
Address: Hon. Pat. B. Dillman, mayor, Du Bois, Pa.
Address: Rev. Louis Kozlowski.
Address: Hon. Frank O'Niel, representative to Pennsylvania State Assembly.
Musical selection.
Address: Rev. John Piathowski, Sykesville, Pa.
Address: John Cherry, Esq., club attorney.
Club progress for 50 years: Anthony Monikowski.
Musical selection.
Address: Frank Kosempa, president, Polish Citizens' Club.
Address: Hon. James E. Van Zandt, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.
America.
Polish national hymn, Boze Cos Polske.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE POLISH CITIZENS' CLUB, OCTOBER 9, 1955, PULASKI HALL, DU BOIS, PA.

I am honored to be given the opportunity of commemorating two notable anniversaries—the 50th anniversary of the Polish Citizens' Club and the 176th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski.

You, the members of the Polish Citizens' Club are to be congratulated for the 50 years of building American citizenship and the contribution you have made in the preservation of the American way of life.

Your ancestors were God-fearing people who loved freedom and instilled such love in the hearts of their sons and daughters.

That is why, in every war in which this Nation has been engaged, and particularly in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, Du Bois has been represented by many courageous young Americans of Polish descent.

This observance of your 50th anniversary is a happy occasion, for it reflects over a half century of love and service to your community, State, and Nation.

In many respects the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the Polish Citizens' Club and the 176th anniversary of the death of Count Casimir Pulaski is highly significant, mainly because they symbolize the strength and the durability of the Polish tradition in our American civilization.

Probably more than any other Pole Count Casimir Pulaski hold a place of endearment in the heart of the American people.

Every American, every schoolchild, has at one time in his life been inspired by the dramatic life of this great Polish soldier.

I know whenever I leave Capitol Hill and going down Pennsylvania Avenue past the statue of Pulaski in downtown Washington, I momentarily reflect upon the great service this Polish nobleman rendered toward the winning of American independence.

As a personality Casimir Pulaski was indeed a remarkable man.

Born and bred in the finest traditions of Polish culture he was a nobleman and a courageous soldier who won the respect of both his enemies and his friends.

Count Casimir Pulaski was to the Poles what Lafayette was to the French. To Americans both were and continue to be something special, something apart from the ordinary war hero. And rightly so, for both fought for the worthiest of ideals, freedom and national independence.

Fearless in battle, extraordinarily courageous, resourceful, and confident, Pulaski brought to war-weary armies of General Washington a dash and boldness that must have electrified all who saw him in action.

Pulaski's contributions to the American cause were great.

At the time of the Revolution the American conception of the cavalry was not clearly and accurately formed.

A trained soldier and an outstanding horseman the young Polish count gave freely of his skills and knowledge in the organization of the American cavalry.

As General Washington said of Pulaski when he recommended the young Pole in the Continental Congress he was "a man of real capacity, experience, and knowledge."

Thus as a leader in the American cavalry, Pulaski became the first of the great cavalry commanders that sparkle across the pages of American history, men like General Sheridan, of the Union Army, the Confederate cavalryman, Jeb Stuart, Theodore Roosevelt's Rough Riders of 1898, and finally, General Patton of World War II fame.

In the role of cavalry commander of the Continental Army and later as commander of the famous Pulaski Legion, the young Polish count established for himself a remarkable war record, fighting in such historic battles as Brandywine, Germantown, Egg Harbor, Charleston, and finally, the ill-fated battle of Savannah. At that memorable battle, Pulaski was killed in action on October 9, 1779.

In all these battles of the Revolutionary War Pulaski displayed in full the heroism and gallantry for which he was universally known.

His finest hour at the siege of Savannah was indeed his last.

A martyr of liberty, he died a hero's death.

He gave his life for freedom's sake and for the sake of American national independence.

Undoubtedly the supreme tragedy in the life of Casimir Pulaski was his untimely death which prevented him from returning to his native Poland, and like Kosciuszko, another great Polish soldier in the American Revolutionary War, to take up arms again for the freedom and independence of the Polish nation.

But if Pulaski was not with Kosciuszko and his comrades in being, he was certainly with them in spirit, because the ideals for which Pulaski fought and gave his life were the same ones that inspired the Polish nation to fight for its independence in the closing years of the 18th century.

More than that, these same ideals inspired the Polish people to rise in revolt in the 1830's and the 1860's in an effort to throw off the Russian yoke of imperialism.

When at last the Polish Republic was reestablished after World War I and the Polish nation was again free and independent, the success that was Poland's was also in a sense the success of Casimir Pulaski.

And then when Poland underwent the supreme tests of World War II, it was again the same spirit of Casimir Pulaski, the spirit of freedom and national independence, which manifested itself and sustained the Polish nation at a time of deadly peril.

Yes, my friends, the name Casimir Pulaski emblazoned on the record of world history has meant for both the American people and the people of Poland freedom and national independence.

And when we hold Poland today, caught up in the Communist tyranny, it is a source of great sadness.

All America feels the loss of Poland to the free world for through men like Pulaski and the many sons and daughters of Poland who, since the close of the 19th century, came to America to begin life anew, a strong bond of affection has been established between the two nations.

America never has nor can she ever be indifferent to oppression wherever it occurs and I am proud of the work of our American Congress in exposing not only Communist oppression in Poland but in exposing every form of Communist aggression and tyranny.

One of the most shocking outrages committed by the Soviet Communists against the Poles was the Katyn Forest massacre.

The congressional investigation of this massacre under the able leadership of my good friend and colleague Congressman MADDEN, of Indiana, exposed to the world the dreadful slaughter of thousands of Polish officers by the Soviet Government.

Nowhere was the true nature of communism, the sheer brutality and ruthlessness of this way of life, revealed with such shocking clarity as in the evidence submitted at this congressional investigation.

When this investigation was undertaken members of the committee conducted hearings here in the United States and in Europe and before the investigation itself was completed the committee had accumulated an imposing collection of documented material showing conclusively that the Russians had committed this horrible crime against humanity.

Eyewitnesses to the massacre reported in detail how the Russian soldiers and NKVD (the notorious Soviet secret police) had tied the hands of the doomed Polish officers with wire and, stuffing sawdust in their mouths, shot them in the head.

While many of the thousands so executed died immediately, many others were actually buried alive.

Rather than shoot some of them the Soviet authorities threw them into the mass grave to suffocate.

The massacre at Katyn Forest first came to the attention of the world in 1943 when the German Government announced to the world that it had found mass graves of Polish officers numbering into the thousands.

At the time the free world read of this account as a purely Nazi propadanga trick.

During the war many Americans did not want to face the realities of Soviet brutality and discounted much of what had been published.

The Germans, however, went to great pains to show this massacre was a Russian affair.

They requested the International Red Cross to investigate all the circumstances.

In addition, they had neutral newsmen inspect the remains of the massacre and the evidence. They even went so far as to bring an American and a British officer, both imprisoned in a German prisoner-of-war camp, to the scene of the crime.

At first these men were convinced this was another Nazi propaganda trick. They went to the Katyn Forest, certain in their own minds, that this was a Nazi crime and not a Russian crime.

However after the graves were opened, both officers came to the independent conclusion that what they had seen was in fact the work of the Russians and not the Germans.

In his testimony before the committee, Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr., the American officer, said that he noticed that the clothing on the unfortunate Polish officers was new clothing and that their boots and shoes were likewise new and gave no indications of wear.

Colonel Van Vliet, who had been a prisoner himself for many months and realized the wear and tear a prisoner's clothing receives, stated in his oral testimony:

"If those Polish officers had been alive and in prison camp until the Germans overran the Polish prison camps, and if the Germans had in fact killed these Polish officers, then by the very virtue of the fact that their clothes had been worn and their shoes had been walked in, they would show much more wear."

Strangely enough the Germans did not notice this bit of evidence that struck the British and American officers.

Yet this was the evidence that convinced both men that these atrocities were committed by the Russians.

As Lt. Col. Donald B. Stewart, of the British Army, stated:

"The decision I reached I can never forget. My decision was that those (Polish) men were killed by the Russians while they were prisoners of the Russians."

And Colonel Van Vliet arrived at a similar conclusion when he observed:

"The sum of circumstantial evidence, impressions formed at the time of looking at the graves, what I saw in people's faces—all force the conclusion that Russia did it."

As a result of this, as well as other evidence uncovered by the House committee, the committee itself concluded that Katyn was truly a Russian crime.

Now I want to read briefly from the conclusions of the committee's report:

"This committee unanimously finds—beyond any question of reasonable doubt—that the Soviet NKVD (Russia's secret police) committed the mass murders of the Polish officers, and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest.

"The evidence, testimony, records, and exhibits recorded by this committee through its investigations and hearings during the last 9 months, overwhelmingly will show the people of the world that Russia is directly responsible for the Katyn massacre.

"Throughout our entire proceedings there has not been an ounce of proof or even any remote circumstantial evidence presented that could indict any other nation in this international crime."

Ladies and gentlemen, such was the manner in which the Soviet leaders tried to destroy the Polish officer corps.

But, it was in fact, their own undoing, because when the Germans invaded Russia in June 1941 Polish and Russian interest, heretofore antagonistic, had joined in common accord.

Both wanted to defeat the Nazis and liberate the occupied areas of their respective countries.

When attempts were made in Russia to organize Polish army units questions were asked about the officers who were to be in command.

On one occasion, Lavrenti Beria, head of the notorious Russian secret police, was said to have remarked in answer to the question why the Soviets did not enlist the officers from the Soviet prison camps for the proposed Polish army he said:

"We have committed a great blunder. We have made a great mistake."

Yes, the Russians committed a great blunder, they had made a great mistake, but their blunder and their mistake could not compare to the enormity of their crime against humanity.

Today as we stand on what may be the threshold of a new era called peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Government, and with communism in general, it might be well to read the evidence of the Katyn massacre.

This investigation is only one of many congressional efforts to call attention of the world to the Communist threat.

Noteworthy also for doing excellent work in laying bare the facts of Communist aggression in Poland, the Baltic States, and elsewhere in eastern Europe was the work of the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression.

This committee of the House of Representatives, under the very capable leadership of former Congressman Charles Kersten, did a service of great value in exposing Communist aggression.

Extensive hearings were held in the United States and in Europe.

And again, as in the Katyn massacre investigation, a huge amount of documented evidence was accumulated to prove conclusively the imperialistic nature of the Soviet Union.

Through these highly important congressional investigations the bold facts of Communist tyranny have been placed before the world.

They are now a matter of permanent record.

This is, I believe, very important because in the days ahead the Soviet Government will continue to do much to persuade the free world that the Soviet Union wants to live in peace and that it desires to coexist peacefully with the West.

Only the future will reveal whether the Communist leaders sincerely desire peace.

But at least the Katyn massacre and Soviet aggression in Poland are now part of the historical record of not only the American Nation but also part of the historical record of the world.

The record will stand for all ages, and for those who desire to see communism for what it is, let them look at this record and ponder upon it thoughtfully.

Tyrannies have risen and fallen since Casimir Pulaski was mortally wounded on the battlefield of Savannah.

But history is a living drama in which the tyrant will perhaps be always present to play his part.

However, so long as men like Casimir Pulaski, men who are dedicated to truth, virtue, honor, and liberty, rise among us the tyrant will not long endure and at length, peace, harmony, and freedom will prevail.

Over 175 years ago the world lost a great patriot and fighter when it lost Casimir Pulaski.

The ideals for which this courageous young Pole died did not die when he was stricken in battle.

Rather they emerged triumphant as a result of the War of American Independence and were carried to broader horizons by the Nation for whom he gave his life.

The hope of all America today is that the same ideals for which Pulaski fought and died, freedom and national independence, will be extended to Poland, the land of his birth, so that one day in the future Poland can take her rightful place among the free and independent nations of the world.

More Heat Than Light

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Journal of Commerce:

MORE HEAT THAN LIGHT

The farm problem will develop into one of the more important campaign issues of 1956.

The Democrats already have served notice that they will start an all-out attack against the Republican farm policies as soon as Congress reconvenes in January. The Republicans, in turn, have no other choice but to accept this challenge unless they want to take the risk of losing the farm vote by default.

Already the newspapers are full of charges and countercharges. Hardly a day goes by without publication of some additional material on the farm problem in the form of a new committee report, a fact sheet of one kind or another, or another campaign guide for one side or its opposition.

It is not surprising that, thus far, these political skirmishes are providing more heat than light.

Actually, there is little chance that political debate—as we have witnessed it since the end of World War II and, in intensified form, since the end of the Korean war—will ever lead to a solution of the farm problem. As long as the two political parties vie for the farmer's vote by outdoing themselves with promises of higher farm prices and greater farm prosperity, no real solution to the farm problem will be found.

The basic evil is that strong and competing farm blocs exist in both major parties. This has effectively blocked any bipartisan approach to the problem.

Yet, if there is to be a solution, it has to be a bipartisan one and nobody but the farmers themselves—through their own organizations and, in the final analysis, their individual votes—can bring about such an approach.

The most significant difference between the Republican and Democratic parties with respect to farm policies lies in the fact that the Democratic leadership has identified itself completely with the political aims of the Democratic farm legislators. In contrast, the Republican leadership—taking its cue primarily from Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson—has insisted on the development of what it considers a sound economic approach to the problem, although this does not completely satisfy some of the Republican farm State representatives, who are straining at the leash.

The Republican stand is currently based on the claim that the Republican farm policies are gradually taking hold, that the worst in the decline of farm prices is over and that therefore there is no immediate need for basic policy changes. The Democrats, in return, are stressing the continued deterioration in farm prices and incomes, and the sharp jump in actual farm support costs during the past 2 years. In their book, the administration's flexible farm price support program is a complete failure, despite the fact that thus far this system has had no time to prove itself and despite the fact that, not so very long ago, the Democrats themselves saw in it the only practical solution to the farm problem.

The Democrats have been very active in suggesting alternate solutions to the farm problem. Chief among them are the return to rigid farm price props at the wartime emergency level of 90 percent of parity, farm subsidies for the diversion of substantial acreages to pasture, and a revival of the Brannan plan-type of farm income subsidies.

All of these proposals are designed for the purpose of creating additional farm income props at the expense of the taxpayer. The Democratic politicians are trying to sell the country on this with the argument that such subsidies would be cheaper for the economy as a whole than a farm-generated general business decline.

This argument assumes that the farm sector of the economy not only is as important to the general economy now as it was 20 or 30 years ago, but also that the farm sector now is in danger of deteriorating rapidly into something like its situation in the early thirties.

Both assumptions are dangerous—but the trouble is that no progress toward a sound long-range farm program can be made as long as these assumptions persist and political debate is centered around them.

The Republican leadership thus far has refused to accept these premises, although of late there are signs of rising panic among some of its congressional farm Representatives. It has recently been stated publicly that Republican farm experts are hard at work in order to come up with an answer to the question of how to change the current administration farm platform for next year.

Time may still be in favor of the Republicans, since it is more than a year until election time.

However, while it is quite possible that the decline in farm prices is about over for this year, the situation hardly justifies any complacency on the part of the Republicans.

Much will depend on the future work of the administration's National Agricultural Advisory Commission, which has just issued an optimistic interim report on the farm situation.

If this Commission succeeds in strengthening its stature and acceptance to the point where it can develop a truly bipartisan approach to the farm problem, it will gain for itself the reputation of great economic wisdom. Otherwise, its reports will merely add to the excess wordage dealing with the farm problem.

Storm Around Mr. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times, Saturday, January 14, 1956, in which that paper takes Secretary Dulles to task for his statements which appeared in a recent edition of Life magazine:

Secretary Dulles has to his credit so many creditable achievements, from the Japanese peace treaty to the completion of a world-encircling defense system of free nations, that it is regrettable to find him the center of an international storm aroused by some unwise remarks of his which are, to say the least, an extreme example of how not to conduct diplomacy. The remarks, which he acknowledges, are contained in a Life magazine article which, aside from the controversial facts involved, represents him as taking pride in practicing the "art" of leading the United States three times to the verge of war to deter Communist aggression without getting us into war.

In supplying material for such an article Mr. Dulles apparently intended, by citing the specific cases of Korea, Indochina and Formosa, to emphasize the established American policy of "peace through strength" which excludes appeasement and seeks to prevent war by creating an approximate balance of power with effective retaliatory means to deter Communist aggression. But by the specific manner in which this has been done he has not only brought upon himself both domestic and foreign charges of "distortion" of history; he has also provided new grist to the mills of both the Communists and the European appeasement elements, and thereby unwittingly impaired the very policy he seeks to support.

It is, of course, a fact that in resisting Communist aggression in the three cases mentioned in the United States and other United Nations members did get into war in Korea, and France in Indochina, before Mr. Dulles became Secretary of State. It is likewise a fact that these free nations faced up to the risk of even bigger wars unless Communist aggression halted. There were ample official warnings of that risk at the time, not the least among them the Sixteen Nation Declaration that a breach of the Korean armistice would expand hostilities beyond the Korean frontiers, the congressional resolution for the defense of Formosa and Mr. Dulles' own warning against armed Communist Chinese intervention in Indochina. But it is one thing to proclaim a considered policy and quite another thing for the American Secretary of State to be cast in the role of an "artist" juggling with threats of war.

Such a representation is quite contrary to the general policy enucniated by President Eisenhower—namely, that while we must maintain a strong defense posture, we must wage peace, not war, because in the atomic age there is no alternative to peace. It is also contrary to the President's specific declaration in reference to Indochina that while each situation involves its own degree of risk, each such situation must be met on its merits.

The Leading Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast over the CBS radio network January 8, 1956, 10:30 to 11 a. m., the Leading Question. Guests: the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, United States House of Representatives, Democrat, of Massachusetts; the Honorable LESLIE C. ARENDS, United States House of Representatives, Republican, of Illinois. The leading question: "What will happen to the President's program?"

Mr. NOVINS. This week the 84th Congress returned to open its 2d session. Three days ago President Eisenhower sent his state of the Union message to Capitol Hill, outlining his program for this final period, and the leading question is: What will happen to the President's program?

The two gentlemen who will help us try to find an answer to that question are extremely well equipped to do so, for they are both charged by their parties with responsibility for seeing that their parties' policies are translated into legislative action.

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, is the House majority leader. Congressman LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, of Illinois, is the House minority whip.

Gentlemen, we are going to try to preview in a half hour what Congress is going to take many months to try to settle, but let me ask each of you: How do you appraise the President's message?

Congressman MCCORMACK, would you start?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The President's message was rather long. On domestic affairs, it contained recommendations and observations that the Congress is thoroughly acquainted with because we have had them up in various forms in the past years. Most of his internal or domestic recommendations were simply embracing the New Deal of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Fair Deal of former President Harry S. Truman, and, of course, we Democrats welcome him into the fold in this respect. We are glad to see that he is converted to good Democratic principles.

If these recommendations on the domestic field, in the main, go through, it will be because of Democratic support, because his greatest difficulty would be with his own party. I am sure Congressman ARENDS would be better qualified to state what support the President might get from his own party in the House on the progressive recommendations that he has made, the President has made, which are strictly Democratic policy.

Mr. NOVINS. Well, let's ask Congressman ARENDS how he feels about the speech, and then perhaps he will answer your question, too.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, first let me say I am very pleased to be here with my good friend Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMACK to discuss this question of what this Congress might do, the last session of the 84th Congress.

I thought the President's message was rather lengthy, too, yes. But it did cover some things that needed to be talked about.

First, I think he mentioned several things which this past session of the Congress failed to do, namely, the shortcomings of the Congress under Democratic leadership, which should have been taken care of in the first session of the Congress.

And he reemphasized the needs on the part of the country to have these particular legislative proposals gone into, and something done about them. I believe this Congress will, because of the attitude as expressed by Congress MCCORMACK this morning, that while he thought some of it was New Deal legislation—and if such is the case, then we can expect better cooperation from the standpoint of the Majority side of the aisle in this session of Congress to fulfill the recommendations of the President. I think we will have a pretty constructive Congress this year, if they will just go ahead and do that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, it is rather interesting to hear the remarks of my good friend, Congressman ARENDS, whom I deeply respect and for whom I express a very happy New Year, and successful in every respect. I do that without limitation.

Of course, we all know that there is going to be Democratic success next fall, but the record shows that in the last 3 years of the Eisenhower administration, that the President has received far more support from the Democrats on domestic matters and on foreign affairs, too, clearly on foreign affairs, than he has from his own party.

I hope the Republicans will get together behind an effective road bill and vote for one, and a pay-as-you-go policy, not the one that will give the bankers of the country about eleven to eleven and a half billion dollars of taxpayers' money over the next 30 years.

And that is about the only bill that I know of that didn't pass last year, but the Republicans wanted to put through a bill that would cost the taxpayers eleven to eleven and a half billion dollars more over the next 30 years than the Democrats. We wanted the pay-as-you-go policy to save that eleven to eleven and a half billion dollars. The school construction bill has gotten the farthest it ever has. It got out of the committee, and it ought to come up in the near future.

Mr. ARENDS. I am very glad to have you discuss these two big items on which we failed to take action in the last session. You must constantly bear in mind you have majority votes in the House of Representatives, and the Republicans can't do anything unless you fellows are there to supply the vote.

On the question of the road bill, it is going to cost the American people money, regardless of how it is financed, one way or another, if we are going to build these very much needed roads. Now, then, the point is: how are we going to get an agreement on this question.

I think that the thing to do is, all of us forget for a moment about politics and not try to gain any political favor in building these roads, because all Americans need them and use them, and go right ahead and reach some compromise and do the job.

The same thing about the school program. I am sure that if we can get out of the Rules Committee, controlled, as it is, by your group, if we can get that bill out of the Rules Committee and on the floor, I am sure we will pass the school-construction bill, which I think will be helpful, as it is so vitally needed in this great country of ours.

Mr. NOVINS. Which of these issues is going to get priority action?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I would think that the school construction, because it is out of committee and that is the furthest it has ever gotten in the House of Representatives. It came out toward the latter part of the last session, and it is in the Rules Committee, as Congressman ARENDS says.

Of course, there are four Republican members of the Rules Committee, and their votes are very helpful, or some of their votes, at times. And I think there should be bipartisan cooperation in connection with getting that rule and trying to get the bill through.

On the road bill, I would agree that it is going to cost the people money, but we Democrats were trying to save the people eleven to eleven and a half billion dollars that the Republican proposal wanted them to pay. And under our bill we would have saved that tremendous amount during the next 30 years, and I think the people are interested in a saving of eleven to eleven and a half billion dollars.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Congressman, can I just ask you a very simple question. Wasn't it amazingly surprising to you—it certainly was not to me because I anticipated it—that when the rollcall came on the question of whether taxes should be raised or not, by an overwhelming majority it was defeated in the House, not only by Republican votes but by Democratic votes, and I think the Democrats surprised themselves by voting against any increase in taxes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, of course, the amazing thing to me was that after the President's proposal, which was opposed by the Comptroller General and by another commission appointed by him, that you Republicans overwhelmingly voted against the pay-as-you-go bill.

Now, the responsibility rests upon each individual Member. The rollcall shows that a far larger percentage of Democrats voted for the pay-as-you-go bill than you Republicans. As a matter of fact, the pay-as-you-go bill was drafted in committee by a combination of Republicans and Democrats. The amazing thing to me is that we know most Republicans in the committee were opposed to the President's bill, and they helped draft the pay-as-you-go bill, and yet they voted for the President's bill as against the pay-as-you-go bill, which they helped draft.

Mr. ARENDS. As did a majority of the Democrats.

Mr. MCCORMACK. But the larger percentage, much larger percentage, of Democrats voted for the pay-as-you-go bill than did Republicans.

Now this year, with the experience of the last year, we ought to try and get together and get a bill through that the leadership of both parties as well as the President will support. If that is done, why, we ought to get legislation through. If not, we will get probably a straight authorization bill through.

Mr. ARENDS. Yes; we want no more stalemates. Let's get something through, that's right. It is needed.

Mr. MCCORMACK. We are all in harmony and agreement on that.

Mr. NOVINS. Let me ask about what kind of a something that is going to be, Congressman ARENDS. What form should the bill take?

Mr. ARENDS. I think the whole issue is still cloudy even as far as the members of the committee are concerned, because I have talked to them.

If it is a question of raising revenue, I think it should go to the Ways and Means Committee under public open hearings, and discuss how much tax is necessary to provide the funds for these roads, and let's bring it out before the American people and let's be equal and fair about the taxes that are to be levied.

Mr. NOVINS. Do you feel that the charge that Congressman MCCORMACK made a few moments ago is an incorrect one, this $11 billion——

Mr. ARENDS. Of course there is nothing new about financing things like that. We do repeatedly and have done it in the Federal Government repeatedly in the various agencies, like the building agencies, HOLC, RFC, and the different things, we have done that repeatedly over the different years.

In my State of Illinois, the first hard road building program we started with a $100 million bond issue, people sort of threw up their hands, but we paid off the bonds and the interest thereon and today, even after the first 20 years expiration date, we are still enjoying the uses of those many,many roads, and that was the way to do it at that time to get started.

Mr. NOVINS. Certainly one of the great and important issues that will be coming up in this session of Congress is the farm question, and I wonder what your opinions are on that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, of course, I haven't got a farm in my district, but I have always supported farm legislation. I have some very strong views, but I assume that Congressman ARENDS has farms and farmers in his district. It would be very interesting to get his views.

Mr. NOVINS. I would like to get the views of both of you, but if you want to go ahead——

Mr. MCCORMACK. I mean coming from a farming district——

Mr. NOVINS. All right. Let him start.

Mr. ARENDS. I would be very glad to talk about it. Congressman McCORMACK, I realize that you come from the city and so are not too close to the farm situation, and it is understandable, and I live right in the heart of a great farming area out in the plains of Illinois.

This is a terrific and most involved question, and from the standpoint of the domestic front, I think it is the most bothersome problem that we will have before this Congress. And it ought to be considered as expeditiously as possible for the welfare of agriculture.

Now, I am not so smart, although I think I rather well understand the farm question, because that is my business and I suppose, in this last recess of Congress, I was in at least 100 farm elevators; I talked to farmers over the fence, on the tractors, whatever they might hove been doing, I called groups together to discuss the question, and not too much unanimity among the farmers themselves because no one knows which way to turn. But this problem is so vital to the economic welfare of the farmer and the country as a whole that we are just simply going to have to do something about it.

Now, as I well know about yourself and myself, we can forget our politics, and on this question of the farm program I hope and pray that those of us who are sincerely interested in the agricultural program for the future, that we will forget our politics and, for the best interests of the farmer, get busy and do something which will be helpful to them, not only immediately but in the long run. It is the most vital question that faces us at this time.

Mr. NOVINS. Congressman, as a practical matter, you really don't expect that the farm question will not be a political issue this year, do you?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, I am a little afraid about it, but I plead with all the sincerity of my heart that those of us who are intensely interested in agriculture do something about it.

Let me put it this way: I am in no position to legislate for a Republican farmer on one side of the road as against a Democrat farmer on the other side of the road, and vice versa. In other words, I am either going to have to legislate for the best interests of agriculture or against agriculture, and I want to constructively and objectively legislate for the welfare of agriculture.

Mr. NOVINS. How do you feel on the price-support program?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, I was one of those who have not only in this last Congress but in a previous Congress voted against rigid parity support prices, feeling in my own mind an honest belief that that was the beginning of some of our troubles, the rigid parity support prices, and flexible parities, knowing full well the flexible parities in itself was not the complete answer to the farm question.

And so I have been one of those who have adopted the principle of flexible, hoping that other things would follow, and I think they will in this session of Congress, which will in substance and in accumulative effect be beneficial to agriculture as such.

Mr. NOVINS. Congressman McCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I said, Mr. Novins, that I haven't got a farm in my district, but during the entire 28 years I have been in Congress, I have always supported farm legislation.

Mr. NOVINS. You have consumers in your district.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know, but politically my votes have sometimes been contrary to public opinion up my way, and I have consistently voted the way I have because I realize that the agricultural community of our country is a very important segment of American society, not only as human beings, but also economically, and an important segment of our national defense.

I don't apologize for any one of my votes. The farmer buys in a protected market, he sells his farm excess or surplus farm commodities on the world market, which is an unprotected market. Industry is protected through tariffs, and the farmer in the world of today has got to receive some kind of protection. And to me it is a fundamental question.

Now, let us see what has happened to the farmer. Parity ratio has reduced from 115 in 1947 to 85 for the first 10 months of this year, and to 87 for October of 1955, rather. The aggregate realized net farm income shows $10,600,000,000 for 1955 against a peak in 1947 of $17,200,000,000.

Mr. NOVINS. Congressman, if I may interrupt——

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. This, while we have a record economy in business.

Mr. NOVINS. There is, I think, general agreement that the plight of the farmer is not a happy one, and I think our problem is how do we solve this situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I supported 90 percent of parity. In the Democratic platform we made a promise. The Republican platform promised 100 percent, or the President in his speeches, 100 percent parity at the market place. Now, if they call the flexible parity compliance with their party platform pledge, it is difficult for me to reconcile myself with it.

Mr. NOVINS. Are you saying that the Republican Party did not meet its campaign pledges to the farmers?

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, the pledge of the Republican Party in its platform and the speeches made by the candidates for President and other prominent Republicans in 1952 show a marked inconsistency with compliance.

Mr. ARENDS. Of course, I can't agree with that, Congressman McCORMACK.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the farmers will do their own deciding.

Mr. ARENDS. Well, I wouldn't get too excited about what the farmers are going to do politically.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not talking politically. I am talking on this question now.

Mr. ARENDS. They are very disturbed about this whole problem, and they want a solution regardless of who brings a solution about.

Mr. McCORMACK. We give a solution.

Mr. ARENDS. Congressman, your 90 percent of parity support prices is not the solution. It has created the tremendous surpluses. It might interest you to know that the consumption of the production in this last year has been approximately on an even keel, but these huge surpluses hanging over our heads are the depressing effect on the market today, and we are going to have to do something about these surpluses.

Now, did you know, Congressman, that in this last year only approximately 25 percent of the people, farmers, have voluntarily gone into the program for support prices? Did you know that? Maybe in my district I would say it was a little bit more, but on the whole only 25 percent have voluntarily gone into this program, which is a strange thing indeed, because here we had the chance for these rigid parity support prices and they themselves know it is not the answer to the problem.

Mr. NOVINS. Will the Republican Party have a program for reducing some of this surplus?

Mr. ARENDS. Yes, we will; and next month the message will come up from the administration, and I suppose through the cooperation of Mr. Benson and those interested in the Agriculture Department down here who are going to make some very good recommendations to the Congress and to the country as to what we might think will help improve the situation materially, and very quickly.

Mr. NOVINS. Can you tell us something of the nature of those recommendations?

Mr. ARENDS. No; I am in no position to do it until the message is brought up, although I have some cognizance of what might be contained in the message.

Mr. NOVINS. Congressman McCORMACK, does the Democratic Party have a solution for the surplus problem?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have put through bills in connection with that. We have given great authority in disposing of surplus farm commodities abroad and in the United States.

Mr. NOVINS. Given authority to the President, you mean?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have given authority to the administration, either the President or the Secretary of Agriculture. It is the administration.

The question of parity in my opinion is a very, very important one. Flexible provisions do not meet the situation. We Democrats have voted for something definite.

I don't like to see my friend from Illinois get himself on the side of Secretary Benson, and I am sure he is not on that side. I wouldn't want to put him on that side. But he has unconsciously and unintentionally placed himself on that side when he tries to defend the Republican position on flexible parity, which he knows has been a failure.

Mr. ARENDS. Let's not raise the personality question because, as I said earlier in this program, I am interested in solving this problem and no one man is going to do it. But the thing that bothers me so extremely about this thing, what are we going to do about these great surpluses?

And if you are willing to ask for rigid parity support prices and put the farmers in a complete straitjacket and put them under complete acreage and allotment controls, then I don't believe you quite understand the American farmer and what he wants.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I think that the American farmer has a very clear idea as to what they want. When they go under controls it is done in the democratic way, they vote for it. If they don't want it, they don't have to vote for it.

One thing is certain: The American farmer's plight is very bad, and I know that when the American farmer's plight is bad, the workers in the cities are going to be bad within a year or two.

Mr. ARENDS. That's right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The first indication of a coming business recession of a marked degree starts with the farmers. And they are a very important segment of our economic society as well as American society, and I agree with you, something should be done even if your party is doing it in the fourth year of its administration, with another election coming around.

Mr. NOVINS. Congressman, do you see those indications of a coming recession now?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, indications among the farmers, it is there.

Mr. NOVINS. You feel that is the first step of a major recession?

Mr. McCORMACK. It always has been in every recession or depression we have had, the study of every one of them since our constitutional history, shows that it starts first among the farmers, and then it spreads to the cities where the workers are.

Mr. ARENDS. Congressman McCORMACK, with your responsibility as majority leader, I hope—and let me say that I am expressing this not only in my capacity as a Congressman and Representative of a fine agricultural district but as an American citizen terrifically interested in agriculture—that you will do your utmost to see that we get the farm question disposed of as expeditiously as it can be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. I don't know anyone who has more consistently supported farm legis-

lation on the floor of the House on several occasions when Representatives from farming districts were undertaking to question me. I have challenged my record with their record.

Mr. NOVINS. Gentlemen, let's look at the state of the Union message again and in another area. The President made quite a point, and it is a very important issue, I think, before the American people, and that is the issue of continued and continuous foreign aid over at least the foreseeable period of time. I wonder how you feel about that, Congressman ARENDS?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, of course, I think it must be continued. The economic aid, the military aid in particular, must be continued to some of our allies and our friends, and if need be, stepped up. I do not think the American people will object to that particular angle of aid.

I am always sorry that they call this foreign aid, use those terms, because I think it is more than that. I think it is the kind of aid which makes possible the friendships and the carrying forward of the objectives of free people and free nations of the world, to the end that we finally solve these problems and all of us remain as free individuals. That is the big problem involved in this thing.

Mr. NOVINS. You tie it then as an integral part of the national security program?

Mr. ARENDS. I do. It certainly is.

Mr. NOVINS. Do you expect that we will get that kind of legislation in this session?

Mr. ARENDS. It is a question whether or not the attitude as expressed by many individual Members of Congress, whether it will be stepped up in sum. That I do not know, and I am not prepared to discuss it in detail until we really understand exactly the proposal that will be forwarded to us in such a message.

Mr. NOVINS. Let me ask you, in principle would you vote for a commitment, say, of 5 years of a continuous program?

Mr. ARENDS. If it can be shown to me after hearings by the proper committees of the House that that is a necessary part of our relationship with foreign nations, those of us on the side of free peoples of the world, why, then, I would be prepared to do so.

Mr. NOVINS. Fine.

Congressman MCCORMACK?

Mr. MCCORMACK. As a matter of fact, when foreign aid first came up, some years ago, and when the argument was made it would be a year-to-year basis, I made the statement on the floor in a speech that I had made that we might just as well face the fact that it is going to be at least 5 years, and probably longer.

I thoroughly agree with the substance of what Congressman ARENDS said. We of this generation, our duty and our responsibility is to preserve America. We have inherited from the past, from the Founding Fathers, the past generations. They built this country, and it is our job to preserve it.

And Americans are fighters. We are not quitters, and we are not going to let the Communist world killers dominate the world. And that doesn't mean war, but it means that we can be so strong as to deter them.

But, on the other hand, we must not only be strong militarily, but we must be strong morally, and we must do those things in the field of foreign affairs, not only in military aid but in economic aid that is for the national interest of our country.

The primary question before us at all times, whether a Member of Congress or not, as Americans, is what course of action is for the national interest of our country, and that transcends Republicanism or the Democratic Party.

Mr. NOVINS. Congressman, you said Americans are not quitters, and of course we agree, but I wonder if you would feel that the inability of Congress to pass a 5-year commitment, if there is such an inability, would be quitting.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, no. I would not say that, no.

Now, if a 5-year program is not put through, that would not fall within that category at all. If the evidence, as Congressman ARENDS well said, presented, justifies it, I would support it. I support it because I consider it to be for the national interest of my country that such legislation and appropriations be enacted into law. But if we should only extend the foreign aid for 1 year, there is nothing about that which would indicate weakness.

Mr. NOVINS. Gentlemen——

Mr. ARENDS. Do I have time to say this? I think, as we just discussed now, if the facts were brought forward, I think you will see no cleavage or difference on the Republican or Democratic side of the aisle as to what we ough to do in unity on this matter of foreign relations.

I think as one, for instance, went way back in the Democratic controlled Congresses, I voted for the so-called Marshall plan, which probably wasn't too popular a thing out in my part of the country. I voted for the aid to Greece and Turkey, and which today I think was a fine vote on those instances, because that was a beginning of a part of this whole program which we are trying to carry out in a unified way and in a bipartisan manner by this Congress.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I might also say that as much discretion in carrying out the national policy of America should be given to the President as is possible. He is in a position to know by reason of information he has what things are necessary, more necessary.

And there are times he can't make them public, where at a later date he can. I am a great believer in the field of foreign affairs in delegating the necessary power and authority to carry out that power to the President.

Mr. ARENDS. Wouldn't you say, Mr. MCCORMACK, that you feel there will be great unanimity again in this session of Congress on this matter of foreign affairs, as there was in the last?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. NOVINS. We are talking, of course, when we are talking about foreign aid, of things that cost money, and I wonder what your prognostications are as to the tax program. The President has suggested we should not try to cut taxes until we have balanced the budget and gotten a pretty good start on reducing the debt.

Mr. ARENDS. Frankly, I liked his approach to this question of taxes and balancing the budget. I have said repeatedly, and I did publicly in my district, when I was on this, that if the time comes in this fiscal year that we see we have a balanced budget, then I think we have a right to consider the matter of tax reduction, bearing in mind, of course, that some token payment on the national debt would be good. And therefore I particularly like that part of his message where I think he is on sound fiscal ground by taking the approach that he did.

Mr. NOVINS. Let me ask you again as a matter of practical predictability, will it happen? Will there be no tax cut this session?

Mr. ARENDS. That is projecting into the future, because no one knows what the spending rate will be between now and the last 6 months of this fiscal year, and therefore I think we just about have to withhold our judgment on that matter until we can see exactly what the income is and what the outgo has been.

Mr. NOVINS. Let me put the question another way. Do you think there is a possibility of a tax reduction before election?

Mr. ARENDS. Well, there are a lot of people who want one, and whether you are asking me for a personal opinion, I would say that I want to see the clear picture before I make my guess on what ought to be done.

Mr. NOVINS. All right, sir.

Congressman MCCORMACK, what about your position on the tax question?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, on the tax question I said that the last Republican tax bill should not have been passed. As a matter of fact, if we had greater revenue than outgo, it should have been used to reduce the national debt. I think that is the matter of primary importance, not a token payment, but substantial payments.

The present national debt is a constant threat to uncontrolled inflation, and in connection with the tax bill this year, why, if the President makes a recommendation, we Democrats will see that a tax bill is passed which considers low-income tax groups.

Mr. NOVINS. You are not expecting that the debt will be materially diminished before election day?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No.

Mr. NOVINS. So I would assume your position is there would be no tax cut, at least you favor that?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I would not say that. I would say that the reasonable probability is that there will not be. But I wouldn't want to commit myself definitely because we Democrats might do things where we can raise revenue and give the lower-income tax group the deserved consideration that the Republicans denied them 3 years ago, and at the same time lose no money for the Treasury.

Mr. ARENDS. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts suggesting that they are going to raise some more taxes? I hope not.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, no; we might undo some of the inequities of the last Republican tax bill and bring in additional revenue and at the same time give consideration where it belongs.

Mr. ARENDS. I think in the last 3 years we have clearly demonstrated to the American people that we are following a sound fiscal policy in this country. Inflation has disappeared. There is some economic stability, and here we are today talking about a balanced budget, which is good.

Mr. NOVINS. Thank you both, Congressman ARENDS, Congressman MCCORMACK, for helping us with this preview of what will happen to the President's program, this week's leading question.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this, the 2d session of the 84th Congress, we are advised by the press that the President will request another huge appropriaiton of almost $5 billion for foreign aid. This notwithstanding the fact that the American taxpayers have already sent foreign aid to the tune of some $50 billion since World War II. Many of us in the Congress, who have consistently opposed these gargantuan expenditures of the taxpayers' money in such a dubious venture, hoped from year to year that each appropriation would be the last one. But these hopes have, alas, been in vain. For, it is obvious that the same philosophy which prevailed in the Truman Administration in our foreign affairs has been adopted as permanent by the Eisenhower Administration.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may be pardoned for again repeating the advice which I humbly gave to my own Democratic administration some 10 years ago and oft repeated on this floor. I stated upon my return from a 2 month's tour of Europe, including some 2 weeks in Moscow, that Russia wants neither war nor peace. Her objective is to destroy our economy and take over in the ensuing chaos and confusion. Certainly with a national debt of $280 billion, with all of the earmarks of ruinous inflation steadily progressing, we are playing into the hands of the Kremlin masters.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, my attention has recently been called to an article by the noted commentator, Henry Hazlitt, as well as to an editorial from the Prentiss Headlight, a rural newspaper printed in Jefferson Davis County, Miss. The one reflects the economic point of view, the other reflects the viewpoint of the small taxpayer and the cross-country thinking. The articles are as follows:

FOREIGN AID FOREVER?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

The request of the administration for an appropriation of almost $5 billion for foreign aid, as compared with $2.7 billion for the current fiscal year, is so ill advised and unjustified that all I can do here is to list some major objections to it and leave further elaboration to a later time.

1. Secretary Dulles' defense of this request is that the actual rate of foreign-aid spending will increase from $4.2 billion in the current fiscal year to only $4.4 billion in the fiscal year beginning next July 1. His defense of an 80-percent increase in the appropriation is that it is necessary to keep foreign aid flowing, to keep the pipeline filled up. Yet even without this addition to its foreign-aid reserves the administration will have a $7-billion carryover of foreign-aid appropriations at the end of this fiscal year.

Moreover, the administration's present line is a complete reversal of its previous attitude on budgetary carryovers. At a press conference on April 30, 1953, President Eisenhower said: "No more glaring illustration of the lack of balance between the military logic and the economic logic could possibly be found than the situation that existed when we took office. On the one hand, we found our allies deploring our unfulfilled defense promises. On the other hand, we found that there was a total carryover of $81 billion in appropriated funds, largely committed, for which cash must be provided from revenues in future fiscal years over and above the normal cost of Government. It's just as if the late administration had gone to the store and ordered $81 billion of goods, which we've got to pay for as they're delivered."

If Mr. Eisenhower was right in 1953, he is wrong now. A larger appropriation now means that the taxpayers must spend that much more, whether in the next fiscal year or later. Only by rejecting the present demand can Congress hope to control even future foreign aid, not to speak of bringing it to a long-overdue termination. The suggestion of a pledge to continue foreign spending for 10 more years is an unwarranted attempt to tie the hands of future Congresses.

2. We have already spent $50 billion of the taxpayers' money in foreign aid since the end of the Second World War. Propagandists for this aid boldly give it entire credit for the postwar European recovery that has taken place. But it could just as plausibly be argued that this recovery would have been faster without it. Certainly it has subsidized and prolonged foreign exchange controls and socialism.

3. As the old excuses for foreign aid run out, our bureaucrats invent new ones. The present somewhat hysterical clamor for it rests on the tacit assumption that allies can be bought if we only raise our price. We are told we must outbid Russian offers of foreign aid. Yet even Secretary Dulles admitted that we ought not "to put ourselves in a position where the Soviets, by just making paper offers, can require us to make real offers to top them. That would mean that the Soviets would be spending nothing except a piece of paper but would require us to spend a great deal of money." Yet this is precisely what we are doing, for example, in offering American taxpayers' money to help Egypt build a grandiose dam.

4. The tacit assumption behind nearly all our so-called foreign economic aid has been statist or socialistic. It assumes that a nation prospers by handouts, rather than by attracting private investments through encouragement of free enterprise.

5. Even our so-called military aid rests on the dubious economic assumption that other countries cannot afford to pay for their own defense, and that American taxpayers must asume that burden.

6. The foreign-aid program is merely one more symptom of budget irresponsibility. The administration is not only asking more for foreign aid, but more for agriculture, more for highways, Federal aid for local schols, and so on. It wants to give other nations more than $4 billion a year, though we groan under onerous taxes, we haven't yet balanced our own budget and are already $280 billion in debt.

[From the Prentiss (Miss.) Headlight of January 12, 1956]

WASHINGTON NEEDS TO CURB FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

J. A. Thigpen, State welfare commissioner, reports that during the month of December State old-age assistance payments to over 70,000 recipients totaled $2,019,940, and that welfare payments during the month distributed to over 122,000 persons totaled $2,588,238. Of course this money had to first come from the pockets of the taxpayers.

On the same front page of a daily paper it was reported that 76,000 persons, members of families of sharecroppers in Louisiana, were destitute and on the verge of starvation due to two successive crop failures, and would be given United States surplus foods to keep them from starving.

We were told at the recent legislative-press meeting in Jackson that the Federal Government had cut the funds to the bone for health services in this country because of the outpouring of funds for sanitation and health in foreign countries.

From where we are viewing the situation it appears that it is time for America to begin to think more of the welfare of Americans. Money has never bought the friendship of nations or individuals, and it won't do it now. Economic aid to foreign countries first has to be taken from the pockets of the American taxpayers, and the taxpayers could use a little relief from their tax burden in these times.

The Till Case: A Catholic Student Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following statement on the Till case appeared in a recent issue of the Truth, weekly publication of Temple Beth Emeth, of Flatbush. The statement, written by Roger Goebel, a Catholic student at Manhattan College, is deserving of our attention:

My brother is dead. He was just a boy, but he's dead now. Perhaps you knew him—he was your brother, too.

Why are you so startled? Have you forgotten him so soon? His name? His name doesn't matter—it might have been Abel once. I suppose you have forgotten him. He's buried now, just as all news of him has been buried in the back columns of the newspapers. He wasn't really very important, and a murder in Mississippi certainly can't compare with the latest, raciest scandals in New York.

Well, he's dead now. And he was a boy. He was only 14, just beginning to grow up. He was full of the wonderful feeling that comes when a boy becomes a man. He was on his first holiday, a thousand miles from his Chicago home. He must have been very proud of his years and of his self-reliance; he must have loved to be alive.

And now he's dead. They killed him. They killed him because of a boastful voice and a cocky whistle; they killed because he was "fresh"—they killed him because he was black. They took him out in the dark of the night and led him away; they beat him, and then they shot him with cold steel bullets whose chill could not match the ice of their hearts. They were fools; they murdered him because of the blackness of his skin, but what blackness could ever match the blackness of their hearts.

And now the boy is dead and soon he'll be forgotten. You feel uncomfortable already, and wonder why I mention him. What's done is done, and who's dead is dead; it happened weeks ago, and you were not to blame. There are more important things now—wars and tensions and world crises. You can't remember a murder—even the murder of a boy—forever.

But he was just a boy and he is dead now, and he was my brother and your brother, too. And you didn't kill him—but you let him die. You let him die, and now you're forgetting him, just as you'll forget others like him. You let him die when you didn't fight to save him, not from death but in life; when you didn't save him from his slums and when you didn't give him an education like your own, when you made him take the poorest seats in your buses and wouldn't let him live in your neighborhood, when you made him a second-class citizen and a second-class man. Now you're willing to give him justice, but you were never willing to give him love.

He was just a boy, and he happened to be a Negro. He might as well have been a Slav, or a Jew, or a Puerto Rican, or any other whom the breath of prejudice taints. He's dead, but he might as well have lived in the shadow of your indifference for 3 score years and 10. And soon you'll forget him, as quickly as you forget me.

My brother is dead. He was just a boy, but he's dead now. Perhaps you knew him—he was your brother, too.

The Honorable Sam R. McKelvie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD two

articles from the Arizona Republic, January 10, 1956, and the Phoenix Gazette, January 9, 1956, that express the admiration felt by all Arizonans for the Honorable Sam R. McKelvie an adopted son of Arizona. Sam McKelvie was Governor of Nebraska for 4 years and in his passing, one of the great builders of the West has been lost:

[From the Arizona Republic of January 10, 1956]

ADOPTED SON

The Valley of the Sun is happy to play host to all its winter visitors, but it is proudest of those who adopt the State as their second home and return each fall to spend part of the year here. Such a man was Sam R. McKelvie, former governor of Nebraska, who owned a small ranch near Chandler where he kept up his interest in farming and basked in the winter sunshine.

Sam—and hardly anyone called him anything else—was one of the Nation's great authorities on Hereford cattle. His By-The-Way Ranch at Valentine, Nebr., had one of the Nation's finest herds of white-faces. The annual auction there attracted cattle buyers from all over the country, to say nothing of hundreds of Sam's friends who turned up for the unforgettable barbecues.

Governor McKelvie, who held the job for 2 terms from 1919 to 1923, didn't raise Herefords in Arizona, but he did bring his interest in politics along with him. He took an active part in the 1952 campaign in this State, contributing to the Republican sweep that occurred that year. He was a persistent exponent of the "pay-as-you-go" philosophy of Government finance which has helped Nebraska carry out an extensive public works program without amassing a big debt.

Like most Arizona farmers, he constantly fought the twin enemies of high taxes and low water levels. He also published the Nebraska Farmer and the Colorado Rancher, through which he preached the gospel of higher yields and better breeds.

Mr. McKelvie died at his Chandler home Friday, after two heart attacks. He was 75, and could look back on helping the development of two great States. His neighbors will miss him, but they will hope that Mrs. McKelvie, once a concert pianist and a fine artist in her own right, will continue to make her winter home in the Valley.

[From the Phoenix Gazette of Jan. 9, 1956]

GRAND OLD GENTLEMAN

The death on Friday of Sam R. McKelvie on his ranch near Mesa took a grand old gentleman from his nationwide host of friends and deprived the political scene of an outspoken, anti-Socialist figure. The former Nebraska Governor (1919 to 1923) made political speeches in Arizona, his adopted home, as recently as the 1952 elections.

No one ever had to wonder where "Sam" stood. He saw the danger in Federal budget deficits—"undermining our economy and in the long run will result in our America becoming Socialist, or even Communist, economically." Governor McKelvie was noted for Nebraska's pay-as-you-go plan of State financing without bonded debt.

Speaking of Trumanism in 1952 to Arizona voters, he pointed out that in 7 years of the Truman administration, Government spending amounted to more than $347 billion compared with less than $300 billion for the Nation's previous 156 years since the first President.

Sam McKelvie had been a Nebraska rancher before he bought similar property in Arizona for a winter home beginning in 1946. For many years he had published the Nebraska Farmer and the Colorado Rancher. He was outstanding among the noted persons who have chosen Arizona for their later years.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*——3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*——
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem entitled "Benjamin Franklin" by Horace C. Carlisle.

The poem follows:

Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom; and all with thy getting get understanding. (Proverbs 4: 7.)

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

On Sunday, the seventeenth of January,
Sev'nteen hundred and six, was born
America's Benjamin Franklin, the statesman
Whose name and whose works will adorn
Our national history, throughout the ages,
Because of his wondrously great
Inventions, discoveries, and sound achievements,
That centuries can't liquidate.

Unborn generations will ever keep reaping
Rich harvests from seeds that he's sown,
And ever enjoy the ripe fruits of his labors,
Which they'd, without him, not have known—
He's laid down full many a faultless foundation,
On which his successors today
Are building a monument to him, that's truly
Built in "the more excellent way".

He put thought in words and then put words in action—
This trinity was the great source
Of wisdom that guaranteed his great successes,
Through wisdom that guided his course—
He worked for the present, and planned for the future,
And trod trails that no man had trod—
With faith, hope, and charity, he daily labored
To be approved by men and God.

Reverses caused Franklin to be more determined—
Discouragements could not control,
Nor stop him, nor slacken him down, in his efforts
To win, in the long run, his goal—
He would not permit faithless friends to dishearten
Him, as he kept on keeping on;
But he labored on, with the spunk of a Spartan,
And never gave up till he won.

To Benjamin Franklin the world is indebted,
For he lit the initial spark
That started the powerful electric current
That illuminated her dark—
Wherever we go, in all civilized countries,
It matters not, in the least, where,
In coal mines and factories and shops and foundries,
Electric lights are shining there.

On Benjamin Franklin's unyielding foundation,
Laid down in the sweet long-ago,
Our scientists still are successfully building—
"Praise God from whom all blessings flow"—
Elab'rately both for the present and future,
And finishing what was begun
By Franklin, as he, back in the past, planned it,
Before his work on earth was done.

—*Horace C. Carlisle.*

Some Blunt Words From a Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the ablest and most perceptive diplomats on the international scene today—to the good fortune of our country—is Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Lester B. Pearson. Last fall Mr. Pearson journeyed to the Soviet Union and held several candid, off-the-record talks with Soviet leaders. He presented some of his frank conclusions last month in a brief Look magazine article. I believe many of our colleagues will be interested in Secretary Pearson's observations, and will want to weigh his advice alongside the newly enunciated "brink of war" policy of Mr. Dulles. I therefore present Mr. Pearson's report:

SOME BLUNT WORDS FROM A GOOD NEIGHBOR

(By Lester B. Pearson, Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs)

As a Canadian, I like to think that I can speak frankly to my American friends without being misunderstood. That's one advantage of being good neighbors on a big continent. We look at the world from the same perspective and can talk about it over the back fence.

Having recently returned from a journey to the Soviet Union, South Asia and the Middle East, I feel impelled to lean on that back fence and get a few things off my chest. For I have come back very worried that we may be failing to adapt our foreign policies to the changing conditions of what is going to be a long, "hard cold war." And by "our" policies, I mean those of the Western democratic coalition in which the United States inevitably plays the leading role in charting the common course.

In Moscow, I had an opportunity to talk frankly and at length with top Soviet leaders. I found them confident that things were going their way in this cold war; that the triumph of their system was just a matter of time. In South Asia, I found the leaders of new nations proud of their independence, generally sympathetic to the new China and often, if unfairly, suspicious of American motives. In the Middle East, I found increased tension and Arab-Israeli bitterness being exploited by Soviet policy.

Nor is there enough evidence that our side is prepared to cope with the new phase of the cold war called "competitive coexistence." Where there exists a clearly defined Western policy, it is too often concerned with the necessary, if limited and often inadequate, goal of containing communism merely by military means.

The Russians apparently feel sure of success in competitive coexistence, a competition which they expect will be conducted under their rules—or under no rules. This confidence is one reason why I believe they are not plotting all-out military aggression. They realize, as we do, that an atomic war would be disastrous for both sides. Their new leaders are not suicidal Hitlers. Moreover, as Nikita Khrushchev told me, "In peaceful coexistence, the best system will survive." They think it is theirs. So why should they provoke "massive" atomic retaliation?

Their confidence is based on the belief that their people have the toughness, the patience and the discipline to carry them through the long period of nonmilitary conflict for which they are preparing. They think that we are too soft, too impatient, and too disunited to stand the gaff. They hope that our freedom will encourage laziness and license. They claim that our alliances will crumble away when the fear that binds them together has been dispelled. Naturally, therefore, they welcome a relaxation of tension.

I was impressed by the candor and realism of the Soviet leaders. I believe that their desire for this peaceful interlude is genuine, though of course self-interested. (They repeatedly expressed concern for President Eisenhower's health and hope for his recovery, as they felt he was a man "who sincerely wanted peace.") But I was also shocked and frightened by what appeared to be their colossal and dangerous ignorance of the West. They are—or claim to be—convinced that NATO is an aggressive American creation designed to make war on the Soviet Union. For this reason, they dread German rearmament in NATO. These leaders—like the masses—may be the victims of their own propaganda, but it is alarming to realize that they exercise totalitarian control over so many millions of indoctrinated, unquestioning people.

These Soviet leaders know what they want—a Communist Soviet-dominated world, to be achieved by any method short of all-out war. They think they know how to get it—by flexible, aggressive, and insistent diplomacy in every corner of the world. Can we say as much? Have we been acting as though we knew how to handle this baffling but well-disciplined adversary? Let us look at the map.

In Europe, there is above all Germany. Here, there is no simple and easy solution, but we should avoid becoming tied to a policy which would give us little room for diplomatic maneuver. The Russians are having too much success in obscuring the real issue—which is whether a Germany unified by free elections is to have the right to decide its own future alinements—by hammering away at the false issue that we are insisting that a unified and rearmed Germany must remain in NATO.

In the Middle East, war could flare up any day between Israel and the Arab states. The Soviets are fanning the embers with arms shipments to Egypt (and incidentally, with other Communist governments, capturing about half of Egypt's foreign trade). Yet the West, which could exercise tremendous

influence on both sides, has not been able to use that influence to bring about peace. All we have now is an uneasy truce, with deadly enmity and deep fear.

In the Far East, there is no settlement of the dangerous situation on the Formosa Strait. No one seriously expects Chiang Kai-shek to return to the mainland. Yet if we seem to support his ambitions, especially on Quemoy and Matsu, a situation is perpetuated that could conceivably develop into a war. Are any of us really willing to go to war to help repel an attack on these "offshore" islands? Have we merely painted ourselves into a corner here, without any obvious way out?

In south Asia, a system of military pacts—justifiable as may be the purpose behind them—has irritated and alarmed nations like India, Burma, and Indonesia, whose friendship could be decisive in the years ahead. They refuse to accept the view that military alliances—what they call America's "aggressive-defensive" policy—are the most effective means of meeting the challenge of Communist aggression in that area. The Russians for their own selfish purposes give enthusastic, if hypocritical, endorsement to their doubts. We would do well to give them at least serious and sympathetic examination, instead of dismissing them as neutralist appeasement.

In Africa, we can already detect the first signs of the same kind of revolution that has changed the map of Asia. New native leaders and governments are emerging, and the Communist coexistence planners are moving in to exploit African aspirations for independence and equality. Colonial control is on the way out. The West accepts that, but because our acceptance is often, and rightly, qualified so that the process can be sure and orderly, we are portrayed by governments whose own peoples enjoy limited or no freedom, as colonial reactionaries clinging to a privileged and superior status.

In NATO, which too many people still think is some kind of breakfast food, it has not yet been possible to construct the political and economic underpinnings of an organization that will not survive as a mere military coalition. NATO cannot live on fear alone. Yet NATO is essential, both as insurance against Soviet aggression in Europe and as a means of coordinating the policies of the Western democracies. Now that the atomic stalemate—plus NATO—has become the main protection for Western Europe, we should be emphasizing the nonmilitary potentialities of the organization during this period of nonmilitary conflict.

I hope I have not sketched too dark a picture. Despite the painful indecisions that have often characterized western policy, we have not yet lost much ground in the cold war. The reason I am concerned is that we will lose ground unless we being to readapt our tactics to a new kind of conflict. We have been sitting in our trenches too long. (And I remember, from my service in World War I, how even trenches can become comfortable—at least psychologically.) It is time we got out in the open where there is the opportunity for maneuver. There is also the risk of ambush. But if we keep our mine detectors in front of us, there is no reason why we should not welcome what the military call a more fluid situation.

We all need to reappraise our cold-war tactics. We need not oscillate so much (as we North Americans are inclined to do) between alarm and optimism. We should have neither chips on our shoulders nor stars in our eyes. This is a time for bold but hard-headed statesmanship, for vigor and vision, where negotiation must not be confused with appeasement, and the positive challenge of competitive coexistence must replace the sense of fear and urgency as the binding element in our democratic coalition.

Because our nations are free democracies, we may not be able to regain the initiative as easily as have the new rulers of the Soviet Union since the death of Stalin. We cannot cynically manipulate public opinion as they can. We cannot abruptly switch our policies nor make decisions as quickly as our adversaries, who have no political opposition at home to contend with, or an enlightened and vigilant public opinion.

But this is not an excuse for making no decisions, nor for finding reasons for not taking action when action is called for, nor for pretending that all is going smoothly when in fact we may be headed for some jarring bumps. This is no time for wishful thinking.

I believe that the next few years are as perilous—for the West—as any since the onset of the cold war. I do not mean that a hot war has become more imminent. Quite the contrary. I do mean, however, that there are things to do, and the sooner we do them the better.

What are these things? I am not the kind of neighbor who preaches over the back fence, but I believe that I speak for many of America's good friends and allies when I say that I would like to see the leading power of the free world giving us a strong lead, with our common policy based firmly on the following considerations:

1. Let us keep our military strength as a deterrent to aggression—but let us bear in mind that NATO has a political as well as a military function. It should serve, as it has begun to serve, as a forum for coordinating the policies of all of its member nations and for increasing cooperation between them.

2. The summit conference at Geneva appeared to assume that neither side will resort to nuclear war as an instrument of foreign policy. So let us take advantage of this opportunity to utilize all of our political and diplomatic skill and flexibility now that we are in a position to get out of the trenches.

3. Let us not hesitate to be bold and imaginative. Why could we not press the Russians to abandon propaganda offers and to join in concrete international programs of technical assistance to underdeveloped Asian and African nations? Whether they accepted or refused, such a move would be hailed in a part of the world where Americans are often, though unfairly, suspected of imperialism.

4. We should recognize the fact that the Peiping government, and not Chiang Kai-shek, is in control of continental China and likely to remain so; that there are basic problems to be settled in the Far East which cannot be settled without the participation and agreement of that government. We can negotiate with Peiping when necessary and desirable without implying approval of that regime or without weakening our opposition to communism.

5. We should keep our German policy under continuous examination (flexibility is the word), remembering that it may not be our own views which will be decisive, but those of the German people. We must also be more effective in exposing the falsity of Moscow's insistence that, if only the Germans rejected NATO, free elections for unification could take place.

6. We should encourage arrangements by which more people from the Soviet world can come and see for themselves what life is like in the West; something of which they are abysmally ignorant. This is not easy to do on any acceptable basis. If we try, however, and the Communists refuse, as they appeared in Geneva to refuse, we shall have called their bluff that the Iron Curtain has been raised. But we must not let them take the initiative in this field.

7. We must avoid making bellicose and provocative statements. These are seized upon by the Soviets as proof of our aggressive intentions. They could at the worst provoke a war no one wants. At best, they are grist for the Communist propaganda mills all over the world.

It is the initiatives in Western foreign policies coming from the United States that have, of course, the maximum effect. The rest of us can do little without the leadership and cooperation of the major partner in our coalition. We must work closely together. Signs of disunity or disagreement only serve to make the Soviet leaders more arrogant, more difficult to deal with, more certain of eventual victory.

All this places a heavy burden on the American people. They are going to have to think harder than ever about problems that have long seemed remote to us North Americans.

Furthermore, they will have to carry on this hard and constructive thinking in an election year; a time when, in all free democracies, long-range purposes occasionally tend to be confused with short-range tactics.

But America's impulses in foreign affairs have been so often right, and so seldom wrong; so often courageous and farsighted, so seldom petty and partisan, that her friends, and especially those like Canada, who know her best, have good reason to hope that out of debate and discussion and reappraisal will come the right response to the new Soviet challenge.

Much is at stake. We cannot afford to drift, to improvise, to "hope for the best." For the first time since the cold war started, time is perhaps no longer on our side.

Good Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. POAGE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article was published on November 14, 1955, on the front page of El Pais, one of the leading newspapers of Asuncion, Paraguay. It refers to the Subcommittee on Foreign Agricultural Operations of the House Committee on Agriculture. True, it was published on the day of the arrival of the subcommittee. I hope that the comments after we were gone were just as favorable, and from the comments of our United States Ambassador at Asuncion, I feel that we can assume this to be the case. Admiral Ageton, our Ambassador to Paraguay, wrote the chairman of the subcommittee on November 29:

We certainly enjoyed and obtained great benefit from the visit of your colleagues and yourself to Asuncion. We especially appreciated the courtesy and promptness with which all of you accommodated yourselves to our rather difficult schedule. * * * We shall always be happy to have a visit from such an agreeable and cooperative group as your committee proved to be.

Many of us fail to understand the feeling of our good neighbors who happen to be away from the great cities and off the highroads. I think that it is ofttimes even more important for congressional committees to visit the less accessible areas than it is to make the usual tours of the great cities, either in South America or elsewhere. I think that it is the especial obligation of the Agriculture Committee to establish contacts with those of our friends who are primarily dependent upon agriculture, and that includes a surprisingly large

portion of the population of the world. Nowhere were we received more graciously or hospitably than in Paraguay. The members of the subcommittee feel that our visit was worthwhile. By the same token, we feel that the sentiments expressed by El Pais are worthy of the consideration of our own citizenship. The article is as follows:

GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

Arriving today in our country is a delegation of United States Representatives, members of the House of Representatives Agricultural Subcommittee, who are currently touring various Latin American nations, and who bring a message of brotherhood from the American people. As representatives of the great northern democracy, their presence is a living testimony of the affection of a people who have grown big through industry and through an unbreakable fidelity to the superior standards of right. These illustrious representatives come to confirm once again with their symbolic warm handshake the good neighbor policy that the United States, responding to an historical compulsion, inaugurated and has been improving in their relations with the people of Latin America who are justified in hoping that there can be derived concrete benefits from the world freedom which is in danger of being destroyed through Russian totalitarianism.

These messengers of American good will come at an opportune time, since through their visit they will come to know many aspects of our way of life, which, no doubt, will teach them at the same time new reasons for increasing our relationship between the two countries. They will also see at first hand the Paraguayan environment which the people of the United States cannot appreciate fully through distance, though they are always trying to maintain friendship with the peoples of Latin America. Knowing that these representatives are in the field of agriculture, we feel they will understand better the agricultural problems of the countries of Latin America, countries which are waiting for the solution to their agricultural problems by means of the cooperative spirit established by the Government and people of the United States.

We wish that the short visit of these representatives could be of valuable experiences and give them an opportunity to appreciate our efforts in striving for a better future. In that field of agriculture, the Paraguayan people have enough reason to give thanks for the help given us by the technical cooperation on the part of the Government and people of the United States. We hope that this continuing problem, which, as in the field of agriculture is also fundamental in the field of social welfare among others and which is supported firmly by the friendship between Paraguay and the United States. For all that, we cordially welcome to our country you representatives of the great American people.

Dr. Sparks Points the Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Indianapolis News of January 9, 1956.

Dr. Sparks, the retiring president of Wabash College, my own alma mater, helps to voice the thinking of millions of Americans who want to help themselves especially when they want to help themselves:

DR. SPARKS POINTS THE WAY

The future looks brighter for private colleges, in the opinion of Dr. Frank H. Sparks. The dynamic president of Wabash College is retiring February 1 to become chairman of the board of trustees.

The encouraging outlook was noted by Dr. Sparks in his final chapel address. And it has come about because privately financed education has discovered a great new friend in the corporations of America.

Characteristically, Dr. Sparks did not mention his own part in this development. Yet it is in a considerable degree due to his vision and energy that business and industry have begun to share in the support of private educational institutions.

In 1955 alone, 2,500 corporations gave more than $5 million to the operating funds of more than 400 liberal arts colleges.

Fortunately Dr. Sparks will continue to devote part of his time to the encouragement of financial assistance by corporations.

Business and industrial leaders more and more are becoming aware of how much the freedom and progress of the Nation depend on the kind of education provided by the private colleges. Their support is the American way to solve the financial problems of higher education.

This is in bright contrast to the philosophy that demands Federal aid for public schools.

Dr. Sparks views the resurgence of such demands with deep concern. He rightly contends that Federal aid is not the best solution for the schools, for the children, or for the Nation.

He believes the school-housing problem can be solved at a comunity level by the communities themselves.

"Let's have schools fit for all American youth but let's get them the American way," he said in his chapel speech.

This is the attitude that has brought about the brighter outlook for the private colleges. It is an attitude which should motivate Congress. There is no good reason to rush into any gigantic Federal spending program on the public-school level.

To Prohibit the Leasing of Government-Owned or Controlled Land for the Purpose of Farm Commodity Production To Be Disposed of by Sale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will prohibit the use of real property, owned by the United States, for the production of agricultural commodities which are in surplus and are to be disposed of by sale. I believe that if this bill were enacted, it would be of great help in reducing our enormous surpluses of agricultural commodities. These Federal lands, purchased and owned by the Government, such as, abandoned military posts and reservations, flood-control projects, and so forth, are usually leased at a very nominal sum to individual farmers who then produce on these lands the very crops that are adding to our already great surplus of commodities.

This land could be retired to grass and other soil conserving legumes and then in the event of a future emergency could be put into high crop production. The bill provides that no officer or agency of the United States shall use, or permit the use, of any real property owned or controlled by the United States for the production of agricultural commodities which are to be disposed of by sale. May I further emphasize that this would help reduce our present surpluses and at the same time provide a valuable land bank for the future.

The Rogue River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a copy of a resolution adopted and signed by numerous organizations in the Roque River Valley of Oregon, including the Grants Pass and Josephine County Chamber of Commerce, Grants Pass Rotary Club, Business and Professional Women's Club of Grants Pass, Grants Pass Active Club, Josephine County Pomona Grange, Williams Creek Farm Bureau, Grants Pass Board of Realtors, Redwood Grange, Rogue River Valley Grange.

The resolution referred to follows:

The Honorable WILBUR BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.
The Honorable DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SECRETARY: Whereas the December 22, 1955 flood of the Rogue River caused disastrous damage to the residents of Josephine and Jackson Counties, Oreg.; and

Whereas the United States Corps of Army Engineers has been requested to make a detailed evaluation of the extent of the damage and financial loss caused by the flood; and

Whereas flood control of the Rogue River is essential to prevent a repetition of this disastrous flood; and

Whereas the Corps of Army Engineers of the United States is equipped with the necessary personnel to make a study of the means and methods of preventing similar floods of the Rogue River: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Corps of Army Engineers immediately conduct a comprehensive survey for the purpose of formulating plans for flood control in the Rogue River Basin and that said survey and planning be made in cooperation with the Bureau of Reclamation and all other interested agencies, including the Oregon State Game Commission and Water Resources Board of the State of Oregon; be it further

Resolved, That the survey and planning shall take into consideration alternate methods of flood control, particularly whether the same can be accomplished by tributary dams or must be done by one high dam; be it further

Resolved, That the survey and planning shall give full consideration to cost of con-

struction, methods of payment, attendant benefits, economic, and recreational interests of the Rogue River Basin; be it further

Resolved, That all necessary steps be taken by your respective offices to secure necessary funds to conduct the above survey and planning; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, the Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, and the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH and that their cooperation in accomplishing the purpose of this resolution is herewith requested.

The Poisoned Air of Nationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of December 20, 1955, will be of interest to those who believe that love of country is a worthy emotion:

THE POISONED AIR OF NATIONALISM

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), is the victim of a set of the most remarkable contradictory coincidences we have ever heard of. UNESCO claims that it has no official views on world government and related matters, and insists that it does not tell teachers what to teach.

However, in face of this impassioned disavowal we find UNESCO-financed booklets that express very definite views on world government and related subjects, and their phraseology definitely is directed to teachers. And what is more these booklets somehow, some way, by some strange happenstance, do find their way into the hands of the teachers.

Some of them—12 to be exact—also found their way into the hands of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and from the hands of some of the teachers at that, and we are indebted to the VFW for reviewing them and annotating some of the rather pertinent parts of them. For instance, under the title "Toward World Understanding," there is this interest-arresting chapter, strangely enough "telling the teachers what to teach." The revealing chapter follows:

"Our children should be educated to live with others and to prepare themselves for citizenship in a world society. So far as the school's part in this is concerned, we may summarize its object as being to secure in the child a sense of loyalties which will enable him later to reach the climax of membership in a world society.

"The United Nations and its specialized agencies is the greatest contemporary effort, on an international governmental scale, to move toward world society. We shall presently recognize in nationalism the major obstacle to the development of world-mindedness.

"As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world mindedness can produce only rather precarious results."

Now UNESCO still insists it has no official view on world government and the like, but pray if not official, what kind of a view would you call that expressed in the UNESCO-sponsored booklet when it urges that every child should be prepared for citizenship in a world society, and when the United Nations takes credit for being the great contemporary effort, on an international scale, to move toward a world society. What pray is a world society if not a world government? How could a world society possibly be governed except by a world government?

And pray what does world mindedness connote if not both world society and world government? And if the United Nations entertains no official distinction between nationalism and internationalism (or world government), why in the world does it get itself so exercised over the subject as to bellow forth with such an intemperate conviction as is expressed in the poisoned air of nationalism?

Knowing the United Nations and its UNESCO, as we do, we can understand that it would be greatly shocked that there actually still are people in the world today who glory in the traditions of the land from whence they sprang. We can see how they would hold up their hands in holy horror at the mere thought that, in spite of the valiant missionary efforts of the United Nations, there are still people in the world who are so benighted that they actually believe in such base earmarks of nationalism as a Constitution of the United States, a Bill of Rights, and a Declaration of Independence.

But to go so far as to label such traditions of American freedom and independence, the poisoned air of nationalism, the top one-worlders in the U. N. indeed must be beside themselves in their concern over the grave dangers of these to the world.

The only thing that we can think of that might make them more hysterical would be for a class of American schoolchildren to stand up and sing, "My Country 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty."

That indeed would be the last word in one world blasphemy.

Agrarian Reform in South Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a great and good Catholic prelate, Msgr. John O'Grady, executive secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities, has just returned from a study trip to Italy, a land which he well knows. He made a special study of conditions in the south of Italy. His observations on these conditions, as described in a letter he wrote to the Washington Post from Italy, which the Post published on its editorial page on January 14, make fascinating reading. It should be read and noted by all who are concerned with the economic and political health of the free world.

I ask unanimous consent that this report on the situation in the south of Italy by Monsignor O'Grady, whom I am proud to claim as an old and greatly valued friend, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRARIAN REFORM IN SOUTH ITALY

During the last days of 1955, I toured south Italy again for the fourth time in 5 years. I had already acquainted myself with all the available information in regard to the improvement of the Italian economy during the past 5 years, but over against these steady improvements there remained the stark fact of Italy's 2 million unemployed which had been reduced very little, and also the large number of the underemployed.

As part of the tour I decided to take a new look at as many as possible of the hundred thousand families that had been assigned parcels of land. It was encouraging to see the large numbers of new houses, both in the high mountains and the plains. Their inhabitants had just begun to show the benefits of the agrarian reform. The majority had been in their new homes more than 3 years, a considerable proportion had occupied them for only 3 months.

When one thinks of what all this has been in the countryside, one must conclude that it has been a complete revolution. One hundred thousand families, who heretofore were part of a backwoods feudal economy, were now on their own. The land had been transformed, new roads, new schools, new churches, new health centers, new villages had been built. Farm machinery had been acquired to be used under a cooperative plan.

I have been concerned about the extent to which the Communists might have been able to use the agrarian reform for their own purposes. I have asked many times what was being done to develop a positive leadership among the new settlers. Now such a leadership is in the making. It is a rank and file leadership, based on mutual aid and self-help. One can see the practice of self-help spreading from one to the other. This is the new counter force to communism. It can provide the base for making the south Italian agrarian program into a truly Christian reform movement.

While the people of the United States will be encouraged by the bright side of the Italian picture, they must not fail to look at the dark side. There are large pools of unemployment almost everywhere in south Italy. There are many areas that have not been affected by the agranian reforms. The situation will be improved by the placing of 100,000 more families on the land.

It is quite clear, however, that the completion of the agrarian reform and the new industrial developments will not solve Italy's overpopulation problem. This becomes quite clear as one moves around in village after village. The people will refer to the 300 families who have received parcels of land, and to those employed in new industries; but what of the 2,000 people in a town of 15,000 for whom there is no visible employment and how about the 2,000 who are employed less than 6 months a year?

This will explain the difference between the political status of the Communists and the Christian Democrats. Sometimes the Christian Democrats have a slight majority and sometimes the Communists have a majority. These are still hard facts in every town and village in south Italy.

The people are very sensitive to the situation. They will tell you about the outlets that are provided for their surplus people by Australia, Argentina, Canada, Brazil, and Venezuela. The people in towns and villages were very sensitive to the closing of United States applications for visas under the Refugee Relief Act. It is clear that a considerable flow of emigration must remain as the hope of the south Italian economy.

Italy and its friends throughout the world are looking to the United States to help with south Italy's immigration problems. It can do this by continuing its support of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Immigration. It can help by turning over to Italy the estimated 60,000 visas under the Refuge Act that will not be used by Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands.

It can also help by removing the discrimination against Italy included in the

present Immigration Act, or, failing this, it can extend and liberalize the present refugee legislation. It is important that the United States now take positive steps toward relieving the impact of population in south Italy, otherwise it may be too late.

My 1955 story of south Italy would not be complete without reference to what has been done by American food distribution to relieve poverty and suffering in south Italy. I have heard many references to what it has meant to the unemployed and their families without visible sources of support. The surplus food distribution highlights the work of the Pontifical Commission on Assistance and the Catholic relief services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

The resources that the Catholic relief services have placed at the disposal of the Pontifical Commission have contributed greatly to its work and the work of its allied agencies, ACLI and the Junta Cattolica, in their joint contribution toward the creation of a truly Christian social program in south Italy.

More Evidence of Drought Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, evidence continues to come in to my office on the continuing and critical nature of the drought emergency in the Southwest, where many families have been fighting this problem for more than 3 years. The half-hearted, half-way measures of this administration in the direction of a drought program must be supplemented by aggressive action on the part of Congress. I earnestly hope there will be no further delays in final passage by both Houses of the small projects bill, to assist smaller communities and areas with their water problem. I earnestly hope the Congress will act even more vigorously than it did last year in appropriating funds for dams and reservoirs to provide stable water supplies in the drought region.

I pray that Washington will recognize the full gravity of this problem for the millions of people who must earn a living in the distressed areas, and will afford to them the consideration and the generous response to their needs which they deserve.

The following editorial, from one of the fine county newspapers in Oklahoma's Second District is submitted for the information of the House:

[From the East Oklahoma Tribune]

A CRISIS LOOMS

Unless heavy rains visit this area within the next few weeks, Sequoyah County will find itself in the clutches of the Southwest's most costly foe—drought.

Unlike other natural disasters, such as tornadoes or floods, a drought is an invisible, creeping enemy, but its effects are just as devastating as the most spectacular of calamities. What's more, serious drought presents acute problems to towns as well as to farmland.

Locally, less than one inch of precipitation was recorded during any of the last 3 months of 1955. So far, none has been recorded for January and, as this is being written, none is in sight.

Many stock ponds and rural water wells of the county are very low. Grazing lands are little more than stubble in some sections. If moisture is not received within 3 to 4 weeks small grains will be a doubtful risk.

Insofar as our agriculture's plight is concerned, the State and Federal Governments soon must find better ways of protecting the man who tills the soil and raises the livestock. Presently, the economic machinery is horribly out of gear. Now, with the specter of prolonged drought staring our farmers and cattlemen in the face, the lawmakers need to cut governmental red tape and join hands in insisting that the rural areas be rescued.

Advocating more billions for foreign aid may be a noble deed. But when drought or any other disaster threatens or strikes, we say it's high time to apply the brakes and to steer more help back home.

At the local level, something positive can be done.

If the drought continues several Sequoyah County towns, including Sallisaw, will face an acute water shortage by or before the summer months. The whole picture shapes up into a first-rate crisis.

Even with normal rainfall, Sallisaw's water reserve is inadequate. With an increasing population here and also with hopes of landing more industries, it seems imperative that prompt action be taken (1) to safeguard the community, and (2) to insure an ample water supply on a long-range plan. And when it's done let's not forget the urgent need of a filtering system.

Water in abundance is among this section's proudest boasts. But oceans of it could pour past Sequoyah County and serve no useful purpose unless it can be harnessed and utilized.

Three separate groups here are cognizant of the looming crisis. For example, the chamber of commerce president believes Brushy Creek may be the most logical source of supply. The mayor and city manager feel that another Big Sallisaw Creek dam may offer a temporary solution. Our State representative continues to work tirelessly for a flowline across the county as a longer range plan to provide more water for industry and irrigation as well as for municipalities.

None of these men contends that his particular proposal is the best or the only solution. Somewhere within the framework of these three ideas lies the solution to one of the most acute situations in the community's history. Whenever a decision is reached, and it needs to be very soon, it should be met with our all-out backing and support.

Political Cause Celebre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial written by Mr. Frank Streeter which appeared in the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier, January 12, 1955. The editorial which is an interesting statement regarding certain hearings now being held, follows:

POLITICAL CAUSE CELEBRE

Renewed efforts to make the Al Sarena mine in Jackson County a nationwide political cause celebre continues apace.

Monday's edition of the Medford Mail-Tribune carries a front-page story based on Washington dispatches quoting Senator KERR SCOTT, the Senate subcommittee head who is bossing the investigation, with making statements, which are untrue.

Drew Pearson, the Washington "crystal ball" columnist, devotes his entire column in Tuesday's Oregon Journal to the case—in typical Pearson fashion. We'll go into details on that later.

The Mail-Tribune story quoted SCOTT as saying that his Portland hearing "very strongly indicates the Department of the Interior concocted a scheme to deal from the bottom of the deck and pass under the table about half a million dollars worth of publicly owned timber to a private company."

SCOTT did so pop off thusly at one time, but later issued another statement to the effect that, under mining law, the Department of the Interior had no other recourse than to take the course it did, in view of the record before it.

The Medford Mail-Tribune itself had published the latter Scott statement but ignored it in the story Monday.

The M-T story also quotes SCOTT as saying that 15 disputed claims were turned down, and the case reopened in 1953 by the Interior Department.

That statement is untrue.

The disputed claims never were turned down during the many years they were considered by the Department of the Interior under Oscar Chapman.

Chapman simply would not give a decision.

It was Congressman ELLSWORTH'S request to the new administration that a decision be expedited which gave his political opponents something to howl about in the 1954 general election campaign.

It is true that the Bureau of Land Management had recommended disapproval of issuance of patents to 15 disputed claims of the 23 which comprise the mining property.

Now for Pearson's yarn.

Pearson says "the sale of Rogue River National Forest timber to political friends of Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH" is being investigated.

When he wrote that statement, Pearson knew full well that issuance of a patent to mining claims staked years before there was any market for timber was the subject of the controversy, not sale of timber to anybody.

Pearson also knew that the original mining activity had begun even before there was a Rogue River National Forest. He knew that the the 1872 mining law was in effect and that a legitimate mine showing entitles the claimant to a patent and that with it goes surface timber.

Pearson makes much of the fact that the McDonalds (owner of the mine) wanted not only the underground mineral rights but the above-ground timber rights.

Certainly they did. And so has many another claim owner who eventually qualified for a patent since 1872, under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

As to Pearson's statement about Ellsworth's political friends: The McDonalds live at Trail in Jackson County but they are natives of Mobile, Ala., and lifelong Democrats.

This writer knows of his own knowledge that one of them, at least, was an ardent supporter of Democratic Senator KEFAUVER for President in 1952.

We doubt that ELLSWORTH ever heard of them until they appealed to him as constituents from his district for aid in getting a decision from the Department of the Interior on their application for a patent.

The current hearings in Washington now are centering not on the legality or justifiability of the Department of the Interior's action in granting patent to the disputed claims but to the reliability of the concern which provided the assay certificates on which proof of necessary mineral content was based.

The testimony so far has shown, however, that former Truman administration officials had acted on assay reports from the same firm over the years, including showings of chrome deposits.

The sessions are bitter politically, too, with frequent face-to-face clashes between Republican members and the Democratic chairman, SCOTT. We may expect it to continue that way to the end because the power behind the scene is none other than United States Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, who attempted to make the Al Sarena case a political issue in his 1954 campaign.

Dulles Deals From Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it must be a source of great satisfaction to every American who believes in firmness in dealing on the international scene to learn from a recent magazine article the steps taken by Secretary of State Dulles, with the full approval of President Eisenhower, which have resulted in a termination of hostilities or an avoidance of new hostilities in three specific instances.

In short, what Secretary Dulles has reinserted into our diplomatic policy is that which was first proclaimed by Theodore Roosevelt; namely, "speak softly, and carry a big stick."

In the case of Korea, the Reds were unquestionably impressed with the word relayed to them by Nehru that unless they negotiated with sincerity and stopped their senseless shenanigans, we would without hesitation use the atom bomb on their Manchurian installations. In any event, an armistice was agreed upon and the killing was stopped. Score one for Dulles.

In the second instance we encountered the not unusual experience of having the British run out on us at the last minute in the matter of Indochina, and we found them dealing offside with the Reds while we were staging a show of force in the South China Sea. Despite their about-face, however, England and France were able to bargain with the Reds from Dulles' show of strength and an agreement of sorts was reached, not perfect certainly, but avoiding another explosion in southeast Asia and at least rescuing from Red domination a part of Indochina. Score two for Dulles.

The situation in the Formosan Straits is more clear-cut than that in the case of either Korea or Indochina for the simple reason that the position taken by Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower had the full backing of the Congress as expressed in the resolution—drafted by Dulles—and passed by an overwhelming vote in both Houses. And corollary to the defense of Formosa and the complete freedom of the Formosa Straits was the President's evident determination to defend Quemoy and the Matsus. Score three for Dulles.

As Dulles himself points out, in any program of retaliation there must always be a calculated risk. In his words, "You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances in war. Of course we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We've had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean War, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action."

The test of any nation's foreign policy is the avoidance of war—the ability to walk to the brink—to skirt the edge of the abyss—without plunging in. Three times we have walked to the brink and, walking from strength and with firm resolution, we have avoided war.

The bankruptcy of a nation's foreign policy occurs when it goes to war. Three times within my generation we have seen such collapse; in 1917, in 1941, and again in 1950. In each instance we were not prepared to fight and advertised the fact in advance. Three times we paid for indecisiveness and vacillation in the blood of our citizens.

Thank God, that era of doubletalk is past. From here on we shall continue to walk softly and without a chip on our shoulder. But withal we shall continue to step forward firmly and resolutely. From here on our policies will be formulated in Washington and not in London and Paris. And we shall continue to prayerfully and gratefully acknowledge the leadership we have in President Eisenhower and his Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles.

Llewellyn J. Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Llewellyn J. Scott is the founder and director of Blessed Martin de Porres Hospice. The average person, after hearing that, might be inclined to say, "so what?" But to the unfortunate man who finds himself without a friend, Mr. Scott and the Blessed Martin de Porres means comfort.

Who is Llewellyn J. Scott? On October 5, 1955, this humble man appeared on the TV program This Is Your Life. Those of you who saw it were impressed with this man, small in stature, dark of skin, slow in speech, strong in his faith in God, and devoted to the belief that there is some good in every human being. You would have been thrilled to share my experience last evening.

I met Mr. Scott, visited with the unfortunate, attended the inspirational service and saw the gleam in Mr. Scott's eye when he said:

If only people will have faith in God. I tell all those who come to me for help: "trust in Him—I can give you only temporary shelter and food."

On entering the Blessed Martin Hospice I was tempted to turn back—15 wretched humans on the stair steps—10 more in the hall—the smell of alcoholic breath—damp clothes. Why were they there? It was time for church. The pastor was present and soon said the rosary. Although I was raised a Methodist, the service was an inspiration to me.

It would be helpful for every member of Congress to visit the Blessed Martin de Porres Hospice, meet Mr. Scott and see first hand the work he is doing for those who find themselves in difficulty. Incidentally, it is only a few minutes walk from the Capitol—38 I Street NE.

Mr. Scott is grateful beyond words to those of you who have helped with the work he directs. He has wanted to thank you personally for the assistance many persons gave him after his TV appearance. You would all have heard from him if he had had a secretary—but there are only two in this work—God and Mr. Llewellyn J. Scott—Mr. Scott thanks you and God will bless you.

The Middle East: Stability Necessary To Prevent Soviet Penetration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the dangerous situation that exists in the Middle East as a result of the Arab-Israeli tensions requires that our foreign policy be based upon the needs of that area and not upon local political considerations. One need not be pro-Arab or pro-Israeli to understand that if communism penetrates the area that all of Africa and Southeast Europe will be controlled by the Russian imperialist government.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter that I received from a man who has been close to this situation for some time and a few years ago made a special trip to the Arab nations and Israel on a mission of inquiry. Dr. Morris S. Lazaron, of New York City, commands the respect of all students who have an interest in the Middle East. This issue must not become a political football and Dr. Lazaron suggests a plan of action.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 29, 1955.

Hon. LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SMITH: Several years ago I was 1 of 3 men sent by American friends of the Middle East, Inc., to the Arab Nations and Israel on a mission of inquiry. Accompanying me were Dr. Harold Fey of the Christian Century and Mr. John Cogley then of the Commonweal. Our assignment was to get the facts and report them objectively. I represented the Jewish Newsletter.

On our return we presented our findings to the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and to the Under Secretary of State, Gen. Walter Bedell Smith. We urged at that time a policy of impartiality in the Middle East and also that the Government should support efforts more effectively to enlighten American public opinion on the issues. Many things we foresaw have come to pass. With Russia now in the picture, I feel positive action is needed more than ever before if we are to prevent disaster to us and the free world.

In this regard the President's own declaration of impartiality as well as the addresses of Mr. Henry Byroade and the Secretary of State have been substantialy helpful. But despite statements, assurances and suggested programs, the middle-eastern nations drift toward a senseless war which will solve no problems, bring disaster upon themselves and weaken the defenses of the free world.

The American people are concerned because our policy of impartiality is not yet clearly defined. It is important for us to state, for instance, whether we are prepared to support the present armistice lines or the U. N. partition of 1947 or some compromise between them, as a basis of discussion. Once we have made our position clear on this basic issue, subsidiary problems will surely be more amenable to negotiation.

These subsidiary issues are: compensation, the principle of repatriation, equal rights and full citizenship for the Arab minority in Israel, a land bridge between Egypt and Jordan, a Jordan outlet on the Mediterranean, lifting the Suez blockade, abolition of the economic boycott of Israel and the internationalization of Jerusalem.

With all our unselfish approaches to this problem, the main issue—our stand on a compromise between present armistice lines and partition resolution lines—is still obscure.

Meanwhile Arab suspicions and uncertainty as to our sincerity persist. Zionist pressures for preferential treatment for Israel continue. Propaganda beats upon the American people from all sides. We need guidance and leadership in a policy whose clarity all can understand, whose justice all will appreciate and whose wisdom everyone will support.

One thing is certain and our fellow citizens should be told it: the crisis is much larger than differences between the Arab nations and Israel. It must be lifted out of this smaller context and put in its real and true perspective as part of the conflict between autocratic Communist imperialism and the free democracies. If our policy of impartiality were put before the American people in this way and in more definite terms, I believe it would receive the unreserved support of all fair-minded citizens.

I appreciate the constraint which the harassed men in the State Department have put upon themselves. They are not anti-Semantic and do not want to be so labeled. On the contrary, they understand the tragedy of Jewish life which gave impulsion to Zionist claims. They appreciate what has been built in Palestine and sympathize with those who have found a home in Israel. They have no desire to see Israel destroyed. They are often blocked by the intransigence of the Arab nations. They comprehend the far-reaching complexities of the Middle Eastern situation. However, our own national security and the security of the free world take precedence over all other considerations.

It is true the Arab nations and Israel stand before the bar of world judgment in the United Nations and you will probably agree that under no circumstances should we act unilaterally but in concert with England and France and through the U. N. However, the core of the problem for our country lies not in the Middle East but here in the United States. We can make a real contribution if we face the problem here.

I have written the President about this situation and within these terms and have suggested that he address the Nation on this issue if his health permits; if not, that the Secretary of State make such an address.

I likewise suggested:

1. Jewish and Christian leaders should be invited to Washington and told by someone high in authority, that no pressure will change our policy of impartiality and that our Government expects their cooperation as a patriotic duty.

2. Politicians and candidates for office who advise State Department and Government to go slow because of fear of an alleged Jewish vote, should be told how their activities are hamstringing our effective action in the Middle East. If it is blameworthy for some Jewish and Christian leaders to advocate greater help for Israel, Jewish suffering and need make it at least understandable. But it is inexcusable and shameless for politicians to pander to group feelings to corral votes on an issue where our national interest and world freedom are involved.

The issues are so clear no one can accuse the administration of attempting to censor thinking or to stop criticism. We must have the moral courage to do what we think is right and wise.

The destiny of nations in the course of history has often been determined by the hesitation of leadership in time of crisis. But man has achieved his most glorious moments when, with faith and courage, he dared to lift his voice for justice, cooperation and brotherhood, though all the powers of evil were leagued against him.

Any support you may be moved to give will, I think, have good effect at this time.

Respectfully yours,

MORRIS S. LAZARON.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

Article in Life Magazine Quoting Secretary Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by David Lawrence, which appeared in the Washington Star of last evening. The article, entitled "Dulles' Meaning: Not Bluffing," sets forth a very interesting explanation of the recent article, published in Life magazine, concerning the Secretary of State, and it presents a very adequate and clear defense of the Secretary of State.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DULLES' MEANING: NOT BLUFFING—ARTICLES BELIEVED TIMED TO ANSWER ACHESON AND DEMOCRATIC CHARGES

(By David Lawrence)

A warning to the world, and specifically to Soviet Russia, has just been proclaimed by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles. It is a warning that the United States, in order to defend itself and its allies, can and will in case of an aggression resist, even using atomic weapons if necessary, and that peace-at-any-price is not the policy of the Eisenhower administration.

This is the true significance of the much-talked-about article in Life magazine giving the views of Mr. Dulles about the brink of war. Instead of being a matter of inept timing, as some foreign critics refer to it or the rewriting of history as the petty partisans here suggest, the revelations constitute a timely and constructive contribution to the worldwide discussion of the best way to achieve and maintain peace.

The facts contained in the Life article are correct and the magazine is to be commended for its enterprise in bringing the subject matter to the attention of the world at this time. For, while there is in the article one brief quotation which might better have been revised for clarity reasons, the essential points are historically true and realistic.

The main thesis, that the United States has not been and is not bluffing and will go to war if challenged, is affirmed by Secretary Dulles, as well it should be. For there is no more certain way to bring on war and to encourage the aggressors to take fatal chances than to let them believe America is bluffing when issuing warnings that there will be massive retaliation in the case of attack on a broad front or selective retaliation in the event local wars require it.

This correspondent can say of his own knowledge, based on talks with high officials of France and the United States at Geneva in 1954, that the article does not rewrite history and that British critics are merely repeating now their version of what happened in the conferences in London at that time over policy in Indochina. This was then and still is at variance with the American version. It was a difference in method of approach rather than objective.

But what Mr. Dulles emphasizes is that, despite those differences of opinion, the world has since benefited by those very differences. It was possible, for example, for Sir Anthony Eden, then Foreign Secretary, to say privately at Geneva in May 1954 to Chou En-lai, Foreign Secretary of the Red China Government, that while the British had not as yet agreed to go along with a common front in Indochina, he knew the United States meant business. It was made clear that if military intervention did come, Britain could not afford to remain aloof. This hitherto unpublished fact might well have been included in the Life article.

To put it another way, the Dulles effort to get France and Britain to agree to united action if the Red Chinese armies openly intervened in Indochina, as they had in Korea, was being discussed then as either a bluff or the real thing and, to the credit of Mr. Eden, it must be said, he reflected accurately in private talks with the Red Chinese the American view and that was the main reason Chou En-lai was impressed and a truce in Indochina resulted.

Now it so happens that the United States didn't agree to the partition of Indochina itself and denounced the terms of the settlement; in fact, never has to this day subscribed to those terms. But the situation when Mr. Dulles interposed his plan in 1954 was not whether the terms of a truce would be acceptable or unacceptable in themselves but whether Red China would agree to any truce at all, and instead gobble up all of

Indochina because she thought the French were too weak to resist and neither Britain nor the United States would intervene. It would have been easy for the armies of Red China to capture all of Indochina—as they were about to do when the Dulles warning saved the day.

There is in the Life article one overcondensed quotation by Mr. Dulles, which was unfortunate. He is quoted as saying: "The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war."

Now this is an ambiguous sentence and might well have been revised if there had been time. It could mean that there is artifice about diplomacy and that going up to the edge is really a matter of intentional bluff. But the Secretary did not mean this at all. What he had in mind was covered in the sentence: "You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances for war."

Mr. Dulles is eternally right—that miscalculation by the aggressor is what brings on war. This error by the Kaiser in 1914 and by Hitler in 1939 caused a World War in each case. The Dulles concept—shared by President Eisenhower—is that bluffing leads to war and you have to show clearly you will fight in order to prevent the enemy from attacking. Appeasement never pays.

Why did Mr. Dulles authorize the article at this time? For two reasons—one the recent article in Harpers magazine by former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, which in effect accused the administration of bluffing and the other was a desire to inform the world that the Democratic Pary spokesmen have not been speaking for America in hinting that this country has adopted a policy of bluff.

Mr. Dulles is entitled to the right to reply to Mr. Acheson's unfounded attacks. That's why Mr. Dulles was receptive to the idea and that's why the article in its introduction says, "Dulles' direction of United States foreign affairs is under attack these days as the presidential campaign gets under way," and that the "new information" made available to James Shepley, chief of the Washington bureau of Time-Life, who wrote it, "bulwarks the substantial case to be made for Mr. Dulles."

Christmas Cheer for Escapees From Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter which I received on December 15, 1955, from the Right Reverend Monsignor Felix F. Burant, president of the Polish Immigration Committee, with offices at 25 St. Marks Place, New York 3, N. Y. It brings a most impressive report of the wonderful humanitarian efforts to bring cheer for Christmas 1955 to escapees from communism, who are presently in free countries of Europe. The letter follows:

Hon. ANTONI N. SADLAK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SADLAK: We think you will be interested to know that from our very limited funds we have managed to transfer to "hard core" cases in Europe for Christmas $1,750 and 2,250 food crusade packages through CARE, apportioned as follows:

Germany: $1,200 and 2,050 packages to be distributed by the Union of Polish Refugees in Germany (22a) Velbert (Rhld), Schliessfach 291. Out of the above 2,050 packages, 250 packages will be forwarded to Austria, which country is not serviced by CARE.

Austria: $200 and the above-mentioned 250 packages. The distribution there will be made by the Association of Poles in Austria, Salzburg, Postfach 23.

Italy: $100 and 200 packages which will be distributed by Reverend L. Rubin of Archbishop Joseph F. Gawlina Committee for Refugees—Comitato Polacco collegate alla Pontificia Opera di Assistenza, via Vecchiarelli 32, Roma.

Sweden: $200 sent to the Council of Polish Refugees in Sweden, 30 Jungfrugatan, Stockholm.

Denmark: $50 to two Polish refugees, recent escapees.

We are taking this opportunity to give you an account of our accomplishments up to December 1, 1955, as far as assurances are concerned:

Great Britain: 408 assurances for 840 former Polish soldiers.

Germany: 355 assurances for 702 Polish refugees.

France: 118 assurances for 229 Polish refugees.

Belgium: 54 assurances for 170 Polish refugees.

Sweden: 30 assurances for 43 Polish refugees.

Austria: 24 assurances for 46 Polish refugees.

A number of assurances were sent for refugees in Holland, Denmark, and Norway.

In the total of the aforementioned assurances there are 114 for 148 Polish escapees.

We are quite confident that 1956 will be even more productive in this respect.

I thank you, dear Congressman SADLAK, for all you have done for us in the past. Your friendship and sympathy is warmly felt and with best wishes to you for Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, I am,

Sincerely yours,
FELIX F. BURANT,
President of the Polish Immigration Committee.

It Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the reaction to the President's farm program indicates that, at long last, we are on the right track. The program was a sober appraisal of a complex problem that requires complex remedies. It takes cognizance, however, of a fact as old as the free-enterprise system—namely, that overproduction destroys markets, whether in agriculture or commerce. And it lays down a blueprint for bringing supply and demand into balance, while conserving and enhancing our soil resources and sustaining farm income. The President's program contains no political razzle-dazzle, but, as the Buffalo Evening News commented in an editorial on January 10, it makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the News editorial, together with an editorial in a similar vein from the Democrat and Chronicle, of Rochester, N. Y., also of January 10:

[From the Buffalo Evening News of January 10, 1956]

IKE'S FARM PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's 8,000-word special message outlining a new farm program was longer—infinitely more detailed and complicated—than last week's state of the Union message. But its gist, it seems to us, can be boiled down to something like this:

1. While the rest of the economy has experienced unparalleled prosperity, the farmers have been left out in the cold. Thanks to the hangover of mountainous surpluses—due to wartime production incentives unwisely continued too long afterward—our American agriculture is the perfect paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty. Despite record production, farm incomes have been on the skids for 5 long years.

2. It is therefore an economic and political must of the highest urgency that the paradox be corrected, and that sound ways be found to let the farmers begin partaking of prosperity with the rest of us. The President admits that the 1954 flexible price-support law has been smothered under surpluses, and new action is imperative.

3. Whatever is done on a temporary basis, however, must be geared to the fundamental long-range aims of reducing surpluses and widening markets. No return to the discredited policy of high, rigid price supports—which merely encourage production, discourage consumption, and pile up bigger and bigger surpluses—can be countenanced.

4. To attack the twin bugaboos of an overexpanded farm plant and a depressing hangover of vast accumulated surpluses, a new billion-dollar soil-bank plan is offered. This will feature two kinds of incentive payments to get farmers to reduce acreage: (1) An acreage reserve for crops in greatest oversupply (wheat, cotton, corn, rice). Farmers who agree to put a percentage of land in this bank can either collect what it would have produced from the surplus stocks in Government warehouses, or they can be paid the cash equivalent. (2) A true conservation reserve. Vast acreage of marginal land that should never have been put to the plow was planted under the pressures of war; the President wants ultimately to get some 25 million acres out of cultivation and into a conservation reserve. He proposes that the Government pay a fair share—enough to encourage broad participation. He would put $350 million into this program the first year.

5. These soil-bank proposals are only part of a complex plan to deal fundamentally and urgently with the farm surplus and overproduction problem. Other basic features involve continuance of the flexible price-support program (with a limit suggested on the total aid that can go to a single farm), stepping up of the drive to broaden both foreign and domestic markets for accumulated stocks, special aids for low-income farmers, and more research to develop broader agricultural markets.

The President had declared in his state of the Union message that this vital area of farm policy must not become a political football field, since too much is at stake for all of us. The only thing political that we detect in his program is a recognition that immediate action to halt the downtrend in farm incomes is a political necessity, as well as an economic one. How well his program will work to achieve that aim, we can't say, and we doubt if he can until it has been tried. The gist of it, however, makes sense to us—and we suspect a big majority of the Nation's farmers would rather give it a try than revert to the tested and discredited

policy of high, rigid price supports which solved nothing and brought American agriculture to its present condition.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Democrat and Chronicle of January 10, 1956]

SOUND SOIL POLICY

Cornerstone of the amendments to the farm program which the President has sent to Congress is the "soil-fertility bank." Farmers would be encouraged on a voluntary basis to retire cropland from production temporarily and receive at least part of an incentive payment "in kind" from Government-owned surplus commodities.

All along, this newspaper has said that the No. 1 farm problem is the huge stock of price-depressing surpluses. We have looked with favor on the soil-bank plan if it would do these two things: Reduce production of surplus crops, and get rid of present surpluses. In other words, make use of the surpluses to solve the surplus problem.

The President rightly blames overproduction of some commodities on continuation of production incentive payments too far into the postwar period. The flexible price supports which became effective in the past year are designed to bring about some adjustment, but it is a slow process. Now a bold attack would be made to increase farmers' returns and at the same time alleviate the price-depressing influences.

As we have said, unmanageable surpluses are no good to anyone and there is danger of spoilage. Payment of incentives in the form of negotiable certificates for surplus stocks has the advantage of getting rid of stored crops and reducing cash payments to farmers for retiring cropland.

The President promises new steps to move surpluses in export and domestic markets. He would speed up plans to aid low-income farmers, refund Federal taxes to farmers on nonhighway gasoline, and increase by 25 percent research funds to find new uses for farm crops and new, useful crops to partly replace surplus crops.

What happens to the President's recommendations depends upon Congress. Last year Congress refused an appropriation to get the rural development program started. Petty politicians and representatives of special interests are yet to be heard from. But from where we sit it looks as if the administration has come through with proposals which should go a long way toward improving the economic outlook for farmers.

Veterans Regulations

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1614) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs who have spoken in behalf of the bill, H. R. 1614. The bill is entirely meritorious and merely provides for a well deserved increase in compensation for those veterans who unquestionably are seriously disabled as a result of their efforts on our behalf in defending our country.

In the Nation—One More Very Curious Official Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a column written by Arthur Krock from the New York Times of Friday, January 13.

I trust that there is no necessary significance in the date of this article, for it appears that once again our Secretary of State has paused long enough in his travels to get his foot in his mouth.

Of course, it is I and not Mr. Krock who states the case so bluntly. Mr. Krock merely gives the story of Mr. Dulles his—Mr. Krock's—customary factual accounting. The conclusion is as clear, however, as any reading of the record can make it.

I am pleased that Secretary Dulles has received a big play in Life magazine. It helps us keep track of the actual spokesman of this Nation in foreign affairs because sometimes it appears that an eager administrative advocate by the name of Stassen fancies this position. Personally, I wish that Secretary Dulles would pause longer before he makes his great pronouncements. If he would follow this suggestion, it is my feeling that the Nation, and Mr. Dulles as well, would have less need of "agonizing reappraisals." Secretary Dulles could hardly have chilled our friends and partners more by taking them into one of his customary cold swims—and surely Pravda has not had such good copy since the "unleashing" days now—it is hoped—of distant memory.

The article follows:

IN THE NATION—ONE MORE VERY CURIOUS OFFICIAL INCIDENT

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 12—The article in the current issue of Life magazine in which Secretary of State Dulles is directly quoted as asserting that bold and timely warnings by this administration that it would use atomic weapons in the Far East had thrice forestalled war in that area "at the brink" bears all the familiar marks of high official cooperation and approval before publication. The leading detectors of these marks are the Washington reporters.

Therefore they heard with what can politely be termed total incredulity the replies Secretary Dulles made yesterday to questions about the Life article. For these invited one of two extraordinary inferences. The first was that a reporter and the editors of a mass-circulation magazine were reckless enough to put out such an article without checking it for approval in an authoritative quarter (for instance, Dulles' assistant in charge of his press and public relations, Assistant Secretary McCardle). The alternative inference was that the functionary who did the checking, though the article quoted Dulles extensively and was replete with foreign policy revelations and claims certain to be politically provocative, made slight mention of it (if any) to the Secretary.

He said specifically, in answering questions about the article, that he had not "read" it, had not "seen" it, had no "precise recollection" of what he may have said to the author, and "would hardly say it was an exclusive interview" because he had talked to a great many reporters "in one way or another at one time or another."

If he had not seen the publication (which, presumably, means it had not come under his eye in the mimeograph copy that Life distributed widely in Washington Monday or in the current issue of the magazine), of course he had not read it either when he met with the newsmen yesterday. Accepting those words as statements of technical fact did not, however, induce his audience also to accept the inference that the article had been published without authorized official imprimatur.

POSSIBLE ASSUMPTIONS

But the Secretary indicated such total unfamiliarity with the contents of an interview in which he was freely quoted as to leave for evaluation the second inference, that, though his public-relations aides knew the matter would certainly arise at the press conference, they took no steps to acquaint him with it. That is possible if it can be assumed that the Secretary was too busy recently to find time to be briefed on this particular subject, or simply declined to allow his aides to bring it up. But, considering his lively interest in what appears about him in print, considering the reaction this article was sure to evoke, and further considering the risk that would be taken by an aide who passed such an article without advising Dulles of its contents, both situations are difficult to conceive.

So Dulles' responses to yesterday's questions, even before he dismissed the subject on learning that the article was not to be released until hours after the press conference was held, enter the category of official mysteries. It is known that the material was submitted to appointed checking authority in the State Department before it was circulated by mimeograph or published in the magazine. It is on the record that the Secretary had not seen, and hence not read, the interview before he was asked about it. But how and why are facts that remain in the realm of the curious and the unknown.

Dulles was virtually alone in unfamiliarity with the publication by the time his news conference assembled yesterday, so far as the political, press, and diplomatic communities in Washington are concerned. The Capitol buzzed with the public attribution to him that the President and he three times had averted war for the United States (a) by notice to the Communist powers that in certain aggressive circumstances we would attack Manchuria, and make aircraft carriers ready to bomb South China ports, and (b) through the Senate resolution drafted by Dulles that authorized the President to take any military course he thought necessary to defend Formosa. In two instances the use of nuclear weapons was specifically mentioned in the warnings; in the third it significantly was not excluded.

These revelations—or clarifications of what the executive department previously had but barely indicated—had atomic effects of their own. Diplomats of European nations were shocked and alarmed that the threat of nuclear war they dread had been revived, and in this casual way. Democrats in Congress, noting that Dulles was loaded with praise in an article (full of his quotes) as the boy on the burning deck whence all but he and the

President had fled, resented his hero portraiture and angrily classified it as a 1956 Republican campaign document. The shudders of the self-styled neutrals could be heard from New Delhi to Belgrade. And hard things were said about the timing, just before Eden's visit here, of an open complaint attributed to the Secretary that the British had reneged on the United States at a critical time.

Path to Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Path to Chaos," which appeared in the January 9, 1956, issue of the Park City Daily News of Bowling Green, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

PATH TO CHAOS

Hard as it may be for the free world to believe, the French have managed to replace an unstable government with an even less stable one.

One might fairly say of the general elections that the political irresponsibility which more and more has become a hallmark of France is now enthroned.

The extremists of left and right have gained at the expense of the moderates, neither of whose two coalitions is strong enough alone to govern France.

The center-right group headed by outgoing Premier Edgar Faure, which led the polling, must find some means of joining with former Premier Mendes-France's center-left group if the French are to have a government at all.

Certainly these rival alinements are not going to get any help from the Communists or the newly formed rightist party of Pierre Poujade, fiery antitax crusader.

The Reds, who had 94 seats in the last assembly, gained more than 50 additional this time and are the strongest single party in France. Their gains should be treated with some caution, however.

Under a rigged election law, other parties put up many joint tickets in the 1951 election to pool their strength and beat Communist entries. So the Reds had proportionately fewer seats than their earlier vote normally would have given them. This time there was no ganging up, and Communists won seats they were squeezed out of before.

This is, of course, small consolation to those hoping for stability in France. What counts in the end is the Communists' power, especially in company with the surprising Poujadists, to hamstring effective government in a nation looked to as a key link in the chain of Western defenses.

Poujade, a small-town bookseller, exstevedore, and exsoccer player, has brought the rough and tumble of the waterfront and soccer field to a political movement that grew from a shopkeepers' war against the tax collector—traditional symbol of evil to the individualistic provincial Frenchman.

Using every demagogic device in the bag, and a few new ones he has raced about France converting tax rebels into political supporters. With violence as an avowed political tactic, he cut a big enough swath to capture some 50 seats—more than twice the wildest forecasts—in the new assembly.

That a 34-year-old political nobody could make such strides with no platform and no program except negative opposition to everything and everybody is perhaps perfectly symptomatic of what ails France politically.

France today seems not very far from the point where all the power groups in the country will checkmate each other, leaving none able to govern. Since this evidently is the goal of millions, possibly such a result is inevitable.

But if it is, so is the final decline of France as a world power. Tragic to tell, there is little enough left of that power now. With irresponsibility run rampant in the January 2 elections, the crucial blow may have been dealt.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence. The centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation constitutes an impressive chapter in the annals of human history. This indomitable will for national freedom clearly crystallized itself in the old Ukrainian Kievan state from the ninth to the fourteenth century; in the Ukrainian Kozak state from 1648 to 1783 and more recently in the Ukrainian national Republic from 1917 to 1920.

As one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, Ukraine, since the very inception of alien Bolshevik tyranny, has proved to be the Achilles heel of the Soviet Union.

The destruction of its national churches, the horrible manmade famine of 1932–33, the mass murder at Vinnitsia in 1937–39, and the vast purges and deportations decreed by Moscow have failed to exterminate the spiritual and moral resources for national freedom in Ukraine. The historic capital of Kiev, with centuries of rich tradition and culture conserved in its vaults, still symbolizes today the indestructible hope and passion of a nation destined to be sovereign, free, and independent.

During the Second World War millions of Ukrainian patriots seized the short-lived opportunity of the German invasion to realize once again this hope, only to be frustrated in their valiant efforts by the scourge of another imperialism. But this unbending will continues to be strong and powerful in the epic struggle of the Ukrainian insurgent army (UPA) against the evil forces of Soviet imperialism, and in the resistance of the Ukrainian people.

As a nation of over 40 million people—the largest non-Russian nation behind the European Iron Curtain—Ukraine stands as one of our most important and natural allies in the eventual defeat of Soviet imperialism. Its historic claim to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free Europe of tomorrow must be assured, if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

Dean Sayre Is Critical of UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD a news item from the January 16, 1956, Washington Post, headlined, "Dean Sayre Is Critical of UNESCO: Churchman Sees Missionaries Doing More Effective Job Winning Friends."

The article does not go into much detail of the dean's speech. I am anxious to read all that he said because it is about time that the church leaders of this country brought their lights out from under the bushels which have been hiding them. For 6 years I have been saying in one public speech after another that UNESCO and point 4, desirable and helpful as they were, were nothing new to Americans and other enlightened societies of the world. They were merely Government programs attempting to do what our great missions had been doing for many decades, indeed for over centuries. Indeed, I resented the propagandizing that went along with these programs which overshadowed the great missionary work in the very same fields, medical missions, educational missions, sanitary missions, missions to teach economic skills, and so forth.

I pointed out that here, as in the field of economic endeavor, political government was moving in to take over private enterprise—for, indeed, in this regard our missions are private enterprise, just as our community chests are private enterprise as contrasted to Government endeavor.

I pointed out that just as in the fields of economic endeavor political government did not lend itself well by its very structure to performing these functions, so in the field of missionary work, political government was not well suited to perform these functions.

The reasons were quite clear to me. If political governments tried to do the job they perforce had to deal with and through the political government which existed in the society they were trying to help. In all too many instances the political government was on the backs of the peoples in the society and many of their basic troubles lay with that government. Yet by channeling economic, educational, medical, or any of these aids through the political government, to a large extent this assisted in keeping that particular political government on the backs of the people. Indeed, the Comintern made much of this argument. It pointed out to the peoples we were trying to assist through these programs that we were keeping a particular political government on their backs and maintaining the status quo. The missionary programs on the other hand were essentially person to person rather than government to person or government to government relationships.

Second, the missionary programs which were most effective were those

where the persons engaged in the work were living with the people they were trying to help. To subject oneself to the living conditions of a backward people requires an attitude of humility and dedication to service which is most often found in our great religious institutions. The persons employed by political government, on the other hand, are motivated more by the wages they will receive and the conditions under which they will live, the promotions they may expect, and so forth. And this is not meant to be critical of them, because government service in relation to employment in private enterprise requires a certain amount of dedication. However, security plays a great role in choosing government service as a career. The result has been, as might be expected, those who have been administering the UNESCO and point 4 programs do not usually live with the people whom they are trying to help. I want to point out there are many splendid exceptions to this generality, but these exceptions would work well under a missionary program—missionary programs are not all attached to churches, some educational missions have been set up by educational institutions, many health missions by private individuals. Furthermore, the Government programs conducted by these people are almost without exception the least costly and the most effective programs toward gaining real friends abroad.

I will never forget the time I inadvertently came across an item in the foreign-aid budget for 100 air conditioning units to be sent to a spot in India. Certainly it was hot in that section of India but I wondered just how these point 4 persons were going to work with the people of India in air-conditioned offices. No; they were not for hospitals.

In 1954 I successfully sponsored an amendment to our tax code which gave an additional 10 percent deduction for donations to medical, educational, and religious institutions. I did not have in mind our domestic institutions, although I was happy to know they would benefit also. I had in mind a little discussion I had with a Congregational minister after I had spoken before a symposium held at his church along the lines of this present talk. He said to me: "This is all well, but the problem is so vast that some source like the Federal Treasury is necessary in order to meet the need." Well, it is true that the problem is great but I do not think money will solve it. Money will help if channeled into the proper places. This tax credit, as far as I am concerned, was to help a little in getting money channeled into our private missions so we could get friends abroad.

Essentially the problems of our would-be friends abroad will never be solved until they take from the limited success experienced in our society the things that have produced this success, and eschew the things that in our society still block our advancement to greater success. These things can neither be sold nor given away. They can be taken freely, however. It is merely a philosophy of life * * * the golden rule applied to modern economics with proper attention paid to the parable of the three servants. If only our missionaries and Government servants engaged in work abroad knew just a little more about the economics of the American society they would be less intent on selling socialism abroad in the belief that because of its professed love of the people it did love them. Which son did the will of his father—the one who said: "I go, sir," and went not—or the one who said: "I will not" but went? Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

The article follows:

DEAN SAYRE IS CRITICAL OF UNESCO—CHURCHMAN SEES MISSIONARIES DOING MORE EFFECTIVE JOB WINNING FRIENDS

(By Kenneth Dole)

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral, declared yesterday that UNESCO was inferior to church missionary work in promoting world friendship.

Relating how he once attended a conference of the United Nations organization, he said he came away with a "poignant" sense of futility.

"All those ambassadors of culture, those emissaries of art and learning and national handicraft * * * were ablaze for the cause of mutual understanding and peace," he said, " * * * yet the drawstring that could draw all together was lacking, and all I heard at the last was aimless talk."

A generation ago many of those at the conference would have been missionaries, he said, "but now religion is a word that is strictly taboo at their meetings."

In the second of 2 sermons on church missions, Dean Sayre told how Episcopalians could, through the Overseas Mission Society, promote the spread of the Christian religion, which, he said, "has done a far more effective job of winning the friendship of others in the world than any secular institution."

The dean used his text, "I Will Go," to point up the sacrifice of the 5 missionaries who were killed in Ecuador last week by Indians . One of them, the Reverend Nathaniel Saint, was the son, he said, of Lawrence Saint, the stained-glass artist who made the Cathedral's rose window.

"All honor," said the dean, "to those 5 young men, on whose lips the Word was strangled; for in their deaths they bore a nobler witness, not so much to God's last judgment, as to His forgiving love."

Outlook Brighter for King Coal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Outlook Brighter for King Coal," which appeared in the January 9, 1956, issue of the Owensboro Messenger, of Owensboro, Ky.

OUTLOOK BRIGHTER FOR KING COAL

Senator HARLEY KILGORE'S plea for Government aid to economically distressed countries of West Virginia is the story of depression in the coalfields. It is a story that Kentucky saw repeated in the coal-producing areas of this State. Both in the far-eastern part of the State and in the western coalfields conditions existed in startling contrast to the general prosperity.

Company houses often substandard originally went unrepaired; company stores forced to close; children skimpily dressed and undernourished looked to the free-lunch program at school to help hold body and soul together. Altogether the outlook in those counties whose sole source of livelihood had been the mines looked dark. The expanding use of gas in heating and in industry seemed to spell the doom of these communities whose soil, generally, was so poor as to offer no hope of surcease there.

But within the last year a brighter outlook for the miner and his family has opened up. Production of coal made a strong recovery in 1955, with production figures about 500 million tons as compared with 392 million in 1954. One of the reasons for this steady and increasing market is the growth and expansion in the steel market with its demand for more high-grade coal.

With the use of coal at home becoming greater, there has also been a growth in the export of coal. Exports tell us that the consumption of coal in Europe is steadily growing. All of this has stimulated the coal industry. With the research in synthetics, with coal as a base for all types of products from medicine to perfume, from jewelry to fabrics, the future of coal should brighten considerably from here on out.

Needless to say, along with experimenting with products from coal there has also been an improvement in the methods of mining, with resulting greater safety, less waste both of coal and of manpower.

In discussing the rosy future ahead for the coal industry, S. M. Cassidy, vice president of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co. also called attention to the improved labor relations that has taken place in recent years.

Problems of the Midwest Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I received from Quincy I. Rice, vice chairman of the Keokuk County (Iowa) Chapter of the National Farmers Organization. Mr. Rice has given considerable thought to the problems of the Midwest farmer and has arrived at some sound conclusions. He analyzes the various phases of the situation and presents suggestions worthy of our consideration. The problem of the small farmer is acute and we are not going to solve it by avoiding it. The farmer deserves a fair share in the Nation's economy, and I feel sure you will agree with Mr. Rice that, under existing circumstances, he is not getting it. I hope all Members will take the time to carefully examine Mr. Rice's letter.

The letter follows:

DELTA, IOWA, *January 10, 1956.*

Mr. KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have seen and read a draft of the bill you are presenting to

Congress in behalf of the hog producer. I appreciate your effort but I feel that you do not have the whole picture of the situation in mind.

Meat production in the United States has increased in 1955, 14.4 percent over the average of the preceding 5 years. At the same time per capita consumption has increased 10.6 percent, which makes a net increase of 3.8 percent. However at the same time our population has increased at least 8 percent during the same 6 years, 1950 through 1955. These facts together with the fact that we have 14 percent less meat in storage than 1 year ago prove that all this talk of surplus meat is pure bunk.

Your plan to reduce hog production by 20 percent would reduce our total meat supply by about 8 percent as hogs make up about 40 percent of our meat supply. Furthermore a flat 20 percent cut to all farmers would be definitely unjust because the increases in pork production we have had in the past few years have been caused by less than 5 percent of the farmers. Some of this same 5 percent have tripled their hog production.

The problem of grain surpluses is a little different in the fact that a surplus does exist, but the present surplus of grain is only enough to insure the Nation a stable grain supply in event of a drought such as we had in 1934. I feel that the maintenance of such a supply of food is as vital to our national defense as arms or any other phase of the defense program and at a lesser cost than other phases of this same defense program. I do feel that some production controls should be put in effect to see that this supply of grains remains at about the present level and does not get larger. The soil bank plan has some merit, however, I feel that our old soil conservation plan could be practiced more vigorously and with strong penalties put on the man who abused his land. Furthermore land taken out of cotton, wheat, and tobacco should not be put in corn or other feed grains and vice versa.

The farm-parity problem of today is not being caused by overproduction nearly as much as it is by the greed of industry and by that I mean the owners of industry. Certainly labor costs have risen, mostly because with the high profits in industry, labor feels that part of that same profit belongs to them, and justly so. If I were making a 20- to 25-percent profit on my investment over and above my own wages and all expenses I surely would feel that any employee of mine would be entitled to a raise in salary. In a great many cases these same wage increases have not increased labor costs because of speedup changes in processing.

The present flexible price-support program is a joke as far as the livestock producer is concerned, like a rubber crutch for a man who is crippled, it just won't hold him up when he needs it. Lower farm prices do not tend to lower production, they do just the opposite. The farmer has fixed expenses the same as any other segment of our industry and he must meet those expenses or he must go out of business. These expenses are paid with the money he receives for his products. If 50 hogs won't pay the bill he must raise more and the same applies to cattle. It is a vicious cycle and if it isn't stopped it's going to be worse and even fatal for our whole economy.

The pork-buying program of Mr. Benson is not helping the farmer or the consumer, only the packer. As you know if you have examined the facts as I have, we have no surplus of meat, so meat taken out of the consumer market will tend to raise the market to consumers and reduce consumption.

As you know, hog and cattle prices have dropped in the last few months, hogs about 35 percent under the average of the last 5 preceding years and cattle almost as much. At the same time meat to the consumer has not come down very much if any, and in some cases is higher. Again industry is being a "hog," it's not the farmer.

Some people say: "Anyone can be a farmer, he doesn't have to know anything." I resent that statement. A farmer, in order to succeed, must have at least a working knowledge of more skills and be able to use them, than any other worker in the world. He must be a pretty fair mechanic and understand the working principles of many machines, he must be a pretty fair carpenter, he must be able to understand the simple properties and elements of electricity, he must have a good knowledge of livestock diets, care, and diseases, he must be enough of a soil chemist and agronomist to know what crops to plant and what fertilizers to use, he must be able to keep a set of books, he must have overall good judgment in regard to weather, harvest time, practicability of farming methods, and others. And last but not least he must be physically able to work 16 hours per day if necessary in all kinds of weather.

Some people resent the fact that the farmer has an automobile. Do you know of any class of people other than perhaps a traveling salesman, doctor, or veterinarian, who has more need of an automobile? Within the last few months Wallaces Farmer made a survey of farmers' automobiles in Iowa with this result: 72 percent drive Fords, Chevrolets, or Plymouths, the lowest priced cars, and the average age of all farmer-owned cars was 5½ years.

To give you an idea who the next segment of our economy to hit the skids will be—take a look at the farm-machinery industry. Laborers are being laid off now in large numbers and more of them will be. Farmers can't buy machinery if they can't even pay their operating and living expenses.

I do not resent the fact that many people are wealthier than I. What I do resent is the fact that through the power given them by this wealth, so to speak, that they try to take away what little I have, when they already have more than they need. Domination by economic power is just as wrong as domination by physical power. Yes; we have laws to protect us from physical power or greed but hardly any to protect us from economic power or greed. Overindulgence in economic power breeds communism, and we certainly don't want that. Economic power of the few must be curbed if we are to succeed and survive as a nation subscribing to the principles of justice and equality for all, as put forth in the creed of our forefathers who founded this great country.

The farmers do not expect to be held as wards of the Government; we only want what is rightfully ours, 100 percent of parity.

Farmers could do well on 10-cent hogs if the consumer goods we buy were priced accordingly but when it takes 120 head of hogs to buy the cheapest 2-bottom tractor, things are definitely out of balance. As long as industry is allowed to take all the cream of our economy, the farmer is going to suffer. The average farmer must sell $3,000 to $5,000 of produce or crops before he can even take his own living out. This same $3,000 to $5,000 is made up of motor fuel, oil, seed, taxes, interest, repairs, rent, depreciation on buildings and machinery, labor, feed, and others.

Industry takes a chance in producing their goods, to be sure, but no more than the farmer does, for he has to combat the weather as well as insects. In the last 10 years, I have had just 3 good crops.

I am 44 years old, married, and the father of 5 children, 1 recently married. I fought with the Ninth Division in Europe during World War II and spent nearly 7 months in a German prison camp so I really know what it is to be hungry. I started farming in 1946 after getting out of the service. I own 120 acres, with a mortgage on it, and rent 160 acres more. I drive a 1948 car and I do not have a television set. I work hard and employ very little hired labor and still I find it really rough going.

It is true the farm population is only about one-eighth of our total population, but farm prosperity is the most vital part of our economy. It is like the ignition system on a car or tractor, which too is quite small but things will not go without it. The rest of the economy must be geared or timed to that ignition, properly, or the machine does not give service and could collapse as far as durability and service are concerned. There isn't too much wrong with the ignition, the trouble is with the rest of the machine.

Yours very truly,

QUINCY I. RICE,
Vice Chairman, Keokuk County Chapter, National Farmers Organization.

Small Publishers Can Hardly Make Newsprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Small Publishers Can Hardly Make Newsprint" which appeared in the January 10, 1956, issue of the Gleaner and Journal of Henderson, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SMALL PUBLISHERS CAN HARDLY MAKE NEWSPRINT

A report issued from Washington that the Small Business Administration has announced it will provide small publishers with pool loans to set up their own production plants is interesting, but as a publisher we are not particularly impressed with the prospects it presents for alleviating the newsprint shortage.

To begin with, it takes more than 2 years to get a newsprint mill into production after a place is located for the mill to be built. It takes about $36 million to build a plant which would produce 300 tons per day. Further, it would take trees to provide the pulp, which means that it would be necessary to locate forests with suitable wood for pulp, and after locating them, there would be the necessity of being able to purchase them at a price which would enable the plant to manufacture newsprint at a price no higher than current levels.

This is assuming that the small publishers who joined in with the project would (1) be able to hire competent men to install the machinery and run the factory; and (2) be able to raise enough capital, individually, to float the necessary loans. It has been suggested that publishers might raise about $250,000 apiece to put into the plant though a smaller sum might be borrowed by small operators in proportion to the size of the shop.

We look upon this announcement of the Federal Government bureau as a sort of "gobblydygook" statement designed to catch the fancy of the public which has just begun to realize that a newsprint shortage exists. Certainly it can't be taken seriously by publishers who know that the shortage exists now, and that the hardest year is just ahead of us. The stringency of 1956 is due to the fact that storage pools of newsprint were

drawn upon during 1955, and that newsprint usage is increasing out of proportion to production.

We have suggested before, we suggest it again, that newsprint producers now in the game might get together (possibly with encouragement from the United States and Canadian Governments) to arrive at a quota system for newsprint users which would be fair to small papers as well as to large. A large newspaper will waste enough newsprint in 1 day to keep a small paper in business for a year. It is unthinkable that in a country where freedom of the press is a basic tenet of government, a technicality would be allowed to cancel out this freedom. In other words—a failure to do the wise thing at the propitious moment may result in small newspapers closing doors because they have no paper on which to print their papers.

The attempt of the small-business bureau to alleviate the situation is a step in the right direction, but we do not believe that small papers have the possibility of paying back loans to the amount of $250,000 these days, for costs have mounted to the extent that profits are cut to the bone. We do not believe that any such plant could get into operation quickly enough to save the papers which may have to go out of business this year because of the lack of newsprint. We do not believe that such an investment would be safe enough for the small publisher to take the risk.

Some large newspapers have their own forests, their own pulp mills. The United States has suffered during the past year in part because the Canadian mills have shipped much tonage abroad, especially to England. No United States law can forbid Canadian mills from shipping their own products to Britain instead of the United States. We can, however, encourage with Federal loans, and so forth, the expansion of already existing mills, a half dozen of which have been located in the south during the past several years. These mills, with adequate encouragement, and with a voluntary control on quotas which give all publishers an equal shake at a percentage of their requirements, might do more than loans to help small publishers.

We appreciate the fact that the Federal Government has finally taken cognizance of the critical situation in newsprint—but we fear that it has begun in the wrong department, and at the wrong end of the planning.

The Brink of Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Wilmington Morning News, Wilmington, Del., of January 16, 1956:

John Foster Dulles is one of the best prepared men ever to serve as American Secretary of State, and in many respects one of the ablest. He might also be one of the greatest—if he only had a little humility, and a gift for knowing when to keep his mouth shut. His worst fault is the lack of that "address or tact in conduct of affairs" mentioned in Webster's Dictionary as an attribute of diplomacy.

We have deferred comment till now on the Life magazine article purporting to reveal Mr. Dulles' philosophy and techniques, hoping that when the Secretary saw how it disturbed our friends without harming our enemies he would be awakened to the need for explaining that he hadn't meant it the way it sounded. But he stood pat last week on what the Washington Post calls massive hindsight in incredibly bad taste, and the New York Times refers to as "to say the least, an extreme example of how not to conduct diplomacy."

The article offers an unproved and unprovable version of three diplomatic victories it attributes to Mr. Dulles. First of these was the armistice in Korea. The Communists would not have agreed to it, the article says, if the United States hadn't threatened to enlarge the war, bomb China, and perhaps use atomic weapons. Second was the armistice in Indochina, made possible only by the same deterrent threat—implied rather than stated in this case. The third was the Communists' decision not to attack Quemoy and Matsu, allegedly because they knew that if they did the United States would fight them with all weapons.

Actually no one knows why the Communists made the decisions they did, but their diplomacy in Asia has been so successful ever since that it might well be argued that they planned it that way. The second and third examples, moreover, distort the historical record as previously given to the American people. Mr. Dulles liked his victory in Indochina so little that the walked out on the armistice conference in Geneva, and left it to Anthony Eden's skilled mediation—ignored in these boastful claims—to retrieve the situation. The record also shows that President Eisenhower refused to commit the United States to defend Quemoy and Matsu.

Even worse was the article's quotation attributed to Dulles: "The ability to get to the verge of war without getting into war is the essential art." How could Dulles fail to see how this sounds in this nuclear age? America's Secretary of State is represented as an omniscient artist who has three times brought the world to the brink of war, who enjoys the game and will play it again, and who has supreme faith that he will never miscalculate.

This is the interpretation bound to be put on his alleged remarks. It is not true. But since Dulles has passed up an opportunity to clarify the record, it may be necessary for President Eisenhower personally to repudiate the brink of war doctrine.

The Good Name of the State of Mississippi

SPEECH
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Davis Lee, a Negro who publishes a newspaper called the Telegram, in Newark, N. J. That is in answer, Mr. Speaker, to an article appearing in Look magazine written by William Bradford Huie, who tried to libel and slander the admirals of the United States Navy because he could not get certain consideration, et cetera, in his book, The Case Against the Admirals, during the time he was a naval officer. The article in question appears in Look magazine of this month in which this man vilified, slandered, libeled, with unmitigated vituperation the good name of the State of Mississippi, the people of Mississippi, the courts of Mississippi, and held out to the Nation that the State of Mississippi is one of the worst places on earth.

Mr. Speaker, I want you to read what a colored man had to say, who went down to Mississippi and spent 7 weeks there; what he found, and what he published in his newspaper north of the Mason and Dixon line.

Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy when the good name of a State is held up for dramatic purposes, to ridicule, and to scorn at the hands of these headline seekers, such as the one that appears in Look magazine. I want you to read this article written by this man who had nothing to gain in writing the article.

The article follows:

[From the Newark (N. J.) Telegram of January 15, 1956]

MISSISSIPPI SURVEY—STATE NO WORSE THAN ANY OTHER; WHITE'S PATERNALISM KEY TO NEGRO UNDERSTANDING

(By Davis Lee, publisher)

In recent weeks the entire world has been led to believe that the 1 million Negro citizens of Mississippi are in constant fear for their lives; that they are ruthlessly exploited, deprived of every right as American citizens.

The murder of the Reverend George Lee of Belzoni, the Emmett Till kidnap murder, and other similar tragedies have given numerous distorted reports the appearance of being true. And those who have never been to Mississippi, from what they read, naturally conclude that it is the worst place on earth.

After spending 7 weeks in the State, touring its 82 counties, meeting and talking with Negro and white citizens of every walk of life, I am convinced that Mississippi is no worse than any other State in the Union, and what has happened there could happen in any of the 48 States with sufficient provocative agitation, and that the decent citizens deplore violence.

My trip to Mississippi was not in search of propaganda material designed to stimulate interest in any alleged righteous cause, nor was I sent by any publication with instructions to dramatize the slightest incident. I went in search of the truth. I didn't go in search of the worst that I could find in the State; I endeavored to find the good.

Naturally my findings will be criticized, but I don't care. Most people would rather believe a false report than a true one.

When I arrived in Mississippi, I began my tour at Biloxi and the first man I met was the able head of the chamber of commerce. He extended a cordial welcome and offered to give me any assistance I wanted. I have never met a man more gracious and considerate.

My next stop was Gulf Port and Bay St. Louis resort towns, with large Negro populations. There are many prosperous Negro businesses in these cities, and some of the finest homes are owned by Negroes.

I visited all of the coastal towns and cities and found no racial tensions. In every community an honest effort is afoot to give the Negroes equal schools.

When I arrived in Jackson, I went by to see Gov. Hugh White, who was glad to see me and talked at some length about the State's efforts toward improving the economic and educational stature of the Negro citizens.

Before leaving Jackson, I conferred with officials of the State department of education,

and learned that the State is spending considerably more money for Negro education than it is spending for white. At Leland, I was told, the State had spent $1 million for a Negro elementary and high school.

Because of the wide publicity given the citizens' council I decided to meet with the heads and find out first hand the purpose for the organization, its objectives, and the type of people who head it.

I drove to Winona where I met Mr. Robert B. Patterson, the secretary. I spent some 3 hours with him. He is a native of Mississippi, young, energetic, and believes that our Creator intended that there should be a separation of races.

Mr. Patterson is an intelligent, fairminded southerner who doesn't believe that integration offers a solution to our racial problem. And his opinion and convictions are based on a lifetime with Negroes.

He operates a plantation at Indianola where he has some 80 Negro families. He travels extensively and leaves his wife and daughters in the care of his Negro help.

In one sentence, Mr. Patterson, in referring to the fact that his Negroes cared for his family, gave me the southern view, the South's feeling, in a nutshell.

"When I am away," he said, "I know that my Negroes will not let anything happen to my wife and children. In fact, they are my children, too."

It is this feeling of parenthood, of paternalism that people outside the South don't understand. Southern white people do regard their Negro employees as their children, their responsibility.

This fact was evident everywhere that I went. White people in Mississippi love and respect their Negro employees and they resent outsiders who interfere with local custom.

To further illustrate the workings of paternalism, I visited Drews, a small town not far from Money. I met a plantation owner who had 150 Negro families on his spread.

Some of these Negroes had been on that plantation all of their lives. The owner is a Mr. Smith, an educated, cultured man. He loves his Negroes as if they were his children.

Recently he missed 35 tons of fertilizer. A private detective was called in. In short order the fertilizer was located in Mound Bayou, the all Negro town. The fence who bought the stuff agreed to pay for it and no charges were made.

Shortly thereafter Mr. Smith missed several bales of cotton. The detective was called in again and given a retainer of $100 to locate the cotton. The next day the detective called and informed Mr. Smith that the bales of cotton had been found in Mound Bayou. The detective informed the plantation owner that one of his Negro employees had sold the cotton.

Mr. Smith sent for the alleged thief, a young man in his twenties who had been born and reared on the place. He readily admitted taking the cotton. The sheriff was summoned and the young man arrested and jailed.

A few days later, at the trial, the young man was fined $200, with the alternative of a jail sentence if he could not raise the money. Mr. Smith walked forward, paid the fine, and took the young man back to the plantation.

Since the Emmett Till tragedy I have read exaggerated reports by Negro reporters that they had to disguise themselves in dilapidated cars in Mississippi. I traveled the entire State, was well dressed, and rode in a late model convertible.

I was not even stopped and asked to show my driver's license during the entire trip. I went on dozens of plantations and talked with hundreds of Negroes, and not one planter questioned me about my being there.

The Federal Forest: How the Hoover Commission Proposal Would Prune It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from a recent issue—January 6, 1956, page 8—of the Wall Street Journal:

THE FEDERAL FOREST: HOW THE HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSALS WOULD PRUNE IT

(By John Chamberlain)

When the task force charged with investigating military-supply problems for the second Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization discovered that the Navy had on hand enough canned hamburger (keeping life: 2 years) to last for 60 years, it set a Nation to chuckling. The laughter became more boisterous when a supplementary announcement disclosed that there were 812,000 gallons of catsup to go with the hamburger, which figures out to about 1 gallon per can.

Titillating details of this sort have done much to dramatize the 19 reports submitted by the Hoover Commission to Congress prior to the completion of its mission last July. But the dramatization has had the defect of its quality: It has shown so many misshapen and grotesque trees that the outline of the forest has tended to get lost.

What is the scope and shape of the forest? One way to view it is in terms of the Hoover Commission's recommendations—362 of them, which, if all of them were accepted, might result in saving the taxpayer $6 billion to $8 billion a year.

This figure, especially if added to the $7 billion (total figure, not annual) already cut from the cost of Government over a 5-year period as a result of the work of the first Hoover Commission, is a prodigious sum even in a day of $60 billion budgets. Six billion in savings a year should make it relatively easy to balance the budget and save something on taxes or provide for debt reduction. Of the 362 recommendations, 145 could be adopted by departments and agencies without act of Congress. Fifty more could be turned into reality by White House order. The remaining 167 are up to Congress itself.

Another way to look at the forest is to study the way the Commission went about its work. It decided from the outset to investigate the Government by function, not by agency (the Defense Department excepted), and it followed the functions straight across the board, which enabled it to spot all sorts of duplication, backtracking and cross-purposes. It dealt with the Government as employer, as consumer, and as a many-faceted business enterprise.

CALLING ON EXPERTS

The Commission itself—a bipartisan group (7 Republican, 5 Democratic) of Congressman, administrators and public figures such as Chairman Herbert Hoover, James A. Farley, Joseph P. Kennedy, and Dean Solomon C. Hollister of the Cornell College of Engineering—drew upon a vast body of experts to constitute its task forces.

What the task forces did was to pursue 16 functions of Government into every nook and cranny. Here's what they found:

In investigating paperwork, a task force discovered that the administrative arm of the Government wrote a billion letters annually at a cost of $1 per letter. When the carbons were filed along with other Government documents, it meant crowding 9 billion items per year into bulging Federal filing cabinets and storage warehouses. (Mr. Clifton Fadiman's fear that we are destined to drown in paper is apparently coming true.) The task force found that 4,700 different forms sent out to private citizens could be greatly simplified. Estimated annual savings on paperwork: $288 million.

The Government employs 2.3 million civilian (annual pay: $9 billion). The Civil Service system which covers most of them was found to be deficient in its ability to identify men of great capacity. The Hoover Commission recommended the establishment of a senior civil service to handle top jobs under the policymaking appointees. Turnover in Government personnel now runs at 25 percent a year. If this could be cut to 20 percent, it would mean $48.5 million saved on training costs.

The task force on medical services found 26 Federal departments and agencies mixing in health activities. The Government is responsible for at least some part of the care of 30 million people. Estimated savings to be achieved by proper coordination and restrictionof Federal medical services: $293 million a year.

The investigators who combed over the Federal lending agencies uncovered vast areas in which the Government duplicates the work of privately owned banks and insurance companies. Estimated savings if the Government were to cease unjustified competition with private finance: $200 million a year, plus a return of $5 billion in capital to the Federal Treasury.

Task force investigators discovered much Defense Department transport competition with privately owned carriers, most of which are subsidized by the Government in the first place. By better traffic management, the Commission says $151 million could be saved each year.

A task force found the administrative agencies of Government to be deficient in observing proper legal safeguards for the individual. It suggested the establishment of an administrative court with tax, trade, and labor relations sections designed to effect a separation of the powers in regulatory agencies which now function as judge, jury, defense, and prosecution. No savings were estimated! as the Commission puts it, "justice is not cheap."

The Government disposes of vast amounts of surplus property each year. Says the Commission: "Each 1-percent improvement in return for selling a piece of so-called junk or scrap means a saving of $20 million a year." Total estimated savings in surplus disposal: $2 billion a year for the next 4 years, $1 billion thereafter.

In buying, storing, and distributing food and clothing for the Department of Defense, a coordinated civilian management might save $340 million a year, or 10 percent out of a total outlay of $3.4 billion.

PENTAGON EMPIRE

The Department of Defense conducts some 2,500 business enterprises which compete with private business. The capital tied up in these enterprises exceeds $15 billion. The Commission says a thousand enterprises could be eliminated without injury to national defense. Five hundred competitive enterprises run by other departments of the Government could be eliminated or reduced in scope.

In depot utilization, a planned cross-servicing of storage space among the military departments and greater use of commercial warehouses might save $253 million a year.

Twenty-nine Government agencies conduct research and development programs,

spending on them $2.4 billion annually. Basic research, however, is skimped. The Commission recommended more money for basic research.

To quote from the Commission report on overseas economic operations: "Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent more than $50 billion in foreign aid * * * the time has come to apply some brakes to this program." Estimated savings: $360 million a year on nonmilitary foreign aid.

The Federal Government owns $40 billion in real estate, and pays an annual rent bill of $107 million. By selling surplus real estate and improving its management of retained property, the Government might save $100 million a year and return $1 billion to the Treasury.

Government budget and accounting practices, if improved and modernized, might well be made to yield a whopping economy of $4 billion a year (a figure which includes considerable duplication of estimates made by the Hoover task force investigating other lines of Government activity).

The Commission looked into intelligence activities; but since the work of the Central Intelligence Agency is secret and classified, it could make only one public recommendation. This called for Presidential and congressional watchdog committees to review the work of the CIA, the National Security Council, and so on.

SOURCES OF OVERLAPS

In water resources and power the Commission found scores of overlaps. I urged a national water policy to eliminate confusion and to clarify the role of private power distribution.

Finally, the Commission, abandoning its investigation by function, made a blanket survey of the business organization of the Department of Defense. It advocated a tremendous shakeup here which might considerably reduce the Department's annual need for two-thirds of the United States citizens' tax dollar.

In running its survey lines through the forest of big government, the Commission turned up vast areas where dead wood abounds and saplings are starved for sunlight. But sensible conservation practices have cleaned up many a forest, and could be applied to this one.

Flag-Raising Ceremony—Curtiss-Wright Research and Development Center, Quehanna, Pa., November 19, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, November 19, 1955, the Curtiss-Wright Corp. officially opened with a flag raising ceremony its new $27 million research and development center at Quehanna, Clearfield County, Pa.

This new installation is located in the heart of Pennsylvania's virgin forest comprising the counties of Clearfield, Cameron, and Elk and is an expression of the confidence that President Roy T. Hurley and other officials of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. have in the future of Pennsylvania and in the free enterprise system.

The principal address for the occasion was delivered by Admiral Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

Admiral Strauss' address follows:

REMARKS PREPARED BY LEWIS L. STRAUSS, CHAIRMAN, UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, FOR DELIVERY AT FLAG-RAISING CEREMONIES CURTISS-WRIGHT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER, QUEHANNA, PA., NOVEMBER 19, 1955

It is a pleasure to be here today and to participate in this flag-raising ceremony on the site where another great center of scientific research and invention soon will be contributing to the technological progress so vital to our national well-being and the preservation of our freedom.

I salute the Curtiss-Wright Corp. and its officials for their vision and enterprise.

We live in an age of science and technology. Our standard of living, our wealth and productive capacity, our ability to defend all these blessings and, in fact, to defend our liberty if need be—all these depend in ever-increasing measure upon the vitality of our scientific skill and imagination.

Our position of eminence in the world could not have been achieved, nor will it be possible to maintain it, without the free enterprise incentives that are responsible for the plants, laboratories and other facilities soon to take form on this 55,000-acre tract, at an initial cost of some $20 million in private funds.

The skills and imaginations which will be assembled here—seeking constantly to expand our store of knowledge of aeronautical and nuclear science—are a symbol of our Nation's greatness and a repository of our strength and hopes for the future.

For me, the pleasure of this occasion is made greater by reason of the fact that it affords me the opportunity to visit the home district of my good friend of many years, JIM VAN ZANDT.

If he should find my references to him slightly embarrassing, then I can only say that this imposition upon his modesty is the penalty to which he unwittingly exposed himself when he took the risk of asking me to come here today and take part in this ceremony.

The people of the 20th Pennsylvania district are fortunate to be represented in Congress by a man whose life, for nearly 40 years, has been marked by high devotion to public service—as a Navy hero of two wars, civil leader, and Member of Congress.

It has been my good fortune to work in close and—for me—rewarding association with JIM VAN ZANDT, because of the important place he holds on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. I have come to know him as a man of outstanding ability and integrity. I feel that my life has been made richer by his friendship and I know that the Nation's atomic energy program has benefited from his understanding, his diligence, and his wise counsel.

Mr. Van Zandt and his colleagues on the Joint Committee have never denied to the Atomic Energy Commission their wholehearted cooperation, nor have they ever stinted us in the matter of support for the proper functioning of the atomic-energy program, either in regard to the weapons we must have to maintain and secure our freedom, or for the development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

I should like to speak briefly this afternoon about that program, and particularly the partnership which has been created between the Government and American industry in exploiting the energy of the invisible atom.

Private industry—as it is exemplified here today by the Curtiss-Wright Corp. and its plans for this great Quehanna Research and Development Center—can be justly proud of its contributions to the nuclear art. Its accomplishments are not confined to industry's expanded role under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, but extend back to those days of war and peril when Government and industry joined hands in the greatest—although in those days secret—scientific-industrial project ever undertaken.

When we look back on those early days and compare them with our atomic-energy program as it exists today, it seems a very tiny beginning indeed.

It began officially in February of 1940 with $6,000 of Government funds for the purchase of materials needed for laboratory studies of nuclear fission. For 5 years thereafter, it remained a secret project, cloaked by the purposely vague name of the Manhattan Engineer District.

But even in those early days the program came to rely heavily upon industry. As a nation we could not have succeeded in the grim wartime race and beaten our enemies to the building of the bomb without the vitality and ingenuity of American industry. No more can we succeed now in our determination to exploit atomic energy for peaceful purposes unless we have the same competitive resourcefulness which only free enterprise can provide.

From that meager beginning of 15 years ago our activities have grown until they presently comprise a vast scientific and industrial complex representing a total Government outlay for operations and facilities of somewhere in the neighborhood of $15 billion—or about 2½ million times the original investment in 1940.

Private industry has participated in this growth every step of the way.

Together, we have built and operate a network of plants, laboratories, and other installations located in 22 States, housing some of the costliest machines ever built, great discoveries, and vital stockpiles of weapons and fissionable materials. The reservations on which these installations are situated cover about 3,200 square miles, or an area roughly equal to the States of Delaware and Rhode Island.

The Government spends about $2 billion a year on this enterprise—of your money and mine. That comes out, I believe, to something like $4,000 a minute, night and day.

These AEC installations give work to about 101,000 people and it is interesting to note that only about 6,000 of them are employees of the Atomic Energy Commission—only a little more than 6 percent of the total. The great majority of the men and women who keep our facilities functioning are the employees of private industry—that is to say, they work for the Commission's contractors and subcontractors. There is no phase of the program—even the most sensitive and secret work on weapons—in which private industry does not have a substantial role. The list of the Commission's contractors and subcontractors reads like a directory of American corporations.

All of our major production facilities, including plants that range in cost up to as much as a billion dollars each, have been designed, built and are operated by industrial concerns. Furthermore, a substantial portion of our research and development program is carried out by industrial research organizations.

The Commission—or, more properly, the Government and the people—have at present around $6½ billion of invested capital in atomic energy plants, laboratories, and other facilities.

In the fiscal year 1955, about $840 million was spent on new AEC plants and equipment—through contracts with private industry. This figure, I am told, accounts for about 2 percent of the Nation's total annual construction costs.

The comparative figure for the previous year—fiscal 1954—was somewhat higher, around $1.2 billion. From this you will see that our construction costs are tapering off, as the expansion of our production facilities nears completion.

It is my belief that American industry plays a far more comprehensive role, throughout the length and breadth of our Government-supported atomic-energy program, than does private industry in any other country. I refer to both our weapons program, and to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The Government's partnership with industry constitutes a vast enterprise, but the fact that it is of such proportions does not mean that only the big corporations are represented in that partnership.

It is the Commission's policy to assure, to the fullest extent possible, that a fair proportion of its total supplies and services comes from the smaller business concerns.

For example: Between July 1, 1951, and March 31 of this year, the total of all contracts awarded by the Commission was $5.6 billion, or at the rate of nearly $1.5 billion a year.

During that same 45-month period, cost-type contractors doing business with the Commission let out contracts to other firms in the amount of nearly $2.5 billion, and small firms got nearly 40 percent of that amount. This was in addition to direct Commission contract awards to small concerns totaling nearly $173 million.

To illustrate the wide spectrum of the Commission's dealings with private industry, I might cite a survey made by the Council for Technological Advancement which is associated with the Machinery and Allied Products Institute. This survey covered only the capital goods industry, where it was found that approximately 10 percent of the responding firms hold prime contracts with the Atomic Energy Commission, and another 22 percent hold AEC subcontracts. Bear in mind that those figures represent only one segment of American industry.

Of course, as we have ample opportunity to witness here today, private industry, in addition to its important role in the Government-financed atomic-energy program, is devoting large amounts of its own capital to the development of the many peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

One recent survey by industry produced the estimate that, during the 4-year period between 1955 and 1958, industry and other non-Government groups will spend about $300 million on nuclear research and development, including capital facilities, new equipment, wages, and salaries, and other operating expenses.

About half of this private investment in the future—or some $150 million—is expected to go toward research and development work in the effort to provide nuclear powerplants which will be competitive with plants using conventional fuels. This is in addition to the more than $200 million of Government funds allocated for that purpose under the Commission's 5-year power-reactor program.

Pennsylvania is a cradle of American industrial achievement and technological progress, as well as a storehouse of great mineral wealth. Therefore it is in no sense surprising that this State should be found in the front ranks of atomic research and development.

In fact, Pennsylvania already has achieved an historic place in the annals of nuclear progress, particularly in the development of nuclear power for propulsion and commercial distribution. Important pioneering has long been a characteristic of your State.

I am sure that most of you must know that the nuclear powerplant of the *Nautilus*—the world's first atomic submarine—was developed in the Commission's Bettis facility at Pittsburgh, under contract with Westinghouse Electric Corp. It may be of interest to you to know that no less than 3,500 industrial firms contributed to the nuclear plant of the *Nautilus* as subcontractors and suppliers.

The Nation's first central station atomic powerplant for peaceful uses is being built at Shippingport by the Duquesne Light Co. and Westinghouse, and in 1957 will be furnishing electrical power to industries and thousands of homes of the Pittsburgh area. These companies deserve great credit for their vision and their confidence in the promises of atomic power, and for their readiness to back up that vision and confidence with large sums of capital. Such bold steps are necessary to properly exploit the possibilities of the beneficent atom. The Shippingport plant like the prototype *Nautilus* reactor are Pennsylvania products.

As a sidelight, I can report to you that Pennsylvania's fame in the field of atomic development became a matter of international interest this past summer—at the Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. We had a large and comprehensive United States technical exhibit there and one of its star attractions was a beautiful scale model of the Shippingport plant.

The nuclear powerplant of the *Nautilus* and the first full-scale atomic station for generating electricity at Shippingport are perhaps the most widely known of Pennsylvania's contributions to the atomic-energy program, but they are by no means to be regarded as the extent of those contributions.

The Bettis plant at Pittsburgh is working on the design and development of a nuclear powerplant for a large surface ship, and will build an experimental prototype for this naval reactor at the AEC National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho.

Several Pennsylvania firms have contracts with the Commission for work on small or "package" power reactors, intended primarily for military use.

At the present time, industries in Pennsylvania, large concerns and small ones, have done and are doing business with the Atomic Energy Commission in a sum in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars—$267,247,144.

More than 80 private firms of Pennsylvania are involved in current contracts, ranging from large engineering and development firms, down to manufacturers of pumps and valves, small dye works and watch manufacturers. These 80 firms hold 38 prime contracts with the Commission, totaling about $235 million, and 105 subcontracts aggregating nearly $33 million.

In its atomic power development program, the Commission currently is spending about $24 million a year in Pennsylvania, the largest items in this category, of course, being the two plants I have previously mentioned. It is estimated that the expenditures in Pennsylvania in the coming year—under the power development program—may be increased by as much as 60 percent or to a total of nearly $39 million.

The atomic energy program, in a more indirect way, also is a good customer for Pennsylvania's coal, since the AEC is the Nation's largest single consumer of electrical power. Our sites, at present, use about 4½ percent of all the electrical kilowatts generated in the United States, and this figure is steadily increasing.

I have spoken of Pennsylvania's stake in the atomic energy program, from the standpoint of the Commission's contracts with industry. But our contracts are not exclusively with private industry. They include many important research contracts with colleges and universities, and in this category, too, Pennsylvania is well up in the list.

Your neighbor of 40 miles to the south, Pennsylvania State University, is the proud possessor of the second research reactor to be built by an American university. This reactor is very similar to the so-called "swimming pool" research reactor which we transported by air from Oak Ridge, across the Atlantic to Geneva, and installed on the grounds of the Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy.

Pennsylvania State University holds six chemistry research contracts with the Commission, ranging from analyses of minerals and ores to studies of Beta radiation. The University of Pennsylvania and the University of Pittsburgh have similar research contracts with the Commission, as do the Carnegie Institute of Technology and Franklin Institute.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is rich in the traditions of freedom, learning and progress, handed down from William Penn and his Quaker followers who pushed into the wilderness, fortified by their faith in God, their vision, and a bold confidence in the future.

Here, in this virgin setting of streams, forests and hills, those traditions are about to find new and vital expression.

New frontiers will be blazed, by men of scientific skill and vision, toward our goal of greater abundance and defense of our freedom.

Guide to 73 Improvements Made To Simplify and Improve Mailing Procedures, Services, and Privileges for Mail Users

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission approved by the House, I am including a report from Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield entitled "Guide to 73 Improvements Made To Simplify and Improve Mailing Procedures, Services, and Privileges for Mail Users." I am sure the Members of the House will be impressed with the improvements that have been made in the Post Office Department designed to bring about better and more efficient mail service for the public:

GUIDE TO 73 IMPROVEMENTS MADE TO SIMPLIFY AND IMPROVE MAILING PROCEDURES, SERVICES AND PRIVILEGES FOR MAIL USERS

CERTIFIED MAIL

1. The Post Office Department has established a new, low-cost domestic mail service, known as the certified mail service, by which postal patrons may obtain evidence of mailing and delivery for documents, receipts, notices, replaceable papers of importance, and so forth. Since certified mail service costs are lower than those for registered mail, mail users, who formerly sent such materials by registered mail, are now enabled to make savings in their mail costs.

2. Certified mail service was extended to and from the Canal Zone in 1955.

C. O. D. MAIL

3. A new easily understood card form has been provided to notify patrons of the arrival of c. o. d. mail. This notice for the first time makes provision for showing the exact date on which the mail, if not accepted, will be returned to the sender.

4. In addition to the notice customarily left with or for the addressee after an unsuccessful attempt to deliver collect-on-delivery mail, a second notice now is sent to the addressee on the new form after 5 days so that he may have every reasonable opportunity to accept delivery if he wishes to do so.

5. Also, addressees are now permitted to use the new notice-of-arrival card to mail instructions to their postmaster, without any postage charge, telling him that they wish the c. o. d. parcel delivered to their home at a certain time when they will be in.

6. Mailers of shipments of baby chicks sent c. o. d. no longer lose a standard 5 percent of the total value of the chicks if the entire shipment is lost, when claiming insurance indemnity for the shipment. Formerly, where the entire mail shipment of chicks was lost and where it was covered by insurance, the Post Office Department deducted 5 percent of the value, on the theory that 5 percent represented the normal death rate in such shipments.

7. The period during which c. o. d. parcels may be held at offices awaiting delivery to the addressee has been increased from 15 days to 30 days.

CERTIFICATES OF MAILING

8. Certificate of mailing, (p. o. d. form 3817), a form prepared by the sender and authenticated by the postal clerk for a small fee, and which shows evidence of mailing for ordinary mail, has been improved. The amount of postage paid, a record-keeping item of importance in many cases for larger mailers, may now be entered upon the certificate. Also, a facsimile of this form may be reproduced directly on copies of documents and authenticated in the same manner as the individual certificates on form 3817.

REGISTERED MAIL

9. New surcharge rates, which are more equitable for registered mail of higher value, have been set up. Surcharge rates formerly were based on an inflexible rate per $1,000 of value for the zone of destination. After the first million dollars of value, progressively lower rates are now prescribed, and authority exists for quotation of surcharge rates for shipments valued over $15 million, based on considerations of weight, space, and value. At the same time, the nuisance surcharge rates from 2 to 10 cents, covering values up to $1,000 formerly subject to surcharge, have been discontinued entirely. Surcharges on registered mail do not provide additional insurance coverage by the Government, but are intended to cover the additional costs incident to the extra care used in handling these valuable shipments.

10. Senders, who are required by law to declare the actual value of the mail they present for registration, are no longer required to declare as the value of nonnegotiable securities the estimated cost of their duplication if lost or destroyed. Such securities may now be declared as having no intrinsic value, thus permitting payment of lower registration costs than formerly on this matter. However, the mailer may optionally insure nonnegotiable securities with the Post Office Department against possible costs of duplication by payment of one of the higher registration fees.

11. The form used to notify the sender of a registered article that it is undeliverable because the addressee is not known at the place addressed, or because the address borne by the article is not good, has been revised so that it may also be used to notify the sender when the post office of address is unable to deliver a registered letter because the sender has restricted delivery to the addressee only and the addressee declines personally to receipt for it. This new notice permits the sender to lift the restriction if he wishes to do so, thus enabling the post office to deliver the mail to the agent of the addressee.

12. Safer internal procedures have been put into effect in the handling of registered mail. Formerly, a shipment of numerous items of registered mail of limited value were "bulk billed;" that is, described only by the total number of items on the bill enclosed with the articles in registered pouches and jackets. Under this arrangement it could not be determined whether a particular registered article had been dispatched or received, and the dispatching employee was responsible only for seeing that the total number of articles he enclosed in the pouch or jacket was shown on the bill. The receiving employee was responsible for checking the number of articles received against the number shown on the bill. In case of a shortage, it was not possible to determine the particulars of the missing article. With the inauguration of the new certified mail service, to which millions of articles formerly registered are being diverted, bulk billing was discontinued. Now, employees handling registered mail must list the particulars of all registered mail dispatched and check the particulars of all articles received against their description on the dispatch bill.

13. Mail that is intended by the sender to go by registered mail, and which contains adequate postage to go registered, but which is inadvertently deposited with a regular mail shipment, now is promptly dispatched as registered mail by postal employees, and a receipt is mailed to the shipper. Formerly, such items intended for registry were delayed until further checks were made with the sender.

14. The value of registered mail that can be transported over star routes (routes over which mail is carried by certain contractors who are not employees of the Post Office Department) has been increased consistent with safety.

CLAIMS FOR MAIL LOST OR DAMAGED

15. The form provided for use by mailers in making application for payment of indemnity on domestic insured and c. o. d. mail has been greatly simplified.

16. The function of adjusting and paying claims for indemnity on domestic insured and c. o. d. mail has been centralized in 15 offices within the postal service, rather than in 57 offices as before, providing speedups in adjustments of claims, and considerable savings to the Post Office Department.

17. Senders of insured and c. o. d. mail that is damaged in transit can now recover damages more easily. Usually, a simple statement of value from them is adequate.

18. The 15 claims-paying post offices also have been authorized to pay many types of claims which formerly had to come to Washington for settlement. This has greatly speeded adjustments.

19. In a good many instances involving claims for damaged mail items started by the sender it is no longer necessary for the addressee to file a declaration about the damages. This applies in instances where the addressee has received a damaged article in the mail and has sent it back to the mailer, or where the article was returned to the sender as undeliverable mail. In these instances, only the mailer needs to file—not both the mailer and the sender, as was the case formerly.

20. Payment of damage claims on parcels that have been accepted by the Post Office Department for insurance is no longer denied because of inadequate packing.

21. If a mailer pays an inadequate fee to cover the requested insurance on a mailed article, because of an error by the postal employee who accepted the item for mailing, the mailer will nevertheless be reimbursed in full if the item is damaged or lost. The Post Office Department made this full reimbursement policy available by seeking on its own initiative a reconsideration of former adverse rulings by the Comptroller General.

22. Mailers who have legitimate claims on insured mail articles can now mail the completed claims forms to the post office. Formerly they had to go in personally to do this. This saves a great deal of time and trouble for many mailers.

METERED MAIL

23. A bothersome requirement imposed on meter users, that they had to furnish a statement of their postage meter readings every day to post offices has been abolished.

24. The Post Office Department has provided a convenient record book for use by meter users in keeping records of meter operations.

25. The requirement that the day date of mailing be shown in meter stamps on fourth class (parcel post) mail has been eliminated. This formerly caused much trouble for large fourth-class mailers where, for instance, parcels intended for mailing on a certain day were delayed. In such cases, the post office frequently would not accept parcels with outdated meter stamps, involving red tape and delay in getting new meter stamps placed on the packages.

26. The requirement for labeling of metered mail with special identification labels from the mailer has been eliminated.

27. Mailers were authorized to deposit metered letter mail in any street or office building mail receptacle within postal district where their meter is registered, thus eliminating trips to the post office for many mailers.

28. The 10-percent penalty that used to apply for those presenting certain metered mail that contained an incorrect date (for example, a piece of mail showing a meter date on the first of the month, but presented for mailing on the 5th) has been eliminated.

REFUNDS OF POSTAGE

29. The processing of claims for refunds of postage was decentralized from Washington to local post offices to speed up payment and eliminate red tape.

30. The minimum amount for which postage refund would be paid was eliminated; now any claim of any amount may be considered.

NOTICES TO SENDERS OF UNDELIVERABLE THIRD- AND FOURTH-CLASS MAIL

31. Where a sender of third- or fourth-class mail requests that he be notified if the piece is not deliverable as addressed the post office marks on such mail, which is not deliverable locally or forwardable, the reason for nondelivery, or a new address if it has one, and sends the piece of mail back to the sender. This enables him to correct his mailing list without delay. Formerly, in such cases, the Post Office Department held the mail and engaged in correspondence, on card forms, with the senders, regarding the mail that was held, why it was not delivered, and so forth. The new procedure is much faster and more direct.

ISSUANCE OF MAILING PERMITS

32 Authority was extended to postmasters to issue meter, imprint, precancel and business reply permits, without obtaining prior approval of the Department from Washington, resulting in much faster action on such applications.

33. The application and authorization forms for these permits have been simplified and combined, to make it easier for mail patrons to obtain and use these permits when needed.

ENDORSEMENT OF MAILER ON SEALED PARCELS

34. The regulations have been changed to remove the requirement that the sender's authorization that parcel-post parcels may be opened for inspection be printed. Such endorsements may now be placed on wrappers or labels in handwriting, or by handstamp or other means.

PREPAID AIR PARCEL POST

35. The regulations have been changed to authorize onward dispatch and collection of postage due upon delivery of air parcel post which does not bear enough postage, provided it bears at least 50 percent of the postage chargeable. This has eliminated requirement for holding such mail and speeded delivery in many cases where mailers have inadvertently neglected to affix adequate postage.

RELAXATION OF MAILABILITY RESTRICTIONS ON PARCEL POST

36. Many complex restrictions on mailing various types of items and their containers have been simplified to give mailers, particularly those sending merchandise through the mails, access to the mails for their products. For example, standard types of aerosol containers are now accepted in the mails where restrictions once barred them.

REVISION OF PACKAGING SPECIFICATIONS

37. Regulations to authorize use of wrapping and cushioning materials recently developed for preparation of products for mailing have been put into effect; formerly, technical requirements banned use of such materials in the mails.

WINDOW ENVELOPES

38. Formerly only a single address window was permitted in envelopes. Now regulations have been relaxed to permit use of other windows—for advertising or display purposes for example, or for return address. Also, more latitude is permitted on where the windows may be located in the envelopes and printing may now be placed closer to the windows than formerly.

MAIL OF NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AT SPECIAL THIRD-CLASS RATES

39. Application and authorization forms for nonprofit organizations to qualify for mailing at special third-class rates have been simplified and combined. Procedures for handling have been revised to speed issuance of authorizations to applicants.

INFORMATION PAMPHLETS

40. Two new publications have been issued for free distribution to the public, to assist in their mailing: 1. POD publication No. 2, containing instructions and illustrations on packaging and wrapping parcels for mailing, and 2. POD publication No. 3, containing all domestic postage rates and fees.

KEYS AND IDENTIFICATION DEVICES

41. Supported bill which became law extending the special postage rate for hotel and steamship keys to all keys and identification devices which have attached, or which bear, a name and address and guarantee to pay postage on delivery.

SECOND CLASS MAIL (NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS)

42. Eliminated from regulations definition of "sample copies" which was impracticable to administer and unnecessarily restrictive.

43. Eliminated the regulation which arbitrarily limited the mailings of sample copies to three a year to the same individual.

44. A regulation was adopted making it easier for publishers to mail separate editions of their publication. This eliminated a mass of involved regulations, fee charges and so forth which formerly prevailed on mailings of such editions.

45. A regulation was adopted permitting "split run" advertising in publications mailed by second-class mail. For example, a publication mailed to one section of the country may contain a certain ad on a certain page slanted especially to that section, while the same edition of the same publication that is sent to a different section may contain on that same page a different ad, especially slanted to the other section.

46. A regulation was adopted permitting advertising pages to be die cut, deckle-edged, or prepared for folding out horizontally, vertically, or both. These technical changes provide important liberations for mailers or second-class mail, giving them more leeway in what types of advertising they may accept.

47. As another major improvement, the Post Office Department adopted regulations which permit use of all kinds of modern papers for pages of magazines. This removed former strict and outdated requirements regulating use of papers used in magazine publication.

48. Regulations were adopted which define and permit the reasonable use of novely pages, for publishers, including such pages as those containing paper doll cut-outs, coupons, and so forth.

49. New commonsense policies for determining distinctions between advertising and non-advertising content of publications were adopted.

50. The Department simplified the manner in which publishers mark their copies that are filed with postmasters to show the difference in content between reading and advertising content.

51. Regulations were put into effect to change and simplify the manner of handling copies of second-class publications that are undeliverable as addressed. To illustrate: Mrs. Smith in Anytown moves from First Street to Third Street and gives her new address to the post office. Her new copy of her favorite magazine comes by mail, and is sent to Third Street. It will contain a new simple form, on which she may notify her publisher of her change of address. She has 3 months to do this, and, if it is not done by then, the post office will tear off of the copy of her magazine the name and address label and itself send it back to the publisher with the change of address indicated. Formerly, the post office engaged in a complicated correspondence back and forth between publishers to get the change of address made, and often copies of the publication were returned to senders.

52. The handling of publishers mail was speeded by discontinuing bulk weighing of each and every mailing. Now, the total weight of the overall mail shipment is computed from statements of the copies involved and verified by taking sample weighings of mail loads selected at random.

53. A regulation was adopted which permits publishers to deliver copies directly from their plants to railway stations, neighboring towns, or elsewhere, for acceptance and dispatch from those points in the mails. Formerly, publishers were limited to one, or a few, points from which they could mail.

54. Publishers were given authority to deposit Sunday and holiday isues in rural mail boxes on Sundays and holidays without paying postage. This is a particular benefit for smaller papers in largely rural areas. (This is an exception from the rule that mailable matter that is deposited in mail boxes is subject to postage, even though it is carried personally by an individual and does not move through the postal system.)

55. The Department placed in operation, first by regulation and later by authority of new law, a method of paying postage in cash on copies of magazines and newspapers, subject to local per copy postage rates—a convenience and record-saving step in many instances for publishers.

56. A regulation was adopted which permits printed illustrations to be pasted to advertising pages in publications.

57. A regulation was discontinued which required publishers to receive at least 30 percent of the amount of the regular advertised annual subscription price on subscriptions that are obtained through agents or agencies that work on commission.

58. Revised special form that is used by subscribers to inform publishers of changed address, and obtained publishers' cooperation in carrying advertisement asking subscribers to use the form.

59. Greatly simplified the regulations prescribing display of title and name of office of publication in copies of publications.

60. Adopted regulation providing for issuance of special issues.

61. The Post Office Department supported a bill, which became law, and which has greatly simplified the obtaining of second-class mailing privileges for publications of churches and religious organizations.

62. Changed regulation to permit publishers to use white or any other light colored paper for wrapping, instead of being restricted to white or manila paper.

63. Changed regulation to permit use of light colored paper by publishers for address strips, instead of mandatory white or yellow.

64. Discarded requirement that black ink only could be used on address slips by publishers.

CONTROLLED CIRCULATION PUBLICATIONS

65. For controlled circulation publications (certain publications sent free by their publishers; usually publications containing highly specialized content and sent, for example, only to persons engaged in a special kind of work) the Post Office Department adopted procedures for weighing and computing of postage which are uniform with those used for second-class publications.

66. For controlled circulation publications, the Post Office Department adopted procedures that are uniform with those used for second-class publications, for handling copies that are undeliverable as addressed.

PARCEL POST SIZE AND WEIGHT LIMITS

67. The Department authorized mailers located on rural routes serviced from first-class larger post offices to mail their larger and heavier parcels at the post office.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

68. Policies of lending technical assistance to press, particularly trade press in preparation of technical articles on mailing were put into effect in Department. Department technical personnel assisted in writing and preparation of articles upon such subjects as mailing of aerosol insecticides and compressed gases, encyclopedia material, postage rate and mailing information materials.

COMBINATION MAIL

69. The Post Office Department put into effect its new combination mail service, permitting for the first time in history the mailing of a letter or message inside a package or publication, provided the sender pays appropriate postage to cover both items.

FORWARDING MAIL

70. Adopted relation authorizing the free forwarding of mail, formerly chargeable with forwarding postage, for dependents of military and civilian persons whose addresses are changed by official governmental orders.

POSTAL CARDS

71. Regulations governing use of postal cards issued for sale to the public by the Post Office Department (and usually distinguished from "post cards" offered for sale through private newsstands, tourist shops, and not containing the printed stamp) have been revised to authorize use of 50 percent of the space on the address side for writing or message purposes. Formerly only a third of the space could be used for this purpose.

POST CARDS

72. Use of post cards with round corners was authorized. Manufacturers formerly could not sell this type of card because use in mails was not permitted.

REGULATION REFERENCES ON MAIL

73. Requirement that regulation numbers, which change frequently, be shown on certain types of mail was eliminated. Mailers now use descriptive terms such as "Bulk Rate," "Library Book," etc. With each change in regulation numbers, it is no longer necessary for mailers to obtain new printing dies.

Ten Centuries of Christianity Mean Nothing to the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following letter and memorandum from Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, of Steele, N. Dak. Dr. Zukowsky is president of the State branch of North Dakota of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc. Dr. Zukowsky's letter and memorandum carry the stories of the destruction not only of the people, but of the faith.

Recently, the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in the Ukraine was observed throughout the world. Special services were held in many parts of the world, but not in the Ukraine, where religion has been driven underground by the Red masters.

The above-mentioned follows:

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Bismarck, N. Dak., December 30, 1955.

The Honorable OTTO KRUEGER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KRUEGER: In behalf of all the members of our committee and all Americans of Ukrainian descent in North Dakota, it gives me pleasure to extend to you, hearty and sincere greetings for the coming New Year, and wish you great success in your important work for this country of ours.

At the same time it gives me an opportunity to write you regarding our recent celebration of the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Ukraine, brought about by the baptism of the Ukrainian Queen, St. Olga, in 955. Special church services, programs, and other celebrations were held not only in North Dakota, but all over the United States, and also in Italy, Great Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, and all over the world, except behind the Iron Curtain; with newspapers carrying publicity on these events.

One thousand years ago, St. Olga, Queen of Kiev and Ukraine, was baptized and became a member of the Christian church, and a few years later all the people of Kiev, capitol of Ukraine, were baptized and St. Vladimir, King of Ukraine, officially introduced Christianity in his state. Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

Since that time Christianity in Ukraine has flourished and also suffered persecution. Today the church in Ukraine is suffering one of the greatest persecutions in its history. It is significant to note that many members of the Catholic hierarchy—cardinals, archbishops, and bishops—have sent congratulatory and inspiring message to our exarchate to commemorate this anniversary. They have joined in our prayers and they express sympathy for our brethren behind the Iron Curtain, who, under the rule of hammer and sickle are unable to celebrate this event. They desire that the light of the true Christian faith shine again upon Ukrainian lands.

In December 1955, Ukrainians all over the world marked two other anniversaries—25 years ago when Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and 10 years ago, when the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church was totally annihilated by Russian Communist Government.

During the 34 years of Red rule over Ukraine, the Russian Communist Government has not only liquidated the liberties of Ukrainian Republic, not only destroyed physically about 10 million Ukrainians, but it has also completely liquidated the independent church life of the Ukrainian people and has ruined its two main churches—the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church and Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church.

At present, official these two chief churches of the Ukrainian people do not exist, they exist unofficially in the underground.

During 1930–31, the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was desecrated and ruined in a most barbarous manner. Thirty-four archbishops and bishops, and more than 3,000 priests along with 75-year-old Metropolitan Lepkivsky at their head, were unjustly arrested, sentenced, without public hearing or trial, to slave-labor camps, where they later died. Hundreds of thousands of faithful, priests were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The archibishops and bishops who died as martyrs are as follows:

Metropolitans: Wasil Lepkivsky, Mykola Boresky, Ivan Pawlowsky, O. Vzovensesky.

Archbishops: George Savchenko, George Mychnovsky, Stephen Orlyk, Joachim Kalnyshevsky, Peter Tarnavsky, Alexander Cherniswsky, Constantine Krotevich, Theodosy Ariyiv, Constantine Malunkevich, Ossyp Oksiuk, W. Dachivnyk-Dashivsky, Peter Romentaniv.

Bishops: Gregory Storonenko, Jacob Shulayevsky, Valdimir Michnovsky, Mark Hrushevsky, Kanon Bey, Basil Pshenechney, Anton Bronovsky, Maxym Zadvirniak, Mykola Karabinevich, Vladimir Samborsky.

After liquidation of the episcopate of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, thousands of her clergy were shot, tortured, or sent to concentration camps in Siberia. All church properties were confiscated by the State.

In the country the churches were turned into granaries, theaters, clubs, or simply destroyed. The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches, many containing precious historical relics, as for example the golden-domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century.

Extirpation of church leaders and religious teachings is an integral principle of Russian policy. The recent arrest and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and the suppression of the Protestant church in Bulgaria, are vivid examples of Moscow's methods aimed at total destruction of all religion, except the religion of Marx-Lenin-Stalin-Krushchev. Nevertheless the government of Moscow has definitely assumed the protection of the Russian Orthodox church, under the leadership of the Moscow Patriarch Alexsey, and has helped to liquidate both Ukrainian churches.

Later, in 1945 and 1946, the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church was almost totally annihilated in the whole of western Ukraine. Upon occupying the western Ukraine after World War II, Moscow immediately began her wantonly cruel liquidation of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic church, which numbered in the millions of faithful followers, and was decidedly opposed to Moscow's irreligious policy, as well as national and social tyranny. Soon Metropolitan Andrei Sheptysky, head of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic church and a man with a patrician spirit, died mysteriously. Somewhat later it had been disclosed that he died from poisoning. Following his death the Communists published a booklet in which they tried desperately to dishonor that great man and his religious work. Then followed arrests and deportations of the whole exarchate because it had refused to serve the false patriarch of Moscow, who was instituted to, first and foremost, spread Communist propaganda and spy abroad.

Here are the names of those martyrs for the Christian truth and defenders of the people:

Metropolitan of Halych and Archbishop of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. SS. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota, were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years, and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotyslovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops' terms expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Ushorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryasiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the "church of the catacombs" as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution. The Reds exterminated all 5 dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,400 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. Two thousand secular priests and monks were arrested. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church and faith.

Therefore, I respectfully request on behalf of our Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State branch of North Dakota, and 20,000 Americans of Ukrainian descent living in North Dakota, that you present to Congress the dreadful situation of the religious persecution in Ukraine and ask to propose that Congress inquire into this anti-Christian terror, and that a special designated congressional committee hold hearings of witnesses of the aforesaid situation.

I also request that the Secretary of State propose to the American delegation in the United Nations that the conditions of the persecuted church in Ukraine be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly.

Enclosed please find a memorandum and an article written by Prof. Nicholas Chubaty contained in Ukrainian Quarterly, volume XI–I, winter 1955, about "Political background of the religious persecution in Ukraine by Moscow." Our committee would appreciate inserting a memorandum in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as a matter of public record.

Thank you.

Very sincerely yours,
Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCA State Branch of North Dakota.

MEMORANDUM

Christianity has been existing in Ukraine for more than 1,000 years. It has fostered a profound faith in God among the people, and has begotten abiding moral principles, and nourished a new culture and erudition.

In December, 1917, Communist Russia invaded Ukraine and in 1919–20 occupied the

eastern provinces of this country. The Soviet were bent on extirpating Christianity from these regions. In their coup d'etat they published aggressive antireligious propaganda and terrorized the people with threats of exile, torture and death.

First, the Communists attacked the Church in Eastern Ukraine. Within 10 years, from 1921 to 1931, they unjustly arrested and ruthlessly murdered 34 Ukrainian Orthodox bishops and more than 3,000 priests. Hundreds of thousands of the faithful were inhumanly tortured in prisons or deported to concentration camps in Siberia; a greater part of these innocent people died martyrs to their faith; the remainder still endures the appalling trials and hardships of imprisonment.

The Reds destroyed 80 percent of the churches (many of these churches contained precious historical relics, as for example the Golden Domed Michalivsky Monastery in Kiev from the 12th century); other churches were despicably converted into warehouses, theaters and convention halls; monasteries were outraged and cemeteries profaned.

By 1930 the Communists had completely liquidated the entire Ukrainian Orthodox Church, barring it from all public activity.

Though article 123 of the Soviet constitution, which is binding in Ukraine as well as the U. S. S. R., explicitly recognizes freedom of religion, yet, during the first Red occupation of Western Ukraine (1939–41), the Communist regime overtly persecuted the church, arresting many Ukrainian priests and ruthlessly murdering 27 of them.

This anti-Ghristian terror adopted more hideous means of exterminating Christianity in Ukraine during the second occupation of this country beginning in 1945. On April 11, 1946, the Soviets arrested the metropolitan of Halych and archbishop of Lviv, Joseph Slipyj, 80-year-old Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn, Bishop John Latyshevskyj, Bishop Nicholas Charnetskyj, C. S. S. R., and Bishop Nykyta Budka. On June 25, 1946, Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj, OSBM, and Bishop Gregory Lakota were imprisoned. All these bishops were condemned to forced labor for 8 to 10 years and even life; the imputation was lawfully unjust. Some of these bishops (for instance Bishop Gregory Khomyshyn and Bishop Josaphat Kotsylovskyj) later died from maltreatment in prison. Still more, when Archbishop Joseph Slipyj's or other bishops' term expired, the Reds would not release them from prison.

In the autumn of 1947, the Communists murdered Bishop Theodore Romza, Uzhorod, Carpathian Ukraine, and in 1950, the Bishops Paul Gojdich, OSBM, and Basil Hopko, Pryashiv, Czechoslovakia, were imprisoned. On January 15, 1951, Bishop Paul Gojdich was tried and unjustly condemned to forced labor for life. Bishop Basil Hopko is now in a concentration camp.

Altogether, 10 Ukrainian Catholic bishops have been liquidated by the Reds.

In 1946, the Soviets enjoined the legal continuance of the Ukrainian Catholic Church in Ukraine. Thus, in our own 20th century, it has been reduced to the sorrowful plight of the Church of the Catacombs, as was the primitive church during the Neronian persecution.

Two thousand secular priests and monks, for rightfully refusing to acknowledge the patriarch of the Russian Orthodox Church as their head—this church is now subservient to the Communists—were arrested and deported to slave labor camps. The Reds exterminated all 5 dioceses of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, desecrated 4,400 of its churches and chapels together with 195 religious houses. The Communists continue to oppress mercilessly the Ukrainian laity for remaining steadfast to its Christian heritage, church and faith.

Therefore, I respectfully request to present to Congress the dreadful situation of the religious persecution in Ukraine and ask to propose that Congress inquire into this anti-Christian terror, and that a special designated congressional committee hold hearings of witnesses of the aforesaid situation.

I, also, request that the Secretary of State propose to the American delegation in the United Nations that the condition of the persecuted church in Ukraine be placed on the agenda of the United Nations Assembly.

DR. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., State Branch of North Dakota.

The Overseas Role of Private Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the testimony presented to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by Mr. Robert R. Nathan printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Nathan is an eminent economist. He gave outstanding service to his Government in World War II, and in recent years has been serving as an economic consultant for private industry, and one of his most important assignments has been as the economic consultant to the Government of Burma. Few men are better qualified to give sound and constructive advice and counsel in the field of industrial planning and economic developments.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OVERSEAS ROLE OF PRIVATE INVESTMENT

(By Robert R. Nathan)

Every effort needs to be made to expand the flow of investment funds from the United States to countries abroad. This is a principle on which there can and should be no fundamental disagreement. Yet there are many problems involved in private foreign investment which must be taken into serious account in developing programs for this expansion.

First, let me risk the criticism of the American business community by saying that in general it is my impression that the daring and imagination and risk assumption which are associated with the American businessman in his operations within the United States are hardly characteristic of his role as a foreign investor. For a variety of reasons the American investor is not generally a foreign investor. If we look at the figures on private foreign investment published by the Government, and if we deduct from the totals the investments made in oil and mineral exploration and the amounts invested in Canada, the residual foreign investment is distressingly small.

INCENTIVES FOR INVESTORS

Our Government has taken steps to provide incentives for American investors to employ their resources abroad. The guarantee provisions with respect to convertibility and expropriation are certainly steps in the right direction. Taxation inducements have not been without merit. Whether we have exhausted all reasonable possibilities for private incentives is doubtful. Therefore, continued study of the experience of existing American investors abroad and of prospective investors is worth undertaking because it might well point the direction for providing advantages to such investors.

We sometimes fail to recognize that foreign governments face difficult problems if they undertake to provide greater incentives to foreign investors than to their own investors. Huge profits are not always politically defensible in recently liberated countries, where generations of colonialism have created a state of mind that does not distinguish clearly between capitalism and colonialism, judging both to be exploitative. Many underdeveloped countries believe in nationalization of basic industries and are hesitant to allow private capital to control such basic industries, least of all foreign private capital. We in America do not share such ideological tendencies, but we cannot ignore them or quickly change them. Presumbly we believe that other countries are free to make their decisions democratically for themselves without interference or pressure from us. One might say that if a nation believes in nationalization of its basic industries it should not expect private investment. There is logic in such a position, but if such countries need foreign capital and if Communist nations are willing to participate in fulfilling such needs, we are hurting our best interests by failing or refusing to be helpful.

Difficulties more often stem from the fact that private investors shy away from any investment in a country which has nationalized some of its industries. This problem poses a serious challenge to our Government as well as to our industrial and financial leaders. We just cannot expect free countries whose economic ideologies vary from ours to change their basic concepts and conform to the United States pattern in the hope that private investment will be forthcoming. In a way, there is a vicious circle involved. The less foreign investment, the more tendency toward nationalization, and this in turn precludes or narrows opportunities for private investment. I emphasize the fact that this is not a simple problem, because too often in the past some of our Government and business leaders have stated irresponsibly and without adequate thought that the problem of providing capital abroad is one exclusively for private solution.

All these problems are not posed for the purpose of concluding that private foreign investment is hopeless as a means of accelerating the development of the less advanced countries. Quite the contrary—they are presented with the thought that their recognition is a prerequisite to solution. In other words, we must understand that private investment has not played a sufficiently large role, and that there are serious impediments which we must try to overcome.

Private investment is important not only because it brings private capital; it also normally brings knowledge and responsibility for management and training. It is very important to provide the undeveloped countries with both know-how and capital. A combination of public capital plus management contracts would perhaps be the next most desirable substitute for a combination of private capital and private management. If American industry cannot be induced to undertake more foreign investment, then operating companies should be more willing to undertake management contracts, particularly where they do not pro-

vide capital but receive adequate compensation, including perhaps profit participation.

PUBLIC INVESTMENT BASIC

There is a very basic relationship between public and private investment. Just as those who are inclined to ignore completely the role of private investment are in error, so I believe that those who seem to think that the entire solution lies in private investment are unrealistic. Recognizing its desirability and importance, it is my conviction that public investment at this stage must play a more important role and must, in a sense, lay the groundwork for private investment.

We are inclined to take for granted—because they are so deeply imbedded in our society—the prerequisites on which the productivity of a society rests, such as a healthy, literate population and working force; a network of transport and communications; land reclamation and irrigation; basic power sources; distribution facilities to active and accessible markets. We are inclined to forget that these have been built up in our own country over many decades and at enormous cost, often directly by public capital or through generous incentives to private capital. Often these forms of investment do not yield an immediate and direct form of return. For this reason, among others, they may not be suitable investments for private capital, but they are necessary before there can be private investment on a large scale. This is the necessary role of foreign public capital, on a government-to-government basis or through international organizations.

In other words, the more intelligent and more constructive the job of increasing the flow of public capital, the more likely an increased flow of private capital in the years to come. Not only does this seem logical in time sequence, but (equally important) government can do much more to step up the flow of capital abroad by direct action than it can through assisting private investors. Therefore, without neglecting private investment and indeed striving to simulate it, our Government should now reappraise our whole foreign economic policy with respect to the foreign flow of public capital and give it the emphasis and support which it needs.

A CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

Before closing, may I make one final point. I should like to offer a challenge to the leaders of American industry, particularly to the larger companies which have the resources and the know-how to help spread the prosperity of America to countries which are still free and which want to remain free. We are all against communism, but it isn't enough to be merely vocal in this opposition. Those who have the technical ability and the financial capacity to carry on the fight for freedom under conditions of competitive coexistence ought to see clearly the need to use these resources to demonstrate that a free economy can help the underdeveloped countries far more than the Communist powers can.

American industry has not done enough in this economic fight against communism; it has not used any significant portion of its resources for this great purpose. If only a little of the time and talent and money spent for nonessential purposes by big business were devoted to sending more of its technicians abroad, to helping foreign enterprises increase their productivity, to providing equipment for some industries in underdeveloped countries, the prospects for winning the fight against communism would be much brighter. The money and the talent needed is insignificant compared with that which our industrial leaders have at their disposal. I hope that the great ingenuity and ability of American business leadership, as demonstrated by the growth of business in the United States, will somehow be directed toward this most serious problem of the middle of the 20th century.

Too Poor For Defense?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, we have been warned by the President of the United States that Soviet Russia and Red China continue to pose a serious threat to the free world. The threat is heightened by Soviet achievements in nuclear research, in technology, and in aircraft production. The air-atomic balance between the United States and the Soviet Union is stilting precariously, for us, in the direction of the Communist bloc in Europe and Asia. Marshal Bulganin has himself boasted that the Soviet armed forces would soon have an intercontinental ballistic missile. By now we should have learned that Soviet boasts usually precede by a narrow margin our own discovery, through intelligence channels, of Soviet accomplishments.

It was only a few years ago that Secretary of Defense Wilson pooh-poohed research as something that discovered why potatoes turn brown when they are cooked. Fortunately, Mr. Wilson was persuaded not to cancel all research being conducted by our armed forces, and after considerable unnecessary delay, we are now really getting somewhere in guided missile research and development.

Whether we are keeping up the production of manned aircraft and conventional weapons at a rate sufficient to insure our defense until we have better guided missiles, is another question. The answer is not reassuring. Soviet output is now far ahead of American output in 3 of the 4 major categories of combat aircraft, day fighters, night fighters, and long-range jet bombers. In fact, the only category in which they are not ahead of us is medium range jet bombers. We got a head start with our B–47, and still maintain a lead in the production of this type of plane, which is the backbone of our Strategic Air Command's striking force.

These facts have caused hardly a ripple in the American attitude toward defense, because of public ignorance and the failure of responsible officials to correct it. Fortunately, if no truthful announcements come from the Pentagon, they still leak to Congress and the public. The periodic reporting of Mr. Joseph Alsop and his brother, Mr. Stewart Alsop, help to correct the situation in respect to vital information, though admittedly no individual outside the Government can command the attention—with the authority—of an administration spokesman.

We have now had a report on the state of the Union. We await with eagerness the President's budget message. But we wait with foreboding. The Alsops tell us that "one of the great secret dramas of the struggle over this year's budget was caused by General LeMay's bold demand for an urgent program to produce no less than 1,900 B–52's" to replace the B–47 and to bring us up to Soviet production of their comparable Bison, which they are producing at the rate of 13 per month.

If the commanding general of the Strategic Air Command lost out in geting this recommendation into the budget, it need not follow that his recommendation be ignored in the appropriations bill for 1957 which it is the responsibility of this Congress to prepare. And an appropriation for these heavy bombers of true intercontinental range need not be omitted—unless the richest country in the world is still too poor to pay for its own defense.

Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues attention to two articles—the first of a series—by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, reporting current changes in the balance of strength between the U. S. S. R. and the United States of America. These articles appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 2 and 4, 1956, and have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON. They appear in the RECORD of January 9 on page 196. Every Member of Congress should read these articles.

Address Delivered by Senator Martin of Iowa Before the American Mining Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, on the 12th day of October last year I had the honor of addressing the American Mining Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADMINISTRATION REJECTS EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT THE HABANA CHARTER WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is again a great pleasuse for me to participate in this important panel discussion of the American Mining Congress on our strategic material and stockpile policies. As I have told you before, Iowa is not a mineral producing area and my concern with the production of minerals arises solely from my interest in our national defense.

Before entering the United States Senate, for 16 years I was a Member of the House of Representatives and my committee assignments in the House were the Armed Services Committee responsible for legislation concerning the strategic stockpile, and the Ways and Means Committee which writes our tariff laws. This experience has given me certain very definite views regarding those policies which will promote our security, and conversely, the basis for opposing schemes which have been promoted over a period of many years which can seriously weaken our economy and our position of world leadership.

Last year when I appeared before you I discussed proposals then pending in the

United Nations to implement parts of the rejected Habana Charter for an international trade organization. Let me briefly review this rejected Habana Charter.

The original proposals which led to this draft charter were developed within our own State Department. They included provisions for establishing what in effect were world antitrust laws to deal with so-called restrictive business practices and for the establishment of intergovernmental commodity agreements. Commodity agreements by their very nature impose restrictions on both producers and consumers. Many different kinds of agreements have been proposed, some of which involve buffer stocks. Agreements have also been suggested to establish a just and equitable relationship between the prices of raw materials and manufactured goods. The difficulty immediately arises as to how one shall define the words "just and equitable" in an international agreement. The long term effect of all of these proposals is to allocate materials and fix their prices through an elaborate system of Government controls.

The Habana Charter was submitted to the Congress by President Truman. It was never approved. Late in 1950 President Truman assured us that he would not ask the Congress to again consider this document. But let us see what happened.

The United Nations Economic and Social Council proceeded to consider the charter chapter by chapter. Chapter VI of the Habana Charter, which dealt with international commodity agreements, was the basis for the establishment of the Interim Coordinating Committee for Intergovernmental Commodity Arrangements within the United Nations in 1947 and, more recently, the Commission on International Commodity Trade. Chapter V, which provided for an international agreement to deal with restrictive business practices, in other words, world antitrust laws administered by the United Nations, was turned over to an ad hoc committee of the United Nations Economic and Social Council for study. The resolution establishing the ad hoc committee was sponsored by the United States Government under the Truman administration. Both of these proposals were under active consideration when I appeared before you a year ago.

A great deal has taken place in the intervening 12 months, and I am very proud of the manner in which the administration has extricated itself from the problems which it inherited from the Truman-Acheson regime. While the United Nations Commission on International Commodity Trade, the group concerned with commodity agreements, was established in spite of United States opposition, our Government has refused to participate in the work of this Commission. The United States representative at the meeting of the Economic and Social Council at Geneva this summer requested the Council to elect another government to our place on the Commission as we had definitely made up our minds not to participate in its work. Let me read from the statement of the alternate United States representative to the Council, Nat King:

"Our views with respect to the Commission on International Commodity Trade are well known and were expressed at the 18th session of the Council and also in comment submitted to the Secretary-General. Nothing has occurred since then to cause us to change our point of view.

"As the committee is aware, my Government has not occupied the seat on the Commission to which it was elected. We continue to question seriously whether the Commission can contribute significantly to the solution of international commodity problems. After most careful consideration, we have regretfully reached the conclusion that we will not find it possible to participate in the work of the Commission. Accordingly, my Government would welcome the election of some other government on the Commission in its place."

This disposes of the commodity agreement problem and chapter VI of the charter for the present.

The agenda of the United Nations Economic and Social Council this year also included the question of approving a proposed agreement to implement chapter V of the charter dealing with so-called restrictive business practices. This agreement had been drafted by the so-called ad hoc committee established in accordance with a United States sponsored resolution by the United Nations Economic and Social Council in 1951.

The statement of the United States in rejecting this agreement was forthright. I shall read two paragraphs which completely express the philosophy of this administration.

"The elimination of harmful restraints on international trade and the furthering of the development of free competitive enterprise continue to be basic objectives of this country's economic policy. In the present circumstances, however, the endeavor to effectuate a plan of international cooperation along the lines envisaged by the current proposals might well prejudice rather than promote the attainment of these objectives.

"It is, therefore, the opinion of the United States Government that present emphasis should be given not to international organizational machinery but rather to the more fundamental need of further developing effective national programs to deal with restrictive business practices, and of achieving a greater degree of comparability in the policies and practices of all nations in their approach to the subject."

Let me congratulate the mining industry on your good fortune that Herbert Hoover, Jr., a mining engineer, the son of one of our most distinguished mining engineers, is the Under Secretary of State and has helped to develop these policies in the Department. You are also fortunate in having the real problems of the industry constantly brought before the Cabinet by Secretary Wormser who has also spent his entire life in your industry.

Within the past month the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary conducted hearings to determine why this administration rejected the proposed agreement on restrictive business practices. The only witness who appeared in favor of the United States adherence to this proposed agreement was Sigmund Timberg, who had served as Secretary of the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee. He expressed his deep concern at the rejection of his handiwork by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles. For many years prior to 1951 he was an official of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in the Truman administration. A review of the history of the antitrust cases brought by the Truman administration in the middle 1940's shows that the Department of Justice was trying to secure jurisdiction over enterprises operating in foreign countries and this jurisdiction had been repudiated by courts in Canada and in the United Kingdom. These circumstances account for Mr. Timberg's desire to remake the world so that he could carry out his pet theories of antitrust enforcement.

A distinguished lawyer specializing in antitrust and international law, Mr. William Dwight Whitney of New York, formerly a Special Assistant to the Attorney General in the Antitrust Division, in his appearance before the subcommittee, made the following comment with respect to the philosophy of Mr. Timberg which I regard as most illuminating. He said:

"The point I think is being lost sight of is that you must have in a nation, and we must have in our Nation, two types of jurisdiction: jurisdiction over the person of the defendant, and jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action, over what happened.

"Now, all our recent cases that I am criticizing talk only about jurisdiction over the person, whether you can catch the person or, as one of the judges said, whether you can lay hold of him. The word 'catch' is in one of the opinions, too.

"I noticed yesterday in a very learned and brilliant presentation by Mr. Timberg, who ought to know something about this because he was in the Department of Justice all during the period when, I think, our law went wrong, talked about jurisdiction over the person, and his report discusses it, under the general title of 'jurisdiction,' but he never makes any reference at all to the jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action.

"Now, it is there that we intrude into the territorial sovereignty of foreign nations."

An analysis of the testimony before the subcommittee confirms all of the fears which I have expressed on numerous occasions during the past year regarding this proposed agreement.

The position of the administration in rejecting the proposed agreement was explained at these hearings by Mr. David C. Murchison, who for the past 2½ years served as legal adviser and assistant to the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. In addition, he served as an adviser to the United States delegation to the United Nations Economic and Social Council at those sessions devoted to considering the report of this Ad Hoc Committee.

The proposed agreement would have established a tribunal to determine what practices were restrictive and had harmful effects on the expansion of production or trade. Mr. Murchison pointed out that member nations will implement the tribunal's decisions under this proposed agreement "in accordance with their respective laws and procedures." He thus showed that:

"The agreement would therefore apply only to countries having antitrust laws and enforcement programs, principally to enterprises located in the United States, Canada, and possibly, to a lesser degree, in the United Kingdom."

This agreement by its very nature is discriminatory and favors enterprises in countries without antitrust laws as against American enterprises.

The agreement also discriminates in favor of public enterprises as compared with private enterprises. Mr. Murchison said:

"For example, dual standards for investigative activity are proposed. Public enterprises are at the outset given recourse to a 'consultation procedure' in the event complaints are lodged against them. Private concerns, on the other hand, are immediately made subject to the tribunal's investigative procedures and the provisions relating to publicity.

"Furthermore, under the terms of the proposed agreement, complaints against a State-owned or controlled enterprise cannot be filed except by governments. Complaints against private concerns, however, can be filed by individuals or private groups."

I cite these remarks of Mr. Murchison because they summarize so many of the points which I have discussed on other occasions, and which have been the subject of addresses and papers by distinguished lawyers who are experts in this field.

Now let me review Mr. Timberg's statement before the subcommittee and rebut some of the points which he made. Mr. Timberg said:

"The difficulty of establishing personal service explains why so many international cartel cases involve foreign coconspirators who are not joined as defendants. For example, in the General Electric case, all of General Electric's German, English, and other foreign cartel associates, with the exception of a Dutch firm that had established a fac-

tory in the United States during World War II, were immune from suit. The selective enforcement of the Sherman Act against foreign businesses that happen to get 'caught within the jurisdiction' pleases neither the United States defendants, nor the hapless foreign defendant, nor the antitrust enforcement authorities.

"* * * Difficulties in obtaining evidence: The second main obstacle is that of getting the evidence which will establish the antitrust violation. It is difficult and often impossible to obtain, by the use of American judicial process, business records located in a foreign country. The location of such records at a distance from the United States increases their unavailability, and facilitates their concealment.

"Moreover, national feelings are aroused in the process. When the Department of Justice some years ago tried to subpena Canadian records in connection with a newsprint investigation, the Province of Ontario enacted a statute making it a criminal offense to send any corporate records out of the jurisdiction in response to the request of any judicial, legislative, or administrative body of another country. This, of course, is an extreme example of the kind of resistance which one might expect abroad to an American court subpena. The more usual type of governmental protest is that which was registered in the Oil Cartel case."

Mr. Timberg has become so obsessed with the problems of establishing personal service and in obtaining evidence in foreign countries that he is quite willing to compromise our own sovereignty and permit an international agency to effectively exercise jurisdiction over United States nationals if such a device would permit him to secure remedies which he thinks justified in specific cases.

I was amazed at the following statement by Mr. Timberg:

"Also, business records and statistics in foreign countries are generally not as comprehensive as in the United States, and may be so different in nature from those in this country as to be unreliable indicators of the business and economic facts relevant to antitrust violation.

"Last, the mere factor of geographic distance and transportation expense impedes the securing of relevant information, which frequently depends on the testimony of witnesses as well as on the existence of business records."

I do not quite see how a United Nations organization could assist in improving business records and statistics in foreign countries unless all semblance of national sovereignty is to be done away with.

Let me emphatically state that I believe in our antitrust laws and support them wholeheartedly. I do so as I am convinced that competition under our American free-enterprise system has provided us with our standard of living and our position of world leadership.

Our Government's statement to the United Nations on the proposed agreement clearly shows the real difficulty in establishing an agreement on this subject. We can agree on a mechanism to grant jurisdiction, but no mechanism can establish substantive agreements on the contents of world antitrust laws. Our conception of the purpose of antitrust laws is completely different from that of the other countries who would presumably participate under the draft agreement. Therefore, an international agreement could not possibly be operative in a constructive manner but could only lead to confusion until comparability in our legal concepts was achieved.

Mr. Timberg not only is obsessed by the problem of obtaining jurisdiction in antitrust cases but he is also disturbed at the "unavailability of extraterritorial remedies." He said:

"Unavailability of extraterritorial remedies: Finally, assuming an airtight antitrust case, in which all the parties involved are properly served as defendants, there would still remain a final obstacle to success in antitrust enforcement—the securing of satisfactory relief. This is the most important of the points I have mentioned, since failure to achieve adequate relief makes any antitrust equity proceeding, however conclusively it establishes guilt, a waste of the Government's time and money.

"In international cartel cases effective relief may require that the court issue injunctions changing the foreign operations affecting the foreign businesses, or disposing of the foreign properties of the defendants. American judges are reluctant, however, to go as far as they would in domestic cases, because of doubts they have as to the extraterritorial scope of their own jurisdiction and because of legal and practical difficulties that they think the defendants will encounter abroad."

The paragraphs I have quoted clearly show Mr. Timberg believes that the findings of the United Nations body would have great weight and would be enforced, yet he testified to the subcommittee that:

"The U. N. draft agreement is an instrument of international cooperation, not a grant of international sovereignty. The agency which is to administer the agreement is not given any judicial, legislative, or other sovereign powers."

These two statements by Mr. Timberg are in direct conflict.

Mr. Timberg also said:

"The end result of the investigtaion of a particular complaint is the issuance, by the international investigating agency, of a report. This report examines, analyzes, and sets out the information received; determines whether the complained-of practice has had, has, or is about to have harmful effects within the meaning of the draft agreemnet; and makes recommendations in appropriate cases to the governments involved as to remedial measures (art. 3, pars. 6, 7, and 8; art. 15, pars. 4, 5, and 6; art. 16; art. 17; par. 52 of the ad hoc committee's report). The report by itself has no sanction except the informal one of publicity."

Adverse publicity for an American enterprise through the course of an investigation brought by this United Nations body could have damaging effects not only on the enterprise concerned but also on the international position of our Government. Let us not forget that it would be expecting too much of human nature for such an agency not to be used as a political instrument by many nations.

Mr. Timberg testified further that:

"However, governments adhering to the draft agreement are obligated to supply the information needed by the agency; to take appropriate action to implement the remedial measures recommended to them by the agency; and to keep the agency posted on their compliance.

"As stated earlier, governments adhering to the draft agreement are obligated to adopt investigative measures that will enable them to supply the international agency with the information needed to analyze complaints of restrictive business practices and to make intelligent recommendations. They also bind themselves to make adequate provision in their legal system for putting the agency's remedial recommendations into operation. They undertake to keep the international agency posted on their compliance with the agency's recommendations. Moreover, under the agreement, diverse national conceptions of 'harmful effect' are harmonized in a uniform standard."

Mr. Timberg is, in effect, proposing that this Government bind itself by a treaty to adopt whatever legal provisions are necessary to put the United Nations proposed agency's recommendations into operation.

Mr. Timberg states "* * * diverse national conceptions of 'harmful effect' are harmonized in a uniform standard." My examination of the draft agreement fails to disclose any standards whatsoever. The pargraphs I have quoted from Mr. Timberg's testimony clearly indicate that countries adhering to this agreement would delegate judicial and executive powers to this new international agency. Yet, Mr. Timberg again said:

"The international agency which would administer the draft agreement is an instrumantality of international cooperation, not an organ with sovereign judicial, legislative, or executive powers. This is a necessary concession to national sovereignty."

I am glad he still feels it necessary to make concessions to national sovereignty. This statement is, however, followed with another indication that the recommendations of the United Nations body would be enforced. He said:

"The tangible outcome of the agency's activity is an advisory report (like a Federal Trade Commission report) analyzing the facts and recommending remedial measures. However, there are assurances in the draft agreement that the analysis will be heeded and the recommendations complied with. Those assurances are to be found, first, in the specific obligations of governments to cooperate in the work of the agency, which have just been set forth, and second, in the publicity that the agency's reports will receive."

Let us go back and review the mechanics of how these recommendations to which Mr. Timberg refers would be made. The proposed agreement would establish a United Nations agency to administer the agreement. Its powers would be exercised by a representative body. Article 10 of the draft agreement provides as follows:

"The representative body shall consist of all members of the agency. Each member shall have one representative in the representative body. * * *

"Each member shall have one vote in the representative body."

In other words, if all the countries in the United Nations adhered to this proposed agreement there would be more than 60 members of the representative body embracing every form of economics from Russian communism to American free enterprise.

Article 10 also provides that:

"The representative body shall establish its rules of procedure. * * *

"The powers and duties attributed to the agency by this agreement and the final authority to determine the policies of the agency shall be vested in the representative body."

The authors of the agreement realized that such a group would be too unwieldly, so they provide in article 13 of the agreement for an advisory staff. Now let me quote from article 13:

"The chief advisory officer of the agency shall be the director of the advisory staff. He shall be appointed by the representative body and be subject to its general supervision.

"In accordance with any rules laid down by the representative body, the director shall select the advisory staff and any necessary consultants to it."

In other words, this one individual, the director of the advisory staff, for all intents and purposes, is the agency. This is clearly shown in articles 15 and 16 of the agreement which deal with the functions of the advisory staff.

"Pursuant to policies and rules prescribed by the representative body, the advisory staff shall (a) perform the functions set out in the following paragraphs of this article and (b) advise the representative body, subject to any limitations established by that body.

"After the executive secretary has collected information relating to a complaint in pursuance of the relevant provisions of article 3, and has transmitted it to the director of the advisory staff, the director shall arrange for the analysis of the information and for the preparation of a report by the advisory staff.

"The report of the advisory staff shall set out the facts established by the information aforesaid, together with such analysis of their effects and significance in relations to the objectives of the agreement as may assist the representative body in carrying out the duties laid on it by the agreement.

"When, in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 8, the representative body shall have arranged for the collection of information from members, all such information collected by the executive secretary shall be transmitted to the directory of the advisory staff who shall arrange for its analysis and for the preparation of a report in accordance with paragraph 4 of this article.

"Reports by the advisory staff shall be submitted to the representative body."

Paragraph 1 of article 16 provides that:

"The representative body, in carrying out the duties laid on it by this agreement, shall take full account of reports of the advisory staff."

Actually this agreement would entrust one individual, the director of the advisory staff, who might be a Russian Communist, a European Socialist, or an American capitalist with fantastic powers over the entire economy of the world.

It is quite obvious that Mr. Timberg feels that he is qualified for this assignment and he undoubtedly believes that the members of the Ad Hoc Committee who served with him are similarly qualified. In his testimony before the subcommittee he discussed the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee as follows:

"The chairman of the committee was a leading name Swedish economist and industry advisor and author of an outstanding study on 'Growth and Stagnation in the European Economy,' and is now a member of the Freedom of Commerce Board, an official Swedish antitrust agency established in 1953. The vice-chairman of the committee was Chairman of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, and is now Uruguay's Minister to Sweden. The acting chairman, who presided over 2 of its 4 long sessions, was in the highest level of the Belgian Government and administered some of Belgium's most important economic policies. Canada was represented by the head of its antitrust department, and this country by the Chief Economist of the Federal Trade Commission (Corwin Edwards). France's representative is now the United Nations Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. The other countries were represented by officials who had important responsibilities in connection with foreign trade, such as Commercial Counselor, Consul General or within the Board of Trade or Foreign Offices of their respective countries. All personal representatives operated under specific instructions from their national governments.

"I have gone into the composition of the United Nations Committee in some detail, because the draft articles of agreement relating to the administration of the United Nations proposals was the work of this talented group."

It is significant that none of these people would be the type of individual selected for apointment to high judicial office in the United States or qualified for an appointment to the International Court of Justice. They are political economists—not judges.

Mr. Timberg recognized that the reputation of individual firms and "national prestige" might be hurt by the investigative procedure even though the investigation later proved them blameless. In discussing the membership of the Ad Hoc Committee he said:

"Such a committee, composed preponderantly of representatives from industrial countries, could hardly fail to be aware of the fact that vital trading and economic interests were involved; that commercial interests and national prestige could be needlessly damaged by irresponsible or politically motivated complaints or publicity; and that there were risks in allowing countries with a small share in world trade to control international policies in this delicate area."

Mr. Timberg's only protection against these admitted problems is the integrity of his advisory staff. He said:

"It (the Ad Hoc Committee) therefore sought to safeguard against these contingencies by making various organizational and procedural recommendations, concerning such matters as independence, impartiality and competence on the part of the personnel that would administer the proposed program of international cooperation, the role to be played by countries of chief economic importance in international trade, and fair procedures for investigating the facts and reviewing and publicizing reports."

"The situation under the draft agreement seems to me analogous to that whereby the report of an administrative commission is prepared in this country; a qualified and nonpartisan staff prepares the original draft of the report, which is then reviewed by a politically responsible and responsive commission."

Let us remember that the advisory staff is a creature of the representative body. It is difficult for me to conceive of the so-called representative body, consisting of some 60 nations, as a "politically responsible and responsive commission" to deal fairly with the problems of an American enterprise submitted to its jurisdiction.

The representative body by its very nature is a political organization. Mr. Timberg in discussing the role of the representative body said:

"It is my observation that, on the international as well as national scene, there is a cooperative interaction between the policy makers and the research staff. National representatives as well as politically appointed commissioners, are concerned with major policy matters and accept to a surprising extent the work of their staff. Perceptive staff work helps smooth out the difficulties, and reconcile the differences, of the more politically oriented international representative body or national commission."

A "politically oriented international representative body, or a national commission" should not be entrusted to make decisions affecting the well-being of our entire economy.

Let us assume that an action was started against an American enterprise and the enterprise was found guilty of restrictive business practices by the director of the advisory staff. Let us for the purpose of argument also assume that the United States representative on the representative body did not believe the complaint justified. He would have 1 vote out of some 60 votes, and would be required to adopt the usual United Nations procedure of lobbying for votes among the other representatives in order to reverse the findings of this one man who heads the advisory staff. Such a procedure is not conducive to the success of the United Nations or to American prestige therein. Furthermore, if he is unable to reverse the staff which would probably be the case in view of the composition of the representative body, we would then be bound by treaty to implement the findings of the staff. I can think of no more impossible situation.

Let us examine the terms of references under which these judgments would be made. In his appearance before the subcommittee Mr. Timberg said, and I quote:

"Definition of restrictive business practices: The draft agreement prepared by the U. N. committee deals with restrictive business practices, which are defined as 'business practices affecting international trade which restrain competition, limit access to markets, or foster monopolistic controls' (art. 1, par. 1). Restrictive business practices are not only defined, but are specifically listed as embracing exclusion from markets or dividing markets, price fixing, price discrimination, limitations of production, and specific types of patent, trademark and copyright abuse (art. 1, par. 3). This enumeration seems to me to cover adequately the main areas to which this country's enforcement of the Sherman Act in international trade has in the past been directed."

Upon examination of the draft charter, I find the practices enumerated by Mr. Timberg are listed in article 1, paragraph 3. While Mr. Timberg refers to specific types of patent abuse in his testimony, I find upon reading article 1, paragraph 3 of the agreement, that the practices affecting patents and technology are far broader than Mr. Timberg stated. Article 1, paragraph 3, subparagraph (e) reads as follows:

"Preventing by agreement of coercion the development or application of technology or invention whether patented or unpatented, or withholding the application of such technology with the result of monopolizing an industrial or commercial field."

In other words, the withholding of technology by an American enterprise or perhaps even our own Government could be the basis of a complaint to the United Nations agency that a restrictive business practice was taking place. The entire patent system is placed in jeopardy by this proposal.

Mr. Timberg, however, neglected to mention all of paragraph 3. I am startled by subparagraph 3 (g) which reads as follows:

"(g) Any similar practices which the organization may declare, by a majority of two-thirds of the members present and voting, to be restrictive business practices."

In other words, this agreement proposes that we write the antitrust laws as we go along by a two-thirds vote of the members of the representative body who happen to be present. Mr. Timberg's friends will then determine what they mean. This is hardly in keeping with American concepts of jurisprudence. Mr. Murchison's testimony meets these issues squarely. He said:

"There are many other defects in the concept underlying the agreement. For instance, the draft agreement's lack of provision for the selection of independent, impartial judges to pass upon matters brought before the tribunal is glaringly apparent. Use of the term 'representative body' to describe the tribunal should not obscure the fact that it would perform functions basically judicial in nature, indeed, very similar to those performed by the Federal Trade Commission in this country. It would seem essential, especially in the field of business practices, for voting members of the tribunal to make their decisions impartially and on a record, rather than as representatives of a particular government or interest."

Again let us examine the agreement to see how a respondent in a complaint would be treated. Article 15, paragraph 3 provides:

"3. The director of the advisory staff shall arrange for opportunities to be given in accordance with paragraph 5 of article 3, for any member or any person, enterprise, or organization on whose behalf the complaint has been made, or any commercial enterprise alleged to have engaged in the practice complained of, to be heard by the advisory staff: *Provided, however,* That the representative body in its discretion may afford opportunities for such persons to be heard by it after it has received the report of the advisory staff."

Mr. Murchison in his testimony on this point said:

"There is a perceptible lack of basic procedural safeguards governing the operation of the tribunal. No provision is made concerning the rights of parties appearing before it. These rights, which are commonly accepted in the English-speaking countries, and considered essential in our own, should certainly include the opportunity to be represented by counsel, to examine, cross-examine, and reexamine witnesses, and the like."

I think I have pointed out enough of the contradictions in Mr. Timberg's tetimony and inconsistencies with American concepts of fair play and Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence to fully justify the position of our Government in rejecting the draft agreement. The amazing thing to me is that the ad hoc committee was established in the first place by a resolution introduced in the United Nations by this Government under the Truman administration to implement Mr. Timberg's pet ideas.

I am sure you cannot fully appreiate the difficulties you have been spared by our Government's rejection of this agreement. Mr. Timberg's statement exposed one of the implications of the draft agreement to the mining industry which is rather startling. After stating to the subcommittee that the proposed agreement on world antitrust laws did not give any judicial powers to the United Nations, Mr. Timberg endeavored to explain how the agreement would work with a hypothetical situation. His hypothetical case is one which directly involves everyone in this room and I want to read from his testimony. This is what he said:

"Let us assume that the General Services Administration was involved in an alleged restrictive practice in the importation of some critical material from a foreign country. First, a complaining government would have to bring its complaint in its own behalf, and not merely in behalf of its nationals. Second, the complaining government would have to take the matter up in the first instance on an informal basis with the United States Government, which controls the General Services Administration, so as to exhaust the possibilities of rectifying the situation expeditiously and without fanfare. In cases involving complaints against private enterprises, governments may (but are not required to) resort to such informal consultations. Once informal consultations fail, a complaint against a public enterprise is handled exactly as is one against a private enterprise."

The Cabinet Committee on Minerals Policy, whose program Secretary Wormser has outlined, recommended that all stockpile objectives be reviewed and new long-term objectives established to reduce and wherever possible eliminate foreseeable wartime shortages. The Cabinet Committee specifically stated with respect to the materials required to meet the new long-term objectives that "in making purchases preference should be given to newly mined metals and minerals of domestic origin." This is the kind of restrictive practice engaged in by the General Services Administration which Mr. Timberg would like to submit to the United Nations.

Mr. Murchison paid a tribute to the State Department under the Eisenhower administration in his appearance which I heartily endorse. He said:

"Fortunately, the United States delegation to the Economic and Social Council in 1955 was well aware of this background. Headed by Preston Hotchkis, and assisted by such able persons as Mr. Joseph C. Hickingbotham, Mr. Nat King, and others in the Department of State, the delegation reversed our Government's earlier stand and opposed the recommendations contained in the report. This turnabout was a difficult diplomatic operation, and Mr. Hotchkis and the entire Department of State should be commended for the admirable way the matter was handled. United States opposition to international machinery of the type recommended was firmly and clearly stated. As a result, the resolution adopted at the close of the May 1955 session of the Council did not approve the report."

Mr. Timberg's testimony clearly shows that he has no understanding of American constitutional government with its division of powers between the executive, judicial, and legislative branches. He suggested to the subcommittee an amendment to the antitrust laws, and again I shall read from his testimony:

"My third suggestion is that the Congress enact legislation whereby antitrust violators, whose practices have excluded competition or raised prices and whose product is protected by a tariff, may, in appropriate circumstances, lose the benefit, in whole or in part, of that tariff."

If we ever start writing our laws by permitting the judicial branch of the Government to invoke changes in the law as a penalty we are in for very serious trouble. The House Ways and Means Committee under our Constitution is responsible for initating all tariff legislation. As a former member, I am qualified to label this proposal as fantastic.

As you know, the development of a sound stockpile policy and tariff legislation have occupied my thoughts for many many years and you can understand why I take a very dim view of Mr. Timberg's proposals.

History reminds us of the famous quotation that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." At present the fires are out on agreements dealing with restrictive business practices and commodity agreements under United Nations auspices. However, the appearance within the past month of Mr. Timberg before this subcommitte shows that the concepts are not dead.

This group representing the leadership of the entire mining industry must support your Government officials who have been carrying on this fight and you must make certain that this policy is never reversed by any future administration which may be less dedicated to free enterprise concepts than President Eisenhower.

More About Our Declining Strength

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the press of the Nation two articles by Mr. Joseph Alsop and Mr. Stewart Alsop, pointing out that the only reason we do not have military strength equal to that of the Communist countries is our unwillingness to spend the money to provide that strength—to spend money on research, first, and on the production of the new weapons research gives us. Meanwhile the Russians move rapidly ahead, building up a modern air force not merely equal to ours but in many ways better.

Today, I refer to another in the series of brilliant articles the Alsop brothers are publishing in an effort to awaken Americans to the danger which is being hidden from them with all the skill and the talents the Pentagon can command.

The rates of production of advanced aircraft types shows the Soviets well ahead of us in the buildup of their air force. The difference in the rates shows the Soviets steadily forging further ahead in numbers and in strength. About the time we expect to have our 137-wing Air Force fully equipped, in 1957, the Soviets' strategic air force will be able to deliver a punch of which our own Strategic Air Command will be incapable. Today we are fully capable of building long-range B–52's which do not require overseas bases for combat operations, but we are gambling on the future use of overseas bases by medium-range bombers. If Russia strikes us, it will be from her own bases, and with long-range aircraft excelling in number our own B–52's. General LeMay's request for an urgent program to provide 1,900 B–52's was rejected, for budgetary and therefore political reasons.

Mr. Speaker, our strength is being overtaken rapidly, and declining needlessly; and the danger is that in a campaign year, politics will be played even more furiously with the vital problem of national defense. The American people need as never before to be fully informed of what is happening. Their own survival is at stake. I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an insertion in the RECORD of January 9, page 197, by the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, of the third article by the Alsops in this stimulating but disheartening report on our declining strength. Every Member of Congress should read these articles.

Communist Tactics in the Near East and Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in a recent powerful address President Meany of the newly merged A. F. of L. and CIO made the following statement:

This conflict between communism and freedom is the problem of our time. It overshadows all other problems. This conflict mirrors our age, its toils, its tensions, its troubles, and its tasks. On the outcome of this conflict depends the future of all mankind. I pray that, on the threshold of the atomic age, we—all of the free world—can muster the moral courage and total strength to preserve the peace and promote the freedom of the men and women of every continent, color, and creed.

We should all share these sentiments.

I returned just before Christmas from an official study mission with 6 other Members of the House which covered more than 30,000 miles by air in just under 10 weeks. The trip made it possible to exchange views with outstanding national figures as well as United States representatives in each of more than 24 countries visited in the Near East and Asia.

During the trip an attempt was constantly made to evaluate the extent of Communist influence, the amount of neutralism and the impact of the United States policy and programs in each of the countries visited.

Nowhere in the area visited was there any evidence whatsoever of any change in the fundamental objectives of strategy of the Communist world.

On the contrary, there was evidence all along the line of persistent Communist activities reflected in infiltration, promises, propaganda, and subversion.

Perhaps we should thank Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev for making the facts crystal clear—for giving the world their real interpretation of the spirit of Geneva.

It is impossible to view the picture in Asia as a whole except against the background of the tragic policies of years gone by which made it possible—policies helping the Kremlin to establish its control directly or indirectly over 800 millions of people, one-third of the population of the world—policies making impossible a military victory in Korea when it lay within our grasp, with the resulting enormous loss of prestige.

Once again come to mind the famous words of General MacArthur, when he said:

Allowing the Communists to grow to power was the greatest political blunder in a hundred years, and one for which this Nation will pay for a century to come.

The free world has made great progress since that day.

We have seen, among other things, the organization of NATO with its 15 members; of the Baltic Pact with its 3 members; of the Bagdad Pact with its 5 members; of the SEATO Pact with its 8 members, and of pacts with our many friendly nations in the Western Hemisphere.

We have seen also the pact of Paris and the admission of Western Germany into NATO; the independence of Austria; the adjustment of important problems in Egypt, Iran, and Trieste.

We have seen the creation of enormous offensive and defensive military power at home.

Fully adequate—

According to Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—

to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and to permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary,

America and its allies have met with great success in terms of our military programs. By a policy of collective security based on military strength we have compelled the Communist world to abandon military aggression for the time being.

We are now confronted by a shift in tactics on the part of the Kremlin. The emphasis now is in the nonmilitary field and on tactics referred to by the President in his message on the state of the Union as the tactics of "division, enticement, and duplicity." These tactics were in evidence pretty generally throughout our trip, particularly in Asia.

Wherever there is friction or disagreement within a nation or between nations the Communist policy of division does everything possible to accentuate the trouble.

This policy was apparent, for example, in the differences between Greece and Turkey, arising out of the Cyprus problem; in the differences between the Arab States and Israel, and between the Arab States themselves; in the differences between Afghanistan and India on the one hand and Pakistan on the other; and in the differences in southeast Asia.

In country after country the Communists were making every effort to infiltrate, particularly into schools and labor organizations; to form cells; to promise anything and everything that might contribute to the desired end, and to weaken and subvert with a view to finally taking over and organizing.

It was heartening in the light of these activities in the nonmilitary field to talk with outstanding and courageous free-world leaders such as President Magsaysay, of the Philippine Islands; President Chiang Kai-shek, of Nationalist China; President Syngman Rhee, of South Korea, and others standing stalwartly against the pressures of the Communist world.

The tide of any struggle ebbs and flows. At the moment in this campaign for the minds and hearts of men in the part of the world which we visited, particularly in Asia, the tide is not running in favor of the free world. It is running against us.

The new Communist tactics, which can become as dangerous as those of military aggression, have been gaining ground, and the trend is important, because as in other campaigns there are those who want to ride on the winning bandwagon.

If the trend is to swing our way, if Communist infiltration and subversion are to be halted, the free world must develop as much power, firmness, and effectiveness in its nonmilitary programs as it has developed in its military programs.

A policy based on strength will build confidence among our friends. A policy based on strength will appeal to those nations who are today neutral. A policy based on strength is the only policy which the Communist world understands.

No campaign was ever won on the defensive. The free world must take the initiative. Its policy must be dynamic.

We must, of course, do our utmost to help settle outstanding problems such as those in the Near East, which, however important to those primarily concerned, from the overall point of view, play directly into the hands of the Kremlin.

We must do what we can to eliminate the threat posed by infiltration and subversion in its early stages.

We must work with and stand by our friends.

The Kremlin does not want war. It will respond in the future, as in the past, to a policy based on strength.

Under the outstanding leadership of President Eisenhower and other free world leaders I am confident that we shall meet the new tactics of the Communist world in the nonmilitary field just as we have met their previous tactics in the field of military aggression.

Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, California, Before the Economic Club of New York

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I made last evening at the Economic Club of New York.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members, and guests of the Economic Club, Americans, regardless of their party affiliation, are pleased to have noted the excellent progress toward recovery that President Eisenhower has made and the fact that he is once again able to resume his duties in the Nation's Capital.

The President has already sent the state of the Union, the agriculture, education, and the budget messages to the Congress. All of these documents have recommendations of great importance to our national life.

Now the 84th Congress as the constitutional repository of the legislative power will determine how much of the recommended program will be adopted and in what final form.

Events may take place this year in Europe, Asia, Africa, in the Western Hemisphere, or in the Middle East that could set off a chain reaction of far-reaching significance.

It is important that in this year when political tensions may mount at home and international stresses may take place abroad, that all those in Government should speak with responsibility and with the knowledge that what is said may be distorted to serve the purposes of those who would destroy human freedom throughout the world.

Yet, in a free Republic it is equally important that those in Government speak with frankness. The American electoral result of 1956 may be one of the great decisive events of modern history.

Our international relations have a great impact on our domestic economy as well as upon other nations. Foreign policy is too important to be left to Government alone. It is of concern to 165 million Americans.

The age of colonialism is dead. Our own excellent record in the Philippines and elsewhere has been marred by impressions in Asia and the Middle East that we have allowed ourselves to be compromised by association with the colonial policies of Great Britain and France.

Countries could understand us better with our noncolonial record in the Philippines and Cuba and our own successful fight for independence if we would say frankly that our foreign policy is based on what is best for America.

They know we seek no territory and that we have an intuitive national conviction that our own survival as a free nation will be better served by assuring a free world of free men that by any system which at-

tempts to hold the loyalty of people by force of armed power and against their national will.

In 1858 a young and growing nation faced a great issue of principle over the expansion of slavery beyond its then limits. Abraham Lincoln, at that time a candidate for the United States Senate, said:

"If we could first know where we are, and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it."

Our aim should be to live in peace with all nations, but to pay tribute to none.

Our desire is for a system of international law and order based on peace with honor and justice.

A world in which small or large nations would have to live in fear of imminent violence or to buy a temporary respite by the payment of extortion is not the sort of existence that we or the other free peoples of the world are seeking.

A decade has passed since the conferences of Yalta and Potsdam, the end of World War II, and the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco.

Today as part of a series of discussions I intend to carry on in the Senate and throughout the country, I desire to review certain aspects of the problem that needs to be considered not only by the executive branch of the Government but by the Congress and the country as well.

In 1945 this Nation was the greatest military power in the world and was sole possessor, as the trustee of free men everywhere, of the atomic weapon. In order to help defeat the Axis Powers our resources had been placed at the disposal of our allies in Europe, Asia, and Africa in astronomical amounts which had no parallel in all recorded history.

From December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor until V-J Day in 1945 our Armed Forces had made a great contribution to the common effort and we suffered substantial casualties in helping to bring the war to a successful close.

In all of this mighty effort, costly in manpower and resources, we sought no territory and no reparations. The American people had reason to believe that the terms of the Atlantic Charter would be honored by us and we expected it to be respected by others.

America's prestige and power were high throughout the world. It was in that year, 1945, when we had the great opportunity to lay a firm foundation for human freedom and for a system of international law and order; for peace based on honor and justice.

When 1945 opened there were less than 200 million people behind the Communist Iron Curtain.

Now, just 10 years later, we are confronted with the following facts:

1. Over 900 million people are behind the Communist Iron Curtain and their totalitarian rulers are united in the common objective of making a Communist world.

2. Governments representing approximately 500 million people have determined to follow a neutralist course rather than to assume the responsibilities of an effective collective security system. They can afford this luxury because others have undertaken the necessary security burdens.

3. In the free world we have approximately 900 million people associated together in a series of interlocking mutual defense pacts. The United States of America appears to be the keystone to the arch, but the columns seem at times to be on shifting sands.

4. The United Nations on its major test as an effective collective security system during the Communist aggression in Korea (1950–53) had the following record:

A. Only 17 out of the then 60 members supplied any armed forces to resist the aggression.

B. The United States of America alone supplied 90 percent of the military forces furnished by the United Nations members and 95 percent of the resources to carry on the collective security action.

5. In the post-World War II period the United States has furnished over $52 billion in grants and loans to allies and former enemy nations.

6. We have a national debt of $280 billion and a budget of $65 billion. Our taxes, personal and corporate, are high and in some instances confiscatory in character. Many of our citizens have had to borrow funds to meet their income tax bills.

It is not my contention that all the virtues are in one political party or all the faults in the other. Members of both parties can fairly share part of the credit and assume part of the blame.

During the decade, 1945–55, the Democrats controlled the executive branch of the Government for 7 years while the Republicans have been in control for 3 years. The administration in power, of course, has the responsibility for the day-to-day formulation and direction of our foreign policy. In this same period the Democrats have had control of both the House and Senate for 6 years and the Republicans were in control for 4 years.

I refer to the past not for the purpose of opening old wounds or in any narrow partisan spirit, but with a deep conviction that in the 1955–65 decade the survival of our country may be at stake and with it the hope for a free world of free men.

As long as there is a strong America which stands for principles which free people and temporarily enslaved ones can understand and respect there is hope for mankind.

This strength is not primarily based on our material wealth though without it we could not support our own defense nor help others to help themselves.

Our real strength is the spirit and courage which under divine guidance, allowed a small colony of 3 million dedicated people to rise up and strike off the chains of colonialism despite the opposition of the mightiest empire of that day.

Our Revolutionary leaders represented the spirit of the song which states:

"Start me with 10 who are stout-hearted men and I will soon give you 10,000 more."

Whither are we tending? Will the next 10 years show the same progress of Marxian socialism? Is there any real indication that the Communist leopard has changed its spots? I believe not.

On July 28, 1955, in the Senate of the United States I said:

"Neither we nor the free world must lull ourselves into a 'Little Miss Red Riding Hood' belief that because the wolf has put on grandmother's cap and nightgown that his teeth are any less sharp or his intentions any less menacing."

President Eisenhower in a great desire to explore the possibility of a changed Soviet policy agreed to the meeting at the summit.

He also knew that a number of the allied governments as well as Members of Congress (including the distinguished Democratic Senator WALTER GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) had urged such a meeting.

The President made it clear that the acid test of Soviet intentions would come at the subsequent foreign ministers' meeting.

Results of that meeting clearly showed that the Soviet Union would not:

1. Agree to free elections throughout a free and sovereign Germany or permit a unification of Germany except on terms that would result in Communist domination of the whole country.

2. Support an adequate system of armament inspection of conventional weapons.

3. Consider the carrying out of their obligations under the Atlantic Charter to permit free elections in the captive nations of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Hungry, Esthonia, Roumania, Lithuania, Bulgaria and Albania.

4. Agree to effective safeguards in the matter of the control of atomic weapons.

Stripped of Communist double-talk their position was and is that tensions can only be released through the Soviet brand of "peaceful coexistence" which would be based on a permanent enslavement of the satellite states of Eastern Europe, a united but Communist Germany, the breaking up of the North Atlantic Alliance and the system of western defenses.

If there were any so naive, in or out of government at home or abroad, as to have believed that the Communist leopard had changed its spots such thoughts should have been dispelled by the reported statements of Khrushchev made at the dinner given on September 17th to the East German Communist Premier Grotewohl. He said:

"Anybody who takes our smile for withdrawal from the teachings of Karl Marx or Lenin is making a mistake.

"Those who expect this will have to wait until Easter Monday falls on Tuesday."

At a Moscow gathering of the Kremlin heirarchy Soviet First Deputy Premier Kaganovich on November 6, 1955, said:

"If the 19th century was a century of capitalism, the 20th century is a century of the triumph of socialism and communism."

But perhaps the clearest expression of Soviet immorality in dealing with other nations was expressed by the late Joseph Stalin:

"A diplomat's words must have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

The test of the accuracy of the Stalin diplomatic doctrine is demonstrated by the broken treaties and subjugated nations along the periphery of the Soviet Union: Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria; all had to learn the hard way.

Do vodka toasts change these words and modify these facts? They do not.

When the free nations of the world retreat from principle and embrace a "package deal" on membership that a short time ago they designated as "unadulterated blackmail," is not our moral position greatly weakened?

When the Republic of China, now reduced to the island of Formosa, and the off-shore islands, is told that if they exercise their veto under the United Nations charter they will likely lose their own membership, is not the conscience of free men troubled?

When the international court has ruled that a "package deal" is a violation of the United Nations charter and the ruling is ignored, is this not nullification of judicial processes?

Is the United Nations now to be governed by expediency instead of principle? At San Francisco in 1945 it was agreed that only qualified nations which assumed the obligations under the charter were eligible to membership. At New York in 1955 governments frankly recognized to be without such qualifications were taken in at the adamant insistence of the Soviet Union.

The final test will come later this year, probably after our national elections, as various members connive to bring Communist China into that organization.

Munich should have taught the world that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is only surrender on the installment plan.

Do not these events and contemplated actions bring to a focus the need for a reappraisal?

If it is not done by the executive department and the Congress it will be done on the Main Streets of America.

Can our economic system survive prolonged burdens of building a system of collective security and a system of neutralism at one and the same time?

If the neutralists are to receive the benefits and have none of the responsibilities of those in the collective defense system will not that act as an incentive plan to build up the fence sitters?

Certainly we should not endavor to remake the world in our political or economic image. We should recognize that neither personal nor international friendships can be purchased, they must be earned.

It is not and it should not be our policy to impinge upon the sovereignty of any nation. We do have a right and I believe a duty to point out as clearly as we can the dangers we believe are confronting free men everywhere.

We can and should point out that we and many of our associates have believed that our own survival and that of free men elsewhere depends upon an effective system of collective security. Whether or not any nation desires to join that system is for their government and their people to decide.

We could I believe properly point out that even the resources of this Nation are limited, that our people are bearing heavy burdens of debt and of taxes. We could point out that many worthwhile projects for the improvement of our own Nation have of necessity been held in abeyance because of the importance of helping rehabilitate the great damage and dislocation growing out of World War II.

We can and I believe should point out that in this country our growth and productivity has come because of the liberties guaranteed under our Constitution and our free economic system. American enterprise has supplied the taxes or the wages and dividends from which taxes are collected to carry in part the heavy burdens of the war and post-war period. The balance from deficit financing has added to the vast debt confronting ourselves and our children.

So that our own people and our friends abroad may understand the magnitude of this debt the following should be noted:

1. With principal payments of $1 billion a year (which was the total cost of all activities of the Federal Government in 1913) it would take 280 years to retire the national debt.

2. If we had started January 1, 1956, paying off on the debt at the rate of $1 million a day it would be the year 2725 before the last payment would be made. (A total of 769 years.)

We could and should point out I believe that in the event of disaster or famine our people, in the future as they have in the past, will generously respond to the relief of human distress and that in this aid there will be no political commitments expected or required of the nations and people we would be helping.

We can and we should point out I believe that we are prepared to help furnish, where requested, technical advice in the fields of public health, agriculture, education, or industry to help other free nations of the world in meeting their problems in these and similar fields.

We can also, I believe, point out that if the economic and political climate is made encouraging there is substantial private capital in this and other nations of the world that could help develop the natural resources, the transportation systems, and the industry of such countries as such investments helped to develop ours.

In this atomic and airplane age in which we now live this Nation can no more return to isolation than an adult can return to childhood.

An effective system of collective security will have to be created and maintained as long as the menace of aggressive communism continues.

In helping our associates who have demonstrated a willingness to do their utmost to help themselves, we will have substantial burdens. Within the policy of building an effective collective defense the President should have some flexibility in the allocation of funds appropriated by Congress.

But is it wise to continue to pour out billions of dollars of additional American aid over a prolonged period of time to nations:

1. That assume no collective security obligations for the preservation of human freedom, but desire to get all the advantages furnished by such a system on a free-ride basis?

2. That have made no reasonable effort to attract private capital to help develop their resources?

3. Whose leaders use their efforts to travel about the world attempting to seduce nations away from collective security into neutralism when such efforts coincide with present Soviet strategy?

As to the latter I recognize a sovereign right of any government or any people to choose the road of Fabian or Marxian socialism if that be their free choice. I question their right to expect or to get long-term government to government grants and loans which keep adding debt and tax burdens to the American free-enterprise camel to the point where its back is broken.

Every responsible man and woman at home and abroad must recognize that if the United States could be destroyed or impoverished by overt aggression from without, by political subversion from within, or by economic collapse, we would likely take the whole free world down with us.

There would then be no oasis of freedom to which those already enslaved might look for hope and there would be no international cornucopia upon which we might call for our own rehabilitation.

On these and other issues confronting us, men in and out of Government may honestly differ. In a free society there is room for such differences and there are certainly no pat solutions for the complex foreign and domestic problems that confront us.

But likewise in a free society it is important that these matters be brought into the open and that they be discussed.

It is my firm belief that if we win the cold war we can prevent a hot war from developing. I believe that this can best be done from a position of strength.

It is not now nor has it ever been my belief that we should have a "get tough policy."

On matters of principle I believe that we should be firm and should not yield principle for expediency. In the working out of the negotiable issues I think we should be reasonable in our attitudes and recognize that conditions change in the world and a policy which was wise 5 years ago or 1 year ago may need modification today.

But I do not believe that we should ever feel it necessary to apologize for either our political system or the economic system which has enabled this Nation to grow from a small colony of 3 million on the Atlantic seaboard to a great nation of 165 million, the most productive the world has ever known.

It is my personal belief that we would command more respect from our allies, from the neutrals, and from our potential enemies if we insisted on a fair quid pro quo for agreements entered into. We should stress the point that an alliance is of little value unless the other party has as much obligation to come to our defense in case of attack as we have to go to theirs.

As a Senator of the United States, as well as an American citizen, I have a deep conviction that if we of this generation will use the same courage and commonsense that motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and under what I believe was divine inspiration, gave us first our Declaration of Independence and later our Constitution of the United States, there are none of our great domestic problems which we as a free society cannot solve and there is no foreign foe we need ever fear.

The Air Force and the Defense of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on Friday, January 13, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, delivered an important and informative address in Oklahoma City to the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce. Because of its real value and interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GEN. NATHAN F. TWINING, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, BEFORE THE OKLAHOMA CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., JANUARY 13, 1956

As I flew out here from Washington yesterday, I remembered what your beloved Will Rogers once said about Oklahoma. He said: "Oklahoma is so far away that a politician can't pay his way that far. Nobody can afford the trip but a statesman, and the road from town out is so bad that even he will get discouraged before he gets there, and turn around and go back."

He said that before the air age was well started, but by the time his career was ended he was an air enthusiast. As the airlines multipled, Will Rogers became their No. 1 passenger. However, farsighted as he was, he would be surprised at Oklahoma today.

Few places in the United States have developed so fast. Less than 70 years ago, this array of tall buildings, factories, and oil wells was only a level plain covered with wildflowers. It seems incredible that in one lifetime, a city like this could grow from the wilderness.

I guess the answer is that the men out here are powerful men and they are in a hurry.

I might add that when the powerful men of Oklahoma are after something, they let nothing distract or lull them, not even the strong scent of orange blossoms.

Watching that wonderful Orange Bowl game last week, I decided I had never seen a better exhibition of power and speed in any football stadium. I wish I had every one of those boys in the Air Force. I know you are proud of them.

You also have reason to be proud of the men who represent you in the United States Congress. These men have demonstrated clear thinking and farsightedness by their appreciation and understanding of aviation and our national air power.

Your senior Senator, ROBERT S. KERR, has long been an air power advocate. He was among the first to realize the potentialities of American air power for the defense of our Nation.

Senator MIKE MONRONEY has become exceptionally well-known for his interest in aviation, particularly civil aviation matters. He has repeatedly held up American aviation as a symbol of progress and has pleaded the case for better airports, for better weather reporting, and for increased prestige of civil aviation.

I am also happy to say that Representative JOHN JARMAN, from your district, is a spirited advocate of airpower.

It is natural that Oklahoma be identified with aviation. Distances out here are vast and the airplane offers the quickest way of

covering long distances. Then too, you have good flying weather—about 328 clear days a year. Both your geography and your climate favor aviation.

Fully as important as those advantages is Oklahoma oil. Oklahoma and the United States Air Force complement each other in the oil business. The Air Force is the greatest single consumer of gasoline in the Nation. We use about 110 million barrels of fuel annually. You can see that the Air Force and the Nation's defense would be in a bad way if we were suddenly denied Oklahoma's great wealth of oil.

Perhaps the greatest spur to the growth of and interest in aviation here is the people of Oklahoma. Recently I was impressed with Governor Gary's comment on Oklahoma's rapid expansion. He said:

"The attitude of the people in our communities is proving perhaps our greatest asset in dealing with industrialists. I always ask our new businessmen why they came to Oklahoma. Sometimes they point to the tax, climate, nearness of certain resources, or available power, but most of them say it's because of the people.

" 'The people of Oklahoma acted like they wanted us here,' one manufacturer told me. 'They invited us in and completely sold themselves.' "

That is one of the finest tributes that could be paid Oklahomans.

Believe me, this hospitality is not confined to incoming manufacturers. In no other place has the Air Force been made to feel more welcome. As a result we have four fine Air Force bases here: Altus Air Force Base where our medium bombers fly, at Ardmore there is a troop-carrier base, and at Vance Air Force Base our flying cadets are trained.

Of course you are most familiar with Tinker Air Force Base. It is the Air Materiel Command headquarters for 11 States, and it is the most modern and largest air depot in the world. That Tinker has grown to its present importance and size is directly due to your hospitality and generosity.

At the present time, of the 2,700 acres of Tinker Air Force Base, over one-half has been purchased by this fine Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce. Even now Tinker is being enlarged by another 638 acres which, again, is being donated by you. This will provide a great degree of protection and flexibility that the air base needs for its ever-growing mission.

In addition to furnishing the supply and maintenance for an 11-State area, Tinker has recently assumed new importance. It is now the home of the 506th Strategic Fighter Wing. One of the 506th squadron commanders said that the community welcome had made all his men happy to be here. He described the housing that was offered at reasonable rents, and the help offered by the local merchants and banks. He told of the advantages of the recently completed, long runway in training new pilots and in reducing the chance of accidents.

You can be proud of this fighter wing. It is an important part of our Strategic Air Command and it also has the capability to bolster the air defense of this important industrial area and population center.

In this connection, your 185th Fighter Interceptor Squadron of the Air National Guard, based at Will Rogers Field, would also be an important part of your defense in case of attack.

Another key link in our defenses is the Oklahoma City Air Defense Filter Center. Your local volunteer ground observers keep this center posted on all aircraft in the area and are an important part of our warning net. They all are doing a wonderful job, but they are shorthanded. I am told that about 1,500 additional volunteers are needed for this part of our country's defense. I hope that the air minded and defense-minded men and women in this community will respond to this need.

Oklahoma's interest in the Nation's defense is not new. But the Nation's interest in the defense of Oklahoma is new. In many ways the position of Oklahoma in the United States is similar to the position of the United States in the world. In the United States, Oklahoma is known as the "last American frontier" and its resources and its people have made it one of our powerful States. The United States is the world's newest powerful Nation.

The United States has done much for the free world. It has supplied strong leaders and it has given the nations of the free world much of the military means they use to protect their freedom. Again Oklahoma is similar. It has provided outstanding men who have helped lead the Nation in times of crisis, and its oil fields and factories have contributed much to the defense of the Nation.

In a world endangered by aggression, the United States and Oklahoma share a third characteristic. For many years, in fact since the War of 1812, the United States has been secure from invasion. The vast waters of the Atlantic and Pacific have protected our shores against armed forces of our enemies. Our Army and our Navy, our Allies, and those seas formed a bulwark which no aggressor however desperate attempted to penetrate. But even if our coastal States could have been invaded, Oklahoma had nothing to worry about. For it was in the center of the United States, protected on all sides. Just as the United States was protected by its geographical location, so was Oklahoma protected.

Airpower changed all this. Airpower has erased the protection offered by the traditional barriers and traditional forces. The United States now lies exposed upon the surface of the earth, vulnerable to an attack which could come suddenly and with little warning. Oklahoma has lost the safety of its position and it is just as exposed to attack as any other part of the United States. Indeed, your industrial centers, airpower centers, and oil fields would be tempting targets. So, although Oklahoma was our last frontier, it is again a frontier, and so is every other State in the Union. And the frontier which we must defend today lies neither to the east nor west but directly above us.

The people of Oklahoma have an important advantage today in understanding the realities of modern defense. Oklahoma has never been the scene of a large scale land battle, and being far from the coast, Oklahoma has had little concern with naval matters. Therefore the people of Oklahoma have fewer built-in or traditional attachments for the historical forms of military defense.

Furthermore, men who are applying new and dynamic ideas to their daily living are likely to find it easier to accept new and dynamic ways of defending our Nation.

Thus I need not elaborate upon the one main reason why this Nation is not at war, or why our allies have not been attacked. It is not our traditional forms of military power that have held the Reds in check. The Soviets have overwhelming strength on the ground. In size the armies of the free world are mere outposts by comparison. The Soviets need not fear our strength at sea, for they are not dependent upon using the seas.

The Soviets fear our power in the air, and airpower has been the main reason for our peace and safety so far. It is airpower that gives us and our allies the best chance for staying safe in the future.

There are those who resist acceptance of the Air Force's leading role in the deterrence of war. They point to the fact that airpower did not stop the Communist invasion of North Korea nor the defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu.

I cannot argue with those observations. In fact I can add more along the same line. Airpower did not stop the riots in Cyprus, the skirmishes between Israel and Egypt, the bloodshed in Morocco and Algeria and the sporadic artillery duels on Quemoy and Matsu.

I could list a hundred other undesirable events that airpower has not prevented, but all of this does not detract from the one all-important fact: Our American airpower has kept the one great potential enemy from attacking us. That has been and will be the real danger to us here at home.

I think a few phrases from President Eisenhower's state of the Union message delivered last week will point up the effect of airpower on the world situation. He said:

"Yet Communist tactics against the free nations have shifted in emphasis from reliance on violence and the threat of violence to reliance on division, enticement and duplicity."

It seems that the Communists may finally be realizing what the people of America have known all along, and which was said so well once by Will Roegrs:

"Wars strike me as being the only game in the world where there is absolutely no winner—everybody loses."

It is important for us to remember that the Communists will abide by this lesson only so long as we make it crystal clear to them that they would be the heavy losers in any war.

To do this we must keep our airpower so strong and ready that it can survive any desperate attack and hit back with devastating and crippling blows.

We now have this strength and capability, but to maintain it we cannot stand still. The Soviets are working hard on their Red air force and it is getting bigger and better all the time.

The growing numbers of modern airplanes in the already huge Red airforce gives us cause for concern, but numbers alone are not the prime worry. After all, the Soviet Air Force has had thousands more combat planes than we for many years.

Our main cause for concern is the rapidly improving quality of the Communist air force. It is in quality that we have maintained our lead in the air and our ability to deter war. Quality of airplanes and weapons, quality of bases and equipment, quality of men and training—these have been our margin of superiority.

We are not in an arms race in the traditional sense. It has become a race for quality—for better, more effective weapons. Today we are in a good position in this race. Our position tomorrow depends on what we are doing now.

In this race for technical superiority, there is a Soviet achievement that should concern us fully as much as their Bison and Badger jet bombers of 1956.

They are outstripping us in the education of scientists and engineers. It is no secret that during 1954, Russian schools graduated more than 50,000 engineers while the universities of America graduated only 20,000. This is fewer than half the number our Nation's industrial establishments and defense departments need.

This year Russia will graduate 120,000 new scientists and engineers of all types, which will compare to our total of 70,000. As we have slipped into low gear in turning out chemists and physicists, the Russian educational system has moved firmly into high gear.

Years ago it was said that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. Let us hope it can never be said that the battle for the free world was lost in the classrooms of American high schools and colleges. We must hold our leadership in

research, engineering, and scientific discovery.

The young men and women in our high schools and colleges today are the ones we will have to depend on to keep the free world safe. It is they who must provide us with superior weapons of defense.

We must all make an effort to guide more of our young people into scientific and technical careers. In these fields they can find fruitful careers. They can contribute to our peacetime progress, but more important—they can insure our survival and our freedom. I know of no element of strength we need more.

For this reason, we are deeply interested in your latest, and perhaps, your greatest project here in Oklahoma. I refer, of course, to your frontiers of science program.

In a way, this program is as much of a pioneering effort as was the great land rush here, which led to the development of America's last great land frontier.

Your program of scientific information—scientific education, and scientific installations in Oklahoma is an inspiring example. It reflects great credit on your leaders in business and industry who are united behind this constructive project. I hope that other areas will follow Oklahoma leadership in this field.

Now before I sit down, I want to add one more thing. My job as a military officer is primarily concerned with the defense of the United States. This kind of a job has many frustrations, especially, it seems, in Washington.

But the job also has its rewards, and one of the finest rewards, I think, is the chance to leave Washington and visit places like Oklahoma City. The things I have seen here, at Tinker and in town, yesterday and today, are the products of dynamic, unbeatable people, and more significantly, of a free people. You are proud of your beautiful buildings, your factories, and your oil wells. But there is something else out here that should make us all even prouder. That is your spirit. This spirit is our biggest margin of superiority and it makes me certain that the captive people of Communist nations can never equal us, if we remain determined to stay ahead.

I have certainly enjoyed being here and I hope you will ask me back again.

The Administration's School Construction Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials praising the President's education message, and praising in particular the administration's school construction bill, which I had the honor of introducing last Thursday.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 13, 1956]

SCHOOL AID—A REALISTIC PROGRAM

In his message of a year ago, on Federal aid to public schools, the President put first emphasis on extending Federal credit to local school districts—to guarantee a cooperating Federal-State market for school construction bonds. For direct grants he asked of Congress less than one-third the amount he requested for the bond purchase authorization.

This emphasis had the great merit of demanding a maximum of local initiative and resources. But it met a storm of opposition, not all of it by any means from politicians merely interested in cutting a cash melon for their constituencies. Many, including school people, felt the need for facilities was so urgent and the legal and other obstacles to the bond idea so formidable that aid would come too late to forestall chaos. Others feared that Federal control might follow Federal holding of the credit strings.

The administration undoubtedly listened to these protests. And the President called the recent White House Conference on Education to advise him on this and other questions. When that group also stressed the urgency of direct aid, the President, as evidenced in the message just delivered, reversed his stand on financing although not his conviction that schools are primarily a local responsibility.

He asks for $1,250,000,000 to be spent on a State-matching basis over a 5-year program as direct grants for construction. He requests $750,000,000 (the same as last year) to establish a guaranteed market for local school building bonds and to set up reserves for State financing agencies. And he asks $20 million to help States overcome legal and other obstacles to local programs.

Perhaps the greatest danger confronting any such program of Federal aid is political pressure for a share for everyone. A flat grant all around, it was pointed out on this page recently, would mean raising four times the money for needs of the poorer States because three-fourths of it would have to be distributed among States with ample income.

Mr. Eisenhower has outlined a formula which would take account of each State's (and school district's) need, its resources, and its efforts. He has countered the fear of Federal control by limiting his program to construction only and to a 5-year period. He has contrived to insure the most in local endeavor by requiring States to match Federal graints and by proposing to penalize States whose efforts lag behind their abilities.

The message also expressed the administration's interest in research, in adequate rewards for teachers, and in higher education. The President hinted at no action in these fields other than a promise to appoint a prestige commission to study the particular problems of the colleges. The contribution the White House thus can make by way of public opinion toward desirable solutions should not be discounted.

Taken altogether and in parts, the President has charted a realistic and a sound program. It is up to Congress now—and to the people who put Congressmen where they are—to handle as nonpolitically as possible a nonpolitical program.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 13, 1956]

THE PRESIDENT'S LIBERAL SCHOOL PROGRAM

An expanded and improved program for Federal help in eliminating the dire shortage of school classrooms was sent to Congress by President Eisenhower yesterday. Congress will be inexcusably remiss if it lets this program get bogged down, with no affirmative action taken, as it did the President's program of last February.

The program of a year ago was avowedly an emergency one. It was subject to revision in the light of the nationwide educational conferences which had been authorized in the previous year on President Eisenhower's recommendation. Four thousand such conferences, local and State, were held in 1955, culminating last November in the White House Conference on Education. Many persons had the opportunity to air their ideas. Equally important, in the words of the President: "The work of the conferences has aroused the Nation. * * * The status of American education—where it is, the future of American education, where it should and can go—have been illuminated as never before."

The aroused public interest in the schools already has had beneficial effect. Construction of schoolrooms rose from an average of 60,000 to 66,000 rooms a year. This is good, but far from enough. Fifty thousand new classrooms a year are needed just to keep up with the new faces that appear at the doors. And we still have a deficit of some 300,000 classrooms, mainly inherited from the war years in which schools were not built. Nearly a million American children are being deprived of full educational opportunities, most of them attending school in shifts.

Two main revisions mark the new liberal administration program for Federal aid in the construction of schools. One is the amount of money involved. The proposal last year was for grants, on a matching basis, of $66.6 million a year over 3 years. Now the proposal contemplates $250 million annually for 5 years. The yearly sum would be increased almost 4 times, and the total sum 6 times.

The second revision makes more flexible the system of allocating the grants. Last year's program was criticized as requiring a community to prove itself on the verge of bankruptcy to obtain Federal school-construction help. This year the administration has laid down principles which are progressive and in keeping with the times. Larger amounts a school-age child would be allotted to States with lower income a child. As the States distribute the Federal funds, the highest priority would be given to school districts with the least economic ability to meet their needs. States which are prosperous enough to do better by their schools than they do would be spurred by finding their Federal grants reduced.

This year's administration program retains basic features of last year's. The Federal Government would buy up $750 million worth of local school construction bonds when school districts cannot sell them at reasonable interest rates in private markets. The Federal Government also would help underwrite bonds issued by State school agencies financing local construction. These are loan provisions as contrasted with grants.

The President did not confine himself to primary and secondary education. "The tide of increasing school enrollment will soon reach higher educational institutions," he said. "Within 10 years we may expect three students in our colleges and universities for every two who are there now." Therefore, he promised to appoint a distinguished group of educators and citizens to encourage active and systematic attack on all the problems of education beyond high school.

True responsibility for construction of, aid control of our schools still rests with the States and communities, in the President's view. He believes that his program of Federal aid should overcome the Nation's critical classroom shortage within 5 years. Once this shortage is overcome, the Federal grant program can and must terminate.

The President has shown the way, and it is now up to Republicans and Democrats alike to follow his lead. It is particularly important for the Republicans to establish a constructive voting record on this forward-looking measure. The need is great; it is national, and for the sake of America's children it demands a national solution.

[From the New York Times of January 13, 1956]

AID TO EDUCATION

President Eisenhower's revised proposal for Federal aid to school construction is in our opinion more realistic than the one he put forward 11 months ago, while still retaining much of the basic philosophy.

The President reiterates his belief, which we share, that fundamental "responsibility for public education rests with the States and the local communities." But he agrees that the Federal Government "can and should help with certain problems of nationwide scope and concern when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough."

The crisis of the public schools presents just such a problem, created partially by curtailment of school construction during the war and partly by the sudden and enormous growth of the school-age population since then. Education in this country is literally in a state of emergency, and to the degree that the States and localities cannot meet that emergency the Federal Government must step in, if only on a temporary basis. Federal aid to the schools is not a gift to anybody. It simply represents a redistribution of tax burdens and receipts, but a redistribution necessitated by the national obligation to see that every child, no matter where he lives, has adequate school facilities.

We doubt very much that the President's plan, improvement though it is over the one of a year ago, can fully accomplish that end despite his expressed optimism that it will enable States and communities "to meet their current and future needs" for classroom construction. The needs are so great that even the increase of more than a billion dollars in grants over last year's administration proposal cannot provide all of the solution; but, limited though it is to construction costs, it should certainly provide a stimulus to further State and local activity. The grants would be made on a matching basis, which we think is essential in order to assure a maximum of local participation, and on a formula that would give to the poorer States relatively larger amounts than the wealthier States.

We think that this affords a more equable method of distribution than the principle—embodied in the House Labor Committee's bill granting $1.6 billions to the States over a 4-year period—under which school-aid funds would be apportioned simply according to the number of school-age children, irrespective of the States' financial condition. The President further proposes to penalize "those few States which are noticeably lagging, behind their ability, to support their public schools." We are all for this idea, too, but just how it can be worked out presents quite a problem.

In addition to his proposals for greatly increased grants-in-aid, the President renews his suggestions of last year for bolstering the credit of school districts by the purchase of $750 millions in local school bonds if they cannot be disposed of "at reasonable interest rates" and promoting a lease-purchase plan of school construction by State agencies. The President stresses his belief that once the classroom shortage is overcome "the Federal grant program can and must terminate." While we doubt that the termination will come as quickly as the President seems to hope, the mere existence of such a program as he puts forward should give great impetus to States and communities that may have been dragging their feet while waiting to see what the Federal Government will do to help them. But to acomplish this end Congress must take up the President's proposals with reasonable speed, improve them if it can, and act on them.

What everyone interested in the welfare of the Nation's schools and school children must fervently hope is that Congress will not become bogged down in fruitless arguments over irrelevant issues that can only block progress on a school-aid bill, as progress has been repeatedly blocked in the past.

Appoint a Special Counsel To Expose the Dixon-Yates Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo., of January 11, 1956, entitled "Coolidge Did It."

In substance the editorial deals with the proposed appointment of a special counsel to help defend the Government's interest in the $3,500,000 Dixon-Yates damage suit. The editorial points out that a special counsel is crucial to making the Government's case a real defense and an exposure of the complete history of Dixon-Yates.

The editorial follows:

COOLIDGE DID IT

Appointment of special counsel to help defend the Government in the $3,500,000 Dixon-Yates damage suit is clearly desirable. It is needed to make sure the defense is a strong one. It is needed to bring out the facts that are still hidden. The designation of a special counsel is therefore being urged very sensibly by Senators KEFAUVER, of Tennesee, O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and ANDERSON, of New Mexico.

Both Attorney General Brownell and General Counsel William Mitchell of the Atomic Energy Commission have to a considerable extent compromised themselves as counsel for the defense, yet they head that counsel. Both were "interested parties" in negotiation of the now-repudiated contract, as Senator KEFAUVER notes.

Both have given legal opinions defending the validity of the contract—in other words, taking the side of the plaintiffs from whom they now propose to defend the Government. Mr. Mitchell's testimony in this regard was so spineless that Senator ANDERSON, chairman of the Senate-House Committee on Atomic Energy, told him he had "given up before the other side presented its case—lain down, rolled over, and was playing dead."

Many of the salient facts about Dixon-Yates may never be known if they are not brought out at the trial of the damage suit. A leading commentator as friendly to the Eisenhower administration as Arthur Krock of the New York Times has welcomed the suit for that very reason. Mr. Krock hopes, as we do, that the trial will bring out the answers to these and other still-unanswered questions:

Who ordered the name of Adolphe H. Wenzell, the New York investment banker, removed from the Bureau of the Budget's complete history of Dixon-Yates? Who advised the President that the AEC in particular, among all the agencies of Government, should make the contract? Who advised the President to "instruct" an agency which Congress had created independent?

How did the Budget Bureau ever explain to the President AEC Chairman Strauss's statement that he did not know of Wenzell's connection with the New York investment house until it was disclosed in the Senate? Did the President reprimand any members of his administration for the many blunders committed in the Dixon-Yates case, and, if so, whom?

These answers have not been forthcoming in congressional investigations because Admiral Strauss and Budget Director Hughes have declined to tell what went on in the executive branch and Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams has refused to testify at all.

The answers will not come out at the trial in response to powder-puff examination of witnesses, the sort of examination which lawyers reluctant to act, partisan to the administration, and themselves involved in Dixon-Yates debacle, could only be expected to make. What is called for is hard-hitting, searching, relentless examination, the kind that may be expected of an able special counsel with no purpose in mind except to put up the strongest possible defense.

The special counsel the three Senators propose is therefore crucial to making the Government's case, not a shadow-boxing and white-washing, but a real defense and an exposure, at interminably long last, of the complete history of Dixon-Yates.

President Eisenhower will find a constructive precedent for this in the administration of one of his recent Republican predecessors. That was when President Coolidge appointed two outstanding lawyers, Republican Owen J. Roberts and Democrat Atlee Pomerene, to investigate and prosecute the Teapot Dome oil scandals.

Address of Col. John J. Griffin, Vice President, First National Bank in St. Louis, to Christopher Council of Knights of Columbus, Christopher, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the Christopher, Ill., Knights of Columbus held their annual banquet on December 11, 1955, and was fortunate in having Col. John J. Griffin, vice president of the First National Bank of St. Louis, Mo., as their principal speaker. He delivered such an inspiring and challenging message that I include the remarks in the RECORD.

I am very happy at the opportunity of again visiting Christopher in an official capacity, although I have been here many times unofficially. So when Mike Gaertner called and invited me to be the speaker at this, your anniversary banquet, I was very happy and pleased to accept.

Mike told me I was to choose my own subject, but there are so many things I could talk to you about in these days and times that I would have been much pleased to have been assigned a subject.

There is no use in making a speech today to draw a word picture or assemble an oration of euphonious sounds, all of which mean nothing. Although one is attempted at times to do it, nevertheless, it accomplishes very little.

I could make a wonderful flowery speech on the history, activities and the works of the Knights of Columbus, their glorious war history, the advantages of their insurance program, the job they have done in Rome, the photographing of the papal documents,

but these are all matters that you know about and are acquainted with, or if you are not acquainted with them, you should be. Therefore, it would be useless for me to discuss the Order with you.

It is my belief that in these days of unrest, this era of insecurity, this day of the cold war, that any time a group of Americans gather in a meeting, we should discuss seriously the duties and obligations we owe our Government in the preservation of the principles and ideals that we seem to enjoy so fully and value so lightly.

I can remember when I traveled this whole territory, discussing the Ku Klux Klan, urging every right-minded citizen down here, the need and necessity of driving that type and kind of thinking out of the minds and hearts of our people, that it was un-American and had no place in our American way of life, and that those who were promoting it were doing it for selfish, greedy purposes. In my opinion, it was the forerunner of the Hitler Black Shirts and our now present Communist threat.

In those days, when I was coming through your territory, discussing the Klan, it was not a very healthy thing to do at that time because so many of our citizens, our good men, were misled, listening and following the advice of false leaders. They believed at least, that they were performing a patriotic duty. We can be charitable enough to say they believed that. But like bad dreams, the era of the Ku Klux Klan has passed into an unsavory and unpleasant part of our history. Again, as soon as the real American people became acquainted with the truth and the facts, their good commonsense took care of the situation.

I could discuss with you tonight how I came through your territory discussing nazism, Hitler, and these un-American activities. That again, fooled the American people, lulled them into a sleep of security with a false belief that in promoting the welfare of this godless demagog they were promoting the welfare of America, deluded with the idea they were performing a patriotic service. I could go back into my files and pick out many of the speeches I made at that time and by changing a few words and phrases here and there, these speeches would be applicable today. But again nazism, Hitler's lieutenants and the Black Shirts have been erased from the American front and are now added to that unpleasant deplorable history that has and does on occasion arise to create a little flurry in America and darken the brightness of the resplendent pages of its history. This movement was taken care of by the good commonsense of the American people just as soon as they become acquainted with and knew the truth and the facts, they immediately struck it into oblivion.

The leaders of the Ku Klux Klan and the leaders of the Nazi movement were infants in comparison with the intelligent program of divide and conquer so as to destroy that is being carried on in America today by the Communist Party, directed and controlled direct from Moscow through its subversive agents planted in America. These men who have no allegiance to or love for anything that America stands for, they are devoted to, associated with, pledged to and are disciples of the Kremlin. They are educated by the Lenin Institution at Moscow and are carrying on a very intelligent, insidious program. It almost seems as though it is a satanic campaign from the depths of hell to bring about the destruction of America. The unfortunate thing about the situation is that again our American people in too many numbers to be comfortable have joined the ranks of and are following false leaders—men who have no love for America and have no respect for anything it stands for; men who are here to create dissension among our people to divide and conquer them; men who are here to fulfill the gospel of the Kremlin, which is to create a Soviet Union of the world with Moscow as its capital.

I know now many of our citizens are going to just shrug this off; they will say the same thing that many said when I was attacking the Klan, that I didn't know what I was talking about; that I was trying to inject Catholic principles into public life. I know, many will shrug it off and are going to say just exactly what was said when I was discussing the dangers of the nazism and Hitler elements, that I was opposed to the German people and I was promoting the welfare of the Catholic Church. But, of course, in both the above instances, time and history proved that everything I said and predicted was correct. The only people in those days who were concerned about what I was saying were the Ku Klux Klan and the Nazis, who attempted on several occasions to run me out of the country.

Today, the situation is about the same. During World War II when I was discussing and fighting communism and everything it stands for, they appointed a committee in 1946 to kill me because I was interfering with their program. In other words, I was telling people the truth, although the people would not believe it. Back in those days, I was a very unpopular individual with many patriotic citizens, because they believed I should not be discussing communism and what it stands for when Russia was our Ally in the war. The Communists knew the damage I was doing, apparently, to the extent of the usual Communist method of eliminating those who get in their way, but our smug American complacency couldn't see it.

I could go back into some of my old files and dig out speeches I made before VE-day and before V–J Day, days in which I warned the American people of the dangers that were ours, calling their attention to the fact we were nursing a viper to our breast, when we opened our arms and took the Communist government into them and welcomed them as brothers. I can recall talking to the American public wherever I could get them to listen, advising them if I were an official in this Government, I would call Russia in and flatly and pointedly lay down the rules that we were operating under; I would advise them we were going through with this program and if they were not pleased or happy about it, to retire back behind their borders as we did not need them. Let us not forget that our Russian friends (as they were called in those days) did not enter into or come over on our side until they were positive and sure they were on the losing side. They then abandoned Hitler and came over with us. Let us not forget they did not enter into the Japanese war until it was ended. We certainly didn't need them. Their entry into both wars was for the preservation of their own hides. They came in and walked off with the loot, stripped the country of anything that was of any value, took it back home.

Now today, again, we are entering into another phase and a different phase of communism. Sometimes as you look and see what is going on, it almost reminds you of Chamberlain fluttering back and forth to Hitler—Chamberlain and his umbrella—his program of appeasement, a program of brotherly love, a program of give them everything they ask for, a program of signing away the liberty, hearts and souls of free independent people, a program of materialistic age; furnish them with all the sinews of war that possibly could be furnished for the money they had to pay. Then, when the day of awakening came and what a rude awakening it was, as they showered down upon England death and destruction. Everything that fell thereon—bore an English trademark. Are we doing that today?

The new Russian cold war program today is taking on a pleasant atmosphere and we are becoming so indifferent and careless as to the security of this Nation that we are gladly accepting this new program; we are proclaiming to the world how happy we are that the Kremlin are now our brothers; they are friendly to us; they smile when they meet us; they stick out their hands and shake hands with us when they greet us; they give dinners and banquets for us; they send their representatives to America in order that they might see how their great American brothers conduct their domestic affairs. How stupid can we get? If we do not know from our own intelligence and training, then we should look into the past and become aware of the fact that you cannot buy loyalty; you cannot purchase security; you cannot hire or employ the support of other people because we are looking at things and dealing with things, judging results from their materialistic point of view. When the Russian delegates and the Russian representatives meet us with a smile, let us not forget what is concealed behind that hypocritical smiling mask; let us not forget that it is the program of destroy the free world; let us not forget that behind it lies a complete plan and program to take over America without firing a shot, without disturbing a pot on a stove or a car in a garage.

When they wine and dine us, let us not forget that behind that wining and dining is the thought and the program that we are a decadant Nation and the wining and dining they are going on with is a part of their program to divide and conquer, and as they slowly await, like a vulture, for us to become weak enough so they can take over under the schedule they have outlined, the program their agents are so intelligently carrying on in America.

When they reach out their hands in friendship—what hypocrisy there is behind that movement. How can we reach for and shake the hand that not only has in the past but is every day being dyed crimson anew with the blood of free people? Let us not forget that; let us not forget the only reason our blood hasn't dyed those hands crimson is they have other plans for us at this time or they consider the time is not ripe.

We find many, far too many in America, promoting the idea that Communism is a type and kind of government we should have. When we find our misguided citizens following again in the footsteps of false leaders, let us ask them if they are willing to go to Russia to live; let us ask them if they are willing to forget the millions of people who are behind the Iron Curtain with the leg irons of slavery fastened to their ankles. Let us ask them if they are willing to forget the thousands upon thousands of people who are still in slave labor or in concentration camps, many of them our own citizens, many of them our own servicemen. Let us ask them if they are willing to forget the trenches and the ditches behind the Iron Curtain filled with the last mortal remains of men and women, who would rather die free than live in slavery. Let us ask them if they are willing to forget the thousands upon thousands of children whose innocent blood was spilled as the Russian hordes turned loose their savage, relentless, ruthless power of government on an innocent people. Let us ask them if they ever stop to realize it can happen here, and unless our American people awake to the responsibilities that are theirs, meet these responsibilities and perform the duties necessary and essential in keeping with these responsibilities, it will happen here.

Let us, (I mean you, I, and everyone worthy of the proud title "American") accept our place on the firing line of civic responsibility, take our place in the trenches of

security with the fixed and firm determination to preserve this Nation in its entirety.

Let us beware of false leaders, keep before us the constant vision of what happened to others who have let down these safeguards. Let us talk to the Kremlin in the only kind of language the Kremlin understands, a language that has behind it the force and power of a free nation, plus the faith of a free people, a people determined that no power upon the face of the globe shall ever deprive us of that freedom. Let them know that we are talking softly or walking softly, but to not be misled because we can tread heavy and use a big stick if necessary and we will do so.

Let us return the minds and the hearts of the American people to God and the things that are God's. Let us not only be preachers of the gospel to render unto God the things that are God's and to Caesar, the things that are Caesar's, but let us live that gospel. Make a promise to yourself on this, the first anniversary of the founding of your council, that you are hereby renewing your determination to carry on for God and country. If we do that, I am sure we will set the example for the world as they come to a realization that it is not the steel and concrete in the buildings, the bathtubs, telephones, televisions, radios, automobiles, that have made America great or that will keep it great, but the thing that has made America great, and will keep America great is the faith of its people.

Let us stop quarreling among ourselves and unite at a time this Nation sorely needs it, as we have never been united before with a full determination and a positive faith that as soldiers in the army of the Heavenly Father and with He as our leader, our Commander in Chief, His commands shall be obeyed. If we do that, we shall live to see the day when communism after it has done its damage, after it has spread its poisonous virus in the bloodstreams of our people, will become like the Ku Klux Klan and nazism—just another dark page in our glorious history. It will pass out of existence if and only if, the American people renew within their hearts their allegiance to God and country, if they get down upon their knees and acknowledge their dependency upon God and the things God stands for. Then and only then, will we have peace in the world.

If we want to keep that peace in the world, the duties and responsibilities rest fairly and squarely upon you. By you—I mean each one of you individually.

Have you ever thought of the responsibility the future imposes upon you? Let us just take it for the next 10 years. Shall 1965 be a year in which the people are living under God, law, and order, or shall it be one in which confusion, distrust, hatreds, cold wars shall continue. It has been estimated that by 1965 there will be a population in excess of 200 million in America; there will be an excess of 60 million pupils of school age; more than 80 million people employed; for your benefit or destruction, depending upon how you conduct yourself, there will be in the United States 50 million or more television sets. Just look at these 10 years. Will you have done your part in that time to build them solidly, soundly, and morally in their program toward God, or will you by indifference and neglect allow them, as they are today, to drift further and further away from God and the moral laws of His teaching?

If freedom is to endure, what type and kind of government will these 200 million people have? You must answer it. It will be the type and kind that you, through your own individual personal effort, train the one that has been selected, trained because he not only believes, but he lives the gospel of Caesar.

The only country upon the face of the globe with a larger number of divorces than America is Russia. Will your effort, your moral leadership champion the sanctity of marriage and the home?

There will be 60 million children in school in 1965. What type and kind of teachers will they have? Will they be teachers who realize and understand their responsibilities in training this youth, not only to prepare them for the material things of life, but teachers who know and understand and realize they have a young soul in their hands, to mold, to culture in order that its growth might be strengthened to enable it to meet Almight God when He calls it home. Will they be teachers who will not be afraid to teach the spiritual truth upon which this Nation is founded?

What kind of leaders will the 80 million workers in 1965 have in the field of labor and management? Shall the leaders of both sides be trained—not only trained but place in actual operating condition, moral values: Shall they be the type and kind who know and realize the tremendous responsibility that is theirs as they exercise the leadership as representatives of Almighty God from whom all authority comes.

What kind of entertainment will be piped into the home living quarters, parlors, recreation rooms of 53 million households? What type and kind of people will be performing? Will it be a continuation of the filth, mire, immodesty, immorality, portrayed promiscuity, glorifying the criminal and all the things that are going on today? Or will it be a type and kind of entertainment based upon the moral standards that were basically, fundamentally right 2000 years ago and has never changed in that entire period?

In a few days you will be celebrating Christmas, the birthday of Christ who came upon earth and gave to us the moral law. That is the only law that will keep America safe.

Printing "In God we trust" on our coins, publicly reciting high sounding platitudes that are meaningless, publicly where it is to our benefit politically or otherwise to boast that we love God and our fellow man when privately in our actions—we defile and debase man rather than help him.

In 1965 shall we continue what seems to be a popularity contest in government circles today in which God is leading? We are now going to put "In God we trust" on our paper money. They changed our pledge of allegiance to the flag; we mention God in the new pledge; we mention him in the prisoner of war code of conduct, and He even gets a Prayer Room in the Capitol. Of course, these are all fine things; I am for them. I want you to know that what I am concerned about is the sincerity that is behind it. Are we back in the early ages where we believe by shouting "Lord, Lord" often and loud enough, we will have fulfilled our obligations? Or, are we living in an age where we believe, not only believe but put into practice that belief of living in strict accordance with the moral law as laid down by God through His Divine Son?

I hope our men in high places in Government, including our Senators and Congressmen and others, many in higher positions; are not doing this because they think it is good public relations, that religion in general is just one of those perfectly harmless things; makes a lot of people feel good. We refer to just good old religion and just like good old flea-bitten Spot—we give it a pat on the head and go on our wild, unrestricted way of living the opposite to our public statements because talking of God was good public relations. If that is not true, then let us see more evidence that our public leaders are reflecting the general conscience and they really do trust in God, love Him, follow Him, accept Him as their leader and as their leader, obey His commands.

One of the best ways to do this is to tighten the divorce laws; outlaw the sale of contraceptives; encourage the teaching of basic religious truths in public schools. Would it be any harm if we taught the children in all schools, both public and private the following:

1. God exists.
2. Man was created by God.
3. All men are created equal.
4. Every individual is of infinite value.
5. All of our rights come from God.
6. All men must obey the natural moral law implanted in them by God.
7. The Ten Commandments are binding upon all men.
8. The Government derives its authority from God.
9. The purpose of government is the protection of the rights of individuals.

Mr. Public Official, if you are sincere in all this public expression of trust in God and it's not merely like patting Spot on the head, then let us see some effort to get rid of the indecent type and kind of entertainment, the sex songs, the pornographic paper back books and crime-crammed comics.

Let us not bar God from the schools; let us not build a wall of separation; let us not look for far fetched legal opinions; but let us bring into the minds and the hearts of our youth a belief in God. If we do this, we know that 1956 will be morally able to meet its obligations. Let us show the way now, onward to victory—our battle cry for God and country. It is your America, its future will be what you make it.

St. Louis University Founders' Day Sermon by Most Rev. John J. Wright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the founders' day sermon delivered at St. Louis University on November 16, 1955, by Most Rev. John J. Wright, bishop of Worcester diocese.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUNDER'S DAY SERMON DELIVERED BY MOST REV. JOHN J. WRIGHT AT ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, NOVEMBER 16, 1955

"Christ Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." St. Paul to the Colossians, chapter 2, verse 3.

The founding of educational institutions was from the beginning a primary preoccupation of the church in America. In Baltimore, Emmitsburg and Washington our first seminary, college and university had their respective beginnings under the first bishop of the first diocese to be established in the United States. The first priest to be ordained in the United States, Father Stephen Badin, ordained in 1793, donated to the Bishop of Vincennes what is now the campus of Notre Dame University. One of the first dioceses to be cut off from the parent-diocese of the church in the United States was Bardstown, and almost immediately there were established under its auspices a seminary of its own and then, in 1814, an institution for the education of young ladies, which became Nazareth College for Women.

It was appropriate, therefore, that in Missouri, the first of the Western States organized west of the Mississippi, there should have been founded the first university of the West, and that this university, growing out of a Jesuit school, as did Georgetown in the East, should have been under Catholic auspices.

Part of the motivation which prompted this early and so ambitious educational effort of the Catholic Church in America was, of course, protective. It sought to preserve the faith of young people who would otherwise have been obliged to seek their higher education in the aggressively Protestant seminaries of the East which were the colleges and budding universities of the day.

But a greater dynamic behind this heroic pioneer educational program was something more positive and permanent, something that is revealed in the quality of our early Catholic schools and colleges. It was an understanding of the kindred roles of the priest and the professor, of the mutual relationship among all the agencies which elevate the mind and perfect personality. This positive motivation behind the effort to build colleges and universities as soon as we had built our homes and our altars demonstrates the authentic Catholic attitude toward the things of the intellect and gives the lie to any idea that the church herself—our Holy Mother the Church, as distinct from any or even most of her children at some given moment—is suspicious of the intellect, indifferent to learning or unsympathetic with scholarship.

That this same positive dynamic behind the educational efforts of the American Church continued throughout the 19th century is reflected in the public pronouncements as well as personal labors of two typical prelates of the last century.

Father John Tracy Ellis recently took occasion in this very city to recall the convictions so admirably expressed by Bishop John Lancaster Spalding in the sermon he preached at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. Spalding argued that all but the most unreasonable of our neighbors were even by his time persuaded of the depth and sincerity of Catholic loyalty, but on the intellectual level he found a less impressive situation and a much more urgent need. In 1884 John Spalding said: "When our zeal for intellectual excellence shall have raised up men who will take place among the first writers and thinkers of their day, their very presence will become the most persuasive of arguments to teach the world that no best gift is at war with the spirit of Catholic faith."

So far John Spalding. It should be immediately evident that the converse proposition implied in his words is not less true, and that therefore the very absence of a generation of authentic intellectuals among us would constitute a serious embarrassment to arguments for the faith which are in themselves unanswerable but which, in the unfortunate circumstances of the absence of impressive intellectual vitality among those who advance them, might have little cogency to a generation rightly or wrongly enamoured of the intellect.

Archbishop John Ireland understood this clearly. Speaking at the centennial of the American hierarchy, John Ireland linked his plea for the development of a vigorous intellectual life among our people to considerations of a pertinent and practical argument for the faith. Archbishop Ireland said: "This is an intellectual age. It worships intellect. It tries all things by the touchstone of intellect. * * * The church herself will be judged by the standard of intellect. Catholics must excel in religious knowledge. * * * They must be in the foreground of intellectual movements of all kinds. The age will not take kindly to religious knowledge separated from secular knowledge."

So far John Ireland. Lest anyone be tempted to minimize his contentions as perhaps reflecting the special American circumstances of time and place in which Archbishop Ireland spoke, let us note the example given us in our own day by the Holy See and notably by the reigning chief shepherd who so luminously blends the intellectual with the pastoral apostolate in the incomparable conferences which he gives the world week in week out on philosophy, on the physical sciences, on literature, law, and the widest range of secular subjects, all to the end that he may demonstrate how congenial are sound religious and secular sciences, how interrelated are the truths of both, and how he who holds the place of primacy among those who pray, or rule, or sanctify, holds also the place of primacy among those who teach and, therefore, is at home with the intellectuals—the poets and prophets—as well as with the priests and princes.

And yet there have been grave reasons in recent years to fear that in our newspapers and our forums, not to say even on our campuses, we have frequently revealed a nervous spirit of impatient and sullen anti-intellectualism. Such a spirit is surely inconsistent with the enlightened understanding and eloquent insistence of our forefathers concerning what must be the attitudes and accomplishments of Catholics in the realm of intellectual life if our holy mother, the church, is to achieve her divinely intended growth in this land of privileged opportunity for her influence and action.

It makes little difference and there is room for much debate as to why so many Catholics have conformed to the prevailing mood of anti-intellectualism in our land. Perhaps Father John Tracy Ellis is accurate in his suggestion that such conformity may be part of the pattern by which our people have in all things sought to demonstrate how thoroughly American they are. In any case, it is unfortunate both for us and for America that we Catholics should so often qualify under the "witty extravagance," quoted by Father Ellis, by which a certain dean differentiated the attitudes of Europeans and Americans toward intellectuals. The dean remarked that "in the Old World an ordinary mortal, on seeing a professor, tipped his hat, while in America he tapped his head."

Such a suspicious contempt for the intellectual life is far from being an exclusively Catholic phenomenon in the United States. It is, as Father Ellis notes, a kink in the American character fairly generally. It is the more unbecoming in Catholics, however, because it is so utterly out of harmony with any authentic Catholic tradition, and it is therefore the more painful that it should so often reveal itself on public questions and in community life as so entrenched among us.

There are, of course, refreshing signs of a requickened appreciation of the intellectual apostolate and of a reevaluation of intellectual interests among Catholics. In recent months one may observe several indications that the question of the role and the responsibilities of the intellectual, both in the apostolic life of the church and in the affairs of the general community, is, to risk a pathetic pun, at last coming to a head. One notes with joy a fresh solicitude among Catholics for a proper evaluation of the intellectual and his potential contribution to both the kingdom of God and the city of man. I have already mentioned the valiant conference on Catholic intellectualism in America by which Father Ellis braved the wrath of the unthinking. A young lay columnist, writing in the (Davenport, Iowa) Messenger, has been groping with admirable earnestness, if sometimes uneven results, to find a few definitions in this problem of the apostolic responsibilities of the Catholic intellectual. A monthly magazine, published by priests for priests, editorialized in a recent issue of "the intellectual." It remarked that the word "intellectual" has become almost an expletive among us. It is so synonymous with "egghead" and "bubble-head" that many of us would rather have reflections cast on the honesty of our ancestry than be designated intellectuals at the moment.

This magazine, the Priest, finds the current distrust of the intellect largely justified in terms of short-range reaction of the follies of loosely defined intellectuals, but it also declares the reaction itself to be dangerous, indeed disastrous in terms of any long-range and authentically Catholic outlook. It writes: "To let just indignation over the intellectuals' betrayal and crass stupidity ever lead us to a repudiation of the intellect itself would mean absolute disaster * * *."

It is healthy that Catholics are saying such things with increasing urgency and apostolic emphasis. It would be not only disastrous but also a bitter irony if any school of voluntarists, preoccupied exclusively with the virtues of the will, even sublime virtues so saving as obedience and so noble as loyalty, were to gain such ascendancy among the sons and daughters of the church as to set at naught or almost annihilate the intellectual tradition in the household of the faith.

So many of the heresies which have wounded our holy mother, the church, and robbed her of so many of her children have been voluntarist heresies, anti-intellectual in their roots and pretensions, that it would be pathetic indeed if anti-intellectualism now became a characteristic of those who have remained faithful to her obedience.

From the "stat pro ratione voluntas" of Luther and the fides fiducialis of Lutheranism, through the blind fatalism of Calvin and the perverse austerities of Jansenism, to the sentimentality and exaltation of instinct or feeling which, for all its superficial show of scholarship, characterized religious modernism, the heresies which have divided the Christian flock in these last four centuries have been chiefly voluntarist and anti-intellectual. By the same token the inspired witness of our holy mother, the church, from the counterreformation, the Council of Trent and the ratio studiorum, to the Council of the Vatican and the syllabus against modernism, has been a witness at once to the reality of revelation and to the validity of reason, to the essential part of rational elements even in the supernatural act of faith and to the divine origin of the primacy and rights of the intellect in the natural order.

What a doubly tragic irony it would be, then, if, after centuries of battling for the natural law and the rights and function of reason, as well as for the primacy of the intellect over passion, emotion, instinct, or even will, the church should find herself represented in the world of the college, the press, or the forum by sons and daughters contemptuous of that wild, living intellect of man of which Newman spoke and cynical about the slow, sometimes faltering, but patient, persevering processes by which intellectuals seek to wrest some measure of order from the chaos about us.

How to prevent the spread of such a spirit of anti-intellectualism? How to uproot and annul it where it may have gained ground? How to foster anew a truly Catholic reverence for the gifts of the intellect and a wholesome vigilance for their proper use and growth? These are timely questions for our universities to face.

Our text this morning suggests the spiritual and theological context within which the question of the dignity and the vocation of the intellectual should be evaluated by persons of truly Catholic mentality. "Christ

Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. * * *" Does not this description of the eternal Son of God incarnate among us impel mediation on Christ as the inspiration and the exemplar of all intellectuals worthy of the name? Because He was reared in the home of Joseph and Mary subjecting Himself to them in all things, we have proposed Him in our schools as the model of obedient adolescence. Because He was reputed to be the carpenter's son and plied the trade of His foster father, we have asked ourselves what He would do as a worker and we have hallowed the cause of labor by the memory of His human toil. Because He shed tears of predilection over the capital city of His nation and paid the coin of tribute to Caesar, we have seen in Him the example of the good citizen. Because He preached a gospel destined to reach and unite all men, because He placed at the equal disposition of mankind without exception the treasures He came to share, we have sought in Him the qualities of the Christian internationalist. Christ the king, Christ the priest, Christ the judge, Christ the friend—all these we have studied in our classes and meditated in our chapels. As a result, these human offices and callings have been cleansed of their dross in our eyes and placed in their proper supernatural and eternal perspectives.

At a moment when the word "intellectual" has become a reproach and when the vocation of the intellectual has become obscured or even discredited, is it not time to reflect prayerfully on Christ the divine intellectual, the eternal logos of the Father, all divinity summed up in one divine idea and then made man, that person of the adorable trinity who is best described in terms of the thought of the divine intellect as the third person is best described in terms of the love of the divine will, the word of God, "Christ Jesus, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge"?

Meditation on Christ so understood may help sanctify and inspire the work of intellectuals even as our preaching on Christ the Worker or Christ the Loyal Son of His nation has done so much to elevate and hallow Christian labor or patriotism. It will throw new light on the Christ-like function of the genuine intellectual, called to imitate Christ by making incarnate in each generation and each culture something at least of the treasures of eternal wisdom and knowledge, the divine ideas summed up totally and perfectly in the Person of the Son, the Logos, the Verbum (quod) caro factum est et habitavit in nobis, that we might see His glory and be guided by it.

Obviously, such an understanding of the sublime vocation and preeminent dignity of the intellectual involves no plea for intellectual license or academic irresponsibility. But it does imply that the living intellect has a certain divinely appointed autonomy and that every valid word of truth has rights analogous to that freedom which St. Paul proclaimed for the word of God: verbum Dei non est alligatum. We make no plea for disloyalty and we hold the will in no contempt when we warn against the voluntarism which is at the core of all fascism, red or black, and when we lament an anti-intellectualism which mocks that spiritual faculty by which the sons of men most nearly reflect the image of the Eternal Son of God.

To this needed spiritual and theological emphasis our schools and colleges can add other means of rehabilitating the name and nature of the intellectual vocation. Perhaps it is necessary at the moment for us teachers and priests to develop a special patience with the bright and the sometimes irritatingly brilliant, a patience comparable to that which we have always virtuously tried to have toward the dull. Perhaps it is needed that we be slow to label revolutionaries or liberals in any unfavorable sense those who have many ideas, including occasional disturbing ideas, instead of a mere comfortable few—or none. Perhaps it were well if for a season or two we preached as often on intellectual sloth as we tend to preach on intellectual pride.

The dangers of intellectual pride are many and grave, and we do well to discipline ourselves and our students in the moral and ascetical controls of this as of all other vices. But the dangers of intellectual stagnation are not less grievous both for individual personality, for the common good, and for the church. The wrath of the stupid has laid waste the world quite as often as has any craft of the bright.

Pride is no more the necessary concomitant of intellect than humility is necessarily the adornment of those lacking in intellectual gifts. Teachers and spiritual directors among us may be well advised to remember that while it is doubtless better to feel compunction than to know its definition, still the grace to repent and to repent humbly is not necessarily impeded by an informed understanding of what compunction is, or even by a knowledge of the bibliography on the subject, or of the history of those who have felt compunction to their own profit and ours—or of those who have failed to do so, with resultant grave loss to themselves and injury to mankind.

A typical Catholic university can do a great service toward correcting the prevailing prejudice against intellectualism by demonstrating that there is no intellectual class in the divisive and exclusive senses in which we speak of a proletarian or peasant or so-called noble class. Our students tend to come from many classes and especially from working and middle class families. When our universities develop the intellectuality which is latent in the common sense, good taste and alert minds found more or less equally among all classes, they produce authentic intellectuals in the fullest and fairest sense of the term, whatever the subsequent special vocations or interests of the genuine intellectual.

Possibly it would break the spell and ease the tension which surround the word intellectuals if we stopped using the word for a while, and used instead the more rugged word scholars, a more solid word, perhaps, and so easily associated with the word saints. In the days when this university was founded men aspired to be known as good scholars, and perhaps we would have more sturdy and more respected intellectuals if we intensified our efforts to make our students good scholars again. If the word intellectual has a recent history of effeteness and ineptness, the word scholar still keeps its ancient and honorable repute.

In any case, we cannot work too urgently for the highest effectiveness of our universities in graduating lovers of ideas, intellectual scholars or scholarly intellectuals as you choose. Pope Pius XI is quoted as calling the loss of the European worker "the great tragedy of the nineteenth century," and the recent history of the part of the workers in the great struggles of the twentieth century confirms his melancholy judgment. The loss of any class or any notable part of any class is a source of embarrassment and grief to our Holy Mother, the church.

But given the nature of the new struggles which lie ahead, the struggles we describe by the awkward but significant word "ideological," no tragedy of the 20 century could be greater than the loss to the church of intellectuals, those who deal in ideologies and who love ideas.

Speaking at the midcentury convocation at Massachusetts Tech 5 years ago, Winston Churchill spoke of the great battles of the future. He said they would no longer be fought on the level of colonial empires, or political empires, or for the dominance of empires of oil, precious metal, or vast populations. The struggles of the future, he said, will be on the level of the empires of the mind.

The phrase is striking and it has the ring of prophecy. The battle for the minds of men, for the furtherance of ideas rather than political boundaries or military spheres of influence, is a battle in which the Holy Catholic Church not only belongs but must be victorious if God's will is to prevail. In such a battle our schools, colleges, and universities are the indispensable arsenals and training grounds, our intellectuals are the soldiers and lieutenants. Of these may Christ be the commander, Christ Jesus the divine intellectual, "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Panama Railroad Abandonment: Panamanian Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, one of the proposals made last session by the Governor of the Canal Zone before the Committee on Appropriations was abandonment of the Panama Railroad and its replacement by a second transisthmian highway located on the roadbed of the railway.

This recommendation generated such strong opposition from so many responsible sources that the Committee on Appropriations in House Report No. 603, 84th Congress, of May 15, 1955, recommended an investigation of that proposal by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries before taking further action. This inquiry is in progress.

Since the indicated abandonment would affect not only the United States in its operation of the canal enterprise but also the Republic of Panama, it is helpful to know public opinion in that country. One of the best reflectors of isthmian views is the well-known Latin-American newspaper, the Star and Herald, of Panama City, R. P., of which Mr. T. Gabriel Duque is president and Mr. Luis Bunting is editor. The leading editorial in its December 9, 1955, issue, immediately following hearings by the special subcommittee in the Canal Zone, dealt with the Panama Railroad crisis and urged retention of that interoceanic link.

To the end that the views of the people of Panama, as developed in the indicated editorial of the Star and Herald, may be available to the Congress, under leave accorded, I include its text:

LET'S KEEP THE RAILROAD

Congressional probes notwithstanding, we still stand right where we stood before. We still say "Don't scrap the Panama Railroad." Whoever does so will be sorry. It continues to be a must, strategically, geographically, historically, sentimentally and as a symbol

of good will among the nations of these still free Americas.

If this sounds confused, dear reader, just read your morning newspaper, your weekly news reviews. Coordinate the facts as your mind encompasses the growing trouble spots around the world and ask yourself: Is this the time for penny-pinching, for making books balance just any-old-how, just to make a hit with the GAO?

The Panama Railroad was the forerunner of the Panama Canal. It reopened the route made famous by the Conquistadores in their quest for conquest—incidentally Panamanian and Peruvian gold. It was the first transcontinental railroad in the New World. It made millions during the California gold rush. It cost millions to build and many, many lives. And it is still running, though they say in the red. Without it the Panama Canal could never have been built. Yet the people of today, shortsighted, penny-pinching people who should know better, are all for scrapping those rails, locomotives, boxcars and passenger coaches, probably at minimum prices, and turning over the transisthmian hauling to one or more fleets of Panama-owned trucks.

In other words the Panama Canal Zone, which has no highway links between its Atlantic and Pacific terminals, would scrap its only land connection with those terminals. For what? For a saving of a few thousands annually and pending construction of a highly costly all-Canal Zone transisthmian road which might take years to build after appropriations were voted for the job.

Perhaps Panama's press sticks its neck out in merely commenting on this anomaly. Panamanians—the Nation's thousands of unemployed—will gain no advantage in the acquisition of trucking trade by a few of its already affluent truck-owners. What Panama needs most, in addition to wide employment openings, is security, defense. It has no army or fleet or air force. Its freedom is guaranteed by the United States. Thanks to F. D. R. it has a highway from ocean to ocean, a road which can easily be blocked by natural slides, could be thoroughly damaged by a few well placed bombs. Would the United States people (voters) be satisfied to know that would be the only land route across the Isthmus were the PRR scrapped?

Life has never been so insecure as it is today in the East-West armament race, including atomic and hydrogen bombs. With all accords failing we can expect a Russian onslaught any day. It is said they will come over the Bering Strait route or across the top of the world via Greenland. They may hit strategic United States targets with a bomb or two. Their best bet will be this Isthmus, completely closing the Panama Canal. There's always a suicide pilot who can manage to get through.

The United States stands pledged to defend Panama. She needs her railroad here just about as much as she needs to keep the canal open. She could do with another transisthmian highway, an all-Canal Zone road. The more such roads the better. They provide employment and increase defense, Panama Canal defense.

Count the millions the United States has shelled out to India (where the Red leaders got such a noisy welcome last week), to other neutral or friendly nations, simply to feed their people and keep them from joining the Reds. What would a few more millions mean spent here in the Canal Zone adjoining a land Uncle Sam is pledged to defend, 1 of 20 other American Republics with which the United States is bound by treaty after treaty?

And still, at this highly critical stage, the United States would pinch pennies in the Canal Zone. Truly, it doesn't make sense.

Preserving Freedom of Independent Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Earl Bunting at a dinner meeting of trustees of Cornell College at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on November 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING FREEDOM OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

(By Earl Bunting, honorary vice president, National Association of Manufacturers, at dinner meeting of trustees of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, held at Roosevelt Hotel, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Monday evening, November 14, 1955)

I am glad to have this opportunity to discuss the mutual interests of industry and education—not only from the standpoint of the great contributions made to business by the academic world—but to consider, with you, how that invaluable assistance may be enhanced, in order that we may be better prepared to meet present and future problems of our country.

And the solution of those problems will not be easy. Whatever other magical feats may be attributed to automation, we see no possibility of a pushbutton process substituting for the painstaking work of investigation, analysis, and evaluation by minds which will have received the type of training best exemplified by those who have unlocked secrets of the ages—and by others who have given them meaning and practical use.

The future will demand much more in its business leaders than the go-getter or hardheaded businessman, in spite of the desirability of the proper proportions of these qualities. The future scientist or engineer in industry will be fully qualified in his specialized field, but, in addition, will possess a knowledge of human beings, politics, and economics.

The responsibility of education to the Nation has been well summarized by the Very Reverend Paul C. Reinert, president of St. Louis University, who has said:

"Without institutions of higher learning to train men in the specific arts and sciences, business and industry as well as society as a whole would be dealt a paralyzing blow. Men of science to harness and turn to human use the forces of nature, to discover new ways to bring happiness to countless millions of people—men of medicine to minister to the the health of our people, men of the arts and literature to satisfy the human thirst for culture, men of religion to care for men's souls, men learned in sound business principles, and above all, men of sound moral training in whatever field they choose—to supply these needs is the obligation of education to society."

I repeat: "Men of sound moral training in whatever field they choose."

Can you imagine the Russian student, cramming in his present scientific courses—about which the Communists are so boastful right now—obtaining the "sound moral training" which is the obligation of education to our society?

Can you imagine the amount of training the Russian student is receiving in "new ways to bring happiness to countless millions of people?"

Would you trade "the sound moral training" of our physicists, chemists, and engineers for the ungodly robots of the Communist state?

Freemen have the right to live by the truth. This is a sacred privilege, the right to know, to question, to evaluate, to improve. The primary purpose of education is to impart those truths men live by. Truth can live only in an atmosphere of freedom.

If a society is to remain free those institutions which comprise that society must complement each other. There must be a constant meshing of the driving gears of mutual reliance and assistance.

American educators are agreed that it is their job to train what they term "the whole man." Science, history, economics, religion, politics—all enter into the "whole man." In spite of specialization, preachers, teachers, professors, doctors, scientists, engineers, and businessmen must be "whole men" in the best meaning of the term.

That's the function of our educational system. Look around you and see how their products measure up.

One of the great factors of strength in free America has been its system of independent, privately endowed, non-tax-supported colleges and universities. They were among our earliest institutions—antedating our form of government by more than a hundred years. They have been truly a key part of our system of free enterprise. They are free enterprise. As such they have been a bulwark against political or bureaucratic control of education, educational content, and educational processes.

Because the political decisions made by Americans are so inextricably tied up with economic problems, it is of utmost importance that all citizens be taught at least basic economic truths.

We can well heed Thomas Jefferson's statement that "I know of no safe repository for the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to increase their discretion by education."

Economics must be so taught that it comes to grips with the problems of everyday living. This means that educators must have a deep appreciation of the exact nature of our modern industrial society—a growth and development which has come from individual freedom, individual courage, and self-reliance. Most of the books on socialism and communism have been based upon European capitalism, which bears little resemblance to the American opportunity system.

Great increases and rapid shifts in population, geographical decentralization of industry, greater productivity, constantly increasing standards of living, and vast changes in living habits have created many social problems. Housing, schools, welfare, employment and employee relations are among the urgent issues of the day. Solutions of many of these problems have been attempted upon a basis of emotional reaction—or political expediency. Yet, political mistakes, arising from economic ignorance, could wreck our country, turning it over to our enemies for liquidation of everything we hold dear.

Decisions made by truly competent people, intelligently arrived at by free access to the world's knowledge, have carried us to dizzy heights among the nations of the world. And today's problems, at home and abroad, place greater and greater emphasis upon the freedom to know.

No past period in the world's history or that of our own country has ever placed

so much reliance upon the benefits anticipated from higher educational institutions. Failure to extend and improve the facilities for training our young people in the arts and sciences, in business and industry, and throughout society as a whole, would deal our great country an uterly paralyzing blow.

All people in industry—in management, in production, in sales, in the various scientific and engineering positions—must possess much more than a superficial knowledge of political and economic institutions and processes. They must possess abilities to discriminate between the truth and the false in arriving at an understanding of the vital relationships between spiritual, academic, political, and economic freedoms.

The American economy is based upon the creation of human wants rather than merely satisfying a minimum of human needs. Our dynamic competition is at the heart of our free-enterprise system. Dynamic competition serves to prevent exploitation, channels economic efforts into producing goods people really want, and spurs producers to ever-increasing efficiency in serving the public. Preservation of a climate in which freedom of competition can thrive is the fundamental purpose of our Federal antitrust laws.

Out of this dynamic competition have come improvements in productivity and the development of new products upon which our general economic growth depends. This process of growth and development is constantly creating new ideas, new patterns, and new problems. Just as the automobile took the customers from every crossroads general store to urban centers whose merchants had much more extensive varieties of goods to choose from, so the automobile is now taking shoppers from their homes to suburban shopping centers. What the helicopter may do in the future is your guess.

Coal producers who formerly faced their main competition from each other now face the competition from oil, water power, natural gas—and solar heat and nuclear fission are on the horizon. Changes in the nature of competition go on steadily in most other lines of activity and are inevitable in a growing economy.

In this process of national economic growth it is the customer who has the final say. He determines just what share of the market each producer will get. Any attempt to substitute the judgment of some official—whether of a Government bureau, or a private cartel—for the free choice of the customer would be to deny him the freedom which is the essence of competition.

Our big job is to do those things which will add to the joys and satisfactions of life for all Americans. From the drawing boards, the laboratories, the test tubes and man's imagination will come the new products, the new processes, the new ways of life. If we follow through the wide-open doorways to the frontiers of science we will do those things which will preserve our country, our institutions and our opportunities.

Our best assurance of keeping the doorways to science open for all who would enter is to maintain our independent educational institutions. They haven't yet begun to serve as they must. In spite of our somewhat astounding progress in applied research, at leást partially accelerated by the pressures of national defense, we have been neglecting our basic studies from which must come most new scientific developments.

Basic studies in the fields of the physical as well as the social sciences canont be subject to political, geographical or industrial pressures. The necessity for showing a profit or of adhering to a politically determined "appropriation" certainly wouldn't be conducive to the atmosphere in which the best work in the fields of "pure" research can be done. And, the best work cannot be done by researchers in this field who have been the victims of political and economic distortions and misrepresentations. They are in special need of understanding which can come best from genuinely free educational institutions.

Can anyone imagine that industry as we know it can continue to be administered and improved if the industrial leaders and their collaborators in scientific fields do not possess the breadth of knowledge we have described?

The importance of protecting, preserving and extending our system of independent colleges and universities, keeping them free from political pressures and subversive influences, is a task for all Americans.

Businessmen must recognize that they have not paid for the tremendous contributions to business by the independent colleges and universities of our country. A very few people in each past generation who made the grants were the ones who made their independence possible.

Now, our independent, nontax-supported educational institutions need money.

They need it for all kinds of things—more and better facilities to meet the needs of a rapidly expanding population; the new things necessary to care for the vastly widened scope of scientific studies, in both the fields of the social as well as the physical sciences. They need to get realistic in the matter of salaries—professors being entitled to more pay than janitors. They need enough for future growth and expansion to make most economical approaches to the needs of the future.

And, why haven't they got this money?

Well, principally because of ideological confusion having given the politicians an opportunity to change the rules! When the income tax was adopted, with its subsequent so-called "progressive" rate provisions, our country embarked upon a new set of ideological concepts.

It was politically easy—and popular—to soak the rich. (From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.) Remember?

The income-tax source of money made it ridiculously easy to provide Federal funds for the wildest expansion of government spending ever known to man. When they could charm voters, nothing was too absurd for the big spenders. (Remember "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect?")

What else happened to us during this period?

Well, we had wars to pay for—which we didn't do. We refused to pay for them as we went along. We coined new money, passed out more Federal Government securities, and by this process so greatly increased the amount of money in circulation that its increase would have bought twice the goods available, thereby cutting the value of the dollar in half!

You will ask, what all this has to do with the present plight of the colleges?

First, let me point out that in spite of our independent colleges not paying income taxes, they are victims of the income-tax laws. Every tax dollar that goes to pay for anything except the proper functions of government is a dollar which will never reach the colleges—unless (and God forbid) it comes through the government and carries with it the Federal control which would be inevitable.

Inflation has hit the colleges, just as it has the rest of us, halving the value of their money. Tuition rates have been raised as much as they dare without creating an economic intelligentsia, which I, for one, certainly won't go for.

Because of our income-tax laws, no new philanthropic pots are being created from which can come the juicy endowments which bought the ground, built the buildings, paid the professors and bills of the past. The colleges can either move into the ranks of the Government spenders and live by Federal handouts, or they can find some new source of income.

Recognizing the problems of those colleges which would stay free, what courses are open to those who would aid in solving this problem?

Businessmen have been asking themselves and each other whether the making of corporate contributions to higher education is a sound business policy. While business has already accepted a commitment to help meet the needs of the colleges and universities, it was felt by a group of business leaders who met some months ago that a clarifying statement was needed, which I quote, as follows:

"We believe corporate financial support of higher education is a sound business policy. This is a matter of enlightened self-interest and a sound investment in order to help maintain the American way of life, the independence of the colleges and universities, and to insure for corporate enterprise a supply of personnel properly educated from which to select management of a breadth of view and understanding necessary for operating business on the high level of wisdom and skill the coming years will demand."

The only way that the independent colleges and universities of our country will be able to meet urgent present needs will be from some form of current support program of contributions from corporations and individuals. Corporations, under present laws, can make contributions for such purposes up to 5 percent of their current taxable profits, while individuals may contribute up to 20 percent of their personal tax liabilities.

For the longer term, the soak-the-rich policy of the advocates of bid Federal spending in our country must be completely eliminated from the governmental picture. If we spent money for only those things which are a proper function of government our citizens would again be able to spend, save, invest or contribute their money in ways which have been traditional in our country until very recent years.

When we can reestablish an atmosphere of fiscal sanity and simple justice in our Government spending and taxation policies, we will again make it possible to accumulate the type of personal fortunes which have been drawn upon so heavily in the past for the large sums going to independent education in America. Many tax-free colleges and universities would never have come into existence without the substantial sums from such sources.

Many of us were alarmed some years back when our youngsters came home from schools and colleges and repeated some of the preposterous charges made by some teacher or professor about the imperfections and inequities of the American capitalistic system. These were cases of either the "egg-head" or the use of the classroom platform for purposes of propaganda instead of freedom of inquiry. Indoctrination instead of education.

Why am I saying these things?

To recognize that our educational system has had problems of its own, not all of which have been financial—and at the same time to pay my wholehearted respect to those great leaders in the field of higher education who have gone calmly and confidently on their way toward equipping young Americans to meet the challenges of the future with courage, with intelligence and with integrity.

No thinking American wants to see such a vital element in our Republic as our independent educational system jeopardized or circumscribed by a failure to remain free. Yet, that is precisely what will happen if private support upon a current income basis is not made available to the private colleges and universities of our country.

And, for the longer term, and to meet the capital as well as operating needs of our independent educational system, we need to

remove the hampering, uneconomic and unfair system of rate-progression in our Federal income tax system.

A trade of academic freedom and responsibility for Federal financing and control is unthinkable. Let's make certain it can never happen.

Indians and Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a steadily growing population on an already overcrowded land area is resulting in increasing poverty for Indians of our reservations.

Present population of our Indian reservations is placed at 400,000 persons, a 60 percent increase since the turn of the century. Economic resources of most of the reservations—excepting those few with valuable oil or timber resources—have long been strained to the limit. As a result, Indian welfare costs have been rising and now the Federal Government is spending $96 million on Indians in 1 year—a 50 percent increase in 5 years.

Relocation assistance for those Indians who want to leave the reservations would help the limited reservation resources to more nearly meet the needs. At the same time, it would give the Indian the opportunity to become independent.

Those Indians who desire to leave the reservations should be aided in such adjustment. The assistance they are receiving now is not sufficient. I stress that such assistance should be provided only to those who desire to leave the reservations. Those who feel unprepared to relocate off the reservations must not be forcibly moved; they have a right to remain where they are.

Relocation officers are being provided to aid our Indians in the transition from reservation to independence. But there are far too few relocation officers.

In Montana, 1 relocation officer, greviously overworked, serves 7 reservations.

Despite the handicap of insufficient time to keep up with relocation applications he reported about 94 percent success last year with those who were relocated. Only about 25 percent of the persons he places are individuals; the remainder are family units. Most are unskilled workers and go into apprenticeship in factory work.

The Government pays transportation costs to the relocation center and provides household and living expenses until the Indians receive their first checks.

Despite the costs of transportation, initial housing and paying initial living expenses, the relocation program saves money for the Government. Without relocation, many of the families would become welfare recipients.

But a single relocation officer for 7 scattered reservations simply cannot keep up with the demand of those Indians who want to strike out on their own. He reports there is always a backlog of relocation applications all the time.

In concert with Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD, I recently addressed the following letter to the Bureau of Indian Affairs advocating the placement of one trained relocation officer on each Indian reservation in the United States:

Mr. GLENN L. EMMONS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMISSIONER EMMONS: During hearings and meetings with Indian leaders this summer we became aware of the need for the assistance and guidance which only relocation officers can give Indians desirous of leaving their reservations.

We heard of many Indians who left their reservation only to return in a short time because they had had no or inadequate briefing on what to expect outside.

Such incidents are unfortunate, because they discourage other Indians from leaving the reservation to take their rightful place in our society. As you know, the Indian land base is so small that it complicates the general problem of continuing to care for our Indians on reservations.

At the other end of the line is the community in which the Indian locates. There, too, a lack of knowledge of our ways on the part of the Indian, an inability to support himself in many cases because he had no vocational guidance, creates a welfare burden.

A relocation program would help both the Indian and the community in which he locates.

The one trained relocation officer in Montana is grievously overworked. There should be one on each reservation in the United States.

Very truly yours,

JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.
MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senate.
LEE METCALF,
Member of Congress.

I believe such a policy would pay great dividends to the Indians, both those who are relocated and those who remain on the reservations; to the communities in which the relocated Indians settle and to the Federal Government and Nation as a whole.

In that connection I believe my colleagues also will be interested in reading the following article which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of December 28, 1955:

INDIANS AND INDUSTRY—FACTORIES REACH FOR RESERVATION RED MEN TO EASE LABOR PINCH—TREK TO CITIES RISES 200 PERCENT SINCE 1952—GARRETT CORP., SEARS, AND HOLLYWOOD—SIOUX, FLATHEADS, APACHES

(By Thomas Bush and Ed Cony)

LOS ANGELES.—Casper Thunder Hawk effortlessly swings 20 feet of green lumber onto a truck at a Food Machinery Corp. plant here, where he came to work just this month as a helper.

The 237-pound Mr. Thunder Hawk, a full-blooded Sioux, is right off the Standing Rock Reservation in North Dakota where he eked out an existence as a part-time farm hand and construction worker. His new job pays him more than twice as much as he's ever made before.

A few miles away, at a Chrysler Corp. plant, Asa Chalepah, a full-blooded Apache, gives a mighty shove with his 249 pounds and pushes the body of a new Dodge onto a final assembly line. He too is taking home twice as much pay as he ever did as a farmhand on the Oklahoma reservation he called home until a year ago.

LABOR SHORTAGE HELP

Except for their size, Mr. Thunder Hawk and Mr. Chalepah are not exceptional cases. Altogether more than 500 companies in the Los Angeles area are putting to good industrial use the skills of 6,500 Indians, many of whom were living on primitive reservations as Government welfare cases just a few months ago. Companies in other cities in the Far West, Midwest, and Southwest are reaching out for the Red Man to help solve labor shortage problems.

Of course, there have long been large numbers of citizens in business and industry who have some Indian blood. But relatively few of their Indian ancestors ever saw a reservation; the reservation system wasn't set up until after the Indian wars of the mid-1800's when the Federal Government put the remnants of the vanquished tribes, mostly full-blooded Indians, on these defined preserves. Since 1924, the reservation Indians have had full citizenship rights, including voting privileges. Although they've been free to leave their reservations, a notable exodus occurred only with World War II. The migration has grown sharply in the past few years.

About 10,000 will make the switch this year, according to the Interior Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs. That's a hefty 40 percent jump over last year's migration and a 200 percent increase over that of 1952 when some 3,000 Indians left reservations to cope with city traffic hazards, assembly-line jobs, and monthly payments on TV sets.

Los Angeles is the No. 1 attraction for city-bound Indians. Over 50 percent of this year's migrating tribesmen were drawn to the southern California metropolis, the Indian Bureau estimates. Geographical proximity is a likely explanation for Los Angeles' popularity; a fourth of the country's 400,000 Indians live in the barren wastes of Arizona and New Mexico, to the east of Los Angeles.

TREK IN MIDWEST

Chicago, Denver, and Minneapolis are also attracting Indians in some numbers. Over 5,000—mostly Chippewas and Sioux—reside in Chicago, for instance, and almost half of them are recent migrants from reservations.

This "new invasion" is of interest to taxpayers, as well as to employers and sociologists. The United States Government is spending $96 million on Indians this year, a 50 percent increase over 1950. Most of it goes for services on reservations, where 3 of every 4 Indians still live.

Why is Uncle Sam's Indian bill mounting? For one thing, instead of vanishing, the red man is multiplying in numbers. The 400,000 population is a 60 percent increase over the turn of the century.

This steady growth has strained the limited economic resources of most reservations, increased the poverty of Indians living on them and made them more dependent than ever on Government help.

An Indian Bureau official says: "Most of the land on reservations is of poor quality. It is estimated conservatively that less than three-fifths of the Indians now living on reservations could be supported on a decent standard of living from resources available on the reservations."

NAVAHOS AND CHIPPEWAS

Some 70,000 Navahos, for instance, are trying to exist on 25,000 square miles of barren, arid reservation tucked away in the remote wildness where New Mexico, Arizona, and Utah meet. The Indian Bureau says the land is capable of providing a decent living for only about 40 percent of the tribe.

Over a thousand miles to the north, close to the Canadian border in North Dakota, some 9,000 Chippewas huddle together on

the tiny, 2-square-mile Turtle Mountain Reservation, "which provides the tribe a little firewood and a squatting place—and that's about all," a Bureau official says.

But this year enough Indians are migrating to town to cancel out any gain in reservation population, and 1955 may mark the turning point in the long, steady rise in reservation population.

What happens to the Indian when he leaves familiar surroundings to strike out on his own?

A young Navaho couple recently arrived in Los Angeles, straight from the reservation. Mrs. Begay—that's not her real name, but among Navahos it's the equivalent of Jones or Smith—carried her baby strapped to her back on a cradleboard. She wore long, heavy braids, a blue velvet jacket and a long, rose satin skirt—a Navaho costume unchanged since the 1840's.

Two weeks later, she'd cut her hair short, was pushing the baby around in a stroller and was dressed like any teen-ager—including bobby sox and saddle shoes.

And her husband was getting interested in buying a television set. "We used to count the number of TV sets bought each month by new arrivals," says an Indian Bureau official in Los Angeles. "But they became so common we gave up counting them. I'd say 50 percent of the Indian families buy a set soon after they arrive; and after 6 months to a year, practically all have them."

Abrupt transitions like the Begay's aren't always successful. One Indian of every eight who tries city life finally returns to the reservation, the Indian Bureau estimates.

Among pale face customs which sometimes confuse newly arrived Indians are those surrounding labor-management relations. For example, one brave thought he was acting correctly during an aircraft strike in Los Angeles. But he soon learned differently. He had been walking the picket line during the day, then after a quick dinner at home, was reporting for his swing-shift job, unconcernedly crossing the picket line.

During the same strike, another Indian came to work but soon ran out of material to fabricate because workers on either side of him weren't at their machines. The Indian quietly went over to the idle machines, began to operate them and soon had his own one-man assembly line operating. "He'd never said 'boo' to anyone, and it's the first time we had any idea he could run any machine but his own," recalls his supervisor.

THE RELOCATION SERVICE

Indians arriving in Los Angeles frequently get help from Mrs. Mary Gamble who heads the local office of the Indian Bureau's Relocation Service which tries to find jobs for Indians in Los Angeles and help them adjust to city ways.

The Relocation Service attempts to help the Indian in the first, difficult days of adjustment in the city. And back on the reservation, the Relocation Service is also ready to help Indians who express a desire to move into town. On 14 reservations, Relocation representatives will give the Indian advice on what he needs to bring to the city, and what to do when he arrives. The Service will also give him a physical exam and in some cases help out financially with moving expenses.

Mrs. Gamble explains that many "blanket Indians" have never before been off their reservations. Riding on streetcars, shopping at supermarkets and using dial telephones are entirely new adventures for them.

"We have a saying around here," says the motherly Mrs. Gamble: "If the phone rings and you hear heavy breathing, you know it's an Indian right off the reservation—and he's in trouble. Otherwise he wouldn't have dared to pick up the phone."

SOME HIGH HURDLES

Many Indians, once they leave the reservation, have to go to schools operated by the Indian Bureau to learn the three R's—and to learn to speak English. On the Navaho Reservation in Arizona, about 45,000 of the 70,000 tribal members couldn't read or write, as recently as 1947. And almost as many couldn't speak English. While schooling on the reservation has improved in the last 8 years, literacy is still far short of 100 percent.

Some also arrive in Los Angeles suffering from malnutrition. A North American Aviation spokesman says: "More than once, we've placed Indians under a doctor's care to build them up so they can pass our stiff medical requirements and come to work for us."

Few Indians are skilled workers when they leave the reservation. But despite these handicaps, Indians have found and kept jobs in Los Angeles where they've had help from cooperative employers and the Indian Bureau.

North American Aviation, for instance, has between 450 and 500 Indians working in its Los Angeles plants.

"I was awful scared the first month on the job, but I'm getting along fine now," says stocky 21-year-old Stan Begay as he stops work for a minute on a hydraulic line he's putting into one of North American's F–100 super-Sabres.

His supervisor agrees: "Stan's an awful good worker. When he's out of something to do, he comes around for more."

After work, Stan heads for night school where he's taking blueprint reading; he soon hopes to go on to mechanical engineering courses.

MR. ZOOK'S VIEW

Indians at North American start out at relatively unskilled jobs, but "because of their handicraft skill and manual dexterity" most of them work into better jobs paying between $300 and $400 a month, an official says.

North American's attitude toward hiring Indians is summed up by Dwight Zook, head of employment: "We look on Indians as a great untapped source of workers in a tight labor market."

Listen to Mrs. Peggy Koester who has a dozen Indians among the workers she supervises at Cole of California's swimsuit plant in Hollywood: "Indians have terrific finger dexterity and they're proud of their work."

At Bethlehem Pacific Steel Corp.'s Los Angeles plant, Peter Pflough, of the Flathead Tribe in Montana, works for $1.84½ an hour as an electric furnace tender. His foreman sums up his performance in three words: "He's the shovelingest."

And at Garrett Corp., where a Sioux named Ben Gullikson works as an electrical assembler, comes this praise from a company official: "If you have more like Gullikson, send 'em out."

BANKS, RETAIL STORES

Los Angeles industrial plants aren't the only ones to employ Indians. Walk into the Security-First National Bank, Sears, Roebuck stores, Los Angeles public schools, and city and county offices, and you'll find copper-hued employees working alongside lighter-skinned workers. And at least one Indian has found his way to Hollywood.

Felix Noriego left the Papago reservation in Arizona a couple of years ago to work in a Los Angeles aircraft plant. But shortly after he arrived here, Hollywood put out a call for "an Indian 6 feet tall, 21 years old, with a face like that on the buffalo nickel."

Mr. Noriego got the job and ever since has been busy appearing in "To Hell and Back," "Drum Beat" and "Battle Cry." The job is fairly easy, he says: "They just want me to act like an Indian."

Among the Indians who didn't take to metropolitan life was Ben Gullikson's brother. He tried living in Los Angeles, got fed up with the noise and the traffic "and has gone back to the Rosebud reservation in North Dakota for good."

But the Indians who stay on in the cities are quick to use their increased purchasing power to grab the same variety of consumer goods as any American—autos, furniture, appliances, to name some.

Take Adolph "Bronc" Nagurski, a 31-year-old Navajo, who is a sheet metal worker at Douglas Aircraft Co. Mr. Nagurski—named after the famous Chicago Bears fullback by a teacher who had trouble spelling and pronouncing his Indian name (Chechinezhesue, or "grandson of a tall brave")—has recently bought an $11,000 house.

In addition to his swing shift job at Douglas, Mr. Nagurski works days as an airplane mechanic at Long Beach airport. He's using some of this extra money to finance flying lessons. "I don't have my pilot's license yet, but I expect to get it this summer," he says.

"I hope to buy a home here soon, like my older brother did," says Bill Thorpe, son of the great Indian athlete, Jim Thorpe. Bill works at North American where his sure hands guide a machine which cuts into aluminum, stainless steel and titanium to form airplane parts.

The Government, of course, benefits too from the Indians' increased purchasing power. A survey last year in one Los Angeles industrial plant showed the average Indian worker was paying $210 a year in withholding taxes. Instead of being a recipient of Government help as a "ward of the Government," the Indian working in industry pays his share of the tax burden.

Of course, on a few rich reservations—where oil has been discovered or where valuable timber resources are owned by the tribe—the brave forks out a substantial tax payment. But consider some of the poorer reservations.

Take the 7,400 Papagoes, who live on a reservation at Sells Agency, Ariz. A report to a congressional committee at the end of 1952 showed the average family income to be $1,500 with a fourth of the families earning less than $100 a year per capita.

Obviously there was little income-tax revenue from the Papagoes.

Or take another Arizona reservation, the San Carlos Apache Reservation, where some 4,000 Apaches are trying to exist on 1.6 million acres.

Tribal leaders, anxious to develop "our own resources" and "to train our people to help themselves," asked Stanford Research Institute to look into the reservation's economic resources.

Here are some of the findings submitted to the tribal council last year:

About 20 percent of the tribe's labor force was unemployed. One reason for the unemployment—the Apaches' reliance on livestock raising as a chief occupation.

"Except during the semiannual roundup and auction periods, relatively few persons are required for livestock operations," the report notes. War and postwar prosperity enabled the Indians to make a living without working consistently. "The consequent idleness and lack of opportunity to find constructive outlets for their energies led to such serious social problems as excessive drinking, breakdown of family relationships, and a relatively high suicide rate."

The institute came up with some suggestions as to how the Apaches might better utilize their resources—range improvement, expanded lumber operations, and additional irrigation. But the researchers also agreed: "There are no easy economic solutions to the problems with which the San Carlos people are faced."

Federal Aid for Surplus Labor Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article on the subject of Federal aid to surplus labor areas and I was pleased to note that the President's recommendations to alleviate conditions in such areas in his state of the Union message were views incorporated in H. R. 9137, which I introduced in the House of Representatives on May 13, 1954, and which I reintroduced on January 5, 1955.

The article appeared in the Boston Globe, January 9, 1956:

IKE EXPECTED TO URGE "LUBRICATING" LOANS—DEMOCRATS SUPPORTING BROADER PROGRAM—FEDERAL AID PLANNED FOR JOBLESS AREAS

(By John Harriman)

Both the administration and Congress are apparently determined to do something about what are usually called surplus labor areas; this is, communities where 6 percent of the labor force is unemployed and likely to remain so for some time.

Lawrence and Lowell are among such areas in this State. Others throughout the country include Duluth-Superior, out in Minnesota; Tacoma, Wash.; the anthracite coal region in eastern Pennsylvania; parts of North Carolina; Charleston, W. Va.; and Atlantic City, N. J.

President Eisenhower promised recommendations to alleviate conditions in such areas in his congressional message last week, and on Friday hearings were started on the same matter by a subcommittee of the Senate.

FEDERAL LOANS TO HELP FINANCE NEW PLANTS

The plan to be offered by the President is said to contemplate Congress appropriating $35 million to the Department of Commerce. This money would be loaned to the 80-odd communities still suffering unemployment.

The loans, as planned, are described as "lubricating"; that is, they would be granted with the idea of bringing in local, State and private funds to finance new industry in these areas.

Federal money would only be a part. The figure 25 percent is mentioned of the cost, for instance, of a new plant for an industry which might locate in the community, with maybe another 20 percent put up by the State or city, and the balance from private sources.

There would also be grants, maybe up to $1 million to universities to train specialists and develop facilities to aid these distressed areas.

Furthermore, the program is said to call for a determined effort by the Government through advice and technical assistance to discover and root out the basic causes of unemployment wherever they exist.

The Democrats, controlling Congress, have a much more ambitious program, however. This is a bill sponsored by seven Senators, including DOUGLAS, of Illinois, LEHMAN, of New York, and KENNEDY, of this State.

FAST TAX WRITE-OFF BENEFITS PROPOSED

This bill would create a depressed areas administration, under an administrator.

This new agency of Government would be authorized to make up to $100 million in loans for new plants and other industrial development * * * plus another $100 million to "initiate programs of public facilities * * *."

Funds for such a program would be raised by the issuanec by the agency of $200 million in notes and obligations, which could be purchased by the Treasury. And it is contemplated that such loans as are made will be self-liquidating, as was the case with the old RFC.

Other provisions in the Senate bill are fast tax write-off benefits for new plants, a program under which the government would supplement State unemployment insurance benefits in some cases, and the distribution of surplus farm commodities to homes and institutions.

Vocational training for new employment, and the siphoning of Governemnt contracts to depressed areas are another part of the plan.

Obviously the Democrats' program goes much further than that to be offered by the administration, and the two will meet head-on in Congress.

What we shall probably see enacted is some compromise between the two plans.

Budget Bureau's Proposal for a TVA Self-financing Plan Is Another in a Long Series of Efforts to Destroy TVA, Says Gordon Clapp, Former TVA Board Chairman—Supports TVA Board Plan for Financing—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, recently, two of Tennessee's most distinguished journalists, Mr. Coleman A. Harwell, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, and Mr. Nat Caldwell, a distinguished member of the staff of the Tennessean, conducted a transcribed interview in New York City with Mr. Gordon Clapp, former Chairman of the Board of the Tennessee Valley.

This interview is virtually a historical document—it is one of the most lucid statements of the purposes and activities of the great TVA that I have ever read and I strongly believe that it should be further considered and this document preserved.

Therefore, under unanimous consent, I ask that this interview be included in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have devided the reported interview into five parts—with the first part consisting for the most part of the high esteem in which the TVA is held by other nations of the world as an example of how best to promote rehabilitation and development for themselves.

Part I of the Clapp interview follows:

Mr. HARWELL. We have come here today to interview you, and we appreciate the opportunity to do it. We, along with all the people of the Tennessee Valley, recognize that you are the outstanding advocate of the things that have made the TVA one of the most remarkable experiments in our day, and you, as much as anyone, have been responsible for its great success and its service to the people of the valley, and we believe, to the people of the country.

Today it sems clear that the TVA has reached another of its crises, and, facing that, we have come to you for your opinions and suggestions, and to ask you to share with the people of the Tennessee Valley and, also, with the people of the country the benefit of your knowledge and experience.

First, before talk of other things, we'd be interested to know, having some general idea about it, a little more about what you are doing now and what your plans are in this interesting new work you are undertaking.

Mr. CLAPP. I am glad to have a chance to talk about the TVA and the future of the TVA. Certainly, the past history of the TVA has a great deal to do with what I am doing now.

Dave Lilienthal (Clapp's predecessor as TVA Chairman) and I are back together again under the auspices of a private company to make our services available for counsel and advice to governments of other countries, or to their public agencies, in the plans and programs they have for development of their natural resources, their rivers, their agricultural lands, their forests, their mineral deposits, and the like.

Mr. HARWELL. How long were you and Lilienthal associated previously?

Mr. CLAPP. You remember that Dave was a member of the original Board in 1933, and later was Chairman until 1946. About 1 month after the Board was established I came into the TVA in a very minor capacity in the Personnel Division. I succeeded him as Chairman of the Board and Director in 1946, when he was made Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. HARWELL. When did you become a member of the Board?

Mr. CLAPP. In 1946. That is 13 years after I went to TVA. During that time I became Director of Personnel, and later General Manager of the TVA. This new work we are in——

CAME FROM RANKS

Mr. HARWELL. So you came from the ranks of the staff of the TVA onto the Board. Isn't it true that you are the only member of the Board who did have that experience? You had the benefit of the experiences as a member of the staff as well as of the Board and then Chairman?

Mr. CLAPP. That is right. Of course, you will remember that Harry Curtis, a present and distinguished member of the TVA Board of Directors was TVA's first chief chemical engineer back in 1933 and 1934, and was with the TVA for a number of years with some interruption before he came back to the TVA as a member of the Board.

Mr. HARWELL. Well, is your present enterprice directed at any one part of the world?

Mr. CLAPP. No. I would say in any part of the free world, although we will, of course, have to limit the number of assignments we take on.

Mr. HARWELL. Is there any news in your plans at present?

Mr. CLAPP. At present we are actively engaged in advisory capacity with the Cauca Valley Corp., which is a public agency of the Colombian Government, in South America. It is setting out to do for the Cauca River Valley very much what the Tennessee Valley program contemplated 20 years ago—flood control, irrigation, power, agricultural improvement.

Mr. HARWELL. How is that to be financed?

Mr. CLAPP. The corporation is working on that now. Most of the financing will, of course, have to come from Colombia, but it will seek other sources, too.

Mr. CALDWELL. That is the National Government of Colombia?

Mr. CLAPP. The National Government of Colombia as well as the departmentos or states directly concerned with the regional development along the Cauca River.

Mr. HARWELL. Has anything recently occurred in connection with your survey and recommendation in Jordan?

Mr. CLAPP. As you know, Eric Johnston has been negotiating in the Middle East among the Arab States and with Israel attempting to get an agreement on a Jordan Valley development plan which the TVA developed at the request of the United Nations a couple of years ago. It is a most difficult and complex assignment. I don't know anything more about the progress on that than what I read in the papers.

WORLD INSPIRATION

Mr. HARWELL. Well, you have said, I believe, that sometimes we are more enthusiastic about sharing the good things in life with other countries than here at home and that the TVA has served as an inspiration to people in many parts of the world, which is an indication of its value to us.

Mr. CLAPP. I don't think there is any question about the tremendous value of the practical experience shown in the Tennessee Valley development in its effect upon the thinking of people all over the world. If you examine the list of the visitors from other countries who have come to the Tennessee Valley on official missions as interested engineers and technicians, as heads of state, and if you were to count up the time that people from other countries have spent in the Tennessee Valley studying the TVA, you would begin to realize that it is really one of the outstanding showcases for United States foreign policy.

It is ironical, however, that some of the very people in high places who are selling it most eagerly abroad are most apologetic about it at home. That fact was borne out to me in a very sharp way when the Jordan River plan that the TVA developed at the request of the U. N. was blessed by the President and put into the hands of United States emissaries for negotiation between Israel and the Arab countries. The plan for doing something constructive about a river was advanced as offering high hopes for relieving international tensions in that part of the world. This came shortly on the heels of the condemnation of the TVA by the President when he labeled it as creeping socialism on the very day that the House of Representatives was debating appropriations for a TVA steam plant.

This type of doubletalk about TVA's value abroad and at home is a serious reflection upon our estimate of the intelligence of people in other countries.

HISTORIC IRONY

Mr. CALDWELL. Hasn't some of the opposition to TVA in the valley been on the claim it could not succeed?

Mr. CLAPP. That is right. History has made that rather ironical. At first the private utilities, and some of those who opposed TVA in the valley and elsewhere, said they were against it because they didn't think it would work and it would be a waste of effort. Then as TVA proved successful the private utilities have continued to oppose it because it has worked so well.

Mr. HARWELL. Aren't those who are saying in other parts of the country today, that we must not repeat the TVA pattern because we must have a great degree of participation of local governmental and civic and individual groups; aren't they actually using that in some measure to advance the purposes of private power and defeat the aim of public power?

Mr. CLAPP. Of course, and it seems to me, they are working that idea to death. The fact is that the Army engineers who conducted the engineering surveys of the Tennessee River years ago, not wanting to get into the controversial subject of public power development on the river, invited the private utility companies in the valley to build dams which the Army engineers considered necessary to control floods and to make the rivers navigable. The private utilities turned down the invitation and, moreover, said that any power development on the Tennessee River would be surplus, unneeded, and that the area was getting all the power it could possibly use.

I think that history in the Tennessee Valley plus the current lipservice that is pushing for local initiative in power development is designed deliberately to confuse the public about the nature of these problems, and the remedy which must be sought to solve them. No agency outside of the Federal Government could do on the Tennessee River what the TVA was set up to do and has done.

Mr. HARWELL. Is there any reason, in your view, that any of the basic original purposes of the TVA as set out in the original act should be modified today?

Original Purposes of TVA Remain Sound Today—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD part II of a significant interview with Mr. Gordon Clapp, former TVA Chairman, conducted recently by Mr. Harwell and Mr. Caldwell, of the Nashville Tennessean.

Part II follows:

REMAIN SOUND

Mr. CLAPP. The original purposes of the TVA Act are just as sound today as they were when they were written into the law. Let me cite them briefly.

It was assigned the task of controlling floods with which the Tennessee Valley was plagued year after year, to make the river navigable from its mouth at Paducah to Knoxville, the head of navigation, and, thereby, make it an important part of the growing inland waterway system of the country. TVA was created to provide for the national defense—certainly, the TVA's record is an illustrious confirmation of the congressional and Presidential wisdom on that point.

Witness the atomic energy development at Paducah and Oak Ridge, the Tullahoma engineering wind tunnel development, the rapid increase in chemical and light-metal industries which the TVA development accelerated, if not made possible.

It also had the objective of bringing about an orderly development of the natural resources of the whole region, including its minerals, its forests, its agricultural lands, and to improve "the general welfare of the people of said region"—as the TVA Act puts it in so many words.

Some of these objectives have been attained in large part, though a process of development of this kind is never ending. Then there is power supply, more efficient conservation and use of forests and agricultural lands, and a greater development of the industrial processing of the raw materials with which that region is blessed.

The main purpose of the TVA in all of area as set forth in the act of 1933 was to lend general oversight to these problems, work with the States, the counties, the cities, and the citizens of the valley to keep moving in the direction of greater and greater development of the resources of the region.

I think the record of the TVA and the Tennessee Valley confirms the wisdom of those objectives. It would be a denial of experience to remove from the scene of the Tennessee Valley that agency which has stimulated, guided, accelerated these developments, and has helped as a partner the thousands of businessmen, citizens, public officials, farmers, and workers in putting these resources to work in raising the standards of living.

ENEMY WISECRACK

Mr. HARWELL. You know, there are people who believe, and there are others who propagandize, whether they believe it or not, against the TVA on the basis that it serves just one area. A favorite wisecrack is to the effect that TVA drains 47 States for the benefit of 1. Is the value of TVA to the country as a whole demonstrable?

Mr. CLAPP. I think the case on that is unanswerable in favor of TVA as a national benefit if people will just review the record with an open mind. Before there was a TVA, and before there was a Federal investment in the dams of the Tennessee River and its tributaries, flood relief had to be poured into the Tennessee Valley when there were floods though not on as large a scale as is true today when regions like New England suffer floods.

When there are floods on the Missouri, the whole country comes to the rescue and pours money for relief into the area.

In one flood alone in 1951 on the Missouri River, the Federal agencies concerned estimated the flood damage and the relief cost at somewhere around a half-billion dollars, which at that time was more money than had been put into the development of the Tennessee Valley by the Federal Government to prevent there the very thing that was happening on the Missouri. On the ground of arithmetic alone related to dollars and cents, the Tennessee Valley experience is clearly a benefit to all of the taxpayers of the United States.

However, one can attribute benefits beyond the obvious arithmetic. There are those who say that the flood-control, navigation and power-development plans that have been devised in recent years for the Missouri River system are good plans, and I am prepared to accept their judgment.

But the record of the development of those plans at the time shows one Government agency was planning the upper end of the river while another Government agency was planning the lower end of the Missouri, and they were both claiming that the other's plans were not good. The existence of the TVA and its record of success in developing a single plan for a single river, can be credited with bringing those two agencies together. They resolved their differences, revised their engineering, and I think TVA should be given a large credit for the improvement and asserted economy that now shows up in the plans for the Missouri.

DOLLARS AND CENTS

Mr. CALDWELL. Has it been of any practical dollars-and-cents benefit in the present atomic program. We are conscious of the Federal budget and the need to save money.

Mr. CLAPP. Well, let's take a look at one case, power for the atomic-energy program. The quantity of power that is required by Oak Ridge and Paducah atomic-energy installations is so great that the difference in their power costs of as slight as one-half of a mill per kilowatt-hour—a difference of one-half of one-tenth of a penny—would account for an annual difference in the United States Government's power bill of at least $50 million.

The existence of the TVA before the construction of the atomic energy projects, the ability of the TVA to build steam plants efficiently and economically, to supply their power needs, established a base line for costs against which the quotations of the private utility companies could be compared. Those private utility companies which now supply part of the power to the Paducah installation and to the new atomic energy installation

going up at Portsmouth, Ohio—those quotations compare rather favorably with what the TVA charges the Atomic Energy Commission, but the power rates paid by the Atomic Energy Commission to those private companies is considerably lower than those private companies ordinarily quote to other industrial users.

It is perfectly clear that if there had been no TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission in those two installations alone would be paying a power cost running into many, many millions of dollars a year more than it is costing now.

You can add up many cases like that in connection with the power cost at the Air Force wind tunnel at Tullahoma, the cost of power for aluminum that went into our bomber program during the war and into the chemical operations that centered in the Tennessee Valley. On the basis of dollars and cents I don't think it would take much figuring to equate savings to the Federal Government for the military and national-defense programs attributable to the existence and efficiency of the TVA, which savings would very quickly equal the investment that has gone through the TVA.

Mr. CALDWELL. Wouldn't it almost save each year from now on the equivalent of the $150 million a year that we have got to spend for new steam plants?

Mr. CLAPP. It would add up to more than that very quickly, and these savings that I refer to go on year after year. Those savings represent a lesser bill that the taxpayer in the States of Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, and New York pay into the Federal Government for the national-defense bill, and it is no small item. That saving in a sense, therefore, is a dividend which the TVA declares by its very existence. It benefits citizens everywhere.

Now, one can go on and spell out many other ways in which the TVA has created national benefits. At least half of all the money that has been invested in the TVA power system, including the steam plants, and in flood control and navigation systems, was spent outside the Tennessee Valley to the great benefit of working forces and manufacturing corporations in Illinois, New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, to name but a few.

ANSWER TO SOVIETS

Mr. CALDWELL. In that connection, and in the light of your present business experiences, what has TVA meant in the world picture?

Mr. CLAPP. The ability of the United States to make a fresh approach to the development and control of a river and the development of the natural resources of the region in cooperation with State and local governments and private citizens, has shown people in other parts of the world that Americans are still inventive not only in the field of mechanical gadgets but also in the more difficult field of methods of administration.

Foreign countries are especially eager to learn how TVA handles the extremely delicate problem of the relationship between a strong central Government and the State and local governments from which so much initiative must come in any democratic society.

TVA's outstanding success in this respect alone has been of the strongest appeal to those underdeveloped countries where heavy reliance must perforce be put upon central government and where leadership in the provinces and outlying areas has a difficult time making itself known and felt.

The Soviets who approach the underdeveloped countries extol the virtues of the highly centralized practice of the Soviet system where plans and the execution of plans are done by the few in the national capital in order to get quick results by dictatorial methods. They offer a very appealing theory to countries where people are hungry and idle and want modern benefits in a hurry.

The success of the TVA within the Federal system of the United States, the success of the TVA in finding a highly effective means of working hand in hand with States and local government without depriving citizens of their individual or economic freedom, but, in addition, helping to create new economic opportunities for them is a dramatic answer to the Soviet line of approach to economic development. The existence of the TVA is a practical, observable answer to what otherwise might be an empty argument about abstract theory.

I believe that if properly understood and interpreted by our leaders in foreign policy, the TVA method of governmental cooperation could be one of the most effective and understandable instruments with which to combat in a constructive way the drive the Soviets are now making in the Middle East and in the Far East to freeze out the technical assistance and ideas of the western world.

Mr. HARWELL. On the yardstick matter, what about the individual benefit to the citizens of other parts of the country?

Mr. CLAPP. Well, that is, really, a dramatic story all by itself. The very fact that the Tennessee Valley has shown that electricity from hydro and steam plants can be brought to the consumer at a rate appreciably lower than the rates charged by the private companies and still produce a good return for the Federal Government and a very good return to the municipal and rural electric cooperatives on their investment has alerted people all over the country about the high charges they are paying for their electric service.

Many cooperatives in other parts of the country have sent their people to the Tennessee Valley to study this system of low rates designed to achieve high consumption. By becoming informed about TVA's experience they have strengthened their hand in bargaining with the private utilities from which they get power, and have been successful in many instances in bringing their own rates down.

Moreover, the rural electric cooperative, which is now commonplace in most parts of the country, originated in the Tennessee Valley, in the State of Mississippi, with the advent of the TVA. One could estimate the effect that TVA rates have had upon rates in other parts of the country, but let me just point out this, that if you chart the rates charged by private utility companies to rural electric cooperatives over the country, you will find that as you move away from the Tennessee Valley and from the Pacific Northwest, where there has been another large public power center, the private utility rates go up in direct proportion as you move away from those centers.

That demonstrates the competitive influence of a TVA demonstration. The ascending rates as you move away from the Tennessee Valley cannot be attributed to increased costs of producing electricity, because even if you equalize fuel costs, for example, you find the ascending rate phenomenon showing up as you chart rate zones outside the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest.

Tennessee Valley Power Consumption Has Been Boon to Appliance and Other Manufacturing Industries of the Nation—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask that part III of the interview between Mr. Gordon Clapp, former TVA Chairman, and Messrs. Harwell and Caldwell, of the Nashville Tennessean, be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Part III of the interview follows:

TWICE NATION'S AVERAGE

Mr. HARWELL. Has development of REA's in the Tennessee Valley been greater than in other parts of the country?

Mr. CLAPP. The contrast between the Tennessee Valley and other parts of the country is not so marked in that respect as it is in the increased use by the individual consumer.

The average residential consumption in the Tennessee Valley, which would include rural users, is about twice that of the national average. That is one of the functions of the low rate. As the rate is reduced, consumers use more and the heavy investment in generating plants is more efficiently used.

Mr. HARWELL. And doesn't that in turn result in the type of thing you cited earlier that the purchase of more appliances——

Mr. CLAPP. Exactly. The appliance manufacturers for years since the advent of the TVA program have marked the Tennessee Valley as the boom market for electrical appliances.

If you added up the amount of money that electric consumers in the Tennessee Valley have spent in purchasing appliances since the war when they became readily available again, it exceeds $1 billion.

There is the increase in house heating, in air conditioning, in water pumps on the farms, to say nothing of cooking ranges, hot water heaters. That increase has been phenomenal in the Tennessee Valley as compared with other parts of the country, with the possible exception of the Northwest.

Mr. HARWELL. Do you feel that the TVA has given the valley an unfair advantage over other parts of the country in its industrial development?

Mr. CLAPP. No, I don't believe that is a valid point. The power rates in the Tennessee Valley are based upon the cost of producing power there. The coal was there before TVA appeared on the scene. The potential hydro was in the river. The raw materials upon which industry must rely were there. TVA simply was a means of mobilizing and utilizing those basic power resources.

As long as the TVA rates cover all costs and provide a sufficient rate of return for private or for the Federal investment, no valid objection can be made as to whatever attraction that rate level may offer for industry.

One must remember that so far as power rates are concerned, the Columbia River Valley in the Northwest offers much greater

advantages than the Tennessee Valley can offer. They have a bigger and better river for power. Yet, the Tennessee Valley has never suggested, to my knowledge, that the advantages of the Columbia River should be neutralized by forcing the private and public power utilities in that area to raise their rates so that they won't compete with the Tennessee Valley.

AIDS OTHER AREAS

Mr. HARWELL. Would you say that the industrial development of other parts of the country in itself is an answer to this question?

Mr. CLAPP. It is a sweeping answer to it. I think it is clear that we gain greater and greater national strength by encouraging within each region that kind of development which its natural resources of transportation, terrain, minerals, ray materials, growing season, fuel and power capacities will best support.

The development in the Tennessee Valley has not been the expense of industrial development elsewhere. It has, instead, supplemented, complemented, added to the national productive capacity, and has in turn encouraged and helped to support industrial development elsewhere.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Clapp, let's consider these conflicts that have been—I think you have said or implied—the good fortune of TVA and the people in the Tennessee Valley. That is because they had to fight back?

Mr. CLAPP. I think they were good things, yes. The major issues that arose in the course of TVA's success made it necessary from time to time for the people of the Tennessee Valley to think very deeply and soberly about the value of this development that was going on and of which they were a very important part. It made them realize anew each time these basic issues came up—such as the issue about keeping TVA free from political patronage—it made them realize that they couldn't safely take the continued successful existence of the TVA or their whole valley development program for granted; that its future depended upon their understanding and upon their activity and aggressive support of the valley's program.

The issue now confronting the Tennessee Valley about future power supply and how it shall be financed is another one of these basic questions, basic issues, which will call as never before for full and devoted understanding of the people so that they can relate the outcome of that question to the future of the valley and their own continued development.

The proposal that the TVA board has made to get an amendment to the TVA act authorizing revenue bond financing as another and additional means of financing future power supply, additional steam plants, is a sound and wise proposal. It will not be easy to obtain the necessary legislation, because the opponents of the TVA in and out of Government will try to use this occasion to destroy the TVA, or to render it wholly ineffective and make it fail.

Mr. CALDWELL. Why?

Mr. CLAPP. Because the diehard opposition to the TVA has only one purpose in mind, and that is to dismantle, disband, and get rid of the TVA, and they don't care by what means they accomplish that purpose.

Witness the ill-fated Dixon-Yates scheme which was the vehicle for a kind of slipperiness in high Government circles that reckoned without the alert attention of the public in these matters.

Mr. CALDWELL. Why do they feel they have to destroy? Does it have any relation to this map of spreading ripples of lower rates that surround the Tennessee Valley? Does that have anything to do with it?

Mr. CLAPP. I am sure that has a lot to do with it. The successful existence of the TVA as an efficient, low-cost supplier of power makes the neighboring utilities or private utilities anywhere in the country very uncomfortable. Being monopolies in the areas they serve, they would much prefer not to be bothered by any demonstrations of how their type of business can be conducted more efficiently or more economically to the benefit of consumers.

FEAR COMPARISON

Mr. CALDWELL. The thing they fear most is the regulation by comparison.

Mr. CLAPP. I think that is right. They would much prefer to be not regulated at all, or, in lieu of that, be regulated by agencies which they can overpower by statistics, litigation, and time-consuming hearings on highly complicated rate studies.

Mr. HARWELL. You made the statement concerning the efficient operation of TVA. President Eisenhower gave assurance that his administration would maintain the TVA at maximum efficiency. Apparently there is a considerable misunderstanding as to what maximum efficiency means.

Would you say that for the TVA to be maintained at maximum efficiency, it must meet the needs of the Valley as to power?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly. It must continue to meet the needs of the valley as to power in the most economical and in the most competent engineering way available. The TVA can meet that responsibility financially under the present circumstances only through two routes; one is through the use of its earnings which it can do under the law, and has done in the past, but which is never sufficient in any private or public utility to meet the capital requirements for power supply expansion.

The other route is through appropriations by which the Federal Government in effect loans money for investment in TVA power facilities, the TVA being required by law to pay back to the Federal Government over a period of not to exceed 40 years every dime that is thus invested. The TVA is proposing to add an additional means of financing, not a substitute means but an additional means, whereby it could go at its discretion under congressional authorization into the private bond market and sell bonds against which the revenues from the sale of TVA power would be pledged for interest and redemption.

That would give the TVA three means of access to capital for expansion of its power system by adding steam plants—new steam plants, or units to existing steam plants.

Now, if the administration really meant what it said when it promised to maintain TVA at maximum efficiency, it will guard very zealously the managerial flexibility which TVA has previously possessed, namely, access to apropriations and use of its revenues, and if it wants to relieve the Federal budget of some of that capital requirement, it will gladly and without tricky restrictions upon the management and board of the TVA authorize access to the private money market.

HIDDEN DANGERS

Mr. HARWELL. Doesn't one of the alternative methods now proposed contain such hidden means of crippling the efficient operation of TVA?

Mr. CLAPP. The proposal which the Bureau of the Budget has advanced as its own self-financing plan for the TVA is full of jokers. If the Budget Director's proposal is adopted, it would take away from the TVA Board and management that degree of discretion which any managerial group must have in timing its financing program and in choosing from among its various means of financing, and draw that discretion into the hands of the Bureau of the Budget which is not set up to run a power system and has no experience in that connection.

The effect of the Budget Bureau's proposal is to—I think the intent behind the Budget Bureau's proposal—and intent may be more important than the language of their proposed bill—is to force the TVA Board to rely upon an exclusive means of financing, frequently ill-timed related to the cost of money, and thereby increase TVA's costs. It will force TVA power costs up and up in the hope that those higher costs would have to be recognized in higher rates to the ultimate consumers—the farmers, the factories, the places on Main Street, and in the thousands of homes throughout the valley.

If they can perpetrate this intent upon the Tennessee Valley, they will have succeeded in doing what they had hoped to do by means of the Dixon-Yates proposal.

Mr. CALDWELL. In other words they may not have had experience in managing a power system, but have had experience in trying to destroy one.

Mr. CLAPP. If the maneuvering that produced the Dixon-Yates scheme is an example of the Budget Director's facility in destructive purposes, I would say he is highly skilled in that art.

Mr. HARWELL. There are those who contend that the Dixon-Yates plan itself was a good one aside from any duplicity in trying to get it across. Can you subscribe to that?

Mr. CLAPP. No, I cannot. I think there are several facts that make that conclusion unsupportable.

In the first place, the Dixon-Yates plant was to be located in the wrong place. The TVA had gone over that problem of plant location from the standpoint of the best interest of the Tennessee Valley and its consumers and the best interest of the taxpayers of the country, and had settled upon the Fulton plant site on the side of the Mississippi River where there was some solid rock upon which it could be built. The Dixon-Yates team picked a dubious physical site from the standpoint of foundation and susceptibility to floods from the Mississippi. The Dixon-Yates plant would have added transportation costs to the cost of coal, as compared with the Fulton site.

In addition to locating it in the wrong place, it was going to produce costs that were substantially higher to the Government than would have been the case had the TVA been able to build the Fulton plant.

On top of that, the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget were gambling desperately with the record of performance of the Dixon-Yates combination whose first reliance was upon Ebasco, when the TVA had already demonstrated in the Shawnee-Joppa contest that it could build faster and more economically no matter where the plant was going to be built.

Does Budget Bureau's TVA Self-Financing Plan Have Same Ancestry as Abandoned Dixon-Yates Deal?—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, continuing the significant interview which Mr. Coleman Harwell and Mr. Nat Caldwell, of the Nashville Tennessean, held with Mr. Gordon Clapp, former TVA Board Chairman, I include part IV in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NOT BY ACCIDENT

Mr. CALDWELL. That wasn't by accident, was it?

Mr. CLAPP. No. That goes back to intent again. The only conclusion I can reach with respect to the whole Dixon-Yates affair is that those who maneuvered to develop and negotiate it were more intent upon doing harm to the TVA than they were upon serving the public interest. Naturally, that intent led them into a whole series of mistakes which they are now trying to atone for by making Messrs. Dixon and Yates the financial goats.

Mr. CALDWELL. The purpose of Dixon-Yates was to deny us an economic power supply, and the purpose of the Bureau of the Budget's self-financing plan is to deny us an economic capital supply; is that right?

Mr. CLAPP. I think that is right. I am confident that the people of the country and their Representatives in the Congress, when they examine the TVA's financing proposal and compare it with the Budget Bureau's financing proposal for the TVA, will side with the TVA's proposal.

Mr. CALDWELL. Would you be surprised if the Budget Bureau's self-financing plan had the same ancestry as the Dixon-Yates plan had?

Mr. CLAPP. I not only wouldn't be surprised, I would be prepared to assume it. Let me add one more thing to that last one. I still retain the hope that the President and his Director of the Budget, who is now so anxious to close the Dixon-Yates episode and have people forget about it, will regard the coming crisis of the TVA as a God-sent opportunity to demonstrate that the President really meant what he said when he promised to maintain TVA at maximum efficiency.

If the President and his subordinates really intend to live up to that promise, they will support TVA's financing proposal and try to obtain its enactment in the next Congress.

Mr. HARWELL. But isn't that a fond hope? Isn't it rather clear that both Mr. Hughes and his predecessor, Mr. Dodge, heard President Eisenhower when he referred to TVA as "creeping socialism" rather than when he promised to maintain it with maximum efficiency?

Mr. CLAPP. They could now make themselves right with their consciences by keeping a solemn promise.

Mr. CALDWELL. Is there any reason why TVA should continue to have appropriations from Congress in addition to the right to issue bonds?

Mr. CLAPP. I think there is a special reason why the TVA must continue to have access to appropriations as a means of obtaining capital for new power plants, and the reason is a very simple one. More than half of the capacity of the TVA system, and well over half of its energy output is committed to Federal national defense establishments, particularly the atomic energy program.

There is no reason that I can understand why the Federal Government should not finance at least that part of the additional power supply for service to itself through the cheapest means available, which is the Federal Government's ability to borrow money, which is represented in part by appropriations to the TVA.

CONGRESS HAS CHOICE

Mr. CALDWELL. There have been suggestions of amendment to the self-financing plan from Members of Congress who say that it is a bad thing for TVA, or any other Federal agency, to be permitted to operate outside of the Federal budget and outside of Federal debt control. What is your opinion on that?

Mr. CLAPP. Well, I think there is good theoretical support for that view, but I don't see that the TVA's financing proposal raises that question to any substantial degree.

There is more to the TVA than power. As long as the TVA is permitted to pursue the objectives assigned to it by law, it will have to go to the Congress each year for appropriations for its non-power activities. In the course of those hearings and examinations, TVA's plans for future power supply will of course, be discussed and reviewed.

If the TVA at any time, under the flexibility that would be granted by the TVA's financing plan, were to abuse its discretion under a wise financing authorization, the Congress could amend the discretion it had granted to TVA.

The Congress will have ample opportunity to control the TVA. One of the main questions involved in the TVA's financing proposal is whether the Congress will authorize the TVA to pick its own time to go into the money market, to set its own schedule for financing—or be subject to specific congressional approval for each loan.

When to buy money in my judgment, is a managerial question, not a question of political policy. If each bond sale has to be approved specifically in advance by the Congress, I see no justification for seeking revenue bond financing authorization at all. If TVA is not authorized to exercise discretion it might better continue to rely upon appropriations as it has in the past, and if Congress and the President failed to obtain them for the TVA, the President and the Congress will have to take the responsibility before the public for the gradual disruption of the TVA by repeated power shortages.

Mr. CADWELL. Some members of the valley's delegation in Congress feel that to win approval of any self-financing plan it will be necessary to provide for Congress to exercise some direct control over TVA's bond issues. They propose as a compromise a plan under which bond issues announced by the TVA would become effective if not specifically disapproved by Congress within a specific period. Do you think this plan would protect the interests of the TVA and permit its continued growth to serve the needs of the valley?

Mr. CLAPP. That idea has some appeal but for my own view I would want to see a thorough analysis of this specific proposal. I can see how in some circumstances it might create difficulties that might be costly. It must be remembered that the ability of the TVA to proceed economically and wisely under revenue bond financing must leave to the TVA sufficient discretion to pick the time at which they go into the market.

Mr. HARWELL. Should we in the valley stress the local aspects of the present crisis?

Mr. CLAPP. It would be most unfortunate and entirely beside the point for this issue to be debated on the basis of the Tennessee Valley versus the rest of the country. In this instance, as in the other big debates over the TVA, the people of the Tennessee Valley in fighting for the principles embodied in the TVA's financing proposal will be performing a national service in winning that fight.

That is particularly true in this case because they will simply be asking that the TVA power system, of which they are a part, be permitted to enter the market for private money with which to expand and enhance a national asset.

The earnings record of the TVA power system will make TVA revenue bonds a very good investment. In fighting for this in urging that this method be made available to the TVA, the valley is simply asking that the TVA have a chance to sell a part of its future to private citizens anywhere who want voluntarily to invest in the TVA power system.

INVESTIGATORS ACTIVE

Mr. CALDWELL. Actually, isn't it true that investment concerns here are prepared to, and are planning to compete for the opportunity of financing the TVA, if the plan is approved?

Mr. CLAPP. As I read the statement of the TVA, of the majority of the TVA Board, it so stated.

Mr. HARWELL. We have understood that some of the investment concerns in Nashville have already been making plans toward that end.

Mr. CLAPP. I would be very much surprised if there were not great competition among underwriting groups to have a chance to handle TVA revenue bond financing issues.

Mr. HARWELL. That would be another instance then, wouldn't it, of TVA's functioning to the benefit of private enterprise.

Mr. CLAPP. Of course.

Mr. CALDWELL. They wouldn't be in for it if they were not going to make a profit.

Mr. HARWELL. That goes without saying, doesn't it?

Mr. CLAPP. It goes without saying that any private financing group representing potential investors would examine the earnings record of the TVA, would examine the future prospects of the Tennessee Valley power requirements, would be impressed by the record of success in increased power demands, in TVA's ability to satisfy it, and would regard those bonds as a mighty good investment.

Mr. CALDWELL. But how do the private utilities feel about the financing plan?

Mr. CLAPP. I am sure the people of the Tennessee Valley as well as a lot of people in other parts of the country are watching the way the opponents of TVA change their tune every time TVA makes a suggestion about a change in the legislation.

It wasn't long ago when the utilities, along with other opponents of the TVA were saying that the TVA should not receive any more appropriations but should be required to finance its project by the issuance of bonds. But now that the TVA has proposed to do just that the private-utility spokesmen argue against it. The United States Chamber of Commerce has done the same kind of a flip-flop.

There is only one safe inference that can be drawn from this kind of double-talk—the opponents of TVA are not interested in the merits of the various methods by which the TVA seeks to remain effective and efficient; they are interested only in making arguments that will lead to a lack of public confidence in the TVA and in its ultimate dismemberment or destruction.

WORDS OF WARNING

Mr. CALDWELL. Do you have any words of warning as to what we might look forward to as fresh obstacles or new points of attack during this fight for the self-financing plan?

Mr. CLAPP. If past experiences on these basic issues affecting the future of the TVA are considered for guidance, I would say that no one should be surprised that the efforts to get the TVA financing plan adopted will take time.

Victory may be slow in coming. It may take quite a while. It may take more than the next session of the Congress. It may take another national election to get people to understand the merits of this idea—as did the Johnsonville issue.

I certainly hope that the people of the Tennessee Valley on this occasion, as in the past, gird themselves for a long engagement. If it comes quickly, so much the better, but we should all be prepared for a long argument. We should keep going back all the time to the basic reasons why the TVA was started in the first place, the successful record of achievement which the TVA, in cooperation with the people of the valley, has achieved, not just for the valley but for the whole country, and beyond the confines of these United States.

We should not be mislead by the attempts of the opponents to make some of the arguments about this TVA financing plan seem like quibbles over language or arguments over theory and thereby be entrapped in bad legislative results.

There will be occasions during this fight when the opponents of the TVA will appear to be willing to compromise and make concessions to the TVA—not as far as they ought to go, but farther than some might expect them to go.

And that is when we must be most careful and make sure that we are not going to yield to seemingly attractive bargains that will bring a quick end to the argument. If we do that, we may bring a quick end to the TVA.

Mr. CALDWELL. I gather that you don't share the apprehensions of your successor, the TVA Board Chairman, of great new danger to TVA if TVA becomes a national political issue.

Mr. CLAPP. I'm afraid I'm not very well informed about the new director's views and apprehensions. I can only say that the TVA has been a national issue since long before it was created. We can be thankful that it has been and hope that it will continue to be. I mean that very seriously for these reasons:

If the ideas and the principles represented in the TVA and the Tennessee Valley development are of consequence only for the Tennessee Valley, then I would begin to question whether there need be a TVA. On the other hand, as long as TVA and the Tennessee Valley and the people in the Tennessee Valley remain true to the joint commitment they have made for a development in the national interest, of course, the TVA will remain a national issue. And that, I think, is in part the answer to those who are fearful that this self-financing scheme may somehow remove TVA from congressional supervision.

I would say that as long as TVA continues to do the kind of job that it is set up by law to do, it will, of course, be a national institution set into a regional program where the Congress will not be permitted to forget it.

Recent Disastrous Floods in New England and California Should Awaken Public to the Tremendous Benefits of Flood Control as Has Been Made Possible by TVA—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, part V of the interview recently given by Mr. Gordon Clapp, former TVA Board Chairman, to Messrs. Harwell and Caldwell, of the Nashville Tennessean, makes some interesting and significant conclusions with regard to flood control and multipurpose programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Under unanimous consent, the concluding portion of this interview, part V, is included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NO EASY WAY

Mr. CALDWELL. And is there no way for the Valley's people to ride easy or tread softly or avoid controversy?

Mr. CLAPP. Certainly not. The Tennessee Valley program, of which the TVA is an important part, represents a practical application of a new idea that has a world spotlight upon it. An idea of that importance, of that consequence cannot be carried on without a terrific amount of hard work, persistence, viligance, great abilities, complete dedication, and devotion to the task, and the thoughtful cooperation of many thousands of private citizens who are making business decisions, public decisions in their own local and State fiovernments, and as voters in the national scene.

The very content of the idea and the manner by which this idea is applied and has been applied requires work. Argument and discussion are important parts of the process, and that I might add is one of TVA's most important contributions to our national life affecting the development of our natural resources.

It has provoked discussion about these questions that would not have been provoked or carried on had there been no TVA.

We used to have a man in the TVA who would occasionally say, "Do we have to argue this issue all over again? I thought we settled that 5 years ago." And some of us would have to remind him, "Look, you never settle these questions permanently. The very fact that they keep coming up means that we continue to discuss, to argue, and to be a part of a process whereby the public reaches conclusions."

And that is one of the functions of the TVA. Once it is all neatly arranged, tucked away on the shelf so that people forget about it, why, it better be ended.

Mr. CALDWELL. There has recently occurred in the section of the country where you live now a pair of disastrous floods, and that seems to raise for the Northeast some of the same questions that we faced before TVA.

Mr. CLAPP. The floods that struck New England and New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania were terrible in their devastation. I am inclined to think that they had a more terrible impact upon the people of these regions than they might have because they have been encouraged too long to consider larger and more devastating floods as something that would not happen.

One of the things that struck me as a longtime resident of the Tennessee Valley transplanted to Manhattan was that all of this is so unnecessary. The costs are tremendous. The individual losses are tragic.

Whether the people of this region adopt or adapt the TVA approach to their own flood control problem and their own water supply problem, I think there are more people in this region now than there were before these recent floods who can understand very well why the people of the Tennessee Valley are so quick to rise to the support of TVA whenever opponents threaten the TVA's existence.

Mr. CALDWELL. Well, moving back from New England down to the Valley again and treating Memphis as a special case, can you see any reason for other big city power boards talking in terms of their own municipal generation?

SQUEEZE ON MEMPHIS

Mr. CLAPP. Well, I regard Memphis as a special case, and I don't see how the other cities of the Valley should or could with wisdom follow the lead of Memphis. I do not mean to be critical of Memphis in going ahead with the decision to build its own plant. There is much to be said in favor of the alternative they elected. The administration was squeezing TVA by the throat through the Dixon-Yates deal and threatening thereby the TVA's ability to continue to supply Memphis' needs without holding them up on the price of power which the Dixon-Yates deal would have required.

The advantages which Knoxville, Nashville, Chattanooga, and a score of other cities and many more communities in the Tennessee Valley enjoy come from the fact that TVA system sells the power to those cities and rural cooperatives on a regionwide cost-plus basis—averaging all costs over the entire system and giving all of them the advantages of the larger scale operations and higher efficiencies which the TVA system as a whole involves or creates.

Now, to think of the Tennessee Valley becoming once again a conglomeration of separate power systems with steam plants of smaller size units, less efficient units, uncoordinated fuel purchases, with an ultimate wide variety among communities on resale rates, that is like looking back to the days when the private companies were claiming to serve the people of the Tennessee Valley.

It would put the valley back even beyond that, because the private utilities at the time the TVA came in were moving in their slow way toward larger and better integrated generating, transmission and distribution systems.

You would have the problem of trying to integrate individual small plants by interchange ararngements. Before long, we would have a system in the Tennessee Valley that is like the antiquated systems of New England where one-third of the power is not a transaction between the supplier and the consumer, but a transaction between one utility company and another. And every kilowatt hour carries a portion of the overhead of various companies who buy and sell it among themselves, which pyramid cost and add superfluous management expenses and high salaried positions to every kilowatt hour of energy.

I cannot believe that the people of the Tennessee Valley having experienced and been a partner in the most modern power system in the world would want to start the road back to the time before the TVA began the process of building an integrated low cost power system.

BENEFITS FOR ALL

Mr. CALDWELL. Is the bargaining issue between TVA and its big municipal distributors over who shall get the profit, a sufficient reason for the big city power boards to consider municipal generations?

Mr. CLAPP. One of the greatest strengths of the Tennessee Valley which none of us should forget is that the power system of the TVA in partnership with the distributors, the municipalities and the cooperatives of all sizes and shapes, by their adherence to a uniform rate policy have achieved a spread of development in evening up of the advantages and disadvantages as between urban and rural living which has meant a great deal to the drive and perseverance and ingenuity of the whole population of the region.

If the larger cities were to cut themselves loose from the power system which serves small and big communities alike and thereby begin to take away from the rural areas and the small towns some of the advantages of low cost electricity and center the industrial development and job opportunities more and more exclusively in the large cities, then the people of the rural areas will move much more rapidly than they do now away from their present communities into the larger cities.

And the larger cities that may think they have gained some benefits by this undue concentration of development within their own city limits by virtue of rate concessions to industrial developments will be faced with a much higher magnitude of new housing, new streets, new sewers, new schools, and all of those things which will then have to rely upon the taxing power to support.

Mr. HARWELL. And wouldn't rural property be reduced in taxable value, putting a further burden upon the city to carry the State load?

Mr. CLAPP. Exactly. And the whole State, in any case, will suffer because the trend

toward a spread of diversification of development industrially and agriculturally which has been helped by this uniform rate policy will begin to stop, and eventually be reversed. Some of the conditions of 1932 and 1933 that showed such sharp contrast between urban and rural living in the Tennessee Valley would return and be sharper than ever.

HISTORY OF STRUGGLE

Mr. HARWELL. We are grateful for the opportunity of this extensive interview and conversation on behalf not only of ourselves but for all the people of the valley. In concluding, would you say something of the past struggles which TVA has come through successfully, as perhaps an encouragement to us in the upcoming fight that we face?

Mr. CLAPP. We should never forget that the TVA was nurtured in long public debate. When the Government, under President Wilson, started to build the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals and the chemical plant for the First World War, it really set the stage for what later became the TVA. The argument about what to do with those properties went on all during the twenties, and it took many years of public debate to bring about the creation of the TVA.

There were two acts creating the TVA passed by the Congress before 1933. One of them was vetoed by President Coolidge and another was vetoed by President Hoover.

The friends of the idea didn't give up. They kept on fighting for it, and were successful in 1933.

I doubt if there would be a TVA today if it hadn't been for the stubborn persistence and vision of George Norris, of Nebraska, who in the Senate led the fight to keep the Muscle Shoals properties, chemical plants, and Wilson Dam from being sold to private interests. He had to continue to fight even after TVA was established in 1933.

Then the utilities, among others, who opposed the creation of TVA, having failed in their opposition, tried to take it over. They came forward with an inviting inducement for peace by offering to buy all of the power TVA would produce at the bus bar, they to sell it to the consumers through their own systems. The TVA had made it clear that municipalities, cities, and towns and farmers organized for electric service and not for profit should have a chance to buy this power themselves. The TVA made clear that it was going to carry out the provisions of the act.

There followed a period of several years of bitter and deep controversy all through the valley between those who favored retention of the private utility system and those who favored municipal ownership of their own distribution systems and the development of rural-electric coopcratives as a means of distributing TVA power.

In very few instances in the history of this country has any subject of local interest been so thoroughly debated and argued out in local communities through the normal elective and democratic voting processes.

In city after city and town after town the people, despite the blandishments and threats of private utility advocates and officials, voted the private utilities out of business and voted their cities into it. This laid a firm voluntary basis for the partnership between TVA and local governments which is without parallel in American democratic procedures.

The Supreme Court litigation which followed the long, complicated, and difficult negotiations for the acquisition of the private utility systems by the TVA and the cities and cooperatives seem many times a hopeless thing and sure to fail, but the people ultimately triumphed and justice was done.

The recollection of that record of deep purpose and vision on the part of the leaders in the Tennessee Valley and thousands upon thousands of citizens should be encouraging now in the fight that TVA faces, even after 20 years of successful experience.

The new Johnsonville plant, which seemed hopeles at one time, was won. There was the Douglas Dam issue which for a period of several years threatened to break up the TVA through threats of legislative reprisals.

The mere mention of this long record of vigorous controversy and debate, and the many times during each one of them at which defeat seemed imminent should encourage TVA and its friends to redouble their efforts to give us a real basis for knowing that the Tennessee Valley will come through again, and that the TVA will, contrary to the hopes of its enemies, not be destroyed or crippled.

However, it will take no less effort and persistence in this case than it took in the other instances. It will not be an easy victory to achieve, but I deeply believe it can be achieved.

Labor's Political Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor's Political Rights" which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on December 8, 1955. It comments on remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. I believe this matter is worthy of the attention of the Senate and the country.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR'S POLITICAL RIGHTS

Senator GOLDWATER said the other day that the newly wedded AFL–CIO has no right to endorse a presidential candidate. Former CIO President Reuther promptly accused the Senator of proposing the political disfranchisement of labor movement.

In this little contretemps there is perhaps more confusion than basic controversy. The confusion centers on the word "right." Of course a union, like any other group in this country, has a right to take a political stand. It has the right to form a political party if it wants.

But buried in the semantics there is also an important question—not least for the union leaders themselves.

What Mr. GOLDWATER meant was that many union members do not share the political views of their union leaders. Therefore, he argued, these members' rights are infringed when the union adopts a political position in which they do not concur.

One answer to this, which Mr. Reuther did not bother to give, is that these members' rights cannot be said to be seriously infringed so long as they retain the right to register their disagreement with their leaders when they vote on political candidates or local or national policies. And this right does still exist. Despite the vast amounts of time, money, and effort the unions expend on political education among the members, considerable numbers of the rank and file frequently rebuke the leaders at the polls.

Yet this answer is not the end of the matter. The fact still remains that many union members, in some cases perhaps majorities, disagree with the political stand of the leadership while the leadership nonetheless professes to speak in their political name.

In other types of organizations the members have avenues of protest besides the polling booth. A member of the American Legion, for example, who takes serious exception to the Legion leadership's attitude toward UNESCO or anything else is free to withdraw from the Legion. A member of the Republican Party who objects to party personalities or policies is free to change parties or dissociate himself from any.

As a practical matter, the member of a union is not free in this sense. In many cases withdrawal from the union would mean withdrawal from his livelihood. So here he is, not only a captive audience for the union leaders' political propaganda but also—if he happens to disagree with the official union line—an unwilling accomplice in the promotion of that line.

And there is no conceivable political ideology which the leaders could embrace that would accommodate the political views of all the members. To this extent the rights of the politically dissident are infringed the moment the leaders presume to speak for them on political matters.

But the rights are not thereby obliterated. The leaders know, and the public doubtless realizes, that when they endorse a politician or a policy they are not expressing the unanimous view of their whole huge amorphous membership. Certainly the answer is not to obliterate the leaders' right to make political pronouncements for themselves.

Indeed, there would be little concern over a collision between members' and leaders' rights were it not for the peculiar condition of economic sevitude which such arrangements as the union shop have imposed on the membership. This is what truly infringes the members' rights.

And this fact that unions have become fundamentally different from other kinds of organizations should give the leaders some political pause. The question is not whether they have the right to take political positions and try to influence their members accordingly. It is whether they are wise to exercise that right, and if so how and to what extent.

There are some very practical pitfalls. Over the years the leaders have increasingly identified their unions with the policies, purposes, and candidates of one political party. This means they have increasingly less freedom of choice. They could get themselves in the position of endorsing that party even when it is not in the best interests of their members to do so. Some would say this is in fact happening.

Even if they avoid this danger and practice the political eclecticism they preach—supporting candidates and policies regardless of party—they still have created a trap for themselves. They cannot get unanimity of support. Because they have made the members their economic prisoners, they will make some their enemies whenever they take a political stand.

The members did not join to find a political voice. They already had that. They joined to advance their economic interests and specifically to improve their position at the bargaining table. That provides a broad base for very general agreement among the members. Politics cannot.

The leaders need not worry about losing their political rights. But, as they try to make unions into something unions inherently are not, the leaders might well weigh the risks of seeking to lead where they cannot be followed.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, for the past several years the people of my State, along with the people of all the other States, have expressed some doubt as to the wisdom of the foreign aid program of our country. They have rightfully asked, "What good has it done?"

Mr. President, because the subject will be debated this year in a rather thorough manner, I believe it is incumbent upon Senators, whose constituents have raised some questions about the foreign aid program, to make available, as much as they can, to the entire Congress the thinking of those people.

I have had the pleasure before of introducing editorials from the rather peculiarily named newspaper, published in Arizona, from which I now have before me another editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial on the subject of foreign aid, published in the Brewery Gulch Gazette, of Bisbee, Ariz., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In a democracy, which this Nation is not (we have a republican form of government, which is something else), the people vote on important questions which concern them. In our Republic the people elect Representatives to Congress who decide these issues. We have before us a proposal by the President that our Government should give some $5 billion in the next year to various countries and nations all over the world, large and small, more than they have been getting lately, supposedly to make their people happier and friendlier toward us and less friendly toward our enemies. In addition to that, there is also a program giving them, or some of them, more billions annually during the next 10 years. There is no doubt that it will make them happy, but how pleased will they be when the payments stop, if they ever do? Many of us are somewhat unhappy about those forty-odd billions that have been dished out since the end of World War II, more than 10 years ago, money that came directly out of our pockets. We cannot believe that we got our money's worth; what good did it do? We invited a lot of our knife-and-fork brothers all over the world to sit down at our table, to eat and talk over a deal to become our friends and allies, but what did they do outside of eating? If we break their plates and they have to rustle their own grub, perhaps they will realize that we invited them only for a few free meals, and they won't like that. But what I am wondering is, if this were a democracy and 60 million voters were given an opportunity to vote on this question of dishing out billions of dollars, pouring them down rat-holes some of us believe, would they O. K. the deal or would they turn it down? I think a majority of them would say, "No soap. Too much is more than enough." This is not a democracy, and therefore we, who have to furnish these billions, have no opportunity of voting on such a proposal. We haven't been too concerned the past few years because we were told that this giveaway program was nearing an end, that it would be stopped, probably this year, but now Washington comes up with its 10-year plan. It's bad enough to lend; if the borrower is a bum, he becomes an enemy when its time for repayment, but start giving away dough by the month or year and it becomes a never-ending program. If you didn't know it before, you know it now.

"Pop, What Is the Gold Standard?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on the gold standard which was submitted to me by Mr. H. J. Stuhlmiller, of Fontenelle, Iowa, a banker who has taken an active interest in returning to the gold standard. The article is as follows:

"POP, WHAT IS THE GOLD STANDARD?"

(By Fred G. Clark and Richard Stanton Rimanoczy)

I

Some 40 million American have been born since 1933, the year when the United States abandoned the gold standard.

The newspapers seldom mention the subject.

Even in political campaigns the issue of gold (which used to be a lively one) is seldom raised even by conservative candidates.

The schoolchild like the little boy on the cover would be completely mystified by running across the words "gold standard" in a textbook.

A college professor we know, when temporarily taking over a junior group of economic students from another professor, was amazed to discover that in their 2-year study of the subject the gold standard had never been mentioned to them.

All this leads us to believe that a few comments on this ancient and honorable institution might interest a lot of our readers.

II

Gold when used as money is a unique force in economic and political life.

Gold money is more than money: it is an instrument of economic and political freedom—a curb bit in the mouth of governmental power.

The reason for this is that when gold is used as money, the supply of gold controls the amount of paper money and bank credit money that the Government can issue.

Under the gold standard the gold does not actually circulate among the people to any great extent because the paper money and bank credit money is redeemable in gold, making it as good as gold.

III

There has always been a sharp division of opinion as to whether the gold standard is the most desirable money system.

A good way to understand the reasons for these different opinions is to see what the gold standard means to different groups of people, that is, who benefits from it and who is penalized by it.

For example, to the elected and appointed officials running the Federal Government the gold standard means that when they want to spend money they must get it from the people in taxes—a painful and sometimes impossible proposition.

The gold standard shuts off the government's charge account, reduces its spending power, and makes the people much more critical of Federal expenditures.

To people who own bonds, insurance policies, and savings accounts, the gold standard means that the dollars they receive from their investment or savings will be worth as much, or more, as the dollars they originally saved.

(As matters now stand, in the absence of the gold standard since 1933, the dollar has lost more than 50 percent of its value.)

To people who owe long-time debts, particularly mortgages, the gold standard means that they will have to pay off their debt in dollars of approximately the same value as the ones they borrowed.

IV

Here then is the situation.

1. To people in government, the absence of the gold standard permits the creation (without the people's consent) of inexhaustible supplies of new inflationary money which is worthless except for the value it sucks from the already existing money.

2. To people who have saved money, the absence of the gold standard makes it impossible for them to predict the value of their savings at any future time.

3. To people who owe money, the absence of the gold standard opens the door to the possibility of being able to pay off their debts with cheap dollars.

It is easy to see, therefore, why people take sides so vigorously on the gold standard issue.

V

Among economists concerned with government policy there are two schools of thought.

One group looks upon the gold standard with disfavor because they believe that the manipulation of money and bank credit has been developed into such a "safe" science that the money supply should be under the control of the experts who will use it to regulate the value of the dollar in the "best interests of the Nation."

One belief within this group is that there should be as much inflation each year as there is increase in the production of goods and services, thus (theoretically, at least) insuring that prices will neither rise nor fall.

The gold-standard economists are guided by the historical experience of many manipulated currency systems without gold backing and maintain that the failure and eventual blowup of all of these in the past is an accurate prediction of what will happen to the United States if we continue an inflationary cheap money policy.

VI

Not long ago we set out to discover (through Opinion Research Corp.) how the American people felt about the various principles involved in the gold standard and discovered that from the standpoint of conservatism the people seemed to be way ahead of the Federal Government.

Two of the questions are of particular interest.

One of these dealt with the desirability of cheap money: "If you had the chance, would you rather get ahead by receiving more money or by being able to buy more with the money you are now receiving?"

Sixty-eight percent said they would rather be able to buy more with the money they are now receiving.

The other dealt with the gold standard from the standpoint of controlling inflation and the rising cost of living.

After being told how the gold standard limits the issuance of new money, they were asked: "Does going on the gold standard sound to you like a good way of controlling high prices and inflation or not?"

Sixty-one percent said it sounded good to them.

VII

From these answers it would appear that even though the gold standard as an institution has become dormant in the minds of most Americans, the principles underlying the gold standard are very much alive.

No economist that we know of believes that the redeemability of paper money in gold coin is a perfect institution.

Like monogamy and Christianity, they admit it to be subject to human error but maintain that, like monogamy and Christianity, it sets up a moral framework within which human error is far less hazardous to the security of our civilization.

It is true that since World War II, America has made spectacular economic progress under manipulated currency.

But it is also true that the economy has been walking the high wire with no landing net underneath.

That is why we believe it might be a good time to do some hard thinking about the gold standard.

The UMW Cares for Its Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include a story by Gerald Griffin, Courier-Journal staff writer, entitled "The UMW Cares for Its Own."

The article is as follows:

THE UMW CARES FOR ITS OWN

(By Gerald Griffin)

Colorful modernistic hospitals glistening in glass and steel have sprung up in the most unexpected places in Eastern Kentucky.

There's even one of them in the valley of Left Beaver Creek in Floyd County at a village called McDowell.

Any of these buildings, similar in design, would grace a large city. They are miners' memorial hospitals, and seven of them have been erected on eastern Kentucky soil. Two others are in West Virginia. Still another is in Virginia.

Besides the one at McDowell, those in Kentucky are at Harlan, Hazard, Whitesburg, Pikeville, Middlesboro and South Williamson, in Pike County on the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River.

Others have been erected at Wise, Va., and in West Virginia at Beckley and Man.

All 10 form a chain of hospitals located along an irregular line extending from Beckley, W. Va., to Middlesboro, Ky., piercing the heart of the bituminous coal fields of the Appalachian Plateau.

The 10 hospitals, erected by the welfare and retirement fund of the United Mine Workers of America, have cost approximately, so far, $27,500,000. The miners themselves didn't put up that money. Their monthly union dues wouldn't go very far in such an ambitious undertaking. The coal operators financed those hospitals through the 40-cent-a-ton royalty they pay to the union in the organized areas.

Since 1946 the operators have paid $882,423,780 into the union's welfare and retirement fund. They know that part of the royalty money at least is being poured back into the regions from which it came.

There has been some opposition to the establishment of the miners' hospitals, but not outspoken except in isolated instances. Representatives of privately owned hospitals in the area haven't been too happy about the union's program. Some doctors in communities where the new hospitals have been built probably saw keener competition from the physicians and surgeons brought in to staff the new institutions.

But, as a whole, the new hospitals and their staffs are being accepted.

From the standpoint of the union, these new hospitals were essential to the welfare of the miners and their dependents. And an economic factor was involved. It was cheaper for the union to operate its own hospitals than to pay other hospitals for the treatment and care of its members.

All of these miners' hospitals, while primarily for the care of UMW people, plan to operate as community institutions.

In this chain of hospitals, welfare and retirement fund officials see an enormous saving in their operation as a group through efficient supply systems and centralized services. Eventual plans even call for a central laundry and the manufacture of certain pharmaceutical supplies.

Outside of the Armed Forces and the Veterans Administration, nothing like this hospital network has been attempted in this country, perhaps anywhere on earth, according to fund officials. And its chain-store method of management is unique for hospitals. Supplies will be purchased centrally for the entire chain, unloaded at a railhead at Williamson, W. Va., and shipped by truck to the hospitals.

Three of the larger hospitals have been designated as base units. These are at Beckley, South Williamson, and Harlan. Satellite hospitals of the Harlan unit will be those at Middlesboro, Whitesburg, Hazard, and Wise. The South Williamson satellites will be the hospitals at Pikeville, McDowell, and Man. The Beckley hospital has no satellites.

The base units will provide specialized services not available in the smaller hospitals. But, as all have been linked with a teletype service, it won't take long to get a specialist to any of the satellites from its base. Patients requiring the attention of specialists may be sent to the base hospitals, or the specialists may ride the circuit to visit patients in the satellites.

Free hospital care will be available in these hospitals for miners employed under UMW contracts. Others eligible for free hospitalization are retired union miners and the dependents of eligible miners, including their wives, children, and parents. Widows and other survivors of miners for whom cash benefits have been authorized also are eligible for free care as long as they are receiving payments from the widows and survivors benefits.

Other patients, however, may be admitted to the hospitals if all the beds are not needed for the miners and their families. They will be required to pay regular hospital fees. Community doctors have been invited to bring in their own patients although each hospital will have its own staff doctors on salary.

Hospitalization for nonunion patients will not be cheap, according to Harold Ward, a representative of the fund, who made a tour of the chain recently.

"We plan efficient service, prompt diagnosis, quick attention and cure to reduce the number of days spent in the hospital," he said. "No patient will be admitted unless he needs hospitalization, and then he will get the best attention possible. These hospitals are trying to provide the best of service for reasonable cost."

Although all these hospitals are amazingly well equipped, even to built-in oxygen tents, Ward said, "we had to pull back our horns in order to meet the budget." The cost of just about everything went up after the first ground breaking.

Ward said that the union expects to have its problems in operating the hospitals. Some businessmen are unhappy at the hospital wage scale, which starts at $1.25 an hour. And some community doctors are waiting to see if the union tries to take over the medical practice for the entire region. Ward said that nothing like that would happen, and fund officials are cooperating fully with the American Medical Association.

In their report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1955, the welfare and retirement fund officials said:

"Existing hospitals have been used and will continue to be used to the fullest advantage of the fund and its beneficiaries. Some have provided a satisfactory quality of service at or near cost; others have supplied an inferior quality of care often at exorbitant rates. Many are privately owned and operated for profit with their income derived largely from beneficiaries of the fund. Their facilities are usually denied to physicians other than those employed on their staffs.

"The requisite number of competent physicians is thereby discouraged from locating in the areas and a monopoly tends to be created. The profit hospital is subject to the temptation of providing a minimum of service at maximum cost. The poorer the care the patient receives the larger the profit may be.

"To restrict admissions to the memorial hospitals exclusively to beneficiaries of the fund would mean that beds temporarily not occupied by miners could not be used by other members of the community regardless of how urgent their needs might be.

"Not only would other persons be deprived of humanitarian service that might spell the difference between life and death, but the hospital rates would be increased by receiving no income from vacant beds that could be filled by patients who needed them and would pay the cost."

Although the hospitals have been built by money paid by coal operators, the UMW and the fund have little connection other than that John L. Lewis heads both of them. The administration of the fund, which also pays out pensions and other benefits, is otherwise separate from that of the union.

The huge welfare and retirement fund actually was started in 1947 when the mines had been taken over by the Government as a result of a general strike in the industry. At that time the operators began paying the union a royalty of 5 cents a ton. Since then, almost every renewal of the contract has seen the royalty rate increase to its present 40 cents.

Naturally, the operators don't like the idea, but at least these hospitals show that fund officials are trying to do something for the communities in the coal fields.

The fund's hospital program is headed by Dr. Warren F. Draper, retired Deputy United States Surgeon General. Under him are 10 area medical officers. Medical administrator of the Memorial Hospital Association, responsible for the 10 new hospitals, is Dr. Frederick D. Mott, Washington, D. C.

New England Has Something To Sell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following interesting article from

the Washington Daily News of recent date by Mr. Charles Lucey, Scripps-Howard staff writer:

U. S. A., THE BIG STORY: NEW ENGLAND PUTS ITS HOPE IN BRAINS AND SKILL

BOSTON, November 3.—A quiet revolution is taking place in this tight and tidy little kingdom of New England.

It is a revolution that faces the cold reality that the society New England built on textiles and old water-power mills is almost gone today.

Factories which rose with the first industrial revolution and poured their goods all over the world in Clipper ships stand gaunt and dreary now. There has been hardship and suffering. New England is coming through an agonizing economic readjustment.

New England is seeking new industry of the bright-and-shiny, day-after-tomorrow type on the basis of the greatest resource it has to offer:

Brains!

Brains in the great research laboratories of Yale and Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston College, Holy Cross, Boston University, and a score of others—a reservoir of knowledge on which challenging new industries can find ways to make new products for a new day. Get research in here, they say, and new production will follow.

For three centuries now, Yankees have earned their living in a hundred ways. They've cut marble and granite from the quarries of Vermont, fished the Atlantic out of Gloucester, built the great brass industries of the Connecticut valleys, and sold insurance around the world. You couldn't count the millions of miles of textiles or pairs of shoes that have come from New England's mills.

NEW ENGLAND SEEKS TO HARNESS ATOM

But today New England is building a sturdy future on electronics and plastics and electrical goods and metalworking and aircraft and is moving to be among the first in turning atomic power to peacetime use.

Head out of downtown Boston on almost any main road and you are likely to see hundreds of acres of new plant facilities, all new red brick and glass and landscaped lawns, in startling contrast to the ancient New England mills. They're called industrial parks, and they may house a score of small- or medium-sized industries. The same idea is being followed in Connecticut and the New Haven Railroad has another planned for Rhode Island.

New England still has no real answer to keeping textile mills from moving South, though most men say the worst is past and that the ones remaining are the best managed and most competitive and best able to stay in business. And also, they say, making the highest-styled textiles.

But where 275,000 textile jobs have been lost in the years since 1920 there are bound to be problems.

It was inevitable, of course, that as population and consumer markets shifted westward in the United States, New England could not retain industrial dominance. When fuel-based energy took over from waterpower the factories began moving nearer sources of raw materials and markets.

A STEADY STREAM SOUTH AND WEST

Cotton textiles went first, then the woolens. The shoe and leather industries began dispersing southward and westward.

The South beckoned with sunshine, cheap labor, and Tennessee Valley power, offers of free plant sites and factories, and low taxes. The bleak milltowns waved doleful farewell to outfits which had been their mainstay of life for a century. Thousands of men hit the streets in search of jobs that weren't there. And there is still some unemployment.

But today, in town after town, local money has been subscribed to take over many of those old plants, or has been combined with funds provided by privately financed development corporations which saw the need of trying to hold old industry and bring in new.

At Lawrence a group of citizens raised $125,000, borrowed $300,000 from the Massachusetts Business Development Corp. A closed mill was bought and small business outfits were brought into Lawrence to fill it. They had a mortgage burning a short time ago; the $300,000 was paid back. That's not unusual. Manchester, N. H., did it years ago when the big Amoskeag Mills closed; so did Nashua, N. H., and others.

But New England's greater hope is in selling United States industry, increasingly devoting more billions to research on new materials, methods, and products, on the proposition that nowhere in America can it find the young brains to build on that can be found here in New England.

THERE ARE LOTS OF SKILLED HANDS

New England has something else to sell—skilled hands with generations of factory work behind them. The displaced textile worker has proved he's the good worker in electronics and other industries demanding sharp minds and deft fingers.

There are 10 million persons in New England, 2 million more than in 1920. Some 4 million work outside their homes. It is estimated now that new industries are employing perhaps 100,000 more persons than have been lost in the exodus since World War II. Jobs in the manufacturing and service industries in August were 32,500 over July and 65,000 over August of 1954. The shoe industry actually has been staging something of a comeback.

New England's growth will not be as spectacular as that of newer United States areas. But that there will be growth New Englanders are certain.

Efforts To Obtain Arbitration in Strike of Electrical Workers Against Westinghouse Electric Corp.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of documents which detail efforts to secure arbitration in the strike by the International Union of Electrical Workers against the Westinghouse Electric Corp.

I believe Senators will be interested in these documents, which reveal that outside parties, including governors, mayors, Congressmen, and the director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, have urged arbitration or a fact-finding board as a means of aiding settlement of this dispute which has been underway since October 17, 1955. In each of these instances, the union agreed to the proposal, while the company refused.

The documents, I believe, speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TELEGRAMS FROM GOV. GEORGE LEADER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AND GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO PRESIDENT JAMES B. CAREY, OF IUE-AFL-CIO, AND CAREY REPLIES

DECEMBER 19, 1955.

A nationwide strike of over 50,000 Westinghouse Electric Corporation employees is now going into its 10th week. As Governor of a State in which these strikers live and in which Westinghouse has its plants, we have been watching this situation with growing concern.

We have been advised that despite many weeks of discussions, representatives of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, and the company have been unable to find a basis for settlement of the dispute.

Furthermore, evidence is accumulating that the strike is getting to the stage of bitterness where serious violence may result.

Under these circumstances, and because of our earnest desire to see industrial peace restored in Pennsylvania, particularly in this season of the year, we urge the union and the company to submit their dispute to final and binding arbitration. While this arbitration is proceeding the employees would be back at work.

We appeal to the leaders on both sides as men of good will to accept our proposal.

GEORGE LEADER,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

DECEMBER 19, 1955.

I am distressed that after all these weeks there has been no settlement in the Westinghouse strike which affects some 4,000 workers in Buffalo. I urge both the company and the union to submit their differences to arbitration and if this is agreed upon that the employees go back to work pending the decision of the arbitrator.

The State government stands ready to aid in bringing about a settlement of this dispute if its services can be helpful.

AVERELL HARRIMAN,
Governor of New York.

PRESDIENT CAREY'S REPLY TO BOTH GOVERNORS

DECEMBER 19, 1955.

We have received your telegram urging Westinghouse Electric Corporation and International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO to arbitrate the issues in the dispute that has kept 55,000 Westinghouse workers on a strike now in its 10th week.

This is to advise you that the union accepts your recommendation without reservation. If the corporation does the same, we are prepared to work out details immediately.

The International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO deeply appreciates the interest you have shown in an effective settlement of this nationwide strike.

JAMES B. CAREY,
President IUE-AFL-CIO.

REJECTION BY WESTINGHOUSE

We fully understand the desire to turn this dispute over to arbitration. It is true that many types of labor disputes can be properly submitted to arbitration. However, in this matter, because of our obligations to stockholders, we cannot delegate to a third party a decision which would affect the competitive standing of our company for at least the next 5 years.

JOINT STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY AND REPRESENTATIVE HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

A strike in 38 plants across the country of more than 50,000 employees of the Westinghouse Corp.—the 12th largest corporation in the Nation—is nearing the end of its

10th week. There are no signs a settlement of the dispute is being reached. A skillful and conscientious veteran official of the Federal Conciliation and Mediation Service, John Murray, has kept the parties to the dispute in discussion over many weeks to no avail.

A few days ago, the Governors of three States in which Westinghouse plants are located—George Leader, of Pennsylvania, Theodore McKeldin, of Maryland, and Averell Harriman, of New York—appealed to President Gwilym Price and his co-officers of Westinghouse and to President James B. Carey and his associate leaders of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO, principal union involved, to submit all issues in dispute to final and binding arbitration.

Mr. Carey and his associates immediately accepted the proposal. Mr. Price and his rejected it. We note that Governor Leader said in his appeal the strike has reached a stage of bitterness threatening to result in violence.

We urge the Westinghouse Corp to reconsider its rejection of the Governors' appeal. We place our faith in collective bargaining, but when that breaks down, as in this case, we turn to arbitration. We are strong believers in voluntary arbitration. We believe it is an important instrument of true democratic principles. We believe its application during the great industrial development of our country has done much to strengthen the democracy of our society. Its methods are the antithesis of those relied on by autocracy. It is based on the rule of reason.

In their rejection of the Governors' appeal, we note that Mr. Price and his Westinghouse fellow officers state that "because of our obligations to stockholders, we cannot delegate to a third party a decision which would affect the competitive standing of our company for at least 5 years." We earnestly suggest to them that, if they still decline to reconsider the Governors' proposal, they submit the simple question of arbitration to their stockholders. We learn from Government records there are approximately 16½ million shares of Westinghouse stock outstanding, widely distributed. We further learn that Mr. Price and the Westinghouse board of directors hold slightly less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the outstanding shares.

It is hard for us to believe the stockholders would feel arbitration would endanger their company as much as a continuation of the deadlock and the already-long-drawn-out strike with its mounting animosities. The employees would go back to the plants while the processes of arbitration are functioning.

JERSEY CITY, *December 22, 1955.*

JAMES B. CAREY,

President IUE, Washington, D. C.:

As mayor of Jersey City where Westinghouse Electric Corp. elevator division has enjoyed a productive 20 years from both company and municipal viewpoints I send you this Yule message. In the interest of continued productivity for your great company and its many thousands of stockholders and in the interest and welfare of 5,500 employees on strike 1,200 of them from Jersey City I respectfully even prayerfully urge that the spirit of the Prince of Peace be permitted to enter the field of differences which has brought about this 10 weeks of strike so costly to both management and union. I urge that this spirit bring about agreement for arbitration of the grievances as soon as possible so that the somberness attendant with halted production lines be lifted and a happier holiday be celebrated by all concerned.

Mayor BERNARD J. BERRY,
City Hall, Jersey City.

BUFFALO, N. Y., *December 23, 1955.*

JAMES B. CAREY,

IUE, AFL, CIO, Washington, D. C.:

Approximately 20,000 workers and members and their families in the greater Buffalo community are directly affected by the Westinghouse strike. In the public interest we urge that both labor and management agree immediately to submit this dispute to arbitration before an impartial board of arbitrators, the decision of the arbitrators to be final and binding upon both parties. Continuance of this dispute over 10 weeks has brought great suffering to the workers in this area and the members of their families. Their personal hardship is even more difficult at this holiday season. To date the parties to this dispute have themselves been unable to reach settlement. Time has come to invite impartial arbitration, otherwise human suffering will continue in our community. We feel confident that in fairness to the stockholders at Westinghouse, the workers, their families and most important, the public interest, that immediate acceptance of arbitration by both parties is imperative.

We the undersigned, are willing to arrange a special meeting in Buffalo designed to settle this strike through arbitration in cooperation with Mayor Sensenbrenner's Committee of Mayors, if you feel such a meeting will bring immediate arbitration and settlement.

May we have the courtesy of an immediate reply? For your information a second wire of this exact text is being sent to Gwilym Price, president, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

STEVEN PANKOW,
Mayor of the City of Buffalo.
BENEDICT T. HOLTZ,
Supervisor, Town of Cheektowaga.

JANUARY 4, 1956.

A labor management dispute between the Westinghouse Electric Corp. and International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO resulting in a work stoppage involving approximately 45,000 employees has been in progress since October 17, 1955. It is my conclusion based upon conferences with representatives of the parties and representatives of this Service, that no substantial progress has been made toward a settlement of this dispute during the intervening period of upward of 80 days. The economic effects of this work stoppage have had a serious adverse effect on many thousands of other workers and upon other related industries. Representatives of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service have exerted every effort in an attempt to assist the parties voluntarily to work out for themselves a satisfactory settlement, but these efforts have not proven successful.

The public interest demands, in view of this impasse, that every method be resorted to by the parties in an attempt to resolve this collective bargaining stalemate.

In view of these factors, I therefore, recommend to the company and the union, that they agree to submit all of the disputed issues which gave rise to this stoppage to a fact-finding board. This board shall report its findings of facts and recommendations to the parties and to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service as the basis it considers affords opportunity for negotiation by the parties to an honorable settlement to this dispute which will be fair and equitable to both parties. The findings of fact and recommendations made by this board shall not be final nor binding upon either party. Such findings of fact and recommendations shall be made in writing and returned to the parties as expeditiously as possible for purposes of further collective bargaining. The board shall be empowered to inquire into and ascertain all of the facts surrounding the dispute through direct contacts, hearings, or any such other manner as a majority of the board may believe necessary or advisable to enable the board to accomplish its purpose.

The board may be dissolved by mutual consent of the parties at any time they feel they can effect a solution of this dispute without the aid of the board.

I further recommend that each party designate a board representative and notify us in writing within 24 hours of such designation; upon receipt of both designations I shall immediately proceed to appoint an impartial public member of the board who will act as its chairman.

I will appreciate being advised by letter or telegram as to whether this suggested procedure for settlement of this long and costly strike is acceptable.

JOSEPH FINNEGAN.

UNION'S REPLY TO DIRECTOR FINNEGAN'S STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATION

The procedure set forth in your communication of January 4, 1956, is accepted; and if Westinghouse will agree with the IUE to be bound by the findings and not discriminate against any striker then work could be resumed immediately under our present agreements as modified by the findings.

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.
AL HARTNETT,
Secretary-Treasurer, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

TELEGRAM SENT TO GWILYM PRICE BY GOVERNOR FRANK J. LAUSCHE, JANUARY 5, 1956

MR. GWILYM A. PRICE,
President, Westinghouse Electric Corporation Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Inasmuch as Mr. Joseph F. Finnegan, Director of Federal Mediation and Conciliation has recommended a voluntary fact-finding board be set up to attempt to settle the current dispute in which your company and its workers are involved and inasmuch as it is my belief that the interests of the company, the employees and the general public will best be served through compliance with Mr. Finnegan's recommendation I urge that Westinghouse Electric Corp. grant its consent to comply with the proposal.

FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Governor of Ohio.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,

JOSEPH F. FINNEGAN,
Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service
United States Department of Labor
Washington, D. C.:

There are circumstances in which a fact-finding board, as suggested by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, can serve a useful purpose in settling management-labor disputes. The issues in the present controversy between Westinghouse and the IUE (AFL-CIO) are not proper subjects for this type of procedure.

The question in point is simple but fundamental: Can the management of a company refer to any agency, not responsible for the job security of the company's employees nor for the interests of its stockholders, the authority to make recommendations which may well have the practical effect of determining whether that company will be at a disadvantage for 5 years with its major competitor. As you know, the IUE has already made a 5-year settlement with our

major competitor, similar to the Westinghouse offer which IUE has rejected.

Another very important consideration is the fact that 26 unions, including several also affiliated with the AFL-CIO, representing over 25 percent of all union-represented people in Westinghouse, have without striking already signed 5-year agreements embracing principles and benefits that the IUE refuses to accept, and which would be issues subject to fact-finding and recommendations under your proposal. The contemplated procedure would place both the company and these other unions in an unfavorable position because they engaged in genuine collective bargaining and arrived at agreements without any stoppages of work.

For the foregoing reasons we cannot accept your proposal of January 4.

We believe our employees, whose job security is at stake, understand the issues better than any fact-finder who has no personal stake whatsoever in the resolution of these issues. Therefore, we respectfully request that the Federal mediation and conciliation service consider recommending to the parties that, as an alternate to your proposal, a secret ballot be conducted under your service's auspices on whether the IUE-represented employees wish to accept the company's offer and return to work or continue the strike. We will cooperate in every way to assist you in expediting the holding of such an election.

One of the reasons prompting this alternate proposal is the fact that title II of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, section 203, dealing with the functions of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, specifies in paragraph (C): "If the director is not able to bring the parties to agreement by conciliation within a reasonable time, he shall seek to induce the parties voluntarily to seek other means of settling the dispute without resort to strike, lockout, or other coercion, including submission to the employees in the bargaining unit of the employer's last offer of settlement for approval or rejection in a secret ballot. The failure or refusal of either party to agree to any procedure suggested by the director shall not be deemed a violation of any duty or obligation imposed by this act."

We firmly believe that our proposal for a secret ballot is truly a traditional American procedure, as Congress clearly indicated by mentioning it specifically in defining the functions of your service

ROBERT D. BLASIER,
Vice President, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

REPLY OF UNION TO PROPOSALS MADE TO THE UNION AND COMPANY JANUARY 11 BY A MEETINGS OF MAYORS OF WESTINGHOUSE PLANT CITIES

We are grateful for the participation and interest of the mayors, and the country owes them a debt. We are gratified by their statement today in that it endorses two basic positions already taken by our union. We proposed and proposed again round-the-clock, 7-day-a-week collective bargaining to start immediately and until the strike is settled.

We long ago proposed and riterate a proposal for an interim agreement which we presented today to the mayors. This includes the following points:

1. That we get now assurances in writing that there were not be wage cuts as a result of the company's new time study program and disputed issues will be arbitrated.

2. Negotiations on wages under our current contract will continue for 30 days after the return to work. If no agreement is reached at that time the amount of the wage increase will be submitted to arbitration.

3. Negotiations to start as soon as the wage issue is settled on the question of a longer term agreement.

On the basis of such an interim agreement the strike could be settled immediately.

REJECTED BY PRESIDENT PRICE OF WESTINGHOUSE

It is very evident that the mayors tackled this difficult problem with great earnestness and objectivity. Also the company believes that the mayors' proposal has considerable merit. The problem is that the negotiation of an interim arrangement under which the IUE would agree to its members coming back to work would probably be difficult and time-consuming in view of the qualifications placed by the union. Furthermore the official negotiations under sponsorship of the United States Mediation and Conciliation Service are expected to continue and it might well be that these negotiations would produce a permanent settlement more quickly than the temporary one suggested by the mayors. Furthermore, Mr. Joseph F. Finnegan, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, has requested both the company and the union to desist from public proposals and counterproposals and to rely on the normal processes of closed negotiating sessions. Accordingly, while we do not reject the majors proposal, be welieve it is a wiser course of action for the time being to pursue the prospects of a settlement in the regular negotiating sessions. The management of Westinghouse is very appreciative of the time and effort devoted to the problem by the mayors and of their willingness to be of service on behalf of the communities they happen to represent.

GWILYM PRICE,
Chairman and President.

When Memory Ceases to Matter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following beautiful editorial from the Gazette, Montreal, Canada, Friday November 11, 1955:

NOT LOST UNLESS FORGOTTEN

"Our dead are never lost to us until we have forgotten them."

These words are carved on a stone in an old Highland burying-ground. They are words that speak of the sacrament of remembrance. On this grey November day the dead are remembered, that they may not be lost. For all that holds them to the present hour, and to this place, is the memory of the living. Once that bond is broken, the dead are lost to the living, the living to the dead.

The desire to be remembered after death, with some warmth of affection, is one of the deepest of human emotions. It may be less an emotion than an instinct, something that goes deeper than a conscience desire. It is close-allied to life itself, as though the chill of being forgotten puts ashes upon the grave, and no greenness.

Only those who have come to hate the world and life would wish to have the earth swallow them up and be utterly forgotten. For all others there is in life, and perhaps most near its end, the hope that those from whom they part company will yet hold them in a firmness of memory, like a hand held out, true in its grip, and not weak with indifference.

Death is never death in this world so long as memory holds the dead close to life. More than a long century ago Thomas Hood was writing these words:

"It is not death * * *
That this warm conscious flesh shall perish quite,
And all life's ruddy streams forget to flow * * *
It is not death to know this—but to know
That pious thoughts, which visit at new graves
In tender pilgrimage, will cease to go
So duly and so oft,—and when the grass waves
Over the past away, there may be then
No resurrection in the minds of men."

On such a day as this it is only fitting that there should be the public ceremonial of remembrance. For 2 minutes the work of the world will cease that the dead may have their resurrection in the minds of men.

But this gray and solemn ritual should be only the outward symbol of the inner ritual of remembrance, the quiet and natural remembrance, at the going down of the sun and in the morning, when the dead are made alive.

Memory might seem a slight bond to keep the dead from being lost to the living. For memory is crowded in the passing scene of the present. And memory fades. Does this mean, then, that these dead of the wars, honored today so impressively, will yet be lost to the living?

It will not be so. For memory is not merely a shadow in life, an intangible and fragile thing. As life goes on, memory comes to have the quality of life itself, and life the quality of memory.

For life itself becomes more and more a mystery, a dream almost, something intangible, vulnerable to change. It is a feeling that comes to all. It may come soon, it may come late, but come it will. It is the feeling in the words of the old hymn:

"Days and moments quickly flying
Blend the living with the dead."

Nor do old memories fade as the years pass, as weather may wear out an inscription carved in stone. As the years pass, it is the distant things that become the clearest, those known long ago who come back, the old companions, long dead, who are most real. The dead, so far from being lost by the memory that fades, are cherished most by the memory that calls them home.

The dead of the wars, on such a day as this, are not hailed as those who have their backs turned upon us as they recede into the gray mist. They are hailed, rather, as those whom we approach, and who approach us.

"The dead are never lost to us until we have forgotten them." So runs the old Highland inscription.

And the returning dead cannot be forgotten by the living until that time when memory ceases to matter, when the mystery is ended, when life and death are joined, and when there will be no more gray silence of November.

Dr. Ernest F. Swift of the National Wildlife Federation Issues a Warning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the text of an address made by Dr. Ernest F. Swift, executive director, National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D. C., at the annual meeting of the Mil-

waukee County Alliance at the Hotel Schroeder in Milwaukee, December 2, 1955. When Dr. Swift left his position as Deputy Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service last summer, we all lost one of our ablest and most dedicated career public servants. Dr. Swift's message is one that may well scare those who cherish what is left of our natural resources. Dr. Swift's address follows:

Conservationists have a terrific power to influence public opinion so long as they can stay organized to accomplish their objective. By and large, it is not a sustained power. It is a mystic and elusive one, more like quicksilver, one might say.

When the call to arms is of sufficient significance to capture the collective imagination of the conservationists, like quicksilver, they gravitate to a common purpose; and when the battle is seemingly won and the hazard over, they disperse to their daily tasks and so become a mystic and indefinable force. They mystify and frustrate the politicians because they cannot be identified by party, color, or creed. Their conservation ideals are something apart from all other loyalties, alliances, and fealties. One day they are embroiled and bickering among themselves, the next they stand before a legislative committee with united front; branded by some members of the business and scientific world as a group of disorganized half-baked fanatics.

* * * * *

Conservationists are not universally blessed with the virtue of eternal vigilance and this is why they gain two feet and lose one and a half; for unless the issues appear large and appealing, unless they have some emotional punch, unless a big smoke signal is sent up, the conservationists will not coordinate their mighty force to defeat the myriad of small, isolated but continuing efforts, of constant destruction which collectively represent mass destruction. Wildlife conservationists win some battles but are losing the war.

* * * * *

I certainly pose as no expert but I do think that I can point your attention to some facts of considerable importance regarding waterfowl from beyond the boundaries of the State and the Mississippi Valley.

To begin with, we start with a basic difference as related to the common concept of local or native game species; waterfowl problems are international in scope. This fact was early recognized and resulted in a treaty with Great Britain in 1916. To give effect to the treaty, Congress passed the Migratory Bird Treaty Act in 1918. Over the years Congress has repeatedly taken cognizance of this great resource and acted to protect it. The Migratory Bird Conservation Act of 1929 was implementing legislation for the establishment of migratory bird refuges and created the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission to promulgate land acquisition for refuges. This Commission is composed of Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce, plus 2 Senators and 2 Members of the House. Again in 1934 the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act and the Coordination Act were made law to help finance and protect transitory wildlife.

A treaty for the protection of migratory waterfowl was ratified between Mexico and the United States in 1936.

I have heard it stated that the Department of Agriculture had a mandate to subsidize drainage; that is not quite correct, but if the Migratory Bird Treaty is not a mandate to protect birdlife then it takes on some such status as our Indian treaties. A mere scrap of paper.

By the very nature of this far-flung problem, when hunters attempt to view its continental complexities from behind one duck blind, it is too much to expect that he will comprehend all its intricate ramifications. Until recently few, if any, State administrators had any factual knowledge to guide them because it was so far away as compared with local troubles, they paid little attention to it except to berate the Fish and Wildlife Service and accede to local pressures so they would be taken off the hook temporarily on some other problem.

One fact stands out above all others. If waterfowl are to be perpetuated as a game bird and not classified with song birds, it is high time that the rank and file of the conservationists have some fundamental understanding of the multitude and variety of issues, crosscurrent, and roadblocks involved, and beyond that they should begin to appreciate the limitations of their own knowledge and begin to rely on career men for their advice.

As a resource to be preserved and perpetuated, migratory waterfowl is one of the most valuable on the continent. The situation is not all bad but it is a long way from being entirely satisfactory for those conservationists who attempt to peer into the future 50 years ahead and compare them with the past 50 years.

I can remember back that far along with some of you present. My experience was in western Minnesota and the Dakotas. Long files of ducks and geese from horizon to horizon quacking and honking their way north while the spring winds warmed the earth and smiled on the pasqueflower. South in the fall, day after day, with the Arctic chill in their tail feathers.

They were uncounted and without number; laws were something to joke about. Spring shooting was nearly as common as fall hunting. Market hunting was a recognized occupation. Subsidized drainage, which has destroyed a greater part of the finest waterfowl habitat in the United States, had not been included into the official conservation concept of the Department of Agriculture. The pothole country of the Dakotas and Minnesota was still one of the best duck producing factories in the North American Continent.

This has all happened in my lifetime, ladies and gentlemen, something that I can remember; and so I wish to remind you as forcefully as I can that too many adverse factors cannot come along to rock the boat or migratory waterfowl will be classified as a songbird at some future time.

It is wishful thinking to hope for original population, to keep them at the present level is going to be a sizable job.

Today more than 80 percent of all waterfowl nests in Canada and Alaska. From the Bering Sea to Ungava, from Baffin Bay Island and the Mackenzie River south to the border. The highest potential is in the Saskatchewan prairies with Alberta and Manitoba running second. The future trend of economic development in the prairie provinces will, in a great measure, determine the destiny of waterfowl of the North American Continent.

South of the border about 80 percent of the nesting grounds of the Dakotas and Minnesota, the best in the United States, has already been destroyed, mostly by subsidized drainage.

At the time of settlement of the Midwest, there were 115,000 square miles of pothole country in Iowa, Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Today, the pothole country has been eliminated in Iowa and reduced in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota to 56,000 square miles. Iowa originally 3 to 4 million ducks in production.

DRAINAGE IN THE POTHOLE COUNTRY

On a 10-township sample in Minnesota, 16 percent of the potholes were drained between 1945 and 1950.

On the basis of published PMA records for the period 1944–54, there were expended $1,800,000 in subsidy for drainage of 800,000 acres, of which it is estimated 25 percent were actual acres drained, or 200,000 acres in South Dakota.

On the same basis, the drainage subsidy in North Dakota, of over $1,800,000 has resulted in drainage of 335,000 acres.

On the basis of PMA records for 1949 and 1950 for all three States, there were 32,000 potholes per year drained with a subsidy payment.

More than 2 percent of the remaining potholes have been drained each year in the pothole country.

In recent years, although no more than 3 percent of the land in eastern South Dakota is wetland acreage, yet over 40 percent of the ACP payments have gone for drainage in certain counties in certain years.

Between 1946 and 1950, 10,700 potholes were drained in eastern South Dakota and, between 1950 and 1954, 130,300 acres of wetlands were drained.

But in looking to Canada as the last source of waterfowl for the American hunter, agriculture and oil interests up there are already competing with the ducks. The prairie province farmer will flatly state he does not want unlimited duck populations. Spring planting sometimes comes when the ducks are nesting, with the result that a high percentage of nests are destroyed. There are instances of deliberate nest destruction. When there is delay in fall harvesting, depredations occur at which time permits to kill are issued.

Drought and floods have a marked influence on nesting in addition to the human influences. This year conditions are good so there was a marked increase. Some seasons end up in a decrease. Winston Mair, Chief of the Wildlife Service of Canada, recently told me that the depredation by waterfowl this past summer and fall was very slight in spite of the increase of birds due to a favorable hatching season. There is no question, however, but what the depredation threat is used as a bugaboo for liberalization of seasons and kill permits.

The question is frequently asked, "Why does the Pacific flyway have a larger daily bag limit and a longer season on waterfowl than the rest of the Nation?" Primarily because a large proportion of the ducks of that flyway winter in California and nearly 90 percent of the waterfowl habitat in that State have been destroyed. Irrigation farming has taken over the once vast tule marshes of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the former wintering area of untold millions of birds. Irrigation has moved out into the desert and is still on the march in the Imperial Valley. Crops are rotated the year round and are subject to depredation during the winter months by birds who now have little or no place to rest and feed. Like the Canadian, the California farmer does not want too many ducks; not when agricultural expansion is paid for by the taxpayer. The claim of an overpopulation of ducks in California or Canada is true or false depending on whose ox is being gored.

One key to the Pacific flyway situation are three refuges: Upper Klamath in southern Oregon and Lower Klamath and Tule Lake Refuges at the border in northern California. These two California refuges comprise an area of about 60,000 acres and upon which nearly 80 percent of the flyway population is dependent for food and protection. It is their ancestral home pinched down to a mere fraction of its former dimensions.

Apparently about 10 to 12 percent of the annual waterfowl production can be credited to the remnant of breeding ground habitat in the United States. What may remain if we continually reshape the face of the continent with drainage, flood control, and irrigation is a matter of speculation. In the Klamath Basin of Oregon, reclamation development has, since the turn of the century, converted nearly 200,000 acres of waterfowl habitat to cropland. The fate of the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, when the reclamation district in which it is located is taken over by the water users, remains to be determined. Here, public lands have been drained with public funds and the crop production has contributed to local economy, yet at the same time, added to a national problem of what to do with the overflow from bulging granaries. In the growing scarcity of natural feeding grounds, the ducks and geese have been pitted against the farmer, and are in competition with the Commodity Credit Corporation for grain which might otherwise be added to surpluses stored in the holds of idle cargo ships.

These refuges were not all purchased by duck-stamp money but a goodly part were overlays of land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation and used as refuge by permit and agreement. The operations are all financed by duck-stamp money.

Agricultural interests continue to hammer away at each succeeding Secretary of Interior to relinquish more Klamath and Tule Lake refuge land. Some is submarginal and subject to frost. Recently it was pinched down still more for farming purposes and partly lost to waterfowl. If conservationists allow this acreage to be diverted to agriculture, they will have to stand trial along with the perpetrators for one of the most damaging and wasteful anticonservation acts in history.

The greater part of the waterfowl of the Pacific Flyway depend on this 60,000 acres for a period of time in their flight south; their fate hangs on a thin thread. It is true there are refuges to the south welded into a vast pattern of irrigation where the birds continue a precarious existence. Finally, the birds reach Imperial Valley just above the Mexican border. This is where much of the depredation takes place. As a result, kill permits are issued to the landowners to kill and harass the birds until they start north on spring migration.

The California Fish and Game Department has spent from eight to nine million dollars in recent years on waterfowl refuges, management, feeding, and so forth. The State laws and the landowner attitude has been such that it is nearly impossible for either the Federal Government or the State conservation department to make purchases for refuges. If I recall, the State was recently negotiating for some 8,000 acres at about a half-million dollars for the bare land. This does not make Horicon look like it had too much money invested in it. In addition, the problem is very complex and fraught with much bitterness by the various interests that are competing for land use in California today. Both Federal and State agencies have made a valiant effort to ease the problem but always are faced with insurmountable odds.

The attempted feeding program has divided the California Conservation Commission. Some are dissatisfied. The unattached hunter feels it favors the duck clubs, of which there are many, powerful and wealthy. In the past 2 years, only about 10 percent of these duck clubs have taken advantage of the so-called feeding program and many of them admit they use it not for the purpose of feeding the birds but for the purpose of enticing them to their duck club. I am told there will be a concerted effort to have this feeding law abolished by the next California Legislature. The Lostetter report was a report by a man highly qualified and with many years of experience in handling waterfowl depredations. The facts of his report were not repudiated by the career biologists of the Fish and Wildlife Service. They all agreed with him but these career people should be allowed to publicly speak for themselves and not be quoted by inference through the press agents of the Secretary of the Interior.

Along the coastal areas of the Gulf of Mexico, an inland waterway plus drainage, has destroyed tremendous areas of inland marsh where waterfowl wintered. Salt water came in some places and destroyed the vegetation. Other fresh water drained out. The lower Mississippi is being throttled by the Army engineers with the result that much former bird area is being drained for various reasons. Waterfowl are being forced to winter further north and the lower country is losing out on a great deal of its former hunting.

In the Lacassine Refuge, Louisiana, where there has been a costly development with duck-stamp money, the oil interests are pressing for drilling privileges; on the Sabine, the shell interests propose to remove shells which would destroy the duck-feeding grounds; the lumbering interests are exerting pressure to get the last virgin cypress of the Okefenokee Swamp; on the Chincoteague Refuge in Virginia, efforts have been made to allow dredging for zircon and titanium, and it is now threatened with a toll road to be built by private industry to service a real estate development. Real estate may win too.

In Massachusetts the State has petitioned to take over the Parker River Waterfowl Refuge for a honky-tonk recreational area.

In Oregon there is a move to set aside a substantial portion of the Malheur Refuge of 165,000 acres, and vital to the Pacific flyway, for homesteading and irrigation projects.

One of the most important refuges of the central flyways, and in that critical area of wetland drainage, the Lower Souris Refuge of North Dakota, farmers are demanding parts of it for pasture and the elimination of the refuge. Gas and oil companies are already exploring it for future drilling.

Strawberry Valley Refuge, Utah. Established 1908, 14,000 acres. Now abolished, 1955. Control of all hunting and fishing resources pass to water users. Public must pay—former public property.

The Air Force is now using a part of the Cabeza Prieta Arizona bighorn sheep game refuge for gunnery practice and wants more; the Army has requested more of the Kofa game refuge, Arizona, much of which they wish to use for the testing of poison gas; on the Desert Game Range, Nevada, the Air Force is taking steps to get primary jurisdiction over some 600,000 acres. It is a bighorn refuge. I spent some time inspecting this.

According to reports the Air Force has decided not to make any further attempts to obtain the Aransas Refuge as a flash-bombing area. This is the refuge where the last whooping cranes make their home and again, incidentally, it was the intervention of the Canadian Government that was one of the deciding factors. Canada, through their Ambassador, very emphatically protested the use of this refuge area along the Gulf of Mexico as a flash-bombing range.

A brutal contempt for wildlife values and an even greater and more alarming contempt for the democratic processes can be reviewed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the attempted rape of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, abutting Fort Sill.

Wilderness and wildlife advocates are constantly being confronted with questions and statements by some of the Nation's leading scientists, by economists, by big business, the military, by proponents of grandiose reclamation schemes which purportedly seem unanswerable. These pronouncements are made with such a weight of authority as to brook no contradiction or debate and it must be admitted that wildlife interests sometimes find them extremely difficult to rationalize.

And so the pintail flies down the Klamath Basin, the Sacramento, San Joaquin, the San Bernardino and the Imperial Valleys to be harassed all winter as a trespasser and a thief. The old green head of the Mississippi finds his coastal marshes devoid of food and full of salt water, or dry, and when he flies north in the spring, circles his favorite pothole only to find a cloud of dust rising from the cutting blades of a disk harrow. In fact, during late summer, fall and early winter, from the Arctic Circle to the Gulf of Mexico, he is subjected to open hunting seasons for 6½ months.

In closing, I wish to leave a few thoughts for your reflection: In the light of history, is it improper for us to examine the ideologies of our prophets, past and present?

In the days of my youth, while the big, bad lumber barons stood trial for the destruction of our forests, and the Lord knows they were far from lily white, the free-running fires from the smoke-filled clearings of thousands of settlers were the glorious signal of manifest destiny for the cut-over country. Fire was progress. The more fire, the more progress. For 30 years you have been taxed to heal the scars of a succession of gigantic abuses to the land, both State and national. At the time it was called progress, resulting from a high quotient of misguided evangelism; managing marginal land with marginal knowledge. Fifty years ago, the draining of Horicon Marsh was an outstanding victory for progress. Today you are taxed to reflood it.

Fifty years ago the miles of drainage ditches in the ancient peat bogs of central Wisconsin was another milestone of progress. Today those ditches have been plugged and the land is growing timber and producing wildlife. However, talk of more progress is in the air now that the water table has been brought back. There is interest to place one of Wisconsin's greater recreational areas into irrigation.

Two decades ago, agricultural leadership advocated clean farming and row crop tillage on as much as 30 percent slope regardless of the effects of erosion. It took big Hugh Bennett and millions in subsidies to start a change in that pattern.

Think long and hard before you accept the new connotation of the word "conservation." Scientific exploitation, just a thin line from plundering. * * *

Those who devise means have been fantastically successful but we are no longer so sure as we once were that the ends being reached are desirable or even tolerable. Many suspect that the world is not becoming in every way a better place for human beings to live in. Some suspect, even, that it threatens to become a place where they cannot live at all. And that is the penalty we are paying for being so pleased with the fact that we are going somewhere rapidly, that we are not at all concerned over the question where we're going.

Conservationists, like many other scientists, are beginning to realize that the question of values has caught up with them. But there is no general agreement among them as to what they want to conserve or why it is worth conserving.

And so, ladies and gentlemen, you will continue to band together sporadically in an attempt to save resources which to you are near and dear, and at the same time, you will continue to tax yourself and have your Congress issue mandates that the tax money shall be used to destroy those very resources that are near and dear.

You think you want these values saved but you will deny yourselves nothing in a

material way to guarantee that preservation. And in the end, some individuals wishing to be counted among those who are serving in the ranks of conservation, if and when these decisions regarding creature comforts and effects on the pocketbooks have to be made, will take the 30 pieces of silver and give their conservation principles the Judas kiss. Leopold said: "There are some who can live without wildlife, and some who cannot." To me, the issue is as simple as that.

Address by Governor Harriman at the Constitution Day Celebration of the New York Committee, Benjamin Franklin 250th Anniversary Celebration, New York City, September 17, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today is the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. Throughout the civilized world, voices are raised in his honor, commemorating his great contributions to government, to science, to literature, and to all the arts which advance the progress of mankind.

The people of my city, Albany, N. Y., wish to join in this accolade, because in our community Franklin presented, more than 200 years ago, the Albany plan of the Union.

The distinguished Governor of our State, in a talk last September, said better than I possibly could what the Nation and the world owes to Franklin. I should like to incorporate his remarks in the RECORD:

I welcome the unusual occasion which gives me the opportunity of being with you tonight. It serves not only to remind us of the greatness of the Constitution under which we live, but of the man who did so much to light America on its way toward human freedom. It serves, moreover, to point up the essential differences in the titanic contest that is going on today between freedom and tyranny for the possession of men's minds and bodies—a contest so vital to the peace of the world.

Tonight we are on the threshold of a national and international celebration to honor Benjamin Franklin on the 250th anniversary of his birth, which took place in Boston, January 17, 1706. I note that this anniversary will be celebrated for a full year. With a man as productive and versatile as Franklin, it would take a year just to list his varied achievements.

This celebration could not be less than international in its scope. Franklin was the first and foremost exponent of American democratic ideals. He was one of the most advanced thinkers of his age, the first interpreter of America to other lands, possessed of an amazing vision for his country, and one of its master-founders.

We in New York State have the good fortune to be selected, for special reasons connected with Franklin's career, to provide an advance observance of this great anniversary celebration. In the year to come it will draw the attention of civilized people throughout the globe to Franklin's honest and solid idealism—an idealism which is as real and vaild today as when he helped to write it into the American Constitution.

We have need of this occasion. Today the world is faced with the greatest assault on the principles of freedom and democracy that mankind has ever seen. For 200 years the ideal and the result of American Revolution have inspired the oppressed people of the world. Communism now claims to be the real doctorine of progress, while in fact it seeks by subversive means to impose a new slavery upon those who are seeking freedom.

More than ever we have need to rededicate ourselves to the ideals of democracy which are the constant foe of oppression. We must become more articulate so that we may help more effectively those who are still struggling toward freedom; or, having won it, do not want to sink back into the despair of slavery and dictatorship.

This is a time when we all have need to revitalize our concepts and strengthen our armor for the defense of human rights and freedom. I know of no better way of doing this than by gaining a more lucid understanding of the concepts of that remarkable group of men who gave this Nation its peerless foundation in the American Constitution—a document which today still stands as the most powerful guarantor of human freedom the world has known.

Franklin, as we all know, was one of that group of Constitution makers. He was known in his day as the first great American. He was so widely recognized as a defender of the rights of man and as an interpreter of America to the world that many in Europe considered him to be the principal advocate of human liberty. Carlyle called him "the father of all the Yankees." Balzac said he was "the inventor of the American Republic."

All of these things grew out of a career so all encompassing that we ourselves are only beginning to appreciate its full sweep and power. We are only beginning to understand him, and to realize the steady and forceful opposition to oppression of any kind that drove him on throughout his life. It has been well said of him that he hated anything that tended to debase mankind.

With many of Franklin's achievements we are all familiar. We know him as a printer, publisher, author, humorist, philosopher, scientist, skilled negotiator, organizer with a rare gift of leadership, diplomat, and statesman. We identify him as the inventor of a stove, the man who drew the lightning from the skies, the founder of the American postal system, of the first circulating library system on this continent, and of the first American scientific society. He was a thinker whose basic creed was to discover the needs of mankind and endeavor to meet them. He was a profound philosopher without being an ascetic. Intensely practical, he always endeavored to translate his concepts into action. He represented, in short, an almost incredible array of talents, and it is no wonder that he atained a worldwide fame.

We know Franklin also for his achievements in public life—as a colonial agent in London, fighting the American cause; as our representative in Paris, where he brought the aid of France to the new Nation in the critical days of the Revolution; as one of the framers of the Declaration of Independence, and as an associate of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and others in shaping the Constitution itself.

But we are not as familiar with another and, some believe, the most significant of all his achievements in behalf of the country he loved so well. This was the plan he drew for the first union of colonies on this continent—a plan which was the beginning of the effort to frame a Federal Constitution for Americans.

That plan is known historically as the Albany Plan of Union. I take pride in saying that it was drawn on New York State soil, in the city of Albany, in the year 1754, by Benjamin Franklin, as a delegate to the first great Congress called in America. It was a plan developed while the colonies were not yet free—while they were torn by strife, disputings, jealousies, and selfishness—totally unable to reach an agreement on any subject, even when faced with perils of invasion and savage warfare.

The basic idea it embodied—the idea that made it great—was Franklin's realization that in order to progress out of the wilderness of provincialism and attain their proper status, the colonies must unite, sinking their individual differences for the good of all.

At that time, union of the colonies seemed a remote, impossible thing. Yet Franklin persevered in his idea, envisioning a nation on this side of the Atlantic which, though still legally tied to Great Britain, would work out its own destiny by vote of its own representative national legislature, financed by its own national treasury and dedicated to the promotion of the common welfare.

And this was 22 years before the Declaration of Independence.

The plan did not succeed at the time, and this is undoubtedly the reason it has suffered from much neglect in telling the story of America. The Revolution, as we know, had its origin long before the Battle of Lexington in a deep sense of resentment against invasion of human rights. As thoroughgoing historians long have recognized that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution had their authentic forerunner in the Albany Plan of Union—the first formal step taken by a representative body to establish a general government for the British colonies.

Nevertheless, it was not until last year, on the 200th anniversary of the plan of union, that the United States Congress gave it official recognition, honoring Franklin as the author of the plan and Albany as the place where, as the congressional resolution put it, the Federal Government had its stirring beginning. To convey the tribute of the Nation a congressional delegation was sent to join in the Albany celebration, and governors of several of the States represented at the original Congress as Colonies sent their personal emissaries.

This pioneer Constitution for the Colonies was written under dramatic circumstances. In 1754, the last of the French-Indian wars was getting underway. The French, driving down the Ohio from Canada, were hoping to push the British from control of the continent. The Colonies, as ever disunited, unwilling to defend each other, were woefully weak and unprotected.

In the emergency, the British Lords of Trade directed the calling for the first time of a general congress of all the Colonies in America to meet in Albany. They were to make a new and lasting treaty with the Six Nations of Iroquois. Under the urging of Franklin and Thomas Hutchinson, of Massachusetts, sentiment for a union had arisen in several Colonies in advance of the Albany meeting. The British ministry was informed of this and initially favored the idea. Lord Halifax instructed the colonial assemblies to send to the Congress their men of highest standing and integrity. Bancroft has said it was the most notable assemblage America had seen up to that time. Albany was chosen for the sessions because, for over a century, it had been the chief treaty center in dealings with the Iroquois Confederacy.

Twenty-four delegates from seven Colonies—New York, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Maryland—met in Albany's original city hall on June 19, 1754, remaining in session until July 11. Virginia and the Carolinas, although sending no delegates, desired

to be considered present for the treatymaking. Two hundred Indians took part in the negotiations which resulted in renewal of their agreement to support the British cause. The agreement was reinforced by 30 wagonloads of gifts, contributed by the Crown and the Colonies, the most lavish outpouring of generosity the savages had ever received.

The delegates, however, were even more interested in the idea of a Colonial Union. On June 24, 1754, they adopted unanimously a history-making motion which has echoed through our annals ever since:

"*Resolved*, That a union of all the Colonies has become absolutely necessary for their security and defense."

A committee was named to receive and consider plans of union. Some of the delegates favored a union in three parts—north, south, and middle. Others wanted a two-part union—north and south. But Franklin prevailed with his proposal for a single government, the capital to be at Philadelphia. The legislative power would be vested in a representative assembly, or Grand Council, of 48 members, chosen from the 11 then existing colonies. The assembly would enact laws, make treaties, and appoint civil officers with the approval of the President-General, who would be appointed by the Crown and would have veto power. On the side of representative government, an astonishing number of similarities are to be found between the original plan and the Constitution that finally evolved.

Franklin himself disliked the notion of a royally-appointed president, but since the plan's approval necessarily was dependent on the king as well as the colonies, it was the only practical solution. And Franklin, with all his idealism, was a practical man.

The plan was debated for 12 days and was adopted on July 10, 1754. Franklin was ordered to put it in final shape, for referral to the king and colonies. Had the approvals been given, it would have been binding upon all the colonies, then with a population of a million and a half.

Franklin had prepared well for the Albany Congress. In May 1754, before leaving for Albany, he had published in his Pennsylvania Gazette a cartoon showing a snake cut in several pieces, the segments labeled for the various colonies. Underneath it was the slogan, "Join, or Die." The cartoon was often reprinted up and down the colonies. It is familiar to us from our school days, but I wonder how many of us know it dates from 1754 instead of 1776.

As Franklin himself said later, the plan of union was rejected for directly opposing reasons. The colonies felt it contained too much royal prerogatives. The crown was horrified by the notion of so much representative government. The plan was not at all the sort of thing that had been envisioned when the British ministry called the Congress—a much more authoritarian setup was their aim.

As events proved, the colonies were not then ready to unite. It required a more direct coercion on the part of Britain to bring the crisis of independence. Yet, it was only 11 years from the Albany Congress until the Stamp Act Congress met here in New York City to protest again taxation without representation; and it was only 22 years from the Albany Congress until Franklin joined in signing the Declaration of Independence at Philadelphia.

In that brief period the course of world history changed. An impetus was set up which created the world's greatest democracy—then and still the largest free nation on earth. Franklin is credited with the authorship of the national idea which is the keystone of the arch. Actually, as we see it in perspective, 22 years was not a long period for a new Nation resting on a base of freedom and common cooperation to emerge from a group of disunited, bickering, self-interested colonies.

President Garfield once said that the "first germ of the American union was planted by Franklin, while to Philadelphia remains the honor of the seat of the First Continental Congress." It is not to quarrel with Philadelphia that I speak tonight. Rather it is to enhance the eminence of the great Philadelphia apostle of human liberty. In a very real sense Franklin not only blazed the trail for a united America, but from start to completion played a master part in forming "the more perfect union" which gave the world a new idea of the dignity of man.

Perhaps nothing reveals Franklin's extraordinary vision so much as a letter he wrote to Lord Halifax in 1756, in which he said he had long been of the opinion that "the future grandeur and stability of the British Empire lie in America." Franklin's Albany plan, had it been accepted by the British Crown at that time, would have laid the foundation for the British Commonwealth. Britain had to lose the American colonies before it learned to embrace Franklin's concept of commonwealth relationships.

After our Constitution had been adopted, it was his great hope that European countries, too, would be able to reconcile their differences and form one grand democracy.

From that day to this, the American example of union has kept alive that hope, and today there have flowered several new institutions beginning to unite the nations of Europe. These institutions we in America can say proudly we helped to bring about through our leadership in the Marshall plan and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

When I was in Paris as European administrator of the Marshall plan, it was most fitting that in my office stood a bust of Franklin presented me by the French Government—a copy of the famous bust by Houdon in the Louvre. That the French Government should have chosen to present this bust reflects the honor they still pay to Franklin and their recognition that our work then carried forward the things he stood for.

Along the difficult, tortuous path toward unity among nations, the ideas and the voice of Franklin are a living guide. What he has helped to teach the world is that men can unite. Then can submerge their differences in the interest of the common good. They can create sound and lasting institutions of democratic self-government embracing broader areas.

And the urgency of his famous warning to the colonies, "We must all hang together or most assuredly we shall all hang separately" has its meaning, too, for the free peoples of the world today.

"God grant," he said, "that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth." This idea rang again in Roosevelt's call for the four freedoms—everywhere in the world.

God grant the time of fulfillment may come. That it may come, it is our mission today, as it was then, to bring the American revolution to the rest of the world.

Many of the people of the world are now in the process of choosing, as the American people chose 200 years ago.

Many are clinging to freedom as to a lifeline. But others are being misled by villainous propaganda to believe human liberties can survive in a dictator-ruled state that parades under the name of a union of republics.

We must not—we cannot—be complacent when we view their plight. We must see that our own house is put in order; that we are renewed in the strength of our own idealism. And we must use our energies to spread this understanding to those who are looking to us for guidance. Let us keep our eyes forever open and our defenses forever firm. Let us not be deceived by sweet words or alluring promises, or fall into a trap laid by this 20th century tyranny. Let us resist at every point the insidious effort to spread the enslavement of humankind. Let us spread the knowledge that human liberty is evidenced in freedom of religion, of speech, of action, and of opportunity.

The question our generation will determine is whether this century will be the century of the Communist Manifesto or the century of the Declaration of Independence; whether man will live by the inspiration of Benjamin Franklin or of Karl Marx.

It is in our hands to decide that issue.

It is in our power to see that the flame of American revolution burns brightly to light the progress of mankind to freedom under God.

The World Must Choose Between Religion and Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, for publication in the RECORD, I wish to include the following complete text of Archbishop Cushing's address to the Holy Name Society officers' 11th annual convention, given in St. James Church on Sunday, December 4, 1955, which appeared in the Pilot, Saturday, December 10, 1955.

The spiritual leader of the Archdiocese of Boston has won the affection of all his fellow citizens by his good works and his devotion to God and country.

In these and other thoughtful observations concerning the contradictions in the lives of individuals, of nations, and the world at large, the archbishop gives us cause to stop and ponder.

Somewhere many have lost the way.

In his kindly wisdom, Archbishop Cushing reminds us that only as we live so as to be worthy of God shall we ever hope to overcome the trials and anxieties of our times.

THE WORLD MUST CHOOSE BETWEEN RELIGION AND RUIN

In undertaking this engagement to address the officers of the Holy Name Society of the Archdiocese of Boston I have been conscious of the heavy responsibility which developed upon me as the spiritual leader of a devoted people to raise up loyal and cooperative helpers among the laity. It is your purpose to fit yourselves for this important function; it is for this reason that I am so eager to assure you of my interest in you and in the program which you are to carry on under the direction of your zealous diocesan moderator.

It would be a great mistake to think of the Holy Name Society as occupying a place of inferior importance in the campaign of Catholic Action which the archdiocese is pledged to maintain. It would be a still greater mistake to assign arbitrarily to the Holy Name Society certain purely devotional functions and to restrict its influence to what is sometimes termed the purely spiritual life of its members.

In point of fact, there is no such thing as a purely spiritual life for any of us. The life we live is bound up inseparably with the

world in which we struggle for material existence, with our fellow men with whom we share the benefits of our individual efforts and with the God who has made us like to Himself, and who has destined us for an eternity of happiness in His heavenly kingdom. The Holy Name Society, if it is to serve the purpose indicated by its dedication to the cause of Christ our Lord, must do something more than provide the incentive for fulfillment of the ordinary obligations of decent Christian living.

It is with this thought in mind that I propose to consider with you today some of the problems which I consider as pertaining in a particular way to those who have been invited, as you have been, to share in the important work of saving the world for Christ in this eventful age in which we live.

WE MUST CHOOSE

It is not an exaggeration to say that we are confronted squarely today with the need of choosing between religion and ruin. Nor is it an exaggeration to say that if we choose to be religious we must make the further choice between the world's interpretation of religion and that which is presented to us by the divinely instituted church which claims our allegiance. It is foolish to think that religion, which implies essentially the dependence of man on God and the satisfaction of man's deepest yearnings in the infinite truth and goodness of God, can be organized according to the proud and self-regarding principles of an atheistic philosophy of life.

To be religious means to look to God as the supreme arbiter of human conduct. To be religious means to be willing to live by principles of morality which are imposed by God and which do not depend on the changing points of view of those who occupy positions of authority in human society. To be religious means to look to God's plan in the organization of every phase of human activity and to be willing to adjust in accordance with God's law even those convictions and policies which may have received approbation and blessing on the highest levels of human jurisprudence.

In a word, we can find the paths of religious life, which are pointed out today as our defense against disaster, only by surrendering ourselves to God and living in humble submission to His will. We cannot be religious by rendering to God only lip service and sentimental protestations of affection while we continue to pursue in effect a way of life which bespeaks defiance of the most fundamental principles of natural law and divine revelation.

LEADERSHIP NEEDED

The world needs the leadership which you, as followers of Christ and pillars of the church, are in a position to afford. Let me point out to you some of the more important ways in which your influence, as leaders in the Holy Name Society, should be exerted.

You must be leaders, first of all, by exemplifying in your relations with others the highest standards of honesty and truth. It is easy to gain a point by deceit and fraud; it requires great sacrifice to be faithful to the truth when the truth demands that we forego some coveted advantage or some considerable degree of material profit.

It sometimes seems that the business world of today has organized its activities on the hypothesis that everyone is dishonest and that successful completion of any business transaction demands unscrupulous readiness to match lie with lie and to anticipate by fraudulent machination any possibility that the other fellow may resort to dishonest methods. So true is this that even theological treatises on the morality of business operations must indicate with considerable precision the extent to which dishonest competition may be met and circumvented without violation of the moral law.

Calculation of the just price of merchandise which is offered for sale must necessarily take into account the fact that people often purchase for credit things that they will not be able to pay for in full, and the more distressing fact that many people deliberately refuse to pay their bills and thus make necessary expensive efforts to force them into payment.

High-pressure salesmanship is not always limited to morally acceptable means of making merchandise attractive and stimulating consumer demands. Too often it happens that the low prices at which merchandise is offered are made possible by fraudulent substitution and deceitful misrepresentation. The prevalence of cut-throat competition makes necessary the development of devious methods of merchandising and equivocal methods of advertising and display. All this would be unnecessary if every buyer and seller could be assured in advance of not encountering dishonesty.

Here then is one important field in which you can exercise leadership. Do all that you can to bring honesty into the business relations in which you may have a part. If you are in business for yourself, never stoop to shady means of increasing your profit. If you work for someone else, do an honest day's work for an honest day's pay. If you sell to others, give them what they have the right to expect for the price which has been agreed upon. If you buy from others, do so within the limits of your means and pay your bills when they become due.

A person who is known in the community in which he lives as honest and reliable, upright, and beyond reproach, is a source of strength and inspiration for all who know him. A self-respecting and self-sustaining community is made up of such people. We admire them and respect them; but we must make it possible for them to be successful as well as honest. This we can do by the contribution of our own efforts to be honest.

The more influential a man is, the greater is his responsibility to avoid any form of unjust enrichment of himself at the expense of others. A man who cheats his neighbor has not only lost the respect of all who learn of his dishonesty; he has failed, in an important field of human activity, to show his fellow men the way of God.

LEGITIMATE AUTHORITY

Christian leadership requires also that those who exercise it be subject to legitimately constituted authority, whether in the church or in the state. It is well known that Catholic theology has always insisted upon respect for authority on all levels of civil government. This means that the laws of the state, when they are properly enacted and reasonably applied, are the laws of God as well.

There must be no opposition on the part of Catholics to the legitimate functioning of the state. However much we deplore the secularistic point of view of so many modern statesmen and however strongly we oppose the extension of state power into forbidden areas, we must never forget that an efficient civil government is essential for the welfare of the church.

Let it be said to the credit of our American form of government, that it has provided an environment of peace and good will in which the church has prospered. However great our debt of gratitude to the zealous bishops and priests who have planted the seeds of the faith in every corner of our land, and to the self-sacrificing, laity of generations past who have bequeathed to us the heritage of their dauntless loyalty, it remains true that had our Government as such taken a hostile attitude toward the church, we could never have attained our present position of influence among our fellow Americans.

As we reflect upon the responsibilities of leadership which we are now able to fulfill, we must be determined to face them not only as Catholics but as loyal citizens of the great Nation which has reared us in a spirit of respect for human dignity. We have never suffered from the efforts of our Government to interfere with the internal administration of the church. We have never been denied the right to communicate with the Holy Father, and with our fellow Catholics in other parts of the world. We have never been forced out of the market place and the halls of justice into the narrow boundaries of our churches and forced to confine our educational program and our proclaiming of the word of God within the limits of state-imposed censorship.

Today, as it becomes increasingly difficult to maintain and develop our schools, let us never make the mistake of assuming an attitude of hostility toward our American system of government as such merely because certain of its policies may effect us adversely or because we may suffer injustice in the distribution of governmental funds and subsidies. We have nothing to gain and everything to lose if we encourage in our Catholic people an attitude of disrespect toward our Government because of regrettable departure from Christian principles on the part of some of our elected representatives. We must fight secularism, but we must never attack the structure itself of the legal institutions through which the authority of God imposes itself upon our temporal life. We must insist upon our rights as members of the church to worship God in accordance with the teachings of our faith, but we must never repudiate in principle our obligations as citizens of the United States of America.

Let us, as intelligent and zealous Catholic laymen, support every reasonable and well planned effort against placing Catholic school chidren in an inferior category because they chose to attend a religious school. Let us oppose with all our energy the attempts of educators trained in a godless tradition to maneuver our schools and colleges into a position of helpless subserviency to iniquitous State control.

Let us do our utmost to place and keep in posts of public responsibility those who can be counted upon to be fair and square to God and country in accordance with the highest ideals of American democracy. And let us at the same time strive to build up in our people an attitude of deepest respect for the authority of every legitimately appointed public official.

Let us never advocate reform by rebellious overturning of the system of Government which has served us so generously in the past and which needs but to be purified of its human defects to provide in the future the helpful cooperation which religion in America will need for its future growth and development.

LOYALTY TO CHURCH

Finally, as Catholic leaders in a community, let us strive to keep alive within the church that spirit of loyalty to ecclesiastical authority which is so necessary for the church's growth from within. It is disturbing to hear from time to time complaints by Catholics that the church's teaching, particulary on moral matters, is unreasonable and out of date. It is still more disturbing to find Catholics adopting a questioning attitude in relation to the very foundations of revealed truth.

HUMBLE MIND

How contemptible it is for one who calls himself a Catholic to put the church on the defensive and to demand as the condition of his assent to the dogmas of faith that his own objections to those dogmas be answered! How can a Catholic honestly assume the role of an adversary toward the church which Christ founded in the flowing of His precious Blood?

The church has never demanded blind assent to its teachings from any one; but certainly the attitude of the faithful Catholic should be that of faith seeking knowledge, not that of knowledge seeking to vilify faith. We can best penetrate the truth of the church's teaching by accepting it first in humble submission to the church's authority. Your most important duty as Catholic lay leaders is to promote this attitude of respect and reverence for every command, every directive, every intimation of the truth which passes through the channels of the church's ministry. Thus, we shall keep intact the deposit of truth upon which the mission of the church is based. Thus we shall safeguard the church from the regrettable dissensions which rend the seamless garment of Christ and expose the faith to the taunts of an unbelieving world.

My dear men of the Holy Name Society, thank God for your affiliation with this organization which has contributed so enormously to the spiritual growth of our archdiocese. I pray that God may bless the work which you have undertaken so willingly and which promises to bear such abundant fruit in the months which lie ahead. Be courageous, be loyal, be true to the ideals of Catholic life which emerge from your faith. Thus you will afford to all who look to you for inspiration the leadership which will save them from the corruption of the world and save the world from the crisis which threatens it as godless statesmen and educators strive to drive God from men's souls.

The Timing of the Collection of the Tax in the Case of Tires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, independent tire dealers everywhere will be interested in the following remarks made by George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, in his appearance before the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems, House Committee on Ways and Means, October 11, 1955:

Mr. Chairman, I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of legislative activities, National Federation of Independent Business, 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. Our national headquarters are located in Burlingame, Calif. We also maintain division offices at New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.

It must be understood by members of the committee that no officer or group of officers is permitted to speak for the federation as to its position on any legislative or economic problems unless so directed by a nationwide poll of our members. The entire membership is polled and the results of these polls give the executive officers the authority to act in behalf of the members.

For the information of the committee, we have in the field approximately 200 or more sales representatives who are in personal daily contact with small business nationwide. Through this we are able to get the factual information from the grassroots.

Mr. Chairman, your announcement of your committee's planning, as released under date of August 16, stated on page 2, paragraph 3 of the release:

"3. Technical problems relating to individual excises, such as, but not limited to, the timing of the collection of the tax in the case of tires, the treatment of reclaimed oil in the case of the tax on lubricating oil, and the treatment of charitable and similar organizations in the case of the tax on admissions. A witness may testify on more than one of these groupings, but it is requested that each grouping be clearly separated and captioned in the copies of the prepared testimony."

My comments will be devoted exclusively to the timing of collection of tax in the case of tires.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee of Ways and Means is to be complimented in having taken interest in this subject matter which has been a thorn in the side of the independent tire sales and servicing stations nationwide since the wartime excise taxes were first inaugurated.

Bear in mind that independent tire dealers are not alone the victims of this discrimination in the tax levy, but all sellers of tires are also victims—be they filling station operators, garages, automobile dealers, or wholesalers, where, on the other hand, a special few, numbering approximately 1,500 to 2,000, in daily competition with all other retailers, are exempt from the tax levy on their stocks of tires and tubes until the merchandise is ultimately sold to the consumer. I am referring to the factory-owned retail stores—owned and operated by Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, and others. The three mentioned own and operate, collectively, approximately 1,500 stores.

In a recent prospectus of a well-known banking house in their report as it related to the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. they said in substance that Goodyear claimed 40,000 independent retailers, and the report further stated that the Goodyear Co. operated nearly 500 retail stores.

In my private capacity, prior to my official connection with the National Federation of Independent Business, I first became interested in this injustice in or around 1940, and from that moment up to the present time, in my dual capacity, I have urged correction of this discrimination.

The National Federation's position in the matter was openly declared through a nationwide poll of its membership when the question was put to the membership, and the result of this poll made to all types of independent businesses disclosed 95 percent for the correction, 3 percent against, 2 percent not voting. Such vote was reported in mandate No. 135, official publication of the federation.

I think it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, to give you the log of our activities in this respect for the information of your committee:

1. In public hearings before the House Small Business Committee January 13, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 26, 27; February 6, 9, 10, 16, 19; March 4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23; May 5; July 9, 10, 15; September 24, 1942; after presentation of the discriminatory excise tax situation the committee was unanimous in recommending immediate correction.

2. The situation was again explored before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on June 10, 1952.

3. Hearings were held before the Senate Small Business Committee on May 6, 1943, on the same subject matter, Problems of American Small Business, referring to pages 2646–2648.

4. Hearings before the House Ways and Means Committee June 13, 1947. Refer to pages 547 to 562. Refer to the letter from the then chairman of the House Small Business Committee, the Honorable Walter Ploeser, who stated that the House Small business Committee feels the discrimination must be corrected, that the committee recommends the dealers be permitted to pay the tax after the sale to the ultimate consumer.

The hearings will disclose in my testimony the correspondence between myself and the United States Treasury officials in which the Department stated it was considering recommendations for correction by the House Ways and Means Committee.

5. Hearings before the House Small Business Committee November 17, 1948, Monopolistic and Unfair Trade Practices, page 567, at which time I urged the committee to recommend that the House Ways and Means Committee adopt H. R. 4407, which was introduced by the Honorable Walter Ploeser, a bill to correct the excise tax discrimination.

6. Hearings before the Senate Finance Committee July 5–13, 1950, Revenue Revisions of 1950. Refer to page 218.

7. Hearings before the House Small Business Committee May 20, 1953.

The above action in behalf of this necessary relief does not tell the full story, and it does not cover the many contacts on the subject matter because numerous personal contacts were made with members of the staff of the Joint Committee of Taxation and constant correspondence with Members of Congress and with members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

It will be noted in the recent annual reports of both the Senate and House Small Business Committees that they recognize this deplorable situation and have urged appropriate correction of the discrimination.

We are not asking, in behalf of small business which includes independent tire sales and servicing agents, any special tax consideration for them, which may be denied to others, but we are asking for a fair break.

The Treasury Department may contend that collecting the tax at the source from the manufacturer is a much simpler and easier procedure for the Treasury Department. We would go along with that if the regulation applied to all other industry products where the tax would be collected from the manufacturer, but such is not the case.

Also, we are not asking for the elimination of the excise tax on tires and tubes.

It is to be noted in the hearings before the House Public Works Committee with reference to the recent highway legislation, this excise tax discrimination subject matter was taken under consideration by many members of that committee, and they were sympathetic to the proposition to have correction made, but held to the premise such relief should be forthcoming through the action of the Committee on Ways and Means. With reference to action taken on the highway bill in the recent session of the 84th Congress it is to be noted that under date of July 27, 1955, on the floor of the House the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, present chairman of the House Small Business Committee, and the first chairman of that committee, being fully cognizant of the injustice to independents in the tire sales and servicing field through the existing method of tax imposition, was prepared to offer an amendment to the highway bill, which would have corrected the inequity in the excise-tax levy. However, as the bill was not open to amendment on the floor, Mr. PATMAN'S proposed amendment could not become a part of that major legislation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I know many members of the Ways and Means Committee have individually expressed to me that something should be done to correct this long-overdue injustice.

These major rubber companies owning and operating retail stores are certainly in a much stronger position to be able to make what might be termed advance payments than the people are now being required to make such advances, namely, small business.

We ask:

1. That the stocks of tire and tubes in the hands of tire manufacturers' retail stores be subject to the excise-tax levy at the time of delivery of the merchandise, the same as is now imposed on independents.

2. That the independents be given the same concession of making payment when their merchandise is ultimately sold, as is now given to the company-owned stores.

Small-business institutions today, of any and all descriptions, have all they can do to keep their businesses properly financed, and there is no reason why the Federal Government should add an increased financial burden through practices such as outlined above.

I ask in behalf of small business that this correction be made, and that it carry the recommendation of your committee, Mr. Chairman.

Increased Federal Aid for School Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Post, Boston, Mass., on the subject of Federal aid to schools:

PAYING FOR SOUTHERN SCHOOLS

The recent White House Conference on Education found agreement in one area of a vast problem—that of increased Federal aid for school construction distributed in accordance to need.

This recommendation will be handed along to Congress. In considering this recommendation to Congress, New Englanders must face the fact that southern Congressmen are better organized as a bloc than New England Congressmen.

One can expect, therefore, that the Southern bloc will offer proof that in school shortages they are the neediest of all. That raises two more questions: Will regions like New England be expected to help build schools in the Southern States which are fighting desegregation? And will New England be expected to help provide schools for those Southern communities which have lured Northern industries away by tax amortization plans?

In 36 years New England has lost 270,000 jobs in the textile industry alone. Most of these jobs are now in the South in communities which attracted the industries by cheap labor, tax amortization and other schemes. These Southern towns now need schools for workers' children and can't afford them. Desegregation has aggravated the Southern school situation.

Recent studies of major Federal programs during the past 20 years have shown that the poorer Southern States gather in more than five times the amount of Federal cash per $1,000 of Federal taxes paid than New England States collect per $1,000 of Federal taxes paid.

The Federal aid to schools proposed is another program in which the New England States will certainly get the worst of it. New England already pays more for food and raw materials than the rest of the country, according to expert economists.

The well-organized Southern Congressmen, always on the qui vive for a fight or a frolic where Federal funds are concerned, have all the more reason to go after Federal school-aid funds with high hopes of success. School desegregation has already arounsed the Southerners and increased the estimated costs of Southern schools by 100 percent. To placate the Southerners it is certain that the leadership of both parties will hand out Federal funds to hush up the Southern bloc.

New England has taken an awful beating from Federal programs. In only a single Federal category—the insurance programs—has New England taken out more than it put in. But, as the school construction aid shapes up at the moment, New England is going to take another beating unless the New England delegation insists upon a bill written with full cognizance of the needs of New England's educational systems and institutions, which serve the whole Nation. But, more than anything else, there must be a requirement that communities with industry tax inducement plans undertake school construction with smaller Federal contributions than those which now support school systems out of local revenue with no tax lures.

Agreement on the Urgency of Federal Aid for Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEWART L. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, there are few men in Washington who have a better grasp of the many issues involved in formulating a Federal program for aid to the schools of the Nation than Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive officer for the chief school officers of the 48 States. In the January 16 issue of the New Republic, Dr. Fuller has concisely presented the current status of school-aid legislation. I am confident his analysis will attract the attention of our colleagues who favor prompt action on this important subject.

Dr. Fuller's article follows:

AGREEMENT ON THE URGENCY OF FEDERAL AID

In the section of his state of the Union message that deals with human concerns President Eisenhower once again argues that good education is fundamental to our democracy. This year he grants in addition that it requires prompt and substantial action by the Federal Government:

"So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms. Such a program which should be limited to a 5-year period, must operate to increase rather than decrease local and State support of schools and to give the greatest help to the States and localities with the least financial resources. Federal aid should in no way jeopardize the freedom of local school systems. There will be presented to the Congress a recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction."

Similar statements in recent years—for President Truman was ardent in his advocacy of Federal aid—have led to no helpful action. But there is reason to believe that in this fourth year of the Eisenhower administration action will be taken at last. For one thing the need has become appalling in its urgency; for another, as President Eisenhower notes, public opinion has been mobilized through the mechanism of the White House conference and its preliminary meetings, in which a half-million Americans took part.

In pressing for action the Eisenhower administration should welcome its present opportunity to share political credit with the Democratic Congress. For on the school-construction issue the administration's political stock has nowhere to go but up, especially in the thinking of large numbers of independent voters among professional school people and other citizens greatly concerned about the schools. Far more important than political advantage, a substantially bipartisan law is possible this year. For if the bill offered once again in the House by Representative AUGUSTINE B. KELLY, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, passes the House and something based on the administration's bill passes the Senate, the two can be merged in a joint conference committee to produce acceptable legislation. This seems the obvious course for Congress to take. The Kelley bill, after all, is the result of years of congressional study and struggle in Congress. It is bound to be a prime factor in responsible congressional action and thus deserves the administration's full respect. But if the Eisenhower administration puts politics first and works to defeat the Kelley bill in the House in order to gain priority for its new bill in the Senate, our schools may be the losers.

And this would be unnecessary as well as tragic. The origins of the Kelley bill itself are bipartisan. Its grant-in-aid section is similar to that of the identical bills introduced with perfect bipartisan harmony a year ago.

In spite of its origins, however, the Kelley bill is widely regarded as the Democratic bill. Speaker RAYBURN has given it priority on the agenda. It was voted out of the House Education and Labor Committee last July by 15 Democrats and 6 Republicans, with 2 Democrats and 7 Republicans in opposition. Its grant-in-aid authorization of $400 million annually for 4 years is too high to be acceptable to the administration. In recent weeks, too, some of the special provisions considered for many years in connection with the old general Federal-aid bills that failed have been dusted off in the HEW Department and found to be good. So the administration has a new bill of its own.

Upon most issues there are no serious disagreements in principle. To illustrate, both parties want Federal funds distributed according to need. Everyone desires that Federal funds shall not displace State or local funds that would otherwise be expended for school facilities. All bills being considered safeguard State and local autonomy completely through State administration of the construction program. They make absurd any charge that there could be Federal interference with programs of education in local schools after the facilities have been constructed by the school districts under State standards with combined local, State and Federal funds.

The question of distribution according to need raises the question about what is fairly defined as such. Both administration and Democratic bills authorize full equalization among local districts within each State under the priorities of State plans. This is the major factor in determining need for school facilities, because variations in fiscal capacity among local districts within States are commonly 100 to 1 and are greater in every State than the less than 3 to 1 variation between the richest State and the poorest State.

The administration's bill goes beyond equalization in allocations within States and authorizes equalization in allocations among States. The Kelley bill takes more into account where the Federal funds come from and authorizes allocations to State on the basis of school-age population alone. Kelley bill supporters point out that after Federal taxes have been credited to the States where the tax burden actually falls, (rather than where Federal taxes are collected), the advantage per school child that the poorest

State would have over the richest State would be about 8 to 1. Since the difference in fiscal capacity between these 2 States is less than 3 to 1, Kelley bill supporters believe the 8 to 1 inherent leveling effect of the Federal tax system is enough equalization. The administration's formula would increase the advantage of the poorest over the richest State to about 16 to 1 per schoolchild. This range is only 2 to 1 if no account is taken of the sources of Federal tax funds.

A majority of the supporters of both bills agree with President Eisenhower that "anti-segregation" amendments are "extraneous" to this legislation. No bill could pass in the 84th Congress with this handicap. Children without schools cannot wait for the reform of a social system and the amendment can only deny them schools.

The complexity of the legislation cannot be denied, but there is rapid progress toward a concensus on school construction aid. The way things look now, the 84th Congress seems likely to rise to is opportunity.

The League of Women Voters and Its Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 16, 1956, at page A340, I called the attention of our colleagues to the December 1955 issue of the National Voter, monthly publication of the League of Women Voters of the United States, which contained an explanatory article on league procedure. Through inadvertence that article was not printed.

The article on league procedure is as follows:

THE LEAGUE AND ITS PROGRAM

How is the league program made?

How does the league reach consensus?

These are the two questions most frequently asked by outsiders. They know the league's reputation as a grassroots organization with a thoroughly democratic process, and they ask: "How do you do it?"

New members in the league ask the same questions. And there are hundreds of new members to ask these days, for the league has grown rapidly in the past 10 years. In 1945 there were 523 local leagues and 52,099 members; in 1950, 740 and 93,090; in 1955 there are 985 and 126,747. A survey of the first 500 delegates to register for the 1954 convention showed that more than half had joined since 1948.

The formal answers can be found in the local league handbook and the national bylaws. And the program record, recently published, tells what the league has accomplished in its 35 years. But the answers are living realities to those long in the league, who have actively participated in program-making in their local leagues and at national conventions, who have painstakingly studied issues and patiently arrived at consensus.

Because it is important that all members understand league procedure now, while they are in the national program-making period, and because there are so many new members not all yet seasoned in the league, the National Voter attempts in this article to answer some of the obvious questions.

HOW IS THE PROGRAM MADE?

The 1956–58 national program will be selected by local and State league delegates at the convention to be held April 30 to May 4 of next year. That vote will be the final step of a process which began in the fall of this year. Most local leagues discussed national program as early as October. Their recommendations had to be sent to the national board by November 30.

Whatever emerges on the national program at the coming convention will be based on the recommendations now in the hands of the national board. About 3,000 have been received, representing over 700 leagues.

Members of the national board are now engaged in studying and analyzing these program recommendations. At their week's meeting in mid-January they will work out a proposed program.

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED

Usually the recommendation made by the most leagues goes at the top of the list, but this is not mandatory and it is not invariably so. The recommendation must be measured against league principles and purpose, possibilities of political effectiveness, and womanpower and time available. Also to be considered is whether it represents a cross section of thinking, that is, did the recommendation come from various sections of the country, from large and small leagues, from city and rural leagues?

The result of this process—1 item or 2, usually—will be the part of the proposed program that is called the current agenda (current governmental issues for concerted action). The current agenda plus continuing responsibilities (positions on national issues to which the league has given sustained attention and on which it may continue to take action) plus the principles (governmental principles supported by the league as a whole) comprise the program.

LOCAL LEAGUES DISCUSS AGAIN

The proposed program will be sent to the local leagues by February 15. The local leagues will go through another round of discussion and by the deadline of April 9 must send to the national board their recommendations, if any, for changes in the proposed program. The national board evaluates these comments and suggestions and may revise the proposed program.

Sometimes leagues protest at the workload, what with local, State, and National programs. In making up the 1952–54 proposed program, the national board sought to respond to this feeling. The proposed program contained only one item; it was an international one. But the local leagues, who had sighed at the workload, then protested because there was no domestic item. So the national board went back to the recommendations received from local leagues in the first round, which had indicated economy and efficiency in government as the field of second greatest interest, and worked out the wording of an item II for the current agenda. That is how the item on congressional procedures of the Federal budget became a part of the national program.

Next comes convention. Now the proposals art threshed out among the delegates. Because the delegate body has grown so large, section meetings, diversified as to region, size and type of league, etc., are set up for the purposes of preliminary debate. Then comes floor debate. Work proceeds in this manner—section meetings, floor debate, section meetings, floor debate—until all viewpoints have been aired and the program is finally adopted by vote of the delegates.

THE VALUE OF DEBATE

It is convention debate which gives the national board direction as to how to carry out the program.

More than one hotel convention manager has had to adjust his usual routine in order to accommodate the league. For the league he must provide a number of aisles, with microphones at intervals in each one. The league is determined to provide an easy way for every delegate to express her opinion to the convention, and no one who has ever attended a league convention can forget the picture of democracy at its best in the queues of delegates awaiting their turn at the microphones.

Suppose your league suggested a current agenda item which does not appear on the proposed program. You are sure that what your league recommended would be adopted if only it could be submitted to the delegates.

Or suppose world events have shifted to such an extent that now you have a brand-new idea to submit to the delegates.

There are ways to achieve the first.

The latter is impossible, and this is why. The league, being thoroughly democratic in its processes, believes that all members, not just delegates, should have an opportunity for consideration of proposals to be voted on at convention. Therefore, the bylaws provide that there shall not be presented at convention a new item.

THE PROGRAM CAN BE CHANGED

However, if your league has submitted a recommendation prior to convention, within the stipulated deadlines, you have a chance. In the first place, you will find it in the list of "not-recommended items" in the convention briefing. This is a bit of league lingo which confuses the press and the public no end. It does not mean that the national board, in making up the proposed program, is against the substance of the item; the board recommends a program, and because the league selects only a very few areas in which to work at one time, the national current agenda is likely to be composed of 1 or 2 items at the most. All other recommendations from local leagues are called "not-recommended items."

So, you try to marshal opinion among other delegates for the program recommendation your league made in the first round. You will find that it takes a two-thirds vote to substitute it for one of the recommended items. And you will think back and remember who put the two-thirds vote there, and why: Convention delegates, as a safeguard against spur-of-the-moment changes. If your motion to consider does receive a two-thirds vote, your "not-recommended item" will be considered by the convention. Again a two-thirds vote is necessary to get it on the final program. And now you will recall even more—that it has twice been proposed to convention that delegates might want to liberalize the two-thirds stipulation, and twice the convention has turned down the idea. The two-thirds vote was put there by delegates from local leagues; it is still there because local leagues voted to keep it there.

However, a simple majority may adopt the proposed program or amend it. Usually it is a big majority.

HOW DOES THE LEAGUE REACH CONSENSUS?

The process involved in reaching consensus is as thoroughly democratic, as thoroughly grassroots, as the program-making process.

First of all, the league takes on national legislative position only on program-related issues which local leagues have had a long time to study.

Secondly, no position is taken without a clear-cut mandate from the membership. If there is not a wide area of agreement, that is, unless it is possible to be sure that a position reflects general membership opinion, no position is taken.

Sometimes the league is challenged because it does not poll its members and does not give out figures when it announces consensus. To understand the league's policy one need only consider the representative system of our Government. Does a Representative or Senator poll everyone in his

constituency when he is preparing to vote on an issue? Of course not; yet he usually has his finger on the pulse of his constituents as a whole. And does everyone vote in an election? Of course not; yet everyone has the chance, and usually those who feel strongly either way on an issue register their opinions.

The national board does keep track of the number of local leagues which send in reports of their consensus or lack of same. But it believes figures are not the only factors to be considered. If numbers of leagues alone were counted, one section of the country could outweigh all the other sections. If numbers of members within leagues were the basis of a count, a few big leagues could outweigh the total of many small leagues. If the issue were one in which, for example, city and rural leagues might be assumed to have opposing opinions, and more city leagues than rural registered opinions, they could outweigh the rural; and vice versa.

Therefore, as in program-making, there must be a wide area of agreement based on substantial numbers, cross section as to States, and cross section as to size and type of leagues, before the national board can determine that consensus has been reached. The board also considers attitudes revealed in local league bulletins, correspondence, field visits, much as a member of Congress keeps up with opinions of his constituents.

THE LEAGUE TAKES A POSITION

To trace a league position from the beginning, consider the Bricker amendment. The league was one of the last of the large national organizations to take a stand on this issue, because it had to await crystallization of opinion among the local leagues.

The Bricker amendment was introduced in the United States Senate in September 1951 and again in January 1952. In March 1952 the National Voter carried an article on it, and in April 1952 the national convention discussed the problem. The 1953 national Council also discussed the proposed amendment. Altogether, pro and con information was made available to members in at least 14 separate instances—in the National Voter, Report From the Hill, communications to local league presidents, etc. Three times—May, October, and November, 1953—the national board asked local leagues to report as to their preparation and views, the final one a reminder that local league opinion would be considered at the coming board meeting "to determine whether a league position is warranted."

Responses were more numerous and opinion was stronger than in the case of any issue on which consensus had been reached in at least 15 years. And, in January 1954, the national board announced that the League of Women Voters was opposed to the Bricker amendment.

The league constantly strives to improve its methods of ascertaining membership opinion. Responsibility rests with the local leagues to express their views; responsibility rests with the national board to determine the point at which opinion is strong enough to represent the membership as a whole. The amount of participation from the grassroots is extremely high in the league, and the league is willing to stack its system up against the method of any other voluntary organization for interpretation of membership opinion.

IS LEAGUE POSITION IRREVOCABLE?

The league has never reversed a position, but it has withdrawn positions.

For example, the equal rights amendment. From 1923 to 1954 the league opposed such an amendment. Then, because of the time that had elapsed since the position had been taken, and because many of the new members who had joined in the meantime had little background or little interest in the subject, the 1954 convention voted that the league had no position on the equal rights amendment. No voice had been raised in convention against the traditional stand, but delegates chose to have the league stand uncommitted on this issue.

As another example, from 1944 to 1949 the league held a position in support of Federal aid to education. But in the course of continued study enough leagues raised questions so basic to the concept that doubt arose as to whether there was the wide area of agreement so essential to consensus. As important as the league felt the issue of Federal aid to education to be, there were other issues to which members preferred to turn their attention. Therefore, in lack of a paramount interest in the subject and in lack of a clear mandate from the membership, convention delegates voted to have the league stand uncommitted on this issue.

DOES THE LEAGUE STAND FOR "MORE AND MORE GOVERNMENT"?

Of course not. The league does not believe that all problems must necessarily be handled by government. The league, however, works only in the field of government, therefore it is obvious that everything on its program is directly related to government. The league might be for "less" government, that is, for defeat or repeal of a measure, in one case, and "more" government, that is, for passage of a measure, in another.

Not more and more government, but more and more citizen concern for good government, is the league's purpose. This is true not only at the national level, but also, in fact particularly so, at the State and local levels. No organization has done more to enlist citizen participation than has the League of Women Voters through its local leagues.

IS THE LEAGUE INTERNATIONALIST?

Yes, and proud of it, if internationalism means cooperation for better understanding among nations. The league has never advocated world government. The United Nations, as the only existing agency that affords a meeting place where nations can come together to discuss common problems, has the support of the league.

In this the league stands shoulder to shoulder with President Eisenhower and former President Truman.

WHAT IS THE LEAGUE PROGRAM ON INDIVIDUAL LIBERTIES?

Because of its dedication to democratic principles, the league long has recognized communism as a deadly threat to the national security. From its beginning the league has been involved in the free examination and exchange of ideas, recognizing that communism or any other form of totalitarianism destroys this freedom first of all.

At the 1954 convention the league decided that the best way it could help strengthen national security was to develop widespread awareness of our American heritage of individual liberties and their relationship to the public interest.

A program to stimulate thoughtful discussion of these subjects is now under way throughout the country. Discussion groups have been held in over 500 communities.

The league, in line with its policy of encouraging free expression of opinion, has served as a catalytic agent in initiating some of these groups. It has helped draw together a cross section of the community, has sparked interest and organized discussion groups, leaving them free to examine a subject as they choose.

In connection with these discussions the league has recommended, as helpful resource material for study, the Freedom Agenda pamphlets published by the Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, Inc., a research organization founded by the league. These pamphlets, prepared by outstanding authorities in the legal and political science fields, are matched with discussion guides designed to stimulate maximum exchange of ideas and pro-and-con considerations. The community discussion groups are free to examine any material they choose and no controls over community organization have been imposed. In supporting freedom, the league advocates freedom.

Some factions which are not in favor of free debate on public issues have suggested that these discussions be discontinued. To members familiar with the league's long-standing policy of encouraging thoughtful discussion of public issues, such reactions only serve to point up more clearly the need for continuing these citizen forums.

The Stars and Stripes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following articles from Facts Forum News, September 1955, on the subject of Our Flag:

OUR FLAG

(By Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, U. S. Army retired)

Our flag, like our religious faith, is something to which we all turn in time of trouble. Let me give an illustration of what the flag means to soldiers.

During the dark days of Bataan, when the surrender of MacArthur's forces was imminent, a handful of spirited United States cavalrymen decided that they would not surrender. It would mean certain death if they were caught, but somehow they managed to escape into the great Zambales Mountain Range of Luzon, which parallels the China Sea. There they hid out for 3 long years. Loyal Filipinos, at the risk of torture and death, gave warning when Japs came near. And what did these cavalrymen take with them into the Zambales Mountain fastness? It was the American flag—the colors of the 26th Cavalry.

On sunshiny days when the mountain passes were clear of the enemy, these American patriots unfurled their emblem of freedom into the breeze, and they lay there by the hour feasting on its glory.

While Manila was being liberated, these lads made their way through the battlelines and proudly presented their honored flag to General MacArthur. Throughout the Japanese occupation, the colors of the 26th Cavalry had never been hauled down.

I should like to hear some of our promiscuous internationalists tell these hard-bitten cavalrymen not to wave the Stars and Stripes.

Shortly after Japan's surrender, the writer, together with less than a dozen officers and a small color guard, stood at the American Embassy in Tokyo and General MacArthur, visibly moved, ordered the Stars and Stripes raised over the Embassy. It was the end of a long and frustrating and heartbreaking and bloody trail. And as our beautiful flag unfurled in the blue over Tokyo, emotion shook every one of us to the marrow of his bones.

I tell you our flag does have a meaning. And if it ever loses its meaning, it will not only be the end of freedom in America, it will be the end of freedom everywhere.

A Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 16, 1956, I introduced a bill, H. R. 8497, to make the President's fund for participation in international affairs a permanent program. This step was in line with the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee which last year said, in its report on the supplemental appropriations bill for 1956, H. R. 7278, that this fund should be made a part of the regular budget. I am very pleased to see that the President said in his budget message that—

> In view of the effectiveness of these activities (carried on by the President's emergency fund) legislation will be recommended to authorize them on a continuing basis.

For the past 2 years the Congress has appropriated an annual sum of $5 million to the fund, the broad purposes of which are first, the presentation abroad of American cultural and athletic attractions by the Department of State; and second, United States participation in international trade fairs. The Department of Commerce has charge of the trade fair program. To date, the $5 million has been divided equally between these two programs. The USIA has done a first-rate job of publicizing these programs abroad.

In the 5 years prior to 1955 the Soviet bloc exhibited at 122 trade fairs at which the United States was not represented. With the help of this fund the Department of Commerce has been able to take positive steps to overcome this long head start by the Communists. On the strictly cultural side our leading artists have performed in some 220 major cities of the world and given the lie to the Communist line that we are barbarians. At least 12 athletic teams have been sent abroad and have been widely hailed.

The administration refused to finance the Russian trip of Porgy and Bess, our most successful cultural export to date. The U. S. S. R. tour of the company is being paid for by the Russian Government. The State Department, which approved the trip, said it could not afford any financial support. That the Russians, instead of our own Government, should be the sole sponsor of this trip is an outstanding example of penny-wise and pound-foolish diplomacy.

The President recommended only a modest increase in appropriations for the educational exchange programs of the Department of State which constitute a basic element of our long-term effort to attain a better mutual understanding with other peoples of the world. Certainly a much larger sum should have been recommended for these important activities.

In the President's own words he is "recommending a modest increase in appropriations for the educational exchange programs of the Department of State." Contrast this with the treatment accorded the information program. In the case of the latter the President recommended that appropriations be increased by $48 million from the level in the current fiscal year.

The vast difference between these two recommendations typifies the Madison Avenue approach to the problems of the world, which is the hallmark and the most distinguishing characteristic of the present administration.

I have introduced a joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 474, to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs. Such a joint committee will be able to make an important contribution to the advancement of these international exchange programs.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to say that Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT will sponsor this joint resolution in the Senate.

I am sure that other Members of the House will want to join me in sponsoring this legislation. I therefore invite and welcome their cooperation, and I would be happy to have similar measures introduced in the House by any of my colleagues.

International exchange of persons has proved a valuable means of developing closer cooperation among the nations of the free world. The need for such cooperation is everyday more apparent. The United States Government is using this technique both for building better understanding of our country abroad and for technical cooperation and economic development. Large exchange programs in both fields are now operated by the Department of State. Students, teachers, prominent specialists and leaders in many fields are exchanged and outstanding cultural performers are sent abroad under the International Educational Exchange Program. The Congress authorized this program through the Smith-Mundt Act—Public Law 402, 80th Congress; the Fulbright Act—Public Law 584, 79th Congress; and several other acts. American technical experts are sent abroad and foreign nationals are brought to the United States for training under the International Cooperation Administration—formerly FOA and point 4.

The Congress receives reports from the Secretary of State on these programs and reviews their operation annually in connection with appropriations. The Smith-Mundt Act also provides for a United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange which reports directly to the Congress on a semiannual basis.

Each of these programs is reviewed separately, and by different committees of the Congress. Each of these programs is extremely complex both from the point of view of administration and source of funds. Each use dollars and foreign currencies and rely to a large extent on the efficient use of similar private resources in the United States.

It is, therefore, not surprising that some confusion has persisted in the Congress as to the relationships between these programs. It is imperative that this confusion be eliminated so that both of these efforts can achieve the most useful results.

No concerted or continuing review of these programs and their relationships to each other has ever been undertaken by the Congress. Such a review is of the utmost importance and would be of inestimable benefit to the Congress. It would help all of us to make a more realistic appraisal of these programs.

The Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs which my joint resolution would establish will provide the necessary review to insure the most effective planning, operation, and administration of these two important facets of our international relations.

I am confident that the Congress under Democratic control will take the leadership in these important matters.

Regarding my bill to make the President's emergency fund for participation in international affairs permanent it may be useful to recall that a subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee under Republican leadership in 1954 rejected 14 bills calling for a similar program saying: "We cannot endorse any of them. We do not believe this is a proper area for the expenditure of Federal funds." This position was taken in a report published almost 2 months after the Congress had appropriated $5 million for the activities proposed in the President's emergency fund.

The bills in the House were sponsored by Democratic Members of the Congress, which apparently made them unacceptable to the Republicans there. However, these bills were a serious attempt to develop the program which had been recommended by the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange beginning in 1951 and semiannually since in its 7th, 8th, and 9th reports to the Congress. The thoughtful recommendations of this commission have been ignored by the present administration which should have taken positive action regarding them several years ago. With the introduction of my bill, H. R. 6874, and the hearings held on it by the Subcommittee on Distinguished Civilian Awards and Cultural Interchange and Development under the chairmanship of my distinguished colleague, Representative LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana, in the House Committee on Education and Labor, the administration finally has bestirred itself.

The legislation introduced in the 83d Congress by its democratic Members for the purpose of establishing a cultural-exchange program was strongly supported by one former Republican Member of the Congress who testified in favor of it saying:

> There is an enormous propaganda weapon which the Russians are using against us, with the most telling effect, all over the world. They are posing, and getting away with it, as the people of culture, as juxtaposed to us who are painted to the world

as the people who don't care for culture. The Russians are doing an enormous job in that. They have sent traveling artists, violinists, pianists, whole ballet companies, theater companies, into the big world centers, and they have made a very distinct impression. Let us not kid ourselves on that. They have made a very distinct impression.

Despite this impressive warning the Republican members of the subcommittee last year recommended that none of the bills referred to in this report be passed.

The text of my joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons programs follows:

Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs

Resolved, etc., That (a) there shall be a joint congressional committee known as the Joint Committee on United States International Exchange of Persons Programs (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the "joint committee").

(b) The joint committee shall be composed of 22 members as follows:

(1) Eleven Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, one from the majority and one from the minority party: The Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Committee on Government Operations; and

(B) Three at large from the Senate, two from the majority and one from the minority party.

(2) Eleven Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House, as follows:

(A) Two from each of the following committees, one from the majority and one from the minority party: The Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Committee on Government Operations; and

(B) Three at large from the House of Representatives, two from the majority party and one from the minority party.

(c) No person appointed by the Speaker of the House under subsection (b) (2) (A) shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee of the House of Representatives of which he was a member when appointed to the joint committee, except that a member who has been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as a member of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress.

(d) A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection.

(e) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members, and the chairmanship and vice chairmanship shall rotate between the two Houses with each session of Congress.

(f) Subject to applicable provisions of law, the joint committee may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it shall determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(g) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee shall—

(1) conduct public hearings on, and cause studies to be made concerning, the extent and effectiveness of all United States international exchange of persons programs, including the international educational exchange programs authorized by section 32 (b) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the interchange of persons under the technical assistance programs carried on by the International Cooperation Administration, and the cultural presentations programs of the President's Emergency Fund for Participation in International Affairs;

(2) cause studies to be made of the relationships among the various United States international exchange of persons programs, exclusive of those relating to military activities, to insure their most effective planning, operation, administration, scope, and effectiveness and to determine their relationship in these respects to private programs in the same fields; and

(3) provide a continuous, cooperative relationship between the Congress and the various United States international exchange of persons programs and similar or related programs both public and private in order to foster, encourage, promote, and otherwise assist their further growth and development.

(b) As used in this joint resolution the term "United States international exchange of persons program" means any program, operated by or financed in whole or in part by any department or agency of the Government, involving the exchange of persons between the United States and other countries for any purposes whatsoever, exclusive of military purposes.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Congress twice annually (beginning on July 1 or January 1 next occurring after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution), and at such other times as it deems necessary, on the extent and effectiveness of the United States international exchange of persons programs; and shall recommend to the President and the Congress steps considered necessary to improve the quality of all such programs.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this joint resolution the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

The World Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in a recent issue of the New York Times. It discusses the 1955 operations of the International Bank for reconstruction and development. I consider the article a very good analysis of the operations of the bank. It shows that the bank is making great headway and doing much good work all over the world, and is fulfilling its mission under the leadership of which the United States can be very proud, in the person of Eugene Black, the chief executive officer of the bank.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD BANK SETS 3 NEW HIGHS—$460,500,000 LOANS, INCOME OF $26 MILLION, INVESTORS TOPPED PREVIOUS LEVELS

(By Paul Heffernan)

The year 1955 was a record one for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The bank made 27 loans aggregating $406,500,000 in 20 counties. This compares with a record of 16 loans totaling $282,700,000 in 15 countries during 1954, and 22 loans totaling $257 million in 1953.

On the income side the bank's 1955 earnings are estimated at $26 million, a new high. This compares with $22,500,000 for 1954. Additions to a special reserve derived from the 1-percent statutory commission charged on all disbursed and outstanding loans also reached a new high and are estimated at about $14 million, against $12 million in 1954.

Direct participations by privately owned institutional investors in the World Bank's loans also reached a new high both as to number and amount in 1955. The year's participation aggregated $30,200,000, and represented a part of 19 of the 26 loans made by the bank in the period. In the previous year private financial organizations participated to the extent of about $12 million in 9 of the 16 loans made in that year.

EUROPEAN BANKS PARTICIPATE

The participants in the 1955 financing included 22 private banks, of which 13 were in the United States, 6 of the Eastern Exchange Banks, and, for the first time, 3 private banks in Europe. All took down participations without the guaranty of the World Bank.

Similarly, the international lending institution continued to sell from its investment portfolio certain obligations of borrowers. These sales totaled $51,200,000 for the 11 months ended November 30, of which $50,700,000 was disposed of without the bank's guaranty and only $500,000 with the bank guaranty. In the year before portfolio sales amounted to $43 million, of which $39 million was sold without the bank guaranty and $3,500,000 with it.

Aggregate participations and portfolio sales on November 30 were $222 million, of which $163 million were without recourse to the bank and $69 million bore the bank's guarantee.

The bank sold three bond issues in 1955, all outside of the United States and for currencies other than United States dollars.

In Canada, $15 million was borrowed on 3¼ percent bonds due in 1965. There was also raised about $10,500,000 on 3½ percent Netherlands guilder bonds due in 1975. In Switzerland, the equivalent of about $11,600,000 was borrowed on 3½ percent bonds due in 1976.

NEED OF DOLLARS DECREASES

The World Bank has not publicly offered bonds in the United States market in almost 2 years because its need of United States dollars has not been urgent. An increasing amount of loans is being made in non-dollar currencies.

Repayments of loans made years ago in United States dollars are beginning to be

made in volume. Lastly, a growing number of private financial institutions is sharing in the bank's grants or credit, both by participating in loans and by purchasing parts of the bank's portfolio investments.

The outstanding debt of the World Bank is $860,806,060, of which $705 million is denominated in the 9 issues of United States dollar bonds. Also outstanding are $73,389,000 of Swiss franc bonds in 7 issues; $36,364,000 of Canadian dollar bonds in 2 issues; $28 million of British sterling bonds in 2 issues; and $21,053,000 of Netherlands guilder bonds in 2 issues.

The European area received more of the bank's loan money last year than any other region. This was largely due to a credit of $70 million made for the improvement of agriculture, industry, and power in southern Italy.

Loans to Europe were disbursed in 4 countries—Finland, Norway, Austria, and Italy—for a total of $117 million.

PAKISTAN A BIG BORROWER

Asia and the Middle East ranked next in obtaining credits. Eight loans totaling $87,100,000 were made in this area, the major share—$32,800,000—going to Pakistan for port, power, and pulp and paper manufacturing projects. The rest of the Middle East and Asian loans were made in India, Lebanon, Thailand, and Japan.

Latin American areas received 11 loans totaling $84,500,000, with $23 million of the total going to cement manufacturing and highway projects in Peru and Honduras. The other loans were allotted for projects in Colombia, Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala, and Uruguay.

Credits totaling $59,200,000 were granted in Africa. The Union of South Africa got $25,200,000 for transportation; Algeria got $10 million for electric power; and $24 million was advanced to the East Africa High Commission for transportation.

A loan of $54,500,000 was granted to Australia for development in equipment.

The investment in Lebanon totaled $27 million and marked the bank's first outlay for river valley development in the Middle East. The advance of $10 million in Algeria was the bank's first loan in the north African region.

In Latin America, the bank's advance of $15,900,000 to the Colombian National Railroad was the second financing in this field. A first loan in 1952 financed the start of the construction of the Magdelena Valley Railroad and the integration of various railroad systems in the South American republic.

In Cleveland, Savings and Loan Cooperative Financing Put This Urban Renewal Project on the Map

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article in the January 1956 issue of the Savings and Loan News entitled "In Cleveland, Savings and Loan Cooperative Financing Put This Urban Renewal Project on the Map." This article points up a splendid formula that can be used as a pattern for developing low-cost sale and rental housing with a minimum of redtape and no Government subsidy:

This could be called the story of the Big C. Cleveland is the setting.

Cuyahoga County Savings and Loan League, Cleveland Plan Commission, Cleveland Development Foundation, Community Development, Inc., and a soft-spoken but tenacious man named Clarence P. Bryan play the leading roles.

Courage and cooperation are the principal elements of the plot, for it took courage to tackle an urban renewal project without the usual subsidy props and plenty of cooperation to see that it got beyond the talking stage.

Today, there must be a real sense of accomplishment for all who have a part in this worthwhile and precedent-setting project.

A year ago, Community Apartments was only a remote possibility. By March, a plan began to jell, and on August 20 the first shovel bit into the soil of 6.1 acres at 79th and Woodland in the heart of Cleveland's slum and blight area. First occupants are expected to move into the 148-unit housing development next March with completion scheduled for next summer.

But how did the Cuyahoga County Savings and Loan League become a part of the script to the tune of underwriting a $1,075,600 mortgage?

Says Clarence P. Bryan, "The real motivating force was H. H. Hampton, one of our directors (Cuyahoga Savings Association, of which Bryan is managing officer). He sparked the idea and found the builder."

Hampton is vice president of industrial development for the Nickel Plate Railroad and a member of the Cleveland Plan Commission and the board of trustees of Cleveland Development Foundation.

Because of his close contact and understanding of the savings and loan business and his keen interest in revitalizing the rotting core of Cleveland, Hampton felt that savings associations could and should lend their financial weight to urban renewal.

"The economic health of Cleveland and other cities only can be assured by improving the tax base through revitalization of slum and blight sections," insists Hampton. "This is a vital concern of savings associations because of their inherent community responsibilities."

Last February, Hampton's persistence had won support of not only the directorate of Cuyahoga Savings but the Cuyahoga County Savings and Loan League as well. Bryan became the liaison, and it was decided that the league's membership resources were such that, through cooperative effort, it could participate in urban renewal financing.

With this decision made, the next step was to find a builder, and Hampton again came up with the answer. The Nickel Plate Railroad's industrial development program had put Hampton in touch with a building organization that in recent years had gained considerable experience in low-cost housing development and construction.

The principals of this organization were operating their residential activity under the name of Community Development, Inc.

In March, the Cuyahoga League, headed by president Joseph E. Sotak, Jr., and Bryan as chairman of the league's special committee for urban renewal financing, buckled down to earnest negotiations with the building firm.

At the very start of negotiations the builders took the emphatic position that the project should be privately financed; that they wanted no part of FHA. Community Development President Oscar H. Steiner and Vice President Chat Paterson said:

"We cannot afford the luxury of doing business with FHA. We will have to add 10 to 15 percent to our costs just for doing business with the agency, and our objective is to set rents and monthly mortgage payments at a level commensurate with the average wage earner to be served. This would be impossible under any FHA provision.

"As far as we can see, all the talk about FHA supporting slum clearance and urban redevelopment has been just that, since our files do not reveal a single unit built anywhere in the country under slum clearance and urban redevelopment sections.

"But the major reasons we cannot afford to do business with FHA would be the delays and redtape. Nor would we have the flexibility so essential in putting over a cooperative rental and sale project of this kind."

VALUE SET AT $1,350,000

The builders found the Cuyahoga League more than willing to proceed on the basis of providing financing without insurance or subsidy of any kind. The league commissioned R. L. Free, of the Cleveland appraisal firm of Cragin, Lang, Free & Co., to establish a value for land and proposed improvements. His appraisal was $1,350,000. Since the builders were putting up approximately $300,000, a mortgage of $1,075,600 was required.

With this as the target, Bryan began the task of rounding up league membership support so that a commitment could be issued to the builders. His first step was to obtain oral commitments from more than 20 associations. And so that the builder and architect could complete plans and specifications, a commitment was given to the builders in the name of Bryan's institution, Cuyahoga Savings.

Issuance of this interim commitment touched off weeks and months of working out all the difficult detail and legal procedure that a cooperative effort of this kind requires. Various other roadblocks were encountered along the way too, but the perseverance of Bryan and others put these aside one by one.

First, there was the site. It had to be one that would tie in with the city's overall urban renewal program. The city-owned 6.1 acre tract at 79th and Woodland was selected; it had to be rezoned from industrial to multiunit residential use. A special emergency ordinance accomplished this. Then followed the city's appraisal for sale and determination of conditions to be imposed upon the sale of the property.

Next, under State law, the site had to be sold by public bid, and the bidders were required to submit a financing commitment with their bids. Actually, this simplified matters for Community Development, Inc., because it was the only firm prepared to submit a bid on that basis. Understandably, it was the only bidder and acquired the property.

At this point it should be emphasized that the city of Cleveland cooperated to the fullest extent possible throughout the negotiations.

Meanwhile, Architect Max Ratner put the finishing touches to plans and specifications, and his interesting solution for the site, as illustrated on these pages, is a story in itself.

Meanwhile too, Cuyahoga Savings' attorney, Thomas A. Quintrell, acting in behalf of the participating associations, was busy unraveling legal and procedural details for the mortgage.

Space does not permit a description and explanation of the numerous special documents and agreements developed by Attorney Quintrell. These include commitment agreements, a pledge agreement and agent agreement (more about these later), and construction loan agreement.

Because the Cleveland cooperative financing plan is not only a "first" but one that could be adopted elsewhere, it is the intention of the United States League to incorporate the step-by-step procedure and most of the legal documents in a manual on savings and loan participation in urban renewal pro-

grams. This manual will be distributed by early spring.

By midsummer Bryan completed negotiations with 19 associations—13 State chartered and 6 Federals. A permanent loan from inception, the mortgage was set up in the amount of $1,075,600 for 25 years at 4½ percent interest. No service charges were involved.

The list below shows a breakdown of each association's participation:

Savings association participation in financing of Community Apartments, Inc.

[Mortgage loan—$1,075,600]

Participants	Participation		Pledge
	Amount	Percentage	
Broadview Savings	$193,132.87	0.17955	$33,074.64
Citizens Federal Savings	57,939.85	.05387	9,922.40
Cuyahoga Savings	54,077.20	.05028	9,260.90
East Cleveland Savings	23,175.95	.02155	3,968.95
Ohio Savings	64,892.65	.06033	11,113.08
Park View Federal Savings	38,626.58	.03592	6,614.93
Provident Savings	23,175.95	.02155	3,968.95
Quincy Savings	3,476.39	.00323	595.34
Ridgewood Savings	11,587.97	.01078	1,984.47
Second Federal Savings	115,879.72	.10773	19,844.78
Security Federal Savings	55,622.26	.05171	9,525.50
Shaker Savings	77,253.15	.07182	13,229.85
South Side Federal Savings	50,000.00	.04649	8,562.66
Southwestern Savings	23,175.95	.02155	3,968.95
State Savings	38,626.58	.03591	6,614.92
Superior Savings	15,450.63	.01437	2,645.97
Union Savings	75,000.00	.06972	12,844.00
United Savings	38,626.58	.03591	6,614.93
Women's Federal Savings	115,879.72	.10773	19,844.78
Total	1,075,600.00	100	184,200.00

The pledge column requires explanation. Regulation provides that savings and loans cannot place a mortgage in an amount in excess of two-thirds of the appraised value of a multi-unit housing project. Since the value was set at $1,350,000 and the builders needed a mortgage of $1,075,600, additional security had to be uncovered to bring the mortgage risk within the two-thirds limit.

This security, in the amount of $184,200, was pledged by the Cleveland Development Foundation. Organized in June 1954, by 100 of the city's largest corporations, the foundation has a revolving fund of $2 million to be used for the express purpose of furthering Cleveland's urban renewal program Foundation Executive Director Upshur Evans quickly agreed that Community Apartments was a most worthwhile project, and the Foundation approved the pledge. The $184,200 was put in trust and each participating association receives its pro rata share of the pledge as construction payouts are made.

CLEVELAND BANK NAMED AGENT

At this point you probably are wondering who handles the accounting and how it is done? Cleveland's Union Bank of Commerce, in which all but one of the participating associations maintained an account, was designated agent. The builders and Cleveland Development Foundation also had accounts in this same bank.

After a payout is approved, the bank charges each account with a pro rata share and credits the builders' account. At the same time, the bank credits the associations with a pro rata share of the pledge and debits the Foundation. Later, after occupancy of the dwellings, rents and mortgage payments will go to the agent who, in turn, will credit each of the savings association accounts in the same manner.

As so often happens with a new venture of this kind, a problem arose from an unexpected quarter. It was discovered in June that the associations could not enter into a construction loan agreement with the builders because the six federals would be acting outside Federal home-loan bank regulations. A FHLB proviso stipulated that a mortgage of this kind could not be made for more than 50 percent of value when the term was for more than 15 years and there were more than 12 units in the project.

This presented no problem to the State-chartered participants, because Ohio's savings and loan code had been modified last summer to permit 25-year amortization.

Bryan immediately contacted Joseph Whittaker, supervisory agent of the FHLBB and vice president of the Home Loan Bank of Cincinnati.

Whittaker told Bryan to write a letter outlining the program. The next day Whittaker advised that he had talked to Washington; that they were interested and would call an immediate hearing. Bryan led a delegation to Washington to explain the Cleveland plan.

Within a week after his first call to Whittaker regulation changes were issued authorizing Federal associations to make multiunit housing loans for a term of 25 years provided a Government entity certifies to the Federal association, in advance of making of the loan, that the development, alteration, repair, or improvement of such property is essential to, or in furtherance of the objectives of, a program of slum clearance or urban renewal which has been or is expected to be undertaken in whole or in part by such governmental entity.

ONLY ONE MORTGAGE, SEVERAL NOTES

On July 1 James T. Yeilding, director of Cleveland's Redevolpment Agency, issued the certification, and the last roadblock to completion of financing arrangements was eliminated.

There is only one mortgage and several notes. Each association has its own original promissory note for the amount of its participation, and an original pledge agreement for its share of the security pledged by the Cleveland Development Foundation. The promissory note permits each association to bring a foreclosure proceeding if there should be default. One association does not have to wait for all in the group to agree there is a serious default.

But all other original documents such as the title, mortgage deed, executed copies of the several agreements, insurance policies, etc., are held by the agent. Photostat copies of all of the documents are on file in each participating association, however.

The participating associations are assured a high degree of performance from the building firm because:

1. A completion bond had to be posted by the builders before construction started;

2. The architect was hired by the associations and is responsible to them, although his fee is paid by the builder. The architect is authorized to make inspections and approve payouts. "This arrangement is a safeguard to assure that construction proceeds in an orderly manner and according to plans and specifications," Bryan explained.

Community Development, Inc., broke ground for the 148 dwellings on August 20, and on December 1 all units were either sold or rented. Ninety percent of the future occupants have indicated an intention to buy by making minimum down payments. All the occupants will be Negroes, and it is the opinion of the builders that all the units will be owned outright by 1959 under a special trust agreement to be set up 6 months after completion.

The 2-bedroom units can be purchased for $8,750 and 3 bedrooms for $10,800. Rents are $79.50 and $95.75, respectively, with a nominal monthly charge for "personal repair and decorating."

The high percentage of purchase intent expressed by future occupants is attributable to attractive mortgage terms, as compared to monthly rental charges. A 2-bedroom unit can be purchased outright with a down payment of $1,750 and a 24-year 4½ percent mortgage payable at $59 monthly, and a 3-bedroom apartment for $2,000 down, and an $8,800 mortgage with monthly payments of $71.50. The monthly carrying charges cover interest and principal, taxes, insurance and services.

The builders already have started to negotiate refinancing of the mortgage upon completion of the project. Biggest reason for this is to create a revolving fund of the savings and loan capital now tied up in the Community Apartments mortgage.

EXPECT TO SELL MORTGAGE SOON

"Several insurance companies have expressed interest in buying the mortgage, and there isn't any doubt in my mind that we will sell," declares Chat Paterson. "We have an agreement with the savings and loans that the funds they now have invested will be made available for another project."

Said Cuyahoga League president Sotak: "We sincerely hope this will work into a revolving fund and that more associations will participate in the future. Our league has 41 members, with assets of $770 million (less than half participated in the first venture), and the only limiting factor is that this type of financing must be within our 15-percent ratio."

Perhaps the finest tribute to the men of Cleveland who zealously worked to put Community Apartments on the map can be extended to them by making this comparison:

In September 1954, 6 months before negotiations started for Community Apartments, the Cleveland Development Foundation began to negotiate with the Federal Housing Administration for mortgage insurance to cover 480 units in Cleveland's Garden Valley urban renewal project. On November 1, when construction of Community Apartments already had progressed to the second floor of all of the units, the foundation and FHA still were wrangling over costs. Should the FHA-insured section of Garden Valley ever get beyond the talking stage, it is conservatively estimated that the housing units, which will be comparable to Community Apartments in size, will cost $2,000 more per unit than those at 79th and Woodland.

Exclaimed builder Paterson, "Do you see now why the entire basis of negotiation between ourselves and the savings and loans was that Federal Government assistance would not be involved?"

Free TV or Fee TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, August 20, 1955:

Only one letter separates "free TV" from "fee TV," but the opposing viewpoints might just as well be stationed at the North and South Poles, remote from one another and remote from any compromise, or so it might seem.

The Federal Communications Commission has been subject to much lobbying pro and

con as to whether it should permit pay-as-you-see television, also known as subscription televison.

At the present time, TV programs are paid for by sponsors, who, in turn, are given the opportunity to advertise their products or services. Of course it is the American consumer who pays eventually and indirectly through his purchases of the goods and services that are advertised.

Under the fee system, advertising would be eliminated; and for a certain small price per program he could choose to see an outstanding movie, a championship sporting event, or any one of many special presentations.

I shall not go into the technical details of the various systems that would make it possible for you in your own home to pay and choose and see the subscription program of your choice.

I am concerned with the larger question as to whether or not free television, as we now know it, should have a commercial rival.

Offhand, it might seem that competition would best serve the public.

But should a Government agency, the Federal Communications Commission, decide this question, or should it be left to the good judgment of the American people?

The large networks are lining up against pay-as-you-look television, while the smaller stations and the general public seem to favor it.

The issue, however, has not been fully debated on a large scale.

I believe, therefore, that the public should become acquainted with the pros and cons of this controversy, so that it shall have a voice in its solution.

First, may I bring you some of the arguments against free TV.

Since the end of World War II the television industry has grown from infancy to an industry in which the American people have invested more than $10 billion in television sets (more than 36 million of them), and in which the annual volume of television advertising, set sales, servicing, and operating runs close to $4 billion per year, under the traditional American broadcasting policy of freedom to listen and freedom to look.

The promoters of pay television would change the American system of free broadcasting to a restricted system of paid narrowcasting. Their standard of interest is: "No fee, no see."

Coexistence between free television broadcasting on the basis of competitive private enterprise, as we know it today, and pay television, as proposed by its promoters, is impractical. Opponents believe that pay television would degrade and ultimately destroy the present system of free TV broadcasting.

The greater the circulation of any medium, the greater becomes its advertising value. As applied to television broadcasting, this has meant that as the size of the television audience has increased the free television broadcaster has had more available to spend on improved programing.

Under the present system, the broadcasters give, at their own expense and as a public service, addresses by the President and national, State, and local government officials. They also carry, as a public service, educational, religious, operatic, and other cultural programs. Many of these programs have limited audience appeal and are not sponsored. The broadcasters bear the very substantial cost of presenting these unsponsored public service programs, including interconnection charges and refunds of revenue to sponsors whose programs have to be cancelled to make room for free public affairs programs.

One of the greatest contributions that the free television system has made to the public interest has been the strengthening of the democratic processes in this country by helping to create an informed public opinion on important national and international issues. Anything that tends to weaken the free television system would automatically tend to reduce its ability to continue to render this costly and invaluable service.

If the pay-television promoters should be successful, the more than 8 million people living in single station areas would be deprived of all free television service whenever pay-television programs were broadcast. These more than 8 million people would be forced to contribute to the cash boxes of the pay-television promoters for their TV programs or have none at all.

Unlike the present free system of television, pay television would come into the homes like gas and light and telephone service for which the consumer pays. The rates and other aspects of such public utility services are now regulated by the Government. If pay-television broadcasting were to be authorized, the public interest may require that it likewise be treated as a public utility and made subject to similar regulation by the Government. In such an event, the practical difficulties of maintaining part of the American radio and television system free and part regulated would seem almost unsurmountable. Such a situation might ultimately lead to Government regulation, on a common-carrier basis, of all radio and television broadcast services, a result that no one advocates but all must guard against. Only the Congress can set the legal bounds of such regulation.

Our American principle of freedom to listen and freedom to look is chiefly responsible for the growth of the most dynamic industry in the world today. It has made the American people the best informed in the world, and it has done so without discriminating between the poor and the rich.

As EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the United States House of Representatives, said, and I quote in part: "As a Federal legislator, expected to consider carefully the overall results of any innovation such as this, I am dismayed at the probable effects of fee TV on our tax structure, employment, those in low-income brackets, transportation, and other industries. Will our movie house, theaters, sports arenas, etc., be thrown into the discard? What happens to the tremendous investments in such real estate? Free broadcasting and free television have been undisputed boons to the industry of this country. I shouldn't think the sponsors would be happy at the prospect of killing the goose that laid their golden eggs, but they are strangely reticent at this time on this subject. In closing may I say I shall continue to oppose all efforts to foist fee TV on the American public."

Now to the other side of the coin.

What are some of the arguments put forth by those who favor pay-as-you-look programs?

A spokesman for Phonevision claims that one of the largest manufacturers of raido and television equipment that also maintains a large network, has always opposed any new electronic development which it does not control, and that its opposition to subscription is another illustration of this policy.

All we ask, he argues, is an opportunity to show that we can bring to the public for a small fee programs which are much better than those they have been getting on an advertising-sponsored basis. We think that the public is entitled to the best—not the worst—that Hollywood and Broadway can create. We propose to supplement with great box-office programs the present continuous stream of 20-year-old horse operas and other hackneyed programs that now fill in most of the short spaces between the long commercials.

The public will turn away from an advertising sponsored program to a subscription program only if the latter is so much better and more interesting that it is worth the price. The networks and the motion picture theater owners are afraid that subscription programs, such as great first-run motion pictures, full length hit plays from Broadway, and grand opera every week in season, will be so popular with the public as to threaten their profits. This is the same kind of argument the buggy whip manufacturers made against automobiles 50 years ago. Why not let the public, which owns the air, decide for itself whether it wants the right to pay a small fee for programs that can never otherwise be brought to television?

Proponents of pay-as-you-see television claim that you take what the big broadcasters and big advertisers send you or nothing at all. You are given no choice. No wonder TV is being criticized for trying to corral the largest market by pitching to the lowest common denominator. First, conventional TV was attacked because it was too sensational. Now, there are many complaints to the effect that it is not growing up. All parents want good programs available for the entertainment and instruction of their children, but they also want a few adult programs for their own enjoyment if they can only manage to get the children to bed at a reasonable hour.

Supporters of pay TV brand as ridiculous the charges that the new system would take over advertising sponsored programs. To spike this propaganda, they are asking the FCC to adopt a rule that no station can use more than 15 percent of its operating time on subscription TV. They are also asking the FCC to keep the existing networks out of the business of supplying subscription television programs. This will guarantee that pay-as-you-see television will fulfill its promise of being a supplemental service, in free and open competition with the present networks. Under this provision, at least, 85 percent of the program fare in any community would be without direct charge.

As the Chicago Daily News observes, and I quote: "But, in any case, it does not seem to us to be the proper function of the FCC to decide whether or not free television should have a commercial rival. The progress of America is due to the leeway given to just such competitive forces. To say that nobody should be allowed to take the risk of offering competitive entertainment, at a price, would seem to us an indefensible substitution of bureaucratic decree for the judgment of the market place."

In this broadcast, I have merely sketched some of the arguments on both sides of this question.

I have been speaking to you over the medium of radio, which has been most generous in alloting me time as a public service.

This broadcast has been coming to you heard but unseen over a local station.

While talking about the "battle of the giants" I have not forgotten the indispensable role played by your radio station in serving the business and cultural needs of the general area in which you live.

Your present receiving set should be a constant reminder that it is people like yourselves who must control mass media of communications to serve all of your various needs and to prevent the development of monopoly in any form.

Defense Against Communist Infiltration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on an educational campaign

against communism written by Dr. H. Truman Gordon, well-known lecturer and economic consultant. Dr. Gordon, formerly a resident of Wausau, Wis., now lives in Waterloo, Iowa.

The article follows:

HOW TO BUILD THE STRONGEST DEFENSIVE AGAINST INFILTRATION OF COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Dr. H. Truman Gordon)

During the past 5 years I have observed with interest the investigations by at least 3 congressional committees dealing with communism.

In the judgment of this writer, no practical proposals have come from congressional investigations as to just how we can put a stop to the infiltration of communism in the United States.

This writer believes that an honest, fearless campaign of education must be launched very soon in the United States if we are to defend ourselves against communistic infiltration. We must get the truth about communism to the American people. They must know the whole truth about communism, the enemy of freedom.

Following are my suggestions for this educational campaign:

1. All patriotic newspapers, magazines, and trade journals should launch a determined anticommunism crusade to tell the whole truth about communism.

2. Arrangements should be made by our large and small business and industrial managements so that every capable lecturer and public speaker who is fully informed on communism can devote their entire time and effort to addressing public meetings, groups of industrial workers, labor union meetings, business organizations, civic and luncheon clubs, Parent and Teachers Associations, etc., throughout the United States.

3. The facilities of every radio and television station should be brought into this campaign.

4. Every church and synagogue in the United States should either open their doors and pulpits to qualified anticommunist speakers, or the ministers, priests, and rabbis should obtain all of the information available and fearlessly tell the whole truth about communism, the great destroyer of liberty and freedom, to their congregations.

5. It also might be well for public school officials, State school superintendents, school boards, etc., to require that every public schoolteacher above the fifth grade and up through the high schools assume the responsibility of teaching the truth about communism, the enemy of freedom, to all of their pupils and students.

This kind of an educational crusade in the United States will very soon make it impossible for the deceiving, misled advocates of communism to make any progress in this country.

In this article I can present only a part of the beliefs, teachings, and practices of communism, but I want to make crystal clear four of the major things that communism seeks to accomplish.

At the outset, let us remember that the first tenet of communistic belief and teaching is that there is no God, and that all churches of religion should be abolished. Only very recently the International News Press quoted Nikita Khrushchev, the head of the Russian Communist Party, as revealing that the new soft Soviet policy will not extend to religion, when he stated: "We remain atheist * * * we do everything we can to liberate the people from the opium attraction of religion. Is it not plain to all of us that communism is organized atheism?

Some of the things that communism seeks to accomplish are:

1. Destruction of the capitalistic system, "the root of all evil," by a violent revolution, if it cannot be accomplished by peaceful infiltration.

2. Establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. This means, of course, the dictatorship of the Russian Kremlin, and, as William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in the United States, said: "The Red Army stands ready to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

3. The liquidation of all classes of society that have been contaminated by capitalism. Well informed American writers on the subject of communism have stated that when communism takes over the United States Government about one-third of our population will be executed for they are said to be contaminated by capitalism.

4. Communism intends to bring about, in the United States, "the reeducation of the total remaining population in a new relationship of labor to the communistic, Soviet Government."

It is my opinion, gleaned from conversations and interviews with tens of thousands of our United States citizens, that far too many are completely in ignorance of what communism really is, and what this godless dictatorship intends to do with our "American Way of Life". Rest assured of one thing, the beliefs, teachings, and practices of communism, and the objective of gaining the domination of the whole world by communism, remain exactly the same today as in the ill-fated year of 1917 when this godless tyranny took over the government in Russia.

But, I believe that even worse than the ignorance about communism is the smug complacency and attitude of indifference expressed by far too many American citizens. In spite of the terrifying conquests already made by communism in such a very large part of the world in these last 37 years, too many American citizens still insist that "It just can't happen here; it will not happen in the United States." I claim that it can happen in our country, if our citizens are not made clearly aware of the grave danger that threatens us.

J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the FBI, made an address less than 1 year ago, in Washington, D. C., where he stated in part: "There was only 1 Communist for every 2,245 people in Russia when communism overthrew that government in 1917. It is now a known fact that we have 1 Communist for every 1,870 people in the United States."

An educational campaign such as I have attempted to outline in this article, will convince all American citizens that:

1. Communism seeks to destroy our American form of government.

2. Under communism all of our business and agricultural establishments will be prohibited.

3. Our economic and public welfare principles, our social and religious institutions and all of our strictly American enterprises, which have made our country the greatest nation on the face of the earth, will be prohibited if and when communism takes over the Government of the United States.

Certainly we can best know how to fight an evil only when we know just what that evil is.

Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD several items, editorials, and letters which have appeared in the newspapers of Alaska in regard to the treatment of Alaska's mentally ill.

Fairbanks News-Miner, July 16, 1955:

A mother in Fairbanks writes:

"DEAR NEWS-MINER: I sent the following telegram to a Representative in Congress. We don't care what you do with this letter; if you would like to publish it, it doesn't matter to us, or if you don't. Just as long as we get a mental hospital.

"'DEAR CONGRESSMAN ———: Our son graduated from college just 1 year ago. He lost his mind 1 week later due to overstrain in some manner. If we had mental hospitals in Alaska, he could have been treated here, near his family who loves him. Because there are no facilities in Alaska for sick minds, he had to be placed in jail, on a mattress on the floor, and have a trial such as might happen to the most hardened criminal. We had to send two escorts with him to Morningside Hospital (in Portland, Oreg.) since he was so sick, making the transportation tremendous in cost. Even a Congressman should hate to have a thing like this on his conscience, such as blocking a bill that would provide mental hospitals for hundreds of Alaska's sick minds. I have been to Morningside Hospital. I have seen the homesick children there, 1,600 miles away from their loved ones. Give us a hospital for Alaska's mentally ill.'"

Fairbanks News-Miner, July 16, 1955:

The mental health bill before Congress provides for humane treatment of Alaska's mentally ill. It takes them out of jails, and provides for an institution within the Territory where they can be treated. At present, a mentally ill person is jailed, tried by a jury, then transported to the States by airplane in the custody of an officer. By no stretch of the imagination can this treatment be considered humane.

Anchorage Daily Times, July 20, 1955:

The primary purpose and greatest provision of the bill is that of eliminating the barbaric treatment of insane persons. It would modernize the legal procedures for declaring a person insane and providing for his treatment. * * * The new committee procedures have won the endorsement of every trained technician in the field of psychiatry who has studied them. The bill has the support of every health and welfare agency that has been involved. It has the support of the Interior Department as well as the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

Former Gov. Ernest Gruening writes:

The disposal of these unfortunates has been the subject of repeated protest by the people of Alaska for over 40 years. The system of trying them as if they were criminals, sentencing them for the offense of being insane, without requirement of medical advice, and then committing them under a contract system to an institution hundreds of miles away from their families, arose, to be sure, half a century ago, when ignorance and consequent cruelty in the treatment of the mentally ill was almost universal.

Since that time, psychiatry has become a science and much progress made in the therapy of mental disease. But the people of Alaska have been unable to change the obsolete and barbaric method of treating their mentally ill. For the Organic Act of 1912 specifically forbids Alaska's Legislatures to modify the provisions of the Nelson Act of 1905 in which the existing procedures regarding the insane were established.

Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on this 250th anniversary of the birthday of Benjamin Franklin, the entire country pauses to pay tribute to this great American.

The life of Benjamin Franklin was amazing because he was not only a printer, but an editor, publisher, writer, soldier, seer, wit, scientist, inventor, legislator, statesman, and philosopher.

Probably no other American has ever had such far-reaching versatile influence on this country as Benjamin Franklin. It is fitting and proper, therefore, that an address delivered by the Honorable Alfred H. Williams, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, at the Founders Day Academic Convocation held at Franklin and Marshall College—the school that bears his name—should receive wide circulation because it will not only create in each of us a new and finer appreciation of Benjamin Franklin, but will cause us to think a little more about today and its problems as they affect each individual.

The address follows:

LOOKING AT LIFE THROUGH BEN FRANKLIN'S BIFOCALS

(By Alfred H. Williams, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia)

It is a pleasure to come to Lancaster to take part in this convocation of Franklin and Marshall College. One hundred and sixty-eight years ago other Philadelphians came to Lancaster to attend your first convocation, the one at which Franklin College was dedicated. These men brought financial pledges of their own and others in the amount of £2,500. Incidentally, the largest contribution was for £200 and, unlike some of the other gifts which later proved difficult to collect, was in cash. It came from an 81-year-old patron of higher learning who, though not a college man, held degrees from Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, Oxford, Edinburg, and St. Andrews, as well as the Gold Medal of the Royal Society of London. The 250th anniversary of his birth will shortly occur and President Hall has suggested that this talk center on him. I refer, of course, to B. Franklin, printer.

Can anything really new be said about this unique individual, who is said to have been "the first civilized American"? Historians, professional and amateur, have accounted for every day of his life for which there is any conceivable record or reasonable conjecture. We know him to have been outstanding as printer, journalist, publisher, businessman; moralist, humanitarian, sage; gadgeteer, inventor, scientist; lobbyist, legislator, public administrator; debater, linguist, educator; humorist, songwriter; and, not to be overlooked, admirer of the ladies.

Carl Van Doren asserts that he possessed "the most eminent mind that has ever existed in America, a mind that moved with perfect ease to its countless tasks." Physicist Robert A. Milliken, of California Institute of Technology informs us that:

"Franklin without any previous training whatever in either the technique or the history of physics, and with almost no contact with what others were doing or had done, within 2 years of the time of his first experiment, had acquired a keener insight into the fundamental nature of electrical phenomena than anyone had acquired, not merely up to his time but even for the next 150 years; about 1900 the scientific world returned essentially to Franklin's views."

But Franklin was also an inventor. He was, as Thomas Carlyle put it, "the father of all Yankees." He was our first gadgeteer and may be said to have founded today's "do-it-yourself" movement. He produced the first electric battery, a smoke-consuming stove, a flexible metal catheter, bifocal eyeglasses, a highly efficient clock, a harmonica, a combination chair and stepladder, and, of course, the lightning rod. He had a proposal for crop insurance, and the essential idea of the present-day plan for paratroop warfare. It is to be expected, moreover, that he had thought about a cure for the common cold, but, like all others, he also was defeated.

Science and invention are but two of scores of aspects presented by this brilliant star, one of the most luminous in nature's galaxy of human individuals. Henry Steele Commager holds that:

"Franklin is the most complete and the most characteristic of Americans. * * * Washington is remote; Jefferson belongs indubitably to the 18th century; John Adams is pure Yankee; Hamilton never accepted his adopted country and never understood it. But Franklin could fit into American life at any point, in any decade, and accept it all cheerfully enough and set about improving it with efficient amiability; he is as contemporary as today's newspaper, as entertaining, as informative, as indispensable and, in the best sense, as commonplace."

Reading this, I was inspired to put Franklin to the test by giving free reign to my imagination and speculating how this bold and resourceful, wise and benign man, who lived in such harmony with his own age—the age of enligthenment—would handle some of the basic problems of the present age—an age so swiftly paced, so vastly intricate, so frustrating. The result is this talk, entitled "Looking at Life Through Ben Franklin's Bifocals." I feel sure that Ben himself would not object to this approach. He never ran away from problems; he was never at a loss for ideas; furthermore, he loved to talk. Time limits us to a glimpse at three broad sectors of present-day life—those occupied by the individual, the local community, and the National Government. These will be discussed in reverse order.

The United States is confronted with deep-seated and persistent international problems. Indeed, almost all the 65 sovereign nations are thus plagued. It seems as though the entire human family is on the move, driven as it were by a consuming zeal for social justice, variously defined. Power politics has become polarized around two nations—Russia and the United States. Huge quantities of mankind's resources—spiritual, mental, and physical—are being expended for overt or potential warfare. What would Ben Franklin say about this conflict between the sovereign powers? What advice would he give his Government?

There is reason to believe that he would express a clean-cut philosophy—one based on his vast experience in international affairs. During the period 1757–85, he spent 16 years in London and 9 in Paris. Most of this time was devoted to representing the Colonies, arguing claims, making alliances, raising money, and negotiating treaties. In all of this work, some of it insuperably difficult, he was highly successful. Students of Franklin's life, as well as students of American foreign policy, have sought the reason for this success. It is explained in part by his high standing abroad as a scientist, his humanistic philosophy, his wit, humor, and rare social charm which the French found so appealing. But this leaves unanswered the questions: What is the guiding principle of Franklin's approach to foreign policy? Is this principle applicable to America's present-day struggle in the realm of international power politics?

Franklin's success in the field of foreign relations was achieved by consistently following the policy of enlightened national self-interest. The key word here is enlightened. In keeping with his general character, he looked at all sides of each problem of international relations. He never failed to study both our short-run and long-run interests. Likewise he took pains to put himself in the position of the other nation and study its national interest. In doing this he brought into play his superb intellect, rare commonsense, vast experience, his serenity, good will, lack of illusion, and innate desire for justice. Thomas Jefferson's appraisal of the way Franklin handled the French is in point here:

"The fact is, that his temper was so amiable and conciliatory, his conduct so rational, never urging impossibilities, or even things unreasonably inconvenient to them, in short, so moderate and attentive to their difficulties, as well as our own, that what his enemies called subserviency, I saw was only reasonable disposition, which, sensible that advantages are not all to be on one side, yielding what is just and liberal, is the more certain of obtaining liberality and justice."

Lest I give the impression that Ben could not be taught, it must be understood that he never gave up his belief that, while attempting to secure peace, one should be prepared for war. As one authority has put it: "When everything else failed, Franklin faced the necessity of the use of force calmly and with complete determination."

Ben often made what appeared, offhand, to be "screwball" suggestions. Bearing in mind that he once laid the basis for converting an enemy into a friend by borrowing one of his enemy's prize books, it would not surprise me if Ben were to hint that we should ask the Russians to send a task force of Siberian experts over here to help us develop more effectively our Alaskan resources.

I turn now to another aspect of Ben's life, the one that reveals his attitude toward the place in which he lived. When he left Boston and came to Philadelphia he found life most appealing. The Quaker town was religiously tolerant, balanced and bustling as to its economy, and intellectually alive. And as if to show his gratitude, he extended his passion for self-improvement to include civic improvement. With imagination and resourcefulness and with his natural aptitude for leadership, he was never without a project. He was the energizing, galvanizing source of two-thirds of the town's important enterprises. The list of projects he started on a voluntary basis includes a fire company, a night watch or police patrol, a hospital, a weather reporting service, a meeting hall for all religious sects, local mail delivery, street cleaning, a debating club, a philosophical society, a circulating library and an academy. In this area, as in most other areas, his activities have drawn superlative praise from a competent scholar; Verner W. Crane states: "By midcentury the most completely civic man in America was Benjamin Franklin, printer." Although the bulk of his time in the last 30 years of life was spent abroad, he kept in close touch with local affairs and remained at heart a homebody.

Suppose Ben were to return and take a look at local community life in America. What would he think? I removed his bifocals from my eyes and reflected:

A community is a place where most of us live most of our lives. A community is a bundle of habits. To me, Philadelphia is among other things the Evening Bulletin,

the River Drive in springtime, the Media Local, the Penn-Cornell game on Thanksgiving Day, the Mummers parade. A community is a social organism. As such it is alive and possesses a distinctive body, personality, and spirit. Cities are vigorous or apathetic, friendly or reserved, efficient or slovenly, distinguished or common. A community is a place where something is shared. And the quality of that is shared—life in common—depends on the balance and resilience of the economy of the city, the efficiency and integrity of its government, and the depth and genuineness of its culture. And the spirit of a community is based upon and evoked by such elusive elements as the role of tradition, the way the amenities are observed, the desire to cooperate, the quality of public taste, the use of leisure, and the role of religion.

While in the mood that had been generated by Ben's love of his home town and by his efforts to promote her welfare, I recalled a statement made almost a half century ago by a professor of philsophy, Josiah Royce:

"We need in this country a new and wiser provincialism. I mean the sort of provincialism which makes people want to idealize, to adorn, to ennoble, to educate, their own province. * * * Further centralization of power in the National Government, without a constantly enriched and diversified provincial consciousness, can only increase the estrangement of our national spirit from its own life."

And it was then that I saw clearly why Ben, in his wisdom, had helped to found the college which has brought us together today to keep green in memory his name and deeds.

And now finally we turn to a third side of Ben Franklin where he shows his attitude toward himself and his fellow men as individuals. He occasionally despaired of mankind en masse but he never lost interest in individuals as individuals. And one person who could always command his attention was B. Franklin. He had a tremendous sense of self. It was an objective sense, permitting him, as it were, to step outside his own being and turn to look at himself with discernment and good humor. This sense of self was revealed in many ways: his zeal for self-improvement, his early desire to form a personal and almost equal relationship with the deity, his personal written code of moral conduct, the care he took to preserve his personal correspondence and other records that would establish his place in history.

His interest in other individuals is similarly manifested in varied ways. He maintained over many years ties of friendship by means of correspondence that must have required much time from a crowded schedule of official duties. Worthy apprentices were befriended by helping them to establish print shops of their own. He loved children and they loved him because he treated them as individuals and met them on their own terms. His comments about persons from whom he had been separated for many years reveal that he had observed them clearly and was conscious of each as a unique and individual person. In the light of the foregoing, what comments would Ben make to young men and women now preparing to enter maturity?

To answer this question it will help if we forget Ben for a moment because, as his biographer, Carl Van Doren, states in the concluding sentence of his 800-page book, "He seems to have been more than any single man: a harmonious human multitude." I suggest that we focus our attention on a normal, healthy, intelligent, ambitious American college student. What requirements does the age in which we live place on him, if he is to live a full life, a life that will employ all his talents and increase his stature as a man? There are, it seems to me, four requirements:

1. Professional competence: It goes almost without saying that an individual should strive for excellence in his chosen field of work. We do not know very much about what determines the choice of field in the first instance; about why a person wants to be a physicist, a writer, a surgeon, an electrical engineer, or a teacher. There are some aptitude tests which seem to help a bit, and counseling can be of assistance, but the best process is still largely one of self-discovery. In this process young men or women can help themselves by being alert to the problems they like to tackle, to the types of activity in which they feel free and easy, where they get the best results. Ben (I cannot get away from him) was taken by his father to a variety of Boston shops to watch different types of skilled artisans at work. The modern problem is not that simple.

In a chosen field, what furnishes the drive that pushes one on to mastery? In large part it lies in a rudimentary professional spirit. This, in essence, is the love of work as work; a feeling that we are affirming or asserting ourselves, our innermost being, in our work and by our work. The true professional spirit causes us to care greatly for excellence. It is one of the ways in which we feed our ego, in the best sense of that much maligned word. An individual can serve his fellow man and worship his Maker by the means of work. Few people really stretch their ability to attain excellence in work.

2. Wide-ranging intellectual and cultural interests: The case of the requirement that each individual should strive for breadth of outlook on life can, perhaps, be quickly made. It is one of the chief means by which each of us comes to know more about himself and others; more about the nature and possibilities of life. By means of broad cultural interests, we enter the mind and spirit of countless other human beings of past ages, other climes, different religions. Most leaders have some knowledge of fields beyond their specialties; moreover they use this understanding as grist for their own mills. Thus a knowledge of history gives one a sense of the continuity of social change and furnishes some protection against unfounded prejudice, against panic arising from short-run change. It makes for social stability by making us conscious of our debt to our forefathers and of our obligation to the oncoming young. It gives a feeling for trends and of need to intelligently adjust to them. James Logan, foremost classical scholar in the colonies, gave young Franklin access to his famous collection of original editions of Greek and Roman classics. Ben made full use of the privilege and, in order to do so, taught himself Greek and Latin; later, he learned Spanish and French.

Literature, likewise, illustrates the value of broad interests. Good literature enables a person to get inside the other fellow. It furnishes insight into motives, fruitful analogies, and awareness of values other than our own. In the same manner, a knowledge of government and international relations broadens our understanding of other ways than our own of living together; it forms a basis for comparing the relative strengths and weaknesses of our brand of democracy. The natural sciences evoke a sensitivity to the wondrously intricate ways in which the balance and harmony of nature is achieved and leads many people by rational steps to a conclusion they cannot accept by faith, namely, a belief in a Supreme Being. These and other areas of thought all add to an individual's understanding and enjoyment of life. They can, in later life, cross-fertilize with one's specialized professional knowledge. Equally important, they will provide avocational fields to which one can turn from the daily job for surcease and refreshment. To all young people who aspire to leadership in their professions I advise: If you have a spark of interest in areas beyond your chosen field, keep it alive; fan it into a flame. The truly great leader is never provincial.

3. Social intelligence: The term intelligence may be roughly defined as the capacity to solve problems and the term social intelligence is here used in the restricted sense of the capacity to solve the problems which arise when men assemble in groups and try to work together. Some people have skill in man-to-man relationships but find it difficult to grasp and solve problems which involve groups such as labor unions, employers associations, school boards, professional societies, legislative bodies, and I might add, college faculties. And the developments of science, technology, industry, and government, indeed, of life generally, make it increasingly necessary that we understand group behavior.

These growing problems should be fascinating and attractive to young people. There are no white rabbits to be pulled out of the hat; we shall add to our knowledge the hard way by sweating it out. Some of the elements in the study of human behavior are: better oral and written communication, sound channels of communication, varied ways of effectively defining problems, more constructive ways of achieving compromise: There are rich opportunities in all fields for men and women with social intelligence as here defined. These are the thoughts that came to the fore as I reflected on Ben's relations with his fellow colonists and with leaders abroad.

4. Unified moral and spiritual values: This calls for the weaving of a set of ethical and moral and spiritual beliefs into a unified philosophy of life. These should be bound together in the sense of being internally consistent. The result is knowing what you believe and why you believe. These are the beliefs one cherishes and holds dear. It is, as you know, not easy to achieve such a set of values. When constructed, however, they produce the inner poise and strength so necessary in these times of change, of international and social and industrial tensions, of personal insecurity and frustration and seeming defeat. All of us do a lot of muddling on this front and the results are not much to look at. And he is a brash person who does not think it necessary to check frequently his own beliefs and motives. Ben was at the task from early youth to the end of life.

This morning I have tried to hold before you fragments of a picture of a great man, Ben Franklin. If you have been helped to form some estimate of his nature, if you have been stimulated to think of his relationship to you and to all other men, my efforts will have been richly rewarded. We have been thinking about a particular man. But in him I perceive each of you, myself, and all men. A prime question of future policy for American civilization is:

Is the individual person important?

Alaska Mental Health Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous letters, telegrams, and statements from various individuals and organizations in Alaska in

regard to the Alaska mental health bill. These have been from doctors, church groups, fraternal groups, business groups, educators, city managers, and members of health councils. They are unanimous in their support of the Alaska mental health bill, H. R. 6376.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD several of these statements, letters, and telegrams.

Byron A. Gillam, a member of the Alaska Board of Health:

Our mental health program is at this time criminal in its operation. The method dates back to one abandoned by all States as reprehensible. The Alaska mentally ill are taken to jail and then placed on trial before a jury of laymen—and with the exception of rare instances—none of these laymen are qualified to pass on the worst case, let alone those where there is hope for recovery. After being adjudged insane, this mentally ill person is remanded to the custody of a United States Marshal and transported to Morningside Sanitarium in Portland, Oreg.

Does this system work? Of course it does. The owner has made more than a million dollars in the last 18 years.

City of Seward Health Council:

We urge passage of the mental-health bill, H. R. 6376, without amendments.

Methodist Women's Society of Christian Service:

Request passage of H. R. 6376 modernizing Alaska mental health laws.

City manager, Seward, Alaska:

The people of Seward request every effort be expended to pass the mental health bill and consider it a dire necessity for Alaska. Any effort expended in our behalf will be sincerely appreciated.

Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce, July 15, 1955:

Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce deplores the Dark Ages outlook of those opposing Alaska mental health bill. Alaskans intolerant of huge profits and poor care of its mental patients at Morningside.

Community Service Council, Fairbanks, June 9, 1955:

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Our organization is composed of the social agencies of Fairbanks and we are concerned with the present situation where the mentally ill are confined to jail until such time as local action and commitment can be made. We feel that this is not just treatment for mentally-ill citizens.

We also feel that the person should be institutionalized nearer his home so relatives could see the individual occasionally and be available for aid in the therapeutic treatment of the person concerned.

Alaska is the only territory under the United States jurisdiction that does not have custody of its citizens when they are declared mentally ill. It is not fair to transport them 3,000 miles away from their home for care and treatment. Facilities could be made available in the local hospital area to care for these persons.

The persons who are living in Alaska are no different than the persons living in the States. They would like to keep their family together and would like to have their loved one near them. One State does not have to send its patients to another State for treatment and it seems as though the Territory of Alaska should have the same rights and privileges.

JACK FRANKEL,
Chairman.

Alaska Board of Health, Dr. Earl Albrecht, M. D.:

DEAR MRS. GREEN: The Alaska Board of Health has, over the years, considered the handling of Alaska's mentally-ill patients as one of the chief problems that must be corrected.

At the last annual meeting of the Board of Health, again there was action taken favoring the present Alaska mental health bill being enacted. This motion carried unanimously.

We request that you bring this letter as evidence to the House of Representatives that the Alaska Board of Health favors the early enactment of the Alaska mental health bill now before Congress.

Very truly yours,
C. EARL ALBRECHT, M. D.,
Secretary, Alaska Board of Health.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*.....
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*.....3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*.....
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Batés, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Davidson, Bell, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, ———, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, ———, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, ———, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, ———, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6017
	Circuit Judges	
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Oliver 2–3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		North 7–8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 2–0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Adams 2–6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		District 7–4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		
	Vacancy	

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8–4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7–0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5–6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Vacancy
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*-------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*--------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*-------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*--------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*--------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*-------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*------1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*-------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*-----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*------
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*------The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*----------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*--------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*----
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*-------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*-----
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet

Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*

Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase. Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*

Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*

Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*

Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*

Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*

Quigley, James M., *Pa*

Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*

Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*

Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*

Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*

Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Gongressional

Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*

Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.

Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Address by Congressman Benjamin F. James, of Pennsylvania, at Commemorative Exercises Marking the 250th Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin, at the Government Printing Office, January 17, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by our distinguished colleague, Representative BENJAMIN F. JAMES, at the commemorative exercises marking the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, at the Government Printing Office, January 17, 1956.

We all know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a valuable and able Member of the House and an impressive speaker. I have particular knowledge of and admiration for his ability, because we work together on the Committee on Appropriations. His selection, however, as the principal speaker for this commemorative occasion was peculiarly appropriate. He is not only the namesake of the great American patriot, but also now owns and operates the printing business which Benjamin Franklin established and operated. I know that his remarks at the ceremony will be of unusual interest to this House:

Let me say at once I feel highly honored with the privilege of having a part in this fine program commemorating the 250th anniversary of the birth of the amazing Benjamin Franklin—the first civilized American and the patron saint of printers.

From the earliest time that Benjamin Franklin became a popular subject for authors, biographers, and orators, until the present—250 years after his birth—something over 1,000 separate works about him (some of them very extensive indeed) have been compiled and published.

There has been a tendency in Franklin scholarship that has emphasized the philosopher, the scientist, inventor, diplomat, the man of broad international culture, the patriot, and the author, and even the lover, all at far greater extent than Franklin the printer.

This despite the fact that Franklin's phenomenal success as a printer and a publisher was the springboard—economically and politically—for his advancement in the many and varied fields of endeavor that claimed his interest.

Eulogies in vast numbers have been pronounced on many occasions.

The shortest and pithiest of these was by Whitelaw Reid, himself a distinguished journalist, who once said, rather incidentally in a speech about something else:

"I honor the memory of Benjamin Franklin because he was a philosopher who wrote commonsense, an officeholder who did not steal, and a journeyman printer who did not drink."

Then there is the little story of a young scholar whose class was given the assignment of writing a brief composition about Benjamin Franklin. This lad turned in the following:

"Benjamin Franklin was born at a very early age in Boston, on a street called Milk. He went to school for 2 years and then went into the printing business with his brother. He didn't like his brother so he took a boat and went to Philadelphia. He was very hungry when he got off the boat so he bought two loaves of bread and carried one of them under his arm while eating the other. This made a young lady smile at him, so he married her and discovered electricity."

That is brevity in rare form, but it does make the point that in the public mind two things about Franklin are preeminent—his association with the printing business, which was real, and the completely false notion that he discovered electricity.

This evening I should like to speak particularly about Benjamin Franklin, the printer. It seems most appropriate that I should do so here in this, the greatest of all printshops in our day.

It will not be my purpose, however, to trace an orderly account of his career in printing, of his experiences as an apprentice with his brother, James, or with his partners in Philadelphia and also in five of the colonies, in Jamaica and in Antigua.

However, some discussion of the social and economic climate in which Franklin learned his trade and then followed it as the leading master printer of his time will be helpful to an understanding of the role of a printer in colonial America.

The printer then was a jack of many skills and trades, which in these times of specialization and modern equipment are all separate and distinct callings.

Were we able to compress into one person a typographer, pressman, advertisting man, author, magazine and newspaper publisher, reporter and editor, stationer and bookseller we would have an amalgam somewhat resembling the early American master printer.

At the time that Franklin became an apprentice in his brother's shop in Boston the printer had not yet achieved an honorable and influential status in the American Colonies except possibly in the city of Philadelphia and doubtless that exception was owing to the broad, tolerant policy of William Penn.

As late as 1733 the Governor of New York felt obliged, for some offense, real or imagined, to stop the press then running in that city.

In 1718 the Governor of Virginia, when advertising a reward for the capture of pirates, was compelled to send to Philadelphia to have the handbills struck off. On another occasion that same Governor thanked God they had no press in Virginia.

Earlier—in 1686, Governor Bradford of Massachusetts had forbidden anyone to print without his consent.

Four years before that, the General Court of Massachusetts had decreed that there should be no printing press used except one at Cambridge, and that one only under the supervision of two licensees.

These restrictions were apparently deemed necessary to prevent editorial and printed abuse of the constituted and privileged authorities.

Even in Philadelphia in those days printing was not regarded as a preferred occupation, but the road to better conditions in that city in the printing trade was yet to be plotted by Benjamin Franklin.

Alhough printing dealt with making books, of which the youthful Benjamin was so much enamored almost from babyhood, he was not inclined to look with favor upon learning the printer's trade. However, the decision was his father's and he was apprenticed, or bound, to his brother James, a master printer in Boston, for a term of 9 years.

His father's first choice for the boy's future had been the trade of the cutler, but the terms demanded by the master cutler required that he be paid a sum equal to about $100, whereas the price named by James Franklin for his brother's instruction in the printer's art was equal to about $50.

It might be said, the want of $50 made Benjamin Franklin a printer instead of a cutler.

In addition to the payment of a lump sum for instruction, his brother would, of course, have his free services during the term of the apprenticeship.

A rather elaborate contract had to be drawn between Franklin's father and his brother James, in which Benjamin was bound to a number of obligations such as keeping his master's secrets, gladly performing his lawful commands, he must not frequent taverns, inns, or alehouses—play at cards, dice tables or other unlawful games—he might not contract matrimony nor absent himself from his master day or night—but, above all, demean and behave himself toward his master during all the said term.

In consideration of all this, the master also assumed a few obligations. The following is from the document given by James Franklin to the father of Benjamin Franklin:

"The said James Franklin, master printer, for and in consideration of the sum of ten pounds of lawful British money, to him in hand paid by the said Josiah Franklin, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the said apprentice in the art of a printer which he now useth he shall teach and instruct, or cause to be taught and instructed, the best way and manner that he can, finding and allowing unto the said apprentice meat, drink, washing, lodging and all other necessaries during the said term."

Further terms of the contract are quaint and somewhat amusing. The master was obliged to provide apparel for the apprentice, described thus:

"A pair of deerskin breeches coming hardly down to his knees, which, before they could be allowed to come into the presence of ladies, at meeting, on the Sabbath, were regularly to be blacked upon the preceding night, in order to give them a clean and fresh appearance for the Sunday; a pair of woolen yarn stockings, a thick and substantial pair of shoes, well greased and ornamented with a pair of small, brass buckles (the latter however to be a present for his good behavior)—a speckled shirt for all the week—and a white one for Sunday—which was always carefully to be taken off as soon as he returned from meeting, folded up and laid by for the next Sabbath."

Franklin once commented that the leather breeches, after several years of wear, became greasy as they grew old and could only be kept flexible when worn, by the superflux of youthful heat.

Thus was Benjamin Franklin, a lad of but 12 years, launched upon a career destined to land him, when only 42 years of age, at the port of wealth and influence, and bring him, in his riper years, greater and greater distinction—not only in his beloved land, but throughout the civilized world.

James Franklin proved to be a mean taskmaster and occasion presenting itself, Benjamin broke the indentures that bound him and though but a lad of 16 years, fearlessly started out to make his way elsewhere.

He arrived in Philadelphia on a Sunday morning in October, in the year 1723, and though his apprenticeship in point of time had been but half completed, he was even then a competent journeyman printer, as well as something of a writer. He found ready employment in the shop of Samuel Keimer, one of the two printers then established in that city. Keimer was slovenly in person and in business, according to Franklin—suspicious and something of a knave withal. This employment was not happy nor did it last long.

The following year a trip was made to Boston at the suggestion of Governor Keith of Pennsylvania, who had become attracted to young Franklin, but who proved to be a very unreliable patron. At Keith's suggestion Franklin sought assistance from his father, Josiah, to the purpose of starting a printing business of his own in Philadelphia.

His father, however, took a dim view of the lad's plans, saying that "Keith must be of small discretion to think of setting up a boy in business who still wanted 3 years of being of man's estate."

Though help was refused by the elder Franklin, advice was generously given, "telling me," as Franklin says, "that by steady industry and prudent parsimony, I might save enough by the time I was 1 and 20 to set me up; that if I came near to the matter he would help me out with the rest."

In December 1724, Franklin sailed for England, again following irresponsible advice and promises by Governor Keith, which were never kept.

The journey was not without profit, however, for he spent nearly 2 years there working for two of London's foremost printers; much improving his knowledge of the business and his skill as a craftsman.

In 1726 he returned to Philadelphia, again went to work for Keimer, for—though still determined to go into business on his own, earnings were neeeded in the meantime.

An incident occurred at about this time of lasting interest, for he fell ill of the pleurisy and in the certainty that he was about to die, he wrote the famous epitaph, which to this day remains one of the most remarkable and widely known writings of its kind. In it he proudly identified himself for posterity with his craft, just as he did later, in his last will—as Benjamin Franklin, Printer.

In the spring of 1728 there was a day to mark the beginning of a new era in the history of printing in America.

The types and press ordered earlier from a London firm by Benjamin Franklin arrived in Philadelphia and were being installed at No. 51 High Street, and the firm name, Franklin and Meredith was hung above the door.

Meredith was a printer in Keimer's shop and a friend of Franklin's. He had been given to overindulgence in drink and Franklin, by advice and example, had redeemed him to a very creditable degree. In gratitude Meredith's father furnished a sum of money, though not wholly adequate, for the purchase of equipment, in return for a partnership—and probably further moral support—for his son. This partnership, however, was dissolved, in 1730, and Franklin became sole owner of the business.

In his autobiography Franklin says that at the time of the beginning of this new firm it was freely predicted that Franklin and Meredith must fail as there were already too many printers in the city. Yet there were only two, one of them Andrew Bradford, the other Samuel Keimer, and neither had the grasp and knowledge of his business possessed by the youthful Franklin.

Franklin did not just hang out his sign, announce that he was in business and wait for customers.

When he and Meredith opened for business, the public printer of Pennsylvania was Andrew Bradford, a dilatory man whose competition had been negligible and only from the highly incompetent Samuel Keimer.

Evidently, the bounty of the public purse was just as alluring in Franklin's day as in our times and political security was then, as now, a dangerous illusion.

Franklin therefore aimed his first competition at Bradford's most lucrative plum, the public printing of the Assembly of Pennsylvania which promptly fell right into his lap.

To use his own words "Bradford had printed an address of the House by the Governor, in a coarse, blundering manner." We reprinted it elegantly and correctly and sent one to every Member. They were sensible of the difference; it strengthened the hands of our friends in the House, and they voted us their printers for the year ensuing.

This, I venture to say, was the beginning of modern lobbying technique in America.

From that year, 1730, until his retirement, Franklin remained the official public printer of Pennsylvania.

In 1736 he clinched the contract by getting himself appointed clerk to the assembly, thus insuring, without interference, the direct transmission of printing orders from the assembly directly to the printer.

This clerkship was Franklin's first political post and his first step in a long career in public service.

Undoubtedly the public printing business was the foundation and side walls of Franklin's Way to Wealth.

At about the same time that he took the job of clerk to the assembly he also broke Bradford's monopoly in the newspaper field.

Keimer, in competition with Bradford's paper, the American Weekly Mercury, had issued on December 24, 1728, his first edition of a weekly called by the impressive title, "The Universal Instructor in All Arts and Sciences and Pennsylvania Gazette."

Within 6 months Keimer was through. He never had over 100 subscribers so he offered the paper to Franklin for what Franklin called a "trifle."

On October 2, 1729, Franklin began publishing the paper with a more reasonable title "The Pennsylvania Gazette." That paper was published regularly until 1815, 25 years after his death.

Franklin was a keen newspaperman. He knew that controversial issues created reader interest, and he has told of controversies he published which, as he says, "Got the publisher and editor talked about by the principal people involved and in a few weeks brought them all in as subscribers."

There is no complete list of books that Franklin and his various partners published from 1728 until 1766, when he sold his interest in the firm to David Hall whom he had taken into a partnership 18 years earlier.

The most reliable count of Franklin's imprints, made about half a century ago, recorded at that time 759 titles.

Next in importance to the public printing were religious works and sermons and books on theology, as a group.

He was not a sectarian publisher and the religious works he wrote, or edited, and published amply covered the field of all sects sheltered under William Penn's "freedom to worship" policy.

Next to religious works and very important profitwise were his almanacs. Of the 759 knows items Franklin published, religious titles accounted for 148 and almanacs for 119 items. Very likely even more have now been accounted for.

One item—Poor Richard's Almanack, regularly published for 26 years, far outsold all of its competitors, but he did not carry all of his almanac eggs in one basket. In one year, 1751, he issued six different almanacs, one in the German language and one in the export field called The Barbados Almanac.

I have mentioned briefly some of the important items printed and published by Franklin but there were other and very profitable items such as forms, letterheads, announcements, and such materials as the job printer and stationer supplies.

In those days it was the custom to print certain business forms, such as bills of lading starting with the words "By the grace of God." Franklin felt that some users of these forms might prefer to have those words omitted so he advertised that he would supply bills of lading with or without the grace of God.

Nor have I accounted for the great numbers of pamphlets which he wrote and printed on the philosophical society, the university, and the library company—all of which he helped to found: on his stove, on electricity, medicine, and on politics.

At 42 years of age Franklin had made amply secure his future, financially, and then retired from active participation in the business so that he might have more time for the increasing burdens of public service and his many other interests.

It may be fairly said that Poor Richard's words of worldly wisdom, his pamphlets, his pen, and printing press did more to mould the new American character than any other influence in his time.

A delegate to the First Congress assembled in America at Albany, N. Y., in 1754, he presented his plan for the union of the colonies, which unquestionably awakened in the minds of the colonists a new national consciousness. Many regard this as Franklin's most significant contribution in behalf of the independence of our country.

George Washington, to whom we refer affectionately as the Father of Our Country, was in that same year, 1754, a lad of about 20 years, mainly occupied with the task of surveying his family's estates in Virginia.

Franklin died at the age of 84 years and 3 months, soon after Washington, at the age of 57, was inaugurated first President of the United States.

I would like to now conclude this discussion of Benjamin Franklin, printer, by recalling, what we must believe he valued among the finest rewards of a life of devoted service to his country and to mankind.

It was a letter that he received on his deathbed, but while he was still in possession of his faculties and ability to clearly comprehend, which I now read:

"If to be venerated for benevolence—if to be admired for talent—if to be beloved for philanthropies—can gratify the human mind, you must have the present consolation to know that you have not lived in vain; and I flatter myself that it will not be ranked among the least grateful occurrences of your life to be assured that, so long as I retain my memory, you will be recollected with respect, veneration, and affection by your sincere friend, George Washington."

Build Up Allies or Enemies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I request that the attached article by Mr. David Lawrence, entitled "Build Up Allies or Enemies?" which was carried in the January 20, 1956, issue of U. S. News & World Report be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

BUILD UP ALLIES OR ENEMIES?

(By David Lawrence)

Shall the United States engage in a competition of spending in foreign lands?

Shall our taxpayers write a blank check and leave it to the Department of State to decide where and how much money will be allocated to foreign countries?

Shall the Department of State tell the American people, and particularly the Congress, the facts about each country involved so that the people of the United States may form their own judgment as to the wisdom of the policies proposed?

These questions go to the heart of the issue of granting economic and military aid to other countries in the crusade to avert a third world war.

Speaking last week in behalf of the President, Secretary of State Dulles puts the case this way:

"The present period in history may one day be recognized as a major turning point in the struggle between communism and freedom. It appears to be clearly a shift in the cold war, in which economic and social problems have moved to the forefront."

Mr. Dulles tells of the way the Soviet Union has been "jumping military as well as political barriers" as in India, Egypt, and Burma. He then says:

"We believe that the United States must counter these Soviet efforts. We can succeed, not by outbidding communism in sheer amounts of economic aid, but by making newly independent and newly articulate peoples feel that they can best satisfy their wants by becoming and remaining part of the community of free nations."

This is all right as far as it goes. Perhaps a warning can be read into it that the United States will be interested in helping only those countries which become members of or remain members of the free world. But there is need for further definition and for an explicit statement.

We cannot recognize such a thing as neutralism or neutrality in our foreign-aid program. The phrase "foreign aid" means "aid for the defense of the United States." Unless appropriations can clearly be allocated for such a specific purpose—for the defense of America—the money of American taxpayers should not in all honesty be used merely for a philanthropic enterprise or adventures in competitive coexistence.

As between right and wrong, there can be no neutrality. Nehru of India, for example, condones the murder and torture of American boys in Korea. Nehru, moreover, defends the right of the Soviet Union to commit acts of treason against the United Nations. For it has been formally conceded by the Soviet Union that it furnished arms and ammunition to the North Korean and Chinese Communists to repel the armies of the United Nations.

The obligations of the Charter of the United Nations require fidelity to the principles of peace as opposed to aggression.

Yet Nehru is on the side of the aggressors and wants to reward the Red China Government with a seat in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Why, therefore, should a single dime be spent to help India unless her Government abandons the tricky neutralism of Khrisna Menon, who manages to persuade the naive Nehru to do his bidding?

It's time to face up to the international blackmail to which we are also being subjected in the Middle East. The United States cannot police local wars and disputes. That's the task of the United Nations. But the decision of the Soviet Union to sell arms to Egypt and Egypt's readiness to accept such arms indicates that Prime Minister Nasser is trying to play one side off against the other. That kind of neutralism should not be supported with American dollars.

Prime Minister Nasser is represented as saying he really wants to be with the West but wishes to avoid signing any treaties or making any public commitments to the West. Why?

Vague assurances are not enough. Acts must definitely demonstrate that the nations which profess to be friends are actually on our side and not ashamed of it—and certainly not at the same time playing games with the enemy.

It's time to be realistic. We cannot outbid communism. For the Soviet is making fake bids. We are in the habit of keeping our pledges whereas the Communists make offers but rarely fulfill them.

The policy of the United States should be applied at all times to protect the people of the United States. If American funds can be effectively used abroad for that purpose, let Congress appropriate on a selective basis. Nations which insist on being neutral in the struggle between slavery and freedom and between morality and immorality can do as they like—just as we can do what we like with our own money. For this is a war—whether we call it cold or hot. Our objective is to help build up our allies, not to build up our enemies.

Our motto should be: "Billions for allies, but not one cent for neutrals."

Farm Subsidy Inevitable, but Why Deplete the Soil?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily News of January 10, 1956:

FARM SUBSIDY INEVITABLE, BUT WHY DEPLETE THE SOIL?

Even before last year's harvests, the Government owned more than 2 billion bushels of grains, 8½ million bales of cotton and comparable quantities of other commodities, including 407 million pounds of cheese. It is against that mountain of surplus food, now costing a million dollars a day merely for storage, that President Eisenhower's new farm program must be read.

Basically, his position is that it is better to pay farmers to conserve and rebuild the fertility of the soil than to mine it by growing unwanted crops.

Since in today's political climate subsidies to farmers in some form are inevitable, we agree with the President that it makes more sense to create a "soil bank" than to deplete the fertility of the land in producing food solely for sale to the Government. For, as Mr. Eisenhower pointed out truthfully, a Government warehouse is not a market.

The President's special message went to some lengths to analyze the growth of the farm problem. He said the initial error was to continue for too long the wartime production incentives. He referred to the price supports at 90 percent of parity, which was simply a way of guaranteeing farmers that they would not lose their shirts by responding to a patriotic appeal to increase production.

The President's motive here seemed obviously to obstruct the plans of some Democratic Congressmen to restore the 90 percent support level.

The somewhat complicated soil bank proposal is two-pronged. An acreage reserve program would offer inducements to withdraw up to 20 percent from land devoted to major crops under the allotment program. A conservation reserve would seek to place additional acres in woodlands or soil-building crops.

For participation in these programs, farmers would receive warrants entitling them to receive, from the surplus board, the amount of produce they would have grown, or its net value in cash.

This is essentially the plan approved by delegates to the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting in Chicago last month. It is designed to reduce the Government's surplus stocks while building the fertility of the soil for future needs, and reducing the over-expanded agricultural plant for the present.

There were other morsels for farmers in the lengthy message: Refunds of taxes on gasoline used in farming; assurance of adequate credit; more money for research to improve crops, and markets. More are to come in another special message on means of stabilizing farm income in the drought-plagued Great Plains States.

On the Chicago Board of Trade, where futures prices are sensitive to influences on the market, the response was hardly more than a yawn. This is probably less of a commentary on the plan itself than a recognition that any farm legislation is going to be subject to a great deal of pulling and hauling in Congress.

The Democratic bid for the farm vote is still to come.

The President's program is assuredly no panacea, yet the judgment of the Farm Bureau is that it is a workable method of attacking the burdensome surpluses. There is already a formidable bureaucracy administering the various programs for the benefit of the farmer, and conceivably the new one would require no great addition to it.

The President made a point of the fact that a way of life for millions of people, as well as our basic industry, was at stake in the farm problem. If it is really the family farm—instead of the industry—that Congress is concerned about it can make this clear by adopting the recommendation for a limit on single payments under price supports.

It is the great farming corporations, many of which collect Government cash high in the hundreds of thousands, which have brought about the revolution in mechanized farming, raised output and cut production costs. We can think of no more reason for the taxpayers to insure their income than to subsidize the cobblers on the ground that we all need shoes.

If it is to be a fixed public policy that several million families shall be kept living on small farms, even thought they can't earn a living there, it would be easier, cheaper and more honest to do it with a direct dole, although that might be harder on the feeling of self-respect and independence than these elaborate subsidy schemes.

It would cure the problem of surpluses, however, for in a free market production would quickly adjust itself to demand. The concern must be for people, not produce.

Address by the Vice President on the 250th Anniversary of the Birth of Benjamin Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, last evening the Vice President delivered an excellent address before the golden anniversary dinner of the Poor Richard Club in Philadelphia on the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President's address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY DINNER OF THE POOR RICHARD CLUB, BELLEVUE-STRATFORD HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 17, 1956

This is a very special occasion for me for several reasons:

Because I am privileged to share with you the 250th anniversary of the birth of the most versatile, the most complete man in our history, Benjamin Franklin.

Because, at the same time, I share also the golden anniversary of this club, which bears a name which both Dr. Franklin and my mother thought well of.

Because you have so highly honored me by allowing me to join the distinguished group of men and women who have received your gold-medal award in years gone by.

In accepting the award may I suggest that it could have more appropriately been presented to many others, but particularly to one who is in this audience. The citation speaks generously of the contribution to good will and understanding I may have made in serving in my present office. May I be permitted to tell you a little story at this point.

When we returned from our two-and-a-half-months' trip to Asia in December 1953, the President and Mrs. Eisenhower very generously invited us to the White House upon our arrival. As we were sitting in the White House apartment on the second floor enjoying a cup of tea, the President turned to me and said, "I've had some good reports on you, DICK, on this trip." And then he turned to Mrs. Nixon and said, "But the reports on you, Pat, have been wonderful."

Now Benjamin Franklin was a most gallant man. As you recall, on being chided by a lady as to why he had not come to call, he replied, "Madam, I am waiting until the nights are longer." I am sure he would agree that this club would have done better to honor the lady rather than the man tonight. In that spirit, then, I accept this award with humility and gratitude.

And now I embark on one of the most difficult tasks which could confront a speaker.

To speak on Benjamin Franklin before this group is like carrying coals to Newcastle. Or, as Foreign Minister Shigemitsu of Japan, put it when he was here a few months ago, like carrying Sake to Nada. You have had distinguished speakers galore tell you again and again of Franklin's life, his achievements, his priceless anecdotes.

But I should like to consider this versatile man Franklin tonight in his role as a public man and a public servant. Because in addition to his many better-known talents he was a superb political operator. He was a businessman who recognized the importance of politics and public service. He was a governor. He was our first Postmaster General. He was our first Ambassador to a foreign country.

I, of course, would like to claim that he was the first Republican, but the terms "Democrat" and "Republican" in the sense we think of them today were not known to him. I am sure, however, that it would not be inaccurate to state that he was a moderate.

And since leading figures in both political parties see the merits of moderation today, that makes any praise of Franklin which I intend to indulge in completely bipartisan in character.

We have only to read the concluding sentence of his famous speech to the Constitutional Convention which had such a great impact on that historic body to find the true guide lines for moderation.

"I cannot help expressing the wish that every member of the Convention who may still have objections to it, would with me on this occasion doubt a little of his infallibility and to make manifest our unanimity put his name to this instrument."

No one could read or hear these words without agreeing that Franklin was in truth a moderate in the best sense of the word.

Let us now see what advice this infinitely wise man might have for us on the great issues which confront our Government today.

We do not have to look far to find what his position would have been on national defense. It was Franklin who said:

"The very fame of our strength and readiness would be a means of discouraging our enemies, for 'tis a wise and true saying that one sword often keeps another in the scabbard. The way to secure peace is to be prepared for war."

And I can assure you that we are following Franklin's advice today in our national policy.

Today America's military strength, combined with that of our allies, is greater than it has ever been in war or peace. We can, if necessary, with our allies meet and defeat any aggressor who dares to launch an attack.

And I am sure that the great majority of the American people will agree when I say that as long as a malignant aggressive force threatens the peace of the world, the understandable desire we all share for cutting our taxes and balancing our budget must never be allowed to compromise our judgment as to the necessary level of our military strength during this period of international tension.

Franklin also, even in those early days of the Republic, was a full-blown, practical internationalist in every sense of the word. It is true that his famous statement, "We must indeed hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately," was made in reference to the American Colonies and not with regard to the United States' relations with other countries, but other statements show the trend of his thinking. With amazing foresight, he virtually predicted NATO and the United Nations.

And there is no doubt whatever but that he would have been a strong proponent of reducing barriers to trade between nations and of providing foreign aid when the interests of the United States as well as the countries aided would be served. It was he who said:

"I am sorry to find that that wisdom which sees the welfare of the parts in the prosperity of the whole seems not yet to be known in this country. We are so far from conceiving that what is best for mankind, or even for Europe in general, may be best for us."

I can imagine that if Franklin were here today he might have given us a new definition of an internationalist. I submit one on his behalf. "An internationalist is a nationalist who recognizes that in the final analysis what is good for our friends abroad is good for the United States, and what is bad for them is bad for us."

In line with this definition, may I at this point say some things about foreign economic aid which I think very desperately need to be said and understood by the American people? What I say now has not been cleared with the White House or with the Department of State, but it represents my own personal estimate of a deadly danger which confronts the United States and the free world.

We seldom have any difficulty in arousing the American people to the necessity of providing men and arms to defend the frontiers of our allies against armed aggression. Korea was a prime example of this truth.

And I am sure that if the Soviet Union were to launch an armed attack against Indonesia, Afghanistan, Syria, India—any of the countries of the Far East, Near East, or Africa—the people of the United States would realize that such an attack endangered our own security and would take appropriate action to meet it.

The reason we are so ready to take up arms and send our men to fight on foreign shores is that we recognize that if a potential enemy is allowed to overrun either free or neutral countries our own world position is weakened and we eventually will be next on the list.

What we must realize today is that sinister new means have been developed by the Communists for taking over countries without ever launching armed attack across a border.

Since World War II the Communist conspiracy has added 600 million people and a quarter of the earth's territory to the area which it dominates. The significant fact about this accomplishment is that the gains were made without the loss of a single Russian soldier in combat.

What it adds up to is that the major danger the free world faces today is not defeat in hot war but defeat in cold war—a cold war in which potential enemies undeterred by any moral restraint use political, economic, phychological and other tactics which are just as effective in taking over territory as armed aggression—and much less costly. This is the way the Communist nations operate.

We hear today a chorus of opposition to the so-called "giveaway foreign aid programs" while at the same time we find virtually no opposition to programs which build up our armed strength at home and that of our allies abroad.

But if we examine the problem realistically we will find that the men in the Kremlin are waging not only a great ideological offensive against the free world but a very subtle and economic offensive as well—an offensive in which they are attacking what they think are the weak spots of the neutralist and the free world with offers of economic aid.

They are not making these offers because of any highly developed sense of philanthropy. The realistic men in Moscow know that a country which becomes an economic satellite will inevitably become a political and military satellite as well.

Our foreign aid program is not designed to buy the friendship of peoples in the countries to which our aid is given. That is why both neutrals and allies should share in that program.

What we are trying to do is to shore up their strength so that they can be free economically and politically of any foreign domination—so that they can be independent members of the family of nations. This in the final analysis is the best guaranty of our own freedom and our own independence.

An economic offensive is potentially just as dangerous and in some ways more dangerous than a military offensive which might be launched against us or one of our allies.

If we want to keep our freedom and our independence we must recognize this threat and deal with it imaginatively, boldly, and effectively.

I am sure that Franklin who, in speaking of the benefits of peace, said, "What vast additions to the conveniences and comforts of living might mankind have acquired if the money spent in wars had been employed in works of upblic utility," would have approved wholeheartedly of President Eisenhower's conduct at the Geneva Big Four Conference.

He would have recognized that the millions of the world's people want peace and he would have argued the necessity and rightness of his country being on the side of peace.

And the Geneva Conference which for the first time since World War II got the United States off the defensive and on the offensive on the great issue of peace and did so without one concession of liberty or territory would in Franklin's judgment have been considered a memorable success.

But the man who said, "There never was a good war, or a bad peace," would certainly not have been an appeaser. We must remember that he was a revolutionary leader. It was he who said, "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." Surely we can find no better guideline for our conduct in the world conflict which engulfs us today.

He would have been proud to have read and heard the statement the President made recently on the subject of the captive countries. "The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, is, and until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy."

In summary, I rather imagine that Franklin would have approved wholeheartedly of President Eisenhower's recent statement—"We must wage peace with our eyes open, our heads cool, and our tempers well under control, yielding neither to Soviet threats or Communist blandishments in our crusade for a free, peaceful, and prosperous world."

I believe too that Franklin would undoubtedly have approved of good will trips of every type and description. He was himself a man of infinite good will, beloved in every country to which his journeys took him.

And it was he who uttered these eloquent words, "I think it cannot but have a good effect in promoting a certain interest too little thought of by selfish man, and scarcely ever mentioned, so that we hardly have a name for it; I mean the interest of humanity, or common good of mankind."

I personally again can testify to the truth of his statement. It has been my privilege to visit 30 countries in the past 3 years and I have no doubt whatever but that as people know each other the prejudices which otherwise would drive them apart will inevitably melt away. I had heard before I visited these countries how different the people of each nation I was to visit were. These people were supposed to be reserved, others were supposed to be arrogant, others were anti-American.

But I found that while there were differences in food, religion, customs, and languages, a smile, a handshake, a friendly gesture, got the same reaction abroad as in the United States. That was true everywhere we went in Asia. And, in Latin America my memories are full of gestures of good will.

And may I say that one of the reasons I am particularly moved by receiving this medal tonight is that this organization recognized the importance and the contribution that can be made by public officials when they go abroad offering no treaties, no arms, no economic concessions, but simply an abundance of American good will.

This very practical man would have had some appropriate comments on some of our more mundane but nevertheless important domestic problems.

I am confident that the subject on the domestic scene which would have fascinated him the most would be the current controversy which is developing over automation. There are a number of reasons for this conclusion.

Franklin invented all types of labor-saving devices. A machine to copy letters. A long arm for taking down books from high shelves. A rocking-chair with an attachment which caused a fan above the chair to move rhythmically back and forth cooling the sitter and shooing the flies.

He was a man who valued time more than any man in history. It was he who said, "Lose no time, be always employed in something useful, cut off all unnecessary action."

He even carried his passion for saving time to extremes which might not be approved in some quarters. He noticed that it always took a considerable time for his father to ask the blessing at the dinner table. He studied the situation and came up with this ingenious idea. He suggested to his father that he could bless all the food in the barrels at one time and thus save the time of blessing each portion of it at the table.

Rather than engaging in gloomy predictions as to unemployment and dislocation which might be caused by further automation, he would probably have pointed out these salient facts:

There has been no significant rise in unemployment in these days when automation is increasing.

On the contrary, employment, wages, and income for America's workers are the highest in history.

There is no appreciable unemployment in those industries in which automation is furthest advanced: chemical, electrical, communications, and automobiles.

And looking to the future he would have noted these facts:

Today the labor force includes approximately 42 percent of our population.

By 1965, it is estimated that it will be less than 38 percent of our population at that time.

On the other hand, the number of nonproductive persons will have increased from 34 percent of the population to over 49 percent in the same period.

These percentage figures are based on a projection by the Bureau of the Census which indicates that by 1965 the total population of the United States will increase about 25 millions while at the same time the number of persons aged 26 to 64 will increase by only 8 millions.

This brings us to an inevitable conclusion. The only way to make up this growing difference between the relative number of workers and consumers is by better management of the Nation's productive resources. It will not be enough to go on doing as well as we have done. We will have to do much better, and that means we will have to have much more automation.

I am sure Franklin would have gloried in this situation. He would have seen that here is truly a new frontier for America, and, with that gentle humor of his which always glowed but never seared, he would have laughed out of court the prophets of doom, the reactionaries who see such grave consequences in this new vista of progress for America and the world.

All in all, considering the manifold problems of the diversive regions, groups and interests in America, we can be sure that Franklin above all would have been a true statesman. It was he who said, "To serve the public faithfully, and at the same time please it entirely is impracticable."

I think that he would have been immensely proud of another man of good will, one of whose actions I would like to describe briefly to you now.

This is an incident which occurred in a Cabinet meeting. It is not necessary to identify the bill involved or the people involved because this incident is so typical of the man who heads our Nation today. A question arose as to whether he should veto a bill if it passed Congress. Though the bill would cost several millions more than everybody in the President's Cabinet believed should be appropriated for the particular purpose, one of those present urged that he not veto the bill on the ground that history showed that vetoes by previous Presidents of such bills had proved to be politically damaging because of the political power of the group favoring the bill.

The President looked him straight in the eye and said: "I have studied the history of such bills also and I agree that in the short run such veto action may have been politically unwise. But I have always found in my life that you never get into trouble in the long run doing what is right, and I am not going to be black-jacked by any group in America to do something which I do not think is in the best interests of all the American people."

I am sure that Benjamin Franklin would say that this kind of statesmanship which we have learned to expect from our great Presidents, both Republicans and Democrats, is what has made America the great country it is today.

Of course, I realize that up to this time I have not commented upon the major political question of the day, and I must admit that even Franklin on this subject appears to be somewhat inconsistent. On the one hand he said, "The first mistake in public business is the going into it." But then again he said, "I shall never ask, never refuse, or never resign an office."

All that I can say is that I know that 32 million Republicans and Democrats who voted for President Eisenhower are hoping and praying that he will see fit to follow the advice Franklin gave in the second quotation rather than the first.

Finally, tonight, I think that your great Philadelphia philosopher would have had little advice for me.

A careful reading of most of what he said unfortunately shows no direct advice to public speakers. But after reading and rereading source materials, I finally ran across this gem: "It is ill manners to silence a fool, and cruelty to let him go on."

Now I don't mean by this quotation that Franklin meant that all Vice Presidents and/or orators are fools. And I know the members of the Poor Richard Club in this City of Brotherly Love could never be cruel or rude.

But I do know that Franklin, a man who loved life, good humor, and good fellowship, with the knowledge of the delightful entertainment that is to follow the speaking part of this program, would say, "Anyone who talks any longer at this point is a fool."

So may I conclude my remarks by saying to you again—

Thank you for the honor you have conferred upon me through your award.

Thank you for the privilege of allowing Mrs. Nixon and me to share this historical event with you.

And may the years ahead for each of you be filled with the wisdom, the good humor, the great humanity with which the creator of Poor Richard was so abundantly blessed.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Marshall College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday it was my pleasure to address a forum at Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va., on the subject of the administration's foreign policy in the European area.

I was pleased to share the platform with my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who discussed the problems of our relations with Asian lands.

I send to the desk the text of my own address, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY COMMENDS EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION FOREIGN POLICY; SAYS NONPARTISAN UNITY MORE ESSENTIAL THAN EVER BEFORE; URGES DEMOCRATS MAKE THEIR CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS, IF ANY, "MORE SPECIFIC"

It is a pleasure for me to address this fine assembly, and to share the platform with my colleague from my neighbor State of Minnesota.

One of his many important services these days is his chairmanship of an exceedingly important subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, devoted to the vital problem of disarmament proposals.

SENATOR HUMPHREY'S POSITION AND MINE

My colleague has become somewhat of a specialist in disarmament. But I trust that when he gets around to any references to the Democratic Party, that his remarks tonight will not prove too "disarming."

Seriously, I know that you will enjoy his remarks, because Senator HUMPHREY has shown great interest in the problems of Asia and real understanding, just as he has been very alert to our problems in Europe as well.

Before I proceed further, may I say that, although my good friend from Minnesota and I have frankly disagreed at times on some domestic issues, we have voted side by side and fought, shoulder to shoulder, on some of the key international questions of our time.

We have both been supporters of the basic policies aimed at constructive American leadership in the contracted world of the air atomic age.

We have both fought against those narrow, backward-looking forces which, ostrich-like, would try to "bury America's head in the sand."

We have both fought for a strong technical aid program to uplift the standards of living in the under-developed areas of the world. And I could cite other instances of our unity as well.

Later on, I shall refer to the points on which we differ somewhat—points which will become apparent to you, as we both proceed to the substances of our remarks.

EUROPE—A KEY TO THE WORLD BALANCE

But first, let us turn to the European area, as such—Europe, the industrial, political, and cultural cradle of our own Western civilization, Europe—the area of our principal ancestry, Europe—the principal arena of the forces that have molded the 20th century.

It is in Europe that communism first established its beachhead. It is in Europe that it gained its home base for aggression. It is in Europe that it made its first spectacular advances. It is in Europe that it posed its most serious threat after World War II. And it is in Europe, where, thanks to the Marshall plan, NATO, and now the Western European Union, that a rough equilibrium has been achieved, stopping communism, at least temporarily, in its tracks.

Most observers, I think, would agree that our most impressive successes in postwar foreign policy have tended to be in the European area, whereas our most significant and ominous problems tend to be in the Asian area, to which Senator HUMPHREY will refer.

EUROPE, ASIA INTERRELATED

Europe and Asia are hardly disconnected, however. They can hardly be spoken of, as if they were separate problems.

Although I shall confine my own remarks principally to the European area, as requested, it is almost inevitable that some of my comments will lap over into the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and, indeed, South American areas as well, just as will Senator HUMPHREY's comments overlap somewhat.

One cannot talk, for example, about continued prosperity of Great Britain without referring to her considerable dependence upon pound sterling earnings in the troubled Middle East and southeast Asia.

One cannot talk about France, without immediately bringing up the sore problem of self-deterioration in North Africa.

One cannot speak in terms of our NATO relations, without almost automatically bringing up problems of our relations with the colonial and former colonial areas which belong now or used to belong to some of the NATO powers.

Obviously, the world today is an interrelated unit—economically, politically, militarily, socially. Of course, this world is divided by the still formidable Iron Curtain. Nevertheless, a solution to our problems in Europe is crucially dependent upon success of our decisions in other areas, and vice versa.

Thus, when you think about our relations with our friends in, say, Portugal, it is more than a European problem. You must also bear in mind the problems of our relations with our friends in India and the specific, difficult problem of Goa.

You must think, however, as well, of those crucial Azores bases—belonging to Portugal—which are an indispensable link in our own Atlantic chain of defense.

KEEP BROAD PERSPECTIVE

We need, therefore, to keep an overall and broad perspective.

A segmented view of the world—a view of merely Asia's or Europe's problems—all by themselves—may tend to be narrow and distorted.

Our problems are complex and interwoven. We dare not ignore dangerous side-effects and after-effects of our European actions in Asia, nor of our Asian actions in Europe.

A BALANCE SHEET OF EUROPEAN POLICIES

Now, let us draw up a balance-sheet in Europe.

What does it show? How successful have our policies been there?

I believe—very successful indeed, although obviously far from perfect.

On the "plus" side of the ledger, our achievements in Europe have been:

1. The coming into being of the Western European Union, as a substitute for the European Defense Community.

WEU is not a perfect substitute, but it is an effective wroking alternative for achieving greater unity, principally between those two traditional enemies—France and Germany.

2. A second success is the reentry by the people of Germany into the family of sovereign nations.

Unhappily, it is only the people of the Federal Republic of Germany, that is, West Germany. But we are continuing our efforts looking toward the earliest possible unification of both zones, along free and democratic lines.

3. The regaining by the people of Austria of their long-sought independence.

4. The settlement of the bitter Italian-Yugoslav dispute over Trieste.

5. Progress under the High Coal and Steel Authority, and steps toward other economic integration.

6. The taking of the necessary steps to bring into being the United Nations Atomic Agency. These steps have been spearheaded by the Atlantic powers which have made the most progress in peaceful application of atomic energy. But non-European powers are of course also included.

7. The continued strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, including efforts, most recently, designed to lead toward a NATO radar system.

8. The entry of additional free European powers into the United Nations, including countries such as Ireland, Italy, and Spain, which had heretofore been arbitrarily excluded by Soviet veto.

9. The continued booming prosperity of Western Europe which, while it is occasionally marred here or there, has been surpassing almost all prewar records in production and consumption.

These are a few elements of the positive side of the ledger. These are the assets, the gains, the pluses.

THE PROBLEM SIDE OF THE LEDGER

No one should, however, ignore the continuing difficulties.

1. Foremost among those difficulties is, of course, that faced by our friends in the uneasy Republic of France.

You are all familiar with the serious parliamentary deadlock between the forces of the right center and the left center, led respectively by former Prime Minister Faure and former Prime Minister Mendes-France.

You recognize how the diabolic Communists will continue to attempt to throw the monkey wrench into France's parliamentary system, by virtue of the fact that they now command 145 seats in the French Assembly out of 594. You recognize too, the unsettling effect of the 52 Assembly votes on the extreme right.

2. Secondly, you are familiar with the disarrangement of the Saar agreement by the recent pro-German votes.

The Western European Union is, of course, hinged on French-German agreement on the Saar.

So, a great deal more must still be done to patch up the obvious differences which have occurred in that iron- and steel-rich area.

THREE DANGERS IN NORTH AFRICA

3. Thirdly, everyone is all too aware these days of the threat posed to the Atlantic powers by the continued serious disturbances in North Africa, particularly in Morocco and Algeria.

The riots and fighting there are not only of grave concern to our French friends, but are of particular concern to ourselves in view of three facts:

(a) The strategic stake which we have in the areas because of the presence of our Strategic Air Command bases. (These bases, I need not remind you, are a crucial part of America's principal deterrent against world war III.)

(b) The dangerous effect of the disturbances on the whole Moslem world—stretching from North Africa through the explosive Middle East—through Pakistan and all the way to Islamic Indonesia.

(c) The fact that France has drained off 300,000 troops for North African duty, and thus has seriously depleted NATO strength in Europe.

DEPRESSED AREAS IN ITALY

4. Another of the continuing problems is the fact that in some areas in Europe, there are still considerably depressed segments of national economies.

The principal example is, of course, in our good ally, Italy. There, in spite of an enormous financial commitment by the United States, and in spite of strenuous efforts by the Government, a vast unemployment problem continues to exist. Meanwhile, land redistribution in Italy has not achieved anywhere near its fullest goals, and there is considerable want and privation among many of the Italian people, especially in the south.

HOW LARGE SHOULD NATO'S GROUND FORCES BE?

5. Another key question relates to NATO's adequacy in the light of changing facts of the air-atomic age.

We must remember that the ground area of Western Europe is actually comparatively small.

That means that supersonic jet planes—fighters and bombers—could streak from Soviet bases across the entire NATO area in a matter of minutes and hours.

Moreover, the Soviets are constantly modernizing their armed forces. And so, we have an enormous problem in terms of modernizing NATO forces, as well.

NATO weapons are quickly becoming obsolete. The question is: Who is to foot the new bill? How much can Uncle Sam afford to provide?

A related question is: How large should NATO's ground forces be, considering the fact that the principal threat to NATO may come from air-atomic weapons, rather than from the traditional-type infantry—ground assault?

Inevitably, the Western European countries find themselves pinched in their military budgets. Inevitably, there is pressure to reduce the size of their ground forces. (This is so, particularly, in view of occasional Soviet smiles and sweet talk.) One can see the impact in virtually every one of the NATO powers. Thus, in some of these powers, there is a tendency drastically to shorten the period of military enlistment, indeed, to make it so short that the men may not have sufficient specialized training at all.

PARLIAMENTARY PROBLEMS IN THE WEST

6. We turn to a sixth problem, relating to recurrent parliamentary crises. Even so relatively stable a country as Britain—which has had only 3 changes in the postwar era, in comparison to France's 22 governments since 1945—even Britain has had her parliamentary conflicts.

Prime Minister Eden, for example, has found himself in difficulty because of a combination of crises in the Middle East—where Britain has traditionally exerted a paramount influence—and because of the United Kingdom's serious economic problems as well.

OUR REVIEW OF THESE PROBLEMS

These, then, are but a few of the problems which exist.

No one should underestimate these problems. Senator HUMPHREY and I, as well as our colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees, "wrestle" virtually every week with these problems.

Very shortly we will be making an intensive review of the administration's mutual-security requests for the coming fiscal year; and, no doubt, many of these specific problems will be coming up.

THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN MIDDLE EAST

Also looming large will be the continuing crisis in the Middle East.

I need not tell you that a match which might be lit near that powder keg could explode in a manner which might quickly engulf not only Europe, but Asia and the Western Hemisphere as well.

Secretary Dulles has, of course, been making an intensive effort to compose the bitter Arab-Israeli dispute. Progress has been made. Agreement has been approached on Eric Johnston's Jordan water-development plan. But obviously a great deal more constructive work still needs to be done.

THE PROBLEM OF FOREIGN POLICY AND NOVEMBER 1956

This, then, for brief summary purposes, must be our general outline of the situation in Europe.

In the few moments which are remaining to me I should like to say just a few words with regard to the relations here at home between the two political parties over our foreign policy.

No one need remind you that in this crucial election year of 1956 it is inevitable that both parties may, to some extent, try to use foreign-policy arguments to their own advantage.

It is inevitable that the Eisenhower administration will "hold with pride," and that some of our Democratic friends may tend to "view with alarm."

It has been my hope (indeed it has been the hope, I believe, of most thinking Americans) that we can keep partisan disputes on foreign policy to an absolute minimum.

We must keep the argument to manageable proportions. We must not allow foreign policy to be completely dragged into the political arena, where it might be kicked around to such an extent that America's prestige declines throughout the world.

The eyes of all mankind are upon us. Our friends are not slow to note our shortcomings, and our enemies are quick to seize upon our shortcomings.

GENERALIZED CRITICISM OF FOREIGN POLICY

Now, let me say just a word with regard to some of the criticisms which have been leveled against our foreign policy.

One quickly notes that one uniform characteristic of these criticisms is that they have really been confined to generalities and not to specifics.

Occasionally the criticisms become specific. One example is the hindsight possibility that we might have become involved in the Indo-Chinese fighting at the Communist siege of Dien Bien Phu.

Well, a lot of things might theoretically have happened in the past and a lot of things might theoretically happen in the future. This is a world of alternative risks and dangers. We could spend time indefinitely discussing risks which we took in the past or alternatives which we might have taken, but didn't.

THE SURPLUS OF ABSTRACT ADJECTIVES AND ADVERBS

Basically, however, as you read most of the Democrats' criticisms, you will see that generally our Democratic friends merely say, in a completely unspecific way, that our foreign policy is "not clear enough." And they use dozens of other abstract adjectives and adverbs as well.

When you try to pin them down, when you try to ask them for their own constructive counterproposals, when you ask them what they would actually do, differently than what we are not doing now, there is a comparative silence. I say "comparative," because silence is not a noun generally associated with the Democratic Party. Basically the Democrats do not really have specific alternative plans to the ones which the Eisenhower administration is now following. The Democrats want us to achieve all of these "lovely" adjective goals which they set forth—flexibly, dynamic, etc.—but they do not tell us how—concretely.

Let me assure you that I, for one, very definitely want our foreign policy to be clear, dynamic, flexible, and so forth.

But I believe that right now it basically does strive for these objectives. And I believe that no two people are working harder for those goals than are Dwight D. Eisenhower and John Foster Dulles.

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIONS ESTABLISHED PRESENT OUTLINES

Lest my position be misinterpreted, let me quickly state that this Nation is indebted to the previous Democratic administrations for the broad outline of leading policies which have proven successful in Europe and emphasized in Europe.

This Nation is indebted to an ex-Secretary of State like Gen. George C. Marshall, who recently observed his 75th birthday. And it is indebted to other men of great stature who served this Republic well in the field of foreign relations during the long period of Democratic occupancy of the White House and control of the Congress.

It is my hope that, thanks to the great talent and ability of both major parties, we will continue to make a success of our policies in Europe, as well as in Asia, and elsewhere.

PRINCIPAL THREAT TODAY IN ASIA

In my judgment, the principal Soviet threat today is not in Europe. It is in the Asian theater, where conditions of colonialism, of widespread poverty, illiteracy, and disease provide ripe opportunities for communistic intrigue. About this we shall hear more from our good friend from Minnesota.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great pleasure to be with you tonight, and I look forward to the opportunity to respond to your questions.

The Problem of Seizing the Foreign Policy Initiative From the Communists

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Eisenhower Should Lead the Godly Against the Reds," which appeared in the Portland (Maine) Press Herald of January 6, 1956.

This article, which was written by May Craig, offers a bold and constructive approach to the problem of how to seize the foreign-policy initiative from the Communists. It should be read by all thoughtful Americans concerned with the problem of how best to combat the campaign of distortion and deceit which the Communists are waging against the free world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSIDE WASHINGTON—EISENHOWER SHOULD LEAD THE GODLY AGAINST REDS

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON, January 5.—Now that the Kremlin and the White House are blasting each other—last remnants of the Geneva ghost blown out the window—why should we not start on a little positive policy of our own? About all we do is to react to the Reds. They are positive enough. They lead us around by the nose for all the world to see. This makes the wavering small nations decide they better get on the Red side, though they do not want to.

Bulganin and Khrushchev went off to Asia and said anything that they thought would please the Asians. They pushed down hard on the colonialism pedal, never mentioning the dread Communist type of colonialism that the Reds impose anywhere they get a foothold.

They told India that India should have Kashmir, which is a part of Pakistan and where most of the people are Moslems and do not want to live under Hindu India. The Reds told Indian that India should have Goa, a small province of Portugal on the edge of India. They offered money and arms and steel mills and atomic plants and anything else they could think of. Now, we may start bidding in this auction. This will cost us money, and the offer costs the Reds nothing. We don't want Reds swarming in as experts along with the mills and the dams and the arms, so we will react by bidding, as in Egypt.

One thing we could do is to rally all the people who believe in religion. The Communists dare not have a god, or a religion, because people must follow the Communist Party line, and not their conscience or the commandments of God or the prophets. This is something that East and West have in common, religion.

In addition to arms and surplus foods and dams and steel mills and NATO and SEATO and U. N.—why does not President Eisenhower call on all nations of virtue and religion to join against the godless Bolshevik.

Christian, Jew, Hindu, Moslem, Buddhist—let all the people of the world who believe in God or gods, or religion of any sort, band together and fight this atheistic materialism of communism.

Let our President lead the holy war if you want to call it that. Let him summon the moral forces as we have summoned the democratic forces. We believe in freedom and in democracy—why do we leave in the scabbard the great weapon we have, the weapon of religious belief?

The Russians are going around the world seeking to gain the alliance of people who need the material things she promises—in the very same breath that Russia condemns the capitalism of the United States which shows the world the greatest production of material things. Where we have surpluses of food, the Communist countries have deficiencies. Where we have comforts, they have shortages. We tell the world about our material advantages, we give them bread.

Why not begin a crusade against communism which has said, over and over again, that religion is the opiate of the people? That would be something positive—something the Russians could not match, because godlessness is essential to communism and the all-mighty state.

Instead of merely reacting to what the Communists do, offering a merely negative bidding against what the Russians offer, why not offer the only thing they cannot match without destroying themselves?

When we talk of material things we run into financial arguments. When we talk of democracy and systems of government, we run into arguments.

India is a religious country—it nurtured a Ghandi. The Moslems are among the most religious people in the world—their religion is imbedded in their daily life. The Jewish religion is a way of life. The Buddhist religion is one of the purest and loftiest in the world. Why should not this great power be harnessed against the ruthless power that would destroy religion as it would destroy freedom?

Instead of the Pope's talking about abolishing nuclear warfare, which would delight our enemies, who would then proceed with other kinds while they stored up their nuclear weapons till ours were destroyed, the Pope could join a religious war on the Communists with all the power of the Roman Catholic Church. Remember that some years ago we scrapped a lot of perfectly good naval ships because we had a disarmament agreement? Nobody else destroyed anything and when the Japanese decided they didn't want to keep down to their quota in the pact, it all went out the window and we had to build new battleships.

Nehru, of India, Nasser, of Egypt, the King of Saudi Arabia, the Greek Catholics of Russia itself, the Buddhists and the Shintoists, the Jews everywhere—all could join this moral and religious war, without infringing on their local quarrels. Only the Communist political philosophy could be hostile to a mobilizing of the religions of the world. It could be a link to bind free people together, because all the children of God, all those who believe in the path, and a good way of life, could come together to fight the godlessness of communism. Godlessness is necessary to communism; that is why they have the League for Militant Godlessness in Russia. Why not a League for Militant Godliness?

M. L. Benedum: The Oilman of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it was my privilege on October 12 last to take part in honoring a great American whose distinguished achievements have brought him worldwide fame. On that occasion, in the city of Pittsburgh, I had the pleasant task of presenting to Mr. M. L. Benedum a plaque designating him as the oilman of the century.

This was a proper and richly deserved tribute paid to Mr. Benedum by the Allegheny County Oil Industry in its observance of Oil Progress Week.

It was a testimonial of love and respect for a man whose vision, courage, and rugged individualism have made him famous as the "King of the Wildcatters."

His outstanding career renews our faith in the traditional American system of free enterprise. It was that system which caused men like Mike Benedum to go into all parts of the earth in search of oil to lighten the burdens of humanity and to stimulate progress for world betterment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks in presenting the plaque to Mr. Benedum, and also his most inspiring words of acceptance.

There being no objection, tht matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN PRESENTING TO M. L. BENEDUM A PLAQUE DESIGNATING HIM AS THE OILMAN OF THE CENTURY AT THE OIL PROGRESS DINNER OF THE ALLEGHENY COUNTY OIL INDUSTRY INFORMATION COMMITTEE, IN THE WILLIAM PENN HOTEL, PITTSBURGH, OCTOBER 12, 1955

It is always a pleasure to join in honoring a distinguished American for outstanding achievement.

It is a proud part of our American heritage that a long list of men of humble origin have led this Nation to great heights.

That is the essence of American progress. It is made possible by freedom of the individual, strengthened by freedom of enterprise and supported by individual responsibility.

Reward for individual effort is the foundation of the greatness of our economic system. It is the right of every American to acquire and own property and to enjoy the fruits of his labor, energy, and initiative.

This concept of individual freedom, written into our fundamental law, made America a land of opportunity. It holds out to the youth of our land equal opportunity to reach the highest place in every activity that upholds the American way of life.

Our paramount obligation as free citizens of our great Republic is to keep it that way. It is our responsibility to keep alive the freedoms and the opportunities that have made the United States the greatest Nation on earth. It is up to us to leave to future generations the same kind of America that we have been privileged to enjoy.

The man we honor tonight is a brilliant product of those priceless American assets—freedom of the individual and freedom of enterprise.

By his own efforts, without social or economic advantages, he reached the pinnacle of success in the toughest and most hazardous form of industrial enterprise—the search for oil.

Those of us who have followed his brilliant career have some knowledge of the great personal and financial risks involved.

We know of the dangers and the hardships that are encountered by those who venture into the most inaccessible places of the world in the hope that oil might be found. We know of the disappointments and discouragements that are part of this extremely uncertain business.

Those were some of the obstacles that gave way before the vision and driving energy of our guest of honor. Every new venture differed from from the other. Every one brought new and more difficult problems to be solved.

But determination, resourcefulness, and hard work won out and in 60 years of wildcatting M. L. Benedum has brought in more producing oil wells from wildcat territory than any other man in history.

We honor him tonight because his rugged individualism will live as an inspiration to generations far into the future.

In him are represented all the finest elements of our national strength and character—faith, vision, courage, integrity, hard work and devotion to the public welfare.

We do not measure the worth of an individual by the dollars he has accumulated, but rather by his service to his fellow man. In that respect I can find no better example than his own words which sum up the noble philosophy by which he lives.

Last July, when interviewed by newspaper reporters on his 86th birthday, Mr. Benedum said and I quote:

"I have always felt that I am merely a trustee of money and that it is my responsibility to use it in the public interest."

No words of mine are adequate to express our high regard for Mr. Benedum. Nor is it necessary for me to dwell at length on the love and esteem in which he is held by this group of his warmest admirers.

He has richly earned all our praise and gratitude and it is a high privilege, on behalf of the Allegheny County Oil Industry, to present to you, Sir, Mr. Benedum, this plaque which rightfully and properly designates you as the "Oilman of the Century."

REPLY OF MR. M. L. BENEDUM ACCEPTING PLAQUE DESIGNATING HIM AS THE "OILMAN OF THE CENTURY"

Mr. Toastmaster, Senator MARTIN, ladies, and gentlemen, I am indeed grateful to this fine group of the oil fraternity for the honor you have conferred upon me, and for this beautiful plaque. I am also grateful to this truly great American, Senator MARTIN, for his gracious and generous remarks.

I have been in the oil business for 65 years and sometimes I feel that I have not learned too much about it, but I have learned a lot about the people in it. In the early days many of the men in the oil business were real diamonds in the rough. Underenath, however, they had honor, integrity, and a high sense of dignity. They respected their obligations, they kept their word, they tried to improve the lot of their more unfortunate fellow men. In short, they lived up to the highest concept of Christian citizenship.

There have been great changes in the business since I started in it, but the oil man still retains those traits which mark the real measure of a man. His word is still his bond. He still believes that a man's wealth is calculated in terms of the confidence and respect of his fellow men rather than in dollars.

Please believe me when I say to you I would rather have the confidence and respect of the men and women of the oil industry than of any other group on earth.

Science and invention to a great extent have pointed the way to all of the progress of the last century so we must give much credit to the scientific men. It is their genius that has sparked the fantastic progress in oil as well as in all American business.

As an oil man, I am proud that our industry has more than kept pace with the industrial revolution. It has been out front most of the time, blazing a trail for the others to follow. There is scarcely a single thing that has been developed in the last 50 years that has not required oil to help in its completion and in many cases it is necessary to use it for its operation. (Take for instance the auto, the aeroplane, and all kinds and characters of machinery that we use daily.) In fact, as I see it, oil is the mainspring of our industrial life. Did you ever stop to think that the economic and social progress of the last 75 years has been in direct ratio to the consumption of oil? The more oil people use—the better they live.

I often wonder what would happen in the world if oil should be suddenly taken from us.

If it were given me to live my life over, I would still want to be an oilman. I am grateful to providence that either through lucky chance or divine guidance I became an oil man.

Several days ago, a Washington newspaper man asked me how I, at 86 years of age, occupied my time. I replied, "I expect to pass through this life but once: I have already lived 16 years beyond the allotted time; I have lived to see most of my associates and loved ones leave; therefore, I now live for those left whom I love; I live for the tasks which God has assigned to me, and for the good that I may be able to do for others."

Again, I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the honor you have conferred upon me tonight. I shall always cherish this beautiful plaque and the memory of this pleasant occasion. God bless you and good night.

Present Agricultural Policies—A Historic Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, many people today are doing some hard thinking, and some constructive thinking, about the problems of our farmers. The farm situation is bad and getting worse. Here in Congress we need and welcome suggestions from the American people as to how that situation can be improved.

Such a suggestion has reached me in the form of an editorial written by Walter Malec, editor of the Hallettsville, (Tex.) Tribune. This is a semiweekly newspaper published in the heart of a rich Texas farming area. Mr. Malec knows at first hand the nature of the farm problem. He sees what is happening to his friends and neighbors, and he is deeply concerned.

In order that all Senators may have the benefit of Mr. Malec's words of wisdom on this subject, I ask unanimous consent that his editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HISTORIC CHOICE

Congress will again have its historic choice.

It can go on subsidizing big farmers as they have been. That's what the present farm policies were doing. This especially in one of the ungraduated allotments, and only in acres, instead of also in lint.

That's what the soil bank will keep on doing. Big farmers get most of the cotton money, including most of the cotton loans. Hence they will be getting most of the soil bank money too.

The soil bank is what the big farmers want and what they will get.

Favored as they have been, the big farmers were prospering and growing in numbers, while the family farmers were going down as never before. Texas alone lost half of its farm population already and will keep on losing. This has been one choice so far.

Or Congress may take the other choice. Instead of subsidizing the big farmers, it may treat the family farmers as the foundation of this country, as they are.

No special favors are needed or asked. Just the same commonsense as in the income tax, making the cotton allotments too graduated.

Since it's the bales that count at the end, why not the bales at the beginning—in the allotments? Why not consider the lint, as well as acres in figuring the allotments?

Also, why not free our cotton of its artificial handicap? Why not sell at the market price? Not merely a domestic allotment, but sell at the market price both abroad and here—to sell more cotton.

And why not pay the parity separately, limited more to the family farmers—to have more farmers?

This would not cost half as much as the soil bank would. And it would be safe and natural. It would be also a natural answer to our surpluses.

If Congress goes on subsidizing big farmers, that's what this country will have. We'll have mostly big farmers—and big cities. With small farmers also our small towns are bound to go down.

Today Congress is subsidizing big farmers. Tomorrow it will have to subsidize—one way or other—those people driven from farms into big cities. They will still have votes and power to get almost anything they want.

This talk of big farms being more efficient and the age of small farmers being gone, should fool no one. Communists evidently feel the same way when wiping out small farmers and making workers out of them.

Congress needs only stop the policies destroying small farmers.

As Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON warns, "So many farmers are moving to the cities and so few young people stay on the farms. It's bad—very bad."

It's very bad indeed—far worse than the people, the press, and Congress generally realize so far. That's the core of our farm problem. And the soil bank will not even touch this problem.

Accomplishments of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Guard and Defense," written by Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst and published on January 13, 1956, in the New York Times. In view of the intense interest of Congress in National Guard and Reserve programs, and the critical nature of recent reports in the press of the Nation, it is indeed refreshing to note the recognition extended by such a distinguished military writer to the programs and accomplishments of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard. This is particularly true because of the unfortunate manner in which the accomplishments of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard have been overlooked by those who have been greatly concerned over the lack of an adequate, well trained, strictly Federal Reserve. The Army National Guard and Air National Guard constitute our most potent reserve force in being and, with the continuing guidance and support of the Congress, will continue to show outstanding progress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 13, 1956]

GUARD AND DEFENSE—A COMPARISON OF ITS GROWING MIGHT TO WEAKNESS OF ARMY RESERVE FORCE

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The investigation by Congress of the Nation's military reserve forces will be able to detect one ray of sunshine in the Pentagon's package of gloom.

The National Guard, part of the country's first-line Reserve forces, is in pretty good shape. Its most recent strength figure (as of November 30) of almost 435,000 is the highest in its history.

The condition of the Guard is in startling contrast to the lean-and-hungry look of the Army's Reserve forces, as presented by the Pentagon in congressional testimony. Last year's Reserve Forces Act, which was supposed to rehabilitate the Reserve, was actually compromise legislation.

A provision for a voluntary 6-month training program, which it was hoped, would flesh out our paper Reserve units was included in the bill. The response to it, as Pentagon witnesses testified last week, has been discouraging. Few young men have volunteered for the 6-month program.

The Army's Organized Reserve forces are, so far, little better off than a year ago, except that they are somewhat more realistically organized. On the other hand, the National Guard, which was somewhat discriminated against in last year's legislation, has continued steadily to increase its strength. The Reserve Act did not provide for the assignment of men who have completed their period of active duty to National Guard units.

GUARD'S ROOTS ARE DEEP

Nevertheless, the guard, with a well-established system of recruiting and roots deep in local communities—a situation in strong contrast to most Reserve units—has moved ahead in both quantity and quality. It is by no means an M-day (Mobilization Day) outfit, as it is supposed to be, and probably it never will be under present conditions.

But the National Guard, as well as many units of the Navy and Air Force Reserve, stands in strong contrast to the almost complete unreadiness of the vast mass of Army Reserve Forces.

In the year ending June 30, 1955, the National Guard increased its net strength by 51,000. That increase is continuing and during the current fiscal year ending next June 30, the guard hopes to expand its total strength by more than 75,000 to a grand total of almost half a million men.

The Army components of the guard numbered 358,241 last June 30, and are scheduled to reach about 425,000 next June 30. The Air Guard strength last June was 61,306 officers and airmen, which is scheduled to increase to 70,400 by next June 30.

The troop basis for the ground guard units are now 21 Infantry divisions and 6 armored divisions, an increase in armored strength. There are also 2,614 nondivisional units, including 9 regimental combat teams, 9 armored cavalry regiments, 123 antiaircraft battalions, and 74 field artillery battalions.

The Air National Guard is organized in 27 combat wings. At full strength there may be a maximum of 75 planes to a wing. These include 87 fighter, light bomber, and tactical reconnaissance squadrons and various support units. Of the strength of 7,900 officers, scheduled to be reached next June 30, 3,950 will be pilots.

Two types of guard units, both assigned to air defense, are now in a semiactive alert status and in a far higher state of readiness than in any prior peacetime period. Selected National Guard antiaircraft battalions in many critical industrial and population areas have taken over from the Regular Army the duty of full-time manning of antiaircraft-gun positions.

Ninety- and 120-millimeter antiaircraft guns, many now manned by the Guard, supplement the Nike guided missile battalions manned by the Regular Army.

This replacement of the Regular Army by the guard at selected sites will continue progressively until mid-1957. Crews of 15 National Guardsmen, hired as civilians, man the gun sites around the clock. They are supplemented by the remainder of the personnel in the battalions, who drill one night a week on the guns and are available at all times for emergency calls at their nearby homes and places of business.

All the 87 squadrons of the Air National Guard are on a 24-hour-a-day-7-day-a-week duty call basis.

Some selected air units, equipped with modern day jet fighters, are on immediate alert or runway alert status to aid the Air Defense Command against a sneak enemy attack. These units are prepared to be airborne and combat ready within 5 minutes, 24 hours a day, every day in the year.

Combat crews for these special units are rotated, and are on active duty for the time they serve in the runway alert status.

What Makes a Good Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Makes a Good Newspaper," which appeared in the Sisseton, S. Dak., Courier on January 5, 1956. The Sisseton Courier, published by Mrs. Grace Adams and her son, Jack, is highly respected in its own community as well as in newspaper circles throughout the State of South Dakota.

There being no obection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MAKES A GOOD NEWSPAPER

A good newspaper, first of all, should have a decent regard for truth. It should report the truth, without fear or favor, and then it should comment on and analyze what the truth means. A good newspaper ought to "comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable."

But the job of presenting the news objectively is one of the hardest jobs given the mind of man. What is objectivity? A reporter begins with a sheet of blank paper. But he also begins with his own selective mind which must sift out the wheat and chaff; if you, as reader, think it is easy, try to write in 7 or 8 paragraphs a speech which takes an hour to deliver. Try to be fair and transmit to the reading audience the heart of what the speaker is trying to convey.

"Achievement in such matters is hardly given to man," observed the late great editor of the Manchester Guardian, C. P. Scott. "We can but try, ask pardon for shortcomings, and there leave the matter."

Along with its feeling of responsibility and fairness a good newspaper must try to be reasonably interesting and entertaining. For if it is dull and poorly written it will not be read, and its influence will diminish.

This is a good time for newspaper readers to examine their responsibility to the cause of a free, unfettered press and their obligation to protect the press both from the "disreputable twins of dignity and docility."

Thomas Jefferson said if he had to choose between a free press and a free government, he would choose a free press. What he said 150 years ago is still true today. The press ought to be the conscience of the community, the State, and the Nation.

An enlightened public can help keep it that way.

The Supreme Court Decision on Segregation in the Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Setting Aside the 10th Amendment Is Not Liberalism," published in the State of January 16, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SETTING ASIDE THE 10TH AMENDMENT IS NOT LIBERALISM

"Today the Supreme Court has proclaimed that the Federal judiciary has the right to determine who shall or shall not attend public schools. This disregards the wishes of the States as expressed in their laws and respective constitutions. It is a short step now to selection of teachers and to the designation of a curriculum by Federal authority."

The above words do not come from some Southern newspaper, conscious that the Supreme Court has stepped beyond all bounds granted it by the Constitution of the United States, but from the nationally circulated weekly, U. S. News & World Report, and its editor, David Lawrence.

Quoting the 10th amendment which reads, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people," Mr. Lawrence commented that, "Time was when the 10th amendment * * * was as sacred as any other provisions of the Bill of Rights, about which we hear so much from today's 'liberals'."

Elsewhere on this page, the full editorial from U. S. News & World Report is reprinted, and we suggest that it be read. Therefore we shall deal with it here only in epitome.

The title of the editorial is "A Call to Liberalism." The point is made that "liberalism has been undergoing a strong erosion. The so-called liberalism of today is a philosophy of coercionism in conflict with the spirit and letter of the Constitution. It is not true liberalism. Time was when liberalism meant freedom from excessive government—freedom from encroachment upon the rights of the people."

But today this is not true.

"Control of education, of course, was one of the powers reserved to the States and to the people," it is pointed out. "No power of the Federal judiciary has until recently been exercised to set forth standards of education or to examine the rule upon physiological influences that may or may not prevail in the classroom * * *.

"Today's 'liberal' acquiesces in this usurpation of power."

As we have commented in these columns before, the dawn seems to be breaking. These seems to be a growing realization that the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954,

affects more than school segregation—that it cuts a deep gash in the body of a great American principle, guaranteed under the Constitution. The ruling has meaning far beyond its immediate application. Yet the very branch of government set up to protect the rights of States and of people under the Constitution is the one to toss the 10th amendment into the ashcan.

The Lawrence editorial takes up other instances in which the sacredness of the 10th amendment is violated, but we shall not go into them here. We shall quote, however, the concluding paragraph of his timely comment:

"True liberalism must be revived in America. It means a government of laws under a written Constitution—not a government by the caprice of men who temporarily hold public office * * *.

"There is only one course for the true liberal—to oppose the ideology of those who, in the name of emergency, expedience, convenience, or profit would forsake both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution."

A Balanced Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the question is frequently asked, "Why balance the budget?" In the December 11, 1955, issue of This Week magazine, former President Herbert Hoover gave an excellent answer which to my thinking should be brought to the attention of all Americans. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this brief article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY BALANCE THE BUDGET?
(By Herbert Hoover)

Question: Wendell W. Vaughn, of Dallas, Tex., asks: "Is it possible for our Government to balance the budget without disturbing our present level of prosperity?"

Because former President Hoover's recent report on the Government has a direct bearing on the problem, we turned to him.

Answer: To help answer that question, let me say that we now have, for the first time, a complete stem-to-stern, top-to-bottom picture of the functions of the executive branch of the Federal Government.

In the past there have been plenty of studies and surveys—I've made some myself. But this one is different. The first Commission study of 6 years ago was conducted for the most part department by department, agency by agency. This resulted in better organization within the executive office and the departments, in greater efficiency and considerable savings. But our second investigation took a look across practically the entire picture, from department to department, to find out how and where similar functions are being carried on in other departments or agencies.

When these similar functions are arranged cheek by jowl, the waste and overlappings show up in a spectacular manner. For instance:

There are 26 agencies engaged in some kind of medical care with five separate hospital systems and 40 percent empty beds.

Some 104 agencies engage in lending or guaranteeing loans, or insurance activities, amounting to some $240 billion—apart from the public debt and social security.

Various United States agencies conduct some 3,000 businesses in competition with private enterprise.

These are only three instances of the functions we investigated. There are 17 other investigations and reports, with recommendations. Added together, if we could eliminate the waste, we could balance the budget and make a handsome reduction of taxes for every family in our country, without lessening our defense or welfare activities. Of course, we stepped on the corns of some pressure groups, but most of the proposals are not controversial.

All this leads to a whole set of questions that often comes my way:

"Why balance the budget anyway? What difference does it make? Aren't we having good times? And if so, what is wrong about going along as we are with an unbalanced budget—what's wrong about a budget deficit?"

The answer is that for any nation there is great danger in unbalanced budgets. Without going into the detailed steps, the poison of an unbalanced budget is that every time the Government borrows money from the banks to meet a deficit it inflates credit or currency or both. This process has a twin poison also when the Government expands installment credit by loans without sufficient equity or other checks. We are doing both these things. For most of 23 years we have had deficits and for some 10 years constant inflation through installment credit.

A theory is advanced that we can keep down prices and the cost of living and thus inflation by increased production and consequent sharper competition. It might conceivably work in some circumstances if the industries by lowering prices could still earn enough to increase their plants—but this is doubtful. We have tried a similar theory in agriculture with dire results to the farmer, the consumer and the Treasury.

For the last 2 years we had a fairly steady cost of living—the best index of purchasing power. But we should not fool ourselves. That period has proved to be only temporary. Again, wages and prices are increasing, and they will express themselves in increased cost of living. There is only one way to stop this upward spiral. That is, to keep taxes sufficiently high, reduce government expenses and curb credit inflation generally until we are in balance.

Those hardest hit by this inflation spiral are the people in the white-collar, salaried groups and those who live on pensions, savings, interest, rents, and other fixed income. The value of all savings-bank deposits, life-insurance policies, annuities and retirement funds, the purchasing power of our college and hospital endowments go down, all amid tragedies and distress for millions of families.

WHAT $3,840 BUYS TODAY

If anyone does not believe this, he had better look at the past twenty-odd years of unbalanced budgets, expanded credit and taxes. Today, a family requires an annual income of almost $3,840 to obtain the same goods provided by $1,500 23 years ago.

I could cite a dozen nations whose economies and representative governments have been wrecked because of failure to apply these brakes. The difficulty of all representative governments the world over is that the legislative representatives find no political profit in keeping taxes up, reducing expenses, or curtailing easy loans.

Moreover, the host of debtors like inflation for, in effect, it reduces loans and mortgages. And there is another ally of inflation in the host of holders of equities in lands and stock who like it also. So also do speculators.

In 1927–29, when I had the duty to warn and protest against the inflation then going on, I was frequently told, "This time it is different; this is a new economic era." I read the same slogans again today. Even in a partly free economy, Old Man Economic Law is a grim reaper. It is time to stop, look, and listen.

Regulation of Natural Gas Producers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "If Gas Producers Can Be Regulated, So Can the Corner Grocer," published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 21, 1956. The editorial pertains to the bill now being debated by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF GAS PRODUCERS CAN BE REGULATED, SO CAN THE CORNER GROCER

There is a shocking absence of understanding about the potentially destructive results of governmental regulation of individual enterprise. For evidence we refer you in advance to arguments made against the Fulbright bill.

The Fulbright bill is the Senate version of the Harris bill passed by the House last session. Both seek to release producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. In June 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that FPC should regulate such producers, although the Natural Gas Act of 1938 had specifically stated that it should not.

This is not a remote legalistic controversy. It involves a housewife in a Chicago suburb who learns with dismay that she cannot obtain the inexpensive natural-gas service which she had expected for cooking and heating in her new house. At about the same time an Oklahoma housewife flips a switch in her house and a light glows. These two events are related. The electricity which fired the Oklahoma lamp bulb was generated in a utility plant fueled by the natural gas which had been intended for the Chicago housewife, but which she didn't get.

The reason for the diversion is simple. Oklahoma gas producers had planned to deliver to a pipeline a supply of natural gas which would have served the Chicago housewife and 265,000 waiting Illinoisans. But when the Supreme Court ruled that sales of gas by producers across State lines were to be regulated—that is, price-fixed—Oklahoma producers abandoned negotiations for the sale. Instead they sold their product within their own State, a transaction that was exempt from FPC control.

So many natural-gas producers were alarmed by regulation that the volume of gas committed to large interstate pipelines in 1954 declined approximately two-thirds from 1953, a loss to prospective consumers of more than 4 trillion cubic feet. And in 1955, drillers completed 10 percent fewer gas wells than in the previous year, while at the same time oil-well completions rose.

Those who want regulation speak in the name of consumers who are supposed to believe that Federal regulation of producers is

needed to curb monopoly and keep cost at a reasonable level.

Take cost first. The argument is that natural-gas producers, although competing against one another in discovery, production, and sale of gas reserves, are in a position to hike the gas bills of city consumers unless they are controlled. Why, then, in the years 1928 to 1954, when producers were free, did gas costs in the field rise less than one-fourth as much as the cost of living? Moreover, the cost of natural gas in the field on the average is only 10 percent of the city consumer's bill. Ninety percent lies in transmission and distribution—two services which are properly under utility-type regulation because they enjoy certain monopolies. Anyway the proposed legislation contains specific protection for the consumer from unwarranted price increases.

But aren't the producers of natural gas a monopoly? There are 8,000 of them, none producing as much as 5 percent of the total. If they constitute a monopoly, then three-quarters of American industries are in exactly the same class, since natural-gas production is less concentrated in number of owners than are most industries.

It is curious that those who most violently predict high cost and monopoly are blind to the fact that regulation of producers will inevitably bring about exactly what they profess to fear. Natural gas has been cheap because it could be bought and distributed in a volume huge enough to distribute the expense of pipelines and city mains among millions of consumers. Cut down that volume and a smaller number of consumers will have to bear the transmission and distribution costs. Houeshold bills will go up, not down, and unwillingness of producers to sell outside their own States could eventually deprive distant consumers of gas altogther.

What, then, becomes of the monopoly charge? A producer cannot gouge a consumer with whom he will not deal. The monopoly will become one of States, not of people, as producing States not only keep their gas at home but as a consequence attract industries from consumer States into their own areas. This is already happening. More than half of all natural gas is now consumed in the States where it is produced.

There is another sinister threat in this controversy. The regulation of producers of natural gas is the first example of regulation of a competitively produced commodity. It would hardly be the last. Natural gas is more often than not intermixed with oil production. Could we regulate the gas and not the oil from the same field? Then why not coal, lumber, iron and on right into a complete statist straitjacket?

Sometimes we wonder if this is not the goal which the regulation advocates have had their eye on all along.

Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with the forthcoming consideration of appropriations for foreign aid, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an editorial entitled "The Unanswered Question," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on December 21, 1955, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—THE UNANSWERED QUESTION

Secretary of State Dulles yesterday clarified an unofficial report that the administration would ask nearly $5 billion for foreign aid in the next fiscal year, as against some $2.7 billion it got this year. But the clarification still leaves a lot unclear.

The administration does plan to ask Congress to authorize further foreign spending of some $4.9 billion, Mr. Dulles explained. As is customary in these matters, however, the $4.9 billion, if received, would be added to the foreign aiders' reserves, or carryover funds. Some of it would be spent next fiscal year, some later.

In this way, thanks to generous carryovers from the past, the administration is actually spending about $4.2 billion this fiscal year on foreign aid, not just the $2.7 billion it received at the start of the year. Next year, actual spending is supposed to be only about $200 million higher than this year's.

So the impression is left that the furor over a huge increase" in foreign aid was just a tiny tempest in a bureaucratic cornucopia, based on a misunderstanding of Government gobbledygook.

This impression is misleading. It is perfectly true that the difference between the money Congress authorizes and the money actually spent in a given period can be considerable. It is not true that the authorization has no relation to spending.

A sum of $4.9 billion authorized for foreign aid is $4.9 billion to be spent, whether next year or the year after. It is $2.2 billion more to be spent than could be spent if the administration were to ask only as much as it received this year. It is, in short, an additional $4.9 billion to be extracted from all of our pockets.

The administration argument is that unless it has this addition to its foreign-aid reserves, which will amount to some $7 billion at the end of this fiscal year, it will be unable to continue actual foreign-aid spending at current levels. But that is exactly the point; the spending should not be continued at present levels. Congress, by cutting requested authorizations, has repeatedly served notice to that effect.

The significance of the new request is the opposite; the administration wants to continue spending $4 billion or more a year indefinitely. Why? One big reason advanced is the continuing need for heavy military aid. It is said, for example, that a lot of the weapons we have been sending abroad are growing old and have to be replaced.

Well, naturally, if this country is going to undertake the replacement of its original gifts, there can be no end to the thing. It might be supposed that after $50 billion worth of aid in the last 10 years, much of it military, the recipients would be able to take care of their own replacements. If not, the military-aid program was remarkably ill-conceived. Certainly this kind of perpetual drain was not contemplated by Congress.

As long as the foreign aiders will have $7 billion or so on hand at the end of this fiscal year, there is nothing much Congress can do about spending in the next fiscal year. But there is a great deal Congress can do about this forthcoming request for nearly $5 billion more. Only by holding firm against such demands can Congress hope even to control future foreign spending, much less bring it to a long-overdue end.

And, as the administration attitude makes abundantly clear, the question of when it is to end is one that only Congress can clarify.

What Meat Ax?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from a recent issue—January 4, 1956, page 12—of the Wall Street Journal:

WHAT MEAT AX?—HOOVER GROUP USES CAREFUL SCALPEL ON BIG GOVERNMENT

(By John Chamberlain)

When Congress starts talking this session about turning the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission on Government reorganization into law, the uproar is apt to be terrific.

The issue is joined between those who think the projected reorganizations would give us modern streamlined Government and those who think they would take us back to the days of Calvin Coolidge. The controversy will have its first airings in Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY's Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations and in Representative DAWSON's comparable body in the House.

The very magnitude of the sums involved—$6 to $8 billion is the Hoover Commission's estimate of possible annual savings in the cost of Government—means that vested interests will combine in the effort to kill any proposed legislation. Six or more billions means a lot of porkchops, perquisites, subsidies and the prolongation of ancient bureaucratic habits. Because so many perquisites are threatened, the Hoover critics have been more loudly vocal than the voluntary Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Indeed, the propaganda against the Report has been first-rate of its kind—and any story on the Hoover Commission's accomplishments must begin by clearing the air.

The reason why the Hoover Commission has particularly worried its critics is inherent in the Commission's original mandate. Back in 1953 it was empowered by a unanimous vote of Congress to consider the worth of Federal policies as well as functions and programs. Looking at the mandate to consider policy, and basing their fears on what is contained in certain task force reports which were by no means accepted in their entirety in the Commission's final recommendations, the critics of the Commission have jumped to some pretty wild conclusions.

FROM ALL DIRECTIONS

The Commission has been accused of trying to turn the clock back past Coolidge's time to McKinley's. Public-power groups have scented a plot to asphyxiate the Rural Electrification Administration and to hand TVA over to the power lobby. Dean Acheson, a member of the first Hoover Commission, has whacked the second commision in his recent book for departing from Fair Dealism. The Secretary of the Navy, a Republican, has remarked that the Commission is out to destroy the Eisenhower administration. And the American Legion has even charged the Commission with trying to socialize medicine merely because it had the temerity to recommend a means test for veterans who look to Government to pay hospital charges for non-service-connected disabilities.

The important point to note, however, is that nowhere has the Commission attacked

spending as such. Despite the minority views of certain members of a group that has been bipartisan since its inception, the Commission as a whole has not adopted an a priori position against the welfare state in laying down its recommendations. It has never questioned the power of Government to increase social services, or to intervene in the economic process, or to spend for the general welfare.

Indeed, the first thing that strikes the reader of the Commission's own recommendations (as distinct from some of its task-force reports) is the mildness and sweet reasonableness of their tone. Even more flabbergasting to one who has listened to the critics is the discovery that, in many instances, the Commission has actually recommended an increase in Government spending for certain things.

The rationale behind the Commission's recommendation of certain increases is that quality of service, if sustained by appropriations not now being made, will pay off in unforeseen ways over the long run. For example, there is the recommendation that calls for the establishment of a senior civil service. In ex-President Hoover's own mind, this is the most important of all the Commission's recommendations.

In combing over the whole question of Government personnel, the Commission discovered a woeful paucity of good men in the positions just below those of noncareer and policymaking administrators. To fill the yawning gap the Commission recommended the addition of some 1,500 civil servants with senior status, at salaries ranging from $10,800 to $17,500. It also recommended doubling the number of noncareer officials from 7,000 to 14,000.

All of this would cost considerably more money than the civil service now requires. But members of the Commission think it would result in more efficient Government—and efficiency would create its own ultimate savings.

The Hoover Commission Report on Research and Development in the Government also contains recommendations for increased spending, both within the Department of Defense and outside of it. For basic research in the Department of Defense, the Commission urged an increase above its present $20 million of annual expenditure. It also advocated more money for basic medical research.

THE PRACTICAL FACT

In the extremely controversial field of water resources and power the Commission rejected its own task force's recommendation that Federal power projects be sold to private industry. "We do not entertain the idea of the sale of dams and their powerhouses," said the Commission. "Nor do we entertain the idea that the electrical facilities in these multipurpose projects could be sold to private enterprise."

All through the Commission's reports there runs a vein of bipartisan respect for the practical fact. The Federal Government is in the abaca, or hemp-raising business in Central America. Remembering that the Japanese cut United States access to Eastern Hemisphere hemp in 1941, the Hoover Commission recommended continuing the Federal abaca program as a strategic measure. Similarly with the federally financed Cuba Nickel Co., the Commission wanted this continued, and advocated its transfer to the General Services Administration.

In Alaska the Government runs a railroad, complete with certain ancillary hotels and commercial services. Although the Commission urged the Government to sell the hotels, it did not advise it to get rid of its railroad.

The Bureau of Mines has had a long-standing program of extracting oil from shale. Since oil from shale has never yet been able to compete with oil from Texas, Venezuela, or Saudi Arabian wells, it might seem logical to argue that money could easily be saved by closing down the program. Nevertheless, the Commission recommended that the Government-supported extraction of oil from shale be continued "until cost data under new methods are fully available." In other words, let the Bureau of Mines spend money for educational purposes that may help industry when oil from shale has become a necessity.

ADDING TO THE BUDGET

Details such as these can be plucked from the Commission reports like raisins from a piece of raisin bread. Moreover, the Commission's concern for the quality of overall control of Government business has led it to suggest the creation of administrative devices such as a new Federal Water Resources Board inside the White House, to be composed of Cabinet officials plus five public members. While the creation of such a Board would undoubtedly help to eliminate the duplication of functions and services within the Department of Interior, the TVA, the Army Engineers, and the Department of Agriculture, it would add something to the Federal budget in itself.

In the light of the Hoover Commission's concern for the quality of Government administration as something that stands quite apart from the question of spending, the attacks on the Commissioners for cheeseparing and for wielding a meat ax fall rather flat. Indeed, the Commission might logically be criticized for not going far enough in its advocacy of smaller, less costly Government. But politics and logic are not always compatible—and it is important to see the Commission for what it is.

Eisenhower Versus Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 16, an editorial which our distinguished colleague, WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, asked me to insert in the RECORD for the attention of every Member of Congress.

My good friend, Congressman MCCULLOCH, is sincerely concerned, and many of us share this concern, over the enormous agricultural surpluses that have been built up over these past many years. This is a serious problem—it deserves a straightforward approach toward solution—but the capricious captain of Battery B is at it again.

While the Plain Dealer has correctly found Harry Truman's latest volley to be sheer nonsense, I hope that each of my colleagues will read this accurate and well-written rebuttal to the erroneous line the former President is attempting to sell.

The editorial follows:

EISENHOWER VERSUS TRUMAN

Former President Truman has returned to the political wars, and he hasn't changed a bit. In a speech at St. Paul, Minn., Saturday, he had the audacity to charge that President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson were responsible for the "mess in agriculture."

There were two things that Mr. Truman conveniently overlooked. One was that the decline in prices of farm products began long before Mr. Eisenhower took office. The other was that Mr. Truman's own agricultural policy was responsible for overproduction and the constantly mounting surpluses, the existence of which tends to depress prices.

The former President obviously was attempting to answer statements made by President Eisenhower in his farm program message to Congress last week. In that message the President said:

"Of the many difficulties that aggravate the farm problem, mountainous surpluses overshadow everything else. Today's surpluses consist of commodities produced in a volume imperatively needed in wartime, but unmarketable in peacetime at the same prices and in the same quantity.

"The plain fact is that wartime production incentives were too long continued. * * * Today, almost without regard to the livestock or crop he produces, nearly every farmer is adversely affected by our surpluses."

So what does Mr. Truman propose should be done about it? He said it would help if price supports were restored to 90 percent of parity—in other words, to continue wartime production incentives and pile up more surpluses.

It has been said that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but Mr. Truman evidently believes he can fool all the farmers all of the time. Or are farmers smarter than Mr. Truman thinks they are?

Misinformation About the Farm-Loan Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of misinformation has been published in recent weeks about the participation of large farms in the farm-loan program.

Several of the cases of large loan participation cited in reports issued by the Department of Agriculture, and picked up by various newspapers and magazines, involve farmers of whom I have personal knowledge. In none of the cases was the cotton sold to the Government. It was placed in the loan to help promote an orderly marketing of cotton, usually at the urgent request of the Department of Agriculture. The cotton was later withdrawn from the loan, and the Government paid the interest required by law. In most cases the Government probably profited by the transaction.

As an example of the real facts in one case, I include a copy of a letter to the magazine U. S. News & World Report, from C. R. Sayre, president of the Delta Pine & Land Co., of Scott, Miss.:

DELTA PINE & LAND CO. OF MISSISSIPPI,
Scott, Miss., January 8, 1956.

MR. CARSON F. LYMAN,
Managing Editor, U. S. News & World Report, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LYMAN: My attention has been directed to the article, Not All Farmers Are In Trouble, in the December 30 issue of your publication.

I am sure that you and your staff are trying most diligently to make a real contribution toward providing an adequate perspective for your readers at this important juncture in farm-policy matters. With that in mind you should correct several errors in the article to which I refer.

First, in the second paragraph the article states, "Since the market was below the 'loan' price at the end of the marketing year, the company kept the money, turning the cotton over to the Government to pay off the loan." The facts are as follows: Out of the 7,554 bales of Delta & Pine Land Co. cotton which went into the loan from the 1954 crop only 68 remain in the loan. Here is a part of the background for our use of the loan program. The United States Department of Agriculture urged an increase in cotton production from less than 10 million bales in 1950 to 16 million bales for each of the years 1951 and 1952. As the stocks began to pile up cotton growers were urged to follow an "orderly marketing program" rather than flood the market at harvest time.

May I use our company's cotton loan operations for the 1953 and the 1954 crops to show both the sequence and the net results of orderly marketing, as it relates to the Commodity Corporation funds.

1953 crop

	Placed in Government loan		Withdrawn from Government loan		
	Bales	Amount	Bales	Amount	Interest paid
1953—September	1,094	$203,077.78	4	$717.90	$0.31
October	2,080	367,285.05	70	11,867.51	21.75
November	3,153	547,905.46	476	80,357.56	291.49
December	893	151,224.38	1,450	361,161.92	1,518.90
1954—January	10	1,773.00	589	98,168.21	570.63
February			392	63,922.24	375.02
March			2,240	397,346.94	6,018.80
April			325	59,640.99	1,177.56
May			139	24,216.40	462.65
September			2	373.38	12.90
1955—March			9	1,612.78	67.24
April			485	85,901.98	4,804.70
May			483	86,233.77	5,327.47
June			485	86,136.05	5,656.49
July			5	947.56	67.33
Total loan	7,230	1,271,265.67	7,154	1,258,605.19	26,373.24
Withdrawn	7,154	1,258,605.19			
Loan balance	76	12,660.48			

1954 crop

	Placed in Government loan		Withdrawn from Government loan		
	Bales	Amount	Bales	Amount	Interest paid
1954—September	1,424	$257,286.19			
October	1,939	339,241.31	173	$29,682.92	$19.21
November	3,910	650,556.01	539	86,311.86	140.62
December	245	39,060.63	90	14,544.04	42.28
1955—January	14	2,233.10	431	70,980.92	331.77
February			3,060	523,099.34	4,712.92
March	22	4,096.01	10	1,505.49	13.44
April			863	149,936.22	2,334.57
May			864	148,820.85	2,689.67
June			864	148,761.94	3,098.69
July			592	108,328.46	2,985.22
Total loan	7,554	1,292,473.25	7,486	1,281,972.04	16,368.39
Withdrawn	7,486	1,281,972.04			
Loan balance	68	10,501.21			

You will note that only 76 bales remained in the loan from the 1953 crop and, as noted above, 68 remain in the loan from the 1954 crop. The total CCC funds tied up for those 2 years is $33,161.69 insofar as our cotton is concerned. Currently, the market value for those 1 1/16-inch and 1 3/32-inch staple length cottons is very close to the 1953 and 1954 loan values. So, at most, the CCC could only have lost the storage costs on the 144 bales of cotton. Storage costs on the remainder were paid by our company as the cotton was redeemed from the loan.

The last sentence in paragraph 2 is incorrect, also. The article states, "No interest was charged on the loan under Federal law." I have included the interest paid by this company for cotton loans for the 1953 and 1954 crops in the above tabulations. The total for the 2 years is $42,741.63. The 1953 cotton loans carried a 4-percent rate of interest. The 1954 rate was 3.5 percent.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand why your Messrs. Vanderschmidt and Ragsdale would conduct an interview here a few weeks ago without attempting to get the facts for this particular area of farm policy when your heading indicates, "This article represents the result of extensive research on a problem of outstanding importance." The subsequent publication of the interview without corrections, such as the above, will imply that I concur in the statements in this article in the December 30 issue. It would appear to be highly desirable that the interview should not be published or it should be revised to permit me to correct such inaccuracies.

Without reference to the interview it seems to me that you should publish the full story of CCC loan operations and not just a part of the story. I believe we agree that farm-policy problems are sufficiently confused without the distorting slants of your special report of December 30.

I trust that you will give this matter early consideration and that you will move appropriately to provide your readers with the facts.

Cordially yours,

CHARLES R. SAYRE.

Segregation in the Public Schools of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on January 9, 1956, Virginians voted overwhelmingly to continue segregation of the races in the public schools of Virginia. The issue was simple and clear cut. I am proud of the great progress that Virginia has made in building up a great public school system. We have a splendid system but on May 17, 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States of America struck our school system a staggering blow which will eventually wreck our schools unless the proper steps are taken to combat the decision. The only hope to save public education in Virginia is the will and the determination of our people to resist tyranny on every occasion and to fight the grasping usurpation of power on the part of those people in this country who would change the habits, customs, mores and traditions of the people of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

The white and Negro races in Virginia each have much to be proud of. We have a fine relationship between the two races. If let alone by outside influence of misguided people we can work out our problems to the mutual satisfaction and advantage of all. I am convinced that if we are to remain strong and aggressive and continue to progress, we must keep intact the integrity and identity of the two races. I believe that mongrelization of the races will lead to deterioration of the stability of the people of our State and will be ruinous to our advancement as a people. Our people are not going to accept integration of the races in the public schools or the mongrelization of the races. We in Virginia are fighting for a principle that we know to be right and just. We know that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in declaring segregation in the public schools unconstitutional was without authority in law. The Court, against all legal precedent, followed the theory of a foreign-born sociologist who, I am informed, has connections with several groups that have been listed as subversive. This means that we can no longer anticipate what the Court might do or where it might strike next. The Constitution is simply what the nine judges might say it is. They have abrogated unto themselves rights, privileges, and authority that were never given them by the people of this Nation. We of Virginia cannot sit idly by and see the privileges and rights of our people taken from them against their will and in violation of the Constitution by a Court following the theories of a foreign-born sociologist who knows nothing of the ways, habits, customs, traditions, and mores of our people. To stand idle at a time like this would be traitorous to our forefathers

as well as to our children and grandchildren. We must not fail by supinely submitting to such desecration. One of the men who has been in the forefront of the fight to continue our way of life in Virginia has been the Honorable W. M. TUCK, Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth District of Virginia. Representative TUCK is one of the outstanding men of our generation. On every occasion he has been in the forefront fighting to preserve the rights of the people. On January 5, 1956, at Farmville, Va., in my congressional district, Governor TUCK delivered to a large audience an address which in my opinion states the issue clearly and distinctly. Under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith the address of the Honorable W. M. TUCK:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT, VIRGINIA, JARMAN HALL, LONGWOOD COLLEGE, FARMVILLE, VA., JANUARY 5, 1956

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to have this opportunity of appearing before you in support of the proposed constitutional convention in the election to be held on January 9, 1956. I intend to go to the polls early on that date and vote for the convention and to do everything I can appropriately do to insure a large majority at my precinct and in my home county of Halifax.

The issue is a simple one. It concerns itself only with the amendment of section 141 of the Virginia constitution, which at present forbids the appropriation of public money for the support of any school or institution not wholly owned or controlled by the State or some political subdivision thereof. The proposed amendment will authorize the general assembly, if in its discretion it deems wise so to do, to enact a law making it possible for the State and the localities to appropriate public funds or make available grants in aid to individual parents or pupils who wish to attend a private nonsectarian school. These grants will apply to both races alike.

We do not vote next Monday on whether we shall have public schools or on any of the many other extraneous matters which have crept into the debate on this subject. The only question at issue next Monday is: Shall there be a constitutional convention to amend section 141 of the Virginia Constitution to authorize the general assembly to enact a law which will permit the State and localities to make funds available to parents who wish to send their sons and daughters to private nonsectarian schools. There is nothing in this proposal to require the general assembly to do anything. It simply expands the constitution to give our representatives more leeway and latitude in dealing with this important and far-reaching subject.

The people of this great Commonwealth understand the problem confronting us. The question is, shall we operate our schools according to the time honored policy of local self-government, or shall we supinely submit to an unwarranted attack upon our rights and liberties and be forced to integrate?

In this matter there is no middle ground. We cannot harmonize, compromise, or temporize. The issue must be met head on. I have said from the very time that this iniquitous decision was rendered, and I shall repeat at every opportunity, that in Virginia we do not intend to send our children to mixed schools.

I have held public office in Virginia for 35 years. There are few others in Virginia now living who have been thus honored and for so long. I shall ever cherish the honors conferred and the trusts imposed, but I would be unfaithful and unworthy if I did not in this tragic hour of our history speak frankly and unequivocably on this subject so close to our hearts and so vital to the welfare and safety of us all. Whether it is popular or unpopular, expedient or inexpedient, polite or impolite, I want it distinctly understood that I am opposed to the mixing and the intermingling of the races in our schools, and I intend to use whatever power and influence I may have to prevent it.

If stating these unequivocal and positive views on this inflammatory subject requires that I be classified as an immoderate or extremist, I will without cringing bear the odium. There is one thing certain: it will never be said of me that I collaborated and that I joined up, directly or indirectly, or in any other way, with our traducers, who would not only expose us to calumny and shame, but who would if they could, encompass the complete destruction of our way of life. We must not let them do it.

This is the issue and I hope and believe that the people of Virginia will be Virginians and vote like Virginians, and will give the proposal an overwhelming endorsement. Although I would warn against overconfidence and taking too much for granted and urge that every possible pro voter to go to the polls next Monday, I predict with complete confidence that the proposed constitutional convention will carry by a substantial majority. Thus, we will have brushed aside with a resounding voice the spurious statements and charges which have been spread to becloud the clear-cut issue.

The constitutional proposal originated with the commission headed by Senator Gray and composed of 32 members of the general assembly from all sections of Virginia and various schools of political thought, who, after giving more than a year's study and consideration to the subject, unanimously recommended it. Governor Stanley approved the proposed constitutional amendment and recommended its adoption. The general assembly at its recent special session approved the amendment by a vote of 131 of its 140 members, with 3 absent. It is a nonpartisan matter, because all Virginians, irrespective of political party affiliations, are affected and have a deep interest therein. In fact, it comes to us on a nonpartisan basis. The referendum was approved by every Republican in the House of Delegates and by all Democrats except 5, and in the Senate by all Democrats and 2 Republicans with only 1 Republican voting against.

I commend the Governor and the general assembly on the forthright, dignified, and patriotic manner in which they approached the consideration of this problem. In fact, one of the many things for which Virginia is noted and for which she has a just right to be proud is the high caliber of her legislators. Hon. John H. Daniel and Senator James D. Hagood from this legislative and senatorial district are examples of the high qualities of character and leadership which mark the membership of the bodies to which they belong. I am sure that the voters of this district would have no hesitancy in trusting them with matters of public concern and involving the education and training of their children.

I cannot find words sufficient and adequate to commend the people of Prince Edward County for their courage and forthrightness in standing firm against this infamous assault upon our rights. The people of Prince Edward County have enhanced the standing of Virginia and have made pages of history which will ever be cherished by patriots everywhere. Had it not been for your firm and unswerving stand, I fear that we would have already had integration.

I also commend the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties, in which I am proud to hold membership, for its defense of the right of the localities to determine what type of school system they shall operate.

There has been created in Virginia much misunderstanding and unnecessary confusion by the opponents of the referendum. Whether it was intended or not, the facts are, a smokescreen has been set up to hide the real issues and to prevent the matter from being settled upon its merits. When these clouds are dispelled and dissipated and we get down to the plain unvarnished facts and naked truth, there is but one question, and that is whether or not we favor or oppose the mixing of the races in the schools. Those who vote for the amendment will be credited as being opposed to the mixing of the races and those who oppose the convention will be considered as favoring the mixing of the races in the schools. As a matter of fact, many, if not most, of the individuals and organizations who publicly oppose the constitutional change have already declared themselves as favoring the integration of the races, and it is my opinion that if you scratch down deep enough the others who have not so publicly declared themselves are at heart true integrationists.

Now as to whether or not the adoption of this amendment will prove to be against the public interest and so destructive of Virginia's institutions, I would, in addition to our governor and the members of the general assembly list as supporters of this change the names of both of our United States Senators, BYRD and ROBERTSON, two of our former governors, Battle and Darden, the latter of whom is a noted educator and president of our highest seat of learning, the University of Virgina, and now delegate to the United Nations. It has also the support of our State board of education, our superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Dowell J. Howard, as well as all former superintendents including Dr. Harris Hart, and Dr. G. Tyler Miller, now president of Madison College, and Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, former president of Longwood College at Farmville, at both of which institutions our Virginia teachers are trained. Dr. Lancaster is so firmly convinced of the necessity and soundness of the program that he has charge of the organizational drive with headquarters in Richmond. He is attempting to see that the people are properly informed as to the facts, and will on January 9 vote for the convention. No persons in Virginia have contributed more to the education and training and culture of the people of Virginia than have these distinguished educators who have devoted a lifetime of service and toil in that field of endeavor. In their endeavors in this direction they are supported by members of school boards, school superintendents, and teachers who have the welfare of Virginia and her people at heart.

The eyes of our Southland and of the Nation are focused upon Virginia and her electorate as never before in recent times. Not in a long time have we had a more challenging situation than that which confronts us. Virginia ranks high in the sisterhood of States, and what we do here may well determine or to a large extent affect the course of other southern States. May the vote on January 9 be a resounding victory for the convention, reflecting the confidence of the people in Virginia leadership, particularly at the educational level, and the course which she is undertaking to establish. May the vote and verdict be such that liberty-loving people everywhere will have a renewed and invigorating faith in the determination of our people to chart their own destiny, free from these evil and extraneous influences from without, which threaten to engulf us and the things which we hold dear.

Unless we choose to resist these outside influences now, the hour may be too late, and we will have accepted without challenge political and judicial doctrines which we hold to be untrue and without foundation.

On December 28, we witnessed in the columns of the newspapers a flagrant and unbridled attempt by outsiders to influence the outcome of next Monday's referendum in favor of integration. It is shocking that this outsider was none other than the United States Department of Justice, and although I have no way of knowing, I have cause to believe that it was the Attorney General of the United States himself. In our daily Virginia newspapers, and in fact all over the Nation, a statement was published as coming from a high Justice Department official in Washington to the effect that such action as we contemplate to set up tuition grants for pupils to attend private schools rather than submit to the unconstitutional act of forced integration of the races would be declared invalid, and that individuals and organizations in Virginia and in the South are being investigated. This self-made and self-appointed law giver and conscriptionist who, for reasons best known to himself, hides behind the cloak of anonymity, would declare the laws of a sovereign State invalid even before they are enacted, and would prevent us in the Commonwealth of Virginia from holding free and untrammeled elections. I demand information as to the authority by which the Justice Department or the Attorney General has set up a secret gestapo to impose upon the people and government of this sovereign Commonwealth a supermonitorship. I dispatched to the Attorney General of the United States a prompt and vigorous protest against this bold and brazen attempt at intimidation and coercion, and I shall continue to make known to those outside meddlers that we do not intend to be bullied by the Attorney General of the United States, the Department of Justice, or others.

In the matter of race relations we have never dealt unkindly with the Negroes. In this regard I can stand upon my record. In 1926 as a young member of the House of Delegates of Virginia I supported the antilynch law enacted at that session recommended by Governor Byrd, the strongest antilynch law on the statute books of any State in the entire Nation. Since that date Virginia has not suffered a single death by lynching. Among other things, during my own term as governor, I recommended in my very first message to the general assembly an appropriation of $15,000 for the establishment of a monument to a Virginia Negro, Booker T. Washington. This appropriation was made, and I know of no other State in the Nation, north or south, that has made an appropriation to memorialize a Negro. I entered an executive order setting up a large sum of money for the establishment of a State park for Negroes in Prince Edward County. I entered another order setting aside a day to be known as Joseph Jenkins Roberts Day in honor of a Virginia-born Negro who became the first president of the Republic of Liberia. On another occasion during my term I drove to a small town on the outskirts of Philadelphia to participate in the dedication of a monument to the Negro composer and musician, James A. Bland, who penned that nostalgic song, "Carry Me Back to Old Virginia." That monument, incidentally, was erected by the Lions Clubs of Virginia, and that song was adopted as our official State song by resolution of the General Assembly of Virginia, and there is not a Negro among the membership of either body. I recommended as governor, and the general assembly enacted into law, the largest single general tax increase in the history of the Commonwealth, of which many millions of dollars went for public health and education among both races. I ask where were these lovers of public education then? They were with us until we passed the collection plate and then they vanished and left us to fight the battle alone. My interest and zeal in the education and training of our youth has not diminished since that time. We must make whatever sacrifice in expenditures and effort as may be necessary to ensure the education of our Virginia children, but in separate schools.

After I returned to my home in South Boston, the late Dr. Roper, director of public health, wrote me that during my term, and upon my recommendations, more money had been appropriated for capital outlay in the eradication of tuberculosis in Virginia than had been appropriated through all the combined years that had intervened from the founding of the Virginia Health Department down to that time, and most of this was spent for Negroes, where the disease existed and where the need was greatest. I cite these facts as to my own record for the purpose of demonstrating that I have never exercised authority conferred upon me by the people in a manner unfair or unjust to any minority group, and what is more I never will.

In Virginia our people, I am glad to say, have on the whole kept themselves free from the faithless and perfidious conduct so characteristic of some of our leaders on the national scale who have not hesitated throughout the years to use the Negro as a political pawn.

These modern-day abolitionists and latter-day reconstructionists know nothing about the Negro and his problems and care less. Their principal interest in the Negro is to use him as a vehicle upon which to ride into high public office and to secure their vote in pivotal States to control the election of Governors, Senators, and Presidents. Their actions remind me of Billy Mahone, of Virginia, who was a brave Confederate general under Lee, but who after the war and in the dark days of reconstruction by making wild and chimerical promises succeeded in forming a coalition among the worst elements of both races in our Commonwealth and captured control of the government of Virginia. He himself was elected to a seat in the United States Senate. John Jasper, the celebrated colored preacher of Richmond, had no faith in Billy Mahone and refused to yield to his blandishments. The colored people excel in at least two particulars in that they have superior powers of illustration, and the other is that they can instantly recognize a gentleman, and vice versa. In order to illustrate his lack of faith in Mahone, the Reverend Jasper told his congregation that he had dreamed of going to heaven and that St. Peter refused him entrance because he was walking. As he dejectedly descended from the pearly heights he met Billy Mahone approaching by foot, his face lighted and filled with hope and ambition. After John had related his difficulties, Mahone replied: "Shucks, John, I can remedy that. Get down on your all fours and I will get on your back and ride you right through the pearly gates and then we wil both be in heaven." John succumbed to his plea, particularly since Mahone weighed less than 100 pounds. After again wending his weary way to the celestial portals with Mahone on his back, the latter knocked, and St. Peter said: "Who comes there?" Mahone replied: "This is United States Senator Billy Mahone, of the Commonwealth of Virginia, late a major general in the Confederate States Army of America." "Are you riding, or are you walking," said the keeper of the gates. "I am riding, sir," replied Mahone. Then the heavenly gates opened and Mahone tied his faithful "horse," John Jasper, on the outside, deserting the vehicle upon which he had gone to glory, and went in to enjoy the pleasures of heaven.

I am proud of the fact, as all patriotic Virginians should be, that the white and colored people have lived here in our Commonwealth in peace and harmony for more than 300 years—longer than any other place in the Western Hemisphere. We understand each other's problems and we have been able to maintain mutual respect. I confidently predict that we will continue to coexist on the same sort of basis despite the handicaps imposed upon us by the decision of the United States Supreme Court, which has inflamed bitterness and anger where it previously existed and has spread it into areas where it did not heretofore exist. It has fostered and provoked anger, discord, and distrust. As harsh as it may seem, I am constrained to say that any Christian gentleman would be ashamed of being the author of such a situation. The dangers and implications of the Supreme Court decision transcend the race question because it threatens to destroy the basic political philosophy upon which our Nation was founded. The Court has undertaken to override the constitutional division of powers by judicial fiat, without respect to its own previous decisions, and in contravention of the same, and in violation likewise of the powers of the legislative branch of the National Government, as well as the constitutional powers of the respective States.

The authority cited for this monstrosity was the maudlin views of at least one sociologist of questionable repute and loyalty, whose name blackens the pages of the reports of the Un-American Activities Committee of the United States House of Representatives. On such authority the Court has attempted to reverse the exact intention of the framers of the Constitution, not by the due processes of constitutional amednment, but by arbitrary decision unrelated to the law precedent or the facts. Because the Supreme Court has strayed so far beyond the constitutional framework, it behooves the people to adopt such measures as may be necessary to restore the traditional balances of power which have raised this Nation to a position of greatness.

For more than 50 years, the Supreme Court of the United States had stood by the principle of separate but equal school facilities for the races. At least five previous decisions of the United States Supreme Court of this period have upheld the constitutional rights of the separate States to control their own schools. It is strange that this long chain of opinions and the constitutions of many States, including our own, should be upset, reversed, nullified and scrapped, jeopardizing the public schools of a large segment of the country, as well as the wishes, traditions and the rights of millions of our citizens.

This is one sample of what can happen when we deviate from government based on the Constitution. Under the cloak of judicial robes a "super legislature" has arisen with a veto power over the rights of the States and the people. It is time that we, through our State governments, reasserted the powers that were reserved to us under the Constitution. On the basis of Constitutional considerations, as well as common sense, the States have every right to operate their public schools as they see fit. We here in Virginia have not become so destitute of mind and character, as well as of ability to govern ourselves, that we are ready to ask anyone to cross over the Potomac and indoctrinate us with false and spurious doctrines that are alien to our American way of life.

If we are to maintain our liberties and freedom as well as our State functions, we have a long, hard fight and rocky road ahead. It will require sacrifice, endurance and patience. If we are to succeed we must unite and stand together. With the weight

of the long line of judicial and historical precedents to support us, and with right on our side, and determination in our hearts, how can we fail in the venture to protect our children and children's children.

What can or shall we do in this momentous hour? There are 2 things we can do, yea, 3 and more. First, we can go out early next Monday morning and vote for the constitutional convention. Secondly, we can join the Defenders of State Sovereignty and Individual Liberties and ally ourselves with that patriotic organization which was conceived in love not hate. Thirdly, we can stand upon the ramparts of liberty unruffled, unashamed and unafraid, and let these impertinent meddlers know that we are determined never to surrender our freedom. We will also let them know that we will not forsake our children and grandchildren who in their innocence and helplessness are now playing around the family fireside and hearthstones and have none but us to whom they can look for deliverance from these flagitious forces who would not only mongrelize them and destroy the identity of both races, but also deprive and deny them and all others the constitutional guarantees for which our forefathers struggled so hard and which we have enjoyed for so long. In such a crises with so much at stake we shall not flag or fail, we will resist to the end. Our children will rise up to love, to praise, and to bless us. They will never, no never, have cause to look upon our faces or reflect upon our memories in dishonor, disdain and scorn. Hence, we will go forth inspired by an infallible and unflagging courage so well exemplified by Napoleon's 14 year old drummer boy on the battle fields of Austerlitz 150 year's ago, to be exact the 5th day of December, 1805, and we will never beat a retreat. In that battle Napoleon's trained soldiers and seasoned troops were retiring from the field in disorder. This brilliant but heartless general and dictator was faced with what he thought was certain defeat and in an effort to restore some semblance of order among his troops, he galloped up on his steed to the 14 year old drummer boy and commanded him to beat a retreat. The young man looked up into the face of his mighty and gallant commander and replied, "Sir, in the Army of Napoleon I have never been taught to beat a retreat, but I can beat a battle charge that will wake the dead upon this field." Napoleon then commanded him to do so. The men of that army were so stirred by the musical notes emanating from the drum, as well as the courage of that boy, that they reformed the battle lines and won the battle of Austerlitz, thus bringing to the Emperor Napoleon and to France one of the most glorious victories ever established on any field of battle in the annals of military history. Sustained by such unfaltering determination and imbued with quality of character which constitutes manhood and which enables us to meet danger with a firmness of spirit that knows no fear, victory on Monday will surely be ours to claim.

In the dark days of World War II when England was being bombarded by day and night and an invasion of the channel and the fall of that country was imminent, the late King George in one of his speeches used this quotation, "I asked the man who stood at the gate of the year to give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown," and he replied, "Go out into the darkness, put your hand into the hand of God, that shall be to you better than a light and safer than a known way."

"God of our fathers, known of old,
Lord of our far-flung battleline,
Beneath whose awful hand we hold
Dominion over palm and pine,
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Liquor in the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Christian Century of December 28, 1955, by Methodist Bishop Gerald Kennedy, of the Los Angeles Area entitled, "Liquor in the Air."

The article follows:

On September 5 my wife and I boarded a Scandinavian Airlines System airliner at the Los Angeles airport and flew to Copenhagen over the Arctic circle. For about an hour before the flight, which took off at 12:01 a. m., liquor was served in a special room at the airport to all passengers desiring it. By the time we were ready to embark the people all around us were drunk, while the usual stupid and raucous noises which accompany drunkenness made sleep impossible for several hours. There was no letup in the serving of liquor, and the fact that it was obvious that a number of people already had too much did not affect the stewards and stewardesses.

In front of us a buxom, slightly more than middle-aged matron got rid of her inhibitions by talking baby talk in a voice with all the mellowness of a finger nail being scraped on a blackboard. Behind us, an elderly man walked around sitting in other people's seats and snarling at his wife, who was trying to make him behave. He never did get sober and was an embarrassing spectacle to all the passengers, as well as a problem for his wife and male secretary. And for the whole flight there was a superabundance and a wide variety of liquors being peddled to anyone who thought he could hold a few more drops.

That was our worst experience, but there have been some other situations that were bad enough. An American Airlines plane from Dallas to Los Angeles had served enough drinks to make the lounge passengers, all men, forget that there was anyone else on the plane. The profanity that burst forth from time to time and the loud talk made the flight like a forced 6 hours in a bar.

Now I am a Methodist and I have certain convictions concerning this whole business. Not everyone shares these convictions, and I will agree that no right has been given me to force them on everyone else. I have no confidence in forced conformity, nor do I desire any unnecessary legal restrictions placed on individual liberty. I despise self-appointed censorship and all pompous guardians of other men's consciences. But I venture to suggest that this drinking in the air does not fall into such categories. To make clear what is in my mind, let me set forth six protests.

1. I protest being forced to listen to drunken conversation. I have to listen to enough useless talk without being overwhelmed with that most stupid of all speech. Commercials on TV can be shut off, but try shutting off a brother who is suffering from the alcoholic delusion that he is a wit or a philosopher. There are few experiences more distressing than being sober yourself and yet having to be in company of inebriated conversationalists.

2. I protest being forced to attend a cocktail party. There are some who like them and apparently they have become a popular part of the social scene. But this does not usually affect me personally, unless I meet someone on the highway returning from one of them. There is a great expanse of the social scene which has no appeal to me anyway, so I simply turn my eyes elsewhere. But you cannot do that on a plane. Even the biggest of them are not larger than a small room. It seems to me amazing that this simple fact is ignored completely by the commercial airline officials.

3. I protest being denied a sober environment on a public carrier. When I ride the train I do not have to stay in the club car, and what goes on there is not of direct immediate concern. When I go out on the *Lurline* to hold the Hawaii mission conference, it is not necessary to spend time in the bar. It is a matter of choice whether or not one goes to the captain's champaigne party. But on an airplane the situation is entirely different. There is no hiding place up there. And I am unreasonable enough to insist that I have a right to sobriety in my immediate environment.

4. I protest having to pay for other people's liquor. I have some Scottish blood which goes up several degrees when I realize that the price of all this drinking is added to passenger fares. Where else could it come from? I am told that the stuff is very expensive and the cost of the liquor locker on a transoceanic flight must be terrific. At the very least, let those who want it pay for it. It just might be one way of cutting down on the consumption.

5. I protest the argument that competition forces the airlines to serve free liquor. We have long ago outgrown the philosophy of public institutions being allowed to do anything they desire in order to increase business. Society assumes the right of regulation and, if necessary, prohibition. If private enterprise will not discipline itself, then it asks for governmental interference. It is a long time since any business leader has said publicly, "The public be damned." But that is what the airlines are saying to a considerable section of the flying public. If I am told to use some other means of transportation if I do not like their policy, the answer is that with life geared to the present tempo I have no choice but to fly. It ought to follow that if there is no alterative, I am deserving of some consideration.

6. I protest the utter disregard of children. I have watched youngsters stare with troubled wonder at the semi-drunken antics of grown men and women. In the old days it was not considered proper for children to be in a saloon, but you may say that times have changed. Not for some of us! We still want our children protected from free-flowing liquor, and we do not believe that this kind of environment is beneficial. The chance of being forced to throw your youngsters into the midst of such a situation for several hours is, to put it in the mildest possible terms, intolerable.

At the risk of summing it all up in the form of an anticlimax: My personal liberty is being interfered with, and it makes me mad.

Resolutions by the Department of Kansas, American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I would like to insert three resolutions which were passed by the Department of Kansas, American Legion Convention, on September 5, 1955, at Hutchinson, Kans.

These resolutions pertain to matters which are of concern to the Congress of the United States, and I feel they are vital and that every Member of Congress should be apprized of the thinking of the membership of the Department of Kansas, American Legion.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION 9

Whereas under existing laws both the Veterans' Administration and the service departments are permitted to independently determine whether or not death in service was incurred in line of duty; and

Whereas in many cases conflicting decisions, based on identical facts, are rendered by the Veterans' Administration and the service departments causing the loss of benefits to deserving survivors, unwarranted embarrassment to families, and numerous other injustices; and

Whereas the service departments base their decisions upon the facts gathered from their own investigation of the conditions under which death occurred and have, therefore, taken a more realistic approach in determining line-of-duty and not-line-of-duty situations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, in convention assembled this 5th day of September 1955, directs the National Rehabilitation Commission to request a more liberal attitude by the Veterans' Administration in determining line-of-duty death.

RESOLUTION 12

Be it resolved, That the Department of Kansas of the American Legion in regular convention in the city of Topeka, September 3–5, 1955, endorse the Veterans' Employment Service and urge the Congress to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Veterans' Employment Service to do adequately the job so essential to the security and welfare of the veteran.

RESOLUTION 13

Be it resolved by the Kansas Department, the American Legion, in convention assembled at Topeka, Kans., this 5th day of September 1955, That we favor and respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to fully staff all veterans' hospitals so that the same may be utilized for the hospitalization and treatment of the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

Higher-Priced Bikes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 22, 1955, entitled "Higher-Priced Bikes":

HIGHER-PRICED BIKES

President Eisenhower's ambivalent decision on the bicycle tariff is the kind one must expect as long as the escape clause is in the Reciprocal Trade Act. Congress must share with the President the reproach for this decision, for it has been constantly whittling away at the act. The protectionist amendments that have been tacked on to it over the years make it difficult if not impossible for the Executive to administer a trade program of the kind so often enunciated by Mr. Eisenhower. His task was complicated by the fact that he was acting on a recommendation of a high-tariff Tariff Commission which is partly his own creation. To his credit he refused to raise the rates as steeply as the Commission proposed. But even so the result will be a 10 percent increase in the price of most bicycles sold in this country.

Under the escape clause, the President is bound, unless he can find compelling reasons to the contrary, to grant relief to an industry when the Tariff Commisison finds that it has been injured by foreign competition. There was strong political pressure on the President to raise the tariff and very little political pressure for him to refuse. He tried to compromise the issue, but his comment that this Nation's "firmly rooted policy of seeking ever expanding levels of international trade and investment is in no way altered by this decision" might better have been left unsaid. The policy has been altered by the President's very act in raising new barriers to international trade. It does not become the President to try to make his decision sound like a victory because it is not quite so bad as it might have been.

Overseas the decision is interpreted as another protectionist move by the United States. It looks to foreign traders too much like another example of the American propensity to talk freer trade until the shoe begins to pinch. The British particularly have reason to be distressed. They created the market for the lightweight bike in the United States. Now the President makes it more difficult for the British to stay in the market here. Yet it might be remembered that while their exports to this country have increased substantially in the last few years the number of bikes manufactured by American companies has remained fairly stable. It is ironic that the world's leading free enterprise country resents this sort of enterprise.

Mr. Eisenhower made it clear in his statement that he believed much of the trouble lay in the lack of enterprise on the part of the American bicycle manufacturers. They have deeply resented this charge in the past. Now, the President said, they are "showing encouraging signs of stirring to meet the challenge from abroad." He sensibly commented that innovations by the industry rather than intervention by the Government "are the domestic industry's real hope for the future." Certainly the industry cannot place any great reliance upon the tariff increase which the President approved. It is too moderate an increase to stem the tide from abroad. But it is large enough to permit a price increase.

The Agricultural Conservation Program in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on December 27, 1955, Mr. Robert M. Koch, executive secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., addressed a letter to members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation. The first paragraph of Mr. Koch's letter was as follows:

I am writing to you and all the other members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation, at the request of the Wisconsin Aglime Producers Association at their annual meeting December 16, at the Park Hotel in Madison.

The letter, aside from an offer to furnish more detailed information, concluded as follows:

If the Wisconsin congressional delegation wants to render a real service to Wisconsin farmers, they will prevail on Mr. Merriam to allow Wisconsin farmers the opportunity to use Wisconsin limestone in their conservation program, just as the National Practice A–4 allows farmers throughout the Nation to.

In between, Mr. Koch outlined two pages of criticism of the agricultural conservation program in Wisconsin. In order to obtain authoritative information relating to Mr. Koch's allegations, I submitted the contents of the letter to Mr. William R. Merriam, the chairman of the Wisconsin Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Committee. Mr. Merriam's response is set forth in full below. Mr. Merriam methodically deals with the various paragraphs of Mr. Koch's letter. In my opinion he quite thoroughly demonstrates that the agricultural conservation program in Wisconsin is, under the direction of the committee consisting of Mr. Merriam; Mr. John Dale, of Menomonie; and Mr. Ivan Kindschi, of Marshall; proceeding on a sound, constructive, and progressive basis.

I am submitting this material because I believe the implied criticism of Mr. Merriam and his committee is unjustified and because I believe that Mr. Merriam's letter contains information relating to the program in Wisconsin which is a source of pride to all members of the congressional delegation from the Badger State.

Mr. Merriam's letter is as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *January 13, 1956.*

Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS,

House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: This is in reply to your letter of December 29, 1955, asking for an explanation of the policy of the State ASC committee in connection with the agricultural livestone program in Wisconsin. Your inquiry was prompted by a letter you had received from Mr. Robert Koch, executive secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc. We are enclosing, for your information, a copy of our 1956 State agricultural conservation program. We have checked in red in the margin the practices included in our program in which application of liming material is involved.

We are replying below to Mr. Koch's letter. You will note that we have quoted the paragraph or paragraphs from Mr. Koch's letter in advance of our reply to each paragraph or group of paragraphs. We hope this will facilitate your following our reply.

"Did you know that Wisconsin led all the States in the Nation in 1954 in the percent of agricultural conservation program funds returned unused; 49.38 percent, $2,101,704?

"Did you know that only 21,590 farms of the 186,796 farms in the State or 24.4 percent participated in the program in 1954?"

1. There are many factors involved in the fact that a large part of the 1954 ACP funds allotted to Wisconsin were returned. We list some of them below. The degree of in-

fluence each had in the end result is a matter of conjecture.

(1) Prior to 1954 in Wisconsin all farmers were visited at their farms in an annual ACP signup. This was not the case in all States. Beginning with the 1954 program the signup was conducted in county ASC offices or in signup meetings held in townhalls or trade centers. This change in method of signup was not optional with the State committee but was a matter of national policy. In citing this the State committee does not intend to imply that they were in disagreement with this national policy. This change in method of signup, however, does account for some of the drop in participation and return of funds. Although all farmers were contacted by circular letter advising them as to this change, there was widespread thinking on the part of many farmers that they would be personally contacted as in the past.

(2) Because of the high number of farmers participating in programs in past years the average payment to each participating farmer amounted to only $40–$50. Many farmers, when advised that they would have to attend a meeting or go to the county office to sign up did not consider that it was worth while to make this effort in order to obtain a relatively inconsequential benefit.

(3) The change in administrative setup away from full-time county committee administration to institution of office managers with the county committee serving only part time as a policy body was not approved by the bulk of county committeemen. Due to this fact the 1954 ACP was presented to farmers by disgruntled committeemen. Many farmers who did attend sign-up meetings were advised that the new AC program contained nothing for them. Even now 2½ years later we encounter farmers who believe that there is no cost-sharing available under the ACP for application of liming materials.

(4) Attention officially given the program by Mr. Koch's organization at this time was purely negative and helped to encourage the misunderstandings engendered by disgruntled committeemen. This was not true of all members of Mr. Koch's organization, some of whom entered actively into a lime-selling program, sought to fully understand the new provisions in regard to lime cost-sharing and to disseminate correct information to their potential customers.

(5) Policy changes and operating procedure changes in ACP in 1954, caused additional administrative work in preparation for issuing the program. Accordingly the program was not announced as early as would have been desirable for maximum participation and there was honest misunderstanding of some of the new program provisions on the part of some county office employees.

"Did you know that in 1943, 82.1 percent of Wisconsin farmers were carrying out some conservation practices?"

2. Under the 1943 ACP liming materials could be applied on any agricultural land and earn benefits. Potash and phosphate applied to grain seeded was also eligible for payment. These were practices followed, even at that time, by a majority of farmers so it was very easy for a farmer to participate in the program. As pointed out above each farmer was contacted at his farm by a committeeman so that it was practically impossible for a farmer to miss applying for and earning a conservation payment. It should also be kept in mind that in 1943 we were at war and national policy was to encourage all-out agricultural production. Under the 1954 ACP (and 1955 and 1956) the national regulations do not allow cost-sharing for fertilizer applied to grain seeded in regular rotation and restricts cost-sharing for liming materials to application of land seeded or to be seeded in 1955. Thus even under the provisions of the national program for 1954 it is not as easy for a farmer to earn cost-sharing as it was in 1943 and rightly so in regard to these practices in a time when agricultural surpluses are a national problem for which even Mr. Koch probably does not have a ready solution.

"Did you know that Wisconsin has the most restrictive practice for using agricultural limestone in the Nation?"

3. Practice A–4 of the national program is entitled "Initial treatment of farmland to permit the use of legumes and grasses for soil improvement and protection." Federal cost-sharing is limited to the application of liming materials. The practice is applicable only to farmland devoted in the program year to legumes of perennial grasses, and to farmland which the county committee determines will be devoted to such eligible uses in the following year.

This practice in our Wisconsin program includes the following specifications not included in the national program.

(1) Liming materials applied on land already devoted to legumes or perennial grasses is not eligible for cost-sharing because our agronomists and soils specialists advise that top-dressing with liming materials is not effective; thus the purpose of the practice as stated in the title quoted above would not be accomplished by encouraging application on existing stands.

(2) It is required that in order to be eligible for cost-sharing for liming materials applied under this practice under the 1954 program the farmer must apply a minimum amount (not less than 100 pounds of available potash and phosphate in terms of commercial fertilizer analysis 250 pounds of 0–20–20 or 0–10–30 or any other equivalent).

In the 1955 State program the farmer was permitted to substitute 14 tons of manure to meet the fertilizer requirement.

In the 1956 State program the farmer is permitted to meet the fertilizer requirement by covering the area being limed with barnyard manure if he does not wish to use commercial fertilizer.

In all three programs the application of fertilizer is not required if a soil test shows no need for potash or phosphate.

We are informed by our soils experts that the application of lime alone is a soil-depleting practice rather than a soil-conserving practice because it makes available for plant use the potash and phosphate in the soil thereby reducing the amount left for future crops to use. This is such a well established principle that a ditty has frequently been used to express it in somewhat the following wording: "Lime and lime without manure, makes both farm and farmer poor."

If we are, in truth, trying to encourage farmers to perform initial treatment of farmland to permit the use of legumes and grasses for soil improvement and protection, it appears that application of potash and phosphate along with lime where the soil is deficient in such elements should be required not only in Wisconsin but in all States for all of the soils experts we have consulted state that such would be their recommendation to any farmer, and even Mr. Koch has admitted to us orally the agronomic soundness of such a practice; it is the popularity of the provision with farmers that he is questioning.

It is the contention of the Wisconsin State committee that if this program is to provide Government financial help for farmers to initially treat farmland to permit the use of legumes and grasses for soil improvement and protection, such financial assistance should be extended to farmers who are willing to perform the practice so that it will accomplish this end and not for any other purpose such as purely to promote lime sales, or to win popularity with farmers by paying them for doing an inadequate practice, or to increase the number of farmers participating by paying them to perform a practice which is recognized as a regular farming operation by a majority of farmers.

"Did you know that Wisconsin soils specialists are among the leading in the Nation and that their stressing of the use of agricultural limestone has been primarily responsible for making Wisconsin the leading producer of alfalfa?"

4. We are pleased to note Mr. Koch's compliment to Wisconsin soils specialists and count ourselves fortunate to come from a State where lime needs were early recognized, accounting in part for our outstanding alfalfa production. It is our belief that our forward-looking, intelligent Wisconsin farmers will not now sacrifice efficient production of this valuable crop by failing to supply lime needs even though our AC program allows Federal cost sharing only in accordance with the sound practice of accompanying application of phosphate and potash in commercial form or in the form of manure. The same soils scientists Mr. Koch compliments so highly, when speaking without regard to ACP cost sharing, recommend that farmers apply lime in accordance with the specifications of our practice 12 (national practice A–4) except that they recommend in most cases even heavier application of potash and phosphate than our program requires.

These soil specialists, for whose scientific accomplishments and knowledge we have great respect, have left the field of soil science, in which they are expert, to advise on an administrative policy matter dealing with how funds available under ACP should be distributed to farmers in connection with lime application. On this administrative policy matter of cost-sharing fund distribution we are pleased to have their advice, but feel that the final decision on such a matter is well left in the hands of the State committee, along with representatives of other agencies who assist in making such final decisions on formulation of the State AC program, in accordance with the provisions of the national ACP handbook.

It appears that possibly at times even soils specialists like to bask in the glow of popular approval which it is often thought emanates from farmers pleased at receiving a Government payment for expenditure of as little effort as possible.

"Did you know that the use of agricultural limestone by Wisconsin farmers dropped from a peak of 2,283,650 tons to 1,133,151 tons in 1954 when the Wisconsin State ASC Committee, of which William R. Merriam, of Janesville, is chairman, required farmers to use 250 pounds of 0–20–20 per acre to be eligible to obtain ACP assistance on agricultural limestone? No other State required this."

5. This paragraph implies that the drop in use of agricultural limestone usage went precipitately from 2,283,650 tons to 1,133,151 tons, which is not the case. The following are figures on total State lime usage obtained from the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture back to 1946:

	Tons
1954	1,133,151
1953	1,566,000
1952	1,786,000
1951	1,514,000
1950	1,841,000
1949	2,012,000
1948	1,926,000
1947	1,974,000
1946	2,003,000

The drop in usage in 1954 over 1953 is due at least partially to some of the factors listed in item 1 above. Some of the drop in usage may also be due to the fact that 1954 was the first year in which a soil test

was required under ACP prior to approving cost-sharing for liming materials. The soil test requirement is a part of the national program and must be adopted by all States except those where a showing can be made that there are insufficient testing facilities. In Wisconsin there was and is no lack of testing facilities. The State committee believes the soil test requirement is a good one but during the first year (1954) it was in effect it was another new piece of information to get across to farmers and ASC offices did not get underway on a free sampling program for farmers as rapidly or enthusiastically as might have been desired. Hence many requests for cost-sharing on practices involving lime application could not be approved due to the failure of the farmer to supply the soil test showing how much lime he needed per acre or due to the failure in some cases of ASC offices to get samplers out to do sampling where that service had been offered farmers.

"Did you know that while the State committee has modified this some for 1956, many counties are continuing to require it?"

6. The 1956 requirements are mentioned in item 3 (2) above. County AC programs are formulated by a group including the county ASC committee, the county agent, the ranking soil conservation service technician in the county and the forester serving the county. This group seeks the advice of representatives of all other agricultural officials in the county including the soil conservation district supervisors, the Farm Home Administration representative, the State conservation department game and fish representatives, etc.

The county program formulation group has the privilege of making the county program more restrictive than the State program if they believe the agricultural conservation goals of their county will be better served thereby. The State committee does not have the authority to refuse them this privilege nor would they desire to do so.

"Did you see the enclosed article by Emeritus Professor Emil Truog, one of the Nation's outstanding agronomists?"

7. Our comment on soils specialists' advice on ACP administrative policy matters is given above under Item 4.

"Did you see the enclosed editorial by the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer?

"Did you know the Wisconsin State Legislature passed the enclosed joint resolution asking the State Committee to eliminate these restrictions?

"With the college, legislature and farm press asking for a practical approach to Wisconsin lime needs—just what is provided in the national program and what farmers of all other States in the Nation have—why does the Wisconsin State Committee maintain this stubborn attitude and position?"

"Why should you vote Agricultural Conservation Program funds each year and have this Wisconsin State Committee attach requirements which Wisconsin farmers either cannot or will not comply with?

"We have met with the State committee many times. At first it was our opinion against theirs. Now these facts are available from official USDA records and they still will not allow Wisconsin farmers the same opportunity to participate in the program as other farmers in the Nation. Secretary Benson allows a State to have more restrictive features than in the national program if they wish so the USDA administrators cannot overrule the Wisconsin State Committee."

8. The State committee and cooperating agency representatives who have the responsibility of final formulation of the State program are attempting to keep in mind the guiding policy statement included in the National Agricultural Conservation Program handbook under "Principles" which states in part:

"The national program contains broad authorities to help meet the varied conservation problems of the Nation. State and county committees and participating agencies shall design a program for each State and county. Such program should include any additional limitations and restrictions necessary for maximum conservation accomplishment in the area. * * *

"Costs should be shared only on practices which it is believed farmers or ranchers would not carry out to the needed extent without program assistance. Generally, practices that have become a part of regular farming operations in a particular county should not be eligible for cost sharing."

Certainly the application of lime alone—anywhere, any time—can be considered a part of regular farming operations in Wisconsin. The "initial treatment of farmland to permit the use of legumes and grasses for soil improvement and protection," which as we have explained must include the application of needed potash and phosphate along with lime and must include the working of the lime into the soil is truly conserving of soil fertility and is not so widely accepted a practice as lime alone—anywhere—anytime.

We fail to find in the "Principles" any statement which says the primary purpose of the program is above all to spend all of the funds made available by Congress, or which says that our every effort must be expended toward having 100 percent participation by farmers regardless of the amount of true conservation accomplished or that says that primarily our object must be to sell for the limestone industry a record tonnage of agricultural lime.

"We took the problem to the 4,300 county and community committeemen who are elected by the farmers. Enclosed is the survey: 99.22 percent disagreed with the State committee and only 0.78 percent agreed with the State committee. Still the Wisconsin committee, in our opinion primarily because of the chairman, William Merriam, will not change."

9. There is some apparent contradiction between the results of Mr. Koch's survey and his statement earlier that in the 1956 program many county committees are continuing to require the original 1954 program restrictions in their practices written under national practice A–4. Judging by Mr. Koch's own statement, either the committeemen in favor of the practice as we use it did not reply to the survey or the committeemen working out the 1956 program are of a different opinion concerning the desirability of these restrictions than were those reportedly answering Mr. Koch's survey.

We would like to close by making a preliminary report to you on our accomplishments under the 1955 ACP. Due to the fact that many of the practices started in 1955 remain to be completed in the spring of 1956 final figures on funds expended and the amount of practices carried out will not be available until July 1956. However, due to enthusiastic support of participating agencies across the board, due to a more favorable and enthusiastic attitude on the part of present ASC committeemen and personnel and due to the working out of administrative bottlenecks and tangles often characteristic when extensive program changes are made, Wisconsin farmers have greatly increased their use of ACP.

Earlier this fall we were quite sure that all funds would be used because we had a heavy fall signup. However, due to the early freezeup last fall many practices such as shallow ditching, terrace and diversion terrace construction, etc., were not performed. Failure to earn all funds available under the 1955 program will be due to a considerable extent to the fact that lime vendors did not complete making delivery of all the lime ordered by farmers under the 1955 program. Deliveries were not completed in Ashland, Barron, Bayfield, Crawford, Douglas, Florence, Forest, Iron, Langlade, Lincoln, Marathon, Marinette, Oconto, Oneida, Polk, Portage, Rusk, St. Croix, Sawyer, Taylor, Vilas, Washburn, and Wood.

The accomplishments under 1955 ACP are more notable when it is remembered that early signup under this program was hampered by cross-compliance regulations tying eligibility for cost sharing to compliance with acreage allotments—a provision which Congress later repealed.

We hope that this rather extensive reply to Mr. Koch's letter will give you a clear picture of our position on the issues he raises and that you may see your way clear to join us in looking with some pride on Wisconsin's pioneering again to try to build and interest Wisconsin farmers in a conservation program in line with the national program principles even though some rather strong pressure groups are opposed to our efforts.

Yours very truly,

WM. R. MERRIAM,
Chairman, Wisconsin ASC Committee.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Planters Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader, Monday, January 16, 1956, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Planters Nut & Chocolate Co., which had its inception in Wilkes-Barre and where the company's national headquarters are maintained.

The editorial is as follows:

PLANTERS' JUBILEE

To Wilkes-Barre, the observance of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Planters Nut and Chocolate Co. has special significance as well as sentimental appeal, for it was here that the firm which has become an international enterprise was launched by the late Amedeo Obici and Mario Peruzzi. Locally, the occasion will be marked by a jubilee dinner in Hotel Redington on Tuesday evening, with Ralph Lisman, a member of the board of directors and head of the National Peanut Corp., a subsidiary, presiding.

The roots of Planters Nut and Chocolate Co. are deep in this community where national headquarters are maintained. Wherever Planters products are made and sold, Wilkes-Barre will be brought to mind, because the names of the city and the company are linked so intimately they are, to all intents and purposes, synonyms.

Wilkes-Barre is indebted to Planters not only for the jobs and opportunities it has provided local residents, but for focusing the national spotlight on the city. Mr. Obici and Mr. Peruzzi had a warm spot in their hearts for Wilkes-Barre and, even though they are gone, it perseveres in the Planters' organization, which is quite understandable.

Mr. Obici and Mr. Peruzzi built well when they established and developed Planters Nut and Chocolate Co. While they naturally are missed, particularly on such a milestone as the 50th anniversary, the fact that the organization is functioning smoothly testifies to their foresight and genius.

Planters heads for the century mark with the best wishes of its native Wilkes-Barre.

Swiss Watches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower increased tariffs on Swiss watch imports by 50 percent in July 1954, many people were concerned that this action marked a backward step in the avowed foreign-trade policy of this administration. The tobacco farmers in southern Maryland, which I have the honor to represent, were concerned about the effect this action would have on their sales of tobacco to Switzerland, for the Swiss are the largest and best customers for our high-grade export tobacco.

These fears have been realized. In the past 9 months of 1955 Maryland tobacco exports were 21 percent below the exports for the corresponding period of 1954. The Maryland tobacco farmer thus has visible proof that international trade is a two-way street.

As if the escape clause action were not enough there have been over the past year and a half further harassments directed at the importation of Swiss watch movements. The tobacco farmer is justified in interpreting these new restrictions as being directed against our tobacco exports to Switzerland.

It is my understanding that the Commerce Department is planning a further reverse in duty rates on Swiss watch imports. I hope the Secretary of Commerce and other administration officials charged with the responsibility of such matters will read once again President Eisenhower's stated position on international trade. If they do, they will discover that any further restrictions against Swiss watch imports would be contrary to the President's position. I would like to remind these officials as well as my colleagues that free access to the market for Switzerland's fine time-keeping products carries with it substantial benefits not only for the tobacco farmers of my district, but for many other industries as well as for American consumers. In addition, incentives for scientific progress in the development of new and better watches and the force of competition essential for the proper working of the free enterprise system whether in Switzerland or the United States results from expanded trade relations between the United States and Switzerland.

In the past few weeks the press has devoted considerable space to new demands on the part of watch protectionists' actions to cut down on the imports of Swiss watches.

On this matter, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD two excellent editorials from outstanding business publications commenting on this subject: one from the Wall Street Journal of December 27, 1955, and the other from the New York Journal of Commerce of December 28, 1955:

[From the Wall Street Journal of December 27, 1955]

THE FEDERAL SHELTER

A year and a half ago the United States ordered an increase of up to 50 percent in the tariff duties on imported Swiss watch movements. The reason was the complaint of the American jeweled watch industry that it was suffering from Swiss competition.

Now the American watchmakers want more Government help. The reason is that they are again suffering from Swiss competition. The domestic producers explain that labor costs have gone up here while the Swiss have reduced their prices. So the tariff boost was not a very lasting boon after all.

It is hardly surprising. Though designed as bars to trade, tariffs are no longer the most efficient bars. Clever governments have devised better methods. Perhaps with this in mind, the domestic watch manufacturers are now suggesting not merely a further increase in tariff rates but other possible solutions as well.

These include a quota on watch imports, a Government subsidy to the domestic producers, or an increase in Government orders from them. A quota, if it could be rigidly enforced, would accomplish what the present tariff rates have not; they would hold down Swiss imports no matter how much the Swiss cut prices. Under a Government subsidy, or a fixed volume of Government orders regardless of need, it would not matter to the American companies how many movements were imported from Switzerland; they would still have their cozy little Federal shelter.

For all that can be positively proved, such measures may be necessary. The domestic industry claims it is essential to defense, and the Pentagon has agreed though only after considerable uncertainty. If so, and if the domestic industry has actually done all it can to meet the Swiss competition, then there would be a case for outright subsidization.

But let's not kid ourselves that it would be a solution. Any industry that thinks so need look no farther than American agriculture, which enjoys both quotas against some foreign imports and lavish subsidization; the subsidization has become its chief woe. At the very best, there is no way a subsidy can solve the problems of competition.

An industry which wants no more than a comfortable home may be able to find it for a while in the Federal shelter. An industry interested in making its way in the real world must look elsewhere.

[From the New York Journal of Commerce of December 28, 1955]

HOW MUCH COINCIDENCE?

Not satisfied with a tariff increase that has cut Swiss watch sales in this market by nearly 17 percent in a little more than a year, jeweled watch manufacturers in this country are now seeking more protection—a lot more.

They have appealed to the Office of Defense Mobilization for support in getting them a further tariff increase plus import quotas which will insure them a larger share of the American market and, coincidentally, hold Swiss sales here to fixed limits.

All this is being asked in the name of national defense which was, as most of our readers will remember, what President Eisenhower had principally in mind when he ordered a tariff increase of up to 50 percent on jeweled watch movements in July 1954. It is the position of the watch manufacturers seeking this extra protection that high labor costs here and lower prices on Swiss watches have erased whatever advantages the higher tariff originally gave them.

This newspaper does not know, of course, how ODM will react to this latest plea. The fact that importers will be given a chance to present their views to its Special Advisory Committee on the Watch Industry late next week indicates that, officially, at least, its mind is still open.

But we recall well enough that it was ODM as a whole that, in May 1954, approved defense essentiality as a reason for a watch tariff increase without letting it be known at the time that a special Defense Department study had brought in findings of a quite different nature.

The Defense Department, which one would normally suppose to be as much concerned with defense problems as anyone, saw no need for special action to protect the American jeweled watch industry, but the full ODM did, and now it is to ODM that the domestic producers have turned again, thus bringing the case to a full circle.

We have long noted something curious about the number of obstacles Swiss watch manufacturers have found along their approaches to the American market in the past few years. It might be helpful to list some of them:

July 1954: President Eisenhower raised the tariff.

October 1954: The Justice Department filed an antitrust suit on watches and movements aimed primarily at the Swiss.

March 1955: The Treasury Department issued a directive which, in effect, banned the upjeweling of Swiss watches coming into the United States market.

April 1955: A Senate subcommittee instituted an investigation of watch adjustments on allegations of fraud.

July 1955: A measure (H. R. 7466) was introduced in Congress which would amend the Tariff Act to tighten the ban on upjeweling.

December 1955: The Justice Department filed a new suit charging restraint in the watchmaking-machinery industry—of which the Swiss were the prime targets.

December 1955: The United States jeweled-watch industry returned to ODM asking further protection on the grounds of defense essentiality.

Although some of the Swiss practices now under fire go back as far as 30 years, no United States official has ever admitted that there is anything more than coincidence in this sudden outcropping of so many different actions against a single foreign industry.

Others, however (and we count ourselves among them), will find it a little hard to believe things are quite so simple. There have been too many coincidences—for example, the suppression of the Defense Department report—for the whole thing to look like a coincidence. It looks less and less like one with every new action that is launched against the Swiss watch industry.

Those who are not in Washington's confidence in this matter are more likely to muse over two more practical suggestions of what is in the wind: Either Swiss business practices are far more nefarious than anyone in official Washington has yet hinted, or someone wielding a good deal of influence in official Washington is conducting a vendetta against the Swiss watch industry.

As we have stated previously, the matter at issue involves a great deal more than Swiss watches. It involves the whole conduct of our trade policy.

It would be a serious matter for American exporters of all kinds of goods, as well as for the Swiss and the American consumer, if our overseas trade relations should be injured by the suspicion, no matter how small, that a foreign industry can be subjected to official persecution if it proves embarrassingly successful in this market. There can be no denying that such a suspicion does now exist.

The time has come for some plain speaking on the part of someone who can speak for

the President, if not on the part of Mr. Eisenhower himself. Someone must know the reason for these simultaneous actions against the Swiss. If it is a good reason, nothing but harm can come of keeping it quiet.

Examination of Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Pilot, Boston, Mass., October 15, 1955, concerning the case of Emmett Till which has aroused great resentment among people who believe in law observance and law enforcement:

THE LESSON OF EMMETT TILL

Now that people have had a chance for second thought and time has begun to wear away our initial feelings of wrath and fury, it might be helpful to take another look at the case of Emmett Till. A Negro lad from Chicago murdered in Mississippi in a brutal manner; his alleged murderers brought to quick trial and acquitted; an honest judge with a feeble apparatus of justice available to him—all of these, and so much more, add up to a situation which will trouble the American conscience for many years ahead.

It is, of course, easy for us so far away from the scene and the social, economic, and cultural problems which are part of it, to take a superior attitude and exercise our moral indignation on the basis of the miles which geographically (and sociologically) separate Mississippi from Massachusetts. As American citizens we shake our heads over the fact that the majority element in the small Mississippi community are not registered voters, and so are among other things unavailable for jury duty. The waves of fear, fear of beating and even death, not to mention economic reprisals as serious as starvation itself, moved almost visibly, if intangibly, across the courtroom, and it shivered spines all over America. All in all, this was the greatest democracy of the world showing itself very nearly at its worst.

Our temptation, far away and so very moral ourselves, is to find inexcusable all that was done there, to condemn without qualification the straitening of justice, to recoil from the brutality and the fear, to blush for the denial of human rights, and finally to be satisfied that it happened in Mississippi. This is all very acceptable except for the last item. With its own gradations, something very much like what happened to Emmett Till is happening in many other communities of America, even those that pride themselves on being supercivilized. To be sure it is seldom that anyone is so murdered and it is almost impossible to imagine a court as hamstrung as the one in Mississippi, but there are many more subtle, equally deadly forms of hatred which flourish almost unchecked among us.

We have problems in housing and problems in hiring—the Negro family that moves into the somewhat better neighborhood and the educated Negro who applies for a better job. We have the social questions of the club, and the bar, and the dance. We have another area worth considering in the school—especially the private school. A test always helpful here is the children we think proper for companions to our own children. There are many, many more things we could mention but the point must be clear. Those who draw back in proper disgust from something like the Till case are too often the same ones who, in small ways, make the same kind of judgements as those who murdered Emmett Till. Of course they don't endorse murder—neither did the anti-Semites ever aprove of Dachau.

It is a good thing that we should feel hurt for what America did to Emmett Till but we should be careful with what dispositions we condemn his murderers. "Let one who is without sin cast the first stone"—this was the Lord's reminder in a situation slightly parallel. Few of us can afford to be self-righteous, but all of us can use the occasion for an examination of conscience. If we make excuses for ourselves, we are excusing his murderers. If we make small allowances for ourselves, we are giving them allowance too. But if instead we set out to cleanse our own souls, we are beginning the necessary purification of America.

Soviet Foreign Policy Since Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include a very lucid and penetrating analysis of Soviet foreign policy since Stalin, delivered at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association, December 28, 1955, by Prof. Thomas T. Hammond, of the University of Virginia:

We all know that after the death of Stalin there was a dramatic change in Soviet foreign policy. The ending of the wars in Korea and Indochina, the settlement of the dispute with Tito, the evacuation of Austria, and the establishment of diplomatic relations with Western Germany are only a few of the manifestations of what has been called the New Look, the new course or the peace offensive of the Soviet Union.

What were the motives behind this change? Was it a result of Soviet weakness? Were the gestures of friendship by Khrushchev, Bulganin, and company merely parlor tricks designed to mesmerize innocent Americans? Was the spirit of Geneva only a drunken stupor imparted by too much vodka? Or did Soviet foreign policy change fundamentally?

Let us look at some of the possible explanations for the New Look in Soviet foreign policy and attempt to assay the validity of each.

One explanation commonly put forward is the supposed economic weakness of the Soviet Union. Chancellor Adenauer, for example, declared recently that the Soviet Union "has to fulfill such a mass of * * * economic, social and cultural tasks, that it would like to devote its entire power to their fulfillment." Secretary Dulles put it more bluntly when he told a congressional committee that the Soviet economic system "is on the point of collapsing."

What are the facts? There can be no doubt that one sector of the Soviet economy—agriculture—has failed miserably. Mr. Khrushchev himself admitted that the number of livestock in the U. S. S. R. in 1953 was less than in 1928. Early this year he confessed that the production of grain had not kept up with the growth of population. His program of plowing up virgin lands has not proved successful.

There is no evidence, however, that the food situation in the Soviet Union has so far become serious enough to cause a change in foreign policy. Of the many Western visitors to the Soviet Union in the last 2 years, none has reported that the supply of food is any worse than previously. Thus it seems dubious that the situation in agriculture is responsible for the New Look.

Some commentators have argued that the rulers in the Kremlin feel that they must follow foreign policies that will permit them to invest more of their resources in consumers goods, so as to meet the demands of the Soviet people for a steadily rising standard of living, and thus mollify discontent.

This argument is likewise unconvincing. The leaders of the Soviet Union have never put living standards first in their thoughts, and they are not doing so today. Nor is it easy to understand why they should be particularly worried about morale. Real wages have risen steadily since the war, with the result that Soviet citizens are living better now than they have in many years—perhaps better than in any year since the revolution.

Another variety of the argument regarding Soviet economic weakness has to do with the high cost of armaments. The Soviet economy, it is said, might somehow be able to hobble along and avoid complete collapse if it were not for the fact that the armaments race, and particularly the competition in nuclear weapons, absorbs so much of its economic resources.

But when all of these economic arguments are added together, they still do not constitute reasons sufficient to have forced the Soviet Union to adopt a more conciliatory foreign policy. The overall picture of the Soviet economy is one of impressive strength, and of strength that is increasing at a rapid rate. The postwar years have seen a steady rise in industrial production and in the standard of living, despite the high cost of armaments.

It is doubtless true that the Soviet leaders would like to have peace and a relaxation of tension for several years, so as to be able to ameliorate their various economic problems, imporove living conditions, and develop the economies of the other countries of the Soviet bloc, particularly China. But this is far from saying that the Soviet Union is seeking a relaxation of international tensions because of the overwhelming pressure of economic weakness.

Occasionally the argument is put forward that one of the chief objectives of the New Look is the restoration of East-West trade, particularly the removal of restrictions on strategic goods. It is said, rather hopefully, that the American-imposed ban on strategic commodities is putting a serious strain on the Communist economies, is limiting their military power, and is thereby forcing the Communist nations to become more conciliatory.

These suppositions seem overly optimistic. The Soviet Union is almost completely self-sufficient, and foreign trade has never loomed large in its economy except during brief emergency periods. The ban on the shipment of military commodities has not prevented Soviet development of top-quality jet fighters, long-range jet bombers, or atomic weapons. The other Communist states, especially China, have probably been hurt more by the restrictions. However, in these countries the great decline in western trade is due not only to American legislation, but also to a deliberate Soviet policy of consolidating its control over the Communist bloc and cutting it off from dependence on the West.

There doubtless are some special items that the Soviet Union would be pleased to purchase. Accessibility to outside markets also would allow the Soviet Union to make up for temporary shortages caused by faulty planning or underfulfillment of production goals. But the need for these commodities

is hardly great enough to have caused a major change in foreign policy.

INFLUENCE OF POWER STRUGGLE

It is sometimes maintained that the New Look in Soviet foreign policy is a reflection of the struggle for power among Stalin's successors. But no one has shown just how a struggle for power automatically produces a foreign policy of conciliation. If the death of Stalin had been followed by a policy of increased belligerency and intractability, we may be sure that this also would have been explained by some as a reflection of the struggle within the Kremlin.

It is difficult to see just how a struggle for power is necessarily connected with any particular foreign policy. Isn't it just as logical to assume that one of the contestants, or one of the competing factions, could gain support by advocating a "get tough" policy? History provides many examples of leaders embarking on foreign adventures as a means of increasing prestige at home and diverting attention from internal problems. Furthermore, the ability to make concessions to foreign powers without fear of domestic difficulties is a sign of a strong government rather than a weak one. Admittedly a contest for power has been in progress since the death of Stalin. But there is no clear indication that the purge of Beria or the demotion of Malenkov were connected with disagreements over foreign policy.

TWO OBJECTIVES

If the new look is not due primarily to economic weaknesses or to other internal problems, what then is the explanation? No doubt a number of factors are involved, but two objectives stand out.

One is to reduce the danger of a big war by effecting a relaxation in the diplomatic atmosphere, to eliminate the possibility that the advocates of so-called "preventive" war will come to dominate American policy, to bring an end to the flammable atmosphere in which some accident could serve as the Sarajevo of an atomic holocaust, and, if possible, to devise some method of preventing the use of atomic weapons.

Isn't it reasonable to suppose that the preponderant motive behind the adoption of the new policy was the urgent desire to avoid a thermonuclear war which the U. S. S. R. might lose? The Soviet leaders know that we have large stockpiles of atom and hydrogen bombs, and they are painfully conscious of the geographic advantage we derive from our airbases in Greenland, Iceland, Alaska, Western Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East. The Strategic Air Command is like a loaded gun pointed at the vitals of Russia, and the rulers in the Kremlin must be desperately eager not to pull the trigger.

A second objective of the present Soviet "peace" policy is to lull us into a false feeling of security, to get us to relax our guard, and thus make it possible for the Soviets to inflict an atomic Pearl Harbor, or to extend their domination by other means. The present talk of peaceful coexistence is a siren song intended to lure the free nations off their course and wreck them on the shoals of disarmament, disunity, pacifism and neutralism. The New Look apparently is designed to bring about the closing of American overseas air bases, the withdrawal of American forces from foreign countries, the prevention of West German rearmament, and the weakening of such defensive arrangements as NATO, SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact.

The Kremlin wishes, moreover, to reduce the widespread fear of the Soviet Union, thereby removing the cement which has united the free world, and creating an atmosphere in which conflicts among "capitalist" states can flourish. That this policy is having considerable success is shown by Britain's decision to reduce its armed forces one-eighth, by the Cyprus dispute, by the weakening of Yugoslavia's ties to the West, and by Egypt's decision to buy arms from Czechoslovakia—to cite only a few examples.

WHY NEW FEARS?

If fear of an atomic war is one of the chief causes of the New Look, then why wasn't this policy adopted during the period from 1945 to 1949, when we had the A-bomb but Russia did not?

A number of answers can be made to this criticism. In the first place, there is considerable difference between the early-type atom bombs, equal to about 20 thousands of tons of TNT, and a modern hydrogen bomb, equal to 20 millions of tons of TNT, and spreading deadly dust over thousands of square miles. It may be that Stalin, along with many people, looked upon the atom bomb as just another more powerful weapon, one which did not require a change in Soviet foreign policy.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that the years when America had a monopoly of the A-bomb were also the years in which we were demobilizing our Army and withdrawing most of our forces from overseas. It was not until after the start of the Korean war that western rearmament began in earnest, and it was some years later before we had built up western military might.

One factor delaying the shift may have been the personality of the aging master himself, Dictator Stalin. Old, irascible, and set in his ways, he probably found it difficult to change his policies or his methods. His successors, on the other hand, were happy to bring a halt to policies which had succeeded in uniting much of the world against the Soviet Union.

RECENT EVENTS

But what about the events of the past few weeks? Such actions as the sale of arms to Egypt, the inflammatory speeches of Khrushchev and Bulganian in Asia, and the attack on Eisenhower have led some observers to the conclusion that the New Look has now been discarded in favor of a return to the Old Look. What has happened to the spirit of Geneva and all that it implied?

The answer may lie, first of all, in the fact that the meeting at the summit was oversold to the world public, and we have since been experiencing the inevitable letdown. There has been a gradual abandonment in the West as well as in the East of the unusually restrained language that prevailed immediately after the July meeting.

Secondly, Geneva signified a general acceptance of the idea that since weapons have become so destructive, and since both East and West have large quantities of these weapons, neither side is likely to risk a large-scale war. Recognition of this fact has had two effects: On the one hand, the Soviet leaders feel that they need not speak so sweetly now, since the danger of war has lessened. On the other hand, some nations that formerly felt threatened by the U. S. S. R. now believe that they no longer have to concern themselves so much with building up defenses against a possible invasion by the Soviet Army.

Part of the explanation for what looks like a shift in Soviet policy since Geneva may lie simply in the fact that there are two main variants of the new look—one for nations committed to the West, and another for nations that are neutral. In those countries receiving American military aid, or belonging to Western-sponsored blocs, the objective of the Kremlin seems to be to reduce the fear of the Soviet Union and persuade them that military expenditures and military alliances are unnecessary.

In those former colonies that have remained aloof from Western blocs, the Soviet Union is using four different tactics. One is to denounce colonialism. Another is to offer these countries the armaments that the West has refused to supply, as in the case of Egypt. Still another is to promise trade, technical assistance, and diplomatic support, as with India, Burma, Afghanistan, and Egypt. A fourth tactic is to put the diplomatic squeeze on pro-Western countries like Pakistan and Israel, by supporting the claims of their enemies.

To Western-bloc nations the Soviets say: "Why burden yourselves with expensive armaments if there is going to be no war?" To the former colonies of Asia and the Middle East they say: "Keep out of Western 'imperialist' alliances, and we will give you aid, with no strings attached."

FUTURE POSSIBILITIES

What then of the future? There seem to be three possible courses which future Soviet policy might take hot war, cold war, or cool war.

First, and worst, would be a hot war. It is reckless to assume that the Soviets would refrain from starting a hot war if they became convinced that they could defeat us without suffering a massive counter attack. As Bulganin said recently, "It is wrong to assert that inasmuch as East and West possess hydrogen weapons the possibility of a thermonuclear war is automatically excluded."

Second is the possibility of cold war. It is certainly not difficult to imagine that in the next few months, as in the past few months, the spirit of Geneva will continue to melt away, polite language will again disappear from Soviet-American intercourse, and we will revert to the former situation of open disputes, openly arrived at. East and West may return to a condition of irreconcilable antagonism, full-scale political warfare, and unrestricted competition for military supremacy.

Third, we may have a continuation of what might be called the cool war, the situation in which we now find ourselves. Such a relationship differs from the cold war in such superficial aspects as the exchange of cultural and scientific delegations, the release of western prisoners from Communist labor camps, and a change in the tone of the propaganda war. More important, the cool war has brought a willingness of the Soviet Union to bargain and to make concessions on points which, if not crucial to Soviet security, still cannot be brushed aside as insignificant. Examples are the Soviet withdrawals from Austria and from the Porkkala Peninsula. It is perhaps too early to tell whether the cool war has also brought a willingness on the part of the Soviet Union to make a genuine effort to control the use of atomic weapons; we can only hope that it has.

In a cool war the struggle between communism and the free world continues, but it is carried on within certain limitations. The primitive slugfest, you might say, has been replaced by a boxing match in which padded gloves are worn and certain rules are observed. The Soviet Union may be wearing brass knuckles under its gloves and it may occasionally hit below the belt, but at least it feels constrained to hide these actions and it no longer openly proclaims the contest to be a fight to the death.

From the point of view of the West, the cool war has both advantages and dangers. We have as much as the Soviets to gain from the avoidance of further killing and destruction. The chief danger is, of course, that we might relax and become demoralized, lower our guard, and thus lay ourselves open to a Communist knockout.

The situation today may be one of coexistence, but it is a highly competitive coexistence. The open struggle of the past 10 years is merely changing its form. It is war, but with certain weapons barred. It is, to reverse the phrase of Clausewitz, war continued by other means.

Miserable Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sunday, January 15, 1956, in which they discuss the problem confronting the administration with respect to possible attack by the Chinese Communists on the islands of Quemoy and Matsu.

The article follows:

MATTER OF FACT—NO FORGETTING MISERABLE ISLANDS

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

Behind the smooth facade of public optimism, the Eisenhower administration is currently driven by a grave and decidedly pessimistic debate about Far Eastern policy. The question is how to deal with a Chinese Communist attack on Quemoy and the Matsus, the little islands Chiang Kai-shek still holds in the Formosa Strait.

This inconvenient question has been put off for many months, while the Communists built up their military power and pushed forward their logistical preparations in the Formosa Strait area. Despite appearances to the contrary, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and other leading American policymakers have argued that the Peking government was giving first priority to its drive to get into the United Nations. Therefore, it was said, the Communists would avoid any taint of aggression at this time.

A minority of policymakers always contended that the Chinese Communists would not miss the smallest chance to realize a territorial claim, in order to gain membership in the heavenly choir itself. Whether rightly or wrongly, this minority is now becoming a majority, because of a series of signs suggesting that "this is where we came in before."

Where we came in before, of course, was last year's Formosa crisis, culminating in the evacuation of Chiang's forces from the Tachen Islands. The pattern now is remarkably similar to the first stages of the pattern of Communist pressure on the Tachens.

All the little warning flags have already been raised. Communist reconnaissance planes have flown over the Matsus. There has been a short but sharp action between Communist and Nationalist PT boats in the neighborhood of the Matsus. Quemoy Island, which is squarely in the mouth of Amoy harbor and almost entirely surrounded by Communist gun emplacements, has lately been brought under heavy artillery fire.

In addition, the official Chinese Communist news agency has bitterly accused the United States of stalling in the interminable negotiations which have just been resumed in Geneva.

Peking wants voluntarily cession of the offshore islands, suspension of the trade embargo against Communist China, agreement on admission of China to the United Nations, and a lot of other things President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles are unwilling to concede.

Maybe the Communists are bluffing and will not move even if Ambassador Johnson does not satisfy them. But if they are not bluffing, what must be expected this winter or early spring is easy enough to foresee.

The second stage of the pressure on the Tachen Islands was the invasion of Ichang, a small island within artillery range of the main Tachen positions, followed by a preliminary blockade of the Tachens. This preliminary blockade, rather than the pleading of President Eisenhower, was what persuaded Generalissimo Chiang to evacuate the Tachens.

Kaoteng, another little island that is rather lightly held has almost exactly the same relation to the Matsu Islands that Ichang had to the Tachens. A landing on Kaoteng is the first step that is now feared.

After that will come heavy artillery fire on the defenses of both Quemoy and the Matsus, combined with a Communist aid blockade cutting off the Quemoy and Matsu garrisons—120,000 troops, the core and flower of Chiang Kai-sheks' forces—from all contact with Formosa.

The surrender of the offshore islands and the loss of Chiang's best troops must inevitably follow, unless the blockade is broken.

The question the administration policymakers are debating is what to do about this prospect. The official American policy concerning an attack on Quemoy and the Matsus is to meet force with force, if the attack on the offshore islands is clearly preparatory to an attack on Formosa. But the "if" is so big and all-important that this is nothing but indecision dressed up as decision.

Furthermore, the Chinese Communists are now locally stronger than all the air squadrons of the Pacific fleet, plus all the units of the United States Air Force in the Pacific, plus the Chinese Nationalists.

Except for nuclear weapons, we have not got force enough in place to meet the force of the Chinese Communists. Hence, fighting for "those miserable little islands," as they are called at the State Department, now seems so unappetizing that any such fighting is highly unlikely.

Wait and see if the worst really happens, is likely to be the motto.

Woodrow Wilson Praised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues a news story from the Washington Post and Times Herald under date of December 28, 1955. It should be observed that the article contains words of praise for former President Woodrow Wilson from our only two living ex-Presidents, Mr. Truman and Mr. Hoover. That Mr. Hoover should commend the works of President Wilson is singularly noteworthy:

WOODROW WILSON PRAISED

NEW YORK, December 27.—The only two living former Presidents today inaugurated the coming Woodrow Wilson Centennial Anniversary Year.

Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman urged observation of 1956 as the 100th anniversary of Wilson's birth.

Hoover said: "There can be no doubt that Mr. Wilson made the major contribution to lifting oppression from millions of people and setting them upon the road to hope."

Truman commented: "Woodrow Wilson labored for what at one time seemed hopeless causes. He sought to establish an effective world organization. He urged us to lead the world in search for a just and lasting peace. * * * The seeds Wilson planted have now borne fruit."

Joining in the tribute was Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who worked with Wilson in World War I.

Speaker Rayburn Lends Power of His Voice to Public Shock and Alarm Following Disclosure of Brink of War Philosophy and Practice on the Part of Secretary Dulles—Calls It Pitiful Performance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, many millions of alarmed American citizens—as well as many of our allies—are reading today with relief and gratification that the calm, reasonable, and powerful voice of our distinguished Speaker, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, has been raised in condemnation of the suddenly disclosed brink-of-war philosophy which, it seems, is being practiced by our State Department; at least it has been practiced, by his own admission, by the Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles.

Speaker RAYBURN, in a press conference statement on yesterday, called Mr. Dulles' practiced brink-of-war philosophy a pitiful performance and many will find themselves in complete agreement. For my own part, I can see only one bright result coming out of Mr. Dulles' self-praiseworthy disclosure of his diplomatic tactics—and that is, that having revealed his tricks of the trade to an appalled world, Mr. Dulles may find them impossible for successful practice further in the future.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I include excerpts from the report of Mr. RAYBURN'S press conference statement, as written for the New York Times by Mr. William S. White, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The excerpts follow:

RAYBURN ASSAILS STAND BY DULLES—HOUSE SPEAKER SCORES PITIFUL PERFORMANCE AND CHARGES PERIL TO UNITED STATES ALLIANCES

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—House Speaker SAM RAYBURN added his power today to Democratic attacks on Secretary of State Dulles.

* * * * *

As Mr. RAYBURN broadened Democratic charges of election-year irresponsibility against the Secretary of State, President Eisenhower coincidentally asked Congress to grant him the right to pledge foreign economic aid for some time into the future.

The Speaker * * * accused Mr. Dulles of a "pitiful performance." Mr. RAYBURN said the Secretary had endangered the United States' alliances by a statement in an interview in Life magazine that the administration's diplomatic skill had saved the peace after the Nation had walked "to the brink of war."

Speaker RAYBURN's denunciation of Secretary Dulles was of unusual significance.

It was the first instance in which a member of the Democratic congressional leadership had joined what had heretofore been rank-and-file criticism of Mr. Dulles over the "brink of war" statement, which appeared in an interview in Life magazine.

* * * * *

Mr. RAYBURN's action was one of the rare times he had assailed the administration on foreign policy since President Eisenhower took office in 1953.

The Speaker asserted at a press conference that Mr. Dulles' interview was likely to lose friends abroad who were needed by the United States more than ever.

"That [the article] may be a satisfactory thing for Mr. Dulles," Mr. RAYBURN declared, "but it is a pretty dangerous performance for the country. All in all, the article and Mr. Dulles' quotes in it were a pitiful performance.

"The brink of anything is too close for me. I think we need friends now more than we ever needed them. I fear that by a performance like this we may have fewer of them in the future than we have now."

If They Would Only Let Us Determine Our Own Destiny

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington (N. C.) Daily News of January 13, 1956:

IF THEY WOULD ONLY LET US DETERMINE OUR OWN DESTINY

Right now Members of Congress are figuring out ways and means to increase the tension and feeling which exist down South regarding the race issues which have become so important.

One Congressman would introduce a resolution, we are told, which would impeach the Representatives from Mississippi. Another would force an antilynch bill through Congress. Another wants a bill passed which we have come to know as the Fair Employment Practices bill or FEPC. And, of course, the removal of the poll tax as a requirement for voting always comes up when Congress meets.

Northern politicians just do not know the tension which prevails just now in the Southland. And in so many cases what they are trying to do is designed to get votes for them rather than to be great humanitarians.

If the Northern politicians would just leave us alone now, we could work out our own destiny in peace and dignity. But when fuel is added to the fire ever so often, the flame roars ever higher and stronger.

We do not defend the poll tax payment as a requirement for voting. We do not in any sense uphold lynching. We do not uphold sinister practices which deny God-given rights to any man. But we do object to the constant stirring of the race issue by politicians who would do well to improve the lot of their own constituents before they try to crusade for a better way of life in the Southern States. It seems that they should have enough to do in their own backyards without meddling and stirring up trouble down here.

If left alone, we'll work out our own problems. Issues and hatreds are being created today which did not exist here a while ago. We are being made the pawns in this great game of politics.

The Southerner has as much sense as the Northerner. Prejudices cannot be erased overnight. All we ask is to be left alone for awhile.

"Do Big Oil Companies High-Pressure Local Gas Stations?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, October 15, 1955:

Greetings. In the maze of congressional activity the evidence developed through some hearings and investigations does not receive the attention that it deserves.

Take the case of Pete, who runs the gas station around the block. We may drive the many cars in his neighborhood, but he is the one who provides the services that enable them to run.

Pete is a pleasant man, who seems to delight in waiting on us.

Even though he is kept busy all of his long day, in his little supply office, at the gas pumps, or under the hoist.

Pete is a small-business man.

We know that he works hard, but we figure he enjoys the fact that he is independent.

There are some 200,000 others just like him, who lease their stations from the major oil companies.

Offhand, Pete would seem to be far removed from the great national and international issues that come before the Congress of the United States for study, debate, and decision.

Pete, however, has his own special problems.

Being a small operator, and dependent upon his big suppliers, there is always the danger that he will be subjected to power pressures.

After receiving many complaints, the Small Business Committee of the United States House of Representatives authorized an investigation.

Subcommittee No. 5, under the chairmanship of Congressman JAMES ROOSEVELT, held numerous hearings concerning alleged coercive and discriminatory practices used by oil company suppliers against retail gasoline operators.

Sixty-four witnesses were heard.

Thirty-one were retail gasoline-station operators.

Fifteen were retail gasoline trade association officers or attorneys.

Twelve were officials of oil company suppliers mentioned in the testimony, or retail operators of the company who testified on behalf of company policy and practices.

In addition, the subcommittee accepted for the record, statements presented under oath in affidavit form.

On the basis of the testimony, the subcommittee reached the following conclusions:

1. A substantial proportion of all sales of refined gasoline of major oil companies to the general public is made through retail outlets where the dealer has a short-term lease from the oil company supplier, usually for 1 year. The importance and the proportion of the total retail market serviced by such short-term lessee dealers has been increasing.

2. The dealer operating his station under a short-term lease with the oil company supplier, oftentimes is not independent and is subject to control by the oil company supplier.

3. The short-term leases and sales practices of major oil companies in relation to sponsored products have had the effect of operating against a dealer's freedom of choice in using or dealing in competitive products, and operate to substantially lessen competition and tend to eliminate price competition.

4. Price discrimination: oil company suppliers have held the level of their prices generally while at the same time cutting their prices to one or more dealers at a particular location. In such situations, the lower price has prevailed until the low price, off-brand dealer saw fit to increase his price. This policy or practice has had the immediate effect of fomenting price wars among the retail dealers, and results ultimately in eliminating a substantial amount of price competition between and among both brand and off-brand gasoline. Moreover, short-term lessee dealers in many instances have been coerced or induced by their oil company suppliers into so-called price wars in an effort to secure the business enjoyed by the low-price off-brand dealer. It was also established that on occasion price wars have been started when some dealers engaged in price-cutting activities on their own initiative.

5. The lessee dealer needs immediate and permanent relief to enable him to fulfill his role as an independent businessman.

Let's take some testimony at random.

A lessee dealer in Manchester, Ga., testified company representatives told him that he had to abide by the policies of the big oil company and that they had a quota of TBA products (tires, batteries, accessories) to meet. His station had to meet this quota and that they were going to do it one way or another.

Despite these threats, the dealer refused to purchase the required items. Shortly thereafter his lease was canceled pursuant to a 10-day notice provision. Forced to move from the station all equipment and stock other than the oil company's products, the dealer suffered a loss of approximately $1,500.

Another dealer in Rockville, Md., testified as to pressure, both as to one big oil company's TBA products, and the retail price of its gasoline as posted. Because of this pressure, he was forced to take a competitive brand of tires out of his station and hide them in another location although he felt that the competitive brand tires were cheaper and had a stronger guaranty than the company-sponsored tires.

Detroit, Mich., lesse testified that he was told by a company representative "to get out of his station all merchandise competitive with the company's TBA items. Following his refusal to do so, his lease was not renewed, and he stated that company representatives told him one of the reasons for the refusal was that he did not sell enough TBA items and lubricants.

A Johnstown, Pa., lessee testified that another big oil company's salesman—"caught me with two winter tires manufactured by a competitor which I had bought on special request for a good customer. The salesman told me that if I could not adhere to the policies of my supplier, he would put someone in my station who would. Every time he wasn't too well pleased with my oil or gas sales, displays, or hours, he would tell me about the fellows in training at the

big company's station, who would replace me on short notice."

This dealer was canceled out of his station on December 24, 1954, the company refusing to buy its own brand stock in his inventory.

A Seattle, Wash., lessee testified: "* * * That there was one point my big company supplier made very clear, that you do carry their complete line * * * I carried this line for one reason, to try and keep peace with them. Even though I don't like their complete line of merchandise."

He further testified that he could have bought the same TBA items he purchased through the company distributor, at a cheaper price from an independent jobber.

The effect of the heretofore described practices of certain oil companies upon the free competitive economy, was brought forth in the testimony of officers of the 'Blank' Oil Company of California. Its president said that his company sold its oil strictly through independent dealers. With reference to motorcar and repair shop dealers, the company was able to sell to approximately 75 percent of such dealers. With reference to service-station dealers, it was only able to sell to approximately 35 percent of the total number of such dealers. Of the 35 percent of the retail gasoline station dealers who did purchase the 'Blank' Co.'s oil, a majority would not display this product, but kept it hidden.

This official states that: "In many instances our delivery truck cannot even deliver to their place of business. They are afraid they will be caught by the major company representative, and so we deliver oil and it is written right on the order that our delivery truck carries it to a man's home, or to a small independent business alongside of him with whom he is friendly. Our oil is stored in the back of automobiles, is stored in locked-up cabinets, in restaurants * * * it is stored where the major gasoline company representative is not likely to find it."

A substantial part of the complaints of retail operators dealt with alleged coercive and discriminatory practices of the major oil companies in relation to the retail price of gasoline.

As one off-brand dealer testified: "Nobody can afford it when a major oil company deliberately goes out and subsidizes a station. Well, the intent is so obvious, in my opinion; it is for no other purpose than to force me out of business, or force me to 'up' the price so that they can dictate the price I can sell at."

The oil companies testified that discounts are given to "meet competition." It is significant when the off-brand station is forced to raise its price to the 2-cent differential, that the discounts are withdrawn, the price war ends overnight, and retail prices return either to their former or a higher level. The evidence therefore, is to the effect that the oil companies concept of "meeting competition" involves a practice which results in the isolation, and then the destruction, of competition.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee recommended that:

1. The antimonopoly laws designed to protect and preserve small and independent business enterprises as necessary to our free and competitive enterprise system, should be strengthened.

2. That all oil company suppliers consider liberalization of their policies regarding leases with retail dealers.

3. That the full House Select Committee on Small Business continue and expand its study of the problems of the small-business men in the petroleum and other industries who are dependent upon large suppliers.

4. That the record of the hearings be forwarded to the antitrust division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission. With the intent that these agencies (a) consider the utilization of existing laws to the extent possible to eliminate the harmful practices shown in the record and the committee's report, and (b) to report to Congress those areas in which existing laws are not adequate to achieve relief, and what further legislation is necessary in order to achieve comprehensive and permanent relief.

Filling station owners should not be forced to carry certain tires, batteries, and other accessories which the big oil companies want carried, whether the neighborhood or roadside dealer wants them or not.

Legislation will be proposed to divorce oil companies from the retail business, just as motion-picture production has been separated from motion-picture exhibition.

Retail trade is the last stronghold of little business.

It must be protected from the high-handed pressures of monopolies.

Anthracite Coal Looks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record, Monday, January 16, 1956, which states that output of anthracite coal has reversed its downward trend and showed a marked increase in 1955 over the previous year. This is as it should be. Anthracite fuel is, and always has been and will continue to be, the king of the fuel industry. There is none more efficient and economical than anthracite coal. It will continue its upward spiral and retain its rightful position in the fuel industry.

The editorial follows:

As the new year was about to begin, the Record directed attention to a statement by F. W. Earnest, Jr., president of Anthracite Institute, to the effect that the outlook for the hard coal industry had improved. He is not alone in that opinion. From the State mines department last week came figures showing that anthracite has reversed its downward trend with 1955 showing output of a million tons better than 1954 with its all-time modern low of 26 million tons.

Interpreting the figures, a department spokesman said that they indicate that the sharp decline in production in recent years has been halted. In the current issue of the United Mine Workers Journal appears an article by Justin McCarthy saying that the new year will be a better year for both the anthracite and bituminous coal industries. He said that this is the point of view of President John L. Lewis and Vice President Thomas Kennedy, of the UMWA, of Francis O. Case, president of Glen Alden Corp., and of top leaders in the soft-coal industry. Supporting statements by Mr. Lewis, Mr. Kennedy, and Mr. Case were published in this issue of the Journal.

Expanding domestic and foreign markets offer more encouragement to coal investors and coal producers than has heretofore been known, Mr. Lewis was optimistic enough to say. He also referred to a process clearly evident in the region, the fact that production is being concentrated into a lesser number of physical plants of larger capacity.

In Mr. Kennedy's judgment, with reasonable winter weather, and in view of several other factors pertaining to the anthracite industry, it looks as though the anthracite industry, like bituminous, is well on the way to increased production and stability. One of the factors in his view is a substantial and growing increase in mechanical combustion of anthracite in modern heating methods.

Mr. Case was "conservatively optimistic" about anthracite. He said it would appear that the precipitous decline in anthracite consumption has tapered off considerably. He too saw that as reflecting successful industry efforts to merchandise automatic furnace equipment.

All these statements are from men who are as close to the picture as anybody can be. They are accustomed to giving careful thought to their expressions of opinion.

Bill of Rights Day: December 15, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to bring to your attention, a scholarly and moving address by the Reverend William J. Kenealy, S. J., dean of Boston College Law School.

It was delivered at historic Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., in celebration of Bill of Rights Day on December 15, 1955.

It concerns the faith by which we, as Americans live.

Believing, as we do, in the natural and inalienable rights of every human being on the face of God's earth.

And it assures us that we have a firm ally in the Catholic Church, as we defend the American philosophy of life, and liberty against "the cynical terror of race and blood and Communist class hatred."

Father Kenealy's tribute to the Bill of Rights, as based on the eternal truths of the natural law, should make us proud that we are Americans.

It reconsecrates in us, the determination to make the rights and responsibilities of freedom prevail.

The address follows:

CIVIL LIBERTIES

(Address by the Reverend William J. Kenealy, S. J., dean of the Boston College Law School, in celebration of Bill of Rights Day, Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass., December 15, 1955)

One year ago this evening, the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, delivered an address on the Bill of Rights. A few days previous to his address, a group of State employees charged with responsibility for determining what announcements could be posted on the State employee's bulletin board refused to permit the Bill of Rights to be posted on the grounds that it was a "controversial document." A bitter altercation arose, and only after the Governor of the State vouched in writing for its noncontroversial character was the Bill of Rights permitted to occupy

a place along with routine items of interest. The Chief Justice in his address, commenting on this extraordinary incident, stated:

"And this happened in the United States of America on the 15th day of December 1954, the 163d anniversary of our Bill of Rights, declared by proclamation of President Eisenhower to be Bill of Rights Day. It is straws in the wind like this which cause some thoughtful people to ask the question whether ratification of the Bill of Rights could be obtained today if we were faced squarely with the issue."

I share the amazement of the Chief Justice in contemplating a dispute of this kind in the United States of America. As an incurable optimist, however, I have no doubt whatsoever that the Bill of Rights would be thunderously ratified tomorrow by the vast majority of our citizens. In fact, I feel sure that the Bill of Rights would be unanimously ratified tomorrow, if all our people could only understand and appreciate the philosophy which underlies it.

I. THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY

The philosophy of American democracy and of the American Bill of Rights is expressed in two immortal documents: the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. The two are inseparably linked together, for the Supreme Court of the United States has told us several times that, while the Declaration of Independence is not part of the organic law of the land, it is indeed the spirit and thought of which the Federal Constitution is the body and letter. And the spirit and thought of this living political philosophy is epitomized in the following familiar words of the Declaration:

"We hold these truths to be self evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

In accordance with this philosophy, government is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. And the end of government is not merely the establishment of order, because order itself is but a means. The end of order is justice; but justice is itself only a means and its end is liberty. Finally, liberty is simply the condition necessary to enable human beings fully to achieve their perfection, their happiness, and their destiny during this life on earth. Thus, the real end of earthly government is a just and ordered liberty. But the essence of earthly liberty is the free exercise by the human person of the fundamental rights proper to human personality. Wherefore the first purpose of government is the protection of the individual person in the exercise of his personal rights. And therefore the prime test of all forms of government lies in the degree of success they attain in maintaining that protection.

Now the distinguishing characteristic of democratic government, as contrasted with other forms of governmental machinery, is that it is rule by the majority. But contrary to a strange and modern popular fallacy, true democracy is not a mere matter of form; and not a mere matter of majority rule. Let us not forget that, only a few years ago, a distressed Italian people flooded the piazzas of Rome shouting "Duce! Duce! Duce!" Let us not forget that, at the same time, the squares of Berlin resounded with the cries of "Heil Hitler" and a bewildered German people voted Adolf Schicklgrubber into power. No one ever received greater majorities than Joseph Stalin. No, there is no magic in mere forms; and mere majority rule is capable of effecting a tyranny as atrocious as that of any oriental despotism. Democracy, as a mere form, would be a faceless and gutless-philosophy of government.

On the contrary, because the essence of liberty is the freedom to exercise personal rights, true democracy must consist in minority rights under majority rule. But never in history has there been, and never in the future can there be, minority rights under majority rule unless the majority repudiates the blasphemy that mere numbers make truth and that might makes right; unless the majority faces and accepts the fact that there is an objective moral order, within the range of human intelligence, to which human societies and voting majorities are bound in conscience to conform, and upon which the peace and happiness of personal, national and international life depend.

The mandatory aspect of this objective moral order is called by philosophers the natural law. In virtue of this natural law, fundamentally equal human persons are endowed by their creator with certain natural rights and obligations which are inalienable percisely because they are God-given. They are antecedent therefore, both in logic and in nature, to the formation of civil societies and the casting of majority votes or the braying of filibusters. They are not granted by the beneficence of any State, democratic or otherwise; wherefore the tyranny of any State, democratic or otherwise, cannot destroy them. Rather it is the high moral responsibility of all civil societies and all majorities, through the instrumentality of civil law, to acknowledge their existence and to protect their exercise, by a wise and scientific implementation of the natural law.

In its essence, granted the existence of Almighty God, the natural law is a simple thing. It is man's participation in the eternal law of God. It implies that we know, independently of School Street, or Beacon Hill, or Washington, or London, or Moscow, or of the Vatican, for that matter, that we are all the children of God, endowed with immortal souls, destined for ternal life, bound in conscience to pursue that destiny, and possessed of inalienable rights to enable us to do so. It commands us to be patriotic, but warns us that the state is our servant and not our master; because it directs that we institute governments and laws precisely to protect our natural rights and to help us to attain, in human dignity, our divine destiny.

Thus it gives a rational and spiritual basis for our civil rights and liberties. Thus it gives a reason for the essential equality of man; it supplies us with a measure of the essential dignity of human personality. It tells us why the Chinese coolie is the equal of the Roman cardinal; the Australian bushman the equal of the European scientist; the African tribesman the equal of the American millionaire: because they are all created by the good God to enjoy Him fully for all eternity—a breath-taking destiny which completely dwarfs all temporary accidentals, physical, intellectual, economic, social and racial; a destiny of awesome dignity which demands decent human liberty for every child of God on the face of God's earth, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

This is the philosophy of the natural law. It is not pietistic pap. It is not self-righteous twaddle. It is not a cloud of theory. It is the soil of freedom. It is the philosophy upon which this Nation was founded and to which this Nation, by its most solemn covenants and usages, is dedicated. The Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights reaffirm the philosophy of the Constitution of this Commonwealth. The Preamble of that constitution solemnly declares:

"We, therefore, the people of Massachusetts, acknowledging with grateful hearts the goodness of the great legislator of the universe, in affording us in the course of His providence, an opportunity . . . of forming a new constitution . . . and devoutly imploring His direction . . . do agree upon, ordain and establish the following declaration of rights, and frame of government, as the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts."

Article II of the Constitution of our Commonwealth refers to Almighty God as the "Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the universe." Indeed, there should be peace in our minds, there should be a song in our hearts, because what a man is before God, that he is before the Constitution of the country and the Commonwealth we love. Despite the cynics, the materialistics, the secularists and the positivists in some academic halls, the glory of the American political system is that, for the first time in recorded history, a great people, formally and explicitly, made human rights the cornerstone of its political structure—and did so in the form of a definite profession of politico-religious faith. Ours is a country with a God; and, precisely for that reason, ours is a country whose philosophy exalts and respects the dignity and liberty of His human creatures.

II. THE TOTALITARIAN PHILOSOPHY

The tragic irony of democracy is that at the very moment when our American Republic was born in a grand profession of politico-religious faith—faith in the existence of God, in the reality of His natural law, in the fact of inalienable rights beyond the reach of any government, at that very moment the foundations of that faith were already shaking in a large part of what we used to call Christendom. The young Republic had not yet attained its maturity before it was assailed and buffeted from across the sea by a maelstrom of political and social theories which pounded away at the foundations of her political philosophy. Thomas Hobbes' theory of the Leviathan state laid the foundation of modern totalitarianism. David Hume's skepticism cast doubt upon the ability of the human mind to attain to any objective truth. Jean Jacques Rousseau's anti-intellectualism cast aspersions upon any rational explanation of human life. Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism repudiated the age-old norm of morality. Emmanuel Kant drove a wedge between the legal and the moral orders. Herbert Spencer's sociological evolution cast aside fixed principles of morality and of the natural law. John Austin's jurisprudence completed the legal bridge to the modern totalitarian state. These philosophies, and the materialistic concepts of Hegel, Marx, and Engels, melted down into an amorphous philosophy of so-called positivism and pragmatism, these are the ideas fighting for dominance in this country and in the world today.

The battle is on, make no mistake about it. Our modern legal and sociological positivists pooh-pooh the very notion of the natural law as a medieval fiction, which served a useful purpose in its day, but is now obsolete—and never had any objective existence. To them, therefore, inalienable rights are so much metaphysical nonsense. There are no duties in conscience; because morality, in its last analysis, is merely current good taste. There are no principles; there are merely prevailing formulae of expediency. Above all, there are no absolutes; no absolutes, that is, except pragmatic public policy—which means the absolute state.

The rise of positivistic state absolutism to challenge the American philosophy of government so impressed the late Justice Robert H. Jackson, of the United States Supreme Court, that in a lecture, which his untimely death prevented him from delivering, he wrote:

"* * * The 19th century closed with Americans repeating the phrases of the Declaration of Independence about the laws of nature and of nature's God, but the real attitude was that attributed by Knickerbocker to the Connecticut Yankees, who resolved to be governed by the laws of God—until they found time to make better ones. The so-called positivists took over, and any command that some authority had physical power to enforce became law. Since the Nuremberg post mortem of the Hitler regime, few will believe that these positivist doctrines are weapons in the struggle to preserve liberty.

"Meanwhile, Marx and Engels, two strangers to the actual workings of our American system, had formulated the revolutionary scheme of values which under new leadership is now our worldwide rival. Their doctrine teaches that there is no such thing as natural law or impartial justice, that the law is and should be a weapon of the class in power and administered in its interests, that law rests on the authority of force and not on any inherent rightfulness, that the object of its protection is the dominant group rather than the individual, and that it should not be administered by neutral judges but by class-conscious and class-serving judges. The Communists reject our claims to liberty as abstract intellectualism, if not hypocricy, and claim that our free Government is a sham to conceal economic exploitation of the most numerous class—the proletariat—which should be aroused to support the Communists in containment of our system and its eventual overthrow." (The Supreme Court as a Unit of Government, p. 5.)

It is the tragedy of our generation that the philosophy of a country with a God is not the philosophy of the predatory nations now threatening the destruction of civilization. In reality, our civilization is faced with the age-old conflict between the idea of the natural law and the idea of the absolute state. The modern name of the absolute state is totalitarianism; but its name is its only novelty. It is a retrogression to ancient Caesarism; the deification of the state, upon the specious grounds of public policy, to the degradation of human personality. The state is not the servant but the master, the alpha and omega of all things, the ultimate criterion of truth and the last norm of right. Human beings, their nature, purpose and destiny, have significance only by the yardstick of state utility. Will is substituted for reason; might becomes right; law becomes organized brutality. The fires of human liberty are extinguished, because there are no inalienable rights; there are no inalienable rights, because there is no natural law; there is no natural law, because there is no eternal law; there is no eternal law, because there is no God—no God, that is, but Caesar.

III. THE TRAGEDY OF THE CONFLICT

Do you think that philosophy is a mere matter of irrelevant theory? Do you doubt that ideas have the awful power within themselves to make and destroy and remake civilizations? Then come back 14 years to the time when mankind was entering one of the greatest catastrophes of human history. The United States was not as yet, formally at least, involved in World War II; but the impact of the armed conflict raging in Europe transformed America into 48 vast debating societies. The air was filled with strident shouts of argument and rebuttal, of invective and recrimination, of fear and hysteria. In the Halls of Congress, in the headlines and over the air, at every public and private gathering, statesmen of renown and unknown men in the streets furiously debated the paramount issue of the day: Intervention or isolation, should we enter the war or stay aloof? But suddenly our voices were stilled. The issue was brought to a head and settled by others. For, on December 7, 1941, the bloodstained fist of totalitarianism reached across the Pacific and plunged a dagger in our back.

The roar of a plane, the crash of a bomb, and the cries of mangled and dying Americans echoed over the waters into the hills and plains and valleys of our land. Who does not remember the shock of Pearl Harbor? The maddening messages which broke over the radio that peaceful Sunday afternoon? Who does not remember that initial moment of stunned and bewildered silence? But who does not remember the very next moment, the instant of unanimous and unified action. Our disputes were over. Our debates were at an end. Our arguments were done. All over the land, from home and school, from farm and factory, from career and ambition and loved ones, in a stupendous dedicatory action, there rushed American youth—millions of them—to camp, to ship, to plane, to foxhole. A united voice from platform and pulpit, from radio and press and newsreel, inspired them to do battle against the scourge of totalitarianism, against this new Caesarism which had the world by the throat; inspired them to fight, to suffer, to die if necessary—not in the name of skepticism or cynicism or materialism or pragmatism or positivism—but, in so many words, for the American philosophy and way of life, for the inalienable rights of man, for the dignity of the human personality, for the liberation of small nations, for the four freedoms everywhere, that by their sacrifice the lights of human liberty might go on again all over the world. And so inspired they fought, they suffered, and many thousands of them laid down their young lives; on the seven seas, and in every land from Berlin to Tokyo.

Who can forget those who did not come back? I cannot. I cannot, because it was my privilege to know many of them, to live with them, to laugh with them, to fear with them, to grieve with them, to confess and anoint them, and to love them. I cannot, because in the acrid smoke and lurid flame of battle I saw them go down; and I buried them at sea in the pitch blackness of the night, in the Marianas, the New Hebrides, the Philippines. Yes, these, our own, are dead. I cannot wipe away the sadness of their passing. But neither can I lose the inner peace and the fierce pride which stems from the conviction that they died, under the living God, for something worth while. They had a country with a genuine brotherhood of man, because it was predicated upon the fatherhood of God. And their reward is now the eternal company of their God.

Would you judge the philosophy of a country without a God by its fruits? Then come with me to the Nuremberg trials and hear a Nazi commander calmly testify to the efficiency with which, under governmental orders, he supervised the systematic murder of 2,500,000 innocent human beings in the extermination camp at Auschwitz. Smell the smoke of the ovens of Buchenwald, listen to the silence in the Katyn Forest, hear the riveting of chains in the slave labor camps of Siberia, hear the tramping feet of faceless Zombies marching in the Red Square of Moscow; see the screaming fanatics storming over the Yalu River to waste their lives in the red mud of Korea; behold the mangled bodies, the rotting corpses, the crippled minds, the broken hearts, the crushed liberties—the stench of physical and spiritual death—in the lands behind the Iron Curtain where modern Caesars have set up countries without a God. Yes, if you have the stomach for it, read the recent diabolical double-talk of Soviet peace intentions and United States war mongering, emitted by Nikolai Bulganin and Nikita Khrushchev in their recent barnstorming tour through India and Pakistan. Nikolai and Nikita have a country without a brotherhood of man, precisely because they repudiate the fatherhood of God.

In World War II American blood was spilled and American lives were sacrificed for a military victory. Our enemies surrendered. But then came Korea. Our own boys are dead. Hitler is dead, Mussolini is dead, and now Stalin is dead. But totalitarianism is not dead. Totalitarianism is still stalking over a major portion of God's earth, crushing the human spirit, stifling human ambition, and repressing the natural and inalienable rights of hundreds of millions of our fellow human beings. Only the callous can say we have liberated the smaller nations. Only the cynical can say we have secured the four freedoms everywhere. Only the blind can say that the lights of human liberty have come on again all over the world. Is this the victory for which we fought? The wine of victory is turning to gall in our mouths; the flame of peace is flickering to ashes in our hands. Surely this is not the victory for which we fought.

IV. THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

Why have we been so bitterly disappointed? Is it not because the war was a two-fold war: one of force, and one of ideas? The first, the war of physical force, resulted in military victory in World War II and in a stalemate in Korea. But the second, the war of ideas, has hardly begun. The ideas of our enemies are gathering momentum on the world-wide front. A soldier can be shot down; but ideas are bullet-proof. And this second war of ideas is even more important than the war of force. Because, in the long run, human beings are determined and governed more by ideas than by force. What is the challenge?

First: It is obvious, I trust, that we must build and maintain our military defenses, at whatever cost, to deter the Soviet Union from launching the thermo-nuclear weapons which threaten the end of civilization as we now know it.

Second: We must build and improve an American foreign policy which will deal with all the nations of the world—not on the basis of a cynical "enlightened self-interest"—but on the basis of the natural and inalienable rights and obligations of all.

Third: And this is specific to the purpose of tonight's meeting, we must assume the responsibility of demonstrating to the whole world, both slave and free, by the treatment of all our own citizens that the American philosophy of government must prevail over the totalitarian. This can be done in no better way than by improving the practical program of civil liberties here in these United States. And that program can be improved.

For the fundamental principles of the natural law, universal and immutable as the human nature from which they derive, require rational application to the constantly changing political, economic, and social conditions of civil society. The application of the natural law postulates change as the circumstances of human existence change. It repudiates a naive and smug complacency in the status quo. It demands a reasoned acceptance of the good, and a rejection of the bad, in all that is new. It commands a critical search for the better. It requires an exhaustive scrutiny of all the available data of history, politics, economics, sociology, psychology, philosophy, and every other pertinent font of human knowledge. Of primary importance, it insists that the search for a better corpus juris be made in the light of the origin, nature, dignity and destiny of man; and in the knowledge of the origin, nature, purpose, and limitations of the state.

This is not an easy task. Natural law does indeed imply the existence of some human rights which are absolute and inalienable, such as the right to life, worship, marriage, property, labor, speech, locomotion, assembly, reputation, etc. These are absolute in the sense that they derive from human nature; they are not mere handouts from the state. They are not absolute

in the sense that they are unlimited in scope. It is commonplace in classical natural law philosophy that human rights, even the most fundamental mentioned above, are limited. They are limited in the sense that they are subject to specification, qualification, expansion and contraction, and even forfeiture of exercise, as the equal rights of others and the demands of the common good from circumstance to circumstance, and from time to time, reasonably indicate. Human rights are absolute only in the sense of the minimal requirements of a just and ordered liberty.

The American philosophy of government, the natural law with its inalienable rights, is not self-executing. The Bill of Rights itself, and the other civil liberties guaranteed by articles I, III, IV, and VI, and by amendments XIII, XIV, and XV are not self-executing. These articles and amendments need and demand practical implementation by way of judicial interpretation, statutory enactments, and sincere acceptance in our own personal and private lives.

In the field of judicial interpretation, *Brown* v. *the Board of Education* (347 U. S. 483) and *Bolling* v. *Sharpe* (347 U. S. 497), ending forever the long and disgraceful discrimination against Negroes in public education, is a triumph of first magnitude in the advance of our civil liberties. I think this gathering should salute the courage, the justice, and the devotion to American ideals manifested by our unanimous Supreme Court in these historic decisions. Some progress has been made, and I trust it is only the beginning, by administrative regulations following the lead of the United States Supreme Court.

In the field of statutory enactments, I am happy that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by its commission against discrimination, has exhibited inspiring leadership to her sister States. I think we should congratulate the Massachusetts commission on its magnificent work, with the prayerful hope that complacency will never dim its leadership.

In the field of Federal legislation, however, I personally cannot be happy. Responsible political leaders and the campaign platforms of both parties have repeatedly promised Federal legislation in the area of civil liberties. Patriotic leaders from all walks of life have repeatedly and consistently advocated congressional action in the field of civil liberties. In 1947, President Harry Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, after holding extensive hearings, submitted a magnificent report recommending legislation which would eliminate vicious discrimination among citizens of the United States on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. Of recent years, over 100 bills have been submitted for the same purpose but to date, despite political platforms, despite the promises of political leaders, and despite the pleas of patriotic leaders in private life, nothing has been done by Congress.

I realize that the job is not easy. The Federal security program is unsatisfactory and needs serious improvement without jeopardizing either security or liberty. In this difficult task there will not be much help from the crackpots of the right or the screwballs of the left, or from the hysteria which befogs the issue from both extremes.

We are still waiting and hoping for the long-promised revision of the McCarran Immigration Act which so shamefully discriminates against the peoples of some countries. If and when the Congress corrects this inequity I shall remember with less embarrassment the inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. That statue facing across the waters of the Atlantic to the countries of Europe has inscribed on its base the following:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore,
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed, to me:
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

But even with the best of judicial interpretation and the best of statutory enactments, the fullness and magnificence of the American ideal of liberty will never prevail among us unless and until we private citizens accept it with conviction and practice it with sincerity in our own personal and private lives. A symptom of that conviction and of that practice would, for instance, be the disappearance of words like "nigger" and "kike" and "mick" and "wop" and "sheeny" and "heinie" and "frog" and "spick" and "greaser" and the rest of the contemptible language of racial bigotry. In the area of our national security, Sidney Hook has this to say:

"In the long run, however, neither laws nor security agencies, as necessary as they are, can constitute a lasting defense of democratic institutions, if the will to freedom is not strong in a people. * * * The Weimar Republic and Czechoslovakia are both illustrations of what happens when citizens idly watch conspirators paralyze the defensive powers of a democracy, avoid the fatiguing task of exposing and struggling against the conspirators in their multifarious guises and activities in the shop, on the street, in the schools, and rely mainly on the protective arm of the state itself infected with the germs of conspiracy." (Heresy, Yes; Conspiracy, No, p. 118.)

This is neither the forum nor the occasion, nor do I have the competence, to discuss the particular merits of the many and various bills which have been filed in the interests of civil liberty. Wherefore I have devoted most of my time in an attempt to outline the American philosophy of law which demands statutory implementation in order to be effective. And effective it must be, if we are to convince the world that our philosophy is something supremely worth while. For totalitarianism can only be defeated by a total dedication to the American philosophy of life and of liberty. It is, indeed, the age-old philosophy which conquered the ancient Caesar and remade the Roman Empire, which defeated and civilized the barbarian hordes, which overthrew the divine right of kings, which crushed nazism and fascism, and which is now engaged in a titanic struggle with atheistic communism. It is the philosophy which once united all Christendom, and which, some day, please God, will reunite a free and peaceful world.

Finally, my fellow citizens, your American philosophical heritage can never be "divisive"; for the philosophy of the natural law is not specifically Catholic, or Protestant, or Jewish. It is the philosophy which is logically antecedent to the theology of every revealed religion. It is the philosophy of the pagan—in the classical sense of the word "pagan," namely, one who worships Almighty God albeit without the profit of supernatural revelations.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to state, as a Catholic priest, that there will never be a doubt as to where the Catholic Church will stand in the struggle ahead to defend the American philosophy of life and of liberty. The Catholic Church will be, where she has always been, on the side of the natural and inalienable rights of every human being on the face of God's earth, regardless of race, or color, or creed, or position. Against the cynical terror of race and blood and Communist class hatred, the Catholic Church will teach, as she has always taught, that in the eyes of God there is neither white, nor black, nor brown, nor yellow, nor red; neither Jew nor Gentile nor Barbarian nor Scythian; but all are brothers in Christ Jesus. She will fight, with all her moral power, against the modern Caesars as she did against the old. For in loving obedience to her divine founder, she will continue to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's. And this she will do, come rack, come rope, unto the end of time.

Fiftieth Anniversary of Planters Nut & Chocolate Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Planters Co., which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent. This company, one of the finest and most successful enterprises in this country, was begun on what you might call "a shoelace" in my hometown of Wilkes-Barre, and through foresight, ingenuity, and sound production and merchandizing techniques by the late Mr. Obici and Mr. Peruzzi, grew into the great organization that it is today.

PLANTERS FIRM OBSERVING ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

The 50th anniversary of the founding of Planters Nut & Chocolate Co. in this city by the late Amedio Obici and Mario Peruzzi is being observed this year by the firm. The peanut and nut enterprise was founded in this city back in May, 1906.

The golden jubilee anniversary observance was opened last month when about 400 officials and members of the firm's sales force held a 2-day jubilee conference and get-together at Chicago's Edgewater Beach Hotel. In attendance were personnel from every branch of the multimillion dollar business enterprise that the cofounders, Amedo Obici and Maria Peruzzi, envisioned while the former was still pushing a peanut card around Public Square and the latter was hoping to make use of valuable experience on distribution gained with a European merchandising firm where he worked before coming to this county at the age of 19.

LOCAL OBSERVANCE

Originally plans called for the golden jubilee observance here in Wyoming Valley to follow closely the Chicago meeting but the passing of the late Mario Peruzzi, cofounder of the firm, last month in Mercy Hospital, forced postponement of the dinner party planned for area associates of the firm.

Tuesday night in Hotel Redington, the Wilkes-Barre office of the firm will hold its jubilee dinner party for valley residents employed at the South Main Street office and plant. Dinner will be served at 7:15, preceded by a cocktail hour at 6:30.

Ralph J. Lisman of Kingston will be master of ceremonies. He is a member of the firm's board of directors, executive director of one of the firm's wholly owned subsidiaries, the National Peanut Corp., which operates the famed Peanut Stores in 18 States east of the Mississippi, Texas, and Arkansas, and who has been with the firm more than 30 years.

LONG SERVICE

Michael Kwochka of Mountain Top, with 45 years service and assistant sales director, will give the firm's local associates a report on the Chicago celebration; P. J. Miller, of Tunkhannock, sales manager, who has been with the firm 36 years, will be among the speakers. A message also will be given by Frank A. English of Kingston, vice president of the board of directors, executive director of the parent company, who has 39 years of service.

Thomas Sangiuliano, 302 South River Street, with 49 years of service, and Miss Mary Sapser, 474 North Pennsylvania Avenue, who is completing her 45th year, will be honored.

Included on the program will be an illustrated review of the history and growth of the firm. A varied program of entertainment by the Walsh Trio will be given.

Highlight of the program will be the presentation of service pins to longtime employees. Those having 25 years of service or more—that are 20—will receive service pins with diamond chips in addition to a savings bond. Presentation of the pins will be by Ralph J. Lisman, assisted by Irving Frank, assistant secretary of the board of directors. Service pins will be presented to 44 longtime employees at the dinner Tuesday night.

The Coast Guard Moves in Rough Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine pride that I point to the ever-present vigilance and courage of the United States Coast Guard as evidenced by the rescue of the Essex yacht *Victoria* off the New England coast. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article on the subject from the November 24 issue of the Hartford (Conn.) Courant:

THE COAST GUARD MOVES IN ROUGH SEAS

The weather is something that preoccupies the landlubber when it's bad or good, but it keeps up with the seagoing all the time. The recent spell of rough weather hit hard at New England coastal sailors. It marooned a troop of visitors on the radar tower off Boston for 5 days, cut off contact with a Liberian freighter after a distress call on Sunday and trapped the Essex yacht *Victoria* southeast of New York so that it needed a tow back to safety. The Coast Guard had a busy week end.

Victoria was trying to make it to Bermuda. It had been forced back on one start by nasty weather in the sound, but gamely tried again under some handicaps. The weather wouldn't cooperate, and the heavy seas that put her deck awash jeopardized the vessel and the lives of the six aboard.

These are the hazards of the mariner, who has long had to cope with the vagaries of the weather. On balance, *Victoria* and its crew were lucky. It may be argued that they took some calculated risks in setting out in the face of the lesson taught by the sound, but breaking through to calm water has always been the ambition of the sailor, and in the face of a bitter winter setting in, it is a logical goal. But many a mariner, including *Victoria's* team, can give thanks again for the sturdy Coast Guard.

Labor Turns to Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there appeared in the September 19 issue of the publication Broadcasting-Telecasting an article by an old friend of mine, Mr. Morris S. Novik, entitled "Labor Turns to Radio."

Mr. Novik is one of the veterans in the field of radio and television. He is a pioneer—one of the early pioneers and most eminent figures today—in the use of radio and television as an educational medium by the great labor organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that this interesting article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR TURNS TO RADIO

(By M. S. Novik)

Lest anyone think, from the title of this piece, that labor is a newcomer to radio let the record show that labor started using commercial radio more than 5 years ago; and has been using the medium consistently on a year-round basis since then; and that labor uses radio on a Monday through Friday schedule. More than that, labor plans to continue using radio.

From the commercial aspect, labor in radio is a good success story for the industry. For not only has it been a consistent user but it has also increased its use of commercial time and can point to a number of specific instances where broadcasting really delivered the goods.

And this despite the interesting point that what labor has to sell is a way of life and not a piece of merchandise from a shelf.

The background on how and why labor turned to radio goes back to the days of the NRA and the Wagner Act during the depression. As a result of that legislation the labor movement grew by leaps and bounds. This growth was so tremendous and there were so many new members wanting to learn about trade unions that no union hall, not even Madison Square Garden, was large enough to hold the audience.

For example, one union, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, had over 150,000 new members. So in February of 1934 I produced, for the ILGWU, the first network labor program. It was a weekly series titled The Union Assembly and its primary function was educational.

To provide the sparkle that would carry the educational portions we used good music—actually, it was the first time chamber music groups like the Gordon String Quartet, the Compinsky Trio and the Coolidge Quartet had been on radio—and show business names like Eddie Cantor, George Jessel, Morton Downey and Molly Picon. All this plus talks by newsworthy personalities like Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, the then Secretary of Labor Frances Perkins, United States Senators Wagner and LaFollette, the then Governors Lehman of New York and Pinchot of Pennsylvania, and New York City's Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia.

This was so effective, on the network level, that in May of 1934 when Local 89, the Italian Dressmakers Union of the ILGWU, found itself with 40,000 new members in the metropolitan New York area, this local union developed a similar program.

Local 89 started with a weekly hour on WEVD New York in the Italian language, using operatic concerts for entertainment and top names for the talks. That Local 89 program which started over 20 years ago is still on the air, using the same format, and now has a regional hookup of stations along the East Coast.

So, when in 1949 the American Federation of Labor considered the use of radio, the labor movement had a precedent.

The reasons for the AFL's move to radio were no secret. As the executive council of the AFL stated in its 1950 report to the convention, "With the vast majority of the press, radio, and magazines still bitterly opposed to labor's objectives and still conducting what amounts to a deliberate campaign of propaganda against labor's policies and activities, it becomes increasingly important that labor present its own side of the story to the public by whatever means possible."

Around the country, at that time, there were eight million AFL members in 30,000 locals. (Now there are 10 million.) A good newscast, on a national network, could reach our members and the general public too. Our problem was to find a network, an experienced and qualified newsman who could build an audience, and to do it all on a limited budget.

On January 1, 1950, the AFL started a Monday-through-Friday quarter-hour newscast over 150 stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System. To stay within the $750,000 budget we broadcast 5 times a week in the 25 major markets, only thrice weekly in the other 125.

In most areas we were no different than any other national sponsor starting a big network program. We worried about the possible competition of the then new medium of television; we fussed about our spotlight ad schedule, and we fretted about notifying our 30,000 locals around the country about the correct time and day and station in their area.

There was one area where we differed and that difference was mighty big: It was in the program content and the commercial treatment. From the very beginning the AFL realized it had to be even more circumspect that Caesar's wife; the news on this program had to be factual, impartial, and comprehensive. The commercials had to be educational, effective, and logical. There could be no vitriolic blasts, no bellicose hard sell, and the name of the sponsor must never be camouflaged.

It was quite an ice jam we had to break in those days back in 1950, but the AFL succeded. Not only have we stayed with radio, but evidence of our effectiveness and vindication of our approach came a year later, when in 1951, the CIO started its own daily newscast on another network.

Today, as most everyone knows, the AFL presents Edward P. Morgan, veteran newspaperman and newscaster who headed the CBS newsdesk for radio and TV before taking the AFL program, while the CIO offers John W. Vandercook, another veteran editor and newscaster and ex-NBC commentator. Both programs are Monday-through-Friday network features and both newscasters have complete editorial freedom.

Another interesting note, and one unusual facet of the commercial treatment, is that the plug does not break into the middle of the program. There's a brief opening and less than a minute of commercial at the very close of the newscast.

One direct result of the success of these network programs by the AFL and the CIO is the use of radio by local labor groups on local stations in their own communities.

Some of these unions sponsor football games, others baseball, still others offer musi-

cal shows, and some participate as co-op sponsors, in their hometowns, of Drew Pearson, Martin Agronsky, Quincy Howe, etc., while others underwrite local newscasts. All of them do this consistently as a method of developing their identity in and with their communities.

In almost every instance, the commercials on these local programs are devoted to the needs of the community. Thus one commercial may call for blood donors for the blood bank and another may stress the union participation in the community chest drive.

As an example of the commercial treatment used by labor, here is what the AFL did on the Edward P. Morgan program during the week of September 5 through 9.

"The upcoming merger of the AFL and CIO will strengthen the campaign for better schools, decent housing, good roads, etc."

"Despite the conference at the summit there is no assurance that Soviet Russia sincerely desires to cooperate for peace. The free world must continue to maintain the strongest possible defense program, etc."

"The merger of the AFL and CIO will result in a united American labor movement with 15 million members standing solidly together for freedom, democracy and human progress, and resisting with all its power any form of dictatorship, including communism."

"The AFL has succeeded over the years in winning substantial advances in the American standard of living. If you work for a living the AFL is working for you."

And here is the complete commercial for Tuesday, September 6, 1955:

"Opening of the new school year underlines the fact that our country has failed to come to grips with its educational problems. The school shortage is more acute than ever. The lack of qualified teachers persists because standards have not been raised to a point high enough to attract young people to this noble profession. The AFL is convinced that this is one problem that time alone will not solve. A coordinated program of action is required—at the Federal level along with community and State cooperation. We have long advocated an effective program of Federal aid to education and we believe Congress should make this its first order of business when it reconvenes in January. The children of our country are its greatest asset and we cannot ignore their acute educational needs without imperiling our free way of life."

These programs have been most effective. This we know just as the national brand advertiser knows if his program is clicking. For the AFL's equivalent of the retailer is the 30,000 union meetings that occur each week all over the country. This considerable grass roots sample soon lets "the home office" know if it's not pleased. And the rank and file like what we do and so do their neighbors and friends.

In the more than 5½ years since the AFL started its network news program, labor has learned a lot about the use of radio. In recent years it has been using the broadcast medium to meet specific local and regional problems.

The United Auto Workers (UAW) created a regional network to air daily reports on the status of contract negotiations for the benefit of its members and their communities.

The Hatmakers Union used radio last year to get its side of a strike story across to its members and their neighbors.

In Miami, where a Hotel Workers Union struck for a new contract, they turned to radio to get their story across.

In New York City last year, the AFL used local radio in its drive to reorganize the waterfront.

Perhaps the best success story of all, about labor's use of radio, is the one that happened earlier this year. After more than a year of negotiation every railroad but one signed new contracts with the railway unions. That one exception was the Louisville & Nashville, a railroad serving 16 southern States. The lack of a contract resulted in a stirke that involved 25,000 workers in some 40 communities throughout the 16 States. Since it was a railroad, the mediation of the strike was under Federal jurisdiction and took place in Washington, D. C.

LABOR TELLS ITS SIDE

As often happens in situations like this, the newspapers, with few exceptions, told one side of the story. Even the statements of union officials were not being used. And since the mediation negotiations were going on in Washington the union had no fast line of communication to its members and to their communities.

All sorts of rumors spread like wildfire. The union members found themselves accused of sabotage, shootings, rioting and wrecking; the familiar reports of back-to-work and break-the-strike started to crop up. The railroad got its story across, the scare rumors cropped up anew each day and, because it had no fast line of communication, the union members were often confused and the townspeople more so. The situation was fluid and, since the economics of the communities were affected by the strike, there were potential areas of violence all over the region.

The answer was a hookup of 89 stations all through the 16 southeastern States involved. Twice daily, at 12:05 p. m. and 8:25 p. m., 6 days each week, direct from Washington where the negotiations were in progress, President G. E. Leighty of the railroad telegraphers and chairman of the joint negotiating committee, reported to the workers and the communities. (When Leighty was in negotiations President T. C. Carroll of the maintenance-of-way employees pinch-hit; the important thing being that again it was a union executive that the members knew and an executive that was participating in the negotiations.) He explained and interpreted what was happening around the bargaining table and covered the reasons leading up to the strike.

For 5 weeks the unions used this regional hookup of stations. After the first week the terrors and tensions disappeared. The union members and the townspeople knew what was happening; some of the newspapers found they had to cover both sides of the story. And, believe it or not, the railroad found it had to buy radio time to justify itself to the people in some of the areas affected by the strike.

This L. & N. strike story is a perfect example of how the speed and coverage of radio quickly and effectively stabilized a potential trouble area that would adversely affect both the unions and the communities. So far as labor is concerned, this series of radio programs opened contact with the general public, as well as the union members, and benefited both.

This successful use of radio by labor didn't come easy; it required a lot of work and doing. When labor first wanted to buy network time, 2 of the 4 national chains would not accept its business and many of the local stations were suspicious of labor and its objectives. Even now, after 5 years, some are still suspicious. Permit me to use some of Ed. Morgan's words, from his July 4 program, to cover this:

"Traveling back and forth across the country, as I have just done, people ask you such questions as these: How much control does the sponsor exercise over your broadcasts? How much editing and censoring of news and comment does the sponsor do? What 'line' does the sponsor dictate that you follow? The answer is, to their surprise, none, on all counts.

"I raise this point for two reasons: first, a reporter likes to try to build up a reputation of what might be called responsible independence. If he takes pride in his work, he wants to avoid becoming, or even seeming to become, a mouthpiece, which means he wants to preserve the right to make his own mistakes. That is why, as I mentioned on January 3, there is nothing in the agreements with the network and/or the sponsor, in fine print or otherwise, inhibiting this correspondent's editorial freedom.

"The second point is more interesting and, I think, generally more important. It stems from this question: Why do people assume, almost automatically, that if a labor union, or a labor federation, sponsors something, it has an ulterior motive, whereas if a business does, it is merely interested in selling a product or a service? The answer to this is not a simple one but I think a large part of it lies in the fact that the public in the past has regarded organized labor in a combative sense, as possibly a necessary but belligerent evil. Only recently has it dawned on the ordinary citizen, including this one, how heavy a stake unions have in, and how positive an influence they have on social progress. If this is a plug for my sponsor, let the most be made of it. It is made as a sincere observation on the basis of experience."

Now, one final word, as to the effectiveness of the AFL's newscasts. In January of 1955 we started on a new network, ABC, with a new commentator, Ed Morgan, at a new time. After 6 months, the ratings show that the program delivers homes at a cost per thousand of $2.36 and delivers listeners at a cost per thousand of only $1.52.

This, we feel, is one of the best, if not the best, buys of network newscasts across the board that any sponsor can make. We're satisfied and so are our members and our listeners.

A Tribute to Free Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the New York Times, January 15, 1956, which describes the ceremonies which took place when the merchant ship *Wolna Polska*—Free Poland—joined the world's itinerant cargo trade.

The article is as follows:

A ship manned by Polish refugees took to the sea yesterday as a symbol of a free Polish merchant marine.

A thousand persons bid bon voyage to the *Wolna Polska* (Free Poland) as the 10,000-ton Liberty-type vessel left pier 42, Hudson River, to join the world's itinerant cargo trade. Her first stop will be at Norfolk to take on coal for Genoa, Italy.

A flag resembling the red and white standard of Free Poland was hoisted just before sailing. It is the emblem of the Pulaski Transportation Line, organized by a group of Polish-American businessmen to charter the ship.

Among those at the presailing ceremony were Vincent A. G. O'Connor, Commissioner of Marine and Aviation; Representative Thaddeus M. Machrowicz, Democrat, of Michigan; the Most Reverend Joseph J. Flannelly, auxiliary bishop of New York; Frank N. Piasecki and Walter I. Guzwicz, chairman and president, respectively of the Pulaski Line; and representatives of the Polish-

American Congress and the Free Europe Committee.

The 37 crew members deserted ships in Europe or the United States to escape Communist oppression at home. Flying the flag of Liberia, since she cannot be registered in Communist Poland, the vessel is commanded by Capt. Jan R. Cwiklinski, former master of the Polish liner *Batory*.

Review of United Nations Administrative, Personnel, and Budgetary Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, during the recess our distinguished colleague and a hard-working, very able member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, delivered a number of very fine addresses while serving as a United States Delegate to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations.

There follows the first of these addresses, delivered on October 11, 1955, which is the first time in the history of the United Nations that such a thorough overall review of the administrative progress and problems in the United Nations and its specialized agencies had ever been given:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS IN THE UNITED NATIONS AND ITS AGENCIES

(Statement by CHESTER E. MERROW, United States Representative to the General Assembly)

As you know, it has become almost a tradition in the United States for the President to appoint at least two Members of the Congress to serve on the United States delegation to the United Nations. As in all countries, such an appointment is one of the highest honors which one can receive. I accordingly consider myself most fortunate to have been asked by President Eisenhower to serve as a delegate to this 10th General Assembly.

In the course of these first days of the General Assembly, I have had an opportunity to meet a number of my fellow delegates from many other countries. We have exchanged views on several topics. One of the favorite topics has been the comparison of assignments. In the course of our discussions, I have been struck by the fact that the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, to which we here have been assigned, is a central and all-important committee. Although the functions of the Committee are comparable to the Appropriations Committees of National Congresses and Parliaments, they also extend to broader problems of administration.

You, Mr. Chairman [Hans Engen], as the respected Ambassador of Norway, a country known for its interest in administration and economy, and the distinguished Chairman of the Advisory Committee, Ambassador Aghnides, are among those whom I have met who share my own view of the importance of this Committee.

Because it is essential that the importance of this body, the counterpart of similar committees in our national parliaments, be fully understood, I hope I may be pardoned if I express my views on the work of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee and on its place in the United Nations structure.

First, and of special importance, is the fact that the Administrative and Budgetary Committee is the only place in the United Nations where the representatives of governments can examine together the organizational, administrative, and financial structure of the various parts of the United Nations system to insure the development of a sound and integrated whole. This opportunity is of particular interest to me. During my service in the Congress of the United States, I have had the privilege of serving as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. This subcommittee conducted hearings and studied the operations of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and other international organizations. I was also head of a mission that visited all of the specialized agencies located in Europe, as well as the branch office of the United Nations. This mission discussed with the key officials of these agencies many of the problems which concern us here. The report of the mission to the Congress has been printed and given public distribution. With Ambassador Aghnides, I share the experience and memory of attending the 1945 conference in London that drafted the UNESCO constitution. All of this makes the opportunity for an exchange of views in the General Assembly especially welcome.

It is well, perhaps, in this 10th anniversary year of the United Nations, to begin with an across-the-board look at the developments in our major fields of concern—organizational matters, budgets and contributions, personnel policy, and coordination of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

GROWTH OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

First, in the organizational field. The years since the establishment of the United Nations have seen a growth not only in the United Nations itself but also the development of 10 specialized agencies of the United Nations. There is the International Labor Organization, which was originally part of the League of Nations and is seeking to raise labor standards and improve working conditions. The Food and Agriculture Organization has been established to improve food and agricultural production and distribution. To promote peace through collaboration in educational, scientific, and cultural matters, there is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. The International Civil Aviation Organization aims at developing international air transport and improving standards of international air navigation. The task of facilitating exchange of mail and improving world postal services falls to the Universal Postal Union, one of the oldest international organizations, dating back to 1875. The World Health Organization is dedicated to raising world health standards. The International Telecommunication Union, which stems from an organization established in 1865, is engaged in promoting the rational and efficient use of telecommunication facilities. Better weather reporting is the aim of the World Meteorological Organization, a recent outgrowth of the International Meteorological Organization. The International Bank and the International Monetary Fund undertake to facilitate the investment of capital for productive purposes and to promote currency stability.

In addition to these permanent and regularly supported specialized agencies, there are now five programs operating under United Nations aegis with the assistance of voluntary contributions. These are the International Children's Fund, to promote maternal and child welfare; the Technical Assistance Program, to bring about higher living standards; the Palestine Relief and Works Agency, to provide food, shelter, and gainful employment for nearly 900,000 refugees; the Korean Reconstruction Agency, to relieve the suffering and repair the devastation caused by aggression; and the Refugee Fund, to find permanent solutions for limited groups of refugees.

The activities of these agencies and programs extend to nearly every part of the world—to approximately 90 countries and territories, in fact, thus reaching far beyond the membership of the United Nations itself. The result is a growth in the size of the regular international secretariats until they now total more than 9,000 persons. To this must be added the internationally recruited personnel required to operate the voluntary programs—a total of approximately 2,200 persons. This is exclusive of local assistance which runs into the thousands.

This trend has led to organizational decentralization, and this in turn raises the most difficult kind of management problems, many of which have yet to be solved in a satisfactory manner. Through his organizational survey extending over the last 2 years, the Secretary-General has sought to assess the character of the problems which the United Nations faces in this area. He is now in the process of instituting measures designed to improve overall United Nations management and control of its far-flung operations. Whether current measures are an adequate answer to this problem remains to be seen. I am convinced that efforts in the same direction should be continued in the United Nations and should be undertaken in the specialized agencies.

TOTAL COST OF THE U. N. SYSTEM

The Information Annex to the Budget Estimates for 1956 (Document A/2904/Add.1) shows us that the gross budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, exclusive of the International Bank and International Monetary Fund, total $85 million in 1955. To this should be added $102,500,000, representing the approximate 1955 operating level of the voluntarily financed United Nations programs of the International Children's Fund, the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance, the Refugee Fund, the Palestine Relief and Works Agency, and the Korean Reconstruction Agency. The combined total of regular budgets and voluntary programs for 1955 approximate $187,500,000. This compares to a total expenditure figure of approximately $122,500,000 in 1947, the first fully operative year of the United Nations, the Children's Fund, and the then existing specialized agencies (inclusive of the International Refugee Organization, but exclusive of the International Bank and Fund).

For the period from 1946 to 1954 inclusive, the total of the United Nations and the currently existing specialized agency expenditures (exclusive of the Bank and Fund) amount to approximately $601 million. If the budgets for 1955 are added, the cumulative total to date is $686 million. Add to this $665 million representing the amount spent on the voluntarily financed programs of the United Nations for the same period, plus $412,700,000 expended by the International Refugee Organization, and we see that a total of $1,764,000,000 has been devoted by the international community to the work of the United Nations agencies.

If these facts and figures are to be really meaningful in terms of the task of this committee, it is necessary to analyze them briefly. The 1947 figures represent the initial development stage of the United Nations, the International Children's Fund, and 7 specialized agencies, 1 of which is no longer in operation, namely, the International Refugee Organization. The 1955 figure represents the going programs of the United Nations, 8 of the specialized agencies, and 5 major operating agencies, supported by voluntary funds.

Translated into activities, the growing figures spell cooperative international endeavor

to keep the peace, to raise standards of living through economic and social development, to feed the hungry, to care for the displaced and homeless, to fight disease and ignorance, to facilitate man's efforts to communicate, and to enhance man's enjoyment of work and life. Given these goals, the funds expended can be easily justified, provided this committee and its counterpart in other agencies exercise the necessary vigilance to insure that waste, inefficiency, organizational defects, and unnecessary overhead are eliminated and that the results achieved are commensurate with the outlay of funds. The fact that the United Nations budget seems to have reached a stabilization point does not mean that we should relax our efforts to find ways and means of improving efficiency and eliminating unnecessary activities. This is a continuing responsibility of good stewardship. The budgets of the specialized agencies should likewise be subjected to continuing and careful scrutiny by governments.

SHARING OF COSTS

At the same time that these regular budgets of the United Nations agencies have been increasing, there has been a trend toward more equitable sharing of costs, so that no one member pays more than one-third of the total budget in any agency. The payment record in all agencies would indicate that with few exceptions, where the circumstances are most unusual, assessments upon governments have not exceeded their capacity or willingness to pay. This presents a sharp contrast to the situation existing in the programs financed by voluntary contributions, viz, the United Nations International Children's Fund, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, United Nations Refugee Fund, and the Expanded Technical Assistance Program.

We had a report last week from Mr. Cutts, the chairman of the special committee set up to negotiate and collect contributions for these programs. This report indicated that pledges in particular lag far behind the financial targets which have been set in order to operate an adequate program. This is in spite of the fact that the larger contributors assume a higher proportion of the total costs than is the case with the regular budgets. In the light of the important tasks assigned to these agencies, I believe we should give serious attention to the possible reasons for this situation—whether targets are set too high or governments are ignoring their responsibilities or both.

The support of all member governments—and I stress the word "all"—for the causes served by the programs of the United Nations agencies must be sustained and indeed increased. The form of such support, i. e., through an international agency or otherwise, and the amount of money devoted to it will require a continuing assessment of the following factors, among others:

(a) whether an international agency can be demonstrated to be the best instrument for meeting the needs which are justifiably the concern of the international community;

(b) the degree to which the members of such an agency are willing to bear an equitable share of the financial burdens entailed in assuming such international responsibilities. It is an inescapable fact that, if the brunt of the costs fall upon a few member states, the undertaking is not truly international and misunderstandings will surely result;

(c) and lastly, whether international assistance will be adequately supported and supplemented by national endeavor.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

Another major area of continual concern to this committee has been the development of sound personnel policies. The record will show, I believe, that this has been one of the most challenging but difficult aspects of the development of international organizations. This is due not only to the human and personal problems involved, but also to the vastly different national traditions and approaches in dealing with these problems. Nevertheless, considerable progress has been made in developing among the United Nations agencies good, sound, and consistent conditions of service in respect of such matters as salaries and allowances, pensions, leave, sickness, and disability benefits. Past and current debate in this committee and in the specialized agencies indicates, however, the continued existence of numerous unsolved problems connected with staff morale and with the selection, development, and maintenance of competent staff of the highest integrity.

For example, concern has been reiterated many times on such problems as attracting high caliber staff, equitable geographical distribution, eliminating incompetent or unsuitable staff, giving encouragement and recognition to competent staff, and development of an esprit de corps within the organization. These utterances, together with expressed attitudes and actions of the various staff councils, indicate that far greater attention and emphasis needs to be given to ways and means of improving personnel management. It would appear to be essential, for example, to develop recognized and accepted standards of competence for selection and promotion and to evolve methods for applying these as objectively as possible. Member governments, the staff, and the public at large must be assured that the controlling criteria are the charter standards of the highest integrity, competence, and efficiency, and that to the extent that these standards are met, due regard is paid to recruiting on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

A second consideration is that perhaps the time has come to examine the concept of geographical representation to see whether the interests of the organization might be better served if this is interpreted to be a fair representation of the various cultures indigenous to the various member states. A mere counting of heads by nationality does not serve the purpose of enriching the organization by the provision of diversified training, background, and traditions. Still another factor requiring attention is mentioned by the International Civil Service Advisory Board, a group of international experts in this field, when it emphasized that adequate staff induction and training, as well as effective supervision, are especially important in an international organization. Yet there appears to be little evidence throughout the agencies of specific programs to insure that these needs are met. These are but a few examples, but I believe this recital serves to illustrate how much more can and should be done in the interest of improving effectiveness of the staff.

COORDINATION OF UNITED NATIONS AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

While I have sought to present an overall summary of administrative progress and problems in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, such a survey would not be complete without mention of the question of coordination, as such. Considerable progress in coordination among the United Nations and its specialized agencies has been made in the administrative field. There are, for example, a generally comparable salary allowance and leave system, a common pension system, comparable personnel and financial regulations, and certain common administrative services. This accomplishment has been primarily due to the combined efforts of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, the Administrative Committee on Coordination and its subcommittees, and the consistency of positions of many of the governments represented in the various organizations.

In view of this and the work being undertaken by the Economic and Social Council to insure coordination and integration of program planning, it seems timely to my delegation to explore what measures this committee might recommend to improve the combined operations and effectiveness of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Before advancing the suggestions of my delegation, let me state briefly what I believe the basic relation of the United Nations and its agencies should be. The central fact is that each agency, regardless of its constitutional autonomy, is a vital part of the whole United Nations system. In the eyes of the world, the success of a specialized agency is considered the success of the United Nations itself and vice versa. Likewise, the weakness of a specialized agency is considered to be the weakness of the United Nations. There is a reality we should not ignore.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Against this background of progress and problems, I shall proceed to outline the views of my delegation on both the issues before us which require immediate action and those on which attention needs to be focused and an exchange of views encouraged if solutions are to be eventually developed.

1. We are satisfied with the role of the Advisory Committee and the Contributions Committee, and we shall on most points support their recommendations for the 1956 United Nations budget and scale of assessment. We note that both committees are authorized by the Assembly to render service to the specialized agencies. The Contributions Committee has been called upon by numerous agencies to provide factual and statistical data. The Advisory Committee received authorization last year to visit the specialized agencies, upon their invitation, to continue the study of administrative and budgetary coordination. It is understood that at least one agency has extended an invitation to the Advisory Committee. It is to be hoped that others will do likewise, since there is a very real need for the budget of every U. N. organization to have the careful and thorough type of expert examination which is given by the Advisory Committee on behalf of governments.

The advantage of having one group do the task for all agencies is obvious. It is a means by which the administration and governments in each agency can obtain objective advice on administrative improvements that would lead to better results for the money expended. It offers a means of identifying and focusing attention on common problems and the solutions thereto. The question arises, however, as to how the Advisory Committee can fulfill its responsibilities to the Assembly and at the same time perform a useful role on behalf of the agencies.

Since article 17 of the United Nations Charter places upon the Assembly certain responsibilities for review of specialized agency budgets, we can all agree that from the standpoint of the General Assembly as well as of the specialized agencies it is important for the Advisory Committee to undertake such a role. The problem therefore boils down to one of practical arrangements. It would appear to my delegation that there are several possible courses of action that would enable the Advisory Committee to fulfill this enlarged role satisfactorily to all concerned. Before advancing any specific suggestions on this matter, however, I think it is more fitting that we should profit from any views the Advisory Committee itself may have on this point. I hope that Ambassador Aghnides, with his usual wisdom, can point the way for a fruitful discussion among delegations and representatives of the specialized agencies.

2. The second major suggestion which grows out of my introductory analysis is in response to the need for giving more attention to achieving better personnel management. This, of course, can only be done successfully if the head of each agency recognizes the importance of this matter and gives it his full support. Otherwise day-to-day operations will tend to crowd out such a program. We would urge that the Secretary-General and the heads of the various agencies give this matter high priority during the course of the next few years. It is important that the U. N. organizations benefit from modern techniques in personnel management. One rather concrete proposal which suggests itself on the basis of current United States experience is the institution of an incentive award system.

The President of the United States, with congressional approval, initiated a program of this kind last November, as a means of enlisting the ingenuity and inventiveness of every member of the United States civil service in the cause of greater efficiency and productivity. The Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission reported recently that during the first 7 months of operation 138,000 suggestions were received, 35,000 adopted, about $1,500,000 were paid out in cash awards, and the taxpayer benefited to the extent of savings of $40 million. While the unique and complex character of personnel problems in international organizations may require considerable modification of national experience, it is still valid to expect that these organizations can benefit from experience like that of the United States.

We also believe that the International Civil Service Advisory Board could play a useful and more active role in this connection. To date the Board has issued advisory reports covering recruitment, training, and standards of conduct. They provide basic policy guides which can and should be used to better purpose by all agencies, but there has been no followup. More could be done by the Board, particularly in assisting those organizations to plan and develop sound programs of this kind, tailored to the agency's needs.

3. My third major suggestion is directed to both the secretariats and the governments represented here and in other agencies. I believe, and it is the belief of my Government, that greater vigilance and restraint are required in order to avoid an unduly large proportion of international budgets being used for administrative and overhead services. There are a number of specific measures which could and should be employed with greater fidelity to curb this tendency and which should lead to greater economy.

(a) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, major meetings of international organizations should be held at headquarters.

(b) Meetings should be scheduled to avoid peaks and valleys in the workloads for secretariats and governments.

(c) There should be strict publication and documentation control. In this connection, my delegation would like to suggest that the fifth committee might set an example and establish a healthy precedent by foregoing summary records except for important debates. For many items on the agenda, such as those we have just disposed of, the report of the committee constitutes an adequate account of the proceedings.

This is not solely a United Nations problem. The following plaintive note is sounded in the report of the Program Commission of the last General Conference of UNESCO.

"In conclusion, the Commission wishes to call the attention of the General Conference to certain problems which have not only caused delay but have also, in many cases, reduced the effectiveness of its work. First is the problem of paperwork. Never before has the Commission had to consider so many documents as this year. * * * A considerable number of important resolutions were hidden in these piles of papers, from which they had to be sorted out in order to be adopted, or more often than not held over for another meeting, or amended, or re-amended, until one's head began to spin."

This has an all-too-familiar ring and has been echoed in these halls as well as elsewhere.

(d) Meetings should start promptly. In this, some of the technical agencies such as WHO maintain a better record than the United Nations organs. The International Scientific Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva last August was outstanding on this score. The following excerpt from the closing address of the president of the conference, Dr. Bhabha, of India, points to the fact that:

"Its success is also due to the spirit and the manner in which all the delegates have played their part. From the very beginning meetings have begun and ended on time, and all the speakers have adhered to the time limit set in the program. I am told that this is by no means a usual feature of international conferences. The difference can perhaps be attributed to the circumstance that, in a scientific conference such as this, each speaker has something concrete to communicate. I suppose that, when one has nothing too concrete to communicate, there is no inherent reason why, having started speaking, one should stop."

My colleagues will be greatly relieved, I am sure, to know that I have taken the last comment of Dr. Bhabha to heart and that very soon I will stop.

ADDITIONAL SPECIAL ITEMS

Mr. Chairman, I should like to indicate at this point the United States position on several nonrecurring items which are important primarily in the United Nations context.

My delegation strongly supports the recommendations of the Special Committee on Judicial Review of Administrative Tribunal Judgments and hopes that the report of that committee will enable the Fifth Committee to deal with this item with a minimum of debate.

The United States Government is also gratified to note that the Secretary General plans to complete the headquarters construction in 1956 and, in this connection, to erect a memorial plaque for those who have died in the service of the United Nations. We also consider it eminently just and proper for the Fifth Committee to act favorably on the proposal to establish a memorial cemetery in Korea.

I could not close these general remarks without expressing the appreciation of my delegation for the work of the various standing committees which serve the Fifth Committee so faithfully, such as the Advisory Committee, the Contributions Committee, and the Board of Auditors.

My delegation would also like to associate itself with the thanks expressed by the chairman of the Advisory Committee, in the foreword to the committee's first report, to the persons who have contributed to the work of the Advisory Committee. This particularly applies to the valuable assistance rendered by Mr. Watson Sellar, retiring member of the Board of Auditors, and Mr. Hans Christian Andersen, retiring Controller, both of whom have contributed so much to the sound financial management of the United Nations. The Fifth Committee is indebted to Mr. Sellar, who has served since the inception of the United Nations, for his personal contribution to the development of a thoroughgoing audit system and for the enormous assistance rendered by the staff of his Government department. Tribute is also due the Government of Canada, which has made this possible.

If, as on this occasion and others, we feel it necessary to comment critically on certain details of Untied Nations administration, we do so only out of a desire to be helpful and constructive. My delegation is convinced that the United Nations must continue to examine and improve its administrative practices if it is to fulfill the great hopes that we—and I think the whole world—have for its continued growth as an instrument working for peace in this nuclear age. I have no doubt that my colleagues on this committee are as conscious as I am of the great responsibility we bear as overseers of an organization which embodies so much hope and promise. If the United Nations is to play the role expected of it in this disorderly and uncertain world, those who carry out its mandate will have to function with a high sense of duty and teamwork.

Convinced as we are of the challenge and the difficulty which this administrative task places upon the Secretary-General, we stand ready always to cooperate with him. His term of office has been marked by accomplishments and improvements which merit our sincere pride and gratitude.

I am confident that, if properly supported, the United Nations system as it enters its second decade will grow, develop, and increase in influence and effectiveness. We are engaged in waging peace with an intensity and earnestness of purpose never before experienced in the history of the world. In that great effort the United Nations system serves as one of mankind's major instrumentalities. The charter is a living organism and has developed and must continue to develop as a potent instrument for meeting the many complex problems of international character which know no boundary lines. As we try to project the future, we can be certain that, with a concerted effort on the part of all of us, the United Nations system will succeed and help man realize his greatest hope and that a new and peaceful world will emerge through the instrumentality of the U. N. structure. Toward that goal the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, by making possible more efficient use of available funds, can make a major contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there follows the final address delivered by the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, while serving as a United States delegate to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations. This address was delivered before the General Assembly on December 16, 1955, and gives a thorough review of the United States position on the United Nations budget for 1956 and the need for improved budget procedure and sound fiscal policies in the United Nations. During the 83d Congress, Mr. MERROW had served as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, and had conducted thorough studies of this subject matter. He thus brought to his U. N. assignment a background of solid and valuable experience.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN CHESTER E. MERROW, UNITED STATES DELEGATE, IN PLENARY SESSION ON THE UNITED NATIONS BUDGET FOR 1956

My delegation will support in this plenary session the total appropriation for 1956 voted by the Fifth Committee, but it does so with some reservations.

ANALYSIS OF BUDGET INCREASES

With the forewarning which we had received as to the necessity for a large supplemental approrpiation for 1955 to cover such items as the Geneva Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, it was the expressed hope of my delegation at the outset of the debate in the Fifth Committee that we could keep the 1956 budget to the level recommended by the Advisory Com-

mittee, namely, $46,016,000. Instead, the budget approved by the Fifth Committee has reached $48,566,350, an increase of approximately $1,600,000 over the budget which this Assembly approved last year for 1955.

These increases fall largely into four categories of expenditures; i. e., activities related to peaceful uses of atomic energy, technical assistance in the social welfare and human rights field, operation of field offices and special missions, and salary adjustments. My delegation in the budgetary committee supported important program expansion and some increased expenditures in all of these items except the one relating to salary adjustments. We opposed some of the appropriations voted for program expansion, and we opposed the increase in headquarters cost-of-living allowance. We recognized that changing economic conditions and particularly the increase in United States Federal Government salaries necessitated a reappraisal of the adequacy of the total level of United Nations remuneration. We were opposed to the Secretary General's proposal for a cost-of-living adjustment at this time because, on the basis of prevailing standards in United Nations and the specialized agencies, there is no present justification for this kind of a salary increase.

However, we believe that the establishment of a committee composed of governmental experts to review the salary, allowance, and benefit system in 1956, is a welcome development. Such a review should make it possible to achieve two objectives: Namely, (1) to adjust the common remuneration system of the United Nations and the specialized agencies to present-day requirements for attracting and holding a highly qualified multinational staff in positions in all parts of the world, and (2) to make these adjustments in a manner which takes adequate account of the responsibilities and financial resources of international organizations and the standards of remuneration in national public services.

In this connection, Mr. President, may I state that the United States Government is not satisfied with the present level of participation by United States nationals in the various international secretariats and technical assistance programs. We trust the recommendations of the committee will be such as to encourage an increased number of United States nationals to seek international employment, not only at the United Nations headquarters but also at other international agency centers as well.

While a number of the proposals for additional budgetary increases were resisted by the committee, my delegation was disappointed that the proposals for increased expenditures were not offset to a larger extent by compensating economies. We had hoped, for example, to make some savings by altering the regulations for publication of treaties. Likewise, we had hoped to defer less essential items, such as expenditures for improvement of facilities for conferences and meetings in Geneva.

The net result of all of the financial decisions taken by the fifth committee is that the expenditures to be assessed in respect of the 1955 supplemental appropriation and the 1956 budget will total $51,830,550, the largest in United Nations history (I might add parenthetically that we hope that this 10th General Assembly will securely hold this dubious distinction unchallenged for many years to come). The amount of these appropriations is due not only to the increase of $1,600,000 in the 1956 budget to which I have already referred, but also to the coincidental occurrence of unusually high supplemental expenditures in respect of 1955, without the offsetting savings that were available last year. The supplemental items for 1955 include $1,400,000 of the total cost of $2,361,000 for the International Scientific Conference on Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy; $1,630,000 representing the last appropriation for reimbursement of national taxes to staff members; and other unforeseen costs relating to such matters as the disarmament meeting in London, and the Secretary General's successful trip in accordance with the General Assembly's directive to obtain the release of 11 United States prisoners and other personnel of the United Nations Command captured in the Korean war.

BASIS FOR UNITED STATES SUPPORT

Despite its concern over the upturn of United Nations expenditures just at the point when we had anticipated stabilization, the United States will support the appropriation recommended by the Fifth Committee for 1956. We do so in recognition of two facts: (1) that the Secretary General and the General Assembly have, over the past 2 years, made a real effort and considerable progress in reducing the regular budget and (2) that a sizable amount of the increased assessments being voted for 1956 is of a nonrecurring character. My delegation strongly urges, however, that the upward trend of expenditures reflected in the 1956 budgets of not only the United Nations but also the specialized agencies not be considered as establishing a precedent for future years.

In an earlier statement before the fifth committee, I expressed the belief that the support of all member governments for the causes served by the programs of the United Nations agencies should be sustained and indeed increased. This should not be interpreted, however, as urging increases in the regular budgets. The avenues by which these causes can be served are many. As I indicated in the fifth committee, the form of such support; i. e., whether through the regular budgets of international organizations, through international voluntary programs, or through such other forms of intergovernmental cooperations as bilateral programs, will require a continuing assessment of the following factors, among others:

(a) Whether an international agency can be demonstrated to be the best instrument for meeting the need which are justifiably the concern of the international community;

(b) The degree to which the members of such an agency are willing to bear an equitable share of the financial burdens entailed in assuming such international responsibilities. It is an inescapable fact that, if the brunt of the costs falls upon a relatively few member states, the undertaking is not truly international, and lasting and bitter misunderstandings will surely result; and

(c) Whether international assistance will be adequately supported and supplemented by national endeavor.

One further fact that must be continuously borne in mind by member states as well as the Secretariat was pointed out to us by the Secretary General last year in his annual report. He stated: "That the very nature of the responsibilities that must be assumed by the Secretary General and his senior staff imposes a limit on the volume of the tasks that can be handled effectively, irrespective of the additional funds, personnel, and facilities that might be placed at their disposal."

All of these factors dictate caution in the expansion by the General Assembly of the permanent establishments and the regular budgets of international organizations. This does not mean that pressing world problems will be neglected by the community of nations represented here and in the specialized agencies; far from it.

Although the sum total of the regular budgets of the United Nations and currently existing specialized agencies for the period 1946 to 1955 inclusive approximates $686 million, an additional amount of more than $1 billion has been contributed to international programs, especially designed to provide relief and rehabilitation for refugees, to give technical assistance for economic and social development, and to promote maternal and child welfare. In addition, very material assistance in promoting economic development is provided through the facilities of the International Bank and Monetary Fund. And augmenting all of these efforts are large national programs of assistance such as the United States technical cooperation plan and regional programs such as the Colombo plan. The value and results which derive from such a flexible, many-pronged approach to these problems cannot be overestimated and should not be jeopardized by premature or unrealistic expansion of the regular budgets and staffs of international organizations.

IMPROVED BUDGET PROCEDURE

In expressing our hopes regarding the budget to be presented next year, I should also like to mention our interest in seeing the advisory committee and the Assembly develop a more simplified form of the budget that will enable the financial control exercised by the Assembly and the Secretary General to be more effective and will, at the same time, reduce administrative redtape.

We welcome, too, the initiative taken by the distinguished delegate of Denmark in the fifth committee in calling our attention to the need for improving the organization and scheduling of the fifth committe's work. This led to a fruitful discussion on ways and means of eliminating delays and of facilitating, in particular, the review of the budget and decisions relating thereto.

The Assembly will note in the report of the fifth committee that the United States suggested that the agenda of the 11th session of the General Assembly might include an item entitled "General Assembly Procedures for Consideration and Adoption of the Budget." We are pleased that the Secretary General will give this matter his attention during this next year.

While experience, particularly this year, has shown the need for procedural improvements, I should like to testify to the skill of the chairman of the fifth committee. With the difficulties we faced, only the direction of a superb chairman could save us. My delegation believes that we, therefore, owe a special debt of gratitude to Ambassador Engen of Norway.

COORDINATION OF U. N. AND AGENCIES

In matters of coordination with the specialized agencies, the decision of the fifth committee to support the Secretary General's request for increases in salaries and in the education allowance was, in our judgment, without sufficient notice to the specialized agencies. This seems a regrettable departure from the repeated emphasis given by the Assembly to the desirability of coordinating administrative policies and practices among the United Nations and the Agencies.

On the other hand, the fifth committee did recommend that the United Nations offer its assistance to the International Telecommunications Union and World Meteorological Organization in constructing a headquarters that would permit them to share the facilities of the Palais des Nations with the United Nations and the World Health Organization. We hope that this will eventuate in closer relationships among these organizations and that it will be ultimately possible for them and us to benefit from the greater use of common services that would result from living under the same roof.

Another step that should be conducive to improved coordination of the United Nations and the specialized agencies in the administrative field is the decision of the advisory committee to undertake a more intensive review of problems in this area. This will be possible by consultations at the headquarters of several specialized agencies during the coming years. We commend the

agencies, the advisory committee, and its distinguished chairman, Ambassador Aghnides, on this constructive approach.

To summarize, Mr. President, my delegation will support the recommended appropriation, in spite of its reservations. We believe that, through the exercise of restraint and the constructive application of our joint efforts, the members of the United Nations should be able to regulate better any further budgetary expansion. We are confident that, by following sound fiscal policies and by inaugurating improved methods of budgetary management and control, the United Nations will be greatly strengthened. The budget is, of course, the reflection of the development of the activities of the organization. The appropriations place in practical effect the provisions of the budget. My delegation firmly believes that, by continued pursuance of sound financial principles, the United Nations during its second decade will increase in influence and effectiveness as the greatest force for helping man to realize his hopes for bringing about a peaceful world.

Hon. George C. McGhee—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have previously called the attention of this body to the Student Conference on National Affairs held by the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas this past fall.

Among the distinguished speakers present for this conference was the Honorable George C. McGhee. Mr. McGhee has quite a history of service in the field of foreign affairs, having been a former Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern, South Asian, and African Affairs; senior adviser, North Atlantic Treaty Council; United States Ambassador to Turkey; Chief, Joint American Military Mission for Aid to Turkey; and Chairman of the United States Educational Commission in Turkey.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include, in two parts, the speech delivered by Mr. McGhee to the student conference:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—SOME THINGS IT IS AND ISN'T

(Address by George C. McGhee before the First Student Conference on National Affairs, Texas A. & M. College, College Station, Tex., December 14, 1955)

It is a great pleasure for me to address this first student conference on national affairs, including as it does representatives from 48 colleges as well as many distinguished visitors and participants from all over the country. I will speak to you tonight on American foreign policy—not as it relates to particular problems—but in its more general aspects. What I will say is concerned more with the philosophy and limitations of foreign policy than with its substance. It is difficult to find a subject for such a discourse, however, I have chosen "American Foreign Policy—Some Things It Is and Isn't."

I would like to make it clear at the outset that I do not speak to you in any partisan way. Although the principal architects of our foreign policy, must, under the President and Secretary of State, be leaders from within a particular political party, I consider that political partisanship as such should end at the door of the State Department. Indeed, one of my principal objectives is to seek tolerance and patience for those who conduct our foreign policy, regardless of which administration they represent.

We should welcome constructive debate on foreign policy issues—including debate by political leaders of both parties—indeed this is necessary in a democracy. But even though political advantage may flow from, it should not motivate such debate. Since I know from experience the immensity of the problems our foreign policymakers face, many of them problems which a reasonable man might dismiss as insoluble, and the limitations on the means at their disposal to control the course of world affairs, I would ask you to give them every benefit of the doubt in the carrying out of their difficult task.

There is a story of an oldtimer in Congress who was giving advice to a young freshman Congressman. "Son," he said, "I'll tell you the secret of my success up here. If you will just follow my advice you can stay here just as long as you want to. You will be faced here with many difficult decisions as to how to vote on legislation. Son, when you are ever in doubt, just vote right."

In its ultimate objectives, the foreign policy of the United States can be defined only in such very general terms as "furthering the interests and security of the United States." How this can be done from day to day is pretty much a question of doing the "right" thing. There are, however, certain guide lines which are derived from our particular nature, history, and situation in the world.

America occupies a unique position in the world, resulting from our unique background. We are deeply influenced by the fact that we were a colony for 169 years, between the establishment of Jamestown, Va., and the Declaration of Independence. Although we share in the European tradition, many of our national attitudes are in reaction to Europe. We were and still are highly nationalistic—with a distaste for European colonialism. Since we were relatively isolated, we were until recently free to pursue a policy of isolation.

We have done well in the world and we perhaps give ourselves more credit than is due to the policies that have guided us—freedom from European entanglement, manifest destiny, freedom of the seas, and the open door, just to name a few. The apparent success, for example, of one of our classic policies, the Monroe Doctrine, which served as a warning to European nations to stay out of this hemisphere, has perhaps given us too much confidence that problems can be solved by such simple statements of policy. In fact, the Monroe Doctrine worked largely because of coincidence with British policy and the British Navy.

In practice few problems are solved by such simple policy concepts. The concepts of containment and liberation, for example, which one hears much of today, are both oversimplifications of the complex of circumstances surrounding our points of contact with Russia in the cold war. They are, in fact, as concepts, more misleading than helpful.

Those who guide the destiny of this country in its relations with the rest of the world steer a difficult and unchartered course. In recent years I have traveled through most of the free world and have had the oportunity to meet and talk with the peoples and many of the leaders of these countries. It is true that one finds a great community of interest in the free world centering around the broad concepts of freedom and dignity of the individual, and security, which all free peoples seek. Even with our friends of the free world, however, there remains sharp conflicts of interest: prestige consideration, conflicts of trade, conflicts of colonies and spheres of influence, conflicts over rearmament for the defense of the free world of countries such as Germany, which other countries such as France think could constitute a threat to themselves.

Even in the best of all possible worlds, there would probably be such conflicts. Indeed, one thing which is important for us to understand and which is often difficult for Americans to understand is this inevitability of conflict, between nations as between individuals. Unique solutions will never be provided for all the world's problems at any one particular time. One can only hope to minimize them and to minimize their impact on other and greater problems. It has been said with respect to the Middle East, for example, that no problem was ever solved except through the superimposition of a greater problem. The traditional British policy of muddling through reflects an understanding of problems that cannot be solved but which one can learn to live with.

We in America, protected in the past by great oceans from the centers of conflict in Europe and Asia, were until recently relatively undisturbed in the pursuit of our own national aspirations. Periodically, we have in our relatively brief history been drawn into armed conflict originating elsewhere, but always for a finite period during which we could make a great all-out effort, which we understand very well how to do and are willing to do. After 2, 3, or 4 years, however, the war was over and we could return to our normal pursuits. An apparent solution had been found in the form of a military victory or a peace treaty. In fact, there was no solution, but merely a transition between conflict of interests through wartime and peacetime methods. We perhaps did not realize clearly enough that the basic conflicts in the world persisted.

One thing we need to learn is how to live with such conflicts, when they do not lend themselves to an immediate military solution. The Turks, for example, have lived alongside Russia for approximately 700 years. Since the two countries first came in conflict in 1677, they have fought 13 major wars. In many of these wars Turkey was defeated, although never overrun nor completely conquered. Today, as during most of the past 300 years, Turkey faces an insoluble conflict with the Soviet Union, which wishes to control Turkey politically and to control the straits area militarily. Turkey also knows that Russia could at any time marshal overwhelming military force at her border. Until 2 years ago, when Turkey joined the NATO, she enjoyed no permanent system of alliances with western European countries which gave her any real assurance that the other world powers would assist her in her defense in the event of an attack by Russia.

Despite this the Turks are probably much less concerned about the cold war, less jumpy about the Soviet menace, than we are. They leave no doubt in the Russian mind that they will fight to the last man in defense of their country. However, in the meantime, they live in equanimity under the shadow of a perpetual Russian threat.

The United States has only recently come into direct conflict with Soviet Russia. Indeed, only recently has the atomic age made a military threat to this country possible. Although I am, of course, opposed to preventive war, I wish very much that we could assume more of an initiative in an effort to win the cold war. However, until we do, we here in America must learn to live in equanimity with the threats and dangers which exist today.

Hon. George C. McGhee—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part II of a speech delivered by Hon. George C. McGhee to the Student Conference on National Affairs:

Another important factor which I would like to emphasize about the world is how stubbornly it resist efforts on our part, or any one country's part, to control or even to predict the course of its never-ending drama. The forces at play in the world are too great and their inter-relationship too unpredictable.

We have so far developed limited ability to control the weather, through rainmaking, or even to make long range predictions of the weather. We mainly seek to adapt to the weather on the basis of short-range predictions. Most stockbrokers do not venture to predict long-range trends of the market. They seek mainly to predict, on the basis of an analysis of particular stocks, how these stocks will rise or fall with respect to the general market.

Take, if you will, a country such as India—350 millions of people evolving in a unique way from an earlier illustrous past through a period of colonial bondage to its newly won independence in a confused and divided world. The ultimate course India will take will not be the result of policies or pronouncements made in Washington or London or Moscow, and to only a limited degree by strong leaders such as Mr. Nehru in New Delhi. India, as did this country, impelled by some inexorable force, will evolve along some course now uncharted and fulfill its unique destiny in some now unknown way.

A lesson to be derived from this observation is that foreign policymakers should be given less credit, and conversely less blame, for what happens in the world that was really beyond their control. Although there is no precise analogy, we do not give the weatherman credit for good weather but only for predicting good weather. Conversely, we do not blame him for bad weather, particularly if it was predicted.

Mr. Adenauer won the last German election not because of some last-minute statement made in Washington or by the American Ambassador at Bonn, but as a result of the interplay of forces within Germany. Indeed, as is often pointed out, any obvious effort to influence a foreign election usually boomerangs. This fact can be illustrated by pointing out what little influence even a close friend, like Great Britain, could have on the election of the President of the United States or the Governor of Virginia. A British Ambassador got in a lot of trouble one time over a chance remark about an American election, and our British friends are far too sophisticated to attempt such a thing today.

I do not mean to imply that situations do not arise where American efforts abroad cannot help carry out American policies. The point I wish to make is that this is usually possible only where the right elements already existed. The Marshall plan helped the European nations do something they themselves desperately wanted to do, and which coincided with our own interests, namely to effect their own economic recovery and rearmament. The leverage of our aid helped persuade them only in minor ways as to how they could do this best. Our efforts to arm Greece and Turkey and to weld them into the European defense structure were successful principally because the Greeks and Turks ardently desired it.

It took a little over 3 years of negotiations, after the nationalization of the Anglo-Iranian oil properties in Iran, before a new agreement could be reached. In spite of all the efforts that we and the British and others made, it appeared that the great outbrust of nationalist feeling in Iran had to run its course and the full effects of the economic pinch on Iran be felt, before the basic situation could develop in Iran which would make an agreement possible.

Similarly, in Guatemala, the Guatemalan people had to understand fully the horror of a Communist police state before they were willing to arise against the Arbenz regime. Just as timing is the principal ingredient of success to the singer or comedian, the timing of a foreign policy move can mean the difference between its success or its failure.

This does not mean that moves must not occasionally be made, for purely tactical reasons, when there is little prospect of success. Even though it failed, the move for a European army through the EDC had, in my judgment, to be made. For the ultimate security of Western Europe there is no alternative to a rearmed Germany and its collaboration in defense with the other Western European countries, including France. No American Secretary of State could have pursued any other policy than to make every possible effort to bring this about. In the light of the French attitude at the time, the EDC seemed to be the best way to do it. Even though there was no assurance of success, EDC had to be pushed with all possible vigor. Even its failure had value in that it eliminated one course of action and made it possible to clear the decks for another attempt through the Brussels Pact, which was successful.

In 1951 this Government, together with England and France and Turkey, made an offer to the Arab States to join a Middle East Defense Organization. We all know that there was little chance of its immediate acceptance; however, for tactical reasons we felt it must be made. The answer was a slap in the face by Egypt, who renounced her treaty with Britain affecting the Suez base, which was considered the key to Middle East Defense.

The move of three powers, although unsuccessful, was, in my judgment, a necessary move. It showed the Egyptians that its government had been offered an honorable way out of their treaty problem with the British. It stood as a proof to the Russians, as well as the Middle Easterners, of United States determination to assist in the defense of this vital area. Recently, after much patient and persistent effort, the western powers were rewarded by the establishment of the so-called Baghdad Pact, based on the "northern tier" concept, which will achieve many if not all of the original objectives of our original proposals.

What, however, you may ask does this mean to you? You have no direct responsibility for the conduct of foreign affairs and perhaps find it difficult even to follow the intricacies of the problems which face the policymakers in London and Washington. This is, however, only relatively true and much less true today than ever before.

In 1922 an ex-Secretary of State, Elihu Root, wrote as follows:

"When foreign affairs were ruled by autocracies or oligarchies the danger of war was in sinister purpose. When foreign affairs are ruled by democracies the danger of war will be in mistaken beliefs. The world will be the gainer by the change, for, while there is no human way to prevent a king from having a bad heart, there is a human way to prevent a people from having an erroneous opinion. That way is to furnish the whole people, as a part of their ordinary education, with correct information about their relations to other peoples, about the limitations upon their own rights, about their duties to respect the rights of others, about what has happened and is happening in international affairs, and about the effects upon national life of the things that are done or refused as between nations; so that the people themselves will have the means to test misinformation and appeals to prejudice and passion based upon error."

Great progress has been made in the last few years in this country in arousing the interest and expanding the knowledge of the average citizen on the issues involved in the conduct of our foreign affairs. The local councils on world affairs and committees on foreign relations bring to our cities as speakers, scores of national and world leaders every year. Your newspapers publish a great deal more foreign news and intelligent editorial and interpretive comment than ever before. It is you who elect the Congressman who helps decide whether we appropriate X or Y billions of dollars of aid to foreign countries. Your letters and petitions are read by the policymakers in Washington. Indeed, few foreign policy decisions can be made today without considering their impact on American public opinion. The State Department has an extensive organization to analyze American public opinion for this purpose.

True, the day-to-day decisions, the tactics, in the conduct of foreign policy must, of course, be left to the President and his chosen representatives, principally the Secretary of State. Only they are close enough to the details of the problems to decide specific actions.

I would like to propose, however, certain broad generalities which in my opinion will always be applicable to the conduct of our foreign policy. These are principles which responsible citizens, such as this group here today, could, if they believed in, help assure that our Government follows:

1. The core of American foreign policy should always be the well-being and security of this country. It should serve what are, in fact, the true interests and aspirations of the American people taken as a whole. It should not follow any will-o'-the-wisp of purposeless do-goodism on the one hand, or serve the narrow interests of any particular "special interest" group on the other. This applies to religious, economic, ethnic, and all area-conscious groups alike.

2. The conduct of American foreign policy should be free from political partisanship. Those who conduct it should approach it on the basis of a public trust. Actions should not be based on desire for credit for political purposes, nor should criticism of the conduct of foreign policy be so based.

3. We should have clear long-range foreign-policy objectives which are not subject to compromise and should seek in obtaining them mutual support from allies whose broad objectives are similar to our own. With respect to our short-range national objectives, however, we must be prepared as in busines and life within our own country to give and take with our allies, who also have particular national objectives often different from our own. We cannot go it alone in the world of today.

4. Both our foreign policy objectives and the methods used to achieve them should never deviate from the democratic and religious principles on which our society is based. Indeed, they cannot, and we would be deceiving ourselves by bluffing or proceeding under any other assumption. Certain fundamental principles, such as respect for the dignity and freedom of the individual and the desire for peaceful solutions, are too thoroughly ingrained in the American people to be changed. They show themselves inevitably when questions affecting such is-

sues as colonialism or preventive war arise. We cannot be anything but what we are.

5. But, finally, this does not preclude the injection into our relations with other nations all of the determination, toughness of mind, and innate practicality that has made America great. Andrew Carnegie, who gave millions for peace, and John D. Rockefeller, who gave millions for the betterment of the world, were hard, practical men. Your church has a religious purpose, yet the treasurer of your church is probably a tough-minded, practical man who fights against the inclusion in your church budget of anything not required for the purposes of your church.

It is this mixture of idealism and hard-headed realism, which is in my judgment the real contribution we Americans can make toward the peace of the world.

Dr. William Lowe Bryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, on November 21 Indiana University felt a great loss, and this feeling was shared by friends of the university throughout the Nation. Dr. William Lowe Bryan, president emeritus, passed on at the age of 95.

President Bryan was born on a farm in Monroe County, Ind., only a few miles from the university that he headed from 1902 to 1935.

As the tenth president of Indiana University, Dr. Bryan presided over it in its golden age of expansion and development. He achieved great distinction as a scholar, and as an educator through his peculiar knack of combining the scholarly and the practical viewpoints. Above this, he excelled in the truly human qualities which mark a great man. A sonnet written of him said "A native who returned to serve his own, a prophet honored in his native land!"

The Indiana Daily Student, campus voice of the students of Indiana University, a paper which President Bryan edited more than 70 years ago, repeated some of his best-known expressions following his death. They are:

At the I. U. commencement in 1902 Dr. Bryan said, "The cause we stand for is already victorious because it is rooted in the heart of our democracy."

Concluding the same address he said, "Our motto is Lux et Veritas. We might translate it by the saying of Jesus. We are come, we who represent the university, we who support the university, we are come to all the folk that they might have light and that they might have it more abundantly."

At the I. U. commencement in 1907 the President-Emeritus said, "It is, I think a most certain fact of history that men have not lived by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."

In his I. U. commencement address in 1908 Dr. Bryan said, "A university has as the first condition of its greatness, not its great plant of buildings, apparatus, and books, but a faculty of quality."

Dr. Bryan stated also in his 1908 commencement address, "what society needs from the university is complete enlightenment."

At the 1910 commencement address at I. U. in 1917 Dr. Bryan said, "The ultimate defense of pure learning is not its actual or possible utility. Its defense is that given by Aristotle. Curiosity, wonder, are instincts as deep and right as hunger. We want to know. We want to comprehend the universe of which we are a part. In pure learning nature rises toward knowing the truth about itself. No greater thing happens in the world than this."

"The best thing which the world of common sense does is to make us work at sensible tasks. This is the best safeguard against insanity, and the best means of developing practical judgment and efficiency.

"But common sense never teaches us the whole truth. It does a man fatal harm to believe that it can. It does a man fatal to believe that he can choose for himself a little world with little purposes, little standards of success, and little rules of cunning, and there can shut himself in safe from the living God," said Dr. William Lowe Bryan, president-emeritus in an address at the 1910 I. U. commencement.

The president-emeritus wrote in The President's Column, in 1926–27, "It is youth which is forever saving the world from the petrified errors of the old."

He also stated, "But beyond any man, however great, who despairs, I value the man who, seeing well the evils of this world, does not despair."

In this same column of 1926–27 Dr. Bryan wrote, "The greatest masters have that which others lack. They have wisdom and wisdom is the principal thing."

"I counsel you to seek wisdom in the matter of changing your ideas. Truth is eternal, but the eternal truth is never wholly in any statement, or theory, or creed of men," said Dr. William Lowe Bryan, the late president-emeritus, speaking at the I. U. commencement in 1909.

"Turn to any great occupation, on its highest level. Find one of its greatest living men, and become his disciple. Get sight of his great idea. Get a sense of the man at his best. See how he works, how he makes his time and energy count. Above all things, see what the man at his best is trying to do. Fill your mind with that. Give yourself to that. And presently the great world values to which your master has pointed the way will have filled you, will have cleansed you from lower habits and ideas and instincts, and will have lifted you into the wisdom and strength of a man." The quotation is from an address at the I. U. commencement in 1909 by Dr. William Lowe Bryan, president-emeritus.

Determined Jobholders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent, January 15, 1956, in which the paper comments on President Eisenhower's health chart and the eagerness of some present jobholders to have him run for reelection.

The editorial follows:

DETERMINED

It doesn't take much of an optimistic rise on President Eisenhower's health chart to have the jobholders insisting that he can run again.

It is to be noted also that they make no predictions on how long he could last after being reelected.

All of which somehow recalls the old wheeze about England being willing to fight "to the last Irishman."

George Washington Carver: Man of God and Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht which appeared in the East Side News on January 14, 1956, entitled "George Washington Carver: Man of God and Science":

GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER: MAN OF GOD AND SCIENCE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

America honors the memory of George Washington Carver. He was a man of God. He was a Negro scientist. He was a noted American artist. We hail his splendid character, his lofty ideals, his exemplary life and his service to his fellow man.

Here is the stirring saga of a man who was born in slavery and ignorance, who was orphaned in infancy, who was cradled in an atmosphere of hatred and contempt for the Negro, and who was emancipated from poverty and prejudice. Carver was born of a race of beaten backs and branded breasts, which, with Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, had been liberated from physical slavery only to face economic and political slavery.

Christ was crucified for claiming to be divine. Carver's people were crucified for claiming to be human. But Carver "lifted his eyes to the hills," whence came his strength, whence came God's grace. It illuminated his human intellect. It steeled his human will.

He possessed the three theological virtues—faith, hope and charity. He understood well the wonderful earthly trinity of the soil, of its fruits and of man. Carver acknowledged God in all his ways. Carver let God direct his path.

He may never have heard the words of St. Ignatius of Loyola—but he reechoed his thoughts. "Receive, O Lord, my entire liberty, my understanding, my memory, my will. From Thee have I received all things. To Thee do I return all things. Give me but Thy grace and Thy love, I wish nothing else of Thee."

When George Washington Carver came to Tuskegee Institute at the invitation of Booker T. Washington, it was a collection of collapsing farmhouses. When Dr. Carver died 40 years later, the Institute was known throughout the land. It had become a splendidly endowed university.

Dr. Carver's fame was worldwide. His name will forever be linked with Tuskegee. Tuskegee's crowning glory was its great educator—Dr. George Washington Carver.

His greatest scientific claim to fame rests on what he accomplished with the "lowly" peanut and the "humble" sweetpotato. He is credited with more than 300 discoveries. He disclaimed credit for his invaluable work. He said: "The things already are there. God, through my hands, brought them to light."

Many honors have come to him. Many colleges have paid him homage. But through it all he walked humbly, seeking no financial gain, desiring no worldly acclaim. His was a saintly life. His was a life of self-forgetfulness. His was a life of sowing seeds of a richer faith in God, of a greater love of our brother.

Indeed, Dr. Carver's life story might be told in the titles of the spirituals he loved so well: "Oh, Mary, don't weep, don't you moan." "You toiled in slavery down in South's land." "And the walls came tumbling down." "And down came the heavenly manna." "And the sweet chariot swing low to carry him home."

Dr. Carver died peacefully as twilight fell at Tuskegee on the evening of January 5, 1943. We memorialize his death day for we do not know his birthday. It might have been a sign from God who, in His providence, concealed Carver's birthday on earth. For the Christian church celebrates the anniversaries of all saints on their death days. It was on this day they were really born. It was on this day they were born into the full sight of the Lord.

Let us—in the beautiful spirit of Dr. Carver—seek to bring forth a nation more firmly rooted to American ideals, more invulnerable to the counsels of hate, more fully conscious of the mission of justice to all races. If we are true to ourselves, if we are true to our traditions, this Nation cannot but fulfill its destiny. Working together we can achieve this lofty goal.

The brotherhood of man is a living, growing reality. The future lies with those who will tear asunder the shackles of bigotry and who will reassert the dignity of man. There is in all of us a real capacity for human kindness. Proud of the power of our country, we can be prouder still of our unflinching defense of the rights of all men. We shall then have remained true to the spirit of America. We shall then have remained true to the promise of America.

Hon. Lyndon Johnson Presents His Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. One of the first, if not the first major political speech made by the able majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, following his recuperation from a recent heart atack was delivered in Whitney, Tex., on November 21, 1955.

In his speech, Senator JOHNSON outlined in some detail the legislative program for the second session of Congress for which he as Democratic majority leader of the Senate would work.

We are all happy that Senator JOHNSON is back with us after his illness as his friendship and the esteem in which he is held by his colleagues goes far beyond any personal considerations:

The speech follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR LYNDON B. JOHNSON BEFORE FUND RAISING DINNER, DEMOCRATIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF TEXAS, WHITNEY, TEX., NOVEMBER 21, 1955

Fellow Texans, fellow Democrats, we meet here tonight after 3 years of a Republican administration. And to Americans, 3 strikes are out.

In 1952, a lot of Texans—in fact a majority—voted for a Republican administration. It was supposed to have something to do with an issue called tidelands.

Well, we got a Republican administration. We think we got at least a part of our tidelands back. And that is the last time the Republicans have looked our way.

They gave our Air Academy to Colorado.

They are trying to give Fort Hood to Louisiana.

They are trying to give Fort Bliss to Oklahoma.

And today the Republican Secretary of the Interior is in Texas to dedicate our Big Bend Park. I hope some of our Eisenhower Democrats are out there to keep him from giving it away to old Mexico.

Personally, I think we should be grateful to the old guard Republicans. They have taught us a lot. And they have made more Democrats in 3 years than we could make in a lifetime.

Do you remember the fine flush of enthusiasm that swept the country with the "great crusade?" Even those of us who had held firm for the banner of democracy were impressed. We were going to get: 100 percent of parity, a balanced budget, tax relief for the little fellow, a strong America, more soil conservation and more rural electrification, a Government free of corruption.

It was a fine program—one of the best ever stolen from the Democrats.

There was only one mistake from their point of view. It was a program with a heart and the heart is something the Republican Party just did not have.

Most Republicans realized they had a program they didn't want. Once they got in, they returned it to us.

And that is when the voters started returning the Government to the Democrats.

It would not be hard to catalogue the misdeeds and failures of the Republican Party. But I am not interested in talking about what the Republicans have not done.

I have never believed that a political party should ask for votes because its opponent has shortcomings.

The American people are tired of wrecking crews. They want builders—people who construct. They will entrust their affairs to the party that is constructive. They will turn their backs on the party that is destructive.

We are here because we are Democrats. But even before we are Democrats, we are Americans. We know that what is bad for America is bad for the Democratic Party. We know what is good for America is good for the Democratic Party.

On that principle, we cannot compromise—not even with General Motors.

As a political party, we seek the support of the American people. But we can gain that support only if we try as hard to deserve it as we do to win it.

The Democratic Party has been in existence for at least 150 years. There is no secret about the reason for its vitality.

It is simply that ours is the party with a heart—the party that is concerned with 160 million Americans. It is the party that holds forth hope for men and women and children who want to march forward—to make life better for all.

I have never questioned the patriotism or integrity of my friends who subscribe to another political faith. But even the most rock-ribbed Republican will admit that his party responds a little faster to the fat cats than to the folks.

In the last 3 years, the American people have had a perfect demonstration of the difference between the two parties. In 1952 they selected a Republican President with a Republican Congress, and in 1954 a Republican President with a Democratic Congress.

I don't believe there are very many Americans who have failed to learn the lesson. They found that the Democratic Party—whether in the majority or in the minority—put the country before partisanship. They always thought more about the next generation than they did about the next election.

I will never forget the first conference of Democratic Senators after the 1952 election. The Democrats were in the minority and the future looked bleak. It was the same situation that had tempted the Republicans to wild criticism and irresponsibility for 20 years.

But the situation was so bad that my friends urged me not to become Democratic leader. They said the Democratic Party would be torn with factional strifes and forced into the position of a carping, dissenting and unpopular minority.

I disagreed. When I addressed the Democratic Senators I said:

"I am a Democrat out of conviction—not out of habit. I believe that the Democratic Party is now—and always has been—the party that is best for America. I believe there are forces holding our party together greater than the issues over which we may squabble for the moment.

"Working together, I think we can do more than merely preserve the gains of the past 20 years. I think we can go forward with a positive program—a program that is pro-American and not just anti-Republican. And if we go forward as positive Americans—and not negative oppositionists—I am convinced that the time is not too far distant when the Democratic Party will again be in the majority."

That statement was made in my acceptance speech to the Democratic conference on January 2, 1953.

Two years later, the Senators met again in conference—this time to organize the Senate as the majority party.

It is even more important tonight that we be responsible. There is the smell of victory, and it is keen and unmistakable.

Since 1952, the Democratic Party has won every major contest.

The people have entrusted to us both branches of Congress; 9 governorships that once belonged to our opponents; 7 State legislatures that we took from the Republicans. Even rock-ribbed Indiana has turned city after city over to Democratic mayors.

We can lose in 1956 only if we stop to lick our chops while the Republicans divide us or we divide ourselves.

I have never found it within myself to hate my fellow Democrats—even when I disagree with them. I would rather spend my time uniting Democrats and inviting them back to the party than driving them out. If you run off enough or run out enough you can stay in the minority for a long, long time.

Speaking as a Texan, I hope and believe that Texas will send a delegation to the national convention ready to abide by the decision of the majority and prepared to fight for the election of our nominee.

I do not know who the Democratic presidential nominee will be in 1956. And, in case any of my fellow Texans are wondering, I repeat what I have stated so often: I am not a candidate of any description for any office in 1956. I am not running for anything except complete recovery of my health.

As far as I am concerned, the people who make up our party will select the candidate. And once a majority has spoken, that candidate will have my enthusiastic support.

I will go a step further and predict that he will have the enthusiastic support of the American people. The party that can produce a record of service to the people can also produce a candidate who will appeal to our people.

The Democratic Congress is producing the record, and the delegates to the Democratic convention will produce the candidate.

My prediction of victory has nothing to do with the Republican candidate. I do not believe that the Republican candidacy matters.

The present President is the best the Republicans have to offer. I do not question his integrity or his patriotism. But, I do question his taste in political parties.

To say he is the best the Republicans have to offer is hardly a compliment. And even the greatest men in our history could not have borne the dead weight of the present Republican Party.

But I want to stress that even though I am confident of winning, the next election is no pushover. It would still be possible for us to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

The American people will weigh very carefully the qualifications of those who seek to guide their destiny. A party that is overly partisan, overly quarrelsome, and obsessed solely with politics, will lose. The party that is the least partisan and the most patriotic will win.

The American people have rejected the extreme of the left and the extreme of the right. They want to proceed along the path of constructive program and responsible legislation. We cannot permit one party to be torn to pieces by those who are more interested in excluding than, including people.

In calmer times, fiery debate over fine points might be entertaining. But we have a job to do and the quicker we come to the conclusion that we must all unite against Republicans rather than divide against each other, the quicker we will get that job done.

Good Democrats avoid trivialities. We must concentrate on the substantial.

Love of liberty and devotion to the long-range interests of our beloved America dictate that we warn all pressure groups of whatever blend—Democratic, Republican, independent, farm, employer or employee—that the term "public servant" means the servant of the public and not the servant of some organized pressure propaganda outfit. He who truly serves all the public, the public will also serve.

We are meeting tonight in a rural area. I see throughout this room my friends who earn their living from the soil.

Search your hearts and ask yourselves which party shows the most genuine concern about your future and the future of your children.

The question answers itself.

To this gathering have come average businessmen from surrounding counties. I ask you to search your hearts and ask yourselves the same question.

Again, it will answer itself.

There are working men in this audience—people whose toil and sweat have made life easier for all of us. Do any of you need to spend endless hours answering this question?

Of course not!

There may be some of you who will remember my Daddy. He was a public servant and a successful politician. He was successful because he had a short—but simple—formula.

"Take care of the people and the election will take care of itself," he told me.

That thought might be expressed more elegantly. But there can be no better advice for the Democratic Party.

The job before us now is not to select a candidate but to complete a program upon which the candidate can run. And the program will be effective only if it is based upon genuine concern for the needs of all Americans.

During the fall recess I have been in contact with Democratic leaders throughout the Nation, including practically all of the men being considered for the Democratic nomination. I am grateful to them for their kindness in visiting me at the hospital and out at the ranch.

We have spent a great deal of time at the hospital and at the ranch and by correspondence talking about the legislative program for the next session. Out of these talks certain areas evolved which should be high on the agenda. In the last session of Congress, we have a record unequalled in the memory of legislative experts. The Senate passed 1,325 bills and, of these 880 received the approval of both branches and of the President.

In the Senate we confirmed nearly 40,000 Presidential nominations and wound up with our calendar of business practically clean. In the next session, we must carry on that record if the needs of our people—the genuine human needs—are to be met. It is my intention to ask the Democratic Policy Committee of the Senate to consider the following subjects in the hope that they can be brought before the Senate, considered, and acted upon by the Senate:

PROGRAM WITH A HEART

1. A Social Security bill reducing the age limit for women and extending coverage to most self-employed groups.

2. A tax revision to benefit the low-income groups—probably along the line of that previously offered by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE of Georgia increasing exemptions.

3. A health program to aid medical research and to include larger grants for hospital construction at least to the level authorized under the original Hill-Burton Act.

4. A school construction program to meet the needs of our children.

5. A public roads program, probably similar to the Gore bill. The question of taxes to pay for highway programs is part of the general tax program—and I hope it can be handled separately.

6. A farm program which will restore 90 percent of parity supports; extend the benefits to additional products; and possibly include a soil rental program.

7. A natural-gas bill which will preserve free enterprise and of course provide legitimate protection to consumers.

8. A housing program designed for America's families who are yearning to build or rent dwellings they can afford.

9. A water resources program with specific consideration to a higher dam at Hell's Canyon, the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Niagara development, the Upper Colorado Basin project, the Washita-Oklahoma project, the Ventura, Calif., project, the Passamoquoddy tidal survey project, a New England development project.

10. A program to relieve critical depressed areas on the basis of Federal and State cooperation, including tax measures to encourage industry; additional public works; supplementary unemployment insurance; and surplus food grants.

11. Amendments to the Immigration and Naturalization laws to insure that they are fair and just.

12. A constitutional amendment eliminating the poll tax.

13. Disaster insurance to protect our people from the ravages of nature.

I want to make it clear that this list is not all-inclusive. Some of the measures—after due consideration—may not be passed; others will be modified.

The final form which they will take is not clear. More may be added on the basis of mature consideration of men who will seek to find the best course to serve our people.

This meeting tonight is a moving occasion for me. I can look about this hall and see the faces of old and trusted friends—men and women who are as close to my heart as my neighbors in the Johnson City hills along the flowing Pedernales.

They are the people who came to my help with their thoughts and their prayers a few weeks ago when there was little to preserve my life except prayer. I will always be grateful.

I am not, however, now indulging in a purely personal mood for the sake of sentimentality. What I am trying to say is that the spirit which moved you to prayer is the same spirit which has made the Democratic Party strong and great.

It represented human concern for a fellow human who was in distress. It was an effort to bring comfort and strength to a man who was in need.

And it was completely unselfish.

To me, the Democratic Party has always been the party of human concern. It has always been the party of people who seek to bring comfort and strength to those in need.

I am very proud to be a member of that party. I am very proud of the honor that you are according me tonight.

Like every other human organization, we frequently fail to live up to our ideals. We have our extremes and we have our people who are "just tol'able."

But underlying the whole history of our party is the fact that Democrats at their worst are better than others at their best. They are not necessarily better as individuals but as members of an organization they share the hope and the dream—and frequently the weaknesses—of the American people.

And I pledge you we will always try to do our best.

The motto of my 1924 graduating class at Johnson City High School was: "Give to the world the best that you have, and the best will come back to you."

The Democratic Party would do well to have that as its guiding policy. We will follow that course and we will serve our people and deserve their support.

It's About Time the Secretary Begins To Watch His Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from a recent issue of the Reading Times:

IT'S ABOUT TIME THE SECRETARY BEGINS TO WATCH HIS WORDS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, a Democrat and a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, took the floor of the Senate last week to excoriate Republican foreign policy in general and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in particular. The New York Times described the attack as "the most vehement ever made upon the Secretary of State within the internationalist wing of the Senate."

The peppery Senator's indictment of the Secretary bristled with fighting words—"fraudulent reassertion," "distortion of history," "indiscretions and miscalculations,"

"one of the most disgraceful periods in the history of American diplomacy." Mr. HUMPHREY was especially incensed at Mr. Dulles' words, as quoted and attributed to the Secretary in an article in Life magazine: "The ability to get to the verge of war without getting into war is the necessary art." Of this, Senator HUMPHREY said, "No other responsible American spokesman in our lifetime has ever so described an American diplomatic objective. I call upon him to repudiate it."

We cannot disagree with the Minnesota Senator. If Mr. Dulles mean what he appeared to mean, that the art of current American diplomacy is to bring the Nation to the brink of war, then avoid war, he is irresponsible and not worthy of holding his high office. Putting the most charitable construction on the words, believing them not to suggest a deliberate attempt to get to the verge of war, we can only conclude that our Secretary of State is grossly inept. And ineptness is a dangerous ingredient in the makeup of any diplomat.

The surprising thing about all this is that we are surprised at the Secretary. We should not be. Remember the New Look in foreign and defense policy? And massive retaliation? And unleashing Chiang Kai-shek? And that agonizing reappraisal? And getting a bigger bang for a buck? Snappy slogans, weren't they? Got nowhere, did they? Let's hope that getting to the verge of war is just another slick observation that won't get us anywhere, particularly in the doghouse with our allies.

Mr. Eisenhower Unveils the Famous Soil Bank Scheme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of January 10, 1956:

MR. EISENHOWER UNVEILS THE FAMOUS SOIL BANK SCHEME

To take the cash aspects of the President's farm message first, the proposal is to start spending up to $1 billion annually to correct the errors of a program for which we have been spending around $1 billion a year. More specifically we are to pay the farmers the additional $1 billion to get their assistance in disposing of the crop surplus which has resulted from our expenditure of an annual $1 billion on the high-level fixed-price support program in the major farm crops.

Just how is the new $1 billion to be distributed? A big chunk of it will go to buy farmer cooperation in what is called an acreage reserve plan. Another big chunk will be spent to buy farmer cooperation in what is called a conservation reserve plan. The acreage reserve and the conservation reserve will together constitute the famous soil bank program which much advance publicity has hailed as the new element of the Republican farm program.

As the bank and reserve terminology suggests, the new program aims to draw land now devoted to raising surplus crops out of the production of those crops. The acreage reserve plan will run only for a few years and will operate directly on the pending surpluses. Under it wheat, cotton, corn, and rice farmers would be paid in the form of certificates for withholding, say, 20 percent of their land from production of these—or any other crops. These certificates could be cashed. Or they could be exchanged for appropriate amounts of present surplus commodities now held in Government warehouses. Either way the effect would be to close the gap between market demand and curtailed current production of wheat, corn, cotton, and rice by drawing down surplus supplies of these commodities.

Looking to the longer future is the conservation reserve plan. This would aim to withdraw from cash-crop production some 25 million acres of low-grade lands and return them to forests and forage. Farmers cooperating in the conservation reserve would get direct cash payments out of the total mentioned above as running up to $1 billion a year.

But if the present trouble is, say, wheat surplus, how does the Government know that the lands withdrawn from wheat would not go into other crops to produce unwieldly surpluses there? Obviously a new and expanded Federal land police would be needed to make sure that acreage reserve lands were really being withdrawn from all uses including grazing, and that conservation reserve lands were being put exclusively to forests, forage, water storage, etc.

It is right there that a major hitch will come. The policing problem implied but not stated in the President's message will be prodigious.

But let's face it: we are now well under the inexorable law that a little governmental intervention often leads to a very great deal. The Government began trying to defend the farmer in 1929 with the Hoover Farm Board. It has been pushing further and further into the control of farm crops, the allotment of farm acreages, the overall dictation of the farmer's business ever since.

The point is that it has to do so. What the Government subsidizes it must more and more control. It must control a crop surplus which threatens to crush all its earlier subsidy operations in a sheer avalanche of unusable commodities. Doubtless the soil bank scheme was the only politically palatable device for doing this.

But the public will insist that if Congress takes the soil bank scheme, it provide for its very rigorous policing. Certainly we don't want a few years hence to start spending another $1 billion a year to correct errors in the $1 billion-a-year scheme now launched to correct errors in the original $1 billion rigid price support program.

And however dubious the soil bank scheme, let it be said with emphasis and admiration that Mr. Eisenhower does not retreat one step from his defense of the flexible (as against the rigid) price supports which afford the best single guaranty against new surpluses in the future.

A Program To Meet Basic Farm Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadephia Inquirer of January 10, 1956:

A PROGRAM TO MEET BASIC FARM ILLS

In his constructive program calling for vigorous new steps to meet the Nation's farm problems, President Eisenhower has given Congress—and the farmers themselves—a choice of two broad approaches.

One is to enlist the cooperation of farmers in measures which will provide them with a measure of immediate relief and establish an enduring basis on which farm problems could be solved without permanent reliance on huge Government subsidies.

The other is to provide farmers with relief from their admitted higher price-lower income squeeze by relying chiefly on bigger handouts according to the rigid high-support system which has helped create the present unsatisfactory situation on the farms.

Both approaches would cost money. Price tag on the nine-point program outlined by the President has been estimated at up to a billion dollars. The cost of reinstituting the old, discredited 90 percent of parity price supports might go even higher.

But the great advantage of the President's program, which ought to insure favorable consideration by the Democratic-controlled Congress, is that it proposes to deal effectively with the crucial elements of the farm problem in ways that point toward freeing farmers eventually from dependence on the Government for their prosperity.

Heart of the Eisenhower proposals is the soil bank plan. Under it farmers would agree to take a certain percentage of their acreage out of production and turn it over to grass or trees. For this they would be paid, either out of present surplus crops held by the Government or in cash.

Three critical aspects of the farm problem would be dealt with under this scheme. One would be the lowering of present production which, in many crops, is in excess of either domestic or export needs. Another would be a gradual reduction of surpluses, which now cost the taxpayers about $1 million a day just for storage, and act to depress farm prices. The third, and perhaps most important, would be that farm acreage which is not needed now would be preserved for the time in the future when growing population has created a huge additional demand.

In all, nearly 40 million acres would be taken out of production and put into the soil banks. It is particularly gratifying to note that the President has urged that more than half of this be planted to trees, to meet needs for lumber and water conservation.

Another distinctive feature of the Eisenhower program is in his proposal to limit the dollar amount of money that can be paid to farmers in price supports. We usually think of these amounts being in the hundreds, paid to small farmers. Actually, large farm businesses sometimes get Government payments in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, which, as the President pointed out, helps underwrite "formidable competition with family operated farms."

Throughout his long message, the President emphasized his aim of helping the smaller farmers by adjusting their output to what the market can absorb at fair prices. The alternative to such measures as reduction of production through the soil bank plan, using up present surpluses and voluntarily limiting crops, he implied clearly, is to drop attempts at controls and lower supports to competitive price levels.

Since the farm issue is political, as well as economic, the President's program faces anything but smooth sailing in Congress—especially in an election year. Democrats already have indicated they will continue to demand a return to high price supports.

But farmers will remember that these rigid high supports did not protect them from hardship. All Americans, realizing that the farm problem cannot be solved in a year, will recognize the wisdom of the President's view that this calls, not for slogans, but for measures to preserve both the farmer and farm land as vital national assets.

Address of Hon. Albert Conway, Chief Judge, Court of Appeals of the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following address by the Honorable Albert Conway, one of New York's greatest citizens, which was delivered on December 1, 1955, on the occasion of the 67th annual dinner of the Brooklyn Bar Association:

I was glad to have the opportunity to attend this annual dinner of the Brooklyn Bar Association. There is nothing like returning to one's own borough and to the friends one has made over the years. Many recollections come flooding back on such an occasion: One's attendance at law school, one's clerkship, the public offices one has held, the trials in which one has engaged, the fact that 8 days ago I celebrated the 45th anniversary of my admission to the bar of the State.

Ours is the oldest noble lay profession known to man. The practice of the law has a great tradition and we as lawyers have a great heritage. We find discussions of lawyers and judges at least as far back as the seventh century B. C. While we lawyers and judges never had an army or navy, have no executive powers, have no legislative powers and so never enacted a law, and indeed have very little power, we have always been in the minds and in the writings of emperors and kings, of prophets, of writers of the Old and New Testaments, and of philosophers. I should like to point this out to you by recalling some incidents and occurrences during the last 26 centuries as a background for what I have to say about a pressing problem of today.

When we examine the Code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, compiled during the seventh century B. C., we find that there were rules prescribed for the conduct of judges even then. I shall take the earliest provision which we find in section 5, enacted nearly 2,700 years ago. That section provided that if a judge pronounced a judgment, rendered a decision, or delivered a verdict duly signed and sealed, he might not change or alter it under penalty of paying 12 times the amount of the judgment, decision, or verdict. It makes one think of the case of *Herpe* v. *Herpe*, in 225 New York Reports in 1919.[1] By section 13, in certain instances, the judge was required to declare a postponement for 6 months.

As we proceed along the stream of time we find the Prophet Moses, as recorded in Deuteronomy, written some 750 years B. C., enjoining upon all judges: "Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment; but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; for the judgment is God's" (Deuteronomy 1: 16, 17.)

We find in the New Testament in the Gospel according to St. Luke in 10: 25–29, the account of the questions asked by the lawyer who sought to learn what he should do to inherit eternal life and, when answered, sought to justify himself by asking, "And who is my neighbor?"

Proceeding further in time we reverence the memory of Aemilianus Papinian and of his courage and uprightness. He was a Roman lawyer and later a judge in the second century A. D. You will recall that he was one of the greatest of the Roman jurists and the author of many books on legal questions and 19 books of decisions. He was an intimate friend of the Emperor Severus who, on his deathbed, commended his two sons, Caracalla and Gaeta, to his charge. The sons, however, were jealous of each other and each desired to succeed his father as emperor. Papinian sought to keep peace between them. The brother Caracalla killed his brother Gaeta in order to become emperor following their father's death. Papinian was commanded by Caracalla as emporer and I quote from Gibbon, "to exert the powers of his skill and eloquence in a studied apology for that atrocious deed." Papinian, realizing full well the end-result of his conduct, replied that it was easier to commit than to justify a fraticide and disobeyed the command. He was promptly murdered and his death lamented as a public calamity.

Continuing along, in north Africa we find living in Egypt one of the great philosophers of all time. Born in Spain in the 12th century, he was forced to emigrate at first to Morocco, and then to Egypt, where he lived for almost 40 years. His philosophical thoughts affected not only the thinking of Jewish philosophers but also of the Christian and Islamic philosophers. Yet this man, Moses Maimonides, in codifying and commenting upon the Bible and the Mishnah wrote Book 14 of the Code, entitled "The Book of Judges," the required attributes of a judge as though they were written here yesterday instead of in Egypt in the 12th century. Those attributes were: "Wisdom, humility, fear of God, disdain of gain, love of truth, love of his fellow men and good reputation."

We did not really begin to be the lawyers and judges which we are today until, turning now to England, we find that following the Norman Conquest in 1066 the duty of administering justice was placed upon the shoulders of judges who were known as Commissioners of Assize who traveled on circuit and thus brought uniform law and justice to the four corners of the realm. In the early history of the judicial system the Judges were dominated by the Crown, and the interest of the Crown came first. Judges then did not have the independence which they now have. It took a long time and great bravery upon the part of both the bench and the bar to achieve it, and we must never surrender it. Prior to the Act of Settlement in 1700 a judge served at the King's pleasure, and his service could be terminated by the King if his judgments were not satisfactory to the King. Holdsworth, writing of that period, said "It was quite certain that a judge who was both learned and honest would hold his seat on the bench by very precarious tenure." Chief Justice McRuer, chief justice of the high court of Ontario, in an address delivered in Cleveland in 1947, quoted from a pamphlet issued in 1658 by the Marquis of Halifax addressed to Charles II attacking the judges, in which he said: "Obedience shall be looked upon as a better qualification in a judge than skill or sincerity." I quote again from Chief Justice McRuer two paragraphs, as follows:

"King James II is recorded as having told Thomas Jones, when he dismissed him from the post of chief justice of the Common Pleas, that he was determined to have twelve judges of his opinion. It is to the credit of the lawyers of those days that the King found difficulty in securing one of real ability who would accept appointments to the bench under such conditions.

"Cromwell was just as conscious as the Stuart Kings of the control that could be exercised over judges by a power of dismissal. Chief Justice Rolle of the King's Bench seems to have resigned under pressure because of the displeasure he caused by listening without interruption to the argument of counsel who challenged the constitutional validity of the Instrument [i. e., the constitution for the Protectorate in England, set forth December 16, 1653] under which Cromwell purported to govern the country."

It is amazing how, over the centuries, two innate human traits, with the aid of lawyers and judges, had the power to overcome King and Parliament: one is the desire for justice, which Daniel Webster once described as the ligament which ties all people together; and the second, the power of the common man to resist arbitrary injustice by his rulers. That has always required fearless leadership by lawyers or judges who were willing to risk, and, if necessary, to lose their lives for the principles which fortunately seem to be the lifeblood of lawyers and judges.

I shall instance but two occasions upon which this has been displayed.

Sir Edward Coke, born in 1552, was Attorney General of England for 13 years; he was Chief Justice of Common Pleas and later of the Court of King's Bench for 10 years. He was removed for his opposition to arbitrary and corrupt actions of the King. Of him, some years ago, Mr. Palmer, of the University of Minnesota, wrote: "What were the forces Coke could bring into the fray * * *? He had no great political party at his call. The powers of Parliament were not yet established. He had not the sword or any great tradition of established judicial power. All he had was an unquestioned integrity in an age of corruption, a passionate love of the common law, a consuming singleness of purpose that was ministered to by his very narrowness of outlook, unexcelled learning in the law, unrivaled professional competency, a practical experience with men, and an utter fearlessness, undeterred by arbitrary arrest, imprisonment in the tower, and a very imminent danger of disembowlement and death for treason in a time when heads fell frequently about him at the mere behest of His Majesty the King." At a time when there was belief in the Divine Right of Kings to whom men were subject, and when King James I had put the doctrine in his own published words, as follows: "As to dispute what God may do is blasphemy, so it is sedition in subjects to dispute what a King may do," Sir Edward Coke stood up to the King and made the contrary pronouncement, which thereafter limited the King's power, viz, that the King ruled under God and the law. At another time King James "asked each of the judges whether if at any time in a case depending before them His Majesty conceived it to concern him, either in power or profit, and thereupon required to consult with them, and that they should stay proceedings in the meantime, they ought not to stay accordingly." (Edward Coke, by Hastings Lyon and Herman Block, pp. 205–207.) Each judge in turn yielded, with the exception of Coke, and acknowlelged it to be their duty to do so. When the question was put to him, he answered: "When the case should be, he would that which should be fit for a judge to do." He was dismissed as Chief Justice within a few months by regal fiat.

Over the centuries lawyers have always been remarkable for their dedication to justice and devotion to their clients. Let us consider, for instance, the role of Chretien Malesherbes, of France. His father had been Chancellor, and he, a lawyer, had occupied high place in the legislative body of Paris. When that body was dissolved in 1771 and a new method of administering justice substituted, he protested against the system, and was banished to his country seat. Upon

[1] In the Herpe case, the court of appeals held a trial court had no appellate or revisory jurisdiction.

the accession of Louis XVI he was twice recalled to serve in the Ministry of the Government. In 1792, at the age of 71, he returned voluntarily from Switzerland in order that he might defend the King before the convention, although he realized that he risked death for his act. He presented the defense of the King, and was required to break the news of his condemnation to the King. Thereafter he was arrested and guillotined.

Returning now to England, the second Magna Charta, as far as lawyers and judges are concerned, is the Act of Settlement in 1700, which provided that judges might be removed only upon the action of both Houses of Parliament instead of being subject to the will of the King. Finally, in the reign of George III, it was expressly provided that the rule applicable to all officeholders that their terms of office would expire upon the death of the King should not apply to judges. So the independence of the judiciary in England became a fact, but only after long centuries of struggle.

In our country and in our State it has never been otherwise, because the lawyers who were leaders in fashioning our form of government so that law might become the sovereign and the people the source of all power in Government, saw to it that there were 3 coordinate branches of Government, each powerful in its own sphere, but no 1 of the 3 controlling either of the others. I shall speak on some other occasion of the independence of the judiciary in this State and in the Nation, and of the contributions to good government made by lawyers and judges here.

In every one of the phases of civilization to which I have referred, when the people were seeking justice and resisting injustice, lawyers and judges had many problems—problems such as no other profession has ever had in this world. It is no different today. With industry, perservance, integrity, devotion to the ideal of justice, and with practical commonsense, lawyers and judges have solved the people's problems (which are ours) and the problems of court administration. Those problems have varied in each century. Today is no different than other days. We have a problem—we have a growing problem, the like of which we have never had to meet. Our court trouble today is automobiles and the injuries they cause. The people wish automobiles and insist that the great automobile manufacturing companies manufacture an exceedingly large number of automobiles which will be sold by them in the United States each year. If the people, the customers, wish them they are the ones who call the turn. Despite the number of automobiles now crowding the streets of cities, towns, and villages, I am told that the output for 1956 has been set at 7½ million new cars. That is twice the number of cars in use in all of England. Without counting the 7½ million cars to be produced for next year, there are approximately 56¼ million cars in the United States, of which more than 4½ million are registered in New York State. Greater New York City alone, has approximately 1½ million cars.

Today automobile injury cases are triable before a jury. In 25 years automobiles in this State and in this city have increased by 2½ million and 700,000 cars respectively. In the same 25 years there has not been added one supreme court justice in this city.

When one thinks of the hundreds of automobile injury cases that are commenced each year in this city alone, and that they must be handled by 51 supreme court justices and 21 city court justices, who have not been increased in number in almost 25 years—while one stands aghast at the enormity of the problem presented—one must be lost in admiration at the manner in which these supreme court justices and city court justices have handled the problem, for it is not an easy problem. On October 26 last, in the New York Times, I found on the front page an article entitled "Police Task Force Combats Rise in Auto Deaths at Danger Points." The first paragraph read:

"Police Commissioner Stephen P. Kennedy announced yesterday that traffic deaths had increased 10 percent and traffic accidents 5 percent in the first 9 months of 1955, compared with the same 1954 period."

The second paragraph read:

"As a result of these horrifying figures a special task force of motorcycle, radio motor patrol and radar units has been assigned to danger points throughout the city, he said."

The fourth paragraph read:

"Mr. Kennedy disclosed that, up to October 1, a total of 446 persons, including 65 children, had been killed in traffic accidents. This was an increase of 10.3 percent, or 46 deaths, over the 1954 period."

The fifth paragraph read:

"In addition, 35,242 persons, including 8,333 children, were injured—a 5 percent increase, or 1,568 injuries, over last year's period."

The sixth paragraph read:

"Mr. Kennedy warned that the special task force was merely a 'stopgap measure, born of expediency and desperation.' He said there could be no 'adequate' protection without a heavy increase in police manpower, far beyond the 963 additional men allowed in the 1955–56 budget."

In March of this year the justices of the appellate division of the supreme court, first department, made a public statement to the citizens of New York City in which they pointed out "There is delay only in a single segment of the court's work, in the jury trial of personal injury actions." There followed a paragraph which I shall read to you:

"There are several calendars or classes of cases in the Supreme Court. There is the personal injury jury calendar, that is personal injury cases which are to be tried before juries. There is the personal injury nonjury calendar, that is personal injury cases which are to be tried before a judge without a jury. There is the general jury calendar, that is the wide variety of cases in the court, other than personal injury cases, including all the commercial cases, which are to be tried before a jury. There is the general nonjury calendar; and there is the equity calendar which comprises all the cases in which something besides money damages is sought, that is the matrimonial and child custody cases, the injunction cases, rent cases, tax cases, condemnation cases and a catalog of other cases. Finally, there are the motion calendars on which appear all the thousands of intermediate motions which are made in the various cases during the course of a year. Every one of these calendars in the supreme court of this department is up to date with the exception of the personal injury jury calendar. In other words, seven out of eight departments or operations of the court—every one, with a single exception—are on time."

These appellate division justices also said that the delay in automobile personal injury actions could be overcome in only 1 of 3 ways. Again I read you a single paragraph from this public statement by the justices of the appellate division, first department, earlier this year:

"Simply stated, apart from hopes, accompanied by doubts, that some of us may have as to the benefits which might accrue from further procedural and administrative reforms, delay can be overcome only (1) by qualifying the right to a jury trial in civil cases; or (2) by multiplying the number of judges, courthouse facilities and calls upon the citizenry for jury duty, so that enough courtrooms, with full complements of judges and jurors will be constantly in session to keep pace with the intake of cases; or (3) by taking the automobile accident cases out of the court and placing them in a compensation board like workmen's compensation."

As I have pointed out, we can find records indicating the presence of judges for nearly 2,700 years. Courts have played a very important part in the history of mankind. It may be that we can solve this matter of personal injury cases, but we must look the problem in the eye. We must say to ourselves: We are handling every other segment of courtwork and are doing it well. There can be no criticism of it. Can we handle this automobile problem, or is it a problem which is the result of such unusual circumstances that the courts cannot handle it in this State without being destroyed? What are the unusual circumstances?

1. Mechanical genius which has reached a greater height in the United States than in any other country.

2. Mass production—again, a product of genius of America which has no counterpart anywhere else in the world.

3. The most amazing and richest city in the modern world, situated in the Empire State of the most powerful Nation in the world.

The courts, as today constituted in this State, are too precious a possession of the people to have them destroyed as a result of the increased demand of the people for automobiles in such quantities that they injure more and more people, so that it may be impossible for the courts to try all the automobile personal injury cases—remember, I said to try them—if we had 20 courthouses for every 1 we now have, and a comparable increase in judges to preside at trials in them. One of the manners in which we have managed to keep up with automobile personal injury cases is by pressing the injured citizen and the insurance company to settle the cases. That is not proper work for a judge—he becomes a glorified adjuster. He tends to cease to be a judge, and to become instead something akin to an administrative official. When the people elect their own officials, who hear the cases in public and make the decisions, there is responsibility. Judges should be kept in their proper sphere of responsibility and their status should not be weakened by compelling them to do work similar to that of administrative officials. If by reason of the factors which I have mentioned—the time, the place, and the mass production of the instruments of destruction so that as courts we cannot cope with the problem, then it may be that it will become necessary to put automobile negligence cases out of the courts in order that the courts may be saved. I have watched and listened to Mr. Arthur Ballentine since at least 1927, when he has appeared before the New York State Bar Association and other bar associations. He has argued, at least during all the intervening period, for a compensation board to pay those injured by automobiles. There are those who say that that never should be done in a death case, but that the widow or widower and next of kin must be able to bring an action and try it or settle it as they wish. Others have the same reservation with reference to serious injuries, by which I understand them to mean the loss of an eye, an arm, a leg, and so on. Still others would leave it as a matter of choice to the injured person whether to go before a compensation body or to go to law. This is a lawyer's problem and this is a bar association problem, a social problem, and an insurance company problem, and lawyers should work it out. The trouble is that we put too many automobiles together into territory which we have prepared for only a fraction of that number of horses. I know no better group of men to look at a problem forthrightly and solve it as they have done for nearly 27 centuries than lawyers and judges. Another suggested solution is to

have automobile personal injury cases tried by a judge without a jury. Whatever it is, I suggest that now is the appointed time to take this problem apart and solve it. I suggest that that is the duty of every bar association everywhere. If we cannot solve it within our court structure, the sooner we preserve our courts for other litigation, and rid them of this automobile personal injury litigation, the better for the bench, the bar, and the public generally.

Racial Incidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the favorite pastime of a great majority of the Nation's press from outside the South in recent years has been to hold the South in scorn and ridicule. Apparently they vie among themselves in an effort to slant and exaggerate news stories coming from the South so as to engender hatred against the South, and Mississippi in particular. They appear deliberately to suppress news that would present the South and her people in a favorable light.

The press of the Nation has given an unusual amount of coverage recently to a few isolated incidents which have occurred in Mississippi. By distorting the facts, they have tried in all cases to make these crimes appear as racial incidents, without regard to the real circumstances attendant to the cases.

As evidence of the biased attitude of a great portion of the northern press, they gave little or no coverage to the incidents which I shall relate hereinafter, though Mississippi newspapers made every effort to get these stories before the rest of the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a news item that appeared in the Jackson, Miss., Daily News under date of October 28, 1955, concerning my good friends and neighbors, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Herren, of Utica, Miss. Also, I am including an editorial from the December 30, 1955, issue of the Jackson, Miss., State Times, dealing with the heroic rescue of 5 Negroes by 2 young white boys at the risk of their own lives. These articles follow:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of October 28, 1955]

FRIENDSHIPS STILL CROSS RACIAL LINES, CHICAGO-UTICA TELEPHONE CALL PROVES

UTICA, MISS.—Stories of friendship across the racial line are quite common in Missippi, in spite of what those who do not understand think and say. Such a story was emphasized at Utica this week.

Richard F. Herren, prominent Utica farmer, has just returned from a Vicksburg hospital where he spent over 2 weeks undergoing several operations. Several weeks ago doctors found that the blood circulation had stopped in both of his legs, and it was necessary to remove one toe and transplant plastic veins into both legs from above the waist to the knees.

One night this week the telephone rang at the Herren home and Mrs. Herren answered. A voice said, "Miss Gertrude, how are you all getting along?" It was the voice of Louiza Brown, calling from Chicago. Louiza and her husband, Oscar, had heard of Mr. Herron's critical condition from their relatives still at Utica and as they said, "Could not rest 'til we called to see how he was getting along."

Oscar came to work for Mr. Herren when quite young and worked 2 years by the month and then after he married Louiza they stayed on to make 16 crops on the Herren farm. The Herrens and the Browns relationship was one of mutual trust as can only be understood by southern white man and southern Negro. Oscar farmed and cared for the cattle with a personal concern.

Oscar decided to seek his fortunes in the steel mills 3 years ago. Upon arriving in Chicago he gave his friend, Mr. Herren, as a reference. A questionnaire came to Mr. Herren and, instead of filling out the form, he wrote a letter assuring the steel mill that Oscar was capable of doing anything they could have for him to do. The questionnaire asked if he would reemploy Oscar if he desired a job. To this the answer was, "If he wants to come back and doesn't have the money, I will be glad to wire it to him." Today Oscar is a stamper in the steel mill and said that he was getting along pretty good.

When the phone rang at the Herren home it was Oscar Brown, or "Man Boy" as the Herrens and others around Utica called him, anxious to know how his good friend Mr. Herren was getting along, and wanting to know if there was anything he could do for him. Oscar and Louiza talked for nearly 10 minutes long distance and the Herrens appreciated it as much as anything that has happened during his sickness.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) State Times of December 30, 1955]

TEEN-AGE HEROES

The courage of 2 Jackson youths in rescuing 5 Negroes from a submerged car is tribute not only to themselves but to their age group.

Thanks to 16-year-old Frank Arnold Jr. and 17-year-old Phil Ray, the Negroes were saved from possible suffocation or drowning when their automobile overturned in a cold water creek near Jackson Tuesday night.

Signaled to the tragedy scene, the boys demonstrated the brand of heroism which marked many of their age bracket during two recent wars. They plunged into the stream and, through teamwork, wrested the victims from the wreckage.

Then the pair, students at Murrah High School, flagged passing motorists who in turn summoned police and an ambulance. Three children—aged 2 to 6— were among the rescued.

This demonstration of cool judgment and bravery under pressure comes in refreshing contrast to recent reports of recklessness among teen-age drivers and delinquents.

It slaps down the oft-heard blanket indictment of modern youth as an irresponsible group unconcerned about the lives of others.

Too, the actions of young Arnold and Ray should help strengthen relations between the races. Their concern over the Negro strangers was automatic.

Contrasting the stigma attached to the Emmett Till case, this outstanding example of two white boys' regard for fellow Negro Missisippians deserves wide play in the Nation's press. We doubt, however, that such recognition will result.

At any rate, we join all residents of our community in gratitude for the heroism of Frank Arnold and Phil Ray.

Classics of American Democracy—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, what are the classics of American democracy that should be read and reread by our own people, that should be translated into the languages of the world and universally made available at accessible places and at low cost to all peoples?

This is the question that has been propounded to a jury representative of an intelligent and well-informed American public opinion. The response in its quality, and in the scholarly standing and national prestige of its participants in all the activities of our national life, is truly remarkable. It reflects a tremendous national interest in and an outbounded zest for undertaking a dynamic and winning worldwide battle for the minds of men.

The letters are of such importance, weighed as they are with such rich suggestions and reflective of such thought and research, that it appears to me they immediately should be made available to the reading and study of all the Members of the House and of the other body.

Here is the text of the letter of December 12, 1955, mailed to a select and representative list of Americans, submitting the idea and commencing the poll of what words really inspired our forefathers, best express the concepts of our democracy and should be translated into all languages and sold at reasonable prices to all the people of the world who desire to know:

DEAR ———: In the next session of Congress a group of Members plan to push for enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

Before stating the proposal in final form, however, we wish to consult the experience and judgment of experts, and leaders and representatives of American opinion.

If you would give us your opinion of the plan as stated in enclosure, part 1, and of the list of books in enclosure, part 2, it would be a much appreciated help. The list is suggestive and illustrative only, and we will welcome any recommendations of yours, additions, omissions, substitutions—of books which you think better meet the purpose of the plan.

Our objective is a list of from 15 to 20 books which, in the majority judgment of this jury of American public opinion, are the basic classics of American democracy. The list so selected will be presented for the action of Congress.

We hope you will give prompt and careful thought to this proposal, and we will give attentive consideration to your reply.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

ENCLOSURE, PART 1. PLAN FOR PUBLICATION OF DEMOCRATIC CLASSICS

It is proposed that the United States Information Agency shall translate and publish in the principal languages of the world a

select list of the time-tested classical statements of democratic theory in their original forms. These books should be published in large quantities at nominal, subsidized cost, not more than a few cents a volume, and should be widely available in each country, not alone from United States agencies. Existing editions should also be widely sold abroad, in quantity, and at cheap prices.

These works should represent the broad historic and international character of the discussion and theory of democratic society and constitutional government, distinct from present domestic or international controversies. This will avoid confusion of advocacy of fundamental democratic ideas and methods, with exclusive or short-run United States interests.

This program would be in addition to the present program and plans of the United States Information Agency, which do not include a similar operation.

The principle of this plan has been approved by the President's United States Advisory Commission on Information and by the Commission's Committee on Books Abroad.

America is known abroad mainly for autos and tractors, for riches and technology, but the specifically American political philosophy and the fundamental ideas of political and social democracy are not widely known in most countries. Therefore, much in the practice of the United States and other constitutional democracies is misunderstood, and democratic methods are not effectively applied to the problems of the various countries, or to international problems.

The Communists owe part of their success to massive, heavily subsidized, publication in many languages of the classics of Communist social, economic, and political theory—the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao—in addition to a large general and current publishing program.

All available reports indicate that American books of any kind are scarce and expensive in most countries, and democratic political philosophy almost unavailable.

In most of the few cases in which books like those on the attached list (enclosure, pt. 2) have been translated, it has often been in connection with the historic movements for constitutional democracy in the various countries.

There is abundant evidence from various international intellectual agencies that there is in many countries an effective demand for books of this type which is not being met, as this proposal would attempt to do.

This proposal has been advanced by a group of Chicagoans, including the Reverend Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century; Dr. Richard McKeon, professor of Philosophy at the University of Chicago and former member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO; Dr. Jerome Kerwin, professor of political science and chairman of the Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions at the University of Chicago; John McGinness, president of Pennsylvania Railroad Lodge No. 225 of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. The Chicago Daily News has taken an active and sympathetic interest in the plan and its editorial article of June 6, 1955, was reprinted in numerous papers. Preliminary discussions by Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio, and myself on the floor of the House of Representatives evoked much interest and support.

ENCLOSURE, PART 2, SUGGESTED AUTHORS AND WORKS

Bryce: The American Commonwealth. Modern Democracies.

Burke: Reflections on the Revolution in France.

Dewey: The Public and its Problems.

Emerson: Moral and Political Essays (which?).

Hamilton and Madison: The Federalist Papers.

Hand: The Spirit of Liberty.

Von Humboldt: The Sphere and Duties of Government.

Jefferson: Selected Writings (which?).

Kant: Perpetual Peace.

Lincoln: Selected Papers (which?).

Locke: Letters on Toleration. On Civil Government, Book II.

Mazzini: The Duties of Man.

Mill: On Liberty. Representative Government.

Rosseau: The Social Contract.

Thoreau: Wadlen. Civil Disobedience.

De Tocqueville: Democracy in America.

Wilson: The New Freedom.

Classics of American Democracy—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the responses of a highly representative group of American editors to the letter of December 12, 1956, the text of which is given in the preceding extension of my remarks:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have your letter and enclosures setting forth the plan for the publication and distribution abroad of a series of great books dealing with the democratic processes.

The plan strikes me as a good one, and I endorse it most heartily. You may or may not know that I served for three years on the United States Advisory Commission on Information, and even then some of us on the Commission were trying to get such a project started. I am delighted to know that you and other Members of Congress are now taking the plan under your wing.

The list of books which you enclosed seems admirable to me. My only criticism would be that the list seems to be intended for rather sophisticated readers and may be a bit over the heads of some of the people you are trying to influence.

To reach a wider audience, I would suggest including a few more personalized approaches to the problem, such books as the autobiography of Jacob Riis or maybe a digested edition of parts of Sandberg's Lincoln. There are, of course, hundreds of other books which tell stories of how individuals, many of them immigrants from other countries, have flourished under our free system.

Although I should like to see people everywhere able to obtain the great classics of democratic political theory at a reasonable price, I certainly think a few books of the type I have suggested might well be included.

Sincerely,

BEN HIBBS,
Editor, the Saturday Evening Post.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I favor the plan for publication of democratic classics to be sold by the United States Information Agency at nominal cost overseas.

I think this plan should be tried in a few selected areas at least, and then later expanded if the demand for these books proves to be large.

Sincerely,

GARDNER COWLES,
President and Editor Look.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for writing about the plan for publication of books basic to an understanding of our form of government.

While I do not pretend to be an expert on this type of bibliography, I do feel that you would be performing a singular service by pursuing your plan to a successful conclusion. The plan is so good that I believe the books should be made available in this country as well as abroad. I doubt that many Americans have read all of the items in your enclosure.

Permit me to make a suggested addition to your list. I think you could well add the Library of Congress volume on Formation of the Union (Government Printing Office, 1927). It was recently brought to my attention by Clarence K. Streit, president of Federal Union, Inc., that this book is virtually out of print. It is a volume perfectly suited to your portfolio and, indeed, any group of books devoted to the formation of democratic government should include it. You would be doing the Nation a service if you could make it possible that this book would be kept available for widespread dissemination. Perhaps the printing necessary for the Information Agency could be enlarged so that a ready store of "Formation of the Union" would remain at the Government Printing Office.

Sincerely,

PHILIP L. GRAHAM,
Publisher, The Washington Post and Times Herald.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: We were very much interested in the proposal you outlined in your letter of December 12, and we would be delighted to cooperate in any way that we can. I can think of no other step that our Government could take which is likely to produce such far-reaching results in the ceaseless battle against Communist propaganda at such a low cost.

All of the authors and works suggested in your memorandum seem to me, and to the other editors here, to be thoroughly worth while. You might want to consider, however, whether this list should be supplemented with a few, more recent works; I believe that Judge Learned Hand is the only contemporary author included on your list. Perhaps some consideration might be given to such recent defenses of American society as Frederick Lewis Allen's the Big Change and Dr. Kenneth Galbraith's American Capitalism.

Perhaps, too, you would like to consider works such as: Lerner's The Mind and Spirit of Justice Holmes; de Crevecoeur, Letters From an American Farmer; Thomas' one-volume Biography of Abraham Lincoln; the collected poems of Robert Frost.

Finally, I hope that it might be possible to find a few books of a lighter nature, to balance the rather serious and heavy works which you have listed: for example, perhaps something of Mark Twain's, and a book or two like George Papashvily's Anything Can Happen.

I hope that a copy of your letter was sent to Mr. Dan Lacy, managing director of The American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 2 West 46th St., New York City 36; he and his associates have given much thought to this problem and I am sure that they would be able to make some excellent suggestions.

Sincerely,

JOHN FISCHER,
Editor, Harper's Magazine.

DEAR BARRATT: With regard to your letter of December 12, asking for suggestions about books that should be published in many languages abroad.

I am sure you will receive many suggestions about the American classics, but I have one for inclusion of a modern work that

interprets American society in the light of today's world and in the light of the intellectual appeal of communism to many Europeans or Asians who have not thought through the dangers of totalitarianism. It is "Capitalism In America, A Classless Society," by Frederick Martin Stern (Rinehart & Co., Inc.). I understand he also was writing a high school textbook along the same line.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. KENNEDY,
Chief Editorial Writer,
Chicago Sun-Times.

DECEMBER 28, 1955.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have read your proposal for enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish at nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

I am heartily in agreement with the proposal, and also approve the list of suggested authors and works which you enclosed. As to the specific writings which should be included from such authors as Emerson, Jefferson, and Lincoln, I would prefer to leave this to those scholars who are most familiar with the works of these men.

Cordially yours,

RAYMOND B. NIXON,
Editor, Journalism Quarterly, Published by Association for Education in Journalism.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thanks for sending me a copy of your proposal to have the USIA publish, at nominal prices, a library of basic statements in different languages. I know nothing about the practical aspects of this problem, but I should think it would be extremely useful to have available, in many languages, the books which you list.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. WIGGINS,
Executive Editor, the Washington Post and Times Herald.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12.

As you may know, I am thoroughly in favor of a project to translate and publish in the most useful foreign languages a group of our basic documents. If one is to begin on a practical basis, I suspect that a reprint of some of the fine single-volume selections from many writers would be an excellent idea. Perhaps your friends in Chicago do not agree with this. But it seems to me there is great danger of overwhelming readers in a mass of verbiage which is not really pertinent to the basic subjects. From my point of view, the single-volume compilations of selected readings from all these classic texts are more useful to more people than a shelf full of 10 or 12 documents.

If our purpose is to get these great foundational ideas to the thinking of more than just a few intellectuals, we should move in the direction of selected readings rather than whole volumes. I would favor the translation of the best selected-readings volume into a large number of languages. I think that way we would have a magnificent text interesting to the largest possible number of people. This would at least be a wonderful way to start. If we found there were still a need for 10 to 15 different books, we could proceed to that stage. But what better beginning could there be than a widely circulated translation of the best available one-volume compilation? This would give the very heart and kernel of the thinking of all the writers you have listed in your suggestions, and more too, perhaps.

If we find that any of the existing compilations are not entirely ideal, we can revise them, leaving out some selections and putting in others. There is a great deal in the writings of the persons on your list which is scarcely helpful and pertinent to the problem in hand.

I very much hope a practical outcome for this project may be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

ERWIN D. CANHAM,
Editor, The Christian Science Monitor.

DEAR SIR: I have looked over the list of books contained in your recent letter and I agree with you that it would be a good idea for the United States Information Agency to print these up in the form you suggested and distribute them as widely as possible.

As a matter of fact, I would like to have a set myself when they are available.

The only one that I am a little doubtful about is Rousseau's "the Social Contract." As I recall, it is a magnificent statement but I wonder if it might not be misinterpreted in some countries.

If there is any further information you desire or any way in which I can be of service, do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

A. M. PIPER,
Editor, Council Bluffs (Iowa) Nonpareil.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I certainly agree with you that some of the books which explain the democratic philosophy should be printed in foreign languages and made available to people in the countries where those languages are spoken.

While it is true that the reading of these books will be confined to scholars, we should not overlook the importance of interesting these scholars in our way of thinking.

It seems to me that the fight against international communism must be fought on a hundred fronts. There is not just one fortress to assault, rather a multitude of outposts which have to be attacked in a systematic way.

We are glad to see that you are not going to give Congress the chance to overlook one important piece in the puzzle.

Very truly yours,

ALBERT M. MARSHALL,
Editor-Publisher, Daily Republican Eagle, Red Wing, Minn.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with the proposal to make available to the peoples of the world the basic statements of democratic political philosophy. I have read most of the books proposed, and approve of the list, but would make this observation: If these books are to obtain wide circulation, there should be some additions which are of the easier-to-read variety.

Very truly yours,

SCOTT B. CHAMBERS,
Editor and Publisher, the Courier-Times, New Castle, Ind.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have your letter of December 12.

I think the plan is excellent.

I'm not so sure about the books. I have read only 10 of those on the list. Most of them, in my opinion, are hard to read. They are not widely read in English and I wonder if they would be in translation.

Many of the books, furthermore, require considerable background knowledge on the part of the reader for their full import to be understood as we would wish to have it understood.

I regret that I am not able to suggest books that would be easier to read and still present the desired facts and ideas. Perhaps that is a job able and popular teachers, say of history at the high school level, could help them.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL F. CRAIG,
Managing Editor, the Springfield, Mass., Union.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of the 12th instant. I have read it with interest and may say I subscribe heartily to the plan proposed. Such a library, in the principal languages of the world, could accomplish immeasurable good in getting over to the people the basic statements of democratic political philosophy. However, I do not believe it goes far enough.

It is our policy on this newspaper not merely to deal with Communist problems as they arise and to denounce them, but to go further and cite the democratic side of the issue involved and to draw comparisons. We do not believe it is enough to say that is the democratic side of the coin—we say this is why democracy is right, and prove it. Our entire editorial policy is based on this. I think this aspect also might be taken into consideration by you.

As editor of the editorial page I work consistently to this end and in addition the editorial writer, Michael Leigh, writes a weekly column, the World and the Week, which interprets Communist policy and world politics, together with those of the democracies, in relation to current events. This also draws comparisons in the simplest possible terms for the easy comprehension of the man-in-the-street reader. In short, there is more, I believe, to the problem than simply stating our case—we must take the current Communist case and by comparison, prove our point. There are over the Nation, I think, similar columns doing the same job and they may be worthy of your consideration as working toward our common goal. Should you be interested, I should be glad to send you the next so related World and the Week to illustrate my meaning.

There is one more point I consider important. Briefly, it may be that writers like Kant, Mazzini, Lock, and Von Humboldt, to quote a few, may write over the heads of the average reader or by reason of outmoded phrasing or use of language be not entirely easy of comprehension. On those grounds, I think that perhaps interpretations of these writers in the simples possible terms might better fit the bill. Toward his end I could add, Justice W. O. Douglas' book, Almanac of American Liberty.

In any event, I may say that I consider the project undertaking a vital and important one and wish you all possible success.

I look forward to receiving your comments.

Cordially yours,

MARION T. GAINES,
Editor, the Pensacola (Fla.) News Journal.

Classics of American Democracy—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include letters from the president of the American Broadcasting System, and from representative editors, together with editorials from newspapers in California, Wisconsin, Washington, and New York, as follows:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I was happy to receive information concerning the proposal to reprint in the major languages of the world authoritative works on the democratic political philosophy. In my opinion, this plan has merit and should be a significant contribution to our efforts in combating political philosophies alien to the welfare of mankind.

The press of business prevents me from devoting the considerable time necessary to evaluate the selections listed in enclosure—part 2. In order to advance an opinion concerning these it would be necessary to compare them with the many other outstanding books in this field.

Thank you for advising me of this proposal. I wish you and its other proponents success.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. KINTNER,
President, American Broadcasting Co.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Replying to your letter of December 12, I am delighted to hear of your inspiring project for the USIA to distribute abroad, inexpensive books reflective of American political philosophy.

The suggested list seems to me an excellent one. I was surprised, however, to find what I consider to be the most valuable one for such a compendium has apparently been overlooked.

If USIA is given this project, and had only sufficient funds to prepare and distribute one work, I believe that should be a condensation of V. L. Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought. It meets all the requirements you listed, and does so definitively.

Good luck to you in your fine undertaking.

Sincerely,

E. J. PAXTON, Jr.,
Associate Editor, Paducah, Ky., Sun-Democrat.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I find your letter of December 12, outlining plans for enabling legislation for the placement of books through the United States Information Agency, highly interesting.

May I be so bold, however, as to express the opinion that the tentative choice of books would be of only limited interest in any foreign land. True, some of these books must be included, but I incline to the belief that it is the average man and woman you must reach, rather than the highbrow. There are many, many more average persons than there are intellectuals.

The plan, I must agree, is excellent; I differ with it only in the type of material.

Sincerely,

C. W. JOHNSON,
Managing Editor, Springfield, Mo., Newspapers.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: In reply to your letter of December 12, it seems to me that it would be an excellent idea for the USIA to translate and publish in the principal languages of the world, a select list of classical statements of democratic theory in their original form. While I do not feel qualified to compile such a list on short order, it does seem to me that some of the books you have listed should be included in any such project, such as Bryce's "American Commonwealth" and "The Federalist Papers."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. REESE, Jr.,
President, Wilmington (Del.) News-Journal.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter on the publication of a library of democratic political philosophy in various languages for world distribution.

Having made a tour of the Far East in 1953 for the State Department, in which I was in close association with USIA, I can say that I believe your project is a practical one. I found our USIA libraries to be widely used throughout the Orient and I think the summary of democratic thinking which you propose is an excellent idea.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. AKERS,
Editor in Chief, Enterprise and Journal, Beaumont, Tex.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In your round robin letter of December 12, you requested an opinion of the project to have the United States Information Agency publish for nominal prices in the principal languages of the world a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

In the first place, let me turn to part II of your enclosure with the list of the works. Certainly with these no fault can be found. They are all books which anyone interested in the science of government should study. And I feel sure that the more that these can be brought to the attention of people abroad the better they will understand our own institutions.

From this you may deduce rightly that we have no objection on this newspaper to the actual proposal. However, the second point which has to be brought up in regard to it is the question of cost. I see no figures as regards that. In our present financial predicament, it is not a point that can be overlooked.

Actually, I suppose that comparatively there would not be too great a drain on the Treasury to get this project put over. If it amounts to any sizable sum, there is certain to be criticism as I am sure you are familiar with the fact that the American people regard with a very jaundiced eye the enormous amount of foreign aid expenditures when they are being expropriatively taxed.

Trusting these comments meet your needs, I am

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. RUGGLES,
Editor, Editorial Page, Dallas Morning News.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is a response to your notice of December 12, concerning the plan for publishing abroad a series of inexpensive books on basic American philosophy.

I would like to endorse this plan most enthusiastically. I am convinced we suffer greatly from exporting weapons, and even peaceful material goods, to the exclusion of our basic philosophy of freedom in its modern dress. A few leaders in the awakening countries of Asia, or the neutralist countries of Europe who have had an American education, or something close to it, understand. Meanwhile many don't. And the Russians are exporting their doctrine by the ton and making it available to students everywhere at a cost that is trivial.

The only question I have arises from the tentative list of titles proposed. Obviously they all do explain the historic Anglo-Saxon philosophy. But if the list is to be that short would it not be better to skip Burke, Kant, Locke, Mazzini, Rousseau, and the rest of the foreigners in favor of American authors? The federalist papers are, for example, really preaching American doctrine as expressed by Americans. Would it not be better to omit the non-American writers on freedom, in favor of good biographies of some of our great Presidents? Say the one-volume Sandburg on Lincoln, or one of the other recent good one-volume works? The same could be done with Washington, and with books like the Age of Jackson.

Then should there not be, in addition to early fundamentals of American life, also later material? I note on your list only Wilson's the New Freedom. How about some of Theodore Roosevelt, and, indeed, Franklin Roosevelt? And is it not almost a must, considering that the struggle is in contemporary terms, to include Frederick L. Allen's the Big Change? It seems to me that nothing so well explains the difference between American realities today and the classic, Marxian view of capitalism that others have, as this book. Then, too, there is the cultural field, as for example in Parrington's Main Currents in American Thought.

These are, of course, offhand suggestions. But I hope they will be helpful in speeding along the idea.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT BRUCKER,
Editor, the Hartford, Conn., Courant.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am enclosing a clipping of an editorial which it was my privilege to write from material you were good enough to send us with your letter of December 12. I thought you might like to have it for your files.

Sincerely yours,

D. L. KIRK,
Chief Editorial Writer, Spokane (Wash.) Daily Chronicle.

The editorial follows:

SO THAT FOREIGNERS MAY KNOW US

Congress is to be asked at the next session to pass enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish, at a subsidized cost of a few cents a volume, a select list of time-tested statements of democratic theory in their original forms.

This would be translated into the principal languages of the world and would be widely available in each country, not alone from United States agencies. The principle of the plan is sound and has been approved by the President's Advisory Commission.

BARRATT O'HARA, Illinois Representative, active in promoting the plan, points out that America is known abroad mainly for its automobiles and tractors, for riches and technology. The fundamental ideas of political and social democracy are not widely known in most countries .

That unquestionably is true. It is true also that language barriers are responsible for a gerat deal of international misunderstanding and intolerance. If these books can be placed in the hands of readers abroad, especially in countries where it will be hard to place them, they should do a vast amount of good. Miracles often are wrought by simple methods just such as this.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Your letter of December 12 to Mr. J. D. Ferguson, president and editor of the Milwaukee Journal, has been referred to me.

The enclosed editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of December 22 comments on your proposal for publication of democratic classics. As you will see, this seems an excellent idea to us.

Sincerely,

LINDSAY HOBEN,
Vice President and Editorial Editor, the Milwaukee Journal.

The editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of December 22, 1955, follows:

MAKE INEXPENSIVE BOOKS ON DEMOCRACY AVAILABLE ABROAD

An Indonesian editor visiting here not long ago said: "We want to build a democracy in our new country—a democracy like the one your leaders planned."

And who did he think of as our leaders? Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln—"I secretly read them all when I was a young man, and your Declaration of Independence and Constitution, too. They are foundations of democracy."

The United States for generations has stirred democratic hopes over the world. Our traditions and our historic political philosophy have made a strong impression. But today, when democracy needs to be understood more than ever before, and is competing against world communism, our efforts to capitalize on the great truths that are the foundations of our way of life are feeble.

Representative O'HARA, Democrat, of Illinois, and a group of his colleagues are pushing a plan that would carry the words of the great democratic philosophers and writers

to the world. They propose that the United States Information Agency be given funds to print in the principal languages of the world a small library of "basic statements of democratic political philosophy." They would put out inexpensive volumes, susidized in part so that they could be sold cheaply over the world.

It would be a course in democracy, ranging from such writers as Rousseau and Locke to Bryce, de Toqueville and Mill, and including such great Americans as Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Lincoln, Emerson, and others whose writings helped shape and develop democratic philosophy.

The aim would be to get such books into the hands of intellectuals abroad—teachers, students, professional people, political leaders, opinion formers.

It's a plan that deserves support. We need to do much more than we are doing to spread our political beliefs and traditions—not only to intellectuals, however, but to many more, even if for millions it has to be done with comic book techniques.

The Communists lose no opportunity to spread their classics over the world—Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, and others. In India alone the Russian-supported Peoples Publishing Co. has 163 different Communist books and periodicals on sale everywhere. Of that list, 89 can be bought for less than 10 cents, and 65 percent can be bought for 21 cents or less.

We have no cheap editions with which to compete. If we don't provide them, we run the risk of letting millions over the world—who are eager to read and to learn—be indoctrinated by Communist philosophy with no opportunity to know anything else.

Walter P. Jones, editor of the McClatchy newspaper of California, mails me the following editorial that appeared in the December 29, 1955, editions of the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee:

BETTER SELLING JOB IS PROPOSED FOR DEMOCRACY

For years Soviet propaganda has been flooding the world with low cost translations of the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-Tung and other exponents of Communist theory and practice.

American travelers comment on the vast amount of such literature to be found in the new and highly strategic Republic of Indonesia.

In India, Soviet Russia subsidizes the so-called People's Publishing Co. which has a wide variety of Communist books, pamphlets and periodicals on sale at extremely low prices.

And the same setup is duplicated in many other areas.

Now come Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, and a group of his congressional associates with the proposal that the United States Information Agency be authorized to publish in the principal languages of the world and sell abroad for nominal prices a carefully combined list of books setting forth the theory and practice of American democracy.

These books would be printed in large quantities and given as wide circulation as possible, not only through the American agencies but through other available channels.

A tentative list includes excerpts from the writings of such Americans as Jefferson, Madison, Emerson, Thoreau, and Woodrow Wilson and such Europeans as John Locke, Rousseau, Lord Bryce, and John Stuart Mill.

The plan in principle already has been approved by the United States Advisory Commission on Information and its committee on books abroad.

America universally is known for its automobiles and tractors, its Hollywood and technology, its great dams and atomic bombs. But O'HARA and his associates feel it is known all too little with respect to the political philosophy and the social traditions and ideas which undergird the Nation's greatness.

The plan to cure this defect deserves support. It has great potentialities in the struggle for the allegiance of the minds of men now going on throughout the world.

We need to do a better selling job for democracy.

The following editorial appeared on January 13, 1956, in the Buffalo, N. Y., Evening News, of which Edward H. Butler is editor and publisher:

BATTLE OF THE BOOKS

The western democracies are losing one salient battle of the cold war to Soviet Russia and Representative BARRATT O'HARA, Chicago Democrat, will ask this session of Congress for ammunition with which to fight back more vigorously. He wants enabling legislation to direct the United States Information Agency to publish a small library of democratic classics in world's principal languages and distribute them in inexpensive editions where they will do the most good.

The objective is to counter the heavily subsidized worldwide book and pamphlet distribution of the Soviet Union. Marxist and Leninist writings and propaganda material by contemporary Russian writers are available in most countries all over the globe. The so-called uncommitted nations like India are literally flooded with the Moscow output.

With the assistance of scholars, editors, and leaders in business and fraternal groups, Representative O'HARA has compiled a tentative list of books he would like to see printed by the USIA and given wide distribution. On it are many of the classic texts and intepretations of democracy and democratic institutions such as the Federalist by Hamilton and Madison; On Liberty, by Mill; and others by Thoreau, Wilson, Rousseau, De Tocqueville, and Jefferson.

Representative O'HARA points out that the USIA book translation program includes at the present time only a little of Jefferson's best-known writings and some selections from the Federalist as representatives of the basic philosophy on which the American concept of freedom is founded.

The Congressman queried 3,500 educators and others throughout the Nation asking comment on his plan. In his own words the replies were astonishing. It received blanket approval as important and worthy. We'd like to add our hearty recommendation that Mr. O'HARA's colleagues on both sides of the aisle in Congress give it their prompt support.

Classics of American Democracy—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the following were some of the letters from American scholars and educators received in response to the questionnaire letter of December 12, 1955:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have read with interest your letter of December 12 and enclosure. Your plan strikes me as very worthy. The suggested list of books is a good selection which, I think, is representative of the best in democratic thought.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH J. BUNCHE,
Under Secretary, United Nations, and Past President, American Political Science Association.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for your letter of December 12, outlining your admirable plan for publication of democratic classics in the principal languages of the world. I have discussed this project with my colleagues here in the department of philosophy, who have all expressed deep interest and basic approval of the concept involved.

Allow me to pass on to you the suggestions resulting from our conversations. The following titles, it was thought, might well be added to the list:

1. Selections from the Army Debates of 1647–1649.
2. Selections from T. H. Green Principles of Political Obligation.
3. Relevant parts of George Sabine's History of Political Theory.
4. Warner Fite's Individualism.
5. The works of Thomas Paine.

I am happy to express my enthusiastic endorsement of this project, with or without the inclusion of the above recommendations.

Cordially and sincerely,

NEWTON P. STALLKNECHT,
Chairman of Department of Philosophy, Indiana University.

DEAR BARRATT O'HARA: I am pleased with your presentation of the idea of listing those books which are basic classics of American democracy. I fully approve this plan, and am willing to underwrite it.

Sincerely,

KERMIT EBY,
Professor, the University of Chicago.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I endorse the proposal to distribute classic statements on democracy in strongest terms. I think such an effort is bound to pay off far in excess of cost.

I suggest three items for consideration:

Elizabeth Page, the Tree of Liberty (a novel).

Carl L. Becker, Modern Democracy.

A. D. Lindsay, the Modern Democratic State.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. HYNEMAN,
Professor of Political Science, Northwestern University.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of December 12 to Professor Vandenbosch has been turned over to me for reply. My field of interest is political theory and political parties. Last year I was a Fulbright research scholar in Norway, hence I have some experience upon the matter at issue. I certainly agree 100 percent in the opinion that a project such as you are sponsoring is badly needed. I could cite instances for the need of cheap editions of American classics in contacts I had last year.

No two persons would agree upon a list of specific titles but I think if American democracy is to be emphasized as a living thing that more books of American authorship should be included. I will suggest a few:

1. Whitman: Democratic Vistas.
2. W. Wilson: Congressional Government.
3. H. Hoover: American Individualism or Challenge to Liberty.
4. Franklin D. Roosevelt: Selected Papers—First Inaugural, War Message of 1941, Arsenal of Democracy, etc.
5. Henry Adams: Education.

6. Henry George: Progress and Poverty.
7. Veblen: Theory of Leisure Class.
8. Calhoun: Disquisition on Government.
9. Frederick Jackson Turner: Frontier in American History.

On the list submitted, I am dubious of the von Humboldt, Emerson, Kant, Mazzini, and Thoreau suggestions.

I wish you well in this worthwhile project.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. SHANNON.
Professor of Political Science, University of Kentucky.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have received your letter of December 12 sent to my former address at Smith College. I am now professor of history at City College of New York, New York, N. Y.

I think that your suggestion of publishing, at a nominal price, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy is excellent. I hope it will be carried through.

As regards the selection of suggested authors and works, I have my definite doubts about the following: Kant, Mazzini, and Rousseau. These three authors represent what I would call a kind of utopian liberalism, which can be used as well by the other side as by ours. Otherwise, the selection seems to me excellent. You ask which papers of Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson, or Emerson should be selected. I would say that in each case an expert should be consulted: in the case of Lincoln, the poet Sandburg; in the case of Jefferson, Professor Dumas Malone of Columbia University; in the case of Emerson, Professor George Counts of Teachers College, Columbia University.

In addition I would suggest that you consider the prose writings of the great English poet Milton, especially his Areopagitica, and parts of his Defence. Instead of Rousseau, I would prefer certain writings by Montesquieu, Voltaire, and Diderot, to be selected by an expert on 18th century France.

These are some of the suggestions which I wish to make in reply to your letter of December 12, and I shall be glad to cooperate as far as I can with your very valuable program.

Sincerely yours,

HANS KOHN.
Professor, City College of New York.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I certainly like your proposal. You are so right when you express the need of democratic books being made available at small cost to the peoples of Asia and Africa. My experience in India 2 or 3 years ago lead me to believe that the Communists were doing a better job in making books on communism available to the people than we were doing with respect to democracy.

I was wondering if some of these books could not be summarized and put out in smaller volumes with the essential portion presented to the public. Whether this could be done with a volume such as The American Commonwealth I do not know. I had in mind the necessity of having the essential principles of democracy presented so that a person will read it who might not read the full volume.

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN E. MAYS,
President, Morehouse College.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I read your letter of December 12 with great interest and it seems to me the plan for publication of democratic classics is excellent. I think it might be well to emphasize that the publications come not only from American writers but from writers of many other countries, thus indicating that democratic ideas are not only products of the United States but of serious thinkers all over the world.

I am going to try to find an opportunity to discuss the list of proposed writers with Jerome Kerwin and Richard McKeon but a few ideas occur to me on first thought. Montesquieu's Spirit of the Laws was certainly far more influential upon the American constitution than was Rousseau's Social Contract. Graham Wallas, Human Nature in Politics (1908) was an important book; also his The Great Society (1913). I should also like to see something from the late Charles E. Merriam included, perhaps his Prologue to Politics would be a good one. Some selections from the late Justice Holmes would also seem to be appropriate, particularly as dissent in the Abrams case. I might also mention Walter Bazehot's Physics and Politics (1869) and the English Constitution (1867).

I note that you take from Edmond Burke Reflections on the Revolutions in France but I wonder whether the speech on "Conciliation with the Colonies" might not also be included. From Lincoln, "The Gettysburg Address" and the "Second Inaugural" should certainly be included among the selections. From Wilson you include The New Freedom. This, I believe, was a collection of campaign speeches. His book on Constitutional Government in the United States might be preferable.

I note the list includes writings from British, French, Italian, and German authors as well as American. It would be effective if something could be included from Russia, or other countries now within the Communist bloc, expressive of democratic theory. Perhaps something from Tolstoy's War and Peace would be appropriate, but I am not certain.

I certainly hope the idea will be carried out.

Sincerely yours,

QUINCY WRIGHT,
Professor, University of Chicago, and Past President, American Political Science Association.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have received your recent letter regarding the list of suggested books which might legitimately be translated for foreign distribution.

Quite frankly, I feel that there is not a single deletion which I would make on your list. I also agree that this type of material, if translated and made available abroad, would serve a very real purpose. If I were to make one suggestion, and this by an American author, I would include some of the essays of Justice Holmes.

With many thanks to you for your inquiry, I am

Sincerely yours,

R. TAYLOR, COLE,
Professor, Duke University.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of December 12, 1955, arrived while I was preparing for the year-end professional meetings.

Your proposal to publish translations of basic statements of democratic political philosophy is praiseworthy. It would be particularly valuable as textbook material to be used by American teachers when they lecture abroad. Too often there is little in the local language to assign to the students as supplementary reading. A proposal such as yours is a natural supplement to the various programs for the exchange of teachers. I hope that it is adopted.

As to the choice of books to be translated, I am in agreement with those suggested volumes which I know. Certainly Bryce and de Tocqueville are valuable although they are of another era. They give the foreigner's view of the United States of America. Above all else I think the Federalist Papers will be useful. I think I would add Magna Charta and the United States Constitution. Perhaps this could be prepared from the annotated edition with notes by Professor Corwin, setting forth some of the history and the great Supreme Court decisions which were milestones in its interpretation.

I would also recommend Austin's Law, Ethics and the State. As for Jefferson, why not use his First Inaugaural Address, and for Lincoln the first and second inaugural addresses?

I appreciate that any recent Presidents' addresses arouse some controversy, but I should think that a judicious selection from Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower would have an important place in a foreign language library on the great ideas underlying our democracy.

Very truly yours,

JOHN N. HAZARD,
Professor, Columbia University.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am delighted to make some comment on your project for the publication of important works on democracy in various languages. I have talked to a number of people about it, and some conclusions seem to emerge.

First, a lot of money could be wasted if such a project were not administered within the limits of effectiveness. A lot of books thrown around will not do any good; and if, for example, we could not get copies into China it might not be wise to print works in Chinese.

Second, some of my friends think that two lists should be made up, one for the intellectuals and another for more general or popular reading. I think the idea is good, though I would admit it would be exceedingly difficult to administer with any efficiency.

Third, another criticism is that some of the foreign books hardly represent an American interpretation of democracy. Personally, it seems that von Humboldt, Kant, and Mazzini are rather weak choices. It is quite possible that American writers presenting the same point of view might be used.

The third point just mentioned leads to more specific ideas. Hand's Spirit of Liberty would not seem to be a sufficiently tested or significant work to be included in this list. Instead of Kant's Perpetual Peace, some of Woodrow Wilson's speeches on international cooperation might be more valuable. For von Humboldt, why not substitute some American work, say Andrew Carnegie's Triumphant Democracy, or something like it. My conviction is that Europeans would not be impressed at this time by von Humboldt. Selections from Jefferson must be carefully done, since they can be slanted in almost any direction. Mazzini has had no impact on American intellectual history, and anyway he was pretty much of an anticlerical. If John Dewey, The Public and Its Problems is to be included, some countervailing work should be listed. Why not include Jacques Maritain's Man and the State, which is a great Christian statement for democratic government? Bryce should be represented by selections, since much of his work is quite out of date, or would not be of interest to readers in other lands. I would suggest the inclusion of Walt Whitman's Democratic Vistas, and also a pamphlet including the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. Millions of these could be distributed, very much as the Communists have distributed the Communist Manifesto and the Soviet Constitution. In the selections from Woodrow Wilson, more than The New Freedom should be used; selections from other speeches and from Congressional Government might be added.

Among the more popular works about the United States, my friends have suggested the following: Carl Becker, The Declaration of Independence; Ben Thomas' and Sand-

burg's lives of Lincoln; Franklin's Autobiography; the autobiographies of William Allen White and Edward Bok; and books on Theodore Roosevelt and Andrew Jackson. Selections from the history by Henry Adams might be quite useful.

Many other suggestions might be made, but in general and with few reservations on my part, I wish you every success in the forthcoming session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS G. WILSON,
Professor, University of Illinois.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12. I am very favorably impressed by your proposal to make publications on democracy available around the world.

If there is any way in which your suggested list of authors and works could be improved, perhaps it would be in the direction of increasing the proportion of American authors and twentieth century authors. I feel that, other things being equal, an American author has greater advertising value for our country, and that twentieth century authors are more likely to have voices attuned to the ears of twentieth century listeners.

I would propose for consideration for the list:

1. Up-to-the-minute demonstrations of democracy in action, giving the texts of important controversial speeches by Eisenhower and replies by Stevenson. Many other such demonstrations could be found in congressional debates and in majority versus minority Supreme Court decisions.

2. Some of F. D. Roosevelt's most famous speeches.

3. Selections from Bertrand Russell's political writings. Russell is today perhaps the world's best known living philosopher, and his clarity and wit have been attractive to a very wide audience. He is a great individualist and an ardent foe of totalitarianism.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM P. KENT,
Associate Professor, University of Utah.

Classics of American Democracy—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, continuing my report of the response to my questionnaire letter of December 12, 1955, I am including, among other letters from eminent educators, a letter from the distinguished Dr. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton, with a copy of the letter sent Dr. Corwin by Dr. William Anderson, professor at the University of Minnesota and past president of the American Academy of Political Science. Dr. Corwin's letter follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: I am sending you a letter to me from my good friend, Prof. William Anderson of the University of Minnesota, because I think you'll be interested to look up the book he writes about. Please return me his letter.

I wish to bring to your attention also Mr. Bruce A. Findlay's Guaranteed for Life. This is a strong cartoon history of the Constitution's safeguards of liberty. For certain kinds of people, those unable or disinclined to read, I believe it will prove rather effective propaganda. The author is associate superintendent of schools in Los Angeles; and it is published by Prentice Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N. J. (1955).

To my mind the best book ever written on American political institutions is still De Tocqueville's Democracy in America, and I was glad to see it on your list.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD S. CORWIN,

Here is Dr. Anderson's letter to Dr. Corwin:

DEAR ED: I did thank you, I believe for sending me a copy of the Cornell reprint of your famous article, "The Higher Law Background of American Constitutional Law." It is still as good as it was when you wrote it, and the best thing in its field.

When you get to the Princeton Library some day, you might want to examine a well-edited collection of reading entitled, "Our Long Heritage": Pages from the books our Founding Fathers read. The editor is Wilson O. Clough, the publisher University of Minnesota Press, and the date, 1955. The selections are in some cases rather too short, but they are long enough to give the flavor of each writer. They start in part I with a selection from Thucydides, and go on through the classical heritage, to Justinian; the English tradition to 1700, ranging from Magna Carta to the Declaration of Rights, 1688; the continental stream from Grotius through Puffendorf, Montesquieu, Burlamaqui, Rousseau, etc., and ending with a fourth part called the "Emerging Pattern," ranging from Anthony Ashley Cooper, through a number of English writers and a few colonials down to Richard Price. The whole collection strikes me as being a very good one as a background for students of American constitutional ideas. One shortcoming of the collection is the omission of continental writings of the medieval period, but I think this is justified to some extent on the ground that the continental materials at that time were not as widely read by the colonial readers who brought about American independence and the establishment of the Constitution.

With best wishes to you and Mrs. Corwin for a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year, I am,

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have read with interest your communication of December 12, 1955, in which you proposed legislation to encourage the distribution of 15 or 20 classics of American democracy. The general plan impresses me as having much merit.

I am not in a position to evaluate critically the list of authors and works which you included in your letter. It does occur to me, however, that it might be worthwhile to add to the list a separate publication which would contain the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Doubtless, these documents occur in some of the writings listed. Nevertheless, their appearance as a separate publication seems to be worthy of consideration.

Cordially yours,

JAMES M. MCCALLISTER,
Dean, Chicago City Junior College, Woodrow Wilson Branch.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is in reply to your form letter of December 12 about the possibility of publishing for distribution throughout the world a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy, consisting of some 15 to 20 books which, in the majority judgment of this jury of American public opinion, are basic classics of American democracy. In connection with a project of this kind it is much easier to be adversely critical than to offer constructive advice. I should like very much to be of help, but I find myself immediately in difficulties with respect to your project. It is one thing to present what are broadly basic statements of democratic political philosophy, and another to present basic classics of American democracy. Among the books which you tentatively list, those by Burke, von Humboldt, Kant, Mill, Locke, Mazzini, and Rousseau are books by foreign authors which are written primarily with their own countries, or at any rate with European countries, in mind. Although they have been used extensively in the United States and have been valuable in the development of American thinking, they are in no sense basic classics of American democracy.

Unfortunately for the educational purposes which you have in mind, I fear that you will be unable to find anywhere basic classics of American democracy in the sense in which the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao are classics or at any rate embody the postulates of communism. Except for the fact that our democracy started with an ideal of relative freedom, relative equality, and I might say also relative Christianity, we got under way with the establishment of our institutions not with a guiding star in the form of a body of dogma, but with a largely unarticulated ideal as to a way of life. While there may be value in presenting American writings by Dewey, Emerson, Hand, Jefferson, Lincoln, Thoreau, and Wilson, and even the works of foreign authors on American democracy such as those of Bryce and de Tocqueville, these works will present at best a series of incomplete theses with respect to the subject. American authors have written almost universally not merely to portray but to criticize. They have assumed in large part a basic knowledge with respect to ideas, ideals, and living conditions about which you rightly aspire to have Europeans informed. Inevitably, therefore, the writings are incomplete from the point of view of your purpose, and they include critical materials or at any rate critical emphasis which might well serve to mislead foreign readers.

It is of course true that the books of many contemporary authors on various aspects of the subject of American democracy are read abroad. As one of the many authors of such books, I fervently hope that foreign readers recognize the fact that the intended audience is primarily domestic, and that such criticism of personnel, organization, and behavior as may be included is intended for the accepting audience at home. We cannot, however, necessarily assume that this will be the case. It may well be close to the time when American authors ought to begin writing on American institutions not primarily for American audiences but for audiences abroad. If such books were written the strategy would inevitably be very different from that of the current major output. It may or may not be part of the function of your particular committee to look into the question of promoting such authorship.

Returning to the specific subject of your list, I should hesitate, without across-the-table discussion on purpose and strategy with other people interested in the subject, to make firm suggestions of books to be added to the list or to say which of the writings of Emerson, Lincoln, Jefferson, and other American writers should definitely be included in the materials to be distributed. One of my colleagues has suggested inclusion of Philosophy of Democratic Government by an able American Catholic author, Yves Simon, and also An Almanac of Liberty, published last year by Justice William O. Douglas. At the very least I have no doubt that these books are worthy of consideration. I should recommend, furthermore, consideration of books by such men as Robert MacIver, including particularly his The Web of Government. However, to repeat, until the

purpose of the publication is more clearly defined, I should hesitate to offer suggestions with confidence.

Very sincerely yours,

CARL B. SWISHER,
Professor, the Johns Hopkins University.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I think your proposal to publish some basic democratic American documents is a very promising and significant one. I have always felt that if a proper and balanced selection were made from our own classics, we could give Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and Mao some very healthy competition. It all depends, however, on the wisdom and validity of the selection itself. While I could make some suggestions based upon the suggested list you enclose, I would like to submit a more substantial proposal to you as to ways and means of arriving at this basic list.

There are now living 12 past presidents of the American Political Science Association, a very fine list of scholars and distinguished American citizens who could probably act in a very helpful and constructive manner in advising with you as you arrive at your final suggestions. Their names and addresses follow:

Prof. William Anderson, department of political science, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis 14, Minn.

Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary, United Nations, New York, N. Y.

Prof. John Gaus, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. Luther Gulick, Institute of Public Administration, 684 Park Avenue, New York, 21, N. Y.

Dr. Pendleton Herring, president, Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Prof. Arthur N. Holcombe, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Prof. Harold D. Lasswell, Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Prof. Arthur MacMahon, department of public law and government, Columbia University, New York 27, N. Y.

Prof. Peter H. Oregard, department of political science, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Prof. James K. Pollock, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Prof Leonard D. White, department of political science, the University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

Prof. Quincy Wright, department of political science, the University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

I take the liberty of making this suggestion to you not only because of the merits of your own proposal, but because having been a citizen of Chicago for many years and having watched your own fine career, I would be anxious to see you carry out this interesting project with distinction. There is probably nothing more important than telling the world (including our own selves) what are our most genuine traditions and abiding theories of democratic government; but at the same time there is no more hazardous job in the field of either scholarship or statesmanship.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT LEPAWSKY,
Professor of Political Science, University of California.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: In reply to your letter of December 12, 1955, concerning the publication, by the United States Information Agency, of prominent statements of democratic philosophy, I wish to thank you for honoring me by asking for my comments. Permit me to say that I am finding this plan praiseworthy and commendable.

However, much of the success of such an undertaking may well depend on the manner in which it is executed. If it is intended to place before the public abroad a collection of entire essays, or entire chapters of prominent democratic thinkers, I feel that this manner may duplicate existing collections of this kind in practically all countries. For example, in Latin America there is no scarcity of such publications.

What is needed, therefore, is a collection of significant statements which addresses itself to the common man in the various foreign civilizations, and this would require a highly selective procedure. What should be presented are abstracts or parts of the writings of famous political thinkers, organized in a logical sequence, dealing, among other things, with the individual, the community, the governmental institutions, etc. In the second place, it occurs to me that such a collection of materials sponsored by an American agency should confine itself strictly to American writers and such foreign writers who have dealt with American institutions or experience. Therefore, it is suggested to omit thinkers like Kant, Mazzini, and Rousseau, while de Tocqueville should remain on the list. I am also doubtful about the value of including Burke who is usually connected with a professedly conservative and even anti-democratic philosophy. Furthermore, I would strongly suggest adding the recent Harvard lectures by Mr. Lord O'Brian, one of the great spokesmen for the values of a democratic civilization in this country. As to foreign writers not mentioned in the list, I wish to call your attention to Juan Battista Alberdi, the great Argentine admirer and counterpart of Jefferson, whose writings frequently deal with American experience.

I hope this letter may be of some assistance to your plans, which otherwise I heartily endorse. Thanking you for having acquainted me with this matter.

Very truly yours,

KARL LOEWENSTEIN,
William Nelson Cromwell Professor of Jurisprudence and Political Science, Amherst College.

Max Abelman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, Max Abelman, of Brooklyn, N. Y., who has spent a lifetime in the service of his fellowman, has received another distinctive honor. He was recently appointed an honorary sovereign grand inspector general, 33d and last degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite for Italy and its dependencies as has been attested to by the following letter received by him under date of October 31, 1955:

MASSONERIA DI RITO
SCOZZESE ANTICO ED ACCETTATO,
SUPREMO CONSIGLIO DEL 33D,
ED ULTIMO GRADO,
PER L'ITALIA E SUE DIPENDENZE,
October 31, 1955.

To the LOFTY AND MOST POWERFUL BROTHER,
MAX ABELMAN 33D,
Oriente of New York.

DEAREST AND MOST POWERFUL BROTHER: It's with pleasure that I inform you the supreme council of the grand inspectors of the 33d and last degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite for Italy and its dependences, in its ordinary meeting held in Rome on the last week of October 1955, on proposal of the Most Elected and Most Powerful Brother Vincent Castorina, 33d, honorable, venable, lieutenant, grand commander, has unanimously deliberated to appoint you honorary sovereign grand inspector general.

While I rejoice together with you for the sign of deepest esteem to you expressed by the supreme council by means of this appointment, I declare my firm conviction that our community will get from your activity a real contribution of wisdom as of works.

I consign to you the annexed warrant and I beg you to accept along with my sincere congratulations, my triple fraternal embrace in our holy numbers.

VINCENZO CASTORINA, 33D,
Honorable, Venable, Lieutenant, Grand Commander.

LONG ISLAND, N. Y.

Declaration of Interdependence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, for several years a distinguished group of men and women from all over the free world have been working to obtain support for a declaration of interdependence.

A group called the Interdependence Council has been organizing this movement on a worldwide basis. The chairman of the council's executive committee is an old friend of mine, Otto Tod Mallery, of Philadelphia, and an author and distinguished economist.

Today, in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, in Independence Hall, this declaration of interdependence is to be proclaimed.

The declaration is signed by 1,371 persons from 49 nations. This is a fine movement for international peace and good will.

In order that my colleagues may be able to read about the objectives of this declaration and of the good work of this fine group of public-spirited leaders throughout the world, I ask unanimous consent that this declaration of interdependence and its explanation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECLARATION OF INTERDEPENDENCE

"There is a spirit in man and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding." (Old Testament.)

"He hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." (New Testament.)

FOREWORD

People have the power to help or harm each other. Which shall it be?

Nations can live in peace or die in war. Which shall it be?

The fate of humanity depends upon the feelings of individuals toward one another. The common interests drawing people together are stronger than the artificial barriers now keeping them apart.

Impending world events and new scientific inventions can annihilate or benefit mankind. The new situation demands the scrapping of outworn ideas and the spreading of a

deeper understanding of the interdependence of people everywhere.

Mutual human needs and aspirations are stated in the declaration of interdependence. This is not an agreement between governments. Governments, like the hands on the face of a clock, are moved from within. The declaration of interdependence is intended to give individuals, who as citizens move their governments, a direction of movement and a sense of responsible participation in a worldwide fellowship.

In a world so large that one often feels insignificant, the declaration of interdependence offers the individual confidence in himself by affirming: I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. What I can do I ought to do, and what I ought to do I will do.

PREAMBLE

We, men and women of different races and religions, children of a Supreme Being through whom all men are brothers, unite our needs and aspirations in this declaration of interdependence.

No man, no people can stand alone. Out of union of diverse elements we will form durable partnerships to withstand the pressures of conflict. The killing of millions would not diminish the mutual distrust of the survivors. Therefore, we seek to be trustworthy and to find men worthy of our trust. With the ocean's strength and the mountain's patience, we will stand together in creative faith that a free and peaceful world is attainable through cooperative action.

Faith is like the bird that feels the coming light and sings when the dawn is still dark. Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. With such faith we will use the increasing human interdependence of modern times for peaceful progress.

Realizing that man does not live by bread alone and that material progress itself cannot produce peace or the good life, we offer ourselves as partners in the following interlocking program.

PROGRAM

We declare our common purpose to—

Reverence life

Exercise reverence for life and human dignity, abolish racial barriers, and repudiate all doctrines of supposed superiority based upon national origin, color, creed, sex, or class. People are more alike than they are different.

Foster mutual understanding and respect for one another's beliefs and cultural values. Many keys are required to unlock all the gates of truth and beauty.

Uphold freedom to think, to read, to listen, to look, to speak, to assemble. Freedom of information and freedom of expression are not rights only but tools with which to create a way of life. Opinions, like the roots of a tree, require nourishment from all sides. There is no substitute for an open mind. Mutual confidence can be approached only through open minds and reliance upon free discussion. The earth is strewn with the ruins of great powers, but great ideas survive and ultimately rule the world.

Benefit the individual

Increase the opportunity of each individual to overcome ignorance and illiteracy. Famine and poverty are their result: It is hard to make an empty sack stand upright. We will press for universal elementary schooling and fundamental education.

Achieve for youth of every land the opportunity to unfold creative talents, to realize noble dreams and enjoy fruitful, unthreatened lives.

Promote physical and mental health of all peoples as fundamental for the attainment of peace and security. Prevention is better than cure.

Work for equality of opportunity—economic, social, and political—for men and women alike.

Protect the individual against suppression or exploitation by those misusing political or economic power. Each individual is the ultimate minority. To protect minorities is to safeguard each human being. Government has evolved for the benefit of the individual, not the individual for the benefit of government.

Encourage our respective governments to work together in cooperation for the solving of social and humanitarian problems, and the upholding of fundamental human rights and freedoms for all.

Seek justice as the foundation of human relations

Eliminate forced labor.

Secure freedom of association and the right of workers to form unions to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, without interfering with the rights of employers.

Favor the progressive participation of subject populations in the business and government of their native lands.

Assist subject peoples toward self-government and self-determination of their changing relationships to an ever widening commonwealth.

Support land reform and relieve tillers of the soil from unjust forms of land tenure, however imposed. Injustices eat away the foundations of human relations. The impoverishment of any area is of concern to all. Peace to be durable must be endurable.

Lift living standards

Lower trade barriers which reduce the flow of goods essential for raising standards of living throughout the world. Whether people eat or starve depends in part upon how widely goods can be exchanged with mutual gain. Many confluent streams of trade are needed to form a worldwide flow of production; therefore, we oppose discriminatory trade practices, which diminish access to markets and to supplies of goods and services.

Explore workable approaches to strengthen human relations through economic unions and political federations.

There is no alternative to peace

Seek a substitute for the illusion of victory. We do not place our main reliance upon the military power of the state or alliance to which we belong. Spiritual power is superior to physical power. Wars are world disasters and after total war the distinction between victor and vanquished grows less and less.

Reject all propaganda from home or abroad which seeks to justify aggression.

Melt the cold barriers of distrust now creeping over the earth like a glacier. We enlist in a personal campaign against fear, bitterness, and prejudice, and we ask that as much thought and effort be given to the art of increasing understanding as is being given to the means of increasing fear and hatred. Through enlightenment, understanding, and cooperation we will eradicate the roots of war and plant seeds of mutual trust in the fertile soil of good will.

Advocate progressive mutual disarmament with adequate safeguards. War is not inevitable. Men are not created to destroy one another, but to work together on their never-ceasing task to build a better world.

Strengthen the United Nations

Strengthen the United Nations and encourage its evolution as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

COMPACT

Believing that with the assistance of divine guidance we shall succeed,

Knowing that it is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness,

Desiring to help one another to mount, step by step, toward these high summits of human aspiration, and

Voicing the longings of all people for peace, freedom, justice, and security with equal rights for all and special privileges for none,

We hereby agree as partners to champion and cherish the declaration of interdependence, its aims, and ideals:

(Your signature)

BACKGROUND

The declaration of independence originated after World War II when a group of North Americans, disillusioned by failure to remove some of the outstanding causes of war, sought to find the bases of just and durable peace. They asked themselves these questions:

What are the specific conditions required for lasting peace?

How can we apply the spirit of live-and-help-live to both domestic and world affairs?

How can this thermo-nuclear age offer more compelling methods of survival through patient conciliation and cooperation?

What common interests transcend differences in ideology, social dogma, and political institutions?

Since no one nation nor any one race monopolizes wisdom or rectitude, what are the highest common denominators of cooperative action toward peace and progress?

This North American group, centered largely in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love, drafted a tentative declaration of independence. Realizing that people of different cultures would offer various answers, they circulated the draft to others, both in the United States and in many other countries. Each contributed suggestions. Twelve successive drafts resulted and after 5 years (1950 to 1955) the final declaration of independence, studied and approved by people in 49 countries, was at last complete.

Therefore, the declaration is a truly international development.

POLICIES

The declaration does not purport to state the foreign policy of any country. As a cooperative undertaking by private citizens in many countries, it presents specific goals toward which signers everywhere may strive.

Until these goals are reached, the foreign policy of any nation often will leave much to be desired. Based, as it is, on temporary expediency, military strategy or supposed economic or political advantage, a foreign policy may not, at any given moment, conform to the principles of the declaration. The Interdependence Council seeks, however, to discover people of good will in every country whose common faith and mutual trust will bring national policies closer to these goals.

OBJECTIVES

One objective of the declaration is to develop and maintain mutual trust among individuals of good will divided from one another by national frontiers but striving for better human relations.

Superior individuals, not superior force, make a nation respected. Such superior individuals can attain leadership only if the spirit of the declaration of interdependence is acted upon with conviction by a nucleus of convinced followers.

Such persons may be few, but they are mighty. One street light, like one individual of good will, illumines only a small area, but this woud be dark without that single light. Just as a line of small street lights makes the whole street safer for passers-by, so the chain of signers can make safer the lines of communication from person to person. If you wish to be one of these small essential lights, make yourself known by signing the declaration.

Another objective is to lift our aspirations. Fear of war is contagious. Preparations for defense by one nation looks like preparations for war to another. Preparations for peace would also be contagious from nation to nation and each constructive step toward peace by one nation would lead to similar steps by others. Peace begets peace.

FUNCTIONS OF THE INTERDEPENDENCE COUNCIL, INC.

The interdependence council is neither an action body nor a propagandist agency. In disseminating the declaration of interdependence and in presenting the objectives contained therein, it recommends no specific legislation nor any special policy. A signer who accepts the principles of the declaration undertakes only to apply those principles according to the judgment of his private conscience.

The declaration of interdependence rests upon the inescapable fact that the whole world has become one economic and social neighborhood and must now become a spiritual and ethical brotherhood. Signers derive encouragement from the knowledge that, despite fevered propaganda and misrepresentations, men of good will can be found everywhere who are striving for the same common goals of justice, peace, and understanding.

PROCLAMATION

The declaration of interdependence was officially proclaimed during January 1956 in a number of countries, including India, Pakistan, Brazil, Japan, France, Germany, Peru, Argentina, Mexico, and the United States. The American ceremonies occurred at Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pa., where, in 1776, the freedom of the United States had been proclaimed. An international gathering, representing many countries, jointly presented the original declaration of interdependence, hand-lettered in gold, red, and black and signed by 1,371 persons from 49 nations, to an international organization for preservation. Of these original signers, 33 percent were residents of Asia, 27 percent of North America, 18 percent of Europe, 14 percent of South America, 4 percent of Africa, 2 percent of Central America and Mexico, 2 percent of Australasia.

The proclamation was the launching of a ship laden with ideas. When a ship is launched no one knows all the ports at which it may eventually call. But the Seven Seas are open to it. So also are they open to the declaration.

REGIONAL ACTIVITY

Regional vice chairmen are currently active in 21 countries—Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, England, Egypt, France, French regions in west Africa, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand, northern Europe, Pakistan, Peru, Union of South Africa, and the United States of America. In some of these areas interdependence councils have been formed, each of them wholly independent of the original council in the United States and of each other.

Signers of the declaration, when traveling, are invited to make themselves known to the vice chairmen. These regional vice chairmen have translated the declaration into Spanish, French, German, Portuguese, Italian, Arabic, Japanese, Hindi, and Urdu. These texts are available from the appropriate vice chairmen or may be procured from the Interdependence Council, Inc., 9006 Crefeld Street, Philadelphia 18, Pa., at 10 for $1, or 100 for $7. A supply in all languages is available in the United States without charge to persons overseas.

ACTION

What can you do? Do first what every man ought to do to promote better human relations. Read, listen, meditate, pray. Today's race on earth is between mutual aid and mutual destruction. Enroll with the mutual aid team by signing the declaration and returning the back cover to the address above.

THE INTERDEPENDENCE COUNCIL, INC.

Officers and directors

Honorary chairman: Andre Lalande, member of the Institute of France, professor emeritus of philosophy at the Sorbonne, Paris, France.

Chairman: Otto Tod Mallery, author of Economic Union and Durable Peace; ex-chief economist, United States Department of Commerce; chairman, board of directors, National Recreation Association, Philadelphia, United States of America.

Vice chairmen

For Argentina: Jorge M. Bano, managing editor Nuevo Mundo, professor of the History of Civilization, Buenos Aires.

For Bolivia: Edouard Kunstek, director of the Polytechnic Institute of the Universitad Jecuica de Oruro.

For Brazil: Dr. Genesio Pereira Filho, lawyer, author, president, Grupo Da Estudos Euclides Da Cunba, São Paulo.

For Central America: Dr. Juan Edgar Picado, attorney; active rotarian, San Jose, Costa Rica.

For Chile: Amanda Labarca H., president, Chilean Commission of Intellectual Cooperation; Director of the University Extension Department, University of Chile, Santiago.

For Colombia, Venezuela and Ecuador: Santiago Gutierrez, business executive; secretary-general Movimiento Pro Federation Americana, Bogotá, Colombia.

For England: Captain W. P. Knowles, D. Sc., M. C., Principal of the Institute of Breathing, London.

For Egypt: Mrs. Eva el Masri Sidhom, president, Egyptian Federation of University Women, Alexandria.

For France: Frederic-Charles Lowenbach, business executive, Paris.

For French Regions, West Africa: J. H. Beunde, president of the Association Fraternelle Kribienne (ASSOFRAK), Douala, French Cameroons.

For Germany: Dr. Edith Ebers, writer, geologist; chairman, Munich Branch, Association of German University Women, Munich, Germany.

Associate vice chairman for Germany: Rudolph Hundertschuh, publisher, Garmisch-Partenkirchen.

For India: U. K. Oza, novelist; former editor Voice of India; chairman, executive committee, All India Convention of Race Relations; Vice President Indian Nationals Overseas Congress, New Delhi.

For Italy: Mrs. Piero Carinelli, Doctor of Belles Lettres and Philosophy, educator, Udine.

For Japan; Dr. Tatsuo Morito: president, Hiroshima University; chairman, Japanese delegation to United Nations Educational, Scientic, and Cultural Organization, Hiroshima.

Associate vice chairman for Japan: Bishop Yoshimune Abe, chairman of the board, International Christian College, Tokyo.

For Mexico: Leonides Andreu Almazan, M. D., Ex-Governor of the State of Puebla, Mexico (13) D. F.

For New Zealand: Herbert Sutcliffe, D. Sc., founder International Sutcliffe Schools of Radiant Living, Havelock North. H. B.

For Northern Europe: Prof. Karl J. Ewerts, Accredited Permanent Observer at United Nations; professor of international law and political science, Stockholm and New York.

For Pakistan: Dr. Mahmoud Brelvi, historian; member of executive committee of the Organization for Moslem-Christian Cooperation; general secretary, International Assembly of Moslem Youth; member of the secretariat, Islamic Congress, Karachi.

For Peru: Estuardo Nunez Hague: professor in facultad de letras, University of San Marcos; vice president of Instituto Cultural Peruàno-Norteamericano, Lima.

For Union of South Africa: Rev. Magnus G. Ratter, minister, Free Protestant Church, Capetown.

For United States of America: Karl Scholz, professor of economics, Univeristy of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Board of Directors

Secretary, Harry Emerson Wildes, author of 4 books on Japan and several on American history, 259 South Farragut Terrace, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer, Ralph Page, columnist, Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia.

Assistant treasurer: Mrs. Alice Rhoads Hart, American Friends Service Committee, Wayne, Pa.

Louis L. Austin, business executive; owner of Capon Springs and farms, author of You Are Greater Than You Know; Capon Springs, W. Va.

Joseph Brown, professor of sculpture, inventor, Princeton University.

Glenn Clark, author, the Soul's Sincere Desire; religious leader; founder of Camps Farthest Out, St. Paul, Minn.

William L. Clayton, authority on world trade; ex-Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs; executive, Anderson, Clayton & Co., cotton merchant, Houston, Tex.

Mrs. William Hammatt Davis, ex-chairman, Women in World Affairs, New York City.

Willard R. Espy, author, Bold New Program and Declaration of Brothers. Board of editors, Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N. Y.

John Frazer, Jr., staff, National Committee for a Free Europe, New York City.

Earl Parker Hanson, professor of geography, University of Delaware; author of Transformation: Story of Modern Porto Rico, Newark, Del.

George Edmund Haynes, educator, author, expert on African affairs, Mount Vernon, N. Y.

Leslie Pinckney Hill, author, What the Negro Wants; president emeritus, Pennsylvania State Teachers College at Cheyney, Pa. Philadelphia.

Noni Gopal Joardar, doctor of laws and economics, writer on Indian culture, Washington, D. C.

Clarence L. Jordan, retired executive in public relations; chairman, Franklin anniversary committee of the Franklin Institute, Philadelphia.

Frank C. Laubach, specialist in world literacy, inventor of alphabets, author of Wake Up or Blow Up, New York City.

Dr. Hyman Lischner, editor, New Outlook, Santa Monica, Calif.

Fred S. Markham, business executive, Balboa Island, Calif.

Oscar K. Merritt, business executive, founder of North Carolina high school world peace study program, Mt. Airy, N. C.

Joy Elmer Morgan, ex-editor of the National Education Association; president, Senior Citizens of America, Washington, D. C.

Norman D. Palmer, professor of political science, University of Pennsylvania; chairman, Institute for Asian Affairs, Philadelphia.

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union; United States adviser to United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, Denver, Colo.

Arthur D. Pratt, Jr., executive director of foundation for International Economic Development and Education, Indianapolis, Ind.

William L. Smyser, ex-United States Consul to Thailand, lecturer on world affairs, Philadelphia.

Melvin K. Whiteleather, board of editors, Evening Bulletin, Philadelphia.

Mrs. Robert D. Wolf, League of Women Voters, secretary, Institute for Asian Affairs, Philadelphia.

Committee of University Students, Harold V. Semling, Jr., chairman, American University, Washington, D. C.

Heckling of Great Secretary Doesn't Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Oroville (Calif.) Mercury, of January 14, 1956.

Mr. Dan L. Beebe, editor and publisher of the Oroville Mercury has written an excellent editorial in which he analyzes the splendid work of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

The editorial follows:

HECKLING OF GREAT SECRETARY DOESN'T HELP

If the Democrats should win the next election and take over the State Department, and if they should junk the policy of Secretary Dulles, which now they are attacking daily, why then we would be in for another series of Communist advances such as lost the satellites and China to the free world.

The present attack on Dulles, one of the greatest Secretaries of State in our history, is pure politics in a political year and amounts to a play on words.

Comparatively few who read and hear the attacks have read the original article in the magazine Life. What the hecklers are doing is to take a sentence out of context and give it a meaning never intended either by Dulles or the Washington bureau man of Life who wrote the article.

The sentence goes like this: "* * * The ability to get to the verge (of war) without getting into war is the necessary art * * *."

In the four pages of the article, there was that small weakness in wording subject to two interpretations. The rest of the article is more or less ignored, and Dulles is being pictured as a tightrope walker who advances to the brink of war as a sort of stunt, and who could plunge the Nation into war if his foot slipped.

But let us read the paragraph from which that was taken:

"Always, of course, there has been and continues to be risk. Says Dulles 'You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances in war. Of course, we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. We've had to look it square in the face, on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action.'"

If the previous administration had been that courageous, we would have saved China from the Reds. We would not have submitted to the loss of Poland and the partitioning of Germany.

Dulles in the article points out that the method of the Eisenhower administration in avoiding war has been to make miscalculation on the part of the enemy unlikely.

There is a classic example of this miscalculation, and Dulles tells about it in the article (which, of course, doesn't endear him to the opposition). The article reads:

"All the great wars of modern history, Dulles is convinced, were started by national leaders who thought they could get away with it. When they found out they could not, it was too late. The Korean war, Dulles argued, had been caused by Moscow's mistaken belief that the United States would be unwilling to fight to stop armed aggression against South Korea. As much as Dulles admired his predecessor Dean Acheson's courageous reaction to aggression he felt that Acheson had made a tragic mistake in suggesting, just 6 months before the Communists attacked, that South Korea was outside the United States 'vital perimeter' area."

So when a pressure play by the Reds, such as the move to capture Formosa, is building up, Dulles quietly lets it be known that the United States will fight. He arranges to have forces concentrated there. And the United States would have fought, he is convinced, and with atomic weapons, if the Chinese Reds had started it. The Reds did not start it. War was avoided, in direct contrast to what happened in Korea.

So it will be seen that the present turmoil is merely a tempest of words, based on a sentence taken out of context, in confidence that only a very small minority of the American people ever will see the entire article. It is political trickery, playing with an American people in a critical period, when all should stand together against the common enemy.

If we wish to surrender more and more to the Communists, we can junk the Dulles policy of opposing strength with strength, and then we can turn tail and run while the Communists take over the world.

Schoolhouses and Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the most urgent domestic legislation before the Congress is that providing a program of Federal aid to speed up the construction of schools for America's boys and girls.

Schoolrooms are needed for America's high-school students. Scholarships are needed for college students.

Along the line of these thoughts I submit for the RECORD excerpts from an article by Roscoe Fleming styled "Aid to Schools, What's the Next Federal Move?" This article is from the Denver Post of December 28, 1955. I recommend its reading to the entire membership of the House of Representatives:

WHAT'S THE NEXT FEDERAL MOVE?
(By Roscoe Fleming)

The next Congress surely will provide substantial aid to local public school building, probably by grant to State boards of education—at least of those States that shall have retained a public school system.

There's no Federal control implied here, any more than of the Red Rocks amphitheater, the Boulder County courthouse or the Golden high school, all built, I believe, with substantial Federal aid.

Now what's the next step? Maybe we tend to forget that not the teacher, nor the community, nor even the children, are the ultimate objectives and beneficiaries of our solicitude—but the public welfare of the United States of America.

That welfare has always seemed to our forefathers to be based most firmly on education, so that the village school was the next building they built after the church—if the two indeed did not share the same structure.

So our system of popular education, imperfect as it still may be, is yet the world's most stirring and striking example—more responsible, perhaps, than any other major factor for America's leap to the forefront among the world's great nations.

If you want in a few words the American credo of education, I think it is that no child shall be barred for lack of opportunity from following the path of education and of self-development, so far as his will and his intrinsic abilities permit.

So what's next. So our most pressing national need, as we hear over and over again in doomful tones, is for youth adequately trained for the atomic age in the physical sciencies. We need, we are told, 15,000 or 20,000 more yearly than we've been getting.

They are there in potential. One of our tragedies lies in the number of kids that are still stopped short, usually by poverty or lack of self-knowledge, before going as far as they might educationwise. One rapid, economical, and adequate way to meet this situation might be as follows:

Create about 10,000 federally financed scholarships for college or post-graduate training with stress on the physical sciences. Students would be selected by competitive Federal examinations given by, say, the United States Civil Service Commission or the United States Office of Education. These students might enter any accredited 4-year college or university of their choice.

Having to work too hard for a living while trying to go to school is actually a handicap, despite all you hear to the contrary, so these scholarships should be generous enough to eliminate the need for any outside work, save perhaps during vacations.

By itself it might not provide all the trained specialists we need. But it would stimulate interest in the physical sciences all down the line. We should have less of such spectacles as that of a high school with magnificent equipment and visual aids for teaching chemistry and physics plus an able and dedicated teacher—and 40 boys and girls out of 800 taking these sciences so basic for understanding the world we now live in.

Democrat Candidate Jokes Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Adlai Stevenson is continuing his 1952 policy of looking at our Government and the American people as a bag of tricks from which he pulls out funny stories. The Washington Evening Star of January 17 carries an article by Gould Lincoln which deals sensibly and seriously with an important issue, one which Mr. Stevenson, still in character, has used as a basis for another of his clever remarks. The American people still wonder if Mr. Stevenson ever faces a problem seriously.

The article follows:

STEVENSON'S MEANINGLESS QUIP
(By Gould Lincoln)

Adlai Stevenson, front-running candidate for the 1956 Democratic presidential nomination, does not like the Eisenhower-Dulles administration of foreign affairs. He has charged that the Secretary of State is willing to play Russian roulette with the life of our Nation. On too many occasions, he has said,

the Eisenhower administration has acted without regard for the Nation's allies. These recent attacks by Stevenson were inspired by an article in Life magazine entitled "How Dulles Averted War."

BRINK OF WAR THREE TIMES

Presumably Mr. Stevenson was not criticizing Mr. Dulles for having averted war. And Mr. Dulles and James Shepley, chief of the Time-Life Washington Bureau, author of the article, showed clearly and in detail how the United States, with Eisenhower at the helm, had gone to the brink of war three times and averted it—each case in Asia. Mr. Stevenson is, again presumably, for peace, not war. Since that is so, he cannot be suspected of opposing actions taken by Secretary of State Dulles, backed by President Eisenhower, which averted a resumption of war in Korea in 1953. For these actions prevented war. He cannot be suspected of attacking the steps taken by Dulles and Eisenhower which in 1954 averted the entry of Chinese Communist troops in Indochina in large numbers, and a consequent overrunning of all southwest Asia. Nor can he be suspected of denouncing President Eisenhower's firm stand in 1955, backed up by a resolution of Congress, which has averted war in the Formosa Straits. Because all of these actions were effective, averted war, and continued peace.

Mr. Stevenson has not said he would undo any of these actions which resulted in peace. Why, then, doesn't he like the Dulles' article in Life?

Mr. Stevenson does not like the article because it is an exposition of the success of the Eisenhower administration's handling of foreign affairs, and because the article reflects upon the Truman administration, which went before. He does not like the political overtones of the article, which is quite natural. Mr. Dulles' description of the victories—for peace—as told by Mr. Shepley, are, in fact, a refutation of the attacks on the Eisenhower foreign policy and its handling that have sprung from the throats and pens of Democratic leaders, as the 1956 political campaign has come nearer.

The Democrats do not like to have the Eisenhower administration take credit for peace—and that's that. Especially, it does not like to have the administration assert that, since 1953 when Eisenhower entered the White House, the country has had both peace and prosperity.

Mr. Stevenson's characterization of Mr. Dulles' action and words as a willingness "to play Russian roulette with the life of our Nation" is a nice quip—if it had any meaning. Russian roulette, played with a revolver containing one cartridge, is a game of blind chance. Mr. Dulles and President Eisenhower played no such game, nor does Secretary Dulles advocate it, or show a willingness to involve the United States in such a game. In every instance, the moves made by the Secretary of State, backed by the President, have followed full study in which all risks were calculated.

The paragraph in Life on which Mr. Stevenson bases his Russian roulette statement quotes Mr. Dulles as saying: "You have to take chances for peace, just as you must take chances in war. Some say that we were brought to the verge of war. Of course, we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action."

REDS MISCALCULATED

Mr. Dulles did not say anywhere that this country should make a practice of going to the brink of war as a necessary exercise. He did not advocate anything of the kind. What he did say was that if circumstances brought this country to the verge of war, it should know how to avert war—without giving away its shirt, or the shirt of any other friendly nation or ally. Mr. Dulles is convinced that the great wars of modern times were started by leaders who miscalculated, just as the Communists miscalculated what the United States would do when they attacked the Republic of Korea.

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson in the Truman administration, 6 months before that attack, made a speech suggesting that South Korea was outside the "vital perimiter" of the United States defense. This was not telling the Reds the United States would fight if Korea was invaded. The Communists miscalculated. There was war.

Religious Freedom in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following statement of the American Jewish Congress on Freedom of Religion and Separation of Church and State, which has been submitted to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE UNITED STATES

INTRODUCTION

The American Jewish Congress is dedicated to the preservation of the democratic way of life and to the unity and creative survival of the Jewish people throughout the world. It seeks to eliminate all forms of political, social and economic discrimination on grounds of race, color, religious ancestry or national origin, and otherwise to strengthen and safeguard democratic freedoms and individual liberties. It regards the principle of separation of church and state as one of the foundations of American democracy and is convinced that both political liberty and freedom of worship and belief can remain inviolate only where there exists no intrusion of secular authority in religious agairs or of religious authority in secular affairs. Accordingly, it deems any breach in the wall separating church and state as jeopardizing the political and religious freedoms which that wall was intended to protect.

In accordance with the request of your committee in its letter of invitation to us, we are limiting the scope of this statement to one subject: a brief account of the instances in recent years in which there have been significant impairments of the mandate of the 1st and 14th amendments to the United States Constitution that neither Congress nor the States shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting its free exercise.

We do not discuss in this statement the constitutional question whether the provision against establishment of religion in the first amendment bars nonpreferential as well as preferential aid to religion. We nevertheless think it appropriate to indicate our view that the 1st and 14th amendments impose upon Government in our American democracy an obligation of strict separation, an obligation that precludes all material aid to religion by Congress and the States, whether accorded on a preferential or nonpreferential basis. We so urged in a brief as friend of the court submitted to the United States Supreme Court in the McCollum case in 1948. We have consistently adhered to that position and have expressed it in the resolutions of our governing bodies and in the briefs as friend of the court submitted by us to the United States Supreme Court and many State courts.

We deem it appropriate also to suggest that the current threat to the principle of separation of church and state does not lie in direct attacks upon it. The principle of separation is so deeply ingrained in our tradition and so universally recognized to be a fundamental component of American constitutional democracy that any frontal attack upon it would be futile and self-defeating. The same is true in respect to the other guaranties of the first amendment: freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and of petition. The danger to separation of church and state, like the danger to the other first amendment liberties, lies in dilution, evasion, circumvention, and compromise, while lip service is paid to the principle itself.

Finally, we believe that religious freedom and the separation of church and state are interdependent, indivisible, and indeed unitary. Religious liberty can only be secure where church and state are completely independent of each other. Since we are convinced that Judaism, and all other faiths, can best achieve creative survival where religious liberty is secure, we are committed to the defense of the principle of strict separation of church and state.

THE AREAS OF DANGER

We take as our frame of reference the interpretation of the first amendment announced by the United States Supreme Court in the 1947 Everson Bus case and reiterated in the 1948 McCollum Released Time case. This is universally accepted as the most authoritative and comprehensive exposition of the meaning of the religion clause of the first amendment. In these cases, the Supreme Court said:

"The 'establishment of religion' clause of the first amendment means at least this: Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid 1 religion, aid all religions, or prefer 1 religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or to remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect 'a wall of separation between church and state.'"

Measured by these standards, we submit that the following are the five major areas in which there are, at the present time, serious infringements of the guaranty of religious freedom and the separation of church and state:

1. Involvement of the public school in religious instruction and observances.

2. Grant of tax-raised funds for religious education and use of Government property by religious organizations for religious purposes.

3. Enforcement of compulsory Sunday laws against persons observing the seventh day as the Sabbath.

4. Restrictions on the erection of houses of worship and religious schools in new residential communities.

5. Judicial and legislative prohibition of the adoption of children by persons of faiths different from that of the children's natural parents even in disregard of the natural parents' wishes.

INFRINGEMENTS AND VIOLATIONS

Religion in the public schools

Since the adoption of the first amendment, the United States has escaped much of the bitter religious conflict and sectarian strife that have risen in other parts of the world and driven men to violence and bloodshed. That good fortune has been due largely to two of the really great contributions the American people have made to Western civilization: the separation of church and state and the free public-school system. The first, by protecting religion against the intrusion of civil authority and by making it impossible for the state to become a battleground for sectarian preference and favor, has preserved both our political freedom and our religious freedom. The second, by providing for the education of our children on terms of complete equality and without cognizance of their differences in religious beliefs or disbeliefs, has been the cornerstone of our American democracy. The intrusion of sectarianism upon the public-school system both threatens the separation of church and state and challenges the integrity of the public schools. That intrusion, if permitted and sanctioned, will destroy the institutions that have preserved religious and political freedom in the United States and that have prevented religious warfare in this Nation.

Nevertheless, by far the most serious threat today to the principle of religious freedom and the separation of church and state lies in the ever-increasing pressures to introduce religious instruction and practices into the public schools. Were it not that some, either through misunderstanding or ill will, equate opposition to religion within the public-school system with opposition to religion, we would hardly need state that our position is in no way motivated by hostility to religious instruction. In Jewish history and tradition, religious education has always been regarded a sacred responsibility of the Jewish community. Today, the majority of Jewish children voluntarily attend after-hours and Sunday schools conducted by local Jewish communities, where they receive their religious education wholly independent of the public-school system. We believe that the responsibility for religious education may not and should not be shared with the public-school system and that invocation of the state educational system to assume what is exclusively the responsibility of church, synagogue, and home in the area of religious education constitutes an admission of spiritual insolvency that we are not prepared to make. We believe with Jefferson that "It is error alone which needs the support of government. Truth can stand by itself."

Our public-school system is one of the most important manifestations of the preeminence of American democracy. Because under our Constitution our public schools must be open to all, regardless of race or creed, they serve as the great unifying factor for a country settled by highly diverse elements. Our public schools inculcate in the American children respect for the rights of minorities which is in essence the basic freedom embodied in our Constitution. When the public schools become involved, directly or indirectly, in disagreements among religious groups, divisiveness is the inevitable result. Such divisiveness affects all American children but is particularly harmful to children of the minority faiths.

Recent intensive efforts to involve the public-school system in religious instruction have been justified on the ground that the alleged increase in juvenile delinquency and the alleged lowering of the moral standards of adult Americans have resulted from lack of religious education on the part of many of our children and that this lack can be remedied by imposing upon the public schools the duty of providing religious training for children. It is further claimed that the public schools have been derelict in their duty to inculcate moral values and ethical standards among our children.

We submit that both indictments are unfounded. We do not believe that there is a greater degree of juvenile delinquency among the youth of this generation than there was in previous generations or that the moral standards of America are lower today than they have been in previous times. On the contrary, we believe that the standards of honesty, integrity, and morality are continually being elevated. Nor do we agree that the public schools are inadequately fulfilling their responsibilities in moral and ethical training. Whatever are the failings of the public schools in this respect result, not from lack of religious education but from inadequate teaching personnel, overcrowded schoolrooms, poor physical facilities, and similar deficiencies.

The most direct instance of public-school involvement in the area of religion is the teaching of religion in the schools either by the regular public-school teachers or religious teachers supplied by church groups. This practice the Supreme Court held to be unconstitutional in the McCollum case in 1948. Nevertheless, it is still prevalent in many parts of the country, particularly in the South and in rural areas. Sometimes only the dominant religion, usually Protestantism, but occasionally Catholicism, is alone taught; sometimes there is separate teaching of each faith. Both programs are equally unconstitutional. As the Supreme Court said in the Zorach case, "government may not undertake religious instruction nor blend secular and sectarian instruction."

A second instance of religious intrusion upon the public-school system is found in many released time programs. In 1952 Zorach case the Supreme Court, in a 6 to 3 decision, ruled that it is not unconstitutional for the public schools to release children for a specified part of the time usually devoted to secular instruction so that the children may receive religious instruction under church auspices. The Court held that the plan was constitutional if the public-school system did no more than adjust its schedule to meet the religious needs of the children. The Court made it clear that the program violates the first amendment if the released time classes are held on public school premises, if the school authorities use their influence to induce enrollment in the released time classes or if the school authorities are in any way involved in the operation of the program. It is unfortunately true that in many schools the limitations set down by the Court are disregarded to a greater or lesser degree. There have been, and continue to be, many cases brought to our attention in which children are pressured by their teachers and principals to enroll in the released time class. In many instances, this results in Jewish children attending non-Jewish religious classes because no Jewish religious classes are held under the released time program. It is not necessary to expound upon the unfortunate consequences of a Jewish child who is subjected to religious teaching violative of his faith by reason of the unconstitutional, unlawful conduct of public-school teachers and authorities.

In many communities it is the practice to engage in devotional reading of the Bible in the public school classes or assemblies. In some schools, deference is paid to the feelings of Jewish children and the passages selected for reading are limited to the Old Testament. We do not consider this an acceptable solution of the problem. All devotional Bible reading we deem unconstitutional, whether it be from the Old or New Testament. The first amendment, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, bars public school involvement in any religious practice. The obligation of the Government is to remain neutral not only as among believers but as between believers and nonbelievers as well. Religious teaching even from the Old Testament is outside the rightful competence of the public schools and should be left for the synagogue, the church and the home.

Recently the Gideons International launched a nationwide campaign to distribute copies of the New Testament to the children of the Nation through the public schools. About a year ago, the Supreme Court of New Jersey in a landmark decision which the United States Supreme Court refused to set aside, held that this practice was unconstitutional. Nevertheless, we regret to say that the Gideon Association has not abandoned its program but continues to use the public schools wherever it can to fulfill its missionary aims.

We believe that religious holiday programs that include Christological pageants, hymns and prayers (undertaken by many public schools to celebrate Christmas and Easter) are an infringement upon the religious freedom of non-Christian children. Moreover, we believe that the inclusion of the Jewish holiday Hanukkah in the school program is likewise a violation of the first amendment and we are, therefore, opposed to it as well.

Lately, a campaign has been launched in a number of communities to introduce a program of teaching moral and spiritual values in the public schools. Examination of these programs shows that in most communities the real purpose is to introduce religious teaching under the guise of moral and spiritual values. This, of course, is unconstitutional and its illegality is not in any way lessened by the innocent label attached to it.

Finally, there has also lately been a good deal of discussion and some experiment in introducing a so-called common core of religious teaching. We are opposed to any public school program that seeks to inculcate as doctrine any body of principles, beliefs or concepts represented to be "common" to all of the major religious faiths. Not only does such a program violate the first amendment but it can lead only to a vitiation of all that is spiritually meaningful in every religious faith.

Governmental aid to religion

A second major area of infringement upon the constitutional guaranty of religious freedom and the separation of church and state is the grant of public funds to religious groups or the use of public property for religious purposes. Our opposition to the appropriation of tax-raised funds for the support of religion is based on a number of interrelated reasons that together underlie the principle of separation and freedom. First, such appropriation infringes upon the religious liberties of our citizens, for it is in effect compulsory taxation for religious purposes. It is significant that the Virginia statute of religious freedom, which was the immediate forerunner of the first amendment, grew out of the defeat under the leadership of James Madison of a measure in Virginia to appropriate tax funds for religious education. It is entirely immaterial that only a small fraction of each citizen's total tax payment may be devoted to this purpose. As Madison stated: "The same authority which can force a citizen to contribute 3 pence only of his property for the support of any one establishment may force him to conform to any other establishment in all cases whatsoever."

In the second place, a policy of permitting such appropriations may well open the door for bitter and dangerous controversy among the different religious denominations as to the shares they shall each receive and will inevitably lead to interreligious conflict and divisiveness. Finally, the price that religious groups may be required to pay for government aid may well far outweigh the seeming benefits. Acceptance of tax-raised funds may result in government control over the manner in which the funds are used. It can hardly be expected that the government will not exercise some supervision of the expenditure of its money. The result must necessarily be the loss by religious schools of much of the independence they now enjoy. As the late Mr. Justice Jackson said: "If the state may aid religious schools, it may therefore regulate them. Many groups have sought aid from tax funds only to find that it carried political controls with it."

The major threat to the principle of separation of church and state and religious freedom in the area of use of tax-raised funds for religious purposes arises out of efforts to include church schools in any program of Federal aid to education. Inability to solve this problem has resulted in the tragic fact that for three-quarters of a century every attempt to obtain sorely needed Federal aid for public schools has failed.

In the States, too, there are many instances of tax-raised funds being used to support religious church schools and religious education. In a number of States, the constitutional prohibition has been circumvented by camouflaging a church school as a public school, even though the teachers are members of a particular faith who teach religion during regular school hours and wear clerical garb while they teach. These instances continue to cause a great deal of interreligious friction and bitterness in the communities in which they take place.

Compulsory Sunday laws

The third major area of infringement upon religious liberty lies in the enforcement by the penal codes of most States of the religious obligation to abstain from work or secular business on the Sabbath. Compulsory Sunday laws go back as far as the Roman Empire and were brought over to this country during the colonial period when church and state were united. Even today they are still popularly called blue laws. The original purpose of these statutes was to insure attendance at church services. Gradually the provision requiring church attendance was dropped but the prohibition against engaging in work, trade or amusement on that day was retained.

These laws have been justified on the ground that they are not religious but welfare laws whose purpose it is to insure 1 day rest in 7. If this be so, however, there is no reason why each person may not choose for himself his day of rest.

Enforcement of compulsory Sunday laws against those who observe a day other than Sunday as their holy day of rest is a particularly serious infringement upon religious freedom. By requiring a Jew, Seventh-day Adventist, Seventh-day Baptist or any other American who recognizes Saturday as his holy day of rest to abstain from engaging in his trade or business 2 days a week whereas his Sunday observing competitor is required to abstain only 1 day a week, the State imposes upon him a competitive disadvantage and thus penalizes him for adhering to his religious beliefs.

A number of States have recognized this and have enacted exemptions in favor of those whose religious convictions compel them to abstain from labor and business on a day other than Sunday. We believe that a State that fails to accord such exemption acts unfairly and infringes upon a right guaranteed by the first amendment.

We suggest that it is a mistake to believe that use of the State's police power to enforce Sabbath observants is either necessary or effective. A number of States, including Arizona, California, Oregon, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, have repealed their Sunday laws and there is no reason to believe that voluntary observance in those States is less than enforced observance in other States that still have Sunday laws.

In the 20th century, religious law should be observed voluntarily. We have outgrown the era when the church could look to the coercive arm of the secular government to insure adherence to sectarian tenets. At the very least, compulsory Sunday laws should take into account the religious convictions of those who observe a day other than Sunday as their sacred day of rest.

Zoning restrictions

The fourth major instance of current infringements upon religious liberty arises out of the present-day movement of population to the suburbs and the development of new communities away from the cities. With many Americans moving to established residential communities outside city limits and with the development of new residential communities, comes the necessity of providing new houses of worship and religious schools. In most towns, the community welcomes those houses of worship and religious schools. Occasionally, however, opposition is encountered to their erection. There have been increasing instances in which governing bodies of residential communities have made or amended zoning ordinances so as to bar houses of worship and religious schools.

There is no doubt that in many cases the erection of a communal building such as a church, synagogue, or religious school may impose minor inconveniences upon the surrounding residential neighborhoods. These inconveniences are seized upon as an excuse for barring the buildings. Nevertheless, we deem such exclusionary acts as infringements upon religious liberty. The minor inconveniences are very much exaggerated and, to the extent they exist, they are small enough a price to pay for the free exercise of religion.

Most State courts have taken the position that the purpose of zoning ordinances is to promote the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the community and that excluding a house of worship from a residential district does not, in any way, promote that purpose. They have therefore held unconstitutional such exclusionary ordinances.

In California, Wisconsin, and a few other States, however, a contrary position has been taken. We believe that these States are thus sanctioning infringements upon the rights guaranteed by the first amendment.

Interreligious adoptions

Ever since our States began to enact statues providing for the adoptions of children, the legislatures and the courts assumed that the test in deciding whether an adoption should be approved by the court would be the wishes of the parents and the best interests of the child. Recently, however, there has been increasing pressure to enact laws that would bar a couple of one faith from adopting a child born into another faith, even where the natural parents of the child approved of the adoption and the child's welfare would be promoted thereby. Recently, the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts has interpreted the adoption law of that State to bar interreligious adoptions in practically every case. The courts and the public child welfare agencies of Massachusetts have followed this decision and pressure is mounting to achieve the same result in other States.

It is our position that a State statute or judicial decision that bars interreligious adoptions even where the natural parents consent thereto and the child's welfare would be furthered, constitutes a violation of the first amendment's guarantee of freedom of religion and the separation of church and state. It is our view that under American traditions and constitutional liberties, religion is a matter of election and not of status and therefore no child is born with a religion as far as a secular state is concerned. The religion of a child is that, and only that, which the parents choose for it; it may not be a religion imposed upon the child by the state.

We believe that it is the basic principle of our Constitution that the religious upbringing of a child is the right of the parents and is no concern of the state. Finally, we believe that the state may not constitutionally employ its adoption laws or any other secular agency to prevent or discourage a change in religion. Religious freedom includes freedom to change one's religion, and the mandate of the 1st and 14th amendments that neither Congress nor a State shall make a law respecting an establishment of religion means that a government agency may not establish the religion of a child through the use of its adoption procedures.

We believe the effect of such a ban upon interreligious adoption is religion by compulsion and is antagonistic to the great tradition of the American Constitution and of American religion which is based upon the principle of voluntariness in matters of conscience and belief.

THE REMEDY

We do not believe that the remedy for these infringements is to be found in congressional action. While the infringements are serious, the initial responsibility for their correction lies with the local communities and the State governments. In the event that these do not satisfactorily redress the grievances, the proper remedy is resort to judicial action.

CONCLUSION

While we have spelled out the major areas of infringement upon the rights guaranteed by the religious freedom and separation provision of the first amendment, we wish to emphasize our conviction that basically religious freedom and separation of church and state are secure in the United States. We believe that the American people are committed and will remain committed to the tradition of religious liberty set forth in the first amendment.

Hon. John Phillips of California—Hon. Ezra Taft Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include two short articles published in the California Farmer, one of the best agricultural papers in California, about my colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS, and also an article in the same publication and in the same issue about Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson.

JOHN PHILLIPS came to Congress at the same time I became a Member of the House. He is an able legislator and was especially versed in agricultural problems because he had been a member of the same committee in the California State Senate.

Just what Mr. PHILLIPS will do after he has left Congress no one knows, perhaps not even himself. But whatever it may be I am sure that he will be engaged in some useful work, perhaps writing.

I am a great admirer of Mr. Benson. He knows what he is doing and I predict that he will outlast all his detractors. He is dedicated to the job of developing a sensible and reasonable agricultural support program and I am positive that he will accomplish his purpose. Intelligence, courage and determination can conquer almost any obstacles and since he has all these attributes I feel certain that he will bring the present agricultural situation out of chaos.

The articles referred to follows:

JOHN PHILLIPS TO RETIRE

Representative JOHN PHILLIPS of the 29th district, representing Riverside and Imperial Counties, has decided not to run again. He retires after 24 years of public life.

We have always had great respect for JOHN PHILLIPS. A handsome, composed man with a good head on his shoulders. He has represented the farmer well and with understanding.

JOHN PHILLIPS writes a newsletter home, periodically, that is in our estimation some of the best writing coming out of Washington, and that includes all the syndicated columnists. Someone should induce JOHN to stay on in Washington as a columnist.

We were impressed with the way PHILLIPS announced his intention of withdrawing. He said that he did not intend to run again next year. That he had no picked candidate and did not intend to take part in the primary campaign of 1956.

Furthermore, he offered to sit down with anybody during the next 13 months who thought he might want to run for the job, and try to outline to him just what the job of being a Representative in the Congress of the United States entailed.

Also, JOHN is going to try in the remaining newsletters he sends home to define that job in some detail. We just hope the next person does as good a job as JOHN PHILLIPS has done.

THE JOB WHERE YOU CAN'T WIN

We see by the papers that a California public relations firm has been retained by the Republican Party to help humanize Secretary Benson. We suppose that all facets of the political diamond are being polished but it is painfully evident that no longer can a man stand on his record.

Our mail tells us that not all farmers in this State are happy with the record of Mr. Benson, but we also know the same would have been true if Davy Crockett had been Secretary of Agriculture during the term of this administration.

It is also evident that a man cannot go to Washington and do the job without mixing in a generous amount of politicking, but imagine the necessity of hiring a firm to make someone like you better.

We have met Benson and found him a charming personality. Evidently he is of the old school that thinks if you devote all your time to the job and do the best you are capable of, you have fulfilled your commitment. Sad to say, that is no longer the case in Washington. You have to waste a great deal of time in the social whirl and spend a great deal of time shaking hands, being seen with the right people, and placating the thin-skinned.

In our humble opinion, agriculture got into her present mess through a bipartisan vote-in of Socialist experimental legislation. The aim to stimulate production worked wonderfully well. The money stimulus combined with an unprecedented era of mechanization, fertilizer advancements, chemical miracles for control of pests and diseases and plant breeding, with the result that double jackpots were hit for years in succession.

Meantime the socialistic experiments had obliterated the true market place and practically repealed the law of supply and demand for some of our basic crops. This encouraged foreign competition. We were afraid of offending anyone in the world market, and agriculture lagged behind the rest of the economy with a depressing inventory of surplus goods. The socialistic tinkering threw out of gear the natural agricultural cycles. After offering the political candy of subsidies, politicians of both parties were afraid to withdraw the sweet bait for fear of losing votes.

People write us and blame Benson for their troubles. It's nice to have a whipping boy but in our estimation the Secretary is being accorded extraordinary powers when you blame your entire plight on him alone.

It will take the President, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of State, and Congress in concert to solve this farm problem or even to influence the economic status of the farmer to any marked degree. It is evident that both parties are a little bankrupt of ideas on how to meet the farm problem. Note that the Secretary has sent out an appeal to all citizens to submit ideas on the problem.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*——3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*——
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----1727 Mass. Ave.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*-----
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*-----
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*---
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*-----
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*----------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*---------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*-----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*---------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*--------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1249 31st St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, 5032 Glenbrook Terrace.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 5020 Illinois Ave.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.

Appendix

Problems of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the past 3 months I have had a tremendous increase in my mail from farmers. I have been very much impressed with these letters. These letters are constructive in their approach to the farm problem, Mr. President. I would say there is a complete absence of any scolding tone in them—a remarkable fact considering the grave economic position facing them, which many of them graphically describe. I do not mean they are not critical of the Eisenhower farm program. Many of them voice complete disillusionment with the program Mr. Benson has to administer. In nearly every letter, Mr. President, there is an indication that the American farmer is thinking his way through this problem. I believe that there is a wealth of suggestions offered by our men on the land from which can come a program to meet the present emergency, provide a long-range plan, and remove from the citizens of this country any fear that they will ever face a shortage of food and fiber. A splendid example of the kind of letter I am talking about was recently received from Gilbert Courtright, of Union County, Oreg. Mr. Courtright is a hard-working farmer who thinks constructively. The letter he addressed to me was also sent to the editor of the LaGrande Evening Observer, who reproduced it on his editorial page.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter which Mr. Courtright sent to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Gilbert Courtright)

If diversion of wheat, corn and cotton land to pasture should threaten an overproduction of beef, this Nation could abandon the age-old policy of bankrupting those who feed beef in order to reduce a surplus. This Nation could reduce a beef surplus, or a threatened surplus, by legislation converting the canner and cutter grades into dog food, cat food, fertilizer or fish food. These animals are so old or so sick that that grade should never have been used for human food.

Our Nation is wealthy enough that our people should have the best meats rather than the poorest.

We need a large national agricultural productive capacity in case of war.

During peacetime a part of that capacity should be directed to—

1. Increasing the quality of the Nation's food by fertilization and scientific feeding so that our children can have better physiques, finer minds, a high protein diet for adults to prevent a burden of fat and its load on the heart.

2. Direct some of the use of land in timbered areas, such as the northern Pacific, northern Idaho, Atlantic, and Gulf States, back into timber for the timber products and organics that our industries will surely need for our expanding population.

3. Another part of our agricultural capacity could be converted from corn and cotton acreage to pasture. These cultivated pastures could be used in place of the woods pastures in the hardwood areas. A very large part of the hardwood is being browsed by cattle. Succulent young trees have their heads bitten off, are killed or converted into brush. Areas protected from browsing have beautiful stands of trees that will be useful and profitable for industry in another generation.

4. A part of our peacetime wheatgrowing capacity could be converted to pasture which would attract livestock from the depleted western ranges. For instance, last summer (1955) there were thousands of head of sheep pasturing on sweetclover diverted from wheat in the Palouse country of eastern Washington.

5. We could divert more land to hay. We could abandon the lack of method, the lack of planning called "supply and demand," which could be more accurately called "waste and starvation." In our hay production, for instance, 2 years ago there was an emergency hay shortage in the Midwest. All the Nation's safety supply of hay was shipped to that area. This year the Pacific Northwest expects a long winter, there was serious erosion of the cattleman's resources for high-priced feed, erosion of meat from the cattle's bones, erosion of meat from the public's dinner table, and erosion of soil from the hills.

This is serious. It is unnecessary.

It is improvident.

It is not necessary for hay to rot in the stack some years and for cattle to go hungry other years. This is the kind of improvidence that has kept nations and soils poor as far as history goes.

A nation as wealthy as ours should be able to afford a year's supply of hay in dry storage to insure an adequate and continuing supply of fine meats, to insure that the soils of its range lands would not be eroded by too early grazing.

Loans could be made to producers for hay storage as loans are made for grain storage.

Support purchases of surpluses could be made the second year after production to encourage first-year direct sales.

Safety supplies could be used to prevent damage to the range.

All these diversion proposals would improve the Nation economy and make its food producing plant more efficient.

These proposals also benefit all the people by improving all the watersheds of the Nation. These improvements to the watersheds are important because watersheds provide water for cities so that people can have water for drinking, bathing, washing, for lawns, flowers, gardens and trees, for swimming, fishing, and fire protection.

Watersheds provide the surface and underground water that industry uses in such enormous quantities for processing materials like paper, steel, and foods.

Let us plan and control our agricultural production and economy as modern industrial associations plan and control their production and economy.

I realize that congressional legislation would be necessary providing for compulsory livestock inspection to channel animals cut off from human consumption to separate slaughtering plants for feed rather than food uses.

Eisenhower's Problems—An Appraisal of Ordeal Confronting Him on Dulles and Ridgway Disputes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article appeared in the New York Times today under the byline of that fine reporter, James Reston. I most respectfully urge the Members to read and digest it carefully.

The article follows:

EISENHOWER'S PROBLEMS—AN APPRAISAL OF ORDEAL CONFRONTING HIM ON DULLES AND RIDGWAY DISPUTES

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—One of the misfortunes of the big Dulles-Ridgway magazine controversy is that a convalescent President Eisenhower is now left to deal in his news conference tomorrow with some of the most emotional issues of his entire administration.

Despite all that has been said and written about Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' interview in Life magazine, and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway's article in the Saturday Evening Post, the fundamental questions have not yet been answered.

These questions have very little to do with Mr. Dulles' theories about the "art" of walking on the "brink" of war. They have to do with policy "decisions" of the most serious nature, with the fundamental relationships between a President and the Nation, between a President and his Secretary of State, between a President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and between the United States and its Allies.

These questions are as follows:

Did the President "decide" on the tactical use of atomic bombs against Communist bases in Manchuria in the event that hostilities should break out after the truce talks in Korea?

Did Mr. Dulles recommend and the President concur in a similar decision to bomb the Chinese Communist staging bases in south China if the Peiping regime rejected a compromise settlement in Indochina and invaded that country?

If decisions were taken on these points, were they passed on to the Allies whose security would be affected by the outbreak of an atomic war?

Did General Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff, dissent from the defense recommendations sent to Congress in January 1954, as he asserts in the Saturday Evening Post article, or was the President correct in saying, as he did in his 1954 state of the Union message, that the defense program was "unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff [which included General Ridgway]?"

QUESTIONS BOMBARD CAPITAL

The question is not whether the President and his advisers considered the possibility of having to bomb Manchuria and south China if the Korean and Indochina wars flared up. It is general knowledge, and has been for a long time, that such consideration was given to these and many other alternative policies.

The question is whether decisions were taken, as the Life magazine article says. This is the question that is being asked, not only or even mainly by reporters, but by the Governments and Ambassadors of all the major Allies.

This capital has been bombarded by questions from many of the leading foreign offices of the world to their ambassadors wanting to know whether the leader of the free world coalition actually decided, in certain circumstances, to wage an atomic war, without letting them know such a decision was taken.

It is only fair to say that this reporter has not been able to find a single allied Ambassador in Washington who knows of any such decision, or who believes any such decision was in fact taken.

Nevertheless, they have to face the facts. The Life article was not written from memory or on the basis of a casual conversation. It was written from a verbatim account of what Mr. Dulles said either to James Shepley, the author of the article, or Jack Beall, another Time-Life reporter, who was apparently in on the gathering of the information.

CRUEL COINCIDENCE NOTED

It is a cruel coincidence that the Dulles and Ridgway articles should have appeared just as President Eisenhower had scheduled his first Washington news conference since last August 4.

The President is confronted by a difficult dilemma. If he repudiates statements made on the basis of a tape recording of his own Secretary of State's remarks, he gives added ammunition to the Democrats, whose leading presidential candidate, Adlai E. Stevenson, has been calling on him to repudiate or dismiss Mr. Dulles.

If he does not clear up the decisions question, however, the most serious point of doubt will remain, both here and abroad, that maybe the President did decide on a course of limited atomic war under certain circumstances without informing the American people, the congressional leaders or the Allies.

Moreover, General Ridgway has either directly challenged the President's facts or his veracity on a question involving the defense of the Nation, and President Eisenhower is bound to be asked about this tomorrow in the most crowded and sensitive news conference in months.

Finally, there is the question of the President's health, which everybody concerned will have to be most careful to take into account.

These are great questions, involving the integrity of the administration, and its approach to the problem of atomic war, but they are also emotional issues that no physician would like to see thrown at a heart patient in a public forum.

Mr. Speaker, of course, if the answers to the questions propounded by Mr. Reston are in the affirmative, and were concealed from the Congress and our allies, a rather grave situation is presented.

On the other hand, if these decisions were not made, what considerations motivated the Secretary of State to make such statements in the first instance.

In either event, is this the way to support and strengthen a bipartisan foreign policy about which Mr. Dulles was so deeply concerned a short while ago?

Hon. Wesley A. D'Ewart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Frank Ducheneaux, chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribal Council, Cheyenne Agency, South Dakota; an editorial from the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., under date of November 13, 1955; an editorial from the Miles City Daily Star, Miles City, Mont., under date of December 11, 1955; an article appearing in the Park County News, Livingston, Mont., under date of December 1, 1955; and a resolution adopted by the California Hydraulic Mining Association regarding the appointment of Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior:

CHEYENNE RIVER
SIOUX TRIBAL COUNCIL,
Cheyenne Agency, S. Dak.,
November 25, 1955.

Hon. E. Y. BERRY,
Member of Congress,
Rapid City, S. Dak.

DEAR MR. BERRY: Recently there have come to my desk copies of resolutions and memorandums from the NCAI and from one of the Sioux Tribes in South Dakota protesting the appointment of Mr. Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

This opposition to the appointment of Mr. D'Ewart is a little difficult to understand in view of his long record of fairness and justice in dealing with the Indian tribes. Certainly this tribe has no objection to his appointment. In fact, we have rather been complimenting ourselves on this particular appointment. Mr. D'Ewart has been helpful and cooperative in all our dealings with him and we see no reason why he should not continue to be equally helpful and cooperative in this new capacity, not only to us but to all Indian tribes.

Personally, I feel that much of this opposition comes from chronic objectors who would not be satisfied with any appointment that might be made and that it is hardly worthy of note.

At any rate, we are well satisfied with the appointment of Mr. D'Ewart and are looking forward to continued cooperation with him for the good of all concerned.

With best personal regards, I remain

Sincerely,

FRANK DUCHENEAUX,
Chairman.

[From the Spokesman-Review of November 13, 1955]

D'EWART IS AN ABLE AND QUALIFIED MAN

Former Congressman Wesley A. D'Ewart of Montana has been the subject of some ruthless and falsely founded abuse since he was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. D'Ewart was recommended by Secretary Douglas McKay because of the Montanan's intimate knowledge of western resources matters, his personal integrity and his keen sense of public responsibility.

Yet some of the same people who have been trying to force Mr. McKay out of the President's Cabinet on wild and belittling charges have now turned their guns on Mr. D'Ewart because his appointment will be up for Senate confirmation in January.

The head of the Senate committee which passes upon the nomination is JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, who was reelected last year over Mr. D'Ewart by a margin of less than 2,000 votes out of 227,000 cast. Democrat MURRAY is personally bitter toward Republican D'Ewart because of that race and has declared he will fight the appointment. His political influence in a Democratic-controlled Senate must not be discounted.

Yet it is time for the friends of an able and honest appointee and the friends of a sincere and honest administration to make clear to other Members of the Senate what kind of man Mr. D'Ewart is.

The attacks against him have come from a vocal minority who object to the fact that he introduced, by request of some constituents, a bill dealing with cattle-grazing privileges on public lands. The bill was never brought to a vote in Congress but the D'Ewart name was tagged to it, even though he helped to bury it in the Public Lands Committee back in 1953.

Mr. D'Ewart has a long record of conscientious service to the cause of western conservation and development, the fields in which he would help to administer Interior Department affairs. There has been no evidence whatever that he is anything but competent, honest and fair. He is the type of enlightened public servant who is continually needed in the Federal Government. He ought to have the backing of everyone except a handful of vindictive figures who seem determined to discredit administration policies and personnel.

[From the Miles City Daily Star of December 11, 1955]

IN DEFENSE OF WES D'EWART

Secretary of the Interior Douglas Mackay is sincere in his belief that Montana's Wesley D'Ewart is the right man for the post of Assistant Secretary of the Interior. His own reasons are explained in a letter to the recording secretary of the International Association of Machinists in Great Falls. The letter, in part, states as follows:

I am aware that some grossly unfair criticism of Mr. D'Ewart was stirred up after his appointment, but I feel that a calm review of the facts will disclose the partisan, political nature of that criticism. In this critical editorial comment, Mr. D'Ewart has been referred to primarily as the man who introduced the controversial uniform grazing bill in the 83d Congress.

As so often happens when bills are introduced by request by chairmen of committees, Mr. D'Ewart did not write it. He did not approve all of the bill's contents and did not expect it to be enacted without its being improved and corrected by amendment. He did exactly what chairmen of committees often do. He introduced, by request, for study, a proposal to provide a greater degree of uniformity in the management of our public lands. As chairman of the committee, Mr. D'Ewart held hearings on the bill for a period of over 2 weeks. He was complimented by all concerned for the fairness of his conduct and for his effort to give everyone who expressed a desire to do so a chance to testify. The hearings showed that there was much misunderstanding regarding the substance of the bill; that there were objectionable features in the language; and that it was not possible at that time to consider the problems of the Forest Service in conjunction with those of other principal land management agencies.

Having in mind the considerations brought forth in the testimony, Mr. D'Ewart did not press for action on this bill and it was discarded. It had, however, performed a useful purpose in that the discussion at the hearings formed the basis for a new bill dealing with the Forest Service alone.

To damn a man forever because of the nature of an initial draft bill, introduced by request, seems to me to be quite unreasonable. There is no doubt in my mind that this particular matter was distorted entirely out of proportion by reason of the fact that Mr. D'Ewart was involved in a political campaign in 1954.

The furor over the grazing bill should not obscure Mr. D'Ewart's positive and constructive contributions to conservation. For example, in the 83d Congress alone he introduced, and the Congress enacted nine bills to protect, enlarge, and improve the management of the national parks. Despite his advocacy of reduced spending in almost every Federal activity, Mr. D'Ewart testified, debated, and voted in favor of increased appropriations for the National Park Service and the Forest Service in every session of Congress during his term of office.

One of the most important conservation measures enacted into law in recent years was Public Law 167. This law corrects the widespread abuses of the mining laws, particularly in the national forests. While in Congress, Mr. D'Ewart introduced and held hearings on a bill intended to end these abuses of the mining laws. Although his bill was not enacted, the attention it brought and the information brought forth in its consideration was beneficial and led to the introduction of a bill similar in form and intent which became law in the 84th Congress. As Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. D'Ewart also contributed importantly to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. D'Ewart is one of the best informed men in the Nation on Indian affairs. He was one of those who were instrumental in the development of the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program, and has contributed to the enactment of other progressive measures in this field.

During his term in office, Mr. D'Ewart sponsored a number of measures, which Congress enacted, to improve public management in the Department of the Interior. You may be familiar with the amendment to the Recreation Act, which permits the lease for a long term or the sale or donation of areas of the public domain having recreational value to nonprofit organizations, such as the Boy Scouts.

Mr. D'Ewart has always had a vital interest in reclamation. He was the first president of the Montana Reclamation Association and was one of the guiding hands in establishing Montana's water conservation program. I think this program is admitted to be one of the finest small water project programs in the country. While favoring other features of the upper Colorado project, Mr. D'Ewart, as a Congressman, registered his opposition to the Echo Park Dam.

I invite your particular attention to the quoted statement of Mr. Carl D. Shoemaker of the National Wildlife Federation, in which he told news reporters: "Secretary D'Ewart's forthright statements regarding the different areas discussed and Department policy were most encouraging to the representatives of the national conservation groups. The whole group left with a completely better understanding of the Department's viewpoint and policy than it ever had before."

And Mr. Shoemaker added: "I certainly feel most encouraged and very happy over the views expressed by Secretary D'Ewart, who long has been a champion of the National Park Service and wildlife interests."

When Mr. D'Ewart's whole record of public service is reviewed, the conclusion is inescapable that his appointment was in the interest of good government. I firmly believe that his vast knowledge of our land, water, and wildlife resources, his outstanding record in Congress, and his sympathetic understanding of the human values involved in administering the Indian, public lands, territories, fish and wildlife, and park affairs of the Department of the Interior now under his jurisdiction, eminently qualify Mr. D'Ewart to serve as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management. I have no doubt that Members of the House and Senate, of both parties, who are personally acquainted with Mr. D'Ewart and his outstanding record, are agreed that he is eminently qualified to serve in the position to which the President has appointed him.

[From the Park County News, Livingston, Mont., of December 1, 1955]

McKay Lauds D'Ewart Record in Letter to Montana Union

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, in a letter to Edgar R. Linn, recording secretary of Great Falls Lodge, No. 1046, of the International Association of Machinists, on November 17 declared "When Mr. D'Ewart's whole record of public service is reviewed, the conclusion is inescapable that his appointment was in the interest of good government" and "he is eminently qualified." Full text of the letter follows:

"My Dear Mr. Linn: Your recent letter to the President expressing your disapproval of the appointment of Mr. Wesley A. D'Ewart for the post of Assistant Secretary—Public Land Management, Department of the Interior, has been referred to me for reply. I appreciate the opportunity it affords me to comment on the qualifications of Mr. D'Ewart for the post to which he was recently appointed by President Eisenhower.

"I am aware that some grossly unfair editorial criticism of Mr. D'Ewart was stirred up after his appointment, but I feel that a calm review of the facts will disclose the partisan, political nature of that criticism. In this critical editorial comment, Mr. D'Ewart has been referred to primarily as the man who introduced the controversial uniform grazing bill in the 83d Congress.

"As so often happens when bills are introduced by request by chairmen of committees, Mr. D'Ewart did not write it. He did not approve all of the bill's contents and did not expect it to be enacted without its being improved and corrected by amendment. He did exactly what chairmen of committees often do. He introduced, by request, for study, a proposal to provide a greater degree of uniformity in the management of our public lands. As chairman of the committee, Mr. D'Ewart held hearings on the bill for a period of over 2 weeks. He was complimented by all concerned for the fairness of his conduct and for his effort to give everyone who expressed a desire to do so a chance to testify. The hearings showed that there was much misunderstanding regarding the substance of the bill; that there were objectionable features in the language; and that it was not possible at that time to consider the problems of the Forest Service in conjunction with those of other principal land management agencies.

"Having in mind the considerations brought forth in the testimony, Mr. D'Ewart did not press for action on this bill, and it was discarded. It had, however, performed a useful purpose in that the discussion at the hearings formed the basis for a new bill dealing with the Forest Service alone. Inasmuch as the activities of the Forest Service are within the province of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. D'Ewart was not the sponsor of the new bill. Instead it was introduced by the House and Senate Agriculture Committee chairmen, and was known as the Hope-Aiken bill. Its enactment was supported by the Forest Service and by many conservation groups.

"To damn a man forever because of the nature of an initial draft bill, introduced by request, seems to me to be quite unreasonable. There is no doubt in my mind that this particular matter was distorted entirely out of proportion by reason of the fact that Mr. D'Ewart was involved in a political campaign in 1954.

"The furor over the grazing bill should not obscure Mr. D'Ewart's positive and constructive contributions to conservation. For example, in the 83d Congress alone he introduced, and the Congress enacted, 9 bills to protect, enlarge, and improve the management of the national parks. Despite his advocacy of reduced spending in almost every Federal activity, Mr. D'Ewart testified, debated, and voted in favor of increased appropriations for the National Park Service and the Forest Service in every session of Congress during his term of office. In 1954, when the Atomic Energy Act Amendments were about to be passed it was Mr. D'Ewart who rushed through a last-minute amendment to protect the national parks from uranium prospecting. It was a D'Ewart bill which, by authorizing the National Park Service to obtain by exchange some 10,000 acres of State-owned land inside the boundaries of Glacier National Park, will enable the National Park Service to preserve the integrity of the park. For this action he received the thanks of all the major wildlife and conservation groups, as well as the Department of the Interior itself.

"To consider still another aspect of conservation, Mr. D'Ewart has been a stalwart proponent of the wildlife refuge system. During the last session in which Mr. D'Ewart was a Member of Congress he introduced what many conservationists regard as an outstanding bill to facilitate the management of our wildlife refuges. The bill provided also for an increase in the number of refuges by establishing a new Division of Duck Stamp Fees, which would provide funds for administration of the areas. The bill he first introduced was the basis for legislation pending in the present Congress.

"One of the most important conservation measures enacted into law in recent years was Public Law 167. This law corrects the widespread abuses of the mining laws, particularly in the national forests. While in Congress, Mr. D'Ewart introduced and held hearings on a bill intended to end these abuses of the mining laws. Although his bill was not enacted, the attention it brought and the information brought forth in its consideration was beneficial and led to the introduction of a bill similar in form and intent which became law in the 84th Congress. As special assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. D'Ewart also contributed importantly to the enactment of this legislation.

"While a Congressman, Mr. D'Ewart was a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission, which has the important duty of blocking out national forest holdings by purchase of private lands lying within or adjacent to them. He gave much time to this program and was instrumental in obtaining expanded appropriations for it.

"Mr. D'Ewart is one of the best informed men in the Nation on Indian affairs. He was one of those who were instrumental in the development of the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program, and has contributed to the enactment of other progressive measures in this field. While striving to safeguard the interests of those Indians desiring to remain on reservations, he has at the same time supported programs designed to provide increasing opportunities for those Indians who want to separate themselves from any special relationships with the Federal Government.

"During his term in office, Mr. D'Ewart sponsored a number of measures, which Congress enacted, to improve public land management in the Department of the Interior. You may be familiar with the amendment to the Recreation Act, which permits the lease

for a long term or the sale or donation of areas of the public domain having recreational value to nonprofit organizations, such as the Boy Scouts.

"The Absarokee Conservation Committee, of which Mr. D'Ewart was a principal organizer and long-time chairman, deserves to be mentioned. It was formed to provide a meeting place for Federal park, forest, and wildlife officers; their opposite members in the State government; and the sportsmen, rangers, and farmers of the upper Yellowstone Park area. Meeting 2 or 3 times yearly, this committee has managed to settle and solve amicably and constructively most of the conservation problems that have arisen in the northern Yellowstone Park area. I think it represents an outstanding group achievement.

"Mr. D'Ewart has always had a vital interest in reclamation. He was the first president of the Montana Reclamation Association and was one of the guiding hands in establishing Montana's water-conservation program. I think this program is admitted to be one of the finest small water-project programs in the country. While favoring other features of the upper Colorado project, Mr. D'Ewart, as a Congressman, registered his opposition to the Echo Park Dam.

"I know that Mr. D'Ewart's personal relationships with the entire Department of the Interior, both as a rancher and as a Congressman, have always been excellent. I understand that his own ranch is a model of good conservation practice. Before he ranched, he was a Forest Service ranger.

"In evaluating his appointment as Assistant Secretary of this Department, I would like you to consider an Associated Press dispatch which was filed from Washington recently after Assistant Secretary D'Ewart reviewed departmental resource conservation policies with 17 outsanding conservationists.

"A copy of that dispatch is enclosed, and I invite your particular attention to the quoted statement of Mr. Carl D. Shoemaker of the National Wildlife Federation, in which he told news reporters: 'Secretary D'Ewart's forthright statements regarding the different areas discussed and Department policy were most encouraging to the representatives of the national conservation group. The whole group left with a completely better understanding of the Department's viewpoint and policy than it ever had before.'

"And Mr. Shoemaker added: 'I certainly feel most encouraged and very happy over the views expressed by Secretary D'Ewart, who long has been a champion of the National Park Service and wildlife interests.'

"When Mr. D'Ewart's whole record of public service is reviewed, the conclusion is inescapable that his appointment was in the interest of good government. I firmly believe that his vast knowledge of our land, water, and wildlife resources, his outstanding record in Congress, and his sympathetic understanding of the human values involved in administering the Indian, public lands, Territories, fish and wildlife, and park affairs of the Department of the Interior now under his jurisdiction, eminently qualify Mr. D'Ewart to serve as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management, I have no doubt that Members of the House and Senate, of both parties, who are personally acquainted with Mr. D'Ewart and his outstanding record, are agreed that he is eminently qualified to serve in the position to which the President has appointed him.

"May I again express my appreciation for this opportunity to acquaint you with some facts about Mr. D'Ewart which, unfortunately, have not received the wide public circulation I feel they deserve.

"Sincerely yours,

"DOUGLAS MCKAY,
"Secretary of the Interior."

"RESOLUTION OF THE CALIFORNIA HYDRAULIC MINING ASSOCIATION

"Whereas the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart is known to be an honest, capable, and loyal American; and

"Whereas the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart is known to be a capable administrator with long experience in the administration of public affairs; and

"Whereas the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart is known to have a great understanding of the public lands of the United States and a great interest therein; and

"Whereas the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, is aware of these considerations and has appointed the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart to the position of trust as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land Management: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the California Hydraulic Mining Association agrees that the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart will be a competent man for the administration of the public lands of the United States; and further

"Resolved, That the California Hydraulic Mining Association favors the prompt confirmation of the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart as Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Land Management by the Members of the United States Senate.

"E. A. BAILEY,
"President.

"FLOYD T. WILMOTH,
"Secretary."

Passed by the unanimous vote of the members of the California Hydraulic Mining Association at the 229th regular monthly meeting of the association held at Grass Valley, Calif., on Sunday, October 30, 1955, and ordered to be distribtued to the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, other United States Senators, other mining associations, and the public press.

FLOYD T. WILMOTH,
Secretary.

Man Behind the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an editorial from the Boston Post of January 14, 1956, regarding a proposal of a new method of selecting the Vice President of the United States. The proposal has been put forth by Mr. Irving Edinger, of Brighton, in the district which I represent. I am sure it will be of interest to Members. The editorial follows:

MAN BEHIND THE PRESIDENT

There are numerous yarns about the casual and often irresponsible ways that vice presidential candidates are chosen, but all too often it is a last minute choice—a poultice to soothe a wounded political ego, rather than a considered choice of a man who might at any instant become President of the United States.

Numerous plans are talked about for ending this shocking weakness in our electoral system, but any plan finally adopted will have to be by an amendment to the Constitution. A Boston man named Irving Edinger has one plan of this kind to have delegates at the convention nominate a slate of 3 or 4 vice presidential candidates for their party and have the office go to the man who gets the most votes in the slate of the party winning the Presidency.

This, of course, is only one of the numerous plans. At a time when the succession to the Presidency has become an important issue, the matter of revising the method of choosing a Vice President and determining when the President cannot carry on his duties, makes consideration of this vital subject important.

Even the most generally approved scheme to have the Supreme Court determine the President's fitness to continue in office does not solve the problem of choosing a man of high caliber for Vice President. That is a reformation long overdue.

The Second Hoover Commission Abandons Reform for Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Hoover Commission, but the following article evoked a storm of comments from the press and from Mr. Hoover himself. I recommend the article as required reading. It appears in the September 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest.

THE SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION ABANDONS REFORM FOR REVOLUTION

Surveying the first group of recommendations put forward by former President Hoover's new commission on overhauling the Federal Government, columnist Doris Fleeson commented: "The new Hoover Commission reports are the counter-revolution to the New Deal."

As one Hoover report after another was unveiled the truth of Miss Fleeson's comment became increasingly plain. The Commission has recommended doing away with the REA program as now constituted; virtually wiping out the present system of direct and insured loans to individuals and businesses; radically altering the parcel post system; and closing up the Army post exchanges.

But the most conclusive evidence of the Commission's desire to turn the clock back was contained in the final Hoover report, whose proposals for drastic increases in Federal power rates would undo most of the benefits of the great Federal power program of the past 20 years. Veteran Washington correspondents spotted in this Hoover report words almost identical to those used by Mr. Hoover in 1931, when he vetoed the forerunner of the act creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This led the Arkansas Gazette to comment that the 18 separate Hoover reports "indicated pretty clearly that Chairman Herbert Hoover hasn't changed his mind on any of the basic problems of Government since he left the Presidency a depression and a war ago."

The radical nature of the change proposed by the Hover Commission is beginning to seep into the public consciousness, and lines of opposition are rapidly being drawn. But columnist Fleeson has pointed up a danger "as the new fight shapes up:" the public may be confused by thinking of this

new Hoover Commission as merely a continuation of the first Hoover Commission established by President Truman in 1947. That commission was scrupulously bipartisan in nature, and confined its efforts to streamlining existing Government functions, instead of trying to decide which functions should be continued and which abolished.

But, as many commentators are beginning to point out, the new Hoover Commission, recommended by President Eisenhower and authorized by the Republican 83d Congress in 1953, is a horse of quite a different color. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has pointed up one major difference: "The makeup of the first Hoover Commission was bipartisan. It consisted of 6 Republicans and 6 Democrats. The makeup of the second Hoover Commission is predominantly Republican. There are 5 Democrats and 7 Republicans."

This is no accident. The GOP Congress made its intent perfectly clear when it pointedly struck from the authorizing law a requirement that the new Commission be bipartisan.

But President Eisenhower must also bear a major responsibility, since it was his decision to fill his 4 posts on the Commission with 3 Republicans and only 1 Democrat, thus giving the GOP a 7 to 5 majority. Moreover, had the Republicans wished to continue the bipartisan tone of the first Commission, they might have followed Mr. Truman's lead and chosen, as Chairman of the new Commission, a prominent member of the opposition party—perhaps Mr. Truman himself. Instead, they placed Mr. Hoover at the head of the new Commission.

A second—and crucial—difference between this new Hoover Commission and its predecessor lies in the broadened scope of its authority. The first Commission confined its activities to an attempt to streamline existing Government functions. As Chairman Hoover then described it, "it is not our function to say whether (a given Federal program) should exist or not, but it is our function to see if we cannot make it work better."

The new Commission is under no such restrictions. On the contrary, its Republican sponsors deliberately wrote the authorizing law so as—in the words of one cosponsor, former Senator Ferguson, of Michigan—to "make certain" that the Commission would be empowered to ask whether "the Government should be performing this activity or service, and if so, to what extent." Senator Ferguson knew precisely what he was after. "This will give us an opportunity at last," he said, "to reverse the trend of the last 20 years * * *."

Chairman Hoover was equally aware of the opportunity his new mandate offered. "Last time," he told the National Press Club, "we had a limited authority * * *. This time we have some teeth."

Mr. Hoover lost little time in placing himself squarely and exclusively in the driver's seat of the new Commission. As the St. Louis Post-Dispatch put it, "As head of the first Commission, Mr. Hoover took scrupulous care to avoid political partisanship. As head of the second Commission, Mr. Hoover has been bitterly and continuously engaged in right-wing Republican politics."

This is a strong charge indeed, but it seems to be supported by the facts. For one thing, Mr. Hoover has compounded the partisan flavor of the Commission by flouting a specific requirement of the authorizing law and failing to appoint a vice chairman, who would presumably be a Democrat.

But a more important usurpation of power to himself was his appointment of all of the "task forces" which were to perform the studies for the Commission without consulting fellow Commission members.

This, in itself, might not have been objectionable had Mr. Hoover followed the procedure of the first Hoover Commission in seeking to fill the "task forces" with experts who, if they were not entirely objective, at least represented a cross section of public sentiment in any field.

This time, Mr. Hoover observed no such amenity. In case after case, he has "stacked" the task forces with men who have vested interests in a given point of view, and therefore cannot be considered detached experts. Not only that, many of the task forces are completely or overwhelmingly "stacked" with men who share Mr. Hoover's own philosophy, with little or no representation for persons of opposing views.

Mr. Hoover's most flagrant abuse of this appointment authority is his selection of the 26 persons making up the "task force" on water power and resource policy. No one of the 26 represents what might be called the "public power" point of view, and the group includes one of the key financiers behind the Dixon-Yates contract, as well as former Republican Leslie Miller of Wyoming, now the spearhead of an organized fight against the Federal reclamation program. When Democratic Commissioner Holifield tried to persuade the Commission that at least 2 of the 26 should be public-power advocates he was voted down, 7 to 5.

As the York (Pa.) Gazette commented, "Never before in peacetime history have so many titans of big business and their spokesmen been given official Government status as is the case with the 'task forces' of the second Hoover Commission."

Another task force dominated by big business spokesmen is the one dealing with the Government's lending activities. Of the 10 members of that task force, 7 are either directors or officers in private banks or insurance corporations, which naturally have an interest in seeing Government lending curtailed. The result, fully to be expected from such a group, was described by the New York Times: "If carried fully into effect, the Hoover group's proposals would virtually wipe out the whole scheme of direct and insured Government loans to individuals and companies which, since the days of the New Deal, has become a part of the political and economic fabric of the country."

As these task force members see it, "many in our society are not capable of being successful businessmen, successful farmers, or even successful homeowners." They neglect to say that many people who are quite capable of succeeding are frequently unable to get the necessary capital from the local bank, which is where the Government has frequently stepped in in the past. The banker-dominated task force believes that Government lending which rescues individuals and businesses which otherwise would go bankrupt "weakens the Nation's economic structure by preventing the failure or other elimination of weak links in the chain."

And then, in the tone of a banker turning down a loan applicant, the task force said, "The failures of such people may be personal misfortunes, but there seems little justification for assessing the taxpayers to cover their losses." What the task force neglected to say is that in nearly every Federal lending program, the repayment record is exceptionally good.

Although many consider that the inherent risks of our economy should be shared by all of our people, the Hoover Commission has other ideas. Quoting the following as a "sound business principle" which should be adopted by the Federal Government, the task force stated that Government credit should not be "given or lent to * * * any individual, association, or private corporation."

This statement of principle might be deserving of more respect if the Hoover Commission really meant that word, "any." But this does not seem to be the case. According to Democratic Commissioner Holifield, who objected vigorously to the Commission's lending recommendations, the subsidies decried in this report are those which "bring widespread benefits to the whole population." In contrast, he stated, the Commission had ignored "hundreds of millions of dollars obtained by large companies as interest-free loans through the device of accelerated tax amortization." Subsidies which help low and middle income groups, he added, "pale into insignificance when compared to the subsidies doled out to big manufacturers."

To this Commission, for instance, it isn't "sound business principle" for the Government to provide the money for loans to the Rural Electrification Cooperatives which have provided electricity to nearly 4.5 million rural consumers. But as to Government help for the shipping industry, which totals many times the out-of-pocket cost of the REA program, the Commission merely says, "We have no comment on these operations."

They do not object, either, to the $4.5 million in subsidies to the airlines since 1951. But it is not "sound business principle" to give $391 million to sustain the Farmers' Home Administration, which has lent money to more than two million small farmers after they had been turned down by private bankers. Nor is it "sound business principle," according to the Hoover Commission, for the Government to pay $4.5 million a year to cover the operating expenses of the Small Business Administration.

The Commission does not object to, and carefully refrains from mentioning, the fact that the publishers of the Nation pay less than 20 percent of the cost of handling their second-class mail. But it isn't "sound business principle" for the millions of parcel-post users to pay less than 100 percent of the cost of handling theirs. Commented the Washington Post and Times Herald: "Perhaps parcel-post rates should be increased to take account of rising costs, but parcel post should not be priced out of the market simply for the benefit of the Railway Express Agency."

If such recommendations could be written off as the creations of a fringe group in the Republican Party, they might not be making headlines. But in the judgment of Washington's press corps, the cannot be thus dismissed.

Many veteran correspondents agree with the analysis of Thomas L. Stokes, who said, "It is doubtful if the American people understand or properly assess the powerful influence that Herbert Hoover exerts on the Eisenhower administration."

Ever since he took office in 1953, many of President Eisenhower's actions and legislative proposals have paralleled the Hoover line, even though his public statements have usually been moderate. Both he and Hoover, for instance, have publicly excoriated public power as "creeping socialism." In the field of agriculture, the Eisenhower administration has cut loan funds and raised interest rates for low-income farmers in three successive budgets, even before the Hoover Commission got around to recommending such a course of action. And top Agriculture officials in the administration have echoed the philosophy of the Hoover lending task force that only a few are destined for success in business and farming and that the country is better off letting the weak fall by the wayside.

In mid-May, the President sent his "personal congratulations and best wishes" to Mr. Hoover and extended "the official gratitude of this Government for the great service he has been rendering through the medium of the Hoover Commission * * *"

So far, however, Mr. Eisenhower has carefully tried to avoid placing his stamp of approval directly on any specific recommendation of the Hoover Commission. As a matter of fact, now that protests against these proposals are pouring into Washintgon from every section of the country, the adminis-

tration is trying to detach itself from the Commission. Only recently Attorney General Brownell ruled that the Hoover Commisison is a part of the oCngress (now that the Congress is in Democratic (hands), not a part of the administration.

The battle over putting the Hoover recommendations into effect will begin when Congress reconvenes early in 1956. Perhaps the Arkansas Gazette will turn out to be prophetic in its comment that "Nothing in any election since 1928—not excluding that of 1952—suggests that any substantial number of the American people are willing to follow Herbert Hoover back into the ghost house of McKinleyism."

Prosperity for Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a chart which appeared in the November issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO GETS THE GRAVY AND WHO GETS THE CRUMBS?—PROSPERITY FOR WHOM?

On September 9, Vice President NIXON told GOP State chairmen that GOP prosperity will be the top issue in 1956. GOP orators will probably follow President Eisenhower's lead in claiming that this GOP prosperity "is not any particular favor to rich and wealthy people and to great corporations."

The facts below show, however, that under the Republicans prosperity has been a particular favor to big business and its stockholders.

Time period	Big business	Others
2d 3 months 1955 versus 2d 3 months 1954.	Corporations' "income" (profits before taxes), up 26 percent	Average worker's income (average weekly wage), up only 7 percent.
1st 3 months 1955 versus 1st 3 months 1954.	Income (profits) of leading companies: Anaconda Copper, up 249 percent Pittsburgh Plate Glass, up 123 percent Aluminum Company of America, up 104 percent General Motors, up 64 percent United States Steel, up 62 percent Du Pont, up 27 percent Standard Oil, New Jersey, up 20 percent	Do.
2d 3 months 1955 versus 2d 3 months 1954.	Corporations' "take-home pay" (profits after taxes), up 26 percent	Average person's "take-home pay" (per capita disposable income), up only 3 percent.
Do.	Stockholders' income (dividend payments), up 9 percent	Farmers' income, down 8 percent.
Last 3 months 1954 versus last 3 months 1953.	Food processors' profits, up 17 percent	Farmer's share of housewife's food dollar, down 6 percent.
Do.	Large corporations' "take-home pay" (profits after taxes of corporations with assets over $100 million), up $330 million.	Small corporations' "take-home pay" (profits after taxes of corporations with assets under $250,000), up $5 million.[1]
April 1955 versus April 1954.	Business failures, large corporations (corporations with liabilities between $100,000 and $1 million), down 16 percent.	Business failures, small corporations (corporations with liabilities under $5,000), up 7 percent.

[1] This rise merely means that these smaller corporations are $5 million less in the red.

Carol Barrett Winner of Essay Contest on Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release relative to a California girl who was named winner of the National Association of Real Estate Board's essay contest on the Bill of Rights. She is Miss Carol Barrett, 17 years of age, of California. She was winner of a nationwide essay contest on "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA GIRL NAMED WINNER OF NAREB'S ESSAY CONTEST ON BILL OF RIGHTS

Miss Carol Barrett, attractive 17-year-old senior at Pius X High School, Hollydale, Calif., has been chosen as the winner of the nationwide essay contest on "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me" conducted by the National Association of Real Estate Boards.

For writing the best of an estimated 9,000 eassays by high-school students in 57 communities in 23 States, she will receive as her prize a 5-day expenses-paid trip to Washington, D. C., for herself and her mother, January 18–22, 1956.

Real estate boards in these communities conducted local competitions, and their winning entries were forwarded to NAREB for the national contest. The Downey (Calif.) Board of Realtors, of which Elmer Wilkerson was 1955 president, sponsored the competition won by Miss Barrett.

As one of the highlights of her trip to Washington, she will read her composition at the inaugural banquet of NAREB, January 18, in the Mayflower Hotel, at which time Clarence M. Turley, St. Louis, will officially be installed as president, succeeding Henry G. Waltemade, New York. This dinner is one of a series of meetings of NAREB groups now under way which has attracted 800 to Washington.

Second prize in the national contest, a $100 United States savings bond, was awarded to Miss Mary Lee Garrett, Edinburg, Tex., and third prize, a $50 bond, to Miss Carol Crow, Los Altos, Calif.

Final judges in the contest were Senator John W. Bricker (Ohio), Representative Bruce Alger (Texas), and United States District Judge Edward M. Curran, Washington, D. C. Preliminary judges of the 57 national entries were the following teachers from the Washington area: Fred H. Hilton, Jr., Capitol Pages' School; Joseph Mabbett, the Bullis School, Silver Spring, Md.; and the Reverend Stephen M. Connelly, DeMatha Catholic High School, Hyattsville, Md.

Carol Barrett, who lives with her mother, Mrs. Geraldine Barrett, at 4863 East 60th Street, Maywood, Calif., put her journalistic experience to good use in writing her essay on "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me" for her history and civics classes at Pius X High School. She was a writer for the paper at St. Agnes High School, Los Angeles, where she was enrolled her first 3 years of high school.

An honor student at St. Agnes, she was treasurer of her freshman class and vice president of her sophmore and and junior classes. She has maintained a B average throughout high school.

Her interest in journalism is reflected also in a feature article which she wrote for the Community Chest Times of Los Angeles in November 1954, and in her plans to enroll next September at UCLA, which the intention of majoring in journalism. She is especially desirous of writing sports.

Carol has been a student of music and dancing and collects records as a hobby.

Following is the text of Carol's essay which was judged the national winner:

"WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME

"Musing one night by the campfire as the crackling flames leaped high, I watched the curling plumes of smoke go up, and as they spiraled I seemed to see the faces of men who once at another time, long, long ago, possessed the courage, spirit, and foresight that made America for me. 'Twas here that I first reflected seriously upon the priceless heritage that is mine. Not satisfied with the constitutional guaranties, they demanded with clear vision a Bill of Rights. This was the beginning of the birth of democracy as we know it today.

"God-fearing men, they realized the moral code, and that code they translated into ten amendments known as the Bill of Rights. Each is a key, as it were, which will open for all time the door to the solution of each problem as it affects my personal life or the life of the Nation. The key to the four fundamental freedoms of every person opens the door of my church, unlocks the silence of my lips, and permits to enter into my life the news of the world about me. The key to my home seals it to unreasonable search and protects my person and those things I would hold private. The key to justice shuts out any possibility of arrest without trial by jury, confinement without the right to be bailed out, and of self-incrimination. The key to eminent domain guarantees me the security that my property will not be taken for the common good without compensation. The key to unlisted rights gives me the assurance that I can appeal until I have reached the citadel of justice. And finally the key to delegated powers makes me a citizen not only protected by my national Government but also by my State government.

"The Bill of Rights has been the citadel of the oppressed, the beacon of light of those

seeking refuge from tyranny, and the security of all free men. It means America to me.

"Therefore, we, the youth of America,
Must guard our land from all danger,
From those who would steal our birthright.
And keep democracy's campfire,
With freedom and liberty bright."

Tribute to Robert E. Lee by Senator Sparkman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, today at the ceremony held in Statuary Hall I had the pleasure of delivering an address in tribute to Gen. Robert E. Lee. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JOHN SPARKMAN AT CEREMONIES HONORING ROBERT E. LEE, STATUTARY HALL, JANUARY 19, 1956

I am deeply honored to join you today in tribute to a great American.

To me the life of Robert E. Lee has always been an inspiration and a challenge. Our history holds no counterpart to the story of Lee. He was by his own appraisal, a failure. Some historians agree that his record was one of failure. If this be true he was the most magnificent failure of all time. For where will you find a life more sublime in its devotion to duty, more inspiring in its reverence of Almighty God, or so grand in its hour of defeat?

The star that guided the career of Robert E. Lee grows brighter with each passing year. So it is with all of the truly great. Today we see in retrospect many facets of Lee's lonely existence which were obscured by the prejudices and the mores of the early postwar years.

In my early schooldays Lee was almost a legendary figure. Some of you, perhaps, will recall that Historian Long declared: "Throughout his whole student life, he performed no act which his pious mother could not have fully approved;" or the words of an old teacher: "He was never behind time at his studies, never failed in a single recitation, was perfectly observant of the rules and regulations of the institution." We can all rejoice that such legendary acclaim has been dispelled. Lee's own letters reveal him as a warm, compassionate man with many of the frailities of mankind.

Still later, we have Lee presented as a man of mystery. His letters and his words, we are told, are couched in formality and carefully conceal his innermost desires or his true nature.

He was by his own admission like his daughter, "always wanting something"—but what? Again, we are given the picture of a lifelong conflict of conscience with the realities of his existence.

Lee deprecated war. He opposed secession, yet with all of the great ability he possessed sought to defend this right of the States. He owned slaves, yet he opposed slavery and freed those he owned long before the war. He was a soldier of the United States, a graduate of the West Point Academy, and a former superintendent of the Academy. Yet his sense of duty, or honor if you please, called him to the defense of his native Virginia. He was devoted to his home and to his family. Fate decreed that much of his life should be spent away from both.

These are serious contradictions. But to me they are not difficult to understand. Lee's life was a pattern of rigid discipline. His religion—he was an Episcopalian—was its dominating influence. Through every deed and word runs the theme of "Let mankind do what man can and must do—God will take care of the rest."

Lee was born April 19, 1807, in Stratford, Va. He was the son of "Light Horse Harry" Lee and Anne Hill Carter Lee. Light Horse Harry served with Washington in the Revolutionary War. Robert E. Lee's father died when Robert was 11 years old.

The Lees moved to Alexandria in 1811 to educate their children.

Unfortunately, very little is known about the childhood or the early education of Robert E. Lee. His first teacher was a Mr. Leary. He later attended the school of Benjamin Hallowell where his time was devoted chiefly to mathematics. He was an exemplary student.

Lee entered West Point when he was 18 years old. He was a good scholar. He graduated high in his class in 1829, and received an appointment in the Engineering Corps.

For some years he was stationed at Old Point Comfort. While there he married Miss Mary Custis, the great-granddaughter of Mrs. Washington. This took place in Arlington in June 1831. Through this marriage, Lee came into control of extensive property—farms, mansions, and a considerable number of slaves.

In the years before the Mexican War, Lee was stationed in various parts of the country, pursuing his profession as a military engineer. He was sent to Ohio to adjust the boundaries of that State with Michigan. Later he supervised the defenses of New York harbor. In St. Louis he worked to control the course of the Mississippi River.

In the Mexican War he began as captain under General Wood. He took part in the battle of Buena Vista. He participated in the siege of Vera Cruz. His promotion was rapid. He was made a major at Cerro Gorda, a lieutenant colonel at Contreras, and a colonel at Chapultepec. He was slightly wounded at Chapultepec.

There is evidence that he displayed great courage and resourcefulness throughout the war. For this he received high commendation from General Scott who also was a Virginian.

After the Mexican War Lee resumed his engineering work in various parts of the country. For some time he was engaged in construction of a fort at Baltimore.

In 1852, at the age of 45, he was made Superintendent of the West Point Academy. He accepted with regret because he feared he could not measure up to the expectations of the Secretary of War. It was his feeling that the job required "more skill and experience" than he possessed. Lee improved the discipline and the courses of study at West Point.

In 1855, Lee left West Point for a lieutenant colonelcy in one of the new cavalry regiments. His service with the cavalry was in the Western and Southwestern States while his family remained at Arlington.

Now the war clouds were gathering. Lee wrote that he hoped President Buchanan would "be able to extinguish fanaticism between North and South, cultivate love for the country and Union, and restore harmony between the different sections."

In October 1859, while on furlough at Arlington, Lee was ordered to arrest John Brown. He discharged his duty in a quiet and efficient manner, as witness his report: "Tuesday, about sunrise, with twelve marines under the command of Lieutenant Green, broke in the door of the engine house, secured the robbers, and released all of the (Southern) prisoners unhurt."

Brown was turned over to the civil authorities. "I am glad we did not have to kill him," Lee remarked afterward, "for I believe he is an honest, conscientious old man."

The year 1861 was the year of the great decision. Lee was 54. "As far as I can judge from the papers," he wrote, "we are between a state of anarchy and civil war. May God avert us from both . . . I must try and be patient and await the end for I can do nothing to hasten or retard it."

Lee had previously expressed his resentment of the North's aggression and "denial of equal rights of our citizens to the common territory of the Commonwealth" and his displeasure with the course of the "Cotton States" which he termed "selfish and dictatorial."

"While I wish to do what is right," he said, "I am unwilling to do what is wrong at the bidding of the South or the North."

Lee's account of the interview with Francis P. Blair in which he was offered and declined the command of the United States Army, is well known.

In this account he said: "I never intimated to anyone that I desired the command of the United States Army, nor did I ever have a conversation with but one gentleman, the Honorable Francis P. Blair, on the subject, which was at his invitation and, as I understood, at the instance of President Lincoln. After listening to his remarks, I declined the offer he made me to take command of the army that was to be brought into the field, stating as candidly and courteously as I could that though opposed to secession and deprecating war I could take no part in an invasion of the Southern States."

This interview occurred on April 18. Lee went immediately to tell General Scott of the proposition that had been made to him, and of his decision. Some historians are convinced that General Townsend's eyewitness account of the talk with General Scott is substantially incorrect, because it makes no mention of Lee's report on the proposition submitted by Blair. In the Townsend report, Lee is quoted as saying: "The property belonging to my children, all they possess, lies in Virginia. They will be ruined if they do not go with their State. I cannot raise my hand against my children."

Townsend said this interview took place on April 19. Lee gave the date as April 18.

Two days later Lee sent his letter of resignation to General Scott saying that "Save in the defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword."

It is significant that Lee clung to the Union up to the hour of Virginia's decision to secede.

In January 1861, he wrote: "I can anticipate no greater calamity for the country than a dissolution of the Union. It would be an accumulation of all the evils we complain of, and I am willing to sacrifice everything but honor for its preservation. * * * Secession is nothing but revolution."

I think we have to consider that Lee had a profound regard for the sovereignty and rights of the States, as expressed by Jefferson and opposed by the Hamiltonian theory. Lee's father had served as Governor of Virginia. Two of his kinsmen, Richard and Francis Lee, signed the Declaration of Independence. A third, Thomas Lee, was President and Commander in Chief of Virginia. The Constitution and the rights reserved for the States were sacred to Lee. Lee felt that he was fighting, not for slavery, but for the preservation of all of the other constitutional powers of the States.

"I had no guide," he said, "nor had I any other object than the defense of those principles of American liberty upon which the constitutions of the several States were originally founded; and unless they are strictly observed, I fear there will be an end to Republican Government in this country. * * *"

Again he declares, "All that the South has ever desired was that the Union, as established by our forefathers, should be preserved, and that the Government as originally organized should be administered in purity and truth."

Then followed the four years of brilliant campaigns that proved him one of the greatest strategists of all time—four years of privation with an ill-clad and hungry army—a heart-breaking struggle ending at Appomattox. "A Caesar without his ambition; a Frederick without his tyranny; a Napoleon without his selfishness; and a Washington without his reward."

It is recorded that no general was more greatly beloved by his men.

In all the storm of criticism toward the close of the War, Lee steadfastly declined to "assume responsibilities or make decisions that were properly those of President Davis or other civil authorities."

If Lee was great in battle, he was grand in defeat. In all of his career, Lee had been resolute and forward-looking in every deed and decision. Now he called upon the people of the South to unite in the restoration of the country and the re-establishment of peace and harmony. For himself all he desired was "some little quiet home in the woods, where I can procure shelter and my daily bread, if permitted by the victor."

He considered himself a citizen of a united country, although his plea for amnesty was never formally granted. He turned a deaf ear to all offers by commercial enterprises for use of his name, declaring: "My name is not for sale."

In August 1865, he accepted the Presidency of Washington College—a school with 40 students and four professors. The college prospered during the 5 years of Lee's tenure. Lee seemed to relish this, saying:

"For my own part, I much enjoy the charms of civil life and find too late that I have wasted the best part of my existence."

Here ended the career of Robert E. Lee. He died on October 12, 1870. He was buried at Lexington in a chapel erected by his efforts.

Lee regarded his life as a failure. Shortly before his death he wrote:

"Life is indeed gliding away and I have nothing of good to show for mine that is past. I pray I may be spared to accomplish something for the benefit of mankind and the honor of God."

It is singular to note that Bradford, a distinguished historian, agrees that Lee's life will always be regarded as a record of failure. He says that success is the idol of the world and the world's idols have been successful.

From Lee's pen we have his assertion that "human virtue should be equal to human calamity." From his own life we have proof that this can be true.

Only recently William Faulkner observed that we are all failures to the extent that we can never achieve all we have hoped to achieve.

And on this subject of failure, let me quote from the great jurist, Learned Hand:

"By some happy fortuity man is a projector, a designer, a builder, a craftsman; it is among his most dependable joys to impose upon the flux that passes before him some mark of himself, aware though he always must be of the odds against him.

"His reward is not so much in the work as in its making; not so much in the prize as in the race. We may win when we lose, if we have done what we can; for by so doing we have made real at least some part of that finished product in whose fabrication we are most concerned—ourselves."

Robert E. Lee a failure. If so, let me say again that he was history's most magnificent failure.

When we think of the influence that he has had down through the years on the people of his own generation and on those who came after him, not only in Virginia, not only throughout the South, but all over this Nation, what more could one have done toward succeeding?

I mentioned above that the historian Bradford considered Lee a failure. Yet it is my understanding that even the study of Lee had a tremendous influence upon Bradford. I have been told that he started his work on the subject, "Lee, the Rebel"; that as he studied Lee's direction of the armed forces of the Confederacy he changed his title to "Lee, the Soldier"; that as he studied Lee's life and influence and his personal conduct following the end of the war he ended up with the title under which his book is published: "Lee, the American."

It is interesting to note the closing paragraph of Bradford's appendix to "Lee, the American."

"It is an advantage to have a subject like Lee that one cannot help loving. I say, cannot help. The language of some of his adorers tends at first to breed a feeling contrary to love. Persist and make your way through this and you will find a human being as lovable as any that ever lived. At least I have. I have loved him, and I may say that his influence upon my own life, though I came to him late, has been as deep and as inspiring as any I have ever known. If I convey but a little of that influence to others who will feel it as I have, I shall be more than satisfied."

Robert E. Lee will ever live in the hearts of Americans everywhere as a great American.

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marks the 38th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the 40 million people of the Ukrainian National Republic.

Ukrainia is a traditionally democratic nation lying within the orbit of Soviet tyranny. The people of this tiny republic have always cherished freedom above all material treasure and have never ceased their long struggle for this liberty.

I point with pride to the fact that New Haven, Conn., located in the district which I represent, was the first city in the United States to recognize Ukrainian Independence Day. Again this year the blue and gold colors of Ukrainia will fly over our city hall. It is a fitting ceremony in these times which clearly demonstrates our protests to the international Communists who treacherously design the envelopment of the entire world.

The historic claim of Ukrainia to national freedom and independence cannot be ignored. Its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the mutual construction of the free world of tomorrow must be assured if the foundation of permanent peace among freedom-loving nations is to be impregnable.

The Christmas Season Has a Deep Meaning for Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including herewith some material believed to be of general interest concerning the celebration of Christmas, as contained in a unique publication issued by the Dalzell Towing Co., Inc. of New York, and edited by the well-known explorer and editor-writer, Wendell Phillips Dodge.

With more than 3,000 major house and employees' organs being put out by American industrial and business firms, some 100 million and more circulation has already been obtained, and these little publications are contributing much toward improving employer-employee conditions throughout the United States. Therefore, when along comes such a fine example as this Christmas issue referred to, beautifully and effectively illustrated in a uniqueness that literally breathes the Christmas spirit, it seems to me that many more people should have the benefit of reading at least a part of its contents, more especially that which has to do with Christmas.

These extracts from the Dalzell line Christmas issue follow:

THE CHRISTMAS SEASON HAS A DEEP MEANING FOR SEAMEN

Aside from the general idea of the origin of Christmas as being in commemoration of the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, with the Christ mass in celebration, the idea of Christmas as practiced was borrowed from those whom we choose to call pagans, as indeed, have most of our theological ceremonies, rituals, and ideas. Many ages before the time of Jesus Christ, among all the ancient peoples of the earth—in the Far East as well as in the Near East and the Middle East—were ceremonies at this season of the year similar in kind to our own, which had reference to a certain occurrence in the events of time. For it is then that the sun itself returns from its journey southward to the north again, and this coming of the sun was understood to be the birth of the sun. With it comes a spiritual, a mental, a moral growth and uplifting. There is a springtime not only in the lower kingdoms, among plants and animals, but among men. There is an incursion of energy which, if we could take advantage of, would enable us to do much more than we now do. But, through the ages man has forgotten the fact of the recurrence of this real Christmas time—the season, not only of the physical renewal of the earth and all beings, but also a return of the inner life, and of impulse of a spiritual kind.

Between Christmas day and the day called Easter—which again has its own significance—the life of the earth is young. Then, too, the inner life of man has its re-

juvenescence and its growth; ideas then taken hold of and carried into expression have tenfold the power which they would have at another time. Christmas is a season of birth and growth; it is the season of the rebirth of the spiritual nature.

Sailors, more especially "before the mast" in sailing-ship days, when there was less static, shall we say, than results from modern ships of metal, making a more perfect conduct of the electricity from the elements at sea, long were conscious every moment of the recurrent waves of activity at this season of the year. Whether they fully understood it or not, they were more actively affected by the cosmic influences which again were ever so more noticeable under sail, and at this season of the year. They more easily, perhaps, than men of today, steered rhythmically on the course charted in the cosmos for all beings of every kind to follow the law of action and reaction, to proceed through the coming back of that which was before, plus whatever had been incurred in the meantime. There is no cessation of this law—an eternality of progress, which is not restricted to any particular form and which is within the means and reach of every individual in every part of the universe. It is to get into rhythm.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune": So, whenever there is a spiritual idea in the heart or in the mind, then is the beginning of the rising tide for that individual; then is the time for him to take advantage of the cycle—to make every possible effort in the direction of his purpose, to chart his course and sail on.

Yes, there are also tides in nature for races and civilizations. History has clearly plotted them for us. As the sun moves northward and then south again, it is in that time of rising tide that we must acquire stamina—the power of concentrated effort—which will hold us through the receding tide and give us a better standing when the tide again rises.

And so, Christmas tidings.

ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTMAS TREE

Near the cave in which was born the Saviour of the world grew three trees—a pine, an olive, and a palm. On that holy eve when the guiding star of Bethlehem appeared in the heavens, that star announced to the long-suffering world the birth of Him who brought to mankind the glad tidings of a blissful hope, all nature rejoiced and is said to have carried to the feet of the infant God her best and holiest gifts.

Among others the olive tree that grew at the entrance of the cave of Bethlehem brought forth its golden fruits; the palm offered to the Babe its green and shadowy vault as a protection against heat and storm; alone the pine had nought to offer. The poor tree stood in dismay and sorrow, vainly trying to think what it could present as a gift to the child Christ. Its branches were painfully drooping down, and the intense agony of its grief finally forced from its bark and branches a flood of hot transparent tears, whose large resinous and gummy drops fell thick and fast around it. A silent star, twinkling in the blue canopy of heaven, perceived these tears; and forthwith, confabulating with her companions—lo, a miracle took place. Hosts of shooting stars fell down, like unto a great rain shower, on the pine until they twinkled and shone from every needle, from top to bottom. Then, trembling with joyful emotion, the pine proudly raised her drooping branches and appeared for the first time before the eyes of a wondering world, in most dazzling brightness. From that time, the legend tells us, men adopted the habit of ornamenting the pine tree on Christmas eve with numberless lighted candles.

A ST. BRANDON YARN OF CHRISTMAS

While they were sailing it came Christmas day and the monks in the coracle said their matins and sang special thanks for the birth of their Savior. Shortly before noon they came upon an iceberg, a small iceberg upon which a man was reclining. They sailed close to the berg and hailed him, asking who he was and what he was doing there.

"I," said the man "am Judas, Judas Iscariot."

The good monks recoiled in horror. Had they miscalculated their bearings? Were they on the road to perdition instead of sailing for the islands of the Blest?

"What do you here?" demanded St. Brandon.

"It is Christmas," said Judas, "and for 1 hour I am free of the tormenting fires. Just 1 hour." He sighed. "When I died, by mine own hand, I was cast into the flames, which was my just fate. But on the first Christmas an angel came to me and said that for 1 hour I might be free to go and to cool my body. I asked from whence came this mercy. He recalled to me that once in Joppa, a leper had appealed for help in his misery, and I, Judas, had thrown him my cloak to cover his sores from the sun. For this, the angel said to me, I was to be given 1 hour's respite from torment each year, each Christmas, the day of Him whom I had betrayed."

The holy men in the coracle fell to their knees and bowed their heads in prayer, and when they looked up Judas was gone, his hour had passed and he already had been returned to his torments.

CHRISTMAS AT SEA

(By Robert Louis Stevenson)

The sheets were frozen hard, and they cut the naked hand;
The decks were like a slide, where a seaman scarce could stand,
The wind was a nor'-wester, blowing squally off the sea;
And the cliffs and spouting breakers were the only things a-lee.

They heard the surf a-roaring before the break of day;
But 'twas only with the peep of light we saw how ill we lay.
We tumbled every hand on deck instanter, with a shout,
And we gave her the maintops'l, and stood by to go about.

All day we tack'd and tack'd between the South Head and the North;
All day we haul'd the frozen sheets, and got no further forth;
All day was cold as charity, in bitter paid and dread,
For very life and nature we tac'd from head to head.

We gave the South a wider berth, for there the tide-race roar'd.
But every tack we made we brought the North Head close aboard;
So's we say the cliffs and houses, and the breakers running high,
An the coastguard in his garden, with his glass against his eye.

The frost was on the village roofs as white as ocean foam;
The good red fires were burning bright in every longshore home;
The windows sparkled clear, and the chimneys volleyed out;
And I vow we sniffed the victuals as the vessels went about.

The bells upon the church were rung with a right jovial cheer;
For it's just that I should tell you how (of all days in the year)
This day of our adversity was blessed Christmas morn,
And the house above the coastguard's was the house where I was born.

O well I saw the pleasant room, the pleasant faces there,
My mother's silver spectacles, my father's silver hair;
And well I saw the firelight, like a flight of homely elves
Go dancing round the china-plates that stand upon the shelves!

And well I knew the talk they had, the talk that was of me,
Of the shadow on the household and the son that went to sea;
And O the wicked fool I seem'd, in every kind of way,
To be here and hauling frozen ropes on blessed Christmas Day.

They lit the high sea-light, and the dark began to fall.
"All hands to loose topgallant sails," I heard the captain call.
"By the Lord, she'll never stand it," our first mate Jackson cried.
"It's the one way or the other, Mr. Jackson," he replied.

She staggered to her bearings, but the sails were new and good,
And the ship smelt up to windward just as though she understood.
As the winter's day was ending, in the entry of the night,
We clear'd the weary headland, and pass'd below the light.

And they heaved a might breath, every soul on board but me,
As they saw her nose again pointing handsome out to sea;
But all that I could think of, in the darkness and the cold,
Was just that I was leaving home and my folks were growing old.

Letter From Homer Laughlin China Co. and Resolution of United States Potters Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to me from Mr. J. M. Wells, president of the Homer Laughlin China Co., the makers of Homer Laughlin China, together with a resolution adopted by the United States Potters Association, furnished me by W. A. Betz, executive secretary.

The resolution urges a return to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign trade and our national economy under article 1, section 8.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
Newell, W. Va., December 30, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: In compliance with your request of December 28, I am delighted to enclose herewith a copy of the resolution which was passed by our United States Potters Association.

I have been assured by the president of the International Brotherhood of Operative Potters, which is the pottery workers' union,

that at the next meeting of their executive board, they will approve the same resolution.

Very truly yours,

THE HOMER LAUGHLIN CHINA CO.,
J. M. WELLS.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingmen or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry; and

Whereas article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress shall have the power to pay and collect duties, imposts, and excises (tariffs or import fees) and to regulate foreign commerce; and

Whereas the Congress transferred the constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade to the executive branch through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as extended from time to time: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States Congress is hereby urged to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce and the national economy through the adjustment of duties, imposts and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and to repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act which transferred such responsibility to the President.

THE UNITED STATES
POTTERS ASSOCIATION,
W. A. BETZ, *Executive Secretary*.

Capitalizing on the Resource of America's Elderly Folks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on many occasions I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on the subject of utilizing to the fullest the great resource available to our country in the persons of America's elderly citizens.

Very shortly, the Senate Finance Committee will be commencing hearings on improving our old-age and survivors insurance system. A great many improvements are necessary and will, I feel sure, be enacted by the Congress this year.

Capitalizing on our old folks involves more, however, than merely increasing pensions. It means having a comprehensive program in the fields of jobs, housing, health, hobbies, education, and so forth. That is why I have introduced my bill, S. 2279, for a system of Federal grants to the States to help develop such programs.

Of late, a great many Americans have devoted real thought to expanding the horizons of our older citizens.

Many Americans, for example, have recognized that one of the most well intentioned but harmful features in present-day American society is compulsory retirement at the age of 65.

Such mandatory retirement makes no distinction whatsoever between physiological and psychological age on the one hand and mere chronological age on the other. It draws no distinction between a man of 65 who is ready, willing, and eager to work 5, 10, or more years, and one who, for a variety of physical and mental reasons, should withdraw, to a large extent, from full-time employment.

One of the best illustrations I know was in my office this morning. He is a former Ambassador of the United States to a foreign country He is well over the age of 65. The day the President suffered the attack which affected his heart there was a young man seated opposite me in Milwaukee—a very young man—who said, "I think the President will get over this attack. I had such an attack when I was in my fifties, and another when I was in my sixties." I asked, "How old are you now?" He said, "85." That was Mr. Monahan, a wealthy man who is busy in the affairs of business in the city of Milwaukee. Fortunately he has his own business, but if he were to come under any of the retirement acts we would not have before us the example set by this man, who, at 85, is young, and and physically and mentally able to carry on in a fine way.

I cannot stress this point too strongly, because through our knowledge of medical science, and our grasp of the subject of how to live, longevity has been increased by a number of years. The result is that those who have contributed, up to the age of 65, to the tax income of this country, and to its betterment, find themselves out of jobs. They are willing and able to work. It seems to me that it is only commonsense not to foolishly throw away this great asset.

We are told that America is short of manpower in every field. That is why we are asking for allies in the world struggle. If we use our common sense, we will employ some of the best manpower we have in the best possible way to strengthen the Republic.

I send to the desk a most thoughtful and stimulating address on this theme, delivered by Mr. J. R. Cominsky, publisher of the Saturday Review, before the University of Rochester last October 14, and I ask unanimous consent that its text, which I believe will make an important contribution to our thinking on this subject, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE WE MAKING THE MOST OF OUR HUMAN RESOURCES?

With a full consciousness of the nature of this gathering it seemed fitting that I choose the announced subject: Are We Making the Most of Our Human Resources? Before a group of men and women dedicated to making as effective as possible the functioning of the human mechanism and to the prolonging of such functioning as long as possible, it would seem fair for you to ask the rest of us: "Now that we are giving our all to our job what is the rest of our society doing to capitalize to the utmost the important headstart we have given the human race?"

And that question poses an interesting problem—or set of problems—too multitudinous, too varied, and too complex to handle in a short talk.

In the few public talks I have given within the past 5 years I have tried to deal with some aspect of education that goes beyond the time spent within the ivy-covered buildings and the immediate problems of the curriculum. I have given voice to some torments of my own, such as: Are the powerful and expanding mass media poisoning the fruits of all our educational and cultural processes? Are we stopping education with the college diploma to turn people into a world changing so fast and so drastically that, except in the most general terms, these people are helpless within a decade to cope with our most pressing problems?

And tonight I want to raise even more troublesome questions as to whether, in the light of some of the current contradictions of life, we are not behind schedule in adjusting to changes that the field of medicine has brought about.

The interrelationship of all human endeavor could not be exemplified better than to point out that while exciting news is flowing from the laboratories of the medical scientists and practitioners another kind of news is flowing from industrial and labor fronts to take the bloom off some great achievements of your fellows in medicine. To state it bluntly: Of what use is a lengthened life span if it is accompanied by a greatly shortened working span? This, of course, is no fault of yours, and the point I am making is not for your benefit except as it may concern you as members of the human family with a deep feeling for everything that affects the health and happiness of all.

It is not your fault that there has been in recent years an almost hysterical absorption with security—security at almost any price, it has seemed to me. And all the pension plans and retirement arrangements aren't worth the price we are paying for them if it means one able-bodied person, qualified in every other way, self-respecting and eager to work, cannot obtain employment after he passes the age of 40, or possibly a slightly higher limit. The life-span figure, large or small, becomes academic in the light of such a development, and all of us had better face up to it. I am not talking through my hat on this score because a good part of my time is now taken up with the problem of placing people past 40 because they lack only one requirement for many jobs—they cannot be fitted into the retirement or pension plan. It would please me no end to be authoritatively and factually contradicted on this point.

It would seem humane for insurance companies to restudy the present group life insurance plans which force business firms to pay higher premiums if they hire workers in their forties. It would seem equally humane for the various states to restudy their unemployment insurance and disability compensation laws which deter employers from hiring older people. It is a recognized fact that older workers take longer to recuperate and tend to raise the disability compensation rates paid by their employers in some States. If the employer were not penalized for this fact of life, he might take another view of the employee over forty. It would also be humane for our leading and most responsible labor unions to study this problem in relation to the pressures which are now being put on employers for social benefits.

All the above flows from the fact that our retirement and pension plans are figured on the basis of chronological and not physiological factors. And now that so many lives are being saved on the operating table, the gain is being more than canceled out by the number of lives we are losing on the actuarial table. You understand what great differences in physical and mental power there can be in people of the same age. Yet this factor is somewhat obscured in our social planning.

The drastic shortening of man's working span brings with it a problem that should

concern every boy and girl going to college, and the parents. The trial and error period, which in the past allowed a person to try his hand at a few jobs in the hope of finding the one he liked best and could do best, is now something that, in retrospect, went out with the model T Ford. Today a person's talents must be channeled immediately into the area in which he can be most effective, or he is sunk. That's the dilemma, and we may as well be realistic about it.

As physicians, you know the importance of proper adjustment to his vocation in man's physical and mental wellbeing, and I think you might be interested in a little homework which I did in preparation for my talk tonight. I wrote to 38 colleges and universities, large and small, private and State, coed, men's and women's, in every section of the United States, to find out what is the picture at the moment in the vocational guidance area. The replies were interesting, illuminating, varied, factual, philosophical and all a credit to those in charge of this phase of work in our institutions of higher education. They showed an awareness of a real problem, and an honest effort to deal with it. Some were more resourceful and practical than others. The personnel and apparatus for dealing with this great and pressing problem ran all the way from the University of California (with ten professional counselors, a manager, who is also a counselor, a psychologist, a psychometrist, an occupational information specialist, a consulting psychiatrist, and five clerical workers) and Columbia, with access to the guidance laboratory of Teachers College, to one of the largest state universities in the South, and in the country, which reported: "We hardly have what could be called a program of vocational guidance."

I'd like to give you a few highlights from the reports that were of more than passing interest to me, and to credit the institutions in each case:

Under the direction of Miss Edith Stedman who, for 24 years, was engaged in vocational guidance work at Radcliffe, there was developed what were called "skills courses" to enable the liberal arts graduates to develop marketable job techniques. The most enduring of these has been the summer secretarial course. If only the sweet young girl graduate would realize how important is the secretarial rung in the ladder of success, Miss Stedman's great wisdom would be readily apparent.

At the University of Michigan an interesting concept of vocational guidance is described by James H. Robertson, assistant dean, as follows:

"As you know, 'vocational guidance' is a many-faceted term. In its broadest sense, we like to think that clarification or discovery of educational and vocational goals is a very desirable end product of the total experience of the first 2 years in college. Approximately 75 percent of our freshmen enter with reasonably definite notions about their vocational or professional future. Frequently, these notions rest on shaky foundations, for during the freshman and sophomore years when students are expected to range widely in natural sciences, social sciences, languages, and the humanities, over 50 percent of our students change their views regarding their goals. The causes for such changes are, I think, the first-hand experience students have had in their courses, in talks with instructors and faculty counselors and with other students. New professional and vocational possibilities have opened up to these young students and, more important, they have had a chance to discover their own capabilities, interests, and weaknesses—factors which may not have been given sufficient weight in arriving at their first announced objectives."

Two effective operations at Hamilton College were described by Dean Winton Tolles, as follows:

"Alumni vocational conferences four times a year. At these meetings a team of three alumni discuss some business or profession from various angles. When banking is discussed, for example, a small-town banker, a large-city banker, and a specialist in investments might make up the team. Talks are followed by a discussion and personal interviews are conducted the next day. We feel this to be a strong part of our program.

"An alumni job advisory service which is organized on a geographical basis. In theory any student can consult a designated alumnus in his home area and be referred to a man in the locality capable of discussing a a certain business or profession."

At the University of Virginia, Mr. Howard Bryant, director of the office of student aid and placement, tells of another interesting development:

"We have just developed a systematic plan for cataloging business and industrial publications and making these available to students. We also utilize the services of leading business and industrial representatives to counsel students and to discuss occupational opportunities with them. Selected films in these fields are shown to various groups of students and numerous group meetings are held for the purpose of vocational guidance."

The whole concept of vocational guidance is so well stated in a publication of Harvard College that I should like to quote it:

"What career a student pursues, how he prepared for it, how effectively he uses his resources to make the most of his potentialities within the career which he has chosen, is rightly the concern of all who work with him. The student's career problem is not an isolated one; it is clearly related to his intellectual and academic training and achievement and to his overall adjustment and degree of emotional maturity. It is doubtful that one office can fully penetrate all the complexities surrounding the student's vocational problem without the benefit of the substantial advice of those who are frequently in contact with students on other matters which impinge upon the total problem. In the broader sense, placement is a problem for the entire faculty, and for all who are engaged in advising the Harvard student."

The machinery for vocational guidance in United States colleges and universities is pretty much the same. It varies only in size and quality with the resources and enrollment of the institutions. The best possible job is being done under a given set of conditions. But is it enough? And hasn't the time come for raising our sights on a truly major problem?

Important recognition of the gravity and the magnitude of this problem was shown by President Eisenhower while he was head of Columbia University. There for 5 years the members of the Conservation of Human Resources staff have been devoting themselves to the task of contributing to basic knowledge about how our human resources determine the shape of our economics and society. Work has been singled out as the key institution for intensive study. Not only do men devote many years to preparing for work and the actual performance of the work, but work largely determines how they live and the satisfactions that they derive from life.

The Conservation of Human Resources is a cooperative undertaking involving Columbia University, the business community, foundations, trade unions, and the Federal Government. Columbia has provided the professional staff; industry, the financial support; and the Federal Government a rich fund of statistical and other materials. The Department of the Army and the Veterans' Administration have made particularly significant contributions to the project by furnishing large bodies of basic data and case materials. The Ford Foundation has made a one-time grant for the support of the project. Thirteen leading corporations have been contributing to the annual budget.

It was equally heartening to me to note that only this week in Washington the annual fall sessions of the National Academy of Economics and Political Science took for a general subject "Human Resources and National Security" and such authorities as Brig. Gen. Donald Armstrong, president of the National Academy of Economics and Political Science; Edward A. Fitzpatrick, president emeritus of Mount Mary College; Eli Ginzberg, director of Conservation of Human Resources, the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University; Robert D. Calkins, president, The Brookings Institution; Howard A. Meyerhoff, executive director of the Scientific Manpower Commission; Eugene M. Kulischer, demographer-consultant with the Library of Congress, all led the discussion.

All this is highly encouraging, certainly a step in the right direction, and all at a very high level. But to get back to the college campus, let us reexamine what is happening in the important vocational guidance area, viz:

1. You have the college machinery for this purpose which follows a natural pattern already described.

2. You have the great business and industrial organizations telling their story and recruiting—and doing it well.

3. You have the parental guidance which often becomes something of a handicap because it is too restricted by personal values and emotions to be of much help.

What's missing?

With psychosomatic medicine so concerned at the moment about relieving human tension, you are probably best qualified to ask whether our vocational and aptitude tests, and our counsellors and psychologists have yet caught up with some of the fundamental decisions that young people will have to make if they are to lead successful, effective and happy lives. For nobody understands better than you that a key factor in man's relation to his environment is the vocation or profession which he pursues. May I state a few questions that you might ask:

1. Would the graduate be better—or worse—off by joining a small growing company with good potential but not yet financially able to offer life security than by joining one of America's titans? This, of course, can only be answered in terms of the talents, character and personality of the person involved and in the light of his mental attitude toward a difficult and hazardous challenge.

2. Would the undergraduate be better off in a less glamorous field—the movies, the theater, concert and opera, radio and TV, publishing and advertising are the glamorous fields, of course. What looks like dull prosaic businesses are limited only by the imagination of men—and may be uranium mines if the graduate is interested in uranium.

3. Would the graduate be better off to start in a comparatively menial job in an area he is excited about rather than to take a better paying job at a higher level with something than down deep in his heart bores him? This is another highly personal decision.

I am more interested in stating problems and asking questions than in solving or answering them. But if you want to pin me down as to two recommendations I'll try to oblige.

My first recommendation would be that there should be an organized effort to pres-

ent to young people the opportunities for a happy and highly lucrative career in small business. This will take a lot more scouting and effort by the undergraduates; the jobs will not be offered on a platter. I doubt whether a company which may have such an opening owns a platter.

My second recommendation is that we get better organized to explain in geographical terms where the bigger opportunities for many vocations and professions exist in the United States. We are now telling the undergraduate what he might do successfully but are we telling him where he might do it even more successfully How many colleges can counsel on that point? This is a vast and growing country full of new and exciting opportunities. Having traveled this country extensively, I had this thought when I was in the Northwest this past summer on a business trip. To carry out this idea I urge strongly that vocational counselors be given more opportunity for extensive travel and personal observation. The expenditure for such travel would pay rich dividends.

To sum up:

1. We should reexamine the growing policy of a shorter average working span at a time of a lengthening average life span.

2. Vocational guidance must be more effective with a shorter trial and error period as a result of a shorter average working span.

3. Let's not overlook the big chances in small business.

4. Let's look beyond established areas in employment for new and expanding sections in the United States that hold the equivalent of uranium in jobs for prospectors of another type—the kind of prospectors that have made America strong and great.

As that part of our citizenry concerned every minute of your lives with our human resources, you would seem to be the logical group to ask questions and make demands on the rest of us lest your dedication to a noble work be less effective than it has the right to be.

Do Americans Really Want Freer Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Do Americans Really Want Freer Trade?" prepared by Col. Willard F. Rockwell, a steel executive of Pittsburgh, Pa.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO AMERICANS REALLY WANT FREER TRADE?—LOUISVILLE, KY.—WHAS–TV SIXTH KENTUCKY WORLD TRADE CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 13, 1955

(By Willard F. Rockwell)

The answer to the question, "Do Americans Really Want Freer Trade?" will depend on how clearly Americans understand the issues involved and the ultimate effect on their personal and national welfare if there is a drastic change. They certainly will oppose lower tariffs if they believe the following statements:

1. Lower tariffs will cause many Americans to lose their jobs.

2. American investments in commerce and industry will shrink in value.

3. This shrinkage of values will hurt every American because it will cause losses in commercial and industrial securities now held by pension and life-insurance institutions, charitable and educational funds, banks and investment trusts.

4. Every American commercial and industrial activity which is wiped out or weakened by lower tariffs will reduce the vast productive capacity which has made us the greatest power on earth in both peacetime and wartime.

5. Even the threat of lower tariffs will make it more difficult to raise the capital required to build factories and other facilities, and our people's savings will consequently either remain idle or be invested abroad.

6. We shall be defying the advice of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Alexander Hamilton, each of whom advocated protective tariffs as the only means of building industry in the colonies, where, in their time, 85 percent of the workers obtained their living from agricultural pursuits and depended almost entirely on foreign countries to provide our country with the tools of peace and the machines and munitions required to defend our country. In less than two centuries, our constitutional guaranties and the protective tariff enabled us to own over 40 percent of the industrial capacity of this earth though our population and land area are each less than 7 percent of the earth's total.

7. If foreign cartels ever dominate our sources of supply of any manufactured goods, they will continuously raise prices until American manufacturers attempt to compete—then they will lower prices until they discourage that American competition. Our American newspaper publishers now have an example in the newsprint field.

In the last 5 years, the effect of tariff reduction has been emphatically indicated by two sadly misdirected experiments. Disregarding the advice of his own tariff commission, the President reduced tariffs on Swiss watch movements in 1949 and on bicycles. It took only 5 years to prove that these tariff reductions threw thousands of American workers out of jobs, brought American factories face-to-face with bankruptcy, and, after the Secretary of Defense had testified that this country's industry must maintain a corps of expert watchmakers to protect its defense needs, the tariffs were raised—but irreparable damage had been done to all the American interests just mentioned. Furthermore, the countries which had temporarily increased their exports to this country claimed they were damaged by our raising tariffs to protect our own vital interests, and that, if we did not reverse the action and again reduce these tariffs, we must reduce tariffs on other American products to compensate them, though they cannot show that we owed them anything in the first place. When our State Department complained recently to the Swiss Federation of Watchmakers that a million watch movements are being smuggled into the United States annually, we were told that smuggling cannot, or will not, be stopped until our tariffs are radically reduced.

Now, let us see what the British have to say about the benefits of American investment and the introduction of American methods in the British Isles. The District Bank Review, published in Manchester, England, in September 1955, states that many American firms have established manufacturing plants in England and find their costs are "from one-third to one-half below those of the parent United States companies." It also says that "dividend remissions to the United States by such foreign branches have been relatively small, and their future growth may be more than matched by expanding exports," which, obviously, will be at the expense of United States factories' employment and general welfare. It also states that, in contrast to 1938, when 70 percent of certain engineering and chemical lines were imported from the United States, the United Kingdom is now nearly self-sufficient—(thanks to gifts and loans by our Government of funds derived from American taxpayers.)

Manufactured products imported from abroad take jobs away from American workers and wipe out savings, simultaneously reducing the earning power of competing American plants. As the Review states, both the invested capital and earnings of American-owned subsidiaries in the British Isles stay in the United Kingdom, where they provide for expansion to enable greater future raids on American workers and investors. Can United States industry grow if its foreign subsidiaries' profits are frozen so they must be invested abroad?

When a dollar is spent by an American for a product made wholly in the United States, more than 80 cents of that dollar finds it way into the pockets of American workers through wages and salaries paid directly to American workers and indirectly for every raw material, metal casting, semi-finished or finished product, and every service such as electric power, water, gas, legal and other professional services, and to 10 million local, State, and Federal employees. Dollars spent for products made entirely in a foreign country provide no wages for American workers or profits to investors in American industry. Out of every dollar received by an American manufacturer for his finished product, at least 25 cents eventually finds it way back to the local, State, or Federal tax collecting agencies, who, in turn, spend 80 percent of it to support government functions such as local policing, national defense, and 10 million civilian and military personnel employed and paid by local, State, and Federal governments. Dollars spent for foreign products imported duty free pay not a single penny to support your local, State, and Federal Governments—so when you buy foreign goods, you add to the already burdensome taxes on American workers and such industries as survive tariff reductions.

The largest ball bearing manufacturer in the world outside of the United States has headquarters in Sweden. Its investments in buildings and machinery, identical to plants in the United States, require one-third less investment, and new machinery can be written off against profits in 1 year. Its workers receive less than one-fourth of the $2.50 per hour wage of American ball bearing workers. It has plants in the United States, so it has the benefit of all American management know-how.

During World War II, our United States Government engaged in "preclusive" buying, under which we attempted to buy so much of the Swedish ball bearing output that we could preempt shipments to enemy countries. Obviously, if reduced tariffs permit European manufacturers to wipe out our ball bearing industry with its specialized machinery and expert workers, it would be impossible for us in wartime to import enough bearings to construct military airplanes and other essential war machines.

American newspapers bought newsprint under free-trade competition until over 75 percent of the newsprint came from other countries. Now they learn that prices are to be advanced $10 per ton, and they are begging Congress to encourage American production to bring back the free-enterprise competition to offset cartel action.

An ardent advocate of lower tariffs before the recent congressional hearings inquiring into the effect of lowering tariffs, was quoted as follows: "The American workman can turn out 2 to 10 times as much production as his European counterpart." This

statement received the widest publicity, although it is an infamous half-truth. If the American athlete could run twice as fast or jump 10 times as high as his European counterpart, we might believe that the American worker can turn out 2 to 10 times as much as his European counterpart. Our American worker can only turn out 2 to 10 times as much work as his European counterpart if he is provided with 2 to 10 times as much horsepower and 2 to 10 times as much investment in power-driven machinery and other production-increasing facilities which are not available to his European counterpart.

When the European worker is given the same kind of machines and facilities, he can produce just as much as the American worker, and he works longer hours at lower pay. Since the end of the war, our Government has furnished billions of dollars to European countries, and, in many cases, gave them the most modern factories of American design, equipped with the most modern American machinery, with the result that they are producing as much, or more, than their American counterparts.

The most vociferous advoacte of lower tariffs has been Mr. Clarence Randall, of the President's Commission. He would have us believe that all Americans will benefit by lower tariffs, but being unable to deny the disastrous consequences of cutting tariffs on watches and bicycles, he made this remarkable statement: "We can't help someone without hurting somebody." It is doubtful if many of our citizens believe that American workers and investors should be hurt to help any foreign "body." Remember that no country in the history of the world ever had either the wealth or the will to spread $40 billion among its allies and former enemies after a war in which the United States gained nothing tangible, and lost the lives and the blood of millions of its citizens and $600 billion of its wealth.

Although Mr. Randall claimed to be a tariff expert, he recently emphatically denied that European countries subsidized exports. He said that subsidizing exports to the United States was illegal because we have a law which forbids dumping of foreign goods at below their actual cost. He must know by now that foreign dumping has always existed. For his enlightment, I have a have a Spanish bulletin issued in Madrid in October, 1955, which states that water meters and melons produced in Spain have been added to the list of products which receive export bonuses for exports made to the dollar zone, which, of course, includes the United States. Subsidies granted by European governments range from special favorable rates on currency exchange and rebates on taxes, to cutrate credit insurance and special guaranties and rewards for obtaining United States dollars. You will be told that these dollars are used to buy goods manufactured in the United States, but you will find that many of them are spent in countries which will not accept European currencies, because they are manipulated by the issuing government.

The free governments of Western Europe were aided in their World War II survival and subsequent rapid recovery by the military and financial aid rendered to them by the United States. If the United States is weakened financially or industrially, we cannot extend similar aid in the future. If Europeans want free trade, they could practice it among themselves. There are 280 million people in Western Europe, and they can form a United States of Europe: cut down their trade barriers, currency restrictions, and national jealousies so that they may obtain the two great industrial benefits which have made the United States the most powerful ever known. These are: mass production and mass buying power, neither of which can exist without the other. If we, in the United States had trade barriers and restrictions between our States, the millions of automobiles made in Michigan could not be made and freely shipped into other States which set up trade restrictions. If the European type of artificial trade barriers prevented the agricultural South and the Midwest from freely selling their products into the industrial Central and Northeastern States, we would have the same self-imposed handicaps which prevent Western European nations, with their much larger aggregate population, from meeting our low mass production costs and other national benefits that are derived from our way of life.

Congressional committees were told there are no trade barriers between the Netherlands and Belgium since 1952, although wages are 25 percent higher in Belgium. Here are quotations from the Belgian Trade Review of October 1955 describing the action taken when Belgian producers faced a crisis in late 1952:

"Representatives of private industry in Belgium and the Netherlands, in cooperation with their governments, held many conferences to determine reasons for the crisis and to find mutually acceptable solutions. In the majority of cases an agreement eventually was reached to lessen Netherlands competition in the Belgian market. As a rule the Netherlands industries affected voluntarily limited their sales in Belgium for the time being."

Please observe that American manufacturers are forbidden by law to either discuss or agree to restrict either domestic or foreign competition.

Does any American believe that we would have the highest living standard of any country in the world, if we had always depended on foreign countries for our essential manufacturing needs? If we had done so, we would probably now be split up into colonies ruled from Europe, and Europe would be dominated by the dictator in the strongest industrial country.

Tariff protection is absolutely essential to our freedom.

GTA Radio Roundups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two GTA Daily Roundups issued by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association of St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1956.

What seems like ages ago, but was just last Monday, President Eisenhower gave his farm program to Congress. Last Saturday, ex-President Truman answered him, and told the Nation why he thought the program was no good, "wouldn't help farmers," he said, in effect.

As a Democrat, Harry Truman took out after the Eisenhower administration's farm record with relish. The always outspoken Missourian was never in better form, judging from the cheers and applause that he got from the Democratic-Farmer Labor rally in St. Paul. The cheers and whistles and applause went out over the Nation on TV screens and radios. What President Truman did was to fire the first big cannon in what promises to be a big artillery duel in the 1956 presidential campaign. The question is, "Who sold the farmers down the river, and who will bring them back again?"

Some of the Trumanisms that got the biggest applause were these: "The mess in agriculture is clearly attributable to the Eisenhower administration. The blame lies nowhere else. The Eisenhower administration has been following a deliberate policy of driving farm prices down. As they keep right on lowering prices, production keeps right on increasing, and surpluses get bigger and bigger."

"The administration officials love International Harvester and General Motors, but are rather cool to the old-fashioned dirt farmer." Mr. Truman then proposed four ways the administration could help farmers, if they really wanted to. They are, 1: Consult with some real dirt farmers instead of with bankers and processors and farm-extension specialists and big-business men. 2: Tackle all out the job of reducing surpluses. 3: Improve the diet of underprivileged people at home. 4: Restore price supports at 90 percent of parity.

In Washington, it was Vice President NIXON'S lot to answer ex-President Truman. He said the ex-President's "memory seems to be playing tricks on him when he tries to put the blame for low farm prices on the Eisenhower-Benson farm program."

Now, let's look at some facts. Farm prices were at their high point in January 1951. When Truman left office in January 1953, they were at 94 percent of parity, after a 15-percent drop. Then the Eisenhower-Benson team took over. Farm prices started skidding again, fell 16½ percent more, down to an average of less than 80 percent of parity. There you are as of today. But, farmers aren't so concerned as to who's to blame. What they want to know is, who is going to do something to stop falling farm prices, and when.

Right now, the burden falls on the party in power, the Eisenhower-Benson team. That's what has the Republican Senators and Representatives worrying, they are trying to take over and call the signals. They started with the farm program. Will it work soon enough? Time will tell, when farmers keep that date in 1956. That'll be the answer.

In the meantime, organize and build and market your grain, GTA, the co-op way.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 17, 1956.

What makes politicians run scared, as they are doing now? Or, run confident, as the Republicans ran to defeat in 1948? Politicians are like rabbits and scare easily. So, sometimes, it is just a shadow that frightens them, or again, it may be the real thing. Right now, it is the way a small minority of the people are feeling that has the politicians running scared. The farmers, and the way they vote, has them scared.

Farmers make up only 13 percent of our population, but the way the elections go in many cities and towns, with Republican and Democratic votes canceling each other out, gives farmers in many States a precarious balance of power. They tipped the balance to the Democrats in 1948, and then jumped back on the Republican bandwagon in 1952, were somewhat undecided in 1954, and now they're waiting to see which wagon they get aboard in 1956. That's the big reason farm news makes headlines these days. It is an election year. Farm prices are made in Washington.

Right now, they are back to the prewar 1940 levels—and farmers, an awful lot of them, are awful close to that disaster level that Secretary Benson talked about in a St. Valentine's Day speech in St. Paul in 1953. Who is to blame? Politicians blame each

other. Farmers like that, but expect more than buck-passing and blaming. They want steps taken to straighten out the farm mess in Washington. How will farmers vote? We know they have a date in 1956, but how they will vote, November will tell. It will be on the record politicians make in Washington. But, here is what the poll-takers and opinion-finders say is happening:

Currently, Republicans in Minnesota are happy over the findings of a recent Minneapolis Tribune poll. It said that 77 percent of Minnesotans approve President Eisenhower's performance in office so far. It's not so high on the farms—only 60 percent of the farmers approve, but still a good showing for Ike. Secretary of Agriculture Benson, and GOP farm policy are a different story. In another Minnesota poll, 73 percent of Minnesota farmers said they don't like the way Benson is handling things. One-half the farmers said they'd be better off with a change of administration in Washington—that means, better off under the Democrats than under the Republicans.

In a nationwide Gallup poll, farmers showed up 3 to 1 against administration farm policies. Just recently, the Gallup poll-takers asked a cross-section of all voters whether they would register as of today in the Republican or Democratic column; 59 percent said Democratic; 41 percent said Republican.

So, climb the poll you like, Republican or Democrat, you can find encouragement in somebody's fingering of the public pulse. But, the big question of 1956—how farmers will vote this year—hasn't been answered. Farmers won't tell. Maybe some haven't made up their minds. Chances are they're waiting to see what the present Congress will do. And, the President, too—who blows hot and cold, but mostly cold, on farm prices.

The Senate Agricultural Committee begins hearings today. The general manager of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, M. W. Thatcher, leaves for Washington tomorrow. He'll testify Friday afternoon, and he'll have printed copies of the 200-page GTA Family Farm Survey, just off the press in final book form, to lay before the Senators. It is the final word on what the cost-price squeeze already has done to family agriculture. What farmers want is legislation to stop the big squeeze, if it takes a law. If one party doesn't do the job, farmers are prepared to give the other party a chance. That's their "date in '56."

But, farmers aren't just wasting time waiting. They're organizing, and building cooperation with bushels. They're marketing their grain, GTA, the co-op way.

Simon E. Sobeloff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, it is well known, I believe, that I have been one of the strongest backers of President Eisenhower's nomination of Mr. Simon E. Sobeloff for a seat on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

Unfortunately, there was opposition to the nomination when it was first presented last year, and it became necessary for the President to send us his selection again during this session.

My own high regard for Mr. Sobeloff has been expressed so frequently that it needs no repetition. It is, therefore, a pleasure to be able to present similar opinions from newspapers which have long kept their keen, journalistic eyes on the day-by-day public life of Mr. Sobeloff. One of the editorials was published in the January 14, 1956, edition of the Baltimore Evening Sun, and the other in the Baltimore Sun of January 19, 1956. I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 14, 1956]

THE SOBELOFF NOMINATION

Mr. Simon E. Sobeloff was originally nominated last year for a seat on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. When Congress adjourned on August 2, the nomination was still in the files of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has done nothing about it.

Now the President has resubmitted the nomination. The nomination ought to be considered by the committee promptly, and it should be promptly reported to the Senate, where we are sure it will receive confirmation. There can be no excuse for a repetition of the dilatory procedure followed last year, when the committee held up action while individual Senators made what they called "investigations." The "investigators" were southerners who wished to punish Mr. Sobeloff for having argued the desegregation cases before the Supreme Court on behalf of the Government. Their tactics recall, in a disquieting way, the procedure which so long delayed the nomination of Justice Harlan to the Supreme Court. That procedure was a disgrace to the Senate and should not be repeated now.

Mr. Sobeloff made an excellent record as Solicitor General. He had previously served as chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals. His qualifications for the post are numerous and impressive. As President Eisenhower himself said last July, Congress has a right to make a thorough investigation of a nominee's record. It does not have the right to hold up all action merely to satisfy the personal animosity of a few Senators.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 19, 1956]

WHY DELAY LONGER MR. SOBELOFF'S CONFIRMATION?

Once more President Eisenhower has sent the name of Simon E. Sobeloff to the Senate for confirmation as United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. At present Mr. Sobeloff is, of course, Solicitor General of the United States, a post which he has filled with remarkable wisdom and success.

When the President submitted Mr. Sobeloff's name at the previous session opposition immediately developed, led by the two Senators from South Carolina, THURMOND and JOHNSTON. Ostensibly they objected because of a feeling that the new judge should come from their State, which lies within the fourth circuit. But no secret was made of the fact that underlying opposition existed because Mr. Sobeloff had so successfully argued the antisegregation cases before the Supreme Court.

The important thing for more open-minded Senators to remember is that Mr. Sobeloff is a brilliant lawyer, with the widest possible experience and a reputation for wholehearted devotion to the public welfare. His first experience was as clerk for Judge Morris A. Soper (whose retirement makes the vacancy he is selected to fill) and in many ways he has patterned his career after that of his first patron. No lawyer could have had a finer mentor. It is true that he has had comparatively brief experience on the bench, but that experience was as chief judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals, one of the most respected judicial bodies in the country. His associates on that court have testified to his quick grasp of its procedures and his wholly judicial bearing. And as for the charge that he displayed bias in the antisegregation cases, the event proved that the members of the Supreme Court accepted his arguments unanimously. What greater proof of legal acumen could be presented?

Underlying all these considerations is this one: The fourth circuit needs its full complement of judges. To postpone any longer the confirmation of Judge Soper's successor is to put an unjust burden on that distinguished jurist and upon his colleagues on the bench.

Hunger Versus Overproduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the question of surplus is one that is receiving much attention as the farm problem is debated. Considered a liability by administration leaders, surplus, in the thinking of an able Oregon country editor, could be an asset. Gwen T. Coffin, editor and publisher of the Wallowa County Chieftain, of Enterprise, Oreg., discussed the subject in his December 15, 1955, edition under the title "Hunger Versus Overproduction."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial of Mr. Coffin.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGER VERSUS OVERPRODUCTION

Efforts to find some way to establish the farm income at a satisfactory level are stirring up a multitude of plans and vast amount of controversy. Some people may have misgivings about the need and desirability of farm price supports and subsidies, but the politicians are almost unanimous in backing some sort of Government assistance. So anyone who has opinions in favor of letting the farmer fight out his problems on an open market without Government regulation or control might as well forget about them.

The individual farmer, who has no control over total production or prices, is in no position to run a successful business without help from the Government, however much he might like to be independent. He might accomplish the same thing the Government does for him by voluntary associations, but this is extremely unlikely.

But most of the plans for assisting the farmer, including the so-called "soil bank" plan sponsored by the Republican administration, accept as a basic principle that there is an oversupply of farm commodities and production must be curtailed. The "soil bank" plan (which would sound less attractive if called a "Plan for paying farmers not

to produce crops") calls for payments to farmers who will agree to take marginal lands out of crop production and allow them to lie idle. The "bank" idea comes in from the theory that these retired lands would be held in reserve to increase in fertility and to be used when future population needs might require an increase in production.

But few students of the world's population figures and the food needs of some billion people will agree that the first order of business should be to cut down on the amount of food produced. Hundreds of millions of people are not getting anywhere near enough to eat, and a lot of these hungry people are here in our own country, as any welfare administrator can readily testify. To pay out money as a bribe to induce farmers to produce less seems almost criminal in the light of the hunger from which a large part of the world is suffering.

There are many people who believe that billions of dollars spent to produce bigger armies and more guns will do more to make the world safe and happy than billions spent for food and other forms of economic assistance, but they may be wrong. It might be that a few billions would do more to promote friendship for the United States and peace in the world if they were spent to supply millions of people living in misery with food, clothing, and homes instead of guns, airfields, and tanks. The hunger which breeds communism will not be satisfied by armies or armaments.

The basic premise for any farm plan in this country which makes sense is the need to get more foodstuffs to people who don't have enough to eat. This means that production should not be curtailed until the hungry are fed. It also means that most of the hungry people of the world will have to get food cheaper than they can get it now. The farmer who grows this food cannot, under present circumstances, raise it and sell it at a price which the hungry can pay. Nor can he carry the whole load of supporting the people who cannot afford to pay what it costs him to raise his products. Therefore, what goes to the hungry of the world, for free or at below-cost rates, will have to be paid for in whole or in part by everybody.

This means coming around to a two-price plan, the price for the domestic market, where presumably people can afford to pay enough to keep the farmer in business, and another for foreign markets, where people will take our surplus only at prices below our production costs. Or it means coming around to a plan which will allow farm products to go on the open market for whatever they will bring with the Government making up the difference between these market prices and the farmers' costs. This plan would promote the widest possible use of farm commodities when coupled with a program for out-and-out grants to people who cannot afford to pay anything. It is essentially the so-called Brannan plan, a much maligned proposal, but one of the most sensible and humane which has been proposed to date.

The United States and U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "United States Gets Better Results When It Bypasses U. N.," written by Edward B. Simmons, and published in the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN YEARS OF THE U. N.—SOVIET'S GREATEST HOAX—UNITED STATES GETS BETTER RESULTS WHEN IT BYPASSES U. N.

(By Edward B. Simmons)

Surest evidence that the United Nations cannot maintain the peace or protect against Communist aggression has been the foreign policy of the United States since the U. N. was founded.

In every instance in which a foreign relations crisis was of such urgency and importance that failure could not be contemplated, or risked, the United States has acted independently or in concert with other nations, outside of the U. N.

This has been the pattern from aid to Greece and Turkey in 1946–47, only a year after the founding of the U. N., to the United States guaranty of money and protection for Egypt and Israel in August of 1955. Acting outside the U. N. has, generally, brought success; negotiations and action taken through the U. N. have meant failure.

A notable example was the war in Korea, in which the United States made a brilliant contribution to permanent peace by acting alone and ordering United States troops to oppose a Communist aggression. Thereafter, under U. N. auspices, the cause of peace found failure in a stalemated war and an uneasy, already violated, armistice.

PUBLIC SHARES UNITED STATES ATTITUDE

The reluctance in official United States quarters to rely on the U. N. to safeguard the Nation's interests now is shared by the public. When the Truman doctrine for aiding Greece and Turkey was announced, there were many protests against bypassing the U. N. Today, the administration's independent policy for meeting issues like the Communist uprising in Guatemala and rearming of Western Germany has full public support. A decision to act through the U. N. in these matters would have raised misgivings.

The U. N. Charter, to be sure, provides for solving problems by "regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means * * * " provided "they are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

However, the emphasis placed on the historical balance of power system—as in the rearming of Western Germany—and on alliances is indication that colective security under the U. N. has failed. Clearly the U. N. has been by-passed far more than ever was contemplated.

A U. N. summary of debate in the ninth General Assembly of 1954 took notice of this condition:

"The trend to go outside the United Nations in negotiating questions of world concern was deplored by a number of delegates as diminution of the rightful role of the organization. Another group of speakers maintained that since such meetings as the Geneva Conference (on Indochina) were countenanced by the charter, they did not affront the U. N.

"Generally, there was a consensus that the position of the organization must not be weakened. Some believed it should be fortified. Nearly all speakers used the question of so-called bypassing as a springboard from which to plunge into a search for the underlying causes, or what were deemed to be the weaknesses of the U. N."

The wishful thinking of the Assembly debate apparently did not lead to any answer. Bypassing of the U. N. has continued at even greater pace.

The extent to which the United States, a co-founder and the underwriter of the U. N., has skipped the organization's facilities in searching for free-world security is evident in these agreements:

For the West, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization of 14 nations, and the more recent Western European Union of 7 nations.

For the South, the Organization of American States of 20 nations.

For the East, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization of eight nations.

Acting independently, the United States last year signed military assistance pacts with nations like Honduras and Nicaragua, which happen to be the two border states of Guatemala, and a mutual assistance pact with the Nationalist China Government on Formosa. All were taken without consulting the U. N.

Earlier, besides its unilateral steps in regard to Greece, Turkey, and Korea, the United States broke the Soviet blockade of Berlin by the famous airlift and promulgated the gigantic Marshal plan for speeding free world economic recovery.

SITUATION EMBARRASSING

However, the United States Government has continued to pay lip-service praise to the virtues of acting through the U. N. a hypocrisy that has more than once led to embarrassment.

Guatemala was an example.

On June 18, 1954, U. N. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., little realizing what the next day would bring, rebuked the Soviet U. N. delegation for vetoing a request from Thailand for a U. N. inspection team.

"I hope," said Lodge, "that I will never live to see the day when a small country comes to the U. N. and asks for protection against war and is simply greeted with the question: 'What's the hurry?' "

On June 19, revolution broke out in Guatemala, and that country's U. N. delegate demanded urgent Security Council action. The United States, loath to have the Soviet Union participate in a situation in which the Communist regime of Guatemala was being overthrown, was forced to reverse itself.

Ambassador Lodge declared the matter was no concern of the U. N., that Guatemala was not entitled to request U. N. intervention and that the Organization of American States was the proper arena for the dispute.

HARD ON U. N. PRESTIGE

It may have been the proper course for the United States, but it did not enhance the prestige of the U. N.

When the United States has acted under U. N. auspices, as in Iran, freedom for Morocco, liberation of United States airmen imprisoned by Communist China, and in unification for Korea, the results have been unfortunate.

As a result of the dilatory attitude of the U. N. of Arab problems, with which the United States was associated, American prestige has zoomed downward among the 70 mililon Arabs.

"Ten years ago, an American flag on a car was like a letter of recommendation from the Prophet," one veteran United States observer has stated. "Today it is likely to be a good target." (What the Arabs Think, by W. L. Polk.)

The late Dr. Stephen B. L. Penrose, for many years president of the American University in Beirut, Lebanon, which has 3,000 students from 26 Arab States, said in the fall of 1954, "By a peculiar and unfortunate turn of circumstances, the situation is such that the Arabs in general now think of Russia as the exponent of liberalism, democracy and freedom, whereas the United States, in their minds, is all too frequently considered to stand for colonialism, imperialism and reaction." (Quoted in Guideposts to the Future, by Gen. William H. Wilbur.)

In 1952, the American president of Cairo University stated that "American prestige in the Arab world has gone from 100 to 0 in the past 10 years."

PRESTIGE LOST IN KOREA

The prestige and affection Americans built up in Korea by defending the free half of that country with their lives and helping it economically is rapidly being dissipated.

Because United States troops have been assigned to protect the U. N.'s Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, a Communist-dominated unit that has incurred the enmity of South Koreans.

The U. N. was completely ineffectual in gaining release of United States airmen captured by Communist Chinese during the Korean war. The General Assembly voted December 10, 1954, for "continuous and unremitting" efforts to bring about the release of the 11 airmen and 475 other Americans of the U. N. Command. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold traveled to Peiping. Nothing was accomplished in 8 months.

Only direct United States talks with Communist Chinese representatives at Geneva in July 1955 secured the airmen's release.

It is little wonder that the older the U. N. grows, the more widespread is United States devotion to regional pacts and independent action in the interests of their and the rest of the free world's security.

Surely, it scarcely is a credit to the U. N.'s role that the American Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, has traveled more than 250,000 miles in search of peace when the organization charged with maintaining it is within 200 miles of Washington.

The Family Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Big Business Must Not Replace Family Farms," which appeared in the Tupelo Journal, of Tupelo, Miss., on November 10, 1955.

I am greatly concerned about our overall agriculture situation, and particularly as it relates to small- and family-size farm units. I do not believe that certain Department of Agriculture officials understand the true value of our small- and medium-sized farmers and the important contribution they make to our economy and our American way of life. If a few owners continue to acquire all of our land in blocks of thousands of acres, then, in time, our great middle group of people will be driven from the land and there will be none left to be shared by our increasing population. When those of our great middle group no longer have a chance to own land and property from which they can make a living, then their independence and their freedom will be lost and our form of government will begin to deteriorate. I strongly feel that the Department of Agriculture should give special attention to developing a program which would enable these farm famiiles to increase their standards of living and hold on to their land.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG BUSINESS MUST NOT REPLACE FAMILY FARM

We had to look twice the other day to believe the dateline on a news item we saw.

The story concerned an address made by a high agricultural official.

This is what he said:

"Farming is no longer a way of life. It is big business. The Nation's small farms are doomed."

That, we said to ourselves, sounds like a Russian official telling Soviet peasants they must give up their independence and join a collective.

But the story wasn't from Moscow. It was from Jackson, Miss.

And the man who expressed the opinion that farming is no longer a way of life was not an official of some Socialist state but the Deputy Administrator of the Federal Extension Service.

It may be reasonably assumed, therefore, that the policy of our current national administration is resignation to the fact that agriculture must be turen over to big business—another way of saying that the Nation's family farms must pass from the scene.

And if this is the correct interpretation to put upon the remarks of Deputy Federal Extension Administrator P. V. Kepner in his address before Mississippi agricultural leaders in Jackson, then we are headed into an even more serious farm situation than has yet appeared evident.

For if it has become the official policy of the United States Government to consider family farms not worth the effort to preserve, then America is destined to lose one of her most valuable assets.

It is easy to sit in Washington and get the idea that turning farming over to big business is the solution to all our problems.

But we should remember that for 25 years Russia and other Communist countries have been trying to convince themselves that agriculture should be considered as big business rather than as a way of life.

And thus far the Reds have got nothing for their trouble but a shortage of practically everything as day laborers simply fail to match the productivity of farmers tilling their own land.

Theoretically, we know, big business is supposed to be efficient.

But many big corporations are very inefficient.

The only reason they can get by is that when one inefficient factory loses money another efficient factory in the same corporation will make a good profit and balance out the loss.

America's family farms, by contrast, are giving the public more and more each year for its dollar.

Completely aside from so-called efficiency, however, should be America's realization that the American way of life is not so much getting the maximum production out of men as it is building maximum character into them.

And if any mode of living has ever been discovered which matches the family farm as a character developer, we have not heard of it.

It is true that agriculture is changing and that 1 farmer can now handle more acres and more animals than he could 20 years ago.

But this is no excuse for turning agriculture over to big business and replacing the family farm with a large commercial enterprise which knows nothing of the neighborliness and the devotion to the soil that have been typical of Americas' farm families through the years.

As Mr. Kepner commented, "Large farms may provide the solution to our present farm problems."

But a national policy of substituting big business in agriculture for family type farms will create new problems that are far more permanent and more difficult to solve than the temporary surpluses that now bother us.

If, therefore, America wants to remain different from the aging nations of Europe—stronger and sounder upon its foundations—we will make every possible effort to preserve the family farm.

And we will preserve it not just because of whatever degrees of efficiency it may possess but because it still is, as it has been for 100 years, a way of life that develops traits of character that are at the heart of America's greatness and cannot be disposed of without serious and irreplaceable loss to our Nation.

The Proposed Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, editorial pages have been centering attention on various aspects of the farm problem since the President presented his program to Congress on January 9, 1956. The "soil-bank" proposal is the subject most widely discussed. Mr. President, not because I agree with all its conclusions, but because it does show a general spirit of open-mindedness, an editorial from the Portland Oregonian of January 12, 1956, should be of wide interest. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL BANK NO SURE SUCCESS—WOULD SHRINK WHEAT FARMS

Most significant factor in the Eisenhower two-part soil-bank proposal, so far as the Pacific Northwest is concerned, is that wheat growers are called upon to be the chief depositors.

Already the wheat farmers of America have diverted to other crops some 25 million acres, through acreage allotments under the price-support program. President Eisenhower wants them voluntarily to put aside 12 million additional acres for 3 or 4 years until market-depressing surpluses are reduced to normal. Since wheat is the major agricultural crop of this region, the proposal is of special interest here.

This proposed set-aside is part of the acreage reserve division of Mr. Eisenhower's soil bank plan. It is a sort of crash program—a deferred-production plan, he called it—to get rid of a large part of the surplus of wheat which is choking granaries and laid-up ships. By sharply reducing production, the President hopes commodities now owned by the Government can be used to supply some of the market needs, bringing carryovers down to normal levels in about 3 or 4 years.

Other than wheat, cotton is the only commodity singled out by the President for inclusion in the acreage reserve. Cotton planters would be expected to deposit 3 million acres in this part of the soil bank. Whether corn and rice should be included was left up to Congress.

Does this mean that wheat growers would have to carry the greater part of the financial burden entailed in bringing American agriculture back into balance? The answer

is "No." They would be compensated by the Government, in cash or in kind, for the crops they might have grown on the soil-bank acres. Presumably they would be no better, or no worse off than if they had harvested wheat from the land, since the Government payments would be proportionate and at an incentive level.

In the long run, the wheat farmer would stand to gain from the plan in rising market prices as the surplus was reduced.

They would not be permitted to crop or graze the soil bank acres—and this is good news to livestock men who have worried about the effects of a soil bank on their industry—but they would retain their historic acreage allotments.

The second part of the Eisenhower soil bank is called the conservation reserve and is a more permanent program. The President proposed that some 25 million acres of land most needing conservation measures be diverted through this plan from crops to forage, trees and water storage. Throughout the country, in greater or lesser degree, he said, land is cultivated which sound conservation would have reserved to forage and trees. This results in wastage of soil and water resources and in production of commodities now in surplus.

Any farmer would be eligible to participate in this program, regardless of the crop he produces or the area where his farm is located. The Government would pay a fair share of the cost of establishing the conservation use, sufficiently high to encourage participation, plus annual payments for a period of years depending on the time needed to establish the use.

Land put into the conservation reserve would be in addition to any land placed in the acreage reserve and would represent a reduction in cultivated cropland. The farmer would agree to carry out sound soil and water conservation on the land and to refrain from cropping or grazing it for a specified period.

If Congress acts in time, some $350 million will be invested in the conservation reserve during 1956. This would be in addition to the $250 million already provided under the present agricultural conservation program.

The news columns have told briefly of some of Mr. Eisenhower's other suggestions to better the farmer's lot. Notable are his proposals that dollars and cents limits be placed on price support loans to encourage efficient family-size farms but eliminate immoderately sized payments to huge corporation farms, and that sale of surplus to Iron Curtain countries be permitted. But the soil bank is the principal "new" approach to the farm problem.

The question arises: Will it work? If the soil bank is adopted by Congress—and some form of it almost certainly will be, so strongly is it supported by farm organizations and Congressmen of both parties—only time will tell whether it will be a major factor in a farm problem solution. Past experience does not fill one with confidence.

The New Deal sought to solve a similar problem by paying farmers to take land out of production. Only World War II absorbed the surpluses. But cash was put into the pockets of the farmers and this the soil bank would do, too—but not soon enough, politicians already are crying, to influence the November elections.

Diversion of many millions of acres from wheat and cotton to other crops has not solved the surplus problem, either, in more recent years. The cotton crop, said President Eisenhower, was calculated at 10 million bales this year; instead, 15 million bales were harvested. Wheat production in 1955 was 100 million bushels above demand despite the big reduction in acreage.

By pouring on more fertilizer and otherwise taking advantage of improved technology, more abundant crops can be grown on fewer acres. The wheat yield per acre in the United States jumped from 18.1 to 19.9 bushels between 1954 and 1955. President Eisenhower recommended to Congress that quantity allotments, rather than acreage allotments, be set for cotton and that Congress consider similar action for other crops under marketing quotas. If wheat allotments were in bushels, rather than acreage, lower yielding, but higher quality grain might be produced and the surplus problem lessened.

A soil bank would present difficulties in administration. There would be haggling over what was a fair price to pay individual farmers for not growing crops. And who would see that livestock did not stray on to soil bank land to eat the grass that must not be grazed?

Perhaps the soil bank is the best plan that can be produced at this time. But it should not be thought of as a cure-all. Other means must be pursued to help bring a healthy balance back to agriculture. One hopes Congress, in a desire to give farm income a preelection shot in the arm, will not couple it with some scheme, such as a return to high, rigid supports, which could only do damage in the long run.

Encroachment by the Federal Government on Rights of the States—News Articles and Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, recently many articles and editorials have been published regarding the encroachment of the Federal Government on the rights of the States. I ask unanimous consent that many of these be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News of January 17, 1956]

FEDERALS TRY TO RUN LOCAL COURTS?

It is becoming more and more apparent, as Ray Tucker points out in his column on this page, that the Federal Government, mainly through the Department of Justice, is bent upon more and more interference in what heretofore have been regarded as strictly local affairs.

County and State courts and law-enforcement agencies are going to be kept under much closer Federal surveillance. The slightest complaint that someone has been denied the right to register or vote probably will result in an investigation. Outright harassment in some instances probably will occur.

The United States Supreme Court recently has shown a predilection for reviewing State and county criminal cases, especially those arising in the South, where there may have been no Negroes on the trial jury or eligible for being drawn for service or when the defendant charges brutal treatment at the hands of law-enforcement officers.

This Federal concern for basic rights is not all bad, of course. An accused person, or one who feels his federally guaranteed rights have been tampered with, should have recourse to the courts of last resort. Only in that way can justice be preserved.

But the cause of justice will be dealt a disservice and real freedom endangered if the Federal courts and the Department of Justice intend to try to run local law enforcement and second guess every trial.

As a case in point, the FBI, under orders from the Attorney General, is investigating the jury system in Cobb County, Ga. Such an investigation may be in order, especially as it relates to the possibility that Negroes may be deliberately kept off the jury lists. But the case which has provided the excuse for the investigation hardly warrants such concern.

In this case, the Supreme Court ordered a third trial of a Negro convicted of a heinous crime. While working on a road gang after conviction on two charges of assault with intent to commit robbery, the defendant entered a nearby home and raped a mother in the presence of her baby. Twice he was tried and sentenced to be electrocuted.

In the first trial, the county court appointed counsel to defend him. In the second trial the defense lawyer was furnished by the NAACP.

The main point on which the court ordered the new trial was not the absence of Negroes from the jury panel. The court merely touched on that. The retrial was ordered because the trial court did not appoint counsel for the defendant until after he had been indicted. It is our understanding that it is the usual court practice to appoint counsel only after a defendant is arraigned (which cannot be until after he is indicted) and tells the court he is unable to furnish himself with a lawyer.

At any rate, the court's mention of the jury matter apparently prompted the investigation which has incensed Georgians and is causing concern in Congress.

It could be that Georgia's refusal to obey the antisegregation decision of the Supreme Court has a lot to do with the State's being put on the spot in this matter.

[From the Greenville News of January 17, 1956]

HIGH COURT SEIZES LOCAL JURISDICTION

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON, January 16.—The Supreme Court's unprecedented seizure of jurisdiction over the judicial and prosecuting processes in several county and State cases has alarmed and evoked bitter denunciation from Southern Members of Congress. They suspect that the tribunal is preparing the way to try to enforce its edict against segregation in public schools and parks.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., has mobilized his agency in the maneuver, including J. Edgar Hoover's Federal Bureau of Investigation. Under Brownell's orders, FBI agents are investigating the method of selecting jurors in Cobb County, Ga. Brownell acted after the Supreme Court had reversed the death sentence conviction of a Negro, partly because no colored people served on the grand jury panel or the trial jury.

Four Georgia Members, all of whom have served as county prosecuting attorneys, denounce both actions as unwarranted interference on the flimsiest grounds. They charge that the grounds amount to an attempt to appease the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which complains that the administration makes no effort to carry out the 20-month-old antisegregation decision.

NEW CONCERN OF COURT

In less publicized cases, the Supreme Court has shown new concern over the judicial conduct and procedure of county and State policemen and judges. It is extending the

Federal arm into faraway and questionable fields, in the opinion of many legislators, lawyers, and jurists.

In a 9-year-old case, Chief Justice Earl Warren's Court ordered the retrial of Stephen J. Herman. Herman was convicted in 1946 on 30 counts of burglary, larceny, forgery, and false pretense in Pennsylvania, and given a 10-year sentence.

On the ground that Herman had been beaten up by police and not informed of his right to counsel, the Supreme Court ordered a court hearing of Herman's allegations. He will be released, if he can convince the county court at this late date of the truth of his charges.

In a Seattle case, the Supreme Court upheld a Federal circuit court of appeals order for a hearing of another defendant's charges of police brutality in order to obtain a murder confession.

Both defendants sought Federal relief after they had vainly exhausted all remedies in State courts. In delivering his opinion in the Herman matter, Justice Hugo Black announced that the Supreme Court would follow the same procedure in all complaints of this kind.

ASSUMPTION IN THE PAST

In the past, acting on the assumption that county and State officials were closer to and more familiar with the facts, the high tribunal has generally refused to intervene in these cases.

In view of the 9-year lapse in the Herman affair, for instance, it may be impossible to round up witnesses and police involved in his arrest and trial, especially as he was indicted on 30 counts for 4 different crimes.

But this detailed checkup and policing of local courts by the Federal Government, with the use of FBI agents, may have far-reaching effects, in the opinion of many Congressmen, judges, lawyers, and editors in sensitive areas.

It may be the weapon which the administration will employ against counties and States now engaged in seeking methods to invalidate the Supreme Court's desegregation fiat. It also promises to plunge the judiciary, Federal, State, and local, deep into political controversies on a national scale.

[From the Columbia Record of January 13, 1956]

FEDERAL AID MEANS FEDERAL TAXES

COLUMBIA, S. C.—Gov. George Bell Timmerman, Jr.'s second annual message strongly condemns the idea of Federal aid for the public schools.

"The propaganda for Federal aid," he said, "is based upon a big political hoax, the claim of an acute shortage of school buildings."

"The claim is simply untrue," he declared. "More school buildings have been constructed in America within the last decade than during any other comparable period. The real need is to meet the normal increase in school enrollment, a need which can be met by the several States without resort to the Central Government. In South Carolina," the Governor pointed out, "the State and school districts are meeting their construction needs.

"The effect of Federal aid would be to shift the major responsibility for levying taxes for school purposes from the State legislature to the Central Government," the Governor pointed out. "Federal aid is sugar-coated Federal taxation.

"It is a fanciful dream to think that the Federal Government could assume this tremendous expenditure without additional heavy taxation. * * * It is inconceivable that the Federal Government would cut vast expenditures for national defense, foreign aid, and public welfare assistance—and public debt service which it cannot cut—in order to give money to South Carolina for school purposes.

"The folly of Federal taxation for State services is demonstrated in the field of highway user taxes—taxes levied in the name of better roads. In reality, much goes to support other Federal programs. That is the reason additional heavy Federal taxation has been proposed for the pending Federal highway construction program.

"Propaganda for so-called Federal aid to education ignores these factors."

[From the Columbia Record of January 13, 1956]

STUKES ELEVATED TO CHIEF JUSTICESHIP

The elevation of Associate Justice Taylor H. Stukes of Manning to the chief justiceship of the South Carolina supreme court will meet with wide acclaim.

Justice Stukes, who succeeds Chief Justice Gordon Baker, now resigning, has been a member of the court since February 29, 1940.

He has demonstrated on the bench both a deep knowledge of the law and a capacity for logical thinking as well as the judicial attitude that South Carolina expects of its judges and justices.

Graduated in the law, cum laude, from George Washington University, Justice Stukes served in both the House and Senate of the General Assembly of South Carolina, being named as speaker pro tempore of the house and president pro tempore of the senate during his service which encompassed two eras of financial crisis for the State. He was a member of the house when the State was embarking on the program of indirect taxation in order to relieve the burden on real property and a member of the senate when the depression produced the State's worst financial crisis. His counsel was of importance in solving both crises.

He was still serving in the senate when in 1940 he was named associate justice to fill out the unexpired term of M. L. Bonham, elevated to the chief justiceship.

As chief justice, Mr. Stukes can be counted upon to lead the court in adhering to the constitution as written. For he is a conservative in the proper meaning of the word.

[From the New York Times of January 19, 1956]

IN THE NATION—DOUGLAS ON CONSTRUING THE CONSTITUTION

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—The latest of the protean activities of William O. Douglas, only one of which—though the most important and concentrated—is his service as Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, is a study of constitutional interpretations by the judges of India. This part of his new book, "We the Judges" (Doubleday & Co.), published tomorrow, is of special interest to lawyers and students of law. But the chief interest and significance of the book are supplied by Justice Douglas' comment on the processes and principles by which the Constitution should be construed by the Supreme Court.

Justice Douglas has sometimes dissented from Bill of Rights interpretations on which a majority of his brethren have united. Therefore his outline of what should be the thinking of the Supreme Court when it resolves constitutional issues must be viewed as personal. But it exactly describes the Court's reasoning in the vital matter of segregation by race in the public schools. And it has produced other rulings for which the losing lawyers—and often court dissenters—have denied any authority in the national charter or the statutes. In these instances the Supreme Court has been charged with "legislating," or "amending the Constitution," to carry out the personal predilections of the judges.

PRINCIPLE OF DECISION

Such charges are in effect that the Supreme Court has violated the following principle of decision which Douglas lays down in his chapter, The Judiciary:

"From age to age, the problem of constitutional adjudication is the same. It is to keep the power of government unrestrained by the social or economic theories that one set of judges may import into the Constitution."

This passage, standing alone, is vulnerable to the standard criticism that has been made of the Supreme Court when the majority of its members were the appointees of succeeding Presidents of the same political party and began overturning long-standing rulings made by their predecessors. It has been the stock attack on the Court throughout its history, most recently on the so-called Roosevelt Court whose appointments began in 1937. And Douglas has been one of the chief targets.

A TWO-WAY STATEMENT

The justice proceeds to anticipate and challenge that charge by continuing the passage as follows:

"[The problem] is to keep one age unfettered by the fears or limited vision of another. * * * A fundamental tenet of faith that has evolved from our long experience as a Nation * * * is this: If the social and economic problems of State and Nation can be kept under political management of the people, there is likely to be long-run stability."

But immediately thereafter Douglas gives new life to the charge, particularly as made against "the Roosevelt Court" of which he was an important component, by adding: "It is when a judiciary with life tenure seeks to write its own social and economic creed into the charter that instability is created." This illustrates the difficulty of the task the author set for himself in laying down general guides to decision. For the sum of these passages is that he advocates a judicial end-product which he decries as a judicial principle.

TO FIT EACH GENERATION

This inconsistency, however, does not long detain Douglas in arguing for the proposition that overruling standing constitutional interpretations is periodically necessary if the Nation is to meet and master the sudden storms of an era.

"A judge" he writes "looking at a constitutional decision may have compulsions to revere past history and accept what once was written. But he remembers above all else that it is the Constitution which he swore to support and defend, not the gloss which his predecessors may have put on it. So he comes to formulate his own views * * * [instead of subjecting his thinking] to men long dead and unaware of the problems of the age in which he lives. * * *"

"Stare decisis (standing by prior judicial rules and principles) in constitutional law must give way before the dynamic components of history. Then the cycle starts again. Today's new decision becomes a coveted anchorage for new vested interests. The former proponents of change acquire an acute conservatism. It takes * * * a new generation to catch the broader vision which may require the undoing of the work of their predecessors. That is the way it must be if the Constitution is to remain a living, vital force in the affairs of each generation."

Or, in other words, the Constitution is, and must be, what the current Supreme Court majority says it is, and vary with changing times. Inevitably it follows that justices will continue to "write their own social and economic creeds into the charter."

[From the Columbia State of January 17, 1956]

THE TIMES RELENTS?

The New York Times editorially took a dim view of the result of the Virginia school election, seeing in it victory for the integrationists rather than for the segregationists. This was in line with the general attitude of the Times on the school problem.

Arthur Krock of the Times Washington bureau has written an article which is much more realistic and which takes notice of the southern viewpoint. Mr. Krock's article, which can be considered as further evidence that the dawn may be breaking, is reprinted on this page today. Two of Mr. Krock's pertinent paragraphs read as follows:

"The Federal Constitution was drafted and ratified on the general understanding that it reserved to the States the full possession of their 'local rights.'

"For many years it was established, judicially and legislatively, in the United States, that one of these 'full possessions' was the pattern of public-school education financed by the State taxpayers. When the Supreme Court, in 1954, banned public-school segregation on a simple sociological argument, disregarding all historical and legal complexities, it reversed longstanding precedents by which the school systems of a number of States had been deeply entrenched."

For the New York Times, Mr. Krock has said a lot.

[From the Columbia State of January 17, 1956]

COURT OPINION "SOCIOLOGICAL"—VIRGINIA'S PROTEST LOOMS LARGE BY EVERY STANDARD

(By Arthur Krock, in the New York Tmes)

WASHINGTON, January 11.—When Virginia in 1788 ratified the Constitution of the United States on assurances from James Madison, 'father" of the national charter, and Edmund Randolph, that the Central Government would "take no more sovereignty from the States" than was necessary to "protect and defend it," the prestige of Virginia was effective in routing the opposition in a sufficient number of other States to put the Constitution in force. Up to then ratification was a matter of grave doubt. And the margin in the Virginia convention itself was only 10 votes because there, though Jefferson, Washington, and Marshall supported Madison and Randolph, those who did not accept the latter's statement were led by Patrick Henry, George Mason, and Richard Henry Lee.

Virginia is no longer the leader of the national political thought in the twentieth century. But its prestige remains very great in the South, where exists the principal problem created by the Supreme Court's public school desegregation order. And the moderate Gray plan by which Virginians have sought to preserve their public school system, and still not require white or colored citizens either to send their children to mixed schools or find some other way to have them educated if they can, will impress States that have turned to outright defiance of the Supreme Court's decison.

The court may hold that the Virginia plan is evasion; Virginia may resort to another and another; for, as its political leader, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, said, "We are in for a long-drawn-out struggle, and may have to shift strategy from time to time." But citizens who would preserve the Federal system, including compulsory arbitration by the Supreme Court of all major disputes between the central government and the States, will best serve their objective by taking into account the background of the overwhelming vote of Virginia this week for the first of a series of orderly public referenda to solve the desegregation problem on a community-by-community basis.

LEGAL PRECEDENTS OVERTURNED

The Federal Constitution was drafted and ratified on the general understanding that it reserved to the States the full possession of their "local rights."

For many years it was established, judicially and legislatively in the United States, that one of these "full possessions" was the pattern of public school education financed by the State taxpayers. When the Supreme Court, in 1954, banned public school segregation on a simple sociological argument, disregarding all historical and legal complexities, it reversed long-standing precedents by which the school systems of a number of States had been deeply entrenched.

"In a very real sense," commented Kelly and Harbison in "The American Constitution" (W. W. Norton & Co., 1955), Chief Justice Warren's opinion for a unanimous court "amounted to a piece of judicial legislation." Those who hold this to be the right and duty of the Supreme Court, when, in its view, changing domestic conditions and international considerations call for the exercise of judicial supremacy over the other Federal branches and the States, applauded this particular exercise as "statesmanship." But the late John W. Davis, who was at least as good a constitutional lawyer as any member of the present court, argued that the tribunal has no such powers.

A STATEWIDE SENTIMENT

In southern Virginia, where the problem evoked by the desegregation decision is an acute condition and not a consequence of cruel prejudice, the vote Monday for the new approach was overwhelming. But in the Shenandoah Valley and southwest Virginia, where Negroes are in a small minority, there was also a large affirmative vote for the plan in response to its endorsement as a flexible method of integration by BYRD and former Governors Darden and Battle. Even in the Virginia suburbs of Washington, where the Washington Post and Times Herald attacked the plan incessantly, the margin against it was much smaller than the opposition expected.

Thus by every democratic measurement of public opinion a great majority of one of the most law-abiding States of the Union, notable also for enlightened interracial conditions and for the equitable administration of justice, was registered against inflexible legal integration in the public schools. Those who in advance of the vote assailed the Gray plan as "defiance of the Constitution," on the very concrete point stated by Charles Evans Hughes that "the Constitution is what the judges say it is," are now arrayed against a large majority of the citizens of the State that brought about the Philadelphia convention in which that Constitution was drafted under the leadership of Virginians, and for many years was construed by the Supreme Court and Congress to legalize color segregation in the public schools.

If desegregation is to be accomplished without great social and political disturbance, or the decay of the public school system in the South, Virginia's effort to do that will contribute importantly to the result.

[From the Columbia State of January 17, 1956]

THE VIRGINIA DECISION—NORTHERN LECTURES HURT—COMPULSION CALLED ISSUE

(By Raymond Moley)

It is not going to help reasonable men in their quest for a reasonable solution of the problem of school segregation for northern voices like that of the New York Times to direct emotional lectures toward the Southern States. The Times editorially said that the recent Virginia plebiscite on the subject "represents an emotional and almost desperate reaction against the clearly defined shape of things to come."

There are many millions of us who are unwilling to accept from the Times or any other single authority a definition of "the clearly defined shape of things to come" on this or on any other subject.

It is, moreover, interesting to note that among those millions unwilling to permit the editor and publisher of the Times to enjoy a monopoly of enlightment are the distinguished Arthur Krock, for many years head of the Times' Washington Bureau, and John N. Popham, the Times' regional correspondent from the South. It is interesting to note that the more remote the Times people are from the problem, the more certain they are that they have the only possible solution.

The State of Virginia, certainly not less enlightened than some of its northern fellow Commonwealths, is recognizing that the problem posed by the Supreme Court in its historical opinion in 1954 requires a policy of cautious preparation for circumstances that it hopes will not be confronted, but that are quite possible. Specifically, the voters of the State by an overwhelming vote have said that they may have to abolish their public school system rather than submit to compulsory integration. The vote authorized the calling of a constitutional convention which will consider the amendment of the present constitution of the State to permit State funds to be appropriated for private schools.

We in the North should understand that the issue is no longer the simple question whether white and Negro children shall attend the same schools. The issue is compulsion, either for or against segregation.

In a very reasonable speech last May, a young North Carolinian, A. Reed Sarratt, Jr., editorial writer for the Winston-Salem Journal, stated the problem this way:

"The Supreme Court has said that laws requiring segregated schools violate the 14th amendment. The Court has not said that enforced mixing of the races in the schools must be substituted for enforced segregation. * * * The Court has not replaced one compulsion with another. * * * It is my belief that North Carolina could remove all legal compulsion for segregation in the schools without causing much change in the present racial composition of the student bodies of the schools. But the social patterns which have governed relations between the races should not be expected to change. If there is any change it will be slow."

This view, expressed by Sarratt, was endorsed by responsible public officials and educators in his State. It may not be the final answer, but it points to a factor which has fundamental roots in human nature. Americans don't like prohibitions. They don't like to be told that they must do or not do things. Perhaps with a removal of compulsions, coupled with a recognition of the differences among school districts which must be left to the districts themselves for adjustment, we shall arrive at a working arrangement acceptable to all but those who would arbitrarily impose upon the future their own concept of morality and justice.

The Late James McLaughlin

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the constant flow of life, the mystery of death, which we must all experience, always seems just a little beyond our comprehension. Particularly is this emphasized when the experience of death comes to one very close to us, when it comes to a friend, a dear relative, a mother, father, or someone very dear.

It is with a very sad heart and with a great effort to understand that I take this moment to bring to the attention of the Congress the passing of a very great friend, Mr. James McLaughlin, of Woburn, Mass., a longtime friend of my husband's, the Honorable John Jacob Rogers, who was a Member of Congress for many years, and an equally loyal and devoted friend of mine through all my years of public service. It is difficult for me to comprehend the great work of representing my Fifth District of Massachusetts in the Congress without his devoted friendship, wise counsel, and constant help.

Mr. James McLaughlin possessed an eminently respected character. He was loved by all, regardless of their station in life. He was a friend who could be depended upon for help wherever and whenever help was necessary. He was interested in the welfare of and improvement of his city. He was devoted to doing good for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He was a strong and loyal American patriot.

The death of Mr. McLaughlin was due to overwork. An excellent newspaper reporter, during his newspaper days, he covered many famous events and wrote many famous stories for the press. For many years he wrote a feature article for the Boston Globe and was a correspondent for the Associated Press. During the latter years of his life he entered the Government service in the Department of Social Security, and the work he did there in helping so many of his fellowmen will always be remembered. Always he had time to do just something more for somebody. Never sparing his strength, he worked long hours in his job and for his friends.

Mr. McLaughlin was blessed in life with a very fine and wonderfully respected family. He is survived by his attractive and charming wife, Christine, 4 daughters and 1 son, a sister and 9 grandchildren. It is a wonderful family who, like their father, are friendly and generous and unselfish.

Although death came to James McLaughlin suddenly, I know he was prepared to receive it, for he lived a fine, Godly, Christian life, and knew so well that in spite of all of its beauty, life on earth is just a temporary sojourn.

Included here in my remarks, I am submitting a report of the life of James McLaughlin from the Woburn Times, a fine daily newspaper, on the staff of which he once served. It is a fine description of the life of James McLaughlin, who devoted his life to his community, his country, and his friends:

JAMES MCLAUGHLIN FUNERAL RITES TO TAKE PLACE FRIDAY

The funeral of James A. McLaughlin, veteran newspaper reporter and public informational executive, will be held from his late home, 35 Sturgis Street, Friday at 8:15 a. m. Solemn High Mass of Requiem will be celebrated at St. Charles Church at 9 o'clock followed by burial at Calvary Cemetery, Woburn.

The sudden death of Mr. McLaughlin was received with a shock of grief in the city where he was known as an active, virile, and resourceful member of the fourth estate with his finger on the pulse of current events at all times. While returning from his office in Waltham, where he was regional director of the Social Security Administration in the area which extends from Newton to Framingham, he was stricken behind the wheel of his car on Lexington Street, this city. A truck driver was in the act of giving the McLaughlin car a push with his machine and he noted that the operation was faulty but snow on the rear window of the car cut off the truckman's vision.

William Murphy, cab operator for the Woburn Cab Co., who was approaching noted the strange happenings and he signalled to the truck driver to stop, as the McLaughlin car came into the side of the road. He saw the driver slumped over the wheel but still breathing. Murphy sent a message over the taxicab radio to the desk in Woburn Square and Joseph Kelleher operator of the company, called the police. Sgt. Edward E. Reil and Officer Edward J. McColgan rushed to the scene in the ambulance and the victim was pronounced dead shortly after his arrival at the hospital. Rev. James J. Cullinan of St. Charles Church administered the last rites.

The fascinating and productive career of Jim McLaughlin as a newspaperman dates back to 1912 when he was an office boy on the old Woburn News. He did not possess a formal education but by self-appliance and an inherent ability in the newsgathering field, he held very important assignments in news coverage and informational center administration. He was a reporter's reporter always quite willing to discuss angles of the developments of a story with reporters from rival newspapers and he was considered outstanding in his thoroughness of investigation, mentally locating the backbone of a story and his ability in literary formation in presenting his version to the reading public.

His range of coverage ranged from famous murder cases which he covered for the Boston metropolitan dailies to concerning Boston City Hall for the Boston Post during one of the several news-developing administrations of Mayor James M. Curley. He was considered among the staff of Boston newspapers as one of the best and in cases where sordidness and sadness smeared with a breath of scandal to the detriment of an innocent family, he was not considered a good reporter, as his human inclinations and his appreciation of the happiness and humanity of his fellowman inspired to play it down in such instances. He had incidently dedicated his life and talents to the uplift of his neighbor and his neighbor was everybody. The revealing testimony of those who worked with him or under his direction bespeak the kindness and consideration of the man and a person in trouble would not employ a better defender than Jim McLaughlin who went to the lengths to extend a helping hand and to convince those in whose hands the ultimate decision in a case rested. His acts were many and without compensation, or any desire for reward. He was a family man, deeply concerned about the trappings and proper development of his children mentally and physically. He was methodical in the execution of his duties and he was well informed in whatever field his talents brought him.

Mr. McLaughlin was born in Woburn, March 29, 1892, the son of the late Dennis J. McLaughlin and Mary Healy McLaughlin. He attended the grammar schools and left to assist his family. While attached to the Woburn News as an office boy, he took courses in Burdett College. From office boy he was promoted to sports reporter and his youthful masterpieces were his version of the prize fights then conducted in Lyceum Hall. From the Woburn News he went to the Woburn Daily Times, where he covered City Hall, politics, obituaries and general news events. He entered the Woburn Daily Times in 1913 and left for a time to become a member of the Boston Post city staff, during which time he covered Boston City Hall, court stories and famous accidents.

The reporter had a fling at politics and was elected alderman in ward 1, and in 1918 he was elected city clerk at which time he returned to the Woburn Daily Times as the news reporter. He became local correspondent for the Boston Post and then became district man for the Boston Globe which position he has held for thirty years. In addition to general coverage of his district, Mr. McLaughlin wrote feature articles for the Globe. He was also local correspondent for the Associated Press and covered elections in this district for the wire service for the past 32 years. He also covered stories for the old Lowell Courier Citizen and later the Lowell Sun and his coverage also appeared on the Boston Record and Boston American, Hearst newspapers. Mr. McLaughlin was dean of local newspapermen not only in longevity of service but in the variety and scope of his news-gathering activities. In the city government, he was also a member of the board of assessors from 1927 to 1931.

In 1934, Mr. McLaughlin entered the Government service in informational or public relations work. His first assignment was the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, where his work was noteworthy for the many local hardship cases he handled for Woburnites because of his desire to serve. He then went on to the Federal Housing Administration and then to Reconstruction Finance Corporation. For the past 6 years, Mr. McLaughlin was regional director for the Social Security Administration in the Waltham district.

The deceased is survived by his wife, Christine (McDonald) McLaughlin, four daughters, Mrs. Lillian Hooban of West Roxbury, Mrs. Rachel Palmer of Woburn, Mrs. Christine Drew formerly of Atlanta, Ga., now of Reading, Mass., Janet McLaughlin, of Woods Hole, Mass., and one son, James A. McLaughlin, Jr., a student at St. Michael's College in Winooski, Vt., a sister, Maude McLaughlin of Woburn, and nine grandchildren.

Providing Hospitalization and Care for the Mentally Ill of Alaska

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is an administrative measure. The bill is a great improvement over any measure we have had heretofore for the mentally ill. This House and the committee in the past several years have considered bills for the mentally ill of Alaska. I do wish to point out, however, that the requirements set up, the standards set up, by the American Psychiatric Association, adopted in the measure, are very high standards. I hope that the Territory or the new State can follow them. When they do the expense will be great. I wish all States in the Union were in a po-

sition to adopt such standards and to follow them. Even though they are not followed in toto, I think we should make the effort to have as high standards as possible.

I do want to call my colleagues' attention to several provisions of the bill. There is a provision in section 371 of title II that provides $6 million for the care of the mentally ill. The money is given to the Territory, $1 million the first year and then tapers off to $200,000 in 1966. After 1966 it is proposed that the Territory assume all the costs of the mentally ill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] has said he would oppose any further grants to the Territory. The taxpayer gets off right easy for the care as of now. It costs between $6 and $7 a day for the care of the mentally ill at the Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg. I predict the costs under this bill may reach $25 a day. Alaska after the 10-year period or after the hospital is constructed must bear that cost. I hope that is crystal clear.

It has been costing the Government through the Interior Department an average of about $800,000 a year to care for an average of 345 mentally ill that are generally taken care of at the Morningside Hospital in Portland.

I visited the hospital and was amazed at the splendid care the patients were receiving. I am not familiar with the economic arrangements or the money that may have been made by the Morningside Hospital. I do know it has cost an average of about $181 a month for a psychiatric patient. I do not know where in this country we could go and get care at the rate of $181 a month. It costs an average of about $24 a day in most psychiatric hospitals in the United States, so there is quite a wide spread between $181 a month and $24 a day.

I expect to support the bill. I do have an amendment or two I should like to suggest. One of the amendments to the bill, which gives the Territory 1 million acres of land, was my amendment. We increased it from 500,000 to a million acres. I think it might be well to spell it out a little more clearly, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], of the Committee on Rules, said this morning, that the funds might well be earmarked for the use of the Territory in running the mental institution. I believe such an amendment will be offered to the bill, and it will receive my support.

The other point I wish to call to your attention is section 372, which provides an outright grant of $6 million. That would be $12,500,000 in 10 years, but the grant is $6 million. The construction grant is $6.5 million.

I call your attention to the word "construction." We spell it out in the report as meaning not only the construction but the initial equipment of buildings, including medical transportation facilities, the architects' and engineering fees, and the cost of the land to be acquired by the Territory. In other words, the Territory has no financial responsibility—not a thin dime of their own in this building—I do not think that right.

It is a princile with me that we should not give an outright grant without requiring some responsibility on the part of the people of Alaska. In other words, in the Hill-Burton bill we provide for a matching of funds. Alaska has shared very generously in the hospital-construction bill and the Hill-Burton provisions of the bill, and I think it is right.

I am going to vote for the bill, whether my amendment is adopted or not, but I am going to offer an amendment which would require the Territory to match funds that are made available by the United States Treasury. We follow that in our Federal aid, with our highway program, and with the Hill-Burton bill. If we are going to give them a complete hospital without any effort on their part, no responsibility at all, I think the principle is wrong. If we are going to do that for this Territory we ought to do it for the other Territories and we ought to do it for the other States in the Union. With that in mind, I expect to offer at the proper time such an amendment. In other words, let us have it on the principle of matching that has prevailed in this country and throughout the Territories for many years.

As I said at the beginning, I think this is a good bill. It is not a perfect bill. It can be improved. Whether the two amendments I hope will be offered are adopted or not, I expect to support the bill.

I want to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] on his splendid handling of the bill, and also the committtee that went to Alaska to investigate closely, on the job, the mental health problem in Alaska. The problems of Alaska are such that they must look to Congress for help. Perhaps some day when they become a State they can assume all obligations. They can if we give them not less than 50 percent of their 375 million acres of land. It was my intention that by increasing from 500,000 to 1 million acres of land granted the Territory that they could use the proceeds of the land to run the hospital and for other expenses of government. Some day they should control their lands. In my opinion there is a great future for Alaska. Great untold resources that might make it one of the rich States. I trust they use their resources wisely.

Did Betsy Ross Make the First Stars and Stripes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, there has always been a great deal of discussion as to whether Besty Ross made the first Stars and Stripes.

The Sons of the American Revolution of Pennsylvania appointed a very distinguished committee to study this subject. The committee was headed by the noted patriot and former judge, Eugene C. Bonniwell, of Philadelphia.

The committee has made a most interesting report, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE WHETHER BETSY ROSS MADE THE FIRST STARS AND STRIPES

The committee to determine whether Betsy Ross made the first Stars and Stripes begs leave to present its report.

There exists no official record that Betsy Ross made the first Stars and Stripes. Nor does any official record exist showing that she did not or that any other person was the first to make it.

The principal evidence that she was the first is her own statement and the affidavits of her daughters, nieces, nephews, and grandchildren that they heard her story from her own lips.

Her statement was that about 1 month before the Declaration of Independence she was visited at her upholstery shop on Arch Street in Philadelphia by George Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross, whom she regarded as a committee of the Continental Congress, and that Washington asked her to make a flag according to a design shown her; that at her suggestion the design was slightly altered and that shortly thereafter a new colored design was sent her, from which she made a flag.

Although this story was doubtless repeated to many others, in addition to her relatives, there is no evidence that it was denied by any of her contemporaries. Nor is there any evidence that any of her contemporaries doubted the honesty and truthfulness of this Quaker lady or her daughters or the other relatives who signed the affidavits.

Before discussing the arguments that deserve some consideration, it might be well to merely mention the statements that have been published without the slightest evidence to support them. They are: That the tradition was invented by somebody in recent years; that it was exploited for somebody's benefit; that Betsy was an unprincipled person who sought to make capital out of the story; that no one took the pains to contradict it; that the story is of the legendary type; that if Betsy made a flag in an Arch Street house, it was made after a design that had been conceived and woven somewhere else and her contribution was no more than her labor in sewing on some stars.

The chief reason that makes historians hesitate to accept the story is the absence of any official record of the event, either in the minutes of the Continental Congress or in any official document.

However, it is not to be expected that, while the Colonies were still under British rule and the British flag, the Congress would have taken official action on, or spread upon its minutes, a motion to have a national flag. In fact, one of the published arguments purporting to prove the falsity of Betsy Ross's statement is that the tradition practically charges Washington and the rest of the committee with seeking to establish and set up a national ensign before we had even declared ourselves a free people with an independent government and without any delegated authority to do so.

It is well known that Robert Morris was chairman of a secret committee on military supplies, although there is no record of this in the Journal of Congress. If it was in this capacity that he visited Betsy Ross, it is unthinkable that his action would have been made a matter of record.

Washington's desire to have the colors ready even before the Declaration of Independence is shown in his letter to General Putnam, dated Philadelphia, May 28, 1776,

desiring him to speak to the several Colonies "to hurry them to get their colors done."

As a matter of fact, the only official notation concerning the stars and stripes is a brief paragraph, tucked among many others in the Journal of Congress for June 14, 1777, that the resolution to have it made the national flag was adopted. There is no official record in the Journal of Congress or elsewhere of when such a resolution was introduced, or who introduced it—whether a member of a committee, or what brought it about, or whether there was a preliminary discussion or any debate on the motion. Even the official proclamation of its adoption was not made until 3 months later.

It has been suggested that, as June 14, 1777 was a time of rushed preparations to meet General Howe's expected attack on Philadelphia, Congress passed many measures that day and that the note on the flag resolution may have been the hasty passage of a long-delayed measure, in order to give official sanction to the colors for ships, or the hasty recording of a resolution passed some time previously.

It should be remembered that the Grand Union or Cambridge flag was never authorized by Congress nor mentioned in its Journal.

As proof that the army had no Stars and Stripes in December 1776, it is stated that it was not used in the battles at Trenton and Princeton. Yet Peale, who commanded a company at these and other battles and who was known to have been particular in matters of historical record, painted the Stars and Stripes in his picture of Washington at Princeton, which was begun in the year of that victory. Similarly Trumbell, Washington's aide-de-camp at the start of the war, who fought in several battles and who was known for his fidelity to historical details, made three paintings soon after the war, which showed the Stars and Stripes in all.

There is no evidence that Washington or any of his contemporaries found fault with these paintings.

Fow, however, thinks he has demolished this pictorial evidence by stating that West painting of William Penn's Treaty with the Indians and Leutze in his painting of Washington Crossing the Delaware used their imagination without consulting historical and geographic details.

Another of Fow's supposedly clinching arguments is that Elizabeth Montgomery made an incorrect claim concerning the armed brig Nancy.

It is known, of course, that various other flags were borne during the war.

It could not be expected that historians of the period, or Washington's biographers would include an account that was not supported by official records.

The absence of official records, however, does not prove that the events did not occur.

Despite the loss of the Pine Creek Declaration of Independence, drawn up on July 4, 1776 under the Tladaughton Elm on the banks of Pine Creek in present Lycoming County, Pa., there is no doubt that it existed.

Although the frontiersmen, who on May 16, 1775 assembled at Hannastown, Westmoreland County, Pa., apparently kept no minutes, it is known that they passed a declaration, which was dispatched to the provincial capital, Philadelphia.

Notwithstanding that the minutes of a midnight meeting, held in May 1775 by representatives of Mecklenburg County, N. C., are said to have been destroyed by a fire in 1800, there is a well-established tradition in that region that they passed a resolution that the people of that county were free and independent of the British Crown.

According to Wigmore on Evidence, declarations about family history is a recognized exception to the hearsay rule and the general inquiry should be: Was the circumstances named in the statement such a marked item in the ordinary family history and as interesting to the family in common that statements about them in the family would be likely to be based on fairly accurate knowledge and sincerely uttered?

The above is the indisputable law in the United States, and in a court of law the affidavits by the family of Betsy Ross would be admitted as actual and primary evidence.

In view of this and of the absence of any proofs to the contrary, until negatived by substantial proofs, it may be stated that Betsy Ross did make the first Stars and Stripes.

Respectfully submitted.

EUGENE C. BONNIWELL, *Chairman.*
D. BARLOW BURKE.
MYER SOLIS-COHEN.
JOHN R. HART.

National-Defense Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "National Defense Paradox," published in Machine Tool Progress for December 22, 1955. This publication is issued by the National Machine Tool Builders' Association, which represents an industry most important to our defense, and also a large industry in Massachusetts.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE PARADOX

Government policy with respect to machine tools is a peculiar paradox in our national defense program.

Machine tools are essential to the manufacture of every type of weapon and device required for national defense—in any kind or quantity, great or small.

The experience of three wars—World War I, World War II, and Korea—demonstrated that the peacetime size of the American machine tool industry was inadequate to meet, and meet quickly, the defense needs of a national emergency. In each case the buildup of our war potential hinged upon the buildup of machine tool production to the level required.

In view of the seriousness of this situation, following Korea there was authorized, by Executive order, the formation of an Advisory Committee on Production Equipment under the chairmanship of Mr. Harold S. Vance. In its January 1953 report to the Director of Defense Mobilization, the Committee stated:

"In the mobilization that followed the communistic aggression in Korea, shortages of machine tools and other production equipment proved to be serious obstacles to rapid buildup of equipped forces-in-being. The outbreak of a new war probably will not allow this country the necessary period of time in which to expand its production equipment industries. A real degree of national security requires the establishment, prior to a theoretical M-day, of a substantial measure of industrial capacity to produce the munitions and implements of war."

Pursuant to this conclusion, the Committee recommended that the Government should continue consistently to purchase machine tools for national defense production with particular emphasis upon so-called long-lead-time machines; that is, those which are large or complex, and which require for their engineering and building a period of many months, and which are absolutely essential to certain types of military preparedness programs.

The Committee's recommendations were founded upon the premise that:

1. We must have actually built and in existence, certain key machine tools vital to the meeting of a national emergency; and,

2. It is imperative to the defense of the country that the American machine tool industry be maintained at a level commensurate with its strategic importance as a major arm of defense production.

The original idea of the Committee was that Government should spend between $500 million and $800 million a year for the acquisition of machine tools which the Committee considered essential to maintain our defense potential.

In its January 1953 report the Advisory Committee on Production Equipment stated:

"The first thing to consider in the matter of cost is the fact that end items are more seriously affected by obsolescence than are the facilities that produce them. When an inventory of 5,000 tanks becomes totally obsolete it means a loss of at least $1 billion, but the cost of keeping the tank-plant facilities up to date would be a small fraction of that amount. Another consideration is the fact that the original cost of facilities is small compared to the cost of producing the end items on a large scale. There is, therefore, a tremendous opportunity for economy which should be exploited in our mobilization effort."

And on page 8 of the report:

"The economy aspect of this policy is striking. As an example, it is estimated that about $500 million expended for long-lead-time items of production equipment in the Air Force production acceleration insurance program would increase the mobilization capability for the production of aircraft by about $18 billion during the first 2 years alone, if the production equipment is actually acquired prior to the mobilization period. This increased production capability would substantially reduce the 'mobilization reserves' that would otherwise have to be accumulated. The savings in required outlay of funds prior to a mobilization is in the ratio of 36 to 1."

Now for the paradox.

Although everybody in Government agrees with the recommendations of the Committee, what actually happened was this:

The Committee suggested an initial appropriation of $500 million for the fiscal year 1954. Congress appropriated $250 million. Because of delays in committing this sum, Congress reduced the appropriation to $100 million for the fiscal year 1955. Subsequently Congress appropriated a second sum of $100 million for the fiscal year 1956.

The first $100 million was portioned out to the three armed services, but purchasing was cut short by an economy move in the Defense Department after only a negligible volume of orders had been placed. The second $100 million, presumably for long-lead-time machine tools as above described, has never been activated.

The net result thus far has been that although the Committee recommended, on behalf of national security, the purchase of machine tools for defense purposes at a rate of $500 million to $800 million a year, purchases resulting from congressional appropriations on behalf of Committee objectives have amounted literally thus far to only about $29 million.

In the meantime the Defense Departments have continued to purchase machine tools for current production in accordance with their normal procurement procedure. Such

purchases, however, have been far below the levels contemplated by the Committee, and have been for the purpose of meeting current requirements rather than for the purpose of building up the defense potential against a possible future emergency.

The Nation's machine tool builders are not concerned about this situation from the standpoint of the industry's survival. What causes profound concern in the machine tool industry is that in spite of actual recent experience in World War II and the Korean war, in spite of the adoption of the policy recommended by the Vance Committee in January 1953, so little has been accomplished in the succeeding 3 years. The industry fears that in the event of war there will be a repetition of the same difficulties, the same problems, the same desperate need for the immediate production of complicated weapons, and the same restrictions that hampered output in the last two emergencies

The fact is that every machine tool builded should have in his files today instructions as to what he should do in case of war. He should have pool orders ready for activation so that he can go directly into production for defense. Procedures should be established so that he would not be subjected to interruptions, confusion, drafting of skilled men, inability to get materials, and all of the other troubles that beset him in previous wars.

And this is only part of the story.

According to the original recommendations of the Committee, agreed to by the Government, Government-owned machine tools useful for defense production were to be retained by the Government as a national defense reserve. But today the Government is under constant pressure to lease some of these machines to producers of civilian goods. They would then be subjected to wear and tear which would make them less effective for defense production; and, what is still more important, in case of emergency, where would they be? Scattered throughout the vast metalworking industry in the United States they could not be collected and reinstalled in time to meet a crisis.

Although purchasing of machine tools by defense authorities for current needs is continuing, Government buying is inherently complex and this discourages machine tool builders from bidding on Government orders.

Foreign governments realize the value of having their own machine-tool industries and therefore discourage the importation of American-built machine tools into foreign countries. In the meantime, the much lower wage rates paid overseas have enabled the foreign builders to increase substantially their sales in the United States. These conditions tend to reduce the capacity of the American machine-tool industry.

To understand the full implications of this situation it is necessary to go back to the close of World War II, when under the Marshall plan our country was busy activating a European aid program. A part of this program consisted of American help in reactivating the machine-tool industries of Western Germany, France, England, Italy, and other European countries.

United States policy is still to the effect that when there is a machine tool to be bought with United States taxpayers' money for aid to Europe, it should, wherever possible, be bought from a European builder instead of from an American builder.

Meanwhile European nations built up a series of tariffs, embargoes, special taxes, licenses, import restrictions, currency regulations, etc., which made it extremely difficult for a European machine-tool user to buy an American-built machine, even though he preferred it to any built in his own country and was perfectly willing to pay the higher American price.

With respect to machine-tool imports into the United States, our tariff has been reduced to 15 percent; which is utterly insufficient to offset the wage differential between Europe and the United States. For example, the United States machine-tool industry pays an average of about $2.20 per hour to its labor force, while the average rates paid by the industry's major competitors in Germany and England are only 70 cents and 90 cents respectively. It is estimated that the same machine can be built in Epurope at about 36 percent to 50 percent lower cost than in the United States, while tariff protection is only 15 percent.

An immediate problem with respect to this whole picture has arisen in connection with the Buy American Act, under which an Executive order originally required that the Defense Department, in purchasing a machine tool, should buy one of American make unless the price differential amounted to more than 25 percent in favor of a foreign machine. But under a new Executive order the price differential has now been cut from 25 percent to 6 percent. In view of the wage differential between foreign countries and the United States above described, it is obvious that foreign machine tool builders can quote prices more than 6 percent below those of American machine tool builders.

To sum up:

Government should carry out the program of securing now the key long-lead-time machine tools that will be essential in an emergency.

Government should constantly screen its reserve of machine tools to remove those which have no future value in defense.

Government should establish complete procedures to enable the industry to expand immediately if war breaks out.

Government should persuade other nations to lower their barriers against machine tools, as the United States tariff on foreign tools has been lowered.

Government should not buy foreign machine tools unless they are of a type not built in this country, as service and repair parts for foreign machines will not be readily procurable in the event of war.

All this raises a basic question:

Where do we want machine tool capacity developed?

In Europe, where it might be over-run by a conquering army within a matter of hours—

Or here at home, where we so urgently need it if war should come?

National defense policy would appear to demand a careful review of all these questions.

Providing Hospitalization and Care for the Mentally Ill of Alaska

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6376) to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the Committee with a long explanation of the amendment; it speaks for itself. It requires that the Territory have some responsibility. As it is under the proposed bill they have not a thin dime invested in the new hospital.

The principle in the United States is to require States to match Federal funds. We do it under the Hill-Burton Act, and the Federal matching for roads; and I feel that the principle should be included in this bill. I am also convinced that the present cost of six or seven dollars a day care at Morningside Hospital—may well be twenty-five to thirty dollars a day in the new hospital. The standards set up in this bill, if followed, will cost a great deal. The Alaska people may not thank this Congress when they assume the much greater financial burden which will occur under this bill.

Edward Bacon Wilber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I am certain many Members feel, as I do, a deep sense of loss in the passing of Edward Bacon Wilber, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration and budget officer of the State Department.

Many of us knew Ed personally. All of us admired him for his integrity, ability, and patience. We trusted his discretion and tact. I am confident that this feeling was shared by members of both parties. It was the feeling all of us have for a truly outstanding public servant.

Edward Bacon Wilber was born in Fairport, N. Y., and graduated from Union College in 1925. He was a widely respected management consultant before he joined the Government in 1941. In addition to his work in the Department of State, he served the Bureau of the Budget for 7 years and was a consultant to the Hoover Commission.

In 1951, to show its appreciation for Mr. Wilber's unswerving devotion to our country and his outstanding accomplishments for good government, the other body adopted a resolution directing that he should "receive a salary commensurate with the service he renders to the Government as an outstanding employee of the Department of State."

Those of us whose duties required inspection trips abroad have had the pleasure of traveling with Mr. Wilber on various occasions. We profited by his extensive knowledge of State Department operations abroad, his ability to analyze the difficult problems encountered in such work, and his sincerity and energy in everything that he undertook.

I know that many Members join me in sincere condolences to Mrs. Wilber and the children, Edward, Jr., Paul and Marcia Jeanne. While there is little that we can do to ease the burden of their grief, I hope it may help them to know of the high regard in which Edward Bacon Wilber was held by all who know him in his Government career.

Frustrated Democrats—Suddenly There Are No Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of January 13, 1956:

FRUSTRATED DEMOCRATS—SUDDENLY THERE ARE NO ISSUES

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The Democrats are beginning to feel rather like the butt of the classic old swimming-hole joke.

While they have been happily disporting themselves in the water, shouting merrily to each other about the fine prospects for 1956, the Republican administration has stealthily made off with all their clothes.

The administration, in short, has done a downright brilliant job of aborting every major Democratic issue. Consider a typical sampling:

Farm issue: This was to be, of course, the Democrats' biggest single issue for 1956. Until very recently, the Democrats dream of the future was clear. They would pass a farm bill restoring fixed 90 percent of parity, and giving the farmers all sorts of other goodies, like special soil banks payments for keeping their land out of production. The President would veto this bill, and the Republican goose would thus be cooked to a turn.

It may work out that way. The farm issue is certainly still the most dangerous the administration faces. But the administration has taken over the soil bank idea, and other ideas first advanced by the Democrats. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, principal Democratic farm policy idea man, complains loudly that "They're stealing my babies."

Moreover, the administration is playing its trump card on the farm issue—President Eisenhower. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson is political poison in the farm areas. But the President himself is still immensely popular with the farmers.

The administration plan now is to have the President move front and center on the farm issue, selling the administration program, and above all persuading the farmers that the Democrats' fixed support program will pile up higher surpluses and depress prices still further. A nationwide Presidential telecast devoted entirely to the farm issue is being seriously considered. And there are signs of doubtfulness already among several Democrats about the vote-getting potentialities of high-fixed parity.

Taxes: The administration has the Democrats nicely boxed in on the tax issue. The President has sternly said that a balanced budget and debt reduction must come before any tax relief. The Democrats strongly suspect a plot. They suspect that, along about June, there will be a jubilant announcement from the Treasury, that due to brilliant economic management, a surplus, perhaps as high as $4 billion, is in sight for the 1957 budget. Therefore, the voters will be pleased to hear a balanced budget, debt reduction, and a nice dollop of tax reduction too, will all be possible.

The suspicion that this is what the administration is up to amounts to a firm conviction among many shrewd Democrats. But what are they to do? If they try to beat the gun with tax reduction now, they will be accused of fiscal irresponsibility and unbalancing the budget. As a practical matter, moreover, any considerable tax reduction for the little fellow could only be compensated for if the oil-depletion-tax allowance loophole were closed. It is enough to point out that the Democratic leaders of both Houses come from Texas.

Education: Here again, the Democrats thought they had a winning issue for 1956, and in the House they have ready a big school-construction bill. But here again the administration is ready to box them in with its $1,250,000,000 school program. On this issue, moreover, the Democrats are in a peculiarly frustrating position, since one of their number, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, is prepared to introduce an antisegregation amendment which would almost certainly kill the bill.

And so it goes. The road-construction and social-security issues have been largely aborted in the same way. Democrats like Senators WALTER GEORGE and RICHARD RUSSELL are angry about the foreign-aid budget, but the Democrats certainly cannot win the election by cutting the living daylights out of the foreign-aid program. On other issues, like natural gas, the Democrats are bitterly divided among themselves.

It is impossible, of course, to predict what issues time and the course of events will produce. Let the Communist bloc make an aggressive move—an attack on the Chinese offshore islands, for example—and the now dormant defense and foreign policy issues will dominate this election year. But for the moment, by the simple expedient of adopting large hunks of the Democratic program, the administration has reduced the Democrats to shouting, "me too, but more so."

Cyprus and Macedonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, last February 2 I introduced in the Appendix of the RECORD a petition by the Macedonian Political Organization with regard to conditions in that section of Greece known as Macedonia. This organization is composed of American citizens of Macedonian descent, and I included their petition in the RECORD in recognition of the constitutional principle that all citizens are free to petition the Congress.

At the time I made it clear I was not taking part in any ethnical or political argument nor endorsing the substance of the petition. I did say that I hoped misunderstandings such as those surrounding Cyprus and Macedonia might be settled amicably.

Unfortunately, I believe, the petition was misunderstood and its insertion in the RECORD was the subject of rather sharp criticism in the Greek press both in this country and abroad.

Under unanimous consent, in the same spirit with which the original petition was introduced, I now include in the RECORD the comments of Mr. John Tozis as expressed in a letter addressed to me. Mr. Tozis takes issue with the Macedonian Political Organization. His letter follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 16, 1956.*

Hon. FRANK T. BOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The statement entitled "Cyprus and Macedonia," which was drawn by the Macedonian Political Organization and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 1955 raises certain questions. That we should strive to deal with international matters in the spirit of justice and democracy is a duty and an obligation. But the performance of such a task requires also careful scrutiny, considering the confusion that exists nowadays not only in the presentation of facts, but even in the terminology itself. Without the latter prerequisite, we are bound to face risks in our effort to serve freedom and democracy. That is the reason behind this short explanation pertaining to Macedonia and the so-called Macedonians.

By way of introduction, it would be necessary to point out that in this country we follow the jus soli principle, which means that anyone born in America is automatically an American, regardless of his racial or national background. In the rest of the world, and particularly in Europe, the principle in force is jus sanguine, that is, regardless of birthplace, a person's status is determined by the race or nationality he belongs to. Therefore, when we speak of Macedonia and Macedonians, we are not speaking of a distinct country or nationality, but merely of a geographical term; that the people who live in it are simply members of some distinct racial or national group. The same applies to Cyprus, where the predominant element is Greek, that is, of people who by descent, language, religion, customs, and culture are Greeks, like the rest of the people of Greece.

Speaking of Macedonia, we must bear in mind that, like Sparta, Athens, Thebes, Cyprus, etc., it was part of the Greek world in antiquity. And, in fact, it was in Macedonia that the idea of uniting the Greek city-states into one single Greek nation was born and carried out by Alexander the Great, who applied the term Greek to his entire army, regardless of their respective areas. It is clear then that those who appear today as Macedonians and who are not Greek are simply remnants of foreign peoples who at one time or another held Macedonia until she was liberated and returned to Greece in 1912–1913.

Your petitioners admit that they are of Bulgarian extraction and that the Bulgarian history covers a period of 15 centuries only (see Macedonian Tribune, September 30, 1955, p. 1.). Be that as it may, one thing is beyond the slightest doubt, namely, that the Macedonians themselves preceded the Bulgarians by at least another 15 centuries. It follows, therefore, that the Bulgarians have nothing in common with the ancient Greek population of Macedonia. The predominant position held by the Greeks in Macedonia throughout the ages had never been seriously damaged by the arrival and the settlement of the Slavs in the northern parts of the Balkan Peninsula (see Charles Eliot, Turkey in Europe, 1908, pp. 273, 332).

Yet, in trying to justify their fantastic claims, your petitioners insist that since the time of Alexander the Great "many a change took place all over the world" and that "the ethnical physiognomy of Macedonia changed also." They fail, however, to specify that if any such changes actually took place, it was confined to the northern sections which are now parts of Yugoslavia and Bulgaria. In their tabulation of the population of all three sections of Macedonia, your petitioners gladly recognize the following ethnical groups: Bulgarians, Turks, Greeks, Albanians, Arumanians, and others. It is significant to note that in referring to any one of them they never use the term Mace-

donia, reserving simply this "holy right" for their own element only.

While, moreover, your petitioners do not hesitate to invoke the principle of change when it serves their ulterior purposes, they automatically choose to keep silent on the ethnological changes that took place recently in Greek Macedonia through the voluntary exchange of minorities between Turkey and Greece, on one hand, and Greece and Bulgaria, on the other.

As a result of this exchange which took place in the 1920's in accordance with the Treaty of Neuilly and under the auspices of the old League of Nations (in point of fact, the three successive chairmen of the Settlement Committee were prominent Americans, to wit, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., Charles P. Howland, and Charles B. Eddy), Greece, of all Balkan States, has today the smallest foreign minorities. Out of a total population of 1,750,000 in Greek Macedonia itself, only 77,000, or 5 percent, constitutes a Slav-speaking minority. What's more, the overwhelming majority even of this tiny minority, being bilingual, regards itself as Greek, and, for this very reason, willingly pledged allegiance to Greece and refused steadfastly to be exchanged, having incurred for all this the Bulgarian curse of being "Grecomani."

Several special committees, consisting of representatives of various nationalities, have been sent recently into Macedonia by the United Nations itself. The findings of all of them openly implicated the Communist regimes of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria for their underhanded efforts to subvert Greece. In the facts established and published by these committees there is not one shred of evidence that can be construed as supporting even remotely the insinuations put forward by your petitioners.

The Greek nation, on its part, will never forget one significant fact, namely, that the most decisive factors in that brilliant Greek victory over the international Communist conspiracy was the initiative and action taken by our own Government, first, in helping the Greek people hold its own, and, secondly, in guaranteeing the territorial integrity of Greece.

Americans of genuine Macedonian descent have every confidence in the innate American sense of justice and fair play. It is hoped, therefore, that you, sir, will be good enough to give this communication the same publicity so as to put the record straight.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN TOZIS,
Honorary Member,
Pan-Macedonian Hellenic Association.

The Majority Don't Count

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Gus Tyler, political director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO, appeared in the New Republic of August 22, 1955. It details the shocking facts of the unrepresentative nature of many of our State legislatures:

THE MAJORITY DON'T COUNT

(By Gus Tyler)

In 1936, a Mr. John Keogh—citizen and taxpayer—rose in an Illinois courtroom to make a point. He pulled a gun, killed the opposing lawyer, and took a shot at the judge. All this he did most impersonally, just "to awaken the people."

Mr. Keogh's unprovoked bit of manslaughter was intended to dramatize the fact that the people of Chicago (Cook County) in the year 1936 were denied a republican form of government and that the Illinois Legislature was an illegal body. In 1901, Cook County had 38.1 percent of the total population of the State and was, therefore, allotted 37.3 percent of the seats in the State senate. A quarter of a century later, Cook County had about half the people of Illinois in its confines, but its representation in the senate was still limited to 37.3 percent.

For a quarter of a century, the officials and people of Chicago and Cook County—faced with an ever-growing population, and a limited voice in the State legislature—searched for a solution of their problem: A Constitutional Convention in 1920; a statewide referendum in 1922; a withholding of county taxes in 1925; talk of Chicago's secession from Illinois in 1926. No result.

In 1931 John Keogh made his first try at righting things by refusing to pay Federal income taxes on the grounds that the Federal Government was neglecting its duty in failing to guarantee a republican form of government in Illinois. The circuit court was not impressed with this argument, and the United States Supreme Court wouldn't entertain a review. Undaunted, Keogh, in a foreclosure case in 1936, argued that the legislature was illegally constituted. The judge refused to hear the plea. It was at this point that Keogh, declaring that "something drastic has to be done to awaken the people," opened fire in the court.

But this shot was not heard round the world. Twenty years later, in the country as a whole, the problem of underrepresentation of cities in State legislatures is greater than it was in 1936.

In 1937, 1 year after Keogh tried to dramatize the problem with a gun, another comrade, armed with statistics, entered the battle. Henry Stoner analyzed each of the 95 State legislatures in America (two for each State except unicameral Nebraska). He was trying to prove that a minority of the population could elect a majority of the State legislature in virtually every State. Stoner listed the legislative districts of a chamber by the population in each district. He then took the smallest districts and totaled them until a majority of the chamber was reached. He then found out what percentage of the total population was represented by this majority of the smallest districts. This was no easy undertaking, as anybody who has ever tried to do this knows. But Stoner was hopeful, as Keogh had been hopeful, that this total study of every State legislature in America would shock the Nation into action.

In the box which follows, Stoner's findings are given. To my knowledge, this is the first time they have appeared in print. The percentage figure alongside the legislative body indicates the percentage of the total population whose representatives constitute a majority of the legislative body. Thus, if, in front of Rhode Island, senate, appears the figure 8.86, that means that the members of the State senate of Rhode Island representing 8.86 percent of the people in that State could compose a majority of the senate.

The figure in parentheses indicates a similar notation for the other house of the State legislature:

MINORITY RULE IN THE STATES

8.67, Connecticut, House (44.9).
8.86, Rhode Island, Senate (22.3).
12.5, California, Senate (47.6).
15.4, New Jersey, Senate (46.7).
18.1, Maryland, Senate (33.6).
18.2, United States, Senate (43.4).
18.6, Nevada, House (26.6).
21.5, Idaho, Senate (37.2).
21.7, Delaware, Senate (32.9).
23.2, Montana, Senate (49.5).
23.5, Florida, House (26.1).
26.5, Kansas, House (37.6).
28.5, Georgia, Senate (31.8).
28.8, Michigan, House (34.1).
28.9, Arizona, Senate (45.3).
29.4, Missouri, House (35.4).
30.6, South Carolina, Senate (45.4.)
31.5, Oregon, Senate (39.5)
31.8, Ohio, House (46.2).
32.3, Kentucky, House (39.7).
33.2, Alabama, Senate (35.8).
33.7, Iowa, House (35.3).
33.9, North Carolina, House (49.4).
34.4, Oklahoma, Senate (39.7).
34.6, Wyoming, Senate (39.2).
35.1, Tennessee, House (41.4).
35.4, New Mexico, Senate (41.9).
35.4, Illinois, Senate (35.4).
35.5, Mississippi, House (39.8).
35.5, Vermont, House (47.3).
35.6, West Virginia, Senate (44.0).
37.7, Indiana, House (42.8).
38.0, Texas, Senate (41.7).
38.5, Minnesota, House (42.3).
38.8, Louisiana, Senate (41.2).
38.8, Pennsylvania, Senate (44.4).
39.9, North Dakota, Senate (44.1).
40.3, Arkansas, House (46.1).
40.3, South Dakota, House (42.3).
40.6, Virginia, House (44.0).
40.8, Old Nebraska, House (43.8).
40.9, Wisconsin, House (44.1).
41.8, Utah, House (42.6).
42.3, Washington, House (45.6).
42.5, Colorado, Senate (42.7).
42.9, Maine, Senate (48.6).
43.9, New York, Senate (51.9).
46.8, Nebraska, Unicameral.
48.0, Massachusetts, Senate (48.5).
50.2, New Hampshire, House (50.6).

If the above table were written out in plain sentences, it would begin: In the State of Connecticut, a majority of the House is composed of delegates from districts representing only 8.67 percent of the people; in the other house, the majority represents 44.9 percent of the population. In California, the senate majority speaks for only 12.5 percent of the people; in the other house, a majority speaks for 47.6 percent. In New Jersey, the senate majority speaks for 15.4 percent of the people, etc.

To check on the trend in the State legislatures since 1937, I repeated Stoner's calculations for the upper house in a number of States where the figures were readily available. Here's what I found:

State:	*1937*	*1955*
Connecticut	44.6	36.1
Florida	26.1	17.7
Idaho	21.5	19.1
Kentucky	39.7	49.0
Montana	23.2	18.9
Nevada	26.6	12.4
New Jersey	15.4	17.1
New Mexico	35.4	17.0
New York	43.9	40.9
South Carolina	30.6	26.6
West Virginia	35.6	47.0

The above is only a spot check; these States were selected only because figures were readily available. But the spot check indicates the trend; no improvement since 1937 and considerable evidence that matters have gone from bad to worse.

Even as Stoner was making his 1937 study, urban dwellers were beginning to bypass their State governments and turn to Washington. They had no alternative. The cities could not handle their problems because they were limited creatures of the States with painfully restricted taxing powers. The States were not handling the mounting city problems because their legislatures, through manipulated apportionment and districting, were dominated by the rural areas. In despair, the urban dwellers, constituting about 60 percent of the Nation's

population, turned to Washington, where the legislature is also weighted in favor of the rural areas, but not as unfairly as in the States. As a result, the people of the United States have found that "the interests of urban areas are often more effectively represented in the national legislature than in their own State legislatures."

This last quotation comes from the findings of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, appointed by President Eisenhower in 1953, to explore the proper allocation of functions and responsibilities among the various levels of American government. After 2 years of study—recorded in 15 volumes—this Commission has concluded:

"In the early history of our country, State legislatures were the most powerful and influential instruments of government in the Nation. It was to them that the average citizen looked primarily for initiative and wisdom in the formulation of public policy on domestic issues. In power and influence they are no longer as dominant as they were—primarily because they have not found effective solutions to problems that become more chronic and more difficult to cope with in a rapidly changing economy."

In blunt words, the States have fallen from their once high estate because they just aren't doing the job. The State legislatures are so composed that they do not accurately reflect the will of the people. And the people, of necessity, have turned more and more to the Federal power for relief.

This significant finding is made more significant by its sponsorship. The Commission was set up in 1953 as a sort of accomplice after the fact. During the 1952 campaign, the Republican Party charged heavily that too much power rested in Washington and not enough power resided in the State capitols. Immediately upon election, Ike promised to restore power to the sovereign States. This Commission, a majority of whose members were appointed by the President of the United States, was to compile the data and formulate the method for restoring a proper balance between State and Federal Government.

The Commission got off to a poor start when it was found that Dr. Clarence Manion, who was to serve as chairman, virtually disqualified himself by voicing fixed conclusions about matters he was supposed to study impartially. Manion was dropped and Meyer Kestnbaum, a businessman of liberal persuasion, was named. The 30-member Commission ranges in viewpoint from Allan Shivers and Oveta Culp Hobby to Hubert Humphrey and Wayne Morse. The work of the Commission is described by the London Economist as "the first official reassessment of the American Federal system since its foundation in 1787."

The net of this historic study is: it would be healthy for the Federal system if the States played a greater part in our domestic policy making, but, can the States be trusted to do so?

The Kestnbaum report revolves around an axial "if." The big "if" is the ability of the States—as presently governed under their antiquated constitutions, their malapportioned legislatures—to find "effective solutions * * * in a rapidly changing society." If the States cannot cope with these problems of change, then, the Commission insists, the sovereign State is likely to become more unsovereign with each passing year:

"If States do not give cities their rightful allocation of seats in the legislature, the tendecy will be toward direct Federal-municipal dealings. These began in earnest in the early days of the depression. There is only one way to avoid this in the future. It is for the States to take an interest in urban problems, in metropolitan government, in city needs. If they do not do this, the cities will find a path to Washington as they did before, and this time it may be permanent, with the ultimate result that there may be a new government arrangement that will break down the constitutional pattern which has worked so well up to now."

But, the very first step toward making the State government a more effective instrument for handling urban problems is to make the State legislature more representative of its total population. Right now, says the Kestnbaum report, "in a majority of States, city dwellers outnumber the citizens of rural areas. Yet in most States the rural voters are overwhelmingly in control of one legislative house, and overweighted if not dominant in the other."

Over the years, this imbalance has grown more and more discriminatory against the cities. As cities have grown more rapidly than rural areas, these systems of apportionment have tended to create an increasing imbalance in legislative representation in favor of rural areas."

The nature of the problem is clearly defined by the report, but the enormities of urban underrepresentation are not described.

The Kestnbaum thesis is that the road to Washington is paved with the failure of the State to handle urban problems. Since the core weakness of the State is the unrepresentative character of the legislature, it appears that the inevitable trend is toward greater power in Washington.

The ancient recourse of the States—an appeal to the Supreme Court to curtail Federal intervention, especially in matters of economic and civil rights—is no longer realistically available to them. The Kestnbaum report holds that the constitutional line between State and Federal jurisdiction in the areas of traditional dispute no longer exists—if it ever did. If in a matter of economic policy the State and Federal Governments finds themselves in dispute, the ultimate decision rarely lies in the courts any more. Today, these are questions mainly for legislative judgment, and the criteria are chiefly political, economic, and administrative, rather than legal.

In our current concept of what the report calls "cooperative federalism" the basic idea is how to use the Federal system to meet the needs of the people. The final criterion is the public welfare. The report suggests that the lowest and most local level of Government get the first crack at doing the job:

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of Government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the national government can undertake."

In this one long-sentence summary of its philosophy, the Kestnbaum report is issuing a polite but unmistakable warning to the States.

Whether the Kestnbaum report can stir the States in 1955 anymore than Keogh's gunfire did in 1936 or Stoner's tables did in 1937 is highly doubtful. The commission's report does not read like a trumpet call to action. In academic style, it merely notes the waning power of our sovereign States, voices its hope that the Federal system shall not disappear, and warns the States in a loud aside that unless they become more representative of their citizenry, they will continue to be bypassed in favor of Washington.

The Kestnbaum report is misdirected; the letter of transmittal is addressed to the President of the United States. It should be addressed to the legislatures of the 48 States.

Addresses of Newell Ellison and H. Brian Holland at the George Washington Law Association Dinner Honoring the Court of Claims Upon Its 100th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on October 27, 1955, the George Washington Law Association honored our beloved former colleague, Hon. Marvin Jones, Chief Judge of the Court of Claims, and the associate judges, Hon. Benjamin H. Littleton, Hon. Samuel Estill Whitaker, Hon. J. Warren Madden, and Hon. Don Nelson Laramore, at a dinner in the city of Washington, in celebration of the 100th anniversary of this distinguished court. The occasion was honored by the presence of the Chief Justice and Mrs. Warren and many other outstanding members of the Judiciary and the legal profession. The Chief Justice and Chief Judge Jones made appropriate responses to personal tributes, and commented upon the significance of the Court of Claims. The two principal addresses were by Mr. Newell Ellison, of the firm of Covington & Burling, member of the George Washington University Board, and by Assistant Attorney General H. Brian Holland. These addresses reflected scholarship and research of the highest order, and under leave to extend my remarks I include their comments in order that students of important legal questions dealt with by the Court of Claims may have the benefit of these remarkable studies. Copies of Mr. Ellison's address with footnotes may be obtained from the George Washington University Law School. The addresses are as follows:

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS: KEEPER OF THE NATION'S CONSCIENCE FOR 100 YEARS

(By Newell W. Ellison)

The 100th anniversary of the United States Court of Claims has deep significance not only for those who are dedicated to the law but to the public at large. Such a centennial is an invitation to reflect upon the court's origin, to recall what needs gave it birth and with what purposes it was endowed, to review its accomplishments and to project its future.

This is one centennial celebration, however, that calls for no eulogy. The court today is a vigorous body, and in its quiet and efficient way it is doing a greater volume of judicial business than at any time in its history. In a real sense, therefore, its first 100 years are only a beginning, and a continuation of its high service can be expected.

Nor is the writer prepared to spend time telling the members of the court that they can do no wrong, and in this forbearance certainly 50 percent of the lawyers will join, depending on the outcome of their last case before the court.

This anniversary calls principally for an assessment of the position which the court has made for itself in our Government. Mere age should not evoke tribute—whether in an individual or in an instrument of Government—because accomplishment and fulfill-

ment of assigned tasks are the true marks of greatness.

THE NEED FOR AND EARLY HISTORY OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Court of Claims was a long time coming. Perhaps the most startling fact about its establishemnt is that it—or a similar court—was not founded many years before 1855. At that time the creation of the court was aptly characterized as "a practical negative upon that vicious maxim, 'the sovereign can do no wrong.'" The surprising thing, however, is how the notion that the "sovereign can do no wrong" ever gained acceptance in this country, or survived as long as it did. The very idea would seem anathema to a people who had declared their independence in 1776 and taken up arms against George III. Certainly it should have been rejected as one of the few principles of the common law that was alien to our temperament and way of life.

To compound this paradox, the English themselves in their own pragmatic way had, by the end of the 18th century, had enough of the antics of their King and had begun to make him accountable in the courts. When the creation of the Court of Claims was being debated in Congress, a European diplomat told a story about George III who, apparently believing he could do no wrong, asked a judge, "Why do I lose so many lawsuits in your court?" The judge is reported to have replied, "Because Your Majesty is so often wrong." Throughout the debates in Congress one of the most persuasive arguments in favor of the court was that many other civilized nations had established methods by which a citizen's claim against his government could be adjudicated. This Nation was not, therefore, among the first to make the Government accountable in the courts, and when it finally did so, almost the only great power failing in this duty was Russia.

This is not to suggest that there was no one in this country before 1855 who saw the desirability of making the Government accountable in the courts. John Quincy Adams, John Randolph, Henry Clay, Stephen Douglas, and Abraham Lincoln were among those in the Congress who saw the need for this court long before 1855. For example, John Quincy Adams concluded from his long experience in the Federal Government that when it came to private claims a deliberative assembly is the worst of all tribunals for the administration of justice. But until 1855 even such men as these were unable to overcome the hard core of opposition that clung to the notion that the Government should not be subject to suit. The explanation of this phenomenon must be left to the political scientists. However, it should be noted that the earliest settlers were proud of the way they had freed themselves of the King and were convinced that if the King could do no wrong, then certainly their own new democracy was similarly infallible. It took a generation or so before this intense pride burned out, and the fact that over the years more and more people became claimants against the Government played no little part in extinguishing it.

The mere establishment of the court in 1855 did not, however, do away completely with the deep-seated notion that the Government can do no wrong, or at least should not be accountable for any wrongs that it might do. The very survival of the court was in doubt for some years. Until 1863 its judgments were not final. Each one required congressional review and a specific appropriation to make it effective. This serious deficiency was cured during the administration of President Lincoln, who said in his annual message to Congress that: "[W]hile the court has proved to be an effective and valuable means of investigation, it in great degree fails to effect the object of its creation, for want of power to make its judgments final * * *." "It is as much the duty of the Government to render prompt justice against itself, in favor of citizens, as it is to administer the same between private individuals." However, several more years were to pass before this legislation was finally accorded the meaning Congress originally intended. And almost 90 years were to pass before the Congress got around to recognizing that the court was a full-blooded, constitutional court, without qualifications or limitations. Even though it thus took almost another century to bring the court to its present stature, the year 1855 is most significant because the creation of the court demonstrated that the United States had come of age. The American people had become sufficiently confident of their ability to survive as a government of freemen that they no longer feared inroads on its sovereignty, and were prepared to make it accountable in the courts.

If "the cornerstone of a temple of justice is no higher than the lowest stone in its foundation," then it is not surprising that Lincoln was among those who played a significant part in the creation of the court of claims, and in starting it on the road to its present position of dignity and responsibility.

THE PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COURT: KEEPER OF THE NATION'S CONSCIENCE

Perhaps the clearest statement of the court's purposes and objectives was made by a distinguished member of the bar just 100 years ago this month. The words of Mr. Charles O'Connor, of New York, are so prophetic of the course that this court has actually followed that they are well worth quoting. In an early appearance before the court he said:

"Here equity, morality, honor, and good conscience must be practically applied to the determination of claims, and the actual authority of these principles over governmental action ascertained, declared, and illustrated in permanent and abiding forms. As step by step, in successive decisions, you shall have ascertained the duties of government toward the citizen, fixed their precise limits upon sound principles, and armed the claimant with means of securing their enforcement, a code will grow up giving effect to many rights not heretofore practically acknowledged.

O'Connor declared that the court should establish a standard for governmental morality, and urged the court never to forget that it was "the keeper of the Nation's conscience."

This is not to suggest that the high mission so eloquently articulated by O'Connor was entrusted to this court alone. All of our Federal courts share in this task. But since this court's jurisdiction involves only the Federal Government, it may be said that it is specially charged with seeing to it that the United States does justice to its citizens.

The real reason that this centennial is being observed is that the court of claims has met the challenge laid down 100 years ago. In discharging its responsibility of holding the Government accountable to its citizens, it has indeed served with distinction as the keeper of the Nation's conscience.

The court has on many occasions rendered substantial money judgments for taxpayers. It has passed upon a number of knotty constitutional questions. It has considered bizarre and spectacular claims arising out of piracy and insurrection. It has meticulously analyzed involved patent claims. The Indian claims which it has considered are legion in number, and some of its judgments legendary in amount. All of these matters are highly significant not only to the claimants who have petitioned the court but to the members of its bar as well.

But the unique and permanent contribution of the court to our Government and our political life is found in the stream of less-noticed decisions rendered over the past hundred years which in various ways have made Government officials accountable to the citizens with whom they deal. Each decision has been as a brick in the substantial structure of justice and fair play which has not only protected the citizen from arbitrary action, but perhaps more important has inspired a high standard of conduct for Government officials high and low. In no other country does the citizen receive fairer treatment from the officers of his government, and one of the principal factors in the development of this high sense of responsibility on the part of Government officials has been the existence of this court and the discipline of its decisions.

Before turning to the court's contribution to the substantive law, a word should be said about its highly effective procedure, particularly the Commissioner system. The manner in which these unusually able men find the all-important facts has been of major assistance in the court's administration of justice. The system has been widely copied and only recently was specially commended by the Hoover Commission in its Report on Legal Services and Procedure.

SOME MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE COURT

This is not the occasion for a detailed analysis of the court's decisions, but it is appropriate to note a few of the important areas in which it has established or enhanced the principle of accountability of the Government to its citizens. Three salient areas are Government contracts, employee compensation and tenure, and the taking of private property for public use. From its inception cases involving these questions have been constantly before the court. In these fields the court is in every sense an expert judicial body. It is no less expert in other fields, but in these fields the cumulative effect of its decisions has been to mold a code of Government conduct worthy of the highest hopes of the court's founders.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

While the court's influence in the field of Government contracts has been making itself felt for a hundred years, a notable example has so recently occurred as to be fresh in the minds of all. It is the controversy sparked by the Moorman and Wunderlich cases. It provides an instructive example both of the court's philosophy and of its stature in the Government.

The problem involved was the power of the Government to bar a private contractor from obtaining judicial review of contract disputes. One branch of the controversy goes to the scope of judicial review of administrative determination of facts under contracts which provide that the contracting officer's decision is to be final as to all facts. The other concerns judicial review of action taken under contracts which provide that the contracting officer's decision is to be final as to all disputes of law as well as fact.

Beginning as early as 1866, the court had consistently held that a contract of the latter type did not bar judicial review of questions of law. Almost as early in its history, the court held that it was not barred from reviewing administrative findings of fact to the extent they involved fraud, gross mistake or failure to exercise an honest judgment. These two interpretations were adhered to by the court, and followed by other tribunals, and until the late 1930's they represented the law of the land on Government contracts.

The court's view of contracts which barred judicial review entirely was that it served the best interests of neither the Government nor the contractor to shift to private citizens the entire risk of arbitrary administration of contracts by representatives of the Government. The Supreme Court, on

the other hand, never quite accepted this view. It reversed one decision in 1939 in a per curiam order, but the Court of Claims continued to adhere to its previously announced views. Some 10 years later in the Moorman case, however, the Supreme Court rejected the position so long held by the Court of Claims and did so in language that could not be ignored.

Most of you are familiar with the Wunderlich decision in 1951. In that case the Supreme Court repudiated the standard which had been long established in the Court of Claims for review of administrative findings of facts under Government contracts. This court had reversed a determination by a Government official because it disregarded the practices of the trade, proper accounting methods, and known facts as to actual cost. But the Supreme Court held that the only basis for review of the contracing officer's determination was actual fraud, which it defined as an intention to be dishonest. The Wunderlich decision thus constituted a deep inroad into the protection which this court for many years had accorded private contractors against arbitrary Government action. The depth of that inroad was measured by one of the dissenting Justices of the Supreme Court, who said,

"Law has reached its finest moments when it has freed man from the unlimited discretion of some ruler, some civil or military official, some bureaucrat. Where discretion is absolute, man has always suffered.

"The rule we announce makes government oppressive. The rule the Court of Claims espouses gives a citizen justice even against his government."

Fortunately, however, the decisions of the Supreme Court in Moorman and Wunderlich were not to be the final word. Rather, the Court of Claims, long-held views as to what the Nation's conscience demanded of its officials prevailed. Congress outlawed contracts which barred review of questions of law, and provided for judicial review of questions of fact in accordance with substantially the same standards as the Court of Claims had followed for years. The adoption by the Congress of this court's views is a remarkable tribute to the court, and is a measure of the esteem in which it is held today by its contemporaries in the Government.

Perhaps, what has been said gives a one-sided version of the place of the court in our Government. It does do more than render judgments in favor of claimants. All too often it refuses. And it does protect the Government against baseless and exorbitant claims. But it is much more noteworthy that this Nation has an institution of government that assures justice to its citizens since over the centuries governments, in their strength, have been able to take care of themselves.

RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Turning now to the second general area in which the court's influence has been particularly felt, it is hardly necessary to note that the rights of employees of the Federal Government have always been a major concern of the court. On occasion, far-reaching questions of constitutional law have been before it. Two such cases are the Myers and Humphreys cases involving aspects of the President's power of removal. Another is the more recent Lovett case, in which the court passed on the constitutional issue raised and was affirmed by the Supreme Court on the ground that the statute in question was a bill of attainder.

In the main, however, the court's influence in this area cannot be charted by landmark cases. Its peculiar contribution has been to provide a forum in which employees can secure relief against arbitrary official action. In a real sense the court has provided for these many years the grievance machinery for the entire Federal Government wherever statutory rights are abridged. Army officers, stenographers, shipyard welders, Philippine scouts all have reason to regard the court as their final protection against what they regard as discrimination or oppression at the hands of Uncle Sam. The court's numerous decisions in the field have left their lasting impression on the administration of civil service laws and regulations.

The recent decisions in the Knotts and Crocker cases exemplify the role of the court in fashioning the proper relationship between the Government and its employees. Neither case involved a great constitutional issue nor a particularly complex legal question. Both, however, required a deep understanding of Government and of human frailties, and both called for an exercise of wisdom and courage on the part of the court to recognize that personnel systems, completely sound in theory, had broken down and had impinged upon the individual rights of a single employee. Under these decisions an employee is entitled not merely to the judgment of his superior, but rather to the honest judgment of that official. The court's willingness to take such action as this has made it an important force in the development of a competent and loyal body of civil servants.

TAKING OF PROPERTY WITHOUT COMPENSATION

It is difficult—in this year 1955—to realize that, before the establishment of the Court of Claims, there was no real substance to the right guaranteed to the private citizen by the Constitution against taking by the United States of his property without compensation. Before 1855, if an individual was paid at all for property converted to public use by the United States, it was purely an act of grace by the Congress.

Over the past few decades there have been marked developments in the doctrine of the Federal law of taking. Here, to, as in other areas, the advance in the law has taken the form of a progressive enlargement of the Government's duty to account to the private citizen for administrative acts which interfere with his property interests. No small part in the development in the law of taking can be credited to enlightened decisions of this court, such as the Causby case, where it was held that flights of military aircraft at low levels over plaintiff's farm constituted taking of a temporary easement in the airspace requiring compensation under the Constitution; and the Silk cases which recognized that a Government regulation could effect a taking even though the property involved was not actually appropriated.

CONCLUSION

There can be seen a common strain running through all of these decisions of the court. In each of them the court has held the Government and its officials to a strict code of conduct in their relations with the citizenry. Technicalities are brushed aside. The rights of the individual are never sacrificed to the demands of expediency. There is indeed a striking resemblance between the jurisdiction of this court and the jurisdiction of the Equity Court before it became merged with the courts of common law. Its origin and the maner in which it has discharged its responsibilities are very much in the high tradition of the Court of Equity.

Though the court's record as "keeper of the Nation's conscience" is to be found in its decided cases, it must be remembered that it has exercised an influence far beyond its recorded decisions. Its main impact upon political life of this Nation has been the salutary effect that its decisions have had upon the everyday conduct of the Government. In these days when Government is big and growing bigger, it is essential that at the bar of justice the Government never becomes more powerful than its most lowly citizen. This is the ideal toward the attainment of which the Court of Claims has made such an important and vital contribution. This court is founded on the proposition that the Government may be wrong—a proposition which today unfortunately is rejected by governments ruling almost half the world.

The role of the court in the long process of making the State responsible for the just claims of its citizens has been as important as any development in our law in the last century. With the growth of the great centralized governments of the 20th century, the need for the court is far greater today than it was at the time of its establishment in the simpler days of 1855.

Perhaps the single most important requirement in our complex society today is that there be adequate protection of the rights of the individual against the increasing demands and power of government. It has been said that an essential difference between democracy and totalitarianism is that democracy has shown a keener insight into the importance and dignity of the individual. The act by which this court was created 100 years ago, and the manner in which the judges of the court have exercised their unique jurisdiction, are inspiring and encouraging instances of that insight. Together they have created an institution of justice that performs the high function assigned the court on its official seal "For the Republic and for Its Citizens."

It can well be said to the court on its 100th birthday: "How well in thee appears the constant service of the antique world."

ADDRESS BY HON. H. BRIAN HOLLAND, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL, TAX DIVISION

This is a most unique occasion in that it is the only occasion, so far as I am aware, when a representative of the Department of Justice has found it possible to concur, without reservation, in everything said by non-Government counsel before the Court of Claims. Perhaps I should simply stipulate my concurrence, sit down, and await the opinion and judgment of the Court. However, one of our most distinguished judges has expressed the view that an indifferent, or even a downright bad, oral argument is better than none at all. So I pray the Court's indulgence for the few minutes that have been allotted to me.

Mr. Ellison has spoken of the circumstances which led to the enactment of the legislation creating "a court for the investigation of claims against the United States." It is interesting to note that in 1854, even as now, there were those who tended to blame all their troubles on the shortsightedness and prejudice of the so-called bureaucrat. In the debates on the bill to create what was then visualized as a board of commissioners to investigate claims against the Government, Senator Cass illustrated the crying need for some such tribunal by relating this anecdote:

"Toward the close of the year 1813 [he said], the army on the northwestern frontier was almost destitute of provisions, the roads were impassable, and we did not know what could be done. Among other things proposed to remove the pressure upon us, a seine was directed to be purchased and sent up to Lake Huron, to catch whitefish. The quartermaster purchased a seine, and the whitefish were caught abundantly, which was a matter of vast importance to the soldiers. The account was sent on; and what do you think was the decision on it by the accounting officer? It was that whitefish did not run in the month of November, and, therefore, that the United States had been cheated. The good officer had lived all his life upon the Potomac, and had heard of shad, which run only in April and May, and he thought that no fish could run in November."

Whether this was the turning point in the debate I do not know. Nor do I know whether the Court in its earlier days ever considered adopting the whitefish as its emblem just as my home State of Massachusetts has given recognition to the importance of the codfish in its own history.

Although the dominant objective of those who sponsored the creation of this new court in 1855 was to take care of citizens who had just claims against the United States, there were those who were also greatly concerned with protecting the Government against fraudulent claims. The congressional committees which passed upon claims did not, of course, purport to be judicial tribunals, and there was no provision for the appearance of counsel to present the Government's side of the case. With the change over to a judicial form of procedure, it was obviously necessary to provide for representation of the Government's interests in litigation before the court. It may surprise you to learn that at the outset the Government was not represented by the Department of Justice. The reason for this is very simple: The Court of Claims was created in 1855, but the Department of Justice did not come into existence until 1870. There was, of course, an Attorney General, who had one assistant. But in those days the Attorney General had little to do with litigation, except in the Supreme Court. So the act creating the Court of Claims provided for a Solicitor of the court, who was to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, and was to be the lawyer for the Government. It was not until 1868, 2 years before the establishment of the Department of Justice, that the duty of appearing for the Government in the Court of Claims was given to the Attorney General. At that time the idea of centralizing control of all the Government's legal business in one department, headed by the Attorney General, was under active consideration; and the transfer of the functions of the Solicitor of the Court of Claims to the Attorney General seems to have been regarded as an entering wedge. Initially it was proposed that there should be a Bureau of the Solicitor of the Court of Claims in the Attorney Generals' office, and that the Solicitor should be appointed by the court itself. Ultimately, however, the position of Solicitor was abolished and the Attorney General was given an additional assistant to help him carry out his new responsibilities. It is interesting to note that in the court's first report to Congress, and again in the debates on the 1868 statute, great stress was laid upon the importance and difficulty of the duties of those who represented the Government before the court, it being emphasized that in the Court of Claims the Government is opposed by the most eminent counsel in the United States—a situation which I am sure you will agree was not peculiar to the 19th century. Perhaps this had something to do with the later adoption by Congress of the requirement that the Attorney General's assistants be learned in the law, a requirement which was perhaps implied, though not expressly stated, with respect to the Solicitor of the Court of Claims, and as to the observance of which I hesitate to testify.

In speaking of the vital part which the court has played in the development of the legal relationships between the Government and its citizens, Mr. Ellison has most appropriately emphasized the point of view of the citizen as litigant, the functon of the court as "keeper of the Nation's conscience," and its influence in promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct for those who carry on the daily activities of Government. As one who is privileged tonight to speak for the Government itself, I should like to direct your attention for a moment to a related, though slightly different, aspect of the court's work. I refer to the invaluable contribution it has made, and continues to make, to the orderly administration of the Government's business through its promotion of uniformity in the interpretation and application of the laws under which that business is conducted.

Although in certain areas of the law the Federal district courts have concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims to hear and determine claims for money judgments against the United States, the concurrent jurisdiction of the district courts is, with only few exceptions, limited to claims not exceeding $10,000 in amount. While the primary purpose of that limitation was apparently to safeguard the Government's interests by requiring that the larger claims be brought in a court upon which the Attorney General could keep close watch, the result has been that the more important issues affecting such matters as Government contracts, the rights of Government employees, and the payment of just compensation for the taking of private property by the Government, have been adjudicated by the Court of Claims, subject to review only by the Supreme Court. This system, whereby the Court of Claims is practically the final arbiter of disputes falling within its jurisdiction, produces a consistent and authoritative body of law in fields in which certainty and finality are of the utmost desirability, to citizen and Government alike. Government departments must know how to fashion their programs and how to operate under them within the limits of congressional appropriations. Persons dealing with the Government must understand the scope of the authority of the Government's representatives and the proper interpretation of Government contracts and regulations. As a court with predominant, if not exclusive, jurisdiction over such matters, the Court of Claims has been in a position, through the application of uniform principles to the decision of individual cases, not only to mete out justice to the citizen but to furnish reliable—if not always welcome—guides to the formulation of administrative policies, the administrative disposition of claims, and the carrying on of the complex business of Government generally. It seems unlikely that comparable results could have been achieved had unlimited jurisdiction over claims against the United States been conferred on the district courts, with appellate jurisdiction vested in 11 courts of appeals, and with only the most limited opportunity for review by the Supreme Court.

Through its daily contact with cases involving virtually all of the executive departments and agencies, the Court of Claims has acquired detailed knowledge of their organization and methods of operation, as well as of the statutes and regulations under which they function. Its decisions have provided the basis for many of the rules which govern their activities. Thus it is well equipped to appraise the varied issues which come before it in their proper perspective and to exercise—as it has done in the past and continues to do—a constructive influence in the field of Government administration.

This does not mean that those who are on the Government's side of the counsel table will always agree with the court's views on particular issues. After all, we conceive it to be our duty to act as advocates for our client to the best of our ability, and like most advocates we are sometimes stubborn in our beliefs. In 1868, when, as I mentioned earlier, there was under consideration the proposal to do away with the office of Solicitor of the Court of Claims, there was some suggestion of criticism of either the Solicitor or the court, or both. Speaking for the defense, Senator Hendricks made this observation:

"I have heard complaints of the Court of Claims, but mainly by persons who have lost their cases there. That is the principal complaint that I have heard, and I have not paid much attention to it, for it is not often that a man, having a claim before that court, would be entirely satisfied if the decision should be against him, although every other person might be satisfied that the decision was proper."

It is only human nature to complain when one loses, and in this respect at least Government counsel are as human as their brethren in private practice.

Undoubtedly one of the most vicious defects in the system as it existed prior to the founding of the Court of Claims was the interminable delay which was so often involved in the disposition of private claims through the legislative process. Although Congress set aside 2 days out of each week for the consideration of private bills, the report of Presiding Judge Gilchrist on the activities of the Court of Claims for its first year tells us that some of the cases then before the court had been pending in Congress for periods ranging from 5 to 80 years. It is no wonder that the confidence of the people in the effectiveness of their right to petition for redress of grievances had degenerated almost to the vanishing point.

During its first term, the court rendered decisions in 125 cases, in 100 of which it wrote what Judge Gilchrist described as "elaborate opinions in questions of law." This was a pretty good start, when one considers that the court was plowing new ground, that there were only three judges, and that in accordance with the genial custom of the day the court sometimes heard arguments in a single case for as long as 2 or 3 weeks, and not at all infrequently for as long as 3 or 4 days. It set a precedent of speedy justice, to which the court has adhered despite the increased volume and complexity of its work.

The growth of our country and the expansion of Government activities have placed great burdens on all the Federal Courts, and as a result some of them have accumulated heavy backlogs of cases. The Court of Claims is singular in that despite the increase in its burdens it has kept as current as the availability of Government counsel would permit. We in the Department recognize that whatever delays occur in this court are largely the result of our not having enough lawyers to try cases as rapidly as the court can take them. Happily, this situation is in the way of being remedied because of the recent action of Congress giving us a special appropriation which has enabled the Department to assign to Court of Claims work by far the largest number of lawyers in the court's history. The Attorney General has directed us to concentrate our efforts on speeding up the disposition of Court of Claims cases, and plans to that end have been formulated and are being put into effect. Although it is obviously too early for me to be able to report the results of this program, I am quite confident that progress is already being made and that the results will become apparent before very long.

I hope that in this way those of us who have the privilege and responsibility of representing the United States before this court may contribute more effectively to the carrying on of the tradition of efficiency and fairness which the court has built up during the past hundred years. That this tradition will be maintained and strengthened I have no question.

New History of the Democratic Party—The Democratic Party Is Born

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Digest, official publication of the Democratic National Committee has

serialized the New History of the Democratic Party. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the first of three installments:

[From the Democratic Digest of December 1955]

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IS BORN—AMERICA DRAWS ITS FIRST POLITICAL BATTLE LINE

"The year was 1948. Harry S. Truman, whistlestopping across the country in the presidential campaign of that year, had been asked to state the fundamental creed of the Democratic Party. In plain words, he replied:

"The Democratic Party is the people's party. It is dedicated to serving all the people and not just the special interests of the few. The record of the Democratic Party is blazed across the face of the Nation in a story of a better, healthier, happier life for the common people of America."

The year was 1824. Thomas Jefferson was asked how his new political party differed from its opponents. "Men by their constitutions," he replied, "are naturally divided into two parties; those who fear and distrust the people, and wish to draw all powers from them into the hands of the higher classes; and those who identify themselves with the people, have confidence in them, cherish and consider them as the most honest and safe, although not the most sure depository of the public interests. In every country these two parties exist and in every one where they are free to think, speak, and write, they will declare themselves * * * call them whatever you will. * * * The appellation of aristocrats and democrats * * * expresses the essence of them both."

Between these two statements passed nearly a century and a half of American history. In that time the American people settled a continent, built cities, fought wars and became the greatest democracy in the history of the world. Through all these years there has been a Democratic Party, and its guiding principle from Jefferson to Truman has been the same. The story of the Democratic Party is the story of how the ideal of government for the common man has been carried through 150 years, to grow and expand with the American Nation.

This belief in the people has shaped democratic thinking in every field of government. It has meant that government should do what it can to insure the richest, fullest possible life to all the people. It has led to the belief that every citizen should have the chance to take some part in politics. It has commanded the preservation of certain personal liberties, without which man's dignity would be lost. And it has based its foreign policy on a sincere concern for the people of every other nation in the world. Much of the story of the Democratic Party is the story of how these goals were fought for, won, lost, and fought for again in the never-ending conflict with those with little trust in the people.

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony of the wisdom and vitality of the principles of the Democratic Party is the fact that it is the oldest political party in the world. It is difficult to fix an exact birthday for the Democratic Party—the most usual date given is May 23, 1792, the date of a letter from Jefferson to Washington giving a name to the party then headed by Washington. But the event primarily responsible for breathing life into the party was the fight for the Bill of Rights. These rights, which insure freedom of religion, speech, and press, and guarantee fair trials to the accused, had been left out of the original draft of the Constitution. The delegates to the Constitutional Convention, mostly plantation ownrs and merchants, had been so concerned with building a government able to keep the peace and protect property rights, that they failed to provide these necessary safeguards. Thomas Jefferson was not at the Convention; but when he saw of the omission, he moved into action. In letters to friends and followers throughout the country, the author of the Declaration of Independence declared:

"A Bill of Rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, and what no just government should refuse * * *."

Despite opposition, Jefferson rallied enough support to make acceptance of the Bill of Rights a condition of the Constitution's approval. The organization he built up in this fight became the core of Jefferson's new party; and the principle of individual liberty became a guiding star in the Democratic constellation.

Thomas Jefferson, founder of the Democratic Party, was the leading Democrat of his day. Despite his aristocratic upbringing, he shunned powdered wigs and finery, and greeted callers in an old brown coat and breeches. An optimist, he believed in the inevitable improvement of the world and its people. A religious man, he carried his faith into his politics. "I have sworn upon the altar of God," he said, "eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." A respecter of property rights, he nevertheless believed that in any conflict between property and men the rights of men came first.

But, most strongly of all, Jefferson believed in the inherent worth of the common man. "Every man, and every body of men on earth," he wrote, "possess the right of self-government." He was certain that, given the facts, the people would use that right correctly, So, to educate the people, Jefferson called for the founding of schools, newspaper, and libraries. Especially in the frontier States, his followers reshaped the laws to give every man a vote.

Jefferson's party first sought office in opposition to the governing class of the time, the Federalists. The Federalists had done much to bring the new American Nation to life. They had been the driving force behind the Constitution, and, under George Washington, had started the operations of the new Federal Government. But the Federalists' view of government was naturally limited by their own aristocratic backgrounds, and by the administrations of monarchs among the then-great nations of Europe. As their leader, Alexander Hamilton, put it, "Our real disease is democracy." "All communities," Hamilton believed, "divide themselves into the few and the many, the first are rich and the well-born, the other the mass of the people. The people are turbulent and changing; they seldom judge or determine right." Hamilton believed that support of the rich was necessary, and that the Government could not last unless the wealthy people of the country could make money under it. To assure this, the Federalists passed a tariff law, founded a national bank, and made other moves to benefit the creditors, merchants, and propertied interests.

Thus, the issue of government for the many versus government for the few was drawn before the United States was 10 years old. Jefferson's party took up the challenge laid down by the Federalists. It was no easy job. The riot and bloodshed of the French Revolution had momentarily discredited the idea of democracy, and the Federalist press interpreted every criticism of the Government as a foreign revolutionary plot. As historian Wilfred Binkley has said, "The Federalists succeeded, to their own satisfaction, in making the terms 'Federalist' and 'patriot' synonymous." But this did not check the Jeffersonians. Through their own newspapers and speeches, they aimed a running fire of criticism at the Federalist Government. Small farmers, workers and frontiersmen were urged to use their votes to give themselves a voice in the Government.

By 1798, a vigorous party had grown up. Because the word "democrat" was then in disrepute, Jefferson's party took the name "Republican," to show its determination to keep the Nation a republic. As the strength of the party increased, the Federalists took alarm. Exploiting fear of foreign infiltration, they passed an alien law, which eased deportation of political objectionables, and a sedition law, which made possible the punishment of anyone who dared criticize the Government. But the laws backfired. They smacked too much of kingly tyranny, against which a revolutionary war had just been fought. The State legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky denounced them as unconstitutional and called on other States to join in resisting them. Following their example, the common people in other States rose in protest and, in 1800, voted in Thomas Jefferson as the first Democratic President of the United States.

If the Democrats have been the party of strong Presidents, Jefferson was the first. In 1803, he negotiated the Louisiana Purchase, bringing into the Nation the most productive river valley in the world. In 1804, he sent Lewis and Clark to blaze a trail through what was to become the Great Northwest. Less daring Presidents might have hesitated before taking these steps, thus holding up development of the Western States. But Jefferson's vision stretched across a continent and through a hundred years of history. Foreseeing the rich returns the Mississippi Valley would someday repay, he proceeded to use the power of the Presidency to its fullest to double America's size.

In 1808, when Jefferson retired to his home in Monticello, he left the Government in the hands of his two trusted lieutenants, James Madison and James Monroe. Madison had been a general in the fight to ratify the Constitution. His faith in the American form of government had been intensified by a lifetime spent studying every other government history had known. Drawing on his vast knowledge, Madison taught the Nation the benefits of government through political parties, and the danger of allowing one group to gain control of the Government. The party behind Madison, made up as it was of Southern planters, city workers, small farmers and frontiersmen, was as diverse for a Nation its size as is the Democratic Party today. Some thought it hypocritical that conflicting groups should unite to support the same candidate and program. To them, Madison said:

"In the extended Republic of the United States and among the great variety of interests, parties, and sects which it embraces, a coalition of a majority of the whole society could seldom take place on any other principles than those of justice and the general good."

Madison was elected President twice. His first administration was harassed by war with England, but his second was peaceful and prosperous. The small Nation beside the eastern seaboard was growing strong, and it was building the Cumberland Road and the Erie Canal to clear its way westward. The frontier, pushing its way across the Appalachian Forests toward the Mississippi, acted as a generator of democracy. There were no extremes or wealth or social classes on the frontier. Men were measured by what they could do with their hands. Because everyday life was dangerous every man was needed, and a spirit of cooperation developed between towns and families. Such people were naturally drawn to Jeffersonian democracy, and their votes helped keep it in office from 1800 to 1824.

James Monroe was President for the last 8 of these years. He was the last of the cocked hats—leaders of the Revolution—to be President. During his administration, the

principles underlying Democratic Party foreign policy were first put into action. Relations with other countries were as important in Monroe's day as they are now, but for a different reason. The United States was a new Nation, fighting for respectability among the world's powers. It could have cut itself off from the world and dealt with other countries only when threatened. But a party and a Nation that believed, with Jefferson, that man's worth and his right to self-government were universal, could not close its eyes to world events. So when Europe cast eyes on the new states of South America, President Monroe gave notice that America would protect its neighbors from foreign interference. Designs on the independence of these countries, Monroe said, would be interpreted as designs on America itself. In a sense, this was America's first security pact. It was a daring gamble for a young Nation, but it worked. And ever since, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine have been the root and core of American foreign policy. Despite times when the Democratic Party has followed the national trend toward isolationism, it has always come back to the fundamental principle that the safety and rights of the common people cannot long be protected if protection stops at the shores of our oceans.

A New History of the Democratic Party—Old Hickory Comes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Democratic Digest of January 1956:

[From the Democratic Digest of January 1956]

OLD HICKORY COMES TO WASHINGTON—PEOPLE VERSUS PRIVILEGE

During Jefferson's and Madison's terms, the Federalist Party was withering away. In Monroe's years, it died. In 1820, Monroe was reelected without opposition. Everyone in public life proclaimed himself a Jeffersonian as the Nation embarked on its political "Era of Good Feeling."

But the truce did not last long. Broad as it was, the Democratic Party could not embrace every region and every interest group in the Nation. Party unity became increasingly strained until, in 1824, it burst. Four different candidates ran for President of the United States.

Amid this confusion, the Democratic Party temporarily lost sight of its Jeffersonian principles. The men of wealth and privilege, in whose hands Hamilton had unsuccessfully tried to place the reins of Government, were quick to seize upon the Democratic split. During the administration of John Quincy Adams, they regained influence in Government. Rallying, as Jefferson had feared, behind the Bank of the United States, they seized control of the Nation's credit and used this to try to get control of the Nation.

The time was ripe for a new champion of the common people, and in Andrew Jackson the Democratic Party had a man to meet the occasion. A true son of the frontier, Jackson had lived in the backwoods, fought Indians and beaten the British in the War of 1812. He was tall and rawboned, and his soldiers had nicknamed him "Old Hickory," after the toughest thing they could think of. Stern and upright, Jackson possessed an intense patriotism, a razorsharp sense of honor, and a burning dedication to the common man.

Entering politics, Jackson and his followers fashioned many of the tools of political democracy. The national convention, the party platform, and the election campaign, were their inventions, and through them, men from all walks of life were given an opportunity to take part in politics. In the election of 1828, three times as many people voted as in any election up to that time, and Jackson was elected President.

Fortified by his victory, Jackson went after the Bank of the United States. As the official depository of the Nation's funds, the Bank had become a vast monopoly, controlling all banking transactions and credit in the country. It kept newspapers and Congressmen on its payrolls, and they ruthlessly attacked anyone who interfered with the bank's activities. Near the end of Jackson's first term, Congress extended the bank's charter. But Jackson vetoed the bill, and withdrew all Government deposits from the bank. In a veto message which reasserted basic democratic principles, Jackson said:

"Every man is equally entitled to protection by law; but, when the laws undertake to add to those natural and just advantages artificial distinctions, to grant titles, gratuities, and exclusive privileges, to make the rich richer and the powerful more potent, the humble members of society—the farmers, mechanics and laborers—who have neither the time nor the means to secure like favors to themselves, have a right to complain of the injustice of their government."

Jackson's words and actions caught the imagination of common people throughout the country. Southern yeomen and small planters, pioneer farmers in the Northwest, German and Irish immigrants, plain country folk of New England and New York—all rallied to the Democratic Party. City workers, forming their first unions for the improvement of working conditions, saw in Democratic principles a sympathy for their own aspirations. These were the people behind Jacksonian democracy. Their votes reelected him President. With Jackson as their leader, they so impressed their spirit upon American life that history marks Jackson's terms as the era of "the rise of the common man."

In 1836, Jackson returned to his beloved home, the Hermitage, in Tennessee. His successor in the White House was Martin Van Buren, former Secretary of State, who had become Jackson's most trusted adviser. Van Buren, a skillful politician, was one of the earliest leaders of the political organizations of the large northern cities. But he did not inspire the other elements of the Democratic Party as Jackson had. Van Buren's attempts to extend Jacksonian democracy were thwarted by a financial panic which hit the country in 1837. In the resulting depression, the common people suffered most. Van Buren, in his bid for a second term, became the first President to be punished at the polls because of a depression during his administration.

The party that ousted Van Buren from office called itself the "Whigs," after a British party of the same name. As historian Roger Butterfield says, "the Whigs * * * took their political technique from the Democrats themselves, improving it as they went along. The Whigs were the new party of business and property, but they carefully suppressed—in public, at least—the old Federalist prejudice against 'the people.' Since Jackson had won his battles by appealing to the common man, the Whigs announced they were common men, too, and their campaign, posters showed them with their shirtsleeves rolled up, hammering at a forge or following a plow." Behind a military hero, William Henry Harrison, the Whigs scored a sweeping victory in the election of 1840. The era of Jacksonian Democracy was ended, but it was to remain as a model for Democratic leaders of the future.

The story of the Democratic Party from 1840 to the Civil War is closely bound up with the breakup of the Union. Although Jackson had declared "Our union—it must be preserved," forces were at work in both North and South to destroy it. Slavery was an issue beyond the reach of politics. The Northern abolitionist and the Southern planter had between them none of the common ground necessary to political compromise. As their anger at each other rose in pitch, their political parties were swept up in the bitterness that led to secession and war. Abolitionist Democrats, unable to gain control of their party, helped form the Free Soil Party, which tried to keep slavery out of the new western lands. In 1848 they called Van Buren out of retirement to run for President on the Free Soil ticket. Northern Democrats gave him strong support. Thus Democrats were early leaders in the anti-slavery fight, even though the party itself was split over the great issue.

Despite growing sectional divisions, the Democratic Party accomplished three important goals in these years: the acquisition of the remainder of the West, the expansion of trade, and the suppression of racial and religious intolerance in the Know-Nothing movement.

Much of the credit for the western expansion goes to James K. Polk, a Democratic President of the 1840's. Polk believed that it was the Nation's manifest destiny to bring all the land to the Pacific under the American flag—by negotiation if possible, but by war if need be. By settlement with Britain, he won title to the Pacific Northwest. Texas entered the Union peacefully, but a war with Mexico was necessary to gain the California country. Thus, in 4 years, Polk had added half a million square miles of some of the richest and most spectacular country on the continent, finishing the task that had begun with Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase.

It was in Polk's administration also that the Democrats passed the Walker tariff. The Democratic Party has always favored moderating tariff charges on imports from abroad, both to aid the consumer and to improve relations with countries whose economies depend on what we buy from them. The Walker tariff did both. So sound was it economically that it remained unchanged until the Civil War.

History credits the Democratic Party with lowering the tariff and gaining the West. But almost forgotten is the strong stand the party took against the Know-Nothing movement. The Know-Nothings were organized to end the immigration from Europe which, even in the 1850's, had reached 600,000 a year. Since most of the immigrants were of the Catholic faith, the ugly mark of religious bigotry stained Know-Nothing beliefs. Members of the organization burned churches and beat up immigrants on the streets. When questioned about their activities they replied, "I know nothing."

By 1856, the Know-Nothing Party had elected seven governors, and was threatening to make a party of intolerance a major political force in America. But the Democratic National Convention unanimously adopted this resolution:

"Resolved, that a political crusade in the 19th century, and in the United States of America, against Catholics and foreign born, is neither justified by the past history or the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlightened freedom which particularly distinguishes the American system of popular government."

This united Democratic opposition broke the back of the Know-Nothing movement.

In the spirit of Jefferson and the Bill of Rights, the Democratic Party had spoken up for the rights of minorities. More than this, the defeat of the Know-Nothings showed the common people of Europe that America welcomed them to a new life. Our Western lands would have been of little use without people to fill them. The democratic sympathy for the immigrant quickened the movement that sent strong men westward to build a Nation.

Towering over all other events of the period was the widening gulf between North and South. Some Democrats, led by the "Little Giant" Stephen A. Douglas, strove to compromise the differences. In his famed doctrine of squatter sovereignty, Douglas proposed that the people of each new State decide for themselves whether to allow slavery. But it was too late for compromise. By 1860, the Democratic Party had split again, the northern wing supporting Douglas for President, the southern behind John T. Breckenridge. The result was a victory for the newly formed Republican Party, led by Abraham Lincoln.

A New History of the Democratic Party—William Jennings Bryan Rededicates the Party

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the Democratic Digest of February 1956:

[From the Democratic Digest of February 1956]

NEW LIFE IN DEFEAT—WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN REDEDICATES THE PARTY

From 1860 onward, the newly-born Republican party was to provide the main opposition for the Democrats. When first formed, the Republicans were a party of free soil and idealism, attracting many believers in Jefferson's principles. Lincoln himself was a devoted Jeffersonian. It was he who said that "the principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

But with Lincoln's assassination, the founders of the Republican party were rudely shoved aside. The new leaders, called Radical Republicans were men with blood in their eyes. Disregarding Lincoln's plea for "malice toward none," they set up a military dictatorship in the South and almost impeached a President who would not go along with their wishes. By their Reconstruction Acts and Force bills, they held up progress in the South for many years.

The Democrats tried to fight these actions, but they were seriously weakened. Republican leaders had disfranchised the Democratic South, and had massed behind their postwar candidate, Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, the voting strength of the Grand Army of the Republic. When Democrats criticized reconstruction measures, their opponents accused them of being rebels and traitors, unfit to govern the country. By waving the "bloody shirt" of the war, historian Charles Beard says, "the Republicans managed * * * to make party loyalty equivalent to national patriotism and voting the opposition ticket identical with sedition."

It was after the Civil War that American big business made its historic alliance with the Republican Party. The need for production and credit during the war had forced the Government into measures which greatly profited industrialists and financiers of the North. After the war, the bankers, railroad magnates and the other industrial giants agreed with the party in power to exchange campaign contributions for beneficial legislation. At first, the people did not mind this. They admired the men who were forging an industrial America, and were dazzled by their show of wealth. They even got the idea that the tremendous amounts of money being amassed at the top would trickle down to improve their own living standards. Events were soon to prove this theory wrong.

Grant's administration provided the perfect setting for business domination of the Government. Grant himself admired and liked to associate with the millionaires and manipulators of the day—Jay Cooke, Jay Gould, and Jim Fiske, the speculators whose names have survived as symbols of financial piracy. Although personally honest, Grant, as he later admitted, let crooked friends take advantage of his trust. As a result, not only was Grant's administration run openly and notoriously for the benefit of big business, but corruption flourished on a wide scale. The Vice President, members of the Cabinet and chairmen of congressional committees took bribes and graft. They made money on Government contracts and tax frauds. As historian Allen Nevins says, "The Grant era stands unique in the comprehensiveness of its rascality."

This stealing did not stop with money, but extended to national elections. In 1876, the Democrats nominated for President, Samuel J. Tilden, the brilliant reform Governor of New York. He had broken the Tweed Ring in New York City, and was pledged to break the ring of thieves around Grant. With the people aroused to Republican corruption, Tilden's integrity was a welcome change. He appeared to have won the election, 4,300,590 votes to 4,026,298, and 196 electoral votes to 173. But through bribery and forgery, the Republicans changed the totals in three Southern States, where Federal troops still were stationed under the Reconstruction Acts. A Republican Electoral Commission ratified the changes. It was the only stolen election in American Presidential history. More impulsive Democrats were ready to don their war uniforms and take the White House by force, but the calm hand of Samuel Tilden restrained them. Putting his respect for orderly government above both party and personal advantage, Tilden acquiesced in the decision of the Electoral Commission and retired to private life.

By 1884, the Republicans had been in power for 24 years. The "bloody shirt" of the "rebellion" was being waved more and more feebly, and people were becoming tired of men who looked upon Government service simply as a road to personal profit. So they elected to the White House another Democratic reformer from New York, Grover Cleveland. A big, gruff man whose honesty was unshakable, Cleveland devoted his two terms to raising the moral standard of Government. His motto was: "A public office is a public trust." Where Presidents before him had allowed raids on the Treasury for private pensions and pork-barrel appropriations, Cleveland used the Presidential veto to prevent them. He relaxed the demands of patronage and put more workers under the civil-service system. Officials who had a stake in the old system, including some Democrats, resented Cleveland's reforms. But the voters agreed with his nominator, Daniel Dougherty, when he said of Cleveland: "We love him for the enemies he has made."

But honest and devoted as he was, Cleveland did not fully sense the needs of the common people. In fact, a large segment of the Democratic Party had fallen under the influence of the big industrialists and their retainers. There followed a period of years in which, from the standpoint of party program, the average voter could not tell one major party from the other.

The Democratic Party needed a transfusion of new leadership and spirit. And in the agrarian movements of the Middle West, this was found. Between 1870 and 1895, the Nation witnessed a series of depressions, the historic price of unrestrained industrial development. True, the small-business man of the East had suffered. Twenty-three thousand small firms had failed in one 3-year period alone. True, the workingman was putting in 12 to 14 hours a day, and his attempts to organize unions were being frustrated by unsympathetic legislatures and courts. But the farmers were destitute. Crop prices had fallen 40 to 50 percent under the impact of Republican high tariff laws. Farms were mortgaged to Eastern bankers to the sum of a billion dollars. The cost of selling farm produce was steadily rising as the trusts and railroad monopolies levied their annual tribute upon the plain people of America.

So, organizing for political action, the men of the Midwest brought new blood and spirit into the Democratic Party. Their wants, by our standards, were not radical: they desired a graduated income tax, regulation of railroad rates, popular election of Senators, and relaxation of the gold standard, which held them in perpetual debt to the financiers of the East. But their opponents called these measures "the dreams and fantasies of Karl Marx," and cried to the voters to "stop this Communist march on private property."

Out of the Midwest came these agrarian reformers, and into the Democratic Convention of 1896. Their leader was William Jennings Bryan, of Nebraska, and the speech he made at that convention stands as perhaps the greatest in American political history. Picture Bryan, with his enormous head, strong, flashing eyes, and vibrant voice, 20,000 delegates and spectators hanging on his words:

"When you come before us and tell us that we are about to disturb your business interests, we reply that you have disturbed our business interests by your course. We say to you that you have made the definition of a businessman too limited in its application. The man who is employed for wages is as much a businessman as his employer. The farmer who goes forth in the morning and toils all day, and by the application of brain and muscle to the natural resources of this country creates wealth, is as much a businessman as the man who goes upon the board of trade and bets upon the price of grain. The miners who go a thousand feet into the earth to bring forth from their hiding places the precious metals to be poured in the channels of trade are as much businessmen as the few financial magnates who in a back room corner the money of the world. We come to speak for this broader class of businessmen. * * * We have petitioned, and our petitions have been scorned. We have entreated and our entreaties have been disregarded. We have begged, and they have mocked when our calamity came. We beg no longer; we entreat no more; we petition no more. We defy them. * * * Having behind us the producing masses of this country and the world, supported by the commercial interests, the laboring interests and the toilers everywhere, we will answer their demand for a gold standard by saying to them: You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Jefferson or Jackson would have felt at ease delivering this speech.

In Bryan, the Democratic Party had found its voice. With a great shout, the convention nominated him for President, and he went forth to wage one of the most exciting campaigns in American history. Bryan was the first modern Presidential candidate. He traveled 18,000 miles and addressed more than 5 million people—a remarkable feat for the days before radio and television.

Alarmed by Bryan's strength, the Republicans got busy. Their leader, Mark Hana, shook down insurance companies, railroads, and trusts for an estimated $16 million, the biggest campaign fund yet collected. Fourteen hundred speakers were sent out to answer Bryan. Contracts were made contingent on his defeat. Workers were told that if Bryan won on Tuesday, they need not show up for work on Wednesday. The pressure paid off: Bryan lost the election. But in so doing, he rededicated the Democratic Party to the common people.

Women and the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a paper prepared for delivery by Rose Berry, wife of my colleague, Representative E. Y. BERRY, in observance of National Printing Week:

WOMEN AND THE PRESS

It would be impossible to do full credit in the compass of one paper to the history, efforts and accomplishments of women who have made their way into the fourth estate, in the face of opposition and prejudice.

Ishbel Ross in her Ladies of the Press said, "By slow degrees the newspaperwoman has moved out of the false framework of legend and prejudice that has surrounded her for the last 50 years, although there is no denying that she is still a negligible factor in the newspaper office and is there only because of her own insistence, not because anyone wanter her. She has her own compensations, however. Invariably she likes her work beyond all telling. Adventure, excitement, romance, danger, praise and blame, glamour and drudgery keep her spinning self-forgetfully day after day in the dizzy world inhabited by ladies of the press."

The word usually used to describe a career in journalism is "glamorous." Glamour, says the dictionary, is mainly "a delusion wrought by magic spells." However, there was a time, distorted by nostalgia, when editorial rooms housed a hard-drinking, brawling bunch of rascals. But they are a breed that has vanished from all but memory and perhaps some movies. Newspaper men and women have traded in that type of glamour for respectable wages and an appreciable measure of security.

Newspapermen and women, these days, are clear-eyed. The prejudice against women on newspaper staffs has faded unevenly but nonetheless surely. Editors used to keep all but a rare few of the staff women in resentful captivity behind the frosted panels of the society and women's page departments. Today you will find women on ordinary assignments with men, on rewrite—even covering politics. Where there used to be about 1 woman to every 20 men on newspaper staffs, the proportion today is nearer 1 in 5.

One might ask "What makes a superior woman journalist?" Certainly one could reply that you would have to know what makes a good woman journalist—love of her work, initiative, enterprise, judgment, resourcefulness, a logical and orderly mind, poise, persistence, honesty, intellectual integrity, a sense of humor, idealism. Then—a superior woman journalist would have all these qualities, plus a compelling passion to learn the truth.

George C. Biggers, one of the Nation's outstanding publishers, has suggested that all children go through a phase of asking, "Why?" "Why is there paper around the crayon?" "Why does the dog sniff everything?" "Why do you have to have money for things?" Most children get over it. But some only change the questions. They go right on asking "Why?" It is one of the few childhood signs that there may be a future newspaperwoman in the family.

The various specialties of the business—reporting, rewriting, copy reading, editing—require different qualifications, but one characteristics all of the better ones share is an acute and driving discomfort in the presence of any question that needs an answer.

We might well ask why have women so capably invaded the profession of journalism; why do they continue to increase in numbers, and why do they remain? Perhaps it has something to do with that mystic pulsebeat of the paper that gets into the bloodstream. Perhaps it is something that happens when the presses start to roll. The women sitting at their desks can feel it, and with it comes a deep satisfaction. It tells them that the work they have just finished is on its way to entertain, and inform, and protect their fellow citizens.

It is impossible for us to know how many young women there are in America who would prefer, above everything else on earth, to get a chance on a newspaper. Probably the number runs into the thousands.

Elizabeth Timothy might be called the first woman newspaper publisher in this country. She published the South Carolina Gazette in 1739. The wife of Andrew Bradford published the American Weekly Mercury in Philadelphia for about 4 years after his death in 1742. Other pioneer publishers were: Cathrine Zenger, the New York Weekly Journal, 1746–48; Ann Franklin, the Newport Mercury, 1762–63; and Clementine Rind, the Virginia Gazette, 1773–74.

Dinah Nuthead conducted a press at Annapolis as early as 1696, but she did not issue a newspaper.

All these women mentioned above were printers' widows. Printers' wives often assisted their husbands.

It is interesting to note that reporters did not become necessary to newspaper staffs until the penny papers had placed an emphasis on local news.

For many years women had set type in printing offices, especially in the smaller towns, but the first woman editor of an important daily paper was Miss Cornelia Walter, who edited the Boston Transcript 1842–47. Margaret Fuller brought a greater reputation, however, to the New York Tribune during her editorial service on that paper 1844–46.

In Washington the picturesque Mrs. Anne Royal conducted her weekly journalistic efforts under the name the Huntress. For 25 years she was a colorful figure in our Nation's Capital. Her papers might be described as forerunners of the modern "gossip column." She was once convicted as a common scold and sentenced to be ducked according to the penalty prescribed by an old law, but the sentence was suspended. Mrs. Royal can be accredited with giving President John Quincy Adams one of his greatest adventures. No woman of the day was more widely known, more greatly feared or cordially hated, and more persistently persecuted than this elderly woman at the peak of her career. It may be said she revolutionized the press of her day. She was a pioneer in modern journalism, introducing the interview and the liberal, more intimate, personal method of handling news. Her methods may have annoyed and irritated the brilliant male stars in the newspaper firmament of the Nation's Capital city, but she waked them from their age-bound somnambulism and aroused them to realization that their sleepy mortality statistics, prosy editorials were not filling the requirements of the reading public at the time when a four-cornered election had thrown John Quincy Adams into the presidency through the House of Representatives. Those were the days when each political leader raged and ranted at his adversaries through the so-called pamphleteers and when the favorite words on every tongue were "tyranny! anarchy! treason!" and on every hand could be heard the whisperings of abolition, of slavery and secession.

Anne Royal decided that she had wasted enough time in polite appeals at the front door of the White House and that strategy would be required—so she set herself to watch the habits of President John Quincy Adams. She discovered his fondness for an early morning swim in the waters of the Potomac, half a mile from the Executive Mansion. So the active old lady gathered up her crinoline, her ink horn, quill pen, and roll of copy paper and sallied forth soon after dawn one July morning determined to end the matter once and for all.

The morning was balmy and the water delightful. Mr. Adams had relinquished his dressing gown and slippers at the Potomac's edge, as was his custom, and was having a fine swim all unconscious that Nemesis was on his trail—or rather—was on his clothes. A hail from the clump of trees from which he had made his plunge into the water disclosed to his horrified gaze the figure of Anne Royal calmly seated on his clothes, with the tools of her journalistic trade ready for use. He knew her and, knowing her, realized his doom. He swam toward shore until his feet rested on bottom and he was chin-deep. Being a modest man who swam before the fashion of bathing suits, he could come no farther. He heard the command "Come here" and the President's bewildered reply was "What do you want?"

"I'm Anne Royal," snapped editor and reporter. "Ive been trying to see you to get an interview out of you for months on the State-bank question. I have hammered at the White House and they wouldn't let me in, so I watched your activities, and this morning I stalked you from the White House down here. I'm sitting on your clothes and you don't get them until I get the interview. Will you give it to me or do you want to stay in there the rest of your life?"

There was no compromise in the heart of Anne Royal, even to the pleas of President Adams that he would most certainly give the interview, if she would vanish long enough for him to clothe himself. But her reply was "No."

In all probability reporter Royal's comments ran something like this: "You are President of the United States and there are a good many millions of people who want to know and ought to know your opinion on this bank question. I'm going to get it. If you try to get out and get your clothes I'll scream. You don't get out ahead of that interview."

Adams was a statesman and a diplomat, and he knew when discretion was the better part of valor, so he stood up to his chin in the placid Potomac River—minus clothing—and submitted to the rapid battery of questions until he had given the first "interview" probably ever given by a President of the United States. His questioner, a pioneer woman journalist, wrung from him what

none of the papers of either New York or Philadelphia had been able to get, the administration's ideas regarding the long and bitterly fought bank question.

It goes without saying that Anne Royal's resourcefulness and energy were always at their height when in search of news. She fought all her life for the entire separation of church and state, for the exposure and punishment of corrupt officials, for sound money, the establishment of public schools everywhere free of religious restrictions, justice to the Indians, liberal immigration laws, Sunday mail transportation, internal improvements, territorial expansion, just tariff laws, the abolition of flogging in the Navy, States' rights regarding slavery and free speech.

On July 2, 1854, she issued her last number of the Huntress, shut down her desk, and died within a few days, dropping like an old wheel horse in the harness. Her last editorial is worthy of note, for with all the power of language she possessed she analyzed the Kansas-Nebraska bill, wrote a strong message on the tariff and concluded with these words:

"Our third prayer is that the union of these States may be eternal."

Authorities on the history of journalism seem to agree that the year 1872 marked the end of an era. Horace Greeley died November 29 of that year. Perhaps even more significant than the passing of this great editor from the scene was the declaration which Greeley made in the Tribune shortly before his death. He wrote, "Henceforth it shall be my endeavor to make this a thoroughly independent journal."

Independence from party bonds had been making great advance. Greeley's declaration may be taken as marking the end of a long period dominated by great party newspapers. Women and journalism were becoming emancipated—hand in hand.

Late in the 19th century the reporter came into his own. He was key man in the new journalism. The growing importance of the reporter can be shown by the increased use of the byline, common in the Sunday papers of that day. Most of the famous editors of the time had risen from the ranks of reporters.

Women flocked into newspaper work during the late eighties. It has been estimated that in 1886, 500 women worked regularly on the editorial side of American newspapers, and 2 years later it was reported that there were 200 on New York papers alone.

Local women's press clubs were organized, and in 1885, a Womens' International Press Association, with Mrs. E. I. Nicholson, of the New Orleans Picayune, as president, was launched.

About 40 American correspondents covered the activities of the American Expeditionary Force in 1918—World War I. The only woman to get a properly accredited pass from the War Department was Peggy Hull of the National Editorial Association, who covered the American expedition to Siberia.

It is apparent that during and since World War II more women have moved into the editorial chairs of the Nation. They have invaded every type of newspaper and every field in a newspaper, editorially speaking. No news job, no matter how sacred to the domain of man, himself, is without its distaff members.

On metropolitan dailies and county weeklies, the women are turning our copy. They are working as country correspondents. They are taking jobs in the police press rooms and sitting around copy desks; they are shooting pictures of fires and pictures of society damsels. They are working practically every variety of beat, as "leg men" and rewriters and feature writers.

The trend toward more women in the fourth estate became a necessity during World War II and grew day by day. Some might call it a virtual revolution in the newspaper world—the kind of revolution that could only come about because of the gigantic, bitter fight in which most of America's young, able-bodied newsmen were helping preserve the freedom of the press they once wrote about by battling for it.

The law in most of the States was changed to provide that a newspaper did not lose its legality if it should suspend publication for a year during the war period. This, it was felt was necessary to preserve the life of the smaller newspaper, especially the weekly where help in the mechanical department was almost impossible to obtain.

Although, our State of South Dakota followed suit in the passage of such a suspension law, very few weekly newspapers permitted rust to gather on the wheels of their presses and linotypes. Instead, the women took over the editorial and mechanical functions of the newspaper office and shop.

More frequently it was the wife of the publisher now in uniform who carried on the work of her serviceman husband, in giving the people of those communities the news of local happenings.

Most of the wife publishers startled not only their husbands but their readers, by keeping a close contact with the men and women in service from their communities and reporting their whereabouts and activities to their readers. It proved to be a subscription builder. They impressed not only their serviceman husband but the State press associations as well, with the kind of a job that women could not do in the editorial department, composing rooms, and even in operating the presses.

Out of more than 200 large and small newspapers in the State of South Dakota, only 3 suspended publication during the war years.

In our own case, we lost all our help to the service. My husband and I were compelled to do everything necessary to keep a weekly paper in circulation. I was forced to learn the local and society news, keep up the subscription list which was no small task in view of the fact our paper went free to all armed service personnel from our county. In addition, I learned to run the linotype and set much of the type that went into our 8-page, 7-column paper each week.

While this was just one of the work-a-day jobs that many women did to help keep up the effort on the home front, it of course, could not compare with the glamourous journalistic work done by such women as Margureate Higgins. One of the 1951 Pulitzer prize awards in journalism went to her. From her desk at the New York Herald Tribune "Maggie" Higgins has become known to the newspaper reading public and through her dispatches from Europe and more recently from Korea. Her reports from the Korean front, where she was the only woman correspondent, appeared in book form in April 1951 under the title War in Korea. She began as a cub reporter on the staff of the Vallejo (Calif.) Times-Herald. The battle passages of her war story are written straight and hard. "She does not spare the blood but neither does she spread it on indiscriminately," Marquis Childs commented in a review of her War in Korea.

In the war theater she proved alarmingly brave, extraordinarily durable, and pretty even in her fighting clothes. She constantly demonstrated her resourcefulness. One bystander said of her "Maggie wears mud like other women wear make-up."

In our Nation's Capital the ladies never have been allowed to join the National Press Club. There are two women's press organizations—one of these is the Women's National Press Club. (The other is named the American Newspaper Women's Club.)

The Women's National Press Club was established in 1919. Its active membership is limited to writers, and they must have had not less than 2 years' experience in newspaper work to be eligible, even though as members they may be magazine writers or Government press agents.

Once a year, in the spring, the Women's Press Club holds a "stunt night"—the female counterpart of the famous Gridiron dinner. Elaborate preparations are made, the program is prepared and acted by club members. The President, the First Lady and high Government officials are honored guests at this occasion.

During the active political season in Washington, the club has regular weekly luncheons to which outstanding persons are invited to speak off the record and submit to questioning.

Perhaps it is surprising to some to suddenly discover that the distaff side of the fourth estate is doing a remarkable job of upholding the traditional quality of the press of this Nation.

It is possible that the secret of the success of women in journalism is due to "journalism" itself. These women journalists are American women who have lived our way of life and have had the unexcelled advantages of a free press to guide them in their present efforts.

Planning the U. N.: Russia Seizes on Yearning for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the first of a series of seven articles on the United Nations.

This article is entitled "Planning the U. N.: Russia Seizes on Yearning for Peace," and was written by Edward B. Simmons, and published in the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of January 9, 1956]

PLANNING THE U. N.: RUSSIA SEIZES ON YEARNING FOR PEACE

(By Edward B. Simmons)

On June 26, 1945, the day the United Nations Charter was signed at San Francisco, President Truman addressed the representatives of the 50 sponsoring nations.

Still somewhat bewildered by the tremendous role of President to which he had become sudden heir, Mr. Truman extended a congratulatory handshake to an official of the American delegation as he made his way to the rostrum.

The acknowledgement was deserved. No one person had been more influential and assiduous in the framing of this "supreme chance to establish a worldwide rule of reason," as Mr. Truman described the U. N. Charter that momentous day, than the man the President greeted, Alger Hiss.

Across the continent another significant event was taking place. The most experienced and best-known member of the administration in Washington, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, was denouncing before a New York audience, "efforts to thwart the peace by fomenting fear and hate of that great nation, Russia."

INCIDENTS POINT TO FATE

These two incidents received little notice in June 1945, with the world absorbed by a yearning for peace, and have claimed little attention since. However, in them may be the clue as to why the United Nations has reached its 10th birthday, with waning prestige, ever more bypassed by the major powers and with a proved inability to resolve its most formidable problems.

What auspices for an organization dedicated to peace could have been worse? As Secretary Ickes made clear, the Government of the Nation most instrumental in founding the U. N., the United States, viewed Russia as a peace-loving state. To represent its interests, the United States chose a man later convicted, in effect, of being a Russian spy.

A review of the U. N.'s background reveals a startling paradox. While Premier Stalin of the Soviet Union ostensibly played "hard to get," his agents and dupes eagerly got in on the proposition from the start.

Although a stalwart American, the late Secretary of State Cordell Hull is credited with being "the father of the United Nations." Leftwingers and subversives in the Federal Government went for the idea like bees to a honeycomb.

In 1954, after it investigated disloyalty among United States citizens on the U. N. payroll, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reported, "Some of these persons exposed in our Government investigation played key roles in the actual establishment of the U. N. itself as well as the establishment of the U. N.'s specialized agencies."

First steps toward a postwar peace organization were taken by Secretary Hull in December 1939, when he established a small policy planning group in the State Department. This was expanded to become the President's Advisory Committee on Postwar Planning, with representatives from many Government departments. The group functioned up to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference of August-September 1944, at which formal groundwork for the U. N. was instituted with the Russian delegation pretending disinterest and raising many "objections."

Membership on the President's advisory group was tantamount to being in on basic blueprinting of the U. N. Although many patriotic laymen were included at one time or another, actual work was performed mostly by the Government representatives, and a more doubtful group never was assembled in Washington.

The important Board of Economic Warfare was represented by William T. Stone.

BEW was responsible for "developing and coordinating policies, plans and programs designed to protect and strengthen the international economic relations of the United States."

RESIGNED UNDER INVESTIGATION

Stone was to resign from the Government while being investigated by the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board.

From the Treasury Department came the late Harry Dexter White, later identified as a Soviet agent by the FBI; V. Frank Coe, dismissed as a security risk in 1952, and Harold Glasser, who was to take refuge behind the fifth amendment after he was accused of being a Soviet agent.

White House representatives on the President's advisory panel were the late David K. Niles and Lauchlin Currie. Currie, who has remained out of the United States for some years, has been accused under oath of being a Communist and collaborator with the Soviet.

The State Department's contingent contained Hiss, as special assistant on Far Eastern matters; Laurence Duggan, specialist for the American Republics, who later fell or jumped to his death during the Hiss trial, and Mrs. Esther C. Brunauer, seated as an "expert" on Far East matters and later dismissed as a security risk.

APPLEBY OUT OF GOVERNMENT

The Department of Commerce's representative was Paul H. Appleby, then Undersecretary. A Henry Wallace appointee, Appleby later was to be Hiss' candidate for Assistant Secretary General of the U. N. No longer with the Government, Appleby is adviser to the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a leftwing ADA-type organization.

Contributing to the pro-Communist leanings of the President's advisory group was the Institute of Pacific Relations. The IPR was "considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence," the Senate Judiciary Committee reported in 1952.

During early planning for the U. N., the IPR sponsored "conferences" on postwar organization, making sure that members of the advisory group attended. Among those who did so were the group's executive director, Leo Pasvolsky of the State Department.

In January 1945, just before the San Francisco Charter Conference, IPR sponsored a conference for delegates from 60 nations, described by the IPR's own bulletin as a "fitting prelude" to San Francisco because "it covered very many of the problems which will be there for decision."

HISS ACTIVE WITH U. N.

Alger Hiss, the record shows, requested that copies of the IPR's report be made available to each delegation at San Francisco.

No one had a closer or longer connection with the formation of the United Nations than Hiss. In 1944, he became acting director of the State Department's Office of Special Political Affairs, which had "policy jurisdiction of all international organizations." In this post, Hiss personally drafted messages on U. N. matters for President Roosevelt's signature.

Hiss came into the height of his official powers at the vital Dumbarton Oaks Conference, the first formal parley on forming the U. N. Dr. Edna R. Fluegel, who compiled the State Department's own history, Postwar Foreign Policy Preparation, and was an assistant to Hiss at San Francisco, has described his role.

"Right before Dumbarton Oaks, when he first came, he immediately took a very active part," she told the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee. "He was in charge of all of the arangements. He was secretary to several of the top planning committees and attended Dumbarton Oaks in that capacity. I suppose you would describe his job as pretty much the job of a secretary general plus personal adviser to the delegates."

In that capacity, she said, "everything in the entire State Department of the highest classification" was available to him.

It is difficult to see how a Communist agent could get closer than this to U. N. planning, but Hiss did.

TOP AID AT YALTA

Hiss went to the Yalta conference as "top assistant on postwar organization," testified Dr. Fluegel, who as State Department historian had access to all records before Hiss was exposed. He participated "in all planning meetings" for Yalta, she said.

The Yalta conference was made necessary, the historian said, because of "failure to settle certain questions" concerning the U. N. at Dumbarton Oaks. The main issue, she disclosed, was a Soviet demand for General Assembly votes for Byelorussia and the Ukraine, Soviet states that even today do not have their own missions to the U. N.

The State Department was absolutely opposed to this, she said, maintaining the demand was comparable to the United States asking votes for Texas and other States.

With Hiss as specialist on international organization at Yalta, it is not surprising the Soviet won its demand.

"He operated in a sense as Mr. Stettinius' assistant with respect to the American delegation," said Dr. Fluegel.

"It should be remembered that Dr. Hiss exercises Svengali-like influence over the mental processes of Stettinius," wrote J. Anthony Panuch, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Security, in a 1946 report to the then Secretary of State Byrnes.

Stettinius wrote that Hiss performed brilliantly at Yalta. Stettinius was Secretary of State during the Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and San Francisco conferences. Hiss attended all three, always as top specialist on the new peace agency.

Hiss had every reason to regard the U. N. as his special "baby."

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times of January 10, 1956]

CONSPIRACY TAKES SHAPE: HISS-SOVIET CHARTER VOTED

(By Edward B. Simmons)

The United Nations Charter, the rule-book under which the organization seeks world peace, was not conceived at the San Francisco Conference of June 1945, as is popularly imagined.

The charter framework had been put together at Dumbarton Oaks and at Yalta, in the preceding 9 months, where the Soviet Union and the United States played the leading roles. The administration in Washington, negotiating on a basis of Russia being a peace-loving state, had Alger Hiss as its specialist on U. N. matters at both conferences.

Handed a framework at San Francisco, the delegates from 50 sponsoring nations filled in niches and added provisions. They argued, but mostly to save face while they swallowed the joint recommendations of the two giants of the conference.

TWO PRINCIPAL CONDITIONS

It was the understanding at San Francisco that there were two indispensable conditions for U. N. success: One, essential solidarity of the great powers, France, Britain, Nationalist China, Soviet Russia, and the United States; and two, that their armed forces must necessarily bear the predominent burden * * * of any enforcement action.

So wrote Dr. Grayson Kirk, now president of Columbia University, who was chief executive officer of the San Francisco commission that determined the duties and powers of the Security Council, the very heart of the U. N. Dr. Kirk's account was written just after the Conference closed. It is, therefore, authoritative and free of the pro and con U. N. propaganda of subsequent years.

Both of these basic assumptions, solidarity among the great powers and sharing of the military burden, have proved to be false. The two underlying cornerstones of the U. N. have crumbled.

MAJOR POWERS SOUGHT VETO

Dr. Kirk has described how the major powers held out for the "Yalta formula," now known as the veto, in the Security Council.

"Open as it is, on theoretical democratic grounds, to serious objection," he wrote in his 1945 summary, "this Council voting arrangement rests upon two basic assumptions to which the sponsoring powers attached great importance.

"The first was that in any enforcement action the permanent members of the council would be those whose forces must necessarily bear the predominant burden. In consequence it would be unrealistic to expect those Council members to allow their own forces to be committed to an action which they, or any one of them, opposed.

"The other argument was that the organization must depend for its strength upon the essential solidarity of the great powers.

"If this solidarity fails, then the security arrangements will as surely fail. Therefore, all measures which will further and which will rest upon such a presumption of solidarity are of such a vital necessity that they override all other considerations."

Dr. Kirk was not offering his opinion. He was summarizing the thoughts and reasoning of the men of good will at San Francisco, duped, it can now be seen, into accepting the "solidarity" and "sharing" propaganda of Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta.

For there has been no solidarity. Seventy-seven vetoes, mostly by the Soviet Union to be sure, many split votes and absentions emphasize the lack of "solidarity" on the Security Council.

Assumption as to sharing military duties has been proved even more false. In Korea, Britain supplied a regiment. France a battalion. The U. S. S. R. gave no forces to the U. N. cause, but helped the enemy. Nationalist China was not permitted to supply any military help.

Besides major weaknesses, of an unwritten character, the charter has fatal shortcomings in its recorded provisions.

CHARTER PROVISIONS COLLAPSE

When the cornerstones collapsed, almost every important provision of the charter collapsed, too. For example, as to membership and expulsion, the charter states:

"Membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states * * * and will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly.

"A member * * * against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken may be suspended from the rights and privileges of membership in the General Assembly.

"A member * * * which has persistently violated the principles contained in the present charter may be expelled by the General Assembly."

These seemingly powerful provisions for maintaining unity and order have one fatal weakness. After each provision is the clause:

"Upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

Thus, all 3 provisions are at the mercy of the veto. It is no wonder, then, 14 genuinely peace-loving states waited years before getting into the U. N. by a "deal" that virtually doubled the Communist membership. Nor is it surprising that no state, however flagrant its violation, has been expelled or suspended.

The charter states flatly:

"All members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes * * * and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the U. N. is taking preventive or enforcement action."

This provision has been openly violated. No punitive action could be taken, however, because the noble-sounding words are merely a statement of principle. The charter provides no method of enforcing it.

The basic outline for the charter inherited from Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta did not mention the word "justice"; the final draft at San Francisco does not define it.

Nowhere in the charter is "aggression" defined. This omission, it has been agreed, is serious, but a U. N. commission has been unable to agree on a definition in 9 years of study and discussion.

"I believe it is a mistake to claim the document (the charter) is so perfect it will insure absolutely against war," said the late Senator Taft in July 1945, when the world was at the peak of the sharing and solidarity delusion.

"If too much is now claimed for the charter, and then it begins to develop faults or fails in some of its purposes, there may be such a reaction by an oversold populace as to reverse the whole direction of our policy.

"I do not think most people of this country realize how much the veto changes the whole nature of the United Nations."

Senator Taft's prophecy, then unpopular, was amazingly accurate.

The people have been oversold on a document that drew all its strength from a great power unity that does not exist. The veto, or Yalta formula, has changed the U. N. far more than its most zealous supporters imagined.

The U. N. has survived more than 10 years on faith, not on its constitution, for that was carefully planned by communism to fail in the crisis.

The People Take the Lead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the American Jewish Committee is one of the oldest, most reputable, and most effective organizations in the United States in the important field of the maintenance of civil rights and the advancement of understanding and cooperation among Americans of all faiths, races, and origins.

We all recognize that there are still many gaps, many distressing areas and developments, in this field which can only give comfort to the enemies of the United States. Nevertheless, there is and has been progress, and it is important that we know of that progress and be stimulated and encouraged in our efforts to further it.

Recently the committee issued a report called The People Take the Lead, showing the record of progress in civil rights in the last 7 years. For an awareness of our progress in this field, I deem it desirable to have this text published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE PEOPLE TAKE THE LEAD

Each year since the President's Committee on Civil Rights issued its historic report in October 1947, The People Take the Lead has recorded nationwide progress toward equal opportunity for all. The cumulative record is impressive indeed.

When the President's Committee conducted its investigations, four States had fair employment laws. Today FEP statutes in 15 States cover more than one-third of our population. In 1947 racial segregation in schools was the unbroken rule throughout the South and in the District of Columbia. Today over 134,000 Negro children in 8 Southern States and the Nation's Capital are enrolled in previously all-white public schools, while more than 2,000 Negro students attend integrated college and professional classes.

Since the report of the President's Committee, 3 States have adopted laws barring discrimination in higher education; 5 States have provided administrative enforcement of public accommodations laws; and over a score of court decisions have sounded the end of segregation in restaurants, theaters, parks, swimming pools, golf courses, and other public places.

In earlier editions, this reported listed the first Negro officeholder in the South, the first Negro staff doctor in a hospital, the first Negro appointed to a city department. As late as last year, one section was devoted to expanding opportunities in amateur sports—golf, fencing, hockey, tennis, track, and so on. Today such firsts are no longer news; a comprehensive tally, even if possible, would more than fill this booklet.

These advances have not always come easily. Sometimes, as with the epochal public school desegregation ruling of the United States Supreme Court, they have occasioned vehement opposition on the part of certain groups trying desperately to turn back the clock. But despite these setbacks, Americans may well take pride in the Nation's forward march toward equal justice and opportunity.

ARMED SERVICES

Administrative measures

Washington, July 1948: President's Executive Order No. 9981 forbids discrimination in military service; creates Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services.

U. S. A., 1949–50: Governors' Proclamations in Michigan, Minnesota and Washington end segregation in National Guard.

Washington, 1950–55: Army drops quotas for Negro enlistments; Selective Service drops questions on race for draft registrants; Air Force, Army, Marines and Navy report segregation entirely eliminated. Defense Department reports number of Negro officers and enlisted men has more than doubled in 6 years.

Washington, April 1954: Army promises end to segregation at West Point.

Washington, October 1954: Veterans Administration announces end of segregation in all VA hospitals.

Legislation

United States of America, 1947–49: California, Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin forbid discrimination in the National Guard.

CITIZENSHIP

Administrative measures

Mobile, Ala., November 1948: Federal officers invoke rarely used civil rights statutes, arrest sheriff and deputy for inflicting physical punishment on Negro prisoners.

New Orleans, La., December 1949: Two policemen are dismissed for depriving two Negro youths of their civil rights.

Legislation

U. S. A., 1949–51: South Carolina and Texas adopt antilynch laws.

U. S. A., 1949–53: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia forbid wearing of masks and burning of crosses.

U. S. A., 1950–53: South Carolina and Tennessee abolish poll tax; Alabama reduces cumulative tax from 24 years to 2 years.

U. S. A., 1951–55: Legislatures in Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, and Oregon repeal ban on intermarriage between whites and Negroes, Mongolians, or Chinese.

Philadelphia, Pa., January 1952: New city charter prohibits discrimination in use of city property.

U. S. A., spring 1953: Florida and North Carolina regulate sale of explosives to prevent hate bombings.

Sacramento, Calif., April 1953: Legislature repeals restrictions on property rights of orientals.

Washington, August 1953: Congress repeals Federal prohibition against sale of liquor and firearms to Indians.

United States of America, 1953–55: Arizona, California, Montana, Nebraska, and New Mexico end ban on liquor sales to Indians.

Lincoln, Nebr., March 1955: Legislature adopts law removing racial references in register of voters.

Court action

Washington, January 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Oyama* v. *California*) in-

validates California alien land law which raises presumption of fraudulent ownership of agricultural land by persons ineligible for citizenship.

Washington, June 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Takahashi* v. *Game Commission*) invalidates California law prohibiting issuance of fishing licenses to persons ineligible for citizenship.

Santa Fe, N. Mex., August 1948: Federal District Court removes last restriction on the right of American Indians to vote.

Columbia, S. C., November 1948: Federal district court enjoins State Democratic Party from barring Negro voters from primaries or from participation in party affairs.

Washington, March 1949: United States Supreme Court (*Schnell* v. *Davis*) upholds Federal district court decision that Alabama's Boswell amendment, which set up stringent educational requirements for voting, is unconstitutional.

Atlanta, Ga., July 1949: State supreme court rules that counties with substantial Negro populations must add Negroes to grand jury and petty jury lists.

Montgomery, Ala., September 1949: Federal grand jury, with two Negro jurymen, indicts one policeman and three former officers on charges of violating civil rights.

United States of America, 1949–52: Supreme Courts of California and Oregon declare State alien land laws, barring sale or lease of land to Japanese aliens, unconstitutional.

Birmingham, Ala., May 1951: United States Court of Appeals upholds sentencing of Georgia sheriff and deputy to 12 months' imprisonment and $1,000 fine for delivering seven Negroes to a masked mob.

Richmond, Va., October 1952: United States Court of Appeals upholds kidnapping convictions against seven North Carolina klansmen.

Madison, Wis., January 1953: State supreme court rules that a State-administered life insurance fund may not reject Negro applicants on ground that they are substandard risks.

Mobile, Ala., April 1953: White jury frees Negro youth charged with rap of white woman.

Washington, May 1953: United States Supreme Court (*Avery* v. *Georgia*) sets aside death sentence of Georgia Negro because jury was chosen on racial basis.

Washington, May 1953: United States Supreme Court (*Terry* v. *Adams*) outlaws "jaybird" primary in Texas as device to prevent Negroes from voting.

Washington, May 1954: United States Supreme Court (*Hernandez* v. *Texas*) rules that systematic exclusion of Mexican-Americans from juries in Texas is unconstitutional.

Sioux City, Iowa, October 1954: Municipal court declares State law prohibiting liquor sales to Indians is unconstitutional.

Jackson, Tenn., May 1955: Madison County criminal court seats first all-Negro jury in State.

Oklahoma City, Okla., July 1955: United States Court of Appeals rules that designation of Negro candidates by race on State election ballots is unconstitutional.

Voluntary action

United States of America, 1949–51: Democratic State primaries opened to Negroes in Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas.

Chicago, Ill., November 1951: Independent Voters League of Illinois gives Negro best legislator award.

EDUCATION

Administrative measures

Washington, July 1948: Report of President's Committee on Higher Education condemns segregation and discrimination in colleges and profesisonal schools.

Albany, N. Y., November 1949: Commissioner of Education orders rezoning of school districts to eliminate segregation by gerrymandering.

Nashville, Tenn., September 1950: Attorney General, in first voluntary compliance with United States Supreme Court decisions in college cases, rules that the State university must admit Negro graduate students.

Tucson, Ariz., September 1951: All school districts except Phoenix abandon segregation in public schools. Phoenix follows in 1953.

Washington, November 1951: President pocket vetoes bill requiring racial segregation in military post schools and other Federal property.

Paducah, Ky., June 1953: City College admits first Negro students.

Oak Ridge, Tenn., December 1953: Town council asks Government to end school segregation in community run by United States Government.

Louisville, Ky., January 1954: City-supported general hospital accepts first Negro student nurses.

Washington, February 1954: Secretary of Defense orders end to segregated military post schools by 1955.

St. Louis, Mo., June 1954: Board of education plans complete desegregation of public schools by September 1955.

Charleston, W. Va., June 1954: Board of education opens nine State colleges to qualified Negro students.

Pasadena, Calif., June 1954: Board of education agrees to abolish method of assigning pupils criticized as "disguised segregation."

Washington, June 1954: Board of education adopts 2-year program to end school segregation in Capital.

Baltimore, Md., June 1954: School board votes unanimously to end segregation in city's public schools.

Albany, N. Y., September 1954: State education department admits Indian children to regular schools, ending century of segregated reservation schools.

Montgomery County, Md., June 1955: County announces plans to begin admitting white and Negro students to the same elementary schools, high schools and junior colleges.

Oklahoma City, Okla., June 1955: Board of regents for higher education orders desegregation of white and Negro students at all State-supported colleges; more than 65 communities, including all the large cities in the State, plan desegregation for September 1955.

San Antonio, Tex., June 1955: President of San Antonio College anounces that its two junior colleges are no longer segregated schools.

Trenton, N. J., June 1955: Commissioner of education rules Englewood must rezone school districts to permit all children, regardless of race, to attend schools nearest their homes.

Nashville, Tenn., June 1955: State board of education approves program of gradual desegregation in State colleges.

Frankfort, Ky., June 1955: State assistant attorney general rules that 51-year-old school segregation law has been invalidated by United States Supreme Court; several cities desegregate public schools.

Texas, summer 1955: School boards desegregate public schools in Alice, Brownwood, Carrigo Spring, Corpus Christi, Eagle Mountain, El Paso, Friona, Harlingen, Kerrville, Kingsville, Mission, San Angelo, San Antonio, and Weslaco.

Annapolis, Md., summer of 1955: State board of education votes to abolish segregation in five State teachers colleges; Attorney General rules that United States Supreme Court's desegregation decision nullifies State laws requiring segregation.

Arkansas, summer 1955: Biggers-Reyno, Charleston, Fayetteville, and Hoxie school districts desegregate; North Little Rock plans gradual desegregation to begin in high schools in 1957.

Austin, Tex., July 1955: Board of regents votes to abolish segregation at Texas University.

Legislation

Trenton, N. J., 1947–49: New constitution ends segregation in New Jersey's public schools; omnibus civil rights law extends jurisdiction of the division against discrimination to all nonsectarian educational institutions.

Albany, N. Y., 1948–51: Legislature adopts first State law outlawing racial and religious discrimination in colleges and universities (March 1948); later extends coverage to business and trade schools (March 1951).

Indianapolis, Ind., March 1949: Legislature adopts progressive elimination of segregation in public schools.

Springfield, Ill., July 1949: Legislature bars State funds to school districts discriminating against pupils because of race or creed.

Madison, Wis., July 1949: Legislature forbids exclusion of children aged 4 to 20 from any public school on account of religion, nationality or color, and prohibits segregation in public schools.

Boston, Mass., August 1949: Legislature adopts fair education law.

Louisville, Ky., July 1950: Legislature amends 46-year-old State law requiring racial segregation of students; Louisville colleges anounce registration of Negroes for fall term.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1951: Legislature repeals education law requiring segregation, permitting individual school boards to establish unsegregated public elementary schools.

Salem, Ore., April 1951: Legislature outlaws discrimination in vocational, profesional and trade schools licensed by State.

Albany, N. Y., April 1953: Legislature bars institutions of higher learning from accepting gifts or endowments conditioned on teaching racial superiority.

Sante Fe., N. Mex., March 1955: Legislature repeals law requiring racial segregation in public schools.

Court action

United States of America, 1948: Suits to equate salaries of Negro and white teachers are successful in Atlanta, Ga.; Oklahoma City, Okla., and Surrey, Va.

Washington, January 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Sipuel* v. *Board of Regents*) decides unanimously that Negro students cannot be excluded from state university which offers educational opportunities unavailable at Negro school.

Austin, Tex., June 1948: Federal district court rules that public schools of Texas may not segregate children of Mexican descent.

United States of America, 1948–52: Courts order Universities of Arkansas, Delaware, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia to admit Negro students.

Washington, June 1950: United States Supreme Court (*McLaurin* v. *Oklahoma; Sweatt* v. *Painter*) rules that forcing a Negro to sit apart from his classmates at a State university or to attend a school lacking the educational opportunities of the State university is unconstitutional.

Fort Worth, Tex., June 1950: Federal district court rules that each school district must provide equal schooling for Negroes and whites; bars transporting Negro students to other districts.

Arlington, Va., September 1950: Federal district court orders school board to provide equal facilities for Negroes and whites.

Jefferson City, Mo., November 1950: State supreme court rules that white public schools must admit Negro students to courses not available in Negro schools.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1951: Federal district court rules that segregation of Mexican American children is unconstitutional.

Tarboro, N. C., August 1951: Federal district court orders Washington County officials to equalize white and Negro school facilities and appropriations.

Phoenix, Ariz., February 1953: State superior court invalidates 1951 statute which permitted local school boards to segregate.

Shreveport, La., May 1954: Federal district court rules that State-operated Southwestern Louisiana Institute must admit Negro students.

Washington, 1954–55: United States Supreme Court (school segregation cases) rules compulsory segregation in public schools is unconstitutional; finalizes lower court decision admitting Negro students to State-supported schools (May 1954). Following further arguments on implementation, Court orders school segregation ended with deliberate speed and rules that moves toward integration must be carried out in a systematic and effective manner, within a reasonable time.

Birmingham, Ala., July 1955: Federal district court rules that University of Alabama must admit qualified Negro students.

Columbia, S. C., July 1955: Federal district court orders Summerton school district trustees to end segregation in public schools with all deliberate speed.

Richmond, Va., July 1955: Federal district court orders Prince Edward County to end segregation in its public schools with all deliberate speed.

El Paso, Tex., July 1955: Federal district court voids all sections of State constitution and other State statutes sanctioning racial segregation in schools; orders Texas Western College to admit Negro student.

New Orleans, La., August 1955: United States court of appeals upholds ruling prohibiting Louisiana State University from barring qualified Negro students.

Greensboro, N. C., September 1955: Federal district court rules that University of North Carolina must admit Negro students.

Austin, Tex., October 1955: State supreme court rules that State funds can be used for desegregated schools.

Washington, October 1955: United States Supreme Court orders University of Alabama to admit Negro students.

Voluntary action

Annapolis, Md., May 1949: United States Naval Academy graduates first Negro midshipman.

Lexington, Ky., May 1949: Catholic Committee of the South urges all Catholic institutions of higher learning to admit Negro students without discrimination.

Washington, November 1949: Poll of 15,000 southern college teachers by Southern Conference Educational Fund reveals 70 percent favor integration in professional and graduate schools.

Chicago, Ill., November 1949: Over 100 university presidents, deans, and admissions officers from 24 States, at Conference of American Council on Education, urge elimination of college admission quotas based on race, religion, or national origin.

Easton, Pa., January 1950: Lafayette College refuses $140,000 bequest restricted to non-Jewish and non-Catholic students.

Birmingham, Ala., October 1951: Southern Episcopal Synod urges admission of Negro students to theological schools at Lexington, Ky., and Sewanee, Tenn.

Chapel Hill, N. C., October 1951: Students' protest wins right of five Negro students at University of North Carolina to sit with white students at athletic events.

Washington, 1952: New Roman Catholic high school and several Episcopal elementary schools announce nonsegregation policy.

Sewanee, Tenn., June 1952: Faculty of Cumberland Forest Music Festival and eight leading religious instructors cancel teaching and concert contracts in protest against University of the South's refusal to admit Negro divinity students; following year, university admits Negroes to school of theology.

Denver, Colo., December 1952: Colorado-Wyoming Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admission Officers votes to delete references to race and religion from applications.

Gadsden, Ala., June 1953: Cumberland Presbyterian Church admits Negro students to theological seminary.

Boston, Mass., December 1953: Department of Education announces that all of the State's 1,131 private schools have eliminated discriminatory questions on admission applications.

New York, N. Y., December 1953: Nationwide survey by Anti-Defamation League discloses that 450 colleges, universities, and junior colleges have removed questions concerning color, nationality, and religion from application blanks.

U. S. A., spring 1954: Catholic archbishops forbid segregation in Nashville, Tenn., and San Antonio, Tex., archdioceses.

Richmond, Va., May 1954: Bishop rules Catholic high schools will admit Negro students.

Ames, Iowa, August 1954: National Student Association, representing students at 250 colleges, calls for swiftest possible integration of the races at all educational levels in all parts of the country.

Nashville, Tenn., August 1954: Fisk University is first Negro college invited to join Rhodes scholarship competition.

Baltimore, Md., November 1954: Society of Friends inaugurates gradual integration in its nursery-through-high private school.

Oklahoma City, Okla., April 1955: State voters approve constitutional amendment paving way for desegregated schools.

Tiffin, Ohio, September 1955: United Student Christian Council takes steps to include more Negro colleges and universities in student Christian movement.

Norfolk, Va., September 1955: Norfolk Catholic High School opens enrollment to Negro students.

Dallas, Tex., September 1955: Jesuit High School admits Negro students.

Nashville, Tenn., October 1955: Southern Education Reporting Service announces that 134,000 Negro children previously in all-Negro schools are now enrolled in desegregated public schools in 8 States and the District of Columbia. Over 2,000 Negro students attend previously all-white colleges and universities.

EMPLOYMENT

Administrative measures

Washington, July 1948: President's Executive Order No. 9980 orders Federal agencies to ban discrimination in employment; creates Fair Employment Board in Civil Service Commission to investigate complaints and establish procedures for compliance.

Philadelphia, Pa., March 1949: Unemployment compensation board rules employee may refuse to work on Sabbath without sacrificing unemployment compensation.

New Haven, Conn., January 1950: Connecticut Interracial Commission conducts first public hearing under a State FEP law and finds complainant was denied employment because of race.

U. S. A., 1950–51: State commissions against discrimination in Massachusetts and New York issue cease and desist orders against employment agencies discriminating in job placements.

U. S. A., 1951: State employment services in California and Illinois announce they will refuse to accept discriminatory job orders and will delete all racial and religious data from records.

Sacramento, Calif., July 1951: Attorney general rules that California Employment Stabilization Commission has many powers of a State FEP commission.

Salenm, Oreg., August 1951: State labor commissioner orders Brotherhood of Railway Carmen to cease racial discrimination against applicants.

St. Louis, Mo., October 1951: State employment service merges Negro and white offices.

Washington, 1951–54: President Truman creates Committee on Government Contract Compliance (December 1951) to enforce prohibition against discrimination in employment by firms contracting or subcontracting Government orders. President Eisenhower creates new Government Contract Committee with Vice President as Chairman (August 1953); Committee tightens nondiscrimination regulations (April 1954).

Raleigh, N. C., September 1952: Governor eliminates Negro-white salary differentials for staff of mental hospital in Goldsboro.

Washington, October 1953: District's Board of Commissioners orders inclusion of anti-bias clause in future contracts. District telephone company drops color bars.

New York, N. Y., October 1953: State commission against discrimination successfully negotiates to modify employment policy of Pennsylvania Railroad. Company hires first Negro brakeman and opens other jobs to qualified Negroes.

Louisville, Ky., March 1954: Segregation eliminated in city's fire department.

Boston, Mass., May 1954: State commission against discrimination announces Pullman Co. of Chicago agreement to end 90-year ban on Negro Pullman conductors.

Sacramento, Calif., September 1954: Attorney general rules that Negro firemen in Los Angeles may not be segregated.

Washington, September 1954: District Commissioners order desegregation of Negro firemen.

Salem, Oreg., September 1954: Special assistant attorney general rules that, under State's FEP law, boards of education may not require teaching applicants to submit photographs.

Silver City, N. Mex., December 1954: State fair employment practices commission orders Kennecott Copper Corp. to cease segregating employees in company-owned housing, washrooms, and on payroll lines.

Washington, January 1955: President's Committee on Government Contracts refuses to permit Bureau of Indian Affairs to negotiate a contract with Mississippi omitting standard nondiscrimination clause.

Atlanta, Ga., January 1955: Southern Regional Council reports 143 cities in 13 Southern States now employ 618 Negro policemen, 92 plainclothesmen, and 112 policewomen.

Washington, January 1955: President creates Committee on Government Employment Policy, replacing Civil Service Commission's Fair Employment Board and making heads of Government departments responsible for preventing job discrimination in their agencies.

Seattle, Wash., January 1955: State FEP Commission announces Northern Pacific Railway agreement to comply with Washington's antidiscrimination law.

Washington, January 1955: Capital Transit Co. drops ban on Negro bus and trolley operators after conferences with President's Committee on Government Contracts.

Red Bank, N. J., March 1955: State Highway Authority orders nondiscrimination clause added to all future construction contracts for Garden State Parkway.

New York, N. Y., April 1955: State commission against discrimination approves consent decree in which brewery local of the AFL Teamsters Union agrees to admit Negro applicants and to end practices deemed discriminatory by the commission.

New York, N. Y., June 1955: State commission against discrimination announces agreement by local of International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, AFL, to admit Negro stagehands to full membership.

Los Angeles, Calif., July 1955: City civil service commission requires all applicants for municipal employment to swear that they will willingly work with or for any associates regardless of race, color or creed.

New York, N. Y., July 1955: State celebrates 10th anniversary of first State FEP law.

Washington, September 1955: President's Committee on Government Contracts inaugurates plan to eliminate employment discrimination in the transportation industry.

Legislation

United States of America, 1948–51: Ordinances in Richmond, Calif.; Sioux City, Iowa, and Cincinnati, Ohio, bar discrimination in public employment or in work under city contracts.

United States of America, 1948–55: City ordinances bar discrimination in public and private employment in Chicago, Ill.; East Chicago and Gary, Ind.; Ecorse, Hamtramck, Pontiac and River Rouge, Mich.; Duluth, Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.; Campbell, Cleveland, Girard, Hubbard, Lorain, Lowellville, Niles, Steubenville, Struthers, Toledo, Warren and Youngstown, Ohio; Braddock, Clairton, Duquesne, Erie, Farrell, Johnstown, Monessen, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Sharon, Pa.; and Milwaukee, Wis. Cities with FEP ordinances now total 36.

United States of America, 1949: New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington adopt enforceable FEP laws, bringing total to eight.

Albany, N. Y., May 1949: Legislature prohibits questions concerning birthplace on applications for State civil service.

Sacramento, Calif., June 1949: Revised civil-service law prohibits discrimination against State employees on grounds of religion, political belief, marital status, race, color, sex, or blindness.

Los Angeles, Calif., January 1951: Ordinance forbids discrimination in hiring of building-construction workers on urban redevelopment projects.

Sacramento, Calif., November 1952: State constitutional amendment eliminates last prohibitions against employment of Chinese on public works.

Juneau, Alaska, March 1953: Alaska adopts fully enforceable FEP law.

Topeka, Kans., March 1953: Legislature adopts FEP law patterned after Wisconsin's educational plan. (Four States now have nonenforceable FEP laws.)

Des Moines, Iowa, April 1953: Legislature sets up commission to investigate racial and religious prejudice in State.

United States of America, 1955: Michigan, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania adopt fully enforceable FEP laws, bringing total to 11.

Phoenix, Ariz., March 1955: Legislature bars discrimination in public employment and in firms holding public contracts.

Denver, Colo., April 1955: Legislature extends State FEP law to include private employers engaged in any work financed in part or in whole by money raised by taxation.

Hartford, Conn., June 1955: Legislature extends FEP law to include discriminatory job advertising.

Court action

Washington, November 1949: United States Supreme Court (*Graham* v. *Brotherhood*) sustains injunction against Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, barring discrimination against Negro railroad employees.

Birmingham, Ala., May 1950: Federal district court finds Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad and Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers guilty of discrimination and awards damages based on wages plaintiffs would have earned on jobs denied them.

New Haven, Conn., October 1950; Superior court sustains interracial commission's order under FEP law.

Charlotte, N. C., January 1951: United States court of appeals reverses lower-court decision which permitted railroads to restrict hiring of Negroes as firemen.

Washington, June 1952: United States Supreme Court (*Brotherhood* v. *Howard*) rules that a railway brotherhood may not use its power as a bargaining representative under the Railway Labor Act to effect racial discrimination against Negroes, regardless of how they are classified.

Hartford, Conn., 1952–54: State courts sustain civil rights commission's order against International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (1952). Superior court fines Hartford local of IBEW $2,000 for refusing to drop discriminatory membership policy, plus $500 per week until compliance. Union abandons 5-year defiance of State FEP law; admits two Negro apprentices (April 1954).

United States of America, spring 1954: Supreme Courts of Michigan and Ohio rule workers may refuse to work on their Sabbath without sacrificing unemployment compensation.

New York, N. Y., April 1954: State court of appeals upholds authority of State commission against discrimination to direct an employment agency to cease inquiries, direct or indirect, as to race, creed, color, or national origin of applicants for employment.

Milwaukee, Wis., August 1954: Circuit court upholds cease and desist order of State industrial commission under so-called educational FEP law.

Daytona Beach, Fla., August 1955: State district court orders electrical union to admit Negro applicant.

Houston, Tex., September 1955: State district court approves agreement by Shell Oil Refinery and Shell Chemical Co. not to restrict workers to certain jobs on the basis of race or color.

Voluntary action

United States of America, 1948–54: Many big league teams admit Negro baseball players, following successful employment of Jackie Robinson by Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947. Pacific Coast League hires first Negro umpire (December 1953).

United States of America, December 1948: Ten railroad unions agree to eliminate discriminatory clauses from their national constitutions, or to make them inoperative in States with FEP laws.

New York, N. Y., April 1950: New York Telephone Co. announces that discriminatory advertisements by employment agencies will not be accepted for classified telephone directories throughout State.

New York, N. Y., June 1950: Journal of American Medical Association announces that designations of race and creed will be dropped from all situations wanted advertisements.

New York, N. Y., July 1951: New York Telephone Co., RCA Communications, American Cable & Radio Corp., and Western Union Telegraph Co. form voluntary committee to cooperate with State commission against discrimination in eliminating discrimination in the communications industry.

New York, N. Y., October 1951: Metropolitan Opera Co., signs first Negro ballet dancer.

Chicago, Ill., October 1951: Personnel manager of Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., declares integrated hiring policy successful.

New York, N. Y., October 1952: International Geneva Association, a society of chefs, headwaiters, and managers serving fashionable hotels and restaurants, lifts ban on Negro members.

Los Angeles, Calif., January 1953: Negro and white locals of musicians union merge.

Indianapolis, Ind., July 1953: Railway hires first Negro trolley drivers.

New York, N. Y., October 1954: Marian Anderson is first Negro singer engaged by Metropolitan Opera Co.

Dade County, Fla., October 1954: Local of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers International Union admits Negro members.

New York, N. Y., March 1955: United, American, and Trans-World airlines hire Negro reservation clerks.

Chicago, Ill., March 1955: Armour & Co. assures United Packinghouse Workers Union that qualified Negro workers will be employed in white-collar positions.

Baltimore, Md., June 1955: Baltimore local of National Federation of Postal Clerks votes to admit Negro applicants.

Peoria, Ill., August 1955: American Federation of Teachers votes to void charter of any local union which continues to segregate members after June 1956.

HOUSING

Administrative measures

Washington, December 1949: Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration refuse to insure loans on new housing covered by recorded restrictive covenants.

Charlotte, N. C., January 1950: Public Housing Administration rejects bid for Federal aid in construction of segregated housing project; city council reverses segregation policy.

Washington, November 1950: Public Housing Administration declares low-rent housing programs must reflect equitable provisions for eligible families of all races determined on the approximate volume and urgency of their respective needs.

United States of America, 1950–55: City housing authorities in Los Angeles County, San Bernardino, and San Francisco, Calif.; Washington, D. C.; Wilmington, Del.; Chicago, Ill.; Baraga, Mich.; St. Paul, Minn.; Omaha, Nebr.; Newark, N. J.; Buffalo and Schenectady, N. Y.; Toledo, Ohio; Allegheny County and Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Pasco, Wash., eliminate segregation in city housing projects.

New York, N. Y., April 1951: State commissioner of housing rules that, for the purposes of the housing law, segregation is discrimination.

Washington, May 1951: Housing and Home Finance Agency says needs of displaced minority-group families and availability of substitute housing will be scrutinized carefully before approval is given to local urban redevelopment plans.

New York, N. Y., June 1951: Federal Housing Administrator announces that all projects to which FHA obtains title will be administered on a nonsegregated basis.

Chicago, Ill., August 1953: Housing authority admits Negro tenants to previously all-white public housing project.

San Francisco, Calif., January 1954: Housing authority includes nonsegregation clause in contract for operation of four temporary housing projects.

Washington, October 1954: Federal Housing Administrator says Government will refuse Federal aid to cities which default on their obligations to minority citizens.

Albany, N. Y., October 1955: Governor appoints new housing advisory council to aid State commission against discrimination in administering laws barring bias in publicly assisted housing.

Legislation

United States of America, 1949–52: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin forbid discrimination and segregation in public housing.

United States of America, 1949–52: Los Angeles and San Francisco, Calif., and Cincinnati, Ohio, bar discrimination and segregation in urban redevelopment.

United States of America, 1949–52: Ordinances in San Francisco, Calif., Hartford, Conn.; Boston, Mass.; New York, N. Y.; Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pa., and Providence, R. I., bar discrimination and segregation in public housing.

United States of America, 1949–53: Legislatures in Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania forbid racial and religious discrimination in publicly assisted housing.

New York, N. Y., March 1951: Ordinance bars discrimination in publicly assisted housing.

Madison, Wis., June 1951: Legislature repeals State law recognizing validity of racial restrictive covenants.

St. Paul, Minn., April 1953: Legislature prohibits race restrictions in real estate contracts.

Denver, Colo., September 1953: City council bars approval and recording of subdivisions containing racial restrictive covenants.

New York, N. Y., July 1954: Ordinance makes it illegal for owners of multiple dwellings, erected with loans or guarantees from public agencies, to discriminate against tenants because of race, creed, color or national origin.

Albany, N. Y., April 1955: Legislature outlaws discrimination in virtually all housing to be built with Government insurance.

Albany, N. Y., April 1955: Legislature extends jurisdiction of State commission against discrimination to publicly assisted housing.

Trenton, N. J., July 1955: Legislature bars discrimination in granting of mortgage loans.

Court action

Washington, May 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Shelley* v. *Kraemer; Hurd* v. *Hodges*) rules that courts cannot enforce racial restrictive covenants. Five years later (July 1953), Court rules that courts may not award damages for breach of racial restrictive covenant (*Barrows* v. *Jackson*).

Birmingham, Ala., December 1950: United States Court of Appeals holds that city racial zoning law is unconstitutional.

Chicago, Ill., June 1953: State circuit court bars condemnation of land owned by Negro, thwarting attempt to drive his family from neighborhood by turning property into a public park.

United States of America, July 1953: Federal district courts in Evansville, Ind.; and Toledo, Ohio, enjoin local housing authorities from segregating Negro tenants in public-housing projects.

San Francisco, Calif., 1953–54: State court of appeal upholds earlier superior court ruling that San Francisco Housing Authority must abandon neighborhood pattern of resident selection and admit applicants without discrimination (August 1953), United States Supreme Court rejects appeal (May 1954).

Denver, Colo., October 1953: State district court rules that housing authority may operate integrated housing on property once covered by restrictive covenant.

Akron, Ohio, April 1955: State board of tax appeals rules that the advent of Negro residents into a white neighborhood does not necessarily reduce property values.

Voluntary action

Chicago, Ill., January 1948: Chicago Improvement Association negotiates agreement under which white owners agree not to enforce existing restrictive covenants.

Miami, Fla., November 1950: National Association of Real Estate Boards votes to change code which held it was unethical for a realtor to introduce new races into a neighborhood.

Buffalo, N. Y., October 1952: Builder of Philadelphia's first nonsegregated private rental housing tells National Association of Housing Officials venture is outstanding success.

Philadelphia, Pa., April 1954: Commission on human relations reports that 88 percent of the city's Negro families and 22 percent of white families live in blocks with some racial integration.

Trevose, Pa., November 1954: Cooperative interracial development of one-family homes opens in Bucks County.

San Francisco, Calif., December 1954: Study by University of California reports west coast white neighborhoods are accepting the arrival of nonwhite residents without incident.

New York, N. Y., May 1955: Fund for the Republic appropriates $100,000 for study of minority groups' housing problems.

Teaneck, N. J., July 1955: White citizens unite to integrate Negro newcomers and to prevent panic selling in neighborhood.

Bayside, N. Y., July 1955: Appeal by Bayside Council of Churches and Synagogues helps locate suitable housing for 16 Negro Army officers assigned to Fort Totten, Queens.

PROFESSIONAL, BUSINESS, RELIGIOUS, AND FRATERNAL SOCIETIES

Voluntary action

Chicago, Ill., 1948–54: The American Nurses' Association votes to give direct membership to Negro nurses refused district membership; 2 years later, National Association of Colored Graduate Nurses votes to disband. By 1954, 53 State and territorial associations—all except Georgia—include Negro nurses in membership.

U. S. A., 1949–55: Negroes are admitted to membership in State medical associations of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Missouri, Tennessee and Virginia; medical societies of Pulaski County, Ark., Fulton County, Jackson County, and St. Louis, Mo., Charleston County, S. C., Bexar and Harris Counties, Tex., northern Virginia, Roanoke, Va., and Washington, D. C.; American Pediatric Society; American Board of Surgery; St. Louis Dental Society; bar associations of Cincinnati, Galveston, Los Angeles, Louisville, St. Louis, and Washington, D. C.; Arkansas Education Association; Arlington Education Association; Albany Junior Chamber of Commerce; North Carolina Academy of Science, Carolina Academy of Science, and California Rotary.

U. S. A., 1949–55: Southern Presbyterian Church votes to absorb colored presbyteries in white synods; Washington Cathedral selects Negro canon; South Carolina diocese of Protestant Episcopal Church welcomes Negro congregation to diocesan convention; bishop of Raleigh declares segregation in Catholic churches of the diocese will not be tolerated; Disciples of Christ in Portland (Oreg.) admit Negro churches to full membership; Episcopal Diocese of New Jersey bars church segregation; Bruton Parish Church (Williamsburg, Va.) admits Negroes; Bradenton-Palmetto (Fla.) Ministerial Association admits Negro pastors to full membership; Presbyterian Synod of Florida calls for end to racial barriers in church membership, church-supported colleges and adult and youth conferences; Texas-Louisiana Presbyterian Synod admits Negro members; archbishop suspends Catholic mission (New Orleans) for rejecting services of Negro priest; Austin Baptist Association (Tex.) admits Negro members; white and Negro ministerial associations in Asheville (N.C.) merge; Tennessee Methodist Conference endorses Supreme Court ruling on desegregation.

U. S. A., 1948–55: Following example set by Amherst, steps are taken to eliminate discrimination in Greek-letter societies at: Allegheny College, American University, Colgate, College of the City of New York, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Lake Forest College, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Middlebury, Northwestern, New York University, Ohio Wesleyan, Pennsylvania State, Rutgers, San Francisco State College, State University of New York, Syracuse, Wayne, Wesleyan, and Universities of California, Chicago, Colorado, Connecticut, Kansas City, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Vermont, and Washington. National Committee on Fraternities in Education is organized to fight bias. Action by fraternities to prevent universities from ordering elimination of discriminatory charter clauses is dimissed by United States Supreme Court.

Washington, October 1950: American Prison Association votes not to meet in cities where hotels practice racial discrimination.

Lexington, Ky., September 1952: Fisk and Howard Universities are first Negro colleges to obtain chapters of Phi Beta Kappa.

Washington, September 1952: American Psychological Association votes unanimously to hold no future meetings in cities imposing racial segregation.

U. S. A., 1955: Exchange Clubs of St. Paul, Minn.; Mount Vernon, Norwich, Peekskill, and Port Chester, N. Y., drop racial bars to membership.

Washington, February 1955: National Press Club elects first Negro member.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION

Administrative measures

Louisville, Ky., May 1948: Public library admits Negroes to all departments on same basis as whites.

Washington, 1949–50: Department of Interior prohibits discrimination and segregation in any activity or facility conducted in parks and public swimming pools of the Nation's Capital.

Miami, Fla., June 1951: City erases color line in its library.

Washington, November 1951: Interstate Commerce Commission bars racial discrimination in sale of tickets on Washington-Mount Vernon excursion boat.

Houston, Tex., December 1951: City authorities bar segregated restrooms and eating facilities in new airport terminal buildings.

Boston, Mass., 1952–53: State Commission Against Discrimination awards damages to complainants denied accommodations at motor court, and service in cafe, because of race.

Chicago, Ill., May 1952: Illinois Commerce Commission bans racial segregation by Illinois Central Railroad.

St. Paul, Minn., July 1953: Governor orders discriminatory resort literature removed from State Tourist Bureau offices.

New York, N. Y., July 1953: State commission against discrimination orders summer resort to discontinue club membership procedures used as subterfuge for religious discrimination and to eliminate brochure references to "selected clientele."

Salem, Oreg., January 1954: Attorney general rules that, under new civil-rights law, restaurants may not segregate patrons.

Dallas, Tex., June 1954: Park department ends segregation on municipal golf courses.

Washington, October 1954: Justice Department asks Interstate Commerce Commission to ban segregation on interstate railroads.

New York, N. Y., December 1954: State commission against discrimination rules swimming pool operating as a private club is still a public accommodation and must admit customers without racial discrimination.

Washington, December 1954: Board of commissioners announces it will enforce 85-year-old antidiscrimination laws in all places of public accommodation, ending 75-year lapse in enforcement.

Washington, January 1955: Police commissioner orders Metropolitan Police Boys Clubs to stop using Government facilities on a segregated basis.

Detroit, Mich., February 1955: Police department and State liquor-control commission strengthen enforcement of law barring discrimination in public accommodations.

Washington, February 1955: Interstate Commerce Commission rules Greyhound Corp. guilty of unlawful discrimination in forcing Negro patron to take rear bus seat in Texas.

New York, N. Y., February 1955: State commission against discrimination announces drive to bar out-of-State resort brochures containing discriminatory racial or religious references.

Columbus, Ohio, June 1955: Ohio Turnpike Commission announces it will not publicize any place along the turnpike practicing racial discrimination.

Legislation

U. S. A., 1948–54: Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Rhode Island extend jurisdiction of State commissions against discrimination to public accommodation statutes; Oregon prohibits discrimination in places of public accommodation; Washington strengthens antidiscrimination law.

Miami Beach and Surfside, Fla., 1949–51: Ordinances bar advertising which discriminates against any religion.

St. Thomas, V. I., October 1950: Legislative assembly passes law providing equal rights in places of public accommodation, resort or amusement.

Annapolis, Md., February 1951: Legislature repeals mandatory racial segregation in public transportation.

Kansas City, Mo., June 1951: Ordinance forbids segregation at municipal air terminal, municipal auditorium, and starlight theater.

Madison, Wis., July 1951: Legislature prohibits discriminatory advertising.

Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 1952: Ordinance bans racial discrimination in public accommodations.

Knoxville, Tenn., January 1954: Ordinance bans segregation at privately owned restaurant at municipal airport.

Richmond, Va., March 1954: Legislature bans religious discrimination in advertising.

Houston, Tex., June 1954: Ordinance bans segregation on municipal golf courses.

Helena, Mont., Sante Fe, N. Mex., 1955: Legislatures ban racial and religious discrimination in public accommodations.

Miami, Fla., June 1955: Legislature bans religious discrimination in advertising.

Springfield, Ill., July 1955: Legislature bars tax exemption for any hospital found guilty of discriminating against patients because of race, color, or creed.

Court action

Washington, February 1948: United States Supreme Court (*Bob-Lo Excursion Co.* v. *Michigan*) decides unanimously that Michigan law forbidding discrimination in places of public accommodation applies to excursion boat operating between Michigan and Canada.

Baltimore, Md., July 1948: Federal district court orders Baltimore to open its three public golf courses to Negroes, though permitting restriction of Negroes to certain days of the week. Three years later (July 1951), park board votes to end segregation in city's municipal courses.

United States of America, 1948–54: Courts in Minneapolis, Minn.; Kansas City, St. Louis, and Webster Groves, Mo.; Trenton, N. J.; Oxford, Ohio; Philadelphia, Pa.; and Houston, Tex.; rule that public swimming pools and bathing beaches may not discriminate against Negroes.

Washington, January 1949: Federal district court sustains right of Civil Aeronautics Administrator to prohibit discrimination and segregation at Washington National Airport, although airport is in Virginia, which has a compulsory segregation law.

Louisville, Ky., May 1950: Federal district court awards $1,500 damages to Negro ejected from bus on interstate trip.

Washington, June 1950: United States Supreme Court (*Henderson* v. *U. S.*) outlaws segregation in dining cars on interstate railroads.

Richmond, Va., January 1951: United States court of appeals holds that segregation on interstate railroad violates United States Constitution.

New York, N. Y., April 1951: Federal district court allows damages to plaintiff forced to move to segregated railway car traveling interstate.

Charleston, W. Va., June 1951: Federal district court rules county airport dining room must serve all, regardless of race.

Orlando, Fla., June 1952: Federal district court holds Negroes may not be refused admission to municipal auditorium if Negro auditorium has inferior facilities and entertainment.

Kingston, N. Y., December 1952: Jury awards substantial damages to Negro patrons refused resort accommodations after their reservations were confirmed.

Washington, June 1953: United States Supreme Court (*District of Columbia* v. *Thompson*) upholds 1873 statute prohibiting public eating places from refusing service because of race or color; voids long-standing segregation tradition of Capital restaurants.

Philadelphia, Pa., June 1953: Federal district court awards $600 in damages to four Negro patrons arrested when they refused to be segregated in an Oxford, Pa., theater.

Philadelphia, Pa., September 1954: Court of common pleas fines pool management $100 for failing to obey injunction against racial discrimination. Supreme court affirms action (January 1955).

Mineola, N. Y., October 1954: State district court fines barber $100 for refusing to cut hair of Negro child.

Los Angeles, Calif., October 1954: Municipal court awards Negro mother $350 in damages from hospital which segregated her on the basis of race.

New York, N. Y., June 1955: State supreme court upholds ruling of State commission against discrimination ordering swimming pool to admit Negro patrons (see administrative measures above).

Norfolk, Va., July 1955: Federal district court rules racial segregation in State parks is unconstitutional whether operated by State or private lessee.

Richmond, Va., July 1955: United States court of appeals declares segregation on interstate buses is unconstitutional.

Washington, September 1955: Municipal court invokes 1869 statute to bar discrimination in public bowling alleys.

Washington, November 1955: United States Supreme Court (*Mayor* v. *Dawson*; *Holmes* v. *Atlanta*) affirms lower court ruling barring segregation in public beaches and bathhouses; reverses lower court ruling permitting segregation on public golf courses.

Voluntary action

Washington, 1948–54: National Committee on Segregation in the Nation's Capital issues report condemning discrimination in Washington, D. C. (December 1948); Actors' Equity bans Washington bookings because theater rejects Negro patrons (May 1948); National Theater drop segregation and reopens for legitimate stage productions (November 1951); last dime-store chain operating segregated lunch counters drops ban against Negro patrons (September 1952); motion-picture theaters drop color line (October 1953).

New Orleans, La., October 1949: Archbishop cancels annual holy hour services in city stadium because park commission insists on segregation of participants.

New York, N. Y., April 1950: New York Travel Agents Committee resolves not to recommend discriminatory resorts.

Washington, April 1951: Daughters of the American Revolution drops 12-year ban on Negro performers in Constitution Hall.

Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1951: Dining room concession at Municipal Airport ends discrimination against Negroes.

New York, N. Y., May 1951: Unions representing more than 70,000 restaurant employees, and management associations comprising more than 1,500 restaurants, pledge equal treatment of patrons regardless of race; Committee on Civil Rights in East Manhattan, Inc., finds (June 1952) discrimination against Negro patrons in East Side restaurants has decreased from 42 percent to 16 percent in 2 years.

Atlanta, Ga., June 1951: National Association for the Advancement of Colored People holds first nonsegregated meeting since reconstruction days in Municipal Auditorium.

U. S. A., 1952–53: Legitimate theatres in Baltimore, Md., and St. Louis, Mo. end segregation.

Miami, Fla., January 1952: First nonsegregated audience since Civil War gathers to hear Marian Anderson.

Norfolk, Va., June 1952: Norfolk Ministers Association cancels annual January preaching mission until racial segregation of audiences is eliminated.

Washington, November 1953: Southern Railway System, faced with lawsuit, orders patrons seated in order of their entrance into dining cars.

Washington, January 1954: Columbia hospital announces complete racial integration of patients.

Houston, Tex., June 1954: Protestant Episcopal Church, protesting segregation, cancels plans for 1955 convention in Houston.

Danville, Va., June 1954: Democratic committee breaks century-old precedent with unsegregated Jefferson-Jackson dinner.

Portland, Maine, August 1954: Medical association changes site of State medical convention to protest discrimination by resort originally chosen.

Detroit, Mich., October 1954: Michigan Tourist Council bars discriminatory advertising in 1955 regional guide books of Michigan Tourist Association.

Chicago, Ill., November 1954: National Association of Attorneys General switches convention site from Phoenix, Ariz., to Sulphur Springs, W. Va., to avoid possible racial restrictions.

Philadelphia, Pa., March 1955: Two roller skating rinks agree to eliminate use of club membership as device to bar patrons on the basis of race.

Lake Junaluska, N. C., June 1955: Three hundred and seventy-five students from 90 southern colleges, attending Methodist conference, call for end to racial discrimination and resolve to shun local pools barring Negro students.

Orlando, Fla., July 1955: Episcopal bishop announces racial integration is working smoothly at Episcopal summer camp for children.

Haverhill, Mass., October 1955: State Baptist convention cancels reservations at hotel barring Negro educator.

MISCELLANEOUS

Administrative measures

Trenton, N. J., September 1952: State banking and insurance commissioner orders auto-insurance companies to remove questions on race from applications and to stop charging Negroes higher rates.

Chicago, Ill., March 1953: Illinois Commission on Human Relations reports that 13 States no longer require designations of race or color on drivers' license applications.

New York, N. Y., April 1955: Police department initiates special police-training course in intergroup relations.

Legislation

New York, N. Y., June 1952: City ordinance bars public funds to any child-care institutions discriminating against youngsters because of race, creed, or ancestry.

United States of America, spring 1953: Legislatures in Iowa and Washington bar cemeteries from refusing burial because of race or color.

Sacramento, Calif., April 1955: Legislature bars racial discrimination in automobile insurance.

Court action

Sacramento, Calif., October 1948: State supreme court invalidates law barring interracial marriages.

Voluntary action

Washington, May 1950: CIO orders local unions to disregard State segregation laws and operate all CIO facilities without discrimination.

Chicago, Ill., November 1950: Red Cross votes to eliminate racial data on blood donations.

New Haven, Conn., December 1952: Yale Divinity School undertakes 2-year survey of racial and cultural references in Protestant Church literature.

Tuskegee, Ala., December 1952: Tuskegee Institute reports 1952 is first year free of lynching in United States since records were begun in 1882.

St. Louis, Mo., March 1955: The St. Louis Globe-Democrat decides not to label persons by race in news columns unless the information is pertinent.

Chicago, Ill., July 1955: City's major radio and television stations adopt program to guard against inflammatory statements in reporting on race tensions.

The Position of the Jews in America Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues a very interesting discussion of the Position of the Jews in America Today, which appeared in the November 29, 1955, issue of Look.

At the time of its publication the Congress Weekly in an editorial observed that the article by Mr. William Attwood, Look's national-affairs editor, followed a nationwide survey during which Mr. Attwood visited dozens of cities and interviewed scores of Jewish spokesmen in every section of the country, seeking answers to questions about Jews, their distinguishing traits, how they live, what they think, what Gentile Americans think about them, and so forth.

The editorial in the Congress Weekly continues with these comments:

Curiously, just 100 years ago, another American periodical published an evaluation of the American Jew. The Easton (Pa.) Express, marking its 100th anniversary, reproduced the front page of its first issue, dated November 5, 1855, and there we find the following account under the heading Our Jewish Population, extracted from a late number of the San Francisco Sun:

"The American Jew is only less proud of his country than his religion. To say that he is a mere dweller upon the soil because it affords him the means of support is to libel the most noble traits of his character.

"His respect for our laws is shown in the fact that he seldom violates them. His wealth has gone toward building our cities. He cultivates the arts and goes heart and soul with our active citizenry in every useful enterprise. He quarrels but little; heads a mob—never. You will find him in the courts of justice, on the bench, at the bar, in the jury box, but seldom ever arraigned for a heinous criminal offense. This is the American Jew. Let his good qualities be imitated—his bad ones should be forgotten."

This is a flattering picture, indeed, and perhaps a bit overdrawn. But Look's present report on American Jews today tallies in its main conclusions with what was written about the much smaller Jewish population in America a century ago.

The Look article follows:

THE POSITION OF THE JEWS IN AMERICA TODAY

(By William Attwood)

You are a Jew in America. Correction: You are an American who happens to be Jewish. (The distinction is important, as we'll see). You are probably native-born and your ancestors came here from Europe, maybe a generation ago, maybe 3 to 5 or more. Perhaps you talk with a southern drawl or a midwestern twang—or your accent may be pure Brooklynese. The chances are you don't even speak Yiddish. You are a businessman, a doctor, a lawyer, an engineer, possibly a farmer. Almost certainly, you are doing better and living better than your father or grandfather. The American success story is your story too.

You are 1 of 5,500,000 Americans. The only difference between you and 160 million other Americans is—you are a Jew. This means that you worship God in your own kind of church. It also means other things that you can't always define. For example, you feel that you belong here in America—up to a point. That point may be the gates of the local country club, the portals of a medical school, or some real-estate broker's office.

As an American, you are comfortable and secure. As a Jew, you are nagged by worrisome questions about yourself and your fellow Jews and your position in a world dominated by Gentiles.

Some of your best friends may be Gentiles (which is unlikely), but you never really know what they are thinking. I am one of those Gentiles. I had some questions of my own about Jews, and I have been searching for the answers these past 2 months—from Boston to California and from Chicago to Mississippi. Starting on the next page are the questions and the answers I came back with. The answers may not all be 100 percent correct. But they are the best that an inquisitive Gentile reported could pry out of his fellow Americans.

What is a Jew?

The American Council for Judaism asserts that the only thing Jews have in common is their religion. There's much more to it than that. Many Jews never go to a temple—yet they remain Jewish, either in their hearts or in the eyes of their community.

You can't stop being a Jew the way you can stop being a Methodist or a Catholic. I know of one who tried: He changed his name, severed his family ties, joined a Christian church, married a Gentile and moved to a small New England town. He was blond and blue-eyed; he passed for 5 years. Then one day, the local rabbi asked him for a contribution to build a new synagogue. And the ex-Jew was delighted. "It felt good," he wrote his brother, "to know that I still belonged."

Jewishness is a complex of religion, of culture, of memories, of habits; it includes certain food and certain jokes. It's a feeling of kinship with other Jews. It's a way of life.

I have heard Jews described as a social phenomenon. Homeless, often persecuted, they had no business surviving for more than 3,000 years. Yet they did, and perhaps one reason is that all Jews belong to one big family, now 11 million strong. They may not like all their distant cousins, but they're proud of them when they succeed, hurt when they fail—and feel obligated to help them when they're in trouble.

But to answer my first question—the best definition I could improvise is this: A Jew is a member of a historical community held together by common memories, religious tradition and external pressure.

WHEN DID THE FIRST JEWS COME TO AMERICA?

The first 23 landed in New Amsterdam in 1654. They have been coming ever since. There were 2,500 Jews in the United States when George Washington took the oath as first President; there were 15,000 in 1840, 250,000 in 1880, nearly 4 million in 1925. Jews have fought in all of America's wars, shared in all of America's good times, and the bad. Jewish peddlers opened up the frontier with the earliest pioneers; their descendants are merchants in dozens of Western towns.

The big influx began in 1880, during the pogroms in Czarist Russia. In the next 40 years, the proportion of Jews in America went up from .6 to 3.3 percent. The newcomers engulfed New York's lower East Side, sweated and toiled in the needle trades, saved their hard-earned dollars, sent their children to college and rose faster in the economic scale than any other contemporary immigrant group.

The Jews were unique in another way: They were the only immigrants not identified with a nation or a geographical area. In America, they found a Nation they could call home—a Nation that granted them more civil rights than any country in the Western World. Today, with a Nation called Israel ready to welcome them, some 5,000 Jews are still coming to the United States every year.

Crowded shiploads of immigrants landed regularly in New York between 1880 and 1914. Among them were hundreds of thousands of Russian and East European Jews fleeing persecution. They learned the language of America, found a security they had never known. Second- and third-generation Jews came out of the melting pot thoroughly Americanized. Some began to lose their sense of identification with Judaism itself. The Nazi German humiliation and the slaughter of about 6 million Jews under Hitler brought about a renaissance and reaffirmation of Judaism in the United States: America was not just a place for Jews to live. It was home, and Judaism was an integral, but not an overriding, part of their American way of life.

Many Jews have fought and died in America's wars from the Revolution to Korea. Moses Levy battled the English at Trenton; Israel Moses was a Union officer in the Civil War (both the South and North had Jewish troops); Sgt. Ben Kaufman won Congressional Medal of Honor in 1918, is excommander of Jewish War Veterans. Lt. Ray Zussman was a Medal of Honor hero in World War II.

Where do American Jews live and what do they do?

For many centuries and in many countries, the Jews were an urban people because they had to be; they weren't permitted to own land. As immigrants, the great majority landed in New York and stayed there. Today, nearly one-half of American Jews still live in New York City—1,100,000 in Brooklyn alone—and more than three-fourths are concentrated in 16 large cities. (An increasing number are drifting out to the suburbs.) Yet you can find flourishing Jewish congregations in every State in the Union, and their members holding a variety of jobs. How many Gentiles are aware that almost 100,000 American Jews live on farms?

If you want to generalize, you can say that the typical American Jew is engaged in some form of trade. His father may well have been a garment worker, and his son will either go into business or enter a profession; the Jewish boy who, a few years ago, could conceive only of becoming a doctor, dentist, or lawyer is now as likely to be thinking in terms of a career in architecture, engineering, or civil service.

American Jews have a larger proportion of business, professional and white-collar workers than do either American Protestants or American Catholics. They also have superior earning power: It has been estimated that they number 3.5 percent of the popula-

tion but receive 10 percent of the total personal income; of America's 9,000 millionaires, about 20 percent are Jewish.

Communications and the creative arts have always attracted Jews; like the Irish, they have a gift for words, for fantasy, for storytelling. They make good lawyers (perhaps they inherited their skill from the legalistic hairsplitting of the Talmudic scholars), but they are only moderately active in politics; at the moment, only 2 Senators, 1 governor, and 11 Congressmen are Jews.

You do not find many Jews in old established corporations like certain banks and insurance companies, or in public utilities, railroads and the automotive industry. The reasons are plain: Jews are inclined to go where opportunity beckons, where discrimination is at a minimum and where they can either run their own business or at least avoid being at the mercy of a Gentile employer.

I realize there are exceptions. There are exceptions to just about any statement you make about Jews.

How are Jews different from other Americans?

Every American Jew, at one time or another, has felt the sting of anti-Semitism. The chances are that somebody, somewhere, has called him a "dirty Jew," a "kike" or a "sheeny." Or he has been made to feel unwanted, excluded. For him, the word "restricted" has a special connotation. This leaves a mark. It has also given him a sense of kinship with other Jews. Together, they wince when Rosenbergs are convicted and rejoice when Einsteins are honored.

I think this is the big thing that distinguishes Jews from most of their fellow citizens. But there are other traits too. The Catholic magazine America listed four: temperance, industry, family solidarity and a zeal for education.

You can find corroborating statistics. Surveys have shown that the crime, divorce, delinquency and alcoholism rates among Jews are lower than the national average. They have a smaller proportion of prison inmates and a larger proportion of college graduates.

Oddly enough, some of these middle-class virtues are just what antagonize Gentiles. "What I don't like about Jews," said an old gentleman at the bar of an exclusive New York club, "is that they don't get drunk like other people."

Businessmen resent a competitor who works when they go fishing. Students scorn the campus grind. Yet these traits exist; without them, Jews might not have survived centuries of discrimination and persecution. They have had to work harder, study harder, use their wits, and stick together, just to hold their own in a traditionally hostile world.

I would add generosity and a wry sense of humor to America's list of Jewish characteristics. Jews love to tell jokes on themselves—and Jews give to charity as no other ethnic group does. For some, philanthropy takes the place of religion, but all accept the obligation to give: Every year, some 5 million United States Jews contribute some $200 million to Jewish causes alone.

What Jews do, they do intensely; they are anything but lackadaisical. I like one answer I got to this particular question: "Jews are just like everybody else—only more so."

Can a United States Jew support the State of Israel and still be a good American?

This is one I can answer without any equivocation: There is no divided loyalty on the part of American Jews.

Don't underestimate the affinity that nearly all Jews feel for Israel. Remember the Crusades. Palestine is Judiaism's holy land too. And for the first time in history, a flag bearing the Star of David is waving over their spiritual home.

But don't underestimate the patriotism of Jews either. Old Glory is still the flag to which they give allegiance, and Jews have proved their patriotism every time America has gone to war. They provided 4.5 percent of the manpower in two World Wars while comprising less than 3.5 percent of the population. They have an impressive combat record.

I'd say that the existence of Israel has made them even better Americans. Jews everywhere take pride in Israel's achievements, and it has given them more self-respect to know that Jews, too, can be good fighters and farmers. And a man with self-respect is a better citizen.

There's this to add: The leaders of certain Jewish organizations have been so carried away by their enthusiasm for Israel that they raise a hullabaloo each time American foreign policy seems to conflict with that of Israel. Fortunately, I found many responsible leaders concerned about this; among the rank-and-file Jews I talked with, most of them readily made the distinction between financial aid to a struggling, pioneer nation and blind support of the policies of what is, after all, a foreign power.

A word about the Jews who call themselves Zionists. Many Gentiles think of Zionists as hyphenated Americans. They are simply Jews who favored the establishment of a national homeland. Now that Israel is a reality, the Zionists have become zealous fund raisers. But they aren't emigrating; they're checkbook Zionists. The proof is that only 2,000 Americans have settled in Israel since it became a nation. That's 0.04 percent of the Jews in the United States.

The other 99.96 percent have no intention of leaving a country that, to an increasing number, is not only their own but their native land.

Is there a Jewish vote?

There is still some bloc voting by ethnic groups in all big cities. In New York, both parties look for candidates with Irish, Italian, and Jewish names. And no candidate can afford to offend the sensibilities of any group: You praise Israel, you eat pizza and you wear a green tie on St. Patrick's Day. But only in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles and only on certain issues—Israel, civil rights, FEPC—is there any identifiable Jewish vote.

It's true that Jews tend to be Democrats rather than Republicans. Most of them live in big cities, and urban areas are traditionally Democratic. Also, they are inclined to be liberal rather than conservative. There's a reason for this that transcends politics and economics. Anti-Semitism has usually flourished under authoritarian regims and withered in a vigorous democracy. Demagogues like Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY alarm Jews; they dread an atmosphere of unreason. They opposed him because their built-in radar detected danger signals.

Are there sharp divisions within the Jewish community?

A generation ago, the answer would have been an emphatic "Yes." Zionists were at odds with anti-Zionists. There were a Jewish proletariat and a Jewish aristocracy. Jews of German extraction who had come to America in the 19th century looked down on the recent immigrants from eastern Europe. I know of an old Jewish lady who still calls the latter kikes. Rivalry between the Orthodox, Conservative and Reform branches of Judaism was intense, and they differed sharply in ritual and worship.

Today, the lines are blurring. American Jewry is becoming more homogeneous. The Jewish working class has all but vanished, having ascended into the middle-income bracket. Zionism is no longer a burning issue, and the only group still shadowboxing against Israel is the vocal but numerically insignificant American Council for Judaism. The immigrants are losing their accents, rising in the social and economic scale and gaining acceptance in the clubs and organizations that once were preserves of the "Germans." (B'nai B'rith, the Jewish fraternal order, has had presidents of East European origin since 1938.) Hitler helped to end the feuds between Jews by showing them that the anti-Semites make no distinctions; the American melting pot did the rest.

The trend is evident in the synagogues too. Orthodoxy is becoming more supple, adapting old customs to contemporary American life. (How many Jews do you know who won't drive a car on the Sabbath?) Reform temples are adding more ritual to their services. There is more mobility among the three branches, and unity too: All cooperate in providing chaplains for the Armed Forces and in agreeing to a common service acceptable to all Jewish soldiers.

The only intramural controversy you hear about these days is between two groups of intellectuals—the parochials and the integrators; that is, between those who feel that Judaism should become a kind of American subculture and those who think Jews should be nothing but Americans who attend a different church. This is an argument that will probably go on for a long time.

Why are there so many Jewish organizations?

The current American Jewish Yearbook lists more than 300 national Jewish groups. Some are subdivisions of others; some are semidefunct. The fact remains, that's a lot of organizations for 5,500,000 people.

There are several reasons. Jews are highly individualistic—they form splinter groups when they disagree. They are joiners. (A survey in Elmira, N. Y., showed that half the gentiles but only 1 out of 15 Jews belonged to no organizations at all.) And because they are often excluded, they must set up parallel fraternities, garden clubs, and lodges of their own.

Finally, organizations tend to survive long after they have outlived their usefulness. Groups formed to shelter and aid the swarms of pre-World War I immigrants live on, even though immigration has all but dried up. Yiddish societies are dwindling away.

For all their myriad associations, American Jews are not well organized—except for philanthropy. There is duplication of certain activities by the big political-cultural groups like the American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Congress because of old jealousies and a difference in outlook. In smaller towns, there is widespread indifference to most Jewish organizations except the local synagogue and perhaps B'nai B'rith.

But why should American Jews have a tight, hierarchial organization? It would set them apart from other American if they did. I asked almost every Jew I met for the names of the five top leaders of United States Jewry. Their answers differed widely; in fact, there was general agreement about only one man—Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN of New York.

In a real crisis—say, an upsurge of anti-Semitism—to whom would Jews turn? They told me they would turn to American leaders they could trust—to men like Eisenhower, Stevenson, Truman, or Warren—as well as to their own organizations. For today's American Jew is an American at heart as never before.

Is there much intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles?

Not much. Less than 10 percent of American Jews marry outside their faith. (The Catholic figure is 30 percent—sanctioned by the church.) In three-fourths of the cases, the bride is Gentile and the groom Jewish. These brides account for most of the 2,000 annual conversions to Judaism (which conversions are not actively encouraged by

rabbis.) Their children, more often than not, are raised as Jews.

A mixed marriage is no longer the cause for lamentation among Jewish relatives, but it is usually deplored. I know of cases where such marriages were boycotted by parents on both sides.

Jews continue to marry within their faith for many reasons: religion, custom, compatibility. But the main one is that their social contacts are too frequently limited to other Jews. Boy meets girl where boy finds girl.

What makes Jews so clanish?

There's the story of the veterans' post that had 160 members, 6 of them Jewish. They held a meeting to elect a post commander, and there were two candidates—Johnson and Ginsburg. When the votes were counted, Johnson had 154, Ginsburg six. "Those Jews," chuckled a member. "They always stick together, don't they?"

Jews do tend to be clannish, partly because they are frequently excluded from gentile society and partly because they are more comfortable with other Jews. Catholics and Protestants have their own professional associations; Jews follow suit. Gentile clubs inquire into your religion, so Jews build their own clubs. Fearful of intruding where they might feel unwanted, they withdraw into a social ghetto. Many prefer it this way. "With a gentile," said one, "I find that I'm on my best behavior. I feel edgy. It's a strain." Jews are seldom awed by other Jews. ("So he's got a fancy Cadillac? He's still a schlemiel.")

A recent survey by a Cornell sociologist showed that, in a typical small city, fewer than 10 percent of the Jews were part of a mixed social clique. Some said they hesitated to invite non-Jewish acquaintances to their homes for fear of being rebuffed. And in the preponderantly Jewish neighborhoods in and around New York, I found that social contact with gentiles was practically nonexistent.

The Jewish community centers sprouting up all over the country (350 at the latest count) fulfill a necessary and important function, but they also help perpetuate clannishness. Example: I found one community where an attempt was made to form a Jewish Boy Scout troop. Fortunately, the attempt was unsuccessful, and the kids in the mixed troop can go on being Scouts, period.

Why do Jews tend to be clannish? I asked a rabbi if he would instinctively seek out other Jews at a large social gathering. "No," he replied. "First, I'd see if there were any other clergymen in the room. But if there weren't any, I guess I'd seek out the Jews. You look for people with whom you have something in common."

Is there much anti-Semitism in the United States today?

Overt anti-Semitism is hard to find. American Jews today have a better-than-even chance of living full, productive lives without being frustrated by discrimination. The United States remains a land of opportunity for all of its citizens.

There is still a handful of hate sheets issued by a scraggly gang of professional anti-Semites. There is still a residue of economic discrimination. Last year a survey of Chicago employment agencies revealed that 27 percent of 9,000 job orders specifically barred Jews. Some medical schools still have Jewish quotas and very few admit Jews to their faculties; the same is true of some private schools and colleges. Among real-estate brokers in certain areas, there is a tacit agreement not to sell to Jews.

But it's safe to say that the last big barrier standing between Jews and other Americans is a social one. This doesn't make it trivial. The social barrier is more important in many communities than most gentiles suspect. For the power structure of any small city is usually centered in the number-one country club—and rare indeed is the prestige club that admits Jews. A business or professional man who does not have access to its golf links, its bar, and its locker room suffers a very real economic handicap. What big corporation will promote a Jew to be its branch manager or sales representative in a community where he can't mingle freely with the top people?

Most young Americans feel that the big corporations now offer the best opportunities for security and advancement. Because of invisible barriers, some young Americans would be forced to disagree.

Geographically, the incidence of discrimination varies from place to place. For example, prejudice and its byproducts are strong in such cities as Detroit, Minneapolis, and Los Angeles. On the other hand, San Francisco, where Jews were among the earliest settlers, has a good record; the same is true of Cincinnati, Washington, D. C., and most of the South.

To sum up: Antisemitism is most prevalent in cities with a large Jewish population that did not grow up with the community and that has little social contact with gentiles. It manifests itself socially, but has some economic repercussions. Antisemitism also is a symptom of subsurface prejudice that disturbs and worries many Jews; for so long as prejudice still smolders, they will be nagged by the fear that it may one day flare up into something bigger and uglier than the snobbish name game now practised in America's best clubs.

What makes people antisemitic?

It's an old sickness, with a long history. For centuries, the Jews were misfits and therefore outcasts in a clerical Christian society. They were regarded by ignorant people, recalling Judas Iscariot, as the Christ killers. Segregated, living apart in their ghettos, the Jews seemed strange and mysterious. Legends about them were invented. And whatever people do not understand, they often fear and hate. Ignorance plus fear creates prejudice.

A survey was conducted not long ago in a Michigan county with a population of 30,000, of whom 13 were Jews. Nearly 40 percent of the gentiles had never met a Jew; yet 3 out of 4 said Jews must not get too much power, and 2 out of 5 were in favor of sending them back to Palestine.

What do prejudiced gentiles say about Jews? I've heard them accuse Jews of being pushy, bad-mannered, mercenary, ostentatious, crooked in money matters, not like us. Seemingly oblivious that Jews comprise only 3.5 percent of the population, some fear Jews will take over their clubs, their housing developments, even their Government.

Many have Jewish friends whom they exempt from their prejudice with the cruel, patronizing (but sincerely intended) remark, "some of my best friends are Jews." But they seldom try to reconcile the imaginary sterotype to which they object with the real Jews they know and like.

The stereotype and its consequences persist because gentiles often fail to stand up to the occasional anti-Semite in their midst; they let him promote the pattern of prejudice. Call it inertia. The stereotype also persists because some Jews, for reasons I have mentioned, tend to be overaggressive. But the main reason, I think, is that Jews, whatever they do, are so frequently identified as Jews. A few weeks ago, in a Midwestern restaurant, I was sitting next to a table of raucous, loudmouthed people. My dinner companion made some remark about those noisy slobs. He didn't say noisy Protestants. But if they had been Jews, I know darn well what he would have said.

Is anti-Semitism declining in America?

Definitely. It reached its peak in the thirties. A worldwide depression, followed by an upsurge of fascism in Europe, encouraged the crackpots of America. Father Charles Coughlin, the bundists, and a pack of petty demagogues thought they were riding the wave of the future.

But they disappeared, perhaps forever, when the United States went to war. Anti-Semitism became un-American; Hitler made it disreputable. I can remember when cracks about the Jews were almost taken for granted. Many gentiles assumed that you, too, were anti-Semitic. Now you seldom hear words like "kike" (which Otto H. Kahn once defined as "a Jewish gentleman who has just left the room.") The anti-Jewish remarks you hear today are somewhat apologetic, somewhat furtive.

Greater Jewish participation in civic affairs and community activities has helped to dispel the miasma of prejudice; so have the educational efforts of organizations like the Anti-Defamation League, the American Jewish Committee, and the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Discrimination in employment is on the way out. It doesn't pay. (A survey by Elmo Roper showed that discrimination cost United States industry, some $30 billion a year.) The shortage of qualified engineers has made it easier for Jews to enter this once-restricted field. Medical schools are dropping the quota system—and we may get more Dr. Jonas Salks. On the campuses, more and more fraternities and sororities accept Jewish students, even though the majority still do not.

There are statistics aplenty to show that anti-Semitism is no longer the major problem it once was for American Jews. It's become more of an irritant than a problem. Yet many Jews fear that the seeds of anti-Semitism are still present and that a national crisis—such as a severe depression—could make them sprout again. As one said to me, "We Jews have a bigger stake in continued prosperity than most Americans. * * *"

How do Jews react to gentile prejudice?

I was surprised to discover that a great many Jews believe that if you scratch a gentile, you find an anti-Semite. They make exceptions, of course (so and so is a decent "goy"). But the persistence of this illusion is a symptom of insecurity. A great many are hypersensitive in their relations with gentiles. They seem to have a special exposed nerve that registers every tremor of prejudice like a seismograph. Let a gentile use an idiomatic phrase like "He jewed me down," and every Jew within earshot will mark him as a bigot.

Some Jews are even inclined to blame their own failures on their Jewishness. A rabbi told me the story of the Jew with a terrible stammer who complained that he was refused a job because "they d-d-don't take Jews." What was the job? "Radio announcer."

Confronted by real or imagined anti-semitism, some Jews wince, some become broodingly anti-gentile, some shrug it off, some turn against their fellow Jews and try to "escape." I asked a prominent psychiatrist how many of his Jewish patients were sick because they were Jews. "None," he replied. "But if they are sick to begin with, Jewishness is always a contributing factor."

Only a few still try to escape. Those who change their names do so chiefly because it's a convenience in an Anglo-Saxon environment. Jews don't criticize a man who changes his name from Abramowitz to Abrams, but they resent a Cohen who becomes a Corwin—he might be a quitter.

By and large, American Jews are becoming more assertive about their faith. Parents who once advised their kids to ignore anti-Semitic jibes ("It's part of being a Jew") now tell them to fight back as Americans who have nothing to be ashamed of. But it will take time both for Jews to overcome their complexes of persecution and inferiority and for Gentiles to extirpate the last vestiges of prejudice from their attitudes. Even today, a hospital that invites a Jew to serve on

its board of directors is doing him a favor; but the Christian who agrees to serve on the board of a Jewish hospital is doing Jews a favor. And don't think everybody concerned isn't aware of the distinction.

"As Americans," I was told by a Jewish leader, "we won't get the respect we deserve until we show that we have self-respect." I heard this stated differently by a young Jew just out of the Army: "If a guy calls you a kike and you swing on him, everybody else is on your side. I've tried it."

Is there a Jewish religious revival in America?

The current religious boom affects all faiths; Judaism is no exception. Synagogue affiliations in all 3 branches of Judaism was up 10 percent last year, and more than half of the Nation's Jewish children are now getting formal religious training in synagogue schools—an increase of 20 percent in 2 years. Only 1 out of 7 Jews go to weekly services (60 percent attend on the high holy days), yet this represents far greater participation in religious life than you might have expected 15 years ago.

In small towns, the synagogue is the headquarters of Jewish community life, and as more Jewish families move out of the cities and into the suburbs, they tend to become affiliated with their new synagogues for both spiritual and social reasons. The classic function of synagogue was to serve as a place of worship, of study, and assembly. In America today, the old definition is valid again—and don't forget to add the basketball, the dances, the kindergartens and the swimming pools that are giving many temples the look of community centers.

You can see the same trend in Christian churches. They have taken a new lease on life because people are groping for spiritual values and religious identification in a complex, impersonal society. Among Jews, the process of reidentification is more significant: It is not only religious, but involves an acceptance of their Jewishness. Wherever I traveled in America, I found Jewish parents who knew little of their faith and their culture sending their children to synagogue schools to learn about Judaism and its history. I have a friend out West who went to a temple for the first time in 20 years. "I was amazed," he told me, "to see how many of my acquaintances were in the congregation."

After more than 100 generations, Judaism is still a vital faith whose precepts are well adapted to contemporary life. It is a common sense, ethical, worldly religion that stresses the good life as its own reward and does not speculate too much about the hereafter. In Judaism, any act of etihcal import is as valid as a ritual observance. Compassion for one's fellow men, personal devotion to one God and emphasis on the home as the center of religious life—these are basic to Judaism.

Some theologians feel that as Judaism adjust to America, it will tend to evolve into something like liberal Protestantism—minus Christ and with an admixture of Hebrew ritual. However it develops, many Christians who go to synagogues for the first time are surprised to see how closely related their own faith is to Judaism. Some may even feel like the friar in Lessing's play, Nathan the Wise, who never really knew a Jew until he met Nathan.

"Nathan, Nathan!" he cried. "You are a Christian! By God, you are a Christian! There never was a better Christian!" To which Nathan replied, "We are of one mind. For what makes me, in your eyes, a Christian makes you, in my eyes, a Jew."

Will Jews ever be completely integrated in America?

It depends on what you mean by integrated. If you mean, "Will they eventually have the same social and economic status as other Americans," the answer is "Yes." That part of the American dream which says that any boy can grow up to be President will apply to Jews too. I venture to say that in another generation, there will be no purpose in a report such as this one.

But if you mean, will Jews lose their identity as Jews?—the answer is "No." Why should they, after all these centuries? Many individual Jews who saw a conflict between their Jewishness and Americanism—and decided to be only Americans—have often found they were not being honest with themselves or society. That's why more and more are reembracing Judaism, reasserting their identity as Jews.

A generation or more ago the problem tormenting many immigrants was: As a Jew, how can I be a good American? Today the children and grandchildren of these immigrants, more secure in their Americanism, more confident of belonging, are likely to pose the problem in a different way: As an American, how can I be a better Jew?

A Jewish social philosopher, Will Herberg, recently wrote that religious distinctions are the only ones that survive in American society. The melting pot takes care of the other immigrant traits—language, dress, and so forth. And he sees America's diverse peoples coalescing into three great subcultures—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. Under these circumstances, to be identified as a member of the Jewish faith will be an assertion of a Jew's Americanism.

From what Jews around the country told me, I am inclined to agree that religion (plus the culture and sense of history it implies) is becoming the binding element that will keep the American Jewish community from disintegrating. In time, American Jews will no longer be regarded as different—any more than Quakers are today.

Already their integration in American life is more complete than in many countries with older Jewish communities. A French Jew may say, "I live in France." An Italian Jew may tell you, "Our family has been in Rome a long time."

But an American Jew will say "America is my home."

Bureaucrats in Business—Hoover Group Explores Government's Commercial Empire

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from a recent issue—January 11, 1956—of the Wall Street Journal:

BUREAUCRATS IN BUSINESS—HOOVER GROUP EXPLORES GOVERNMENT'S COMMERCIAL EMPIRE

(By John Chamberlain)

Government, as a keen economist once said, works by ratchet action; you crank it up a notch and seldom, if ever, can it be made to slip back. The Hoover Commission, in its wide-sweeping investigation of Government competition with private industry, uncovered some 3,000 examples—invested capital; $15 billion or more—of federally owned enterprise, ratchet action on a huge scale.

The classic example of ratchet action, used by Herbert Hoover whenever he wishes to drive home his point, is the case of the Government-owned Inland Waterways Corporation, formed during a World War I emergency. Mr. Hoover tried to liquidate this corporation twice—once when he was Secretary of Commerce, and again when he was President. But whenever he threatened to lay a hand on it, civic organizations from Baton Rouge, La., to Keokuk, Iowa, sprang to its defense.

True, it lost money practically every year; true, it was competitive with private transportation. But it had a subsidy value to all sorts of people in the river towns, and the pressure on Congress kept saving it until, after 30 years, the Eisenhower administration was finally able to get it off the taxpayer's neck.

Deploying widely through all the Government administrative agencies, the Hoover Commission investigators found activity after activity to parallel the history of the federally owned Mississippi barges.

Item: Mailbag and lock manufacturing shops run by the Post Office Department. Item: Tourist facilities and services operated by the National Park Service which might be farmed out more cheaply to private concessionaires. Item: The fertilizer business run by the TVA. Item: The postal-savings banks which offer nothing that the private banking system is not prepared to offer under a Federal deposit insurance guaranty.

HELIUM AND HEMP

Item: The helium producing facilities under the Department of the Interior. Item: Various operations conducted by the Bureau of Mines, including the extraction of oil from shale. Items: Federal production of hemp in Central America and nickel in Cuba. Item: Various executive department printing plants. Item upon item: All the power installations and distribution systems run in connection with federally owned big dams, and all the Federal lending agencies from housing to those dealing in credit for farm cooperatives.

Since the biggest part of the tax dollar is spent by the Department of Defense, the Commission naturally found the Pentagon to be the source and sponsor of the biggest mare's nest of Government commercial and industrial-type facilities. The Pentagon runs cobbler shops, ice plants, sawmills, bakeries, aluminum sweating plants, motion-picture studios, dental manufacturing establishments, meatcutting plants, a ropewalk, ice cream plants, tire retreading facilities, tree and garden nurseries, plastic laminating operations, airlines, commissary stores, sea transport lines, a railroad in Panama and at least 30 other types of enterprise.

The sum total of individual commercial and manufacturing establishments run by the Defense Department is 2,500, a thousand of which, according to Herbert Hoover, could be curtailed or eliminated. The Commission argues from its own research that it makes little sense for the Department of Defense to run launderies in communities where there are plenty of launderers, or coffee roasting plants in big ports like New York City or Oakland, Calif., where coffee is roasted commercially every day.

Nor does the Commission think it makes sense for the Army to maintain commissary stores and post exchanges in metropolitan areas of the United States where there are plenty of privately owned stores where it is possible to buy practically anything. The comimssaries and post exchanges are abused everywhere, for military personnel seemingly have little compunction about buying food, cameras, and whatnot for civilian friends at Government-subsidized prices. Moreover, the commissaries and post exchanges are frequently used as a source for black-market operations at cut prices.

In certain areas the Department of Defense even competes with the Government facilities operated by other Federal agencies. The Government-owned Panama Canal Company, for example, runs the Panama Steamship Line, which maintains weekly service between New York and the Canal Zone by way of Port-au-Prince, Haiti.

The three Government-owned ships which ply back and forth between New York and the Caribbean lost about $350,000 over a 5-year period. The number of passengers carried at Government rates declined from 6,248 in 1950 to 4,746 in 1954; freight also dropped seriously from 1951 to 1954. Yet during this period the Department of Defense was busy carrying freight and passengers from east-coast ports of the United States to Panama.

NECESSARY TRIPS?

In 1954 alone the Army's Military Sea Transport Service made 28 passenger-ship voyages and 8 freighter voyages to the Canal Zone, carrying 6,781 passengers, 9,311 troops, and 79,515 tons of cargo. This was at a time when the Panama Steamship Line was making weekly sailings with partly empty staterooms and holds.

More than a hundred Government agencies are engaged in lending, and nearly all of the lending contains concealed subsidies. The Hoover Commission notes that, as of 1954, agencies engaged in home and housing finance had received more than $4 billion from the Federal Government in capital stock and loans and had further authority to borrow over $3.5 billion from the Treasury.

As of 1954, credit agencies engaged in financing farmers had received some $6.8 billion of Federal funds in the form of capital stock and loans; they also had authorization to borrow some $3 billion more from the Government. And foreign governments and foreign business establishments owed the United States Treasury some $30 billion, a figure which did not include grants or gifts. Many of the lending operations which compete with private finance companies could be eliminated; others could be "mutualized" and blended into the private-enterprise system.

The Hoover Commission limited its allegations of duplication and unnecessary competition with private industry to little more than a third of the 3,000 Government-owned business activities. In other words, it moved tentatively and gingerly into an extremely controversial field.

THE CIRCUMSPECT APPROACH

In making its report on water resources and power the Commission was especially circumspect; rejecting its own task force's recommendation that Federal powerplants be sold outright to private utilities, it limited its remarks to saying: "The problems involved cannot be solved by simple recommendations that such activities should cease and these projects be sold."

But if the Commission used no broad ax in its reports that touched on Government competition with business enterprise, it firmly called attention to its congressional mandate, which was to make recommendations bearing on policy as well as on matters of mere technical performance. "The genius of the private enterprise system," the Commission said, "is that it generates initiative * * * and unparalleled productivity."

The Commission might have added that initiative and productivity depend on a flexability which the ratchet action of Government inevitably precludes.

Pretty But Unreliable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today, it is my pleasure to include an editorial which appeared in the Griffin (Ga.) Daily News on Saturday, January 14, 1956. This is a signed editorial written by the editor of the Griffin Daily News, Hon. Quimby Melton, Jr., a distinguished citizen of Griffin and of the State of Georgia. Mr. Melton is a member of the board of regents of the University System of Georgia, is president of the Georgia Press Association—a statewide association of newspaper editors—and this year was voted Georgia's outstanding citizen by the County Commissioners Association of Georgia. His editorial in opposition to the proposed bill to provide Federal aid for school construction follows:

PRETTY BUT UNRELIABLE

In calling for $1,250,000,000 in Federal funds with which to help build badly needed schoolrooms, President Eisenhower had this to say:

"I am confident the Federal Government with this program can help construct schools without in any way weakening the American tradition that control of education must be kept close to the local communities." He added that "any legislation enacted should embody this principle."

That sounds real pretty.

But is Mr. Eisenhower not the same man who only a few days prior to that statement called for a commission to investigate alleged violations of civil rights? And was such a request not a demand of the infamous National Association for the Advancement of Colored People? Is he not the same President who wants the schools in the Nation to be integrated, the same man who held up the schools of the District of Columbia as an example of mixing the races in the classroom? (The population of the city of Washington, by the way, is now well more than half Negro. And white students, we are told, are dropping out of the integrated public schools there.)

Mr. Eisenhower's statement that schools wil continue to be controlled locally if his Federal aid program passes just does not jibe with his earlier statements. They are too far apart because on the one hand the Federal Government is seeking to force us to mix our schools while on the other the President says local folks will run local schools. The mixture is no better than oil and water.

In our anxiety to improve our schools which certainly need improving, we should not forget the fact that every time the Federal Government offers Federal funds, it also insists upon Federal control. This may not come immediately, but it is as certain to follow as night follows day.

Furthermore, let us not forget that Federal funds are not "something for nothing." They must be raised from the same source as State and local funds, the taxpayer. And as far as those of us who prefer local control are concerned, we'd rather pay local and State taxes to operate our schools than to pay Federal taxes for the same purpose. Then there would be no doubt about us retaining local control.

If Mr. Eisenhower really wants to help solve the serious school problem and at the same time leave our schools in our own hands where they belong, then we suggest that he balance the budget and start paying off some of our Nation's staggering load of debt. Thereupon the Federal Government could get out of fields of taxation which rightfully belong to the States. Then the States could finance the schools more adequately themselves. This would offer the further advantage of reducing the "drainage" of funds which inevitably occurs when a Federal agency handles them.

Yes, Mr. Eisenhower's lip service to local control of schools is real pretty. But we can place no reliance in it whatever because of his other statements and policies as regards forcing integration by Federal decree.

Not even Mr. Eisenhower can play ball on both sides of a pasture fence at the same time.

Secretary Dulles' "Brink of War" Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the attempts by Republican spokesmen to persuade the Nation and the world that attacks on Secretary Dulles brink-of-war policy are just a political dust storm raise some very serious questions. If Democrats were alone in pointing out that Mr. Dulles has made a grievous blunder in agreeing to the portrayal of himself as a gambler who plays with atomic dice, there might be evidence to support Republican claims. But can the British press, the Indian press, even our own American press—which is hardly noted for its unswerving devotion to the Democratic Party—be accused of blowing up a political dust storm? Can the fact that Mr. Dulles has, as Walter Lippmann says, "provided the Soviet propaganda with a text which is sheer bonanza" be set down to campaign trickery? One might easily conclude that there is a concerted Republican effort to put the shoe on the wrong foot.

The Life magazine article has had two highly unfortunate effects. The first has been to revive our allies' fears about the responsibility and maturity with which we conduct our foreign policy. They know well that we are not playing with tin soldiers or pen knives and that braggadocio is hardly a suitable weapon in our arsenal. Secondly, the bipartisan support which has been the foundation stone of our foreign policy has been dealt a smashing blow. Mr. NIXON has commented:

> The Eisenhower-Dulles record, which has brought peace, standing against the Truman-Acheson policy which brought us war, will settle that issue and I think the rest of us will take care of the campaigning. All this "yackety-yak" about what Dulles said and how the foreign policy was developed will have little effect. The people are only interested in results. The Eisenhower-Dulles policy has brought peace without concessions.

This is a perfect illustration of the attempted misuse of foreign policy for what the Republicans hope will be partisan advantage.

If Democrats express their amazement at reading about developments which Mr. Dulles calls history but of which they were never informed, despite their role in conduct of the bipartisan foreign policy; if a storm of adverse opinon arises in the free world; if the Soviets fall upon Mr. Dulles' quotes with cries of pure glee—are not these matters which the Republicans must reckon with

and face honorably and conscientiously? I recommend to them an earnest study of the newspaper articles which I call to the attention of the Congress herewith:

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 13, 1956]

DULLES POLICIES IN HOT WATER

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of State John Foster Dulles is currently in some of the hottest political and diplomatic water of his career.

How he happened to get there, whether he waded in deliberately or was shoved in by an overzealous journalist or a careless State Department aid, currently overshadows all other topics along Embassy Row or on Capitol Hill.

It has brought forth a demand from Democratic leaders that the State Secretary repudiate the statements attributed to him on administration action in recent crises or they will release secret testimony by the Secretary said to be in direct contradiction of "his historical distortions."

It has brought forth a denial from the British Foreign Office that Britain never agreed to intervene in the Indochinese war and then reneged—as the article asserts.

MAGAZINE ARTICLE

It has brought forth criticisms from Britian's leading newspapers—the Times, of London, and the Manchester Guardian—that flatly contradict the version of affairs attributed to Mr. Dulles. And it has provided the Soviet news agency Tass the opportunity to assert gleefully that the American Secretary of State has now openly raised the "constant preservation of international tension" to the status of official American policy.

The tempest, considerably larger than most teapots, in which the Secretary finds himself, was brewed in this week's Life magazine article on "How Dulles Averted War"—not once, but 3 times in the past 3 years.

In this article, Mr. Dulles is represented as asserting that Communist aggressions in Korea, Indochina, and the Formosa Strait had been halted or forestalled by a deterrent policy of the administration based on, among other things, atomic weapons.

The most provocative quote—in a long list—is the following:

"You have to take chances for peace just as you must take chances in war. Some say we were brought to the verge of war. Of course, we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war.

"If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. We've had to look it square in the face—on the question of enlarging the Korean war, on the question of getting into the Indochina war, on the question of Formosa. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face. We took strong action."

PREVENTIVE ACTION

In two of these cases, as the article asserts, the administration made clear its intentions to use nuclear weapons if necessary. In the third, use of such weapons was not excluded.

Then there is a parenthetical insertion in the piece that states, with every evidence as being authoritative, that "Dulles has never doubted, incidentally, that Eisenhower would have regarded an attack on Quemoy and the Matsus as an attack on Formosa."

Stripped of its verbiage, what the piece appears to its critics to say, and claims as the facts straight from Mr. Dulles, is this:

In Korea the United States was ready to expand the war and use atomic weapons if the truce talks broke down.

In Indochina, the United States and its allies (London dissents strongly) were ready to enter the war and use atomic weapons if truce talks had failed.

In the Formosa Strait, the United States' promise to defend Formosa and the Pescadores (and Quemoy and Matsu, too, according to Mr. Dulles) has kept the Communist Chinese from unleashing war.

The Dulles thesis is that only by letting the enemy know what the United States could do, by deliberately "going to the brink of war," was war actually averted in these three instances.

MATTER OF JUDGMENT

Perhaps the most charitable comment on the article by a Democratic Senator, WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat, of Georgia, was that whether the administration's actions had prevented actual conflict was "a matter of judgment as to how things happened." "It is particularly difficult," he said, in a mild rebuke to the Secretary, "to say why certain events didn't happen."

The most scathing comment was from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, also a member of the Senate Foreigns Relations Committee, who charged Mr. Dulles with "rewriting history" for political purposes, with making statements in direct conflict with his Senate testimony, and with endangering bipartisan support of foreign policy.

There is considerable uncertainty as to just how aware Mr. Dulles was of the events leading up to the publication of this provocative article. Life magazine itself, according to reports, may have been first preparing to put it out as an exclusive interview with the Secretary, but later, so the stories go, watered down its claims and changed some of the language as it appeared in the first mimeographed copies circulating in Washington.

Meanwhile, Secretary Dulles, on January 13, seemed to back up the claims attributed to him in the article. A press officer said: "The Secretary has now read the Life article. He feels that the statements specifically attributed to him do not require correction from the standpoint of their substance."

At his weekly press conference, January 12, Mr. Dulles (who was queried about the article that had not yet appeared) showed such apparent ignorance of both its claims and content as to lead most listeners to the conclusion that there might be much less "original Dulles" in it than seemed indicated.

DULLES STATEMENTS DISPLEASE BRITISH

(By Henry S. Hayward)

LONDON.—Britons, it is only fair to report, are particularly displeased about recent comments by American Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

They have taken keen interest in his statement that on three occasions in 1953 and 1954, all-out war almost broke out in the Far East.

But they take special umbrage at these words attributed to Mr. Dulles:

"We were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge of war without getting into war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war * * *. If you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost."

It is safe to say that the overwhelming majority of the British people today disagree with the implications of that statement.

Getting to the verge without precipitating a holocaust may be an art, they agree. But they are emphatic that it is an art that should not be indulged in by Americans—or anyone else.

FLUTTER OF APPREHENSION

Thus the burden of the Dulles remarks, as they reach this country, is that American policymakers flirted with the verge of war—not once, not twice, but thrice—and thought it a creditable action.

Each times it caused a flutter of apprehension in Britain. The fear frankly was that in a cliffside struggle, somebody would go over—and that war, as Mr. Dulles himself admitted, inevitably would result.

Britons think back to the Korean armistice crisis, the Dien Bien Phu crisis, and the Formosa crisis, not as triumphs for iron-nerved western diplomats, using threats of atomic warfare, but as nerve-wracking intervals when world peace may have hung by a thread.

Rightly or wrongly, many thinking Britons Their impulse, then and now, is not to edge up to the brink of vast hostilities, but to make all honorable speed in the other direction.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE

Rightly or wrongly, many thinking Britons regard this as a fundamental difference between their world viewpoint and the American outlook.

There is little genuine anti-American sentiment visible in this country. But, as any visitor here can soon determine, there is a genuine portion of apprehension about what the United States does and fails to do.

And when the real or fancied omissions and commissions of Americans affect such vital issues as war and peace, the distinction between apprehension and out-and-out opposition (or anti-American) soon vanishes.

In British opinion, the differences between British and American positions during the Indochina crisis, which were exposed by Mr. Dulles' remarks, are much more an indictment of Dulles' diplomacy than of their own.

DIPLOMACY QUESTIONED

The apparently inadvertent reopening of such issues at this time also is cited as an act of dubious diplomacy.

If the Dulles move is for internal political purposes, as has been suggested, it still is not understood or sanctioned here.

As an illustration of how strongly Britons feel about the "verge of war" comment, some of those who recently have been busy belaboring Sir Anthony Eden for alleged shortcomings as Prime Minister took time out long enough to heave a sigh of relief that their man does not harbor what they regard as such dangerous sentiments.

"Sir Anthony Eden, to his eternal credit, would have none of this deadly game," wrote Columnist Cassandra in the mass-circulation London Daily Mirror, a newspaper that has been in the forefront of Eden critics.

STRONG-MAN POLICY

While turning their fire on the American Secretary of State, some British mouthpieces appear to have been led into questionable assumptions, however. One newspaper speculates that Mr. Dulles is hopeful of becoming a presidential candidate and is setting himself up as a strong man on Far East policy.

Another press speculation aired here is that the American Secretary of State, for some unexplained reason, is trying to increase Anglo-American tension at a time when Sir Anthony is under criticism at home and on the eve of his departure for important talks in Washington.

Like Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (D), of Minneosta, it is apparent that the British also would like to hear Mr. Dulles repudiate his "verge" statement.

DULLES STARTLES WEST EUROPE

(By Volney D. Hurd)

PARIS.—Nothing could better illustrate the great gulf separating Britain and France from the United States on the question of big-power diplomacy than the reaction of the Dulles claim that the threat of atomic retaliation had saved the world from war 3 times in the past 18 months.

When Britain and France were dominating world affairs, before World War I, they did not hesitate to use a strong show of force

as a diplomatic instrument for keeping world order and peace. Yet, today, they are startled and shocked to see the United States doing the same thing in the atomic-age version of such a show.

Britain's famous "send a gunboat" or "send a cruiser" to the scene—depending upon the size of the threat required—has been replaced by America's sending an aircraft carrier, whose ammunition includes tactical bombs.

TODAY'S ATTITUDE

But since in today's interdependent world a military action anywhere could lead to a worldwide conflict, a weary Western Europe, whose days of playing this game apparently are past, sees such a show of force as a dreadful gamble.

Even with weapons limited to the 1914 version, the Europe of today would unquestionably hesitate to use shows of force as it used to do. Now must be added to this hesitation the vast destructive power of nuclear weapons.

Finally, to use such a threat in a world in which the other side is a tough communism, ruthlessly on the make toward world domination, causes Europe to believe that any needless show of force is something to be avoided at all costs.

SHOW OF FORCE DROPPED

The British and French school of diplomacy has always enjoyed and preferred the art of negotiation. But a show of force was always kept in the pocket of their chief negotiator, "just in case."

Today, negotiation appears to be the only term in which this diplomacy thinks. It is startling, in talking with Foreign Office men and politicians, to see how the show of force has been completely dropped from their diplomatic vocabulary. Constitutionally unsuited to their 20th century mood, it simply doesn't exist.

By disclosing this fundamental diplomatic difference between Britain and France and the United States, the Dulles statements must be considered as providing a useful and essential spotlighting of the Western European diplomatic mind of today.

So long as military forces exist and war represents the extension of diplomacy by other means, diplomacy must be made up of a combination of negotiation and a potential force which can be shown at the right place and time.

History indicates that any large nation which fails to keep these two complimentary elements of diplomacy in equal balance is rapidly jeopardizing its place as a world power.

FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE

The problem of a united-front diplomacy among the Western Big Three has long been marked by this problem of Britain and France holding back from American concepts of how to handle expanding world communism.

So far, such hesitations have been accepted as merely these European nations' individual attitudes on some given problem. But the Dulles disclosure, and European reactions to it, show the existence of a deep and fundamental difference which must be resolved in behalf of Western survival.

The European reaction is to pull back pale and shocked and wish it could avoid being tied to a great and powerful ally whose Secretary of State can frankly state with easy calm:

"Of course, we were brought to the verge of war. The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost * * *. We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face.

MAJOR QUESTION POSED

To today's Europe, such a statement is as foreign-sounding and nightmarish as something a space cadet might bring back from Mars.

Sound and detached diplomats here say this disclosure poses one major question which must be resolved before all others. It is: "Britain and France can no longer remain just where they are vis-a-vis the United States. Either they must break away, which would be just what Moscow wants, or they must move even closer, which goes against all their present lack-of-power, let's-negotiate-at-all-costs feelings."

Such comments give special interest to the Eden visit to Washington at the end of this month.

The Reversal—The Precarious Balance—The Other Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, in its issue of January 17, finds the President's budget so disappointing and so pointed in its failure to redeem pledges of reducing Government spending, that it devotes its entire editorial page to the subject.

Its three notable editorials corroborate my statement on the floor following the reading of the budget message that the margin of balance is so precarious as to justify doubt as to whether the surplus is merely a bookkeeping item or whether it is a dependable and permanent balance.

Even so friendly a commentator as the Wall Street Journal is unable to find sufficient comfort in the message as to warrant commending either it or the budget.

After referring to reductions in expenditures in fiscal years 1954 and 1955—much of which was the natural concomitant of cessation of war in Korea—the first editorial recites:

Then, last August, the progress faltered. Spending for the current, or 1956, fiscal year was increased slightly to $63.8 billion. And now, in the budget message submitted yesterday, the faltering has turned into a reversal.

The editorial concludes:

All this comes at a time when the country is at its most prosperous, when there are neither wars abroad nor great troubles at home to call for more billions of Government spending. There could hardly be a plainer notice that the administration has abandoned its earlier fiscal course and buried its promise of a $60 billion budget $6 billion deep.

The second editorial, "The Precarious Balance," is even more emphatic:

To see how precariously this 1957 balanced budget is really balanced it is only necessary to look at some of the assumptions upon which it rests.

It then cites a number of specific assumptions, among which is the assumed enactment by the Congress of the once-rejected $350 million postal rate increase—a second rejection of which would cause the projected 1957 surplus to vanish in thin air.

The third editorial, "The Other Direction," cites chapter and verse. It calls attention to the obvious fact that inclusion af almost every conceivable kind of spending program, many on a larger scale than ever before and many presented for the first time, signals not only a turn in the other direction in fiscal 1957 but for years beyond. Many of them are dubious ways of spending the people's taxes, says the writer. And he concludes his reference to new and expanded spending proposals gloomily:

It justifies more spending solely on the grounds that there are more billions on hand. And if that is the new direction of the administration's budget policy, then it has embarked on a road that has no journey's end.

Mr. Speaker, under leave of the House, I include the complete text of these editorials from the Wall Street Journal:

THE REVERSAL

In the 1952 campaign General Eisenhower set forth two fiscal and economic goals for his administration.

The first was to provide a sound dollar by eliminating the deficit from the Government's budget. The second was a corollary, to reduce Government spending and thereby permit lower taxation. He set his sights firmly on a $60 billion budget.

For almost 3 years these 2 things were more than vague goals; they were the twin principles on which the Eisenhower administration based its economic actions. Since it came to office the people have had a $7 billion tax cut, they have found their money achieving a dependable value and they have seen the cost of Government steadily decline.

In fiscal 1953 the Government spent $74.3 billion. In 1954 it was $67.8 billion. In 1955 it was $64.6 billion. The budget which President Eisenhower submitted just a year ago, for the fiscal year ending next June, forecast spending at $62.4 billion.

This was truly a phenomenal achievement. One reward was a prosperity such as this country has never known before. It brought the administration within reaching distance of its dedicated spending goal. It brought the people promise of a further lifting of their burden of taxes.

Then, last August, the progress faltered. Spending for the current, or 1956, fiscal year was increased slightly to $63.8 billion. And now, in the budget message submitted yesterday, the faltering has turned into a reversal.

President Eisenhower says that in the current fiscal year the Government will actually spend $64.3 billion, an increase of nearly $2 billion from his forecast last January. In the coming fiscal year, 1957, the budget expenditures add up up to $65.9 billion.

Now it is true enough that all this is proposed within the framework of a budget that is, on paper, balanced. But the $400 million margin by which receipts are expected to exceed expenditures in 1957 is, in the President's own words, a slim one. It offers no room for a tax cut and provides at most only a token reduction in the national debt.

Even this slender margin is really no budgetary achievement by the administration. It will be cahieved, if it is achieved, solely because the Government finds itself in unexpected good fortune. It now thinks it will be able to take more money from the people than previously anticipated. And it must take a great deal more. To put this budget in balance the total tax take must

rise from the $60.4 billion actually received in 1955 to an estimated $66.3 billion in 1957.

But there is one thing in this budget that is certain. In the space of a year the administration has enlarged by $3.5 billion its idea of what the Government's annual spending should be—it has raised its sights from the $62.4 billion it sought in the original 1956 budget to the $65.9 billion it now asks for 1957.

And all this comes at a time when the country is at its most prosperous, when there are neither wars abroad nor great troubles at home to call for more billions of Government spending. There could hardly be a plainer notice that the administration has abandoned its earlier fiscal course and buried its promise of a $60 billion budget 6 billion deep.

THE PRECARIOUS BALANCE

To see how precariously this 1957 balanced budget is really balanced it is only necessary to look at some of the assumptions upon which it rests.

There is, first of all, the fact that it depends on the state of the economy being not only as good in and beyond 1956 as it was in 1955, but even better. In short, it depends not only on continuing good times but on a bigger boom.

Corporation profits are counted on to remain at least at the $43 billion level throughout 1956 and into 1957. Personal income is expected to rise from the $302.5 billion at which it has been estimated for 1955 to more than $312 billion for the rest of this year. That way the Government hopes to pick up some $5.4 billion more revenue than in fiscal 1955 and $1.5 billion more than it expects to receive in the current, 1956, fiscal year. All this assumes no reduction in individual or corporate or excise taxes.

The administration is also keeping its books as though Congress would approve a $350 million postal rate increase at this session, although last year, when the budget was completely out of balance, Congress refused to do so.

Finally, this budget is kept in balance by providing no funds for the new Federal highway program which the President asked for in his state of the Union message and which he again endorsed in yesterday's budget message.

We are not trying to suggest that any particular one of these wishes may fail of fulfillment. It could just as well be, for example, that the Nation will prove to be even more prosperous in 1956 than the administration expects.

But after all the most optimistic allowances have been made, it is still true that this margin has been stretched to the breaking point by the increase in spending plans. For the surplus to be achieved not just one or two but all the gambles must turn out right. If any one of the variables varies the wrong way, this little surplus will vanish into thin air.

The administration is right to prize the balance in the budget, but it seems to be prizing prudence too little when it depends on a balance that can be toppled by the slightest ill wind.

THE OTHER DIRECTION

If the Eisenhower administration had drawn up its spending plans for the 1957 budget solely on the basis of existing legislation that authorizes Government spending—that is, had not asked for any new spending powers—its total expenditures for the new budget would have come to $63.9 billion.

This figure of $63.9 billion is itself $1.5 billion above the spending line which the administration set for itself last January in the original budget for 1956. Had it held to that line in every other category it could have added a billion to national defense and still had a 1957 budget totaling no more than $63.4 billion.

In either case the prospect in the next fiscal year would be a surplus in excess of $2 billion on the basis of current revenue estimates. At the best there would be room for a tax cut. At the worst there would be a cushion against untoward events.

These speculations are not as idle as they may seem. For they show that to have obtained a sizable surplus in the 1957 budget it would not have been necessary to find any more economies. It would only have been necessary not to succumb to new temptations to spend money.

In short, this budget increase—the actual total is $65.9 billion—cannot be blamed simply on the high cost of national defense or the ordinary functions of Government.

The new spending programs cover a wide range. Some of them, like the new soil bank ($400 million), involve rather large sums. Some of them, like the program for new veterans' hospitals ($50 milion), do not seem individually large in relation to the total budget.

But in the aggregate, as well as they can be dug out from a complex budget document, the plans for new spending total between $2 billion and $3 billion. Nearly a billion dollars is involved in brandnew projects for doing things. This category includes a hospital building program, new public health activities and a construction program for local public schools. Another $2 billion is involved in extending programs scheduled to lapse next June 30, such as the college housing program originally intended to take care of returning veterans from Korea and World War II.

And in addition some older programs have been broadened. Foreign-aid expenditures have been boosted another $100 million between 1956 and 1957. Expenditures under labor and welfare will go up $228 million—an increase of $442 million over the 1955 level. Much of this last item involves new legislation also; or, in the President's words, the increase "stems largely from my proposals to strengthen and expand education, health, and research services substantially."

Now the purpose of this recitation—and the list could be lengthened—is not to argue that all of these things are undesirable. Many of them are dubious ways of spending the people's taxes, but quite a few of them are items which, considered individually, are unobjectionable. Some might even be useful expenditures in a budget not already laden with burdens.

Nonetheless, it would be hard to make a persuasive argument that in the past several years this country has suffered any economic or social hardship for the absence of this additional spending.

Nor does the administration try to pretend this is so. The President's budget message explains the new spending simply on the grounds that "budget revenues now permit us to undertake some new and expanded programs for enhancing opportunities for human well-being and economic growth."

However you phrase that sentence, it justifies more spending solely on the grounds that there are more billions on hand. And if that is the new direction of the administration's budget policy, then it has embarked on a road that has no journey's end.

Tax on Gasoline Used by Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to refund the 2-cents-a-gallon tax on gasoline used by farmers for nonhighway use. This tax is an unnecessary and unwarranted burden on the farmers of this Nation.

Farmers should be expected to pay the same taxes as others on the gasoline and lubricating oil they use to travel public roads and streets. There is little justification, however, for extracting this tax from them for gasoline and oil used to power the vehicles and instruments of modern farm production. This tax is a significant item to many farmers, and should have been set aside long ago. It is all the more worthy at this time when so many farmers are caught in the squeeze between higher costs of production and lower prices for their products.

Other Congressmen have introduced legislation for this purpose, and the Ways and Means Committee is presently considering the subject. I trust a bill to exempt farmers from payment of this tax on gasoline purchased for nonhighway use will be approved by the committee in the very near future, and will be passed by a resounding majority.

A Soldier Goes Astray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Star of Washington, Wednesday, January 18, 1956 which emphasizes the responsibility of the President relative to recommendations of the Chief of Staff of the Army.

A SOLDIER GOES ASTRAY

No one who has even a casual acquaintance with General Ridgway would think of questioning his sincerity of purpose. Moreover, he is a fine soldier—a dedicated officer to whom the security of his country comes first, last, and always. It is too bad that he did not stick to his field in the first of a series of articles he has written for the Saturday Evening Post.

General Ridgway is competent to speak on the subject of national security. His opinions in this area are not necessarily conclusive, but they are entitled to great respect. We had better listen when, speaking as a professional military man, he says that our current defense policies are endangering the safety of our country. It is also necessary, however, to keep in mind the limitations under which General Ridgway testifies. He concedes this himself in these words:

"As Chief of Staff of the Army and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it was my duty and obligation to advise the Department of Defense, the National Security Council and the President on military matters. This advice should be based on my honest, fearless, objective estimate of what the Army needed to serve the national interest, and it should have no reference to the impact my recommendations might have on the national economy, on domestic politics, nor on administration policy at any particular time."

This is a correct statement, and it would have been better if General Ridgway, in his magazine piece, had confined himself to military advice. For that is the field in which he is competent and in which his

responsibility lies. But a President cannot ignore, as General Ridgway could, the impact of military recommendations on the national economy, politics, and policy. A President has to look at the whole picture and form his judgments accordingly.

In writing for the Saturday Evening Post, General Ridgway has not stuck to the single-minded duty which he laid upon himself as Army Chief of Staff. Unfortunately, he has strayed into the realm of politics. And the effect is to impugn, by implication, the good faith and the integrity of the President.

The release of advance copies of the article led to a Senate debate. Democratic Senator SYMINGTON said that the Ridgway article in effect "says that the security of the Nation is being thrown into the market place, to be traded for political advantage." Other Democrats, without mentioning that General Ridgway had also been severely critical of the Truman administration, chimed in. In all fairness, however, it must be said that the inferences drawn by the Democratic Senators were justified by the things General Ridgway wrote.

Thus, a statement by a distinguished soldier, which might have contributed to intelligent debate of a vitally important question, feeds the fires of political controversy at a very low level. And it will be a self-defeating thing. For the effect of all this is to accuse President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Wilson, not of being mistaken in their judgment, but of selling the country short for the sake of votes. We do not believe this, and the people will not believe it.

Home Again: An Inspiring Story of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM A. DAWSON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States to Home Again, a first novel by James Edmiston, which I believe is one of the clearest testimonials to democracy and our way of life that I have ever read.

It was presented to me recently by Mike M. Masaoka, the Washington representative of the Japanese American Citizens League, for Home Again is, in a real sense, a documentary of the Japanese in our country.

It tells in capsule form the history of the Japanese people in our Nation through the medium of the life story of a single Japanese-American family. It suggests the many and great contributions which our Japanese immigrants have made to this land of their adoption in spite of the discrimination and prejudice which challenged them on the west coast. It describes the heartaches of World War II, and documents the unprecedented sacrifices which this group of Americans and their alien parents had to undergo to demonstrate their loyalty. But, most important, it reports the triumph of our American way over wartime hysteria and bigotry.

I am proud to number among my constituents in Utah many Japanese-Americans. I know them, and their story, so I can vouch for the truth of Home Again.

Some extracts from reviews by representative newspapers throughout the Nation describe better than I can this story of democracy in action:

Boston Globe: "This is a story to make us think and to renew our confidence in our Government."

Cincinnati Enquirer: "The stirring account of how democracy conquered prejudice."

Norfolk (Va.) Pilot: "Dollars four, and worth every cent * * * this is not only a dramatic story, lively, educational, exciting and authentic but a healthy experience in self-examination."

Christian Advocate: "The reader will lift his head high as he marvels at the power of democracy to rectify its failures."

Abiline (Tex.) Reporter-News: "The story of how faith in democracy turned the tide of bigotry and hate."

San Francisco Examiner: "Home Again certainly deserves a place among the documentary literature of this generation."

Daily Sentinel, Grand Junction, Colo.: "A vivid book by a man with sentiment and a belief in democracy * * * a sharp picture taken from the facts."

Salt Lake City Tribune: "Home Again combines the stark documentary facts with the emotional impact one finds in the best novels. It does it extremely well * * * a fine testimonial for the democratic way of life as well as the remarkable perseverance of the Japanese-Americans."

Omaha World Telegram: "If you have forgotten, or never did know, how we treated our Japanese-Americans, this book is required reading. Humility becomes so proud a Nation as ours."

Catholic Book Week Supplement: "The loyalty of our Japanese-Americans never falters * * * Home Again closes on a note of courage and hope."

Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch: "This is the story that needs telling * * * those who fought the good fight for decency and a genuine working of democracy."

Patriot-Ledger, Quincy, Mass.: "Told with the emotional impact of a novel and the force of truth * * * in brief, this is the record of how a dynamic democracy can triumph over the sickness of intolerance."

Los Angeles Times: "Home Again proves that in a democracy, even when a sad mistake is made, it is possible to repair it; and second, that the overwhelming majority of our Japanese-Americans proved to the hilt, and with justifiable pride, that they were first-class citizens."

Chicago Tribune: "Home again is an angry, proud, confident book, a blazing and unforgettable lesson in civics worth the time and attention of every American."

Seattle Post-Intelligencer: "The moving story of a whole segment of our population into a novel * * * his story gives a good insight into the lives of Japanese-Americans."

Hollywood Citizens News: "A stirring book * * * to help dispel race prejudice."

Lubbock (Tex.) Journal: "It would have been easy for the author to have let his interest in Japanese Americans stir him to write a book of propaganda for them, but instead he has restrained himself to produce an excellent fictionalized bigoraphy of grays, not blacks and white."

Denver Post: "Your first impulse on reading this factual novel will be to say, 'Fantastic: It couldn't possibly be true. This could not have possibly happened here.' But it did happen * * * it is a dramatic story of tremendous impact."

Baltimore Sun: "We congratulate Mr. Edmiston on his zeal and compassion * * * in the same capacity as such pioneering novelists as John Steinbeck and Harriet Beecher Stowe, he has produced an effective propaganda piece."

Sacramento Bee: "This story is a good one and a dramatic one about an important chapter in California history."

New York Times: "Mr. Edmiston has undertaken to record, in semidocumentary form, one of the most dramatic segments of this Nation's history."

Almost without exception, I have been told, the newspaper and magazine reviews have been uniformly specific in pointing out the historic lesson this powerful book preaches—that democracy can and has corrected its mistakes.

I commend Home Again to the Members of both the House and the Senate and to all Americans as one worthy of reading.

I think some Hollywood studio should consider making a motion picture out of Home Again for its theme is the epic of America repeated again in the story of the Japanese Americans. It would make a motion picture that will make all Americans proud, and show all the rest of the world the workings of democracy in a troubled time.

The Downward Trend of Farm Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of Centerville, Iowa, expressing great concern over the continued downward trend of prices of farm products at the very time the prices of everything the farmer needs to buy is increasing. The resolution urges the Congress to take prompt action to adopt legislation to take care of the present emergency as well as a long-range program that will be equitable.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the board of directors of the Centerville Chamber of Commerce fully realizes the great importance of the farmers in the Centerville trade area to Centerville merchants; and

Whereas the directors note with concern the continued downward trend of farm prices which is taking place while the prices of the articles the farmer has to purchase is rising; and

Whereas recent predictions by some leading economists indicate a further drop in farm income in 1956, but a continuing increase in other business; and

Whereas no evidence is noted that anything concrete has been done in Washington to alleviate and correct the above discrepancies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the said board of directors of the Centerville Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled in Centerville this 9th day of January 1956, do hereby urge the administration and Congress to immediately put into effect such temporary measures as may be necessary to assure

farmers of fair hog and cattle prices during the present emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration and Congress to prepare, pass, and put into effect with as much celerity as circumstances will permit, legislation that will assure farmers of equitable prices for their products in times of maladjustment without instituting any permanent controls that would limit their freedom of operations and opportunity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Senators Hickenlooper and Martin, to Congressman LeCompte, to Gov. Leo Hoegh, to Appanoose County Farm Bureau officials, and to Appanoose County press and radio.

In witness whereof the following officers of the said organization hereto attach their signatures.

H. H. HINES,
President.
WAGA B. HALDEN,
Vice President.
HARRY L. DUKES,
Managing Secretary.

Medical Progress and the American Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday night, January 15, there was held in the city of Washington, D. C., the first anniversary dinner given by the advisory board of the Jewish Consumptive Relief Society for the support of the American Medical Center at Denver, Colo. It was attended by a number of the Nation's most distinguished citizens in the fields of clergy, the military, and public officialdom.

It was at this dinner that the Surgeon General of the United States, the Honorable Leonard A. Scheele, delivered the principal address. His speech was one of great significance, recording the accomplishments of the medical profession in its battle against disease. His talk records in great detail the story of medical research and portends great progress which may be anticipated in the not too distant future.

I am sure that his remarks are of national interest, and, therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

MEDICAL PROGRESS AND THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL

(By Leonard A. Scheele, M. D., Surgeon General, U. S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Congressman DAVIDSON, Mr. Nellis, distinguished guests and friends of the American Medical Center at Denver, I consider it a great honor to be with you this evening and to take a small part in your efforts in behalf of the American Medical Center at Denver. The history of that institution is closely linked with the history of our country's long battle against tuberculosis, a battle which voluntary and official health agencies, the professions, and the public have fought together for nearly 75 years.

When the Denver Hospital and Sanitarium, forerunner of the present medical center, was established, tuberculosis was the leading cause of death and long-term illness in the United States. The death rate from tuberculosis was nearly 200 per 100,000 at that time and was exceeded only by those arch-allies of the disease, influenza and pneumonia. The long-term suffering of tuberculous patients, combined with the hopeless outlook for recovery, the disastrous effects upon family life and economic status, justified Americans of the 1900's in calling tuberculosis "Captain of the men of death."

Since that time, medical science and public health methods have made enormous advances, parallel with continuing progress in all departments of life in the United States. The picture today is quite different. In 1954, the estimated tuberculosis death rate was about 10 per 100,000, a reduction of 95 percent since 1900. Much of this progress against the "Captain of the men of death" is due to very recent medical progress.

In fact, some of the most exciting and important advances in medicine have been made within the past 10 years. It is difficult for most of us to realize, for example, that in January 1946 we had no streptomycin, no para-aminosalicylic acid, no isoniazid for the treatment of tuberculosis. Yet all three of these drugs have been developed, tested, and put to effective use since that date.

In 1955, research workers in the Public Health Service discovered that isonaizid is remarkably effective in preventing tuberculosis in laboratory animals. This encouraging discovery is now being tested in several hospitals as a means of preventing serious complications of tuberculosis among children who have already acquired infection. Further trials in larger groups may give medicine and public health the first effective synthetic drug for large-scale preventive programs against tuberculosis.

One can report comparable advances in many other important medical fields. Radioactive cobalt and iodine have been added to the physician's armament for the diagnosis and treatment of some forms of cancer. Drug treatment of leukemia, a malignant disease affecting the blood, is now prolonging hundreds of lives. Surgical treatment of various heart diseases and diseases of the blood vessels, impossible 10 years ago, is applied successfully in most major medical centers in the country.

Cortisone and other steroids, reserpine, chlorpromazine, diantin, mestion, asparagine, and scores of other new hormonal and synthetic drugs are providing better treatment for arthritis, mental illness, epilepsy, and numerous diseases which hitherto had defied the practicing physician. The widespread use of sulfa drugs and antibiotics have literally revolutionized the care of patients with many infectious diseases.

In terms of prevention, we now have an effective poliomyelitis vaccine capable of reducing the annual toll of paralytic cases by 75 percent or more. Retrolental fibroplasia, a leading cause of blindness in infants, can be prevented by the controlled use of oxygen in the care of premature babies. Prevention of rheumatic fever is possible through the use of antibiotics, with a consequent reduction in the cases of rheumatic heart disease. Fluoridation of public water supplies, such as is practiced in the District of Columbia, makes possible the prevention of at least 60 percent of tooth decay in our children.

I have mentioned only a few of the striking advances that have marked medical progress in the past decade. What does this progress mean to the American people and how does it affect the American hospital?

In terms of national health statistics, it means an increasing life expectancy and a declining general death rate. In 53 years, 1900 to 1953, the average life expectancy at birth in the United States increased from 47.3 to 68.8 years—a gain of 21½ years. Five of those years were added since 1943.

The general death rate has declined 12 percent in the past 10 years. The drop in death rates from certain specific causes has been much more spectacular. For example, the tuberculosis death rate has declined by 24 percent in the 3 years just past—1953–55. In the past 10 years, the mortality rate from influenza and pneumonia has declined by 77 percent; from syphilis, 56 percent; from nephritis and other kidney diseases, 40 percent. Unfortunately, not all this life-saving is clear gain. As we conquer many diseases of early life, more people are living longer to those ages when they are most likely to have cancer, heart disease, and other chronic illnesses.

To the individual patient and his family, however, these figures have little meaning. People measure medical progress by the speed and effectiveness with which their physicians can relieve suffering and restore patients to health and social efficiency.

There is no doubt that the availability of the ever-increasing battery of wonder drugs has reduced the fear and dread with which people regard the onset of many acute illnesses, especially the acute bacterial infections. The occurrence of many chronic diseases, too, can be met with more fortitude, since improvements in diagnosis and therapy make possible earlier discovery and better control of long-term illnesses in the individual patient. Much of this change in attitude has occurred parallel with medical progress in the past 10 years. I will say more about the chronic illnesses later.

Hospital care also has changed radically in the same period. In the institution you are supporting at Denver, the shift in emphasis from exclusive care of tuberculosis patients to a broader program including the care of cancer patients, illustrates some of the changes that have been going on in hospitals across the country.

Early ambulation, home-care programs, expansion of outpatient services, blood banks, psychiatric services, and rehabilitation programs are among the many new concepts and programs now accepted by general and special hospitals.

Advances in medicine have not only changed the nature of hospital services in many instances, but have also greatly increased their costs. Modern radiation equipment alone for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer, for example, may cost as much as $1 million.

Bone banks, eye banks, and artery banks are becoming commonplace adjuncts in large hospitals. New types of anesthesia also call for new equipment. It is impossible to put a firm pricemark on any one of the modern technical services of a hospital, since their operation requires not only costly equipment, but also the full-time attention of highly trained professional and technical personnel.

On the other hand, many advances make possible more economical operation of some hospital services. It has been estimated, for example, that effective home care of long-term patients can be provided by a hospital at about one-third the per diem cost of in-patient care.

Let us look at the other side of the coin for a moment. Despite the advances I have mentioned and many others, the annual bill which could be prevented and which disease and accidents presents to our country is still far too high. It is excessive in terms of human suffering, needless deaths, and loss of productivity.

We cannot measure the suffering, nor can we accurately measure the loss of productivity. But we can get some idea of these imponderables in the knowledge that nearly 800,000 Americans, representing all age

groups, died of heart diseases alone in 1954. Another 237,000 died of cancer.

More than half a million new cancer cases are reported annually. One in every 10 children born in the United States today will be confined to a mental institution at some time of his life. It is estimated that about 10 million persons suffer arthritis or other rheumatic diseases; 9 million from neurological diseases, blindness, and other sensory disorders.

For the most part, the splendid medical progress of the past 10 years has touched only what we might call the outward and visible signs of these catastrophic causes of death and disability. In so far as scientific understanding is concerned, we may liken the major chronic diseases, mental illnesses, and many viral diseases to icebergs. One-tenth of the volume of the iceberg is above water—and can be seen and dealt with. The remaining 90 percent of the bulk is hidden.

The Nation's current medical research program is responsible for our ability to see and deal with the smaller fraction of our major health problems. It is for this reason that President Eisenhower has recommended to Congress a greatly expanded medical-research program, for the year beginning next July 1, including aid for the construction of research and teaching facilities in our non-Federal institutions.

In his state of the Union message of January 5, the President gave this reason for his proposal: "The Nation has made dramatic progress in conquering disease—progress of profound human significance which can be greatly accelerated by an intensified effort in medical research. A well-supported, well-balanced program of research, including basic research, can open new frontiers of knowledge, prevent and relieve suffering, and prolong life." Coupled with the recommendation for expanded Federal assistance in medical research and training is the President's conviction that "we must aid in cushioning the heavy and rising costs of illness and haspitalization to individuals and families."

We in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—and particularly in the Public Health Service—are greatly heartened by these proposals of the President. Our Secretary, the Honorable Marion B. Folsom, has presented the Nation's needs for medical research and other health services at the highest levels of public policy and has discussed these needs with non-Federal scientists, professional people, and citizen groups. He has indicated that our research budget request for next year will be increased by 25 to 30 percent.

Should the expanded medical research program be adopted by Congress, the Public Health Service would be able again to increase substantially its research grants to private and nonprofit public institutions in the fields of mental health, cancer, heart disease, arthritis and metabolic diseases, dental research, and allergy and infectious diseases, including tuberculosis. Scientists participating in these expanded programs could place more emphasis on basic research. Our research programs at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Md., would be moderately expanded, although most of the additional funds would go to medical schools, hospitals, health agencies, private laboratories, and individual scientists throughout the Nation. For almost 2 decades the Congress has recognized the value of medical research and has acted with nonpartisan unanimity in providing funds for an expansion of the attack on the major cripplers and killers.

So that increased funds for medical research can achieve the maximum benefits, it is proposed also to increase Federal assistance for the training of research scientists. In many medical fields, there are major shortages of scientists. The development of a highly-trained scientist is a long-term process. Upon graduation from college, young men and women who are considering medical research as a career require from 8 to 10 years more training before they can undertake independent research. Often the only way they can support themselves while obtaining advanced training is by qualifying for a fellowship. Although the Nation's private and public institutions have made tremendous strides in increasing the support of research training since World War II, we have not even reduced the scientific personnel shortages existing at that time, much less met the needs of our ever-expanding scientific effort.

The President also proposes to recommend a new program of Federal assistance to medical and dental schools and nonprofit research institutions for the construction of research and teaching facilities. This is a logical supplement to the proposed expansion of research and training. For if it is true that increased funds for the conduct of medical research should be accompanied by the production of additional scientists, it is also true that there must be addtional facilities in which to do the research and train the research workers.

In 1955 an important new research program was implemented by a special congressional appropriation to the Public Health Service. The hospital and medical facilities research program is of more than usual interest to all institutions caring for patients, and especially to those caring for long-term patients.

Medical research illuminates understanding of the human organism and the diseases which afflict mankind. In order to apply the findings of medical research most effectively we need another type of research—that is, study of the ways in which hospital and medical services of all types may be organized and operated to the best advantage of the patients, the professions, and the community.

Research in this area—which for convenience many people call hospital research—has lagged behind the rapidly expanding medical research effort in this country. There has been a great need for studies and demonstrations that will serve as guides to individual institutions and groups of institutions in the development and operation of their services.

In connection with the hospital and medical facilities survey and construction program of the Public Health Service, the Congress authorized the expenditure of $1,200,000 this year for grants to communities, hospitals, universities, and other institutions, which would help in the conduct of studies, experiments, and demonstrations related to improved hospital and medical-care programs.

There is a great deal of interest in this type of research throughout the country. The best proof, I believe, is that the Public Health Service received 54 applications for grants totaling nearly twice the amount of money available. So far the Federal Hospital Advisory Council, composed of experts outside the Government, has recommended the award of 16 of the requested grants totaling more than $600,000. Other applications are still under consideration by the council.

Since this is a relatively new field for categorical research grants, let me tell you about a few of the projects approved by our council last December.

At the University of Arkansas, the department of sociology will conduct a study of recordkeeping by general duty nurses in 3 small hospitals and 2 larger hospitals. The aim is to find ways to simplify records, and thus to save the valuable time of nurses.

I am sure that the administrators of your hospital at Denver will agree that the results of this study would be of value to them. The shortage of professional nurses is nationwide and serious. It plagues hospital administrators, physicians, and patients. Earlier studies have shown that an inordinate amount of the professional nurses' time in hospitals is absorbed in keeping records. If we are going to use expert nursing skills most effectively for the care of patients, it is obvious that ways must be found to relieve nurses from their clerical duties, at the same time maintaining the necessary medical records.

Another grant has been made to a team of scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a study of ways to apply managerial techniques, now commonly employed in industrial and business establishments, to hospital administration. The American Hospital Association also received a grant to study the operation of hospital planning and license laws. Both these studies will produce new information essential to the planning and operation of our American hospitals of today and tomorrow.

Progress in medical research and in the study of hospital and medical care programs represents only a small fraction of our total national effort for better health. The Federal Government has played an increasingly important role in these fields without domination or control, while at the same time our State and local governments, our private organizations and institutions, our voluntary health agencies have increased their efforts in all areas—research, training, and provision of services.

The truth is that our medical research and health problems are too large to be solved by any one segment of our Nation, or any one organization. These problems must be solved by the combined efforts of Government, voluntary agencies, industry, and private institutions. We cannot do without a single organization that is conducting a valuable program, whether in research, training, service—or in combinations of these activities.

Voluntary hospitals have always been in the forefront of the Nation's health services. They always will be. One reason for this is that in most instances, the voluntary hospital has been able to break ground as has the American Medical Center at Denver—in new fields and lead the way in providing special services.

At the present time, the United States has about 1 million acceptable hospital beds of all types. According to figures submitted by each of the States and Territories, we are still short well over 800,000 beds. We need every acceptable bed in hospitals of all types, plus thousands more.

The situation with respect to special hospitals, however, is a little different than that presented by this overall picture. It is a striking fact that in many parts of the country, fewer tuberculosis beds are needed than were available 10 years ago. In contrast, in some areas, there are still not sufficient beds for tuberculosis patients. In the well-supplied areas, State and local governments are reducing the number of operating tuberculosis beds, while expanding their home-care and follow-up programs. Waiting lists of many sanatoriums are rapidly shrinking. This means that patients urgently requiring sanatorium care can receive it sooner.

Nevertheless, about 100,000 new cases of tuberculosis continue to be reported annually throughout the country, a considerable percentage of which occurs in areas where the bed supply remains inadequate. Thus, voluntary services such as are provided for tuberculosis patients by the American Medical Center at Denver will be needed for some years to come.

In contrast with the tuberculosis picture, we have only a few tens of thousands of beds in chronic disease hospitals. The need for chronic disease beds, as well as for well-managed, medically supervised nursing

homes and homes for the aged has grown progressively with the rising toll of chronic diseases and the increasing number of old people. The need will continue to grow. So long as we are unable to attack the problem of chronic disease at the roots, as we have been able to attack tuberculosis, the need for voluntary services to chronic disease patients and the aged will continue to grow.

The recent expansion of your program at Denver to include care of cancer patients demonstrates the willingness of your organization to remain a pioneer in the provision of hospital services to the sick.

This is the wonderful objective of America's voluntary hospitals throughout the country. They cannot continue to carry out their mission unless they have the support of local groups such as the Washington members of the Jewish Consumptive Relief Society have brought together here tonight.

With your support, and the support of hundreds of other community groups, our American hospitals will continue to fulfill their glorious mission of relieving pain and restoring the sick to health.

General Ridgway's Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, Thursday, January 19, 1956, in which the paper discusses and comments on the recent article written for the Saturday Evening Post by Gen. Matthew Ridgway, former Army Chief of Staff:

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway has raised two sobering issues of national policy in his pointed article in the Saturday Evening Post. The first concerns procedures for handling military recommendations to the administration. Is it proper that an Army Chief of Staff be muzzled and his views misrepresented in an effort to give the appearance of unanimity? The second concerns the reductions in Army manpower in relation to a balanced defense. Are we relying so heavily on nuclear weapons that we would be forced to drop the first bomb for want of other means to fight a limited war?

It is no secret that General Ridgway was in disfavor with some administration officials before his retirement last summer. The general was outspoken and blunt in his opposition to cuts which he thought impaired the Army's capability to fulfill American commitments. President Eisenhower once termed his views "parochial"; and there may have been good reason for others to disagree with him. Nevertheless, it is a shock to read General Ridgway's emphatic contradiction of the statement in Mr. Eisenhower's 1954 state of the Union message that the new military program had been unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Ridgway makes it clear that he did not agree. He regarded his function as that of giving military advice uninfluenced by budgetary considerations or the advantage to be gained in the field of domestic politics by a drastic reduction in military expenditures; and he regarded the 1955 budget as a directed verdict. Evidently the President was misinformed about General Ridgway's views, and the finger points to Defense Secretary Wilson.

There is an equally strong indictment of Mr. Wilson in the use of the "confidental" label to bottle up Gen. Ridgway's final report. This report, which was critical of the inadequate military capacity to cope with limited wars, went to Secretary Wilson as an unclassified document. Yet it was returned with the request that it be classified confidential, and it was pigeonholed until someone leaked the contents. This amounted to a prime abuse of the military classification system to suppress information that was merely embarrassing and had no direct relation to security. It is precisely this sort of thing that justifies the continuing protests against the Pentagon stranglehold on information.

On the substantive issue of whether budgetary cuts have injured the defense posture, it is difficult to have an objective judgment. Although an Army commander's devotion to the national interest may be unquestioned, he still may think in one-service terms and not have a sound overall appraisal. Because there is not enough money to satisfy all services, compromises must be made. This newspaper, nevertheless, is inclined to agree with General Ridgway that the emphasis on saving money through an all-atomic strategy could lead to a situation in which the country would be able to deter so-called brush fires only at the risk of general war. It is significant that General Ridgway is the man who bucked the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and who ultimately was upheld by the President, in opposing the kind of atomic countermeasure on Quemoy and Matsu that Secretary Dulles has skipped over so blithely.

The question of disagreements among members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of economic considerations in the military budget, is one the Nation has faced many times before. Ultimately the decision has to be made by civilians on the most balanced advice. Once the decision is made, it is the job of military officials to go along loyally or request reassignment; the country cannot tolerate the kind of end runs of the sort conducted in the past in efforts to change policy. But none of these considerations is warrant for misrepresentation of views. Surely Congress is entitled to know, on demand, the honest feelings of a military chief who disagrees. Perhaps the major fault lies in the insistence on buttressing decisions with "unanimity" whether or not it actually exists.

The Upper Colorado Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, over the past 10 days I have submitted for the RECORD a series of editorials published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, covering the entire scope of the upper Colorado storage project. Today I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the last three editorials in the series.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News of December 14, 1955]

THE WORK HORSE UNIT: GLEN CANYON WOULD BE TOPPED IN UNITED STATES ONLY BY HOOVER DAM AND WOULD CREATE GIANT RESERVOIR

1. One of the world's major dams, 700 feet high and 1,400 feet long, topped in the United States only by Hoover Dam.

2. A reservoir 186 miles long—equal to the distance between Pocatello, Idaho, and Murray, Utah.

3. A power capacity of 800,000 kilowatts—enough to supply electrical power needs of 1,500,000 persons.

These impressive statistics refer to Glen Canyon Dam—the proposed $379,143,000 work horse unit of the Colorado River storage project.

It is one of four major dams provided by the House bill now awaiting final vote of Congress.

The three other major dams are the $74,648,000 Flaming Gorge Dam on the Green River near the Utah-Wyoming border, the $32,933,000 Navajo Dam on the San Juan River in New Mexico, and the $80 million Curecanti unit on the Gunnison River in Colorado.

Time and space do not permit a detailed examination of each of these three major dams included in the House bill. However, a close-up look at Glen Canyon Dam will illustrate how each dam contributes to the over-all master plan for the development of the long-neglected upper basin of the Colorado River.

Glen Canyon Dam would be the only dam scheduled in the project which would actually be built on the Colorado River proper. Most other units would be built on its major tributaries.

Site of the dam is in northern Arizona, only 13 miles downstream from the Utah-Arizona line. Thus, the bulk of its tremendous reservoir would back up across southeastern Utah.

When filled, Glen Canyon Reservoir would extend 186 miles up the Colorado nearly to the mouth of the Green River, and also 71 miles up the San Juan River.

HUGE STORAGE CAPACITY

Its normal water surface area would be 153,000 acres. And it would store a whopping 26 million acre-feet of water.

(An acre-foot of water is the amount it takes to cover 1 acre of ground 1 foot deep. A football playing field covers approximately 1 acre. Thus, Glen Canyon Reservoir when filled, could flood 26 million football playing fields to a depth of 1 foot.)

The dam itself would be a concrete arch structure, rising 700 feet from bedrock and 580 feet above the river. It would be topped in the United States only by Hoover Dam, which is 726 feet high. It would be 150 feet higher than Grand Coulee Dam. Glen Canyon Dam's crest length would be 1,400 feet, and thickness at the base 425 feet.

It would be located only 16 miles upstream from Lees Ferry which is the division point between the upper and lower basins of the Colorado.

Glen Canyon Dam thus would be the final regulatory structure delivering water to the lower basin as guaranteed by the Colorado River compact.

Its major function would be stream control and storage of upper-basin water, most of which now pours unused into the ocean. Its vast reservoir could catch water from the flood season for use in the dry season and hold over water during wet years for use during dry years.

UPSTREAM USE

When filled, while providing water for lower-basin areas as guaranteed by river compact, it would make it possible for upstream areas to take water out of the river

and its tributaries for municipal, culinary, industrial, and farm use.

Besides ending flood dangers and putting this uncontrolled water to work, Glen Canyon Dam also would fill another vitally needed function, that of silt control.

As it is now, the lower Colorado, heavy with mud, is rapidly filling up Lake Mead and threatening the useful life of Hoover Dam. Construction of Glen Canyon, it is estimated, would extend the useful life of Hoover Dam 200 years.

Even after 200 years of silt deposits at the current rate, Glen Canyon would still boast a storage capacity of 10,455,000 acre-feet. And, of course, construction of the Colorado River storage project and conservation of upstream soil and water, is the best hope of cutting down this colossal soil loss.

Glen Canyon is a multipurpose dam, which means that in addition to storing water and regulating the stream, it also will generate power.

TREMENDOUS POWER

Its hydroelectric generators will turn out a tremendous 800,000 kilowatts—half of the total capacity of the entire originally planned Colorado River storage project of seven major dams.

The powerplant, located at the toe of the dam, would consist of 7 generating units. The power would be sold to REA cooperatives, public organizations and to private utility companies which have applied for purchase of the power to meet expanding power needs.

There is no public versus private power controversy here as in the case of Hells Canyon in Idaho.

Sale of the power produced could be applied toward repaying the cost of the power facilities, and when they are paid for, toward repaying the cost of building the dam itself.

While repaying the Government for the cost of building the power facilities, the project also would pay the Government standard 2½ percent interest on all monies advanced for power construction costs. Thus Uncle Sam would net a neat profit on the transaction.

Three other factors make Glen Canyon a feasible project: one the site is geographically favorable; two, no relocation of existing facilities is necessary; three, abundant construction materials are located nearby.

At the site, the sides of the canyon rise abruptly from the river bed in nearly vertical walls 650 feet high. The rock forming the abutments and the foundation is fine-grained sandstone, buff to red in color, remarkably free of structural defects.

No man-made improvements, roads, farms, towns, or improved lands of any consequence lie in the reservoir area which would require condemnation or relocation. Thus, the cost of the dam would be kept to a minimum.

And as for construction materials, supplies of satisfactory quality and adequate quantity can be obtained from deposits in Wasweap Creek about 7 miles northwest of the dam site, according to engineers' reports.

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News of December 14, 1955]

WATER'S RICHER THAN GOLD—IT'S THE WEST'S LIFEBLOOD—THE COLORADO PROJECT WOULD HALT SHAMEFUL WASTE OF RIVER'S WATER

"In this country, water is more precious than gold."

One of Brigham Young's scouts first said it. And it has been echoed by nearly every mountain-west resident who has endeavored to scratch his livelihood out of the fertile but arid valleys of the high Rockies.

"Far more westerners have died fighting over water than over gold," Utah's Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS notes.

It is because of this situation that planning on the Colorado River storage project has moved slowly. The Colorado is the last untapped water source of the area—the "last great water hole" of the West.

Whatever plan is finally adopted for its development must first of all assure the most economical use of the available water.

The Colorado River storage does just that. It has won the enthusiastic endorsement of the cities and States which it will serve, of the Eisenhower administration, and of both political parties.

It has been debated by two Congresses. At present, it lies within one rollcall of passage. The project has passed the Senate and the necessary House committees. It awaits only the final stamp of approval of the House membership. And the House is scheduled to take up the project when it convenes for the 2d session of the 84th Congress in January.

Briefly, this is what the project consists of:

To be authorized first by Congress would be four major dams. These would store water for consumptive use. Supplementing these large dams would be 11 smaller participating projects. These would actually take the water out of the river and channel it to municipal, industrial and farm use.

The controversial Echo Park Dam is not included.

The major dams are project keystones. They must be built first. They would be true multipurpose units.

First and foremost, they will control the river and end floods. The Colorado is one of the wildest streams ever to be challenged by man, coursing through the most rugged and spectacular of our last frontiers.

SIXTY PERCENT WASTED

Because there are no storage facilities in the upper basin, 60 percent of the river's waters presently is flowing unused into the Gulf of California, a shameful waste of the area's most precious resource.

Secondly, the dams will provide the storage facilities needed to fulfill terms of the Colorado River Compact. This compact assigns each of the seven river States its just share of water. These dams will carry over surplus water from the wet years to the dry years so that no State will suffer a shortage. They also will act as water banks upon which the entire river system can draw.

Thirdly, these dams will provide the means of paying most of the project's cost. True multipurpose dams, they will generate needed electrical power, using the same energy source, falling water, over and over again.

UTILITIES BACK PROJECT

This power will be sold at the source to the area's private power companies, REA cooperatives, and public agencies, who will distribute and sell it to waiting markets.

All of the Mountain West's power utilities unitedly back the project. They have agreed to purchase all available power to satisfy their power-hungry customers. There is no public power vs. private enterprise controversy here.

Fourthly, these major dams will help put an end to the second great current waste—that of the Mountain West's topsoil. The present muddy Colorado each year carries downstream, in its uncontrolled runoff, thousands of tons of rich topsoil, in a continuation of the erosion that produced the spectacular Grand Canyon.

This erosion, besides being a shameful waster of the Nation's most valuable resource, also imperils existing structures of the lower basin.

Fifth and lastly, these dams of the project would provide tremendous recreational and wildlife benefits in an area where few lakes presently exist. All America could share in these playgrounds, enjoying boating, fishing, swimming, and camping.

These dams are engineered to do all these things. But the thing the typical westerner likes best about them is the fact that they stand on their own feet. They will pay for themselves.

"We're not asking for handouts," veteran rancher, Briant S. Stringham, of Vernal, explains.

"We're just asking that Congress invest the money in a sure thing. Revenues from water and power users will pay back the loan according to contract, same as in other reclamation projects—and for the most part with interest, too."

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News of December 14, 1955]

THE COLORFUL COLORADO RIVER—THIS MUDDY STREAM DRAINS ONE-THIRTEENTH OF THE NATION—THE VAST BASIN IT TRAVERSES IS RICH IN HISTORY, SCENERY, MINERALS

To millions of Americans, the Colorado River is just a muddy, sluggish river, winding its way through spectacular vistas.

Tourists remember it as a yellowish-gray ribbon cut in the depths of Grand Canyon, or as a wide, sluggish stream of silt oozing its way through to the Gulf of California.

They do not know that it is one of America's largest rivers, draining 244,000 square miles—one-thirteenth of the area of this Nation—along its 1,700-mile length.

Or that it is one of the most remarkable rivers in the world, because of its capriciousness and erratic flow, because of its colorful history, its power potential, and because of its undeveloped, fantastically rich "last frontier"—the upper basin.

The Colorado is remarkable because of its origin and the spectacular country through which it flows.

It is entirely a snow-fed stream, with 90 percent of its waters originating in the high mountains of the upper basin: Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico. And because it is a snow-fed stream, its flow varies unbelievably, both from season to season and from wet year to dry year.

During the spring runoff, the Colorado floods destructively, with a flow as high as 100 times as great as the low-water flow in the fall. And because the snowfall on its watersheds vary with the weather, the runoff during a wet year may be six times as great as during a dry year.

The very extremes of the flow are prime reasons why storage dams of the type called for in the Colorado River project are urgently needed to prevent flooding and to carry over surplus water until needed.

DESTRUCTIVE RIVER

This flooding, of course, makes the Colorado the most destructive erosively of all major rivers—witness the Grand Canyon. The silt measured at Yuma averages 0.62 percent by volume. The annual load of silt brought to the delta region by the Colorado averages 105,000 acre feet, or 170 million cubic yards annually.

This terrific silting waste also is imperiling existing Lower Basin structures. Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam is slowly filling up with silt. The construction of one dam alone in the upper basin area could extend the life of Hoover Dam by 200 years.

But the Colorado is more than a muddy, soil-moving river. Historically, it figures in the earliest and in the most colorful episodes of western history.

FORGOTTEN PEOPLES

Along its reaches in earlier years lived forgotten peoples of which there are now no trace except for hieroglyphics on the rocks and the ruins of their cliff dwellings by which they are most widely known.

The area's modern history begins in the earliest days of American history. The region boasted Spanish missions as far back as the days of Balboa and Cortez. Then came the mountain men and fur trappers and behind them the pioneers along the

Santa Fe and Oregon Trails, both of which traversed the Colorado River system.

The basin has witnessed the full scenario of Western development: the Indian warfare of Navaho, Ute, Shoshone, and Apache; the struggle of the rancher and farmer for survival, the range wars, the gold and silver rushes and the mining booms, the bandit wars from Rustler's Roost to Hole-in-the-Rock in the remote fastnesses of the isolated Southwest, the Pony Express and the coming of the railroad. All have echoed along the Colorado and its tributaries, in a remarkable historical kaleidoscope.

The Colorado also is unusual for its high rate of fall on its way to the sea. This carries great significance to engineers—it means an unsurpassed power potential.

REMARKABLE RIVER

"The Colorado River is one of the remarkable rivers of the world in its value for irrigation and water power," the Encyclopedia Britannica notes.

"It combines, in proper sequence for complete use, a large quantity of water, great concentrations of fall, reservoir sites for the control of flow, sites for powerplants and several million acres of irrigable land below the stretch where power may be developed. Over 5 million prime horsepower can be developed."

Prime producer of power along the river's lower reaches at the present time is, of course, Hoover Dam. This world-famous structure generates 1,835,000 horsepower and irrigates 2,100,000 acres. More power is produced at dams still farther downstream.

But the prime power sites are located on the upper half of the river, the upper basin—and on all these hundreds of miles of river there now exists not one dam.

This circumstance arises from geographical reasons. Despite all the activity which has swirled across the West, one large section has remained relatively isolated. That is the upper basin of the Colorado River. Some areas here are so isolated they still remain unmapped and unexplored, virgin territory to the white man.

It is a forbidding—but spectacular—country, characterized by high plateaus, crevassed by jagged and deep canyons wherever streams carve their way through. But breaking up the Colorado Plateau are spiny ranges of the Rockies, and lying between the mountains are fertile valleys, some green from irrigation, some completely undeveloped.

They are not developed despite their fertility and mineral riches because of the mountains and the river. Much of the upper basin is isolated by high mountains. Usually when this happens in other sections of the country, the rivers can serve as highways.

But not in this case. Many stretches of the Colorado and its tributaries are impassable, foaming with white water rapids. Also, for the most part of the year, at low water the river is not navigable. Travel thus is limited to one way only, over rapids, during a short time between the flood season and the low-water period.

Then, too, the rivers have carved such deep canyons that access to the plateaus and valley areas is impossible. This feature also causes the anachronism of fertile valleys going unirrigated within a stone's throw of the river. There is no way to get the water up the canyon wall and onto the land—or to transport the produce out.

For these reasons, this area has remained largely primitive and isolated while western civilization has built up all around it. Development of the area requires engineering assistance, beyond the ability of the few residents of the area. Otherwise, the residents would not be asking the Federal Government to take over the master planning of their future development.

Something To Bank On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of hysteria and name calling generated by the supposed political implications of the present agricultural economy. Seldom have we heard the situation discussed in the light of cool reason since somehow, reason departs, and party propaganda takes its place when the farm question is raised.

It comes as a rare surprise to read a commentary, grounded on reality and based upon an understanding of the part agriculture has played in our Nation's history. Such an article is the following editorial of the Zanesville Signal for January 16, 1956:

SOMETHING TO BANK ON

During war and its aftermath, the Government gave American farmers incentive to expand their output to meet the extraordinary needs of this country and its allies. Now it must supply fresh incentives to get them to reduce production in the face of monumental surpluses.

For too long the high, rigid price-support law encouraged farmers to produce too much. Foreign markets fell off but the crops kept piling up—in Government warehouses.

At length, under President Eisenhower, a shift was made toward more flexible supports designed to minimize the lure and put prices more in line with true market conditions. But the switch was so long in coming that by then the Nation's surpluses had become well nigh unmanageable.

Meantime the farm price decline that set in even before the Eisenhower regime has continued apace. Total net income from farm products has slipped substantially. This has hurt family-sized farms more than large commercial establishments. It has left many ordinary farmers outside the sweep of America's newest wave of prosperity.

The President's new farm proposals represent a broader and more drastic attack upon the farmers' dilemma. They seem to emphasize not so much immediate relief as a long-range approach which might conceivably get farmers out of their predicament for an indefinite time. In this respect they show political nerve in an election year, when the clamor is for quick solutions.

In addition to offering a multitude of devices for directly reducing present surpluses—research into new market uses, removal of barriers to sales abroad, etc.—the President asks Congress to enact what is being called the soil bank program.

Under this plan farmers would be compensated for taking out of production either fertile lands or marginal soil or both. Payment could be taken in cash or feed stocks now in Government hands.

In the case of productive soils, farmers would be asked to cut their crop acreage voluntarily below existing allotments, in return for payment.

They would also be urged, with the same incentives, to put their marginal lands back into forest or grassland. This soil presumably would be removed indefinitely from the crop-producing category.

These soil-bank measures, together with the frontal assault on current surpluses, would be expected within fair time to make deep inroads into our mountainous reserves.

No one can properly say how effective this approach would be. But at least it is an approach that goes beyond the sterile thinking which says that high, rigid price supports and only they can get American farmers out of their low spot.

At the minimum the soil-bank plan constitutes a start down newly inventive lines. At best it may contain the core of a real solution.

Address by Philip M. Klutznick, President of B'nai B'rith, at Dinner Session of Conference of Major Jewish Organizations, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 18, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

My dear friends, in anticipation of the convening of this meeting, on January 5, I dictated a memorandum of statements that I would make on this occasion. Events have moved with such a degree of rapidity that what I would have said then has been outmoded today. Perhaps, in the same framework, what we say tonight will become ancient history within hours or days. The Middle East has taken the center of the stage. Only a few months ago it was still a far-off place to many Americans. Suddenly, Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Egypt brought the Middle East into the very home of every American, whether he things about it or not. The potent light of a blinding type of urgency has settled over an area which for so long was far down on the agenda of pressing international problems.

There are those who question the timing of this conference. I say to them and to others when potential tragedy and catastrophe are riding herd over a vital area of the world, any time is both a good and a bad time to convene Americans to deliberate together.

I therefore welcomed not only the delegates to this conference and the friends who are present tonight, but especially I extend our greetings to those distinguished members of our Government who have seen fit to grace this occasion.

Seventeen important national Jewish organizations have convened this meeting. By agreement, we limited our representation to 20 representatives of each organization plus others who, in a sense, represent the communities at large. We are not here to pack a meeting with the countless hundreds who would have come; we are here to think aloud and to deliberate. These people come from all parts of the United States and who they represent and what they represent is a matter of record.

No one is selected or annointed to represent all of Jewish life in America, not even a small group which in its own troublesome fashion persists in trying to run everybody's business instead of its own. On January 16, in the New York Times it is reported that the American Council for Judaism challenged the right of the B'nai B'rith, which I have the honor to represent as its president, as well as certain other organizations, to represent American Jews on issues concerning United States policy in the Middle East. In a distasteful and dishonorable incursion into

the freedom of conscience this infinitesimal percentage of American Jews arrogantly and without knowledge of action taken by our organizations conveyed to the Secretary of State and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives the strange concept of a new limitation on the right of American citizens because they are Jews.

Curiously, similar attacks were addressed to individual members of our organization, the B'nai B'rith. In these attacks they urgently petitioned this membership to convey to me their belief that I had no right to be here or to involve the B'nai B'rith in these discussions. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of nearly 400,000 members of the B'nai B'rith resident on this continent that despite this harassment only 2 saw fit to address a communication to me, 1 directly and the other through a subordinate officer. In both instances, while they questioned the position, they did not question the basis of our participation.

Please permit me the luxury of a personal comment. For years I have been importuned to attack publicly the right to exist of the American Council for Judaism. Firm in my belief in the freedom of speech, no matter how diametrically opposed to my own views, as in this case, I have refrained. Even to the contrary, I have insisted on the right of this small group as any other to express its views—even though they are fallacious in my own reckoning.

Now that its president on its official stationery has sought by innuendo, direct attack and malicious misrepresentation to silence organizations of long standing, respectability and status, I can only say for myself personally that he has subverted the word "American" and dishonored the word "Judaism." It is impossible for me to believe that this action represents the belief of any substantial portion of even the members of that organization.

As far back as the birth of B'nai B'rith in 1843, it adopted a policy of expressing itself publicly on matters of concern to our great land and to our people. Since 1886 our organization has through acts and deeds expressed a sympathetic understanding of the problems in Palestine, now Israel. We have never and will never tell a foreign country, whether it be Israel or anyone else, how to run its public affairs. We will, however, continue to persist in the expression of our views on matters of vital concern to America as well as to the people from whom we stem. At the last triennial meeting of all of B'nai B'rith in May of 1953, by unanimous resolution this attitude was conveyed to the public and to our Government with respect to problems affecting Israel. As recently as November 8, 1955, we expressed our vital concern to our Government by unanimous resolution of our representative policy assembly, the board of governors, about the recent events that have raised havoc in American thinking and in middle-eastern affairs.

Another source has indirectly attacked the right of American Jews to express themselves on this subject domestically. While for some time we have known the extent of the hate campaign launched against not only Israel but American Jews by official representatives of certain Arab nations, it is significant that on January 16, in a documented article by Guy Richards and Jeffrey Roche in the New York Journal-American, the full extent of this unholy pressure is described. We shall never be guilty of telling Americans, be they Jews or of any other religious persuasion, that they must agree with us. We shall, however, persist in our own right to express our views to the greatest degree of our intelligence in matters that affect our beloved country and that concern us most intimately.

On the eve of this conference I had occasion to read a monograph on the life of one of the early presidents of B'nai B'rith, Simon Wolf, as prepared by Esther and David Panitz. It reminded me of similar incursions into the rights of man when Wolf, in his extraordinarily capable fashion, made certain representations to the White House in what has historically become known as the "ill-conceived order No. 11," on the very eve of the presidential campaign of 1864. He was attacked for having had the gall to intervene in a matter of great concern in the midst of the War Between the States. His statement, made at a time when we had not yet advanced in the preservation of human dignity and human and civil rights to the point we now have reached, I repeat to the American Council for Judaism, to our Arab detractors, and to anyone else who may question this or any similar conference: "We are not Jews except to God; we are to the country what Mrs. Smith, Jones, and Brown are—citizens. We seek no tolerance from anyone in this age of progress and ennobling humanity. Tolerance is for slaves, not for humanity."

I would add one more thing to the representatives of the Arab nations who have entered into this fray on our domestic front. An effort seems to be in the making to suggest that American Jewry is against the Arab nations. This insinuation would imply that Egypt and others are not only at war with Israel, but with those Americans who are Jews, save the few to whom I have referred who are openly anti-Israel. This is utter nonsense. When the United States of America influenced Great Britain to evacuate the Suez, what substantial segment of American Jewry opposed Egypt's return to dignity? When have we in any official or individual sense opposed our country's economic aid to this and other lands? One would have to be a fool of the first order not to favor a friendly relationship between our great country and the Arab nations. All that we have ever urged is that such friendship should not be bought in the open market at the expense of a friend, Israel. Even Israel and all nations believing in democracy and freedom profit from a relationship of an Arab world oriented to the West and not to the East.

Pro-Arab or any other propaganda which suggests that American Jewry is against the Arab world does untold damage to its own cause and shocks the intelligence of thinking people. This is not the issue in the Middle East.

The transformation, wrought practically in a moment by the Russo-Czech-Egyptian arms transaction, has naturally created a substantial measure of chaos and confusion. In the midst of such uncertainty some very dangerous ideas gain currency. What I have said to you now is one of them. Perhaps left alone they would tend to dissipate themselves. But left alone they might also serve to substitute unreal issues for those that are truly at stake in the problem of the Middle East. Time is of the essence. This being true, the real issue should be faced.

The real issue is in a measure presented in the reported statement of Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser, as contained in the New York Times of January 17, on the occasion of the presentation of a new constitution to the people of Egypt. I quote first from Premier Nasser's own speech: "From the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf there is but one Arab nation, which no one will succeed in dividing again. After World War II part of the Arab heart was snatched from the Arab body. Today Arabs from the Atlantic to the Persian Gulf will cooperate in restoring that part. Today's constitution is the beginning of a structure toward this end." I now quote from the observation by the author of the article, Osgood Caruthers:

"The latter was a reference to Egypt's contention that the Israeli created their state out of land they seized from the rightful Arab owners and the avowed intention of Egypt and other Arab States to regain that land."

This is a polite way of identifying the basic issue in the Middle East which is war or peace. Does America and the other Western Powers have a stake in this? Do we, as Americans, face this prospect without concern? Let me quote once again from a January 16 London dispatch of the conservative Daily Telegraph which seems quite well to understand the truth of the predicament.

"It is of vital importance for the United States, Britain, and France to make a firm pronouncement they will intervene against either an Arab or Israeli aggressor in the event of war.

"It is clear that the main question before the forthcoming Anglo-American conference in Washington will be how to maintain peace and stability in the Middle East. * * *

"The main preoccupation of all Israel's neighbors is her extermination, and the prospects of any sort of compromise are remote. If the West cannot now make a real peace, it can still prevent war.

"A firm pronouncement by the three signatories of the 1950 declaration that they will intervene against either an Arab or an Israeli aggressor would not be a bluff. Nothing else can hold the ring until fears lessen and tempers cool."

One other reference in this statesmanlike pronouncement is of major significance. The Telegraph noted that there have been suggestions that all would be well if only Egypt's Premier Gamal Abdel Nasser's "friendship can be secured," and commented, "certainly much has been done to secure it, but without avail."

The concluding observation to which I make reference is vital in our thinking. It follows:

"Our view of priorities is to guard first against the Communist menace—his (Nasser's) is to liquidate first what he would call the Israeli menace."

I do not pose as an expert on the technicalities of international commitments and pacts. I know only that whether it is done by unilateral security treaties or pacts, in which the United States and Israel and Arab nations that wish it are secured against aggression, or whether it is done, as suggested, in tripartite fashion, it must be done and with teeth. Treaties and balances in military strength may not be the heroic achievement of immediate peace, but they are the only combination that has been devised thus far to prevent war in this current chaotic struggle between East and West. This policy, so successful elsewhere, should not be withheld from the Middle East just because Israel is one of the exposed parties. To my mind in foreign affairs this is the issue.

The United States and the Western Powers have an indescribably vital stake in the peace and economic growth of the Middle East. We cannot and must not in our own interest permit Egypt or the Arab nations to become so strong in military strength as to be tempted to wipe out what they call "their menace, Israel." Until this balance is reestablished by appropriate defensive military provision and operative agreements, the hope for the ultimate aim—peace—becomes vain and elusive.

In this framework it is that we gather to help in the thinking of our great country in the best tradition of American citizenship to establish a forthright and effective policy that will prevent war. In this first step all right-thinking Americans should find the essence of a measure of hope that good sense may be restored to the Middle East and that Arab nations and Israel alike in such an atmosphere will one with the other, through negotiation and discussion, find a formula for the greatest of gifts that an Almighty can convey on His suffering humanity—a just peace.

The Brilliant Record of the Kansas City, Mo., Police Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Kansas City, Mo., take great pride in the brilliant record achieved in recent years by their police department. During the adjournment of Congress, I observed at firsthand the operations of this dedicated and able law-enforcement organization. I was enormously impressed by the energy, enthusiasm, and effectiveness of every person concerned, from the president of the board of police commissioners to the newest member of the force.

What has been accomplished in Kansas City is best revealed by the following facts: From 1952 to 1954 the national crime rate rose 22.6 percent. In Kansas City the 2 years revealed a 20.5-percent decrease. I understand that the latter trend continued during 1955.

There follows an address entitled "One-Man Car Patrol," by the outstandingly able chief of police of Kansas City, Bernard C. Brannon. The address was made before the 62d annual conference of the International Association of Chiefs of Police on October 3, 1955, in Philadelphia, Pa.:

In the broad sweep of time, it has been but yesterday that the prevailing opinion held the world to be flat, with the horizon's end promising a sudden drop into bottomless chaos of old cosmogonies. Those who held to other theories were scoffed at and challenged for proof.

The proof was forthcoming when the bolder explorers of the seas did not drop off the table edge of the world. Old convictions died and new beliefs were substituted. Another shackle of progress was cut away. But even if it had developed that the world was not a sphere, those who sailed over the edge into the void of nothingness would still have resolved the issue through experimentation.

Thus it has always been that man has hunted for truth, for facts that prove or disprove a given proposition. From the massive controversies of the universe to the simple, detailed issues of daily life, the process of solution and progress has been theory supported by experimentation. We seldom fail to derive ultimate benefit from efforts aimed at discovery of truth.

It has been so in our police world. Our progress has been predicated on the formula of discovering needs, formulating theories of solution, and testing them out. As each of us gather facts that may be helpful to the other, it is incumbent on us to pass our findings along. One of the best ways to determine what is going on around us in the law enforcement profession is to encourage our fellow worker to stand up and tell his story.

I need that encouragement today, for I am about to report on and briefly discuss the controversial issue of one-man patrol cars. As I do so I recall the admonition, "It is better to be silent and thought a fool than to open your big mouth and remove all doubt." Yet I will assume the risk with the hope that I might receive your valuable advice while offering some enlightenment on the issue.

In June, 1953, Kansas City, Mo's., police department first tested the one-man patrol car. We had always operated with two-man crews. It was the beginning of a plan that would eventually see a complete change-over from 2- to 1-man patrol. Some 6 months later, after prolonged study and consideration, the transition on a citywide, 24-hour basis, was effected. This was December 1, 1953.

I well realize the one-man patrol car idea is not new. It has been used in smaller cities and towns for many years, sometimes by choice but often through necessity. Modified forms of one-man patrol cars have been and are being used in some of our larger law enforcement agencies. But to my knowledge, Kansas City, Mo., was the largest municipality ever to inaugurate a 100-percent change to the one-man patrol car system. This should prove of interest, for we were surprised to find that there was little or no factual information, accurately compiled statistics, from large cities that proved or disproved the issue of 1- and 2-man cars.

To be sure, there was an abundance of personal opinions pro and con, but with few exceptions those opinions were not based upon comparative data gathered over a reasonable length of time. The safety factor of the individual officer was often the foundation of adamant opinion, with certain incidents of tragedy affecting the police executive's overall views. Also, the tendency to support one's administrative decision as to the use of 1- or 2-man patrol cars seemed to background some opinions.

Modern surveys reveal that the proponents of one-man patrol cars are in the minority. Some daytime use, especially in residential areas where the workload is light, is about the extent to which most larger cities have gone into the use of one-man patrol cars.

Here are some of the objections to one-man patrol cars voiced by police administrators: The safety of the officer is definitely impaired; it is impossible to drive and adequately observe at the same time; it is impossible to drive at high speeds and use the radio or firearms effectively; the lone patrolman is inclined to overlook suspicious persons and conditions simply because he is alone; it is difficult and hazardous to effect an arrest with only one officer; it is dangerous to bring in a prisoner alone; with one-man cars all calls have to be screened to determine the risk involved, and more than one car sent to the scene, leaving other areas unpoliced; there is too much time off the air because of personal needs of the officer; and the average officer simply does not like to ride alone.

Proponents of one-man cars have said: One-man cars provide equal or better police service for less money; more officers are available to operate more cars or perform other needed police duties; police surveillance is increased; more cars add to a feeling of public security; there is no distracting conversation or personality clashes with fellow officers; the lone patrolman does not take unnecessary chances, is more alert, and hence safer; the officer knows he will get credit where credit is due and works harder; self-reliance develops and argues for a stronger and finer police officer; the officer is more courteous and builds better public relations.

Because of the variables involved, such as the location, size, population, and other particular law-enforcement problems of a city or area, it is impossible and inadvisable to confidently take sides. However, since there is a dirth of substantial supporting facts, the mere reporting of our experience in Kansas City may be a contribution more solid than opinion alone.

Why we made our decision to use one-man cars, how it was made, and the operating results, are questions that have been asked by many police departments here in the United States and in other countries. Because fact finding on an acceptable basis requires the passage of time, we were forced to delay answering many of the inquiries. But perhaps it is now the time to do so.

For a moment I would like to go back to the days not so long ago when police patrolling was accomplished on foot. Even then decisions had to be made as to whether a certain beat should be covered alone or by officers in pairs. In the tougher, more dangerous parts of town, where, as we would say today, the workload or number of police incidents were high, patrolmen often worked in teams. But the vast majority of beats saw the officer patrolling alone.

With the advent of the automobile and its application to police patrol, it developed that at least two men to a car were thought necessary to get the job done. There were good reasons for this thinking. Patrol areas were increased in size as the cities spread out, separating the officer from his fellow patrolman by miles instead of blocks. Where he could formerly call for assistance by voice, whistle, or nightstick pounding on the pavement, now, riding alone some distance away, he would be cut off from his fellow patrolman in neighboring patrol area.

So the motorized patrolman had to have his help with him. If only there were some way the officer could summon immediate assistance. A way came. A great boon to law enforcement—the radio. As it developed from 1-way communication to 2-way, and then to 3-way, or car-to-car, many police administrators came to the thinking that it was time to reappraise patrolling tactics.

Somewhat like the advent of the telephone in the home, a means of contact with the outside world, the radio gave the motorized patrolman a new link with his fellow officer and a new sense of confidence. The distance barrier had been cracked. The patrol cars were brought closer together in point of effective coassistance than had been the foot patrolman of yesterday. Those who earlier advocated the one-man patrol car now spoke in louder voice. If the patrol areas could be reduced in size, bringing the cars physically closer together, and with newly developed car-to-car radio communications, why couldn't the patrolman ride alone with safety and effectiveness?

It was only after exhaustive study and consultation among veteran police officers that Kansas City made its decision to move to one-man patrol cars. The sole objective was to obtain greater police service without (1) increasing the hazards of police employment by adversely affecting the personal safety of the officer, without (2) increasing the individual workload of the officer beyond fair and reasonable standards, and without (3) increasing operating costs beyond normal budgetary limitations.

I was deeply concerned for the safety of the individual officer, and this was our gravest problem. After much study and consideration it was concluded that if the patrolman was physically and mentally prepared, adequately trained and thoroughly schooled in strict compliance with our selected one-man car procedure, and assigned to a smaller patrol area with a workload determined by new calculations, the question of personal safety would be favorably resolved.

We considered such factors as the average age of our patrolmen, whether they were young enough to grasp the new idea and support it. A reexamination of their intellectual level as indicative of ability to assume added responsibilities and to comprehend fully the detailed procedures to be followed was made. Supervisory officers were consulted and closely checked to determine whether they would be able to support the system without openly or latently offering opposition due to preformed personal prejudice.

Need for the establishment of special training programs was early recognized. Both

the patrolman and supervisor would have to receive extensive instructions in one-man car procedure and technique. The radio dispatchers became keymen in the success of the operation. Their appraisal of police calls was vital, and they, too, needed special training and complete understanding of their added duties.

While it was contemplated that the trial and error method would have to be the great teacher, we were determined to do all within our power to foresee and anticipate the mistakes that could be made, and to correct them before they had a chance to happen. Several years ago under our two-man car operations a police officer was shot and killed while seated in the police car beside his partner, and while in the process of stopping a car for a routine traffic violation. Other than the sorrow of the department arising from the tragedy, and the criticism of the technique of the officers in stopping the car, there was an acceptance of the incident as one of risks of the police service. The two-man car patrol system was not blamed, yet it could well have been, for the single officer might have been more alert. I have no doubt, however, that if the tragedy occurred during one-man car operations, the patrol system would have been blamed. Police and public reaction to scrap the system would swell up to the bursting point. This risk was recognized in our decision. We knew that regardless of our preparation an unforeseen happening could wreck our plans.

Kansas City is divided into three large police districts broken up into patrol areas or beats. Under the 2-man patrol car system we had 24 such patrol areas, each with 1 car and 2 patrolmen. It was never contemplated that these old patrol areas would be left as they were and that a 1-man car would be substituted for the 2-man car.

At no time have I felt, nor do I now feel, that the one-man car system of patrol can offer any improvement over the two-man system unless the patrol area is reduced in size and the patrolmen moved closer together. Neither should it be attempted without the finest of radio facilities and especially car-to-car communications.

Therefore, the most important aspect of Kansas City's change to one-man cars was a redistricting of the 24 patrol areas into 42 areas. The new areas followed the census tract lines as nearly as possible so as to provide material from government sources of value to the patrolman in orientation for his area.

The average size of the patrol areas was reduced from 3.4 square miles to 1.9 square miles. In effect, this was a reduction of patrol areas by about half. It might roughly be said that the workload of each patrol area was also cut in half, and that one patrolman was assigned to each of the halves. Observe that the patrolman was not riding his old patrol area alone—his fellow officer was still there, but in an additional car.

To me, this is the secret of success in Kansas City's application of the one-man patrol system. You will see, then, that it is not an economy measure. Actually, it costs more money to operate. The police administrator should obviously be prepared for increased costs, for more automobiles are needed, more gas and oil, more car repair and maintenance will be needed, and more equipment must be provided. The economy effected is the purchase of more police service, without the employment of more patrolmen.

To assign two-man crews to the current patrol areas in Kansas City would require an additional salary expenditure of $592,800 per year, and $45,600 in uniforms and equipment.

We needed 20 additional cars for the one-man patrol. By setting up a motor pool we acquired some automobiles from other units of the department, but 16 additional cars were purchased new. Together with equipment, this cost was $50,018.78. Automobile maintenance costs, excluding depreciation, were $222,291.79 in 1954, as compared with $163,461.25 during two-man car operations in 1952. Our comparison years are 1952, which was the last full year of operation under the two-man patrol, and 1954, the first full year under the one-man system. 1953 was the transition year, as I have said, the first six months of which were still total two-man car operations.

So the cost for additional cars and equipment together with maintenance increased 27 percent. The total number of motor cars subject to maintenance increased in number from 128 to 148, or 14 percent. As a natural corollary to the acquisition of more vehicles, the item of depreciation increased from $46,947.53 to $72,514.87. Added to the maintenance costs, the total increase in 1954 over 1952 was $87,939.76.

In explanation of the increased maintenance costs, other than the normal expectancy arising from 20 more vehicles being placed in patrol work and the rise in prices occurring during the 2-year period, was the increase in the number of miles traveled. In 1952, the two-man patrol covered 1,277,762 miles; in 1954, the one-man patrol car traveled 2,777,460 miles, a numerical increase of 1,499,698 miles, or 117.4 percent. This amazing increase in activity was viewed favorably by the department in light of results.

You are certainly entitled to ask the $87,000 question: What were the results? To me they are little short of amazing.

Referring to the annual bulletins of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I find that the national crime rate rose 22.6 percent from 1952 to 1954. In Kansas City, Mo., the 2 years revealed a 20.5 decrease. All of our statistics are carefully kept in accordance with the requirements of the Uniform Crime Reports as requested by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Thus far this year our crime rate continues to decrease. For the first 6 months of 1955, as compared with the first 6 months of 1953 (under two-man car patrol), there has been a 36.6 percent decrease in part I classification offenses.

All along the line patrol activity has increased. There are more arrests, more checks of buildings, and stricter traffic enforcement. Our patrol cars were painted solid white with large black letters to identify them as police vehicles. More conspicuous and in greater numbers, the patrol cars are noticed with greater frequency by the public. The public reaction has been good. Time in answering calls for police service has been cut by one-third.

We have had no officer fatalities attributed to one-man car operations. Personal injuries to officers present no problem. Incidents of resisting arrest have not increased in proportion to the step-up activity, and for the first 6 months of this year such incidents have decreased 13.7 percent over the corresponding period in 1953.

We will continue to compile statistics to prove or disprove the value of one-man patrol cars. Such data will be made public.

Kansas City, Mo., is a growing, expanding municipality with a diversified population approaching 500,000. It is the hub of a metropolitan area of a million persons. Presently 81.72 square miles in area, it will reach 129.83 square miles within the next 3 years through annexations that have already been voted. It is geographically the largest city in Missouri, and is second in population to St. Louis. Surrounded by penal institutions, possessing a great railroad center, and being the headquarters for one of the countries largest airlines, it is a city of increasing congestion and activity. There is every potential for crime that normally exists in every city of the United States. Our past history reveals heavily publicized blots of police failure and criminal activity. I say this to you so that you will understand that we are not a city where criminal activity would tend to decline without good reason. I believe that one of the most important reasons for the declining crime rate is the institution of the one-man car patrol, operated as I have described.

We will be happy and proud to supply any further information you may desire. We consider it your right to inquire and our duty to answer.

Remarks of Senator James H. Duff, Republican, of Pennsylvania, at Conference of Jewish Organizations, January 18, 1956, Shoreham Hotel, Washington D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

It can no longer be gainsaid that the darkening clouds in the Near East are the early portents of a storm that could burst in that area with completely devastating violence.

There is every evidence that the Communists have concluded that the Near East is the soft spot that now presents the most promising opportunities for exploitation in the characteristic Communist way.

In determining how to deal with this critical situation, it is important to bear in mind that in the years intervening since the end of World War II the Communists, by methods similar to those now being employed in the Near East, have brought under their domination seven hundred million peoples and one-quarter of the whole surface of the earth, and with this, enormous material resources, including those vital to supplement the particular deficiencies which the Communist world has so far suffered from the lack of. The implication of the successful continuation of such methods is too clear to require elaboration.

It is of no avail at this late hour to cry over past spilt milk. But possibly a realization of how that milk was spilt may be instructive in dealing with the present constantly mounting crisis. Failure to act in 1949, when Israel had won a decisive victory against the Arab States, has resulted, as such delay always does, in making infinitely more difficult the resolution of the problem.

At that time, had treaties been definitized and a modus operandi established, there would have been no crisis today.

As might reasonably have been expected, the Communists have shifted from one tack to another in dealing with this situation, studied to create confusion, and done everything in their power to prevent a peaceful and fair solution of the difficulties in that area.

Hardly a day passes without some new move by the Communists to keep the whole situation upset and to make it increasingly difficult to deal with. Only today a dispatch out of London indicates that Czechoslovakia has offered cheap Communist arms to Afghanistan, an immensely important spot on the flank of the Baghdad Pact Defense Alliance. Other moves of the same character can with assurance be expected. All of which indicates that this vitally critical area

to the free world has been selected by the Communists for the embarrassment of the West and the continuous further march of the communistic infiltration and expansion.

This complicated and aggravated situation in the Near East, especially between Israel and Egypt, poses the greatest possible threat to world peace. Too little and too late is a sure invitation to Communist aggression as was proven both in Korea and in Indo-China.

Formosa is not the only place where it was necessary for the free world to draw a line and say: "No further."

It was always the dream of Imperialist Russia under the czars to extend the domain of Russia eastward to the Pacific—a dream realized under the Communists. It was as well the dream of Imperialist Russia to extend their domain from the Mediterranean and the Dardanelles eastward to the Persian Gulf. There is every reason to believe that the intention of the Communists to realize this second ambition is as definite as was the first. There can be no doubt that the free world cannot possibly permit this expansion to be realized. And yet the Israel-Arab dispute is on the very doorstep of that expansion.

Consequently it would seem that it was in the enlightened self-interest of the free world to put a period to this expansion now before it expands beyond control so as to threaten the peace of the world.

The policy of the United States is to wage peace, not war. The policy of the Communists is to wage war, and not peace. The sure way to play into their hands, to make it easier for them to gain their ends, is to vacillate at a time when decisive action is necessary and it seems to me that this is the time for decisive action in the Near East. Certainly that problem will not be settled in the United Nations. It will not be settled at all except by the definite and united action of the United States, Britain, and France. That was true in 1949. It is true today. It will continue to be true until the situation develops into a crisis that may be unresolvable except by conflict. That conflict must be prevented.

Speaking as an individual, the only practical solution for this problem is for the free world to guarantee the existing borders between the disputants, to offset arms to Egypt by arms to Israel—not to encourage an arms race but to maintain a proper balance between them.

Vacillation can only result in ultimate disaster. Decisive action now is the answer.

To the answer that this is dangerous procedure, the reply is: Of course, it is dangerous. Everything is dangerous unless the Communists are permitted to have their own free way. To guarantee these boundaries at this time instead of allowing the Communist infiltration and expansion might very well be the means of preventing another local war of enormous strategic importance where ultimately we would be compelled to interfere. Therefore, the risk would be no greater now than later and it very reasonably might be expected to stabilize a situation that would otherwise be completely out of hand.

By the very nature of current events, it must be clear that we are living in a tremendously dangerous and explosive world. And it will continue to be dangerous and explosive until the Communists are made to understand unmistakably that the time has come when we will act and not talk when they continue in a course that unimpeded can lead to disaster both to us and free people everywhere.

In conclusion, the time has come when we've got to say to the Communists: "You've got to stop this and you've got to stop it now."

Art for Whose Sake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that many patriotic people and organizations are exposing the hoax of modern art. I wish it were possible for every student in America to read the following article. I commend it to the attention of every Member of Congress:

ART FOR WHOSE SAKE?
(By Esther Julia Pels)

In the story "The Emperor's Clothes," by Hans Christian Anderson, the Emperor, stark naked, marches proudly down the street between rows of his people. The admiring crowds murmur their appreciation of his beautiful new robes, their soft coloring, and their magnificent texture. Two thieves pretending to be tailors had convinced the Emperor that they could weave for him the most beautiful rope in the whole world, but that the cloth could only be seen by wise and intelligent people.

With huge sums of money obtained from the gullible and vain Emperor, they pretended to weave these beautiful new textures. So skillful had they been in convincthe palace retainers that failure to appreciate their handiwork would brand one as having no taste, that not a single courtier had dared to raise his voice to protest against what was obviously a swindle. So, while the gullible Emperor marched down the street naked, the perpetrators of the hoax rolled on the palace floor in helpless laughter at the success of their scheme.

If the beloved Danish weaver of children's fairy tales were alive today, he would be astonished to see that his delightful fable has been taken over literally by swindlers in the field of so-called modern art. Here we find an identical parallel—the perpetrators of the hoax of modern art have generally convinced the gullible that failure to appreciate their new forms of art expression brands one as hopelessly unintelligent and behind the times. In fact, the situation is almost identical in that blank canvas is actually exhibited as art.

This may sound very funny, but the sickening story of decadence, perversion, and revolutionary purpose behind the introduction of modern art to America is far from humorous. So-called modern art had its origin in socially sick and decadent European art circles before the First World War. From them sprung Cubism, Dadaism, Futurism, Symbolism, Expressionism, etc. In the social ferment that was to produce communism, fascism, and nazism, there arose artists who plotted to use art as a means of power over the masses. Since its inception, modern art has been revolutionary, not in the sense of bringing new beauty and craftsmanship to the world, but in the deliberate turning of the human mind from what is true, good, and beautiful to the contemplation and worship of ugliness, disordered visions of madness, social protest, and the use of esoteric and occult symbols for reality.

All over Europe the revolutionaries, the dabblers in the occult, and the demented overturned the traditional forms of beauty and art. They boldly proclaimed themselves the new elite of the world of art. They formed into tight little groups, issued manifestoes, and tirelessly promoted their new art forms.

In 1920 the Dadaists held their most spectacular exhibition under the direction of Max Ernst, the artist. The entrance to the exhibition, which was held in Munich, was through a public urinal. A young girl dressed in white, as if for her first Communion, recited obscene poems in a loud voice. A feature of this early Dada exhibition was an aquarium full of blood-red fluid in which were an alarm clock, a lock of hair, and an arm carved in wood. Visitors also were invited to take an axe and chop at a large block of wood.

The general impression created by this insane exhibit was to convince the ordinary visitor that he too had gone mad. Indeed, some of the visitors did go mad in the sense of outraged anger. They seized the axe and proceeded to chop down the whole Dada exhibition before the police arrived. The Dadaists were elated—they had proved their point that the whole world was in a state of complete madness.

The Dadaists were not alone in unleasing perversion and madness on the world. In June of 1936 the Surrealists held an exhibition in London. The noted British novelist, J. B. Priestley reviewed it for a London paper. He said in part:

"The Surrealists stand for violence and neurotic unreason. They are truly decadent. You catch a glimpse behind them of the deepening twilight of the barbarism that may soon blot out the sky until at last humanity finds itself in another long night."

Prophetic words written almost 20 years ago. Part and parcel of those helping to bring on the long night were the following artists:

J. T. Baargeld, founder of the Dadaists who helped establish the Communist Party in the Rhineland.

Filippo T. Marinetti, founder of the Futurists. He was a friend of Mussolini, and was proclaimed the cultural leader of the Italian Fascists after their seizure of power. Marinetti proclaimed: "Man has no more significance than a stone."

Vassily Kandinsky, leader of the Expressionists. Kandinsky, who was born in Russia, studied painting in Germany. He was a mediocre painter until he discovered Expressionism. This theory of painting was that painting in a trance would produce visions of the unconscious on the canvas. This was supposed to produce a like state of trance on the part of the spectator. The followers of Kandinsky in Germany were known as the Blue Knights. In 1914 he returned to Russia. He was a friend of Trotsky, and after the revolution he and his pals sought to dominate the Russian art world. For a while they succeeded. They created their own workshops and art organizations. Kandinsky became the director of the Museum of Pictorial Culture in Moscow. He helped establish museums throughout Russia. But his triumph was shortlived.

A smarter and far greater Communist, V. I. Lenin, was watching the newly developing Bolshevik art movement. Master of revolutionary techniques himself, Lenin saw in the art of Kandinsky and his associates just another way of subverting the masses through distortion and neuroticism. The Russian masses which Lenin had chosen to conquer for socialism, had to face cold, hard, reality—neuroticism and decadent distortions were for people outside of Russia whom Lenin hoped to soften up and demoralize for later conquest. Kandinsky was kicked out of Russia by Lenin in 1921, and the Expressionist leader returned to Germany. A few years later he was brought to the United States by Katherine Dreier, an aging but active leftwinger from Brooklyn.

Kandinsky, former cultural commissar in Bolshevik Russia, believe it or not, became vice president of the Société Anonyme in New York 2 years later. This was an international association set up in 1920 by the same Katherine Dreier for the promotion of the study of progressive art in America. There is no reason to believe that Kandinsky, who had failed to establish his revolutionary art form in Russia, had abandoned his ideas or plans when he got to this country.

In a speech entitled "Modern Art Shackled to Communism" Congressman DONDERO of Michigan said:

"The Société Anonyme according to the American Art Annual was first organized as the Museum of Modern Act. The Museum of Modern Art founded in 1920, officered in 1923 and for years thereafter by Kandinsky, Russian commissar of the isms becomes crystallized in 1929 as the present Museum of Modern Art. As an enduring link between the two, Alfred H. Barr, Jr., member of the board of directors of Société Anonyme, is the director of the present Museum of Modern Art."

The way was open for the virus of the foreign-spawned isms to be injected into the bloodstream of American culture, and it was. Books written by or about the leaders of social protest in the art world were published or sold by the Museum of Modern Art. The art critics of liberal and radical magazines praised to the skies the daubs and monstrosities of the new school artists. They employed a gibberish even more incomprehensible than the alleged paintings they so lavishly praised. Even more fantastic were the prices asked for some of this abstract junk.

Abstract art offered the Communists a quick route to fame and fortune. It dispensed with the long training and talent demanded by traditional painting. A few daubs of paint on a canvas called abstract art could be boosted and pushed as great art. Many of the newly rich were eager to emulate an older generation of millionnaire art patrons. Most of the great works of art of past centuries have been acquired by museums or families of great wealth. Therefore, it became tremendously chic to purchase works of unknown artists and to become a patron and defender of the new culture.

On the other hand, the average American under no such delusions derived no pleasure or inspiration from the new art forms. The spectator felt uneasy and bewildered looking at paintings that conveyed neither beauty nor sense. Nevertheless, like the emperor's courtiers they were easily cowed into silence because they feared the ridicule which the so-called critics and defenders of the new isms would heap upon them.

This was not an American art movement. At practically all of these American exhibitions, even today, the names of the same leaders of European modern art appear over and over again—Salvador Dali, Max Ernst, Pablo Picasso, Miro, Paul Klee, Tanguy, Chagall, De Chirico, et cetra.

The wedge of confusion having been driven home, a new phase was started. William Z. Foster, veteran Communist leader, made this significant admission in the New Masses in 1946:

"There must be a clear understanding that art is a weapon in the class struggle. Not only is art a weapon, but a very potent one as well. Moreover, rising revolutionary social classes instinctively realize the importance of art as a social weapon and have always forged their own art and used it to challenge that of the existing ruling class."

The Communists had started to organize and exploit artists in the early 1930's by setting up fronts along cultural lines. One of the most notorious was the John Reed Club, named in honor of an early American Communist, John Reed, who had died in Russia shortly after the Bolshevik seizure of power and had been buried with full red honors in the Kremlin wall. Also active in New York was the artists union. Organized in 1933 by unemployed artists working on Federal arts projects, a part of the Federal relief program, it was supermilitant. On May 1, the Communist holiday, it called upon all artists to come out into the streets, to don chisel and brush, and march shoulder to shoulder with his fellow workers toward the future.

These artists were primarily interested in art as Communist and revolutionary propaganda. Federal and State art projects set up to alleviate unemployment and distress offered wonderful opportunities to get paid, with taxpayers' money, for daubing revolutionary propaganda on public property walls. They violently resisted all controls, which they called censorship.

These founders and early members of the John Reed Clubs and artists union can be found today as favored and prominently displayed artists in many museums throughout the United States. The names of these same artists appear over and over again as sponsors or supporters of literally dozens of Communist fronts during the past 20 years.

William Gropper was one of the founders of the John Reed Club as well as a founder of Artists Equity in 1947. According to Congressman DONDERO, "Artists Equity Association lists practically all the notorious red artists in the country." Gropper was present in 1930 at an international Communist conference on art in Kharkov, Russia, set up to bring American artists under Comintern control. The sabotaging of American art was the direct outcome of this conference. In a cable to Moscow in 1932 Gropper reported to his Soviet masters the accomplishments of American Communists in the struggle for world socialism:

"I have held exhibitions of cartoons, drawings, and paintings on the imperialist war and the defense of the Soviet Union throughout the west coast of the United States like Berkeley, San Francisco, and Los Angeles in California, and in galleries in New York City. At present I am at work on a mural painting to be exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art, which thousands of people visit weekly and I shall register my protest by exposing the war plot against the Soviet Union in this painting.

"With revolutionary greetings,

"WILLIAM GROPPER."

Gropper's Communist-front record with some 60 or more affiliations is second only to that of Rockwell Kent with well over a hundred. Yet he had the gall to tell the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations in 1953:

"You see I am an artist. I am primarily an artist. I am not in with this political business that you people are all involved in."

Despite this long Communist-front record and his protests of complete lack of political knowledge, Mr. Gropper nevertheless conveniently took the fifth amendment when asked if he was a Communist. He admitted he had received between $4,000 and $5,000 for a mural he did for the new Interior Building in Washington. When asked whether he had contributed any of this money to the Communist Party, Gropper again took the fifth amendment.

In 1947 the State Department paid $55,000 of your tax money for a collection of 79 works of art to be shown abroad as examples of American culture. At least nine of the contributing artists had front records. The project was quickly dropped when the then Secretary of State, George Marshall, received a flood of protests from Congressmen and indignant citizens. The War Assets Administration later disposed of the whole collection for $5,544.45, or about 10 cents on the dollar.

A year later an "art gallery on wheels" was set up to tour Veterans' Administration hospitals. Congressman DONDERO exposed the front records of 17 artists whose works were included in the project. The sinister purpose behind such an otherwise harmless idea was to give these Communist-front artists a sort of patriotism by association halo in that their modernistic daubs had presumably benefited recuperating veterans. They could also later claim that they had at least been inferentially cleared of any taint of subversion by virtue of the fact that the United States Government had displayed their works in veterans hospitals. You have to get up awfully early to outsmart Communists.

The Communists are tireless in boosting each others' products. They are also highly adept at infiltrating art juries. Recently the National Council for United States Art announced the first competition for art work to decorate the U. N. Building in New York. The 10 jurors include at least 3 with Communist-front records, Leon Kroll, Paul Manship, and William Zorach. Six of the 18 members of the Visual Arts Panel of the United States National Committee of UNESCO are connected with Artist Equity. This is a cozy "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours" arrangement.

Small wonder that so many young and struggling artists go left. They are smart enough to realize that with such obvious infiltration, and in some cases, control of art juries and panels by notorious leftwingers, anti-Communist painters do not stand much of a chance. For example, Anton Refregier was selected from 86 other contestants to paint the Rincon Post Office murals in San Francisco. There were 3 artists on the jury; 2 who voted for Refregier had long front records. Outraged protests from patriotic groups finally forced a congressional hearing on these slanted murals. Refregier himself was not even called to testify as to what part of the $26,000 of taxpayers' money which he received was diverted to any of the Communist fronts with which he was connected. Despite the protests of large groups of patriotic citizens, the objectionable murals painted by a Communist sympathizer are still on the walls of a United States Government building. Who benefited by the selection of Anton Refregier as the artist?

In the story of the emperor's clothes, it was the voice of one small child which exposed the whole carefully built-up hoax. "But he has nothing on," exclaimed the child. The emperor, realizing that the child spoke the truth, rushed back to his palace to turn out the rascals who had made such a fool of him. The clear-sighted vision of small children is apparently not given to the blind worshipers of modern art. Consider the reply of Sidney Marcus, chairman of the Dallas Museum board, to a resolution of the Dallas public affairs luncheon club. The resolution protested the exhibition of works by Communist and pro-Communist artists at the local museum. "Tommyrot," sneered Mr. Marcus.

Christianity is today the main target of world communism. What more subtle way could be devised to destroy children's faith in religion than to show Christ on the cross as a gigantic insect? Nothing is more despicable in modern art than the vulgarity and ugly distortion in religious themes.

The real thinking behind these sacrilegious paintings is given away by a critical review in the Communist Daily Peoples World of April 6, 1955. Criticizing Rico Lebrun's Crucifixion series, the review says:

"In attempting to depict man's inhumanity to man there was a deep and important fallacy. The carpenter who erected the cross, the soldiers who rent the garments, and the crowds who jeered and mocked were all portrayed in unsparing horror. But the forces which put these executioners into movement, the instigators of mankind's most notorious execution of a radical thinker, nowhere were these forces shown."

Can you believe it? Jesus Christ, not the hope and Savior of all mankind, but merely a radical thinker.

This is hate art. The purveyors of it have their vile works exhibited in museums and private galleries throughout the country. They are praised, financially supported, and defended by the very class that they plot to destroy. The Daily Worker of April 10, 1955, carried an article on the Jack Levine show exhibited in the Whitney Museum of Art in New York. The following excerpts are significant:

"He paints dead souls in living bodies with devastating power and insight. He paints men and women who would stifle humanity, starve mankind, brutalize the world for their own parasitic, selfish, greedy ends. He divests these people of their outer garments of wealth, position, and respectability and exposes the sham that covers the leering evil, the greed, the corrosion of upper-class immorality and self-indulgence.

"His technique in depicting death in life, evil inhuman form is close to perfection. The painting, The Trial, has deep political significance today as witchhunts and hysteria have made a mockery of courtroom justice.

"Throughout the exhibition it is more clear what Jack Levine hates. He says himself, 'Those I love I simply leave out. A painter should do what he does best.'

"He has created unforgettable faces expressive of corruption that grows and decays, of hypocritical souls wielding power today."

Pope Pius XII summed up the whole situation recently when he spoke at an exhibition of the works of Fra Angelico, famed 15th century Florentine painter of saints and angels. His Holiness extolled the work of Fra Angelico, who had painted an ideal world of angellike men, and then said:

"If the artistic expression turns instead to a false, empty, and unclean spirit, which deforms the designs of the Creator, if instead of elevating the mind and heart to noble sentiments it should incite the more vulgar passions, it might find acclaim or acceptance by some, even if only because of novelty, which is not always of merit.

But such art would degrade itself, denying its own principal and essential aspect and would be neither universal nor perpetual as is the spirit of man to which it is addressed."

A few years ago, Col. William R. Kintner wrote a book entitled "The Front Is Everywhere." He demonstrated beyond cavil that secret Communists and their sympathizers in our midst are waging total war against us every hour of the day and night, on every level and stratum of our society—religious, cultural, political, economic, social, moral, and intellectual. This constant corrosive attack seeks to destroy our religion, our home life, our national unity, our history and traditions, our very will to resist and live. In this titanic struggle for the world, no sector of human thought or activity is overlooked by the minions of Moscow. So, remember that even in the museums, "Art is a weapon in the class struggle."

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, there follows the Good Evening column by Clifford B. Ward which appeared recently in the Fort Wayne, Ind., News-Sentinel. It contains some very sound views, in my opinion, with respect to our foreign policy:

A few of us, sitting around the other day in the self-constituted roles of saviors of the world were discussing the increasingly important subject of a satisfactory foreign policy for the United States.

That's so big a subject that almost anyone can be an expert in it. As in all such discussions, there are many points of view. One man stated that it has been suggested that an academy, similar to West Point or Annapolis, be established for State Department career men. Another said that such an academy would have little value unless the academy itself knew the fundamental philosophy on which this country would try to operate in the field of foreign relations.

With this latter view I agreed, on the theory that a policy is only an extension of a philosophy, but went on to express my view that we have no such philosophy and need to develop one. There was a point in the history of civilization when it became necessary for Christians to formulate a list of things in which they believed and the result was "the Apostles' Creed." We need now something like the formation of an Apostles' Creed with reference to the attitude that this country should take first to itself and then to the rest of the world. We had such a policy for decades prior to the coming of Franklin Roosevelt. We have not had any since. Our present policy is to extemporize from day to day on the basis of expendiency, not for ourselves, but for the world generally.

IS NATIONALISM OBSCENE?

First of all, we should determine in our own minds, whether we owe any apology to ourselves for being ourselves. Is it wrong to be an American in preference to being a citizen of the world? Is it wrong to take an ordered pride in our views of human freedom and the manner in which we have succeeded in applying them? Is an ordered nationalism, not an excessive nationalism, an obscene thing? Is it wrong for an American to feel a thrill running up and down his spine when he views the American flag fluttering in the wind and is it wrong if he doesn't feel a similar thrill watching a UN flag fluttering in the breeze? To be sure we are all members of the human race, all sons of the same father, but the general welfare can never exclude the welfare which an individual must worry about for himself. All human society begins with the individual. It is no better than the sum total of all the virtues of the individuals who go to make it up and a man must be true to himself before he can be true to his own family; and true to his own family before he can be true to his state; and true to his own state before he can be true to the world at large.

A PROPER SELFISHNESS

There is a proper selfishness in the affairs of all men and that proper selfishness is extended to a nation. No man ever has a right to surrender his own conscience completely to someone else and neither has any nation the right to forget its own proper interests for the interests of all the nations of the world.

The bases of any philosophy of foreign affairs for this country have to be some very old things such as truth and honesty. We have an idea in this country that any problem can be solved if sufficient money is appropriated to correct it. Is religion failing? Give the churches more money. Is the school system failing to educate? Give it more money. Is our reservoir of good will over the world running low? Give it more money. This sort of thing is wholly fallacious. A man doesn't establish a reputation for truth and honesty by buying it. He earns it over the years by being truthful and honest. Affection he may not get, but respect he should. Today in most countries, we are not liked as Americans. That is not nearly as alarming as the fact that in most countries we are not respected. To earn again the respect which we once had, we will have to forget the idea that what we want we can buy. It isn't that easy.

Is Wolters Abandonment Justified?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include the following editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Star Telegram on Sunday, January 15. The editorial very succinctly presents a situation involving both ethics and economics:

IS WOLTERS ABANDONMENT JUSTIFIED?

Mineral Wells seems about to suffer a cruel economic blow for the second time in 10 years. This time the blow threatens to be far more damaging than when Camp Wolters was shut down as the country's foremost infantry replacement center at the end of World War II, for the reason that the city and its residents have more invested and have assumed greater financial obligations than before.

The impending blow comes from a decision of the Defense Department to deactivate Wolters Air Force Base, which succeeded the infantry replacement center as a place for the training of aviation engineers. With considerable justification, Mineral Wells feels that it is the victim of bad faith, for its cooperation in the opening of Wolters Air Force Base in 1951 and its more-than-substantial expenditures to accommodate it were based on what it thought was assurance that the installation would be a permanent one.

On the basis of what they viewed as a binding promise, the city government and private firms and individuals have spent heavily to provide such things as housing, recreation facilities, water, schools, utilities and transportation, and streets and churches. As reckoned by a Mineral Wells committee which is trying to prevent abandonment of the base, the total of these expenditures comes to nearly $11 million—no small sum for a city of less than 8,000 population. To add to the city's plight, it gave up a promising industrial development on some of the land of old Camp Wolters in order to make way for the new base.

The taxpayers at large also have a substantial investment in the facilities which now seem about to be abandoned. The investment is in land, in buildings and equipment, in aircraft runways, and in publicly built housing for personnel of the base. In fact, a hospital on the base is now at 70 percent of completion, and runway building is still in progress.

Efforts abetted by the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce and by Texas representatives in Washington have won no promises so far that this damaging blow to Mineral Wells' economy will be averted. Admittedly, the Defense Department cannot always reconcile its needs with the economic needs of the area in which its installations are situated. But appropriate committees in Congress would be justified in looking into the question of why a $20 million base is

slated for the discard while it is still abuilding, and both the poor planning and the disregard for the taxpayers' money that such an action betokens.

Fuel for Republicans Seen in Truman Memoir Chapter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of January 17, 1956

TODAY IN NATIONAL AFFAIRS—FUEL FOR REPUBLICANS SEEN IN TRUMAN MEMOIR CHAPTER

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 18.—"O that mine enemy might write a book"—it's an old slogan and has its application to the 1956 Presidential campaign. For the latest installment of the memoirs of former President Truman seeking to defend the loss of China to the free world is about as useful a piece of political ammunition as the Republicans could acquire this year.

When, as Mr. Truman declares in the current installment published in Life magazine, the loss of China is due to the fact that Chiang Kai-shek wasn't conciliatory enough toward the Chinese Communists, the whole issue surrounding the Democratic administration's tragic policies in the Far East is revived.

The American people have not only been brought to the brink of war in Formosa but they lost 140,000 casualties in Korea in an actual war because the policies of the Truman administration turned out to be to the advantage of the Communist government in China.

Mr. Truman says that General Marshall tried to get Chiang Kai-shek to agree to a coalition government. The general, to be sure, was acting on the basis of detailed instructions prepared for him by experts in the Department of State whose fidelity to the best interests of the United States versus Soviet Russia came into question later in hearings before congressional committees. Nobody with a sense of fairness has ever suggested that General Marshall knew the sinister influences at work in the Department of State. For, as a good soldier, he followed orders. But the fact is that the idea of a coalition government in which the Communists and the Nationalists would participate was a hoax from beginning to end.

COALITION TRICK

The coalition idea had already resulted in the sellout of the people of Poland through the Yalta agreements, and it isn't hindsight as Mr. Truman argues now, to recall that point. For the whole world knew the Communists were using the coalition trick to gain military supremacy. Indeed, they notified the American negotiators in China that they wouldn't integrate their armies under any circumstances. How could Chiang Kai-shek agree to a coalition government while his enemies were maintaining an armed force to continue their military pressures?

Mr. Truman says, in effect, that the Nationalists should have surrendered because they didn't have a chance militarily to win, and General Marshall thought so, too, but the opinion of other observers, including the American Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, an educator of wide experience in China, was that the failure of American aid to come at the opportune moment was the real cause of the weakness of the Nationalists and the disintegration of their armies. Many Nationalist military commanders went over to the enemy because they saw the United States withdrawing moral support from Chiang Kai-shek.

Mr. Truman boldly defends what the Treasury did. He doesn't mention the late Harry Dexter White, named in congressional hearings as a Communist spy, who sat in the Treasury Department with full power to say when the money promised Chiang Kai-shek would be forwarded or held back. The former President commended Harry Dexter White in writing on April 30, 1946, even after J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, had in November 1945, and February 1946, called the President's attention to the questionable record of White's relations to the Communists.

TRUMAN ON THE LOAN

On the subject of the loan, Mr. Truman doesn't identify the Treasury experts who held it up but he writes:

"General Marshall devoted his brief stay in Washington (March–April 1946) to talk with Government officials regarding loans for China and aid in the form of shipping and surplus property. I instructed the Treasury Department to cooperate with him in every way, and an agreement was reached for an immediate loan to China of $500 million. Unfortunately, when nothing but the Chinese signature was lacking on this document, Chiang Kai-shek's representative, the Chinese Ambassador in Washington, insisted on changes before he would sign. And to complicate the matter further, the Generalissimo on the same day made a speech in China that was in effect a call to arms. It is no wonder that the Treasury experts felt that it would not be in line with our policy to make a loan if political settlement was not forthcoming in China. They were correct."

This is by no means all of the story, but it is a sensational paragraph nonetheless. It shows that Mr. Truman either didn't know how the loan was being squelched by some persons in the United States Treasury Department friendly to the Communists, or else that he naively accepted the superficial explanation which he now repeats.

For certainly Chiang Kai-shek had to keep on fighting. The Communists were refusing to dissolve or disarm their forces. Already betrayed by the Yalta agreement which secretly gave Soviet Russia advantages in Manchuria that paved the way for the conquest of all China by the Communist Chinese, the Nationalist Government of China was deserted at a critical time by the United States Government, which welched on its promises and involuntarily built up a Communist regime in the Far East that any day may bring the world to the brink of war.

Tribute to the Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, so much is said and written these days about the destructive, antisocial habits of the younger generation, that our thinking about them is in danger of getting out of focus. It has been my observation that the young people of today are smarter, better informed, more ambitious, and more conscious of their obligations to each other and to society than those of other generations. Juvenile delinquency is a fringe problem. The great mass of young people are pulling their weight and acquitting themselves with credit.

In order to call attention to, and underscore this fact, Mr. Speaker, I intend, during the present session, to insert in the RECORD, illustrative accounts of young people in the 39th Congressional District of New York who are winning distinction in many fields. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include today accounts of three young women of western New York who, on the basis of outstanding qualities of leadership and character, have been selected to participate in the good citizenship contest of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The accounts are all from the Batavia Daily News of Tuesday, January 17, 1956:

ELBAN IS SELECTED FOR DAR'S CONTEST—MISS SALLY WARBOYS OF DRAKE STREET ROAD, WILL REPRESENT BATAVIA GROUP

Miss Sally Warboys, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Irving Warboys of Drake Street Road, has been selected by faculty members and fellow classmen to represent Elba Central School in the DAR Good Citizenship contest, sponsored by the Batavia chapter.

Miss Warboys has been an outstanding leader throughout high school. She has served as student council representative and secretary as well as corresponding secretary of the county organization.

Interested in sports, she has been a cheerleader for 4 years, a member of the Girls' Athletic Association and Leaders' Club.

In the school band for 6 years, she played in the county band 3 years and has won 3 awards for solos in State competition. She has participated in chorus, dramatics, and public speaking. This year she is editor of the school yearbook.

Miss Warboys was elected to the National Honor Society when a sophomore. She plans to attend Buffalo State Teachers College, specializing in the education of handicapped children.

A member of the First Presbyterian Church of Elba, she has been active in Westminster fellowship, serving as treasurer of the local group and vice moderator of the County Young People's Council.

SENIOR AT PAVILION NAMED GOOD CITIZEN; RECEIVING DAR AWARD

Barbara Griffith, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Griffith, of Wyoming, was chosen by the senior class as Pavilion Central School's "good citizen" to represent the DAR. The qualifications were based on dependability, service, leadership, and patriotism.

Upon submitting her essay "The Spirit of '76 in 1956," Barbara became entitled to receive a certicate of award from the National Society and to wear the DAR Good Citizenship pin. Barbara is a member of the National Honor Society, the yearbook staff, is active in the Girls Athletic Association, and has been a member of the cheerleading squad for the past 4 years. She participated in the junior and senior plays, has been a member of the student council for 3 years, was editor of the school paper during her sophomore and junior years, and was president of her class in the sophomore year.

Barbara plans to enter Nazareth College in Rochester in the fall.

LYNDONVILLE STUDENT NAMED FOR DAR AWARD

LYNDONVILLE.—Judith Ann McCargar, 15, a senior at Lyndonville Central School, has been picked as the school's representative for the annual Daughters of the American Revolution Good Citizenship award, according to Principal Robert Starr.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Harold McCarger of Marshall Road.

The Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Recently all New York City newspapers gave prominence to a roundup story showing that a total of 132 big ships had made their maiden visit to the world's largest port during 1955.

New York is my home port, and port officials there were greatly gratified to learn that such a great flotilla of fine vessels had passed the Statute of Liberty for the first time and docked at the city's piers carrying passengers and cargo from all over the world. It was good news, indeed, for everyone except those of us in Congress who hold the interests of the American merchant marine to be one of our paramount considerations

As a member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee I read these stories with keen disappointment. For, out of the grand total of 132 ships making their initial visit to New York, only 6 flew the American flag. Twenty-two times that number carried foreign flags. This is distressing news, indeed, for anyone holding the firm conviction that the American merchant marine is not only vital to our whole economy, but to our very security as a Nation.

The American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars at their last annual conventions again emphatically stressed the necessity of a strong American merchant marine as a vital defense factor. These veterans' organizations realize, probably more deeply than anyone else, the hard fact that it was the American merchant marine that made it possible to fight and win two great World Wars on the enemy's territory instead of fighting it out here on our own. It was this offensive defensive which paid off so brilliantly, and it was our own merchant marine which made it possible.

But the figures I have cited on new-vessel arrivals in my own home port are a dramatic warning. We are letting our merchant marine, the most powerful defense corollary of our Armed Forces, decline. It will decline even more rapidly unless Congress meets head-on a new threat whose ominous proportions at last are made clear. I speak of the oncoming attempt by foreign-flag steamship lines, with the direct assistance of their governments, to break down the historic 50–50 law whereby American ships are carrying half of the relief cargoes we are sending to those very countries. These cargoes are financed by the American taxpayer. Because of this, you would naturally think that our foreign marine competitors would accept the fair and just principle that Americans just be given an even break with their own. But no. Apparently they want to transport it all. If this strikes a paralyzing blow at our merchant marine, well, so what?

The exposure of this calculated plot was fully revealed just the other day by Francis T. Greene, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute. Appearing before the National Security Commission of the American Legion here in Washington on January 18, Mr. Green charged that there is a collective conspiracy by powerful foreign steamship groups to pressure Congress into emasculating one of its laws, "to the detriment of our national security and the security of the free world."

President Greene told the Legion Security Commission that the law the foreign shipping interests sought to break down is the statute which the Legion has strongly supported for years, guaranteeing that 50 percent of the cargoes for foreign relief and paid for by American taxpayers, must be carried in American ships.

It is due largely to the vision and support of the Legion that Congress each year has assured the American people that their own merchant marine shall be used to transport a fair half of these cargoes—

Mr. Greene said.

The hope of this conspiracy by foreign steamship lines is to mislead the American farmer and the American people into the belief that the fair and equitable 50–50 law is blocking surplus agricultural disposal—

The shipping official told the Legion. He continued:

Thus, the foreign shipping associates, by arousing the fears of American agriculture, hope to ride on the back of the American farmer and tear down the 50–50 law. These foreign shipping lobbies could never do this by themselves.

Mr. Greene charged that as early as September 1954, the principal European maritime nations represented by the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, made the pointed suggestion that their member countries, rather than abide by the 50–50 provision in American law, might prefer to take care of their agricultural requirements elsewhere.

The American shipping official cited an impressive list of collusive incidents by Scandinavian shipowners' associations in refusing to buy American agricultural products where the 50–50 law applies.

This documented record proves that the Western European shipping associations have induced their governments to raise the 50–50 issue in their own self-interest in order to put pressure on the American farmer to put pressure on our Congress to remove this essential safeguard for our own merchant marine—

Mr. Greene added.

All these attacks by foreign shipping interests on American laws violate a basic tenet of American Legion policy, which supports a strong American merchant marine as being vital to our security as a nation—

Mr. Greene testified.

The authoritative Defense Department estimate is that this country should have not fewer than 1,085 ships in the dry-cargo category alone—

Mr. Greene said.

This is greater than our entire private merchant marine today, tankers included.

Another factor impairing the efficiency of the American merchant marine as a defense auxiliary is the direct competition of the Military Sea Transportation Service with our commercial passenger fleet, Mr. Green said.

Currently, MSTS is operating 47 Government-owned passenger ships, as against 39 privately-operated liners. While this direct competition is destructive, the paramount issue is the retention of the 50–50 principle. Its emasculation or abandonment would put American exporters in general, and American farmers in particular, at the mercy of discriminatory foreign-flag rates. All Americans who produce any commodity for export need the assurance of reliable ocean transport. This can be given only by a merchant marine under American control. It is my sincere conviction that elimination of 50–50 from Government-financed sales of Government surpluses, or from any other category of public cargo to which it now applies, would, in the long run, be no less a disaster for American agriculture and industry than for American shipping, which it would severely cripple, or for our national security, which it would dangerously jeopardize.

House Joint Resolution 433: To Expand and Improve Our International Information Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to submit the proposals made by Mr. Walter V. Chopyk before the World Fellowship at the University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., on December 9, 1955. Mr. Chopyk is a leading citizen and civic worker in the city of Buffalo, and holds the position of secretary to the Department of Public Works, city of Buffalo.

The proposals submitted follow:

1. Formation in next Congress of a joint congressional committee on United States International Information Programs. In other words, passage of House Joint Resolution 433 which calls for this. Purpose: To finance, expand, and improve our information program to compare with Moscow's.

2. With this expanded program, concentrate especially on the non-Russian nations in U. S. S. R., with Russian colonialism and imperialism as the prime targets. We should hammer away on the basis of a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives in 1955 against Russian colonialism.

(a) Russian propaganda in southeast Asia portrays Ukraine, etc., land of great prosperity, etc. Why? To mislead the Asiatics that there is any Russian colonialism in U. S. S. R. and to, therefore, associate more closely with

Moscow against the West and its colonial powers, such as England and France, our close allies.

We must counteract this in Asia and give the truth, centering attention on Russian colonialism.

3. Press still for United States Ambassador to Ukraine and Byelorussia, to force this concentration in America on the non-Russian nations and play up to them in order to split the basic Russian empire in the form of the U. S. S. R.

4. The Government follow the once proclaimed policy of liberation by supporting undergrounds in Europe and Asia. This can be done without precipitating any war. Time is with Moscow, not us.

Of the People, by the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, 71 years ago a group of German-American immigrants founded the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, to provide mutual help in times of economic crises. This year its publication Solidarity celebrates its 50th anniversary. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Mr. Morton B. Lawrence before the national executive board of the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, on January 12, 1956:

OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE

The history of the Workmen's Benefit Fund is the story of individuals joining together to work for the common good. It is a familiar story for Americans, but it can never be told too often. For it repeats in its own special way the pattern of America and its growth.

The story begins—like the American story—with a group of men who sought political asylum. With their families they fled the oppressive laws of Germany under Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, in the 1880's. They came to the United States. They came as free men—machinists, cigarmakers, and other skilled craftsmen, to work and to raise their families in freedom. A major part of that freedom is the right of men to organize to protect themselves—from political tyranny, from economic exploitation, from the poverty which follows upon the sickness or death of the family's provider.

Wage earners in the 1880's could not fall back upon savings, as their paychecks were small. Neither was there any aid from the Government, or organized charity, to which they might turn. On September 24, 1884, a group of those exiled German workers met for the purpose of forming an association which would protect its members in times of sickness or death. Scandals had brought the established profitmaking insurance companies into disrepute. "Order of the day," the minutes of that meeting read, "Self-help." Less than a month later, on October 19, 1884, that association was founded—the General Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of New York and Vicinity.

The beginnings were modest enough: payments to begin when the organization had 75 members; weekly sick benefits of from $6–$9; a death benefit of $75. These payments seem insignificant in the light of today's wages and the cost of living, but it should be remembered that 70 years ago $7 a week was the salary of a skilled working man. Only a few months after the establishment of the society, it was faced with a dramatic challenge. Two members died. The $150 needed in death benefits had not yet been collected in the treasury. Had the society failed its members in that crisis, it could not have survived. But the enterprising treasurer raised the money by borrowing from friends. The death benefits were paid, and the society's reputation for honesty and reliability was thereby established.

The membership rolls expanded. By 1887 there were 4 branches with 527 members. By the end of 1888 there were 733 members and 15 branches in 3 States: New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. Growth was so rapid and so extensive that the society's name had to be changed to include the wider territory; it was now called Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of North America. (The designation North was later dropped.) After 1888, sick benefits were extended to 26 weeks, with another 25 weeks at half benefit, and death benefits were raised from the original $75 to $150 in 1888 and $250 in 1891.

With such rapid growth, there was a sharp need for new administrative machinery. The small group of German workmen who founded the society had provided a completely democratic organization, and the organization proved flexible enough to meet the needs of expansion. Headquarters were expanded too—from a small office on East 4th Street at $6 a month to a store at $12, and by 1889 the society leased larger quarters in the Metropolitan Savings Bank Building on Third Avenue, which remained its home until 1930 when it moved into its own building at 714 Seneca Avenue in Brooklyn.

The problem of coordinating the activities of the member branches with the main administration was met and solved by holding a convention. The first was held in November 1892 and there all branches were represented. A second convention met in 1895 and a third in 1898. In 1898 the National Executive Board applied for incorporation of the society. There were now 161 branches in 21 States and over 20,000 members. Eminent personalities began to join the organization, among them the genius in the field of electricity, Charles Steinmetz, who for a time was the financial secretary of one of its branches, Daniel Hoan and Jasper McLevy, many-term mayors of Milwaukee and Bridgeport respectively.

By 1905, the society had grown so large that it needed its own publication to spread news of its activities to its membership. At the convention of that year, a motion was passed authorizing the publication of a paper, Solidarity. Its first issue appeared in April 1906 and it has since been published regularly for half a century as the official organ of the society. Its policy was stated clearly in that first issue: "Our paper shall be a means of enlightenment and conciliation. Its best efforts will be given to that great work of culture: The winning of the workers to the goal which we must set for ourselves * * * enlightenment, teaching, education are the prerequisites."

The Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund had been founded by German immigrants, and in its early years it remained essentially German in composition. The convention of 1910 proposed, among other things, the organization of English-speaking branches. During World War I the society, like all German-American groups of the times, was subjected to a certain amount of harassment by self-styled superpatriots. Its loyalty to America, however, was never questioned, and the society grew in strength during the war. Soon after World War I, the United States Department of Labor asked the society for permission to scan its records for statistical purposes, because the organization's sick benefit figures were at that time practically the only source of health insurance statistics. The society gladly cooperated with various Government agencies, for it had been an early advocate of a system of Government-run social security. Even today, the society is urging broader coverage and higher benefits under the social-security laws.

The postwar period was one of expansion and consolidation for the society. In 1928 the organization adopted new additions to its benefit structure: women could now join the sick benefit group, and children were also admitted to the society. Membership rose to a new peak in 1929. In 1934, when it celebrated its 50th anniversary, it could look back with satisfaction over its half-century with the knowledge that it had survived war, labor unrest, and the great depression. During the period of great unemployment, its relief fund had helped thousands of members to survive. No person was dropped from membership for nonpayment of dues, so that regardless of the members' economic condition, they were eligible for benefits in times of sickness and distress.

In a new era, which recognized the rights and duties of men to organize in their own interests for their security and protection, the society moved ahead steadily. In 1939 at the 18th convention, its name was officially changed from Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund to Workmen's Benefit Fund. Once again, as it had done many times before, the Workmen's Benefit Fund asserted its firm opposition to fascism, nazism, and communism, "with their intolerance, hatred, persecution, and destruction of culture, freedom, and peace." At this convention, too, the medical care and hospital plan was adopted on a national basis, following the institution of similar services by local branches a few years earlier.

The Workmen's Benefit Fund continued to expand its activities and its services to members. The 20th national convention of 1943 set up a life-insurance program of regular and endowment policies. The emergency relief fund had been greatly strengthened and is constantly being used to help member families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods or other disasters. District committees were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various part of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, of course, also engaged in social and educational activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health purposes. Many branches provide general practitioner care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service. By 1955 the membership was 58,000 in 26 States.

Over the years of growth there have been many changes, but the fundamental structure of the workmen's benefit fund has remained unchanged. At the 70th anniversary celebration in 1954, guest speakers Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, and United States Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, praised the society in glowing terms for its years of dedicated service to democratic ideals and to the enactment of forward looking social reforms and legislation. The editor of its magazine Solidarity reiterated briefly just what their organization means to its members: "In itself, the society is a very sober-minded affair, a purely protective institution, organized for self-help on a nonprofit basis. The very purpose gives the organization its idealistic aims. For this reason, progressive thinking men and women of all national origins, and of all occupations, can be active in the workmen's benefit fund as they are active in political, educational, and economic organizations."

Thirteen-Cent Hogs to Seventy-Nine-Cent Chops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial written by Mr. Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times:

THIRTEEN-CENT HOGS TO SEVENTY-NINE-CENT CHOPS

Ever wonder how come the farmer is getting less for his produce and you are still paying the same high price in the market? We have. There is an article in the December issue of the Farm Journal by Dean Wolf which explains this unhappy situation pretty well.

Mr. Wolf decided to go to a farm and witness the selling of some hogs and travel with them until they appeared on someone's dinner table. He kept cost records along the way of each item which went into the processing and the selling. His experience is an interesting one and helps to show why a 13-cent a pound hog gives us pork chops which cost as much as they did when the farmer got a much larger bite. We'll try to summarize the article for you.

Wolf went out to a farm in Iowa where he found people in that area were raising 5 percent more pigs than last year (the national total is 9 percent more) and in the week he began his experiment the slaughter was 24 percent higher than the previous year. Here, of course, is one of the big troubles.

The first cost on the hogs started when a small truck picked them up at the farm and transported them to a nearby community where they were reloaded for the 200-mile haul into Chicago. The expense here (on 32 hogs) was 63½ cents per hundredweight; 50 cents for the truck; 3 percent Federal tax on the trucking charge and 12 cents for in-transit insurance.

At Chicago the pigs were sold. The stockyard bite was $11.16 for yardage and $4.20 for 2 bushels of corn. Fire insurance took 7 cents and the National Livestock and Meat Board got 21 cents to use for promoting pork. The stockyard cost is the same as last year even though the CIO stockyard employees got a 5-cent an hour boost last December and a 13-cent increase this August.

Commission firms are still charging the same selling prices as back in 1951 atlhough their wages have gone up 5 percent to 10 percent just in the past year. The 31 hogs—1 died—were sold by the commission firm for $11.77 or 38 cents a hog.

All these charges have been against the original farmer. The hogs which sold for $14 a 100 pounds in Chicago returned him $12.88 a hundred back in Iowa.

Armour & Co. who bought the hogs, shipped them to their plant in New Jersey. Freight charges are 15 percent higher than last year and now total $1.05 a 100 pounds. Railroad costs have been upped on this line in the past year. Yardmasters' pay checks are $21 a month fatter and base pay for trainmen is up 10½ an hour. The conductor in the caboose where Mr. Wolf rode told him his annual wage was $7,300 a year.

With the increase in railroad costs Armour & Co. now had $16.48 in their $14 hogs.

The packers handling margin on the fresh pork from a 192-pound hog averaged $3.98 the week these hogs were sold compared to a $3.17 margin a year ago. That's an 18½-percent boost compared to the farmer's 28-percent cut.

This isn't all profit though. Costs are averaging 12 percent higher than last year. (Labor in this packing plant is up 19.3 percent, the average wage rate is $1.97 per hour plus fringe benefits.)

Up to this point with the hog killed, cut up, and in the plant's cooler, the costs for each 192-pound hog amounted to $32.49.

With the hog cut into pieces, each different cut was valued at a different amount. Up to this point it was easy to tell who had been paid and how much for handling these hogs, but from here on out the author found it impossible. The pieces went in all directions.

He decided to follow a pork loin. It went to a supermarket in New York. The market paid Armour a wholesale price of 40 cents a pound, only 3 cents less than on the same day a year ago. Center-cut pork chops from that 40-cent loin sold that day for 79 cents a pound yet the meat department manager said he was having a hard time making last year's figures. Like everyone else, he complained about rising costs.

Supermarket costs on a pork loin are for slicing, wrapping two chops in a cellophane package, and various overhead charges. Labor, a big item, has gone up 30 percent at this one market in the past year. It costs 12 cents just to put an empty package on the meat counter when all the overhead is figured.

Mr. Wolfe stood in the meat market until a Mrs. S. J. Ciaccio came along and bought the chops and he was invited to eat them with the family at Sunday dinner.

What were Mr. Wolfe's conclusions from this trip? He says, "Well, one thing was that the further you go back toward the farmer in the lineup of middlemen, the less anybody was making. And the farmer is by far the worst off of all.

"It was hard to tell what the retailer and the packer was making compared with a year ago, but it is generally believed that they are doing better. The railroads are showing increased earnings too.

"But the one group that is doing better for sure is organized labor, wherever you find it. And the one group that is doing a lot worse is the hog raiser."

The Late Dr. Will W. Alexander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to express my regret in the passing of Dr. Will W. Alexander, who died from a heart ailment in my home town of Chapel Hill last Friday.

Dr. Alexander had been in failing health for the past 4 months but until recently he carried on his duties with the Rosenwald Foundation.

Will Alexander lived a full and rewarding life and served in many posts of distinction in his long public career. Ordained as a minister, he served churches in Tennessee before leaving the ministry to become executive director of the Commission on Inter-racial Cooperation in Atlanta. He was president of 1 college and trustee of 5 colleges. An assistant director of the United States Resettlement Administration and vice president of the Rosenwald Foundation, he labored faithfully to improve living conditions for many groups, particularly in the South. Under the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dr. Alexander served as Director of the Farm Security Administration.

Known nationally as a race relations authority, Dr. Alexander was awarded in 1928 the Harmon award for service in American race relations.

On retirement, Dr. Alexander moved to Durham County in my district, and bought a farm. He had many friends and admirers in the university community of Chapel Hill, and his counsel and advice were often sought. He will be greatly missed throughout the South and the Nation, and I am sure many Members of the House who knew him and know of his work and influence will regret the ending of a useful life devoted to the public good.

Honor for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the January 13, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American:

HONOR FOR US

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, started a campaign for better roads for this country more than 3 years ago.

At that time he had never heard of the George S. Bartlett Award, presented annually to the individual who contributed outstanding service to highway progress.

His orders to the Hearst newspapers were to battle continuously in the cause of better roads until that cause was victorious.

The chips and the awards could fall where they may.

However, since Mr. Hearst has now been awarded the Bartlett plaque, the Hearst newspapers are enjoying that comfortable sense of well-being that comes when you know that your efforts are recognized and appreciated.

Presentation of the award means that Mr. Hearst has been selected as the one man who did more for the better-roads movement during 1955 than any other person in America.

Who says so? Three authoritative organizations: The American Road Builders Association, the American Association of State Highway Officials (of all 48 States), and the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences.

The award was presented to Mr. Hearst at Miami Beach yesterday by L. L. Colbert, president of the Chrysler Corp., representing the three organizations. Mr. Colbert said many nice things about the Hearst newspapers and the effectiveness of our 3½-year-old better-roads campaign, for which this is formal thanks.

We know that Mr. Hearst will not mind our sharing this award with him because, by

his own direction, this has been a Hearst organization fight. All of the facilities and skills available have been used for the single purpose of securing adequate highways.

Thus all of us in the Hearst organization rejoice at the honor received by the man who started it all and, once started, has seen that it did not falter.

We have never heard of the Bartlett award either, but just between you and us, we're tickled pink that there is one and that Mr. Hearst has it.

And now back to the roads battle, and won't you pitch in and help us?

The Sordid Picture of Integration in the Nation's Capital—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a long-time Washington newspaperman, Mr. Howard Suttle, has recently written a series of articles on the subject of racial integration in the Nation's Capital. Mr. Suttle wrote these articles only after long and exhausting study into the operation of integrated public schools and other public institutions in the District of Columbia.

Because the whole story of integration in the Nation's Capital will not be found in the local newspapers or in the left-wing-controlled periodicals of the country, I am placing these articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Suttle's candid exposure of hypocrisy among our top-level Government officials, his frank but sordid picture of racially amalgamated public schools in operation and the other startling information in these articles deserve the attention of our people.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including herewith Mr. Suttle's first article, which appeared recently in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News and other papers throughout the Southern States:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 9, 1956]

INTEGRATION PICTURE IN WASHINGTON IS SORDID

(By Howard Suttle)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Veteran Washington newsman Howard "Slim" Suttle his spent the past few weeks digging into the facts beneath the surface of the District of Columbia's newly integrated public schools. In a series of articles beginning today in the Jackson Daily News he gives the true picture of the failure of integration in the Nation's Capital.)

WASHINGTON.—When Mississippi's Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND in an address in early December held up to ridicule Washington's system of integrated public schools he was immediately denounced as a "bigot" by minority pressure groups.

The truth about the sordid facts connected with integration in Washington was the one thing the "Mix-ie-crats" didn't want aired.

They immediately intensified their left-wing propaganda in frantic efforts to "wash over" the ugly picture that has developed in the Communist-inspired campaign to promote racial discord in the United States.

That they wield considerable influence through political intimidation of Members of Congress, the United States Supreme Court and other public officials became quite obvious when President Eisenhower recommended a few days ago that Congress set up a bipartisan commission to investigate alleged violations of the so-called civil rights of Negroes "in certain sections of the Nation"—meaning Mississippi and other Southern States.

It also is quite obvious that the President, himself, has been misled concerning the true facts about racial "mixology" in the United States.

EASTLAND, in his address, recalled that minority pressure groups such as the NAACP had boasted that integrated schools in the Nation's Capital, now in their second year of "mixology," would be an "example of how good racial integration would be."

"Now they do everything possible to hide the example," EASTLAND said, "but the facts are leaking out."

The alarming and distasteful facts sustain EASTLAND'S contention that mixed public schools in Washington are not by any means attaining the success claimed for them by the "Mix-ie-crats."

But in Washington, as in many large northern cities, newspapers in the city and area have shied from printing the true facts concerning the failure of integration.

HOME RULE FAILED

Negroes have been coming to Washington to live in increasing numbers since the end of the War Between the States. It was, in fact, the influx of former slaves into the Capital that caused Congress to end the system of "home rule," under which District of Columbia citizens once elected their officials under the so-called territorial system.

Years before the big-city bosses of today, such as New York's Carmen De Sapio, Chicago's Jack Arvey, and Pittsburgh's Dave Lawrence, adopted the Negro vote-bait formula, a character known as Boss Shepherd had built a corrupt Washington political machine by organizing and bloc voting the ex-slaves.

The political odor of Washington became so offensive to Senators and Congressmen—even to those generally accustomed to offensive political odors—that a policy was laid down under which Congress would in the future "exclusively govern the District of Columbia." Thus ended Washington's system of home rule, return of which leftwing and minority pressure-group bosses clamor so loudly for today.

Fifteen years ago Washington was virtually a "southern city."

Separate schools were operated for white and Negro children. These included not only the primary, elementary and high schools, but also Wilson Teachers College for whites and Howard University, affording both undergraduate and postgraduate courses for Negroes.

The District of Columbia government maintained separate public parks, play grounds, golf courses and swimming pools. About the only difference in the segregation picture between Washington and southern cities was that separation of the races was not practiced in street cars and buses.

At that time, however, the influence of the minority pressure groups and their intimidation of the politicians who desired their balance-of-power votes in elections had already begun to transform the United States capital from the cultural center it had been into the "crime capital of the world."

NAACP OFFICES IN SLUMS

It's rather ironical to drive through the New Jersey Avenue slums and note that headquarters for the National Association for Advancement of the Colored People, with its perpetual multi-million-dollar slush fund, is in a ramshackle building in the midst of these slums.

NAACP could very well maintain clean, luxurious offices in clean surroundings. However, visitors to NAACP headquarters would then be denied the opportunity to see the squalid conditions upon which the politically potent organization, infiltrated with notorious Communist-fronters, relies for grist for its propaganda mill.

The story of the transformation of Washington into a Negro-coddling city, where the Police Department handles with kid gloves blacks charged with crime, is a sordid one.

It's also a story of political intimidation of public officials, many of whom, believing they needed minority group votes to stay in office, joined in the well-organized move to break down separation of the races, reduce economic and social standards achieved by white leadership and retard the education training of students—an obvious intellectual "slowdown," patterned after the industrial "slowdown" dictated by union brass hats.

These minority groups, aided and abetted by their political stooges, set out to achieve their integration objectives, even if, in the achievement, it mean abrogation of the Federal Constitution and destruction of the principles upon which the United States has reached world leadership.

RAPE CASES RAMPANT

That the soft attitude toward crime among Negroes in Washington had an encouraging effect upon those with criminal inclinations is most obvious.

The records show that around 75 percent of Washington crime is committed by Negroes. Negroes commit about 5 murders to every 1 for the whites. Rape cases of record show Negroes leading at the rate of about 7 to 1. This does not include the unreported rape cases, in which white victims—mostly school students—decide to remain quiet rather than subject themselves to the public disgrace they would have to bear through no fault of their own.

About 15 years ago, police found the body of a white Government girl, raped and mutilated, in an alley. She was the first of a number of women who were apparent victims of the same person.

The criminal, a Negro named Theodore Roosevelt Cato, was finally caught—but not by Washington police. Cato decided to transfer his activity to New York, where he raped and murdered a white woman, was caught and returned to Washington, tried, convicted, and electrocuted. He confessed to several of the crimes before his execution.

The Cato case was the first of several hundred that followed. Whether the soft attitude toward minority groups of law-enforcement authorities and politicians in these parts encourage such crime is, of course, a matter for argument.

It seems quite obvious, however, that the activity of NAACP leaders, drawing five-figure salaries and liberal expense allowances, and politicians, supporting integration objectives chiefly because of the vote bait involved, provide encouragement for this type of crime.

The Sordid Picture of Integration in the Nation's Capital—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, herewith the second portion of the articles of Mr. Howard Suttle, which appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) Daily

News and other papers throughout the Southern States follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 10, 1956]

WASHINGTON IS FAST BECOMING AN ALL-NEGRO CITY

(By Howard Suttle)

WASHINGTON.—Early last spring, Mississippi's Senator JOHN C. STENNIS received a telephone call from District of Columbia Commission Chairman Samuel Spencer.

The District of Columbia official asked the junior Mississippi Senator for a conference. The subject involved the question of revenue needs of the District of Columbia government to offset dwindling tax collections.

STENNIS is chairman of the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, which handles legislation to set aside money for financing the District of Columbia government. Each year Congress is called upon to supplement revenues collected in District taxes from Washington citizens.

Such an annual appropriation is accepted as justified—up to a point. Many thousands of District of Columbia residents, working for the Federal Government, maintain legal residences in their respective home States, where they pay State and local taxes. Congress concedes that with such persons legally exempt from levies in the District, other than sales taxes and taxes upon property they may own, it's fair for the Federal Government to make a lump sum gift appropriation to augment District of Columbia revenues.

REQUESTS BOOSTS EACH YEAR

During the past several years, however, the District of Columbia government has found it necessary to request annual increases of the Federal gift appropriation.

The reason for this situation may be summed up briefly.

Negroes are moving into Washington in increasing numbers. As they move into the District, substantial, tax-paying white citizens are moving into suburban Virginia and Maryland. As the Capital City's black population is swelled, the relief rolls become longer for many of the Negroes go on "de welfare" as soon as they can establish a local address.

The problem of making up the revenues formerly paid by white citizens, who now pay their state and local taxes in Virginia and Maryland, is admittedly serious—a major headache to Senators STENNIS, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana; RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, and other Members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, as well as Members of the corresponding House committee.

NEGRO CENSUS NOT ACCURATE

"I can't give you much sympathy," Representative JAMES C. DAVIS, Georgia, chairman of the House District of Columbia Crime Subcommittee, told a group of D. C. officials a short while ago. "You brought it upon yourselves."

DAVIS was thinking, when he made the statement, of the manner in which facts were suppressed concerning the influx of Negroes into Washington. He remembers well how the Census Bureau took violent issue with those who questioned the bureau's figures concerning Washington's Negro population.

Shortly after announcement of the preliminary 1950 census count, showing the Negro population of D. C. to be slightly more than 25 percent of the total of 802,178, several newspapermen were so bold as to challenge the figures, insisting that Washington's Negro population was at least one-half the total.

NEGROES SLEEP IN SHIFTS

The late Jack Lait and Lee Mortimer, New York newspapermen, are credited with having been the first to apply the word, "ridiculous," to the Census Bureau's 1950 count of Negroes in the District of Columbia. These figures showed a black population in Washington of 280,524. Lait and Mortimer kicked off the controversy in their "Washington Confidential," a sensational-type book purporting to give the "lowdown on the big town."

Census Bureau officials prefer to say as little as possible concerning charges that census-takers, covering Negro slum areas, failed to take into consideration the fact that many black workers sleep in shifts.

It's a fact that in Washington, beds in legitimate use in some of the shacks occupied by Negroes are vacant, in a 24-hour period, only during the few minutes for arising of occupants after their sleep and retirement for the next sleeping shift of those who take their places. In many of these cases, the census-takers thus overlooked 2 Negroes for each 1 counted.

Irrefutable figures showed that Negro students in Washington schools outnumbered the Whites during the 1950–51 session. At that time, there were 47,807 Negro public school students, compared with 46,080 Whites.

That was before the Mixiecrats took over. School integration started in the 1954–55 session.

SIXTY-FOUR PERCENT NEGROES NOW

The manner in which Negroes have poured into Washington the past few years is clearly shown by the increase of Negro students in District of Columbia public schools. Most recent figures on the 1955–56 enrollment show a total of 68,877 Negoes, compared with 38,768 Whites. This means 64 percent of Washington's public school population are Negroes—that Negro students outnumber Whites by 2 to 1.

Twenty years ago, the situation was reversed. At that time, District of Columbia schools had 59,582 White students, 38,768 Negro students.

Today, no other large American city has as great a proportion of Negro students in public schools as has Washington.

An idea of the rapid increase in Negro enrollment is shown by the boost during the present session over the 1954–55 session. Last session, there were a total of 64,501 Negro students, 41,358 Whites. This means that while the Negro student population, in 1 year, went up by 4,826, the total White students dropped 2,590.

This represented a 7.5 percent increase in Negro enrollment, against a 6 percent decrease in whites. In the 1954–55 session, the Negro enrollment increased 8.6 percent, while the white student total dropped 7.7 compared with the 1953–54 session.

DISCRIMINATION IN ASSIGNMENTS

It's interesting to note that minority group leaders, who decry so loudly asserted discrimination against Negroes, seem satisfied with the obvious discrimination—against both white and Negro students—in assignments to District of Columbia public schools.

Washington has 11 high schools, plus 1 for shut-ins; 22 junior high schools, plus 1 for shut-ins; 5 vocational high schools, and 129 elementary schools, plus 1 for shut-ins.

Spingarn High School has a student body of 519, with only 1 Negro. Woodrow Wilson High has 1,207 students, with 2 Negroes. Six white students are enrolled, along with 757 Negroes, at Cardozo High. Eastern High, scene of a large amount of the trouble among students since integration, was once an all-white school. Today, Negroes at Eastern outnumber the whites.

A check of elementary schools will show the discrimination more extended. A. Bowen with a total of 519; Carver, with 712; J. F. Cook, with 801; Langston, with 327; Grimke, with 816, and Barrville, with 713 each has a lone white child among all the blacks.

Van Ness School has 4 whites, 207 Negroes; Van Ness Annex, 5 whites, 207 Negroes; Taylor, 3 whites, 293 Negroes; Perry, 4 whites, 355 Negroes; Morgan, 2 whites, 691 Negroes, and Monroe, 3 whites, 503 Negroes.

Ann Beers School has 1 Negro, 632 whites; Key, 3 Negroes, 208 whites; Takoma, 3 Negroes, 358 whites; Stoddert, 3 Negroes, 275 whites; Randle Highlands, 5 Negroes, 311 whites; Murch, 4 Negroes, 665 whites; Maury, 1 Negro, 340 whites, and Simon, 5 Negroes; 1,104 whites.

This type of discrimination in assignment of students is one of several reasons why white parents in Washington are trying frantically to get their children into private schools of the area. It's also one of the reasons why the segregated private schools are operating at capacity—sometimes higher—and have waiting lists.

The Sordid Picture of Integration in the Nation's Capital—Part III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, following is the third portion of Mr. Suttle's article:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 11, 1956]

LAWMAKERS' CHILDREN ATTEND SEGREGATED SCHOOLS

(By Howard Suttle)

WASHINGTON.—White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty was fast on his feet when asked by reporters about attendance by President Eisenhower's grandchildren at a private, segregated school, in Alexandria, Va.

The President's grandchildren, whose father is Maj. John Eisenhower, are attending Episcopal School, an all-white denominational institution for children, across the Potomac from Washington.

When asked at a White House press conference about this, Hagerty replied that Major Eisenhower and his family live in Alexandria—not in the District of Columbia. The inference, of course, was that even if the Eisenhower children attended a public school in Virginia, as of now, it would also be a segregated school.

The inquiry to Hagerty was inspired by an address by Mississippi's Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, who called attention to the fact that the President's grandchildren were attending a private, segregated school.

"President Eisenhower's own children have been removed from a system that permits integrated schools, and placed in a private Episcopal school in Alexandria, Va.," EASTLAND declared in the speech, delivered, December 1, in Jackson before the Mississippi Association of Citizens Councils.

But whether Hagerty had told the complete story when he sought to kiss off the EASTLAND statement with an explanation that Major Eisenhower and his family live in Alexandria, not in the District of Columbia, appeared worth looking into. Major Eisenhower and his family occupy a home at Fort Belvoir, located in a group of houses set aside for officers on the post.

Fort Belvoir schools are integrated, in conformance with military policies dictated during the Truman Administration, after General Eisenhower had left the office of Chief of Staff, but continued under the administration of President Eisenhower.

IKE REJECTED INTEGRATION

When General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff, he refused to order mixing the races in the Armed Forces, obviously feeling at the time that efficiency would best be served by keeping segregated white and Negro soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen.

The President apparently reversed himself later, after entering politics as a result of the timeworn argument of integrationists that the world is severely critical of segregation practices in the United States.

Although Hagerty's attempt to kiss off the EASTLAND disclosure was apparently accepted by most of the reporters who attended the conference when the inquiry was submitted, it would be a hard matter for the President's press secretary, or anyone else, to give any major reason for attendance by the Eisenhower children at a segregated private school except that their parents desire that they attend school where their progress will not be impaired by Negro children, less capable of advancement.

And the Eisenhowers are not, by any means, in an exclusive category among white parents in the District of Columbia, who are able to send their children to private schools and who have been so fortunate as to find places for such children.

Private all-white schools in and around Washington are operating at capacity, or above, according to officials of such schools with whom this reporter has talked during recent weeks.

SOLONS' CHILDREN ON LIST

Among the largest of the all-white private schools in the Washington area are the Congressional Schools of Alexandria and Arlington, operated by Prof. and Mrs. Melvin Devers.

The operators of the congressional schools, which send their own buses through Washington, twice daily on school days, to pick up and return home around 1,000 students declined to reveal the names of the children of Senators and Congressmen whose children attend the schools.

Devers said, however, that "more than 50" children of Members of Congress are enjoying the advantages of attending the Congressional Schools.

Senator EASTLAND is sending his son, Woods, to Friends School, which was also attended by children of Attorney General Herbert Brownell. Incidentally, the Attorney General's office intervened before the Supreme Court in the school-segregation cases, asking the high tribunal to order mixing of the races in the public schools.

Friends School, operated under direction of Robert Lyle, was founded by the Quakers. It's now a private school, however, with a self-perpetuating board of trustees. The Quaker influence recently brought a proposal that the school permit entry of Negroes. tI was decided, however, that if the institution integrated, it would lose more students than it gained.

Mississippi's Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Charleston, also sends his son, Jimmy, to Friends School. Recently, when one of his colleagues, in critical manner, remarked to him, "I hear you're sending your son to a private school," WHITTEN replied:

"I'm sending my son to a segregated school."

PARENTS MAKING SACRIFICES

Officials of the private institutions are obviously fearful that publication of the names of such children might, in a number of instances, cause their withdrawal.

These officials, most of whom said they would close up before accepting Negro students, are also preparing for the possibility of lawsuits from minority groups that might demand entry of Negroes into their white institutions.

Children of Senators, Congressmen and other Government officials are scattered through the many private schools, such as Holton Arms and Mount Vernon Seminary. A few of the private institutions—for instance, Cathedral School and some parochial schools—are now accepting Negro students.

Parents in Washington are making great sacrifices in order to send their children to all-white private schools.

SCHOOLS LOSE TALENTED STUDENTS

The family of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Blake presents a case in point.

Blake, manager of Fairfax Village, an all-white apartment development in southeast Washington, has two beautiful, charming and talented daughters.

Barbara, 17, went to Charlotte, N. C., to live with her grandparents and attend high school. Now in her second year at Charlotte, she is drum majorette of her high school band, and recently was the subject of a feature story in Newsweek magazine as the result of her ingenuity in obtaining an interview by long distance telephone with Ernest Hemingway in Habana.

Linda, 11, lives at home here and attends Arlington Congressional School. She arises at 6 a. m. each school day—one hour earlier than when she attended a District of Columbia school before integration. When the Congressional School bus stops at her house, at 7:45, she's ready. She gets home in the afternoon more than an hour later than when she attended school in the District.

Linda Blake is also talented and popular. She was elected queen of the Homecoming and presided over the annual "grudge" football game between the two Congressional schools.

These are examples of the manner in which District of Columbia school integration is taking talented students away from Washington public schools.

The Blake parents report the cost of sending their two daughters to private schools is around $225 per month.

There are many parents in the District of Columbia who would be willing to make this sacrifice, but can't get their children any closer to private schools than the waiting lists. Some Senators and Congressmen, because of their influence, are fortunate enough to get their children into integrated schools where there now are only a few Negro children. But if Negroes keep coming to Washington at the same rate they have entered the past few years, there won't be any such schools in a few years.

The Sordid Picture of Integration in the Nation's Capital—Part IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, herewith follows the fourth portion of the articles of Mr. Howard Suttle:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 12, 1956]

CLAIMED CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATED—WASHINGTON PAPERS SET UP A HOWL WHEN STUDENTS SEARCHED FOR KNIVES FOLLOWING STABBING INCIDENT

WASHINGTON.—The excursion boat, *Mount Vernon*, steamed into Washington's Potomac docks about midnight during the school holidays last spring carrying about 1,000 white schoolchildren.

The steamer had just completed a round trip to Mount Vernon, home of George Washington. Members of senior classes—boys and girls from some 20 high schools across the Nation—paraded down the pier, en route to hotels to which they were assigned.

The young students were enjoying themselves thoroughly, as do the hundreds of thousands of schoolchildren who are fortunate enough to visit their Nation's Capital during the most beautiful time of the year here.

The boys and girls who returned from the *Mount Vernon* cruise on this occasion had toured the historic estate of President Washington, picnicked under the trees in the shadow of his tomb and danced together, to the tunes of a good swing band, on the excursion boat.

LULA-RICH STUDENTS IN PARTY

In the group were some 30 members of the senior class from Lula-Rich Consolidated School, in the Mississippi Delta. They had come to Washington in a bus, under supervision of Prof. Thomas J. Bogue, superintendent of Lula-Rich School.

When the *Mount Vernon* docked, several of the Lula-Rich girls obtained permission from the superintendent to walk to their hotels with their dates—boys from other schools they had met during their sightseeing tour of the Nation's Capital.

Professor Bogue and five Lula-Rich boys returned to their hotel—the Lee House—together. When they arrived at the hotel the supervisor told the boys he would have to remain in the lobby until all the students had checked in with him. Frank Hudson, Jonestown; Morris Anderson, Tunica; Howard Foster, Coahoma; and Frank Lee, Jr., Lula, obtained permission to "take a stroll" while the supervisor awaited arrival of students who walked from the docks, about 20 blocks away.

STABBED BY NEGROES

The 5 youths were about 6 or 7 blocks from their hotel, enjoying the bright lights of the Capital and kidding each other as they walked toward Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington's "Main Street."

Two Negro boys, each appearing to be about 18 or 19, approached them. According to their own story, the white boys stepped into single file to permit the Negroes to pass.

One of the Negroes bumped shoulders with Ashby, then belligerently exclaimed:

"Why don't you look where you're going?"

Ashby replied with the same question, "Why don't you look where you're going?"

Later, in a talk with Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Ashby said he and his associates tried to "avoid" trouble—that they told the Negro they did "not want any trouble." Ashby was the only member of the group who was not attending Lula-Rich School. He had not had the opportunity during his senior year—the previous session—to come to Washington, and had joined the group last year.

But trouble they had—lots of it.

The Negroes pulled knives and started slashing.

LEE CALLS POLICE

Frank Lee, Jr., a Chinese boy whose father operates a Lula laundry, shouted he was going to "call the police." He ran to a restaurant, open across the street, to do so. The Negroes ran toward a dark alley.

The encounter resulted in injuries to Ashby, Hudson, and Anderson.

Young Foster flagged a cruising taxicab. He and Lee loaded the injured boys, told the driver to take them "to the nearest hospital."

At Sibley Hospital, where the wounded Mississippi youths were treated, it was found that Ashby was cut seriously across the

stomach. Eight stitches were taken in the wound. Hudson and Anderson were stabbed in the back, less seriously injured. Ashby told Senator EASTLAND he "did not know I had been cut until I looked down and saw the blood pouring out."

Hudson and Anderson, after treatment, were released to return to Mississippi on the bus with their class. But Ashby had to remain in Sibley Hospital for several days.

CRIMINALS STILL AT LARGE

When Washington police learned of the encounter, they immediately threw up a human cordon for several blocks around the scene of the scrap. Several score suspects were jailed. Foster and Lee, the uninjured Mississippi youths, were brought to the lineup in efforts to identify the culprits. Negroes were paraded before the boys for some time, but they were unable to make identification.

Washington police report they are still working on the case. They made an arrest in November.

Ashby, Hudson, and Anderson, now in the armed services, were brought to Washington to look at the suspect. They said he was not 1 of the 2 who attacked them.

As this is written, the Negroes who attacked the Lula-Rich boys were still at large.

SEARCH STUDENTS FOR KNIVES

Apropos of the incident in which the Mississippi youths were slashed, students—both boys and girls—at several Washington junior high schools were recently searched for knives.

These searches led horrified Washington newspapers to protest that the rights of the students were being violated. The attitude was that a knife is traditionally part of the pocket equipment of American boys.

There seemed to be little or no argument with the position of the newspapers concerning the right of youths to own pocketknives.

The awful thing about the case is that the Mixiecrats had brought about a situation, through school integration, where authorities felt they should make such searches.

The searches were said by police to have been part of a "survey" to ascertain what the "knife situation" was at District of Columbia junior and senior high schools.

"If we can prevent just one case of the students at the school," said Chief Robert V. Murray, "the survey will have been justified."

But the editorial howl of the newspapers—most prominently the Washington Post and Times Herald—caused District of Columbia Schools Superintendent Hobart M. Corning to order the searches halted after they had been conducted at only two schools. Most of the students at the schools where the searches were made are Negroes.

POLICE PATROL EASTERN GROUNDS

When word got around among segregation advocates in Washington that a check was being made on the effect of public school mixology, persons desirous of making available information on the subject began to be heard from.

A white mother said her daughter, a student at Eastern High School, had been receiving telephone calls from Negro boys, asking for dates.

Another mother advised that lunches taken to school by her children were periodically stolen. She said the lunch stealing had occurred only since Washington schools had been integrated.

The situation became so serious at one time at Eastern High School that police officers were assigned to duty on the school grounds, in the morning before school opened, during morning and afternoon recess periods, at noon and other classes were dismissed in the afternoon.

The Sordid Picture of Integration in the Nation's Capital—Part V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, herewith follows the concluding portion of Mr. Suttle's articles:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News of January 13, 1956]

WHEN INTEGRATION CAME WASHINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS WERE FORCED TO LOWER STANDARDS OF PROMOTION TO LET NEGROES KEEP PACE

(By Howard Suttle)

WASHINGTON.—Officials of Washington's mixed public schools, now in their second year of integration, are obviously most concerned and greatly embarrassed with the necessity for lowering standards of promotion, so that Negro pupils may keep pace in advancement with their more intelligent white fellow students.

The fact that promotion standards in District of Columbia public schools have been lowered since the Mix-ie-crats took over was aired by Mississippi's Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND in a recent address before the Mississippi Association of Citizens Councils, at Jackson.

But the educational slow-down in Washington was brought to light earlier, in a sensational manner, during a November meeting of the District of Columbia Board of Education.

Dr. Rowland F. Kirks, member of the Board, aired his dissatisfaction in no uncertain terms.

It was Dr. Kirks who directed a most embarrassing question to Dr. Hobart M. Corning, superintendent of District of Columbia schools.

"Is it valid," Kirks asked Corning, "that the essence of education is deteriorating in the District because we're not maintaining academic standards, and that you can advance practically on the basis of poundage and height?"

Corning denied that promotions are now based upon poundage and height. However, he did concede in effect, that standards of promotion had to be set to accommodate the average.

CORNING TALKS TO PRINCIPLALS

Dissatisfaction expressed by the District of Columbia School Board no doubt influenced statements by Corning when he addressed principals of Washington schools a day following the board parley.

Corning told his principals "our emphasis needs to be changed somewhat." He urged that teachers put more stress on bringing children up to standard on each grade level and not pass on the responsibility for making up deficiencies to the next grade.

Corning admitted at the school board meeting, on questioning by Kirks, that there are students in both junior and senior high schools of Washington who cannot read. He added there always will be. When Kirks said the system of promotions should embrace some irreducible standard, he was told by Corning, that your basic concept is wrong if you think we dilute things.

A colleague in the Washington correspondents corps said he had reports that failures in Washington schools had increased 75 percent since the practice of racial mixology was started in schools of the Nation's Capital.

DISCUSS SUPREME COURT EDICT

Washington newspapers are loath to publish facts in the school segregation picture that are unfavorable to integration objectives. The Washington Post goes all-out to break down segregation completely. The Post, headed by Eugene Meyer, former Federal Reserve Board member, a short while ago acquired the Times-Herald. The two publications have been consolidated, leaving Washington with only this morning paper and two afternoon papers—the Evening Star and Washington Daily News. The latter is a Scripps-Howard tabloid.

Top men on the Post recently opposed the election of Luther Huston, New York Times correspondent, to the National Press Club Board of Governors, giving as the reason for their opposition the fact that Huston had actively opposed admission of a Negro reporter to club membership.

It's not often that owners of a big newspaper are so bold as to try to impose upon their reporters their ideological and political policies.

Reporters in the capital press corps are, of course, divided, in their personal views, on the segregation issue. It's discussed daily around the press club council table.

KISS OFF COURT VIOLATIONS

And it's most amazing how prointegrationist white newspapermen try to kiss off the charge that members of the Supreme Court violated their oaths in the school-segregation decision, when they assumed prerogatives to legislate that are not given them by the Constitution.

"The Supreme Court has encroached upon the authority of Congress before," one colleague insisted. "That's (the school-mixing decree) not the first time."

His argument, of course, was the same as saying that two wrongs make a right.

The complacency with which such correspondents meet the charges of corruption in the Supreme Court is also most startling.

It seems to be of little or no significance to those who favor racial mixology that Justice Hugo Black accepted a plaque from the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, a Communist front, in recognition of his contributions to integration, at the same time that organization was helping to finance cases pending before the Court.

Persons of the same thinking also seem unimpressed with the fact that Justice William O. Douglas accepted two $1,000 cash contributions from the CIO at the same time that group was contributing also to help the NAACP prosecute the school cases before the Supreme Court.

And it seems to be of little moment to these that 16 of the so-called sociological and psychological experts quoted by the Supreme Court in the Black Monday decision have Communist-front records.

In conclusion of this series regardless of the claims of Mixiecrats that racial mixology is working successfully in Washington schools, the facts are that the present school system in the District of Columbia has retarded the advance of both white and Negro children, increased confusion and tension in the Nation's Capital, and contributed to wholesale discriminations against both white and Negroes that did not exist under the segregated school system.

That the Mixiecrats are surprised, even astounded, at the national extent of the opposition to integration is interesting to advocates of racial separation, who are convinced the Supreme Court's school integration order was issued in violation of the Constitution and in complete disregard of precedent.

Young Citizen of 23d Congressional District of California Wins National Essay Contest by National Association of Real Estate Boards on Subject What the Bill of Rights Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am naturally very happy and very proud to present to you and all the Members of this great legislative body the winning essay in the nationwide competition sponsored by the National Association of Real Estate Boards on the subject of What the Bill of Rights Means To Me.

This national essay contest, I am very proud to say, was won by Miss Carol Barrett, attractive 17-year-old senior at Pius X High School, Hollydale, Calif.

Hollydale is one of the thriving, happy communities in the great 23d District which I have the honor to represent this my fifth term in Congress. It is immediately adjacent to the important community of Downey, which is also in the great 23d Congressional District. And, in Downey is one of the active, successful realty boards in my native State of California.

Miss Barrett, the national winner, is sponsored by the Downey Board of Realtors, Inc., of which Earle M. Sweet is President, Giles D. Hollis, vice president, and Dorothy Chamberlain, executive secretary. The directors are Henrietta Durston, Gayle Fredrickson, James F. Hall, C. Larry Hoag, E. E. McCallum, Chris Parr, and Elmer Wilkerson.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, the whole 23d District is very proud of the worthy and distinguished achievement of Miss Carol Barrett. Her own high school and her own community of Maywood are also justly and especially proud of having her in their midst.

I was pleased to be able to meet her and her mother, who were accompanied by Mrs. Bernice Mason, an able and much appreciated member of the Downey Realty Board, at the plane arriving from California Tuesday evening, with the representatives of National Association of Real Estate Board Convention Committee, which is now in session at their Annual Convention at the Mayflower Hotel. I was also accompanied by Mr. Orvan Leavell, a member of the Lynwood, Compton and Southeast Realty Boards in the 23d Congressional District of California. Of course, the NAREB had planned extensive entertainment for Miss Barrett, her mother and Mrs. Mason. It will be the pleasure of Mrs. Doyle and myself to have these friends from the great 23d District of California as guests here at the Capitol today, at which time I will have the honor of having them as my House Gallery guests and also Senate Gallery guests and luncheon guests.

Final judges in the contest were Senator John W. Bricker, Ohio; Representative Bruce Alger, Texas; and United States District Judge Edward M. Curran, Washington, D. C. Preliminary judges of the 57 national entries were the following teachers from the Washington area: Fred H. Hilton, Jr., Capitol Pages' School; Joseph Mabbett, the Bullis School, Silver Spring, Md.; and the Reverend Stephen M. Connelly, DeMatha Catholic High School, Hyattsville, Md.

Carol Barrett, who lives with her mother, Mrs. Geraldine Barrett, at 4863 East 60th Street, Maywood, Calif., put her journalistic experience to good use in writing her essay on "What the Bill of Rights Means to Me" for her history and civics classes at Pius X High School. She was a writer for the paper at St. Agnes High School, Los Angeles, where she was enrolled her first three years of high school.

An honor student at St. Agnes, she was treasurer of her freshman classes and vice president of her sophomore and junior classes. She has maintained a "B" average throughout high school.

Her interest in journalism is reflected in a feature article which she wrote for the Community Chest Times of Los Angeles in November, 1954, and in her plans to enroll next September at UCLA, with the intention of majoring in journalism.

Carol has been a student of music and dancing and collects records as a hobby.

This distinguished young lady was honored last evening at the national banquet of the National Association of Real Estate Boards by being called upon to read her winning essay to the many hundreds of people there present.

I herewith set forth the text of the letter dated January 12, 1956, from the Downey Board of Realtors, Inc., together with the consent dated January 8, 1956, addressed to said Downey Board of Realtors, Inc., signed by Carol Barrett, the national winner, and approved by her mother, Mrs. Geraldine Barrett:

DOWNEY BOARD OF REALTORS, INC.,
Downey, Calif., January 12, 1956.

The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
Representative in Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the suggestion of Leon Emerson, our board attorney, the matter of forwarding the winning essay of the Downey Board of Realtors to you on the subject of What the Bill of Rights Means To Me was placed on the agenda for the board of directors meeting held January 3, 1956, with the following action recorded in the minutes:

"It was moved by Elmer Wilkerson, seconded by Gayle Fredrickson, and carried, that the directors approve the publication of the board's participation in the What the Bills of Rights Means To Me essay contest in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Action of the directors at this meeting was approved by the general membership of the Downey Board of Realtors at the regular business meeting held on January 4, 1956.

We are attaching a copy of the original essay written by Carol Barrett whom we know you will be proud to have in your district when you learn that she was also the national winner of the contest and will read her essay at the inaugural dinner to be held in Washington, D. C., at the Mayflower Hotel the evening of January 18.

I was in hopes that I would be able to attend the inaugural meetings myself in Washington this year; however, the workload in the office at this particular time prevents my taking advantage of the opportunity to be on hand to welcome you and Mrs. Doyle myself to the congressional dinner which will be held by the California delegation on Monday evening. My thoughts and good wishes for you both will be there in my stead.

We are also attaching a signed authorization from the author and her mother (father is deceased) for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and want to express to you our sincere appreciation for your interest and cooperation.

With kindest personal regards.

Yours very truly,
DOROTHY R. CHAMBERLAIN,
Executive Secretary.

MAYWOOD, CALIF., *January 8, 1956.*
DOWNEY BOARD OF REALTORS,
Downey, Calif.

GENTLEMEN: Permission is hereby granted to the Downey Board of Realtors to authorize the publication of my original essay on the subject of What the Bill of Rights Means to Me as submitted to the Downey Board of Realtors for entry in the annual essay contest conducted by the National Association of Real Estate Boards or any portion of the essay or mention of the essay for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very truly,
CAROL BARRETT.

Approved:
Mrs. GERALDINE BARRETT (mother).

Following is the text of Carol's essay, which was judged the national winner:

WHAT THE BILL OF RIGHTS MEANS TO ME

(By Miss Carol Barrett, Maywood, Calif.)

Musing one night by the campfire as the crackling flames leaped high, I watched the curling plumes of smoke go up, and as they spiraled I seemed to see the faces of men who once at another time—long, long ago—possessed the courage, spirit, and foresight that made America for me. 'Twas here that I first reflected seriously upon the priceless heritage that is mine. Not satisfied with the constitutional guarantees they demanded with clear vision a 'Bill of Rights.' This was the beginning of the birth of democracy as we know it today.

God-fearing men, they realized the moral code, and that code they translated into 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights. Each is a key, as it were, which will open for all time the door to the solution of each problem as it affects my personal life or the life of the Nation. The key to the four fundamental freedoms of every person opens the door of my church, unlocks the silence of my lips, and permits to enter into my life the news of the world about me. The key to my home seals it to unreasonable search and protects my person and those things I would hold private. The key to justice shuts out any possibility of arrest without trial by jury, confinement without the right to be bailed out, and of self-incrimination. The key to eminent domain guarantees me the security that my property will not be taken for the common good without compensation. The key to unlisted rights gives me the assurance that I can appeal until I have reached the citadel of justice. And finally the key to delegated powers makes me a citizen not only protected by my national Government but also by my State government. The Bill of Rights has been the citadel of the oppressed, the beacon of light of those seeking refuge from tyranny, and the security of all free men. It means America to me. Therefore, we, the youth of America, must guard our land from all danger, from those who would steal our birthright. And keep democracy's campfire, with freedom and liberty bright.

Psychiatric and Narcotic Hospitals a Federal-State Partnership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak today in support of my bill H. R. 7838, which I introduced in the first session of this Congress. This bill would amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act to provide grants of Federal aid to States for surveying and meeting the needs for psychiatric hospitals and auxiliary facilities and for narcotics hospitals and auxiliary facilities. There can be little doubt as to the crying need for action in these areas of concern for public health.

Nor can there be any doubt that under the provisions of the so-called Hill-Burton Act great strides forward have been made to alleviate the painful shortage of general hospital facilities. From January 1948 through September 1955, 126,740 general hospital beds have been provided or are in process under the provisions of the 1946 act. The emphasis in the past has been, however, on general hospital facilities, and the time has now come for specific attention to be given to two of our Nation's major health problems: mental illness and narcotic addiction. Both of these phases of our Nation's health have been all but neglected in the administration of the Hill-Burton Act, and it is only through a specific allocation of funds for these purposes that significant steps can and will be taken to improve the present situation.

In the field of mental illness, it has been estimated recently that 9 to 10 million Americans, 1 of every 16, are suffering from some mental or emotional disorder. On any given day, 750,000 are mentally ill in a hospital bed. In addition, some 400,000 persons suffering from mental illness should be in mental hospitals. The remaining millions, though not requiring hospitalization, are seriously handicapped in their ability to work and lead normal family and civic lives.

The fact remains clear that existing facilities are nowhere near adequate to handle the present burden. In some States, persons legally committed to mental hospitals have to wait months, sometimes years, before they can be placed. In some cases, these mentally ill persons spend this waiting period in jails, often ruining any chance they might have had for recovery.

The hospitals are extremely overcrowded. Two out of every four State mental hospitals are handling a patient load greater than their intended capacity. The need for additional hospital beds has been estimated at between 330,000 and 500,000, but even the lowest figure is a huge one. Congress, having recognized its function in the construction of general hospitals, should now provide specific aid to the States to ease the critical shortage which now exists in the field of mental care. We must recognize the need to aid States which cannot provide or have not provided adequate facilities to care for their mentally ill.

In addition, my bill provides for surveying the needs and constructing badly needed psychiatric rehabilitation facilities. More than 200,000 persons a year are being treated at these clinics and they too are greatly overcrowded. It has been estimated that to fulfill the requirements for outpatient psychiatric services, an additional 800 centers are needed.

The effectiveness of psychiatric clinics and rehabilitation centers has already been well established. Psychiatric techniques have so advanced in recent years, that authorities in the field have estimated that as many as one-third of the patients being treated successfully in clinics would, several years ago, have been regarded as suitable only for more costly hospital treatment.

These facilities are used not only for cases which are of a less serious nature, but also function as diagnostic centers, spotting incipient mental disease and recommending treatment before it becomes drastically disabling. Furthermore, clinics provide follow-up aid for patients who have been released from mental hospitals.

We know that readmission rates to mental hospitals are very high. Although there are no adequate statistics for the total picture, studies have indicated that in my own State of New York, for example, one-third of all mental hospital entrants have been in these hospitals at least once previously. The follow-up treatment given at psychiatric clinics may well cut into this readmission rate substantially. Thus, establishment of such clinics would represent a saving in money and in human resources.

In the area of treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts virtually nothing has been done under the Hill-Burton Act, and every day the scourge of narcotic addiction increases. My bill is designed to allocate funds for the specific purposes of surveying the need for narcotic hospitals and narcotic rehabilitation facilities, as well as for their construction. The narcotic problem merits the considered attention of the Congress.

At the present time, the Narcotics Bureau estimates that there are 60,000 addicts in our population; that is, 1 of every 3,000 persons. This represents an increase of 10,000 to 15,000 addicts since 1948, an increase which is frightening since the trend indicates that since the end of the war there has been an increase of narcotic use among our juveniles. In 1948, for example, approximately 3 percent of all addicts admitted to the Lexington Narcotics Hospital were under the age of 21 years and, in 1955, the figure rose to approximately 7 percent. Some form of aid must be given to help these young persons.

In addition to the problems caused by the use of narcotics by these minors, there is the testimony of many authorities that addicts, to support their habit, must resort to crime. It has been previously estimated that as much as 50 percent of the crime in our major cities today is perpetrated by drug addicts.

Commissioner Anslinger has stated that 11.8 percent of the total Federal prison population in this Nation are persons convicted of violations of the Federal narcotics and marihuana laws. He further cited a city in this Nation where there was heavy traffic in narcotics and a 600 percent increase in the number of housebreakings, armed robberies, and larceny. The Commissioner reported that when narcotics agents cracked down on the drug traffic, the crime rate dropped to its normal level.

The tragedy of the situation is simple: All efforts have been and are being directed at the flow of narcotics to the user, and few forward strides have been made in the cure of the addict who is captured or voluntarily comes forward for cure.

It is generally recognized that it is impossible to defeat addiction outside of institutions specifically and specially staffed and equipped to effect a proper cure. At the present time, there are only two hospitals in the United States specifically equipped to supply a comprehensive treatment to addicts. They are the Federal institutions at Lexington and Fort Worth. The combined facilities of these 2 hospitals is a mere 2,340 beds, a pitifully inadequate figure. There is a waiting list at present of over 500 applicants.

The shortage of facilities must be overcome. To do the job intelligently, however, it is necessary first to determine the specific needs of specific localities. For this purpose, my bill authorizes that funds be appropriated for a survey to inventory existing facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, and care of addicts, to determine the need for construction of facilities for such diagnosis, treatment, and care, and to develop programs for the construction of such facilities.

Perhaps the most important feature of my bill is its concern with the construction of rehabilitation facilities to aid users of narcotics who are not as yet addicted, to counsel addicts to prepare them to accept the benefits to be derived from hospitalization, and, finally, to provide aftercare to addicts who have been released from narcotics hospitals so that they may once again take their place in society.

This latter phase is one which is receiving growing recognition. Commissioner Anslinger recently testified before the subcommittee investigating this problem that "aftercare is probably one of the most promising phases of rehabilitation." Aftercare in clinics would help the addict adjust psychologically to withdrawal of drugs after he had been relieved of physiological dependence on them.

Too many addicts, who have been treated at the hospitals, return to the same environment from which they came and, unable to find work, or acceptance by a new social group, they return to their addiction. This is considered a strong factor in the large proportion of addicts, estimated at 85 percent, who return to their addiction after

release from the Federal narcotics hospitals.

With clinics and rehabilitation centers which could provide psychological counseling, and which could mobilize community employment and recreation resources, we might be able not only to cure the addict, but to keep him cured. Only a small number of such rehabilitation centers exist. They are of recent origin and are located in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Although they are able to handle only a small number of cases, their indicated progress is heartening. I feel that Congress should provide aid to the States in establishing more of such facilities.

I wish also to report, Mr. Speaker, that I have requested the opinions of State public-health officials, and of public-health groups throughout the nation on the bill I have introduced. The response has been exceptionally gratifying, not only in terms of the number of replies, but much more important, in terms of the enthusiasm displayed for the legislation. I shall present all of these communications to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce when hearings are held on the bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this bill, H. R. 7838, represents an application of a well-established principle, Federal aid to State health activities, in two crucial areas of national concern. I hope that consideration of the magnitude of the mental health and narcotic addiction problems will cause the legislature to pass this bill.

Markings on Social Security Checks Sent Through the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives that would amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that benefit checks and certain related materials sent through the mails shall not bear any markings which would reveal the nature of the recipient's entitlement or disentitlement to benefits under the act, such as, for example, unremarried widow.

My bill would provide that no check drawn in payment of any benefit under title II of the SSA, and no envelope or other outer covering for any such check, or for any other statement or document relating to an individual's eligibility for any such benefit, which is sent through the mails, shall bear any markings or devices which might disclose any information with respect to such individual's status under title II, or to the nature of his or her entitlement or disentitlement to benefits under title II.

Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous complaints from constituents on this problem.

After all, communications between the department of social security and an individual should not be for the information of outsiders; it sometimes causes needless personal embarrassment.

Our Tribute to Douglas McKay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article regarding Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay which appears in the first annual yearbook of the Republican Party of Oregon which was published this month:

OUR TRIBUTE TO DOUGLAS MCKAY

Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay is the second Oregonian ever to serve in the Cabinet of a President of the United States in the nearly 100 years that Oregon has been a State.

This signal honor by President Eisenhower is a tribute both to Oregon and to a native Oregonian who has compiled a distinguished lifelong record of civilian and military service to his community, his State, and his Nation.

In the 3 years that Douglas McKay has held one of the highest offices in the land, he has conducted the affairs of the Department of the Interior with ability and integrity, conserving and developing the natural resources in his care.

Secretary McKay's present national position has tended to obscure what he stood for and what he accomplished here in Oregon as a private citizen, as a legislator, and as Governor of Oregon.

With this thought in mind, we review his record to remind Oregonians why they have given this distinguished American their votes of confidence in the years before his elevation to the Cabinet.

Before becoming Secretary of what he has described as "the United States Department of Natural Resources," Mr. McKay compiled an outstanding conservation and resources development record.

He established the governor's committee on natural resources, the first of its kind in the United States. This committee provided an effective method for coordination of State agencies dealing with resource conservation and development and was later formalized by law.

At the Governor's direction, a special subcommittee spent a year studying means of controlling and abating air pollution. Governor McKay endorsed the findings of the subcommittee and the 1951 legislature enacted an air-pollution control and abatement law.

He worked vigorously for the fastest possible development of hydropower, irrigation, and flood control in the Pacific Northwest, appearing before congressional committees in support of adequate appropriations for Federal multipurpose projects.

In addition, he regularly attended and took a leading part in the activities of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, the Federal-State coordinating body for regional resource development.

Governor Martin in 1935 named State Senator McKay to the newly organized Willamette Valley Basin Commission. The 50-man group named Mr. McKay the chairman, a post he held for 14 years. Under his long-time leadership, funds were obtained to complete a substantial portion of the multipurpose dams in the Willamette Valley.

Efforts to save the scenic beauty of the Columbia Gorge were supported by Governor McKay, who appointed the Columbia Gorge Committee. Activities of this committee have been a major factor in maintaining the natural-forested beauty of the world-famed water-grade route through the Cascades.

A believer in soil conservation, he lent the support of the Governor's office in actively furthering a vigorous soil-conservation program.

During his term as mayor of Salem, from 1932 to 1934, the capital city of Oregon laid the foundation for its present water system. He carried out the mandate of the people to purchase the then privately owned water system serving the city.

In 1933 Mayor McKay obtained voter approval of a bond issue to finance construction of a sewage disposal plant for Salem, thereby ending a major source of Willamette River pollution.

CIVIL RIGHTS ADVANCED

Governor McKay received national recognition when he banned racial discrimination in the Oregon National Guard.

He appointed an advisory board to counsel with the State Labor Commissioner in administering the Fair Employment Practices Act adopted by the 1949 legislature.

The Governor's Council on Indian Affairs was established during his administration to aid the Indians of Oregon to discuss and solve their problems.

A leading Negro newspaper praised the Civil Rights record of Governor McKay at the time of his appointment to the cabinet.

A GOOD ADMINISTRATION

Governor McKay's administration was noted for the economies and strict budgeting which reduced the expenditures of the State government while maintaining State services. He supported the "Little Hoover Commission" proposal for a State Department of Finance and Administration adopted by the Legislature.

Observers generally agreed that no administration in a comparable period accomplished so much in improving State institutions and expanding their physical facilities. There was agreement, too, on his excellent appointments to judicial and other positions and his ability to bring people together to work for common goals.

Through his efforts, labor and management in Oregon joined in the first cooperative legislative program. As a result, mutual understanding between labor and management was encouraged. An industrial safety program that earned the active participation of management and labor made possible a record increase in accident benefits paid injured workmen and at the same time a $1 million cut in contributions to the State fund required from employers.

HIGHWAYS AIDED

Both as a State senator heading the senate roads and highways committee and as governor, Mr. McKay worked for better roads and highways. In recognition of his efforts, he was called upon for the principal address at the ceremonies marking the opening of the Sunset Highway linking Portland and the seaside area of the Oregon coast.

Governor McKay called upon the legislature for a road-building program sufficiently large to keep pace with the growth of the State and make up for the construction delayed and lost because of World War II.

In response, the legislature authorized a $72 million highway bond program that has restored Oregon to its former rank as having one of the best toll-free market road and superhighway systems in the United States.

Mr. McKay began his political career in 1932 when he was elected mayor of Salem only 5 years after moving to Oregon's second largest city. He was so successful as mayor that in 1934 he was elected State senator from Marion County for the first of four terms. Each time he led the Marion County ticket.

SERVICE IN THREE WARS

His military service began with the outbreak of World War I when he volunteered for duty following graduation from Oregon State College. He served as a combat second lieutenant with the 91st Infantry Division through much of the bitterest fighting in France.

In 1918, while serving as a battalion scout in the last great offensive of the war, he was critically wounded in the Meuse Argonne. He was retired from the Army as a first lieutenant after a year in a hospital, then was intermittently hospitalized for approximately 12 years before making a full recovery.

The start of World War II found State senator McKay in Honolulu where he witnessed the attack on Pearl Harbor. In the confused hours that followed the attack, he joined the visiting Willamette University football team in guard duty on the beaches.

Back in Oregon, he was accepted by the Army for a second tour of wartime duty. He waived 66 percent physical disability, received military leave from the Oregon senate and starting in August of 1942, served 3½ years of Stateside duty.

On December 20, 1945, he was retired from active duty with the rank of captain. Five years later, as Governor of Oregon, he instituted a program for civilian war preparation during the Korean emergency.

Mr. McKay's chosen profession was farming and his degree from Oregon State College is in agriculture. But his war wounds required an occupation less physically demanding than farming. After starting in Portland as a salesman, he acquired a then small automobile agency in Salem, building it into one of the largest in Oregon.

RECOGNITION AS A CIVIC LEADER

Through the years fellow students, colleagues, his college and the public have honored Mr. McKay with their confidence. Besides serving as mayor of Salem, president of its chamber of commerce and commander of the Salem American Legion Post, he was president of his State trade association and helped organize the Oregon chapter of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults.

Oregon State College honored him in 1955 with an honorary Doctor of Laws degree in recognition of one of the school's most distinguished graduates. While working his way through college in three years, he was elected president of the freshman class, helped organize the student cooperative and was elected president of the student body.

His grandfather, Malcolm McKay, arrived at Fort Vancouver in 1841, and was a storekeeper for the Hudson's Bay Co. under Dr. John McLaughlin. All of his grandparents were in Oregon by 1852.

The future Secretary of the Interior was born June 24, 1893, in Portland at 347 Taylor Street, at that time on the outskirts of the city and now near the heart of the Oregon metropolis. As a boy he played baseball on Broadway, which was then little more than a residential street.

When he was 13 years old he began working to provide the chief support for his mother and sister. Summers were spent working on farms. After leaving school to work full time, he prepared for college by attending night school.

Perhaps it was from these experiences that he first acquired the stamina and philosophy which has guided him in public life. Shortly after becoming governor of Oregon, which at that time had a population of one and a half million persons, he observed:

"No kind of job can be too demanding or too annoying if you have the kind of bosses I have."

The Wounded Shall Never Be Forgotten

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the New York Journal-American on Saturday, January 14, 1956.

It is my hope that they will take the time to urge each of their home communities, that have not yet done so, to organize a similar organization to remember our disabled 52 weeks a year.

FIFTY-TWO ASSOCIATION DOESN'T FORGET

(By Phyllis Battelle)

It's a happy quirk of nature and the mentality of mankind that we are able so often to forget the bad things and cling sweetly to the memory of the good.

Like the times we played hookey—we remember the circus we saw, but forget the castor oil we got after. Or the men we've known—we remember the roses they brought Saturday nights, but forget how they were taken tardy from drinking with the boys. And parents, of course, we remember them observing our birthday, not our report card.

But sometimes, in very specialized cases, this pleasant-recollection stuff is not right. As a man named Mortimer Karrp says, "There are some uncomfortable realities that a man is a heel to forget."

What Mr. Karrp is referring to, in a pleasant and businesslike tone of voice, are the realities of war. What he represents is an organization called the 52 Association. It is dedicated to the proposition that the wounded shall never be forgotten—and it is called 52 because that proposition applies 52 weeks a year.

CLUB'S BASIC RULE

A big man with a friendly face, the executive director of the New York branch of this outfit, went on to say that a basic rule of his club—founded 10 years ago next month—is complete anonymity for its members.

"The only reason I'm telling you about it," he said, "is that membership has fallen off gradually since the Korean war. We don't feel so bad about that—the flag-wavers have lost interest, and it's better to have people working with you who feel they have a serious obligation to the men who have been injured in wars."

But the point is, he says, other people should form organizations similar to the "52s" because the more secure the outside world becomes, the more heartbreaking is the plight inside service and veterans' hospitals.

"Our club now has 13,650 members and has chapters in New York, Miami Beach, Buffalo, Chicago, and Los Angeles—but there are vast areas of the country that are untouched.

HOW GROUP OPERATES

What "52" (and groups which might follow its technique) does for the boys is this. Every week, every few days, in fact, the members put on suppers for hospitals they select—bringing food and entertainment to the wards, for the boys who cannot leave, bringing the wounded boys who are capable of it into town for dinners, dances, parties.

It costs each member $52 a year, 1 leisure night a week, to belong.

The "52 Association" is formed of business and professional men who like parties, love people, and are stuck with a few sad memories along with the happy ones.

Resistance of the Non-Russian Peoples—The Weak Point of the U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article entitled "Resistance of the Non-Russian Peoples—the Weak Point of the U. S. S. R." I have been asked also to call attention to the 38th anniversary of the Ukraine which is being celebrated here in Washington on Saturday next, January 21.

With reference to the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic and the long liberation struggle of the Ukrainian people, we must recognize that throughout the existence of the U. S. S. R. it was never confronted with a more dangerous and explosive problem than the organized and spontaneous resistance of nations enslaved by it. Therefore there is nothing that the rulers of the Kremlin fear more than the danger of the free world speaking openly of the great centrifugal liberation forces of the non-Russian peoples inside the U. S. S. R., and lest the free world support these forces.

What is the essence of this weakness of the U. S. S. R.? The point is that contrary to widespread opinion in the West, the Soviet Union is not a monolithic nation, united by a single idea, but a horrible prison of many nations which aim at severance from Moscow and desire independence. This condition prevailed even in the tzarist empire, and only thanks to demagogic agility were the Bolshviks able to turn back the process of complete internal disintegration. Aware of the power of the liberation movements of the Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Turkestanians, and other non-Russians, Lenin wrote as early as 1913, addressing himself to Russian Chauvinist circles who did not understand it, the following: "The gentlemen nationalists forget that there are no more than 43 percent of Great Russians of the population of Russia . This means that aliens are a majority. How can a minority hold a majority without promising the majority the comforts of political freedom and national equality." (V. I. Lenin, Staty I Rechi ob Ukrainye (Articles and Speeches on Ukraine), 1936, p. 248.)

Notwithstanding these promises of the Bolsheviks, the non-Russian nations established their independent republics and declared their severance from Russia right at the start of the revolution in 1917. Sensing this threat of disintegration of the Russian empire, the Bolshevik government of Moscow dispatched its armies to Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, etc., and after several years of war conquered their territories and subjected them again to Moscow. But even then Bolshevik Moscow conducted its conquests under the alleged motto of "liberation" of non-Russian nations. The Bolshe-

viks were also able to utilize to their advantage the fact that Kerensky's government was unwilling to recognize the right of non-Russians to their separate states. This matter was subsequently commented upon by Stalin as follows: "Do not forget, comrades, that we advanced against Kerensky with flying colors and overthrew the provisional government partly because we were backed by the confidence of those oppressed peoples which were expecting liberation at the hands of the Russian proletarians." (Joseph Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, London, 1942, p. 154.)

The Bolsheviks obviously never meant to keep their promises made to non-Russian peoples. After overthrowing their national states, Moscow introduced ruthless terror and russification, branding all opposition as so-called bourgeois nationalism of non-Russians.

For resisting collectivization alone and for continued desire of independence, Moscow starved to death 7 million Ukrainian peasants and liquidated thousands of political and cultural leaders. A well-known student of Soviet matters comments on this genocidal policy of Moscow in the 1920's and 1930's as follows: "Thus the non-Russian peoples lost two sets of their national elite during the period stretching from the October revolution until roughly the outbreak of the Second World War." (Walter Kolarz, Russia and Her Colonies, London, 1952, p. 11.)

Is it surprising, that under these circumstances the non-Russian nations aim at the quickest possible severance from Moscow and establishment of their true independence? This became quite apparent during World War II when millions of Red army soldiers, primarily non-Russians, surrendered and declared their readiness to fight Moscow. Hitler rejected their offer being unwilling to permit the nations of the U. S. S. R. to become independent and this caused his defeat in the East. This is not denied even by those scholars in the West who cannot under any circumstances be called friends of the non-Russian peoples. Thus, Eugene Lyons in his book Our Secret Allies (New York, 1954, p. 232) states: "An American journalist was talking to a prominent member of the former German general staff after the war. 'Do you know where we lost the war in Russia?' the German asked. 'In Stalingrad,' the journalist answered promptly. 'No, we lost it long before that; in Kiev, when we hoisted the swastika instead of the Ukrainian flag.' "

The Ukrainians and other peoples of the U. S. S. R. organized an underground against the Germans and they are continuing it against Moscow. Recently returning German prisoners of war speak of organized and spontaneous resistance of the peoples of the U. S. S. R. and confirm that this is the greatest threat to the present imperialism and colonialism of Moscow.

These conditions inside the U. S. S. R. give us a unique opportunity to raise the flag of liberty of enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. and to give them full moral and political support. At the 19th Communist Party Congress in October 1952 Stalin called upon the Communist parties of the whole world to become spokesmen of the idea of national liberation and this part is being played with signal mendacity by Khrushchev and Bulganin who are mobilizing the nations of Asia against us. To forestall this march of falsehood and provocation led by Moscow, we must turn their own weapons against them. We must show the world that nations and peoples are being enslaved by Moscow and not by us, and that it is Moscow that is guilty of genocide committed upon dozens of nations.

Why have we failed to bring to the forum of the United Nations the problems of aggression of Moscow against Ukraine, Georgia, Poland, Turkestan, Kazakhstan, and the Baltic lands? Why have we thus far not raised in the United Nations Committee on Human Rights the question of Soviet concentration camps, that greatest shame of the 20th century? Khrushchev and Bulganin should be made to answer before world public opinion for their criminal practices of Moscow's Communist colonialism upon the Moslem nations of Asia, as well as upon the Ukrainians, Poles, Lithuanians, and others. They should also answer why they are depriving the Russian people of liberty and why they are proclaiming the superiority of the Russians over others and thus incurring the wrath of non-Russians against them.

The public opinion of the world must be informed of all that goes on inside the U. S. S. R., and a courageous declaration must be made that in the gigantic struggle of enslaved peoples against Moscow, we are on the side of those peoples and not on the side of the Communist oligarchy in Moscow. The great ideals of freedom which brought glory upon our Republic have to be again the beacon of our external policy. They will help us oppose effectively Moscow's Communist aggression. They will hit Moscow where it hurts the most: in its very innards. They will also give the enslaved nations of the U. S. S. R. a chance to develop the decisive fight for liberation from the yoke of Moscow's colonialism and imperialism.

Pan American Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, today's Washington Daily News carried the information that President Eisenhower has instructed the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider, in the light of new developments, its decision to keep Pan American Airways off the great circle route to the Orient in competition with Northwest Airlines.

Inasmuch as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is concerned with the stability and progress of our civil air transport system, this is a most gratifying development.

We all know of the pioneering work Pan American did in spanning the Pacific 20 years ago and it seemed inconceivable to us that one carrier should enjoy exclusive privileges in flying the shortest route to the Orient. Ironically, until the President's action, Pan American, which first surveyed the great circle route, was forced to use the old island-hopping route to Tokyo and beyond, a distance some 1,200 miles longer than the route now flown by Northwest.

Certainly a restudy by the CAB of this situation is necessary. A prompt decision, in line with the President's recommendations, should make for keener United States flag line competition in an area which has opened up an entirely new trade route for our large and growing cities in California, Portland, and Washington.

President Eisenhower is to be congratulated for his understanding action.

The International Labor Organization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from the First District of Wisconsin inserted in the RECORD a news item published in Human Events for July 1, 1955. This item played up the views of Mr. William L. McGrath, who has been, for several years, the employer delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization.

Since his association with the ILO, Mr. McGrath has continuously been critical of the ILO and has recently recommended that the United States Government withdraw its participation.

In the article published in Human Events, it is alleged that the ILO has underway a move to raise the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 to $3 million a year. This statement is contrary to the facts. There is no contemplated change in the present budget of the ILO commensurate with the $3 million figure alleged by Mr. McGrath.

Budget proposals for the year 1956 will be presented to the governing body for its consideration at the February-March meeting. The charge that the ILO budget will be enlarged to the extent that the United States contribution would be increased from $1,750,000 to $3 million is ridiculous and absurd. It would necessitate an ILO budget of approximately $12 million from its present $6 million level. The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, which has been the organization responsible for the nomination of the worker delegate to the ILO, in contrast to the views expressed by Mr. McGrath is in complete support of the ILO and its work. The AFL–CIO believes that the United States Government should strengthen its influence in the ILO and help this organization continue its efforts to improve the economic and social status of people throughout the world.

I would like to insert in the RECORD at this time the following speech made last year at a regional academic meeting at the University of Notre Dame by the worker delegate, Mr. George P. Delaney, international representative of the AFL-CIO, which clarifies some of the allegations contained in the remarks inserted in the RECORD by the gentleman from the First District of Wisconsin:

The American Federation of Labor has been long and intimately concerned with the work of the International Labor Organization since its inception. Samuel Gompers played an instrumental role in the creation of that body, and left a definite imprint upon its very nature and structure. He regarded it as one of those great and infrequent opportunities afforded men to make something decent and humane out of their world and and of their relationships with one another. He saw it as an opportunity to bring out of the bloodshed and chaos into which the world had plunged itself, an instrument of

lasting practical value to the millions of working people everywhere who had been exhorted, bullied, and dragooned into hating, starving, and actually killing one another. The fact that this dream has been but partially realized is not a valid argument against the dream, or the organization itself, but rather a demonstration of the countervailing power of cynicism, avarice, and ignorance which still stand in the way and which must yet be overcome.

The ILO is the only international body in which both workers and employers share immediate responsibility with government representatives in the direction of its decisions and actions. Formal position is taken by the conferences of the organization only after full and complete study and discussion, in which tripartite delegations from all of the member nations are entitled to take part.

The basic purpose of the organization is to secure and to protect the human and civil rights of all working men and women. In so doing it seeks to contribute to the establishment of universal and lasting peace by furthering social justice. It seeks by international action to improve labor conditions, so doing it seeks to contribute to the estab- and social stability.

The ILO pursues these aims through the formulation of minimum labor standards, in the form of conventions having the status of draft treaties—which may, of course, be adopted or rejected by member nations as they see fit. In most instances these minimum standards are well below those prevailing in this country, so that the benefit to American workers is mostly indirect. Of one thing, however, we can be sure—the establishment and continuing improvement of the standards enjoyed by workers in other lands will enhance our ability to protect and maintain our own. Furthermore, as the incessant use of the "cheap foreign labor" argument in the current debates on the tariff question indicates, the elevation of foreign standards would greatly facilitate the reduction of trade barriers, expand our own foreign markets, and greatly increase the job and profit opportunities open to every American.

The broader application of decent minimum labor standards is indeed a vital objective. But in our approach to the world at large, as well as on the domestic scene, labor can never rest content with bare minima. Workers must be encouraged to continually move ahead, through their own free collective efforts, to establishment of higher levels above and beyond any basic minima. This can be accomplished only through the development of strong, free and independent trade union movements, operating in every country.

An equally essential phase of the ILO's program, therefore, is the promotion and the protection of the right of workers to organize freely into trade unions of their own choosing, without interference, domination, or control by governments or employers. While the ILO does not sponsor or directly promote any trade union organizations, it does endeavor to promote the principle of freedom of association among the nations of the world, and thereby to help create conditions and attitudes favorable to the independent development of legitimate organizations of workingmen.

In recent years, the ILO has devoted much of its time and energy to the discovery and exposure of facts concerning the systems of slave labor that exist behind the Iron Curtain. These efforts have culminated in the recent report of the U. N.–ILO Ad Hoc Committee on Forced Labor, disclosing and documenting in detail the extent to which slave labor is employed, both for economic purposes and for political coercion, within the Soviet Union and its satellite nations.

This report has done much to arouse the indignation of the free world, and perhaps more importantly, to awaken the peoples of the uncommitted nations to the grim truth behind the fraudulent claims of the Kremlin. It has placed new moral resources within the grasp of the forces of democracy which, if intelligently and actively exploited, could help to weld the non-Communist world together in stronger opposition to the Communist bloc. Certainly, in the light of the facts uncovered by the ILO, only the wilfully blind can any longer fail to see that the only alternative to resistance is abject slavery.

These facts serve to underscore the crucial role which free labor must play in the struggle against Communist tyranny. In this contest, a labor force composed of freemen—motivated not by fear of the alternatives, but by a deep and positive devotion to the affirmative ideals of a free society—is the greatest single advantage on our side of the issue, and the one element of strength which the Soviet world does not share. We must not fail to extend that advantage and build upon it.

In today's world, an active and influential International Labor Organization, supported by all segments of the American public and inspired by the enlightened and energetic leadership of the United States, would be a powerful—and perhaps a decisive—asset to the cause of freedom. Regretfully, such a description cannot be accurately applied to the ILO today, nor to the role of the United States in relation to that Organization.

As a consequence, the ILO is threatened with a sort of creeping paralysis and stands in danger of being crushed between the millstones of reactionary extremism, on the one hand, and Soviet opportunism, on the other.

Let me set forth a few reasons why this is so. Mr. McGrath, the previous speaker and employer delegate to the ILO, has on many instances in the past 3 years, bitterly attacked and discredited the ILO in articles in trade association magazines and in public speeches. Mr. McGrath stated that the ILO today presents, quote "a growing threat of the use of treaties as a means of transferring legislative authority over our domestic affairs from our own lawmaking bodies to an international agency." This statement is a direct quote from his testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, when it was considering Senate Joint Resolution 1, commonly known as the Bricker amendment.

This statement has no foundation in fact, for the ILO exercises no "legislative authority" whatsoever. It has no power over the domestic or internal affairs of any nation, and there is no threat that this or any other nation's sovereignty will be transferred to the ILO. Mr. McGrath, in addition has alleged that the ILO is a hotbed of socialism, and that it is dominated and controlled by a Socialist government-labor coalition, bent upon forcing Socialist programs upon the United States. Certainly any blanket assertion that any of the member governments are socialistic in character should be called to account before any serious credence is given to any arguments which proceed from such a premise. The large majority of the nations participating in the ILO are, allowing for variations in economic conditions and stages of industrial and political development, predominantly free enterprise in character.

Until comparatively recent years, delegations representing American employers played a positive, constructive role in the work of the ILO, often supporting and voting in favor of conventions and other conference actions which the current employer delegate loudly condemns as examples of rampant "Socialism."

Thus it can be seen that through the influence of the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, the American employers are today represented in the conference of the ILO by an antagonist of the ILO itself and all its works.

It has become quite apparent to most of those who have observed their pattern of conduct at firsthand that the primary aim of the employer delegate and his principles is not to promote or to improve but to defeat the work of the ILO. This is an objective which they share, whether they recognize it or not, with the Kremlin. The Soviet Union withdrew from the ILO in 1937, and from that time until this past year has kept up a running campaign of propaganda against the Organization, attacking it as a "tool of capitalist imperialism." Suddenly last year, however, the Kremlin made another of its well-known reversals of field, declared its willingness to meet the obligations of membership, and submitted a formal request for readmission to this "tool of capitalist imperialism."

The motives behind this maneuver are quite transparent. The object is to create confusion and discord within the ranks of the non-Communist nations, to neutralize the effectiveness of the ILO as a force for freedom, and to place the Soviet Union in a more strategic position to direct its appeal to the working peoples of the uncommitted and underdeveloped nations.

The various issues posed by the reentry of the Soviet bloc marked the battleground upon which a major struggle in the conflict between East and West took place during the last ILO conference. This struggle revealed the nature of current Communist strategy.

Under the urging of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, a move was made at the Conference to unseat the worker delegates of the U. S. S. R. and Czechoslovakia. This move was defeated. The real stumbling block to success for the ICFTU on this issue was a defect in the constitution of the ILO which does not explicitly exclude so-called worker delegates of the Soviet type who are, in fact, the creatures of their Government. The real action needed is an amendment to the constitution, so that workers and employer delegates may not be handpicked by totalitarian governments.

Aside from this regrettable action, the Western democracies did win all of the other important political decisions at last year's conference. They defeated Soviet attempts to substitute the government of Red China for Nationalist China. They likewise showed a united front against the application for membership of Red Rumania. The conference also turned down an attempt to seat the Hungarian delegation at a time when Hungary was more than 2 years in arrears in its contribution to the ILO.

Similarly, the Soviet satelites failed to win a single elective seat either as titular members or as deputy members of the ILO's governing body, and the worker and employer groups of the new governing body elected no Communist members or substitutes. The sole Communist-held seat on this 40-member body is that of the Soviet Union which acquires nonelective status as one of the 10 states of chief industrial importance.

As a one-vote minority, the Soviet Union is not likely to be very influential in the ILO executive machinery unless isolationist political pressures here at home serve to weaken further the influence of the United States within the organization. I can conceive of many reasons why the men in the Kremlin would like nothing better than to see the United States out of the International Labor Organization. It would enable them to plant their agents in technical administrative jobs in southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. It would abet their efforts to turn the delegates from other non-Communist nations against us. It would give their spokesmen

greater access to the ILO rostrum without timely response by American worker, employer, and Government delegates. And, in the last analysis, it would utterly destroy the positive effectiveness of an organization which has been and is today a veritable thorn in the side of Communist slave-labor dictatorship.

But whatever the motive, the designs of the Soviet Union are definitely advanced by division in the western ranks, and by the anti-ILO and anti-U. N. outcries of our domestic isolationists. Now, more than ever before, while the Communist bloc in the ILO remains small and relatively ineffectual, it is up to the free governments and to organizations of free employers and free workers to do all that they can to strengthen the hand of the ILO, to move in an orderly way toward a tightening of the ILO constitution and rules of procedure, and to take the lead in helping to make the organization an effective instrument of practical progress in pursuit of our democratic ideals.

The blame for American failure to make the most of the opportunities offered by the International Labor Organization cannot be laid at the door of any one element or group—it must be shared by all. Likewise, every element concerned—labor, management, Government, and the public at large—must share responsibility and cooperate in the steps that must be taken to rehabilitate the American position in the world and to make effective use of the International Labor Organization as a means to that end.

Let us for a moment examine the role now played by the American Government, its deficiencies and some of the things that need to be done to revitalize this Nation's leadership in the world. It is my firm conviction that the times demand that the United States assert a bold, forthright, and affirmative policy, based upon concrete and practical—rather than merely rhetorical—objectives. Talk is very cheap and we have had a great deal of fine talk about a dynamic policy, but in action it has boiled down into retreat, retrenchment, withdrawal, and failure, and a complete collapse of our appeal to the ordinary people of the world. We should endeavor to associate ourselves with the legitimate aspirations of peoples, rather than the ambitions of premiers, generals, and petty potentates.

There could be no more effective way to bring this about than to make strong, active, and positive support of the ILO a fundamental attribute of American foreign policy, by placing our full influence, both political and economic, behind the standards and the objectives of that body. A good beginning in this direction would be to increase our contribution to the U. N.-ILO technical assistance program so as, at the very least, to meet our full quota, and to give that program the stability and assurance that it has lacked because of the failure of the United States to live up to its obligations and to deliver on its commitments.

We have often heard it stated by our public officials that the ultimate aim of our foreign aid program is the improvement of the conditions, the opportunities, and the level of living enjoyed, or rather endured, by the rank and file citizens of the nations involved in those programs. Yet, in all too many cases, the deed has not lived up to the word. Billions have been distributed abroad that have lined the pockets of the wealthy, with little or none filtering down in the form of concrete improvements in the status of laboring people. The result has been a widespread and growing cynicism and disillusionment among the workingmen and women of the world, who should rightly be our strongest allies in the fight for democracy, freedom, and progress.

There could be no better way to correct this situation—though it may be already too late—than by using the principles and standards of the ILO as a practical test of merit in the allocation of aid and expenditures overseas. Certainly no project or nation where those standards are grossly violated or disregarded is a proper channel for the distribution of funds raised in large part by taxes upon the paychecks of American workingmen. By making it clear that we regard the work of the ILO as something more than empty talk, the United States could give the prestige and influence of the Organization a powerful lift in those nations that look to America for aid or trade.

Yet, before we can adopt such a stance in our dealings with other nations, our own moral position in relation to the ILO must be greatly improved. We can scarcely question the sincerity or the performance of any other country when we ourselves have ratified no more than a handful of the less important of the ILO's conventions. A more serious attitude toward our responsibilities as a member of the ILO needs to be taken, both by the Congress and the administration. It must be realized that, while the ratification of most of the ILO's conventions would do little or nothing to alter the standards and practices already observed in this country, such action is very important as evidence of our sincerity of purpose in supporting the Organization.

With that kind of backing at home, it would then be possible for the American delegation to the ILO to assume the role of vigorous, constructive leadership befitting it as the representatives of the greatest and most advanced industrial democracy in the world. Perhaps then our Government delegates would shed some of that timidity that has assailed them in the past and take the initiative in advocating new and positive steps to secure and advance the rights and standards of the laboring poor. This would indeed be a welcome improvement over the present situation where, before voting on someone else's proposal for some such meager proposition as the principle of vacations with pay, spokesmen for our Government wrestle long and fearfully with their consciences. And, all too frequently, the conscience loses the wrestling match.

It is not, of course, my part to advise the employers of America as to the direction in which their best interests lie. Yet I cannot accept, without comment, the argument advanced by their representatives to the ILO—that their interests are best served by the obstruction of, or withdrawal from, the work of that body. Such an argument makes no more economic sense than would the argument that the economic interests of New England employers who pay decent wages are advanced by the continued absence of effective standards to effectively restrain the exploitation of labor by their southern competitors.

I sincerely believe that American employers can—if they will and as they have at times in the past—put their best foot forward and make a great contribution to the objectives of the ILO and to the cause of social justice without sacrificing any real principles of their own. American employers have an opportunity to make a strong case for the benefits of free enterprise, where mass markets and top efficiency are promoted through the incentive and reward of high wages. But they should deliver that message where it can do the most good—among employers abroad who today accept oppressive, subhuman conditions with utter complacency.

In the meanwhile, they should not obstruct the work of the ILO, but support it—for, under a different kind of private enterprise abroad, the persistence of the conditions which the ILO seeks to correct is of no benefit, and much injury, to that great majority of American employers who have no large foreign plantation or petroleum holdings and who employ only American workers, under American conditions.

I believe also that American employers have the same interest that we all do in the establishment of a secure and lasting peace throughout the world. Such a peace however can be built only upon a foundation of social justice.

I do not mean to exonerate American labor or its representatives of any blame for the lack of understanding and bedrock support for the ILO within this country. Labor, perhaps, has a greater and more direct responsibility toward the ILO than does any other group, for the main function of the organization is, after all, the improvement of the conditions of labor. I have no doubt but that, had the trade unions of America been more consistent and active in cultivating an understanding and appreciation of the importance of the ILO among their members and in communicating their interest to the Congress and to the administration, America's role in the organization would have been far more fruitful than has actually been the case.

As in the case of the public at large, the effectiveness of labor's support for the ILO has been handicapped by the lack of interest at the local level, by the inability—common to most human beings—to see beyond the range of one's immediate bread-and-butter interests and to appreciate the stake of American labor in the welfare and progress of its brothers overseas.

We can none of us—whether we come from labor, management, government, the academic world, or the public at large—afford to neglect the responsibility and the opportunity presented by the International Labor Organization. The world does not offer very many such opportunities to correct old mistakes and to avoid future catastrophes, and the time is short.

None of us has anything to lose in the effort to make the International Labor Organization a more effective instrument for the attainment of a better world society.

We all have much to gain.

Julian H. Krolik

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great man, Julian H. Krolik, a humanitarian and a philanthropist. He was loved and respected by all his fellowmen. He was active in Jewish charities and philanthropies; among them, the Jewish Welfare Federation, the United Jewish Welfare Federation, and the Sinai Hospital. He was also active in many non-Jewish charities and is perhaps best known for his activities on behalf of the Community Chest, in which organization he was a tower of strength giving unselfishly both of his time, energy, and money.

He was a strong man, but time finally took its toll of his strength, and although his body failed, his mind remained that for which his friends had long admired and respected him, clear and powerful. Although I only knew him by the universal respect in which he was held, I join his many friends throughout the

community, his family, and the people of Detroit in the knowledge that we have lost a great man for whose presence all of us are richer in things spiritual and physical.

At this time I introduce into the RECORD an editorial by my good friend, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, the editor of the Detroit Jewish News:

JULIAN H. KROLIK—TRULY, A GREAT MAN

About Julian H. Krolik it may truly be said that "sar v'gadol nofal b'Israel," that a prince and a great man has fallen in Israel.

He was a genuinely cultured man, an able leader, an inspirer of his fellow men.

And his chief distinction was that he was a man with a deep and abiding sense of justice. He had few prejudices. He was always on the side of the underdog. He fought for unpopular causes, and although his family background was non-Zionist, he alined himself with the Zionist cause when it was still unpopular.

He was more than a leader in the Jewish Welfare Federation. With the late Fred M. Butzel, he shared for many years the distinction of having inspired Michigan Jewry to action whenever there was need to help distressed Jews, when there were calls to action for causes in behalf of oppressed people, when our country called its citizens to respond to liberty loans or war-bond drives.

Our Community Chest counted him among its most devoted leaders.

His fellow Detroiters often marveled at his vitality, at his having shunned hat or overcoat, at his love of nature and all natural phenomena. In recent years he was not well, and it grieved all of us to see him losing his health. But although his body weakened, his mind retained the great strength of a great man. We mourn his passing. We shall miss his absence from our midst.

The Cost of World Wars I and II
A Staggering Sum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting valuable information compiled for me by the Economics Division of the Library of Congress. Mr. Hermann Ficker, analyst in international trade and finance, has prepared the material which I am inserting.

Mr. Speaker, this information covers the cost of World Wars I and II. It is obvious at a glance that war is costly and destructive and it seems that we should be on the road to finding a solution to this problem other than by an armaments race with Russia, which appears in the making at this time.

The above-mentioned follows:

THE COST AND ESTIMATED PROPERTY DAMAGE OF WORLD WAR I

Twice in one generation the shadow of mass warfare has fallen athwart the world. These great wars have caused incalculable human misery due to the loss of millions of men in the prime of life and the death and displacement of civilians in even greater numbers.

While immense sums are consumed in the prosecution of wars, as well as in recovery and rehabilitation of war-ravaged areas, we know that great problems remain and that wars add greatly to the tax burdens of succeeding generations.

METHODS OF COMPUTING THE COST

Estimating the cost of war in olden times must of necessity prove futile since records were not kept as to the cost of armies in the field, tribute, slaves, destruction of property, and other items included today in a general war assessment. Conclusive compilations of the exact cost of World War I have never been made due to the difficulty of separating war-related items from the current budgets of all the governments concerned. Similarly there has been found no conformity in the definitions as to what programs are allocable to war and what other programs during a war period were merely to carry on the ordinary administration of a nation's general economic life.

Statements as to the exact cost of World War I are therefore to be taken merely as approximations based on insufficient statistical evidence. In fact, most countries have not issued detailed official figures on World War I expenditures. Published computations have mostly been made by students far removed from the actual operational procedures incidental to the expenditures of money from the national exchequers.

The waste of treasure that wars have brought to humanity should also include the loss of national wealth comprised in the drain of raw materials and natural resources. When converted into the implements of war they are not replaceable and future generations are forever deprived of them.

Another evaluation of the cost of war should include losses in national income due to the prolonged absence from productive work of millions of men and women engaged in unproductive and destructive war work. The billions of hours devoted to preparedness and to actual fighting if turned into the building of homes, schools, hospitals, bridges, roads, and factories would assuredly have advanced humanity toward greater achievements in all cultural and humanitarian fields.

DIRECT MONEY COST

Many estimates of the cost of World War I are available, all divergent in totals, but basically the differences in cost are due to the period of time over which the cost is spread.

E. L. Bogart, on behalf of the Carnegie Endowment for Peace computed in 1920, that the direct money cost of the war to all countries was as follows:

A. Allies:	
United States	$32,080,266,968
Great Britain	44,029,011,868
Australia	1,437,418,680
Canada	1,665,576,032
India	601,279,000
New Zealand	378,750,000
Union of South Africa	300,000,000
Belgium	1,154,467,000
France	25,812,782,800
Greece	270,000,000
Italy	12,313,998,000
Rumania	1,600,000,000
Russia	22,593,950,000
Serbia	399,400,000
Other allies	500,000,000
B. Central Powers:	
Germany	40,150,000,000
Austria-Hungary	20,622,960,000
Turkey	1,430,000,000
Bulgaria and Rumania	815,000,000
Total	207,850,860,348

These costs included not only the maintenance of the armies, transportation and the production of war materiel but also the aid etxended to other countries by both sides. The total of this aid is tabulated separately merely to show the amounts that individual countries expended. It amounted to approximately 10 percent of the total direct costs of World War I.

ASSISTANCE TO ALLIES

Included in the overall estimate of the cost of World War I are the advances made to their allies by the belligerents. These were:

United States	$9,455,014,125
Great Britain	8,695,000,000
France	1,547,200,000
Germany	2,375,000,000
Total	22,072,214,125

INDIRECT COSTS OF WAR

Among the indirect costs of World War I should be included an estimate of the value of property destroyed during the period of belligerency. This is physical damage to homes, schools, churches, factories, power installations, transportation facilities and equipment and other property. Again Bogart has made an estimate in rounded figures without trying to give a breakdown by type of property destroyed. The only differentiation made is in property on land and shipping.

Property damage:	
Belgium	$7,000,000,000
France	10,000,000,000
Russia	1,250,000,000
Poland	1,500,000,000
Serbia, Albania, Montenegro	2,000,000,000
East Prussia, Austria, Ukraine	1,000,000,000
Italy	2,710,000,000
Rumania	1,000,000,000
Germany	1,750,000,000
British Empire	1,750,000,000
Total	29,960,000,000

SHIPPING AND CARGO LOSSES

The total losses in shipping to the allies and neutrals from the beginning of hostilities to August 1, 1918, are estimated at 15,000,000 tons. This is approximately one-third of the world's prewar shipping tonnage of 48,500,000. Production cost of that tonnage was $1,050,000,000. Germany and Italy lost almost all of their merchant shipping. In addition to the deadweight tonnage there is also the question of cargo. Altogether, the estimate for shipping and cargo amounts to $6,800,000,000.

COST OF WORLD WAR II AND PROPERTY LOSSES

Statisticians have not yet attempted to assess the total expenditures of participating nations in the prosecution of World War II. Military expenditures as part of national budgets do not portray the full extent to which the energies of any nation were directed toward warmaking purposes in the war emergency.

Guess-estimates have varied from $1 trillion to $4 trillion, depending on the type of direct and indirect cost included in the overall totals. If the figure of $4 trillion is used, the cost of World War II amounts to $1,708 for every man, woman, and child in the earth's estimated population of 2.3 billion people.

In the following tables an attempt has been made to state the direct cost of war insofar as figures are available from published sources with a total of $1,439,250,000,000. Indirect losses are summarized under two headings, namely property damages estimated at $259,557,000,000 and an itemized list of shipping losses for which dollar value figures are not available. Illustrative data for property destruction in various countries are added to show the extent of war damage.

Lastly, a total of aid rendered foreign countries by the various belligerents is given. This list is incomplete. The sums mentioned are included in the direct money cost of the war.

DIRECT MONEY COSTS

Insofar as published estimates are available, the various nations spent the following sums as direct costs in the prosecution of the war:

United States [1]	$317,600,000,000
United Kingdom	120,000,000,000
France [2]	192,000,000,000
Canada	14,000,000,000
Australia	8,000,000,000
South Africa	2,250,000,000
New Zealand	1,650,000,000
Germany	273,000,000,000
Italy	94,000,000,000
Japan [3]	56,000,000,000
Finland [4]	2,000,000,000
Rumania	1,750,000,000
Russia	357,000,000,000
Total	1,439,250,000,000

[1] Commercial and Financial Chronicle. Dec. 13, 1945. P. 2927.
[2] London Times. Aug. 17, 1945. P. 4.
[3] New York Times, Mar. 18, 1947, p. 4 and Aug. 12, 1945, p. E–2.
[4] U. S. News. Sept. 17, 1945.

To these totals should be added the expenditures of India, Egypt, Turkey, Greece, China, and many smaller entities.

PROPERTY DAMAGE

The best estimates of property damage has been compiled by the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies.[1] According to an analysis published in 1947 fixed property destroyed during World War II was valued as follows:

Austria	$534,000,000
Belgium	2,274,000,000
Denmark	159,000,000
France	21,504,000,000
Greece	3,269,000,000
Holland	3,947,000,000
Italy	2,900,000,000
Luxembourg	179,000,000
Norway	1,275,000,000
United Kigdom	6,872,000,000
Germany	48,000,000,000
Albania	512,000,000
Bulgaria	420,000,000
Czechoslovakia	4,202,000,000
Hungary	4,330,000,000
Poland	20,000,000,000
Rumania	683,000,000
Yugoslavia	10,497,000,000
U. S. S. R.	128,000,000,000
Total	259,557,000,000

There is wide discrepancy in totals for individual countries. The authoritative London Times stated that France suffered $122 billion in property damage, whereas the French themselves put their losses at just over $20 billions. If mere replacement value were the criterion of worth then the overall totals will assuredly be very much smaller. On the other hand many of the later estimates are expressed in terms of currencies suffering in many instances from inflation.

SHIPPING LOSSES

The following French Institute estimate of merchant ship losses includes only vessels of 100 gross tons or more during the period September 1, 1939 through September 3, 1945.[2]

Merchant-ship losses, Sept. 1, 1939, to Sept. 3, 1945

	Vessels	Tons
United States	736	4,734,768
British Empire	1,910	11,193,964
United Kingdom	1,753	10,484,595
Belgium	57	341,190
Denmark	109	407,715
France	313	1,581,761
Greece	247	1,078,482
Holland	240	1,326,536
Norway	418	2,027,204
Poland	9	45,000
Sweden	120	450,645
Turkey	9	25,994
U. S. S. R.	51	207,450
Yugoslavia	46	189,161

WAR DAMAGE IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES

It has been found impossible to make detailed lists of property damages suffered in all countries. Illustrative of the type of damage suffered by individual countries a brief statement will be made concerning those areas for which data were found.

United Kingdom: "In England, by March 1944, 3 million war-damaged houses were 'first-aid' repaired, and 102,700 badly damaged houses were restored to use. The following year more than a million houses were damaged or destroyed by flying bombs." [3]

France: "The total number of buildings damaged and destroyed * * * in World War II was some 1,804,000. Nearly 25 percent of all buildings damaged in World War II were completely destroyed.[4]

"The French ports have been notable casualties in the war. Toulon is blocked by the scuttled French fleet much too effectively for German salvage or French reconstruction. The Atlantic ports are almost useless. * * * The Channel ports were bombed ruthlessly." [5]

Countries such as Finland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, and Belgium, and Czechoslovakia suffered damages to physical installations that amounted to hundreds of thousands of homes destroyed, transportation paralyzed, ports demolished, and extensive dislocations of the national economies. Damage can be assessed in the trillions of dollars.

China: "Property losses have been astronomical. In Shanghai alone $2 billion worth of homes and factories were destroyed. In their campaign of terror the Japanese did not hesitate to level hundreds of towns and villages. Nor will it ever be possible to compute the dollar-and-cent loss suffered by China in the forced flight of 40 million people. Or of the damage done to the soil by the gerat floods which followed the breaching of the Yellow River dikes." [6]

Japan: Apart from all industrial destruction and dislocation of the economy, 2,252,000 buildings were destroyed.[7]

Germany: Few nations have suffered such utter destruction as was heaped upon Germany. Complete estimates have never been computed.

U. S. S. R.: The fantastic destruction in Russia is noted in the following statistics of war damage: [8]

Towns	1,710
Villages	70,000
Houses	6,000,000
Hospitals and medical centers	40,000
Schools and research institutes	84,000
Libraries	43,000
Industrial plants	31,850
Electric motors	239,000
Metal-cutting lathes	175,000
Railway track (missing pieces)	40,625
Railway stations	4,100
Railway bridges	13,000
Locomotive depots	317
Steam and motor locomotives	15,800
Passenger and freight cars	428,000
Passenger and freight vessels	4,280
Ports and docks	479
Post, telegraph, and telephone offices	36,000
Collective farm headquarters	98,000
State farm buildings	1,876
Tractor stations	2,890
Horses	7,000,000
Cattle	17,000,000
Hogs	20,000,000
Sheep and goats	27,000,000
Poultry	110,000,000

Italy: The most detailed list of war damage has been compiled for Italy.[9]

Military operations involved practically the entire peninsula and every aspect of life was in chaos because of material destruction and disorganization of the central network of economics, financial and administrative life. Among the various classes of property which had undergone most damage were:

(a) Housing: 1,900,000 habitable rooms destroyed; 1,100,000 seriously damaged; 3,800,000 to a lesser degree.

(b) Public works: State roads destroyed and damaged 60 percent; secondary roads 20 percent; important bridges destroyed 2,968; secondary bridges 5,269; post buildings 90 percent damaged; port machinery and docks 50 percent destroyed; schoolrooms 40 percent destroyed; hospitals and equipment 20 percent destroyed; churches destroyed and damaged 11,000.

(c) Mercantile marine: Itay's merchant navy consisted of 1,109 units over 100 tons gross. Total of 3,400,00 gross tons was reduced to 429,000 representing a 90 percent loss.

(d) Railways: 40 percent of all railway equipment and facilities was destroyed.

(e) Agriculture: Direct damage was estimated at 550 billion lire. Indirect damage would take years to eradicate due to the lack of fertilizers, damage to water supplies, deteriorating of river defense-works, uncontroled depreciation and the abandoning of sound methods of cultivation.

(f) Industry: Plant and property destroyed amounted to 450 billion lire. Worst hit were the steel works, electrical works, shipbuilding, chemical works and metal works.

In addition to these serious overt aspects of war damage there are the aftermaths of a continuing deterioration in the entire governmental system, the reduction in agricultural and industrial production, the reduction in the standard of living, the inflationary movement, unemployment and the price spiral which will take years to be overcome.

Asistance to Allies by the United States of America [1]

American Republics	$493,025,430.04
Belgium	156,254,519.40
British Empire	31,610,926,129.35
China	1,603,441,952.60
Czechoslovakia	435,446.23

[1] 36th Report to Congress on Lend Lease Operations, 84th Cong., 1st sess., H. Doc. 221, Oct. 19, 1955.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Assistance to Allies by the United States of America—Continued

Denmark	$4,060,493.95
Egypt	2,322,611.92
Ethiopia	5,151,480.09
France	3,269,964,492.02
Greece	81,424,112.31
Iceland	4,496,553.29
Iran	5,303,624.18
Iraq	891,469.57
Italy	186,414,869.65
Liberia	19,440,619.66
Netherlands	246,404,116.16
Norway	47,036,563.93
Poland	12,232,889.88
Saudi Arabia	22,670,314.52
Turkey	42,850,057.09
U. S. S. R.	11,054,406,165.82
Yugoslavia	32,188,847.92
Miscellaneous	1,331,110,616.67
Total	50,232,453,376.25

Assistance by Allies to the United States of America [1]

Belgium	$191,215,983.35
British Empire	6,752,073,165.40
China	3,672,000.00
France	867,781,244.70
Netherlands	2,367,699.64
U. S. S. R.	2,212,697.81
Total	7,819,322,790.90

[1] Report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations, U. S. Treasury Department, June 30, 1949.

Only fragmentary information exists concerning aid rendered to various countries by the belligerents so that a final list of such aid is not included in this report.

[1] Institut National de la Statistique et des Etudes Economiques—Nos. 17, 18, 19, October, November, December, 1947, p. 43.

[2] Idem, p. 48.

[3] Municipal Year Book (London) 1946, p. 357.

[4] Monthly Labor Review, November 1945, p. 927.

[5] War Damage in Europe. The World Today. April 1946, p. 157.

[6] Gayn, Mark. China's Bill Against Japan. PM. September 9, 1945, p. 9.

[7] New York Times. April 20, 1949, p. 5c.

[8] New Republic. December 16, 1946, p. 810.

[9] Italian Affairs. January 1954, pp. 173–178.

Classics of American Democracy—VI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include replies from a representative group of religious leaders to the proposal to translate the Classics of American Democracy into many languages and to make them easily accessible and at reasonable prices to people everywhere. The letters follow:

DEAR SIR: I have read with interest and appreciation your plan and the suggestions made for books. In my opinion this is one of the most effective attacks that I can imagine on the inroads of communism in foreign countries. I am particularly impressed by the creative diversity in your list ranging all the way from the authorities being cited by "our new conservatives" to the classical liberals.

I am most delighted with this undertaking in the defense of democracy.

Very truly yours,

NELS F. S. FERRÉ,
School of Religion, Vanderbilt University.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This is in answer to your letter of December 12 concerning the matter of enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

I am thoroughly in accord with the feeling that such a step should be taken, and believe that every reasonable means of distribution should be used.

As to the books and papers listed, I am altogether unfamiliar with some of them. However, I would select these five without question: The American Commonwealth, Bryce; The Spirit of Liberty, Hand; Representative Government, Mill; Democracy in America, De Tocqueville; The New Freedom, Wilson.

I think that, in general, books written since around 1900 should be given highest ranking.

Sincerely,

GEO. H. SMITH,
Pastor, Church Street Methodist Church, Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I was very much interested in the plan for publication of Democratic Classics, which you sent. I feel very strongly that the United States has not done sufficient to popularize the meaning of democracy to the nations of the world. The Communists have been much more aggressive.

In my travels through Europe and Israel, I was able to note the prevalence of subsidized literature which the masses could afford to buy. This literature presented the Communists' point of view. We of the democracies ought to be as aggressive in communicating our ideas.

I therefore endorse this proposal, and urge its acceptance. The books that you list constitute a representative sampling. Since I am not expert in these matters, I hesitate to express an opinion. I am sure that a satisfactory list will be prepared. What is important is that we make our point of view known to the world.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH SIMON,
Rabbi, Congregation Rodfel Zedek, Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of December 12 concerning library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy is at hand. I am warmly in favor of establishing such a library. Furthermore, I have carefully studied the list of proposed works and find it an excellent one. I would suggest that you might well add on works containing essays or addresses or excerpts from such by various writers. Here I would think of some of the speeches or writings by men like President Eisenhower, President Herbert Hoover, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, Dr. Elton Trueblood, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, and others. In other words, I would like to have a little more by contemporary and living writers than your list contains.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT GEZORK,
President, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I give my enthusiastic support to the proposal described in your letter and enclosure of December 12.

Nothing, in my judgment, would serve to help combat the insidious intellectual appeal of communism, as much as widespread distribution of the basic and classic formulations of the reasonings of Democracy.

I think that the numbers and names of the books ought to be the subject of a meeting of a number of authorities in the field. You would probably find disagreement with some titles and the recommendation of the addition of other titles, but these details are not nearly so important as the proposal itself.

I do hope that you will push this proposal hard when it comes before Congress in the form of a resolution and I should be happy if you were to see fit to use all, or part of this letter in any way that you might deem best.

With very good wish, I am,

Sincerely,

DR. BERTRAM W. KORN,
Rabbi, Reform Congregation, Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In response to your letter of December 12, may I give my whole-hearted approval of the list you have sent to me. It would be an excellent beginning.

With good wishes to you in the sacred cause of the rights of man, I am,

Sincerely,

NORMAN GERSTENFELD,
Rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have your letter of December 12, and I think this is a most excellent plan.

One of the problems is, going to be to get the kind of things into the hands of simple people which they can understand.

A lot of the things that you have written down here will be way over the heads of ordinary people. There is a little book by Dr. Daniel Marsh, former president of Boston University, called The American Canon, that can be understood by an intelligent schoolboy. It deals with the creation of the seven fundamental documents, as he believes, of American history. I believe this could be republished to great advantage and spread abroad, and would take on with simple folk better than some of the learned volumes that you have written down, although these are important, of course, also. I did a little book myself called, Freedom and Faith, and am sending you a copy of it under separate cover. This, too, is of a very much simpler order. It contains some addresses I gave over WJZ years ago. Clarence Manion's book, The Key to Peace, is also extremely valuable. I believe this all needs to be hit from many different angles.

Warm good wishes to you in this fine enterprise.

Sincerely yours,

S. M. SHOEMAKER,
Rector, Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12. I think your proposal an excellent one. I have believed for a long time that we have been remiss in not making available at a reasonable price the basic statements of democratic philosophy. I am happy that you contemplate this.

I should like to write you later concerning the list of books. There is always the danger that in meeting the Communist challenge we speak in terms of political democracy and fail to present works that deal sufficiently with the issue of economic democracy. The Communist tries to point out that political democracy, while stressing

freedom, avoids the issue of justice. This is not true. However, most of the books you recommend approach the problem solely from the political point of view. It seems to me that we have got to show that the democratic concept can bring justice in the economic sphere and maintain freedom. The Communist sacrifices his freedom to get what he calls justice. Actually, he gets neither. But this is a matter I think you may wish to consider.

With every good wish, believe me,

Ever sincerely yours,

G. BROMLEY OXNAM,
Bishop of the Methodist Church.

MY DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of December 12 asking for my comment on your plan for publication of democratic classics.

May I say that I'm completely in accord with part 1 of the plan. However, I feel that part 2 could be expanded and to this I would like to give more time and attention. If there is opportunity to do so, I would be very happy to discuss such a listing with the newspaper editors and educators of our own community.

Sincerely yours,

SELWYN D. RUSLANDER,
Rabbi, Temple Israel, Dayton, Ohio.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you so much for sending me the material concerning the publication of a small library of basic statements of our philosophy. I like the idea tremendously and have no suggestions to give you. I think the books you have named are the ones that ought to be included. The whole idea has my enthusiastic support.

Thank you again for writing to me.

Sincerely,

GERALD KENNEDY,
Bishop, The Methodist Church, Los Angeles Area.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I think the plan as outlined is excellent and I will be happy to do anything I can to aid in the program.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. ROSENBLOOM,
Rabbi, Congregation Share Emeth, St. Louis, Mo.

MY DEAR SIR: Mr. Samuel Gale asked me to make some comments on your letter concerning the publication of books on our democratic philosophy. He suggested that I might communicate directly with you. Needless to say, I am honored by his confidence in my judgment. However, I am deeply aware that on a matter such as this there cannot be an unanimity of opinion.

I am tremendously interested in your proposed legislation. I have for a long time held the conviction, and have so expressed it many times, that we have failed to spread the gospel of democracy in such a manner that it becomes available and intelligible to the average man throughout the world.

Will you permit me to make one suggestion concerning the list of authors? It strikes me as being somewhat topheavy with "classical" works. There are only three names which belong to our modern era: Dewey, Hand, and Wilson. It would be difficult for me to say what to select from Jefferson and Lincoln. So much of the former's writings and the latter's speeches breathe the very spirit of democracy. Emerson's Essays on Politics, Compassion, Self-Reliance, and Character probably express more what we have in mind than anything else he ever wrote and said.

It appears to me that in this selection of books considerable thought should be given to the emphasis of responsibility which falls upon the individual in a democracy. There is constant danger that the element of privilege can be stressed to a degree which brings about an unbalance. This is particularly true in such a case as Dewey. I would have no hesitancy in adding modern names which put democracy and its basic tenets into the framework of contemporary circumstances. Writings similar to those of Learned Hand would make a great contribution. The names of such men as Lippman and Commager are good examples.

I am grateful to Mr. Gale for the privilege which he has accorded me in writing to you.

Very respectfully yours,

ARNOLD H. LOWE,
Minister, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In response to your request for suggestions on the list of democratic classics, let me say just this: Some of those proposed appear to me to be rather heavy reading. I think especially of Burke, Kant, and von Humboldt. These would be more fitting for a University of Chicago great-books course. I would, however, certainly like to see included Milton's Aereopagitica.

I think a volume of exerpts of some of the great opinions of Holmes, Brandeis, and Cardozo would be effective as an indication of how the democratic principle has come into the actual legal structure of the land. I think also another volume devoted to excerpts from Benjamin Franklin, Hawthorne, Melville, Twain, Whitman, Henry George, Carl Sandburg, and Clarence Darrow would not only be readable but would give a better opinion of America's commitment to the democratic ideal. You might even add another volume on American folk lore and humor, reflecting the folk commitment to democracy.

At any rate, I think we have to guard against the rather heavy, academic tone which the present list reveals.

Most sincerely,

JACOB WEINSTEIN,
Rabbi, K. A. M. Temple, Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I heartily endorse the plan which you outline, even though there may be a good deal of dispute as to the type of work included in such a library. I would not wish to quarrel with the gentlemen who have drawn up this original list, but I would strongly suggest that those who can and will read Kant will find him easily enough available and do not need this special series.

I would make two suggestions:

1. To include the text of the basic constitutional government of some of the world's leading democracies such as our own, France, Switzerland, etc.

2. I would suggest the inclusion of Great Statements on Democracy by Americans as well as others. I have in mind Washington's inaugural, Lincoln's inaugural, and Gettysburg Address, and other similar documents, many of which have been collected in anthologies as those by Henry Steele Commager.

Wishing you the very best in this undertaking, I am,

Sincerely,

W. GUNTHER PLAUT,
Rabbi, Mount Zion Temple, St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of December 12 and the enclosure relative to a desirable list of books, etc. In reply thereto, let me say that I am in favor of the project, but I find the list unsuitable for the following reasons:

You are evidently after the intellectuals. In that case, at least half the titles are without a doubt familiar to them. To think oherwise, is to underestimate the European intellectual. What they need is being brought up to date.

In the second place, why not aim at a middle group? Why not make up a list of books popularly written which present the subject of "Democracy and Freedom" in a manner understandable to the more-or-less average?

The above are general statements. I am not in a position to give alternate titles. But I know they are available, and that your staff can easily compile many titles.

I hope that you will take my criticism in good spirits. Had you not asked me, I would not have given it.

With kind greetings,

Sincerely yours,

Rabbi JOSEPH UTSCHEN,
Temple Emeth, Ardmore, Okla.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In response to your letter of December 12 concerning your plan for the publication of a small library of basic classics of American democracy, let me say that I think it is a splendid idea. I have traveled abroad often enough to know that such a thing as this is terribly important and valuable. In looking over the list which was suggested, I should simply like to make the general observation that classics need not necessarily derive only from 18th and 19th century writings.

I have the feeling that many intellectuals around the world would like to know what some of our 20th century political philosophers are writing. Thought should be given, therefore, to including such volumes by contemporary authors as would be in harmony with the basic concepts of the list, which in the main is excellent.

As you may note, I am no longer with the congregation in Milwaukee but have assumed this new position in New York.

Very truly yours,

Rabbi HERBERT A. FRIEDMAN,
Executive Vice Chairman, United Jewish Appeal.

Classics of American Democracy—VII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include among other communications from industrialists and leaders in business and finance a letter from H. W. Prentis, Jr., past president of the National Association of Manufacturers, past director of the United States Chamber of Commerce and recipient of honorary degrees from 14 American colleges and universities, as follows:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have been out of town almost continuously for the past 2 weeks, which accounts for my delay in replying to your letter of December 12. I think that the idea of authorizing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of the political philosophy on which the American Republic is based, is excellent. I have looked over the list of publications that you enclosed and of all the works mentioned, I think The Federalist Papers are of the most importance. Next I would rank de Tocqueville's Democracy in America, and Bryce's The American Commonwealth. One other book which I think very highly of is The Power in the People, by Felix Morley. In my opinion, this work, which came out a year or two ago, is the best analysis of the American system that has appeared since The Federalist Papers. One book on your list that I have some question about is Rousseau's The Social Contract, because in my opinion The Social Contract provides a good deal of philosophical justification for socialism.

I am very glad that you have undertaken this project and I sincerely hope that you will be successful in getting the enabling legislation through Congress.

Yours sincerely,

H. W. PRENTIS, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board, Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.; Past President, National Association of Manufacturers.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This is in reply to your letter of December 12.

I have asked one of my associates who is a prominent editor to give me the benefit of his judgment in connection with your suggestion and I am quoting from his letter to me:

"I think this list proposed by Congressman O'HARA is all right, if we assume that the readers to be reached are reasonably sophisticated and acquainted with political history. Personally, I wouldn't include Rousseau as in the liberal tradition, but who am I among so many?

"To reach a wider audience, I would suggest including a few more personalized approaches to the problem, such books as the autobiography of Jacob Riis or maybe a digested edition of parts of Sandberg's Lincoln. There are, of course, hundreds of other books which tell stories of how individuals, many of them immigrants from other countries, have flourished under our free system.

"Although I should like to see people everywhere able to obtain the great classics of democratic political theory at reasonable price, I would certainly think a few books of the type I've suggested might well be included."

I would agree entirely with this gentleman's letter, although I think I might add one other title, that is, "The Americanization of Edward Bok, which also tells the story of an immigrant boy's success in this country.

I hope this answers your question.

Sincerely,

W. D. FULLER,
Chairman of the Board, the Curtis Publishing Co.; Past President NAM.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: The proposal expressed to me in your letter of December 12 is one of the best undertakings I have heard of in a long time.

This, however, is my personal opinion. But within our organization we have a very active committee on economic education. It meets shortly. I will put the proposition to the group, which is made up of executives in industrial firms, and give you their reaction.

Please call on me for any assistance I can afford you on any matter.

Thanks.

Very truly yours,

JOHN E. GREGG,
Executive Vice President, Mississippi Manufacturers Association.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am honored to have your letter of December 12 asking that I check the list of books which will be proposed for printing in foreign languages.

I am so interested in this undertaking that I have engaged a competent person, Shirley Ann Sackman, to assemble copies of these books and review them for me. As soon as this has been done I will give you a report as to my thinking about them.

Cordially,

ROY A. GOULD,
President, Diamond Lumber Co., Portland, Oreg; Director, National Association of Manufacturers.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I appreciate receiving your letter of December 12 outlining the proposal for distribution of basic statements of democratic political philosophy through the United States Information Agency. I think the plan of distributing inexpensive copies of such books is an excellent one and I heartily approve of your plan for obtaining the necessary enabling legislation.

I think the list of books which you enclosed represents a fine selection. I would like to suggest that you also consider the possibility of using the following:

1. The United States Declaration of Independence.
2. The Constitution of the United States.
3. The Secret of American Prosperity (publisher: Greenberg—A Corwin Book).
4. The Epic of America, by James Truslow Adams.
5. America Comes of Age, by Andre Siegfried.

Also, although it might not be in exactly the same category as the others, I would suggest that you consider How We Live, published by the American Economic Foundation, as being one of the best short statements of basic American economic principles.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD I. YOUNG,
President American Zinc, Lead and Smelting Co., St. Paul, Director, National Association of Manufacturers.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: As you requested, I have reviewed the list of books which you are seeking to have the United States Information Agency publish in the principal languages of the world.

The list as submitted seems to be a good one.

I do not feel, however, that I am in a position to comment on the value of such an activity as you propose. I am not very familiar with the work of the United States Information Agency or with the present availability of such books, already printed in foreign languages.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. FOY,
President, Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh. Regional Vice President National Association of Manufacturers.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I think the idea of book distribution in foreign countries is an excellent one.

I am not familiar enough with the books mentioned to know whether they are or are not the right choices. But it seems to me that the principle is sound.

Cordially yours,

GEO. OLMSTEAD, Jr.,
S. D. Warren Co., Boston, Director NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: After reading your letter of December 12, with the enclosed plan, I would like to say that I stand behind your views on this matter.

I believe that this plan can do a lot to better world relations.

At the present time, I have no additions, omissions, or substitutions of the books recommended in the plan.

I would appreciate you advising me if and how I can be of further help to you.

Wishing you success in the coming new year, I remain,

Yours very truly,

J. CLIFTON YAUN,
Baton Rouge, La., Director, NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In reply to your letter of December 12, it seems to me that your program has very good objectives, provided the subject matter can be brought to the proper people at a nominal cost.

It seems to us that the Constitution and Bill of Rights should head the list of publications. We would like also to call your attention to a book, Essays on Liberty, as published by the Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-Hudson, New York. In this very excellent book there are a number of essays which are particularly pertinent, including the Bill of Rights, That Something, For the Better Economic Life, The Most-Dreaded Enemy of Liberty, The Guaranteed Life.

There is also another book, Understanding Our Free Economy, published by D. Van Nostrand Co., New York, which we think would be very good for your purposes.

Wishing you all success in this enterprise,

Very truly yours,

ALLEN ABRAMS,
Vice President, Marathon Corp., Rothschild, Wis., Director, NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have your letter of the 12th outlining a plan for making available abroad at nominal cost a selected group of books describing the Democratic political philosophy.

I am in accord with the thought that we should wage war with all appropriate tools in the battle of ideologies. It would seem to me that this move provides an added tool.

I have no suggestions with regard to authors and works. The list you mention would, I think, be very difficult to improve upon.

Have you thought of making "The American Heritage" available? It presents the best historically in current fashion.

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. MASLAND, Jr.,
C. H. Masland & Sons, Carlisle, Pa., Director, NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have received your letter which you have sent to all the directors of the National Association of Manufacturers regarding the plan for passing legislation directing the United States Information Agency to distribute a small library of basic statements in the principal languages of the world.

I am not familiar enough with the material that you list to make a constructive comment, but I do think the idea is a good one and I also think some publication that stresses our Bill of Rights and the outstanding features of our Constitution should certainly be distributed worldwide.

Yours truly,

B. C. ESSIG,
Gardner-Denver Co., Denver, Director, NAM.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: It is a pleasure to comment about the proposed publication of basic classical works on democratic philosophy, through the United States Information Agency, as requested in your letter of December 12, 1955.

I find no criticism of the idea that we should be more active in selling the democratic point of view, nor with the proposal that it be done by wider dissemination of the basic works from which the American Republic drew its founding philosophy and proceeded to develop it in later years.

No list of 15 or 20 books can do the complete job, but it can be comprehensive. In developing such a list, there are bound to be omissions and differences of opinion about those included. Frankly, I would not relish the job of making the selections.

The list of suggested authors and works accompanying your letter is a good one. As to specific recommendations, I would not include the writings of Dewey as representative of the best democratic thinking, because of my familiarity with his works generally rather than the specific work, the Public and Its Problems.

To generalize a comment is dangerous from a scholarly standpoint * * * yet to be specific runs headlong into accusations that one is quoting out of context.

Although all of the works listed are controversial to the extent that they offer much for pro-and-con discussion, it is my opinion that including Dewey would be like waving a red flag in front of a large segment of the

American public which would class his philosophy far to the left of the others * * * certainly not worthy of listing alongside Emerson, Hamilton, Jefferson, Kant, Locke, et al.

Sincerely yours,

RAYBURN WATKINS,
Managing Director, Associated Industries of Kentucky.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Mr. Daggett, director, NAM, has asked me to reply to your letter to him dated December 12 in connection with a plan for legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish certain books.

The idea that publications should be available in foreign languages to explain the American system of government and economy is obviously sound. It is a project which our Government should be prepared to underwrite. Furthermore, it is to be presumed that the United States Information Agency might very well be the agency through which this might logically be done. The question about which there is room for divergent views is as to what sort of publications should be sponsored.

It would seem that the list of suggested authors and works would be entirely appropriate for certain potential readers, particularly scholars in foreign countries. However, they do not appear to be particularly well chosen for the information and education of many other classes of persons. For example, Thoreau's Walden, a literary masterpiece, a very interesting book and one with expressions of opinion which are part of the concept of democracy, is nevertheless somewhat removed from contemporary time and conditions of living. It was written before the Civil War and under conditions of population and economic life much different from our own. It is to be feared that a reader who is something less than a philosopher or serious student of history might not learn much from Walden which would help him understand the American concept and practice of government.

In view of the well printed and well bound books which the Soviet Government makes available to citizens of other countries at nominal cost, it is possible that our Government should make available books which will have an offsetting influence, if it has not already done so. However, it is possible that one or more books should be used which are more comprehensive as to our background and present situation than are any one or few of the works listed. I am sorry that I cannot suggest such a book. If there is none, an especially prepared publication might be advisable, particularly if such a book included appropriate excerpts from many of the works suggested in your letter.

Very truly yours,

E. I. WHYATT,
Assistant to the President, Gould-National Batteries, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.

Classics of American Democracy—VIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, letters from leaders in the labor movement in response to my letters of December 12, 1955, follow:

DEAR SIR: In response to your communique concerning enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish a small library of basic writings concerning the democratic political philosophy, let me say in my opinion this is a very worthwhile and urgently needed addition to our foreign-policy program.

My only suggestion, for whatever it is worth, would be that you might add to part 2, since I am in full agreement with part 1, the following authors or works:

Beard, Rise of American Civilization.

Commons, American Labor Movement.

Parrington, Main Currents in American Thought.

Paine, Commonsense.

If I can be of any further service in helping promote this legislation, please feel free to call upon me.

Sincerely,

JULES PAGANO,
Director of Education, Communications, Workers of America.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am much in favor of your proposal to have Congress direct the United States Information Agency to publish a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy in the principal languages of the world.

There can be no doubt in my opinion that such a project would not only meet a great need, but could also go far to promote democratic thought particularly in the uncommitted countries of Asia and Africa. Needless to say, however, Congress should also provide sufficient funds so that USIA can make effective distribution of the series down into small-town libraries, local trade-union centers, editorial offices, etc.

I also generally agree with the titles suggested so far. It would seem to me, however, that the series could be brought a little more up to date without impairing the noncontroversial nature of the selection. In other words, the thought that democracy and our American democracy in particular, is ever-growing and basically able to cope with the problems posed by the industrial and atomic age should, in my opinion, be considered in the selection of the works.

One book which demonstrates this thought in thoroughly objective fashion and also includes some of the vital documents and thinking behind the New Deal and other more recent applications of democratic thought to new problems, is Henry Steel Commanger's Documents of American History (Appleton-Century, Crofts). This or some similar work may well be worthy of inclusion in the proposed series.

Sincerely yours,

F. K. DASHIELL,
Labor's League for Political Education.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I think that your suggested plan for the publication of Democratic classics is an excellent one.

There is nothing that I could add to the proposal other than to say it should provide for expansion, provided the initial start receives a good response.

Within the last 5 years I have spent nearly 18 months in the various countries of free Europe. In many countries people do considerable reading and the response to books on political science is always in evidence.

It would seem especially appropriate during these times that we should make available books depicting our way of life.

Sincerely,

E. E. PHELPS,
Director, Research and Education Department, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, C. I. O.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: Arnold S. Zander, president of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, and his associates in our national headquarters in Madison have studied with favor your proposed bill authorizing translation of basic literature of American democratic thought.

At your suggestion we are submitting herein a list of writings that we feel strongly should be included in such a list. We are not critical of your suggested authors and works and do not suggest deletion except for some of the early documents written by the English, French, and German authors. Our preference would be to substitute some from the following list:

The Crisis, by Thomas Paine.

The Declaration of Independence.

The Supreme Court Decision on Desegregation of the American Public Schools.

President Eisenhower's Proclamation for Desegregation in the Armed Forces.

The Constitution of the United States.

President Lincoln's Proclamation of 1863 on Slavery.

The political platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the 1952 election.

The Constitution of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations adopted in New York in December 1955.

The thought behind our selections is that the industrial worker and farm laborer of Europe and Asia would find the living documents above more meaningful in terms of his struggle for freedom than the basic, but difficult texts you have suggested.

If we may be of further service in your cause, please call upon us.

Most sincerely,

JOHN P. CALDWELL,
Director, Education and Publications, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Madison, Wis.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I think the plan for publication of Democratic Ideas is a splendid one.

I do wish that a somewhat less forbidding list of titles could be drawn up and agreed upon. I think the life of this Nation, for example, is often better reflected in its fiction and its poetry than in the kind of literature that is included in the list you sent me; however, I do see that you are, and must be, interested in the democratic abstractions and that getting agreement on a list of different kinds of books would be all but impossible and also even if preliminary agreement could be reached, it would not be feasible to get the list finally approved in Congress, so I settle for the list you sent me.

All good luck with what seems to be a really quite wonderful project.

Yours truly,

BRENDAN SEXTON,
Director of Education, UAW-CIO.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge your letter of December 12, 1955.

I believe the plan to enact legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy will definitely make a contribution to winning the minds of men to democracy over totalitarianism.

I would recommend a book named "Thomas Jefferson on Democracy" selected and arranged with an introduction by Saul K. Padover; Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863; Lincoln's Gettysburg Address on November 19, 1863, and Emerson's oration on the American Scholar delivered at Harvard College in 1837, to be included in the suggested authors and works made in your enclosure, part 2.

Very truly yours,

JOHN J. MCCOY,
Editor, the Hosiery Worker, American Federation of Hosiery Workers.

JANUARY 3, 1956.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I wish to acknowledge reciept of your letter of December 12, 1955, relative to establishing a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy, in the principal languages of the world.

Regarding enclosure, part I, I must admit that the program is not quite clear to me. If it is directed toward students and intellectuals, I believe the vast majority of these people are polylingual and fluent in English. The books listed in part II are famous books, and I am confident they are available to students throughout the world.

If the program is not primarily directed toward students and other intellectuals, but for literate populations throughout the world who may be curious about the principles of democracy, I believe the books listed in part II are too advanced. I believe this segment of the world's population would be more interested in the evolution of democracy.

While I understand it is not part of the proposed program, I cannot help but suggest that there is a great need for a small book written in simple, native language, with many pictures and drawn illustrations of democratic principles functioning. If communism breeds on unrest and unrest first manifests itself among working people, it is the workers who need most a knowledge of democratic theory and principle. A simple, well written book, distributed without cost to workers throughout the world, would be a real contribution to any program dedicated to the enlightenment of those unacquainted with democracy in action.

Regarding part II of the enclosure, with the exception of Thoreau's Walden, I believe the list of books represents an excellent choice. I would like to suggest two others for your consideration: American Democracy in Theory and Practice by Robert K. Carr, Donald H. Morrison, Marver H. Bernstein and Richard C. Snyder, published by Rhinehart & Company, Inc.: The Big Change by Frederick Lewis Allen, published by Harper Brothers.

I think your objective is laudable and one that our country sorely needs. The National Postal Transport Association will be happy to cooperate with you in advancing the necessary legislation.

With best wishes for success.

Sincerely,

WALLACE J. LEGGE, Jr.,
Chairman of Labor Education, National Postal Transport Association.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: We are in receipt of yours of December 12 and the attached enclosures regarding the publication of Democratic Classics.

I am strongly in favor of the idea. My only suggestion with regard to the list of authors is that perhaps Tom Paine should have been included. I realize that he has some followers among the Communists but that does not seem to be an adequate reason for excluding him from the list.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY G. WEINLEIN,
Director, Building Service Employees' International Union.

DEAR SIR: This refers to your letter of December 12, in connection with the translation into various foreign languages several books which you list.

I am not familiar with many of these books, but it seems to me that if they cover the principles of our democratic form of government, the Bill of Rights, etc., then the purpose will be served and a great deal of good should come from this project.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. LOVING,
Director, Educational Bureau, the Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 12 relative to legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

I have carefully studied the suggested words and authors, and am heartily in approval of same.

I trust this will aid you in your decision.

Very sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. COUGHLIN,
Assistant to the President, American Federation of Technical Engineers.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thanks for your note of December 12. I am sure that most of our thoughtful fellow American citizens will endorse your plan.

Over the weekend, I am going to try to examine the list carefully and possibly suggest some additions. In the battle for public opinion throughout the world, the circulation of such books as you mention will be of untold value. You probably know that the National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program is circulating the list and is calling attention to your admirable proposal.

The season's greetings, and with hope that this good idea can reach fruition in 1956.

Yours sincerely,

MARK STARR,
Educational Director, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: As promised, I gave further thought to the list of books which were circulated by you with a view for translation and publication by the United States Information Agency. One general comment is that these books are certainly classics, but the people who will be likely to read such books are college professors and specialists who will have a reading knowledge of English.

Would it not be advisable to think of American books with a more general and popular appeal? In my travels abroad, I find that such books as Upton Sinclair's "The Jungle" and Jack London's "Iron Heel," as well as John Steinbeck's "Grapes of Wrath" are still quoted and referred to by liberal and radicial groups. Would it not then be wise to issue something by Sinclair some 30–40 years later to show what he now thinks about democratic procedures in the United States?

Why should we claim Burke and Kant for the United States, and if Burke is published, we might consider publishing Tom Paine's reply to the particular book cited. May I suggest that some biographies, such as Van Doren's "Story of Benjamin Franklin", along with Franklin's own autobiography, and of Lincoln would be more readable? What about the stories of some of our outstanding immigrants, as described in their own writings, or by Louis Adamic? Mary Anton's "The Promised Land" is an example of the book I have in mind. "American Memoir" by Henry Seidel Canby, Houghton Miffling, 1934, gives an interesting picture of the growth of the United States. Then, what about a short and popular history of the United States, such as those written by Nevins-Commager or Richard Heffner? A good short and popular history of the labor movement in the Untied States should also be considered.

I would suggest that, in dealing with Emerson, you use the selections made by Dr. Edward Lindemann, and Saul Padover, has made a good selection of Jefferson's "Opinions on Democratic Principles and Practices."

It seems to me that Tom Paine's "Common Sense" is more closely connected with the United States than, say, Mill, Mazzine and Locke.

I hope these suggestions will be helpful to you. The fundamental decision, I think, rests with whether you are going to publish classics which have been written elsewhere and which can be listed as the source of American democracy, or whether you want to give a picture of the growth and development of the United States itself.

Yours sincerely,

MARK STARR,
Educational Director, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In reply to your request of December 12 for our opinion concerning the plan of a group of Members in the next session of Congress pushing for legislation that would direct the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy we have the following comments:

1. We believe that the proposal and the idea is an excellent one. It has our wholehearted cooperation and support.

2. We wish to register our opposition to the works of the following authors appearing on your suggested list: Burke, Emerson, Madison, Mill, Rosseau, and Thoreau.

3. I believe that every effort should be made to include a book of the present day which could be representative of our democratic political philosophy at this time. We do not feel qualified to make the selection of such a book at this time although we are studying the matter, but we believe that your committee could give consideration to this idea and come up with some good suggestions. I realize that it is difficult to do this in an era when the author may be still alive, but I think that our present day democratic philosophy is probably going to be of more interest to the foreign countries than our history of the past.

We wish to express our appreciation for having an opportunity to pass judgment on your suggested material and, if after further thought, we have any suggestions to make which we think might be of some interest we will write you again concerning them.

Very truly yours,

E. W. KENNEY,
Director, Research and Education, International Woodworkers of America.

Classics of American Democracy—IX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, following are letters from librarians concerning the proposal to translate into many languages and to make easily accessible at reasonable prices throughout the world the classics of American democracy:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I acknowledge with much interest your letter of December 12, 1955, with enclosures describing a plan for publications of democratic classics and providing a list of suggested authors and works.

I concur heartily in the suggestion contained in the plan. There appear to be reasons for supposing that in the present competition for the interest and adherence of foreign audiences, the classics of Marxism-Leninism have a certain advantage over those of Western democracy. It is highly desirable, in consequence, that publications be made more easily available to these audiences which explain the American system of

government, and the philosophy and ideals on which it is based.

However, I am not quite prepared at the present moment either to adopt the list of suggested authors and works or to suggest substitutes. The problem appears to me to be one of sufficient difficulty as to justify a kind of consideration that I am very doubtful of my preparedness to give.

On the one hand, the classics of Marxism-Leninism, which are being distributed by the Soviets in the countries to which we would appeal, represent writings of an industrialized society, and speak in modern terms. Meanwhile, many of the classics of Western democracy represent writings of a preindustrial society and a considerable number of those in the list actually derive from the 18th century. While, of course, it is desirable to call the great writings of liberty, of whatever period, to the attention of the audience whose loyalty for those ideals we wish to win, the equality of the competition into which we would advance these classics may nevertheless be questioned before venturing upon a wide campaign of distribution.

To put the problem succinctly, we wish to capture the interest and loyalty that is attracted by Stalin's Problems of Leninism; is Locke, On Civil Government, adequate for this purpose?

It appears to me, accordingly, that the selection of a list of works for the purpose of the "plan" should result from a very considered study by persons well acquainted not only with the literature which it is desirable to present, but also with the conditions of reader-interest and acceptability which the literature will encounter in the countries in which distribution is intended.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 12 describing your proposal under which the United States Information Agency will be directed to publish for nominal prices and in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. This is an area of much interest to the association and one which falls within the field of its International Relations Board. Consequently, I am asking Mr. William S. Dix, librarian of Princeton University, and chairman of the board, if he will write you.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID H. CLIFT,
Executive Secretary, American Library Association.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Mr. David H. Clift, executive secretary of the American Library Association, has forwarded to me from Chicago your letter of December 12 with its request for comments and suggestions on the proposal to have the USIA publish a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. When I have had an opportunity to study your list of suggested authors and works and to confer with some of my colleagues, I shall write to you in more detail. I can say now that the basic idea seems to me an admirable one.

Cordially yours,

WILLIAM S. DIX,
Chairman, International Relations Board.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to comment on your letter of December 12. I think that the idea of providing translations of from 15 to 20 books that are basic examples of the American philosophy of life is exceedingly important. There is little question that these would be well received if subsidized to sell at a competitive price in the local bookstores in foreign lands. Everyone I know who has looked at bookstands in the troubled areas of the Middle East and Far East in particular, report finding beautifully produced and inexpensive editions of Russian materials in the local languages in all the bookstores, but substantially none of the classics of our way of life.

While it is probable that no two people would agree on all the titles to be included, I think there could be no quarrel about the titles listed in your letter as being among those that might well be reproduced. The only suggestion that I can make is that I hope this program can be broadened, after the initial experiment, to become a fundamental part of our information work abroad.

If there is any way that I or the American Library Association can be of assitance to you in this project please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

RALPH R. SHAW,
President-Elect, American Library Association.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter dated December 12 and recently received.

As one who has had the good fortune to travel abroad, I am particularly struck by the excellence of your program. In foreign bookstores, American books are represented mainly by the expensive, hardbound, new titles, that only the wealthy can afford to buy.

Your proposal would make fine and inspiring books available in a format that would be familiar and within reach of the people generally.

Some titles have already been translated, although the translations may not be adequate.

Your list is good and I am particularly pleased to see such foreign visitors as Bryce and de Tocqueville represented. No such list would be complete, however, without Tom Paine's Commonsense and Rights of Man. And I would put in a word for that old classic, much admired abroad, Main Currents in American Thought, by Parrington.

Several collections which deserve consideration are:

Commager, Henry S., editor, Documents of American History. Fifth edition, Appleton.

Edman, Irwin, Foundations of Freedom; the Growth of the Democratic Idea. Harcourt. "Part I is an essay on the origins and implications of the democratic idea. Part II is an anthology of illustrative material * * * from philosophers and statesmen of all time." The Bookmark, May 1951.

Ketchum, Richard M., editor, What Is Democracy? Duton, 1955. Attractively printed quarto telling through text, maps and captioned photographs "the truth about the nature, the principles and the achievements of our society." The Bookmark, October 1955.

As to additions or selections, I would suggest:

For Jefferson: Saul K. Padover's Thomas Jefferson on Democracy, New American Library of World Literature.

For Lincoln: Paul M. Angle, editor, The Lincoln Reader, Rutgers University Press (also in pocket books); and T. Harry Williams, editor, Selected Writings and Speeches of Abraham Lincoln, Farar, Straus.

For Emerson: Essays, Everyman's Library, Dutton, or Bliss Perry, editor, Heart of Emerson's Essays, Houghton.

If we may be of any further help to you, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Sincerely yours,

C. F. GOSNELL,
State Librarian, New York.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The list of suggested authors and works is one which I consider quite satisfactory to meet the purpose of the plan to publish a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. The list certainly includes time-tested classical statements of democratic theory and I think it is desirable to have on the list authors other than Americans. Certainly the classics of American democracy included in the list owe a great deal to the works of such authors as Burke, Kant, Locke, Mazzini, Mill, and Rousseau. The only title which I would suggest for consideration is Milton's Aeropagitica. I recognize the difficulty of keeping a list such as this to reasonable proportions but I feel that the idea of freedom of the press as exemplified in Milton's work certainly should not be omitted from any discussion and theory of democratic society and constitutional government.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE H. WILSON,
Director of Libraries, University of Colorado.

Classics of American Democracy—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as indicative of the interest among the women of the United States, and the study and thought they are according to the proposal, are the following letters from representative leaders in woman activities:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I think it is a wonderful idea for us if we are going to add to the Information Agency to ask them to translate and publish in the principal languages of the world classical statements on democratic theory in their original forms. To make it valuable, however, in competing with the Soviets we will have to give them some modern statements that apply to contemporary situations.

A list of books is a good idea but I would ask experts who know various parts of the world as to the choice in different cases, because democracies are going to be different in different areas of the world. They will not be exactly as in the United States, though based on the same principles. Any appeal would have to be geared to the needs of the people into whose language it is translated. For instance, to talk about freedom of thought, speech, and religion is almost foolish unless it is tied up with the first freedom you can think of, namely the right to eat and the right to learn to read.

This can be one of the most effective programs in counteracting the Soviet subsidizing and selling for a few pence many of their classics as well as pamphlets on their political concepts. But I think it requires expert advice to have it really well done and I would ask the Library of Congress to get a group together and the State Department to get someone with background on the nations and their conditions so that the consultation can be on both these levels.

Very cordially yours,

ELEANOR ROOSEVELT.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of December 12th has been given my attention. The plan for the translation and inexpensive distribution of basic and classical statements on democratic theory in their original forms as outlined in that letter, seems to me to have much to be said for it. I have not made an exhaustive study of all these materials, but I am acquainted with many of them and the list seems to me to have been carefully

chosen. It is always hard to limit one's choice.

I believe if the United States Information Agency accepts the plan that emphasis should be made that whatever is produced must be simply done in format—easy to read, and very cheap in price so that those who need to read them and would, can purchase them easily.

Truly yours,

DORIS STEPHENS,
Director, League of Women Voters.
OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am writing in reply to your letter of December 12, 1955, regarding the plan for publication of democratic classics.

The plan seems to me to be a sound and constructive one and to provide an affirmative answer to the wide dissemination of the Communist classics. This opinion is based on the premise that these or similar books are not now readily and inexpensively available abroad. I assume also, that the plan does not overlap or duplicate any current program or plan of the United States Information Agency.

The choice of books seems to me good. In addition to or in substitution for some of those now on the list, you might wish to consider A Documentary History of the United States by R. D. Heffner, Thomas Jefferson on Democracy edited by Saul K. Padover, both published by the New American Library, and Primer of Intellectual Freedom edited by Howard Mumford Jones and published by the Harvard University Press.

Sincerely yours,

RUTH M. LURIE,
Mrs. Moses H. Lourie,
Director, League of Women's Voters.
BELMONT, MASS.

DEAR SIR: I was much interested in your "Plan for Publication of Democratic Classics" but, not being familiar with many of the books nor several of the individuals mentioned in your letter, I consulted one of the history professors at the University of Maine. He believed it to be a step in the right direction, thought the backers were capable and interested citizens, and considered the list of books excellent. His only comment not entirely favorable was that some of the books were rather out of date, but admittedly classics. He thought that the books written by men of other nations would have considerable influence.

With this corroboration of my own opinion I am very glad to give my approval for this project.

Sincerely yours,

SARA T. WENTWORTH,
Mrs. Chauncey D. Wentworth,
President, Maine Council of Church Women.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: If I could take an opinion poll of the church women of Nebraska, I believe they would heartily endorse the proposal as outlined in your letter of December 12.

America needs friends and more friends. Please note that the United Church Women have sent an "Ambassador of Good-Will" around the world and in 1955 we sent a "Fellowship Team" of four, for one specific purpose—to understand each other.

With the encouragement of two minister friends and the high school history teacher, I have checked the books. As I told them the purpose of my inquiry, they said, "Wonderful."

Blessings on you.

Sincerely,

MRS. HARRY COGGINS,
President, Nebraska Council of United Church Women.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In my humble opinion, I think it would be a fine thing for the United States Information Agency to translate and publish in the principal languages of the world a select list of classical statements of democratic theory. I approve of the list of books given in part 2 and have no other suggestions to offer. I trust that the next session of Congress will see fit to pass the plan suggested in part 1 and 2. They certainly have my approval.

Respectfully yours,

MARY S. ETTER
Mrs. E. O. Etter, Sr.,
State President, Virginia Federation BPW Clubs, Inc.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I was very much interested in your letter of December 12 and the proposal that the United States Information Agency publish for nominal prices in the principal languages of the world a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

I am sure from my contact with foreign students in the United States that there is a great interest in the subject and that even if these books were available at a low price in English, they would get wide circulation abroad. I have little idea of the cost involved in translating and printing them in a variety of languages. I am constantly amazed at the degree at which foreign students are able to read the English language. While the ordinary man in the street may not be able to read English easily, the documents on your list are more likely to appeal to college students or other well educated men and women when the present generation, at least, have English as a second language.

As I look over your list, I have no suggestion for deletion, but 2 suggestions for inclusion: Thomas Paine's, Rights of Man, and Walt Whitman's, Leaves of Grass. My only reservation is whether some of these books will be understandable without considerable editorial comment or interpretation in a classroom. It is a good many years since I have read most of them, but I recall I found them rather heavy going and I was raised in the Pennsylvania school system and have graduated from college.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET BARNARD,
President, Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State.

MR. O'HARA: I would like to suggest two more books for the list you are asking about especially for Americans to read in inexpensive publications, "The American Past" by Roger Butterfield and "The Great Rehearsal" Carl Van Doren.

I think it is a wonderful idea to make these books available to foreign peoples but the common citizens of our own country need them also.

Respectfully,

Mrs. SEYMOUR Y. MCALLISTER,
Ogden, Utah.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I was much interested in your idea of asking the USIA to publish a library of statements of democratic political philosophy.

Although the League of Women Voters cannot give your idea official support because the subject is not on our program, I would like to say that as a private citizen I applaud the idea, as outlined in your letter of December 12.

Sincerely,

ZELIA P. RUEPHAUSEN,
450 East 52d Street, New York City,
Director LWV.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: It is gratifying to know that a group of Congressmen are thinking in such constructive terms about publicizing democracy as you suggest in your letter of December 12. I think the plan for publication of Democratic classics in volumes which can be obtained at nominal cost is excellent. It would be desirable not only to make such volumes available to citizens outside the United States but also to citizens in the United States, especially young citizens.

While I am not a political scientist and, therefore, feel unable to render expert judgment on the list of books and authors you suggest in your enclosures, the list does seem to me to include the leading authorities on democratic government and philosophy.

I think it might be well to secure the judgment of Dr. Boyd and his associates of Princeton University on the writings and speeches of Jefferson, as well as Dr. Dumas Malone of Columbia University who is the author of the life of Jefferson. You might also wish to examine W. W. Willoughby's Congressional Government.

I shall certainly follow with the most sympathetic interest the progress of your proposal in the next Congress.

Sincerely yours,

NELLE S. REESE,
Mrs. Albert M. Reese,
President, League of Women Voters of West Virginia.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Your letter of December 12 concerning the publication of a small library of basic democratic philosophy, in the principal languages of the world, has aroused my interest. This is most certainly a constructive suggestion and one which may offer great rewards in international understanding.

I do not speak for the federation in commenting upon your plan, for I do not know whether our members would approve the expenditure of Government funds for this purpose; but if Government subsidy were not necessary, I am sure many of our members would heartily endorse your proposal.

The list of books seems to me to be excellent, for while I have not read some of the volumes you list, I recognize them as being foundation works in their fields. No doubt you have had the advice of teachers of political theory in making this selection.

Thank you for keeping me informed of your project.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET N. MATHENY,
National Chairman, Program Coordination Committee, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I received your letter of December 12, 1955, in regard to the proposed enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

I approve of the principle of this plan but I do not feel that I could express myself properly in regard to the list of books in enclosure, part 2, because I am not personally familiar with all of these books.

I would like to express myself in regard to the inclusion of some books that would represent the spiritual growth and strength of our Nation, which to me is one of the chief ramparts of our security and freedom.

Sincerely,

MARGARET WILKINSON,
Memphis, Tenn., National Federation of Business and Professional Women.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am sorry to have been so slow in answering your letter of December 12 asking for suggestings of books on American democracy which might be printed in the principal languages of the world and sold for nominal prices so that peoples of other countries might be able to learn about our American democracy. I felt that this is such an important venture that I wished to consult with some of our well-informed league members.

We believe your plan to have the USIA publish in many languages an inexpensive and compact library of classics on democracy

is an excellent one and long overdue. We will ask our members to urge their Congressmen to support it.

The proposed selections in your enclosure, part 2, are good but we feel they are too heavy and too exclusively academic for wide general reading. Granted that many of them are basic and should have priority, we feel that more modern selections, simply and clearly written should be included. Eighteenth century writings that show the origin of our democracy should be balanced by more modern writings that show it as a living, growing, working concept.

Of the earlier writers we would definitely include the selections listed from Locke, Rousseau, Kant, Mill, the Federalist Papers, deTocqueville, Selections from Jefferson (Saul K. Padoveis mentor book—Jefferson on Democracy) Thoreau, Emerson, and Abraham Lincoln.

We feel inadequate to recommend specific modern writings, in addition to Hand and Wilson, both excellent, but we urge you to consider:

1. Where Constitutional Liberty Came From, by Alfred H. Kelly, of Wayne University, Detroit, Freedom Agenda Pamphlet No. 10, Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, 164 Lexington Avenue, New York.

2. The Democratic Way of Life, by T. V. Smith and Edward Lindeman.

3. Some selections from the writings of our eminent Chief Justices, such as Oliver Wendell Holmes and Charles Evans Hughes who have written brilliantly on democracy from the judicial viewpoint.

4. Also to consult some of our great historians such as Henry Steele Commager for selections or suggestions of writings on democracy today.

5. Also if eminent world figures like Einstein or Albert Schweitzer have written on democracy their work would add to any collection.

Such a balanced, well-rounded set of books we feel would help fill the need. Some Europeans have criticized us for relying on 18th century writers to explain democracy. We can't explain without them but a balance of present-day writings show proof of its adaptability and workability.

This suggestion may not comply with your desire to include only time-tested classics, and we certainly do not wish to precipitate a congressional argument over modern authors, but for wider reader interest and consumption it is essential to balance the collection.

We trust that these suggestions may be of help to you, and thank you for asking the League of Women Voters of Nebraska to participate in this project.

Most sincerely,

EDNA J. MARSHALL,
Mrs. Roy Marshall,
State President, League of Women Voters of Nebraska, Omaha, Nebr.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12, in which you describe the proposed plan for enabling legislation to direct the United States Information Agency to publish a small library of democratic political works in the principal languages of the world.

It seems to me to be an excellent plan and one in which the American people would be much interested. The list of suggested authors seems to me a fine one but I am unable to comment specifically on the choices you suggest.

The best of luck to you in this project.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN B. LATIMER
Mrs. John G. Latimer,
Director, League of Women Voters.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12, 1955, outlining plans for the cheap publication of statements of democratic theory. This seems to me a most interesting and worthwhile project.

Before making suggestions for your book list as you requested, I should like to get the opinions of some of my associates. I should have a chance to do this in the next week or so. Then I will be better able to give you a more thoughtful reply, which would reflect more than my own.

We appreciate your consideration in writing our organization.

Yours very sincerely,

SUSAN H. BAKER,
President, League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have read with interest your letter outlining the plan for having the United States Information Agency undertake the publishing of a library of books on democratic political philosophy in the principal languages of the world.

At the moment, I feel I have no very useful ideas on the subject, although I do have a number of questions. First, I wonder what you would consider to be "the principal languages." My impression is that most if not all of the books on your suggested list have been translated into French, German, and Spanish, and are available in many countries in inexpensive paper-backed editions. This, it seems to me, raises a couple of problems, one being the matter of distribution of large quantities of books published at "nominal, subsidized cost" which should be widely available "not alone from United States agencies." Is there not a danger that the United States would be accused of unfairly competing with local publishers in some—particularly European countries? The other problem is in the field of public relations. Would it not appear somewhat presumptuous for the United States to publish books by, say, the English and French authors for widespread distribution in the countries of their own origin?

There is no question in my mind but that the works you have chosen are all excellent. I would suggest only that more American and fewer foreign authors be included and that some be contemporaries even though the subject matter itself remains historical. I would also like to see the list broadened to include more interpretation of our form of constitutional government by such men as Charles Beard or Justice Holmes, for instance.

The idea of promoting widespread circulation of the concepts of democratic government is undeniably a good one provided it can be carried out in the right places and without infringing on local interests. (It would even be helpful, I think, to have such subject matter more widely circulated in the United States.)

I will be interested in learning what action is taken on your plan in the coming session of Congress.

Sincerely,

MARGARET E. BRUCE,
Mrs. Rudolph Bruce,
President, League of Women Voters of Massachusetts.

Get Trained Man for the Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under previously granted leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt from an editorial which appeared in the Fort Worth Press on February 3, 1955. This editorial, in my opinion, describes a fundamental situation which exists in many localities throughout the country and commends itself to the reading of all Members of the Congress:

GET TRAINED MAN FOR THE JOB

The Post Office Department is one of the biggest business enterprises in the world.

And, that being true, it naturally follows that the Nation's 40,000 post offices—particularly those as large as the one in Fort Worth—should be run with a maximum of efficiency and a minimum of politics.

Which brings us directly to the point—the regrettable tradition that has been followed for so long in selecting postmasters, a tradition bogged deep in the quagmire of political patronage.

More often than not the county political committee of the party which happens to be in power decides that good old Joe or faithful old Jake should have this patronage plum—regardless of the fact that Messrs. Joe or Jake probably know little more about postal affairs than how to lick a 3-cent stamp and stick it on an envelope.

God old Joe or jolly old Jake may be anything in the professional field—butcher, baker, or candlestick maker—but, as a usual rule, that deters a country committee not one whit.

The committeemen are prone to reason that since the selectee has chalked up a good mark as a party wheelhorse, he should be thrust into a key position in one of the world's greatest businesses * * * and without any apparent qualifications for the job.

On the other hand, there are men in the various postal services—both Democratc and Republicans—who have long and outstanding records as career men, people with the know-how that comes from years of experience in handling the affairs of the Post-Office Department.

The late Dudley C. Jernigan provides a case in point. Mr. Jernigan was a long-time career man in the Department and he went to the postmastership after distinguishing himself in the postal inspection service. He was a man who knew all the ins and outs of the mail business, and although his tenure was all too brief, he will be remembered as one of Fort Worth's most outstanding postmasters.

Ben Franklin's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 17, 1956, our country will observe the 250th anniversary of the birth of one of America's most revered and beloved statesmen, Benjamin Franklin. It would be most fitting if on that day we all joined in repeating the prayer he penned on December 4, 1789. It follows:

BEN FRANKLIN'S PRAYER

God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man, may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, this is my country.

Appendix

The Importance of Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "The Importance of Transportation," which I delivered on September 24, 1955, at Reading, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF TRANSPORTATION

(Address of Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, at the parade of progress, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Parish Pressed Steel Co., at Reading, Pa., Saturday, September 24, 1955

I am highly honored by your invitation to come to the historic city of Reading, the county seat of the rich and charming county of Berks.

Courageous and God-fearing people have developed this area into an industrial and agricultural section unsurpassed by any similar area in the world.

In all the history of Berks County its many cultural institutions and its churches of every denomination have had the splendid support of the people.

We meet to celebrate the 50th anniversary of a great industry that has contributed so much to the welfare and prosperity of Berks County, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Nation. The establishment of the Parish Pressed Steel Co. a half century ago was a notable event in our history. It was the first step in the parade of progress that has marched forward through the years.

This celebration demonstrates pride in the past and renews our faith in the future. It represents outstanding achievement under the system of free, competitive, private enterprise which is the foundation of American economic strength.

It is an example of success based on the superior skill and know-how of the American worker and American management, which have created the greatest industrial empire the world has ever known.

Today I want to direct your attention to the important place of transportation in the growth and expansion of the United States.

Transportation has always been and still is one of the big problems in America. It is a problem that we must face with the same courageous spirit that our ancestors met the difficulties of their day.

The history of transportation in America is a fascinating story. It is filled with the romance of an expanding empire of freedom and opportunity. It is the story of resolute, courageous men and women who pushed westward over the mountains and plains to open new lands, to clear the forests, and to create new communities that have become great centers of industry and enterprise. From the earliest settlements along the Atlantic seaboard, to the present time, the development of our systems of transportation has been one of the most important factors in our material, cultural, and spiritual progress. It is the foundation upon which were built the great foreign and domestic commerce carried on our rivers and harbors, our highways, railroads, airlanes, and pipelines. It made possible the development of agriculture, the opening of rich mines, oilfields, and forest resources.

In the early days the streams and Indian trails provided the only means of communication and travel. The first roads that connected scattered communities were built to accommodate horse-drawn vehicles in the unhurried pace of that day.

Military necessity was another strong influence in road development.

The westward migration brings to mind the great fleet of Conestoga wagons, which had their origin in Pennsylvania, and other covered wagons, ever moving toward the setting sun. This is an inspiring picture. It is typically American. It embodies the American spirit of self-reliance and individual responsibility. It meant hardship, privation, and often death, but it developed the greatest nation the world has ever known.

Today we have five major transportation systems in the United States: Waterways, roads, railways, airplanes, and pipelines.

There is much competition among these systems. It would be most helpful if our five methods of transportation could be coordinated so there would be less competition, but in our free-enterprise system this is almost impossible as it would involve too much governmental interference.

However, the people should demand that each type of transportation be required to bear its fair and equitable burden of taxation.

Each system of transportation has had some help from government.

Roads are entirely financed by the three levels of government.

Railroads in the early days received grants of land to aid them in their financing.

Airports are constructed from public funds.

Ports and waterways have been financed by the Federal Government.

Pipelines had some Federal help during World War II to aid in their construction. They are owned by private enterprises.

We now have invested in highways, 1931 through 1955, $75,230,000,000 distributed as follows: Federal $11½ billion; State: $43 billion; local: $21½ billion.

In waterways the Federal Government has invested, including harbors, channels, inland and intracoastal waterways, 1931 through 1955, $1,450,000,000.

In railroads we have a total of 401,539 miles, with a value of $33,581,000,000. They pay taxes of $1,261,000,000 a year. They are owned by the people.

In aircraft the total investment of public money is $2,200,000,000. The total value of scheduled and nonscheduled airlines is $1,175,000,000, and the total taxes paid by airlines is $450 million a year.

The Federal Government has not built any pipelines except during World War II—the Big and Little Inch—which were sold to private industry in 1947 for $143,127,000. Private enterprise in the last 10 years has invested almost $50 billion in pipelines for oil and gas.

The waterways of our country have always held a magnificent place in our material, cultural, and spiritual progress.

Transportation on the rivers may not be as romantic as it was at one time, yet it continues to increase in importance.

In the early days, transportation on the rivers centered around speed. Now the objective is tonnage. For example in 1953, from conservative estimates, there were 158 million tons carried on the Mississippi River system, which includes the Gulf Intercoastal Canal. This tonnage was principally bulk commodities, such as coal, steel, chemicals, and petroleum.

An ordinary towboat, pushing 9,000 tons of petroleum products form Houston, Tex., to Pittsburgh, Pa., is doing a job that would require 830 tank cars of 8,500-gallon capacity, or 1,300 tank trucks of 5,000-gallon capacity. By rail it would require 16 trains of 50 cars each. If transported by truck, it would cover 50 miles of road space.

This traffic is constantly increasing. The Army engineers' records show that in 1944 the waterways over which petroleum products and coal are transported carried about 20 billion ton-miles; in 1953, it had moved to over 33 billion ton-miles.

In 1953 the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, estimated the total cost to complete all authorized river and harbor projects presently deemed necessary in the interest of commerce and navigation at about $2½ billion.

The natural waterways in America have been a success, but there have been some notable examples of financial failure in State government construction and operation of canal systems.

The great example was the most dismal failure of the publicly owned canal system of Pennsylvania. That system started in operation about 1824. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania offered its direct obligations in bonds to finance the construction of these canals. The total construction cost was about 33½ million; maintenance and repairs amounted to about 24½ million; interest on loans amounted to 43½ million, which made a total investment for the State of over 101 million. The State collected in tolls about 32½ million and sold the canals for $11,281,000, or a financial loss to the State of almost $60 million. That was an enormous amount of money at that time.

America has more men of know-how in the operation of business than any other country in the world, but somehow Government operation of business has been almost a complete failure. Considering living standards it has always failed any place in the world.

For a moment, let us consider our expansion in the United States, for this is the real reason for much of our transportation difficulties.

One of the most spectacular developments has been the surprising increase in our population. According to the latest Census Bureau estimates we are now a Nation of more than 165 million people. We never expected to reach that number.

The figure represents an increase of more than 13 million, or nearly 9 percent, above the total for the last general census of 1950 and 25 percent since 1940.

Translated into terms of human needs and the American way of life this population

increase has imposed upon us many great problems.

We need more schools to educate the growing army of young people. We need more hospitals. We must build more churches of every denomination. We must have more, better and safer roads to accommodate the vastly increased volume of motor traffic that crowds upon our inadequate and hazardous highway systems.

The highways are today, as always, the basic means of transportation. The other transportation systems—waterways, railroads and the air—aid and supplement the roads just as the auxiliary branches of the armed services help the doughboy gain and hold his objective.

Turning now to the present and the future, there is widespread agreement that bold, new steps must be taken to correct the deficiencies that have accumulated on our highway system during and since World War II.

President Eisenhower has proposed that bold plan.

The Nation has not kept pace with highway needs. The time has come when obsolete and dangerous roads must be replaced or rebuilt to modern standards of safety and efficiency. Larger, faster, and increased numbers of motor vehicles have added to our problem and will continue to do so. The American people now own more than 58 million motor vehicles and that figure is expected to rise beyond 81 million in the next 10 years. They now own 253,000 buses, about 10 million trucks, and 48 million passenger cars.

The trucking industry has grown to be one of the big industries of our country. Its annual gross expenditures for all purposes is about $29 billion.

The Federal Government has collected annually from taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricating oil, excise taxes on motor vehicles and tires and tubes more than $2½ billion. The Highway Act of 1954 allocated funds equivalent to all the Federal gasoline tax to the States for road construction.

For many years roads were built where there was the strongest political pressure. There was no comprerensive plan.

The plan proposed by President Eisenhower places emphasis on the national system of interstate highways. This is a specially designated network of 37,600 miles to connect 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all the cities over 50,000 population. It will have controlled access and will bypass large centers of population. It will cost about $25 billion.

The system has been carefully laid out to take care of the military, civilian defense and industrial needs of the country. When completed it will bring our people closer together and provide the means for a better understanding of our great country.

We need the roads. There is no disagreement on that score. We must have them if we are to have an expanding economy. We need them for our industrial, cultural, and spiritual advancement. We need them for national and civilian defense. We need them to reduce the frightful toll of lives taken each year by accidents on our highways. The big decision we must make is how they shall be financed. It's up to the American people to decide, for they must pay the bills.

Personally I feel the President's plan for a bond issue is sound. I do believe, however, that serious consideration should be given to the question of tolls. I believe that the collection of tolls, wherever feasible, on sections of roads, bridges and tunnels, would be advantageous to our country and fair to the traveling public. Or perhaps it might be wise to require the payment of a license fee for vehicles traveling on the interstate system. Some money should come directly from the general funds.

In the past the romance of traveling in covered wagons, stagecoaches and packet lines were adventures pictured in the famous prints of Currier and Ives and other artists. The tying together of the Atlantic and the Pacific by steel rails was acclaimed all over the world.

The first plane across the continent was hailed as an event unparalleled in transportation.

The completion of the interstate highway system will be another romantic story in American progress. I am hopeful that the next session of Congress will see the wisdom of an early start on this tremendously important project. Let me assure you that as a Member of the Senate and as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Public Works Committee, I shall do everything possible to expedite the enactment of the necessary legislation.

Again, I say, it is an honor to appear in this historic county.

Through the years you have contributed outstanding patriotic service to our Nation.

You have had a large part in building the economic strength of the United States. You have worked hard to make America.

What has made us such a great nation?

First and foremost in attributing the success of the American Republic I would place our system of government, based on God's greatest gift to mankind, freedom of the individual.

Second, I would place the sturdy courage and faith of our people—the American character based upon hard work, thrift, tolerance, love of liberty, and love of God.

These priceless endowments are the foundation stones upon which American initiative, energy, and know-how, combined with transportation, created the vast empire of industrial and agricultural production that twice in a third of a century saved the world from dictatorship.

Let us take inspiration from this parade of progress to rededicate ourselves to patriotic purpose, to face the future confident and unafraid, trusting in the mercy and goodness of God to direct the course of our Nation in the path of righteousness, justice, and peace.

Major Aspects of the Senate Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the major aspects of the Senate highway bill, which I delivered before the first general session of the American Roadbuilders' Association, 54th annual convention, at Miami Beach Municipal Auditorium, on Thursday, January 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR ASPECTS OF THE SENATE HIGHWAY BILL

(By Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, United States Senator)

It is indeed a pleasure for me to be here again today to address the very fine organization which you gentlemen represent. I have known many of your members and Washington representatives for years during my service in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, where I have had the honor and privilege of serving since 1930. Your president, Jack Robertson, is a particularly good friend of mine, and the other officers of your fine association are always welcome, not only in my office but before the Senate Committee on Public Works of which I have the honor to be chairman.

I am happy to greet this exceptional group of Federal, State, and local highway officials and I know that the many heads of industry have taken time from their own pressing business to attend this important meeting.

I wish to pay my respects, too, to the distinguished guests of this convention who have come from the Republics of Central and South America. We have been working in the Senate and the same can be said for the House, I think with considerable success, to hasten the completion of the Pan-American Highway and also extend increasing technical and engineering assistance to our other friendly neighbors in the Pan American Republics. Surely it would be a wise course for our Government to expand the highway assistance program that is now under way. I feel confident that we shall take steps in this direction in the near future.

My experience in the field of highway legislation has been continuous since becoming a Member of the United States Senate in 1935, and during the more than 20 years which I have served on the committee concerned with roads many changes have taken place in the field of highway transportation, with the motor vehicle registration increasing from about 26 million in 1935 to more than 61 million in 1955, and it is estimated that the total will reach 81 million by 1965.

Until 1950 Federal assistance was provided mainly on about 234,000 miles of the primary Federal aid system which interconnected most of the principal cities which had been selected by State and Federal authorities. In 1940 $100 million was provided for the primary system and only $15 million provided for the secondary system, and $20 million for grade crossings.

World War II saw the end of the pioneering period of road building and many cities were interconnected by two-laned surface roads but they were entirely inadequate to care for the great volume of traffic which had developed.

We in Congress recognized the great importance of an accelerated road program and in the Highway Act of 1944, we authorized a greatly expanded postwar highway program of $500 million annually for 3 years and increased funds for the secondary system by tenfold, and included for the first time funds for routes within cities. There was a delay in the initiation of the program until October 1945, however, progress was slow because of shortages of manpower, materials and contractors.

The national system of interstate highways was designated in 1947. Authorization of funds specifically for this system was first made in legislation of 1952 for funds for fiscal years 1954 and 1955 and allowed $25 million for each year, which we realized was insufficient to make the needed progress. In the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954, we authorized $875 million for apportionment to the States for each of the fiscal years 1956 and 1957, which was an increase of 52 percent over funds for the 2 preceding years. In the 1954 act we increased the funds for the interstate system from 25 million to 175 million dollars annually and authorized the use of these funds to pay for 60 percent of the construction costs.

I feel that the statistics which I have quoted is desirable to emphasize the fact that the Congress has recognized the extreme importance of an accelerated highway program and we have realized that even the 1954 authorization is not sufficient to care for the tremendous impact of automobiles, busses, and trucks on our highways which

amount to a total of more than 3,366,000 miles, of which about 235,000 miles are on the primary Federal aid system, which includes the interstate system, and about 483,000 miles on the secondary system. It is interesting to note that of the 3,366,000 miles there are more than 1,200,000 miles with no surfacing.

Although the 1954 authorization provided for matching funds up to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, steps were taken during the first session of the 84th Congress to authorize a greatly expanded program of road construction to enable our highly mobile economy to move about with greater ease and safety. Several highway bills were introduced and hearings were started on February 21, 1955, and extended through April 15, 1955, with about 100 persons and organizations interested in highway development being given an opportunity to be heard. Among this group many outstanding members of your own organization gave fine testimony on the problem of highway needs and the ability of our industries to carry out the program of construction.

After the many days of public hearings and numerous executive sessions by our Committee on Public Works the bill designated as Senate bill 1048 was reported and passed by the Senate with certain amendments being made on the floor of the Senate.

I want to say that in my many years of experience as a representative of my people in New Mexico and the country as a whole that the legislation which we passed in the Senate on the highway program is one of the most outstanding pieces of work that I have seen. The bill, as you know, would authorize $900 million annually for 5 years for the primary, secondary, and urban highways and $1 billion, $1.25 billion, $1.5 billion, $2 billion, and $2 billion for each of 5 years for the interstate system. We felt that the interstate system should be accelerated because of its value in serving interstate commerce and national defense but that we must not neglect the secondary system which not only means much to our national economy but also to the local economy of each State and community.

In our consideration of a program of such magnitude for the interstate system we believed that since the Federal Government would be matching on a 90–10 basis, on the interstate system, that protection should be provided for this investment, so we included a provision designed to limit weights and dimensions of vehicles. We also instructed the Bureau of Public Roads to conduct tests to determine the effect of overloading on highways. The Maryland road test and the recently completed road test in Idaho, have indicated that roads must be constructed much more substantially to withstand the impact of heavy vehicles. However, many of our existing roads are not now constructed to such standards, therefore we must not overload them. Other provisions included were designed to expedite the acquisition of rights-of-way and to take care of relocations.

One of the many items which have given me great concern over my many years of experience in highway legislation, is the effect of by-passing communities which depend on highway traffic for their livelihood. In many cases communities prefer to have main highways pass around them but they should be given consideration in the matter.

During consideration of the highway bill I pointed out that in any program of the magnitude proposed, we should insure that the workers on these projects would not be treated unfairly insofar as living wages and decent hours are concerned, however, there was considerable opposition to including compulsory labor pay standards as a part of the legislation but I was assured that such matters would be taken care of by the States and contractors and that in the construction program all workers would be treated fairly.

There are many more features of the bill which we passed in the Senate which are technical in nature and I need not dwell on them at this time, but I cannot leave you without commenting on the terrible toll of life which is taken daily on our highways and streets. In 1941 highway traffic deaths reached nearly 40,000. Then wartime gasoline rationing reduced the toll but they began to increase and in December 1951 we had our millionth traffic death. In 1954 there were more than 36,000 deaths as a result of traffic and in addition a million and a quarter people were injured, with over 100,000 suffering permanent disability. It is quite evident that our highways are not adequate to handle the terrific amount of vehicular traffic, nor to utilize the tremendous power to speed being built into our modern automobiles. The only answer is to drive carefully and work for better roads and continue to drive carefully.

Acknowledging the need for a great new system of modern roads—for the States and the cities and the counties and the hamlets—is one thing; defining the method by which we can bring this miracle to pass is something else again. It seems to me that we are possessed here with a problem that embraces our total economy and modern society—probably our defense and survival. Thus, when we speak about building roads for this country, whether it be in New Mexico or Maine, we are really touching one of the most delicate nerves of the Nation. There is absolutely no place for political bickering or a scramble for credit in the essential job to be done. The great burden will rest, as it always has, with the States and their political subdivisions. But the responsibility of the Federal Government cannot be lightly brushed aside. There is no sense in pretending that there will be any substantial difference in the saving of dollars because we shift responsibility from one government to another. There isn't anything easy or cheap in this whole road building plan. It's all going to have to be paid for and the only important question is how can it best be planned to serve the Nation as a whole? The Federal-aid program has become an old adventure, once termed radical during the administration of Woodrow Wilson. But after 40 years, the remarkable cooperative Federal-State arrangement which has been distinctive in the field of road building has proved itself beyond question. We have recently been expanding the Federal-aid program and I see no good reason for changing my view that the program should be expanded to a still greater degree.

The nub of these remarks is that, in my opinion, better highways are a desperate American need. Further, insofar as I am able to judge, our committee and the United States Senate will continue to warmly support a reasonable, workable national program to bring about a solution.

I would not want to close my speech without paying tribute to a dear friend of mine and your association who has passed away.

While Tom Keefe was well known from coast to coast among the ranks of men who serve the highway industry and the engineering profession, his friendship with key figures in the Federal Government in Washington was developed highly.

Tom built up a fabulous array of friendships, not only among the most powerful and highly placed Members of Congress but throughout the Federal executive branch. His formula for winning friends was disarmingly simple and in its philosophy mirrored the man himself. "Serve others," he would say, "without hope or desire of personal reward."

That was the credo by which this exceptional and, at times, explosive man lived and by which he was able to perform remarkable services for his country. Those who were privileged to know him well are aware of the nobility and true essence of his service and his unflagging work.

We shall look far to again find such a man. We are filled with gratitude for the unselfish help that he gave us. We miss him now most deeply. But we hope, since that is the way matters are arranged by the Highest Authority, that he is finding a richly deserved and everlasting peace.

Thomas J. Keefe, a native of West Philadelphia, lived at 4411 Bradley Lane, Chevy Chase, Md. He is survived by his wife, Elizabeth, three sons, and a daughter.

A Message in German

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, recently the Governor of Pennsylvania sent a letter of congratulation to Chancellor Adenauer, and it was in German. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Pennsylvania has produced many outstanding men of Pennsylvania German descent. Among those were the ancesters of the President of the United States. They lived in Pennsylvania, and he has many of the characteristics of those great people. General Pershing's people lived in Pennsylvania.

I mention these facts because in this trying period, when we sometimes have doubts about the loyalty of those coming from other countries, it is a pleasure to point to these fine people who have been so loyal to our country and have been fully in accord with our ideals.

I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial referring to this matter printed in the Appendix fo the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MESSAGE IN GERMAN

That Governor Leader's congratulatory message to Chancellor Adenauer on the latter's 80th birthday anniversary was in German has caused comment. Says the Associated Press:

"The telegram * * * is believed to be the first message written in a foreign language by a Pennsylvania Governor in recent years."

Well, there is no State whose governor would have a better right to write in German than Pennsylvania.

For, surprising as it may seem to those who never have inquired into the subject, an immense number of Pennsylvanians have German backgrounds.

We call them Pennsylvania Dutch, Dutch being a corruption of the German word "Deutsch," which means German.

The Pennsylvania Dutch were among the earliest settlers in Pennsylvania and were so numerous that after the Revolution there was a brief discussion over the question of whether English or German should be the official language of the legislature.

To this day there live in rural districts in eastern and central Pennsylvania thousands of persons whose ancestors have been Pennsylvanians for 4 or 5 generations but who

still speak the German dialect called Pennsylvania Dutch as their mother tongue.

Pittsburgh's oldest church, the Smithfield Street Congregational, still occupying land given it by William Penn's heirs, began as a German language church. And a 100 years ago Pittsburgh had German language daily newspapers with what for those times was a large circulation.

Governor Leader is of Pennsylvania Dutch extraction, as were also his Republican predecessor, Governor Fine, and many other Pennsylvania governors.

President Eisenhower is the descendant of Pennsylvania Dutch ancestors and so, too, was the American commander in the First World War, General Pershing, whose ancestors, some of whom lived in Westmoreland County, spelled the name Pfoerschinn.

As the Pennsylvania Dutch became Americans of unquestioned loyalty, so, too, will the more recent immigrants from eastern and southern Europe.

Some of the second and third generations already are prominent in politics and public affairs.

Address by Former President Truman at St. Paul, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is with particular pleasure and pride that I bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate an address by its most distinguished alumnus, the former President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

President Truman was the guest of honor and the principal speaker at a dinner honoring the Governor of the State of Minnesota, the Honorable Orville Freeman. This dinner was attended by over 2,200 persons. President Truman's address was carried over radio on a nationwide hookup through the CBS facilities. It was presented over television by 11 midwestern television stations. The former President distinguished himself not only by the excellence of his address, but by his gracious, pleasant, and engaging personality. We Minnesotans like Harry Truman—and he seems to like us.

The former President's visit also afforded us an opportunity to make a substantial contribution to the Truman Library. Some of the most distinguished citizens in our State were present at a luncheon in his honor. He was warmly welcomed and received, and honored our State by his visit.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address of the former President printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am very happy to come here today to pay tribute to this wonderful young governor of yours. He deserves all the good things you have been saying about him. He is a fighter for the people, and he is carrying on in the great, liberal tradition of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota.

Orville Freeman is worth talking about in his own right, but he is more than that. He is a sample of the vigorous young Democratic leadership that is rising to the top all over the country. I could name a number of young governors who are carrying the Democratic banner to victory in many States. They are doing that by dedicating their lives to the welfare of the people—and by giving the people good government. It is really wonderful to see this crop of new and brilliant leaders coming to the front to carry on the great tradition of the Democratic Party.

I always like to come to Minnesota. I have known your Senator HUMPHREY for a long time. He was a great help to me when I was in the White House. He is taking his place now as one of the most respected and trusted national leaders of the Democratic Party. He is a man who has given the cause of liberal, democratic government new life and greater vigor not only in Minnesota but throughout the country.

Being here in Minnesota reminds me of the visits I made in this area when I was President. I remember that I was up this way campaigning in 1948 and 1952. On both occasions, I warned the people not to vote for a Republican administration, particularly if they were farmers. I told you then that the Democratic Party had the interests of the farmer at heart and would work for farm prosperity. And I pointed out, and proved by chapter and verse, that a Republican administration would be bad for the farmer—and it has been.

Well, in 1948 a sufficient number of people believed what I said. We elected a Democratic administration and we had 4 years of good farm prices and good farm incomes. Then in 1952, a majority of the people refused to believe what I said and they put in a Republican President. And now I can say—and I will say—I told you so. I told you on both those visits that a farmer who would vote the Republican ticket ought to have his head examined. I am sure you believe that now.

I don't have to argue about it any more. You can just look around you and see for yourselves. The price of every single farm product has gone down—wheat is only 78 percent of parity, hogs have fallen to $11, and corn is at 63 percent of parity—and the costs of farm equipment are rising. Overall, farm prices were 101 percent of parity in 1952—now they are 80 percent of parity. There is real distress, real suffering and anxiety on American farms today, and that is a sad thing and bad for the whole country.

I notice that the administration is talking very sweetly to the farmer these days. President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message last week that, and I quote: "The longstanding and deep-seated problems of agriculture have been forthrightly attacked."

Well, there has been an attack, all right. But it's not the farm problem that has been attacked—it's the farmers.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson began driving farm prices down as soon as he took office. In the nonbasic commodities, where price-support levels were discretionary with the Secretary, he began lowering support prices early in 1953. He reduced the price of milk in 1954. And the worst is yet to come. Because this year support prices are going to slide even further down Benson's sliding scale, and the farmers are going to slide right into the abyss of bankruptcy.

I don't know whether the middle western farmer will be able to make 50 cents an hour this year or not. I doubt it. I expect that a lot of farmers will have to sell out. But don't worry—that is all part of the plan of the Eisenhower administration.

Listen to what his Assistant Secretary of Agriculture had to say on this subject:

"Agriculture is now big business. Too many people are trying to stay in agriculture that would do better some place else. Farming takes capital and managerial capacity."

And his Under Secretary of Agriculture says the same kind of thing:

"Price-support programs tend to keep the inefficient farmer in business instead of allowing the normal healthy adjustment that should take place in agriculture," he says.

The Republican administration in Washington does not understand the traditional farm policy of the United States. They have the whole thing backwards and upside down. If you look at the history of this country, you will see that we have always been determined to make the independent, family farm the foundation of our system of agricultural production. For generations we have protected the family farm, and fostered it, through political battles, economic depressions, and civil war. We have done this because we believe the family farm is a way of life that preserves moral values and human values essential to the growth and vigor of this Republic.

Jefferson was the champion of the small farmer, and so was Jackson and so was Lincoln. The family-farm concept inspired the early pioneers to settle west of the Alleghenies. As population moved west, the free soil movement claimed the lands of the West for the family farmer—in opposition to the slavery movement, which wanted to impose the plantation system. When the men of this area marched off to the War Between the States, one of the things they were fighting for was the free and independent family farm. During the war the Homestead Act was passed, giving the national domain to small farmers who would settle on the land and farm it. And so it has gone, all through our history. The Reclamation Act incorporated the family-farm principle, and so did other progressive measures.

The great depression that began on the farms in the early 1920's—and came to its dreadful climax in 1932—presented a grave new threat to the family size farm. Many small farms were sold during that period, and fell into the hands of banks and mortgage companies. Some people thought that the future of agriculture lay with the corporate farm, and the big landholder, and that the day of the family farm was over.

But the New Deal stepped in and saved the family farm. And the measures of the New Deal worked, in spite of all the clamor by Republicans who said it was wrong to tamper with economic laws—that is, Republican economic laws, laws that make the rich richer and the poor economic slaves.

Agriculture was saved by the Democratic New Deal and Fair Deal, and the family farm remained the bedrock of our farm policy. And it is well that it did. For the family farmers of America proved their efficiency in World War II—and gave to the Allied cause the abundance of food and fiber that was necessary for victory and for the relief of a war-torn world.

Today, the prosperity of our agriculture is again in danger; and the welfare of our family farms is in danger, too. The danger comes from the very men who, under the laws and the Constitution, are entrusted with the responsibility for helping our agricultural system. These men are dominated by the big business point of view, and are out of sympathy with the needs of agriculture. They love International Harvester and General Motors, but they are rather cool to the old dirt farmer. Of course, this is the year 1956, and an important election is coming up. As a consequence, the Eisenhower administration is going to say a lot of things and make a lot of gestures in a desperate effort to hide the record of what they have done in the last 3 years. To my mind, this attitude smacks a little of death-

bed repentance. If the Eisenhower administration had been really concerned about the condition of the farmer, they would have done something about it long before this.

Let me give you an example: In March 1955, your own Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY introduced a conservation acreage reserve bill to set up a soil bank program. It was a constructive and forward-looking proposal. The Eisenhower administration took 7 months to consider it, and finally, on September 30, 1955, they turned it down. Now, 3 months later, all of a sudden, in his State of the Union message pointing toward a presidential campaign, General Eisenhower advances the very same proposal—although I suspect it will come out in a very watered-down version.

And on top of all this, the Republican administration has the nerve to say we must not let politics influence our agricultural policy.

I do not think the Republicans have changed their policies. I do not believe in the sincerity of their present show of concern to the farmer. I do not think Secretary Benson has changed. In fact, he has given us fair warning that he has not changed. On January 4, he said, and I quote: "In 1956, the administration will continue along the sound lines of the past 3 years, and we will intensify our many-sided attacks on farm problems." If you ask me, that is fair warning. Those many-sided attacks have about ruined the farmer.

In practically everything he says, the Secretary of Agriculture does his best to blame me and my administration for the distress of the farm population.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, I am going to cite chapter and verse on the mess he has gotten our agriculture into. He didn't inherit it. He and Ike made it themselves.

Secretary Benson keeps saying that farm distress is due to the "repeated urging" of his predecessors, that means Charlie Brannan and me, "for all-out production." Now there were 3 occasions on which the Secretary's predecessors urged full production, and 3 good reasons for it. The first was the fighting and winning of World War II, and food and fiber were necessary for that. The second was to prevent a collapse of civilization in famine and anarchy after the war was over, and food and fiber were necessary for that. The third was to win the Korean conflict, and to put this country in a strong defensive position if the Communists started another world war, and food and fiber were necessary for that.

The farmers responded wonderfully to their country's call for supplies. They did what their Government asked them to do, and they deserve the thanks of their Government. Instead of which, this Republican administration tells them they have been living in a dream world, and they had better wake up.

This Republican administration might at least apply to the farmer the same consideration they give to other defense contractors when the emergency is over. They might at least try to save them from financial ruin for having fulfilled their commitments to the Government. I don't believe they told General Motors or General Electric or International Harvester that they had been living in a dream world and had better come out of it.

Oh, no, my friends, the present mess in agriculture is not the fault of Democratic farm policies. The mess in agriculture is clearly attributable to the Eisenhower administration. The blame lies nowhere else. They have been following a deliberate policy of driving farm prices down. That does not reduce farm production. That was made abundantly clear from 1921 to 1932, but now the Republicans seem determined to prove it all over again. They keep right on lowering prices and production keeps right on increasing and surpluses get bigger and bigger. But brother Benson keeps right on saying the way to get rid of surpluses is to lower prices still further.

In the 3 years of the Eisenhower administration—

Farm prices have gone down.

Prices to consumers have stayed up.

Farm income has slumped by $4 billion.

Production of farm products has increased.

Government stocks on hand have piled up.

And the price-support system has cost more in these 3 years than it did during the entire 20 Democratic years before that.

And Mr. Benson now says that they are going right ahead along the same sound lines. I'd say the same sad lines for the farmer.

Now comes a special farm message to the Congress. This message claims the administration has done a lot of wonderful things for the farmer—the most wonderful, of course, being the lowering of support prices.

Then the message makes several recommendations. Every one that is any good was copied from the Democrats.

However, the main point about this farm message is that it is too little and too late—even if they meant what it says. The Eisenhower administration is clinging stubbornly to its devotion to low support prices. There is nothing in this message that will stop the decline in farm income this year or next. It recommends only parts of a farm program and leaves out the heart.

It's like giving the farmers a nice, new, shiny General Motors automobile, with all the chrome and slick paint on the outside—but no engine to make it run.

There are many things this administration really could do to help the farmer if they wanted to do them.

First of all, they could sit down and consult with some real farmers. All their advisory committees have been loaded with bankers and processors and farm-extension specialists. Most of their top officers in the Department of Agriculture have been men from big business. They have been doing away with the system of farmers' committees in the counties, and turning over the administration of the farm programs to their office help. So, my first suggestion is that the Eisenhower administration give the farmers a voice in the management of their own affairs.

The second thing they might do is to tackle the job of getting rid of the excess carryovers. They moan and groan about the costs of storage, and the $7 billion tied up in stocks—but all for the purpose of discrediting the price-support system.

All over the world there are millions of empty stomachs and poorly clothed bodies. Our surplus food and fiber could be channeled to the poor and hungy of the world, where they would not only save lives and restore hope but also help to build the free world's defenses against communism.

That is what could be done, but I don't think this Republican administration will really do it. They are always talking about the idea that balancing the budget and reducing taxes come before everything else. But they've never done either, except to give the rich a tax break. I believe they would rather make demagogic speeches on false economy than use our food stocks to block communism.

The third thing they might do is to use some of these so-called surpluses to improve the diet of some of our underprivileged people here at home. There are still many people in our own country who don't get enough of the right kind of food.

In fact, if we used our farm production as we should to meet the needs of people at home and abroad, we would not have any problem of surpluses. We ought to be thankful and grateful to American agriculture for the abundance it can produce, and we ought to use that abundance for the benefit and welfare of mankind.

The fourth thing the Eisenhower administration might do—and do promptly—is to restore price supports to 90 percent of parity.

Ninety-percent supports are not the whole answer and never were, but they sure would help. They would do much to stabilize the situation while the other necessary measures are put into effect.

There are some other things the Republicans might do—if they would—to straighten out the mess they have made in American agriculture. They might try a system of production payments, such as Charlie Brannan recommended in 1949, and they might really get behind a good solid conservation acreage program, such as Senator HUMPHREY has proposed.

Yes; the Eisenhower administration might do all these things. But I'm afraid they won't. The farmers of America, if they are going to share fairly in the American dream of a good and abundant life, will have to look to the party of the people—the Democratic Party.

The Democratic Party believes that the farmer is entitled to a fair share of the national income—not only for his own sake but also in the interest of prosperity for the whole Nation.

The Democratic Party believes that the family farm is worth preserving as a valuable and cherished element of our free society.

We believe that the 22 million Americans who live on farms are human beings, with human problems and aspirations, and are entitled to participate fully in advances in our standards of living.

The Democratic Party beileves that the ability of American agriculture to produce a great variety of food and fiber in abundance is not a curse but a wonderful blessing, and a source of great national strength.

And, finally, we believe men of courage and good will, working together, can devise and administer programs under which American agriculture will make its full contribution to our national well-being and, at the same time, provide a good life for those who live close to the soil.

This is our faith—our Democratic faith.

It is the faith of Orville Freeman and HUBERT HUMPHREY. It is the faith of Democratic leaders throughout the land. It is, I believe, the faith of every man who is regarded as a potential Democratic nominee for the Presidency.

God willing, it is the faith which shall prevail in the Halls of Government in Washington when you have returned this Government to the party of the people where it belongs.

International Labor Organization (ILO)—Communists Are Using It as a Sounding Board Against the United States—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a speech by Mr. W. L. McGrath, United States employer delegate to the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, November 18, 1955.

Mr. Speaker, in our desire to prevent the further spread of communism and its propaganda we must be ever alert to its evil program. At the 1954 conference of ILO Russia, which had been absent from the meetings of the organization, returned with three countries, itself, Ukraine, and Byelorussia. In addition thereto it was reinforced by five satellite countries, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Albania, and Czechoslovakia. This immediately raised the question of eligibility of Communist so-called employer and worker delegations. It must be clear to everybody that there is no free employer groups in Communist dominated countries, nor are there free worker delegations.

Mr. Speaker, the address by Mr. McGrath follows and in addition thereto I will include in another extension, No. II, which will follow this, a report by Mr. McGrath at the Geneva meeting of the governing body on November 9, 1955.

The information contained in these two insertions will put the Congress on notice of the true situation that exists in ILO. It demands vigilant attention in order to prevent the continuance of a diabolical situation.

Immediately prior to the 1954 International Labor Conference a bloc of three Communist countries, exercising their right as members of the United Nations, chose to join the ILO. The exercise of this right could not in any way be challenged.

Because of the complete inability of these 3 nations to send legitimate employer and worker delegates to the ILO, since there are no free employers or free workers in those countries, it was obvious that instead of the usual 2 government, 1 employer, and 1 worker delegates, these nations instead would have 4 government voting delegates.

Coupled with the fact that 5 other nations which had been members of the ILO for a number of years and which are now under Communist domination, this meant that there would be a bloc of 8 Communist-controlled countries in the ILO—8 countries with a total voting strength of 32 votes, all of which would be government votes, when they are only entitled to 16 government votes—2 per country.

Now the views of the free employers of the world were made perfectly clear at the 1954 Conference. We believed then and we believe today that all so-called employer representatives from these totalitarian countries should be disqualified from sitting in any of the councils of the ILO.

We therefore challenged the credentials of these men who would come into what had been a free employer group of the ILO. We challenged these credentials on the very fundamental ground that violence would be done to the constitution of this organization if it forced Communist government agents into the employer group. As all in this room know, the 1954 conference refused to sustain our challenge which was put forth as vigorously and as sincerely and as persuasively as possible.

What has happened since then?

At its first session following that conference, in November 1954, this governing body at Rome, decided that at its March 1955 session, it would consider a resolution providing for the appointment of a governing body committee, the terms of reference of which would be to make proposals for such amendments to the ILO constitution as would insure that worker and employer representatives could only be appointed after nomination by organizations of workers and employers which the free and independent of their governments.

At its next session in March 1955 the governing body did not adopt such a resolution. Instead, it decided to request the Director General to arrange for the preparation of a report covering the membership of the ILO regarding the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from government domination or control. It also decided that this report would be prepared by a committee of independent persons, and, because of the extreme gravity of the situation, it was understood that every effort would be made to submit the report to the governing body by the end of October 1955.

At the same time, the governing body decided that it would consider immediately in the light of the results of the report, whether any and if so what steps might be taken as a matter of urgency to deal with the situation disclosed therein.

Following the March 1955, session of the governing body, the 38th International Labor Conference was held in Geneva in June 1955. At this Conference, despite the universal opposition of the free employers, so-called employer representatives from Iron Curtain countries were seated as deputy members on four Conference tripartite working committees. This decision was reached in total disregard of the autonomy of the employer group who, through established procedures of the organization, had elected their representatives to serve on these committees. That decision breached these traditional and accepted procedures. Neither the constitution of the ILO nor the standing orders required the Conference to vote these Communist representatives seats on the Conference committees as deputy members.

Following this decision, I withdrew from participation on the four working committees in question. I did this because I felt that positive action was imperative in order to emphasize the need for maintaining a stand on principle on behalf of preserving not only the tripartite structure of the ILO but its very existence as well.

We are now at the first session of the governing body following that Conference. The sixth item on our agenda is the report of the committee on the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations. The report of this committee is not before us for consideration notwithstanding the urgency with which the entire matter was viewed by the governing body in March 1955.

If the Organization sincerely wished to face this issue and resolve the problem we have had for over 18 months, it would hasten to bring the matter formally before the earliest possible session of the International Labor Conference, and take remedial steps to correct the situation.

Even though the report of the committee on freedom is not before us, this governing body session could place the matter before the 1956 Conference. In my opinion, such action would not prejudge the contents of that report in any way, because on such an important issue as this—which the governing body itself has found to be urgent—only the Conference can take remedial measures. Therefore, there is no valid reason why, even though we do not have the report, the Conference should not be presented with this issue at its 1956 session.

Apparently, however, no further urgency is attached to this problem. There is no inclination to take this course of action which has the merit of bringing about prompt Conference consideration, but more importantly, telling the world the ILO governing body recognizes it as a problem, and is willing to do something about it

We are soon to face the 1956 Conference. What will happen then? For one thing, we can look forward to the grim fact that Communist so-called employers will again be seated on the working committees of the Conference. That course has already been charted, and the precedent established. The deterioration of the ILO's tripartite structure—begun at the 1954 Conference—will be further advanced because the organization will have refused to take steps to purge itself of a threat to its very existence.

My deep concern over this matter has been repeatedly expressed, not only in the governing body and Conference, but in the United States as well. I have prepared detailed reports on each Conference and governing body session I have attended, and in these reports I have endeavored to focus attention upon the serious matters of principle that are involved.

Rather than compromise in the slightest with my position—demonstrated by my withdrawal from the committees of the 1955 Conference—I find that in view of all the above circumstances, there is no further constructive purpose to be gained by the continued participation of United States employers in the ILO.

Accordingly, it is my intention to recommend not only to the employers of my country that they refrain from sending delegations to the ILO until such time as the situation created by participation of Communist so-called employers in the ILO is cleared up, but also that the United States Government do likewise.

International Labor Organization (ILO)—Communists Are Using It as a Sounding Board Against the United States—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the governing body of the ILO may well be likened to a board of directors. It meets three times each year to conduct the business of the organization and is no doubt the most important and most influential organ of the ILO. The governing body is tripartite, consisting of 20 government representatives, 10 employer representatives, and 10 worker representatives.

Mr. Speaker, the report of Mr. H. L. McGrath, United States employer delegate to ILO, referred to follows:

GENEVA MEETING OF THE GOVERNING BODY NOVEMBER 9 TO 18, 1955—REPORT OF UNITED STATES DELEGATE W. L. MCGRATH FOR EMPLOYER GROUPS

In my brief address to the governing body of the International Labor Organization at the close of its November 1955 session in Geneva, Switzerland, I made the following statement:

"It is my intention to recommend not only to the employers of my country that they refrain from sending delegations to the ILO until such time as the situation created by participation of Communist so-called employers in the ILO is cleared up, but also that the United States Government do likewise."

Upon my return to the United States, I formally recommended to the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce that under present circumstances they not only refrain from nominating employer delegations to annual ILO conferences, but also cease to

participate in ILO industrial committee meetings or other ILO meetings for which they nominate United States employer representatives.

I likewise addressed a letter to the President of the United States, urging that our country forthwith withdraw from any participation in the International Labor Organization and withhold from it any financial support whatever, unless and until the Communist issue within the ILO can be clarified and resolved.

THE COMMUNIST ISSUE IN THE ILO

What is the Communist issue? It is simply this:

In the ILO, the employer delegation from each country is supposed to represent free associations of employers, and the worker delegation is supposed to represent free associations of workers by contrast to the government delegation, which represents government. But are there free associations of employers of workers in Communist countries? You know the answer as well as I do.

Therefore when, at the 1954 Conference, Russia, which had long been absent from the ILO, came back as 3 countries, the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia—reinforced by 5 satellites, namely, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Albania, and Czechoslovakia—the question of the eligibility of Communist so-called employer and worker delegations became paramount.

It was obvious that Communist employer and worker delegations represented, in fact, neither employers nor workers, but were simply agents of the Communist Party, echoing and reinforcing the government delegations from the Russian and satellite countries.

This completely violated the original concept of the ILO constitution, which assumes that each country will send to ILO conferences workers and employers, respectively, who are free to speak independently of their governments on behalf of their constituents.

The employer delegations of the free countries in the world therefore challenged the right of the so-called employer delegations from Communist countries to participate in the Conference. A block of worker delegates representing free trade unions likewise challenged the eligibility of so-called worker delegations from Communist countries. I said to the Conference on that issue:

"What will remain of the tripartite nature of this body, if we admit a solid block of votes, none of which represent free workers or employers, and all of which are under the direct dictation of the Kremlin?

"I charge that the purpose of the attempted reentry of Russia into the ILO is that of disrupting this organization and using it as a springboard for Communist propaganda.

"Unless steps are taken to preserve the tripartite structure of this organization, it is my intention to recommend to my government and to the employers of the United States that they refrain from sending future employer delegations to this Conference."

My position was thus clearly stated at the 1954 conference.

The Conference voted, however, by a substantial majority, that Communist so-called employer and worker delegations should be accredited.

This, however, by no means settled the issue; for basic principles remained unchanged.

Realizing that something would have to be done to attempt to quiet continuing employer objections, the governing body, at its November 1954 meeting, voted that there should be placed on the agenda, for consideration at its March 1955 meeting, a resolution to the effect that the governing body should establish a tripartite committee "to examine article 3, section 5, of the constitution, which provides for the appointment of worker and employer representatives, and make proposals for such amendments as would insure that worker and employer representatives could only be appointed after nomination by organizations of workers and employers which are free and independent of their governments." It was presumed that this might lead to the amending of the ILO constitution in such a way as to disqualify Communist so-called employer and worker delegations.

But at the March 1955 meeting of the governing body, when the issue came up for actual determination, the courage to face it squarely was lacking. The governing body abandoned completely any suggestion of amending the ILO constitution, and instead passed a watered-down resolution to request the Director General to arrange for the preparation of a report covering the membership of the ILO regarding the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from government domination or control, the report to be prepared by a committee of independent persons specially appointed for that purpose by the Director General.

It was at that stage that I personally became very doubtful, indeed, as to whether the ILO would ever have the courage to purge itself of the Communists elements which it had admitted contrary to the original principles of its constitution. I voted, however, for the above proposal in the hope that it might possibly lead to constructive action.

It was with this background that we went into the annual ILO Conference in June 1955.

At this conference representatives of the free employers, still firm in their insistence that Communist so-called employer delegations could not possibly represent free associations of free employers, naturally did not elect any Communist employer representatives as employer members of Conference committees. The Communist employers who had put their names up for election thereupon appealed to the entire Conference for placement upon the committees to which they had failed to be elected. The Conference as a whole voted that they should be seated on these committees.

Everyone at the ILO knew what these Communist so-called employer representatives were. They were simply agents of the Communist Party. Putting these men in the ILO employer groups which were supposed to represent viewpoints of employers as contrasted to workers or governments was as ridiculous as if the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce were asked to put Communist agents on their boards of directors. Nevertheless, such was the action taken by the 1955 ILO conference.

The United States employer delegation thereupon withdrew from participation in the four committees upon which Communist so-called employers were seated; continuing to participate, however, in the other committees and in the plenary session of the conference.

There was considerable talk at the 1955 conference to the effect that since the Director General had in fact appointed a committee to study "the extent of the freedom of employers' and workers' organizations from government domination and control" (as directed by the governing body at its March meeting) and this committee was supposed to submit its report to the governing body at its November 1955 meeting, no attempt to resolve the Communist issue should be made at the Conference itself. The obvious way out of a difficult situation was to "put it off until November."

But upon my arrival at the November 1955 meeting of the governing body, I found the report of this committee was not ready. We were told that it was in the process of completion, and would probably be drafted in final form by about the end of January 1956.

This news was, as near as I could judge, what the majority of the ILO governing body wanted. They had no desire to come to grips with this issue. Governments especially welcomed anything that would enable them to postpone and delay.

The crucial point as to timing was this: The November 1955 meeting of the governing body was the last possible time at which, under the ILO constitution, the matter could be put on the agenda of the 1956 conference.

Failure to take action by the governing body at that meeting would therefore make it impossible for the matter to come up as a formal agenda item before the entire Conference until June of 1957.

By that time Communist employer, and worker, delegations from Communist countries would have been accredited for 4 consecutive years—and in the face of that accepted fact, it would be well nigh impossible to unseat them.

Recognizing this situation, I pressed, at the November 1955 governing body meeting, for immediate definitive action.

I pointed out that if the committee report was complete by February it could be discussed by the governing body at its March 1956 meeting and governments would have plenty of time to study it before June. Therefore, I insisted, there was no reason why, if the governing body wanted it done, it could not be put on the formal agenda for discussion at the 1956 Conference.

Toward this purpose I prepared a draft resolution to the effect that the committee report should be reviewed at the 1956 Conference and in light of its disclosures steps should be taken to amend the constitution in such a way as to preserve the tripartite structure of the ILO. To me this was an entirely reasonable and procedurally possible approach. It was an approach which, if accepted, would have enabled me to believe that the ILO wished to face and solve the problem. But, as matters developed, it was impossible to gain any concerted support for any such resolution.

A compromise was then suggested, to the effect that the governing body might put the committee report on the agenda of the 1956 Conference in such a way that the Conference would not actually have to deal with it at all, but could merely refer it to a committee for further discussion, but even as to this proposal no agreement could be reached.

If this proposal, which was far more indirect than mine, had proved to be generally accepted, I would have been glad to go along in hope that it would lead to some definitive action. But since even this was unacceptable, I felt that I had arrived at the end of the road. I became convinced that the ILO had no sincere intention of resolving the Communist issue. The attitude of the governing body majority was to stick their heads in the sand and let matters take their course.

I therefore reviewed the entire issue in a brief address to the governing body, concluding with the statement quoted at the beginning of this report.

If we are simply to accept the present situation in the ILO, the end result is, to my mind, inevitable. The Communists, with 8 nations to our 1, and 32 votes to our 4, will remain firmly entrenched and will progressively dominate the ILO. It will become merely an international forum for the dissemination of Communist propaganda, financed to at least 25 percent by the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, at its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year.

At annual ILO conferences Communist orators, outnumbering ours in the ratio of 32 to 4, will tell the representatives of 69 nations about the decadence of the free-enterprise system, the superiority of the Communist system, the exploitation of the

workingman by the American capitalists, and our greed and desire for war. These speeches will be reprinted by the ILO and circulated all over the world. One cannot imagine a better ready-made vehicle for the promotion of Communist indoctrination. Do we want to continue to finance this Communist operation?

The future of the ILO, unless strenuous corrective measures are taken, has been well foretold by the history of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

According to Sir Alfred Roberts, United Kingdom's worker delegate to the ILO, following World War II, when the World Federation of Trade Unions resumed sessions, there was an agreement with the Communist unions, who were members, that political issues would be outlawed so that mutual progress could be made on behalf of the welfare of labor.

But the ink was no more dry on the agreement than the Communists set out to use the WFTU as a springboard. They blocked and obfuscated any accomplishments, while they made the most of any opportunity for political propaganda.

Within 18 months they had completely destroyed the usefulness of the WFTU. The free trade unions of the world were thereupon compelled to pull out, which they did, and form their own organization—the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

There is a time that calls for action. In my opinion that time is now.

If the ILO does not have the courage to stand by the initial principles of its constitution, and is simply going to temporize and "beat around the bush" and "let things ride" and allow time to pass until it becomes internationally recognized as a Communist-dominated organization, I think the time to get out of it is today.

On the other hand, it is barely possible that sufficiently forceful action might yet spur the ILO into an effort to prevent that organization from being taken over and destroyed by the Communists. The strongest action that can possibly be taken is financial action. The withdrawal of United States support and participation "until such time as the situation created by the participation of Communist so-called employers in the ILO is cleared up" might effect the desired result.

It is on the above basis that I recommend the course of action which I have outlined in this report.

Views of Senator McCarthy on the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning my views on the natural-gas bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

Let me state why I am supporting the Harris bill which prohibits Federal control of the production of natural gas.

The primary purpose of the Harris bill is to promote our free enterprise system which has helped make America strong and free. The bill is designed—not to protect monopolies, or to gouge the public, as some people claim: But to serve the public interest. That is the point I want to emphasize. Let me first deal with several arguments of those who oppose the bill.

The opponents of the Harris bill claim that the gas-producing industry is a monopoly. This is not true. There are over 8,000 producers of natural gas, not one of whom supplies over 5 percent of the market. As a matter of fact, of the 452 manufacturing industries in the United States, all but 70 of them are more concentrated than the natural-gas industry. Beyond this, natural-gas producers must compete for the fuel market with the producers of coal and oil. The transportation and distribution phases of the industry are, in most bases, monopolies; they are and should be regulated by government. The production phase is highly competitive and thus is regulated by the free market.

Opponents of the Harris bill claim, nonetheless, that the cost of gas to the consumer is too high. These are the facts:

(1) Between 1938 and 1953 the average price of all types of gas to the home user increased only 7 percent—while the general cost of living increased 90 percent, and the costs of competing fuels, coal and oil, doubled. Moreover, the price of straight natural gas actually decreased by 7 percent.

(2) It is true that in the past 2 years consumer gas bills have gone up more rapidly than in the past. It is important to remember, however, that the field price of gas (which opponents of the Harris bill want to regulate) is only a very small part of the customer's gas bill. To illustrate this point: The cost of gas to the average Wisconsin family is $74.62 a year; but if the gas producer should give away his product, if gas were free, this average family would save only $4.96 a year. (The major portion of the consumer's gas bill goes to those who transport and distribute the gas.) We should therefore remember that the Harris bill deals with only a fragment of the problem of the rising cost of gas. Now, how does the Harris bill deal with this fragment?

The field price of gas, along with the other components of the customer's costs, has risen in the past few years. The principal reason for this recent increase is that more people are changing over to gas from other fuels, coupled with the fact that the increase in the supply of gas has not kept pace with the increase in the demand for it. Since 1945, the consumption of gas has doubled, while available gas reserves have increased by only one-third. When demand outstrips supply, prices will rise; it is the law of supply and demand. Now: Since we cannot decrease the demand for gas, the only way to check the price rise is to try to increase the supply of gas. This is what the Harris bill aims to do. One of the main reasons that supply is falling behind demand is the existence of Federal controls.

What opponents of the Harris bill either do not understand, or wish to conceal, is that Federal regulation has the effect of decreasing the supply of gas and thus of increasing the price to the consumer. The gas business is a highly risky venture: The producer, to survive, must get as high a price as the free market will allow for the gas he does find—in order to offset the tremendous losses he suffers when, as happens 7 times out of 8, he drills a dry hole. Federal regulation will discourage the investment of risk capital that is needed for new gas discoveries. We already have evidence of this. In the past 2 years, since Federal controls have been in effect, additions to gas reserves have drastically decreased. Moreover, many producers in Texas, Oklahoma, and Louisiana—instead of submitting to Federal regulation which gives them less than a fair price on sales in interstate commerce—have begun to divert their gas to local utilities and to nonfuel uses, such as the manufacture of carbon black.

If Federal controls are kept on, the present trend is bound to continue: Less and less gas will be added to present reserves, and more and more of the gas that is available will be diverted for local use in the gas-producing States. This means that the Wisconsin gas consumer will have to pay higher and higher prices for gas, and it may mean, in the not too distant future, that the gas supplied to Wisconsin and other States located at great distances from the producing areas will be cut off altogether.

The Harris bill seeks to prevent this from happening. It proceeds on the theory that the consumer's best protection against high prices is the free market. Let me add that in the event a single gas producer corners some section of the market and tries to hike his price above the market level, the Harris bill provides adequate protection. It prevents any producer from selling gas in interstate commerce at higher than the reasonable market price.

Finally, let me express my fear that Federal regulation of this competitive industry is a step toward socializing our entire economy. If gas production is subjected to Federal regulation, there is no logical reason not to regulate coal and oil production. And if all fuel production is regulated, why stop there? Why not impose Federal controls on the production of cheese and milk? To prevent socialization of our country, I believe Americans must stand together and oppose the attempts of the planners and the socialists to pick off competitive industries, one by one.

Bernard DeVoto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, last November this country lost a great conservationist and historian with the death of Bernard DeVoto. He was perhaps the most articulate spokesman among those who treasure and have long fought to preserve our natural resources.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], which appeared in the January 1956 Progressive under the title "Defender of the Wilderness," and article entitled "Death of a Fighter," written by John B. Oakes and published in the New York Times, and an editorial entitled "A Man Who Knew the West," from the Glasgow (Mont.) Courier, all of which pay tribute to Mr. DeVoto and his work.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Progressive of January 1956]

DEFENDER OF THE WILDERNESS

(By Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon)

Bernard DeVoto once told me that, above and beyond everything else, he would like to have been with Lewis and Clark on that first of all treks across our continent. This privilege having been denied him, he did the

next best thing. He became the principal defender of the realm Lewis and Clark explored. Let some greedy looter touch so much as one pine grove or a single foaming waterfall, and DeVoto was off to the rescue—armed with a portable typewriter that shot dum-dum bullets.

He voted and he paid his taxes in Massachusetts, on the edge of the Harvard yard. He frequented the magazine offices, publishing houses, and broadcasting studios of Manhattan Island. He was an intellectual and a sophisticate, and he never made any bones about it. Yet, when he died suddenly this past November, the deepest sorrow must have been in the far-off mountain ranges and lonely canyons of the West. This might have astonished him, for once he wrote:

"I have nothing to do with the West. I broke the story of the attempted land-grab in 1946 and, because at that time I happened to be the only slick-paper journalist who was a qualified conservationist, the spotlight has been on me ever since. * * * I do go West a lot. I love the country. I have a lot of friends out there."

Thus did he play down his role as protector of the wilderness. But others knew that role for what it actually was. After DeVoto's death, at the early age of 58, the former Chief of the United States Forest Service, a lean man named Lyle F. Watts, said to me, "He was our best friend, because he wasn't afraid of anybody or anything, and because he could command an audience. Our natural resources are a whole lot less safe today, now that he is dead, than they were last night, when Benny DeVoto was alive."

DeVoto had a profound faith in the average person's love of this land and its bounty. He visited my wife and me in February of 1954, a few weeks before I filed for United States Senator. Over broiled Chinook salmon from the Columbia River at lunch, we wondered if a Democrat could get elected in the State of Oregon, where it hadn't been done since 1914. My adversary was to be the incumbent Senator, who had sponsored the surrender of the oil tidelands, the relinquishment of public grazing and timberlands, and the yielding up of Hells Canyon.

After DeVoto had bidden goodby to us and walked down the steep steps in front of our old frame house, he abruptly turned on the sidewalk and puffed back up the cement steps. I came halfway to meet him. Breathing deeply from the exertion, he faced me in the bright sunlight. A faint smile creased his face, with its broad mouth and wide, flattened nose. He could not have been described by his own mother as a handsome man, yet a kind of aura lighted his eyes as he spoke.

"Be of good cheer, my friend," he said. "The American people have never yet voted to abandon their natural resources when the issue was understood by them—and they never will. Everything's going to be all right. I'm just about sure of that."

Throughout the hard, bruising Oregon campaign which followed, a stream of small checks came steadily from Cambridge. They were the result of dinner parties "for NEUBERGER," given by DeVoto and his personable wife, Avis. Often the signatures on the checks were of celebrated teachers, writers, and scientists. Some of them I knew to be Republicans. When I later asked Mrs. DeVoto about this political heresy on the part of her guests, she replied, "Oh, certainly, but when Benny told them of the grand fight you were making for conservation out in Oregon, they couldn't resist. He just melted them away, and they reached for their checkbooks."

He was that sort of man. To him, halfway measures were worse than none when the American outdoors seemed in peril. He was the first person to sniff danger when a presumably innocent bill was introduced by Senator Guy Cordon and Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, both of Oregon, allowing lumber companies to be reimbursed with public timber of their own selection rather than in money, when the Government took over any of their land for reservoirs, highways, or military encampments. The bill might have slipped through Congress almost without notice, had not DeVoto led off with a bristling "Easy Chair" in Harper's, warning that the legislation could give the country's biggest lumber operators a foothold in the national forests from which they might never be wrested.

II

Another writer would have let the matter go at that. But with DeVoto, who was born in Ogden, Utah, this was merely the beginning. He wrote innumerable letters about the Cordon-Ellsworth bill. He goaded groups like the Wildlife Management Institute and the National Wildlife Federation. He summoned the Wilderness Society and the Sierra Club to battle. He set up headquarters at his own expense in the Hay-Adams House, where he conferred with people like Representative LEE METCALF, of Montana, and Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, of New York. He irritated his editors at Harper's by hammering away on the issue of natural resources, when they thought the interests of magazine circulation dictated more diversified contents in the Easy Chair.

Yet, althought the Cordon-Ellsworth bill for timber exchanges had the full backing of the Republican administration, it was voted down decisively, 226 to 161, by a Republican House of Representatives. Many Members of the House told me that a man who never participated directly in this roll-call deserved nearly full credit for the outcome. "Without DeVoto," said Representative METCALF, "the bill probably would be part of our Federal statutes right now."

Wesley A. D'Ewart, then a Republican Congressman from Montana, tried harder than anyone else to bring about passage of the timber-exchange legislation. He also was the author of a grazing bill which would have given 18,000 privileged livestock operators greater control over upland meadows in the national forests than would have been vested in 33 million Americans who enjoy using this domain for fishing, camping, hiking, and hunting. When Secretary of the Interior McKay recently appointed D'Ewart as his assistant in charge of public lands administration, DeVoto heard the fire bells clanging. He was embroiled in the battle against D'Ewart's confirmation by the Senate at the time that death claimed him. This cause, and many others, will suffer for want of his pugent phrasemaking and his boundless energy.

I have thought frequently that Benny DeVoto loved the West because he knew so much about it. Riding with him one afternoon on the Great Northern's gleaming Empire Builder, I listened to a recital of each place along the line where some mountain man had snared a beaver or hidden in the bullrushes to save his scalp. When DeVoto felt that Oregon had not properly marked historic points on the campfire trail of Lewis and Clark, the "easy chair" which ensued helped to shame our State into some corrective measures.

Perhaps DeVoto's most controversial essay appeared in Harper's in 1947, entitled "The West Against Itself." Its theme was that the major demands for exploiting the timber, minerals, water, and scenery of the West always had come from westerners, who, in turn, were under heavy political and economic pressure from absentee landlords. This exploitation contrasted with orderly development. The doctrine was hotly challenged, particularly by leading figures in the Republican Party, who kept promising a new and brighter era in Western progress if only a "dyed-in-the-wool" westerner could become Secretary of the Interior.

In January of 1953, President Eisenhower appointed as Secretary of the Interior a native of Oregon and that State's former governor, Douglas McKay. This dyed-in-the-wool Westerner indorsed the bills to give preferential priviliges in the national forests to big lumber operators. He approved the relinquishment of the tidelands oil deposits. He indorsed commercial invasion of the national park system. He led the crusade to abandon Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co., which is incorporated 3,000 miles away in Maine. He suggested turning over the John Day power site on the Columbia River to Pacific Power & Light, another Maine-incorporated company. He fired the career biologist heading the Fish and Wildlife Service and replaced him with a political appointee.

Westerners, looking at the wreckage of the resource program in their region, remembered DeVoto's reminder of Theodore Roosevelt, of Oyster Bay, N. Y., and of Gifford Pinchot of Connecticut and Pennsylvania, who had teamed up originally to set aside the national forests for all the people. Westerners remembered how DeVoto had told them of Franklin D. Roosevelt of Hyde Park, N. Y., who had built Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, and of Harold Ickes of Chicago and Oscar L. Chapman, born in Virginia, who had administered these dams in the public interest. They thought of the Westerner who was taking Hells Canyon away from them, and they wished they had heeded the warnings voiced by DeVoto.

There was a place above all others that held DeVoto's heart. On the lofty divide above the Lochsa Fork of the Clearwater River in Idaho, wavers a thin and overgrown trail. Lewis and Clark tottered along that trail when they were near starvation. Tears of excitement and high adventure filled Benny's eyes on the day he trod the trail himself. This, to him, was all that Valhalla could ever be—the wilderness, the solitudes of lodgepole pine and alpine fir, the tossing meadows of bear grass, that path where the first white men had come so long ago.

III

It was an experience he never forgot. It lived with him until his death. One memorable evening, in the spring of 1955, he recalled it to me as we ate prime ribs in the paneled dining room of the Carlton in Washington. I know that this sumptuous atmosphere faded for DeVoto, and that he was back again on the trail with Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, whose marvelous exploits of exploration are the substance of his greatest book, The Course of Empire.

DeVoto wrote: "Whenever I go back to the Bitterroots, I realize afresh that they are my country—Traveler's Rest to Lolo Pass, to Crooked Fork, to the Lochsa, and on down the works of the Clearwater.

"* * * To everyone his own desire in mountains, mountain meadows, and mountain streams, but for me the best of the West is the Lochsa country. * * * If working journalists are rewarded on the far shore, I will sometime get a long summer within a few miles of the Powell Ranger Station."

I prefer to think that courage and persistence and integrity are qualities of character which never die. The next time that I go down the Lochsa and over the Lolo Trail with his friend Bud Moore, the district forest ranger, perhaps we shall see DeVoto in faded breeches and green flannel shirt and his old logger's boots. And we shall hear him, too, in the lilting roar of the Lochsa, as it surges

through the timbered fastnesses which he thought so important to save for the next generation of Americans.

[From the New York Times]

DEATH OF A FIGHTER

The cause of conservation in the United States has lost one of its most articulate, militant, and influential spokesmen with the death of Bernard DeVoto. Noted as a historian, as an editor, and as a critic, Mr. DeVoto was a fearless fighter for the things he believed in, and one of the things he believed most passionately was the preservation of America's natural resources, including its majestic scenery.

From his famous "Easy Chair" which for 20 years he occupied in Harper's magazine, he fought many a major conservation battle. As a westerner and an expert on American land policies, he was particularly well qualified to expose the efforts of some stockmen to push through a grazing bill that would have given them vested rights in national forest land. He fought the proposed invasion of Dinousaur National Monument tooth and nail; and one likes to believe that before he died he knew that that project had been defeated.

Among the last verbal bouts which he enjoyed was one with the State of Maine. He had written an article describing part of United States Route 1 running through Maine as "an uninterrupted eyesore of drive-ins, diners, souvenir stands, purulent amusement parks, cheap-jack restaurants," and he summarized that part of coastal Maine he had seen as "a jerry-built, neon-lighted, overpopulated slum." Mr. DeVoto's vivid words could apply equally well to many other sections of U. S. 1, in Connecticut and New Jersey, for example. They could apply to dozens—probably hundreds—of roads in many parts of the United States, including some that formerly were among the most beautiful.

[From the Glasgow (Mont.) Courier]

A MAN WHO KNEW THE WEST

The recent death of Bernard DeVoto, author and historical authority, brought to the end of his life a man who probably knew as much about our section of the West as any person in the world.

Mr. DeVoto had won a Pulitzer prize for his great book, Across the Wide Missouri. It is a definitive volume on the western fur trade. He had done other notable jobs on the West, such as his editing of the Lewis and Clark journals and his book, Course of Empire.

If one is curious about the mountain men, trappers, and Indians who were roaming this country, right where we live, early in the last century, he will get an explicit portrayal of their lives, down to minute details, in Across the Wide Missouri.

Mr. DeVoto visited here several times. We recall one occasion when he came with two Montanans who had gained prominence as writers—A. B. Guthrie and the late Joseph Kinsey Howard. Their respect for him gave evidence of his spiritual mentorship of their efforts to tell the story of our country.

So we Montanans are indebted to Mr. DeVoto in several ways. He was the kind of writer who sometimes injected himself actively into current controversies and never left anyone in doubt where he stood. Above all that, he did much to chronicle the real, unvarnished annals of a generation that bloomed and died and left its mark on the intermountain West.

Tariffs or Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Tariffs or Socialism," delivered by Edgar M. Queeny, chairman of the board of the Monsanto Chemical Co., before the chamber of commerce at Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. Queeny is a well-recognized authority on the manufacture and marketing of chemical products both here and abroad.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the estimated cost of printing this address is $320. I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, notwithstanding the cost.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TARIFFS OR SOCIALISM

(By Edgar M. Queeny, chairman of the board, Monsanto Chemical Co.)

Although my association with Arkansas industry is recent, I am no stranger here. I have been coming down to watch the rice-fed mallards of your Grand Prairie pitch into my decoys for over 20 years. And, for the past 17, I have been a part-time resident here. I own a substantial rice and cattle farm in Prairie County where, upon my retirement, I look forward to living not 2 or 3 months a year, but to becoming a year-around resident. At that time I shall vote Democratic probably—just as many of my friends, who have moved from Little Rock to St. Louis to occupy prominent places in that community, vote Republican there. In my case, the transfer of party allegiances will be much easier than I believe it was for them, or than it would have been for me a few years ago. Now my political ideology is much closer to that of most southern Democrats than to that of certain elements of the Republican Party.

I have seen great changes in Arkansas during these 17 years. When I bought my farm, rice was about 75 cents a bushel; the State's average yield of long-grain rice, less than 50 bushels an acre. Today's price exceeds $2 and, aided by last year's favorable growing season, the boys on my farm raised 77,500 bushels of dry, long-grain rice on 815 acres—a little over 95 bushels an acre.

Then my tractors were small, spiked-wheel jobs. We used many mules. Now we use large, rubber-tired diesel tractors and no mules. To the best of my knowledge, not a ton of fertilizer was used on Prairie County rice before 1940; farmers believed it did not benefit rice. This year we used on my farm, over a ton of concentrated fertilizer for every 3 acres, and it paid off. Then we harvested, when the weather permitted, with binders; men followed, stacking the bundles, nine to a shock. When the heads had dried, threshing machines—some steam-driven—moved from field to field, marking their path with large straw stacks which were burned later. Now powerful combines each cut and thresh some 20 acres daily. We fertilize by airplane, we spray herbicides and defoliants by airplane, we often seed by airplane.

Then harvest hands earned a dollar a day; now, up to $10 a day. But their productivity has gone up, too. Recently, the Agriculture Department stated that in 1955 one man raised as much corn as 3¼ men raised in the later 1930's. A well-managed Arkansas rice farm will show at least as great an increase in productivity.

As consumption of rice and other farm products has not kept pace with this increased productivity, great surpluses have accumulated. People not needed on farms have moved to towns and cities, finding employment in manufacture. Arkansas, which is predominantly agricultural, has lost since 1940, 184,000 in population—almost 10 percent. Prairie County's population dropped more than 16 percent, while that of the Nation has increased 23 percent. It seems probable that this trend will continue unless industry which can provide new employment is attracted to Arkansas. We have the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission but, in my opinion, its prospects of success are being dimmed by policies common to recent and present national administrations.

Tonight it would be very pleasant for me to stay within the usual banalities of a brief, after-dinner address. However, I have not made an address such as this for 15 years, so you must pay the penalty of listening to many accumulated words; and these words will concern a subject which prudence advises me to avoid in Little Rock. I know many of you hold traditional democratic views on free trade.

Yet, you are interested in attracting manufacture to Arkansas, so let me begin by stating a manufacturer's pro-tariff case. The increases in wages, pensions and associated costs which we have negotiated during 1955 in Monsanto plants is almost equal to the hourly wages we pay in our Japanese plants—about 15 cents an hour. Because American industry provides its workers with more automatic devices, Americans are more productive than Japanese, but not in an 18-to-1 ratio. Experience in our own plants indicates that in our type of work 2 Japanese are as productive as 1 American; but Japanese productivity would be just as high if the cost of many automatic devices could be justified there.

Monsanto's hourly rates in its United States plants are more than four times the rates it pays in its British plants, and five times those paid by its German competitors; and, in many cases, the productivity of British and German labor is as great as American. In some instances, German productivity is even higher than ours, particularly in the construction industry. German bricklayers lay 1,200 bricks a day; in St. Louis the fixed maximum output is 500.

American factories cost more to build than European. An American chemical plant costs twice as much as its German counterpart; our laboratories, at least three times as much. With the exception of Britain, if one includes their dividend tax, American corporate-income taxes are higher than those of any other industrial nation. Hence, to yield the same rate of return on capital, net profits in the United States must be more than twice as much as, for instance, in Germany.

Except for some industries favored by cheap, indigenous raw materials such as natural gas, or by the fortuitous circumstance of our large, presently prosperous population which permits some companies to tool production lines for million-unit outputs,

all the factors I recited require much higher selling prices for American products to yield reasonable profits.

Many people assume erroneously that production genius is an American monopoly; that, by the use of esoteric formulas we conjure secret automations, and that in consequence American costs remain competitive, despite higher labor rates. If so, why does this genius stop short of shipbuilding, farming, and overseas airlines?

In order to compete, our shipping industry is heavily subsidized. More than one-half the cost of the superliner *United States* was paid by our Government, which also subsidizes about one-half the cost of its operation.

The American wage cost of operating a C–2 cargo vessel in 1954 was $24,000 a month; the British wage cost, $4,500. Our Government paid American operators the difference—$19,500 a month for each ship.

American oil and shipping companies which operate overseas without subsidy now build their ships in Britain, Germany, or Japan and operate them with foreign crews under Panamanian or other foreign flags.

Our overseas airlines are subsidized also. Even though foreign airlines, as a rule, purchase American equipment, and so have the same capital investment, the operating subsidy to American overseas airlines for the fiscal year 1955 was $18,632,000. Without this subsidy they could not compete. Furthermore, neither foreign airlines nor ships are permitted to compete in our domestic market. Foreign airlines cannot carry passengers or freight between our cities nor can foreign ships carry coastwise cargo.

As I have related, American farmers have achieved outstanding improvements in productivity; but to make a return on their labor-saving equipment, pay their helpers adequately, and maintain an American standard of living for themselves, they require higher selling prices than foreign farmers using cheap labor instead of machines—and through Government intervention in production and the free flow of trade, they do receive higher prices.

It is difficult to compare prices of farm products accurately because of varying national varieties and standards. However, in Winnipeg, No. 2 wheat sells for about $1.69, against about $2.15 in Kansas City. Burma exports medium-grade rice for about $5.25 a hundredweight; in New Orleans, Blue Bonnet rice is about $10.50 a hundredweight. Cotton is about 33 cents in Little Rock; Liverpool quotes May–June futures at 27 cents.

To maintain these differentials, our Federal Government supports domestic prices, subsidizes exports, and restricts each farmer to a reduced acreage which he may plant and which he may not exceed without heavy penalty. Incidentally, because of these price differentials, one-half of our agricultural exports are subsidized or otherwise aided by some Government program.[1]

Furthermore, imports of such farm commodities are limited by quotas. Imports of cotton and cotton wastes are limited to approximately 136 million pounds annually; short-staple cotton and cotton waste are allocated meticulously by quota among 32 nations. Some of these quotas border on the ridiculous—Haiti, for instance, is permitted to ship us 237 pounds annually; Iraq, 195 pounds. In the case of wheat, 10 nations may ship us but 100 bushels, and 18 nations less than 10 pounds of wheat products annually. To such extremes will bureaucracy go to provide all nations with a fair share of our market as required by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a subject to which I shall return.

In the past, the costs of our manufacturing industries were equalized with foreign costs by tariffs so that selling prices in our market of foreign and domestic products were comparable. But progressive reductions made during the past 20 years, under successive trade agreement acts, have made many rates inadequate and, as a result of the adoption of the Randall Commission recommendations, more unjustified reductions are in prospect.

Facts do not support the program for further reductions. Our tariffs average but 5.4 percent. Of 43 of the world's principal nations, only 7 have lower average rates.

For the 18 months ending last June, excluding military shipments, we had a favorable balance of trade and services of less than $3 billion, most of which resulted from heavy machinery and supply shipments to Canada, Venezuela, and the Near East, where American companies are developing oil, iron, and other deposits, and shipments under economic-aid programs. Nor does this trade balance reflect substantial outgoes for imported plutonium and uranium ore. However, even without these factors, the balance was more than offset by private remittances and grants. Commenting on last year's third-quarter trade figures, the internationally minded New York Times said that once again there was no dollar gap.[2]

In fact, since January 1954, we had an unfavorable balance of trade with Western Europe and its dependencies, and with Great Britain and its colonies. These are the nations which ship to us most of the industrial products upon which duties are payable. The excess of imports from them would have been much greater had their industrial capacities not been required to supply heavy home demands created by the current European boom. Europe is buying American coal, as her mines can't furnish boom requirements. She is buying steel, chemicals, and other products she can make more cheaply herself. Britain and Germany, Europe's leading producers of coal and steel, are about to become net importers of both. Our exports of these products will stop when Europe's capacities are increased or if her boom pales; then the flow will reverse.

I should like to emphasize very strongly that current tariff rates have not been tested during normal times, when the world's industrial capacity to produce exceeds its capacity to consume. I am confident, for reasons I will give later, that many of those advocating further decreases in tariffs know this.

Swelled by grants and our military expenditures abroad, the gold and dollar balances of foreign countries stand at an all-time high of almost $26 billion.[3] Their holdings of gold and earmarked gold are up more than 7 billion since 1948. In the same period our gold holdings are down over 2½ billion.

Proponents say that tariff reductions are necessary to keep our allies prosperous. Yet Europe is enjoying record prosperity. There is no real unemployment in either Britain or Germany. Western Germany, even after absorbing almost 10 million refugees, is importing Italians to augment her labor force.

When one digs out facts, lyrical phrases and other promiscuously worded propaganda such as "Trade, not aid" and closing the dollar gap, aimed at opening American markets wide to foreign dumping, appear in their true, mischievous character.

Who is behind it all? This has long puzzled me. I have sought to rationalize their motives. Tonight I shall present a case which I hope will convince you that adequate protective tariffs are not an impediment to normal foreign trade and that in our free society they are the only alternative to a supranational socialism.

In proceeding to develop this rationalization, I divide the proponents of tariff reduction into three groups:

Group I are importers and exporters who think that they would benefit.

Group II are well-meaning but uninformed individuals and groups who have been taken in by State Department and allied propaganda.

Some of this group have a nostalgic yearning for the return of the 19th century world, when relatively free trade was in effect. It was a world without passports, income taxes, social-security schemes or trade unions. Socialism and communism were little more than words. After Waterloo it was a century of relative peace.

Then when one nation imported more than it exported, the excess imports were paid for in gold. When too much gold left the nation, money became scarce, interest rates rose, hard times followed, imports dropped, unemployment induced lower wages and emigration to colonies or the United States, which had no restrictions on immigration. When that nation's costs had been reduced, others bought from it, it recaptured its gold and all was in equilibrium again—this is a thumbnail sketch of the classic world of free trade.

Now even though more than half a century of war and change precludes a return to such a world, some people idealize it. Mr. Clarence B. Randall seems to be one of them.

Mr. Randall is a lawyer. He is chairman of Chicago's Inland Steel Co., which, by reason of its inland location, happens to be sheltered from foreign competition by freight rates alone. Mr. Randall is a vocal and effective crusader—a zealot—in the causes in which he believes. And he believes in free trade.

He made this abundantly clear in his book Freedom's Faith, published in October 1953. But in this book he also made it abundantly clear that he would not allow facts to interfere with the conformity of his heart and mind to his economic creed. For instance, on page 132 he states that, although we have been pressing foreign countries to remove their import licensing quotas and other trade barriers, "our own tariff barriers have not only not been materially reduced, but on the contrary, have in some instances actually been increased.

The facts are that in 1933, before the passage of the first Trade Agreements Act, average tariff rates on dutiable goods were 53.6 percent. In 1954, such tariffs averaged 12.2 percent—a reduction of almost 77 percent.

On the same page he proceeds, "Hanging over each European manufacturer who might be willing to try to sell to us even in spite of our tariffs is the threat that if he is too successful he will have to climb a still higher wall which we will thereupon erect. It is like a pole vault, where the bar is raised after each jump."

This is a nice similie. But what are the facts? The facts are that for more than 20 years prior to the date Mr. Randall wrote, the only tariffs on manufactured goods which had been raised by administrative action were those on fur felt hats and hatters' fur, if the latter can be included in the category of manufacturers.

Now anyone with such a startling genius for ignoring fact was a natural ally of a group in Government which has, I believe, other motives for reducing tariffs. This is group III. While review copies of his book were in circulation, Mr. Randall was appointed chairman of a commission to recommend a foreign economic policy to the President and Congress.

Its work is described in a joint statement of general dissent filed as part of the Commission's report to the President, from which I now quote: "Less than 4 months had been fully used when the report was frozen. * * * No comprehensive study of facts, conditions, and problems was made. The only witnesses allowed to appear at public hearings * * * were representatives mainly of recognized

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

pressure groups whose views were known in advance. Witnesses in the United States were allowed 2 days for appearance; those appearing at private hearings in Europe, whose primary interest was to obtain help for foreign countries, were allowed 4 days. * * * There is no evidence in the report of serious consideration of the exhaustive studies prepared and submitted by domestic industries. Spokesmen for industries vitally affected were not permitted to testify."

Yet within these 4 months—which included a trip to Europe—Mr. Randall conjured not only a pattern for further reductions of American tariffs, but made proposals in fields of foreign economic and military aid, for reduction in the taxation on American investments abroad, for policies to be followed by the Export-Import Bank, for eliminating our agricultural price supports, for changes in our merchant marine policy, for amendments to the Buy American Act, and for handling one of the world's most baffling problems—currency convertibility.

A thorough job on any of these subjects would be a monumental accomplishment within 4 months; a thorough job on all within 4 months an impossibility. Hence, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the dissenting statement—"that there was no comprehensive study of facts"—must be correct. Yet Mr. Randall's recommendations for further tariff cuts were sent to Congress as "must" legislation—and most of them squeaked by last spring.

Mr. Randall's Commission also recommended renegotiations of the mammoth General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as GATT, to eliminate certain compulsory features which had attraced severe criticism in Congress. The State Department disregarded this recommendation. Instead, it is trying to set up a new international agency, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, to police GATT and perpetuate its compulsory features. Undeterred by this departure from his Commission's recommendation, Mr. Randall is now busy drumming up support for the new organization.

A bill to approve our membership in this organization, which is called the Organization for Trade Cooperation, is now before Congress. Styled H. R. 5550, it has the administration's blessing. While it submits the charter of the Organization for Trade Cooperation to Congress, it does not submit any of the complicated and far-reaching text of GATT itself. Perhaps one reason for separating the two was to obtain congressional approval for the seemingly innocent organization without having to submit this text. Nevertheless, if Congress approves the Organization for Trade Cooperation, it will, at least by implication, also approve GATT and we will be saddled with the whole package.

What are the history and purposes of this organization?

There exists in Washington, London, and many foreign countries, a hard core of zealous and effective individuals who would like all aspects of the economic life of society to be brought under collective control. This applies to production and distribution alike. Some favor all production being owned by the State—none remaining in private hands. The more moderate would settle for what I shall call welfare capitalism wherein commerce remains in private hands but with salaries and profits regulated and prerogatives of shareholders under State control. They desire equality of economic, social, and political status for all; they desire such a society to be global; they believe this can be achieved only by a supranational world government. They are my group III. Some eminent individuals and groups also advocate world government, believing it will attain permanent peace. I do not include them in group III.

The American members of group III, such as Americans for Democratic Action, do not call themselves Socialists. They are, however, the political counterparts of the British Fabians who are more candid. Fabians call themselves Socialists. They sired Britain's Labor Party which, during its postwar tenure, gave effect to part of the Fabian program—it socialized medicine, nationalized coal, steel, railroad and other transport industries and, so long as it remained in power, it continued rationing and state trading in basic commodities.

No acrimony attends my use of the word "socialism." Brilliant minds formed and form Fabian policy. You will recognize such world figures as George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, John Maynard Keynes, Bertrand Russell, Clement Attlee—all apostles of Fabianism; all made many converts.

Group III distinguishes between economic freedom, which they oppose, and political freedom, which they support. They condemn equally what is left of laissez-faire capitalism in the United States and the police-state violence of Russia. They applaud equally political freedom in the United States—and planning, compulsions and economic sanctions in Russia.

The emphasis of British group III is national, as Britain has neither a written constitution nor a bill of rights. Its people are protected against absolute government only by tradition.

However, America's group III has a "one world" psychosis due in part to altruism—an American characteristic—but, of greater weight, I believe, is the facility with which they can subvert our constitutional rights if we enter into world government. Group III formed the core of the New Deal and Fair Deal. They were master-architects of United Nations. They were and remain most influential in our State Department. Their purposes are more easily accomplished in times of strife. Hence, to them depressions and wars, hot or cold, are not unmixed misfortunes.

In 1952 the Fabians published a series of essays—Clement Attlee, recent head of the Labor Party and King George VI's Prime Minister, wrote an adulatory introduction in which he said, "I commend new Fabian essays to all our comrades not only in this country but overseas."

In the leading essay written by the volume's editor, R. H. S. Crossman, a member of Parliament, I found these words relating to the current cold war: "If freedom is to survive it is essential that neither the United States of America nor the Soviet Union should win. * * * We are opposed to Russian expansion but also to an American victory. Our object is to keep the cold war cold, and in particular, so to restrain armament so that it remains at a level which both sides can sustain over a period of years * * * we must realize that cold war brings possibilities of good as well as evil. Under its stress, both Communists and anti-Communists are overcoming antiquated forms of national sovereignty and developing new institutions of international planning and technological changes."

Elsewhere in the volume one finds many comments on the desirability of the United States increasing its expenditures for economic aid to the less developed nations, and praise for the social advances reaped during, and as a result of, the big hot war when Russia was an ally, and when some Communists were in our Government and the British Government and worked closely with group III in furthering their common economic ideology.

Under the leadership of Alger Hiss they helped to draft at Dumbarton Oaks, and later at San Francisco, the United Nations Charter—and it may not be inappropriate here to quote a December 12, 1952, U. S. News & World Report estimate that as many as one-half of the 1,350 administrative executives of the U. N. were either Communists or persons who willingly did Communist bidding. Hence, when Ambassador Lodge and Russia's Ambassador Sobolev make faces at each other, as many of the U. N. staff applaud Sobolev as Lodge.

The heart of group III's work is contained in the euphonious language of four of the U. N.'s Charter articles:

Article 55 states that the U. N. shall promote:

(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development.

(b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems.

Article 56 states: All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in article 55

Article 60 vests responsibility for carrying out these aticles in the Economic and Social Council.[4]

In 1946 our State Department made proposals to this Economic and Social Council for an International Trade Organization. GATT, financed and partly staffed by the U. N., was the ultimate outcome. GATT's "obectives" include "raising standards of living, ensuring full employment * * * developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods, and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all member nations." GATT's official Basic Instruments and Selected Documents fill 800 pages. Of particular importance to this analysis are:

A. (Art XI, sec. 2.) GATT would under certain conditions consider what share of a country's market of a given product belongs to other countries.

A. (Art. XIII, sec. 2.) Which outside countries are entitled to supply that share of a country's market and in what proportions.

C. (Art. XVI, sec. 3.) What is a country's fair share of the world export market in a particular product.

D. (Art. XX, sec. 1 (j).) What is a country's fair share of raw materials or other products in short supply.[5]

Although Congress has never approved GATT—the State Department accepted GATT on behalf of the United States provisionally in 1947, and ever since has operated through it.

I shall not belabor you by tracing all the involved maneuvering preceding the present Organization for Trade Cooperation and GATT; nor shall I analyze all the jargon of language contained in their documents, articles, and rules. Any such attempt would only prolong this address and confuse its essentials. Thirty-four other nations have accepted GATT provisionally—almost all being recipients of our economic aid. Naturally, our State Department's influence over them is not diminished by holding the strings of Uncle Sam's multibillion-dollar grab bag; and, by the way, this seems a cogent reason for the Department to insist that such aid be continued year after year.

Another reason might be rooted in Stalin's involved dialectic: "That is why it is essential that the triumphant proletariat of the advanced countries should render aid, real and prolonged aid, to the * * * backward nationalities in their cultural and economic development. * * * Unless such aid is forthcoming it will be impossible to bring * * * the various nations and peoples within a single world economic system that is so essential for the final triumph of socialism."[6] Later Stalin said: "Unless this slo-

Footnotes at end of speech.

gan is put into effect, the amalgamation and collaboration of nations within a single world system of economy which constitutes the material basis for the victory of socialism will be impossible." [7]

And Earl Browder, one of America's leading Communists, wrote:: "There is nothing more necessary in the postwar development of foreign trade than precisely the intervention of the government as organizer, director, and financier of the whole process * * * the large-scale entry of the government into the sphere of foreign trade is only another part of the development of state capitalism. It is another step in the capitulation of the bourgeoisie before the invasion of the principle of Socialist planning." [8]

In conformity, Henry Julian Wadleigh, who confessed his Communist affiliations at the Hiss trials was transferred from the Department of Agriculture to the State Department at his own request, pursuant to instructions from the Communist Party.[9] Wadleigh became an official in the Trade Agreements Section. Harry Dexter White, identified by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers as a Communist agent, represented the Treasury Department on the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements.

You may ask, "Why this concentration on the Trade Agreements Act?" It was the first step in wresting control of our foreign trade away from Congress. This was necessary before Stalin's "single world system of Socialist economy" could be established. The administration of trade agreements was not in the Commerce Department, where logic would place it, but in the State Department, where the cell and its group III allies could carry out its purposes.

Hiss and Wadleigh are out of Government. White is dead. But the Economic Affairs Section of the State Department, which makes trade agreements and conceives foreign economic projects, lives on. The State Department's current register, which provides brief biographies of all principal staff officers, lists under "Economic Affairs" 56 names, exclusive of the Deputy Undersecretary. Of the 56, 53 served in the State Department prior to the Eisenhower administration. Of the remaining 3, 2 served in other Government agencies prior to the Eisenhower administration.

I trust I have made it clear that, although some of these people served under Hiss and with Wadleigh, I am not charging any with communism. But I do want to suggest, emphatically, that what they have done and what they now advocate will lead to a supranational Socialistic Government which could eventually control not only American foreign trade, but which could dictate, through subservient American authorities, our domestic intrastate and interstate commerce as well

Group III is far too intelligent not to know that the present level of tariffs is not seriously limiting imports of most manufactured products, and if Congress approves the Organization for Trade Cooperation which, by indirection, approves GATT, our tariffs in fact will be frozen at or below this level. They foresee that, at the first break in world prosperity, a flood of cheap imports will cause great unemployment in this country.

In which case an appeal to GATT for relief will be necessary. This occasion would set in motion forces which could result and, in my opinion it is the desire of group III that it should result, in gigantic global economic planning that would dwarf our current farm and wartime controls into insignificance. It could bring into effect GATT's latent power to allocate markets as illustrated by articles XI, XIII, XVI. GATT would then be in a position to determine what share of our market in every affected product belonged to other countries—what share of this share such countries were entitled to supply, and what the proportions of each would be.

Is this too fantastic? Article XX, section 1, of GATT authorizes measures for the distribution of materials in short supply. In conformance with its spirit, during the Korean war, our State Department proposed to President Truman a world authority to allocate among nations, materials whose supply was inadequate for civilian and military requirements. President Truman instructed the State Department to organize what became the International Materials Conference. It operated as a supranational cartel, dictating prices and allocating the world's output of metals and other materials to various nations.[10] Our Defense Production Administration, Office of Price Stabilization and National Production Authority enforced its decrees, dividing among American companies what the international conference allocated to the United States. As a result, American war industries were short of sulfur, copper, nickel, and other commodities. Our stockpiling program was thwarted; while other nations, some of whom sent token troops but no significant amounts of material to Korea, received for civilian consumption what the conference determined was their fair share.

After complaints from American industry and the Munitions Board, the Senate held hearings; then prohibited use by the State Department of any of its fiscal 1953 funds for the International Materials Conference. The administration ignored Congress and the Comptroller General ruled that other money could be used to finance the International Materials Conference.[11]

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, while testifying before Congress for Randall's tariff recommendations, said he had often been tempted by the import-quota scheme, but he added "that is to establish pretty much of a Government regulated cartel system, telling people how much they can produce, how much they can sell, where they can sell it and the like. It tends toward the socialization of an industry."

Yet, by requesting approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, his aides are clearing the path to this socialization.

If what I am saying to you reaches the ears of these people, you may hear pious denials, pointing out that GATT has a general rule against both export and import quotas. GATT has such a rule. GATT has rules against a multitude of other practices too—but GATT can amend and make exceptions to its rules. GATT's rule against quotas is stated in 66 words; however, 3,500 words are used to describe exceptions already granted to this rule. It may be merely a matter of semantics. GATT frowns on the bad word "quota", but smiles on the good word "share."

Already we can see shadows of the gathering clouds of supranational socialism. Last spring while Congress was considering Randall's tariff recommendations, many domestic oil producers requested protection against rising imports of cheap foreign oil. Congress heeded the State Department's demur. Imports continued to increase. Congress protested. Then, according to newspapers, our Government requested importing companies to reduce their imports 7 percent during the last quarter of 1954. Administrator Arthur S. Flemming stated he was "justified in seeking voluntary action by the industry before launching the Government down a road of regulations which it had never traveled before." [12] It does not require a soothsayer to divine that he had compulsory company-by-company quotas in mind.

At the same hearings, cotton textile manufacturers and fabricators protested further tariff cuts on their products, presenting convincing evidence that if such tariffs were reduced the United States would be flooded with cotton goods, especially Japanese. In the Japanese Trade Treaty, concluded subsequent to these hearings, the State Department cut such tariffs, some as much as 50 percent. American manufacturers knew what would happen; the State Department knew what would happen. It did happen. Japanese cotton goods are pouring into our market. For instance, importations of Japanese cotton blouses and shirts jumped from about 1 million dozen in 1954 to an estimated 3 million dozen in 1955, although the treaty was not signed until June 8. If imports would continue at the same rate in 1956 as in 1955, it is estimated that approximately 10,000 American workers in the blouse and shirt industry would be displaced.[13]

Sixty Senators went into action. Congress had not yet authorized participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation and GATT. Hence, Dulles wrote Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH that he had "personally advised representatives of the Japanese Government that they should exercise restraint in their exports." [14] Japan's Ministry of International Trade and Industry suspended exports until it fixed export quotas for all cotton goods, then allocated these quotas, or fair shares, for 1956 among individual Japanese firms.[15]

The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute has just petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture to find a condition requiring emergency treatment as required by section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and, by its authority, establish import quotas for each major group of cotton goods, not only for Japan, but for Britain, France, Germany, and other nations who also threaten our market under the reduced tariffs. Such a step would also be in conformity with the exceptions granted under GATT, article XI, and hence, by a premeditated act of the State Department, tariffs, the historic regulators of international trade, have been voided for this important industry. Quotas take their place. Dulles said "Socialization would result."

And let me repeat Browder's exhortation: "The large-scale entry of the Government into the sphere of foreign trade is only another part of the development of state capitalism. It is another step in the capitulation of the bourgeoisie before the invasion of the principle of Socialist planning."

What would have happened in these cases if Congress had already accepted the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the State Department had, by executive agreements, bound our tariff reductions for 3 years, as is its announced intention? Congressmen and Senators would be helpless to go to the aid of their constituents. Such executive agreements would be the supreme law of the land.[16] Our Government could no longer negotiate with any other one Government because other nations would be involved. Control of our foreign trade would have passed to a supranational agency where we would have 1 vote in 35—the same as Communist Czechoslovakia, or Luxembourg, a nation whose whole population is considerably less than that of Memphis, Tenn.

Now, need I remind you that, after suffering from interference by one external absolutism in the conduct of its early trade, our Nation gained its independence by force. Those who had suffered wrote into our Constitution inhibitions upon the power of our Government to oppress its own people—who in consequence, have enjoyed almost 2 centuries of liberty and unmatched material progress.

Now one of the good things that might come to Clement Attlee's Fabians and his

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

"comrades across the seas" out of this cold war, is the acceptance by Congress of the Organization for Trade Cooperation. Almost daily, each one of you and Americans everywhere are subject to the propaganda of group I, II or III, or all of them. So is Congress. Unfortunately, our Constitution contains one anomalous loophole, article VI, which makes treaties the supreme law of the land. Through this article our Government may grant to an international body, powers over its own people which are denied to itself. Our courts are then bound to enforce the edicts of such a body.

There is now danger that under the guise of containing communism and attaining our national cherished hope for an end to all wars, hot and cold, Congress may be high-pressured to grant such powers over our trade to an international absolutism, which is responsible directly to no peoples anywhere, but to 35 governments—some socialistic, some communistic, some military despotisms.

The United Nations has drafted a Covenant on Human Rights which would destroy the freedom of the press and freedom of speech provided by our Bill of Rights. This Covenant on Human Rights provides that these freedoms be subject to law—our Bill of Rights states that Congress shall make no laws that abridge them. The United Nations has also drafted a Genocide convention which under certain vague conditions would deprive us Americans of the protection of our own courts.

Surrender of our liberty to trade as authorized by H. R. 5550 might well be followed by surrender of other liberties into a tyrannic grip from which we could emancipate ourselves later only by force, or threat of force, if by then we are strong enough to do so.

And here, south of the Mason-Dixon line, a hint may not be inappropriate—neither does the United Nations Charter contain a provision for peaceful secession.

---

[1] Address by Don Paarlberg, Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, November 15, 1955.

[2] New York Times, December 27, 1955.

[3] Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1955, p. 1195.

[4] The Economic and Social Council acts under the authority of the General Assembly in which the United States has one vote.

[5] Not all of these questions are explicitly referred to OTC by the article cited. The general authority conferred by article XXIII of GATT, however, and article 14 of its own charter, gives OTC full power to deal with each of these questions, and dozens of others of like import, in case of dispute.

[6] Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, Joseph Stalin in a report on the immediate task of the party in connection with the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, March 10, 1921 (Fineberg translation, p. 116).

[7] Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, Joseph Stalin in a lecture The National Question, April 1924 (Fineberg translation, p. 196).

[8] "Keynes, Foster and Marx" (pt. 1), by Earl Browder.

[9] Witness, pp. 28–29, Whittaker Chambers.

[10] "These 'entitlements for consumption' were implemented for the State Department through the cooperation of the Defense Production Administration, the Office of Price Stabilization, and the National Production Authority. As a result of these artificial shortages and in order to keep our industries going, it was necessary to withdraw strategic and critical materials from the stockpile and, was equally important, to divert to industry delievery of enormous quantities of strategic materials contracted for the stockpile."—Report on "Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials to the United States in Time of War and for Our Expanding Economy," by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—July 9, 1954—(p. 166).

[11] Report on Accessibility of Strategic and Critical Materials to the United States in Time of War and for Our Expanding Economy by a Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, July 9, 1954, p. 287.

[12] New York Times, November 3, 1955.

[13] M. J. Lovell, director counsel of the National Association of Shirt, Pajama, and Sportswear Manufacturers. New York Times, November 8, 1955.

[14] Daily News Record, December 5, 1955.

[15] Daily News Record, December 5, 1955.

[16] *United States* v. *Pink* (315, U. S. 203, 1942). The Supreme Court gave executive agreements the same force and effect as a treaty. V. Orval Watts, The United Nations: Planned Tyranny, p. 86.

Classics of American Democracy—XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include letters from representative leaders in veteran organizations on the proposal to translate the classics of American democracy into many languages and make them easily available at reasonable prices to the peoples of the world, as follows:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In response to your letter of December 12, I am impressed with your general plan as outlined in part 1 of the communication, but with reference to it have these opinions:

The works which treat of the subject and which are suggested for instance in part 2 do not as a class constitute lively reading and in large measure should, I think, be the subject of digesting in the manner used by, for example, the Reader's Digest in their treatment of current books from month to month. I assume that the pace in other nations is not comparable to the existing pace of life in America but it seems that a message to the American people must be written in such form that he who runs may read, and as I would expect that the result of your enabling legislation would be to direct many Americans to source material I think the republications should not be so lengthy as to defeat the purpose before the individual who has been intrigued is well-launched in any one volume. Just how Emerson can be modernized into ready readability is, for instance, one of the problems. Frankly I have found him difficult to read. Selected Federalist papers should find a present-day audience but the reprint of the papers in their entirety is again offering to one who becomes interested more than can be readily absorbed.

Might I direct your attention and the attention of those who will be considering the subject to the preface to the Virginia debates on the adoption of the Constitution. My volume is a second edition published as I recollect about 1807. In it there is the preface without the author being named. To me, it is one of the classics of our language as explaining the underlying spirit which prevailed and the sincerity and seriousness of purpose which actuated those who were concerned with the adoption of our Constitution.

It refers to the division which marked the delegates as to whether or not the Constitution should be adopted with or without previous amendment in order to include those amendments which subsequently became the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments. To me, it is a piece of inspired writing, explaining the purposes of free men to launch a government to preserve their freedom. May I suggest that you call the Library of Congress and read it. It will take but a few minutes and I feel has a distinct place in our approach to our fellowmen in other countries, who may be considering the ways of democratic government in representative form.

Personally I would also suggest the careful consideration of Carl Van Doren's The Great Rehearsal. I am one of those who believe there will be no peace in the world until there is within strict limitations some degree of world law. His book, of course, throws into comparison the adoption of the American Constitution with the need for the institution of some form of limited world government, and it might be that those who make the final determination might feel that this falls within the realm of present international controversies. But to my way of thinking, it goes to the very crux of that which we are endeavoring to present as the American plan and the American governmental structure, and ipso facto, the American political way of life.

I feel you are to be commended upon your endeavor.

Very truly yours,
STEPHEN F. CHADWICK,
Past National Commander,
American Legion.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Referring to your letter of December 12, I certainly feel that dissemination of the type of works described would be of considerable benefit, assuming that they are not already available in other countries of the world.

I am familiar with most, but not all, of the publications listed and in my opinion, based on those that I know, they would be good selections.

With best wishes of the season.

Sincerely yours,
LYNN U. STAMBAUGH,
First Vice President, Export-Import Bank; Past National Commander, American Legion.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Pardon this belated acknowledgment of the receipt of your letter of December 12 enclosing plan for publication of Democratic classics and suggested authors and works soliciting my comments thereon.

Ideas cannot be killed with bullets. We in the United States, who have enjoyed the beneficence of a Christian civilization built around the dignity of man, as the son of and created in the image of God, endowed by his Creator with fundamental freedom and liberty, with the right and power to govern vested in him, believe that the world would be better and peace more likely to be attained, if other peoples enjoyed a like opportunity.

A program calculated to attain that objective is commendable and praiseworthy. Such can be accomplished only through bringing to others information, understanding, and appreciation of our so-called American ideal. That cannot be accomplished through force or coercion, in any form or manner, but only by demonstrating and convincing to others that our idea and plan is better for them. For that purpose the plan to publish what you refer to as the Democratic classics is a good one.

However, at the moment, I confess that I am not sufficiently conversant with the list of suggested authors and works to express an opinion as to their use for the purpose intended. Of course, I know of them in a general way. My reading is too far removed to be able to express, currently, a definite appraisal, or to suggest other authors and their works. I would like to get time to examine the works listed and make such an appraisal but, under my present pressure, I just don't know when I can get at it.

However, I will try and write you further.

With commendation for your interest in this practical approach, I am,

Very sincerely,

HARRY W. COLMERY,
Past National Commander, American Legion.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In response to your letter of December 12, 1955, I am happy to endorse your plan for publication of democratic classics as well as the suggested authors and works enumerated.

Wishing you much success in this fine project, I am

Sincerely yours,

A. J. THOMAS, Jr.,
Department Commander of Florida, the American Legion.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your communication, and I wish to commend you for your approach to what I consider to be a very worthwhile project. In my reply, I must emphasize that I am expressing my personal reaction, and that under no consideration can my ideas be accepted as representing American Legion policy.

I don't believe anybody can find fault with the Bryce and de Tocqueville books, which were written in the 19th century, after visits by the authors to this country. However, I feel there is one definite "no good" book on the list, and that is the Thoreau work, comment on which will be made as I refer to the works in chronological order.

Taking the books in the order in which they appear on the list, I wish to offer the following comment:

1. The two Bryce books, Modern Democracies, being Bryce's matured opinions. This must have been published sometime around World War I, some 30 years after the first book. They are excellent volumes.

2. Burke's Reflections represent a highly conservative view of the French Revolution and should be supplemented by another view, which can be secured in Jefferson's writings. I believe Burke was totally opposed to the Revolution, even to the destruction of the Bastille. Jefferson, on the other hand (and he was closer to it than Burke) believed that if Marie Antoinette could have been removed to a convent that the King would have accepted changes in the governmental structure, and that the terror would not have materialized.

3. Dewey's the Public and Its Problems. I am not familiar with this book. John Dewey is always thought of as the apostle of state socialism, and perhaps The Road to Serfdom or one of the books of Russell Kirk should be offered as an offset.

4 and 5. Emerson's Essays, and Hamilton and Madison's The Federalist Papers. These classics should certainly be included.

6. I haven't seen Judge Hand's book The Spirit of Liberty, and suggest that Clarence Manion be asked about it. Hand was praised so extravagantly by Elmer Davis that perhaps the book should be looked into.

7–13. Von Humboldt, Jefferson, Kant, Lincoln, Locke, Mazzini, Mills. All of these look good. Thomas Jefferson and John Adams had read deeply in Locke, and many of the ideas in the Declaration of Independence stemmed from Locke. I haven't seen Kant's Perpetual Peace, but as I remember Kant's other writings, it is probably rather heavy stuff, and it may be that William Penn's plan for perpetual peace should be put on the list also. If Mills' Liberty is used (and it should almost head the list), the editors should in a foreword call attention to the marvelous tribute to the United States of America he offers in the final 1,000 words of this book.

14. Rousseau's The Social Contract is credited with having been one of the causes of the French Revolution, and should be included in the list.

17. Thoreau's Walden is a batch of back-to-nature essays, but in some editions the Civil Disobedience is included, and definitely this essay, which glorifies philosophic anarchy, should not be included. The right of the citizen to refuse to obey laws with which he personally disagrees is put forward, and that, of course, would lead to some sort of nihilism. The people of the United States, through Congress, give maximum protection to those who, because of religious convictions, refuse to do what the rest of us conceive to be a duty to the State, but Thoreau's stand is against all goverment.

18–19. The De Tocqueville and Wilson books are excellent.

Sometime in the late 19th century, a man named John R. Dos Passos, probably a relative of the Dos Passos of our generation, wrote a book on communistic associations in the United States. (You could easily get a copy of this book from the Library of Congress, and I believe you would want to add it to the list after you had looked it over.) Without exception, the experiments all failed, and yet all of them started out with bright hopes, and in most cases the groups were small, and composed of persons of like racial and economic background and of a single religious preference, though in a few cases the atheism of the Marxists was substituted for religion. But from Jamestown and Plymouth, through Brook Farm, the Owenite experiment, the Oneida Community, Amana, and other adventures in community ownership they all failed. This book[1] would show to Europeans and Asians that even under ideal circumstances communism in its various manifestations has been a complete failure.

I should like to suggest a couple of additions to the list which you submitted to me. More than 50 years ago, Booker T. Washington, the great Negro educator, wrote his autobiography, Up From Slavery. It is a truly great story of accomplishment, and can be matched with stories of accomplishment by many who came to these shores from abroad and made their contribution to this great Nation.

About 5 years ago, a book telling the story of the Continental Congress from 1774 to 1789, was published under the title The Reluctant Rebels. It was written by Lynn Montross and published by Harper's, and though it is a magnificently moving story of the birth of a nation, I believe it was not by any means a best seller. The Congress of the United States would honor itself if it were to recommend to the United States Information Agency this story of how the "Congressmen" of the United Colonies brought into being the United States of America and took the steps which led to the Constitution, which is the basis of all our liberties.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. O'NEIL, *Publisher.*

---

[1] I don't see this listed in the account of Dos Passos' career in his sketch in the Dictionary of American Biography, and it may be my memory is playing tricks with me. It is likely that this is a magazine article, possibly in two parts, and I would guess that it appeared in either the North American Review, or Harper's Monthly magazine, as it was then known, to differentiate it from Harper's Weekly.

DEAR SIR: We heartily approve of your plan for publication of democratic classics. In our opinion the program is most worthwhile.

We have no additions or deletions from the suggested. We are satisfied to leave selection to you and your committee.

Thanks for calling this program to our attention.

Cordially yours,

CURTIS M. JEWELL,
Commander, Department of Ohio, VFW.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I read with interest your letter of December 21, 1955, and the enclosure, and believe that the work as proposed in your enabling legislation will be good both for us and for the world.

I recently returned from participation in the VFW pilgrimage to Europe and from my short period of observation, I came to the conclusion that we, with our present program, are not reaching the little man in the European streets and farms. I have often wondered why communism moved in so easily when we released or withdrew any part of our support. Proper education of the United States and its basic philosophy might be a partial answer to prevention of this problem.

I think that your suggestion is a good one and will be helpful. I would appreciate receipt of about one-half dozen copies of the enclosure so that I may circulate them through my council of administration for suggestions and informational purposes.

History tells us that the leaders in the American Revolution and the founders of our present form of government were widely and deeply read in some of the books that you cite. An impression gained by them of such lasting merit must be of value if it can be given to another, who is in need.

Thanking you for bringing your request to my attention, I remain

Sincerely yours,

FRANK G. HAHN,
New Jersey Department Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Since receiving the copies of the letters and enclosures relating to your enabling legislation for publication of the democratic political philosophy, I have distributed the same among my officers and legislative committee.

My legislative chairman intends to discuss the subject of obtaining additional works with two of the English professors at Princeton University. If we have further suggestions for you, we will forward them on.

I am preparing a letter to each of the Members of Congress and the Senate from New Jersey requesting their support of your proposed legislation. We have also advised our membership of your work and keep them informed. Our State council of administration, on Sunday, January 15, 1956, approved of your proposal by unanimous vote.

Trusting that the above is of help to you and expressing my personal appreciation for your work, I remain

Sincerely yours,

FRANK G. HAHN.

Classics of American Democracy—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include

letters from representative leaders in the field of advertising and public relations on the proposal to make the Classics of American Democracy easily available in inexpensive translations to the peoples of the world, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have your letter with regard to USIA and in reply I would like to say that I think your plan is constructive and necessary.

I am sorry I cannot answer part 2 because I don't feel that I am really qualified to do so.

Sincerely yours,

STUART PEABODY,
Assistant Vice President, the Borden Co.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is in reply to your letter of December 12 concerning your proposed legislation to dirct the USIA to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

To have available to most of the people of the world basic classics of American democracy seems to me to be a laudatory objective. I must admit, however, that I am not familiar with all of the works listed in Enclosure, part 2, and, therefore, do not feel qualified to express an opinion as to their merits in meeting the purposes of the plan. Some of the books and essays I have read many, many years ago, and, thus, of necessity, would be relying on hazy memory for any recommendations concerning same.

Consquently, unless I have the opportunity to refamiliarize myself with same, I would not wish to make any specific recommendations. I do appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention, and I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. FELLOWS,
President and Chairman of the Board, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is a somewhat tardy acknowledgment of your letter of December 12. I have been out of town a good part of that time—hence the delay.

First of all, let me say that I think the plan to make available through the USIA a series of books along the lines you mentioned, and at a low price, is an excellent one.

Friends of mine who have recently made extensive foreign tours state that this is one important area in which the Russians run rings around us. I am delighted that steps are being taken to correct this situation.

While I realize that the selection of such a list will be a matter of long and heated debate, I can't help feeling that it would be advantageous if it contained the work of some American writer more recent than Woodrow Wilson. One possible candidate might be Russell Davenport's The Dignity of Man.

Here's hoping that this project can be pushed through to a speedy conclusion.

Sincerely,

HAROLD S. BARNES,
Director, Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Inc.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have your letter of December 12 concerning a plan to come before the next session of Congress, directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic democratic political philosophy.

I do not feel that I am expert enough to aid in the selection of individual books. It seems to me those listed in your attachment are a very worthy group.

I do want to go on record as saying, however, that I am completely in favor of this plan for presenting to the world a truer picture of our fundamental democratic ideals and culture.

I have long been a director of the advertising council in which we have worked very hard for certain domestic issues in the realm of better understanding by the public of our Government's needs.

One of the things that is coming up before Ted Repplier and our whole industry group is a program for tapping some of our public relations brains for directing and helping in the great work of the United States Information Agency.

I can unqualifiedly recommend the passage of this legislation and do hope that you will be instrumental in carrying the ball to aid its speedy completion.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM R. BAKER, Jr.,
Chairman of the Board, Benton & Bowles, Inc., New York.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In view of the fact that I feel that Dr. Arnold Lowe is more fully conversant with serious literature and particularly that of democratic philosophy, than anyone else in these parts, I showed him your letter outlining your proposed bill. He has kindly sent me a copy of his communication to you.

Let me say that both my wife and I have given much thought and considerable study to this need and heartily second your proposals.

Our feeling is that the library you propose will be excellent from the most important standpoint, that of informing thought leaders everywhere. However, we feel that some supplementary texts dealing more specifically with the current scene and the achievements of the practice of democratic philosophy would be helpful and particularly effective with a somewhat broader segment of the peoples. In this area I have four short texts to suggest:

1. The Good Citizen, a booklet describing the political institutions of this country and the responsibility of the citizen in implementing the functions of our governments, published by the American Heritage Foundation, 11 West 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

2. The Authentic Revolution, a speech by Erwin Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., published in 1950, and receiving the Freedom Foundation's principal award for that year.

3. February 1951 issue of Fortune magazine (Time, Inc., Time, Life Building, Rockefeller Plaza, New York City) containing several articles under the broad heading, "The Continuing Revolution."

4. Atlantic Monthly, either June or July 1951 issue, the proposed reprint to consist of an article by Barbara Ward entitled "The Silent Revolution."

Thanks and congratulations for your sponsorship of this vital task.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL C. GALE,
Vice President and Director, General Mills, Inc.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Answering your letter of December 12, received December 23, regarding the proposal to publish inexpensive translations of "classical statements of democratic theory" for distribution in countries throughout the world:

I would certainly support the intent of this plan, to spread familiarity with democratic ideas.

It does seem to me that it raises certain questions, though.

There is the basic question whether such books, even if available at very low cost, would manage to get read. One wonders how many of our own citizens have read most of the books on the proposed list, despite the fact that they are readily available in public libraries and in fairly inexpensive editions.

There is the question, raised in your enclosure, of what books to include. Could a representative and comprehensive list omit Adam Smith, for instance or Jeremy Bentham? Yet if the list of individual books becomes too long, the project becomes unfeasible.

There is some question, is there not, whether overseas readers will always associate the books with our United States way of life? The Communists are adept in their own uses of the word "democracy."

Perhaps these questions could be answered by taking a lesson from the successful experience of United States publishers and, instead of publishing a series of books, collecting the best extracts from pertinent authors into a democratic anthology.

This would mean the best pages from each writer, without the dull and tedious pages that might otherwise discourage reading. It would permit a wide range of authors. It could be clearly published under United States auspices. It could draw on all the techniques of popularization and appeal which have been so highly developed by Life, Reader's Digest and others. And it might well hold down the cost, involving the printing of 1 book instead of 15 or 20.

I am sorry at the need for anthologies and digests. But the approach may be well worth considering in this case.

I have an additional question whether the program needs to be conducted outside the auspices of the United States Information Agency.

And I must emphasize that this letter represents my personal views, not in any sense the views of our association.

I hope this may be helpful.

Sincerely,

FREDERIC R. GAMBLE,
President, American Association of Advertising Agencies.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This will reply to your letter of December 12. The delay, for which I apologize, was caused by a year-end business trip.

I should like to commend you for furthering the plan to make available a list of 15 or 20 books for overseas consumption. Your list looks very sensible to me, and only because of its completeness and accuracy I would suggest adding the History of America, by Charles and Mary Beard.

Thank you for consulting me on this project.

Sincerely yours,

E. G. GERBIC,
Vice President, Johnson & Johnson.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of December 12 asking for comment on the plan to publish in inexpensive editions abroad a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. As to part 1 of your enclosure, please let me say that I am a most enthusiastic supporter of the idea and feel that it should by all means be done—done soon, and done on a large scale.

As to part 2, I imagine that everyone will have his own individual list of 20 books that best exemplify the spirit of the democratic philosophy, and particularly of the sort of democratic community we have evolved here in the United States. My own comments about the particular list contained in part 2 of your enclosure are as follows:

1. If Bryce's American Commonwealth is to be included, as by all means it should, I should recommend that the American rather than the English edition be taken. The early English editions, as you know, contained a number of extremely frank comments on the American Presidency, with corollary reactions as to why great men could never be elected to the office—all of which were tactfully omitted for American publication. I think they might equally well be omitted, for obvious reasons, in any contemporary European edition.

2. I am inclined to wonder as to the necessity of putting out special editions of such

writers as Kant and Rousseau for European consumption. I should imagine that these authors were already in sufficiently wide distribution abroad.

3. I should be inclined to omit Thoreau simply on grounds of the general confusion and obscurity of his writings, though I realize that this is a purely personal reaction.

4. I should by all means include the writings of Tom Paine and Walt Whitman.

With every good wish for the success of your undertaking, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. LUDLAM,
Vice President, the Advertising Council, Inc.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Mr. H. J. Morgens, executive vice president of our company, has asked me to reply to your letter of the 12th, in view of his heavy traveling schedule at the present time.

I have discussed it with some people here whose judgment we value, relative to books, and have the following comment to make concerning the list of books which was attached to your letter.

We would recommend, particularly, the following in the order listed:

1. The Federalist Papers, by Hamilton and Madison.

2. The American Commonwealth, by Bryce.

3. Democracy in America, by de Tocqueville.

We do not think Perpetual Peace, by Kant; the Duties of Man, by Mazzini; and the Social Contract, by Rousseau, should be included in the list because the authors are considered to be in the category of persons who have contributed to the European political philosophy rather than the American.

It would seem to us that it would be best to approach this whole plan slowly with a few books to see how it takes on and to learn possibly something about better techniques of the distribution of books, before jumping in with a large list of books and no thoroughly tested plan for distributing them.

Yours very truly,

WM. G. WERNER,
Director, Public and Legal Services, the Procter & Gamble Co.; Director, National Better Business Bureau.

DEAR SIR: Thank you very much for sending me the clipping from the Chicago Daily News dated June 6 concerning "the battle of the books."

I agree completely that we spend far too little to circulate American books abroad, and I agree that additional circulation for American classics would be most desirable. In addition, I think we must also make available more of the books favorable to democracy which will be widely read.

It seems to me that the idea war must be treated in the same fashion as a hot war and that we make a serious error when we allow ourselves to be badly outgunned. This is certainly the case with the overseas book program.

Sincerely,

THEODORE S. REPPLIER,
President, The Advertising Council, Inc.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I thought you would be interested in the letter I received from George Gallup, one of the members of our committee.

I am also enclosing copy of the letter I wrote Mr. Gallup, in answer to his.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. BERNAYS,
Chairman, National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF PUBLIC OPINION,
Princeton, N. J., December 29, 1955.

Mr. EDWARD L. BERNAYS,
Chairman, National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program, New York, N. Y.

DEAR EDWARD: I have looked over the suggested book list which Mr. O'HARA wants to send abroad. I think Mr. O'HARA's suggestion is commendable, but I find it exceedingly difficult to find any one book which expresses the basic philosophy of American democracy.

I would think the best expression of American democracy of today is to be found in our current magazines such as Reader's Digest, Ladies' Home Journal, etc. I suppose it would be difficult to translate articles from these magazines and to give this material wide distribution. But I think that the audience would be far greater.

I can't believe that more than a few dozen persons in any one nation would be interested in the classics of American democracy—much as I wish the contrary were true.

Sincerely,

GEORGE
George Gallup.

JANUARY 3, 1956.

Dr. GEORGE GALLUP,
Director, American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N. J.

DEAR GEORGE: I am passing on your letter to Mr. O'HARA.

I don't know whether I quite agree with you as to your last paragraph. It would seem to me that in most countries there are intellectuals who play a dominant role in keynoting the thinking and attitudes of their constituencies. Their unfamiliarity with American thinking and American tradition may be a great deterrent to the people of their country getting a true picture of our country's real ideology.

It would seem to me that making translations of books that reflect the American spirit available to them might be extremely useful to our cause.

Sincerely,

EDWARD L. BERNAYS,
Chairman, National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program.

Classics of American Democracy—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, following are letters from representative leaders in the Sons of the Revolution:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I read with interest your circular letter of December 12 and approve thoroughly your plan, supported by Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio, for the printing and publishing by the United States Information Agency of translations of the classic books on democratic free government.

I have read the list attached to your letter and while it is very good, I think there are some books which should be added and I hope to write you again shortly suggesting some of the additions.

With best wishes for a happy New Year, I am

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN O. LEWIS,
President Judge, Court of Common Pleas No. 2, Philadelphia, and Honorary General President, Sons of the Revolution.

DEAR SIR: I thank you for your letter of December 12 addressed to me as the State president of the Sons of the Revolution.

Regarding the enclosure to your letter, it would appear that a plan for the publication of the democratic principles to be distributed and sold in all foreign languages would be good. However before giving any such endeavor my endorsement, I would like to see just what such a publication might say and outline.

Of course, anything that we do to present to the other peoples of the world a true picture of our great country, would be helpful.

Yours very truly,

MARMADUKE CORBYN, Sr.
Oklahoma State President, Sons of Revolution.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Replying to your query of December 12.

In my opinion your plan for publication of democratic classics is definitely in order.

I might suggest, as a matter of more general appeal, you also tie in to the title the following: "The Principles of Government of the Independent Republic of the United States of America."

Sincerely yours,

H. G. BADGEROW,
Vice President, W. A. Alexander & Co., Chicago, and Active Member, Sons of Reovlution.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The project outlined in your letter of December 12 has my hearty support and I shall be glad to cooperate in every way possible.

There is one addition I would like to recommend to the list of books suggested. The Epic of America by James Truslow Adams gives an excellent summary of the American form of government and the progress our country has made.

Is there any way in which a book designed especially for children could be included and distributed? It seems important to me that youngsters of impressionable age should be included in this program. Perhaps you know a source from which such a book could be secured.

I hope very much that the next session of Congress will act favorably upon your suggestion.

With best wishes for the New Year.

Yours very truly,

R. E. HUTCHISON,
35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., Board of Managers, Sons of Revolution, in Illinois.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Answering yours of December 12, I am happy to reply that Kansas City chapter advises me to say that it is much in favor of the legislative project of providing a library of basic statements of true democratic political philosophy.

The list of authors and works in enclosure No. 2 is comprehensive. At present I do not wish to make any suggestions until a little more study.

Wishing you and associates early success in activating the good idea.

Sincerely,

EARL B. MUSSER,
Secretary-Treasurer, Sons of the Revolution (1776) in Missouri.

MY DEAR SIR: It is very heartening to get your letter. It would be a fine thing for the

welfare of our country if doses of patriotism could be fed to our own. I have been hoping that some inspired columnist would write a series of articles which would be published in every paper, daily and weekly, in dynamic style which would catch the thought of every citizen.

Bryce: The American Commonwealth, Modern Democracies. His Lectures at Yale—probably they are included in the edition of Modern Democracies.

Hamilton and Madison: The Federalist Papers.

De Tocquesville: Democracy in America.

And the good things in all the others you have mentioned. Of course you know there is now being published a magazine of American history. A nation which has no honor for its traditions is on unstable foundations which may crumble under at any moment.

Thanks for honoring me.

Very truly yours,

MADISON MARINE.

Board of Managers, Sons of the Revolution in California.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of December 12 makes a most interesting proposal and I find myself entirely in favor of presenting American books, telling of our way of life, in such fashion as to gain wide reading overseas by making them cost little. But merely to bring about inexpensive books is not in itself sufficient; there would have to be a well-thoughout-out and well-executed program of publicizing them. All this adds up, of course, to subsidy.

We are perhaps at a disadvantage in any war of books with the Communists. They have a definite propaganda, an ism, a body of systematized dogma, deliberately drawn up as such. We have nothing of the sort. Americanism is not a true ism at all; not something dreamed up to crusade about. It is a feeling, a spirit, not a dogma. And that makes it harder to talk about in precise terms.

Your suggested list of books certainly includes classics of American thought—the Federalist Papers, for instance. I've never read them. I've read at them and found the going rough. I'm quite sure very few people have read such material as the list consists of—and still fewer with pleasure. In brief, it does not seem an attractive list. I would include, rather, such books as Truslow Adams' Epic of America or Gerald Johnson's This American People, or the History of the United States by the Beards.

I mention these as representations of a class of books rather than as specific suggestions for inclusion. Such a selection would have to be carefully made by persons much more expert and knowledgeable in the literature than I am or ever hope to be.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. PASSANO,

State President, Sons of the Revolution in Maryland.

Classics of American Democracy—XIV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, letters from four outstanding university professors in the field of political science follow:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12 and the enclosures. The plan proposed is excellent, even though there is not the same degree of agreement on what constitutes a good statement of democratic political philosophy as there is on what are the major classics of Marxist and Stalinist doctrine.

There are only a few observations as to detail which I could make. In the first place, it might be well to avoid even the appearance of wanting to compete with native publications in foreign countries. Thus, for example, there is now an excellent Italian translation of the Federalist papers, published in Pisa by the firm of Nistri-Lischi, with an introduction by Professor Ambrosini and comments by Drs. Negri and D'Addio. A book of its size may not be so easy to produce cheapy, but for such practical matters a solution might be found.

Second, in general complete editions of the works in question are preferable to selections; thus, I would certainly hate to see any edition of the Federalist papers not containing Nos. 5–8. These are often overlooked in excerpts, but have implications of considerable importance in judging the present political scene.

At the same time, it might be well to make use of existing American editions, such as the Modern Library editions of the Federalist papers, and the recent Knopf editions of De Tocqueville's Democracy in America. There may be technical difficulties in the way of making these editions available at prices lower than those now current in this country. I am wondering, however, whether it would not be a good thing indeed to have such American classics as the Federalist papers available at a price so low—let us say 25 cents—that college students in certain courses could afford to buy them in addition to their regular textbooks, and that they would also appeal to high-school classes.

To mention a few possible additions to the list given in your memorandum: Helen Byrne Lippmann made, at the beginning of the war, an edition of Benjamin Constant's On Conquest and Usurpation (Reynal & Hitchcock, New York, 1941) which I have always felt is excellent, although its significance is not always realized. Anyone interested in the state of public opinion behind the Iron Curtain should, however, be acquainted with this book, even if it does not constitute a complete translation of Constant's work. The second book which I intended to mention is Prof. Charles E. Merriam's New Democracy and New Despotism, which I hope is not too recent to be considered for inclusion in your list.

One further point: It is well and good to have general statements of democratic doctrine, but if they all suffer from the current stress on liberty to the exclusion of authority they will only add to the supply of wishful thinking with which the proponents of democracy are adequately provided. The best antidote would be Water Bagehot's English Constitution, now nearly 100 years old but still the best statement of the relation between freedom and authority as related to the practical problems of democratic constitutionalism. It would be difficult to mention something of similar importance for American constitutional government. Woodrow Wilson's Congressional Government would, for a number of reasons, not fit into this collection any too well, but at the same time I am wondering whether something should not be done to get this book back into print, if not in connection with this particular project, then at least in connection with the Woodrow Wilson centennial celebration. (The book would, incidentally, require a substantial introduction dealing with the recent controversy surrounding its major tenets.)

Finally, something could be said for having a brief one-volume edition of shorter classics of democratic thought, beginning with Pericles' Funderal Speech in the translation given by Sir Alfred Zimmern, or perhaps even with the remarks on forms of government in Heigel's History. Jefferson's and Lincoln's first inaugural addresses should find a space in such a collection, as should a number of other statements of similar brevity.

In the case of one of the books mentioned I have misgivings. John Stuart Mill's Considerations on Representative Government is superlative in some respects, but it gets enmeshed in dismal and destructive fallacies when demanding a representation of minorities in the sense that the founders of the American Republic would have considered in fundamental contradiction to their basic views. Walter Bagehot has criticized Mill unmercifully, but he expresses himself in a terminology which the modern reader would not easily understand. Prof. C. J. Friedrich has, however, restated Bagehot's views rather lucidly (in his introduction to my Democracy or Anarchy? A Study of Proportional Representation, Notre Dame, 1941. That volume has been out of print since the end of the war, but I am enclosing a reference to a briefer one published in 1951, even though it now also is on the verge of going out of print.) If Mill is made available, this should certainly not be done without explicit reference to a simultaneous publication of Bagehot's volume which, incidentally, has not always been well translated; the only German translation known to me is sad.

It would be a pleasure indeed to learn that the project is progressing well and that we may see a beginning with its implementation in a not too distant future.

Sincerely yours,

FERDINAND A. HERMENS,

Professor of Political Science, University of Notre Dame.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: You have my wholehearted support in your Plan for Publication of Democratic Classics in translation for distribution abroad by the United States Information Agency. It only seems incredible to me that this was not done long ago.

To many peoples, who are trying to develop free institutions of their own as they emerge from colonial circumstances, the great documents that we used, others that we wrote, and still others that were written about our experience by discerning visitors, can be a positive help. Such aid need not compete with other forms of technical assistance, and nothing else can take its place.

In the second place, this program can do much to correct a false idea of the United States that has unfortunately been spreading abroad, partly with the help of our enemies but also because of our own silence about matters of universal concern. Americans, it is said, are interested only in wealth and gadgets, not in the things of the spirit. Our slick-paper pictures of autos and electrical kitchens, if not supplemented by evidence of our other interests, helps to support this allegation. Our active sponsorship of democratic classics written by thinkers of all nations as well as by Americans can correct the picture as nothing else can. Original thinking about democratic institutions is one of our chief contributions to civilization, and why should we keep our light under a bushel?

I have taken the liberty to write a letter about this program to Congressman MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, of Ohio, an old friend of my father.

All good wishes for your success.

Yours sincerely,

WARNER A. WICK,

Associate Professor of Philosophy, The University of Chicago.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I have delayed answering your letter of December 12 relating to the publication in cheap editions of a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy until I could consult with some of my colleagues. We are all agreed that it is of very real importance

to put in the hands of peoples of other countries books of this sort. Those of us who have lived abroad have seen the cheap editions of Communist books which are so widely distributed and for which the democracies seem to have no counterpart.

We have discussed the suggested list which you enclosed and, as I am sure you anticipated, have some suggestions to make with respect to it. A substantial proportion of the volumes are either very old or are not written by Americans. It is our feeling that for this purpose it is desirable to have more American writers or books about American democracy than it is to have somewhat outmoded statements by 18th century writers. Thus, we would omit the following:

Burke: Reflections on the Revolution in France.

Von Humboldt: The Sphere and Duties of Government.

Kant: Perpetual Peace.

Mazzini: The Duties of Man.

Mill: Representative Government.

We would even omit Rousseau's The Social Contract although, of course, at one time it had tremendous revolutionary power. We doubt if it would have such power in the present world.

Bryce's two volumes on Modern Democracies are not nearly as useful from the point of view of helping people understand American democratic government as The American Commonwealth. We would omit Modern Democracies but would certainly agree to include The American Commonwealth. Woodrow Wilson's The New Freedom is highly dated at the present time and we doubt if it would be of particular interest abroad. In addition to the volumes which you have listed we should like to suggest a few others as follows:

Becker, Carl: Declaration of Independence.

MacIver: The Web of Government.

MacIver: The Ramparts We Guard.

Mason: Free Government in the Making.

Gabriel: The Course of American Democratic Thought.

Hofstadter: The American Political Tradition.

Croly: The Promise of American Life.

Hallowell, J.: The Moral Foundation of Democracy.

Lindsay: The Modern Democratic State.

These are more modern works and tend to represent more recent developments in democratic political theory. For this reason we feel that they would be more eagerly sought by students abroad.

Sincerely,

RODNEY L. MOTT,
Director, Division of Social Sciences, Colgate University.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: I most enthusiastically support your plan for publishing the great classics of democracy in the principal languages of the world and in cheap editions. In many parts of the world, the subsidized publications of the Communists are virtually the only ones available to impoverished local populations. Unlike ourselves, the Communists have never undervalued the power of ideas in the struggle for the human mind.

Your initial list is an excellent one and contains on it almost every important item that occurs to me. It does have one possible deficiency, particularly for audiences who are bursting through the limitations of their previous colonial existence and see their new experiments with democracy as revolutionary rather than as conservative or traditional steps; this deficiency is the rather conservative quality of most of the writing on the list—a natural outcome of the fact that, for the most part, Americans have been and continue to be essentially a conservative people. Only Jefferson and Rousseau can be regarded as representative of what one might call radical democracy. I would therefore suggest that you might want to add some work of Tom Paine to the list—possibly, The Age of Reason. Although they serve a different purpose, probably Wilson's Congressional Government and his Constitutional Government of the United States should also be on the list.

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with this splendid project, do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. DAHL,
Eugene Meyer Professor of Politcial Science, Yale University.

Study by Party Leaders of Democratic Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Democratic Vote Gains Exceeded First Reports," published in the Democratic Digest for January 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL STUDY BY PARTY LEADERS SHOW DEMOCRATIC GAINS EXCEEDED FIRST REPORTS

As the local elections of November 8, 1955, approached there were many questions in the minds of political observers:

Would the Democrats be able to continue the virtually unbroken string of victories they had built up ever since the Eisenhower landslide of 1952?

Would the Republican propaganda on "peace and prosperity" take hold with the voters and bring a leveling off of Democratic fortunes?

Had the Democrats overestimated the extent of dissatisfaction among the farmers? Would this dissatisfaction be reflected in the farm trading centers as well?

What would be the effect of the President's illness on the impact of an out-and-out "support Eisenhower" appeal to the voters?

Although the press has already reported on the Democratic victories throughout the country in the November 8 elections, the results of a special questionnaire sent to Democratic Party leaders by the editors of the Democratic Digest contain significant answers to all of these questions that go beyond published press reports.

Pennsylvania is a good example. There the eyes of the Nation and, naturally, the main attention of the press were focused on the mayoralty race in Philadelphia, where President Eisenhower's personal endorsement of the Republican candidate gave the race some national significance. But, dramatic as the Philadelphia landslide was, it did not tell the full story of the Democratic trend in Pennsylvania.

The Digest reports from Democratic leaders revealed the following:

Democrats won 5 mayoralties formerly held by Republicans in Pennsylvania cities with a total population of 443,000, whereas the Republicans only captured 2 formerly Democratic mayoralties in towns with a total population of merely 25,000.

Democrats gained control of 14 county commissions, more than doubling their former holdings, and lost none to the GOP.

What is even more significant than these raw figures is the fact that many of the Democratic gains, not only in Pennsylvania, but in most other States as well, were in rock-ribbed Republican areas which the Democrats have not been able to crack for decades. Examples:

Bucks County, Pa. (the home of former GOP boss Joe Grundy) went Democratic for the first time in 53 years.

Beaver County went Democratic for the first time in 100 years.

Indiana County went Democratic for the first time since 1883.

Even where Democrats failed to win offices, they made substantial inroads into what used to be an overwhelming Republican vote. For example, the Snyder County chairman reports that "we cut the Republican majority down from 4 to 1 to less than 2 to 1." And in counties where the registration is still heavily Republican, GOP voters were crossing party lines to support Democratic candidates. In Forest County, Pa., for example, where the registration is Republican by a margin of 750, the Democratic candidate for associate judge lost by only 62 votes.

The Pennsylvania story is repeated identically in Indiana, where press and national attention centered mainly on the dramatic Democratic sweep of the mayoralty races. There was, to be sure, national significance in the fact that the 73 mayoralties which the Democrats now control as a result of the November 8 elections far surpasses the previous record of 56, achieved in 1930, at the height of President Roosevelt's popularity. It is also significant that in the local elections preceding the presidential races of 1948 and 1952, as Indiana went, so went the Nation.

But Democratic gains in Indiana went far beyond the mayoralties. Reports from party leaders indicate that Democrats won control of at least 27 city councils, and replaced at least 52 Republican city councilmen with Democrats, while only losing 1 council post to the GOP.

The Fulton County chairman reports that "Rochester elected five city councilmen for the first time in history," and in White County, the chairman reports that this was the "first time in history that Monticello City elected the entire Democratic ticket," and this was the "first time a Democrat was ever reelected mayor." And in Whitley County, it was reported that "Columbia City voted more like it did back in the thirties."

The pattern seen in these reports from Pennsylvania and Indiana was repeated wherever special elections were held on November 8. Some highlights:

Reports from Ohio (which the press portrayed as a dark spot in the Democratic picture because of the decisive defeat of an unemployment benefit increase supported by organized labor) showed the Democrats picking up at least 5 mayoralties and 28 city council offices from the Republicans while losing none to them.

The reports also described dramatic changes in traditionally Republican areas. "Columbiana County, which has been a Republican stronghold for years, now has the Democrats in control of almost every city and village in the county," reports County Chairman Don Gosney.

In a Delaware County race, in an area that normally votes 3 to 1 Republican, a Democrat managed to be reelected by 193 votes. County chairmen in Marion and Ross Counties report that the usual GOP majorities of 1,000 to 2,500 have been reduced to only a few hundred votes.

The New Jersey results have been portrayed as slightly disappointing for the Democrats, in view of the hopes of substantial Democratic increases in the State legislature. While these hopes were not fully realized, the special reports from New Jersey leaders nevertheless show dramatic Democratic gains. Examples:

Essex County elected its first Democratic State senator since 1911; and in the vote for the State Assembly, the Democrats polled 40,000 more votes than they had in 1951, while the Republican vote only increased by 5,000.

In Monmouth County, the Democratic vote picked up by 6,000 over previous elections, the Republican vote by only 1,000.

Democratic gains were not confined to any region. They ranged from New York (where Democrats gained eight upstate mayoralities from Republicans, including the major cities of Troy, Schenectady, Ithaca, and Auburn), and Connecticut (Democrats won back Waterbury after 8 years of Republican rule and retained New Haven by 20,000 votes, having won it by only 4,000 in 1953) to California (a victory in traditionally Republican Santa Barbara gave the Democrats the largest number of State senators since 1938), and Arkansas (where an 8-year grip on the city of Little Rock was broken).

The special reports from Democratic leaders did more than show the extent of the Democratic trend. They also helped to answer some important questions. For example, what is the true extent of farm discontent, and what effect does it have at the polls?

Reports from county leaders show that the farm issue was important, not only among farmers, but in the towns where farmers trade. For example, from Sullivan, Ind. (which went Democratic for the first time in 8 years), comes the report, "We think that the farm issue was an important part as our town is an agricultural trading center."

The elections also contained important clues to help answer another important question: What effect has the President's illness had on the impact of a support-Eisenhower appeal?

Philadelphia contains the most dramatic answer to that question, for the President was more personally committed there than anywhere else. Prior to his departure for Denver, he had made a special point of inviting the Republican candidate for mayor to the White House in order to give his personal endorsement. Subsequently, the Republican National Committee sent both personnel and funds into Philadelphia, and GOP newspaper advertisements played the "support-Ike" theme. The results: Democrat Richardson Dilworth's 132,000-vote margin was even greater than the lead the Democrats piled up 4 years ago, and wards that had voted Republican since 1932 turned in Democratic majorities.

Other indications of the ineffectiveness of the Eisenhower appeal:

Full-page pictures of the President carrying the slogan, "Don't Let Ike Down," appearing in the Newark, N. J., papers, did not dissuade voters from electing the first Democratic State senator since 1911.

In Adams County, Pa., in which the Eisenhower Gettysburg farm is situated, Democrats elected a majority of county commissioners and a district attorney, in addition to reelecting Judge W. C. Sheeley to an unprecedented third term.

The Democratic victories of November 8 were really a continuation of the trend toward the Democrats that established itself in the first elections after the Eisenhower landslide of 1952, when the Democrats won 7 out of 8 special elections to Congress. Since that time, the following has taken place:

Democratic candidates for Congress in 1954 polled the highest percentage of the off-year vote since 1934.

Democrats won more governorships from the Republicans, have lost none to the GOP.

Democrats made sweeping gains in local elections in the spring of 1955.

In June 1955, Hanover, N. H., elected a Democrat to the State legislature for the first time since 1904.

In October 1955, little-noticed elections in Connecticut, gave a preview of what was to come a month later, when 4 towns went Democratic for the first time in 50, 40, 35, and 30 years, respectively.

What does this Democratic trend mean for 1956? Most observers agreed with the New York Times, which commented, "What cannot be denied is that the Republicans have been put on the defensive by the election results."

But Mayor David Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, had perhaps the wisest comment:

"Anyone can argue, of course, over what constitutes a trend. In the final analysis, you do not pay off on trends; you have to go out and win the big one."

New Feud Over Indian Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Feud Over Indian Cases," published in the Devil's Lake Journal, of Devil's Lake, N. Dak., on December 26, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW FEUD OVER INDIAN CASES

Welfare agencies of the State and the Federal Governments are feuding again over who should be responsible for the medical care of Indians on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation in Rolette County.

Carlyle D. Onsrud, director of the North Dakota Public Welfare Board, in a telegram to Glen L. Emmons, the United States Indian Commissioner, said that Indians are being refused care at the reservation hospital, so must turn to the county or State for assistance.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, in typical fashion, has ruled that it will not be responsible for the care of Indians not enrolled on the reservation although living in the area.

The Federal Government, which has the moral and legal responsibility for the care of the Indians, now would try to foist off its duties on to the State and local governments.

County welfare agencies, for instance, can scarcely afford the additional financial load of medical care for Indians. Rolette County, in particular, has never cared for Indians in the Turtle Mountain community before, whether or not they were technically enrolled on the reservation.

As Onsrud wired Emmons: "We regret the idea that a lightening of the Federal load should be done * * * in a negative fashion through technicalities in the Federal manual rather than through an affirmative process collaborated in by all parties concerned."

Lack of clarification on the subject has created friction between Federal and other agencies, who are wondering about Federal policies, as are the Indians who are caught in the crossfire of jurisdiction.

It's not anything new as far as the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which has often tried to bully local agencies, who have less resources to handle administration of the Indian program if the Federal Government would provide for reimbursement.

With limitations on their taxing power, counties are only able to provide for a certain amount of assistance. Inasmuch as the Indians are the wards of the Federal Government, under original treaties made with them by Uncle Sam, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has a prior responsibility for their case.

What happens at Belcourt or on the Turtle Mountain Reservation has a bearing on the whole State, which may be handed the Indian problem as a gift from Uncle Sam and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, unless protests are made.

Few people question but that the reservation system has drawbacks, but the answer lies not in transferring expenses to the State and local governments, but rather in reimbursing their agencies for their contributions to Indian welfare.

While the Bureau of Indian Affairs insists on bickering, the Indian is left out in the cold, not knowing which way to turn for the assistance, medical and otherwise, which he needs.

North Dakotans must awake to the facts or they may have the entire Indian problem dumped in their laps, courtesy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Alleged Roadblock in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Roadblock Story," which was published in the January 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROADBLOCK STORY
DEMOCRATS SAY GO

Expanding housing program: The Democratic Senate in 1955 passed (over the opposition of 78 percent of GOP Senators) an expanded housing program providing 135,000 public housing units a year (compared with only 35,000 proposed by the Eisenhower administration) but the opposition of the Eisenhower administration and 79 percent of House Republicans forced Congress to settle on 45,000 units next year.

Expanded world trade: The Democratic 84th Congress did what the GOP 83d was unable to do: it passed (over the opposition of 64 percent of House Republicans) the 3-year trade program recommended by President Eisenhower. In 1954, 84 percent of Senate Democrats voted for the Eisenhower program, with 100 percent of the Senate GOP opposed.

One dollar minimum wage: The Democratic 84th Congress passed the $1 minimum wage needed to keep workingmen's income abreast of increased cost of living, over the opposition of the Eisenhower administration and congressional Republicans, who held out for only 90 cents.

New public power starts: The Democratic 84th Congress provided funds for 107 public works projects not recommended by the Eisenhower administration—including sev-

eral new starts on major public power projects—but the administration has hinted it would ignore Congress and refuse to spend the funds.

Tax cuts for all: 99 percent of House Democrats and 66 percent of Senate Democrats supported a move to provide a $20 tax cut for every taxpayer in an effort to correct the lopsided GOP tax bill of 1954, which gave only 9 percent of its tax cuts to the 80 percent of American families earning less than $5,000.

DEMOCRATS SAY STOP

Dixon-Yates deal: Democrats fought and finally forced the administration to drop this deal, engineered by a utility spokesman within the Government, which would cost the taxpayers needless $90 to $140 million in higher power rates, netting tremendous profits to the Dixon-Yates utility syndicates.

Antilabor law: Senate Democrats unanimously opposed a Republican effort to enact a group of "toughening" amendments to the Taft-Hartley law which were opposed by every major labor organization, and which had been rammed through a Republican-controlled Senate committee without any consideration of democratic proposals.

Defense cuts: Democrats in Congress opposed administration cuts in the Air Force, the Army and the Marines, but were unable to prevent the GOP 83d Congress from approving a $5 billion cut in the Air Force which set back United States air development by 2 years and allowed Russia to gain superiority in many aircraft types.

Bankers' highway bill: 70 percent of Senate Democrats and 97 percent of House Democrats opposed the Eisenhower administration's banker's highway bill which would involve paying to bankers and other money lenders at least $2.7 billion in unnecessary interest payments that Democrats felt should be devoted to highway-building.

Tax cuts for the rich: 96 percent of House Democrats and 77 percent of Senate Democrats tried to prevent the GOP 83d Congress from passing special tax cuts for corporation shareholders which were 20 times as much as the tax cuts proposed for working mothers and 100 times the cuts proposed for families with foster children.

Conditions in Asia and Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials from the Steuben News of January 1956. One of the editorials is entitled "The U. N. Package Deal," and the second "The Saar Reaffirms," together with a letter mailed to me transmitting the editorials.

There being no objection, the letter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 22, 1955.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Enclosed herewith please find tear-sheet from the January 1956 issue of the Steuben News.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, we thought you might be interested in the two editorials, "The U. N. Package Deal" and "The Saar Reaffirms."

We shall be most happy to have your reaction.

Sincerely yours,

J. H. MEYER,
Editor in Chief, the Steuben News.

THE U. N. PACKAGE DEAL

Notwithstanding the hue and cry from the housetops in Washington, New York, and elsewhere, it is a pretty well-established fact that the United States has suffered a severe defeat in the council chambers of the United Nations.

We wanted Japan to be admitted to the so-called world organization, but we were not realistic enough to pay a price—the admission of Outer Mongolia—to achieve our aim. On the matter of population and industrial might alone, the two countries compare like a whale to a minnow. Every one knows that it was actually Nationalist China which rejected the admission of Outer Mongolia. But it stands to reason that energetic pressure and blunt talk on the part of the United States delegates could have forced the Formosa government to come around to the thinking of a realistic United States of America—and, we are sure, to the judgment of all the other delegations of the western bloc.

This time, it was a question of Japan against Outer Mongolia. The next time, surely, it will be a question of Japan against the Peiping regime. Our policymakers in Washington and on the East River should have learned by now that the price goes higher and higher; and Great Britain and some others with large commercial interests in the East will not move a finger if attempts should be made to replace the Formosa delegates with Peiping delegates. Moreover, the Japanese who are badly in need of export markets and most eager to come to an understanding with both Soviet Russia and Communist China, are realistic enough to recognize who is in a position to gain admittance for them—and who is not. This plain fact is apt to play a most important part in the current peace-treaty negotiations between the two countries.

Let us probe a little deeper and find out what else this package deal implies which brought another 16 nations into the United Nations.

As far as the United States is concerned, we have factually recognized the status quo in the east-west division of Europe through the admission of such satellite countries as Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, notwithstanding our declared policy of "liberating" Iron Curtain countries. It is true that we did not vote for admission, but by abstaining, we did not vote against it, either—and acquiescence is often the unpardonable sin.

Let us also keep in mind that certain U. N. provisions setting up qualifications for membership (however tongue-in-cheek they may have been) have been utterly ignored. The issue was not even debated; overnight, the U. N. has become a body to which all nations can be admitted now, be they peace-loving or not. Sooner or later, Red China is sure to enter the halls of the U. N. under the same banner. There seem to be sufficient votes even now.

Let us sum up:

1. It was Soviet Russia taking the initiative on the compromise deal and it is Soviet Russia taking—and getting—the credit for it.

2. The moral standing of the United States behind the Iron Curtain has taken a thorough beating. To those down-trodden peoples in the East, we must be just big talkers and little doers with our talk of liberation.

3. The people and the government of Japan, in their bitter disappointment and being very rational beings, will undoubtedly reevaluate their policies and endeavor more than ever to achieve a working agreement with both Soviet Russia and Red China.

And in the face of all these developments, our own John Foster Dulles who has vacillated between "massive retaliation" and the "Geneva spirit," has just returned from another NATO conference with the optimistic declaration that the member nations are more firmly united than ever before.

Yes, Mr. Dulles, as long as they get more financial help, for military purposes and otherwise, from the United States. They must have seen too what we have read in the papers; that the United States Government is inclined—to put it mildly—to raise foreign aid by several billion dollars, which, we trust, the American people through their elected representatives will utterly reject.

THE SAAR REAFFIRMS

Once again, the people of the Saar have reaffirmed their allegiance.

The election of December 18, 1955, for representatives to the Saar Parliament constitutes a clear-cut victory for the return to the German fatherland, about which no one in Paris, Washington, or Bonn can quibble.

Even the party of Johannes Hoffmann, the former Premier, has seen the handwriting on the wall, and there should be enough votes in the new paliament to make the necessary constitutional change.

Let us ever be aware that such a return is only in accordance wtih the freely expressed will of the people of the Saar and no more than an act of justice. And we hope that certain papers in this city of New York will no longer write of a union. There is no union. There is only a reunion.

Through military power and an act of political expediency, of which Washington is just as guilty as the other victorious nations, the Saar was separated from Germany as pure and simple war booty.

It wishes to go back to Germany and no conditions whatsoever should be put into the way of a speedy reunion. We trust both Paris and Washington will realize that. We also trust, the Bonn Cabinet will recognize the people's will and not pay a price—any price—to France for the return of German soil.

If, for the sake of harmony, certain economic adjustments for the benefit of the French Republic are to be made, the time for such adjustments is after the reintegration of the Saar into the German body politic.

Unless that is done, the overheated nationalism, upon which our newspapers put so much stress, may well break forth again—and the blame for any such outbursts would have to be put squarely on the shoulders of those elements who, in 1945, were responsible for the rape of the German Saar—in violation of that much-abused document, the Atlantic Charter.

Retirement of Roy L. Cochran From Bureau of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by John Jarrell in the Omaha World-Herald of January 15, 1956, paying a well deserved tribute to Roy L. Cochran, an outstanding Nebraskan who served three terms as governor of my State. Mr. Cochran, an engineer by profession, will complete more than 10 years

service in the Bureau of the Budget upon his retirement next January 31. He has served all levels of government with great distinction, and is acknowledged as a national authority on development of water resources.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COCHRAN WILL ENJOY RETIREMENT—FORMER GOVERNOR WILL COME BACK TO NEBRASKA

(By John Jarrell)

On Tuesday, January 31, a tall, straight, white-haired man will step briskly from Washington's Shoreham Hotel, disregard the line of taxicabs at the curb, and begin walking toward the downtown section of the Capital.

Nothing short of a blizzard will prevent Robert Leroy Cochran, the 23d Governor of Nebraska, from making that 3-mile walk.

It will be, however, Mr. Cochran's final walk between his home and his office in the sprawling Bureau of the Budget that lies just west of the White House.

On January 28, Mr. Cochran reaches his 70th birthday. That makes retirement mandatory on the last day of that month.

But Mr. Cochran sees no reason to make it any different than any other day, so he will go afoot to work, as usual. Last year, there were only 2 days when he considered the weather too bad to walk.

He looks back on 44 years of public service, on three continents, with no regrets.

"I've had interesting work and, for the most part, satisfying work," he said. "It has been diversified. There has been enough foreign service thrown in to make for contrast."

No, he said, if he had it to do over again, he wouldn't make any major changes.

BROUGHT UP IN SODDY

Roy Cochran is a Nebraskan all the way through, by birth, inheritance, tradition, and choice. Born at Avoca, in Cass County, he was taken at the age of 6 by his father and stepmother, together with his older brother and sister, to a farm near Brady, in Lincoln County. He still owns the farm.

There he lived in a sod house with dirt floor. He attended a one-room school, and later he rode horseback every day to Brady for eighth grade and high-school studies. He was the first graduate of the high school to attend the University of Nebraska.

In January 1912, Mr. Cochran went to work for the State engineer's office. He stayed there 20 years, the last 12 as State engineer, except for a break in World War I when he served as an artillery captain in France.

As a Democrat, he was elected Governor in 1934, 1936, and 1938.

In 1940, he aspired to the Senate, defeated the incumbent Democratic Senator, Edward R. Burke, in the primary, but was himself defeated in the general election by the late Hugh Butler.

After he left the Governor's mansion, he went into the service again, as a colonel, and was commanding officer at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. Then he did a hitch with the War Housing Administration, and was transferred to UNRRA, attached to the Mediterranean Theater and serving in North Africa and Italy.

IN BUDGET 10 YEARS

In October 1945 the late Harold Smith, then Director of the Budget, was casting about for an engineer to specialize in civil-works matters. It was he who brought Mr. Cochran into the Federal Government.

First he was assistant chief of the civil-works section. In recent years he has been special assistant in the field of water resources.

There was a 7-month break in 1947. That was when his old friend, Dwight Griswold, another former Nebraska governor, asked him to go to Greece with him, as Deputy Greek Aid Administrator.

That, in brief, is the 44-year public career of Roy Cochran.

"NO RUNNING FOR GOVERNOR"

In Washington there is a saying, "They never go back to Pocatello." That refers to the number of men who come to the Capital, in Government or in Congress, and never return home, even when retirement, the voters or a change in administration render them jobless.

Not so Mr. Cochran. He retires January 31. By February 2, at the latest, he and Aileen, his wife, will be en route to Nebraska.

Their future plans? Not definite. They will spend some of their time in Nebraska, some in California, some traveling. Perhaps even a cruise.

The Cochrans have a son in Lincoln, Robert Leroy Cochran, Jr., and a daughter in Oxnard, Calif., Mrs. Lee Grimes. They have four grandchildren, too—Robert Lee Grimes, 9; Douglas Grimes, 7; Diane Grimes, 4; and Robert Leroy Cochran 3d, 3.

As the last consistenly successful Democrat in Nebraska politics, Roy Cochran has received a good many suggestions that he reenter politics, perhaps as a candidate for governor this year.

He says he will not.

"I don't believe anyone who reaches 3 score years and 10," he declared, "should undertake a job harder than the one he has been performing. And that applies particularly to elective office."

ENJOYS ENGINEERING WORK

Around the Budget Bureau, and through the various departments of Government and Congress as well, Mr. Cochran has achieved quite a reputation for the close scrutiny he gives civil works projects that cross his desk.

Before he will give them a favorable recommendation, he insists that economic feasibility be shown. In the case of power and irrigation projects, he demands financial feasibility be guaranteed.

"These giant projects in the Pacific Northwest, in the Missouri Valley, in New England, all over the country, run into billions and billions of dollars," he said. "It seems to me important that we point out just what will be the costs to the Federal Government, and whether financial feasibility is present."

Mr. Cochran admits he gets gratification from the fact that he began his career in public life as an engineer, at the practicing level, and that he is ending his career as an engineer, at the analytical level.

ON THE ECONOMICAL SIDE

He believes he stepped out of character when he ran for the United States Senate.

That is because State politics, during his 6 years as governor, were in direct contrast to national politics, in the spending area.

Mr. Cochran, a Democrat, was an economy governor, ran a taut administration, moneywise, holding down taxes and keeping spending low. The national Democratic administration, at the same time, under President Roosevelt, was setting new spending records and running deeper into debt.

It was "not too pleasant an experience," he says, to be running for national office on a national ticket with which he was in fundamental disagreement on fiscal matters.

His 6 years as governor were very satisfying.

He looks back with particular satisfaction on the economy and road-building phases of his administration, with roads built on a pay-as-you-go basis.

"I was Governor and no longer State engineer," he recalled. "But I had been State engineer for a dozen years, and a good many road delegations still called on me."

Twice he was chairman of the Governors Conference and president of the Council of State Governors.

Last time the Cochran name appeared on a ballot, he won handily. That was for a post on the board of governors of the Nebraska Society of Washington. He served 2 years as president of the society.

READING AND TRAVEL

Mr. Cochran is looking forward to visiting the old family farm near Brady, and another near Scottsbluff which he purchased before World War I.

Edwin Hoagland has rented the 200-acre Brady farm from him for 25 years, and J. A. Anderson rents the 160-acre Scottsbluff farm, and has for 32 years. He has never had a written contract with either man.

The former Governor does not expect to be bored when he has no office to visit every day.

"I expect to catch up on some reading I haven't had time to do," he said. "And we like television. And we like to play bridge and canasta. And we love to travel."

He and Mrs. Cochran had been what he termed "indifferent" bridge players. About 3 years ago they began taking lessons.

"Now," he said, "we play with more interest to ourselves and perhaps, create less disaffection among those we play with."

He and Mrs. Cochran share driving chores, an hour at a time, when crossing the country.

She also shares his enthusiasm for walking. In Washington, they take long walks each weekend in Rock Creek Park.

Roy Cochran leaves public life for retirement with no regrets, no recriminations. He served in Washington under 2 Democratic Presidents and 1 Republican, without trace of partisanship, but in the interests of what he considered good economy and good government.

"I'm glad I've been in public office," he said, "and I'm glad I don't feel that just because I have been, I must continue to be. I'm glad I don't have it in my blood to the extent that I've observed it in others."

He sounds like a man who is going to enjoy retirement.

Farm Conditions in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written to me by Anton Novak, Sr., of Williston, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLISTON, N. DAK., *December 28, 1956.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I just want to tell you that I butchered a 4-year-old fat cow. I mean a fat cow that dressed 808 pounds with head, tongue, feet, and liver off and I received $1.54 for the hide and had a pair of shoes half-soled, no heels fixed, just half-soled, and paid $2.52 to get them fixed. It just does not add up. I wonder what's going to happen. Just keep up the good work you are doing and the fight you put on. We are watching you. I would like to have a copy of Ike's preelection speech that he made at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., or Kasson, Minn., and that Benson are sure a joke.

Yours truly,

ANTON NOVAK, Sr.

Ridgway Had His Day in Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, General Ridgway's first article in the Saturday Evening Post is merely raking over deal coals, or as some of our oldtimers used to say, "threshing old straw."

The general, for whom I have great respect, and have so stated publicly, made known his objection to cuts in the Army strength to his superiors, both military and civilian. They did not concur in his views. He made his views known to committees of Congress, both House and Senate. They did not concur.

During the debate in the House of Representatives on the fiscal 1955 and 1956 military budget, his words were repeated time after time. Amendments were offered to restore the cuts. These were voted down.

The 1955 military budget presented by the Appropriations Military Subcommittee, with Representative WIGGLESWORTH, Republican, Massachusetts, as chairman, after these open debates, was passed unanimously 378 to 0. The 1956 budget, with Representative MAHON, Democrat, Texas, presiding, passed 382 to 0.

Mr. VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, after hearing General Ridgway, said, on the floor of the House, that he approved the action of the President in recommending these reductions.

Never at any time before the House Military Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am a member, did General Ridgway express surprise or shock at President Eisenhower's 1955 message. He did express his disagreement, to both the sums and strength authorized for the Army.

Of course, as he said, as Army Chief of Staff, he never took the cost or our economic situation into consideration, but President Eisenhower had to; Secretary Wilson had to; our committee had to; and Congress had to. There is just so much money available each year. We must not destroy ourselves by the consuming fires of inflation. That would tickle Russia pink if Russia were not already Red. Our economy, as well as our defense, mut be kept sound.

Worthy of your reading, or re-reading is the editorial appearing in the Washington Star of January 18, 1956, which follows:

A SOLDIER GOES ASTRAY

No one who has even a casual acquaintance with General Ridgway would think of questioning his sincerity of purpose. Moreover, he is a fine soldier—a dedicated officer to whom the security of his country comes first, last, and always. It is too bad that he did not stick to his field in the first of a series of articles he has written for the Saturday Evening Post.

General Ridgway is competent to speak on the subject of national security. His opinions in this area are not necessarily conclusive, but they are entitled to great respect. We had better listen when, speaking as a professional military man, he says that our current defense policies are endangering the safety of our country. It is also necessary, however, to keep in mind the limitations under which General Ridgway testifies. He concedes this himself in these words:

"As Chief of Staff of the Army and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, it was my duty and obligation to advise the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, and the President on military matters. This advice should be based on my honest, fearless, objective estimate of what the Army needed to serve the national interest, and it should have no reference to the impact my recommendations might have on the national economy, on domestic politics, nor on administration policy at any particular time."

This is a correct statement, and it would have been better if General Ridgway, in his magazine piece, had confined himself to military advice. For that is the field in which he is competent and in which his responsibility lies. But a President cannot ignore, as General Ridgway could, the impact of military recommendations on the national economy, politics, and policy. A President has to look at the whole picture and form his judgments accordingly.

In writing for the Saturday Evening Post, General Ridgway has not stuck to the single-minded duty which he laid upon himself as Army Chief of Staff. Unfortunately, he has strayed into the realm of politics. And the effect is to impugn, by implication, the good faith and the integrity of the President.

The release of advance copies of the article led to a Senate debate. Democratic Senator SYMINGTON said that the Ridgway article in effect "says that the security of the Nation is being thrown into the market place, to be traded for political advantage." Other Democrats, without mentioning that General Ridgway had also been severely critical of the Truman administration, chimed in. In all fairness, however, it must be said that the inferences drawn up by the Democratic Senators were justified by the things General Ridgway wrote.

Thus, a statement by a distinguished soldier, which might have contributed to intelligent debate of a vitally important question, feeds the fires of political controversy, at a very low level. And it will be a self-defeating thing. For the effect of all this is to accuse President Eisenhower and Defense Secretary Wilson, not of being mistaken in their judgment, but of selling the country short for the sake of votes. We do not believe this, and the people will not believe it.

Attitude and Procedures of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions—Correction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, some time before the Congress adjourned last year, I put into the RECORD an article dealing with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particulary relating to credit unions. I find I was misinformed, and I think I owe it to the Senate to ask unanimous consent to have printed an article correcting the statement made at that time, together with a letter written to me on the subject, dated August 15, 1955.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of July 25, 1955, contains an extension of your remarks Attitude and Procedures of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions comprised of a letter you received from the North Dakota Credit Union League dated July 21, 1955, as well as an article published in the Flint Weekly Review of July 14, 1955.

Inasmuch as the Flint Weekly Review article made reference to "wholly false accusations made against the Ford Rouge Federal Credit Union," I thought you would be interested in the attached photostatic copy of the Detroit Free Press article of July 28, 1955, which indicates the action of the Federal grand jury on July 27 with respect to that case.

Sincerely yours,

J. DEANE GANNON,
Director.

[From the Detroit Free Press of July 28, 1955]

SIX FORD CREDIT-UNION AIDES INDICTED—MISUSE OF FUNDS ALLEGED—ACTION SEQUEL TO $53,000 SHORTAGE

Six men were indicted Wednesday on charges of misuse of funds of the Ford Rouge Employees Federal Credit Union.

Four other persons were named as coconspirators but not defendants.

Six indictments were returned by a grand jury before Federal Judge Arthur A. Koscinski.

Ronald L. Greenberg and Willis Ward, assistant United States district attorneys who presented the Government's case to the grand jury, said the defendants will be arraigned Tuesday.

Each count carries a maximum penalty of 5 years' imprisonment and $5,000 fine.

Robert Vezzosi, Dearborn councilman and former treasurer of the credit union, was named a defendant in five indictments. He is charged with a total of six counts.

Other defendants and their addresses and identifications as given by the Government:

Arthur M. Bowman, of 1966 W. Boston, the organization's attorney.

Guisino Caprara, of 6552 Thiesen, Dearborn, former supervisor of cashiers.

Charles H. Thompson, of 2014 Highland, former chief cashier.

Franklin Lohmes, of 22431 Beech, Dearborn, present credit manager.

Giulo DeSantis, of 3305 Edsel, Deadborn, part owner of Canton Bar, 39651 Michigan, Canton township.

Named as coconspirators were Vezzosi's mother, Theresa, of 6050 Appoline, Dearborn; Clifford Steele, of 3616 Moore, Inkster; R. Reid Crum, of 24061 Calvin, Dearborn, identified as a partner with Vezzosi in the Research Electronics Co. in Plymouth, and Leroy Folks, of 518 Frazier, River Rouge.

The credit union whose members belong to Ford local 600, UAW (CIO), was rocked by a scandal last March when a $53,000 shortage was reportedly uncovered.

The organization was closed briefly by the Federal Bureau of Credit Unions and a new staff of officers was chosen.

Vezzosi and Thompson were indicted last March, Vezzosi on a charge of misrepresenting the financial condition of the credit union and Thompson on a charge of embezzling $53,000.

Edmour Bertrand, former owner of the Crystal Bar, Lawton and Grand River, was indicted then on charge of aiding Thompson

in the embezzlement. Bertrand was not named in Wednesday's indictments.

The indictments contained these various charges:

The Vezzosi obtained a $30,000 loan so Caprara could purchase the Canton Bar, although he had no security, and that Mrs. Vezzosi and DeSantis were partners with Caprara in the bar.

That Vezzosi and DeSantis participated in a check-kiting scheme for paying off the loan.

That Vezzosi obtained a $7,300 loan from the credit union for Crum to cover liabilities of the Research Electronics Co.

That Lohmes and Thompson, aided by Vezzosi, obtained credit-union loans of $450 and $400, respectively, to cover teller shortages.

That these loans were repaid from money obtained by Lohmes and Thompson by padding expense accounts.

That Bowman, although ineligible for loan, had Steele, a Ford worker, borrow $10,800 for him. Steele allegedly got $500 for his role.

That Bowman arranged a $37,379 loan so Folks could buy a roller rink and that Bowman was paid $2,000 by Folks.

That Bowman kept $5,282 of the loan to Folks and used the money to cover his purchase of a convalescent home at 1876 East Grand boulevard.

General Ridgway's Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I request that the attached editorial entitled "General Ridgway's Battle," which was carried in the January 19, 1956, issue of the Washington Post, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

GENERAL RIDGWAY'S BATTLE

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway has raised two sobering issues of national policy in his pointed article in the Saturday Evening Post. The first concerns procedures for handling military recommendations to the administration. Is it proper that an Army Chief of Staff be muzzled and his views misrepresented in an effort to give the appearance of unanimity? The second concerns the reductions in Army manpower in relation to a balanced defense. Are we relying so heavily on nuclear weapons that we would be forced to drop the first bomb for want of other means to fight a limited war?

It is no secret that General Ridgway was in disfavor with some administration officials before his retirement last summer. The General was outspoken and blunt in his opposition to cuts which he thought impaired the Army's capability to fulfill American commitments. President Eisenhower once termed his views "parochial"; and there may have been good reason for others to disagree with him. Nevertheless, it is a shock to read General Ridgway's emphatic contradiction of the statement in Mr. Eisenhower's 1954 state of the Union message that the new military program had been "unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff." General Ridgway makes it clear that he did not agree. He regarded his function as that of giving military advice uninfluenced by budgetary considerations or "the advantage to be gained in the field of domestic politics by a drastic reduction in military expenditures"; and he regarded the 1956 budget as a directed verdict. Evidently the President was misinformed about General Ridgway's views, and the finger points to Defense Secretary Wilson.

There is an equally strong indictment of Mr. Wilson in the use of the "confidential" label to bottle up General Ridgway's final report. This report, which was critical of the inadequate military capacity to cope with limited wars, went to Secretary Wilson as an unclassified document. Yet it was returned with the request that it be classified confidential, and it was pigeonholed until someone leaked the contents. This amounted to a prime abuse of the military classification system to suppress information that was merely embarrassing and had no direct relation to security. It is precisely this sort of thing that justifies the continuing protests against the Pentagon stranglehold on information.

On the substantive issue of whether budgetary cuts have injured the defense posture, it is difficult to have an objective judgment. Although an Army commander's devotion to the national interest may be unquestioned, he still may think in one-service terms and not have a sound overall appraisal. Because there is not enough money to satisfy all services compromises must be made. This newspaper, nevertheless, is inclined to agree with General Ridgway that the emphasis on saving money through an all-atomic strategy could lead to a situation in which the country would be able to deter so-called brush fires only at the risk of general war. It is significant that General Ridgway is the man who bucked the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and who ultimately was upheld by the President, in opposing the kind of atomic countermeasure on Quemoy and Matsu that Secretary Dulles has skipped over so blithely.

The question of disagreements among members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and of economic considerations in the military budget, is one the Nation has faced many times before. Ultimately the decision has to be made by civilians on the most balanced advice. Once the decision is made, it is the job of military officials to go along loyally or request reassignment; the country cannot tolerate the kind of end runs of the sort conducted in the past in efforts to change policy. But none of these considerations is warrant for misrepresentation of views. Surely Congress is entitled to know, on demand, the honest feelings of a military chief who disagrees. Perhaps the major fault lies in the insistence on buttressing decisions with "unanimity" whether or not it actually exists.

Whose Farm Prices?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1956:

WHOSE FARM PRICES?

In his speech at St. Paul former President Truman declared that Secretary Benson didn't "inherit" the farm problem, but that Mr. Benson and the President "made it themselves."

It is true that wholesale farm prices have declined in this country from about 99 at the end of 1952 to 84 at the end of November 1955, or about 15 points. But this is by no means the whole story. For those who are interested in the whole record it may be noted that farm prices declined 18 points in the last 21 months of Mr. Truman's own administration.

As for Mr. Truman's proposal that we return to 90 percent of parity price supports, it may be worth observing that, of the total decline of 33 points in farm prices since early 1951, 27 points were accounted for in the era of high, rigid price supports.

Passamaquoddy Tidal-Power Project

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 12, to request the Secretary of State to arrange for the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, to conduct a survey of the proposed Passamaquoddy tidal-power project, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, the platitudes of the recent state of the Union message this year would remind one of the days of the New Deal. I am more than happy that the administration is going along with Passamaquoddy because of the fact this was originally a New Deal measure. This was considered during the great depression and was the first real public project in the Nation.

As we look back over 25 years, the reason it was not completed was due to the fact it was laughed at, it was ridiculed, it was condemned, not only by the Republicans of Maine but by the Republicans of the entire Nation. I am happy to see here a united Republican front asking for Passamaquoddy. I am happy that they are assisting in cooperating with Governor Muskie who has been down here recently, who has seen the Speaker and the majority leader, who has used his prestige and influence on the members of the Rules Committee to get a quick hearing on this measure so that it may be promptly considered by the House.

I am glad that we from the northeast part of the United States are working in harmony now, all in favor of this bill. There is no question in my mind but what it is going to be of great benefit to New England as a whole. We need more power, we need cheap power. We are all aware of the economic situation that now exists in New England. So I ask the Members of this House to go along with the united efforts of all the Members from New England. Again I say that the cooperation showing what good can be done by Governor Muskie coming down here working and cooperating with the Republican Members from Maine has been of inestimable benefit. I am therefore certain this joint resolution will be passed promptly.

Appendix

Resolution Passed by the National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Panama Conveying Best Wishes for the Fullest Success of the 1956 Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to have printed a resolution passed by the National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Panama conveying cordial greetings to the Congress and the people of the United States and to the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties of this Nation.

This is a most generous gesture on the part of the Republic of Panama, which is a proud and a friendly nation. The people of Panama have been friendly to, and have stood by, the United States in peace and in war. I know that every Member of the House of Representatives will appreciate this further evidence of the friendship and the faith the people of Panama have in the Congress of the United States and the people who compose it.

Let me say for myself that I deeply appreciate this significant gesture made to us by the people of this great nation.

The resolution follows:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

As members of the National Legislative Assembly of the Republic of Panama, it gives us great pleasure to convey on behalf of the people and the Government of Panama, cordial greetings to the Congress and the people of the United States and to the great leaders of the Republican and Democratic parties of this Nation. But this pleasure is greater when we realize the fact that our visit to this historical capital may contribute to the closest understanding and effective unity of ideals between our two countries.

There is a long established tradition of cooperation among the legislative bodies of the Americas to preserve the principles of Western Christianity and the most vital interests of their peoples. Let us remember that when the Virginia Legislature convened on May 1769, several resolutions defending the fundamental human rights of the inhabitants of the American Colonies were adopted and, with the votes of Washington and Jefferson, another resolution was passed ordering to send a copy of these resolutions to every legislative body on the Continent. This democratic lesson has been learned and will always be remembered.

We feel that the close ties of friendship between our two countries grow stronger day by day. The joint statement of President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the United States and President Harmodio Arias, of Panama, issued in the fall of 1933, was an eloquent demonstration of these feelings. Then and there the lines of a policy of cooperation were established and it was recognized that Panama, as a sovereign power, is entitled to the commercial advantages inherent to her strategic geographical position.

These basic principles found expression in the General Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation of 1936, in which the 2 countries reaffirmed their willingness to cooperate for the purpose of insuring the full and perpetual enjoyment of the benefits of all kinds which the canal should afford the 2 nations that made possible its construction. However, there still was much to be done by men of good will in both countries.

Thus, 20 years later President José Antonio Remón of Panama met in the fall of 1953 with President Dwight Eisenhower, an outstanding leader of mankind. At the White House the two presidents considered some aspects of the relations existing between their countries. As a result of the presidential conference, they reiterated, in a joint statement, the basic principles set forth by our governments in 1933 and 1936. They agreed further that such basic principles should have as a consequence the adoption of measures tending to make them more effective, such as enabling the commerce and industry of Panama to take advantage of the market offered by the Canal Zone and by the ships transiting the canal.

President Eisenhower and the Panama president equally agreed that the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment must have full effect in regard to the citizens of Panama and the United States employed in the Canal Zone. They recognized also the advisability of giving due consideration, in the cases of lands granted in the past for canal purposes which are no longer needed for such purposes in order that arrangements may be agreed upon for the return of those lands to the Republic of Panama.

Upon the basis of the principle of sovereign equality of the States, negotiations to reach a new treaty between the United States and Panama were started in Washington, as a good example to mankind that here in the Americas the United States and her sister Republics constitute a brotherhood of nations, large and small, but by no means a satellite system of the sort that has developed elsewhere in the world.

These considerations led the representatives of the United States and the Republic of Panama to sign on January 25, 1955, a Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation and a Memorandum of Understandings Reached, whose exchange of ratifications took place on August 23, 1955.

In those instruments several important obligations were mutually undertaken. It was agreed, among other provisions, that the United States would request the United States Congress to enact legislation providing for all United States and Panamanian employees in the Canal Zone, equality of opportunity and treatment, the establishment of a single basic wage scale and the uniform application of the Civil Service Retirement Act; and that the United States would request the United States Congress to authorize the construction of a bridge across the canal at Balboa, and the return to Panama of certain lands not required for canal purposes.

Within the inter-American system Panama has gaind a relevant place in history. It was in the Panamanian Isthmus of Darien, in the city of Santa Maria la Antigua, the oldest settlement on this continent, where in 1510 the first municipal legislative body of this hemisphere was elected by popular vote. The Royal Audience of Panama in 1535 extended its jurisdiction from Cape Gracia a Dios to Cape Horn. More than a century ago Panama became the repository of the ideals of the great liberator Simón Bolívar. He chose the capital of the isthmus as the site of the Congress of 1826, which was the cradle of Pan Americanism.

Bolivar tried to find a common meeting ground for the Americas at the Isthmus of Panama; and it has been said that the Canal which united the waters of two oceans by cleaving the lands of the continent has become a means of fulfilling that hope. Indeed, it is very significant that the first meeting of consultation of American foreign ministers was held in Panama City in 1939, where practical effect was given to the doctrine of the common defense of this hemisphere.

The American Continent is united by strong ties of political and ideological solidarity. Within this admirable union Panama and the United States are partners par excellence, due to the unique nature of their relationship. The effective understanding and cooperation between such special partners is particularly important as it reflects upon the entire framework of continental solidarity.

This ideological association has been loyally maintained in theory and practice. During the last war we contributed with Panamanian vessels to the victory of the United Nations. We have opposed from the outset every áttempt to spread to this hemisphere the harmful effects of the Communist doctrine and will cooperate in every way possible to defeat the plans for world domination of the Communist fanatics.

Panama is perhaps one of the few merchant marine powers which in 1951 prohibited her vessels to carry on trade with the aggressor countries of Communist China and North Korea. We have done so because we sincerely believe in the good neighborliness and partnership among the American Republics; because we do believe in the outstanding record of championship of liberty for everybody attained by the United States, and in the principles of international decency, of international law and of Western Christian civilization which are the groundwork of the inter-American system.

One of the great leaders of your country has expressed in fine words that we have been able to achieve in this hemisphere a unity of nations heretofore unknown, by holding fast to the doctrine that the rights of all nations, great and small, must be respected and that the problems of any nation in our group may be laid before the others in the certainty that there will be a friendly hearing and sympathetic help toward a constructive result with justice ever in mind.

We are happy on this occasion to pay personal tribute to the Senate of the United States which ratified the Eisenhower-Remon Treaty. But we are even more happy because of the fact that the legislation to implement said treaty, which is to be submitted to the United States Congress, will merit the consideration of this august body.

In this connection we wish to express our deep confidence and the confidence of the Panamanian people in the high sprit of statesmanship and Americanism of the ladies and gentlemen in both Houses of Congress. The adoption of this legislation not only will be particularly welcomed to the people of Panama and of the Americas, but also will serve as an excellent instrument to strengthen the inter-American system of continental solidarity.

It is a great honor for us to present to you, at this moment, a resolution of the Panama Legislative Assembly, conveying its best wishes for the fullest success of the 1956 session of the 84th Congress of the United States of America.

MAX HEURTEMATTE,
President of the Legislative Assembly of Panama.
INOCENCIO GALINDO,
Assemblyman.
JORGE E. ILLUECA,
Assemblyman.

WASHINGTON, *January 18, 1956.*

An Emergency United States School Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 13, 1956, on the President's school aid program:

AN EMERGENCY UNITED STATES SCHOOL PROGRAM

President Eisenhower's request for congressional action on a 5-year, $2 billion Federal school program points up two vital aspects of the crisis in the Nation's educational system.

One is that shortage of educational facilities for our children—due to a wartime lag in construction combined with a soaring birth rate—poses a national problem demanding prompt action if we are not to pay a heavy price tomorrow for failing to educate our children today.

The other is that providing proper schooling for our children is and should remain a local responsibility—but many communities, to their shame, have avoided it.

Because any failure to give our children proper educational opportunities can weaken the Nation, the President proposes that the Federal Government take unprecedented action to alleviate the shortage of public school classrooms which has denied schooling to some, and subjected millions of children to overcrowding.

Major part of the program is a proposal that the Federal Government provide a total of $1,250,000,000 over the next 5 years to aid in the construction of new public schools and additional classrooms. "Aid" is the key word, for Mr. Eisenhower insists that any sums granted by the Federal Government be matched by the States.

To complement this system of grants, the Federal Government also would purchase—up to a total of $750 million—local school construction bonds where the local district cannot sell them in private markets at reasonable rates.

Need would be the basis for the grants. In a way this would penalize communities which have acted on their own to build their own schools. But the President suggests a formula for denying aid to States or communities which have the resources to build schools, but have simply failed to use them.

There is no question that this program or any like it, if passed by Congress, would put the Federal Government into the business of helping to pay for public schools which, up to now, has been a local responsibility. But the President feels that the need calls for drastic temporary measures, and statistics on the lack of classrooms back him up.

There is ample evidence, however, that Mr. Eisenhower has not shifted his ground on the imperative need for local communities to handle their own problems, in this and many other fields.

The requirement for matching contributions by the States is one provision he recommends to insure local action. Another is his request that any legislation contain safeguards against the danger that Federal aid will diminish local control of education.

Most important is the time limit. Mr. Eisenhower emphasizes that current and replacement needs for public school classrooms in general are being met. The 5-year program is to catch up with the war and postwar backlog of needs. After that is done, the Federal Government would step out of the school picture.

We hope that is the way it works out. For essential though it may be at this time, the Federal aid-to-schools plans demonstrate once more the way the Federal Government moves in when local communities fail to meet their own problems. And once the Federal Government has started to handle local problems—and to pay the bills—it is far too easy for the local communities to let down.

If this program goes through, it may give hard-pressed communities a chance to catch up on their job of schooling their children. It should spur local efforts to get more, better-trained and better-paid teachers—surely as important as school buildings.

Above all, if it is to be successful, it ought to strengthen the willingness of people in every State and local community to meet their own school responsibilities once the emergency is over.

To Run or Not To Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of January 20, 1956:

TO RUN OR NOT TO RUN

If one political fact emerges clearly from the President's press conference, it is that Mr. Eisenhower has not yet finally decided whether he will run for re-election. All other conclusions which may be drawn are guesswork.

It ought to be said, however, that Mr. Eisenhower discussed his future with unprecedented candor. Certainly no other President ever dealt with the intimate question of his own physical well-being in such a detached, forthright and objective fashion.

He began by reading a telegram in which he acknowledged the entry of his name in the New Hampshire primary. He said that he had no objection, but that he wanted to make it clear that this implied no final decision on the second-term question. "I hope," he added, "that all who vote in the Republican primaries in 1956 will carefully weigh all the possibilities and personalities that may be involved." In this, he seems to be urging Republicans not to vote for him in any primary in the belief that he necessarily would be the candidate in November. Then came this paragraph:

"It would be idle to pretend that my health can be wholly restored to the excellent state in which the doctors believed it to be in mid-September. At the same time, my doctors report to me that the progress I am making toward a reasonable level of strength is normal and satisfactory. My future life must be carefully regulated to avoid excessive fatigue. My reasons for obedience to the medical authorities are not solely personal; I must obey them out of respect for the responsibilities I carry."

It is hard to see how the President could have spoken more candidly. For, by plain implication, he is saying to those who will vote in the primaries that he may not run. He is also saying that if he does decide to run, and is elected, he will embark on a second term in less than complete health, and that his activities would have to be carefully regulated to avoid excessive fatigue.

A President who will say this in advance of the first primary can be trusted when he goes on to give assurance that his final decision will be based, not on some personal or partisan motive, but on what he believes to be best for the country.

Management Study Lauds Efficiency of Catholic Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to insert into the RECORD an article appearing in today's issue of the New York Times regarding the report of the American Institute of Management giving the Roman Catholic Church the highest administrative efficiency rating of all nonprofit organizations. Similar articles are being published also in other newspapers about this report.

In our struggle against the spread of communism, and in all our aid programs, we should take advantage of the facilities offered to us by such a benevolent organization which has successfully penetrated the Iron Curtain and continues to keep aloft the hopes of all men aspiring to live in freedom and dignity.

No other organization within the area of our knowledge or experience does so much with so little—

The report says about the Catholic Church.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of all my colleagues. It is published in the New York Times, January 23, 1956, and reads as follows:

CATHOLIC CHURCH HELD EFFICIENT—STUDY GIVES IT HIGH RATING FOR EXCELLENT PRACTICES IN MANAGING AFFAIRS—FINDINGS WORLDWIDE—AMERICAN INSTITUTE THAT MADE SURVEY CITES COOPERATION OF VATICAN OFFICIALS

(By George Dugan)

The Roman Catholic Church got an A yesterday for administrative efficiency.

Its numerical grade was 88, but since 75 is considered excellent and the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey was at the top of the class with ninety-plus, the church's mark was well up in the cum laude category.

This rating was awarded by the American Institute of Management in what is believed to be the first management audit ever made of the church.

At a press preview of the audit, Jackson Martindell, institute president, said that no other nonprofit organization had been rated so high.

He said the purpose of the institute was to improve management practices all over the world by methods of comparative appraisal. A nonprofit body, it has a membership of 15,000 persons, including 5,000 presidents of large corporations.

Mr. Martindell said his purpose in conducting the church survey was to create a document that might become a landmark in religious sociology. The 26-page printed brochure will be expanded into a book to be published next fall by Harper & Bros.

NO DOGMA INVOLVED

He emphasized that the audit had nothing to do with dogma.

Mr. Martindell said Vatican officials were astounded when they heard of the project, but the church has not refused a single request. He added that the Vatican library was opened to his researchers for 2 months last summer.

Mr. Martindell volunteered the information that he was not a Catholic and had no intention of being one. He said that his interest in religious organizations began in 1940. Later, after a personal audience with Pope Pius XII, he asserted that he felt it was his duty to know more about Catholicism.

Last year, the Institute made a study of the American Baptist Convention but did not release any ratings to the general public.

Two Jesuit priests attended the press preview. One of them, the Reverend Joseph T. Clark, of Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y., hailed the audit as simply tremendous and said that while the Catholic Church was "divinely founded and guided, it operates through human beings."

The Reverend Robert A. Graham, an associate editor of the Jesuit weekly magazine America, will pay tribute editorially in the January issue to the "obviously fairminded approach of the institute's report."

"Some things are said that are not complimentary to the church or flattering to its leaders." Father Graham's editorial will declare. "On the other hand, sincere praise is given grudgingly where it seems to be deserved. Bigots will find ample material on which to sharpen their knives. But the effort, time, and money (reportedly $100,000) employed to dig out the material on which the evaluation is based should be sufficient of a guarantee of a generally solid work."

DETAILS OF EVALUATION

The following management evaluation table, which appeared on the front page of the institute's study, was compiled on a point basis:

	Optimum	Minimum for excellence	Rating
Social function	1,000	750	1,000
Organization structure	800	600	700
Growth of facilities	500	375	375
Membership analysis	1,300	975	1,100
Development program	800	600	650
Fiscal policies	800	600	700
Trustee analysis	800	600	525
Operating efficiency	700	525	650
Administrative evaluation	1,200	900	1,100
Effectiveness of leadership	2,100	1,575	2,000
Total	10,000	7,500	8,800

The categories of social function and organizational structure refer to the contributions of the church to society over the years and its administrative setup from the Pope down to bishop. Membership analysis was audited on the basis of the church's evangelistic activities. Development program refers to promotional activities and trustee analysis to the transmission of leadership from generation to generation. Administrative evaluation assayed the effectiveness of management at the top levels.

Mr. Martindell indicated that some of the institute's findings were "sure to be highly controversial." One probably is the audit's assertion that Archbishop Giovanni Battista Montini of Milan is being "groomed" to succeed Pius XIII as Pope.

The study paid tribute to Pope Pius X (1903–1914) for "providing the modern corporate structure and procedures that now characterize the church's activities."

"The present corporate structure has been carefully formulated," it declared, "and from the point of view of the American Institute of Management has but two apparent major weaknesses."

The report listed these as "too little provision for staff research work" and "too much line and staff responsibility vested in the Pope himself."

CRITICISMS ARE LISTED

The report made these additional criticisms:

"While the number of facilities of the church has grown prodigiously over the world in the last 50 years, several problems have aggravated the situation from an operating point of view. Many institutions of the church are housed in buildings given to it and ill-suited to the purpose.

"Many others are so old and antiquated as to be scarcely functional and yet they must be utilized. The financial planning of the church has never set up depreciation reserves for new constructions, perhaps in the belief that a way will be found.

"Both in architecture and furnishings there has been a noticeable lagging in artistic taste (true of all religious bodies) since the time of the great Catholic masters of former centuries. The Holy See has not exported either managerial efficiency or artistic appreciation to the provinces in sufficient quantities."

The audit went on to add that "in the sum total of its financial affairs from the bishop down, the church performs amazingly well."

"No other organization within the area of our knowledge or experience does so much with so little," the document declared.

A listing of 32 suggestions, entitled "What Managements Can Learn From a Study of the Catholic Church," included these points:

The benefit of long executive training and slow promotion.

The advantage of haste in some directions and delay in others.

The need to utilize the knowledge and power of elderly men in staff capacities.

The long-term benefit of avoiding nepotism in the hierarchy of any management.

The benefit of promotion from the ranks.

The importance of being slow to praise, and slower still to condemn.

An Equitable Excise Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the testimony given during the hearings on the administrative difficulties, techniques, and inequities of our present hodge-podge system of Federal excise taxes—whether the testimony was given by representatives of the Treasury who have the responsibility of administration, or whether the testimony was given by the taxpayers who are affected by the taxes—was to the effect that our entire excise tax system constitutes an indiscriminate mess of taxes, levied without rhyme or reason, in a hit-and-miss fashion; that it is full of inequities between the producers and distributors of the various commodities taxed; that every time the Ways and Means Committee tries to remove one of these inequities, two more inequities are created; and that our present excise tax system generates one continual headache for both taxpayers and Treasury officials.

The only conclusion, therefore, that one can reach as a result of the testimony given in these hearings is that the permanent solution of the problem of Federal excise taxes, and the only fair and equitable solution, is to repeal all Federal excise taxes now on the tax books, except those on liquor and tobacco, and substitute for the repealed excise taxes a flat 5 percent manufacturers' excise tax upon all end products, to be collected at the source.

Mr. Speaker, the repeal of all present excise taxes—except the taxes upon liquor and tobacco—would reduce the tax take of the Treasury by about $5 billion, and the substitution of a flat 5 percent manufacturers' excise tax upon all end products would bring in about $5 billion to the Treasury, insuring neither a loss nor a gain to the Treasury by this very desirable substitution.

The advantages of this proposed change in the Federal excise tax field are as follows:

First. It would get rid of the present hodge-podge, hit-and-miss, inequitable system of excise taxes—taxes levied without rhyme or reason—and lower all present 10 percent excise taxes down to 5 percent.

Second. The manufacturers' excise tax is the cheapest and easiest of all taxes to administer and collect.

Third. It would leave the retail tax field to the States, most of which now derive the bulk of their State revenue from retail taxes.

Fourth. It would tend to equalize the total tax burden upon all our people, without hurting any one producer or consumer.

Mr. Speaker, pertinent questions in connection with our Federal excise taxes are:

First. What proportion of our overall Federal revenue collections should come from excise taxes?

Second. What constitutes a well-balanced, equitable Federal tax system, one that spreads the tax load equitably over all segments of our national economy?

England gets about one-half of her total government revenue from excise taxes. Canada gets about one-third of her total revenue from excise taxes. The United States gets only one-seventh of her total revenue from excise taxes. We depend more upon income taxes and less upon excise taxes than any of the other major nations of the world.

A well-balanced, equitable Federal tax system should collect about one-third of its needed revenue from personal income taxes, one-third from corporation taxes, and one-third from excise taxes—levied at the manufacturers' level.

Mr. Speaker, the imposition of a flat manufacturers excise tax, in lieu of the present hodge-podge of excise taxes, would constitute a long step forward toward the establishment of a well-balanced, equitable, and efficient Federal tax system. It would be a sensible and permanent method of collecting needed revenue for the government, and it would remove most of the inequities that exist in our present mess of Federal excise taxes—an objective greatly to be desired and for which we should strive.

Congressman Halleck's Salute to Ike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1956, the third anniversary of the inauguration of our beloved President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Republicans all across our great Nation joined together in 53 gala salute-to-Eisenhower dinners to pay homage to this most distinguished American.

One of the foremost of these salute-to-Eisenhower gatherings was in Cleveland, Ohio, where the number of Republicans who desired to honor our famous President was so tremendous that the dinner was served in two separate auditoriums. On hand as the featured speaker of the occasion was our extremely able colleague the gentleman from Indiana the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK.

Congressman HALLECK's remarks in Cleveland during this third anniversary celebration are inspiring not only to all Republicans but to each and every American citizen, and for this reason I wish to include his brilliant comments and thoughts on the conduct of our Nation's Government:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, my honorable colleagues in the Congress, and fellow Republicans, it is always a pleasure to come to Cleveland.

I have enjoyed your hospitality on many occasions in the past, and I hope you will be kind enough to invite me back in the future.

I am particularly happy to appear in the State so ably represented in the Senate by JOHN BRICKER and GEORGE BENDER and in the House by your splendid 17-man delegation: GORDON SCHERER, BILL HESS, PAUL SCHENCK, BILL MCCULLOCH, CLIFF CLEVENGER, CLARENCE BROWN, JACK BETTS, TOM JENKINS, OLLIE BOLTON, JOHN VORYS, DAVE BAUMHART, BILL AYRES, JOHN HENDERSON, FRANK BOW, HARRY MCGREGOR, FRANCES BOLTON, and BILL MINSHALL.

You know, a list of names like that is music to my old Republican ears. It's going to be even longer next year.

From time to time I have come here on fund-raising missions. (For the party, that is—not for me personally.)

I have always found folks around here most generous and loyal in their support of republicanism.

These two wonderful dinners here tonight certainly underscore that support.

Well do I remember the lean years, when many of us wondered whether we would ever again be able to elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress, and give the country guidance under sound Republican leadership.

It sometimes seemed that we would never overcome the illusion of free money out of Washington and the Federal paternalism of the double dealers—new and fair.

I know about those long, difficult years, because I was fighting the battle in the House of Representatives and carrying the story, as best I could, up and down the land.

Let me say "thanks" for the help and encouragement you have given in the past.

And let me say, also, that your time and money were not wasted.

Republicans did triumph.

We did win.

And tonight we meet here in tribute to our Republican President—one of the truly great leaders of American history—in war and in peace—Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Few men, indeed, have been accorded the honor of serving their Nation in both military and civilian positions of highest trust and responsibility.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has met the challenge of both assignments with magnificent success.

We called on him to help us win a war. Under his banner victory was ours.

Now we have called on him to help us win the peace. Under his wise and courageous leadership, we are moving toward that goal.

I scarcely knew Dwight Eisenhower before his election to the Presidency.

It has been my rare privilege since the late days of 1952 to meet with him, to work with him and, I might add, to enjoy some moments of relaxation with him—although for a President of the United States, such moments are all too rare.

As a result of this association, I can say with all the conviction at my command that here is a man completely dedicated to serving all the people of America.

Dwight D. Eisenhower is devoid of any desire for personal glory.

His sole ambition is to do a good job for his country.

But Dwight Eisenhower needs no accolade from me.

The trust and confidence he inspires was reflected in the overwhelming public endorsement he received in 1952.

Today public trust in Dwight Eisenhower is running stronger than ever.

His place is assured in the hearts of his countrymen as one of the most beloved and admired Presidents in history.

For us it is a matter of pride and gratification that he bears the label of our party and is one of us.

Our principles are his principles.

His triumphs are our triumphs.

We share a common pride and satisfaction in the record of Republican stewardship, of unparalleled achievement for America.

No administration has ever done more to keep faith with its pledges to the people.

We promised to strive for peace.

The Korean war—is that grinding, stalemated, treadmill war so soon forgotten?—was ended as one of the first orders of business for the new administration.

There have been no new wars.

And let me say here and now I'd rather have an administration that saves us from the abyss of war than one that pushes us over the precipice.

So would every right-thinking American.

We promised to strive for solid prosperity.

The Nation today is enjoying the greatest economic abundance ever known to mankind anywhere.

More Americans have jobs today, are making better wages, producing more and better products, buying more and investing more than ever before in the country's history.

Back of those two broad accomplishments are a host of actions that have made America—for all of us—a better place in which to live.

And back of the actions we have taken are the principles for which we, as Republicans, stand.

Our accomplishments speak for the wisdom of Republican policies and principles.

I could not let an opportunity of this nature pass without paying deserved tribute to Senator Robert A. Taft, who played a vital role in the championing of the principles and policies under which we operate today as a political party.

I had the privilege of working with Bob Taft on a special assignment in 1950 to draft a statement of Republican principles and objectives.

He was the chairman of a three-man committee in the Senate and I was chairman of a similar group in the House.

You know, that's about all Republicans had back in those days—principles and objectives—and a never-say-die spirit.

Out of that statement, adopted by Republicans in the Congress and endorsed by the Republican National Committee, grew the Republican platform of 1952.

No one knows better than I of Bob Taft's devotion to the cause of Republicanism.

I say to you here tonight: He, too, would have been proud of the record his party has made in the last 3 years.

He would have been in the forefront of these dinners, speaking somewhere over this broad land in a sincere testimonial to the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower.

Back in 1950, 2 years before the 1952 platform was drafted, Republicans made this pledge:

"We dedicate our efforts to win lasting peace * * *," and "to build a country in which every citizen may make the most of his skill, his initiative, and his enterprise. * * *"

In 1952 we were given the chance to make good.

We have come a long way—farther than a lot of folks thought possible in so short a time.

In foreign affairs, citizens were confused by bumbling, fumbling diplomacy, by inconsistency and indecision.

They were alarmed by disclosures of one-man deals involving the lives and fortuntes of millions and millions of free people.

We took a firm stand against secret commitments. We pledged no more Yaltas or Potsdams.

There haven't been any—and there won't be any as long as a Republican President remains in the White House.

No President has gone further than President Eisenhower to bring Congress into his confidence in the conduct of foreign relations.

The Formosa resolution is exhibit A of that policy.

We expressed our conviction, in 1950, that a strong national defense must be maintained at all cost as long as the threat of Communist aggression remains.

Republican leadership today is giving America more defense for every dollar.

Equally important, we are balancing the needs of the military with the needs of our domestic economy, thereby holding fast to another cardinal principle set down in 1950 that:

"A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security."

Believing what we said, your Republican administration and a Republican Congress

brought into play policies that would get the job done.

You know, friends, this has been quite an experience for me.

I spent nearly 20 years of my career in the Congress on the outside looking in, as far as the administration of government was concerned.

When I first went to Washington, I was the only Republican from Indiana. It was convenient. I could hold my Republican caucus in a phone booth.

I've often said I felt like the banty rooster who was turned look in the barnyard with a herd of Percherons.

The little rooster looked up at the horses and said, "Look here, fellows, let's have an understanding: I won't step on your toes if you don't step on mine."

In any event, folks, it was rough going and, as I say, we began to wonder whether the time would ever come when Republicans would be called upon to take over the reigns of government.

But the day of reckoning did come.

The people of America were sick of war and threats of more wars.

They were alarmed at the accelerating march toward socialism.

They were chafing under controls and regimentation.

Taxpayers were angered by the increasing waste of hard-earned dollars taken from them in ever higher amounts.

Citizens were worried about a spiraling inflation which drained their savings, shrunk the value of annuities and pensions, and cut deeply into living standards.

Our people were rightfully indignant at the growing disclosures of scandal and corruption in high places.

They were startled by disclosures that Communists and their sympathizers were holding positions of trust within the Government itself.

In short, the people of this country were finally wised up, fed up, and burned up at the mess and they called on the Republican Party to clean it up.

Believe me, the job has not been easy.

No one expected it would be.

For instance, we knew Uncle Sam had been taken on a spending spree and that this finances were in bad shape. But we hadn't suspected how bad.

The national debt was a well-advertised fact.

But we discovered the old boy had been put in hock for another $81 billion worth of merchandise and services for which no provision to pay had been made.

This $81 billion represented obligations of the Federal Government—I O U's, promises to pay, or c. o. d. orders—whatever you want to call them.

And consider this: Here were $81 billion worth of bills run up by an administration which had been promising the American people a tax cut.

How irresponsible can you get?

I hardly need mention that for a new administration, one pledged, among other things, to bring the Federal budget into balance at the earliest possible moment, this was something of a shocker. And that's an understatement.

And I hardly need mention, but I'm certainly going to, that tonight, we can list another major accomplishment to the credit of the Eisenhower administration.

We have reached the goal of a balanced budget.

We have halted deficit spending.

We have restored fiscal integrity to the national scene.

And let me pause right here to give due credit to another great citizen of Ohio, an outstanding American, George Humphrey, who has done a distinguished job as Secretary of the Treasury.

For my money, and, I might add, for every taxpayer's money, we've never had a better one.

And that reminds me of another important fact about this Eisenhower-Republican team.

We've got a lot of high-caliber citizens serving America now.

President Eisenhower's genius for finding the right people for the right job has played handsome dividends for the country.

No longer, may I say, is it a condition precedent to service in Washington that you must first have been a failure at everything else you ever tried.

Back in 1950, Republicans spoke out against a planned economy, price and wage controls, socialized medicine, Brannan plans and other radical schemes being put forward in a flood.

One of the first major actions by Republican leadership was to throw controls out the window.

Remember the anguished howls from the opposition?

Remember the dire predictions of what was going to happen to commodity prices, to rents, to the cost of living in general, how everything was going to skyrocket?

It didn't happen, did it?

What did happen was that American enterprise, freed of artificial restrictions and bureaucratic regimentation, rolled up its sleeves and went to work in a new atmosphere of freedom.

Labor and management, working under a fair and impartial administration of the Taft-Hartley law, have moved steadily forward—and with a minimum of time lost from strikes.

You don't hear much about the Taft-Hartley Act being a slave labor law any more, do you?

It never was.

Even labor leaders themselves know that unions have made unprecedented gains in membership.

And their members know that they have made steady progress toward higher wages and more take-home pay.

Their standard of living was never higher.

Can anyone believe this is all an accident?

Any reasonable person knows otherwise.

This better life for all Americans has come about because of sound, far-sighted Republican leadership in government.

It has come about because Republican policies have stimulated the economy.

We have halted inflation.

America today has a dependable dollar.

We promised the American people we would materially reduce Federal spending.

We have cut spending—with a vengeance. Starting with a $14 billion chop in the spending proposals of President Truman, we have continued an unrelenting drive against waste and extravagance in the Federal household.

We had to, because we had also promised a tax cut.

Thanks to Republican thrift and the determination of the Eisenhower administration and a Republican Congress to make good on a pledge, we gave the American people the biggest tax cut in the history of any nation—nearly $7½ billion.

Who benefited the most?

Two out of every three dollars of that tax cut stayed in the pockets of individuals.

Your Republican Congress completed a monumental revision of our Federal tax laws.

By this action, we encouraged wider ownership of business enterprises.

We stimulated plant expansion and the creation of more jobs.

We provided increased deductions for medical expenses.

We corrected inequities, bringing tax relief to working mothers and improving the status for citizens in retirement.

We encouraged soil conservation through more favorable treatment for farmers engaged in these activities.

Let me say something here about the farm situation.

I am amazed at the audacity of Democrat spokesmen who attempt to lay the blame for our farm problems on Republicans. These people are trying to cast themselves as heroes on the basis of their own past mistakes—which is a good trick if they can get away with it—but I don't think they can.

Even the most casual observer of the economic scene a few years back was aware of the growing crisis in agriculture—a crisis spawned by mounting surpluses.

It was a simple case of war-inspired production engulfing an economy based on peacetime needs.

We have tackled the difficulty with courage, refusing to be stampeded into ill-considered, trick panaceas that can do no more than offer an illusion of relief while speeding the day of an even worse reckoning.

No problem we have faced is more complex or more delicate.

Let no American farmer be deluded by promises that there is an easy answer.

Our goal is to restore the farmer's prosperity in the market place through a program which will assure him his fair share of the national income.

We propose to accomplish that purpose without resort to political witchcraft and without demanding that the farmer forfeit his traditional independence.

We will have no part of any scheme to make our farm families the wards of Government, or to threaten the farmer himself with jail if he doesn't comply with Federal edict.

We will reach our goal as we have reached others, mindful that a strong agricultural economy is basic to the welfare of our country.

There were other things good for America we pledged to pursue in that Republican statement of 1950.

We recognized the social responsibility of government.

The record of the past 3 years in this respect is on the books.

Under the Eisenhower-Republican administration, we have established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, giving it Cabinet status.

We have broadened and improved the social security program.

Unemployment insurance coverage has been extended to millions of additional workers.

The minimum wage has been increased.

A program of hospital construction for the chronically ill is now in operation.

And we have done these things under traditional American concepts, without anything smacking of socialization.

We said something, too, in that 1950 statement, about loyalty.

The Republican 83d Congress was quick to give the administration new legal weapons in its fight against subversives.

Our internal security program has been completely overhauled, and security risks are under notice that operation "open-up" has replaced "cover-up" as a Federal policy.

We have rooted the risks out of Government wherever they can be found.

And we aren't hiring any new ones.

I could go on and on, with specific examples of Republican accomplishments for a better America.

But I want to speak just briefly, now, about the broad picture.

We have taken a few old-fashioned virtues out of the mothballs and restored them as principles of Government.

They are as good as new.

I speak simply of such virtues as thrift, diligence, self-reliance—yes, the old "do it yourself" spirit, if you please.

What's wrong with that? It made our country great, didn't it?

I speak of initiative, freedom, dignity and integrity.

Republicans, under the leadership of Dwight D. Eisenhower, have brought them all back to the national scene—and we're building a better country than the world has ever known, on those foundations.

And now I want to offer a personal observation on a subject which is currently holding the attention of the whole world.

I wouldn't care to hazard a guess on how many people have asked me for an opinion on the matter—even since arriving in Cleveland this morning.

The question is this: Is President Eisenhower going to run again?

I have said before and will say again that he's going to run.

He's the best man in the country for the job.

Oh, of course, folks on the other side say all Republicans are hoping the President will run again because the party needs him.

Well, we wouldn't expect them to admit it, but they know, deep down, that another 4 years with Dwight D. Eisenhower in the White House would be the best thing that could happen to the country and to the cause of world peace.

The President is alert and active. He is full of bounce and sparkle.

Let me say this: President Eisenhower will make his ultimate decision with one thought in mind: "What is best for America?"

I only hope that his deep humility will not lead him to underestimate the vital importance of his leadership.

We have come far in 3 years toward putting America back on the track.

We have restored that priceless ingredient to the national scene—public confidence in Government.

Evidence of that confidence is everywhere—in consumer spending, private investment and in the vast plans for expansion of business and industry.

We are moving forward with giant strides.

How important is a Republic victory in 1956?

The alternative is a return to what we had, the loss of what we have gained.

We can't let that happen.

The ground we have covered in 3 short years is but the promise of what the future can hold for our beloved country under wise and understanding leadership—Republican leadership of the kind we have enjoyed under Dwight D. Eisenhower.

We must not fail.

Ridgway Reneges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, one would be surprised at my surprise at General Ridgway's recently expressed surprise at President Eisenhower's budget message for 1955, stating that the military budget was unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Early in February 1954 Secretary Wilson had told the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations that this was a unanimous recommendation. Admiral Radford had told the committee the decision was unanimous.

And, as shown in the printed volume of the Department of the Army appropriations hearings on the 1955 budget, on page 51, Representative WIGGLESWORTH, the then committee chairman, stated:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand, General, from the testimony of Secretary Wilson and Admiral Radford, that this overall military program, of which the Army program now before us is a part, is a result of the New Look and has the unanimous endorsement of the President, of the National Security Council, and of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is correct; is it not?

General RIDGWAY. Yes, sir. So far as the Joint Chiefs of Staff are concerned it was on stated assumptions and limitations.

With this record of unanimity before you, are you not also surprised at General Ridgway's surprise?

The Natural Gas Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, should the Federal Government regulate and control the price of natural gas at the wellhead? The House said no when it passed the Harris bill last summer. Briefly, the controversy came about as follows:

In 1938 Congress passed the Natural Gas Act regulating the rates charged by the interstate pipelines for transporting gas. Since these carriers enjoy a monopoly in the field of transportation, it is only proper that their transportation rates—like all other interstate transportation agencies— should be regulated and controlled. However, in the Natural Gas Act of 1938 Congress said "The provisions of this act shall not apply to the production or gathering of natural gas," leaving the price charged for the production of gas to be determined by the operation of a free market.

In 1954 the Supreme Court by a 5 to 3 decision—in spite of the clear prohibition contained in the act—ruled that the Federal Government had the power to regulate and control the price of gas at the wellhead. Since this decision was contrary to the express provisions of the Natural Gas Act of 1938 and violates the specific provision of that act, bills were introduced in Congress by Congressman HARRIS and Senator FULBRIGHT to nullify the Court decision and to place the production of natural gas where it had always been—the price at the wellhead subject only to the control of a free market.

Mr. Speaker, the price of natural gas for heating homes is made up of three factors, namely:

First. The price to the producers at the wellhead.

Second. The price charged by the pipelines for transportation, and

Third. The price received by the local public utility for distribution.

The last two factors are regulated and controlled as public monopolies, yet they get 90 percent of the price charged the consumer. The producer of the gas gets only 10 percent of the price charged.

In other words, if the average Illinois consumer pays $70 per year for heating his home with gas, the producer gets only $7, and the transportation and distributing agencies get $63. This figures out about 60 cents per month or 2 cents per day the consumer pays to the producer for the gas he uses. The balance of his bill goes to the pipeline owner and to the local distributing utility—each one of which has been and now is regulated and controlled by Government.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial taken from the Saturday Evening Post of January 21, 1956:

IF GAS PRODUCERS CAN BE REGULATED, SO CAN THE CORNER GROCER

There is a shocking absence of understanding about the potentially destructive results of governmental regulation of individual enterprise. For evidence we refer you in advance to arguments made against the Fulbright bill.

The Fulbright bill is the Senate version of the Harris bill passed by the House last session. Both seek to release producers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission. In June 1954, the Supreme Court ruled that FPC should regulate such producers, although the Natural Gas Act of 1938 had specifically stated that it should not.

This is not a remote legalistic controversy. It involves a housewife in a Chicago suburb who learns with dismay that she cannot obtain the inexpensive natural-gas service which she had expected for cooking and heating in her new house. At about the same time an Oklahoma housewife flips a switch in her house and a light glows. These two events are related. The electricity which fired the Oklahoma lamp bulb was generated in a utility plant fueled by the natural gas which had been intended for the Chicago housewife, but which she didn't get.

The reason for the diversion is simple. Oklahoma gas producers had planned to deliver to a pipeline a supply of natural gas which would have served the Chicago housewife and 200,000 other Illinoisans. But when the Supreme Court ruled that sales of gas by producers across State lines were to be regulated—that is, price-fixed—Oklahoma producers abandoned negotiations for the sale. Instead they sold their product within their own State, a transaction that was exempt from FPC control.

So many natural-gas producers were alarmed by regulation that the volume of gas committed to large interstate pipelines in 1954 declined approximately two-thirds from 1953, a loss to prospective consumers of more than 4 trillion cubic feet. And in 1955, drillers completed 12 percent fewer gas wells than in the previous year while at the same time oil-well completions rose.

Those who want regulation speak in the name of consumers who are supposed to believe that Federal regulation of producers is needed to curb monopoly and keep cost at a reasonable level.

Take cost first. The argument is that natural-gas producers, although competing against one another in discovery, production, and sale of gas reserves, are in a position to hike the gas bills of city consumers unless they are controlled. Why, then, during the years 1938 to 1954, when producers were free, did gas costs in the field rise only one-ninth as much as the cost of living? Moreover, the cost of natural gas in the field on the average is only 10 percent of the city consumer's bill. Ninety percent lies in transmission and dis-

tribution—two services which are properly under utility-type regulation because they enjoy certain monopolies. Anyway the proposed legislation contains specific protection for the consumer from unwarranted price increases.

But aren't the producers of natural gas a monopoly? There are 8,000 of them, none producing as much as 5 percent of the total. If they constitute a monopoly, then three-quarters of American industries are in exactly the same class, since natural-gas production is less concentrated in number of owners than are most industries.

It is curious that those who most violently predict high cost and monopoly are blind to the fact that regulation of producers will inevitably bring about exactly what they profess to fear. Natural gas has been cheap because it could be bought and distributed in a volume huge enough to distribute the expense of pipelines and city mains among millions of consumers. Cut down that volume and a smaller number of consumers will have to bear the transmission and distribution costs. Household bills will go up, not down, and unwillingness of producers to sell outside their own States could eventually deprive distant consumers of gas altogether.

What, then, becomes of the monopoly charge? A producer cannot gouge a consumer with whom he will not deal. The monopoly will become one of States, not of people, as producing States not only keep their gas at home but as a consequence attract industries from consumer States into their own areas. This is already happening. More than half of all natural gas is now consumed in the States where it is produced.

There is another sinister threat in this controversy. The regulation of producers of natural gas is the first example of regulation of a competitively produced commodity. It would hardly be the last. Natural gas is more often than not intermixed with oil production. Could we regulate the gas and not the oil from the same field? Then why not coal, lumber, iron, and on right into a complete statist straitjacket?

Sometimes we wonder if this is not the goal which the regulation advocates have had their eye on all along.

Meany's Talk to Rotary Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of January 20, 1956:

MEANY'S TALK TO ROTARY MEETING

Following is the text of an address by George Meany, president of the A. F. of L.-CIO, yesterday at a luncheon of the Rotary Club of New York at the Hotel Commodore:

"I want to limit my remarks to a problem which is the problem of our age—the most urgent problem confronting our country, our community, our voluntary organizations, and each one of us individually—regardless of what profession or trade we have, regardless of the line of business in which we may be. I refer, of course, to the problem of preserving peace and safeguarding and strengthening human freedom. All other problems, important as they may be for our country, for our family, for ourselves, are not as decisive as this one. Whether we live in some isolated backward community, or in the skyscraper jungles of our big cities, none of us can escape the world crisis over the maintenance of peace and the future of freedom. No matter how much we may try to isolate ourselves, we can no longer be isolated—or isolationists.

"Today the big threat to world peace and human freedom comes from the Soviet Communist dictatorship and its worldwide fifth column operating as a subversive conspiracy throughout all countries and regions of the free world.

"This vast conspiracy has its base, its head and heart, its source of inspiration and instigation, its material and military support, in Moscow. Its aim is to conquer and dominate the world and then to transform it in the Soviet image. When I say the world, I don't exclude any one of us here or anywhere else. No smile or diplomatic agreement can hide or remove this aim.

"UNIONS NEED DEMOCRATIC CLIMATE TO SURVIVE

"We of free labor know that we simply cannot exist under any dictatorship—whether it be communism, nazism, fascism, falangism, or peronism. Free trade unions by their very nature must have a democratic climate in order to survive. And democracy needs free trade unions and other voluntary agencies of free assemblage and speech such as your group meeting here today for its survival.

"In the realm of diplomacy the Communist enemy of peace and freedom operates officially and openly under the banner of the Moscow-Peiping axis governments. In the nongovernmental realm the Communists operate through the Cominform, through the various Communist parties, the so-called World Federation of Trade Unions and a horde of camouflaged front organizations and fellow-traveler outfits. That is why there are no American Communists; there are only Communists in America. There are no French or Chinese Communists; there are only Communists in France or in China.

"Some people in our country consider the Communist Party and its various front organizations in the United States as the major threat to our peace, to our most cherished moral and spiritual values, to our liberty, to our prosperity. Therefore, these people think that the Communist menace can be ended by getting some congressional committees to hold some hearings, locate some Communist infiltrators, pass some stringent laws, and get some indictments and convictions. Of course, our democratic state has the right and the duty to defend itself. But I wish it were that simple and that easy. I am not minimizing the Communist danger at home. Since 1917 we of the labor movement have fought the Communists in the United States. We have given them no quarter in any walk of life. We have uniformly had the initiative against them.

"We have carried the fight into the Communist camp at home and abroad.

"MAJOR RED THREAT COMES FROM MOSCOW

"Years of experience have taught us that the major Communist threat to our democratic way of life, to our free institutions, to our national security, comes from the center and seat of Communist power—Moscow—rather than from its agencies or branches in the United States. Without the cash and the guidance which come from Moscow, there would be no Communist movement of any importance in our country today. The Communist movement in our country, as elsewhere, was made in, by, and for Moscow. If Moscow were ever really to stop supporting and training the Communist conspirators, or if the people of Russia were ever to overthrow their brutal dictatorship, the Communist movement in our country would go out of business overnight.

"Communism is the deadly enemy of the businessman, of his associations and his freedom. There can be no free enterprise without freedom. Yet, somehow or other, many in our American business community, are not sufficiently alert to the danger of world communism. Stressing this point may sound surprising to you, since the business community is certainly not pro-Communist. and not many businessmen are consciously at the forefront of any open or covert Communist outfit. What I have in mind is the costly mistakes some in our business community make in their attitude toward the Communist menace. Here are some of their typical errors:

"1. They have so much confidence in the strength of the American system, that they firmly believe it can't happen here. Such complacency and smugness are suicidal at a time when at least 1 billion people from the Baltic to the Formosa Straits are already under the yoke of the Communist bloc which has the biggest military machine on earth. Such talk reminds one of how some people used to say: 'Germany is a land of philosophers, poets, scientists, and great industry. In such a cultured, stable country, Hitler and his ignorant Nazis could never take over.'

"PROSPERITY NO BAR TO COMMUNIST GROWTH

"2. The second serious error in some business circles is that, because of our prosperity, communism can at best take very little hold in our country. This is just not true. The record will show that communism has made progress in many places where economic conditions are improving. For example, in France today, despite marked economic improvement over the last few years, Communist strength continues undiminished.

"3. The third and perhaps the most dangerous error on the part of some business circles is the belief that the main threat of communism to our country is to be found in the Communist organization within the United States.

"This mistake quite logically and inevitably leads to another very serious error. Since these businessmen don't see Moscow as the mainspring of the Communist menace to American progress and prosperity, to the security and freedom of our country and to world peace and human liberty everywhere, they turn to appeasing the Soviet rulers.

"APPEASEMENT POLICY CAN LEAD TO ANOTHER WAR

"They try to do business as usual with Stalin or Khrushchev. They have forgotten that this policy of business as usual toward Hitler helped him build his war machine and led to World War II. I warn you that business as usual and appeasement policies toward Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung can only help these dictators build the Moscow-Peiping war machine and greatly encourage them to further aggression and even another world war.

"Some business and professionals believe that they can somehow manage to get along and become real friends within the Moscow dictatorship. These people forget the nature of communism and Communist regimes—a nature which cannot be changed as long as they are Communists. These well-meaning people forget that the Moscow regime has killed many hundreds of thousands of innocent people. It has robbed many millions of its own subjects of every human liberty. Since the close of World War II, the Kremlin has destroyed the national independence of 10 nations. It threatens many others today. This is the nature of communism.

"That is why every one who cherishes freedom and seeks peace is keenly disappointed at the shortsightedness and illusions shown by some of the leaders of the business community about trade with Russia. Let me cite the article by the president of General Motors, Harlow Curtice, in a recent issue of Look. Here, Mr. Curtice urges the increased sales of cars and other peacetime products to the Soviet bloc, as long as such sales fit in with United States State Department policies. Mr. Curtice stresses: 'I no longer see any reason why sales of cars

and other peacetime products to the Soviet bloc cannot be increased.'

"FOREIGN TRADE WEAPON AGAINST US

"Doesn't Mr. Curtice realize that to the Iron Curtain rulers, to the Communist warlords, foreign trade is not so much an economic undertaking, as we know it in the free world, but rather a political weapon to be used against us? They will buy from us only that which they need to bolster their dictatorship against their own people at home and build their war machine for aggression abroad. And, if they are to buy from us, we also have to buy from them. Otherwise, they will not have the dollars for purchasing General Motors cars. Such an interchange greatly helps the Kremlin rules to overcome the economic havoc of the fallacies and errors of communism.

"Mr. Curtice must surely realize that American cars bought in peacetime will serve the Russians aggressors in wartime. A good Chevrolet can serve a Soviet officer at war against a non-Russian people, just as much as it can and does serve a Communist bureaucrat at home in maintaining the totalitarian regime against the Russian people themselves. Mr. Curtice must know that if General Motors and other big-business corporations should expand their policy of 'business as usual' with the Soviet bloc there will have to be some policy readjustments. More than likely, it will be the State Department and not big busienss that will do the readjusting.

"Surely, Mr. Curtice must realize that our country's trade with Communist China or Communist Russia cannot be the same as trade with democratic Britain or democratic France. I really wonder why he 'no longer sees any reason' to differentiate between the two types of foreign trade.

"Those businessmen who see a 'New Look' and smile in every zigzag by the Kremlin diplomats are living in a fool's paradise. They are the prisoners of their own wishful thinking. They should heed Mr. Khrushchev when he frankly tells the world: 'Anyone who mistakes our smile for a withdrawal from the politics of Marx and Lenin is making a mistake.' If you think I am exaggerating this dangerous illusion on the part of some businessmen, let me cite the following written by Ernest Weir, one of America's leading industrialists, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

" 'An auspicious moment has come which should be fully exploited. * * * The western countries, particularly the United States, should renounce their attitude of suspicion and distrust. Western countries should proceed from the principle that Russia now wants peace and more stable international relations.'

"On June 1 last, the Moscow radio greeted Mr. Weir's statement with great joy. In my opinion, Mr. Weir would be serving America better if he renounced his attitude of suspicion and distrust of collective bargaining in our own country before he showered his trust on Khrushchev and his comrades behind the Iron Curtain.

"My friends, as I have told you, the free trade-union movement has everything to lose, if communism should ever win. But you of the business world, you who proclaim loyalty to the principles of genuine free enterprise, likewise have everything to lose, if communism should ever win. Neither free trade unionism, nor free enterprise, can survive where and when communism thrives. I urge you not to let the prospect of momentary profits blur your vision. Know your enemy. Don't help him. Do more than that: Help the cause of free enterprise by supporting sound economic policies and good labor-management relations at home and democratic foreign policies overseas.

"HAVE EXPOSED RED PROPAGANDA ABROAD

"Perhaps business could take a leaf out of the book of American organized labor in another respect. We have gone abroad and exposed the fraud of antidemocratic, anti-American, Communist propaganda in the ranks of world labor. We have had our representatives go to other lands and tell the workers the truth about our free trade unions, about our other democratic institutions, our expanding freedom, and the ever-better conditions of life and labor in the American economic system. We publish a monthly International Free Trade Union News in English, French, German, and Italian editions, as well as numerous pamphlets. We give away free many scores of thousands of these publications explaining the truth about America and exposing the fraud of the Soviet paradise.

"Could not some of our business groups send capable representatives overseas to explain to their colleagues of Italy, France, Germany, India, or Japan how our American free-enterprise system really works? Believe me, their cartel-ridden economies have no idea of what free enterprise really is—let alone how it works in the United States.

"Perhaps your overseas business colleagues would then learn that it is more profitable to produce for a big market where you sell many items, each at a popular price, than to continue with their time-worn policy of selling few items, each at a high price and high rate of profit? Why could it not be made clear to some of the businessmen in the free countries of Europe, Asia, and Latin America what sales volume really means and how it is impossible to get that many sales without the working people and the middle classes in the offices and on the farms having adequate purchasing power?

"PROMOTE UNDERSTANDING OF FREE ENTERPRISE

"Once you would do that, many a European businessman, whose enterprise was saved by Marshall plan aid and other American economic help, would have more trust in the economy and the future of his own country. He would then reinvest in improving his own machines and in strengthening his country's national economy instead of rushing to export his capital to the United States.

"Now, don't mistake me. I am not advocating that United States business should go out and propose that the American economic system be imposed on, or even voluntarily transplanted, in other countries. The historical background and conditions of these countries may be entirely different from ours. I am proposing that you merely go out and promote better understanding in other lands of the free-enterprise system as it has worked in the United States and benefited the American people.

"I merely suggest that the American business community should help the business communities in the free world get a better understanding of American free enterprise. Greater international understanding and cooperation among the free peoples of the world provides the greatest hope for the defeat of the Communist threat to freedom, human decency, well-being and peace.

"Organizations like the rotarians, with worldwide connections, can do much toward realizing this great goal. I hope and pray you will."

A Farm Dilemma of Truman's Making

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 22:

A FARM DILEMMA OF TRUMAN'S MAKING

If any one man can be said to be responsible for the failure of farmers to participate in last year's general prosperity, it is a President of the United States. And not Roosevelt. For the unhappy consequences of experiments were erased by World War II. Neither was it Eisenhower. He only inherited the mess. The guilt rests on Truman. Oddly enough he has the crust to talk about his farm measures and call them good.

Mr. Truman made many mistakes in dealing with agriculture, but 2 of them are enough to talk about in 1 editorial. The end of World War II found farm acreage expanded in response to the price supports the Government properly offered to get enough food and other produce for our expanded home economy, our armies, and those of our allies, and to meet the needs of civilians in allied countries, cut off from peacetime supply sources.

With the coming of peace, a cutback in our agricultural production toward prewar levels was needed. Government intervention would then have been justified to offset somewhat the decline in farm income after the war demand for American foods and fibers had ended. But Truman's policy was to continue price supports, and at higher levels. To obtain bigger supplies, farmers were offered $1.23 a bushel in 1943, $1.35 in 1944, and $1.38 in 1945. In 1947 wheat was supported at $1.84, in 1948 at $2, and in 1952 at $2.20. For cotton, farmers were guaranteed 18 to 20 cents from 1943 to 1945, 29 cents in 1948, and 31 cents in 1952.

Thus when Mr. Truman should have been seeking to get farmers to grow less, he upped the inducement used during the war to get farmers to grow more. The resulting surpluses would surely have brought a collapse of the whole arrangement by the end of the Truman term of office, but for the temporary relief brought about by the European droughts and floods of 1947 and 1948 and the outbreak of the Korean war in June 1950. As it was, when Truman left office in January 1953, the Government was still holding corn dating as far back as the 1948 crop, and other products with varying amounts of accumulated age.

Truman's high price supports had other harmful effects. As the support levels used were above the price in world markets, countries which looked to the United States for supplies were offered an inducement to provide for themselves. Other countries with export surpluses were induced to step up their plantings to serve customers who used to get their supplies from the United States.

Another serious Truman mistake which also cut the outlet for American farm products is rarely mentioned. One of the declared objects of the Marshall plan of 1948–52, which has since been extended under other names, was to encourage "continuous application on the part of recipient countries, individually and jointly, of vigorous efforts directed to increasing the production of food and materials needed not only to meet their own essential needs but the needs of other countries as well, so that their requirements from abroad be limited to a minimum."

Thus countries which had been our biggest importers of farm produce were supplied at the expense of the American taxpayers with tractors, plows, disk harrows, grain drills and mowers, and fertilizer and seeds as well. By pricing American farm produce out of the world market with 90 percent price supports and grants of aid to foreign countries to enable them to produce more, farm exports have dropped to a fraction of what they formerly were.

That this appraisal of the evils of Trumanism in agriculture is not a partisan one

was made evident in the address of Prof. John D. Black, of Harvard University, as president of the American Economic Association late last month. Dr. Black said:

"No doubt a sizable fraction of the farmers of this country realize pretty well that our Government cannot keep on supporting prices on a level that brings forth growing surpluses. But many of these will say if asked, 'Labor is grabbing all it can get. Business always has been able to get pretty much what it wants. If we farmers don't grab the same way, we are being silly.'

"In this confused situation, there is a fair chance that rigid 90 percent price supports will be voted either in 1956 or 1957. The United States Department of Agriculture that has the task of administering such an act will be in a worse spot than the present Department of Agriculture is in now. It will be dramatic injustice if it is not a Democratic administration that has to take on this task. Such a course of events will simply mean that, bad as things seem now, they will have to get worse before the rank and file of the people of our Nation sense the situation well enough to take the necessary action. The party in power at the time they sense it will lose a good deal of standing with the general public in the ensuing 5 or 10 years."

It is always desirable that the birds of retribution come home to the proper roost. But can the country afford it if the result can be obtained only at the price of putting up with the lunacies of more Democratic administrations?

Slenderizing Program Set for United States Fiscal Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there is a ground swell of grassroot interest being manifested at this time concerning the budget and the importance of the Congress following a sound fiscal policy this year on the subject of tax reduction, a balanced budget, and the practice of commonsense economy.

A good example of that concern is contained in the following editorial which appeared in the January 18 issue of the San Angelo (Tex.) Standard-Times:

SLENDERIZING PROGRAM SET FOR UNITED STATES FISCAL OPERATION

The process of slenderizing the fiscal department of the United States Government, almost as unpopular as for fat folks to go on a diet began yesterday with the budget message of President Eisenhower. A balanced budget by July 1, 1956, if it is achieved, will be the first one since 1951, and at that time the balance came more from the sale of war material than it did from economical operations of the Government.

Of course, the proposed budget is still a little on the fat side, and the degree of slimming can be measured in small percentage. However, it is one of the three times since 1930 that the taxpayers have had any encouragement that we were going to stop the borrowing and start pulling in the belt.

The unprecedented thing about the recommendations is that in an election year a President, the leader of a party expecting votes enough to be returned to office, isn't making a bid for a tax cut.

It is realistic in that it does not presuppose that a high level of prosperity warrants our living it up at the expense of future generations. It begins to take some note of the future, of the taxpayer who has become more tax conscious throughout the years of big spending, of the recognition at the top that a little more conservative administration of tax funds is overdue.

One recalls that last year there was a move to give everybody a $20 income-tax cut. This would have cost $2.5 billion a year. It was hailed as a political move taken at the expense of any chance to reduce the debt. Had it prevailed there would have been no chance to balance the budget this year and no possibility of reducing the national debt.

It is fortunate that the move did not prevail.

If we can curtail spending to any degree, there, is a chance that the expected slim margin of balance can be increased.

That will be up to Congress. Our Congressmen ought to determine where there is any fat in our spending program. They will be responsible for implementing the program outlined by Eisenhower or denying some of its phases.

Representative O. C. FISHER, of this city, phrased the tax problem rather aptly in this fashion: "Tax reduction is a delusion, if, in order to have it, the resulting loss in revenue has to be made up in borrowed money and a corresponding increase in the public debt. Under these conditions tax reduction is really tax postponement—just passing the added burden to our children and our grandchildren to pay."

That sort of reaction to the Presidential message is realistic economy. It is cognizant of the public welfare—not a political party's welfare.

Kiwanis Trophy Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, throughout the world there are many organizations putting forth every effort to make the world a better place in which to live. One of these organizations is Kiwanis International.

Every Member of Congress is familiar with Kiwanis as I doubt if there is a single Member who has not at one time addressed at least one of the Kiwanis clubs in his district.

On Saturday evening, January 21, it was my privilege to attend the annual dinner honoring the past presidents of my own club, West Akron Kiwanis, in Akron, Ohio. Several years ago one of our members, Mr. Ray Fair, originated the idea of presenting a speech trophy each year to one of the members who proved himself to be an outstanding salesman for Kiwanis. It is customary to present the winner with a trophy patterned after the favorite sport in Spain. In the past the following Kiwanians have been so honored: Jacques Belet, Lee Shannon, Walt Garner, John Kistler, Ed Kusel, and Lloyd Oliver.

This year the honor was bestowed on Mr. Austin F. O'Brien. The choice was excellent and I feel confident Mr. O'Brien will uphold the tradition of the honor.

Defense Department Answers Waste Critic: It's Rough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include herein two very informative articles written by Robert G. Spivack, correspondent of the New York Post, and appearing in the issues of January 13 and January 14, respectively.

Mr. Spivack has followed this matter very closely, and is one of the best versed correspondents on the subject matter of the articles he wrote:

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ANSWERS WASTE CRITIC: IT'S ROUGH

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON, January 14.—The Defense Department today offered no defense to charges by House Democratic Leader McCORMACK that its wasteful and inefficient purchasing policies are costing the taxpayers $500 million a year.

A spokesman for Defense Secretary Wilson said only it's rough trying to streamline the Department's buying policies on nonmilitary goods.

"You go slow and some people think you aren't doing anything," the Department said. "It is a terrific problem and Mr. Wilson is trying to deal with it as have all his predecessors."

This was the first time anyone high in the administration has come close to admitting failure in the GOP efforts to clean up the mess in Washington, as promised in the 1952 campaign.

The Post called Wilson's office for comment on McCORMACK's charges, published Friday, that overlapping in procurement by the Army, Navy, and Air Force have made a myth of unification.

McCORMACK said each service continues to duplicate the purchases of the others in everything from rubber bands and pencils to medical supplies and petroleum.

The Navy won't use materials stored in Army depots and the Air Force boycotts both.

Along with a group of economy-minded Democrats, McCORMACK has been fighting for months to cut nonessential expenditures in the Defense Department.

He said Wilson has proved helpless in coping with the Pentagon's strongly entrenched bureaucracy, despite GOP claims that business methods would be instituted when President Eisenhower took office.

Wilson's spokesman replied more in sorrow than in anger. The one thing the ex-GM boss prided himself on was his capacity to put over effective management.

The Defense Department, it was said, hopes soon to integrate its purchase practices by dividing up the various services.

Wilson takes credit for instituting a "new single manager plan" in the purchase of food for the services. This assignment has now been turned over to the Army.

The Navy, it was said, will probably soon be asked to take over all medical supply buying.

"The purchase of petroleum will probably be turned over to the Air Force," Wilson's spokesman said. He gave no date when this plan might be put into effect.

McCORMACK said the "single manager plan" was not very new, but he approves of it nevertheless. Only he wishes the department would hurry up.

The plan began under Defense Secretary Lovett, who tried it in medical purchases. For some unexplained reason the Republicans abandoned it.

Now, due to McCORMACK pressure, they apparently are trying to restore the Lovett system, even thought it originated in the Truman administration.

McCORMACK HITS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT WASTE

(By Robert G. Spivack)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—House Democratic Leader McCORMACK charged the Defense Department today with "wasteful and inefficient" purchasing policies that are costing the taxpayers $500 million a year.

The Boston legislator made his charge in an exclusive interview with the Post.

He detailed prolonged but fruitless efforts by himself, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and a handful of economy-minded Congressmen to eliminate "duplication and triplication" by purchasing agents of the Army, Air Force and Navy.

Despite "claims of accomplishment" by service officials, McCORMACK said Defense Secretary Wilson has been helpless against the Pentagon's "strongly entrenched bureaucracy" in curbing the waste.

Armed Forces "unification," so far as procurement policies are concerned, is a myth, McCORMACK said. Inter-service rivalry remains just as strong as it has ever been, he said, despite the Unification Act of 1946.

McCORMACK said there has been overlapping in the fields of medical supplies, petroleum, transportation, storage, health facilities and Armed Forces Research.

"I have yet to see any signs of an effective unification system as intended by Congress," McCORMACK said. "If there is one place where we could have 'unification' and where the taxpayers could be saved several hundred millions annually it's in the procurement field, particularly in the 'common use' items."

These are items which all services use and where tremendous savings could be accomplished through coordinated buying.

Despite propaganda about this being a "businesslike" administration, each service still goes off on its own, when it comes to nondefense spending money, McCORMACK said.

"There is no question of the duplication," McCORMACK insisted.

"If an integrated system were established for the three departments at least $500 million a year could be saved."

McCORMACK detailed his criticism 3 days before the President's budget message goes to Congress, on Monday.

In that message, according to informed sources, the President is expected to congratulate Wilson on the savings achieved during his management of the Department through institution of a "single manager plan" for the purchase of Armed Forces food.

Whether the expected congratulations are offered after McCORMACK'S blast is speculative. The Democrats are waiting to see.

McCORMACK, along with Representatives BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina; CURTIS, Democrat, of Missouri; and Senator DOUGLAS, have been after Wilson for months to streamline the Department's buying program. They have also had support from Republican Representative BROWN of Ohio.

There has been a continuous exchange of correspondence, with various Defense officials patting themselves on the back for their claimed accomplishments. But they usually neglect to list facts and figures.

Said McCORMACK: "They talk one way and act another."

Most of the criticism centers about the O'Mahoney Act of 1952, which required the Defense Secretary to issue regluations bringing about integration of common-use items.

An order along these lines, known as Regulation 4000.8, was issued by Secretary Lovett in the fall of 1952 during the final months of the Truman administration. Lovett began instituting drastic reforms, but as soon as Wilson took over they were abandoned, McCORMACK said, notwithstanding 1952 GOP campaign promises.

As late as October 24, 1955, McCORMACK was still pressing Wilson return to the Lovett policies.

Even before the O'Mahoney Act Lovett had instituted the single manager plan for purchase of medical supplies. This was abandoned by the new Republican team.

Two weeks after McCORMACK'S October letter Wilson put out a news release announcing the virtues of what Defense press agents called a new idea. It was the single manager plan for purchase of subsistence items.

Since all other purchasing continued in haphazard fashion, DOUGLAS then wrote to Wilson on December 22, 1955. DOUGLAS found himself bewildered by the Department's inconsistencies.

"I was deeply disappointed when, in 1954, you gave up this centralized treatment and single manager system for medical supplies," DOUGLAS wrote, "and now I am bewildered * * * to find you are apparently establishing it for food and subsistence."

He asked what is being done to comply with the law in other purchases.

In one of his letters McCORMACK had told Wilson bluntly the Department had no overall plan and asked what Wilson intended to do about it. Wilson referred it to an assistant.

In 1951 General Eisenhower told a group of Congressmen in Paris, including Representative BONNER, that these problems of waste could be solved if we had a Defense Secretary "with enough guts" to go after the military bureaucrats. BONNER and his committee asked the general to put this in writing.

The language was then softened a bit, but General Eisenhower's meaning was still clear.

"I feel that what is really needed * * * is to vest in the Secretary of Defense sufficient authority and responsibility to permit him to accomplish whatever degree of improvement in the efficiency and economy of our service of supply system as is now necessary or that becomes so as time passes," General Eisenhower wrote.

As a candidate in 1952, General Eisenhower hit at Defense Department waste under the Democrats.

Investigators who have followed the Defense Department's extravagances tell of recent cases like these in substantiation of McCormack's charges:

At Fort Dix, N. J., the Army receives medical supplies from a depot at Schenectady, N. Y., although until recently there was a Navy medical depot at Edgewater, N. J., only a few miles away.

On the west coast, there are depots stocked with the same supplies at Stockton, Alameda, and Oakland, Calif., maintained by each of the services.

The Air Force ships supplies from New Jersey out to bases in the Rockies, but neglects to use materials closer at hand in Army depots at St. Louis.

One authority says there are over 100,000 separate items purchased by the three services. In 90 percent of the cases they are duplications of similar supplies stores by one of the other services, sometimes in depots almost across the street from each other.

The armed services now use in excess of 500 million square feet of depot space. Many depots are overflowing and the services are constantly obliged to sell as "surplus" thousands of items at a fraction of their cost to the taxpayers

Republicans, Democrats, and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been plenty of hot air generated by the recent charges and countercharges over the policies of the administration and Secretary of State Dulles. An editorial appearing in the January 19 issue of the Green Bay Press-Gazette is a breath of fresh air in this debate.

After the quibbling is over, the real test of the success or failure of foreign policy is whether it brings war or peace. It is time for us to look at the record. The editorial referred to presents that record:

REPUBLICANS, DEMOCRATS, AND WAR

For stating that the art of diplomacy sometimes necessitates bringing the Nation to the verge of war, Secretary Dulles is under attack from the Democrats who took us not to the verge but into three wars in a generation.

From the very early days of the Eisenhower administration, it has been apparent that the ideas of President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles on the strategy this country should follow in prosecuting the cold war were very different from those of their predecessors; and it also has been apparent that the Democrats simply have not understood what the administration was talking about a good deal of the time. For example, when Mr. Dulles soon after taking office warned the Soviets of "massive retaliation" should they commit aggression, Democratic spokesmen seemed to almost deliberately blind themselves to the real meaning of Mr. Dulles' words and instead insisted that he had threatened to blow Moscow and Peking and the other great Communist cities off the map in the event a conflict broke out in any part of the world.

These protests by the Democrats played directly into the hands of our enemies who would like to persuade the world that we are too trigger happy to be trutsed with nuclear weapons. Yet it was apparent to many people at the time that Mr. Dulles did not mean any such thing, but that nuclear retaliation could be tailored to fit the needs of any situation. At the very time that Mr. Dulles was making his statement, the newspapers were full of reports about the development of tactical nuclear weapons such as atomic artillery and rockets, yet the Democrats could see in the Secretary's statement nothing but big bombers hovering over great cities.

The Democratic leaders similarly could not or deliberately refused to understand the meaning of Mr. Eisenhower's discussion during the 1952 campaign of the necessity of giving the people of the Soviet satellites some hope of eventual liberation. They accused him of threatening aggression in Europe, and again the Communist propagandists found their words pleasing. The administration, of course, has carried on no aggression; but it has made it crystal clear in its public statements, through our propaganda outlets throughout the world, at the Geneva meetings and elsewhere that we will never accept Soviet colonization of the satellites as a permanent situation. Only recently this policy paid off to the extent of forcing Khrushchev to cry out in anguished

tones against the meddling of the United States Government in Eastern European affairs.

The Press-Gazette said several weeks ago that in its opinion foreign policy is a perfectly legitimate subject for discussion and debate during a presidential election campaign. The more we study the differences in the two parties' approaches to this most important of all problems that face us, the more we are convinced that the American people should clearly understand the respective positions of the parties on it.

We can think of no better way to illustrate the contrast between the Truman-Acheson and Eisenhower-Dulles ideas on the direction of our foreign policy than to compare the manner in which the former handled the Korean question and the way in which the latter handled the recent crisis in the Formosa Strait. Several months before the aggression occurred in Korea, Secretary Acheson had announced publicly that that country was not considered vital to America's defense. His statement was as irrelevant as it was unnecessary, for it had then been apparent for some time that our reaction to aggression against our friends anywhere in the world would not necessarily depend on how that aggression affected the strictly military security of our country. But it was interpreted—as the Secretary should have known it would be—by the Communists as an invitation to strike, and when their tanks rolled, Mr. Truman was faced with only two alternatives: War or appeasement. He made the right decision and made it courageously, but a President with a capable Secretary of State would never have been placed in that position in the first place.

In contrast, when the Communists threatened an invasion of Formosa, Mr. Eisenhower acted in such a way that our side took the initiative away from the enemy and held on to it. They wanted us either to appease them, in which case they would get what they wanted, or to draw a line and tell them that if they stepped over it we would shoot, in which case they could accuse us of interference in Asian affairs, and gain a propaganda victory. We did neither; Mr. Dulles simply let the Communists know that our forces were ready and that if we did strike it would be with every weapon at our disposal. But he let them guess as to whether we would strike or not. The Formosa crisis is now almost a year old and no aggression has yet taken place.

The best test of the Republican handling of our foreign policy is the fact that during the past 3 years the world has been at peace as it has not been for many decades, and that during that time not 1 inch of free soil has been gained by the Communists. Compare this to any similar period under the Truman administration, and it is easy to understand why there is debate today between the parties about foreign policy, and why the Democrats are so bitter over the contrast that is there for all to see.

What Is a Girl?—What Is a Boy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House, I include in the RECORD an appealing article received in this morning's mail from a friend:

WHAT IS A GIRL?

Little girls are the nicest things that happen to people. They are born with a little bit of angel shine about them, and though it wears thin sometimes there is always enough left to lasso your heart—even when they are sitting in the mud or crying temperamental tears or parading up the street in mother's best clothes.

A little girl can be sweeter (and badder) oftener than anyone else in the world. She can jitter around, and stomp, and make funny noises that frazzle your nerves, yet just when you open your mouth, she stands there demure with that special look in her eyes. A girl is innocence playing in the mud, beauty standing on its head, and motherhood dragging a doll by the foot.

Girls are available in five colors—black, white, red, yellow, or brown. Yet Mother Nature always manages to select your favorite color when you place your order. They disprove the law of supply and demand—there are millions of little girls, but each is as precious as rubies.

God borrows from many creatures to make a little girl. He uses the song of a bird, the squeal of a pig, the stubbornness of a mule, the antics of a monkey, the spryness of a grasshopper, the curiosity of a cat, the speed of a gazelle, the slyness of a fox, the softness of a kitten, and to top it all off, he adds the mysterious mind of a woman.

A little girl likes new shoes, party dresses, small animals, first grade, noisemakers, the girl next door, dolls, make believe, dancing lessons, ice cream, kitchens, coloring books, makeup, cans of water, going visiting, tea parties, and one boy. She doesn't care so much for visitors, boys in general, large dogs, hand-me-downs, straight chairs, vegetables, snowsuits, or staying in the front yard. She is loudest when you are thinking, the prettiest when she has provoked you, the busiest at bedtime, the quietest when you want to show her off, and the most flirtatious when she absolutely must not get the best of you again.

Who else can cause you more grief, joy, irritation, satisfaction, embarrassment, and genuine delight than this combination of Eve, Salome, and Florence Nightingale? She can muss up your home, your hair, and your dignity—spend your money, your time, and your temper—then just when you patience is ready to crack, her sunshine peeks through and you've lost again.

Yes; she is a nerve-racking nuisance, just a noisy bundle of mischief. But when your dreams tumble down and the world is a mess—when it seems you are pretty much of a fool after all—she can make you a king when she climbs on your knee and whispers, "I love you best of all."

WHAT IS A BOY

Between the innocence of babyhood and the dignity of manhood, we find a delightful creature called a boy. Boys come in assorted sizes, weights, and colors, but all have the same creed: To enjoy every second of every minute of every hour of every day, and to protest with noise—their only weapon—when their last minute is finished and the adult males pack them off to bed at night.

Boys are found everywhere—on top of, underneath, inside of, climbing on, swinging from, running around, or jumping to. Mothers love them, little girls hate them, older sisters and brothers tolerate them, adults ignore them, and heaven protects them. A boy is truth with dirt on its face, beauty with a cut on its finger, wisdom with bubble gum in its hair, and the hope of the future with a frog in its pocket.

When you are busy a boy is an inconsiderate, bothersome, intruding jangle of noise. When you want him to make a good impression his brain turns to jelly or else he becomes a savage, sadistic jungle creature bent on destroying the world and himself with it.

A boy is a composite—he has the appetite of a horse, the digestion of a sword-swallower, the energy of a pocket-atom bomb, the curiosity of a cat, the lungs of a dictator, the imagination of a Paul Bunyan, the shyness of a violet, the audacity of a steel trap, the enthusiasm of a firecracker, and when he makes something he has five thumbs on each hand.

He likes ice cream, saws, Christmas, comic books, the boy across the street, woods, water (in its natural habitat), large animals, dad's train, Saturday morning, and fire engines. He is not much for Sunday school, company, schools, books without pictures, music lessons, neckties, barbers, girls, overcoats, adults, or bedtime.

Nobody else is so early to rise or so late to supper. Nobody else gets so much fun out of trees, dogs, and breezes. Nobody else can cram into one pocket a rusty knife, a half-eaten pie, 3 feet of string, an empty Bull Durham sack, 2 gumdrops, 6 cents, a slingshot, a chunk of unknown substance, and a genuine supersonic code ring with a secret compartment.

A boy is a magical creature, you can lock him out of your workshop, but you can't lock him out of your heart. You can get him out of your study, but you can't get him out of your mind. Might as well give up—he is your captor, your jailer, your boss, and your master—a freckle-face, pint-size, cat-chasing bundle of noise. But when you come home at night with only the shattered pieces of your hopes and dreams, he can mend them like new with two magic words—"Hi, dad."

Another Mississippian Receives National Recognition—Illustrious Luther A. Smith, 33d Degree, Sovereign Grand Commander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago Mr. Boyd A. Campbell, a citizen of Jackson, Miss., and a former college classmate of mine, was signally honored by being selected as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, a position which he is currently serving with honor and distinction. Now another Mississippian, the Honorable Luther A. Smith, a distinguished jurist and citizen of Hattiesburg, Miss., has more recently been selected as the sovereign grand commander of the supreme council, 33d degree, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, southern jurisdiction of the United States of America.

Mr. Smith for many years has been an outstanding and consecrated worker in Freemasonry in Mississippi. He has possibly devoted as much time and effort as well as having made as great a contribution to that cause in the whole of the South as any other man. But all of his efforts have not been in behalf of Masonry. He has enjoyed an enviable record as an outstanding citizen and jurist in his native State. It was, therefore, no surprise that he was selected for this high honor by his fellow Masons. He is a man of high demeanor, an outstanding Christian gentleman of substantial character, who enjoys the confidence and respect of all who know him. His appointment to this full-time position re-

quired his resignation as judge of the court of chancery for the 10th district of Mississippi and his removal to Washington.

We predict that this beloved Mississippian will make an outstanding contribution in his new position not only to Masonry, but to his God and country.

Smith Act Needed in Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Bellingham (Wash.) Daily Herald of Sunday, January 15, which points up the value of the Smith Act as a weapon against Communist infiltration in our Nation:

In their petition last month to President Eisenhower urging the release of 16 top Communists convicted of conspiracy against the United States Government, 46 signers suggested by implication that the cold war between the free and the slave world is over.

The petition was presented several weeks after the Russian Soviet leaders had brusquely turned their backs on the West at the summit conference in Geneva, and after Soviet party boss Nikita Khrushchev had declared that the Kremlin would abandon Marxism—which calls for the triumph of communism over democracy—only when the shrimp learns to whistle.

In urging that the sentences of the convicted American Communists be commuted, and that 100 similar cases pending or under appear be postponed, the petitioners said the trial and conviction of the top Reds "was carried through in a period of the 'cold war' (in 1949) and in an atmosphere of hysteria."

In her remarks at Mount Vernon last week Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, one of the petitioners, said her stand on the Smith Anti-subversive Act, under which the convictions were obtained, coincided with that of the two dissenting justices of the Supreme Court—which sustained the constitutionality of the act by a vote of 6 to 2—and that her concern was not for the Communists, but for what she regarded as the dangers to civil rights and liberties involved.

The Alien Registration (Smith) Act was passed by a Democratic-controlled Congress. It makes it unlawful to teach or advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government or to adhere to a group which underwrites such objectives. The House passed the bill by a vote of 282 to 4, the Senate without a rollcall.

In 1951 the Supreme Court sustained the act in upholding the conviction of 11 Communists tried in New York in 1949 for conspiracy.

Possibly many persons have forgotten that 9-month trial, in which "hysteria" was produced, not by the people or by the Government, but by the Communist defendants and their claques, while Judge Harold R. Medina maintained a judicial claim despite what a biographer describes as the sneering and shouting of defense attorneys (five of whom were later held in contempt of court) and their constant attempts to badger him into making a reversible error.

Most of the 11 defendants were high officials of the Communist Party, which the Senate Judiciary Committee has termed "the American branch of the Russian Communist Party," which "follows faithfully the conspiratorial pattern laid down by its parent body," and "looks upon our Government as its enemy, which it seeks to overthrow by forceful means."

President Eisenhower did not see fit to turn the convicted Reds loose. Had he done so the Communists would have won the greatest psychological victory in the struggle between free government and the Moscow-directed world conspiracy.

In 15 years the Communists have spread their control over 750 million people and 5 million square miles of the globe. They have done so both by military force and by infiltration and subversion. The Smith Act is intended to prevent subversion in the United States. It is a legal instrument in the cold war, which the Kremlin is waging on a global scale.

Thwarting Thrift—Hoover Reforms Will Face Powerful Foes in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial taken from a recent issue—January 13, 1956, page 8—of the Wall Street Journal:

THWARTING THRIFT—HOOVER REFORMS WILL FACE POWERFUL FOES IN CONGRESS

(By John Chamberlain)

What chances have the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for adoption?

Members of the voluntary Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, which is headed by Clarence Francis, former head of General Foods, say that some 84 percent of the suggestions could become realities before many years have passed. Obviously, however, this way of putting it may mean much or little. To the extent that 16 percent of the recommendations are in the realm of the controversial, the big projected savings outlined by the various Hoover task forces could be postponed for a long time to come.

It should be relatively easy to do away with the foolishness that has resulted in a Navy depot storage of 79 months' supply of canned beef and gravy. The administration is already putting into effect some of the less controversial proposals. But when it comes to such things as the elimination or the mutualization of Government lending agency, or the establishment of a means test for veterans seeking hospitalization for non-service-connected disabilities, then all the familiar forces of pressure group politics can spring into play to stop the economizer in his tracks.

Ever since 1933 the executive branch has been the big spender of United States politics. This tended to obscure the fact that Congress itself is a congeries of special interests which are devoted to getting specific appropriations for specific things. There may be 96 Senators who are for economy in general, but when each one of the 96 has traded votes to protect his own regional specialties economy more often than not goes out the window.

STORY WITHOUT AN END

The story of the Texas City tin smelter is a case in point. Long ago the Hoover Commission singled this out as an example of unwarranted Government competition with private industry. The tin smelter lost over $1.5 million in 1954. Since it is no longer needed for strategic reasons, or even for producing for a Government stockpile which is now estimated at a 5-year war supply, President Eisenhower recommended closing it. But the Senate, partly in response to the wishes of Senator LYDON JOHNSON of Texas, forced a continuance of the tin smelter until June 30, 1956, at which time Mr. Eisenhower is supposed to report to Congress on feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smeltering industry.

Many of the Hoover Commission's recommended reforms could be legally accomplished by mere Executive fiat. But when Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson announced that he was going to make a beginning at getting the Pentagon out of competition with private industry by closing down 4 coffee roasting plants, 2 paint factories, 5 cobbler shops, a dry cleaning plant and a Navy rope walk, Congress intervened at once.

It did this by wigwagging a signal to the Comptroller General, who functions as a congressional agent in seeing to it that appropriated funds are spent in accordance with the intent of the law. The Comptroller General flatly advised Mr. Wilson that he would disallow any Pentagon expenditure made in connection with closing down coffee plants or cobbler shops.

The Comptroller General derived his authority for such action from a rider that had been attached to an appropriation bill. It reads: "No part of the funds appropriated in this act may be used for the disposal * * * of work that has been for a period of 3 years or more performed by civilian personnel of the Department of Defense unless justified to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the House."

Although President Eisenhower himself considers this particular rider to be an unconstitutional interference with the power of the Executive, the Comptroller General's neat little ambush has effectively kept the Pentagon from carrying out some very ponderable Hoover Commission recommendations. These projected economies in Pentagon business activity cannot now be made unless specific congressional approval is obtained.

Pressure groups have struck at the Hoover Commission's presumed intentions even in advance of their actual formulation. This happened last spring when the American Legion, confusing a task force report with the Commission's own opinion's attacked the Commission for "recommending the closing of 20 Veterans' Administration hospitals when at this time there are thousands of eligible veterans certified for hospitalization unable to secure proper medical care and treatment because of lack of beds."

REJECTED RECOMMENDATION

When the Commission made its final recommendations on health, it did not accept the task force recommendation that 19 (not 20 specific Veterans' Administration hospitals be closed. In its report to Congress the Commission limited itself to saying that "there are more veterans' hospitals than are necessary." It recommended that the Veterans' Administration "consider the recommendations made by the task force * * * and obtain the advice of the proposed Federal advisory council of health on these recommendations."

According to the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, the 12 "whereas" clauses and the 3 "resolved" clauses of the American Legion's attack on the Commission contained "5 allegations that are untrue, 2 that lack a factual explanation, 1 that is redundant, and 3 that are matters of opinion."

When arguments over the Hoover Commission reports begin in Congress—Senate hearings start on Monday—the important

figures to watch will be the youthful Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, who heads the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, and Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, head of the House Committee on Government Operations. As between the two men, KENNEDY has shown the more sustained enthusiasm for the Hoover proposals. KENNEDY'S position takes on added significance because of his family background; he is the son of the former Ambassador Joseph P. Kennedy, who was himself an enthusiastic and hard-working member of the Hoover Commission.

TAXPAYER PRESSURE?

But even with Senator KENNEDY constituting himself a special watchdog, many of the projected reforms will stay bottled up in committee if the country remains apathetic about such things as economy and quality of Government service. The less controversial—and less costly—Hoover proposals should get by the Kennedy and Dawson committees easily enough. But the ones which would result in real savings may not even emerge on the floor of the Senate or House during the present session of Congress. This is an election year, and in election years economizers have traditionally had a hard time of it.

With billions in pork and perquisites at stake, the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole may have to act as a gigantic pressure group if the special pressure groups are not to combine to defeat major Hoover recommendations in both the Senate and the House.

Partnership at Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial from the Mount Vernon (Wash.) Argus, which points up the successful operation of the power-partnership policy advocated by the Eisenhower administration:

PARTNERSHIP AT WORK

Much has been said the last 2 years about "partnership" in electric power development. For some politicians this declared policy of the present national administration—to encourage the cooperation and joint participation of private and public agencies in power development—has provided a handy subject for campaign oratory.

These partisan and power politicians would do well to take a second look before they say too much in our own Puget Sound-Cascade area. For here, in northwest Washington and over the Cascade hump in Chelan County, we already have a working partnership consisting of 2 public-utility districts, 2 municipal electric systems and a private power utility, who through their Puget Sound Utilities Council are planning to provide this area in the next 8 years with the equivalent in kilowatts, almost, of a second Grand Coulee Dam.

You can't shrug off this kind of partnership. When the people of this area begin to see the fruits of its efforts, surely they will recognize its merit. Already the Utilities Council's program has progressed so far that it is now urging local communities to work actively to attract new industry in order to, as the council says, "help boost your 'take home' pay." This the council members' leaders would not dare say if they did not feel assured they could provide the new power that new industry will need.

For our part, we prefer the kind of power we can offer new industries and new residents to the kind whose main potential is talk.

Thirty-Eighth Anniversary of Ukrainian National Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, the eve of the celebration of the 38th anniversary of Ukrainian National Independence, it was my privilege to be the guest speaker at a dinner sponsored by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and Ukrainian Association of Washington, D. C.

I was happy to see so many of my colleagues in the Senate and the House in attendance at this dinner, and to hear stirring words of encouragement for the cause of human freedom. It was also significant that in attendance at this dinner were many representatives of organizations which advocate the restoration of national independence to all of the nations now enslaved. Because I feel my remarks on this occasion will be of interest to those Members of Congress who did not have an opportunity to attend this dinner, under unanimous consent I insert my address in the RECORD:

RUSSIAN COMMUNIST COLONIALISM: THE SCOURGE OF ALL MANKIND

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure for me to join with you on this occasion when we commemorate the 38th anniversary of national independence of the Ukrainian nation. An occasion such as this is always a welcome one because it affords me the opportunity to meet so many old friends and to take part in a program which is always sure to bring forth some new ideas beneficial to the cause of individual liberty. This year, in my judgment, is a unique one because world developments are compelling us to return to fundamentals and to decide upon a course of action capable of beating the Russian Communists at their insidious game of peaceful coexistence. I believe it is apparent to all gathered here tonight, that the Russian Communists used the conferences at the so-called summit which took place in Geneva, Switzerland, to launch their latest political offensive, and that we have not yet awakened from the sedatives applied to liberty-loving men at the Geneva conferences, because we have failed to launch anything that could be called a political offensive against the Russia Communists. I am equally certain that everyone gathered here this evening would like nothing better than to see such a political offensive launched, if one could be produced, which would give better hopes than the sterile containment policy, or the latest version of containment which has been appropriately called evolution, not revolution.

I think it is very fitting that on this occasion we should discuss ways and means of restoring national independence to all those nations which have lost it to the Russian Communists. We meet each year on occasions such as this in order to keep bright the happy memory of the times when those nations were free and independent. We also hope that by keeping this memory bright, we will give added hope and promise to the hundreds of millions of people in those enslaved nations, that they are not forever doomed to a life of tyranny and colonial exploitation. More than anything else, it is high time that we developed a practical and winning program in order to give real purpose to our hopes and aspirations for all the people of the world.

In my considered judgment, the greatest threat confronting the free world today is that presented by colonialism. I mean, of course, Russian Communist colonialism because that is the only colonial power today which is in the acendency and which, in fact, does threaten all of mankind. I believe it is fair to say that whatever is left in the world of colonial empires, other than the Russian, represents nothing more than the death-bed throes of an archaic system which civilized mankind completely rejects. All of us are heartened to see so many nations formerly in colonial status, securing their national independence. We all hope that the numbers of nations regaining their national independence, while breaking the chains of colonial status, will continue to grow with each passing year. We cannot help but hope that the day has come when not one more nation on the face of this earth will be subjected to the degradation and agony of colonial status.

But we have not yet had the courage to face up to the many questions raised by the ruthless colonial practices of the Russian Communists. In fact, I am told that it is quite improper, while moving in certain circles here in Washington, to even make mention of the ruthless colonial practices of the Russians, or to even infer that the Russians are Communists. In those same circles, the rules of etiquette require that the word Soviet be used when referring to Russians, Communists, and Red colonialism.

This same phony etiquette has caused many Americans to become very confused as to whether the enemy is communism, Russian imperialism, or the workers, soldiers, and peasants of Russia. I say this because as most of you know, the only understandable meaning of the word "soviet" is a council of workers, peasants, and soldiers. I find it very difficult to believe that the American people would ever align themselves against a council comprised of workers, peasants, and soldiers. Certainly our basic traditions require us to take an unalterable stand against Russian colonialism and communism, regardless of what cover name these twin evils may be operating under.

With this understanding and with the assurance that I intend to break every rule of etiquette established by that crop of global strategists who acclaim themselves to be Russians experts, I would like to say a few words about the colonial practices of the Russian Communists. All one has to do is to consult any global map, other than those prepared in Moscow or by Russian sympathizers elsewhere in the world, and it becomes immediately obvious that the area of the world now occupied by the Russian Communists constitutes the greatest colonial empire in all of recorded history. That empire stretches from the Baltic Sea in north Europe all the way across the Eurasian continent to the Pacific Ocean. At a glance, one immediately realizes what a tremendous expanse of geography this empire occupies, but it takes a second glance to notice all the non-Russian nations which comprise this land mass, and which, in every sense of the word, are abject colonies being subjected to the most ruthless exploitation. It takes a little more study to learn that well over 900 million people are held within the bondage of this empire and that less than 9 million of that total population comprise

the new elite class called members of the Communist Party. It takes not only a little more study, but indeed a great deal more objectivity to acknowledge that in this empire of over 900 million human beings, less than 90 million of them are Russians. The importance of this last statement can best be measured by recalling to memory that Stalin frequently referred to the Russians as the superior people of the Soviet Union.

I am sure the record will bear me out when I say that the present empire over which the Russian Communists rule, is made up of more once free and independent nations than any other colonial empire in the history of mankind. It is startling when one recognizes that in addition to Ukraine the following nations are held in colonial bondage by the Russian Communists—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Poland, East Germany, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, North Caucasia, Idel-Ural, Inner and Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

This empire certainly goes far beyond the imperialistic dreams of the czars, Peter and Ivan. Moreover, it dwarfs the conquests of Caesar, Genghis Khan, Attila, and Tammerlane. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the great problem of mankind in our times is that of Russian Communist colonialism.

It is one thing to recognize the menace created by the ruthless colonial practices of the Russian Communists, but it is still another thing to develop a program to counteract and defeat the Russian imperial empire. I feel that the platform afforded me here this evening is an ideal one from which to launch a four-point program which, at least, represents the beginning of a political campaign to eradicate the plague of colonialism from the face of the earth.

As a starting point, I believe it is necessary that we fully identify and then expose the Russian colonial empire for what it really is. The time has come for us to stop talking about Soviet imperialism and Red imperialism and to start using language that the man on the street the world over, understands. We must make it known to all the people of the still free world, particularly those who are indulging in the dangerous practice of neutralism, the unvarnished facts concerning the colonial empire of the Russian Communists.

When one understands the political struggle now taking place in Southeast Asia, it immediately becomes elementary that we expose to the world the fact that the Asian nations of Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Inner and Outer Mongolia, as well as Manchuria, China, Tibet, North Korea, and North Vietnam, are now being subjected to a colonial exploitation unequaled in any chapter of history. This same political principle applies in a geopolitical sense to every quarter of the world. As a first task, therefore, we must fully and objectively identify Russian Communist colonialism and then we must, by all the information media at our command, expose the ruthless practices to all the world.

As a second step in this political campaign, I feel it is necessary to acquaint the people of the world with our traditional stand on colonialism and imperialism. From my own personal experience, I state that there is a great deal of confusion in the world today concerning our position on colonialism. For example, throughout most of Asia, the people there who want terribly to be our friends, find it difficult to understand our basic stand on colonialism. This is so because we have attempted to straddle an issue which it is not possible to straddle. I am sure the people of Asia understand our desire to help them in their aspirations for national independence, but I am sorry to say that they still have grave doubts concerning our position on the question of colonialism. I believe this same situation applies throughout other areas of the world such as Africa, the Near and Middle East. This poses a problem which must be quickly resolved if we are to hold the confidence and good will of millions and millions of people, most of whom reside in the so-called twilight zones of the world.

One has only to recall the effort being made by the Russian colonizers in these twilight zones to understand the importance of the need for getting across our basic position on colonialism and imperialism.

It is fortunate that we already have a powerful instrument which properly conveys the position of the American people on the subject of colonialism and imperialism in order to meet this crying need in our foreign policy. I refer to House Concurrent Resolution 149, which was introduced in the Congress by the distinguished majority leader of the House—a great American patriot, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. That resolution, in clear and inspiring fashion, sets forth our traditional policy against all forms of colonialism and imperialism as well as our unqualified support for the principle of national self-determination and the right of nations to national sovereignty. It restates our time-honored position of support in enabling all nations to assume and maintain an equal station among all the nations of the world. The McCormack resolution is an ideal starting point from which we can and must acquaint the people of the world of our stand against colonialism and imperialism. That resolution, in my judgment, is a magnificent weapon to remove the uncertainty which exists in the minds of so many people of the world who want to be our steadfast allies and warm friends.

Finally, it is an excellent vehicle to eliminate our fence straddling position on the subject of colonialism and imperialism which has caused us to lose a major part of the initiative in the conduct of the cold war.

As a third step, I believe it is urgently necessary that we shake the dust, feathers, and fuzz out of our foreign policy. In order to do this, I feel it is necessary that we make our primary national objective the eradication of colonialism and imperialism from the face of the earth. Once having taken this step, we must then harness the full strength of our diplomatic, political, and economic capabilities to the task of winning through on that objective. I would like particularly in this connection to point out the great opportunity that is ours in the forum of the United Nations to strike a blow on behalf of all the enslaved non-Russian nations in the Russian colonial empire. I am sure most of you are acquainted with House Resolution 183 which sought to require the United States Delegate to the United Nations to introduce a resolution branding Soviet Russia as an aggressor and therefore a threat to the peace. This same resolution will, if furthered by the Department of State, unavoidably raise all the pertinent questions on Russian Communist colonialism and the exploitation of the non-Russian nations.

I fervently hope and pray that House resolution 183 will be passed by the present session of Congress and that the United States delegation to the United Nations will have the honor to be joined by other nations in leading the fight against colonialism, in which fight they will surely be joined by the overwhelming majority of the nations holding membership in the United Nations.

As a fourth step in this program, it is necessary that we take maximum advantage of all the media of communications in getting across to the people of the world our determined position on colonialism and imperialism and our fervent desire to assist each and every nation which struggles against colonialism and for their national independence.

In the last session of Congress, I introduced House Resolution 433 calling for the creation of a joint committee of Congress on United States international information programs. The reason I introduced this resolution is that I am convinced that unless and until we begin to use all our scientific advances in the field of communications to bring our fundamental beliefs and aspirations to all the people of the world, we will continue to remain on the defensive in the face of the political offensive being carried out by the Russian Communist colonizers.

In connection with my resolution, I want to make one thing crystal clear. The purpose of this joint committee would be to work with the officials responsible for all our information programs in order that we can begin to build a program based upon long-range objectives and one clearly calculated to both expose and offset the massive propaganda output carried on by the Communist conspirators. The governing spirit of such a joint committee should be that it is one thing to criticize and find fault, but it is still another thing to create a long-range winning program in which the best brains and leadership in this country all play a responsible part.

All of us are heartened by President Eisenhower's advocacy of an enlarged and a more dynamic program for the United States Information Agency. I have no doubt but that Congress, in the face of the present world situation, will support the President in his call for an expanded and more dynamic program for the United States Information Agency. President Eisenhower's recommendation to the leaders of Congress underscores the need for a practical bipartisan approach to building the type of United States international information program demanded by the political offensive of the Russian Communists.

I hope that my resolution will pass in the present session and that we will thereby, in the years ahead, reap a rich reward from the benefits which will certainly come from a constructive, bipartisan approach in the field of international information programs.

I have this evening attempted to lay the cornerstone of a foreign policy that would give practical purpose to our long expressed hope that all the nations enslaved within the Russian colonial empire, will soon again be free and independent. I recommend this program as an expression of my fervent desire that Ukraine and all the other nations enslaved within the Russian Communist empire, will, in the foreseeable future, attain their God-given rights of equity among nations and a position of equality in the family of nations. I remain convinced that there shall be no true and just peace in this world until all nations are free and independent.

The Late Vera Buchanan

SPEECH

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow the Members of the House heard the sad news of the untimely passing of VERA BUCHANAN.

Those of us who knew and admired VERA BUCHANAN as a friend and colleague through the years of her service in the House of Representatives join in expressions of deepest sympathy to the members of her wonderful family in their bereavement.

No one could have more ably served the 30th Congressional District of Pennsylvania than has VERA BUCHANAN. Her un-

selfish devotion to the things she believed in and her untiring efforts on behalf of her constituents have taken her far beyond the usual line of duty. She was gentle, gracious, and courteous at all times and made a deep and abiding impression on all who knew her.

The passing of such a capable Member of Congress leaves us all with a feeling of deep regret and sorrow. It can truly be said in consolation for the loved ones she leaves behind that she earned the esteem and gratitude of all of us, and that she was a faithful and loyal servant of not only her constituents but of our entire country.

Address by Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, at Naturalization Ceremonies in the United States District Court, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief address delivered by me at the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, on January 10, on the occasion of the naturalization ceremony at which about 125 new citizens assumed their citizenship responsibilities.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, I am pleased and honored to be one of the first to welcome you as new citizens and to hail you as fellow Americans.

You have come to the United States from more than 30 countries throughout the world. I find that to be an extraordinary and happy fact. And I see in it a promise of ever-accelerating vitality for this new country of yours.

This great Nation will never become decadent, will never become ingrown and feed upon itself, so long as the strengths, the hopes, the skills, the aspirations and the cultural attainments of new citizens like yourselves continue to enhance its life stream.

You are going through a crucial experience which may not be apparent or entirely comprehensible to the millions of Americans who achieved their citizenship solely through the accident of birth. I think I have some understanding of how you feel as you raise your hands and swear allegiance to the United States.

Some of you came to us from other free, democratic nations because you felt that this country offered you a promise of greater opportunity for yourselves and for your children.

Others among you fled from poverty, persecution and degradation.

No matter what your national origin, no matter what your previous station in life, no matter what your cultural background, you share this in common:

The United States offered a beacon light of hope, to which your eyes were turned long before you set foot on our shores.

No matter how severe the poverty and persecution some of you are leaving behind, it was an emotional strain for you to cut your ties to your homelands. I wish more of our older citizens could comprehend this fact as easily as they can understand the feeling of exhilaration and hope with which you eagerly accepted your new status as Americans.

American citizenship is not given easily, nor should it ever be accepted lightly.

Citizenship bequeathes privileges. Citizenship also demands responsibility. And the greatest responsibility which has devolved upon you today in accepting the rights and privileges of citizenship is to so exercise them as to become evermore responsible citizens.

The complexity of our times throws a heavier and heavier burden upon every citizen. The citizens' responsibility in our times are no longer merely local and confined to his individual community. They are also national and international.

A great American, Benjamin Franklin, used to say that if a man keeps his business, his business will keep him. Nowadays, if a man should attend solely to his business, he might find himself ultimately with no business to which to attend. This is especially true in international affairs. For, as you know better than most native-born Americans, this country is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with a powerful enemy who is determined to subdue all others to his will.

Hence, the citizen must be profoundly concerned with the advances of this enemy and the counteradvances of his own government to meet them. Keep yourselves informed. For the more informed you are the more likely that you will not only act forehandedly but wisely.

Never forget that your new government is much more than just a group of men here in Washington. Government should be, and will be—if we all, new and old citizens, participate alike—a combination of the desires and the spirit and the willingness of all of us.

So long as this admirable spirit prevails among us, our democracy shall retain its continuing vitality and its ability to grapple successfully with questions of the greatest magnitude and complexity.

Fellow Americans, never forget that this is a nation of immigrants. We have drawn upon the diverse races and cultures of the world. Our prosperity and our preeminent place in the world are as much due to our greatest resource—people—as it is to our vast store of physical assets. Immigrants like you have tapped them and, consequently, this Nation has flourished.

Take, for example, the varying nationalities of men who helped the United States to create the first atomic bomb. Among them were men born in Germany, in Hungary, in Denmark, in Italy, and elsewhere. And without their minds and skills one doubts that we could have achieved atomic fission, and certainly not for many years.

Yet I must admit to you quite frankly that this Nation has, in recent years, piled up great difficulties for people from other nations who hope to make their home here. I am convinced that the period of hysteria on which this shortsighted policy is based will pass—as all periods of hysteria in our national life have passed—if those who truly love America and its great tradition of freedom will only act as freemen.

In conclusion, I want to assure you that there are no second-class American citizens. The rights and responsibilities you have just had conferred upon you make you the equal of all other citizens—no matter how many generations ago their forefathers first came to this land.

Enjoy your privileges and rights. Exercise your responsibilities. And welcome most sincerely, fellow Americans.

Brink-of-War Statement Is a Bonanza to Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Lippmann:

"BRINK OF WAR" STATEMENT IS A BONANZA TO RUSSIANS

(By Walter Lippmann)

There is not as yet available any plausible explanation of why Secretary Dulles chose deliberately to have the Life magazine article written about him. For the extraordinary thing about this article is that while it pretends to reveal the inner truths of our recent policy in the Far East, it provides a fundamentally false account.

The falsity lies in this: That Mr. Dulles describes what has happened in Korea, Indochina, and the Formosa strait in terms of unilateral deterrents by the United States. What has really happened is that both sides and all concerned have been held within a condition of mutual deterrent.

Thus, while it is no doubt true that the Communists have been deterred by fear of our retaliation, it is also undoubtedly true that Syngman Rhee, Chiang Kai-shek, Admiral Radford, and those who wanted to intervene in Indochina have been deterred by our fear of Soviet retaliation.

The existence of the military stalemate explains, as Dulles' one-sided account does not explain, the political situation in the contested area on the approaches to China.

The actual condition of mutual deterrent, or military stalemate, was first discerned by Winston Churchill when he learned the results of the hydrogen bomb test. Shortly after that the conclusion was drawn by the President in his famous declaration that there is "no alternative to peace." It was that declaration, which the Russians have since then subscribed to, that led to the first Geneva conference, and was the core of that conference.

Now if there is no alternative to peace, then no one can go to the brink of war in the sense that he threatens to go to war.

If war is not an alternative, then anyone who threatens war is either mad or is bluffing. If war is not an alternative, then issues have to be compromised. If, as Dulles' article implies—though he himself must know better—we were the unilateral deterrers in the Far East, we would have enjoyed a military superiority sufficient to make the Communists give in to us on the issues in dispute. In fact, all we have been able to get has been peace on the basis of the military status quo. Both sides have had to accept peace without victory.

Dulles must come very near to being the first foreign minister who has ever wanted to appear more warlike than in fact he was. Life magazine has painted a picture of a bold and threatening man who has overawed the adversary. The fact is that everybody has been overawed. The Communists have been deterred from aggression beyond the line of the status quo; we have been deterred from liberation beyond that line.

In order to maintain and stabilize that line—at which both sides are deterred—we have not only made known that we would fight if that line were crossed by armed forces, we have also given assurances that

we ourselves will not cross the line in the other direction.

In Indochina we were deterred from intervening with an air strike to save Dien Bien Phu by the fear that China would then intervene openly by invading northern Vietnam. Such an invasion would have required an air bombardment of China to repel it.

That was a course from which we were deterred by the fear that this would cause the Soviet Union to intervene. This is how mutual deterrents work.

In the Formosa strait we gave Chiang a treaty of guaranty which was, as Dulles says, a warning not to attack Formosa. But Dulles has, in his role of melodramatic hero, omitted the other half of the story. The other half is that we then released Chiang firmly, and sent word to Peiping through various diplomatic channels that we would not permit, much less assist, Chiang to attempt to return to the mainland.

In sum, the Eisenhower policy in the Far East has operated—as it had to—within the overall condition of a military stalemate. This has led to a series of compromises—probably temporary—based on the military status quo. What we have done is not glorious. It is merely making the best of things as they are.

The article has done damage to the country and to Dulles' own usefulness as Secretary of State. He has provided the Soviet propaganda with a text which is sheer bonanza.

The exasperating thing about it is that whereas ordinarily we have to contend with untruths that others tell about us, here we have to contend with half-truths that are tantamount to untruths put out by the Secretary of State himself.

Dr. Will W. Alexander

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, on January 18 I spoke briefly of the career of Dr. Will W. Alexander, a wise and good man who died at his home in Chapel Hill, N. C., on January 13. Later I read an editorial tribute to Dr. Alexander by Jonathan Daniels which eloquently expresses appreciation for the significant leadership which he provided. Dr. Alexander's life exemplified the idea that harmonious race relations are achieved by patience, good will, and commonsense, and Mr. Daniels' editorial is a deserved recognition of his remarkable service. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Daniels' statement, which appeared in the Raleigh News and Observer on January 15, 1956:

DR. WILL W. ALEXANDER

It may be that Dr. Will W. Alexander and the time for the need of such a man as he was came to an end together when he died on the little farm of his retirement near Chapel Hill on Friday morning.

In a world which depends much on labels he had been famous for half a century as an "authority on race relations." But at the end of that half-century, as Dr. Alexander probably realized better than most of us, the relations had altered and changed. Indeed, in some respects they had disappeared. What had been relationships of men had become the antagonism of lawyers. And the problems which he had approached with a magnificent combination of love, humor, hardheadedness and common sense seemed only confronted by decree on the one hand and defiance on the other. Between those two there seemed when Dr. Alexander died less room for wisdom and warmheartedness.

Actually, of course, nothing could be further from the truth than such an idea. Dr. Will Alexander's death gives emphasis, never more needed than now, to the truth that real race reations can be established neither in the courtroom nor the legislative hall but at last and lastingly only in the human heart. He himself had understood that from the time when as a young man he retired from the Methodist ministry in Tennessee to become executive director of the Commission on Interracial Cooperation. He applied that understanding as vice president of the Rosenwald Foundation and as administrator of the Farm Security Administration in which last position his concern was not for Negroes as such but for a better chance for all little people on the land.

There never was a man who looked and acted less like a do-gooder than Dr. Alexander. He was never an idealist with his head in the clouds but always one with his feet on the ground. There was never a fanatic gleam in his eyes. No one appreciated more than he the comic aspects of the life and character of some of those he most sought to help—or of those, some of whom he had to bear, who became the pompous or arrogant stuffed shirts of reform. The comic faults in people, both the underprivileged and the overpretentious, never shook his faith. Indeed, his faith in the dignity of man was based upon his loving, often laughing, understanding of man's faults.

Such a man will not soon be an anachronism. Indeed, the need for his counsel to the last days of his life came from far places over the rural telephone line to his farm. Professors and students drove out the highway to sit on his porch or stand beside Dr. Will while he directed the clearing of a cornfield or knelt himself to plant an asparagus bed. In his retirement the wisdom which he possessed and the good will which he exuded never seemed more needed by so many than in his last days when sometimes race relations seemed darker and harder than ever before.

No one knew better than he that he did not have all the answers. In half a century of hard work he had not found them. But he did know, at last as at first, that the only ways to seek them are the ways of the warm heart, the humorous understanding and the wilingness to deal in good will and common sense.

Political Requirements for Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered before the Congress of American Industry, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, at New York City, on December 7, 1955. The subject matter of the address was the political requirements for an expanding American economy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a privilege to be invited as one of the guest speakers at the 60th Congress of American Industry. You represent in considerable measure the economic lifeline of our dynamic American economy.

Let me at the outset give you a few words about my political and economic philosophy, in order that you may better understand the bill of particulars I intend outlining as essential political requirements for an expanding and prosperous economy.

I have great faith and confidence in the political judgment of the American people, and the economic know-how of American industry.

I believe in free and open competition in the market place of commodities, as well as in the market place of ideas. Political and economic freedom cannot endure long without the free exchange of ideas and material goods.

A balanced and orderly free society, however, requires not only competition, but cooperation, between the individuals and segments of that society. This cooperation must embrace not only private individuals and institutions, but also embrace the institutions of government.

The topic assigned for this discussion clearly indicates the widespread recognition of the importance of government in the American economic structure.

Government—Federal, State, and local—and I include all three levels—can act as a creative force, either through positive action or by negative and restraining influence.

Fortunately for the American people, the Constitution of the United States places a direct responsibility on the Government to promote the general welfare. That general welfare relates to the economic welfare of each and every citizen.

The first obligation of government is to be just—to assure equal opportunity for all. With this moral requirement of justice and equal opportunity, it has been necessary in the past, and it will be necessary in the future, for government to use its powers to curb the private exploitation of our human and natural resources, to regulate commerce in the interests of fair and honorable competition, and to assist the underprivileged and those who are the victims of economic and social injustice.

There are those who term such action by government as interference with free enterprise. I respectfully suggest that they are either unmindful of the constitutional requirements of the government to promote the general welfare, or have willfully and wrongfully in interpreted the rules of free enterprise to be synonymous with the code of the jungle.

Freedom is not license, nor is enterprise exploitation.

Free enterprise is a constructive force. It has a social obligation as well as a profit motive.

A political democracy or a constitutional republic cannot long endure when the social and economic needs of the citizenry are sacrificed or ignored. For that reason, the political requirements for prosperity must, above all, include social justice and equal opportunity.

Before looking ahead, it might be wise to look briefly at the past—to place in perspective where we are today. As in most areas of life, there is little that is new—but much to be learned from the past.

We have found it necessary to regulate utilities in the public interest. We now accept the obligation of government to design and administer programs on behalf of conservation of our great land, water, mineral, and timber resources.

We discovered in the late 1800's that competitive enterprise could develop organic

monstrosities in the form of monopolies and trusts. It became necessary for the Government to adopt a body of law, such as the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act, in order to preserve an orderly and responsible competitive enterprise system.

We have witnessed within the past half century unscrupulous speculation in the stock market which seriously threatened the solvency of our entire financial and industrial structure.

Government had to act, to protect the public interest, by establishing the Securities Exchange Commission.

Likewise, the laws and regulations pertaining to our monetary and credit institutions had to be strengthened and revised in order to protect the public from unwise and, at times, unethical financial manipulation. The Government's response was establishment of a Federal Reserve System to assure an adequate credit for a growing economy, and a banking and monetary code to assure fiscal solvency and the confidence of depositors.

Social needs of the American people were recognized in passage of the Social Security Act, the fair labor standards law, and a wide variety of measures dealing with health, welfare, and education.

These are some of the lessons and experiences of the past.

But these public policies also have served us well in recent days and the present. Rather than stifling private enterprise, they have encouraged wholesome development and expansion.

Legislative policies of the past 25 years have greatly assisted in building a strong base for the American economy.

This is a mass-production economy, and mass production requires mass consumption.

This is a consumer's economy, and it can expand and remain prosperous only so long as it is geared to maximum purchasing power.

Every segment of the economy must be afforded an opportunity to share in prosperity.

Here, in my opinion, are the five major political requirements for that kind of prosperity:

1. We must coordinate programs and policies of Federal, State, and local governments, and private groups, within the framework of a free, private, competitive economic system, to insure maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. This means a continuing, effective concern for balanced economic growth and stability; for increased productivity which relates itself not only in an expanding volume of goods and services but also in a higher living standard and wages.

We have embodied this philosophy into public law—the employment Act of 1946. That act places upon Government a responsibility to assure maximum production, maximum employment, and maximum purchasing power. It calls for keeping our economy in balance. This is no idle gesture. It is but further expression of the constitutional mandate to promote the general welfare.

We need full employment and decent wage standards, not only to provide a rising living standard for workers and their families but also to maintain the output of industry and to provide the major incentive for capital-goods expansion. Our machines are no more profitable in their capacity to turn out goods and services than the economic capacity of our consumers to pay for and use those same goods and services.

Encouragement of responsible collective bargaining under law is an essential link to achieving the balance we seek under the Employment Act of 1946. Collective bargaining is labor's response to corporate business structure. We need both—but both without abuse of privilege or power.

We must expand and modernize such built-in safeguards to the economy as our programs of social security and unemployment compensation. Such programs, in effect, are part of our economic life insurance, for which principal and premiums alike must be constantly adjusted to keep pace with growth of our national production and population.

2. We need a tax structure at Federal, State, and local levels that not only meets the standards of social justice based on the principle of ability to pay, but also contributes toward our goal of economic growth and stability. Our Joint Committee on the Economic Report is right now conducting studies and hearings aimed at this very purpose, and I hope from such hearings will flow recommendations which can be enacted to meet this objective.

Personally, I feel that revision of our tax structure in line with these long-term objectives should include both greater allowances for families, thereby stimulating family purchasing power; and a more equitable structure for middle-income groups, who under present laws find it extremely difficult to accumulate reserve capital.

Independent small business cannot grow and expand on credit alone—even liberal credit. It must have the opportunity to reinvest earnings. I know of no better way to restrain the present trend toward monopoly and mergers—a trend that has been accelerated in the past 3 or 4 years.

Unfortunately, the present tax laws are a mosaic of inequities, loopholes, and favoritism. I remind my friends in business that for every special privilege loophole written into our tax laws, someone else must pay the bill through a heavier burden of taxation. The Government needs a certain amount of money for purposes of national security and Government services. If a few are permitted to evade paying their just and fair share of this national bill, then others are compelled to pick up the check. A just and fair tax policy is more than mere tax reduction. It is tax equity.

3. We must stop at once the sharp recession in American agriculture, and by well-directed and designed Government policies restore agriculture to a position of equality in the economic scene.

We need to attack the farm problem on several fronts, including more adequate and effective income protection for farmers through the most workable combinations of price-supporting crop loans, purchases, and possibly production payments; expansion of both domestic and overseas surplus distribution efforts; use of some form of a conservation acreage reserve land-rental plan as an incentive for production adjustments similar to the aid given wartime industry for conversion to peacetime markets; and improved and modernized credit facilities geared to modern mechanized farming's greater cash operating needs.

We must fully recognize the interdependence of all segments of our economy. There is no such thing as long-term prosperity in business and industry if agriculture continues to suffer from drastic income decline and growing indebtedness.

America's farmers are still one of the great potential markets in the world. I suggest that we spend as much time developing American markets as we do foreign markets. Both are important, but the potentialities of a stronger American market offer much greater opportunities to American industry for the immediate future. It is not trite to say that our problem is underconsumption, not overproduction.

A point 5 program to assist the underprivileged and underdeveloped areas of America will yield every bit as constructive a result as a point 4 program in foreign areas.

4. We need a liberal, long-range credit structure with flexibility to meet short-range needs. We can no longer evaluate credit policies on the basis of standards acceptable a generation ago. The amount of outstanding credit must be related to gross national income, and potential maximum production and employment. I am referring not only to commercial credit, but also to consumer and housing credit. Liberal credit terms for home construction may be justified not only in terms of our rapidly expanding economy, but equally so in terms of our rapidly growing population. There is yet another justification—the social values of home ownership.

Consumer credit is the life-line of consumer goods production. Expanded consumer credit becomes dangerous only when the economy slackens, or irresponsibility creeps into its use. Credit, therefore, must be closely related to our objective of increased investment, maximum employment, and economic balance between industry, labor, and agriculture.

Fifth, we must have a continuing long-range development of our natural resources—and encourage peacetime uses of atomic energy as newest of our resources. It is with natural resources in particular that government must play a paramount role. First of all, government is the only agency that can mobilize the manpower and technological resources of the Nation to control the erosion of land, the protection of forests, the harnessing of the rivers for the purpose of flood control, navigation and irrigation. Likewise, if these costs are to be offset in part, the building of hydroelectric facilities is sound economics. Such electrical energy is a new capital resource made available to the American people and to American enterprise, out of resources already belonging to all the people.

Atomic energy is our greatest untapped source of power and potential wealth. Because it is a Government-developed resource, the Government has a direct responsibility to stimulate its peacetime uses for the benefit of all. The Government must not jealously withhold such a resource, but instead share its great potentialities with private industry, with rural-electric cooperatives, and with municipalities.

These, then, ar my basic criteria for political economic policies required for prosperity.

But economic policies alone do not assure a wholesome and healthy environment for an expanding economy.

We still have objectives of social justice to be fulfilled, and social values to consider.

Health, welfare, and education of our American citizens is basic to a dynamic and expanding economy. It would be short-sighted to seek a material prosperity in which such basic human needs were brushed aside.

There are often costs to maintaining full prosperity.

Yet there have been and still will be far higher costs to industry as well as consumers for failing to maintain reasonably balanced growth in our economy.

The 1953–54 recession, measured realistically by lost production and consumption, is estimated to have cost all Americans about $30 billion. This is a loss which is never recovered. It is a mighty big chip out of the log of prosperity. During the 10 years of the great depression and partial recovery, estimates of our accumulated economic loss, due largely to unemployment and industrial idleness along with agricultural decline, ran as high as $600 billion to $700 billion in 1954 prices.

It is these economic facts about which we need to be concerned in considering whatever political and economic measures are required to assure prosperity.

A Government policy of doing too little, too late, of taking halfway measures when dramatic action is required, is false economy.

The question is not so much how much we spend or what tax adjustments we make to insure prosperity, but rather that we do the right thing early enough, and on a large enough scale, to obtain the results we need for our balanced objectives of maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power.

In summary, the key to the success of any of these political requirements for prosperity is a constant alertness, a boldness of vision that refuses to be satisfied with any goals of the past as being satisfactory goals for the future, a determination to act aggressively and quickly on any of these related fronts when action is needed, and a willingness to accept change when change is called for rather than be chained to any dogma of the past.

Civil Service Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a speech by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, which he made January 21, 1956, at a banquet held in the Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C., observing the 73d anniversary of the establishment of the Federal civil service.

Senator JOHNSTON'S speech follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a real pleasure for me to be here tonight and join with you in observance of the 73d anniversary of the establishment of the Federal civil service.

I think you will agree with me that we have come a long way since 1883—when the Civil Service Act was first signed into law—the purpose of which was to make Government service attractive to able men and women who wished to make the public service a career.

I am equally confident you will agree that from time to time the road has not always been an easy one—that on occasions the rate of progress and record of accomplishments have not always been as accelerated or productive as we would have liked.

We all can recall very recent instances of roadblocks that have been erected to slow down and even untrack the civil service system.

Yet—today our civil-service system is given almost unanimous public acceptance. Any thinking man or woman—in the Federal service or outside—is well aware that the caliber, integrity, and ability of the great rank and file of our career Government employees are not merely above reproach, but are outstanding.

I know that all of us are constantly acknowledging the progress and achievements of private industry.

But how many of us are familiar with, or even aware of the record of contributions by Federal workers to this amazing parade of industrial progress.

Private industry and management are thoroughly aware of it.

Hardly a day passes that some industry representative or technician, from almost any field of endeavor one cares to mention, is not seeking guidance and help from Government experts—career employees.

Unfortunately, my dear friends, despite its wide acceptance, there has been—and only too recently—a disposition in some quarters to discredit the civil-service system and Government employees. We noted with considerable alarm—efforts, blazingly unfolding before our very eyes, to wreck the civil-service law, throw out thousands of loyal, competent employees, and return Federal employment to the chaotic political spoils system from which it had emerged some 73 years ago.

Tampering with the public career service should not be entered into lightly. Certainly it is not an undertaking to be attempted by any political party.

It was my great pleasure to appear also at last year's civil-service anniversary observance.

At that time I expressed my deep concern over the misleading, unfair and un-American operation of the administration's so-called security program for Federal employees. I referred to the reporting of security statistics as the numbers game.

It is now 1 year later. And tonight, my friends, I think I can say with calm assurance that the American people have at long last been given the facts.

The record is now clear.

Swept away is the smokescreen of political intrigue and deliberate confusion.

No longer will anyone be taken in by politically motivated, deliberate misleading and unwarranted attacks on Federal employees. Not only has the web of confusion been swept aside, but exposure of repeated injustices to loyal, patriotic, competent employees has made those in charge of this program of planned deception more cautious and less eager to smear, without cause, the reputations of employees they wanted to be rid of for reasons which were solely political and had not the slightest relationship to national security.

I am happy to be able to say that our investigation of the security program has resulted in making the air in Washington somewhat cleaner this year.

In this respect, I want to take just a moment to pay tribute to the press, particularly the reporters in Washington, D. C. True to their finest traditions, they were not fooled by the political camouflage. They probed deep and exposed to public opinion the injustices, the outrages which were being attempted in the name of national security.

I have stated many times before—and I repeat it again—that politics are, and should be, a basic part of the operations of our Government, whether it be on a National, State, or local level. They are an integral part of the two-party system which has made the economic and social health of our great country so sound and progressive.

And it follows that patronage jobs are an elementary part of our political system. However, I say most emphatically, that the practice of patronage jobs should be confined only—and solely—to positions of topmost or policymaking level.

I am unalterably opposed to the philosophy that has sprung up during the last 2 or 3 years of claiming all Government jobs as political plums. That eligibility for Federal employment be considered on the basis of party affiliation and contributions. I am opposed to this type of job clearance or approval for either party—Democrat or Republican.

When the 84th Congress convened a year ago, the morale of the Federal career service was at low tide. The service had been visited by patronage raids and jobs both high and low were under scrutiny for merger with schedule A, B, or C.

The pay raise approved by Congress with enthusiasm only a few months earlier had evaporated like the morning dew with the rising of the sun.

Several administration bills enacted by the 83d Congress were found to be deficient or unworkable. Career employees were well aware of the frigid atmosphere sweeping down upon them from above.

In that setting there is little wonder that the future seemed dark and void of any real chance of improvement short of another 2 years.

When I stood here on this platform 1 year ago, I promised you that the 84th Congress had drawn a plan of definite objectives for strengthening and reestablishing the civil-service laws toward the purpose for which they were created—as well as generally improving the lot of Federal workers.

They were not idle words, nor empty promises.

The recorded accomplishments of the 1st session of the 84th Congress are unsurpassed and unparalleled in American legislative history.

We did not choose to wait for 2 years but moved with dispatch to improve immediately the lot of the Federal career employee by approving an unprecedented number of beneficial, needed, and workable measures.

Among such enactments were:

A bill to provide pay increases to career employees under the Classification Act of 1949.

A bill to increase the pay and provide other benefits to our postal employees.

These two pay bills marked the third attempt on the part of Congress to obtain a pay increase for Federal employees—for on two previous occasions similar bills were snuffed out by Presidential veto.

Additionally, the 84th Congress approved:

A bill to amend the Employees Uniform Allowance Act so as to make its benefits available to all employees who are required to wear a prescribed uniform.

A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act to protect the policies of thousands of Federal employees who were members of various beneficial associations.

A bill to require the Civil Service Commission to grant career appointments to a large number of employees who were denied conversion under the administration's program.

A bill to give persons now retired or who retire in the near future benefits equal to the increase in pay given to active Federal employees.

A bill providing for the purchase of bonds at Government expense to cover officers and employees.

The 84th Congress also approved:

A bill to increase travel allowances and a number of other measures of importance to certain groups of Federal emlpoyees.

I believe there is rather general agreement that the list of accomplishments during the 1st session of the 84th Congress in behalf of the carreer service is an imposing one.

But let me hasten to add that much is yet to be desired and I am so bold as to predict here and now that much will be accomplished during this, the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

We have established a group of experts to study the Civil Service Commission and its administration of the civil service law. To assist in this endeavor, I am inviting five outstanding Americans to volunteer their services as advisors and consultants to the committee for this study. I am happy to announce that your own president—my good friend and advisor Jim Campbell—has agreed to represent the Federal employee groups on this Advisory Council. The committee will make its report and recommendations later in the year.

This is also an appropriate time and occasion to announce that public hearings on S. 2875, the bill I introduced to revise the Civil Service Retirement Act from stem to stern, will be held February 1, 2, and 3.

It is my hope that the bill can be reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee within a few days after conclusion of the hearings and then be called up for consideration in the Senate soon thereafter.

The bill has many good features, some of the more important of which are:

1. It raises the factor for the computation of annuities for employees generally from 1½ to 2 percent.

2. It permits optional retirement after 30 years of service regardless of age under a vastly more favorable reduction formula for each year the employee is under the age of 60 at the time of retirement.

3. It provides for immediate annuities to employees who are separate through no fault of their own with 25 years of service regardless of age and to employees with 20 years of service who are 50 years of age or older.

4. It establishes minimum benefits for employees retired because of total disability.

5. It provides automatic cost-free annuities to surviving spouses up to one-half of the first $4,000 of an employee's annuity.

6. It increases the benefits payable to surviving children by one-third.

Finally, the bill corrects many inequities in a number of areas.

In conclusion I wish to express the hope that during the current session of the 84th Congress we will be successful in obtaining enactment of:

1. Legislation to provide health insurance to Federal employees on a joint Government-employee-contributory basis.

2. Legislation to guard against unjustified salary cuts as a result of the downgrading of an employee's position.

3. Legislation to provide longevity increases to wage-board employees.

4. Legislation to provide proper employee union recognition.

5. Legislation to redirect, reorganize, and revitalize the Civil Service Commission to the end that it once again will measure up to its responsibility as chief architect and protector of the civil-service merit system.

Any contribution I can make to the enactment of the legislation program outlined above is more than justified on the basis of the contribution made by our body of career employees toward making ours the greatest Government on the face of the earth.

I thank you.

Chance for Gas Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Times-Picayune of January 20, 1956:

CHANCE FOR GAS BILLS

Washington reports say the chances of Senate passage of the Harris-Fulbright bills relieving several thousand natural-gas producers of the incubus of Federal regulation, are 50–50 or better. On the showdown, due next week on the Senate floor, we hope the results are so decisively in favor of the bills that the question of applying Government regulation in this field where it doesn't belong will not come up again soon. The House passed the Harris bill last summer.

The Federal Power Commission got into producer price regulation of gas against its own will through the Supreme Court interpretation in 1954 of a 1938 law. Much of Congress itself was surprised to learn from the Court that it intended to regulate producer prices when it passed the pipeline regulatory bill.

Of course there is no excuse for regulation. The number of producers, varying from time to time, has been figured at about 2,100 to 4,000. There seems to be no question of plenty of competition in selling the gas both locally and to the interstate pipelines.

Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and some of his confreres have made much ado about the possibility of Southwestern producers holding the householders of the North in price captivity, charging them what they choose. That is ridiculous not only because the thousands of producers are in competition but also because the price of gas at the wellhead is only about 10 percent of what the ultimate consumer pays. What is more, the interstate pipelines have to show that they have a market and have contracts for a long-term supply of gas before they can get a permit to build a line.

There seems to be wide agreement that one principal effect of regulation at the wellhead is to discourage exploration and cut down the total supply of gas. That is anything but a help to the consumer. Senator FULBRIGHT and others have pointed out that another major effect would be to virtually guarantee the earnings of the pipeline distributors. Apparently that would be so where the FPC fixed a wellhead gas price lower than that named in the long-term contracts of the pipelines.

So far as big-producer States like Louisiana and Texas are concerned, regulation holds no particular terrors. Gas for intrastate transport and use is not subject to FPC rule. These States can use their gas at home and there will be plenty of it for local consumption regardless of the effect of Federal regulation on wildcatting. But failure to eliminate the wellhead price control would hurt the industry. Moreover the creeping extension of Federal controls into areas of economy where there is no good excuse for it should be stoutly resisted. To allow it makes for more regimentation, more expensive government, and more drag on our economy.

D'Ewart Is Well Qualified to Serve as Assistant Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ORVIN B. FJARE
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the excellent qualifications of Mr. Wesley A. D'Ewart for the position as Assistant Secretary of the Interior. A brief résumé of his varied activities follows:

CONSERVATION AND LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND OF WESLEY A. D'EWART, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR FOR PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

More than four decades of firsthand experience with natural resource conservation and development were brought to the Department of the Interior by Wesley A. D'Ewart, of Montana, who on October 6, 1955, was sworn in as Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management.

This experience dates from 1912, when he became a forest ranger, until 1955, when he served as a Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, which position he left to accept the appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Interior. During the intervening years, Mr. D'Ewart engaged in ranching in Montana, was a member of the State legislature, a member of the State College Advisory Committee, president of the Absaroka Conservation Committee and a Member of Congress. As a rancher he put together a cattle operation which he still owns and which is managed by his son. On this property he carried out the best soil and water conservation practices, reseeding at his own expense over 1,000 acres of his range, building a water storage reservoir and carefully managing his grasslands so as to greatly increase their productivity.

As a member of the Montana State Legislature's House of Representatives for 3 terms and of the State senate for 2 terms, Mr. D'Ewart served on committees concerned with resource development and management. Montana has a State water conservation board that has a national reputation for the development of small water and irrigation projects. Mr. D'Ewart took an active interest in this and supported legislation and appropriations to strengthen the work this agency was doing. During this time he was instrumental in organizing and was first president of the Montana Reclamation Association. This association has taken a very active part in supporting the State Water Board and the Bureau of Reclamation in developing the water resources of Montana. Montana has 5 million acres of State-owned land. Mr. D'Ewart as a member of the State legislature, made a study of their management and operation and sponsored legislation to improve their operation.

Mr. D'Ewart was elected to the United States Congress in a special election in 1945, and served continuously until January 1955. Throughout this decade in Congress, Mr. D'Ewart was a member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or its earlier counterparts. This committee is charged with the conservation, development, and operation of the vast Federal public domain of the United States and its Territories. As a member of this committee he made official visits to many of the national parks, and Indian reservations ranging from Alaska to Florida. On committee business, he toured Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands, and became familiar with matters affecting those areas which came within his jurisdiction as Assistant Secretary.

As a Member of Congress Mr. D'Ewart made many positive and constructive contributions to conservation and land management. In the 83d Congress alone he introduced, and the Congress enacted, nine bills to protect, enlarge, and improve the management of the national parks. Despite his advocacy of reduced spending in almost every Federal activity, Mr. D'Ewart testified, debated, and voted in favor of increased appropriations for the National Park Service and the Forest Service in every session of Congress during his term of office. In 1954, when the Atomic Energy Act amendments were about to be passed, it

was Mr. D'Ewart who rushed through a last-minute amendment to protect the national parks from uranium prospecting. It was a D'Ewart bill which, by authorizing the National Park Service to obtain by exchange some 10,000 acres of State-owned land inside the boundaries of Glacier National Park, will enable the National Park Service to preserve the integrity of the park. For this action he received the thanks of all of the major wildlife and conservation groups, as well as the Department of the Interior itself.

Mr. D'Ewart has been a stalwart proponent of the wildlife refuge system. During the last session in which Mr. D'Ewart was a Member of Congress, he introduced what many conservationists regard as an outstanding bill to facilitate the management of our wildlife refuges. The bill provided also for an increase in the number of refuges by establishing a new Division of Duck Stamp Fees, which would provide funds for administration of the areas. The bill he first introduced was the basis for legislation pending in the present Congress.

One of the most important conservation measures enacted into law in recent years was Public Law 167. This law corrects the widespread abuses of the mining laws, particularly in the national forests. While in Congress, Mr. D'Ewart introduced and held hearings on a bill intended to end these abuses of the mining laws. Although his bill was not enacted, the attention it brought and the information brought forth in its consideration were beneficial and led to the introduction of a bill similar in form and intent which became law in the 84th Congress. As Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. D'Ewart also contributed importantly to the enactment of this legislation.

While a Congressman, Mr. D'Ewart was a member of the National Forest Reservation Commission, which has the important duty of blocking out national forest holdings by purchase of private lands lying within or adjacent to them. He gave much time to this program and was instrumental in obtaining expanded appropriations for it.

Mr. D'Ewart is one of the best informed men in the Nation on Indian affairs. He was one of those who was instrumental in the development of the Navaho-Hopi rehabilitation program, and has contributed to the enactment of other progressive measures in this field. While striving to safeguard the interests of those Indians desiring to remain on reservations, he has at the same time supported programs designed to provide increasing opportunities for those Indians who want to separate themselves from any special relationships with the Federal Government.

During his term in office, Mr. D'Ewart sponsored a number of measures, which Congress enacted, to improve public-land management in the Department of the Interior. Among these was the amendment to the Recreation Act, which permits the lease for a long term or the sale or donation of areas of the public domain having recreational value to nonprofit organizations, such as the Boy Scouts.

Assigned to the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management are a vast and almost infinitely varied scope of responsibilities for conservation and development of the Nation's natural and human resources.

Under his direction are five key bureaus of the Department of the Interior—the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Office of Territories, and the Bureau of Land Management.

In supervising these 5 agencies, the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management directs the activities of more than 27,000 Department of the Interior employees, or more than half of the Department's total number. He is responsible for the custody or management of almost a billion acres of land; the welfare of 400,000 Indians; the administration of 176 national parks, monuments, and similar areas, the administration of 5 territories, numerous island possessions, and 96 trust territory island units; and the conservation of vital fish and wildlife resources.

Some indication of the responsibilities vested in Mr. D'Ewart as the Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management:

The Bureau of Land Management has exclusive jurisdiction over 486 million acres of unappropriated, unreserved public lands, varying degrees of responsibility for 300 million acres of reserved lands, and administrative jurisdiction over 58 million acres of acquired lands. This is a total land area of 826 million acres.

Land responsibilities of the Department of the Interior are varied. The Bureau of Land Management, for example, not only issues leases on public lands and processes withdrawals, but under the mining and mineral leasing laws it leases the minerals on public domain lands. An important phase of this latter activity in recent months has been the conduct of lease sales on the outer Continental Shelf, the first three of which returned more than a quarter of a billion dollars to the Federal Treasury in bonus bid payments and first year rentals.

Through the granting of grazing permits, the Bureau has numerous range responsibilities. It also carries out sustained yield forest management of timberlands under its jurisdiction.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is responsible for 53 million acres of Indian land held in trust by the United States. It manages 300 reservations or similar areas located in 25 States. Activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs include: Acting as trustee with respect to Indian lands and money and assisting the owners in making the most effective use of their lands; providing public services where needed; furnishing guidance and assistance to those Indians who wish to leave reservation areas; and collaborating with the Indian people in the development of programs leading toward full-fledged Indian responsibility for the management of their own property and affairs as well as the gradual transfer of public service responsibilities to the agencies which normally provide these services for non-Indian citizens.

The National Park Service administers 21,898,000 acres of Federal land in 176 national park system areas as well as 2,020,000 acres in 5 areas administered for other Federal agencies. It is responsible for the protection of natural and historical areas while providing for their use and enjoyment by the public.

The areas over which the Office of Territories has jurisdiction cover 582,000 square miles and include a population of 3 million. It guides and coordinates operating programs designed to promote the economic and political development of the areas under the jurisdiction of the United States. The office supervises and directs the operations of the Alaska Railroad and the Alaska Road Commission, and conducts public works construction programs in the Virgin Islands.

The Fish and Wildlife Service administers 264 national wildlife refuges in 42 States, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, and 89 fish hatcheries in 42 States. The total land area administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service aggregates nearly 18 million acres. Its activities embrace the conservation of North American waterfowl; the administration of laws governing commercial fishing; programs for the maintenance of fresh water fisheries; the control of injurious species; and programs for fish and wildlife restoration.

Address by Hon. Clarence J. Brown, of Ohio, at Salute-to-Eisenhower Dinner, Wilmington, Del.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address given by the Honorable CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio, at a salute-to-Eisenhower dinner held in Wilmington, Del., on January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, it was with genuine pleasure that I accepted the invitation of your splendid chairman of this dinner, Barton Feroe, to come to Wilmington tonight to address the Republicans of Delaware, for my appearance here has given me the opportunity to see many old friends. I am always happy to appear on any platform with your great United States Senator, JOHN WILLIAMS, a man whose civic courage is unsurpassed in the Nation. He has contributed much to bring about honesty and decency in the affairs of Government.

It is also pleasing to come to the State which gave to our national life such outstanding legislators and statesmen as my old friends, Dan Hastings and John Townsend. Both gentlemen were, and still are, giants in governmental affairs. Both were outstanding leaders during their service in the United States Senate, and were so recognized far and wide.

Then, too, it is a real pleasure to come to the State of which my longtime friend, and

former colleague in the House of Representatives, Caleb Boggs, is the able and distinguished Governor. He has given a splendid account of his stewardship during the time he has occupied the Governor's chair. Under his direction your State has enjoyed good government, great prosperity, and almost fantastic growth. Delaware is today the fastest-growing State east of the Mississippi River, with the possible exception of Florida, where I understand they count the tourists. Delaware ranks fifth in the Nation, but even more important, it ranks first in the United States, in the percentage of its citizens who are gainfully employed, and last or lowest in the percentage of those who are unemployed. It is not difficult for any person who wants to work, to find a job at good pay, here in the State of Delaware. Such a condition springs not only from good government on the State, national, and local levels, but also as the result of forward-looking and enlightened industrial and business leadership within your State. And to add to my pleasure is the opportunity it affords for me to renew my friendship with your efficient State chairman, Ed Duffy, who has given to Delaware an effective Republican organization. There is none better in the land.

So I salute you—the political, civic, and industrial leaders of this great State of Delaware, in your forward march toward the fulfillment of your destiny.

We are here tonight to participate with thousands of other Republicans in the more than 60 salute-to-Eisenhower dinners which, at this very moment, are being held across the width and breadth of this land to pay tribute to one of the greatest Presidents this Republic has ever had—Dwight David Eisenhower. Like the immortal Washington, he was first in war when the forces of cruel dictatorship threatened our continued liberties and, in fact, our very existence. Like Washington, he has been and is first in peace, for no one has waged a more valiant battle for the cause of world peace than has our warrior chieftan of World War II—now the President of the United States—Dwight D. Eisenhower. And may I add, ladies and gentlemen, that like the first President of this Republic, Dwight David Eisenhower today comes first in the hearts of his fellowmen. It is due more to his efforts than to those of any other human being in this world, that the guns are now quiet on every battlefront and military planes no longer drop their cargoes of death and destruction.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, as a candidate for President in 1952, told the war-wearied people of the United States and the world that if he were elected he would go to Korea and do what he could to bring an end to the fighting there. There were those who argued, in the height of the campaign, that Mr. Eisenhower was playing politics—that he did not mean what he said. But he kept that promise—just as he has kept every other promise he has ever made. The guns in Korea were silenced in late July of 1953, less than 6 months after Mr. Eisenhower assumed the Presidency of the United States. Nowhere in the world tonight are American boys fighting and dying. True, they stand on guard tonight in many places in this troubled world to protect the security of their beloved country; but they are not being called upon to kill or be killed. Today, under the leadership of a gallant warrior and great statesman—our beloved President—our national defense is stronger; our people are more secure; and the outlook for world peace is brighter, than at any time since World War I first began.

So in the field of international affairs, Dwight D. Eisenhower has brought peace to the United States and hope to the world. While it is an uneasy peace we enjoy, it is a stronger, more secure one than we have had for many years. Under his leadership the people of a free world have united in a determination that the freedom of their governments, and of their individual citizens, shall be maintained and preserved.

On the home front the President we salute tonight has brought a reformation in our governmental affairs that is almost unbelievable. Above all else he has given us honesty and decency in Government. And only those who have served in Washington under past administrations can understand and appreciate the importance of the flat statement I have just made. The ever-recurring scandals of former years suddenly came to an end when Dwight D. Einsenhower became President, for he brought to Washington with him men of outstanding character and ability, all as part of a team, to help in the gigantic task of remolding and redirecting the affairs of state.

Not only did Ike bring honesty to Washington, but efficiency and economy, as well. For the first time in many years the budget will be balanced this fiscal year, and again next. Federal expenditures have been reduced during the Eisenhower administration by approximately $10 billion a year. The work of Government is being conducted more efficiently and effectively than ever before, with 175,000 less employees on the public payroll. We have a stronger national defense today—with less manpower—than at any time since World War II ended.

During these first 3 years of the Eisenhower administration the Nation has enjoyed the greatest peacetime prosperity in all human history—a prosperity which has been established upon a sound basis. Business and industry have been freed of costly, worrisome controls, and our national economy has been placed, and maintained, up a high level. Needs of the workingman have been met, and his rights protected and furthered, without bending the knee to corrupt labor bosses, or the placing of unfair or undue burdens upon his employer.

As President Eisenhower starts the fourth year of his administration today, he is in a position where his opponents dare not attack him personally, or his record. Instead they deal in generalities to make such charges as—and I quote: "The Cabinet is made up of millionaires," and "the Eisenhower administration favors the rich against the little man," and so on, ad nauseum.

Perhaps it may be well to look at the record. For 20 years before Mr. Eisenhower came to office we had one party doing a lot of talking about "the forgotten man," and how much it would do for "the little man." I cannot help but wonder if public memory is as short as some people would like us to believe. I do not believe the average wage earner has forgotten what went on during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations, and especially during the postwar years, under Truman, or the effect such activities actually had on his—the wage earner's pocketbook.

All of you here tonight, along with every wage earner, can remember the famous cost-of-living wage increases which came about under the Truman administration, and how our Fair Deal friends boasted of what they were doing for the workingman. If I recall correctly, there were five rounds of those so-called cost-of-living wage increases. Now I ask you, why were they called cost-of-living wage increases? The answer is simple. It is: That the Truman administration deliberately sponsored one of the most terrific periods of inflation this or any other country has ever endured. Between the end of World War II and the end of the Truman administration, the cost of living increased 47.4 percent. Just think of it. I repeat, under the Truman administration, the cost of living increased almost 50 percent—47.4 percent, to be exact. Do you wonder that the American workingman had to have five rounds of such so-called cost-of-living wage increases?

The truth is, the Truman administration had the American workingman on a treadmill. Or, to put it another way, it reminds me of the story about the farmer dangling an ear of corn on a pole just out of reach of his mule's mouth, just to keep him running.

Now let's take a look at the record of the Republican Party and Mr. Eisenhower's administration since he took office 3 years ago today. Let's see what our party and our President have done for the average workingman, or for the little man, if you please.

Inflation under the Truman administration has been stopped dead in its tracks by the sound Republican policies put into effect under the Eisenhower administration. In the 3 years we Republicans have been in power nationally the cost of living in the United States of America has increased less than 1 percent, as compared to the astounding 47.4-percent increase which took place, to the detriment of all, during the 7 years of Truman.

And now, get this: While we were checking inflation, the wise policies put into effect by the Eisenhower administration made it possible for our working people to get wage increases—real wage increases—not phony cost-of-living wage increases. Should you believe this to be only my personal opinion, let me cite my source of information. It is the American Federation of Labor. That great labor organization, in its monthly research report, volume 8, No. 2, issued in February of last year, stated that wage increases—and I quote—"were almost entirely over and beyond the amount needed to compensate for the cost of living." In other words, the AFL disclosed in its official report, that wage increases during 1954 represented the greatest gain in real wages since World War II. And they pointed out that those wage increases had been gained with fewer hours and less work-time loss through strikes, than in any year in recent history.

I repeat, my source of information is the American Federation of Labor. Do you wonder, ladies and gentlemen, that George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor, said publicly, just a few months later, at a luncheon at the Washington Press Club—and I quote—"Yes, right now we never had it so good."

Let's take one more look at this whole matter of real wage increases. The pre-Eisenhower peak in real wage earnings was $61.28 during the year of 1944, which was the height of World War II. With peace under the Truman administration real wages plummeted nearly $10 a week and did not start back up again until the Korean war had begun. In the last year of the Truman administration real weekly earnings, with the Korean war going full force, averaged only $59.89.

But under President Eisenhower and the Republican Party, in peacetime, with none of our boys fighting and dying, real earnings of the American workers have climbed each year to set a yearly new all-time high, with the result that the latest official figure or real wage is $68.32 per week. I call this doing something for the little man instead of just talking about how much will be done for him, don't you?

But let's look at the matter in another way. Some of our friends of the opposition try to tell us everything is being done for the rich by this administration and nothing for the average American. Well, according to the United States Treasury we have approximately 9,000 millionaires in the United States, out of 168 million people. Last year the motor-car industry of America produced and sold over 8 million automobiles. Now you and I know that the 9,000 millionaires have not bought all of them. At least 8 million motor cars were sold to the little men of the country in 1955. During the past 3 years of the Republican administration, approximately 4½ million new homes have been built in the United States. Now I don't believe anyone can tell you that the 9,000 millionaires in this country are

occupying all of those 4½ million homes. Neither are they looking at the 30 million television sets, or using all of the millions of refrigerator and deep-freezes, automatic washers and dryers, and all of the many other appliances which make modern living so much better than it was a few short years ago.

Now the truth is Mr. Meany was right in his Press Club speech. The little man has never had it so good as under the Eisenhower administration.

Of course, that is not all of the story, by any means. The Republican Party under the leadership of President Eisenhower can list scores of other things it has done in the interest of the little man. For example: 10 million more workers have been brought under old age and survivor benefits of the Social Security system, while at the same time the actual amount of retirement benefits has been increased for all. Unemployment coverage has been extended to 4 million additional American workers. Draft calls have been reduced. And let me emphasize that no American boy is being drafted today to be maimed or killed in a futile war.

Taxes have been cut by 10 percent on the average. Numerous benefits have come to the average citizen in the way of reduced excise taxes, and other helpful tax law provisions have been voted. For example, 2,100,000 working mothers can now deduct $600 annually from their income tax report for child-care expense; 1,300,000 parents have been given an additional deduction of $600 where a dependent child earns more than his $600 exemption yer year; 1,800,000 retired people have been given an additional $1,200 annual retirement exemption from taxes, and 8,500,000 families get larger medical expense deductions than ever before, all thanks to the Republican Congress and a Republican President cooperating on the gigantic job of revising and rewriting the Nation's internal revenue laws for the benefit of the average American—the so-called little man.

And on the economic front, let me point out that in the year of 1955 our national product reached the grand total of more than $390 billion. The total of our individual incomes last year was $302 billion. More than 65 million Americans were gainfully employed in December of 1955, and less than 2 million were unemployed, mostly for reasons of their own.

So, if I may use the same sort of an expression as did that great leader of American labor, George Meany—Never did America have it so good as under the Republican administration headed by the man we salute here tonight—our President—Dwight David Eisenhower.

For many weeks now all Americans—and in fact thoughtful persons all over the world in every land and clime—have been concerned over the state of the President's health. There are very few human beings who do not know that in late September the man we honor tonight suffered a heart attack out in Denver, which incapacitated him for some time.

I cannot tell you tonight the condition of the President's heart, but I do know one think—he has a heart. Not since our Party a 100 years ago gave to the Nation the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, have we had a President more humane—more interested in the welfare of his fellow men, more religious in mind and nature, more ready and willing to take his difficulties and the troubles of his country to Almighty God in prayer, than the present Chief Executive of the United States, our beloved Dwight David Eisenhower. We know—not as Republicans but as Americans—that he is a good man, that he is a trustworthy man, that he is a man of faith and of courage; that he bears good will toward all men, and that he is dedicated to the pursuit of peace. May all of us here tonight, each in our own way, say a silent prayer that God in his wisdom may strengthen and renew the gallant fighting heart of our President so that he may continue to give to us and to the world the enlightened leadership which has been his during the past years.

So here tonight, not as Republicans alone, but as a grateful people, we give our salute to Eisenhower.

Petition for Arms to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a petition from a group of constituents of my district urging my intercession with the Department of State to make available arms to the State of Israel in its present crisis.

I am wholeheartedly in support of the views expressed in the petition. I shall do everything possible to bring to the attention of the State Department the urgent need for sending arms to Israel in order to safeguard its existence as an independent state. In the very near future I hope to introduce a resolution in Congress along these lines, and at that time I shall express my views in greater detail.

In the meantime, I am inserting into the RECORD the following petition of my constituents and the names of the individuals signing the petition:

To the Honorable Congressman VICTOR ANFUSO:

DEAR SIR: As the distinguished representative of our district we as American citizens appeal to you to bring to the attention of the State Department, that the course being pursued now poses a great threat to the very existence of Israel.

Our country being the first to recognize Israel as an independent country must consistently feel the responsibility to help protect its existence as well as its borders. Russia and her satellites for their own selfish and imperialistic reasons are rapidly arming Israel's enemies. Is the United States going to sit idly by and watch this young country which gave asylum to thousands of homeless and helpless people, this little country that has been a bulwark against communism, the only democracy in that region, being wiped off the face of the earth?

Our country since its very beginning has been a guiding light and a tower of strength to people all over the world, who chose to live the democratic way of life. Our tradition has always been to give them help and comfort in their struggle for freedom. Can we then, now deny to Israel the arms she so sorely needs to protect herself and her very existence?

Therefore we strongly urge and pray that you use your influence in Congress to see that justice is done. A policy of appeasement that did not work in Munich with Hitler will not work with Nasser.

Your efforts will be greatly appreciated and remembered by your constituents.

Sincerely and respectfully,

Abraham Lipson, Benzion Pfeffer, Shea Edelstein, Nathan Greneman, Hyman Lurie, William Goldberg, H. Schmell, Benj. Furman, Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Hoffman, David Sabath, Joseph Itzkowitz, Chane Pomerantz, A. Wolpinsky, Louis Kronowitz, H. Schwartz, Abram Leverkoop, Sam Peisner, David Turkish, Joseph Lanter, P. Weiner, O. L. Weiner, Mary Postofsky, Jean Peisner, D. Winter, M. Winter, I. Siegel, Abraham Weidberg, Mrs. Rae Greif, Jack Greif, Mrs. R. Lipson, Pauline Shneider, Jean Behar, Mrs. S. Peltz, Mrs. F. Pavany, R. Kieval, A. Sternblitz, M. Krawitz, L. Prager, R. Heslowitz, I. Shneider, H. W. Halpert, Maurice H. Kronowitz, Rabbi Elchanan W. Weitz, Hyman Peltz, Joseph Weinberg, Mrs. N. A. Posner, Mrs. E. Zureback, Irving Hirsch, Frank K. Wainawski, Irving Rosner, Gussie Citrin, William Meyer, Samuel Mishkin, Hyman Fischberger, Sylvia Fischberger.

Hells Canyon Giveaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the award of a license to the Idaho Power Co. for the construction of three low dams on the Snake River in Idaho unmasks the lack of regard by the Federal Power Commission for the principle of comprehensive, multipurpose development of our great Columbia River system.

The power partnership envisioned by this administration holds forth no partnership whatsoever. The partnership proposal has meant, instead, the use of administrative authority to block all further power development except where private utilities were cut in for all or most of the profits therefrom.

I offer for the RECORD a letter to the editor of the publication Public Power from Mr. Samuel Moment, of Portland, Oreg., formerly chief economist of the Bonneville Power Administration, which documents the destructive effect of this giveaway program.

The letter follows:

HELLS CANYON GIVEAWAY

PORTLAND, OREG., *September 21, 1955.*

The bitter truth of the giveaway of Hells Canyon Dam was virtually admitted yesterday by the Army engineers in the hearing on John Day Dam. The Board of Engineers rejected the request of private utilities for a low John Day Dam because it meant giving up 1,500,000 acre-feet of flood-control storage possible from a high John Day Dam. General Foote observed that we are losing what we had contemplated in Hells Canyon, referring to the loss of 2,800,000 acre-feet of storage resulting from acceptance of the Idaho Power Co. three-dam scheme by the Federal Power Commission, instead of the bigger Federal Hells Canyon Dam.

And so the engineers were instructed to restudy the matter, and see whether they can get storage elsewhere. Maybe they will look again at the Paradise Dam site on the Clark Fork where 5 million acre-feet of storage will be thrown away because the Montana Power Co. wants three lows dams in a repeat performance of the Hells Canyon case. Maybe the engineers will look to Mica Creek in Canada where 10 million acre-feet of storage will be thrown away because of opposition by Washington Water Power, Idaho Power, and former Idaho Governor Len Jordan, of the

Joint International Commission. And maybe the engineers will find that the simplest method of flood control for the lower Columbia River will be to let the Canadians divert most of the water on the Upper Columbia into the Fraser River, and also divert from the United States a few million kilowatts of electric power, and a few hundred thousand jobs.

That is the crime of Hells Canyon, the destruction of the principle of full development of the river. Out of that destruction has come a quarrel for bits and pieces—partial development at Paradise, partial development at John Day, and friction with our Canadian neighbors over storage proposals on the Upper Columbia in British Columbia. All this under the shadow of the worst floods in the history of New England. All this under the shadow of the 1952 worst flood on the Missouri. All this in the shadow of the right way to do things, the "308" Army Report in 1948 on the Columbia River system, born out of the brightest period in Northwest history when a Federal program of full development was under way at Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Hungry Horse, with McNary, Chief Joseph, and The Dalles ready to follow, and Hells Canyon and others to have come later, bringing more of the industries.

All this because of the power-partnership plan, advocated by certain private utilities, and made into a political issue. Too bad that those who are destroying the principle of full conservation have no responsibility for replacing the jobs, the flood control, and the greater prosperity they would take away from the Northwest.

SAMUEL MOMENT,
Former Chief Economist, Bonneville Power Administration.

Address by Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, at the Salute to Eisenhower Dinner at Louisville, Ky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, in the many speeches lauding our great President, last week, there were hundreds of references to the many accomplishments of his administration. One of the finest tributes, however, was paid by Maryland's Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, in speaking of the personal character of Mr. Eisenhower. "Like George Washington," said Governor McKeldin, President Eisenhower is human and "therefore he can make mistakes. But his strongest opponents do not believe that it is in him to be shifty, or treacherous, or cowardly, or mean." That point and others made by Governor McKeldin, during his speech in Louisville, Ky., are so worthy of consideration that I ask unanimous consent to have the entire address of Governor McKeldin inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I propose to speak of you of Eisenhower. Not the President of the United States, not the world statesman, not the leader of the Republican Party, but the brave and honorable gentleman whom his countrymen of all parties delight to honor.

Without disparagement of other wise and patriotic men who have held the office, I think it may be said that seldom have we had a President whose hold upon the confidence of men was due in such great measure to his manifest integrity. He, as much as any living American, has earned the tribute that the Lord paid to Nathanael: "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile."

This sturdiness of character is the same element that made George Washington great, and that made Washington invaluable when the new Nation was threading its way along unknown paths to an unknown position in the world. At such a time brilliance, daring, vigor, resolution, qualities of immense importance to a leader, yet all these yield place to plain integrity. For when we are facing the unknown with no precedents to guide us, all these other qualities may be transformed into their defects: Brilliance may become fantasy; daring, recklessness; vigor, mere hardihood and resolution, ruthlessness. But integrity is unchanged by time or circumstance, and it is precisely when all else becomes uncertain that men cling to it most.

The United States is facing today a situation that in important respects is like that existing in Washington's two administrations. The problem then was to inspire confidence in the 13 former colonies, recently become independent States. They had just come through a dreadful war in which they had narrowly escaped falling under a tyranny that would have wiped out their national existence; so they were deeply, and rightly, suspicious of all organized power. Yet without organized power national existence was impossible. The problem then was to convince nervous, suspicious people that the power they had established in the new Constitution would be exercised reasonably and rightfully.

The problem was solved by putting the power in the hands of Washington and permitting him to establish the precedents by which his successors would be guided. It worked, not because of Washington's learning, or administrative skill, or intellectual brilliance, but solely because of his towering moral stature. It was admitted that Washington could be wrong; but it was not believed that he could be shifty, or treacherous, or cowardly or mean. So in his hands power was safely bestowed; and under his guidance the 13 States were welded into a solidarity that has endured longer than any other nation in the modern world has lived under its present constitution.

The problem of today differs from the one he faced, mainly in being larger and more complicated. The nervous and suspicious people are not inhabitants of 13 United States, but of nearly 70 disparate nations more loosely organized than the States were under the Articles of Confederation. The authority that the President of the United States wields over them is purely moral authority, with no legal power whatever. These people, too, have recently come through a great war in which they narrowly escaped falling under a tyranny that made the tyranny of George III seem benevolence itself. They are naturally, and rightly, suspicious of all power; and since a large part of all the military power remaining in the world is in our hands, they are suspicious of us.

It is unfortunately true that no man alive today has the moral ascendancy over the United Nations that George Washington had over the 13 States; but the man who comes closest to that lofty eminence unquestionably is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Like Washington, he is human, therefore he can make mistakes. But his strongest opponents do not believe that it is in him to be shifty or treacherous or cowardly or mean. Therefore the nations know, even though some will not admit it, that power is safer in his hands than in those of any other man now prominent in public life.

While our tremendous armament undoubtedly has been a deterring force against war, armament alone is not enough to avoid involvement. We are fortunate in that ours is reinforced by the known integrity of the man who commanded the Armed Forces. Our enemies have been loudly accusing us of designing to attack them; yet, even the leaders of the Soviet Union have publicly admitted that the President does not desire war, and excuse their belligerent attitude by the unsupported assertion that other forces are driving him toward it. This means that even potential enemies know that from Eisenhower they will receive no stab in the back.

In a time of great confusion and perplexity, when all policies are questionable, all values uncertain, all defenses unreliabe, it is a priceless gift to any people to have one point of support that is fixed and motionless in the whirling chaos that surrounds it. We discovered that in Washington's time. Men knew that whoever else might lose his head and collapse into screaming hysteria, Washington would stand firm. Whoever else might forget his sense of values and be tempted to sell our national birthright for a mess of pottage, Washington would adhere to his standards of right and reason. So around his rock-like figure the Nation rallied and fought its way through its difficulties.

We are discovering it again today. At this moment of tribute to a man, I am not concerned with defending the political record to serve the interests of the party. For the moment I am claiming nothing except what our opponents themselves will not deny; I am merely pointing out that at a time when in much of the world all standards are being repudiated and the big lie is accepted as an instrument of policy we have in the White House honor and truth. Around that strong point the free nations have rallied and are forging ahead through one of the most difficult periods in history.

There is, of course, no indispensable man. That has been proved a thousand times. But in the government of a free people and the leadership of free nations there is an indispensable quality, namely, character, and when a man is distinguished for that quality above all others, while he may not be indispensable, his value is immeasurable.

The debt that this country and all free nations owe to Eisenhower was enormous before he came to the Presidency; but as "he that ruleth his spirit is better than he that taketh a city" so the gift of stainless honor surpasses in value the most brilliant military triumph.

We hope and pray that a gracious God may relieve us for a long time from any desperate need of military genius; but it would be blasphemous to hope or pray that we may not need integrity at the head of the state, now or ever. Masterly leadership against armed enemies is, at worst, an intermittent necessity; but masterly leadership against such foes as passion and prejudice, falsehood and dishonor is a necessity every day that the Nation exists. Eisenhower has given us both; but it is my firm conviction that the latter gift is more valuable than the former.

Nor am I ashamed of the swelling pride I feel when I reflect that this man is in the most exact and literal sense a product of America. He was tried and tested, and his quality was first proved under the African sun and on the beaches of Normandy; but stamped into his metal, never to be erased, is the line, "Made in U. S. A." What is any nation in the eyes of the rest of the world, except the roster of its illustrious sons? Greece is not an area on the surface of the globe. It is Pericles and the philosophers. Rome is Cato, Caesar, and the lawgivers. England is the Lion Heart and King Harry, and her poets and statesmen. So America, to the rest of mankind, is not her piled-up wealth, not her steel-tipped battalions, not

her fleets and flights of bombers, but those of her sons whose lives have added to the honor of the race.

Among these I count Eisenhower, not so much because he is what the Old Testament describes as "a mighty man of valor" as because in times when the souls of men were troubled even though their bodies were at ease he has consistently held up before them the ancient ideal of a gentleman, to fear God and tell the truth, and has never wavered in his belief that only through loyalty to that ideal shall we attain anything of our hearts' desires, or even physical safety, while we live.

The greatness of a country is measured by its production of such men, and it will not produce them save in measure as its own spirit is consonant with theirs. Eisenhower, the individual, may not be indispensable, but the spirit that animates him is; and if the time ever comes when America fails in appreciation of that spirit, fails to honor it with delight, and to cherish it fiercely, then, indeed, the decline of the Nation will have begun. For a great man is a diamond that is brilliant by collecting, concentrating, and flashing back the light that it receives. A great American reflects America:

"Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter, learnt of friends; and gentleness
In hearts at peace."

We cannot all be great, but the least of us can assist in creating the climate in which greatness can survive and flourish and come to its finest flower. The first step in this direction is for us to teach ourselves what true greatness is, and to applaud it, and foster it and cherish it wherever it appears. Brilliance is a part of it, but only the superficial part. Daring and strength and vigor and resolution all appertain to it, but they are not of its essence. The core and heart of it, or, let us say, the matrix in which it is formed, are none of these, but a thing that is not beyond the reach of any man. To describe it in Lincoln's words, it is simply "firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right." No man is so humble that he cannot achieve that; but no man is truly great unless he has achieved it.

The fact that this quality is so conspicuous in Dwight D. Eisenhower is sufficient answer to anyone who inquires why we follow him; for those who are loyal to a truly great man are inevitably touched by some reflection of his greatness. There are other reasons, many and strong—reasons of policy, reasons of history, reasons based on rigid logic, reasons based on our hopes and fears. If I have not touched on them, it is not because they are unsound, but because, for the purposes of this occasion, they are unnecessary. To all inquirers today I give one simple answer: We follow Eisenhower because, first of all, he is such a man that merely to be loyal to him is in itself a radiant badge of honor.

The Decision on the Proposed C. & O. Parkway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last week a newspaper in Hagerstown, Md., reported:

United States Senator GLENN BEALL isn't happy over the decision of the National Park Service and the United States Department of the Interior to abandon the long-discussed C. & O. Canal Parkway plan.

That observation, even if it had been expressed in terms 100 times stronger, would still be an understatement. After more than 5 years of working for a project, it leaves a man more than unhappy to find that someone has tried to cancel all his efforts. This is especially true when the goal is so worthy and when so many people will benefit. The situation, I feel, was summed up clearly in an editorial in the January 21, 1956, edition of the Cumberland News. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the above-mentioned editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SHOCKING DECISION ON THE PARKWAY

The unexpected decision of the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior to abandon a plan to construct a parkway along the route of the old C. and O. Canal between Cumberland and Hancock comes as a great shock to the people of western Maryland.

Originally proposed by the Park Service itself more than 5 years ago, the people of western Maryland, led by Senator J. GLENN BEALL, overcame many an obstacle in order to push the parkway plan to the point where construction of the water-level highway between Cumberland and Hancock appeared to be in the foreseeable future.

Just what objections the Park Service and the Department of the Interior have to construction of the parkway are not specific, but reports indicate that canal rights-of-way and the Harper's Ferry national monument area will be tied in with a national historic park plan for the stretch between Cumberland and Seneca.

The most widely known individual opponent of the parkway plan is Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas who walked the length of the canal to point up his argument that the canal area should be preserved for its natural wilderness beauty. Other outdoor and wildlife adherents took a similar position, evidently overlooking the fact that wildlife they want to preserve has been disturbed at rather regular intervals over the years by passing trains of the Baltimore and Ohio and western Maryland railroads, whose tracks run along or within a stone's throw of the canal for many miles.

Should it be that the Park Service and the Department of the Interior have yielded to the pressures of these groups, then is it not logical to ask why the Government ignores the wishes of the great bulk of the people of western Maryland in order to cater to the desires of the minority?

Cumberlanders and all western Marylanders have a great stake in construction of the parkway which we have looked upon for half a decade as an impending boon to our economy.

A parkway will not destroy the recreational aspects of the canal area. Instead, it will make the area more accessible to the people who want to use it. The Park Service undoubtedly had this in mind when, in their original plans for the parkway, they included numerous recreation spots adjacent to the road.

And as Senator BEALL pointed out when first advised of the decision of the Park Service and the Department of the Interior to abandon the parkway plan, "The recreational advantages to be derived from such a parkway * * * are many, but its use as a defense highway grows ever more important."

Further, it can be pointed out, tourists who now steer clear of Route 40 because of the mountains, doubtless would be inclined to follow such a level, scenic, historic route as the parkway would provide between Cumberland and Hancock. Cumberland unquestionably would benefit economically from the tourist dollars left here.

Senator BEALL properly was indignant at the decision to abandon the parkway plan as well as at the manner in which he was advised of the decision. He has promised to continue his fight for the parkway, and so has Representative DEWITT S. HYDE.

The parkway plan is vitally important to western Maryland, and western Marylanders should raise their voices loud and often at this decision to abandon the parkway. We have got to remember that the "squeaky wheel gets the grease," refight some of our battles to have the parkway again included as an integral part of the Park Service plans, and never again assume the lethargic attitude that the parkway plan is an accomplished fact—not until the wheels of traffic are turning over it.

Statement of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at United Jewish Appeal Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks which I made at a dinner sponsored by the United Jewish Appeal at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel on the evening of January 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A POSITIVE POLICY FOR THE MIDDLE EAST AND A LOOK BACKWARD AT PAST MISTAKES

(By Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, at dinner sponsored by United Jewish Appeal, Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, January 21, 1956)

I am much moved by the tribute you have paid me this evening. I do not consider the tribute to be directed to me personally. I would be vain, indeed, if I did.

I take your approbation to be for those causes and principles for which I have stood and fought for many years. I am proud and glad of the support you have thus expressed for those causes and principles, and thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I would surely be insensitive if I were not deeply affected by your having singled me out as a symbol of those causes and principles.

But what means even more to me is the fact that this large assemblage has shown with its deeds tonight a true devotion to some of those causes.

I mean the cause of freedom. I mean the cause of humanitarianism. And I mean the cause of democracy.

In a sense Israel symbolizes all of these causes, and more. Israel is also the cause of faith fulfilled, of prophecy come true, and of sacrifice recognized and rewarded.

But in contributing to the United Jewish Appeal, as you have so generously done tonight, you are doing more than contributing to the State of Israel and to the cause for which she stands.

You have contributed to the fight against prejudice and discrimination and oppression. UJA stands for these causes, as well as for the welfare and the upbuilding of the State of Israel.

You have contributed to the hope of a future for hundreds and thousands of Jews in north Africa, in Europe, and Asia, and wherever Jews still live with the mark of fear upon their hearts. You are holding out to them the lifegiving hope of emigrating one day to a land of refuge, freedom, and opportunity, and of escaping finally from either the shadow or the fact of terror and tyranny. This in itself is a noble and essential undertaking.

For these reasons, and just because I enjoy meeting with old and true friends, I am happy to be here tonight and to join with you in acclaiming the work of UJA.

I need not enumerate the full category of all UJA accomplishments, reflected in human souls rescued from every quarter of the globe and resettled in many quarters of the globe. That work is going on today, and, of course, it must continue to go on.

But it is surely worthwhile to reexamine and reassess the fundamental significance of what UJA has up to now accomplished in Israel, and the full scope of the present challenge there. Thus we may be able to see that problem in full perspective.

What has been achieved up to the present?

You have helped to build a State: a fortress of freedom, a haven of refuge, and a bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

You have helped to transform an idea into a fact, a hope into a reality, and a prayer into a realization.

You have helped to provide asylum for 800,000 hard-pressed human souls, the unwanted, the uprooted, the homeless and helpless.

You have helped to write history and to fulfill an ancient promise.

You, with your contributions, have helped to buy that which is beyond price and purchase—a future for an entire people and a place in history for a new democratic nation.

But all of us know that what has been done in the past provides only a measuring stick for that which remains to be done. The present challenge is far greater than any faced heretofore.

We must, however, understand better than we do the nature and magnitude of this challenge. It is not susceptible of simple description or simple solution.

Forces have been unleashed which we did not conceive when the establishment of Israel was first undertaken and pressed to realization. Stupendous dangers have arisen beyond any we foresaw. We must see them clearly now and grapple with them. There is, of course, no turning back now.

On the turnpike of history, there are few entrances, but the exits are equally few and equally difficult to reach. We are supremely confident that whatever the dangers ahead, Israel is on this turnpike to stay.

The forces and dangers rampant today in the Middle East were not brought into being by Israel. They were there all the time. But they were brought into focus by Israel, and today they are directed against Israel.

These forces are not local. They are international, just as the dangers are international. And they are not single, but plural.

First of all, and most apparent, is the force of international Communism, aggression and subversion. This force, while worldwide, has only lately loomed as an immediate danger in the Middle East. But in fact, it was potentially there all the time.

Side by side with this ruthless force is another, even more powerful and violent—the revolutionary force of the oppressed and underprivileged peoples of the earth, awakening after centuries of troubled passivity, to demand their share of the 20th century. This force was also there, in the Middle East, all the time. But it was not recognized. Some do not recognize it, and do not reckon with it, even today.

Frequently, these two forces, so utterly different and distinct, are mistaken for one and the same, because they often overlap each other. In this lack of perception on our part there lies a danger to us as great as from communism itself.

The tidal waves of these two tremendous forces, churning the waters of our time, wreaking havoc upon all shores, could easily be expected to spare Israel from their effects. And they have not.

In fact, Israel today lies at the very focus of both these forces, and is receiving the buffets of both of them.

For the Soviet Union, Israel represents an intolerable enclave of freedom and stability in the midst of a seething world, ripe for a Communist-type revolution. For the Arab leaders, Israel represents a convenient diversion for the surging forces of ferment and upheaval within their countries—a ready object for blind feelings of resentment and indignity among the ruled and oppressed peoples of the area.

Israel symbolizes a kind of revolution, too, but an orderly, western-type revolution, the unleashing of the energies of a people for dynamic progress, within the framework of democracy, and by the consent of the governed.

To both the Arab leaders and the Kremlin, then, but for different reasons, Israel is a menace—for the Arab chieftains, a dangerous example; for the men of Moscow, a dangerous center of western influence.

In the face of this situation, what has been the policy of the free nations, and more particularly, the policy of our own Government?

In brief, it has been a shortsighted policy, reflecting little resolution or determination, and no comprehension whatever of the basic forces or factors involved.

Our Government has followed a policy of so-called "impartiality" as if it were a simple question of favoring one or the other of two equal and equally good friends who cannot get along with each other * * * as if the merits were equally distributed on both sides.

Our Government has acted as if the Arab nations were stable powers and stable societies, like England and Norway and Holland and Denmark.

We sought to draw one and then the other of the Arab States into our complex pattern of world politics, as in the Baghdad Pact and the Northern Tier.

In this we have built a fortress out of straw, and set it up on quicksand.

What a folly this has been. What a lack of understanding this has shown.

We have reaped from some of the Arab nations, for all our so-called impartiality, a harvest of hostility and anti-Western agitation. And we set the stage for the direct entry of the Soviet Union into the very center of the scene. Perhaps it was inevitable, but we made it doubly easy for the Communists and doubly hard for ourselves.

Meanwhile our policies have served to give the Israelis a shattering sense of isolation—a feeling of having been abandoned and left to shift for themselves, though surrounded by deadly enemies bent on their destruction.

We should have based our policy on the bedrock facts of the Middle East today: grinding poverty, unrest, and instability in the Arab States; and dynamism, democracy, and stability in Israel. But instead of that, we based our policy on pious phrases about peace, meaningless sentiments about impartiality, and mechanical calculations of naive military strategy.

We undertook to build up a line of defense against the Soviet Union, without reckoning on the power of the Communists to leapfrog the line and come up in our rear.

We have given short shrift to the stable and democratic nation of Israel, whose ideals are the same as ours.

Meanwhile, we have vainly courted the favor of neighboring totalitarian regimes, which sit uncertainly on top of seething volcanoes within their own countries, and which logically look for any expedient to remain in power, even the expedient of alliance with the Soviet Union.

But where do wo go from here?

It is rather easy to criticize, and I would be less than fair if I did not say that the problem is hard and complex, even beyond description.

I do not envy Secretary Dulles his responsibility, although I strongly disagree with the solutions he has put forth up to now. Nor would I begrudge him his mistakes, if they were the result of efforts pointed in the right direction.

But it is not enough to speak of peace as a goal and of impartiality as a principle. The test of words and settlements lies in actual, specific policies and programs.

It seems crystal clear to me that as far as the Arab States are concerned, we must concentrate with all our might on helping them to resolve their basic problems. We must not let them fall prey to Communist-type revolutions or to Communist intrigues.

We must help to raise the status of their people.

We must assist and cooperate in basic economic undertakings, such as the Aswan Dam in Egypt and the Jordan River development plan.

We must offer large-scale assistance for the resettlement of the Arab refugees.

We must encourage progressive and forward-looking policies, such as land reform and the disestablishment of economic feudalism.

We must be generous but firm.

We must make clear that our economic assistance is designed to release the energies of the Arab peoples to enable them to help themselves to peace and prosperity, not to war and hostility against Israel.

Israel must be assured of security and territorial integrity. Her fears of aggression must be quieted, and the saber rattling that now resounds through the area on both sides must be stilled.

A program of progressive disarmament, as soon as peace has been agreed upon, should be and can be in order, so that all energies may be harnessed for the betterment of the peoples concerned:

This, then, must be our answer to the Soviet intrusion into this area:

1. A security pact with Israel, but open to all her neighbors.

2. Arms for Israel, as long as arms are needed to maintain the present precarious balance of forces.

3. Large-scale and long-range economic aid to the Arab States and to Israel.

And then peace and disarmament.

Does this not constitute a positive policy? I think so.

Let us then, as a Nation, without regard to any partisanship whatever, unite on some such policy, with all the collateral programs and conditions which are required. Let us take the lead and convince the other free nations of the desirability of this policy, and solicit their cooperation and participation in it.

Let us, as individuals, advocate and support such a policy. Let us meanwhile con-

tinue to support our embattled and endangered coreligionists in Israel and elsewhere with United Jewish Appeal and with bonds. Let us do this with unmeasured devotion and unstinted generosity.

And then let us all, together, work and look forward to the day when the spur to our efforts will not be the threat of war and destruction, but what Henry James called the moral equivalent of war: Heroic dedication to the uplife of humanity and the fulfillment of mankind's dream: Peace on earth, justice to all, and security for all.

This we will surely achieve in a not too distant day, if we have courage, and faith, and humility before God, the one Father of us all.

Politics and Public Office: Is It an Honorable Profession?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, it is with particular pleasure and pride that I bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate an address entitled "Politics and Public Office: Is It an Honorable Profession?" delivered by one of Florida's outstanding citizens and public servants, the Honorable Stephen C. O'Connell, justice of the Florida Supreme Court, to the Coral Gables Kiwanis Club, on October 8, 1955. He points out with great clarity the case for public service in one of the finest presentations I have ever heard.

In public life we have all encountered too often a distressing and widespread cynicism toward politics and government. It is one of the most disturbing facets of the contemporary American personality.

While few officeholders have betrayed their trust, people are prone in this day and time to remember the exception rather than the rule. The popular concept of a public servant today seems to be that he is one who feeds at the public trough in a pursuit avoided by honorable men. Of course, this isn't so. Such a popular attitude, however, tends to turn away from public service young men of integrity and ability who normally would be the future keepers of the flame.

Justice O'Connell's address dealing with this problem is an excellent one, and I commend its reading to every Member of the Congress. At this time, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND PUBLIC OFFICE: IS IT AN HONORABLE PROFESSION?

(Text of speech given by Stephen C. O'Connell at Coral Gables Kiwanis Club on presentation of Allen Morris Award, October 6, 1955)

Obviously, most of you here would, under these circumstances, answer "yes."

Yet the attitude of the people of this State and this Nation generally gives a negative answer.

How many of you have, or ever will, offer yourselves for public office? Why not?

Chances are that the answer you would give would indicate that politics and public office is considered by you as neither being honorable, nor a profession, nor worth the sacrifice it requires.

Should this attitude concern us?

When there is a shortage of doctors and engineers we recruit more men and women to enter the field and make the reward more attractive.

We spend a great deal of money recruiting men and women for our armed services.

We portray the military as an honorable profession and increase the benefits to those in it.

Private business has learned that it must recruit, train, and educate its personnel to operate efficiently and develop leadership.

It has made tremendous strides in channeling young men and women into the proper courses of training, to selecting a vocation where they are needed and in placing them in the proper job.

There was a time when Jefferson's theory that government was best when governing least was acceptable.

However, the size of government, its scope and effect on our lives, and the world, has increased to the point that it is by far the biggest business in almost every town, county, and State in this Nation, including Florida.

We can no longer accept nor tolerate government by chance.

Unfortunately, our public officials for the most part enter politics and public office much in the same way they did in Jefferson's days, principally, by chance.

True, we offer courses in our schools in government. But those who major in the subject usually turn to teaching or a civil-service job. Seldom do they enter politics.

While there are 10 candidates for every acceptance in medical school and 5 applicants for each accepted in Harvard Graduate School of Business, hundreds of political offices in the State are filled by some group drafting an unsuspecting and unqualified citizen to fill the office as a stopgap measure.

Have you ever stopped to compare the relative qualifications and training of your political officeholder with men in private business holding posts of comparable importance, or to compare the compensation each receives.

Do these conditions exist only because we fail to establish strict entrance exams to politics, or fail to require qualifications of and examinations to be passed by those seeking public office, such as is required by a professional man or for a civil-service job.

Why, then, is it that politics and government, in too many instances, are getting the leftovers and business and the professions the more able and qualified.

Why, then, do so few young people, as well as so few of the more mature, plan to make a life of politics and political office. It is because politics and government are considered less important than business or the professions?

All the answers are not certain, but some are obvious.

While we spend millions in this country each year trying to determine why a person smokes a certain cigaret, listens to a certain radio or TV program, and to plot the love life of the cricket mole, we have done little if anything to determine who so few of our better qualified citizens make a life of politics and government service.

Nevertheless, I would be willing to say there are three principal factors which prevent politics and political office obtaining the status of an honorable profession, and persons entering it by plan for a life of service. They are:

A. Our failure to establish it as a profession and to offer schooling and training for it.

B. Our failure to establish adequate financial reward for the officeholder.

C. Our public and individual attitude, that politics and government is dishonest, lacks integrity and is for the incompetent who can't make a living in private business.

It is obvious that our more capable young people will select and plan a course of political life, by choice, only if we as parents, as citizens and as employers, urge them to do so, make such service more attractive financially, and remove the stigma now borne by politics and those in it.

More adequate salaries must be paid, but will be paid only when the voter recognizes that politics and government service is a profession that seldom is mastered by an act of will or by sudden and short exposure to political office.

One should not be required to be wealthy to afford public-service and conversely should not be required to strip himself of all business interests in order to enter political office. But we criticize the individual who doesn't do so.

But of the factors involved in improving the quality of politics, political office holders, and Government service, our attitude toward politics is the most serious.

We encourage our children to become a member of the professions or business.

We glorify the role of the actor and the actress and the professional and amateur athlete.

We gladly give our children and ourselves to service in the ministry, the priesthood, and the synagog, and it should be so.

We speak of the high ideals of service to God and country. Yet, we encourage the first and discourage the latter.

And we visualize and portray the politician and the officeholder as a cigar smoking heel in a backroom or on a soapbox making a fool of himself.

We picture politics and Government service to our young and to each other as something base, unclean, and to be avoided.

In a survey of a decade ago, 7 out of 10 fathers said they did not want their sons to enter politics.

A young business executive, banker, or professional man is likely to be passed over in promotions or to lose his job, if he enters politics or holds public office.

We, by our attitude, create the presumption that a politician is dishonest and incompetent.

We impute the few cases of corruption, dishonesty, and corruption to politics and officeholders, generally, using the broadsword when we should use the rapier.

We invite the incompetent to serve by establishing the qualifications of public office as being only:

1. A pleasing personality.
2. The endurance of a 2-mile runner.
3. A glib tongue and loud voice.
4. A big campaign fund.

It, therefore, becomes a vicious circle.

Politicians and government will be held up to scorn so long as they act from ignoble motives and are incompetent.

Until politics and officeholders improve in quality, they will be given a bad press, so to speak.

So long as they are held up to scorn and given bad reports, it will be difficult to persuade the more competent and able to make public service and politics a career.

Is it necessary to improve our politics and government?

It is not only necessary, but imperative. Other nations have in the past and some are now failing because of the lack of competent public officials, needed leadership, and quality of and confidence in government.

With the importance and complexity of present-day government, at every level, the selection of those to run it cannot be left to chance and whim. It requires those men and women with the best intelligence, judgment, and motives.

Politics, as we speak of it, being the process by which we select our officials, becomes increasingly important.

Is it possible to improve politics, to make it and government service an honorable profession?

I say it is.

It must be done.

How to do it?

First, recognize that politics and government service is a profession that is seldom mastered by an act of will or by sudden and short exposure to political office. It requires training and education.

Second, salaries must be increased to a point somewhere near that comparable to those paid by private business.

Third, women must be encouraged to participate in politics and to hold public office.

With their higher ideals and less willingness to be practical politicians they will raise the level of integrity and respect of politics and service.

Fourth, political organizations must seek and welcome the intelligent, the capable and the young, and select candidates on a basis of merit, first, ability to get votes, second.

Fifth, parents, employers, the professions and business must encourage the young, as well as the mature, to select politics and public office, not only as an avocation, but as an occupation.

Public service must be stripped of the air and presumption of dishonesty and incompetence.

The sacrifice of public service must be recognized for what it is, as being next in importance to that of service of the minister, the priest and the rabbi.

Sixth, and last:

We must stop deriding the politician and the officeholder. We must realize that he has the same right to make an honest error as the businessman.

Instead of treating him as a servant, to be verbally kicked and beaten at will, he should be treated with the common decency and respect that we treat the other professional and businessman.

The mudslinging, the backbiting, the attempt to reduce in character, the rumor mongering, can be outmoded by rejecting at the polls, he who uses it.

The media of news, the press, radio, and TV., the movies, all of which control public opinion, should and must, without sacrificing truth, seek to inspire confidence in Government and those who run it, and encourage men and women to enter the field, must portray politics and Governemnt as an honorable profession manned not by incompetents and racketeers, but by capable honest citizens.

If news is to be slanted, slant it to praise and encourage rather than to deride and assassinate character and lessen confidence.

The fear of public abuse, wagging malicious tongues, and of unfavorable publicity, sometimes justified, but more frequently not, does more to prevent men and women of integrity and ability from entering the political field than any other factor.

Most men and women have a desire to serve. It is inborn.

Adequate compensation is not a bar to entry of the capable into public service.

Given the opportunity and encouraged to enter the field of politics and Government and being assured that they will not be abused unnecessarily, that their families will not suffer from unwarranted attacks, and being made to feel that it is an honored profession, respected by their fellows, more of the capable with integrity and honesty would enter the field and work to make a life, not just a living.

The man or woman who decides on a career of public office, of Government service, makes the same decision and must be motivated by some of the same ideals as a man of God.

Both must have a desire to serve his fellow man.

Both must have placed the value of service above wealth.

The Honorable J. Saxton Lloyd, presently chairman of the Florida Development Commission, told me recently of an experience in which he had heard the remarks made at the last rites of a man who had served God all of his adult life.

The speaker stated that the deceased had every quality that would have enabled him to have been a man of wealth, of prominence in this State, yet he had decided to serve God.

Why? The speaker asked.

Because, he answered, that man did not mistake the pleasures of life for happiness, nor did he judge success by money.

Government service must be elevated to the same honored position, so that men and women can judge the value of it and gain some of the same satisfaction from it, as did that man.

It can be done, it must be done.

Education Is a Federal Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently in response to an editorial entitled "Education Is a National, Not Federal, Problem," which appeared in the Star, of Minneapolis, Minn., I cited the activities of Federal Government which related to our educational system, with specific reference to legislation developed and passed providing Federal aid to education. I ask unanimous consent that my letter dated January 13, 1956, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1956.

The EDITOR, THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR,
Minneapolis, Minn.

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Your editorial of Wednesday, December 21, entitled "Education Is a National Not Federal Problem" deserves further consideration. This editorial was written in reply to my letter of the same date printed in your column Everybody's Ideas..

You may recall that I served as a member of the President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. We studied with great care and detail the educational needs of our country, and gave specific attention to the efforts currently being made by the respective States and local subdivisions in order to meet educational needs. Furthermore, we studied the financial needs or capacity of States and localities to further develop their educational structure, including both facilities and personnel.

The primary responsibility for public education does belong to the State and its political subdivisions. The educational system should be close to the people. The management of our schools should rest essentially with the local citizenry. Our public education system is one of the great achievements of our people.

Indeed, education is a national problem. Your second paragraph indicates a lack of understanding as to the American tradition, or an unwillingness to accept the role of the Federal Government in our educational structure. You stated as follows, referring to my letter: "But he also implies that education is a problem for the Federal Government, and there he is at odds with the tradition of America. Financing education is a local and State problem, which on the whole has been handled well at those levels."

Let's examine the role of the Federal Government in education, and see whether or not my conviction that the Federal Government does have a responsibility in the educational field is at odds with the tradition of America.

The legislative milestones in the development of Federal aid to education are as follows:

In 1787 the Northwest Ordnance set aside certain public lands for public education purposes.

In 1826 the Morrill Act provided for grants of Federal land to each State for the establishment of colleges specializing in the subjects of agricultural and mechanical arts. Our own University of Minnesota is such a college.

1867: Congress established an independent Federal Department of Education. Its name was officially changed to the United States Office of Education after 1929.

In 1917 the Smith-Hughes Act established the first program of Federal grants-in-aid to promote vocational education in public schools. This in turn was strengthened and expanded under the George-Barden Act.

In the 1930's the Public Works Administration made loans and grants for school construction, and the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, along with the WPA, provided funds for school construction plus adult education and nursery school programs.

1936: The George-Barden Act.

In 1940 the Lanham Act, which authorized athletic aid to local governments for construction, maintenance, and operation of school facilities.

In 1944 the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, commonly known as the GI bill of rights, set up a program of additional benefits for World War II veterans, and later extended to veterans of the Korean war.

In 1946 the National School Lunch Act authorizing aid in the form of funds and food to cities for use in school-lunch programs.

In 1950 Public Law 874, authorizing Federal payments for maintenance and operating costs of schools overburdened by increased enrollment resulting from Federal activities.

Also in 1950, Public Law 815 authorizing grants to States for construction of schools in federally affected areas. Both of these laws have been extended.

In 1954 Public Law 530 authorizing the White House Conference on Education, along with Public Law 532 establishing a 9-member advisory committee on education.

This is but a brief review of some of the activities of the Federal Government directly relating to our educational structure. Again, I should add that our vast programs for scientific, technological and medical research are not included in the above listing of legislative enactments. The scope of our research programs is growing every year, and the amount of funds appropriated runs into the millions. Surely, Mr. Editor, it is within our tradition for the Federal Government to have an important role in education—a tradition which started in 1787 and continues to this day—a tradition which was recently reaffirmed by the reports and conclusions of the White House Conference on Education.

Until the 1930's the overwhelming share of school revenues were obtained at the local independent school district level. Then came the period of State aid to the local schools. State aid was bitterly opposed, but the economic necessities of a modern school system equipped to meet the growing population brought acceptance and approval of State aid.

The impact of the depression and World War II, along with the postwar surge in population, placed tremendous burdens on our school system. There can be no doubt

as to the shortage of school facilities, despite a major school construction program by local school districts. It is common knowledge that our classes are overcrowded, that our teacher shortage is growing every year, that our colleges are not graduating an adequate supply of new teachers to fill the gap and to replace those who are retiring.

Here are the facts as reported in the Congressional Quarterly for February 1955. Since then, the situation has grown even more critical despite the enlarged program of local school districts and States.

A report by the United States Office of Education shows that in the fall of 1954 there were 2,600,000 pupils in excess of normal school building capacity in the United States. About 9 percent of all pupils were being accommodated in makeshift or improvised quarters. Nationwide there is a shortage of over 340,000 classrooms. An additional 58,000 teachers were needed in 1955. The teacher total is diminishing rather than growing in relation to pupil population. It is estimated that in the next 5 years approximately 620,000 public elementary and secondary classrooms and related facilities will be needed. The 1955 building program was scheduled to produce about 60,000 classrooms, far short of current needs without taking into consideration the lag in construction during the depression and war and immediate postwar years, or the future growth of the population.

Again quoting from the Congressional Quarterly: "While school needs are essentially a State and local community problem, the Federal Government has played a major role in promoting education. For example, in fiscal year 1953, Federal expenditures for education in the States totaled $1,200,000,000. The bulk of the Federal funds, $725.6 million, were for education of veterans. Other major items were support of land grant colleges, vocational education and payment to the States for school construction and maintenance in federally affected school districts. This figure does not include the vast sums of money appropriated by Congress for research, much of which was allocated to our universities and technical schools.

I know of no public or lay spokesman who is recommending that the Federal Government take over the responsibilities for our public school system. However, our public education program is in trouble due to inadequate facilities, shortage of teachers, and lack of adequate local and State revenues. To be sure, some of the States could do a better job than they are doing. Federal legislation should not be designed to relieve States and local governments of their responsibilities. Federal aid should be supplemental and not replacement. Federal aid to public education should in the main be limited to school construction needs. Control over school management, curriculum, and educational program must remain in the hands of the local community and its appropriate school agency. There is no evidence that would lead one to conclude that Federal aid means Federal domination. Our land-grant colleges have not been dominated by the Federal Government. Our vocational education programs are not dominated or managed by the Federal Government. Yet, in both of these areas of education the Federal Government has made a sizable contribution.

Regrettably, many States and localities are restrained by constitutional and charter limitations in providing the necessary funds for school purposes. Theoretically, one can argue that city charters and State constitutions should be changed, and indeed this should be done. In the meantime, our public education structure continues to deteriorate and becomes evermore inadequate to meet the heavy increase in school enrollment. The Federal Government is the people's Government; it belongs to the people. The Federal Government is responsive to public opinion and public will, yes, even more so than some State and local governments. The Congress is elected by the people, just as is a State legislature. The President is elected by the American people, just as is the governor by the people of his State.

Our Nation is becoming evermore integrated. The American people move from one area to another. Our system of commerce and transportation has united this country into one great Nation. Education is a national problem, and the provision of proper educational facilities is the responsibility of the people of this country acting through their instrumentalities of government. While editors and Senators, governors and Presidents, Congressmen and legislators argue over Federal aid to education, our school system suffers and remains inadequate. We are in a struggle for survival. We need a strong, intelligent, and well-informed citizenry. We need competent scientists and technicians. We need, above all, equality of opportunity for education. That equality of opportunity is being denied today to millions of our young people—young people who are called upon to serve in the defense of this country; young people who may reside in our State or some other State in the years to come; young people who will be called upon to shoulder burdens of yet unknown and uncharted proportions in the future.

I suggest we bring this argument on Federal aid to education to a halt and get on with building the schools, training the teachers, providing scholarships for talented men and women, expanding our programs of research and development, equipping our universities and institutions of higher learning to meet an unprecedented enrollment. A rich and prosperous America can afford to pay the bill. Our failure to pay this bill could well result in jeopardy to our national security and long-term national prosperity. Education is a sound investment. There are no cutrate prices nor bargain-basement sales on the development of talent, skill, and good citizenship.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Freedom for Suicide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks a thought-provoking editorial Freedom for Suicide, appearing in the Catholic Standard, archdiocesan newspaper of the archdiocese of Washington, of January 20, 1956:

FREEDOM FOR SUICIDE

Last year Russian graduatel 53,000 engineers; we graduated less than half that many. In Russia, about 40 percent of the total secondary school time is devoted to science and mathematics; in our country, in 1954, only 4.3 percent of our high school students studied physics, which is generally now an elective course. As former President Herbert Hoover remarked some time ago, if our country is destroyed it will be by a flood of electives. It almost seems that only the private schools of the country insist on courses in physics and science in our secondary schools.

This decrease in the study of science is in itself thoroughly alarming. What is infinitely more alarming is that some American educators are determined to do nothing about it. Dr. Alan T. Waterman, director of the National Science Foundation, felt compelled to state to an audience, after rehearsing this dismal state of education, that there is no desire to depart from American principles of free choice of careers. American students are to be given the freedom to commit national suicide.

This incredible attitude of some American educators reveals two fundamental errors: American citizens, regardless of age, cannot be required by the Government to do whatever is morally right in order to protect their country; civil "freedom" means that school children cannot be taught a fixed curriculum if they choose not to accept it.

These pernicious errors, unknown a few years ago, contradict reason and a whole national practice. During the past war, our inductees were taught to learn flying and whatever trade was necessary for the protection of our country. For the same reason, a boy of 16 or 14 can be taught physics and science. Futhermore, education (by the very meaning of the word) means that a student's knowledge is broadened, that his faculties are developed, regardless of whether he likes it or not. Education, like medicine, can be given whether the person likes it or not—admitting that liking it is greatly desirable.

What has happened to the rule once fervently honored, that education is supposed to fit one for life? Prescinding from our defense needs, in a world of technology and automation, physics and science are among the basic courses. The need is even more imperative when we consider our defense needs. General Taylor, Chief of Staff, is desperately pushing the construction of the ultimate weapon, the intercontinental ballistic missile, in the belief that it is absolutely required for our defense. This is symbolic of the nature of future wars, if they cannot be averted.

But where will the skill and talent come from for our defense if students are given the freedom to reject all courses in physics and science? They may end with the freedom to surrender to tyranny or suicide.

Profit for Philanthropy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial from the Salem (Ohio) News dated December 16, 1955. This seems to me to be an effective answer to the critics of all the foundations in the United States and certainly the hospitals and schools through the generosity of the Ford Foundation can effectively refute the carping critics:

PROFIT FOR PHILANTHROPY

Half a billion dollars for better teacher salaries in colleges and better services in hospitals, on top of previous grants of $350 million since 1936, puts the famed Ford Foundation in a class by itself.

No other source of philanthropy can compare with the productivity of this organization to give away money, started by the original Henry Ford in 1936.

Despite the vast sum it has given away, at least $850 million, counting the latest half-billion-dollar disbursement, the growth

of the vast Ford enterprise and the declining value of dollars give assurance of a great deal more money where all that came from.

The profit system geared to continuing philanthropy is something new in the world of finance. It is a kind of tithe being paid by many profit-making enterprises to institutions and organizations that could not support themselves without the profit system's help.

The thing that makes the Ford Foundation distinctive is the large amount of its profit-producing holdings relative to the Ford enterprise as a whole. This is the direct result of the founder's initial success in retaining ownership of the company as it grew, instead of being forced to share it with money lenders.

The members of the Ford family thus were able to amass and control tremendous wealth. They, themselves, never have used their wealth extravagantly. They have run the Ford Co. as a family enterprise and will continue to do so under the new distribution of voting and nonvoting stock to outside investors.

But they have been running it largely for the beneficiaries of the Ford Foundation and will continue to do so.

Vast sums of money that otherwise would have gone through the corporation income tax wringer have been turned over intact to beneficiaries who could meet the foundation's standards for advancing human welfare.

Thousands of college teachers now can look forward to better pay and hundreds of hospitals will be able to provide better service because a mechanical genius also proved to be financial genius. They can testify that profit for philanthropy is giving the profit system a kind of glamor it never had when profit was for investors only.

Festival of Music

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement commenting on a forthcoming musical presentation on January 30 to be broadcast over the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co. This presentation has considerable significance in the cultural world, and will be heard and listened to by many millions of our fellow citizens. It will bring together a very large number of outstanding artists of our time.

It has been suggested that in recognition of this event, as well as of the general public interest in music, the week of January 30 be proclaimed as Festival of Music Week.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the remarks I have prepared for this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Monday evening, January 30, 1956, the National Broadcasting Co. will telecast in color and black and white, over its nationwide facilities, a major presentation entitled "Festival of Music."

Although the chief emphasis of this program is, of course, on music, it will have overtones of education, art, and culture. Because of the scope of this program, the great array of talent to be presented, and the groundbreaking nature of the transmission itself, this NBC undertaking commands our attention and invites reflection.

A century ago America was awakening to the universal language of music. Our forefathers were crowding into small concert halls—into drawing rooms and other available auditoriums, to hear the first performances of Beethoven's Fidelio and Verdi's La Traviata. But an opportunity to see and hear these performances was available only to the privileged few. Still, the national appetite for musical presentations was not to be denied. There were touring companies which appeared in centers of population from one end of the country to the other. Who of that era will forget the barnstorming production of Ben Hur, and the tours of the Metropolitan, Chicago, St. Louis, and San Francisco opera companies? The enthusiasm of those who attended band concerts by John Philip Sousa and the great philharmonic orchestras left their landmark in the thousands of public-park bandstands across the land.

Then there was the phonograph which caught the public fancy, then declined in popularity, then rose again to present heights. Surely it was a wise man who said he preferred to write a nation's songs rather than to make its laws.

Then, in recent years, the inventive genius so characteristic of America produced the television. American inventive genius made it possible, through television, for half the Nation's population to have the finest songs and the most notable performances of the greatest artists brought into their own homes. And now television, the world's seventh scientific wonder has added the brilliant hues of the spectrum—color television—to the conventional black and white.

It would seem appropriate, I think, as a recognition of the possibilities of this new medium, to establish a week in which we may remind our people of the values which can and sometimes do come to them through television—a Festival of Music Week.

The National Broadcasting Co.'s Festival of Music will be an unprecedented color-television transmission which for quality of artistic performance, I am told, will be outstanding. The NBC color-television transmission of Monday, January 30, will last 1½ hours. Mr. Charles Laughton will act as master of ceremonies. He in turn is to present the glories of the world's greatest composers, sung and played by such great artists as Marian Anderson, Jussi Bjoerling, Zinka Milanov, Jan Peerce, Roberta Peters, Gregor Piatigorsky, Artur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, Rise Stevens, Renata Tebaldi, Blanche Thebom, and Leonard Warren.

Seldom has so distinguished a group of artists been assembled for a single performance.

It might be appropriate, therefore, to take advantage of this significant event and to set aside the week of January 30, by proclamation, as Festival of Music Week.

The United Nations: Some New Perspectives After 10 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, January 13, 1956, I attended a meeting of the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., and heard an address entitled "The United Nations: Some New Perspectives After 10 Years" by Hon. Francis O. Wilcox, able and distinguished Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. Secretary Wilcox delivered, in my opinion, an excellent and outstanding address on the United Nations. It is a clear, eloquent, analytical, and forceful presentation of the activities, accomplishments, and possibilities of the United Nations. It has not been my privilege to hear a finer statement.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein excerpts from the speech delivered by Assistant Secretary of State Francis O. Wilcox entitled "The United Nations: Some New Perspectives After 10 Years":

Just a few weeks ago the General Assembly concluded its tenth, and perhaps its most momentous session. High on the list of accomplishments was its action in enlarging the membership of the United Nations from 60 to 76 countries. This expansion of the organization's membership brings new vitality and new voices to the task of creating and maintaining peace with justice among nations.

The United States must now assess the implications for its foreign policy of a United Nations in which European representation has been increased, the voice of Asia and the Middle East has become strengthened, the number of so-called uncommitted countries has been enlarged, and the proportionate numerical strength of the Latin American group reduced.

* * * * *

The President in his state of the Union message stated the cardinal aim of our foreign policy: "The waging of peace, with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency, as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war."

In charting our course in a newly revitalized United Nations, we must search out and understand the new forces at work.

IMPACT OF BANDUNG AND THE GENEVA SUMMIT MEETING

Two important developments in 1955 made themselves felt in the 10th General Assembly. The first was the convening of the Bandung Conference. The second was the summit meeting in Geneva. Together they loosened the rather rigid cold war alinements which have thus far prevailed in the United Nations.

The Bandung Conference reflected an upsurge of confidence among the Asian-African countries. Representatives of the conference, it should be noted, rejected Communist colonialism, as well as the discarded colonialism of former times.

Within the United Nations the spirit of Bandung gave rise to increased expressions of solidarity of interest among members of the group and continued cohesiveness on issues of special mutual concern such as colonial questions, questions of race, the needs and desires of underdeveloped countries, and the question of membership. This current of Asian-African self-expression cut sharply across prevailing Communist-Free World alinements and brought the 10th General Assembly face to face with changing political and economic realities.

Despite the spirit of Bandung, however, the General Assembly, after voting to include the Algerian item on the agenda, subsequently decided not to consider the question further, and on the Cyprus item the Bandung powers were divided.

* * * * *

The Asian and African countries, however they may differ in their foreign policies, share a compelling desire for rapid advancement along the road of industrial, economic, and social progress. Many of these peoples

are newly free of colonial rule. They find the climate of independence no less invigorating now than it was for us in 1776. Nor did the United States, after winning its independence, emerge into a static world assured of a secure and prosperous place among the nations. True, it did not, as do the newly independent lands today, have recourse to a United Nations. But one may well imagine some of the issues we would have hotly pursued in such a forum.

The Summit meeting held in Geneva last July also left its imprint on the Tenth Assembly. This historic meeting reaised the hopes of peoples that the danger of war had further receded. It appeared that the U. S. S. R. joined us in realizing that neither side can survive a global hydrogen war. It seemed possible that some of the outstanding political differences could now be dealt with in good faith.

The General Assembly began its work in this warm afterglow of the Geneva summit meeting. Many delegates invoked the spirit of Geneva in their speeches. The Soviets came wearing the smile of conciliation. The great powers for the time being at least were not glaring at each other across conference tables, fighting out problems born of the Second World War.

* * * * *

While the Bandung Conference and the Geneva summit meeting did not confront us wtih an entirely new situation, we can agree that there was a shift of emphasis which resulted in blurring traditional issues and alinements. At least until the close of the second Geneva Conference in November, Soviet tactics in the assembly appeared more flexible than in the past. Prior to that time the Soveits used the gloved rather than the mailed fist.

Our impression from this past assembly is that Soviet leaders would like to maintain the appearance of cooperative relations, even though they are not willing to create the indispensable conditions for a secure peace. The cold war, in the sense of peaceful competition between conflicting ideologies, was in fact conducted with much vigor.

We must therefore reckon coldly with the true aims of the new flexibility of Soviet tactics in the United Nations. These are to divide the non-Communist world and to gain acceptance as the champion of all peoples seeking a better life.

The Soviet challenge was met resourcefully and to good effect. Let us consider four of the important issues before the Assembly: The admission of new members, the peaceful development of the atom, disarmament, and economic assistance for underdeveloped areas. These are issues of major import for the future of the United Nations and for United States policy.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

* * * * *

There are six points that I wish to stress regarding the United States attitude on the admission of new members. I shall then try to assess the implications for our foreign policy of the increase in size of the United Nations.

First, we have followed a consistent policy based squarely on the principles of the charter. In the words of Ambassador Lodge, the United States was guided by three basic principles: "To bring into membership all qualified states which apply; to follow the provisions of the charter as to judging the qualifications of the applicants; to avoid thwarting the will of a qualified majority by use in the Security Council of the veto."

The admission of qualified states had been prevented solely by the Soviet veto. These would long ago have been members of the United Nations had not the Soviet Union used the veto 45 times on the membership question in the past 10 years.

Second, consistent with these principles the United States took the initiative early during the Assembly session. We actively sought the agreement of the five permanent members of the Security Council not to use the veto on the admisison of new members.

The United States has long favored such an agreement. We stressed this point in varying ways with each of the permanent members. In the present case we ourselves said publicly that we would not use the veto and that we would abstain in the voting on the applications of the Soviet satellites even though in our view their present governments are not independent and their conduct has been reprehensible. This voting position accorded fully with the spirit and intent of the Vandenberg resolution, adopted by the Senate in 1948 by a 64-to-4 vote, which expressed the view that there should be agreement among the permanent members not to use the veto to prevent the admission of new members.

Thirdly, we believed that the admission of qualified applicants would enrich and strengthen the United Nations morally and materially. Their participation in the Organization would outweight any disadvantages which might follow from the admission of the four satellites.

Fourth, it is evident that the pressure of world opinion does exert influence on the Soviet Union. Its original position was that the United Nations must admit all the Soviet satellites, including Outer Mongolia, or the Soviet Union would veto all qualified candidates. We made no comparable insistence. We did not condition the admission of one state upon another under threat of veto. But evidently, among other motives, the Soviets did not wish to bear the onus for having vetoed the long list of free-world applicants.

We should frankly recognize that Soviet willingness to see 16 nations admitted was a comedown from its rigid 18 or nothing position. But we must nevertheless hold them accountable for frustrating the admission of Japan. Contrary to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, the Soviet Union conditioned Japan's admission on that of the fictional entity of Outer Mongolia. It withheld United Nations membership as a new instrument of pressure on the Japanese in their peace treaty negotiations. We deeply regret the continued exclusion of Japan, whose candidacy was backed by every member of the Security Council except the Soviet Union. We also deplore the exclusion of the Republic of Korea and the Republic of Vietnam, both of whom we regard as fully qualified.

Fifth, the abstention of the United States in the voting on the satellites does not mean that we accept as permanent the present situation in Eastern Europe. We will continue to hold the four new Eastern European members responsible for past agreements. We will continue to charge the Soviet Union with its undeniable responsibilities in this regard. As Secretary Dulles said recently, the United States "will accept no compromise with the Soviet Union" that would seem to be acquiescence in the present status in Eastern Europe.

* * * * *

Sixth, our abstention on the satellite applications does not mean any change in United States policy on the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations. We continue to support the Government of the Republic of China. We continue to oppose vigorously the seating of the Chinese Communists.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

What are the implications of the admission of 16 new members? On the organizational side, it is clear that the number of members of the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and perhaps on other bodies should be increased.

Let us look, for example, at the Security Council. Asia has never been adequately represented on the Council. With the admission of six additional Asian members, this imbalance must be redressed. The increase of 10 European countries also requires a review of the number of Council seats allocated to the European region. While we have made no decision on this matter, it may be that only two seats need to be added, although perhaps 3 or 4 more will be required. I believe the concept of the semipermanent membership as it evolved in the League of Nations is also worthy of study.

Any increase in members of the Security Council would, of course, in turn affect the number of votes required for decisions. Moreover, this question of the size of the Council involves an amendment of the Charter which requires the concurence of two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, including the five permanent members of the Security Council. This complex question will obviously require extensive diplomatic negotiations. The United States hopes to begin such negotiations within the next month or two.

We can also expect that new and important political problems will be brought to the General Assembly for solution as a result of its new membership.

The enlarged United Nations will speak with wider authority. It will more accurately mirror underlying conditions as they are in the world and confront all of us in a more decisive manner with the crucial problems of the atomic age. A greater sense of responsibility will be required of all the members if the organization is to develop in a sound and practical way and if problems are to be solved and not aggravated.

There are, of course, those who are already predicting that the United States will lose voting support in the General Assembly. I have this comment regarding such dim predictions.

Up to the present time the United States has been able to retain a position of leadership through the justice of its cause and the logic of its arguments. Almost invariably on important issues our policies have been overwhelmingly supported by the members of the free world.

If the time should ever come when we found ourselves consistently outvoted on important issues in the United Nations, that would surely be a sign that we ought to reexamine in a hard-headed way our basic policies.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

We face another major challenge in promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy. President Eisenhower originally announced his atoms-for-peace plan at the United Nations. We proposed that an Agency be established under its aegis. This reflected his estimate of the value of the United Nations as a mechanism for promoting international cooperation. That is why he also proposed that once established the Agency should be brought into an appropriate relationship with the United Nations.

The traditional way would have been to continue with our bilateral programs. The need to safeguard our security interests and the difficulty of working out an international mechanism for parceling out and controlling the use of fissionable materials would have justified a unilateral approach. But President Eisenhower rejected the pattern of the past in recognition of the needs of the present.

He rejected it in the knowledge that the acquisition of nuclear technology and material brings with it the capacity to manufacture nuclear weapons. Atomic-power reactors can be utilized to produce nuclear materials for weapons even as they generate electricity. Unless effective preventive measures are taken soon, the wider utilization

of atomic energy—which will occur whether or not an international agency is created—will inevitably hasten the day when many nations will be in a position to manufacture atomic weapons.

Think of what this means in terms of existing international tensions, current power relationships, and international plans generally. This is what gives the President's call for international cooperation in this field its great sense of urgency. In the long run it may well be that the greatest contribution of the International Agency will be to assure that atomic energy is used exclusively for peaceful purposes.

* * * * *

DISARMAMENT

Disarmament is a third important challenge. This past Assembly urged that the states concerned should continue to seek agreement on a comprehensive disarmament plan. It also urged that in the meantime priority should be given to the following "initial steps":

"1. Such confidence-building measures as President Eisenhower's plan for exchanging military blueprints and mutual aerial inspection and Marshall Bulganin's plan for establishing control posts at strategic centers"; and

"2. All such measures of adequately safeguarded disarmament as are now feasible."

With this resolution, which was the product of United States and United Kingdom initiative, the Assembly has revitalized 10 years of fruitless debate. It has adjusted its sights to a new and feasible disarmament goal.

This fresh approach to the disarmament problem will have its first test early this year when the Subcommittee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission resumes its work. If the Soviet Union will now agree to the early implementation of the President's "open-sky" plan, the United Nations will finally have the possibility of progressing to a more comprehensive plan of disarmament. Regrettably, Mr. Khrushchev's recent attack on the President's plan is far from encouraging.

Meanwhile this Government is making an intensive review of concrete measures which might be taken now to reduce or limit armaments and armed forces with adequate safeguards as to inspection and control. * * *

ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

The shifting emphasis of the cold war has made the solution of economic problems even more vital. The current Soviet effort to exploit the economic needs of some of the underdeveloped countries, highlighted by the Khrushchev-Bulganin Asian tour, is a matter for serious concern to all those who are genuinely interested in the freedom as well as the progress of the economically underdeveloped countries.

I am convinced that from a dollars and cents point of view, economic aid through multilateral organizations is less costly to us in many instances since it spreads the burden over a larger number of contributors. Moreover, the multilateral approach may often be found more acceptable by some of the underdeveloped countries.

The crux of the matter is that we must remain flexible regarding the manner in which economic aid is made available to our free-world partners. When the job can best be done bilaterally we should use this approach. This is equally true of the multilateral approach.

In the face of the new challenge, it has now become even more important to increase the effectiveness of our economic and technical-assistance programs. Thus it is essential that we continue and strengthen our support of the expanded program of technical assistance of the United Nations which is generally recognized as a long-range program for the economic betterment of underdeveloped countries.

* * * * *

Another area which deserves imaginative exploration is the problem of international financing. There is no one answer to that problem. Much is already being done, and perhaps more could be done, through such bodies as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development on the multilateral side and our own Export-Import Bank.

Further headway is likely to be made through the early establishment of the International Finance Corporation which the General Assembly endorsed unanimously at its last session. It will help to bring together opportunities in underdeveloped countries and potential investors in capital exporting countries and will, we trust, encourage the flow of private capital. The Congress has already approved this undertaking and the United States has formally adhered to the new organization.

It is an open question whether all these measures will be adequate to meet those basic needs for capital in the world which cannot be satisfied by the underdeveloped countries from their own domestic resources. While there can be no doubt that domestic savings must in the long run provide the bulk of the necessary funds, President Eisenhower has recognized that additional funds may be necessary. As you know, over the past several years there has been mounting pressure from the underdeveloped areas for a special United Nations fund for economic development. President Eisenhower has made it clear that as some success in disarmament is achieved, this Government will ask our people to join in devoting a portion of the savings thus achieved to an international fund for economic development within the framework of the United Nations. Such a fund would help in the development of roads and other means of transportation, the multiple use of water and other basic services which, in turn, will create better conditions for private investment.

The formula for a special United Nations fund for economic development as developed to date may not be adequate, but I hope that ways and means will be found for the United States to participate constructively in such a fund.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Since the General Assembly approved the idea of charter review in principle we must examine carefully in the months ahead the ways and means by which the United Nations can be improved.

In some respects the United Nations has never had a fair chance to function. When the Organization was born in 1945 those who drafted the charter did not know about the atomic bomb. Moreover, they assumed that the peace treaties ending the war would soon be concluded and the U. N. would be able to function in a relatively peaceful world. They also assumed that the five great powers would work together to win the peace as they had cooperated to win the war.

All these basic assumptions proved erroneous. The signatures on the charter were hardly dry when the atomic bomb was dropped over Hiroshima and we all realized the world had entered a new and dangerous era. Shortly afterward the great powers, instead of working together, fell to quarreling among themselves. The peace treaties were scrapped, and the United Nations, together with its members, became enmeshed in the cold war.

What we have, therefore, is a preatomic charter which is compelled to function in a nuclear age. Some United Nations critics point out that we are, in fact, sending a Cub Scout to do a man-sized job.

Chief Justice Marshall once said of the Constitution that "it was intended to endure for ages to come, and, consequently to be adapted to the various crises of human affairs." The Constitution has, in fact, proven a living document and has kept pace with the growth of our Nation.

In a somewhat comparable way the charter has proven flexible enough to be adapted to a good many new situations without the need for formal amendment. In the first decade of U. N. existence, for example, not one formal amendment has been put to the vote in the General Assembly. Even so, many important changes have taken place within the United Nations system. Some provisions of the charter have already fallen into disuse. Others have been applied in a way the framers of the charter did not contemplate.

It is important to remember that we are not examining the charter drafted in San Francisco in 1945. We are examining the charter of 1956 as it has been amplified by custom and usage, resolutions of the various U. N. organs, and treaties like the Atlantic Pact and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. If we were to proceed now to consider amendments to the old charter rather than the new, it would be very much like a surgeon planning an operation on the basis of a diagnosis made 10 years ago.

What I am saying is that even though we have a preatomic charter, we do not have a static charter.

We ought to keep this fact in mind for any amendment we propose can be rejected by the Soviet Union. But even if this obstacle proves insurmountable, a decade of experience has taught us that a great deal of progress can still be made within the framework of the present charter without resorting to formal charter amendments.

* * * * *

If the next decade brings, as I believe it will, a greater striving for harmonization for relations among nations—the United States must be in the forefront in helping to create favorable conditions conducive to peace, security and well-being. In our relations with the United Nations we should be completely aware of its shortcomings, enthusiastic over it potentialities, and dedicated to its principles.

Equity on the Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to give added emphasis to a letter recently directed to Members of Congress by Mr. Frank Gregg, editor of the conservation magazine, Colorado Outdoors.

With this open letter, Mr. Gregg forwarded an article from the January-February issue of Colorado Outdoors, entitled "Equity on the Colorado." In both his letter and the article, Mr. Gregg develops this point by an evaluation of recent modifications in the philosophy behind the Colorado River Storage and Development Act.

I do not wish to add much comment of my own to this material for it is self-explanatory. I do not necessarily endorse each statement or position taken by Mr. Gregg, but I am convinced that his material is, as he puts it, a straightforward explanation of recent changes affecting this proposal which deserves serious consideration by the Congress.

We of the upper basin States who have long been working for this sound plan of development firmly believe that the changes referred to have a material bearing on the feasibility of the program. As a consequence, I should like to urge a review of this material to those who may have some doubt or reservation about this legislation as it has been previously offered.

It will be noted that the controversial Echo Park Dam is no longer being supported either by the States involved or by the Bureau of Reclamation. With this out of the way, it is my hope that the legislation will now be considered, and approved, on its merits.

DENVER, COLO., *January 11, 1956*

To Members of the Congress of the United States:

Enclosed is a tearsheet from an article appearing in the current issue of Colorado Outdoors magazine, one of the Nation's leading conservation publications. The article is a straightforward explanation of the reasons behind and the details of Gov. Edwin C. Johnson's proposal for development of the upper Colorado River.

The Governor's proposal differs from others with which you are familiar over the matter of allocation of anticipated power profits from the storage project phase.

Previous proposals to the Congress for the development of the river have made no formal division of these profits. As a practical matter, however, future profit credits have been committed, arbitrarily and inequitably, through the Bureau of Reclamation's recommendations on repayment of the construction costs of participating projects in the four upper-basin States. The article points out clearly that all previous proposals have been made without regard either to the apportionment of water among the States or to any equitable allocation of power profits.

Equity is the key to the Governor's plan—equity in the sense that under his proposal power profits would be divided among the States on the basis of practical present and potential uses of water, as specified in the upper basin compact of 1949 which divides the water among the four States.

Such a division of the profits would allow each State to plan in an orderly fashion for construction of the projects necessary to put its allotted water to use. It would prevent any single State from so encumbering anticipated power profits that other States would be forced to seek appropriations that could not be repaid within a reasonable period. It might even be possible to claim that such a division would encourage each State to seek only the most efficient and economic projects for development, urged on by knowledge of the limited funds available from the power profits.

In recognition of the complexity of the entire problem, the Governor would ask the second session of the 84th Congress for authorization of and appropriation for Glen Canyon Dam, only, as a first step in the development of the whole basin. A glance at the tables will demonstrate that Glen Canyon is the key to the entire development plan. It stores sufficient water to allow expanded use in the upper basin while still meeting commitments to the lower basin, and it will provide an overwhelming share of the expected profits.

Those who have studied the Governor's proposal agree that it is sound and constructive. It has the virtue of simplicity. Above all it is just. It is fair to each of the States of the upper basin and it is fair to the citizens of all the United States, because it provides the best guaranty yet brought forward that the Federal investment in the upper Colorado will bring the desirable benefits that all of us seek.

There are many indications that the Governor's program will win the support that it deserves. Water authorities in the four upper basin States have reached tentative agreement on a division of the power profits similar to that proposed by the Governor. Several major national conservation groups, heretofore bitter opponents of any development on the river, have endorsed the proposal. Leading newspapers of the West have indicated basic agreement with the Governor's aims.

It is to be hoped that the Congress will give this constructive plan serious consideration. It is our firm conviction that immediate authorization of Glen Canyon plus an equitable division of power profits is the best means yet devised for assuring orderly and beneficial development of the vast resources of the upper Colorado River Basin, to the enrichment of all the people of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

COLORADO OUTDOORS,
FRANK GREGG, *Editor.*

EQUITY ON THE COLORADO

(By Frank Gregg)

BASED ON AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF WATER AND POWER PROFITS AMONG THE UPPER BASIN STATES, GOV. EDWIN C. JOHNSON'S PLAN FOR INITIAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE UPPER COLORADO MAY WIN SUPPORT IN THE 84TH CONGRESS

The barebone facts about the efforts of the people of the upper Colorado River Basin to win congressional approval of a federally financed plan for development of the Colorado ought to be familiar to everyone.

Beginning a half-dozen years ago with the first proposals to the Congress, a violent controversy over Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument has kept the river constantly in the news. Conservationists, including many groups not opposed to the principle of development, were joined by advocates of economy in government and a solid block of representatives of one of the lower basin States, to block all proposed projects through the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Objections to Echo Park have been so effective that the upper basin has publicly abandoned it, and even the Secretary of the Interior has announced that the Bureau of Reclamation will no longer press for the unit.

As matters now stand, the Senate has approved a project which includes Echo Park plus additional power and storage projects, and several smaller participating projects. The House has taken no floor action on the project. Thus the future of the river for the incoming session depends on what is approved by the House, and on what finally emerges from the Senate-House conference committee.

A meeting of Senators, Representatives, and Governors of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming was held in Denver a few months ago, with the announced purpose of reaching agreement on a compromise project. After an all-day session, the conferees agreed to eliminate Echo Park, and charge off the cost of the irrigation features of one of the most expensive projects (Navaho, in New Mexico) as a Federal gift to the Indians of the affected region.

The new and harmonious project, through the Echo Park and Navaho provisions, would seem to be welcome to everyone—except, of course, to the economy bloc and the dogged southern California interests, and excepting also one of the key figures in the upper basin itself—Gov. (and former Senator) Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado.

The story behind this apparent defection from the common cause by one of the elder statesmen of upper basin politics involves a history of the basin and its vast resources and the long struggle over the waters of the Colorado—given in the following articles:

The basin and the river

A contagious feeling of optimism pervades the atmosphere of the upper Colorado River Basin—a conviction on the part of the people of northern New Mexico, eastern Utah, southwestern Wyoming, and western Colorado that after decades of painfully slow growth, the region stands but a step or two away from economic fulfillment.

There are impressive reasons for these buoyant expectations. For the past 100 years, since the first permanent settlement was established, the slowly growing population has supported itself by skimming the surface of the region's wealth.

The list of largely undeveloped resources of the upper basin printed elsewhere on these pages gives no more than a hint of the meaning of this wealth to the people of the United States.

The irrigation of a couple of million acres of land for the production of forage for livestock, as well as fruits and other cash crops, must be considered as adding to the wealth of the nation, especially when it can be—and should be—stated, that only insignificant acreages of the new irrigated lands would be used for the production of crops now considered surplus.

And, as the United States Bureau of Mines indicates in its summary of the mineral resources of the basin, these may well form the basis for an entire new industrial complex of the greatest magnitude—a vast industrial region where minerals are removed from the ground and processed and possibly fabricated into finished form, where at any rate the energy sources of the basin are transformed into usable form—liquid petroleum or processed ore or kilowatts of power—for operating the machines of our civilization.

In one important resource, nature was niggardly with the upper basin. The region is rich and vast and beautiful, it contains all that it promises, but it is dry save for the waters of one river and its tributaries—the Colorado. The whole future of the region—the extent of the development of its agricultural and mineral resources, whether it shall become an industrial center or an impoverished source of raw materials—depends on how and where the waters of the Colorado are to be used.

Under terms of the Colorado River compact of 1922, the upper basin States must share the waters of the river with Mexico and with the lower basin States—Arizona, California, and Nevada. Mexico is apportioned 1½ million acre-feet per year, as measured at the international boundary. The lower basin is apportioned 7½ million acre feet per year, as measured at Lee Ferry, Ariz. The upper basin is also apportioned 7½ million acre feet, and the compact architects provided that the first million acre feet of any surplus beyond these allocations would go to the lower basin.

In recognition of the fact that the annual flow of the river fluctuates widely—from as little as 5 million acre feet to as much as 23 million acre feet, the compact also provides that the upper basin must deliver not less than 75 million acre feet to Lee Ferry in any 10-year period following ratification of the compact. This provision in effect gives the lower basin's initial apportionment of 7½ million acre feet a clear priority over the upper basin's share, and (in combination with the delivery requirement to Mexico) forces the upper basin into the position of either storing enough water during wet years to provide for its own needs plus downstream delivery requirements in dry years, or doing without water in those years when the entire river flow was needed to meet downstream obligations.

The 1922 compact made no apportionment of water among the States of the two basins. The lower basin is still arguing the issue before the courts, but the four upper basin States got together in 1949 and settled their differences with the upper Colorado River Basin compact. This document apportions

51.75 percent of the water available to the upper basin to Colorado, 11.25 percent to New Mexico, 23 percent to Utah and 14 percent to Wyoming. Colorado contributes 72 percent of the water in the river at Lee Ferry, Utah 16 percent, Wyoming 10 and New Mexico 2; but the compact apportionments are based on present and practical potential uses of water, rather than on contributions.

The upper Colorado River storage project, as proposed in the Congress, is the means chosen by the upper basin to make possible the use of the water allocated to the four basin States by the 1949 compact.

The ultimate development plan for the river, as prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, makes a clear distinction between two kinds of projects, and sets up a method of repayment for the money advanced for construction by the Federal Government. The storage project would authorize construction of several huge dams on the Colorado and its main tributaries, with two main purposes in mind: these dams would store enough water to allow use of the upper basin's apportionment while meeting the 1922 compact obligations to the lower basin and Mexico; and they would, through generation and sale of power, earn profits large enough to repay the cost of the storage projects plus a major share of the participating projects—those projects which are designed to actually put water to beneficial consumptive use, which are dependent on the storage project for an assured water supply, and on contributions from the power features of the storage project for financial feasibility.

The various versions of the upper Colorado River storage project that have been introduced into the Congress included, until it became obvious that no dam in Dinosaur would be approved, Echo Park and Split Mountain, a power dam a few miles downstream. Other storage projects included Glen Canyon on the Colorado in northern Arizona just above Lee Ferry; Flaming Gorge on the Green in northeastern Utah; either Cross Mountain or Juniper on the Yampa in Calorado above Dinosaur; and from time to time, Curecanti on the Gunnison below the town of Gunnison.

In its understandable eagerness to put the precious waters of the Colorado on the land, the upper basin States inserted a varying number of participating projects into the so-called storage project. Throughout the period, two participating projects have appeared in every version of the legislation—Navaho Dam (and its irrigation features) in New Mexico, and the first phase of the central Utah project, the latter a monumental undertaking to divert the waters of the Green into the populous section of Utah west of the Wasatch range.

Division of water and power profits

	Percent of water contributed by each State to total	Percent each State to receive under upper basin compact	Distribution of power profits under Bureau project in 50 years [1]	Percent	Distribution of power profits under Johnson proposal in 71 years [2]	Percent
Utah	16	23	$164,783,500	75.9	$98,000,000	23
Colorado	72	51.75	16,712,100	7.6	220,700,000	51.75
Wyoming	10	14	33,761,300	15.5	59,700,000	14
New Mexico	2	11.25	1,932,000	1.0	48,000,000	11.25
Total	100	100	217,188,900	100	426,400,000	100

[1] With Glen Canyon, Echo Park, and Central Utah project power units.
[2] With Glen Canyon alone.

The harmony meeting in Denver came up with the usual approval of the first phase of the central Utah project and the Navaho project, with the gift provision of the costly irrigation features to the Indians, as previously noted. And the meeting also brought forcefully to the attention of the public the defection of Gov. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, when the governor appeared at the opening session of the meeting and announced that he considered the previous proposals completely unacceptable to Colorado, demanded equity as the basis on which Colorado's support for legislation could be obtained, and made his own proposal for initial development of the river.

The Johnson plan

Beginning well over a year ago, Governor Johnson explained his opposition to the then current development plan at a meeting of upper basin governors in Cheyenne:

Power profits from the operation of the storage project, after deducting the cost of building the storage project itself, are separately accounted for by the Federal Government, and are to be drawn upon by the upper basin States to repay the moneys advanced by the Federal Government for construction of participating projects. Without a formula for allocating these power profits among the States, it would be possible for one State to get authorization of a project so costly that the entire income from power sales might be needed to repay the cost of that one State's development.

Wouldn't it be wiser, wouldn't it be more just, the governor asked, to arrive at some agreement on division of the power profits, so that each State would know approximately how much money it would have to invest, and each could be assured of sound and orderly development of its share of the waters of the Colorado? And what better basis could be found for this division than the very formula on which the water is apportioned under terms of the upper Colorado River compact of 1949—a formula agreed upon by all four of the States, and based on present and practical potential uses of water.

In support of his position, the Governor presented, both at the governors' meeting and at the more recent Denver meeting, tables showing that the proposed projects implied a grotesque inequity in distribution of the power profits. One of the tables is given here as an example, based on the Bureau of Reclamation's project submitted to the Congress last year, and approved with minor changes by the Senate. If that bill were to become law, with all participating projects requested in it authorized, Colorado would receive but 7.6 percent of the power profits over a 50-year period, in spite of the fact that it contributes 72 percent of the water to the river and is apportioned 51.75 percent of the water under the 1949 compact.

The decision ultimately made by the Denver conference would improve this outlook somewhat by its device of charging off the major share of the Navaho project as a gift to the Indians under an existing law. But the inequities would remain, the only difference being a matter of degree; and, in any case, there is no reason to believe that an economy-minded Congress would approve an outright gift of a project that it turned down when at least most of the anticipated Federal investment would have been repaid.

Governor Johnson would ask the 2d session of the 84th Congress to provide for the division of the power profits and authorize construction of Glen Canyon Dam—the only storage unit to be sought at this time.

The parliamentary situation in Congress, in the opinion of the Governor, is not favorable to approval of a complex and costly project. The estimated cost of the Glen Canyon Dam and the power features of the project is $421 million; the cost of the Denver agreement would be several hundred million more, in spite of the elimination of Echo Park and the fund juggling on the Navaho project.

Glen Canyon would form a lake equal in capacity to one 9 miles square and 500 feet deep. It would operate power generators with a capacity of 800,000 kilowatts—more than 6 times the capacity of all power facilities now in the basin—generating up to 4.4 billion kilowatts annually.

As for the effect of the governor's proposal on power earnings, reference is made to the table. The 50-year total profit from the Bureau's much more costly program, including Echo Park (which is now out of the picture) and the central Utah project is estimated at just over $217 million. The profits from Glen Canyon alone in a 71-year operating period would be over $426 million.

The governor anticipated objections to his program on the grounds that it would not provide the storage necessary to allow use of water in the upper basin. Taking the Bureau of Reclamation's own figures, the governor showed that Glen Canyon alone will meet that need. Taking the worst 10-year runoff period on record (1931–40), about 23 million acre-feet of storage will be required. Glen Canyon's capacity is 26 million acre-feet, with well over 20 million of active storage.

Governor Johnson feels that with the construction of Glen Canyon underway and the division of power profits agreed upon, each State could plan for the expenditure of its funds on an orderly basis. His program, he states, would simplify a project proposal that has aroused great opposition because of its complexity and its apparent ignoring of the apportionment of water among the States. He points out that his plan would not prevent any State asking the Congress for funds in addition to its share of the power profits for construction of a participating project, but it would prevent the monopolizing of power profit funds by any one State.

It is the governor's belief that his program would launch the chain of events that might lead to the useful and prosperous period that the upper basin has dreamed of these many frustrating years. It might be the last major step for the upper basin in attempting to progress from its role as producer of raw materials to a secure position as an agricultural and industrial and recreational center of the United States.

Resources of the upper Colorado River Basin

Agriculture: Over 70 million acres of land in upper basin. Most is suitable for and used as grazing land. Three to four million acres are arable with irrigation; 1½ million now irrigated.

Forests: Over 13½ million acres in national forests, most in use for lumbering and grazing. Primary value is as watersheds.

Wildlife and scenic values: Deer, elk, bighorn sheep, bear, antelope, upland game, waterfowl and trout; incomparable mountain and canyon scenery.

Minerals:

1. Radioactive metals: The four corners area is the biggest source of fissionable materials in United States. Major discoveries are made every week throughout basin.

2. Coal: One-third of all coal deposits in the United States; one-sixth of all known coal deposits in world. Huge source of energy and variety of chemical derivatives.

3. Petroleum and natural gas: Over 50 developed major fields, frequent new discoveries. Full potential not known. Rangely area alone contins reserves estimated at 350–400 million barrels.

4. Oil shale: In northwest Colorado alone, shale deposits estimated to contain about 500 billion barrels of oil. Other great shale deposits in Wyoming and Utah. Full extent not known. Experiments by Bureau of Mines indicate production of liquid petroleum from shale is financially practical.

5. Other mineral resources: Huge bituminous sandstone deposits. Gold, silver, lead, and copper in quantity. Manganese and molybdenum. Phosphate rock, and magnesium and potash salts, of great potential importance as fertilizer.

Summary by United States Bureau of Mines: "This array of mineral fuel and carbonaceous materials is not approached by any region in any other part of the world."

Lamentable Incident for Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks one of the most severe articles of criticism, if not condemnation, I have ever read, written by Dorothy Thompson, and appearing in the Washington Star of January 20, 1956:

LAMENTABLE INCIDENT FOR DULLES

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Secretary of State Dulles, under questioning by the Washington correspondents, was a lamentable witness in his own behalf.

The subject was the article in Life. Mr. Dulles' attitude was surprised innocence. He didn't write the article, he told the press; he didn't know its publication date, and he didn't read it until after it was released for publication. He didn't collaborate with the author; he just had an informal chat, without even knowing whether an article would result. He wasn't conscious that anything he said might be quoted or he would not have expressed himself in quite that way. "Articles such as this, dealing with a complex subject, inevitably oversimplify and * * * tend to overemphasize."

He knew that a tape recording was made of the conversation, but did not hear it. He refused to discuss the contents of the article because that would make it into a sort of State paper.

The article, he was reminded, had been submitted before publication to the State Department. But he hadn't seen the manuscript or proofs. A change had been suggested, but by the Public Relations Division of the Department—and too late.

Remarkable testimony.

What did Mr. Dulles think the Life reporter was up to when he requested and was granted an informal little chat? Was he there merely to satisfy his personal curiosity on certain matters? Or to write an article for a weekly of enormous circulation?

Are exclusive informal chats with the Secretary of State everyday occurrences, or do they constitute a scoop? Was there any possible chance that an article would not ensue?

Did the Secretary warn the reporter that nothing he might say was for quotation? Did he insist that any article dealing with a complex subject should be submitted to him for possible revision? Did he reserve the right to decide after advance reading whether to sanction its publication at all?

And could the reporter have produced the article without the Secretary's collaboration in granting him the interview in the first place?

The Secretary's explanation of the genesis of the article was childish. His explanation of what followed was incomprehensible. Nor do we understand his press aids never informing him that Life had submitted the manuscript, but who made one correction on his own, too late. What was the correction, and why was it made too late?

Mr. Dulles refused to discuss the article because he was not its author. To discuss it would make it into a sort of state paper. Does the Secretary not know that any detailed and verbatim exegesis of his views is de facto a state paper?

Even for Mr. Dulles to have allowed the interview to be conducted as it was, on a very complex subject, made him, in fact, the author of the article. Even without direct quotation, the author records the Secretary's views, not his own. And not to have followed up the product of the interview, and have gone over every word was sheer irresponsibility.

Finally, if the article in any way misrepresents the conversation, why did the Secretary refuse to release the verbatim record to the national press?

A man who talks off-the-cuff in such a manner, affirms that he didn't know he was talking for publication, and expresses surprise but no self-dissatisfaction when he finds the gun was loaded, obviously understands little of statesmanship, diplomacy, or even of public relations.

It is a lamentable incident for Mr. Dulles, this administration, and for international confidence in America. It is a display of personal vanity and public irresponsibility. And, like much that Mr. Dulles says, it was completely unnecessary.

Tribute to Dr. William Manger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution proposed by Dr. César Tulio Delgado, Ambassador of Colombia and President of the Council of the Organization of American States, which was unanimously adopted on January 18, 1956, expressing the Council's deep appreciation for the outstanding achievements of Dr. William Manger as Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIBUTE TO DR. WILLIAM MANGER

Whereas Dr. William Manger, the Assistant Secretary General, has performed the duties of Acting Secretary General since October 19, 1955, when the Secretary General, Dr. Carlos Dávila, died; and

Whereas in the performance of these duties, just as earlier in the capacity of Assistant Director of the Pan American Union and later of Assistant Secretary General of the Organization, Dr. Manger has rendered exemplary service, showing the highest sense of responsibility and unselfishly devoting his exceptional talents and experience to Pan Americanism; the Council of the Organization of American States

Resolves:

1. To record the Council's deep appreciation of Dr. Manger because of his extraordinary achievements in the Organization of American States in the various positions that he has held, particularly in the executive positions of Assistant Director of the Pan American Union and Assistant Secretary General and Acting Secretary General of the Organization.

2. To extend to Dr. William Manger renewed assurances of its utmost confidence and personal esteem.

This resolution was approved unanimously by the Council in its regular meeting January 18, 1956.

United States Testing Ultimate Weapons, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "United States Testing Ultimate Weapons, Too," which appeared in the January 16, 1956, issue of the Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

UNITED STATES TESTING ULTIMATE WEAPONS, TOO

Although the Alsop brothers continue to tout the superiority of the Russians in the superweapons race, we don't believe it is so. In fact, we believe that Uncle Sam is far from asleep, and that the Russians are indulging in propaganda in an effort to make the world think they are keeping up with Uncle Sam.

Premier Bulganin said the other day that Russia will soon test an intercontinental ballistic missile—called an ultimate weapon by military men. Bulganin's statement caused a flurry, of course, and the Alsops and some others were quick to swallow the Russian claims.

There are some steady and resolute minds in America who tell us that our fears lest the Reds be winning the race for pushbutton atomic war is groundless. They point out that Uncle Sam is completing arrangements to extend our missile testing range which now runs from Banana River near Cocoa, Fla., out over the Bahamas. Extent of the present range, we note in the Florida papers commenting upon the subject, is about 750 miles.

Anybody can draw the conclusion that the 750-mile range is too short for the guided missile Uncle Sam has ready for testing. Another 850 miles is being added, and this will place the last observation post on British St. Lucia in the Windward Islands.

However, that is not all. Talks are under way for an extension of our range past Brazil, where an observation post would be set up on an abandoned World War II base, into the South Atlantic for a distance of more than 5,000 miles. Yes, a distance of more than 5,000 miles.

This makes it clear that Uncle Sam is not sleeping, but is working on ultimate weapons which, if the truth could be learned, probably surpass in range and deadliness those which the Russians—and the Alsops—can boast.

As was pointed out the other day, there is an odd historical note in all this. Our country is able to negotiate for the right to fire missiles over British territory because Franklin D. Roosevelt—remember—traded some overage destroyers to the hard-pressed British early in World War II. In exchange for the overage destroyers we got 99-year leases on these island bases. After the war Uncle Sam surrendered the leases but retained the right to reoccupy them when necessary.

The destroyer deal kicked up a lot of fuss in its day, but it helped save England, our first line of defense in the war, and it is paying off now in the highly important field of ultimate weapon testing.

New York Letter Carrier Is Poetry Expert on $64,000 Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, millions of people throughout the country follow with keen interest each week the television program known as the $64,000 Question. On the night of December 13, 1955, a New York letter carrier Roscoe C. Wright reached the $16,000 question which he answered correctly and with ease. For 2 weeks he then debated whether to continue for higher stakes or accept the $16,000 he had already won. He decided on the latter course.

Roscoe C. Wright has not only covered himself with glory in this contest, but he is also a great source of pride to all those who are associated with our postal service in New York. He has demonstrated to the people of this country that our letter carriers, clerks, and all the others in the postal service are of a higher than average intelligence, ability, and education. He typifies the opportunities afforded the average citizen in a democracy such as ours.

Let me cite a few facts about him. Mr. Wright is 54 years of age. He was born in Lexington, Ky. During World War I he enlisted in the Army at the age of 15; he was made a sergeant the next year and served in the Medical Corps. After the war, he lived with his widowed mother in Boston for a time, then they moved to New York. There he met his wife, Edna, whom he married in 1940. They have 2 children, a boy of 13 and a girl of 10. His mother, Mrs. Willy Wright, now 71 years old, still lives with her son in his home in Jamaica, N. Y.

Besides his regular schooling, Mr. Wright had extension and evening courses at Harvard University for 1 year during the time he lived in Boston. Back in 1923 he took a job with the Post Office Department and has been a letter carrier for the past 32 years. He works at the Grand Central postal station in New York City. He delivers mail to some 5,000 people and it was at the suggestion and prodding of many of these people that he decided to get on the television program.

His hobby is poetry in which he became interested back in 1928. He has considerable knowledge in this field and an excellent memory. People would ask him all sorts of questions relating to poetry and he always knew the answers. When he was deciding whether to accept the $16,000 he had won or try for $32,000, the 5,00 persons whom he services on his mail route signed a scroll to wish him luck for the higher prize.

Mr. Wright is now using the prize money he had won for two main purposes: To pay off the mortgage on his home; and to give his church, the Lemuel Haynes Congregational Church, an organ.

Mr. Speaker, because many people will find it very interesting to read the questions and answers, particularly the literary content, I am inserting into the RECORD the exchange of questions and answers on poetry in which Mr. Wright participated so eloquently. It is as follows:

THE $64,000 QUESTION
MR. ROSCOE C. WRIGHT'S QUESTIONS (POETRY)

Questions on November 29

I'll read you the first line of a famous poem; you tell me the poet.

Sixty-four dollar question: "Tell me not, in mournful numbers, life is but an empty dream."

Answer: Longfellow (A Psalm of Life).

One hundred and twenty-eight dollar question: "I wander'd lonely as a cloud that floats on high o'er vales and hills."

Answer: Wordsworth (Daffodils).

Two hundred and fifty-six dollar question: "Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit of that forbidden tree."

Answer: Milton (Paradise Lost).

Five hundred and twelve dollar question: "Drink to me only with thine eyes, and I will pledge with mine."

Answer: Ben Jonson (To Celia).

Questions on December 6

One thousand dollar question: There is a famous narrative poem by Tennyson about a shipwrecked sailor who returned home after many years to find his wife happily remarried. He concealed his identity rather than spoil her happiness. For $1,000 tell me the man's name, which is also the name of the poem.

Answer: Enoch Arden.

Two thousand dollar question: Probably the most popular poem by the present English Poet Laureate, John Masefield, is Sea Fever. It begins, "I must go down to the seas again * * *"—and this phrase opens each of its three short verses. For $2,000 recite the rest of any one verse.

Answer (as Wright gave it): "I must go down to the seas again, to the lonely sea and the sky, and all I ask is a tall ship and a star to steer her by; and the wheel's kick and the wind's song and the white sail's shaking, and a gray mist on the sea's face, and a gray dawn breaking."

Four thousand dollar question: The anguish of parting has supplied inspiration for poets throughout the ages. For $4,000 tell me what poets lamented the following maidens: First, Highland Mary. Next, The Lost Lenore. Finally, Lucy.

Answer: First, Robert Burns. Next, Edgar Allen Poe. Finally, William Wordsworth.

Eight thousand dollar question: Many great poetic passages consists of two successive lines of poetry. I will give you the first line of four such well-known passages. For $8,000 you give me the second line and the poem's author. 1. "I am the master of my fate." 2. "For all sad words of tongue or pen." 3. "Theirs not to reason why." 4. "Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet."

Answer: 1. "I am the captain of my soul" (Invictus) by Ernest Henley. 2. "The saddest are these: 'It might have been!'" (Maud Muller) by John Greenleaf Whittier. 3. "Theirs but to do and die" (The Charge of the Light Brigade) by Alfred Tennyson. 4. "Lest we forget—lest we forget" (Recessional) by Rudyard Kipling.

Question on December 13

Sixteen-thousand-dollar question: Poetry has enriched the lives of us all. Certain immortal lines are especially well remembered. I will quote four famous poetic phrases. For $16,000 tell me, first, the name of the poem in which they appear; next, the poet who wrote the poem; finally, quote in full any 1 of the 4 poems involved. 1. "Sunset and evening star." 2. "When I was one-and-twenty." 3. "My heart leaps up when I behold." 4. "The year's at the spring."

Answer: 1. Crossing the Bar, by Alfred Tennyson. 2. When I Was One-and-Twenty, by Alfred Edward Housman. 3. The Rainbow, by William Wordsworth. 4. Song from Pippa Passes, by Robert Browning.

The following is the poem that Wright chose to recite in full:

"WHEN I WAS ONE-AND-TWENTY

"When I was one-and-twenty
I heard a wise man say,
'Give crowns and pounds and guineas
But not your heart away;
Give pearls away and rubies
But keep your fancy free.'
But I was one-and-twenty,
No use to talk to me.

"When I was one-and-twenty
I heard him say again,
'The heart out of the bosom
Was never given in vain;
'Tis paid with sighs aplenty
And sold for endless rue.'
And I am two-and-twenty
And oh, 'tis true, 'tis true."

Study Shows Squeeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Study Shows Squeeze" which appeared in the January 20, 1956, issue of the Franklin Favorite, of Franklin, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

STUDY SHOWS SQUEEZE

If there has been any question about the squeeze on the small farmer a recent study of the Bureau of the Census seems to answer it. A study covering 5 years, 1950 through 1954, found an 11.1-percent drop in the total number of farms. However, the same study showed the total acres in cultivation remained about the same. This means fewer farmers farming, each cultivating or tending more acres.

During that 5-year period the average-sized United States farm grew from 215 to 242 acres—an increase of 12.9 percent in acreage. Here in Simpson County, where the trend in the 1940's was toward smaller farms, the average farm showed an increase in acres, reversing the trend.

One interesting—and perhaps surprising—point in the study is that a growing number

of farmers are doing their own farming. A larger percent of farmers owned all, or part, of their acreage than at any time since 1880 when census taking was started.

The study showed half of all farms now have telephones—with an amazing 90 percent of all United States farms having electricity. Together all farms owned 250,000 more tractors than at the start of 1950.

Sixty percent of the Nation's land is in cultivation with harvest crops spreading over 330 million acres, just a relatively fewer acres than in 1950 croplands.

From the report, it is obvious that farming is following the footsteps of business. It is moving toward mergers and bigger farming. If the trend reflects conditions not conducive to survival of the small family-size farm it is disturbing—just as the squeeze on the small-business operator is.

That squeeze means more than just throttling the small farmer or small-business man out of business. It strikes at the basic makeup of the Nation. Let our family-size farm be threatened—and our liberties are at stake.

News Dimout Blocks Defense Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more important to the American people than to know whether or not their Government is taking the steps necessary to make our military might so great that no aggressor will dare to attack us. I am alarmed at the secrecy that keeps the pulbic from knowing the facts about our defense. This secrecy is attacked in an article appearing in the February 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest and I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article follows:

WHAT'S HAPPENING AT THE PENTAGON—NEWS DIMOUT BLOCKS DEFENSE REAPPRAISAL

When Defense Secretary Wilson and Treasury Secretary Humphrey walked from President Eisenhower's cottage at Camp David to the National Security Council meeting at Laurel Lodge December 8, a reporter asked them if the meeting had made any change in the defense budget. Secretary Wilson's only comment was that he and Secretary Humphrey were still speaking.

The incident was but one of many fresh reminders to correspondents that the administration door is sealed tightly on the debate within administration circles on national security issues. From the outside, it appears that the Treasury boss man, Mr. Secretary of Everything Humphrey, still speaks with the decisive voice even though he recently has had to make some concession to spiraling prices for defense goods.

What most impresses reporters, however, is how little the press and the public have been allowed to share in the administration's deliberations on this vital issue. The public's participation in the debate is, in fact, perilously close to nil.

Literally, a multitude of questions about the defense program are pressing for attention from the American public, but the news clamp maintained by the administration makes it increasingly difficult for the people to debate any of them, or even to know that serious questions demand attention.

As one veteran Capitol newsman expressed it, "One thing is indisputably wrong with our defense program, and that is the 'paper curtain' which has been drawn around the Pentagon. The necessity for reappraisals of our defense posture is reemphasized daily by the fast-changing international picture, but we can't even begin to have an intelligent reappraisal unless the public has constant access to the actual facts of our military situation."

Similar alarms over the deepening dim-out on defense information have been sounded repeatedly in recent days, but the cloud of secrecy and censorship continues to settle more heavily over Republican Washington.

A "philosophy of secrecy" that might be called a "scorched freedom" policy "seems to pervade the defense establishment and the National Security Council," said J. R. Wiggins, executive editor of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. Wiggins, who is chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, was testifying before the House Government Subcommittee on Information. He was one of 13 press spokesmen who appeared as witnesses at the opening in November of the subcommittee's inquiry into policies and practices being followed by the National Government in the area of news.

"What was variously described as a 'paper curtain' and a 'redtape curtain' was said to be cutting the American public off from the kind of information it needs to make intelligent decisions," the Post reported.

Summing up the editors' cause of complaint as stated by the chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee, the Washington Evening Star listed four examples of "a dangerous trend toward unjustified secrecy or suppression in the Defense Department and elsewhere." They are:

Classification of a letter of Gen. Matthew Ridgway last June as "confidential" because it might have been "misunderstood" if published at the time of the Geneva Conference. (The letter from General Ridgway, retiring Army Chief of Staff, was directed to Defense Secretary Wilson. In it, General Ridgway restated his reasons for his earlier expressed view that the administration's cut in Army manpower "jeopardizes" national security. His warning was buried under Wilson's "confidential" stamp until one New York newspaper got wind of the letter through a news leak.)

Introduction of entirely new categories of withheld information. (Answers to questionnaires—sent by the House subcommittee to 64 governmental agencies concerning their information policies—revealed that at least 30 new such classification types have been established in various agencies.)

A Defense Department directive last March to information officers to give out only such information as would "constitute a constructive contribution to the primary mission of the Defense Department." (That directive can be, and has been used as a gag rule—as many editors and writers have noted.)

Another directive last September advising defense project contractors to release no information that might be of "possible value to a potential enemy." (Such a blanket restriction on unclassified information serves to slam the censorship door on all news.)

The Wilson news restriction, which still stands, is but one feature of the Administration dim-out on defense facts. The gravity of this issue is underscored by protests like the following which have multiplied in recent months:

"Official figures belie claims by top civilian officials that the Army has been able to maintain its effective strength at the height-of-Korea level during the past 2½ years in spite of a reduction in personnel of better than 400,000. * * *

"Claims of maintaining the Army's strength based on these paper units is a case, in our opinion, of deliberately misinforming the public and is dangerous to the Army and the country." (Army Times, October 1, 1955.)

"Dr. Ralph Lapp, a noted atomic scientist, has accused the Atomic Energy Commission of withholding from the American people the fact that Russia has detonated a dozen nuclear devices within the past year.

"One possible reason advanced by Dr. Lapp for the AEC's withholding of facts is that if the people knew too much of Russia's atomic capabilities, they might 'resist a balanced budget.' This may or may not be true. For our part we do not feel that the American people want a balanced budget at the price of creating a risk to national security." (The Arkansas Gazette, October 30, 1955.)

"We hear a lot of statements that the Russians are moving forward in aviation, in military aviation, in a way which is outstripping us, and yet we haven't got the facts * * * we get driblets of information from the Pentagon, and the American people aren't told what the realistic conditions of our defenses are." (Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, Face the Nation interview, October 9, 1955.)

"It is steadily becoming more apparent that this administration is not being candid with the American people with respect to the current relative strength of the United States Air Force as against that of the Soviet Air Force." (Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, former Secretary of the Air Force, July 9, 1955.)

"The Eisenhower administration is not yet giving the American people either a candid or a full explanation of why it is reducing by 400,000 the manpower strength of the Armed Forces by June 1956. * * *

"The explanations are not, I believe, half-truths, but even when added together are not more than two-tenths of the whole truth." (Washington Correspondent Roscoe Drummond in the New York Herald Tribune, January 5, 1955.)

"But even more serious than the growing threat of Russian air power is the deception being practiced officially by top-level civilians in Government that denies the American people the facts they must know if they are to make the intelligent judgment necessary to insure our survival as a nation." (Aviation Week, May 1955.)

"The public does not expect to be given military secrets. But it does expect an early end to the double talk in Washington. That only creates confusion. And confusion helps the Reds." (The Philadelphia Inquirer, May 23, 1955.)

Adding further to the public's confusion is the new Pentagon mystery—the hush-hush over the Killian report. A high-level study of our military situation with particular relation to scientific, technological, and industrial factors, the report takes its name from Dr. James Killian, Jr., president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He headed a committee of scientists, industrial leaders, and other experts, who labored many months preparing a comprehensive analysis of the relative curves of Soviet and American armed strength for the National Security Council and the President.

In mid-September, an account of some of the disturbing conclusions in the report appeared in two articles written by Joseph Alsop in the New York Herald Tribune. His version brought a quick challenge from Murray Snyder, acting press secretary for President Eisenhower at the summer White House in Colorado. My Snyder termed the Alsop story "inaccurate," and added that the content of the Killian report is "classified."

Since then there has been complete governmental silence about the report, and growing speculation that it will never be released to the public. The facts set forth in the report would not, it seems, throw a favorable light on some of the administration's past and present defense policies.

In his account of the Killian committee's conclusions, Mr. Alsop writes that the report shows "the Soviet Union is now overtaking

the United States in the air atomic weapons race."

"As of now, by this report's estimate," Mr. Alsop adds, "the frequently mentioned American lead may be expected to become a Soviet lead in the period 1960–65. * * *

"This report that the National Security Council now has before it also includes recommendations for reversing this unfavorable trend in the American-Soviet balance of power. But these recommendations will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement without upsetting the administration's present budgetary and fiscal plans."

The conclusions which Mr. Alsop attributes to the Killian committee are findings supported by a formidable body of evidence on new military and scientific developments—facts which have been verified by sources outside Government channels, and which the administration is unable to suppress.

Some administration recognition that the defense cuts have gone beyond the bounds of prudence came with the President's late December decision for a $35.5 billion budget next year, $1 billion above the current annual expenditure. But, as the Washington Post reported, "Rising prices paid for weapons and equipment account for a major share of the increase in defense spending." Still other increases result from legislation passed by Congress at the last session. No new major step-up is involved.

The administration still holds the line for the heavy reductions which have been made over the last 3 years—the delayed Air Force build-up, resulting from the big 1953 slash in our air power; the reduction of nearly a third in Army manpower, the trimming of Navy and Marine Corps, and most of the cuts in the Armed Forces civilian manpower which were projected earlier in the winter. The Humphrey carving on the Defense Establishment stands virtually intact despite the deteriorating foreign situation, and despite the slump in the Reserve program, which was supposed to compensate somewhat for the cuts in existing forces.

Today it is undeniable that the administration's glossing over of the world military picture in 1953 led to a serious miscalculation with respect to the Air Force. Then the Air Force budget was cut by $5.1 billion, and the goal of a 143-wing Air Force by 1955 was abandoned. Developments this year have shown that Defense Secretary Wilson was 100 percent wrong 2 years ago when he reassured Congress that Russia was concentrating on a defensive air force of fighter planes.

A heavy shock to the whole country came last year with Russia's May Day air shows, exhibiting new jet long-range heavy bombers and new jet fighters which established that the Russians had stolen a march on American planners.

Administration efforts to keep the bad news from reaching the people were frustrated by reports of the Soviet gains in newspapers, in independent technical journals and in Congress. The Democratic Congress raised a storm over the developments which compelled the administration to ask reluctantly for an additional $356 million for stepped-up B–52 jet bomber production, and also to order speed-ups in jet fighter output and research.

The administration's defense cuts, as numerous observers have warned, constitute a perilous form of unilateral disarmament in advance of any agreement on international arms limitation, or any firm prospect of such agreement.

In computing the costs of this premature easing up of our defense effort, a formidable expense item will be the extra cost incurred as new crash defense programs are undertaken to offset the bad effect of the crash economy cuts.

Heavy though that extra dollar cost may be, the main loss lies in the effect which the decline in our relative military superiority has had in prolonging the cold war, with all its enormous hazards.

America's reduced defense gait obviously has encouraged Russia and Communist China in the hope that they can overtake and surpass the Western colossus in military power. That fact becomes doubly evident now that the Communists have used the smile tactic and the Geneva spirit to play for more time while they hurry with their crash armaments programs and stall off real settlements.

Reappraisals of our defense program become even more urgent with the revival of the cold war and the vanishing of the spirit of Geneva. For success in that enterprise it now seems conclusive that the first thing which needs to be done is to lift the administration's curtain on defense facts.

Ridgway Sheds Some Light on United States Defense Budgets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Ridgway Sheds Some Light on United States Defense Budgets" which appeared in the January 19, 1956, issue of the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

RIDGWAY SHEDS SOME LIGHT ON UNITED STATES DEFENSE BUDGETS

Gen. Matthew Ridgway long has been on record as opposing huge and successive cuts in Army manpower. As Army Chief of Staff he told one Congress after another that in his opinion the cuts endangered the national security. To emphasize his restatement of this opinion, he retired 2 months ahead of schedule last June 30, a day before the newest military budget he had opposed went into effect.

Now in retirement, General Ridgway, again with the utmost circumspection, has begun to detail the explosive account of his successive defeats at the hands of the Eisenhower administration budget-planners. His six-part series, beginning in this week's Saturday Evening Post, was reviewed and cleared by the Defense Department with full awareness that they contained comment critical of the Secretary of Defense and the President of the United States.

This clearance by the Defense Department, let us hope, betokens both a willingness on the part of the Eisenhower administration to reexamine its policies and a hope that the impact of Ridgway's views on a complacent public might build popular support for a painful increase in our defense expenditures. For implicit in Ridgway's first article is the alarming indication that military budgets sold to Congress on the basis of President Eisenhower's own military expertness were instead measures prefabricated by his team of politico-economic planners and presented to the President most falsely as the "unanimous" recommendations of his own handpicked military team, the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Has Defense Secretary Wilson put up an iron curtain between the President and the men who should be his military advisers? Have he and his economy-minded aides browbeaten some of the military into glum acquiescence with their own views by portraying them as a must from the White House and then transmitted this acquiescence to Ike as the unanimity so successful in selling their program first to Ike and then to Congress?

These monumentally grave questions presuppose that President Eisenhower did not bother to read—or never had before him—newspaper accounts of General Ridgway's troubled testimony correctly afforded when congressional committees asked for it. Whatever the detailed answers, the general's memoirs show that the President did indeed stun the nonconcurring general by presenting the 1955 fiscal-year program to Congress as "unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff." And the facts, General Ridgway says, are that the Army budgets for 1955, 1956, and 1957 were all directed verdicts, that the Defense Department tried to silence or suppress his disagreement as an expert witness, that he was pressured to fit his views to a preconceived politico-military party line, and that the force levels set in all three budgets were not based primarily on military needs but were squeezed within the framework of preset, arbitrary manpower and fiscal limits.

Such testimony from the Army's former Chief of Staff is political dynamite, of course. The Nation will be hearing much more about it. But it should become not a matter for partisan exploitation but for bipartisan concern. And both for the moment and for the long run the Nation's interest ought to be centered not on Secretary Wilson's methods and motivations for producing seeming unanimity in his empire, but on General Ridgway's persuasive argument that the Nation is courting disaster unless it reverses a 3-year program of defense cutbacks—a program that within a few months more will have reduced Army strength from 1.5 million to barely more than a million and the Army appropriation from 16.2 billion to only 8.9 billion.

The admen working for Secretary Wilson sold the cutback program as insuring "a bigger bang for a buck." Wilson and his supporters, in Congress and out, admitted that the Communist danger was as great as ever but said that huge reductions were justified for three reasons: (1) new weapons with enormously increased firepower, (2) the strength afforded by the impending new Reserve forces setup, and (3) the strength of the new West German armed forces.

The trouble with this "bigger bang" apparently is that it resembles a firecracker too much—all noise and no bullet. The new Reserve setup was mutilated by Congress at birth, and in any case, General Ridgway reminds us, won't amount to much for another 5 years, and even then will be of questionable value in what might well be a quick war. As for the West German Army of half a million, by the Germans' own estimate it will be at least 3½ years before the whole 12 divisions are ready. And the powerful new weapons? The number is extremely limited, General Ridgway says, and in Europe even the Russians know that we have there only a few guided-missile units plus 5 battalions equipped with only 30 of the vaunted 280-millimeter atomic cannon—a thin line indeed on the 400-mile-long front from the North Sea to the Alps.

These are the figures for the Army, and it is a brilliant Army man speaking. The figures do not include the new nuclear weapons of the Air Force or the Navy. And the viewpoint may be suspected of being too partial to the role and the needs of the Army. But General Ridgway reflects a dedicated concern not for the Army as such but for the national security. The concern is based on a belief, frequently voiced even by administration spokesmen, that we may face wars, little ones as well as great ones, in which no nuclear weapon will be used. And for such wars, General Ridgway grimly reminds us, the Communist powers, unworried by political

demands for cutbacks of manpower and firepower, have formidably superior forces. They are taking out double insurance on another Ridgway conviction; that nuclear warfare itself will require greater instead of lesser manpower, but that if the bomb is never dropped you stand to lose only money, not the war.

Obliquely—and by happenstance—Secretary Wilson has just answered some of the Ridgway reasoning. He quoted President Eisenhower as having warned his Cabinet in December that excessive defense spending might disrupt the Nation's economy and lead to dictatorship.

That is an ancient fear. And it has some validity, of course. But General Ridgway's point is that he assesses only the military needs of the Nation against its hopes of survival, against its dangers and its specific commitments around the world—to Canada, 20 Latin American and Caribbean countries, Berlin, West Germany, Spain, Yugoslavia, 14 NATO nations, Libya, Ethiopia, Saudia Arabia, Iran, Australia, New Zealand, 7 Manila Pact nations, Pakistan, Korea, Japan, the Republic of China; and the United Nations Organization. If we can't afford to pay for freedom, that's for civilians to say.

To us his argument spells out the need for a sharp reexamination of defense policies by the President and the Congress. We can spend a lot more on defense before we have to start worrying about a native dictatorship, and we would prefer to face even that danger in preference to foreign conquest. Better a shortage of butter and Buicks and bourbon now than a shortage of guns and fighting men when the chips are down.

General Ridgway reports that his 2 years in the Pentagon shocked him far more than did any bomb or bullets in battle. His record of those 2 years will probably shock his compatriots even more. It might even shock the White House censors into letting the President hear about it.

The Women of the Bible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include with considerable pride the following address by my friend and constituent, Edith Deen, which was delivered before more than 300 Fort Worth Kiwanians and their wives on January 5.

Mrs. Deen will be recognized as the author of the current best seller All of the Women of the Bible, which in less than 2 months has gone into three printings and parts of which are to be offered to the public as a syndicated feature by a national news agency during the pre-Lenten season.

Edith Deen and her illustrious husband, Edgar Deen, the former mayor of Fort Worth, are examples of the best in truly constructive American citizenship. Her remarks commend themselves to the reading of the Members of Congress.

The story of the women of the Bible, from the creation on through the Christ and the formation of the New Testament church, is one of the most dramatic on record. In fact the Bible is the only literature in the world up to our own century which looks at women as no better and no worse than men. It is no wonder then that the Bible presents a feminine portrait gallery unsurpassed in the world of literature.

Because these women of the Bible give us the world's most imperishable record of women's influence for good and evil, they are the most important women in the world. To think that these women have survived these thousands of years is the wonder of it. The time of the Old Testament, as you know, is a disputed question. But to say the least, we know that it dates back thousands of years before Christ.

In a few centuries the great women of our generation, Eleanor Roosevelt, Queen Elizabeth, and others, will have passed into oblivion. But there will still loom large in the hearts and minds of Christians everywhere these same women of the Bible.

These women are as much alive today as they were centuries ago. They are as immortal as the Bible itself. They cannot pass into oblivion because they represent the world's most wonderful record of woman's relationship to God, and that record is imperishable.

After more than 3 years of relentless research on "All of the Women of the Bible," I am fully convinced that as woman goes so the world goes. In her elevation the race is recreated. In her degradation the very fountains of life are poisoned at their sources. In nowhere is this more evident than on the pages of the Bible, where you find traced the story of man and woman's search for God, written in the history of His chosen people.

The ultimate aim of our book is to show the part women played in the civilization of Bible times. Particularly have we endeavored to stress woman's spiritual role in civilization.

As someone has aptly put it, "The hand of the clock today is pointed Godward, and women must realize their role as God intended it, the equal partners with men in the spiritual destiny of mankind." We have this confirmed right there in Genesis 2: 24, "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him: male and female created He them."

Here, too, we have warranty for woman's dominion. The fact that God did not give man dominion until he had woman standing beside him is evidence enough of her exalted place in the creation.

As molders of civilization the Bible seems to tell us that women must realize to the fullest their partnership with men in the spiritual destiny of mankind.

In Kings and Chronicles, we have warranty for the fact that women were molders of the race. In the biographies of the Kings of Israel, we find appearing 20 times, like a refrain in a song, "And his mother was * * *. And he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord," or "And his mother was * * *. And he did that which was good in the sight of the Lord."

In every epoch of the Bible, from the creation on through the crucifixion, these women of the Bible stand preeminent. They are the first at the cross and the last at the tomb and later among the first to assemble in the upper room to form the new church. Finally we find them as colaborers with Paul in the spreading of the Christian gospel throughout Europe.

These women—all of them—live on the pages of the Bible, a great river of spiritual reality rising out of Israel's remote past and continuing to flow more deeply and powerfully through succeeding centuries and right into your life and my life.

The Bible gives direction and continuity to our individual understanding of things spiritual. It is a story of man's search for God and in studying it as we should, great spiritual vistas open before us.

All of the Women of the Bible is divided into three parts. In the first section are the 52 searching studies of the 64 women of the foreground. This is the part of the book that I labored on for months and months, writing and rewriting some of them as many as 20 times. All the while I was trying to create a living procession of women beginning with the larger-than-life figures of Eve and the partiarchal mothers, on through the women of Israel's years of triumph and calamity and finally the women of the early Christian church.

In All of the Women of the Bible you will find saints and harlots, faithful mothers and wives, queens, fortune tellers, concubines, business women, all of whom give the Bible much of its color, charm and drama.

In the second edition of our book are all the named women in alphabetical order with a Bible chapter, verse and sketch about each. Here, for example, you find every named woman in the Bible from Abi, the mother of Hezekiah to Zipporah, the wife of Moses. And all between these names beginning with A down through those beginning with Z, you find many others, 2 Abigails, for example, 2 Abihails, a Bernice, a Chloe, 2 Deborahs, an Elizabeth, a Gomer, a Huldah, an Iscah, a Jemima, a Keturah, 7 Maacahs, 6 Marys and on and on they go through a Tryphena, a Vashti, and a Zibiah.

In the third section are those nameless women arranged for easy reference into the sections of daughters, wives, mothers, widows, and so on. Many of these nameless women, such as Sisera's mother and Potiphar's wife, are remembered only through their son or husband.

Among other nameless ones is the woman with 7 husbands. She was the woman of the New Testament, you recall, who was married first to 1, then another of 6 brothers. As each one died, without leaving a child, she became the wife of another of the brothers. Her marriage was in keeping with the early levirate law, making it obligatory for a man to marry his brother's widow.

The Pharisees and Sadducees, desiring to place Jesus at a disadvantage, brought to Him this unusual but hypothetical case of the woman with seven husbands, asking Him whose wife she would be if the husbands arose in the resurrection. And he told them that they knew not the Scriptures nor the power of God, for in heaven they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven.

Among other nameless ones are two women at the mill, a picture used by Jesus to make clear to His disciples how necessary it was to be ready for the day when the Son of Man should be revealed. He said, "Two women shall be grinding together; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

Jesus used this story immediately after that of the 2 men in bed, 1 of whom shall be taken and the other left, and just before the story of the 2 men in the field, 1 of whom should be taken and the other left. The fate of everyone was dependent upon whether he or she was ready for the sudden and unexpected coming of the Kingdom of God.

Jesus wanted woment to know, just as he wanted men to know, that none was exempt, not even women busy at their household tasks.

Another nameless one is the woman with leaven, who appears in one of Jesus' parables about the Kingdom of God. He likens the Kingdom of God to leaven, "Which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." Three measures were probably more than a bushel, an enormous amount for bread, but the quantity probably was large in order to emphasize the extent of God's rule. In this parable Jesus teaches that His Gospel, though apparently small and weak, nevertheless possesses the power quietly to transform all of life.

Woman the loaf giver as well as man the seed sower are both needed to feed the hungry.

Among these nameless ones also are the women of Proverbs. Among these are the

evil woman, and there is strong warning not to lust after her beauty or be taken by her eyelids. There is the foolish woman, who is said to be clamorous, simple, and knoweth nothing. We have, too, the brawling woman, and we are told it is better to dwell in the corn of the housetop than with her in a wide house. We are told it is better to dwell in a wilderness than with the angry woman. There is also the contentious woman, who is said to be like a continual dropping in a very rainy day.

Finally there is the virtuous woman in that last chapter of Proverbs, a woman "whose price is far above rubies." Totalizing as it does the most noble attributes of the wife and mother, this is literature's most perfect portrait of the ideal woman.

Her chastity, charity, diligence, efficiency, earnestness, her love for her husband and children, even her business foresight, are brilliantly illuminated in words that rise up majestically from the page. The light in all its effulgence shines upon her godliness. This quality, the Bible seems to say, is what gives meaning, purpose, and direction to this womans' life.

But you know those magnificent lines, which I quote in part, "Who can find a virtuous woman, for her price is above rubies? The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her. She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. Strength and honor are her clothing. * * * She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness. She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness. * * * Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her."

Another nameless woman who appears in our searching studies is Lot's wife, the woman who looked back. Though only 15 words tell her story—it's the shortest biography in literature—it has placed her among the well known women of the world. The 15 words are, "But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt."

Even though Lot's wife was well out of Sodom with her daughters and husband before the destruction came, she could not be influenced either by the warnings of the angels or by the pleadings of her husband. And as she looked back, she was turned to a pillar of salt.

Tradition has pointed out, however, that a mountain of salt, at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea, was the spot where the event took place. The text described it as a rain of brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven, "by which the whole district was overthrown."

Geologists explain that the south end of the Dead Sea is a burned-out region of oil and asphalt. A great stratum of rock salt lies underneath the Mountain of Sodom on the west shore of the sea. This stratum of salt, they say, is overlaid with a stratum of marl, mingled with free sulfur in a very pure state. Something kindled the gases which accumulate with oil and asphalt, and there was an explosion. Salt and sulfur were carried up into the heavens red hot. Literally it could have rained fire and brimstone. The cities and the whole plain and everything that grew out of the ground were utterly destroyed. This may explain the incrustation of Lot's wife with salt when she turned back.

The difference of opinion regarding the myth and literal aspect of Lot's wife do not change the great truths of the story. She still stands as a permanent symbol of the woman who looks back and refuses to move forward, the woman, who, faced toward salvation, still turns to look longingly on material things she has left behind.

Women of the Bible had many tests and trials, heartaches and punishments. That's what makes them so real. I know they are real, for I lived with them intimately for more than 3 years as I wrote this book, and they always came up as real live human beings.

There was Rebekah, for example, whom we first see as a gracious, beautiful young girl in love with her husband Isaac. But like some other women, as they grow older, Rebekah's love for her son Jacob came before everything else, even before her loyalty to her husband and her fairness to her other twin Esau.

Finally we find Rebekah deceiving her blind husband and at the same time wrongly influencing her son Jacob to ask for his father's blessing. And so we see her at the end, an old woman bidding her beloved Jacob goodbye as he started on his long journey to Padan-Aram, with his staff in his hand and his bundle of clothes over his shoulder. We can picture this Bible mother as she takes a long look at her son's form as it becomes lost on the horizon.

The tingle of goat's bells and bleating of the sheep would be heard as usual. The sun would rise on the morrow. When night would come the stars would be there as usual, but Rebekah would never see Jacob again. It would be more than 20 years before he would return, and then she would be buried in the sepulchre beside her mother-in-law and father-in-law, Sarah and Abraham. Rebekah spent her last years with a son Esau, who always remembered his mother's part in deceiving him and with a husband who had lost confidence in her.

Oh, these are wonderful stories, filled with the drama of human lives, and all showing what happens to people when they forsake what is right and good.

We even have in the Bible the five daughters of Zelophehad who declared their property rights. Their father had died. They were entitled to what he had left, but because they were women—women didn't have many rights in these times—they had been denied this property. But these five girls marched courageously before Moses and declared their rights to their father's property. You lawyers know of course that the daughters of Zelophehad filed one of the earliest reported lawsuits on record, and they won.

One of the most lovable women in the Bible is Ruth, the central figure in the Book of Ruth. And her abiding love embraces the person you would least expect, her mother-in-law Naomi.

And so it was Ruth, the widow of Naomi's son, gave up her homeland of Moab, and traveled with her aged and poverty-stricken mother-in-law back to Judea and never swerved from her unselfish purpose during the many trials that followed. Or did she complain because she had given up everything: her country, her relationships with young friends, or her chance to marry a man of her own nationality. Or did she complain because she had to go into the hot fields and glean, in order to earn for her mother-in-law and herself.

But how much she gained. Ruth became the wife of one of the richest and most influential men in Judea, the noble Boaz, in whose field she had gleaned. From this marriage sprang an auspicious lineage, the House of David.

Love had worked the miracle in Ruth's life. She had proved that love can lift one out of poverty and obscurity, love can bring forth a wonderful child, love can shed its rays, like sunlight, on all whom it touches, even a forlorn and weary mother-in-law. Ruth's love had even penetrated the barriers of race.

We can never give a talk on women of the Bible without centering on Mary, who as the mother of Jesus Christ stands apart from all women in history.

Adoration of the mother of Jesus is ageless, classless, raceless, and timeless. Mary's divine mission of being the mother of the only Begotten Son of God never faltered from the manger to the Cross on Calvary. Because she bore nobly such loneliness and such heartache at the foot of the cross, countless people down the centuries, in moments of anguish and pain, have found comfort. Mary's silent endurance of what she could not change is her great lesson at the cross to the world.

Mary the mother was to experience new confidence in her own mission after she learned that her son had arisen from the dead. She now was not so conscious of her own motherhood as she was of the divine Sonship of Jesus.

The last mention of Mary is when she was gathered with the infant church after the ascension. She was praying with the apostles in the Upper Room in Jerusalem. We can know that great now was her faith in the eternal.

I wish I could bring dozens of these great women of the Bible before you, but that is impossible. We could prepare countless talks such as this, always using different women. For we have the stories of more than 300, you know, in "All of the Women of the Bible."

Among some of the more notable ones are Eve, the first woman in the Bible, Rachel and Leah, the two sisters, who as the wives of Jacob became the mothers of the 12 tribes of Israel. Another was Jochebed, the faithful mother of Moses. Another was Miriam, the sister of Moses who led the women of Israel in that oldest of all national anthems, "Sing Unto the Lord," when four centuries of bondage in Egypt had been lifted.

And there were two mothers who came before King Solomon, who received them as would a judge presiding over a court of justice.

Each had given birth to a son. One child had been born 3 days before the other. Like most infants of such a tender age, they looked much alike.

The real mother rushed before Solomon telling him how the other mother had lay on her child as she slept in the night and had awakened to find it dead. And then spoke this mother excitedly to King Solomon, "She arose at midnight and took my son from beside me, while I slept, and laid it in her bosom, and laid her dead child in my bosom."

After hearing the case King Solomon called for his sword and said, "Divide the living child in two, and give half to the one, and half to the other." Of course it was the real mother who hastened to say, "O my Lord, give her the living child, and in no wise slay it." And the other said, "Let it be neither mine nor thine, but divide it." You know to whom Solomon gave the child. Of course it was the mother who had real concern for the fate of her child.

Many of these stories of women of the Bible are filled with drama, just like this. And all tell a lesson that will be helpful in solving problems in our own lives today.

The stories of these women of the Bible, though ages old, are as new and fresh as if these women lived today. It is no wonder that this feminine portrait gallery is unsurpassed in the whole of literature and that these women will still be alive centuries from now, for they are as immortal as the Bible itself.

New Year Warnings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial

entitled "New Year Warnings," written by Frank D. McKay, which appeared in the Michigan Times under date of January 6, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YEAR WARNINGS

(By Frank D. McKay)

When General of the Armies Dwight D. Eisenhower campaigned for the Presidency, he preached commonsense and a return to the traditional ways of American life. People responded, and elected him.

He promised things almost everybody wanted, namely:

1. Stopping the Korean war—and by implication overseas wars, also.

2. Balancing our unbalanced budgets, so we could pay as we go, and stop making debts for our grandchildren to pay.

3. Cut tax takes down to somewhere near the American levels that used to be.

4. Stop the creeping communisms and sneaking socialisms set going by New Dealers.

5. Cut out the palsy-walsy playmate games we'd been playing with the Kremlin's killers.

Ike's long army career showed administrative ability and cleverness in managing masses of men. Hence most practical people felt he could pull us out of the political pitfalls the New Dealers dug to return to traditional American ways.

But Ike's military career and genius wasn't quite able to conquer the political abilities of the Lefties and Liberals who had entrenched themselves in Government offices widely; whose organizations were still able to formulate policy.

So it was that many lifelong Republicans felt disappointed over the clear continuance of the New Deal, the death of Senator Bob Taft and his rightwingers, and Ike's inability to outsmart the Russians or to put our finances on sound, American basis.

Ike's heart condition today prevents Republicans generally from looking clearly into the future, or from waging any practical election campaign at present. The well-financed Democrats are making hay rapidly, and getting men and money and the masses of voters lined up on their side.

All that leaves the American future largely in doubt, unclear. Perhaps a resurgence of new new dealism. Creeping socialisms, patterned after the European revolutions may come with a strong drift toward a dominant Labor Party government which might confiscate business and private wealth, and put Washington, D. C., in undisputed control of our 48 States and Territories, our 3,000 counties, and 55,000 cities, towns, and villages.

Most citizens never anticipate a robbery until the thieves have come and gone. Most people are murdered secretly and quietly by criminals who leave no clues or trails, and who have well-made alibis to prove they never done it nohow.

Most of communism's takeovers have come quickly, sneakily, under some polite camouflage, with polite names and personable "front" leaders.

The murders, the pillage, the rapes and rapine, and robberies come after the Commie criminals are in full control of all government agencies and officials.

It happened just that-a-way in France, Russia, Italy, Germany, England, East Indies, South America, Middle East, the Balkans, and the Baltics.

I am told that over 25,000 Socialists, Communists, liberals, lefties, and un-Americans went into important Washington positions during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

Only a very few, a mere handful (such as Hiss, Remington, Weiss, and the like) have been legally exposed as fully proven traitors, spies, and agents of Russian secret police.

Our American outcries have merely frightened the others underground, where they cover up and wait for some better opportunity to continue their reforms of our American ways of life.

Our long-time traditions favor free speech, free assembly, free press, free thinking, freedoms of every kind and description, including the civil rights necessary to run down the Constitution, to reform the Republic in any way we wish, and to completely change our ways of life.

All these American concepts seriously impede justice and our courts from catching up with and exposing the un-Americans.

The Civil Rights Congress (long a defender of outright Commies and criminal subverters) rightly claims such privileges for all the foreigners and social dynamiters they defend in court—and similarly for all foreigners working to upset our American prosperity and world trade.

Almost every other country in the world, and its commerce, of course, would profit greatly by a letdown of American prosperity, by a stock-market panic, or by any cutdown of American power and prestige and popularity.

Hence, with Russians as the spearhead, there is great power and much trickery behind the newspaper scenes. Many agencies are dedicated to cutting us down to size.

Our prosperity and peace could be upest and confused. This would profit multimillions of foreign traders and businessmen all over the world.

They have already copied our methods, borrowed our machines, hired our labor experts, gotten gifts of billions of dollars, so they can now compete strongly.

Foreigners today have a legal claim on fully half our national gold supply, buried at Fort Knox, Ky.

Foreigners today legally own enough American securities, stocks and bonds and United States Government obligations, so that a united drive on our stock markets and bank reserves could easily upset and confuse our present prosperity.

Such a drive selling short our securities may someday produce a panic fully equal to that disaster of 1929, in which foreign interests were so prominently charged with pushing off our panicy toboggan slide.

Foreigners today resent our world-wide superiorities in goods and gadgets and industrial methods. They have copied our best techniques and, with union labor's connivance, have set themselves to win away much of our world trade, just as they took away all our farm crop markets and trade.

Foreigners today figure that the more socialism that creeps into Washington's policies, the better chances they will have for benefiting, just as world traders benefited when socialisms cut Russians out of world trade 100 percent during the past 38 years.

Foreigners' factories have a great advantage over us in cheap labor supplies. Most of them can undersell us now with equal-quality goods at 50 percent to 75 percent less than our homemade goods must sell for.

Only our protective tariff walls prevent this today, and many Washington experts want these walls torn down, so foreign goods can enter our home markets more freely.

These are a few random thoughts and a few commonsense warnings that all Americans ought to keep in mind. They should not frighten or upset us. They should merely put us on guard, so we can prevent consequences. These facts are indisputable. Everybody should know about them.

Let us not be lured into pitfalls and deadfalls like blind men. Let's spot the Indians' ambuscades and avoid them, before bloody disasters strike secretly and suddenly.

Coal Turns the Corner in a Big Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Coal Turns the Corner in a Big Way" which appeared in the January 20, 1956, issue of the Madisonville Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

COAL TURNS THE CORNER IN A BIG WAY

The coal industry, which shared for several years the plight of agriculture as stepchildren in the American economy, is held by experts to have entered a new era of rapid development and expansion. This will lead, by 1970, to a 100 percent increase in output, the optimists say, which translated into tonnage will mean production of 800 million tons per year.

This new era which is forecast for coal had its first full year in 1955, with a gain of 73 million tons or 18.6 percent. The next few years are not expected to witness a repetition of such a rapid increase, but within the next 5 years the industry will reach a potential production level of 600 million tons, or an increase of 50 percent over 1954.

Predictions along this line, based on increased demands for energy throughout the world and increased production efficiency within the coal industry, are made by Joseph R. Forsythe, general manager of Keystone Coal Buyers Manual, a McGraw-Hill publication which is widely circulated in the industry.

Forsythe says the upswing for the coal industry, which turned the corner in the summer of 1954, also promises prosperity for coal's allies—mining equipment manufacturers, transportation industries, electricity, steel, chemicals and finance.

Eight major factors supporting the growth prospects of the coal industry cited by the McGraw-Hill man are:

1. Coal's largest consumer the electric utilities, now have under contract additional facilities on which a valid estimate of a 37 percent increase in coal use can be made for the 1955–60 period.

2. The aluminum industry, faced with a possibility of expansion at a rate even higher, is turning to coal.

3. Overseas export demand is now near an all-time high, with every likelihood that it will establish new tonnage records in the next few years.

4. The competition of gas and oil has passed its peak.

5. Coal's top management is developing new techniques in mining, in transportation and in merchandising.

6. The steel industry, dependent on high-quality coking coal, is finding it necessary to use coal in a new way. Anthracite coal will be used in pelletizing taconite, which will supply immense quantities of iron ore to steel furnaces, and bituminous coal will be used to supply the electricity required.

7. The chemical industry holds coal's greatest growth potential. Development of low-temperature carbonization for both energy and byproducts for chemical use holds a potential of sizable tonnages.

8. Experimentation with coal-burning gas turbines is now on the verge of success, and it is now a possibility that these will replace diesels for railroad use as fast as diesels replaced steamers.

On the basis of all these things, it is calculated that to meet the challenge of the future the coal industry will have to develop production capacity over the next 15 years. This will call, of course, for investment of billions of dollars in new properties and new equipment, and also will contribute to the development of communities in which the industry expands.

United States and Latin-American Relations—Tributes to Dr. William Manger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Washington Daily News on January 16, signed by Persio C. Franco, former Chargé d'Affaires of the Dominican Republic in Washington, which is highly complimentary of the great talents of Dr. William Manger, who has served at Assistant Secretary General of the Organization of American States, together with a similar editorial which appeared in the New York Times on January 19, also laudatory of Dr. Manger's great contribution toward the betterment of United States and Latin American relations.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of January 16, 1956]

DR. WILLIAM MANGER URGED FOR OAS POST

This is an open letter addressed to the governments of Latin America by a Latin American who has always tried humbly to serve the ends of justice.

It would be in the best interest of the Organization of American States and an act of justice to Dr. William Manger to elevate him now to the position of Secretary General of OAS, as successor to the late Dr. Carlos Davila.

In the best interest of the OAS, because Dr. Manger is unquestionably the best qualified person in the world to discharge the duties of such high position.

An act of justice to Dr. Manger, because he has devoted a lifetime to that organization, and because the opportunity to give an eminent reward for his contribution to Pan-Americanism will not present itself again while he is still of desirable age.

Dr. Manger is, intellectually and spiritually, a son of Dr. Leo S. Rowe, the man who has made the greatest and noblest contribution to the realization of the Pan American ideal formulated by Bolivar and maintained by Lincoln, Roosevelt and others.

The position of Secretary General of the OAS is so unique that the question of nationality should never be taken into consideration. The best qualified person—man or woman—should always be chosen to fill it. All persons employed by the OAS, from the humblest to the highest, should be made to feel at all times that it is through merit—and through merit alone—that anyone can climb to the top. The failure to elect Dr. Manger now for Secretary General would be demoralizing to all of them.

I know that all those presently working for the OAS are friends and admirers of Dr. Manger and give him their best cooperation in every way. That being so, they should sign a petition addressed to the council of the OAS signifying their desire that he now be appointed secretary general. It is their privilege and they should consider it their duty to do so.

When Dr. Rowe passed away I addressed a letter to the editor of the New York Times, which was published December 16, 1946, in which I stated, among other things, the following:

"He was an idealist, a model citizen of the Americas, a generous heart, a perfect friend. His cordiality, courtesy, spirit of service, modesty, imaginative perception and intellectual capacity and diligence evoked the utmost admiration. * * * Each and every Latin American, from the most exalted to the humblest, who has had the good fortune to be in contact with him were made to feel that they were his fellow countrymen."

For the above reasons, all Latin Americans, including those that have been mentioned as probable candidates for the position, should favor Dr. Manger. He should be unanimously chosen by Latin America.

PERSIO C. FRANCO,
Former Chargé d'Affaires of the Dominican Republic in Washington.

[From the New York Times of January 19, 1956]

SECRETARY OF THE OAS

An admirable choice has been made for one of the most sensitive official posts in the Western Hemisphere. Ambassador José A. Mora of Uruguay has been elected Secretary General of the Organization of American States to finish the unfilled term of the late Carlos Davila of Chile. Dr. Davila, in his turn, succeeded one of the outstanding statesmen of Latin America, Alberto Lleras Camargo of Colombia.

It is well that the OAS keeps to such a high standard, as the position—regionally speaking—is the equivalent of Dag Hammarskjold's in the parent organization of the United Nations. Of all the regional organizations, the OAS is the most successful. No area in the world has such a fine record as ours in the peaceful settlement of disputes and the Secretary General, as the administrative head, always plays a key role when trouble arises.

As it happens, Dr. Mora was the chief negotiator in the two most recent quarrels in Latin America and he performed so well that he became a natural choice to succeed Carlos Davila. The first of these occasions, and the more important, was the settlement of the dispute between Costa Rica and Nicaragua a year ago. Dr. Mora also handled successfully the nervous charges by Ecuador against Peru last September.

It has always been thought necessary to appoint a Latin American to the post of Secretary General and there are sound reasons for doing so. However, this means that our own Dr. William Manger, who has served as Assistant Secretary General since 1947 and who has been with the organization since 1915, could not take the top post for which he, also, is so eminently fitted. Dr. Manger is one of those selfless, devoted public servants who is indispensable and fully appreciated by all his colleagues but who does not come before the public eye. It is thanks to Dr. Manger that Ambassador Mora picks up a smoothly functioning organization.

Everyone can feel sure that the OAS has now chosen a man who will make a notable Secretary General, and our hearty congratulations are extended to Ambassador Mora.

Educational Benefits for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND P. RADWAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks I have been working intensively on a bill which I consider most essential to the continued progress and security of our Nation. Today I was privileged to introduce it for the approval of the Congress. It is entitled "A bill to extend the educational benefits of the veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to all veterans of the Armed Forces who have served therein since June 27, 1950." Because the purposes of this proposal can easily be hidden behind such an austere title, I would like to explain them briefly.

As you all know, Congress passed a bill during the closing days of World War II which was intended to show our 11 million citizens under arms the Nation's appreciation for their victory, and to lend them a helping hand as they returned to civilian life. That was the purpose of the "GI bill of rights," as it was promptly dubbed, but as it turned out, the Nation could not have done itself a greater favor in its efforts to aid the veterans. Just as an example, the 7,800,000 veterans who took advantage of the education and training program are now paying back the cost of that program, because their education has permitted them to attain an income level at which they are paying an extra billion dollars in Federal income taxes. These benefits were revived for the Korean vet, and then once again permitted to expire.

For some time, as my constituents are aware, I have been concerned with several serious national problems. It is said that Russia has now surpassed us in the education and training of scientists and engineers, and that they are at the present time training over twice as many engineers as we are. Everyone knows that science and engineering is the key to survival in this scientific world.

Another problem is represented by our need to keep our guard up in this period of so-called peace. It is difficult to make the Armed Services attractive to our young men when we are technically at peace. Still a third problem lies in the fact that we have and probably will continue to have a serious shortage of doctors in this country. A fourth problem exists in the need to aid and improve our educational system generally. The recent White House Conference on Education, and the constant efforts to bolster our colleges and universities are ample proof of that. Finally, as I indicated above, we have been a Nation that has always shown gratitude to its veterans.

My purpose in introducing the above-described bill is to extend the education and training benefits of the GI bill to all veterans of the Armed Forces. Rarely does one enactment serve so many useful

purposes. It should certainly encourage enlistments in the Armed Forces, and at the same time encourage many who would otherwise not receive a higher education to acquire training in the sciences and engineering. As happened after World War II, many beneficiaries of the act will undoubtedly study medicine. The Nation's colleges and universities will receive a much needed helping hand, and the veteran will know that his gift of a period of service is not unappreciated. The overall benefit to the Nation will be incalculable.

I have long been active in veterans affairs and have served on that committee in the House. I can sincerely say that I never experienced greater satisfaction in presenting a bill concerning the veteran.

A Letter to Peggy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 16, on page A319, is an address entitled "What's Right With America," by Boyd Campbell, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. The highlight of Mr. Campbell's speech was a reply he gave to a farm housewife in Texas who had asked him for a letter to her daughter, to be placed in a scrapbook she was preparing.

Because Mr. Campbell's reply to Peggy was not a part of his prepared speech, the reply was omitted from my insertion in the RECORD. I have since secured a copy, and would now like to include it in the RECORD, prefaced by the original letter from Peggy's mother:

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I am a farm housewife, the mother of a 7-year-old daughter, Peggy.

Since, in all probability, I will be unable to leave her anything much of this world's goods upon my death, I am making her a scrapbook of Americana.

Mr. Campbell, would it be possible for you to send Peggy a letter about what you think of America, so that I can place it in her book?

If you can't do this, could you send your autograph and one of your business cards, as I do want you, as a representative of American business, to be in my little girl's book.

Thank you for your kindness, and may the Lord bless you.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

JACKSON, MISS., *September 6, 1955.*

Miss PEGGY WILLIS,
Forestburg, Tex.

DEAR PEGGY: There are millions of people around the world who would give everything they have for that which cost you nothing—your American citizenship.

That does not mean, Peggy, that the priceless freedom which is yours was not dearly bought. Many of those who came before you paid for it with their lives.

The United States is the greatest Nation on earth. Its greatness, however, is not in the things you can see—not in its skyscrapers and banks and assembly lines, nor in its ships and automobiles and airplanes.

The greatness of America is in the things you cannot see—in human freedom, individual dignity, and trust in God. These values comprise the deep-laid foundation of our Nation. Upon them the things you can see were built.

America was a clean start in its economic, social, and political life. It was built into a great Nation by a free people for you, Peggy, and for all the girls and boys who will come after you.

To you and to your generation, and to each succeeding generation, comes the high privilege of defending our precious heritage.

Sincerely,

BOYD CAMPBELL.

A Résumé of Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "A Résumé of Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A.," a traveling exhibition which started its tour of the United States on September 19, 1955, under the direction of Mr. Lee Howard, of Miami Beach, Fla. The statement was prepared by the participating organizations.

The purpose of Schoolroom Progress is to encourage interest on the part of young Americans in teaching as a profession, to pay tribute to the contribution of the American teacher, and to increase interest in our schools and school facilities. These are highly laudatory objectives and merit the enthusiastic support of educational and civic organizations on both the local and national level.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RÉSUMÉ OF SCHOOLROOM PROGRESS, U. S. A.

Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., is a traveling exhibition which started on its tour of the United States in Washington, D. C., on September 19, 1955.

It is cooperatively sponsored by the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village of Dearborn, Mich., and the Encyclopedia Americana, and is under the direction of Lee Howard, of Miami Beach, Fla.

It has three basic purposes—to encourage an ever-increasing interest on the part of young Americans in teaching as a profession, to pay tribute to the contribution of the American teacher, and to increase interest in our schools and school facilities. As such, it merits and has the cooperation and enthusiastic support of educational and civic organizations on both a local and national level.

Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., travels, and is exhibited, in its two railroad cars. In each exhibition city, these cars are exhibited either in the railroad station or at a convenient station siding—very much in the same manner as was the Freedom Train.

It will visit approximately 40 major cities per year over a period of 3 to 5 years, and will spend each summer on exhibition at Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Mich. During the summer hiatus, therefore, it will be viewed by the additional hundreds of thousands of persons who visit the village each summer.

The exhibit is contained in specially designed railroad cars containing both heating and air-conditioning facilities for the comfort of visitors. These cars were donated to the exhibition by the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.

The exhibit graphically depicts the contrast of the American schoolrooms of yesteryear with those of today. It exhibits a frontier log-cabin schoolhouse, a replica of the McGuffey-type school of the early 1800's. This schoolroom contains an open fireplace, whaleoil lamps, split-log benches, a birch rod switch, slates, quill pens, McGuffey readers and many other wonderful, authentic artifacts from the collections of the Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village.

Similarly exhibited are American rural and city classrooms of the 1880's with its kerosene lamps and wood-burning stoves and other historic equipment of the classroom of 19th century. Exhibits of early American books, writing implements and other school equipment made or used by famous Americans are also exhibited in the old section of Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A. This yesteryear section of Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., is truly a historical museum on wheels.

Then, in sharp contrast, Schoolroom Progress U. S. A. exhibits five schoolrooms of today. The most modern of classroom architecture, equipment, and audiovisual devices are exhibited along with architect's drawings and photographs of outstanding examples of today's school buildings and classrooms. These classrooms consist of the following types: Kindergarten, elementary, home economics, industrial arts, and office practice. These rooms have been designed by five architects who were award winners in the American Institute of Architects' honor awards program. Also exhibited are prize-winning entries in the school division of the American Institute of Architects' honor awards competition.

Thus the exhibition portrays the great progress in American educational facilities and will, we sincerely hope, stimulate interest and activity in our schools.

Since it is felt that adequate school facilities are great assets in attracting young people to the profession of teaching, we feel this exhibition serves that purpose. Further, it is hoped that Schoolroom Progress U. S. A. will serve as a "peg" upon which educational campaigns of newspapers, radio, and TV stations may be hung, bringing their influence to the side of the American school.

Schoolroom Progress U. S. A. does not attempt to say, "This is what your school should be like." It merely contrasts the educational limitations and hardships of years gone by with the wonderful school facilities which exist—are available—and are in use in American schoolrooms today.

The Henry Ford Museum and Greenfield Village, authorities in historic Americana, are sponsoring the old section of the exhibition. The research, reproduction, and artifacts of the old American schoolrooms are provided by this famous institution.

The modern section of Schoolroom Progress U. S. A. is sponsored by the Encyclopedia Americana. The outstanding research facilities of this great educational organization have been lent to finding the most effectual and advanced classrooms and school equipment extant and which are already in practical use.

Schoolroom Progress U. S. A. is accompanied by its own curator from the Henry Ford Museum. He is Robert Johnson, formerly community relations director of the Indianapolis public schools. Its executive director is Lee Howard, of Miami Beach, Fla.

In each exhibition city, Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., is locally sponsored as a public

service of a prominent local organization. Local sponsoring organizations are usually utility companies, banks, chambers of commerce, and/or outstanding newspapers.

In each exhibition city, prior to opening Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., to the general public, the local sponsor holds a press preview. Actually, press preview" is a misnomer since, in addition to representatives of press, radio, and TV, invitations are issued to the following groups: All educational authorities, teachers, boards of education, parent and teacher associations, and other educational organizations, and civic, business, industrial and political leaders, et cetera. In other words, every effort is made to attract the attendance of persons of leadership in each exhibition city, as well as from all surrounding communities. Consequently, although Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., is expected to visit approximately 40 cities annually, it is believed that the "leader public" of some 200 cities or more will visit the exhibition each year.

Then, following the preview and its ceremonies, Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., is viewed by students and the general public during an average visit of 5 days in each exhibition city. In the case of students, arrangements are made wherever possible to have them attend the exhibition en classe, accompanied by their teachers as scheduled field trips.

Persons visiting Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., are given a 32-page booklet. This literature provides a detailed description of the exhibition—its contents and its purposes. It also credits those industrial organizations whose products (school furniture, equipment, instructional material, etc.) are seen in the modern schoolroom section of the exhibit. On this point, it should be explained that some outstanding industrial organizations, whose products are utilized in modern schools and classrooms, have been invited to participate in Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A.

The introduction to the 32-page booklet is written by Dr. S. M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education. Dr. Brownell's statement pays tribute to the modern American teacher. This statement is also displayed on the exhibition train.

The National School Public Relations Association, a department of the National Education Association, has provided a "suggestion sheet" containing thoughts pertaining to the local use of the exhibition to highlight and aid the activities of local educational groups. This material is distributed by the local sponsor to local educational groups in advance of the arrival of the exhibition.

Previous experience indicates that Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., will probably have an attendance of close to one million persons per year. Between one and one and one-half million booklets will be distributed annually. Publicity will be released through all media. Many local radio and TV stations will cover the exhibition as public service programs, utilizing direct remotes or by tape and films for later playback.

We sincerely believe Schoolroom Progress, U. S. A., will represent a major contribution to educational thinking.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS PARTICIPATING IN SCHOOLROOM PROGRESS, U. S. A.

American Seating Co.; Carrier Corp.; Congoleum-Nairn, Inc.; Crane Co.; Curtis Lighting, Inc.; Day-Brite Lighting, Inc.; De Walt, Inc.; A. B. Dick Co., Inc.; Eastman Kodak Co.; Electric Auto-Lite Co.; Felt & Tarrant Manufacturing Co.; General Electric Co. (lamp division); General Outdoor Advertising Co.; Ludman Corp.; The Miller Co.; Monroe Calculating Machine Co.; New York Silicate Book Slate Co., Inc.; Owens-Corning Fiberglas Corp.; Philco Corp.; Pittsburgh Corning Corp.; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Corp.; Radio Corporation of America; Remington Rand; Silvray Lighting, Inc.; Singer Sewing Machine Co.; United States Plywood Corp.; Wakefield Brass Co.; Yale & Towne Manufacturing Co.

Policies of Secretary of the Interior McKay Relating to Conservation of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the West's great editors, Mr. Robert W. Ruhl, of the Medford, Oreg., Mail-Tribune, has written a most cogent editorial about the policies of Secretary of the Interior McKay, which are so inimical to the conservation of our natural resources. Mr. Ruhl is a former winner of the Pulitzer prize for excellence and achievement in editorial writing. His trenchant comments in the Mail-Tribune of January 17, 1956, emphasize that personal attacks are not being directed at Secretary McKay but, rather, at a program of abandonment and surrender which threatens the heritage of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial under the title of "It's His Policies, Not McKay," from the Medford Mail-Tribune of January 17, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S HIS POLICIES, NOT MCKAY

It is somewhat disappointing to find some of our favorite newspapers in Oregon joining the GOP press at the wailing wall over the alleged abuse suffered by Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

They don't dare attack the popular President, so they pick on poor little "Doug." "Doug," who is new in Washington, didn't realize what a hot spot he was getting into when he accepted the Interior job. In fact he should be getting bouquets instead of brickbats, for he is as honest as the day is long, and doing his best to serve the best interests of the administration, etc., etc.

That is the general line of the defenders of the Interior Department.

We have heard no one question Secretary McKay's basic honesty.

Nor in previous administration did we hear of anyone on the other side of the political fence, question the honesty of two of President Truman's Cabinet members, Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes or Secretary of State Acheson.

But there were plenty of brickbats thrown at both of these controversial figures in the last Democratic administration, and the same were not heaved at the Democratic President.

This has been true ever since the Harding administration and the reign of Secretary of the Interior Fall, and will undoubtedly be true again—and again. For that is the only sensible procedure—the blame rests—if there is blame—not with the man who appointed the officials, but with the officials themselves, guilty of the misdeeds.

So these complaints about "picking on Secretary McKay," instead of President Eisenhower, rather than arousing sympathy for Oregon's former governor are likely to do the reverse.

As before remarked, it is not Douglas McKay's integrity that is at issue. In fact as far as this department is concerned we believe the man is entirely honest and sincere, just as we believe his ideas about democracy, conservation, and public power are honest but entirely wrong.

We doubt if there is anyone in the present administration who believes more thoroughly in Secretary Wilson's dictum and its implications that what is good for General Motors is best for the people of the country, than Douglas McKay—unless it be the Secretary of Defense himself.

That is a matter of fact, the basic, and extremely practical philosophy of accepted GOP doctrine.

And thousands—in fact millions—of good law-abiding American citizens believe it.

So giving tidelands oil to a few States and a few large oil companies instead of to the people of the country as a whole, as the Supreme Court directed, was "good politics because it was good business." Handing over the power at Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co. instead of the Government for the benefit of the people was similarly good business. Secretary McKay's most recent "give away" opening of wild-life refuges to mining prospectors and oil company representatives, as well as 252 game refuges is also good business—why consider the dumb animals or nature conservation when a few smart operators could make more millions out of the natural resources formerly protected and conserved for future generations.

The only fly in the ointment, as far as Secretary McKay is concerned—and the Republican Party for that matter—is that there are more millions of entirely honest and law-abiding citizens who do not believe making money is everything; who do believe that the public welfare should be considered before private profit, and who not only believe in the conservation policies of Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot but are willing when the issue arises, to fight for them.

In short, the critics of Secretary McKay have no personal grudge against the "little Secretary of the Interior," no desire to "pick" on him, impugn his motives, or question the purity of his character—they just don't like his policies. They don't like what he has done since he became head of the important Department of the Interior, and what he promises to do before he gets out.

It is no defense to call this playing politics—unless all efforts by individuals to secure a government in whose policies they believe, instead of one in which they don't believe, is playing politics.

We don't believe even Secretaries McKay and Wilson would uphold that doctrine.

Decrease of Family-Size Farms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRICE DANIEL
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I know of no person in Texas who has given more serious thought to the plight of family-size farmers than has Mr. Walter Malec, publisher of the Hallettsville Tribune and other south Texas weekly newspapers.

Mr. Malec was among the first persons to interest me in the seriousness of this

problem, and the need for Congress to take more of the human and social elements into consideration while trying to improve our farm program. The San Antonio Express of January 17 contains an article entitled, "Size of Farms Increasing as Farm Population Drops," in which Mr. Malec's picture is carried as that of an authority on this problem, and in which he is quoted by the writer, Mr. R. G. Jordan.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the San Antonio Express be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIZE OF FARMS INCREASING AS FARM POPULATION DROPS

(By R. G. Jordan, agriculture editor)

Farms are getting fewer, the average size of the farm in Texas is increasing while the number of people residing on farms continues to decline.

These facts are borne out by the 1954 Federal farm census. It follows a trend which has been underway for the past several years.

For instance, in 1950 the number of farms in the State was 331,567; in 1954 it totaled 292,946. But during this period the average size of the farm increased by almost 60 acres—from 438.5 in 1950 to 498.3 in 1954.

The number of farmers residing on the farms operated in 1950 was 292,296; in 1954 it had declined to 251,253.

Another factor which points to the trend away from the farms is that the census report showed 103,477 farm operators in the State in 1949 who had income exceeding the value of agricultural products sold. By 1954 that number had increased to 112,139. In 1949 a total of 134,682 operators were working full time away from their farms while in 1954 the number had risen to 142,948.

For the past few years economists have cited that some 13 to 14 percent of the population is now feeding and clothing the remaining 86 to 87 percent. The ratio now may be down even somewhat more.

But let's take a look at some of the individual counties in south Texas where the farming population has shown a steady decline in the past two or more decades.

Walter Malec, publisher of the Hallettsville Tribune, claims that his county (Lavaca) has lost some 1,000 farmers since 1940 and that adjoining Gonzales County has lost fully 1,300 farmers.

"I would guess that since 1940 Texas has lost at least half of its small farmers," said Malec. "These losses which have occurred in this county are true in almost every county in the State," he added.

In Lavaca County, census figures show 3,398 farms in 1950 and 3,294 in 1954. The average size of farms had gained from 159 acres in 1950 to 171 in 1954.

The number of farm operators who did not reside on farms jumped from 128 in 1950 to 231 in 1954, and the number of those who were totally working off their farms increased from 618 in 1949 to 1,042 in 1954.

Uvalde County is another example of where the number of farms is declining and the average size of the farm is increasing. In that county 690 farms were listed in 1950 and 641 in 1954. The average size of a farm in that county was 1,878.9 acres in 1950 and jumped to 2,307.5 acres in 1954.

Another example is Bexar County where the number of farms declined from 3,132 in 1950 to 2,772 in 1954 with the average size of the farm set at 203.5 acres in 1950 and 192.5 in 1954. A total of 2,871 operators resided on the farms operated in 1950 but declined to 2,500 in 1954.

The figures which are cited from these few counties give an indication of the trend of people away from the farms as they seek more gainful employment in other lines of endeavor, and the trend toward larger farming units in many of the counties.

As Malec cited in an editorial in his paper some time ago: "The more people we have owning their farms, the safer all of us are. These fundamental facts are largely ignored. Yet there is no escape from them. And it's not only farmers, but all of us."

The Farm Situation—Broadcast by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Daily Radio Round-Up of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn., for January 19, 1956. The broadcast deals with the farm situation.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THURSDAY, *January 19, 1956.*

In Washington, this week, the seed from which the 1956 farm program will sprout is being planted. And, as the biblical quotation says, "As ye sow, so shall ye reap." But, before a harvest can come, a lot of ground must be cultivated, the plants tended and watched over, and a good deal of machinery tinkered with and repaired.

The seed for this new farm program is the testimony being given by farm leaders, farm-State legislators and Government officials before the farm committee of the United States Senate. Is it good seed? Well, some is, and some isn't. Farmers know that when they want a big, bumper crop, they must plant the best seed they can get their hands on. Some of the people testifying this week don't want a big, bumper-farm program, and they're planting second-rate seed.

But, Farmers Union and GTA want the biggest and best farm program it is possible to get, and they're planting top-quality seed. Jim Patton, for example, testified yesterday. He's president of the National Farmers Union. Other farm organizations, of course, have had their say—the Grange, the Farm Bureau, milk producers, cattlemen's groups. Some good points were made, and also, unfortunately, some bad ones.

But, tomorrow, GTA's M. W. Thatcher takes the stand. He left yesterday for Washington. He carried with him a carefully thought-out statement on what should be included in this new farm program. Long in the preparation, Thatcher's statement draws on the experience of more than 30 years of working at the grassroots with the thousands of dirt farmers who own and control GTA.

Yet, no seed grows well unless it is in the right soil, well plowed and worked. The Congress itself is the soil that will grow this new farm program seed. For 2 years now, members of the House and Senate farm committees have worked through the farm areas of the Nation. They've talked to the farmers themselves, getting at the true needs of the people who farm for a living. And, in the GTA Family Farm Survey, they at last, have the facts and figures that document agriculture's economic crisis. Now it is up to the Congressmen—men like HUMPHREY, MARSHALL, HOPE, ELLENDER, and all the others—to separate the wheat from the chaff and come up with a farm program that will do the job.

So, the soil is well prepared, and the seed is being planted. Will it grow and produce as bountiful a farm program harvest as farmers have produced bountiful harvests of food and fiber for the Nation? Time will tell.

Tomorrow, on this program, we'll tell you about M. W. Thatcher's testimony before the Senate farm committee in Washington. He'll be appearing before that group as we go on the air here. Listen in—you'll be interested in what he has to say. It is the voice of the farmer, heard in Washington through GTA, the co-op way.

Address of Gen. Robert E. Wood, Before Corps of Cadets at the Citadel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address before the corps of cadets at the Citadel, January 14, 1956, by Gen. Robert E. Wood, president, Sears Roebuck & Co.:

I am pleased to have the honor of addressing the staff and faculty, the corps of cadets, and veteran students of the Citadel. Your institution, founded in 1842, has had a long and honorable history. West Point, V. M. I., and the Citadel have stood for many years in the front rank of military schools. The Citadel furnished 193 officers out of 224 graduates to the armies of the Confederacy. It furnished 6,000 men to the United States Army in World War II, of which 2,200 were officers. Three hundred and fifty-two of its sons have given their lives for their country on the fields of battle.

Beside my interest in your institution and its history, I have a very personal interest. One of my best friends was a Charleston boy—Edmund Rhett. I have known your president, General Clark, since his boyhood. I served with his father in the Philippine Insurrection, and members of his family have been neighbors and friends of mine for many years. I have rejoiced at his success as a soldier, a citizen, and a patriot. He deserved this success because he had courage, ability, and character.

Perhaps I can talk to you understandingly because, like you, I had a similar course of military training and discipline that you are now undergoing. Like many of you who may choose the military profession permanently as a career, I served 19 years after my graduation from West Point in our Army. But 80 percent of your graduates will eventually enter civil life after their graduation. I have been in civil life for 35 years—as vice president, president, and chairman of a large corporation (Sears, Roebuck & Co.). I have seen both sides of the picture, military and civilian—the Army and business life.

During my period as cadet at the Military Academy, Dr. Elliott, then president of Harvard University, introduced at Harvard the elective system, which was to revolutionize university education. This system has had

a great impact on our higher centers of education. To my mind, it was a bad impact; as a matter of fact, the system was modified later from the very wide elective system to a much more restricted one.

It seems to me that our educational system at West Point, which I assume is similar in many ways to yours, is the very best. With the military training as a background, it prepares students for life far better than the average college or university. Our Nation needs discipline, devotion to duty and country as we never did before.

While I hope that many of you may enter the armed services as officers of the United States, the fact remains that the majority of you will enter civil life, either in the professions or in business life. Business may be roughly defined as the process by which the men and women of a country earn a living. The standard of living of a country is largely determined by the honesty and integrity of its government, the ability of its business managers, the intelligence and industry of its working people, the charater of the machines, tools, and equipment developed.

The United States has the finest industrial plant in the world. It has the finest machines, tools, and equipment in the world, the ablest business management, the most intelligent labor force. There is no other nation in the world (with the exception of Germany) that really understands mass production, and it was the productivity of the United States that was the largest factor of our victory in World War II. It was only the policy of the U. N., aided and abetted by our State Department, that prevented us from winning a complete victory in Korea.

To cover the whole field of business administration in a single speech or article would take too much of my time and yours. I will only touch on the high spots. As head of Sears, Roebuck & Co., for many years I had a wonderful opportunity of watching the economic panorama of the United States—for that matter, of the whole Western Hemisphere. We had stores in every section of the United States. Dealing as we did in every commodity except food and automobiles, we had contacts with 9,000 manufacturers, of every industry, located in every part of the country.

The most important changes I have seen in the past 30 years have been:

1. The increase in population.
2. The decentralization of manufacturing.
3. The decentralization of distribution to the larger cities.
4. The change in distribution of income.
5. The change in management's attitudes.

I. INCREASE IN POPULATION

The most important crop in the United States is the baby crop. In 1932 there were 2,200,000 babies here in the United States. In 1955, over 4 million. The average increase in population in the United States in the decade 1930–40 was 800,000 per year. Since 1950 it has averaged 2,500,000 people per year. At the present rate of increase we will have a population of 200 million by 1970. Now, this increase makes for good business in that, to keep up with this expanding population, there is increasing consumption of goods, and facilities have to be constantly expanding, with a resultant tremendous capital investment. There is, however, another side of the picture: Unless our increased productivity keeps pace with the increased population, our standard of living will decline. So far we have been able to increase our production more than our increase in people. It remains to be seen whether we can keep this up.

II. DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY

Up to World War I the Northeast and Middle Atlantic States were the great workshops of our Nation, and the products of their manufacturers were distributed nationally. Beginning in World War I the textile industry began its migration to the South, followed by many other industries. In the past 30 years more and more a regional pattern has developed; and each great region—the Middle West, the Southeast, the Southwest, and the Pacific coast—are developing and increasing their manufacturing to the point where they can supply the needs of their own people.

III. DECENTRALIZATION OF DISTRIBUTION IN THE LARGER CITES

Beginning about 10 years ago, the movement in all the great cities, as well as many of the smaller cities, began in the migration of large portions of the population to the suburbs and the outer periphery of the city. Thousands of small ranchhouses are springing up in every section of the country, transferring the city flat dweller to the country or suburban home dweller. This movement has caused a profound change in distribution. Stores are following their customers to the suburbs, as well as manufacturers, and even office buildings. The primary causes of the migration were the automobile, the increasing congestion in the shopping districts and business districts of all cities, the higher wages, increased purchasing power, and increased mobility of the worker, wage and salaried.

IV. CHANGE IN DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

I have not always been in accord with our tax laws—income taxes and inheritance taxes. However, they have had a marked effect on the distribution of income. The poor and the middle classes have a far larger share, and the rich a small share, of the national income. Up to a certain point this is all to the good, but beyond that point it will have a harmful effect.

V. CHANGE IN MANAGEMENT ATTITUDE

Thirty years ago, corporate management was stupid and reactionary. The heads of corporations, as a result, did not have the proper perspective. But there has been a great change in management itself, the character of their thinking, and their attitude to their employees and to the communities in which their plants are located. The shoe is on the other foot, for I have seen in the past few years the union leaders make the same mistakes, show the same arrogance and disregard of the rights of others as did the corporate managers of the country in the 1920's.

These factors mentioned are causing profound changes in our national life. While the population of the United States is increasing rapidly, there is a marked disparity in the rate of growth. The areas of great growth are the gulf coast and the Pacific coast—the area starting from Brownsville to Houston, Beaumont, Port Arthur, Mobile, Pensacola, and Tampa. Beginning in 1964, California and Texas will furnish as many delegates to the conventions of the two parties as New York and Pennsylvania. It is certain that, within the next 25 years, political, financial, and economic power will pass from the New England and Middle Atlantic States to the Middle West, the Southwest, and the Pacific coast.

No man can foretell the future. If we have no basic change in government, if our system of free enterprise is allowed to function, if we have no major war, if through the discoveries of science, capital, and labor, we are able to apply these discoveries, and thereby further American war productivity, and our standard of living, the economic future for the next 10 years looks good. But there are many ifs, so we cannot be too sure of our future. As a matter of fact, the whole modern cult of security is founded on false premises. There is no real security except in ourselves, our individual character, our intelligence to work, and our devotion to our country. That does not mean that we should not do our best to protect our population against old age and sickness.

I hope you have not been bored by these generalities. Though it is well for you to understand the changes that are occurring in this country of yours, I realize that you are probably more interested in your chances in the world of business and the professions, after your graduation.

To begin with, it is more important for the young man to pick the right employer than it is for the employer to pick the young man. If you enter business with an employer whose business is static, or poorly managed, in a static locality, you have very little chance of advancement, no matter how hard you may work and what ability you may exercise. If our rate of economic progress continues, you can pick and choose, which, of course, is not possible in a time of economic depression.

In the generation after the Civil War, when the South was in a period of economic depression, a large number of the brightest and best brains of the South went to the great northern cities, while other thousands of the finest and most adventurous of the southern young crossed the Mississippi River and built up the great Southwest, including the great State of Texas. Today with the industrial renaissance of the South, there are and will be great opportunities in the South itself. Its immense natural resources are realized; it is entering a period of great growth in every field.

I am a believer in the eternal verities, faith in a divine power, religious faith, the maxim of duty, honor, country, which I am sure is taught here, as well as at West Point—the emphasis on character and discipline which you get here—I have been out of sympathy with what I consider as the false liberalism of the past 20 years, of the shallowness of much of modern thinking, the shallowness and mediocrity of so many of our so-called radio announcers, literary performers, columnists, who distort and slant the news of the day. But I believe in your generation. I believe that thinking will change, that we will get back to the eternal verities and that we will have a better country and better world.

I conclude by congratulating you on your alma mater, on the training you get here, on the fact that you have a great leader in Mark Clark, and that this institution is bound to grow and progress and to continue to be a source of pride to the State of South Carolina and its citizens.

For 50 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "For 50 Years," by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., head, department of education, Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Heights, Ark.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR 50 YEARS

(By Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., Arkansas A. & M. College)

The writer recently returned from the 25th biennial council and 50th anniversary celebration of Phi Delta Kappa, an honorary professional education fraternity, where he

served as the delegate of Beta Pi Field Chapter. The meeting was held on the campus of Indiana University at Bloomington.

Pi Kappa Mu was first founded at Indiana University. Dr. John Andrew Bergstrom, of the department of education of that institution, was one of the founders. The date of this organization is recorded as January 24, 1906. Eight students joined at that time, and Joseph A. Williams, one of this number, was present at the recent meeting.

At Columbia University on April 6, 1908, four students met to organize Phi Delta Kappa. The organization was completed on May 13, 1908, with six members. Robert W. Selvidge, of Missouri, was one of the six.

On February 23, 1909, a third independent organization developed at the University of Missouri. It was called Nu Rho Beta.

There were other groups, too. Dr. E. L. Hendricks was the first secretary-treasurer of the chapter at the University of Chicago. He later became president of Central Missouri State College, and is buried at Sunset Hill, Warrensburg, Mo.

The present fraternity was a result of the bringing together of these earlier ones. This was accomplished at the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Ind., at a meeting which started on March 1, 1910. Dr. Hendricks was again present. The new name became Phi Delta Kappa.

Some prominent Missouri leaders through the years other than Dr. Hendricks and Dr. Selvidge were Dr. C. H. McClure, Dr. Earl A. Collins, and Dr. W. W. Carpenter.

The first three campus chapters were and are: Alpha, at Indiana University; Beta, at Columbia University; and Gamma, at the University of Missouri. The writer joined the latter chapter.

The first three field chapters were and are: Alpha, at San Francisco, Calif.; Beta, at St. Louis, Mo.; and Gamma, at Topeka, Kans.

There have been several headquarters. The one at Homewood, Ill., will be remembered by many; some will remember the one at Cleveland, Ohio, but the writer likes to think of the one at 63d and Woodlawn, Chicago, because he did business with that bank when he resided in Chicago from 1946 to 1948. The fraternity office was upstairs in that building until 1938. The new building, the first owned by the fraternity, was dedicated at Bloomington, Ind., Eighth Street and Union Avenue, on December 31, 1955.

Dr. Paul M. Cook will soon retire as executive secretary. He was honored for 30 years of service. The officers during the meeting were: Dr. Emery Stoops, president; Dr. M. L. Cushman, first vice president; Dr. J. Roy Leevy, second vice president; Dr. John C. Whinnery, recording secretary; and Dr. Maynard Bemis, comptroller. Logan Anderson is the editor of the Phi Delta Kappan and John R. Jones is the business manager.

Several commisisons have attracted favorable attention. Among these are: Free Public Education, The Study of Integration in the Public Schools, The Selective Recruitment of Teachers, Research, and International Education. The second listed commission has changed a part of its name, with council approval, from the word "integration" to "desegression," which probably was an error. Seldom is progress aided by stepping backward.

This council made the forward step of including area coordinators in future councils. Also, the writer served on the subcommittee that recommended the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor as the 1957 meeting, which was wise. As to finance, the steps taken are doubtful. Those of us who prefer avoiding deficit spending were unable to raise dues even though more than a majority voted with us. Deficit spending is wise only in an emergency, but has developed as a trend of the times.

Dr. Carter V. Good, of the University of Cincinnati, was present to report on his revised Dictionary of Education, which will be published in late 1956 or early 1957. Not only did the original dictionary make money for Phi Delta Kappa, but it was received by the public very nicely.

Several fine addresses were delivered. Dr. Wendell W. Wright, dean of School of Education, Indiana University, gave a fine one termed "Welcome." Dr. Paul M. Cook's address, The State of the Fraternity, was also fine.

Dr. Herman B. Wells, president of Indiana University, spoke on the subject, The Uniqueness of American Education, and he noted: "As we look to the next 15 years I know of no reason why we shall not accomplish again in our State what we have achieved in the past 15 years and twice in the past 35 years. Why can we not double again if we must? I am not dismayed by the statistics that attempt to prove that we cannot build the classrooms, cannot find the teachers, and cannot pay for the necessary expansion. I have faith in the vitality and energy and resourcefulness of our people. Our past experience disproves the charts."

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, spoke on the subject: Fifty Years of Progress in Education and a Look Ahead, and he said: "The Nation's colleges and universities are spending $350 million on research in the sciences, and that if every dollar spent on educational research could be traced down and added to this, it would only change the last digit of that 350 figure.

"What I am saying, in short, is that we are not doing nearly enough in the field of education to insure that we will solve our immediately pressing problems, let alone be prepared for future developments."

Phillip Lovejoy, former executive head of Rotary, gave the dedication address, which was wonderful. He said: "The historian will observe that America was founded by a group that wanted to get away from oppressions, that wanted to establish a country where the worth of each individual would always be in the ascendancy and where he could develop in accordance with his individual ability. There were to be no barriers to his advancement if he were willing to work. He would be enabled to go as far as his individual ability would permit. From the earliest times when man began to think for himself, there has been a wide consensus that the basis of true civilization is the belief in human dignity and the intrinsic God-given value of every human person. The United States of America was created out of that faith in liberty and the integrity of the individual. Our ancestors in the United States knew that each individual must be educated to take his rightful place. He must have knowledge of affairs past and present and he must see the place of the individual in the total picture in an uneducated democracy is self-destructive. Thus from the earliest times in America, education and the means thereof were to be forever encouraged."

Dr. Russell J. Humbert, president, De Pauw University, gave the final address, which was Sunday morning, January 1, 1956. He stated: "Great advances have been made in our lifetime in the understanding of the human mind, yet we stand at the edge of mystery in the age of the mental. It can be said that the mind has come of age in our generation. The wise providence of God has timed this well, for when man is surrounded by his own creations, he is forced to sharpen his God-given mind to guide his creative ability. It is important that we feel the tug of the eternal as we stand at the edge of mystery in the area of the mind. Man by himself can become arrogant, deceitful, and destructive. We need the nudge of the divine to become moral constructive agents."

Many additional comments could be made about such things as the fine way Indiana University treated the delegates, or the nice way ex-President Douglas G. Graffin of New York presided at the recognition banquet. The writer left feeling the meeting was a great experience in his life.

While in this section of the Uinted States, the writer witnessed additional fine things. Some few will be mentioned. There was the service at Bellevue Baptist Church in Memphis, Tenn.

The visit to the George Rogers Clark State Memorial at Vincennes, Ind. Hirons and Mellor of New York were the architects and Bennet, Parsons and Frost of Chicago, did the landscaping. The murals were painted by Ezra Winter, and Herman A. MacNeil was sculptor of the bronze statue. President Franklin D. Roosevelt dedicated the memorial on June 14, 1936, after it was erected at a cost of $2,500,000. The memorial is open daily to the public without charge. Clark did so much yet he lived a life without the "girl of his dreams," because they were isolated by the events of the times and she became a nun. He, like George Gershwin, gave so much to the world and yet received so little, and finally Clark died in poverty.

President William Henry Harrison's home is also in Vincennes. It was built in 1803–04. The bricks were made at the Thompson (later Vigo) farm, 3 miles east of Vincennes. The solid walnut woodwork is hand-carved. Wooden pegs and hand-forged nails were used. The house was divided into the following places for the visitors: council chamber, family living room, passageway between the main house and the kitchen and dining room, family dining room, stairs to servants bedroom, west bedroom, master bedroom, nursery, trap door section, bedroom (now museum room), wine room, servants' kitchen, servants' dining room, and school room.

On this trip, my mother, was very impressed with Santa Claus, Ind. This small community of less than 50 inhabitants was founded by a group of pioneers of German descent and thus named in 1852. There has been a post office here since 1856. It is on State highways 162 and 245. It has a superior place to eat and many fine attractions for children. The one for adults is the Hall of Famous Americans.

Here the artist, Lewis Sorensen, has created life-size people. The characters and settings are: early American Indians, Benjamin Franklin (1706–90), Betsy Ross 1752–1835), George Washington (1732–99) and Martha Washington (1732–1802), Eli Whitney (1765–1825), Thomas Edison (1847–1931), Henry Ford (1863–1947), Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826), Andrew Jackson (1767–1845), Abraham Lincoln (three scenes 1809–65), Stephen Foster (1826–64), Lillian Russell (1861–1922), Man and Lady of the 1880's, Mark Twain (Samuel Clemens 1835–1910), Tom Sawyer, Becky Thatcher and Huckleberry Finn, Little Women, James Whitcomb Riley (1849–1916), Will Rogers (1879–1935), and Babe Ruth (1895–1948).

Nearby is Nancy Hanks Lincoln State memorial where President Abraham Lincoln's mother was buried when she was 35 years of age. The shrine, which is across the highway, was dedicated in 1943. The memorial is divided into: The Kentucky Panel (1809–16), The Indiana Panel (1816–30), The Illinois Panel (1830–61), The Washington Panel (1860–65), and The Apotheosis.

En route home, we finally visited again the Reverend and Mrs. Clarence J. Jacobson and the Louisville Friends of Israel. This capped a fine trip, as it gave the necessary spiritual phase. It is doubtful if there are two more devoted Christians than this dedicated couple.

After returning home, the writer thought of the words of three council songs. They were:

"PHI DELTA KAPPA'S LIGHT

"(Valentine-Jones)

"Phi Delta Kappa's light preserves, where men the sons of men do serve.
Loyal hearts have lit the flame where shines the beacon of her name.
Her faith is steadfast as the star that guides the mar-i-ner a-far;
And as a guide o'er trackless sea, Phi Delta Kappa's star shall be.
Where men the sons of men do serve, Phi Delta Kappa's light preserve."

"PHI DELTA KAPPA MEN

"(Magnell)

"We are Phi Delta Kappa men, united in a band to give a helping hand to research, service, leadership, all for the child, the home, the school.
We are Phi Delta Kappa men, with a desire our strength to pool.
Child centered learning Interaction too, the whole child, every child, nothing else will do.
Ever evaluating! Phi Delta Kappa Hail!"

"THE DELEGATE'S DIRGE

"(Bertram G. Chalmer, Alpha Psi)

(Tune: Roll Out the Barrel)

"Roll out the motions
We'll have a lot of fun
Appropriations
We've only just begun.

"Phi Delta Kappans
Vote for your favorite choice
Now's the time for speech and seconds
'Til you lose your voice.

"Meet in committees
Separate wheat from the chaff;
Recommendations
Cut all expenses in half.

"Push legislation
Let's cut all stresses and strife
Let's complete our council business
And I'll get home to my wife!"

Report of United States-Israel Relations—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimously consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part I of a Report on United States-Israel Relations, which was made in December of 1955 by Jacob K. Javits, attorney general of the State of New York. Attorney General Javits made an extended stay in Israel during the month of November 1955 and this report contains a great deal of factual material as well as his findings and recommendations. It is a valuable document, and should be given the broadest possible circulation.

Part I of this report deals with the economic and financial situation of Israel, while part II pertains to Israel's international position. At a subsequent session of the Senate, I shall request that part II also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON UNITED STATES-ISRAEL RELATIONS

(By Attorney General Jacob K. Javits of New York)

PART I—INTRODUCTION

This report continues a study I made as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives in November 1951 and reported in a committee document in January 1952.

I have revisited Israel and made an intensive survey of the situation renewing the close contacts which I have maintained with United States-Israel relations since 1946 and through visits to Israel (then Palestine) in December 1946, in December 1949, and in November 1951.

The days I have just spent in Israel were closely packed with conferences with government officials, opposition leaders, trade-union leaders, businessmen, workers, established citizens and new in-migrants. I conferred with the Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion; with other ministers including Mr. Levi Eshkol, the Minister of Finance, and Mrs. Golda Myerson, Acting Foreign Minister; the speaker of the Knesset, Joseph Sprinzhak; the representatives of the major Knesset parties; the Chief of Staff of the Israel Army, Maj. Gen. Moshe Dayan; the commander of the Israel Air Force, Maj. Gen. Dan Tulkowsky; leading officials of the courts of Israel, including Chief Justice Olshans, officials of Histradut, Israel's labor federation; and with Maj. Gen. Yakoo Dori, former chief of staff and now president of Technion, and many others. I visited key areas throughout the country including the Galilee and the Negev to get a picture of conditions. I was able to observe the situation along the Gaza strip, along the truce line between Israel and Jordan, passing between new and old Jerusalem, and along the line between Israel and Syria, including the Huleh and the Sea of Galilee. It should be possible therefore, by putting together the information which I have brought back, with information otherwise available, to get a fairly balanced view of the present situation in Israel.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL SITUATION—PROGRESS TOWARD VIABILITY

1. Inmigration

In May 1948 when her independence was proclaimed, Israel had a Jewish population of 650,000, and by the time the armistice frontiers were established in 1949 a non-Jewish population of 150,000—a total of 800,000.

As a result of the vast tide of immigration and natural growth, the Jewish population soared to about 1,600,000 at the end of 1955. Meanwhile, the non-Jewish population rose to 200,000, bringing the total population to nearly 1,800,000.

This unprecedented and necessary inmigration is one of the major causes of the critical economic problems faced by Israel. The other causes grew out of the efforts of the Arab States to eliminate Israel by aggression in 1948 and by economic boycott and blockade since that time—unremitting pressure which has compelled Israel to keep on strengthening its defense forces to preserve the continuously deteriorating balance of power in the Near East.

It is, of course, well known that the basic law of Israel—the law of return—permits free immigration for every Jew who wishes or has to come to Israel.

It should also be added that the warm support which Israel has received from the American public generally and from those of Jewish faith particularly, is largely attributable to this policy.

Between the establishment of the State and until the end of 1955 more than 770,000 inmigrants will have found their home in Israel. At the beginning, the high tide of inmigration reached 30,000 per month, and, during the first 2 years population increased at the rate of 30 to 40 percent per annum. Since 1951 however, the rate of influx of inmigrants declined from the record figure of 1,000 per day to less than 1,000 per month in 1953.

The rate of inmigration into Israel is determined partly by the wish of many to return to an ancient homeland, and also by the degree of physical insecurity to which Jews may be exposed in some countries in which they live, as well as by Government policy in those countries, etc. Hence, for example, in 1951 there was a rapid evacuation of thousands of Jews from Iraq and Rumania because of dangerous internal conditions in those countries and because the government imposed strict time-limits on the grant of exit permits. There are still more than 2 million people of the Jewish faith in the U. S. S. R. aside from about 500,000 in Soviet statellite areas.

When life for Jews became increasingly unbearable in north Africa, Israel experienced a new upsurge of inmigration. On August 20, 1955, riots in the Jewish quarters of Morocco reached a climax. Jews were murdered, children were kidnaped, property was looted and many had to flee from their homes. A few days later the Knesset (Israel Parliament) held a special session and endorsed the Government program to bring 45,000 Jews from Morocco in the next 12 months. This decision more than trebled the rate of inmigration into Israel from 1,000 per month to 3,800 per month. The estimated cost of the initial absorption stages of these inmigrants (including travel expenses, modest housing facilities) is I£75 million (over $40 million). In order to raise these funds, the Israel Government made the population tighten belts by raising taxes and duties on some essential goods.

The Israel Government has made radical changes in its immigration and resettlement policies. Methods of absorbing inmigrants have gone through three main stages.

In the first years of the mass immigration, the newcomers were housed in huge tent camps, such as, for example, in Beit Lid with a population of 22,000 refugees largely from Europe, and Ras-El-Ein with a population of almost 10,000 largely from Yemen. The inmigrants remained in these tent camps until they were provided with housing and employment elsewhere in Israel.

In the year 1951, the system was improved. The inmigrants were received at reception centers, processed for identification, health, and so forth, and immediately decentralized in camps which are called Maabaroth, literally meaning "passing over." There have been two types of Maabaroth: Those which were originally designed to develop into permanent settlements, and those of a temporary character located where employment was available. This system accelerated the process of absorption by enabling the inmigrants to become economically independent more rapidly.

Last year a ship to village program improved the system of absorption further. Villages with parceled-out lands, and installed utilities are erected in advance. On their arrival the inmigrants are brought directly to their future homes and farms. This system will insure more efficient absorption of the refugees from north Africa.

A major problem in the early mass immigration was the large proportion of hard-core cases of the old and sick. That situation has changed. The Jewish Agency, which is responsible for the transfer of inmigrants into Israel and the initial stages of their integration, decided to give preference to inmigrants in the productive age group and meeting established minimum health standards. However, these preference standards are to be suspended whenever an emergency situation arises in a Jewish community

abroad. This policy of selective inmigration has speeded and facilitated the absorption of new immigrants as productive members of the economy.

The inmigrants are, as a rule, unskilled and untrained or without occupational experience in a pioneering community. The Government initiated vocational projects. Between 1948 and 1954, more than 60,000 persons attended courses in about 200 trades, over and above a large number who received on-the-job training, in industry and agriculture. Such vocational training was carried out by Israel's ministries (often aided by United States economic and technical assistance ORT, Haddasah, Technion and other voluntary organizations receiving United States citizens' support.

The inmigrants came from 65 different countries, from as many cultural backgrounds and spoke almost as many different languages and dialects. Their social and cultural absorption into the existing community, was one of the Government's major tasks. The Israel Ministries of Education and Culture, together with many public and private organizations, established an elaborate system of Hebrew courses throughout the country. Professional inmigrants mastered Hebrew in 5 to 6 months of intensive study in special schools, called Ulpanim. Since 1951, 8,000 inmigrants finished such courses. By 1954, 50,000 pupils and 600 teachers were engaged in this activity.

2. Economic stabilization and growth

As mass inmigrations declined in 1952, the Israel Government took drastic measures to overcome serious imbalances in the economy.

Israel's new economic program established more realistic exchange rates and intensified credit control; tax receipts increased (income-tax receipts have tripled since 1952); the budget deficit was eliminated; the rise in prices was slowed down after an initial upswing; administrative controls were reduced and the country's economy was stated to have been liberalized. By 1954 it was claimed inflation had been curbed and a measure of economic stability achieved. In 1954, the price rise was estimated at only 10 percent as compared with 60 percent in 1952.

The larger degree of stability enabled the country to develop its output and productive capacity at a faster rate.

In 1954 the national income of Israel is reported to have reached a level of almost I£1.5 billions, an increase of 20 percent over 1952 in real terms. In 1954, the average per capita income increased by over 10 percent.

In physical terms, net investment from all sources, domestic and foreign, increased by 20 percent in 1 year (from 220 to 300 million Israel pounds). One-third of the investment in 1954 was channeled into agriculture, another third into housing and the balance into industry and other branches of the economy.

3. Agricultural production

Between 1951 and 1954, agricultural production is reported to have nearly doubled. In 1954 alone, the increase reached 24 percent of the 1953 figure. As a result of this intensive development Israel has become self-sufficient in fruits, vegetables, milk, eggs, and poultry. It is now developing industrial crops. The rehabilitation of citrus groves following the period of war damage, 1948–49, was very rapid. By 1955, the area under citrus cultivation increased by 50 percent compared with 1948, and expanding citrus exports amounted to 35 percent of the total exports in 1954.

The irrigated area has trebled since 1949. To a large extent, further development in agriculture is dependent on the rate of land reclamation and on irrigation projects. The Yarkon-Negev pipeline which was put into operation a few months ago will supply water to another 50,000 acres of now arid lands, largely in the Negev. Within recent years, Israel has been restoring neglected grazing lands, training cowboys, bringing in new strains of cattle, and expanding its meat supply.

4. Industry

Industrial output in Israel increased during the last 5 years by 60 to 80 percent. The use of electricity in industry, a reliable indicator of activity, increased by 50 percent in 1952–54 alone. Most of the increases in 1954 were recorded in metals, machinery, electrical appliances, diamonds, tires, chemicals, and building materials. Much of the increase occurred in export branches.

The deficit in Israel's balance of trade was reduced by more than $20 million between 1953 and 1954. In 1949, Israel earned only enough to pay for 11 percent of its imports. By 1954 its earnings mounted to 30 percent of import expenditures.

5. Foreign trade

The reduction of the deficit in the balance of payments on current account was due to the increase in production of import substitutes as well as to a significant rise in exports.

In 1954, exports increased by 50 percent over 1953—from $59,700,000 to almost $88,-100,000. Exports doubled between 1952 and 1954; 24 percent of the exporting plants in 1954 were founded after the State was established. In that year, their share in industrial exports amounted to almost 70 percent.

Progress continued in 1955. Agricultural and industrial production mounted; the economy grew more stable; confidence in the local currency was strengthened; savings schemes were launched; and productivity was stimulated by technical assistance and vocational training.

6. United States Government Aid

United States assistance has proved of crucial importance in Israel's extraordinary economic record. Loans from the Export-Import Bank, now being repaid by Israel, totaled $135 million; grants-in-aid amounted (at the end of fiscal 1955) to $228,400,000; technical assistance (1952–55) to $6,296,000. More recently there have been sales of surplus agricultural commodities to Israel under favorable payment terms pursuant to Public Law 480. In addition to United States Government aid, Israel has benefited from the receipt of reparations payments from the German Federal Republic (West Germany), from sales of Government of Israel bonds in the United States and other countries, and philanthropic remittances. The economic development of Israel, the rapid growth of its agricultural and industrial plants, the transformation of barren land into farm communities, industrial sites, and flourishing towns, all bear out that the United States Government aid to Israel has been effectively used for the purposes intended.

If Israel is to reach economic viability, exports will have to be increased by five times the 1954 level and national income will have to be doubled. Expansion of tourism, the main invisible export of the country, would contribute materially toward this goal.

7. Disturbing factors

Nevertheless, several disturbing clouds darken Israel's economic horizon. In addition to a partial drought which necessitated increased agricultural imports and caused a sharp rise in the prices of vegetables, the main factors which seem now to threaten growth and stability are as follows:

First, Israel has been forced to divert a larger part of its resources to defense because of the deterioriating military situation on the borders and because of the unrestricted sales of Communist supplies of arms to the Arab States. This must inevitably retard the country's rate of economic development.

Second, the resumption of large-scale immigration, due to the emergency situation of the Jews in north Africa has again forced the Government to increase its budgetary expenditures for inmigrant absorption purposes. Since the contribution of the new inmigrants to output is negligible at the outset, the menace of inflation has again increased.

Third, the reduction of United States Government grants-in-aid to Israel from $70 million in fiscal 1952 to $40 million in fiscal 1955, and probably to an even lower figure in fiscal 1956, has reduced the resources available to Israel for basic economic development and investment.

In view of Israel's past remarkable performance, there should hardly be any serious question as to the ability of the Israel economy to attain economic viability. The question is how soon and how smoothly will the goal be reached.

8. German reparations

Because of the importance of German reparations in supplying a substantial part of the imported capital equipment Israel needed, the date on which these reparations end, i. e., 1963–64, is commonly regarded as the date by which Israel is to achieve economic viability, assuming that the requisite foreign financing will be available. By then, Israel should be able to complete the network of irrigation projects which are vital for further expansion of agricultural production. On the basis of existing water resources (except the Jordan River), it is possible to put some 100,000 additional acres under irrigation. This, however, will require huge investments which, it is reported, cannot possibly be financed from existing reserve under present conditions. The aid of United States financial institutions is vital for the accomplishment of this objective. It is already 2 years since negotiations started on the proposed Jordan River development. In spite of the vigorous endeavors by the Honorable Eric Johnston and the Israel Government, no solution has been found as yet because the Arab States still withhold final approval. Thus, 2 years which could have been devoted to constructive progress, both on the part of Israel and the Arab States, in economic development for the region, have been wasted. For the execution of the irrigation plans based on the Jordan waters, Ambassador Johnston, the special Ambassador of President Eisenhower, called for a grant of $60 million, which is only part of the total sum required. When the Jordan water plan is completed, another million dunams (250,000 acres) could be put under irrigation. Under those conditions, agricultural production could provide all the necessary foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials for industry and for a population in Israel of more than 2 million. Agriculture would then be able to finance from its exports of citrus and other agricultural products all the requirements for agricultural imports of raw materials and foodstuffs in foreign currency.

9. Mineral resources

The large investments necessary to exploit Israel's potential mineral wealth should be forthcoming. In addition to the expansion of Dead Sea potash and Negev phosphate exports, there will undoubtedly be an exploitation of copper deposits and the production of bromide from the Dead Sea waters. The foundations of a petro-chemical industry area to be laid. This should prove to be especially worthwhile, if further quantities of petroleum are discovered. This discovery of petroleum in Israel was made possible by large private investments, both local and foreign, and industrial investment in Israel should greatly increase in all lines of production, especially in the export fields.

10. Technical assistance (United States)

United States achievements in economic and technical assistance to Israel continue to be widely recognized and appreciated and have a high standing and esteem in the country. The head of the United States Opera-

tions Mission to Israel, Dr. Lincoln B. Hale, and his principal assistant, Dr. Paul B. Orvis, Director of the project of the State University of New York, are extremely well known and respected in Israel. The most distinguished achievement in United States technical assistance has been in the field of agriculture, where remarkable strides have been made with United States help. The emphasis in American aid is now shifting to industrialization and this too looks very promising. Much domestic construction has come through the use of counterpart funds realized through United States grants-in-aid. One of the most important projects aided by our program is the Yarkon-Negev pipeline to extend 75 miles (63 miles completed) and bringing water from the north to irrigate the land in the Negev; an undertaking absolutely indispensable to the settlement of immigrants in Israel and vital if Israel's present territory is to be developed to meet the needs of her contemplated population.

Text of President's Talk at GOP Salute Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the permission of the House to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the address made by the President of the United States on the occasion of the salute to Eisenhower dinners held in many parts of our country on January 20, 1956.

Of course, this was a partisan affair, perhaps the largest of its kind ever held, and in his brief address the President was at his best. In it he revealed the sincerity of his character which has profoundly impressed the people of our country; he stated in simple language his philosophy of government; and he showed in no unmistakable terms the reverence for duty and service to his country which have dominated his entire life. Americans everywhere admire and respect such devotion, free from the taint of personal ambition, and his underlying and undying resolution to do the right as "God gives him the power to see the right." Yes; it was a partisan occasion, but President Eisenhower spoke as a dedicated American, and his principles are enshrined in the hearts of us all.

The above-mentioned address follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT'S TALK AT GOP SALUTE DINNER

Thank you, thank you very much indeed. Mr. Vice President, Chairman Hall, my very dear friends here and throughout the United States, in this past half hour, on the magic carpet of television, I have traveled around the country, recognizing faces of old friends hundreds of miles distant, recalling visits to cities as I glimpsed them on the screen, feeling the enthusiasm and warm friendship of so many thousands whom I have never met. I wish I could meet them so that I might personally say to each, "Thank you."

In fact, my friends, all my friends, after such a tribute as has been paid to Mrs. Eisenhower and to me this evening, the heart is so full that it is indeed dangerous to try to say more than "thank you." I shall let it go at that.

GRATEFUL TO ALL

Naturally, I have been deeply moved through the flying minutes of this electronic hour. I am grateful to everyone—the Republican clubs, and all the organizations and individuals and their friends—who, directly or indirectly, participated in this salute.

But my deepest emotion is concerned with things not shown by the TV cameras, things of the mind and heart and spirit—the memory of millions of our people—Republicans, Independents, and Democrats—who in 1952 worked tirelessly to make reality of their ideas of good Government; the memory of men and women who stirred their friends and communities to action and who—when the election was done—returned to their jobs and their homes, quietly performing the work of America, raising their families, discharging their responsibilities of citizenship, living worthy, rewarding lives.

Those many millions made possible the event whose anniversary you observe today. They are the basis and the strength of what so many have called a new era. They brought fresh vigor to the political life of America with their vision, energy, and dedication. We in Washington—inspired by them—have sought to be worthy of their trust. The heartfelt thanks of everyone at these dinners tonight goes to them. They, in the homes of America, are the ones who truly merit a great salute.

During recent months I have had an unusual, even an enforced, opportunity to ponder on many subjects—the essential goodness and honest purposes of people; the common bonds that join all Americans, regardless of ancestry, faith, or politics; the anxiety of multitudes, at home and abroad, to encourage and pray for one stricken by illness; the unity of aspirations that binds humanity together.

DEFENSES ARE ALERT

In pursuit of these aspirations, we in the Federal Government strive with all our strength to convert the uneasy peace in which we live to one that is genuine, based on the great moral principles of justice and right. Knowing well that true peace cannot be achieved by retreat from reality and responsibility or by desertion of friends, we make certain that our defenses are alert and strong; that our partnerships with others are based on deep friendships and common great purposes; that gradually the truth of our Nation's peaceful goals and our respect for the rights of others is brought to all peoples of the earth. Let no one be in doubt; this struggle for peace will be waged relentlessly by Americans of all parties and all creeds until at last success shall crown our efforts and reward our faith.

At home we enjoy prosperity; not the false prosperity of a dizzy inflation or of economic activity based mainly on arms spending; not the tragic prosperity of a few who can squander and of millions who must pinch; rather, the genuine and widely shared prosperity of an immense productivity for peacetime satisfaction of human needs.

This record is the product of an industrious citizenry, supported in the Federal Government by a program designed for progress, and dedicated to integrity, to concern for every individual, to faith in America and its principles.

Many tasks still await action. Problems involving sectors of the home front and relationships abroad demand the earnest and sympathetic attention of all Americans. Thus the present and the future are heavy with challenge, rich with opportunity. We must not relax merely because the general record is good.

For every good citizen, his party is, or he wants it to be, an instrument for genuine service, united in its devotion to a program that preserves intact the vital principles of the American creed; that attacks every problem in the light of those principles; that recognizes inescapable change and meets it; that believes in the dignity of every individual, in his equal right to justice and fair play, in his equal opportunity for the exercise of his talents, in his right to proper sharing in the Nation's prosperity. This is my conception of the Republican Party on this January 20, 1956. As long as our party lives by these principles and dedicates itself to these goals, it will continue to draw into its ranks in ever-increasing numbers, men and women of idealism from every walk of life and from every section of our country.

PONDERS HIS ROLE

As we move toward the solution of existing problems, my own future role in our party remains undetermined; whether to be a candidate for your nomination or a worker in the ranks. I could devoutly wish that there were some method by which the American people could, under the circumstances, point out the path of my true duty. But it appears that this is a question that first I alone must answer.

That answer will be forthcoming as quickly as it is firmly fixed in my mind. I trust that it will not unduly reflect concern for self, and I pledge that in whatever capacity I shall serve, I shall support with all my strength the foreign and domestic programs for America that have been the guide of all of us for these past 3 years. That work must go on to fruition, in the interests of all Americans.

Again my warmest thanks to all of you.

Extension Through June 30, 1957, of Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to extend through June 30, 1957, the duration of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955—Public Law 377, 84th Congress. The present terminal date contained in the act is February 15, 1956.

In view of the fact that little time is left before the expiration of Public Law 377, 84th Congress, the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has scheduled hearings on the bill, which I have introduced today, to begin Tuesday, January 24 at 10 o'clock.

The extension of the Poliomyelitis Assistance Act has been requested by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and, in introducing this bill, I would like to make public the letter dated January 19, 1956, signed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and addressed to the Speaker requesting introduction of the extension bill:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
January 19, 1956.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill to amend the

Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955 (Public Law 377, 84th Cong.). The proposed amendments would extend the terminal date for the availability of funds appropriated for carrying out the purposes of the act, but would not otherwise modify the original program authorization.

The present terms of the act authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Surgeon General, applications for Federal grants. Sections 2 and 6 of the act, however, contain provisions terminating the availability of funds appropriated for this purpose on February 15, 1956. The Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 219, 84th Cong.) included an appropriation to the Public Health Service of $30 million for "grants to States for carrying out the purposes of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955."

The legislative history of both the enabling legislation and the appropriation for carrying out the purposes of the act indicates that it was the intent of Congress to authorize and initiate immediately a program of Federal assistance to States but to provide an opportunity for reviewing program developments early in the second session of the Congress before completely implementing the Federal grant provisions of the act. Thus the objective of program review is the apparent reason for the inclusion of the February 15, 1956, time limit on the availability of appropriations, as well as the limitation of the initial appropriation to an amount sufficient to provide the several States with approximately half of the allotments indicated by section 3 of the enabling act.

On the basis of our experience to date, we believe that the enabling legislation provides an adequate base for program planning and administration, and we see no need for amendments other than the proposed extension of the time limit on availability of funds.

The progress of program development thus far has been contingent upon two key factors, apart from the availability of Federal funds: (1) the development and approval of State plans under the act and (2) the rate of production of vaccine required for State vaccination programs, as well as for distribution through private channels.

The progress of State plan development to date has been very satisfactory. With one exception all States have completed, and had approved, their plans for vaccination programs, and have initiated their programs of vaccine purchase and distribution. As of December 31, 1955, Federal payments totaling $7,674,766 had been made to these States from the initial appropriations for this purpose. Further progress in the implementation of these programs will therefor be governed primarily by the availability of vaccine.

The volume of vaccine production and release during 1955 was limited but it is expected that the rate of production will now accelerate. Through December 31, 1955, a total of 16,390,608 cubic centimeters of vaccine had been released for sale to public agencies and commercial users (in addition to the 13,571,223 cubic centimeters of vaccine supplied to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis). Approximately 53 percent, 8,750,000 cubic centimeters, has been reserved by the States for public agency purchase. It is presently estimated that by February 15 of this year, the amount of released vaccine reserved for public agency purchase will aggregate approximately 15 million cubic centimeters. This will be about one-fourth of the total required for implementation of the federally aided vaccination programs indicated by the allotment formula in section 3 of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act. The purchase of this amount of vaccine, together with additional State program expenses authorized by the act, will require payments to the States by February 15 of approximately half of the $30 million appropriated last year.

On the basis of present data on prospective vaccine production, we are recommending that the availability of funds appropriated pursuant to the act be extended through June 30, 1957. This should allow ample time for vaccine production to reach the required levels and for the available supply to be distributed and administered.

We shall appreciate it if you would refer the enclosed draft bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM, *Secretary.*

Statement by Senator Lehman Before Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, because of the increasing interest, in and out of Congress, in our present immigration and citizenship laws and policies, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the highlights of the testimony I gave on November 22, 1955, before the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, urging and advocating general revision and liberalization of these citizenship and immigration laws.

This testimony may be of use and interest in the continuing study which is being given, and is yet to be given, to this vital subject.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION IN SUPPORT OF S. 1206, AN OMNIBUS BILL, PROPOSING REVISION AND LIBERALIZATION OF OUR IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP LAWS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you. I need not tell you what high importance I, personally attach to these hearings, on a subject in which I have a deeper interest and with which I have a closer identification than perhaps any other legislative subject before the Congress.

I would like to pay tribute, Mr. Chairman, to your own leadership as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and of this subcommittee, a leadership which has resulted in the convening of these hearings.

As you know, I have been urging the holding of hearings on proposals to revise our basic immigration and naturalization laws for the past 3 years, since January 1953. Hence, I personally consider these hearings to be historic—the opening phase in a procedure which must lead certainly—whether next year or the year after—or the year after that—to a wholesale revision and overhaul of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the so-called McCarran-Walter Act.

In paying tribute to your leadership, Mr. Chairman, and to the support given to the holding of these hearings by other members of your committee and of this subcommittee, I would also like to pay my special respects to the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, Mr. WATKINS. My tribute to him is not on account of his views on this particular subject, because I think we start off in basic disagreement on the McCarran-Walter Act, as on quite a few other matters. But I have always found him to be deeply sincere in his desire to get the facts and to be fair and judicious, and to do the wise and honorable thing in any situation. I know that he is eager, as I am, to arrive at a proper jugment on this pending matter. I am pleased and gratified with his presence at these hearings, in this recess period, here in Washington, at such a great distance for his home State.

I make this special mention of Senator WATKINS, because I want to emphasize the completely nonpartisan nature of the move to revise the McCarran-Walter Act.

I assume that the first question before this subcommittee is: Should we revise the McCarran-Walter Act at all? Is there need or strong support for revision?

These hearings will give you the answer to that question, Mr. Chairman. But let me point out, should there be any question or doubt, that the drastic revision of present law can be correctly described as a public mandate, long overdue in being carried out.

In 1952, when the present law was approved, the President of the United States vetoed it, and the support for his veto fell only two votes short of the necessary one-third of the Senate. During the original Senate consideration of the McCarran-Walter Act, despite the absence of an adequate debate on the subject, almost one-third of the Senate voted for radical amendments to that measure.

And in the presidential election campaign of 1952, the candidates of both major parties, including the successful candidate, pledged revision of the act. President Eisenhower, as a candidate, made a number of speeches and statements to this effect. So did the candidate for the Vice Presidency, who now presides over the Senate of the United States.

Subsequent to that election, President Eisenhower urged revision in his first state of the Union message, and in many subsequent speeches, statements, and remarks.

Mr. Chairman, there are pending before the Senate at least three major bills for drastic revision of the present law, bearing the names of 20 Senators, of both parties. I have not had time to count the number of bills pending in the House on this subject, but it is a very great number indeed.

I would guess that if Congress does not make a comphehensive revision of the law in the next session, this will be a political issue in many parts of our country, and both parties will be called upon to make an accounting of the attitude of their representatives in the Congress toward the revision of this law. And many individual candidates will likewise be called upon. Let no one think that the people are not watching or are not interested. I am sure these hearings will bear me out on this point.

But Mr. Chairman, as I have said again and again, this is not a partisan question. I am critical of the officials of the present administration for not having responded to your recent efforts—extending over many months, as I understand it—to get the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to testify before this committee in regard to this legislation. But I am equally critical of the fact that no Attorney General or Secretary of State of any other administration has personally appeared to testify on this vital subject in the past 20 or 30 years.

But today this is an issue which begs for the concern of all men of good will. It calls for a strong and consistent bipartisan effort to erase from our statute books the shame of the McCarran-Walter Act.

I am sure that most of those who voted for the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952, and who voted to override the President's veto, did so in good faith but without a thorough knowledge of the provisions which they were voting to fix upon our statute books. With respect to my colleagues in the Senate who voted for this law, I believe it is fair to say that very few of them comprehended its scope and impact, at that time, when its 302 pages of highly technical material were thrust upon them during the closing days of the 82d Congress.

Few of them had any idea what effects their vote would have on the lives of literally hundreds of thousands of naturalized American citizens, resident aliens and potential immigrants overseas.

I hope that these hearings will help to dispel any remaining illusions about the McCarran-Walter Act.

I think, then, that the question of whether there is a demand for the revision of the McCarran-Walter Act answers itself. The reply to the question "Shall we revise the McCarran-Walter Act in any respect?" must be in the affirmative.

The next question, of course, is: "How shall we revise the McCarran-Walter Act? What, exactly, is wrong with the present law?"

Mr. Chairman, the rest of my remarks today will be devoted to answering these questions.

I need scarcely remind the committee that there is pending before you, among other proposals, a comprehensive bill introduced by me and 12 other Members of the Senate, S. 1206. My cosponsors on this bill are: Senators GREEN, HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, KENNEDY, LANGER, MAGNUSON, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MURRAY, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, and CHAVEZ.

I think I may say without fear of contradiction that S. 1206 is the most complete proposal before this subcommittee. It is a complete rewrite of present law, a complete recodification of the codification of 1952. I shall discuss this bill at length in the course of my remarks.

Of course I would like to see S. 1206 adopted in substantially its present form. But Mr. Chairman, despite the herculean labors which went into the drafting of my bill—and I will describe those, too, in a few moments—I have no pride of authorship. I want to see the present law overhauled and drastically revised. I don't care whose name is attached to the bill reported out by this committee. As long as a bill of appropriate amendments curing the substantial evils of present law is reported out, I shall support that bill with all my heart.

The question then is: What are the substantial evils in our present law, Mr. Chairman, and what kind of a bill must be reported out to overcome those evils?

The McCarran-Walter Act has some good parts in it. Of course it has. It provided, within its four titles and 407 sections, some improvements over preexisting law. But the improvements were relatively few. And the preexisting law had many repressive, discriminatory, and restrictive features. The McCarran-Walter Act adopted most of the worst features of preexisting law and added scores of new evils.

So today I will not try especially to distinguish between those unfortunate features of the McCarran-Walter Act that were newly added in 1952 and those taken over from the legal jungle of immigration and nationality laws which preexisted the McCarran-Walter Act. They were all included in the act of 1952 and must all today be scrutinized and reexamined.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 is characterized by a consistent philosophy. That philosophy we must scrutinize first of all.

That philosophy is based on a collection of discarded theories—really myths—which are absolutely alien to all our legal, social, and political institutions.

I will enumerate some of those myths in a moment, but first let me say that the present law, in my considered judgment, has done more harm to our country than can be easily repaired—and I was abroad for 2 months this summer and saw at first hand the evidence of some of the damage that the McCarran-Walter Act has done, in terms of our prestige and reputation, among the plain people of Europe.

The McCarran-Walter Act represents a pyramid of unfounded fears—fear of foreigners; fear of criminals; fear of Communists and anarchists; and fear even of naturalized American citizens. Waves of fear have passed over America—fear of depression in peace and of betrayal of war. Each wave has left its flotsam and jetsam imbedded in our immigration and citizenship laws.

Like the inhabitants of ancient China, we have built a great wall designed to keep out fancied hordes of invaders. And like China's Great Wall, our modern-day wall—the McCarran-Walter Act—has, in fact, served only to isolate us, and not to protect us. Those few resourceful Communists or criminals who are determined to enter our land can enter with a minimum of danger to themselves across the long, unguarded borders of Mexico and Canada.

But our official gates of entry through which we could admit selected, qualified, and useful immigrants—and visitors—are kept so heavily barred and guarded that application for lawful entry is discouraged; only those driven by the direst necessity persist in their efforts to gain legal admission into our country. This might be called admission by adverse selection.

I know that some aliens do gain admission to the United States, but it is a fact that some of the most desirable, both would-be immigrants and would-be visitors—scientists, teachers, writers, professionals, and businessmen—are either discouraged from applying or barred from entering.

The issue before us is not just one of immigration. It is citizenship, too. The whole basic concept of membership in our Nation is involved in this legislation. And that concept affects every citizen of our land, and, of course, those living abroad, too.

Once upon a time, American citizenship was an unqualified patent of membership in our society. Once acquired by birth or naturalization—without distinction—it could not be forfeited, save by deliberate and willful surrender—by an oath of renunciation.

Under present law, citizenship acquired by naturalization may be stripped from the citizen or may be forfeited by the citizen—on any one of a half dozen or more grounds. And in many cases the citizen involved may not even know that he has forfeited his American citizenship or has been stripped of it. Some of the grounds for denaturalization are acts which a native-born citizen may perform without major penalty or without penalty at all.

And even native-born citizens may lose their citizenship on relatively minor, technical grounds, also without ever knowing about it.

This whittling away, bit by bit, of the inviolability of American citizenship status, is, in my judgment, one of the most dangerous and reprehensible aspects of our present law. And the violent distinctions between naturalized and native-born citizens are, to my mind, un-American and intolerable.

I believe that if the Congress, as a whole, and the American people, as a whole, knew of these provisions in the present law, they would not rest until the cancerous encroachments upon the sanctity of citizenship were completely cut out of the law.

These provisions, and all the other evils in the present act, were lumped together and justified as being made necessary to combat Communists.

Mr. Chairman, none of us want to see Communists gain entry into the United States. But as I have already indicated, this law does not prevent real spies or saboteurs from entering this country, if they really want to. All they have to do is either come in as diplomats, or walk across the Canadian or Mexican borders.

All this law does is hurt our own people, and our own country in the eyes of the people of the rest of the world. And it hurts thousands and hundreds of thousands of innocent people here and abroad.

In order to guarantee absolutely that no Communist ever enter the United States, it would be necessary to forbit all entries, even by diplomats. We would have to seal all our borders. Such a solution would, of course, be untenable, and impossible.

We can and should be careful about whom we admit into the United States. But we should be reasonable—not hysterical. We should have clear and enforcible standards of entry—not an impassable maze of barriers.

We have built into our immigration laws scores, and even hundreds, of restrictions which depend completely on the discretion and judgment of minor government functionaries. And from the decisions of these functionaries there is, in many cases, no appeal whatever. We have made a grant of unreviewable authority to these officials. Questions of life and death can be decided without a chance for review or appeal.

This law, as now written, presupposes that these minor functionaries have both the gift of clairvoyance and the profoundest knowledge of the inner secrets of human nature. An alien can be barred from admission if, in the opinion of a consular officer, within his sole judgment, the alien might, in the future, after his admission into the United States, join an organization on the Attorney General's subversive list. A consul may, in his discretion, bar an alien from admission into this country if it appears to the consul, again within his sole judgment, that such an alien is likely, after admission, to engage in a public disorder.

And there are scores and scores of such restrictions—all of them meaningless except insofar as they provide the consular official, or the immigration officer, with a justification for rejecting any and every alien whom the consul or immigration official does not happen to like.

Mr. Chairman, this law resembles no other law of which I have knowledge. The criteria it establishes for admission into this country are so numerous and so impossible of standardization that they violate the basic principles of our Constitution.

I realize, of course, that no alien has an absolute right to be admitted into this country. Nor is the Constitution effectively applicable to aliens seeking entry into the United States. Still, I think it would be desirable if we would apply, to the maximum possible extent, our legal principles of justice and fair play to all who come into contact with our laws—whether they be aliens or citizens of the United States.

We need to apply human standards to human beings. It has been many centuries since trial by ordeal was a practice under Anglo-Saxon law. The presumption of guilt until innocence is proven is repugnant to us. Yet, the McCarran-Walter Act provides for trial by ordeal and presupposes guilt until innocence is positively proven.

This law, Mr. Chairman, bears the dark stains of prejudice, of fear and suspicion. It is an archaic law—something out of the

dim past. The law needs to be modernized, humanized and liberalized. It needs to be simplified.

It must be made flexible so that its implementation can be adapted to the changing needs of changing times.

It must be simplified so that it can be understood by all our people at home and by those abroad, too.

It must be strengthened so that a positive and uniform control can be exercised over immigration from all parts of the world in a way to serve the best interests of the United States and the needs of the people desiring admission into our country.

I said a few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, that the McCarran-Walter Act is based on a collection of outmoded myths and theories entirely repugnant to the great body of American law.

The first of these myths is that the American people have a particular blood strain which would be corrupted by Italians, Poles, Greeks, and other peoples from southern and eastern Europe, unless protected by the national-origins quota system. According to this racist theory, a person of Anglo-Saxon blood is 20 times more desirable as an immigrant and as a citizen than a person of Italian blood.

The general concept of blood strains, on which the national-origins quota system is based, is an old one, but it was generally discredited and discarded by the beginning of the present century. Still, it was embraced in the national-origins quota system when that system was adopted by the Congress in 1924. This concept was also adopted at around the same time by Adolph Hitler, who used it as justification for his notorious nonsense about the so-called Aryan race.

But in 1952, the national-origins quota system was revalidated in the McCarran-Walter Act, although its supporters insisted, at that time, despite all the evidence to the contrary, that no racial bias, prejudice, or discrimination was intended. I contend, however, that you can't change a skunk by insisting that it's a kitten.

The second myth underlying the philosophy of the McCarran-Walter Act is that all aliens are potential criminals, Communists, and saboteurs, or must be treated accordingly.

The third myth is that immigration is a burden on the national economy and that immigrants threaten the jobs and wage levels of American workers.

There are other myths, too, but these are the ones which most clearly dominate our present immigration and citizenship policies. I believe it is necessary to bring these myths out into the open, so that we may better understand what the McCarran-Walter Act is all about.

I believe it is necessary, Mr. Chairman, to eliminate the last trace of this mythology from our immigration and citizenship policies.

That is whly, Mr. Chairman, I cannot go along with a proposal for piecemeal amendments to the present law.

This law needs radical surgery, not minor patchwork. It needs to have the spirit and the philosophy cut out of it, and to be infused with a new and different philosophy, as well as a new and different set of provisions.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the best way to amend the present law is by an omnibus bill, retaining the good features, and there are some, but replacing all the objectionable provisions. Immigration and citizenship law is so complex and the whole immigration and citizenship code is so inextricably interwoven that the job of piecemeal amendment would be a totally impossible one, if there is to be a sincere effort to eradicate the marks of suspicion, discrimination and injustice from the present law.

At the time of the consideration of the McCarran-Walter Act, I, and some of my colleagues, including you, Mr. Chairman, prepared over a hundred amendments, perhaps there were 200, in an attempt to improve the bill. Even the sum total of these amendments did not get at some of the worst features of the law.

So, I repeat, that in my view the only way to remedy the evils complained of is to enact a substitute measure. I realize, of course, that there can be differences of opinion over the content of such a substitute measure.

I have submitted our bill, S. 1206, in the belief that it is not only the most comprehensive, but indeed, the best legislative proposal on this subject, and I say this without personal pride. I did not personally draft this bill, although I participated in scores of drafting conferences on it over a period of many months.

I believe that our bill, S. 1206, represents the best thinking and the most expert information now available in legislative form on this subject. It was the work of perhaps 30 to 40 different experts and legislative draftsmen, outstanding lawyers, professors of law, former officials of the immigration service, social scientists and lay workers in the field of immigration and citizenship.

I want to add that we worked directly from the report and hearings of the President's Commission on Immigration and Citizenship, headed by the former Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Philip B. Perlman, and including some of the most distinguished representatives of the Government and of the great religious faiths in our country.

This bill, S. 1206 conforms in general to the recommendations of scores of religious and nonsectarian organizations of all kinds and complexions, veterans groups, church organizations, labor unions, scientific organizations, and representatives of industrial and commercial firms in this country. This bill was drafted after exhaustive consultation. I hope this committee will find it worthy of exhaustive study and review.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to some of the specific provisions of S. 1206, and in the course of commenting upon them, I will also comment upon the comparable provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I shall append to my testimony, and ask that there be inserted into the record, a detailed summary of the provisions of S. 1206. Hence, my testimony this morning will touch only upon the highlights of this measure.

APPROPRIATE ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY

The Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department, are the agencies presently charged with primary responsibility for the administration of our immigration laws. This divided responsibility is the result of a long history of transfers, consolidations, and separations which have accomplished little in efficiency or logical administrative organization except to establish the relative immunity of both the INS and the consular service to cabinet-level direction. The general attitude which prevails in the lower echelons in these services—and understandably so—is anti-alien.

I do not mean to cast any reflections on the individual civil servants involved. They merely reflect the general spirit of the present law.

It is clear to me that neither the State Department nor the Justice Department is equipped to discharge the full responsibility for this highly sensitive operation. The Secretary of State cannot give major attention to this complex problem. His concerns are already far too burdensome.

I can say the same of the Attorney General.

The Congress has been faced before with the problem of coordinating and consolidating complex programs. In many instances, the solution has been found in the creation of an independent agency of the Government.

In this bill we are proposing the creation of a single, new and independent agency to be known as the Immigration and Naturalization Commission, and to consolidate within this commission the present immigration and naturalization responsibilities of both the Attorney General and the Secretary of State.

I believe this subcommittee would be extremely interested in reviewing the discussions in Congress which led to the establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission following World War II. You will remember that there were those who sincerely believed that all atomic energy functions and activities of the Federal Government should be vested in the hands of the Department of Defense. But witness after witness, representing many varied backgrounds, argued in favor of an independent Atomic Energy Commission.

When I recently reviewed some of this testimony, I was struck by the many parallels between the arguments used for the establishment of the AEC and the arguments which persuaded me to propose the creation of an independent Immigration and Naturalization Commission. It occurred to me that we might never have had the success in our postwar atomic energy developments if the sole responsibility had remained with the military, whose prime concentration and interests would have logically been in the weapons field.

In the same way, the primary concentration of the Department of Justice is upon detection of law violations and the apprehension of violators. Hence the prevailing spirit in the Immigration and Naturalization Service is naturally one of suspicion and even of antagonism toward the alien. The whole emphasis is on prevention of immigration and to deportation of aliens already here. I do not mean to say that there are not individual immigration officers who have a kindly and humanitarian spirit. I do say, however, that the prevailing attitude, which springs, as I have said, from the law, is that of the cop on the beat.

I would like to see the emphasis placed on the welcoming of duly qualified aliens and on resettling them and helping them to integrate into our national life. This can best be done by setting up a new agency which will reflect the spirit of the proposed new law.

In reference to the Consular Service, the immigration function is, for most consular officers, a part-time and transient duty, the least interesting in their category of duties and generally regarded as the most onerous. It is an apprenticeship job for foreign service officers on their way up the ladder of promotion. Yet this vice-consuls and consuls have what amounts to the power of life and death over aliens who apply for admission into our country.

The Hoover Commission has, in the past, recommended that the Consular Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, be merged for the sake of efficiency. They do duplicate each other's work to a major extent.

I agree with the Hoover Commission in this respect. I think these functions should be combined, and that they should be placed in a new independent agency, along the lines I have suggested. I hope this committee will look favorably upon this important aspect of S. 1206. The approval of this proposal will help give a fresh start to a radically modified immigration and citizenship policy.

Today, the alien seeking admission to the United States has no assurance of uniform justice and no right of appeal from the decision of a consular officer. The alien who has landed in the United States has a limited right of appeal and review; but these rights

are far from being either adequate or uniform.

Under present law, administrative review in deportation and exclusion cases is not assured by statute; it exists at the pleasure of the Attorney General in the form of a Board of Immigration Appeals set up by order of the Attorney General. And the Attorney General is not bound by the decisions of this Board.

The proposed act establishes an orderly system of fair procedure and adequate review, by an independent, quasi-judicial tribunal. This so-called Board of Immigration and Visa Appeals would be independent of the Commission itself and is modeled after our Tax Court.

As is generally true of other independent agencies, the Commission, under the terms of S. 1206, would be governed by the Administrative Procedure Act. And this would assure a separation of the prosecuting and adjudicative functions, and fair and open hearings, unavailable under present law. It is my proposal that the Board's decisions in visa denial cases would be final, but limited judicial review would be permitted in other matters coming before this Board.

QUOTA SYSTEM

In the year 1797, a Congressman looked at the population of the new American Nation, and said that while a liberal immigration policy had been a good thing up to then, the United States had already reached the peak of its absorbable population, and that immigration to the United States should be stopped altogether. That was in 1797.

This Representative was the forerunner of many others down through the centuries who thought that they recognized the limits of the potentialities of the United States. It is unfortunate that some of this heritage of pessimism is still present in our land today.

Our capacity for absorbing immigration is still great today. I do not know what it is. No one knows. But it is a fact of our history that our greatest periods of economic expansion took place immediately following great tides of immigration. Our Nation continues to support an ever-increasing population at an ever-higher standard of living.

Other witnesses will be more competent than I to discuss in detail the economic implications of immigration. I am sure, however, that we not only can absorb; but that we critically need a constant but controlled stream of fresh immigration for the expansion of our economy.

Of course, I do not propose unlimited immigration into the United States. I know of no responsible student of the subject who does. Indeed, I propose a very conservative level of immigration, not measurably greater than the average number who have been entering the United States for permanent residence in recent years.

I propose a limit of roughly 250,000 immigrants per year, which is considerably less, in my judgment, than the number we could safely admit. But I wish to be conservative in this matter. My main purpose is not to increase greatly the flow of immigration but to change radically the discriminatory and restrictive manner in which immigration is regulated today.

Indeed, if S. 1206 is approved and if proper enforcement powers are given to our border patrols, the amount of immigration into our country—if we include illegal immigration from Mexico and Canada—would be considerably reduced from the present level.

I don't know how many illegal immigrants are currently entering the United States from Mexico and Canada, but I have seen official figures for 1952 and 1953 indicating that this illegal immigration has been in the neighborhood of 2 million entries per year.

I propose, of course, the long-overdue abolition of the national origins quota system.

I propose, in its place, a so-called unified quota system, an entirely new manner and formula for the selection of individual immigrants.

I believe that with due consideration for a potential immigrant's ability to meet specified standards of health, security, literacy, honesty, and ability to earn a living, the alien's admissibility should be based on the criteria first of our country's need for him, and then of his need for our country.

The national origins quota system reflects neither of these two criteria. And of course the national origins quota system, whatever its merits—and I know of none—is stamped with the loathsome stigma of racial and national discrimination.

In fact the national origins quota system is a totally inflexible and unworkable method of selecting immigrants. It is so unworkable that ways and means must constantly be found to get around it. The whole series of emergency immigration bills we have enacted in recent years, the hundreds and thousands of private bills we enact periodically, and which take up so much of the time of this committee, and the special bills, such as the bills to admit sheepherders—all these are made necessary solely by the incredible national origins quota system.

I say that this is no way to run the immigration policies of our Nation. It is unwise, expensive, unfair, discriminatory, and above all, works against the best interests of the United States in foreign policy, economics, and national defense.

May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that it is a little realized fact—but a very true fact—that the national origins quota system has never accomplished its own stated purposes. The advocates of the national origins quota system in 1924 had as their avowed purpose the maintenance of the so-called pattern of national origins as it was purported to be in the United States in the year 1920. I will not discuss further the fallacy of the underlying theory. I have already done so.

Rather, I must point out that the NOQS has worked in an exactly opposite manner. In reality we have not received 42 percent of our immigrants from Great Britain and Northern Ireland since 1927, as contemplated in the original statute. It has been much less for the very simple reason that Englishmen do not particularly wish to emigrate to the United States.

It is perfectly clear that the NOQS has not served to preserve our so-called national origins pattern.

If this is so—and I am sure that it cannot be refuted—why then did the authors of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 continue this system? The answer is quite clear—this was a devious way by which immigration from Spain, Italy, Greece, the Middle East, Africa, Asia and all areas of the world, except a few northern European nations, could be kept to a bare minimum.

True, there was a slight—a very slight relaxation of restrictions for the Nations of Asia by means of the Asia-Pacific Triangle formula. But it was a most paradoxical relaxation—one which fixed the concept of the blood test into our immigration laws. Today not only is an immigrant born in Japan charged to the Japanese quota and to the overall Asia-Pacific Triangle quota, but an immigrant born in England whose mother was Japanese and whose father was English is also charged to the Japanese quota and to the overall Asia-Pacific Triangle quota.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the unified quota system, which is at the heart of S. 1206, is logical and administratively practical.

I have outlined it in a simple chart which I will append to my testimony.

In simple terms, four preference categories are established. The first preference category is designed to expedite the reunification of families. The second preference is designed to bring to the United States persons with special skills and technical and artistic abilities who will promote our national economy, our national security, and the arts. The third preference category is designed to provide a quota to be used for the oppressed, the persecuted, and the refugees, including orphans, of the world. The fourth and final preference is designed to be allocated to promote the foreign policy interests of the United States.

Finally, S. 1206 provides for a so-called newcomer quota of 50,000 a year for all qualified persons throughout the world wishing to immigrate who are eligible on a first-come-first-serve basis.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this new quota approach to you for your most serious consideration. No halfway approach, no pooling of unused quotas, can remedy present law.

There is one aspect of the unified quota system which has elicited some criticism—namely, placing the nations of the Western Hemisphere under the general quota system. I would like, briefly, to answer the criticism.

In the first place, it is inaccurate to say there is no quota system for Western Hemisphere nations today. In actuality there is and there isn't, depending on where you live, who your parents were, and the sometimes informal quotas established by individual consular officials.

I say to those who criticize placing Western Hemisphere nations under the quota system, let's be fair to all. The same criteria should apply to all peoples, regardless of the place of their birth. I believe our Latin American neighbors will respect us for such a policy.

FAIR PLAY AND DUE PROCESS

Mr. Chairman, I turn to another general area of immigration policy on which I would like to comment. I turn now to the question of the violations of our standards of justice and fair play written into our present immigration laws.

We should have an immigration law which guarantees to aliens and to naturalized citizens the maximum possible sweep of administrative justice and judicial review available under our system of government. The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 does not do this. S. 1206 is, I believe, a fair and honest attempt to achieve this goal, while at the same time providing adequate safeguards for the security of our Nation.

In the proposed act, every practical protection has been provided for our national security. Comprehensive and workable standards are established so that genuine subversives and antidemocratic elements are effectively barred from the United States. The proposed law contains enforceable provisions for the deportation of those truly undesirable aliens who, despite all precautions, might obtain entry into this country.

It is my belief that the antisubversive provisions of the proposed act will be more effective in actual operation than those of the 1952 act. The fact is, that the 1952 act erects such a confused and contradictory network of antisubversive provisions that it catches in its web many anti-Communists while allowing true subversives—Nazis, Fascists, and Communists, to slip into the United States.

Turning to the question of the deportation provisions in present law, I believe that these sections of the law ride roughshod over our Constitution. Here the special inquiry officer of the Immigration Service is both prosecutor and judge in deportation hearings. The statutes of limitations on deportation were abolished in the 1952 act, and all of the new grounds for deporting an alien have been made retroactive.

I would like to comment at this point on the subject of private immigration bills. In every session of Congress, hundreds and thousands of these bills are introduced by Members of both Houses. I do not believe we should deny to an alien or to a citizen the recourse to congressional relief in extraordinary circumstances calling for such relief.

But what Congress is doing today is acting as a supreme court of immigration appeals.

I believe that the Congress—in order to provide a more just and orderly procedure for the handling of the thousands of these individual cases—should establish a statutory Immigration Review Board with adequate powers, together with authorization for limited review of the Board's decision in our courts.

This was the justification for the establishment of the United States Court of Claims—and while it hasn't completely solved the problem of private claim bills, it has greatly relieved the Congress of this burden.

I have already discussed the impact of present law on citizenship status. Under S. 1206, two basic changes are made in present law:

First, those acts which automatically cause loss of citizenship are limited to (1) renunciation of United States citizenship; (2) obtaining naturalization in a foreign country; (3) deserting in time of war; (4) leaving the country to avoid military service; (5) conviction for treason; and (6) an attempt to overthrow the Government by force of arms.

But under the terms of S. 1206, all distinctions between native-born and naturalized citizens are removed.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken at great length—much too great length, I am sure—in view of the number of witnesses you have yet to hear today and during the many days to come. You have indulged me, I know, because of your awareness of how deeply I feel about this issue.

I want to make clear, however, that in this testimony I have only scratched the surface. I have not undertaken to describe all the defects in the present law or all the provisions of my bill designed to cure these defects. To do so would not only try your patience, but would be beyond my physical capacity at one sitting. I have given some of the highlights. Some further details—but by no means all—are included in one of the appendixes which I have attached to my testimony. I am also submitting for the record various pertinent statements, data, and material which I believe will supplement the record in regard to this legislation.

In conclusion, let me say only this. You have as heavy a responsibility as any committee I know. The complexity of the legislation before you is as apparent to me as it is to you. You have sought and will receive the guidance of many persons who are more expert than I on some of the technical phases of this legislation.

I know that you, and members of the staff of this committee, will continue, during the months ahead, to explore all the manifold intricacies of this legislation. I know also that many aspects of the matter will receive no public testimony whatever.

I can only suggest and urge that you give this legislation all the time that it needs.

I would be less than honest with you, or with myself, if I held out the hope, or entertained the hope, that a major revision of present law is likely in the coming session of Congress.

But progress toward that goal can be made. The hearings which you are now holding represent such progress. I hope that the committee may reach some definite conclusions regarding some of the legislative proposals before you.

If this much can be done, much will have been accomplished, not only for the thousands and hundreds of thousands of aliens directly affected, but for the prestige of America throughout the world.

Classic American Democracy—XV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in my letter of December 12, 1955, to a representative group of American leaders it was proposed, first, that a decision be reached by a jury of informed public opinion as to the 20 or 30 books that best represent the classics of American democracy, and second, that they be translated into the principal languages of the world and be made readily available and at reasonable prices to peoples everywhere who wish better understanding of the political philosophy upon which our Government is based. The response has reflected a widespread interest in the subject. Reading the letters received from leaders in all the activities of our American life, each contributing of his study and thinking to answering the question, what are the basic classics of our democracy, I have thought that these letters unabridged and unedited should be given through these extensions to the Members of the Congress in both bodies and, as far as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is read, to the American people. As has been suggested by Philip L. Graham, published of the Washington Post, and others, it is hoped that this discussion may stimulate our own people into the reading and rereading of the works that an enlightened jury of American public opinion selects as the classics of our democracy and which we should in cheap and translated editions bring within the reach of peoples everywhere. Continuing with the letters responding to the questionnaire:

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of December 12, 1955, was received in my office only yesterday, perhaps due, as indicated, to a faulty address.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to comment on the plan mentioned in and attached to your letter.

Enclosure, part 1—Plan for Publication of Democratic Classics.

I am most favorably impressed by the proposal that the United States Information Agency translate and publish in the principal languages of the world a select list of the time-tested classical statements of democratic theory in their original forms. particularly since the present programs and plans of the agency do not include a similar operation. If such statements are widely available in quantity and at attractive prices, they may do an infinite amount of good.

Enclosure, part 2—Suggested authors and works.

I suppose that at this time, with crisis following crisis, and the world in tension, with the need for security in our country, that our basic freedoms may not be lost, in balance against the fear that in overconcern as to the form of security we may lose its substance, any list of authors and works may be suspect in one quarter or another. To me it seems that authors and works you have listed may well and properly and safely be read by any intelligent American. Accordingly, I think they should be read by intelligent people in other countries, and that the probable effect will be that such readers will be informed about and helped and inspired by the fundamentals of American political philosophy.

Should such an inspirational document as the Declaration of Independence be included? I think so. Should the sublime Gettysburg address be included? I think so. It seems to me that by reason of their brevity they will appeal to many readers, and that their inspirational effect might be profound. Should well-balanced American histories be included, showing our country in action since its beginning, and telling of the fabulous development of our country? Might it not be that the story of the winning of the West would be a challenge to undeveloped countries in which nationalism is now strongly stirring, whose people must be saved from communism?

I strongly hope that the preliminary discussions by Congressman FEIGHAN, of Ohio, and yourself begun on the floor of the House of Representatives will be followed by specific implementation of the plan. I think you are entitled to great credit for what you have done in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

RAY MURPHY,
Past National Commander, American Legion.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Replying to your letter of December 12, I concur wholeheartedly with reference to your proposal for enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. In my opinion, the suggested list of authors and works is extensive enough for the initial proposal.

If I can personally be of any assistance to you and your group in this matter, please accord me that privilege.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE A. LEWIS,
Past Commander in Chief, VFW.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter of December 12 outlining a proposal for the translation, publication and distribution of democratic classics.

The idea seems to be an excellent one, although the extent of interest in these publications among Europeans would have to be determined from your sales.

One thought does occur to me that I should like to pass on to you for consideration. The Communist writers you mention all wrote in a modern idiom, and addressed themselves to questions of political and social structure largely in the context of an urban industrialized society—even though I am sure we would agree that the Marx-Engels picture was based on poor assumptions and poorer predictions.

Among the writers on democracy whom you list, however, the majority either predate the industrial age, or have little interest in the problems of democracy in an industrial civilization. Only Bryce, Dewey, and Wilson survived into the 20th century. Burke, Hamilton, Madison, Jefferson, Kant, Locke and Rousseau are of the 18th century. While I believe that what they have to say

is relevant today, conditions are so changed that the translation is not always easy.

I wonder, therefore, whether it might not be desirable to add the names of some contemporaries or near-contemporaries, such as the Beards, Brogan and the Schlesingers.

I wonder, too, whether you would consider adding two peculiarly American spokesmen—again of the 18th century—Thomas Paine and Samuel Adams.

Among specific titles you could consider (in addition to those you have listed), I could suggest the following: Norman Cousins (editor), A Treasury of Democracy (Coward-McCann, 1942); Charles Beard, Economic Interpretation of the Constitution; Thomas Paine, The Living Thoughts of Thomas Paine, presented by John Dos Passos (Longmans, Green, 1940); Samuel Adams, Selections from the Cushing Collection of Adams' Writings (Putnam's, 1904); Thomas Jefferson, Basic Writings (edited by Philip Foner, Wiley, 1944); Clarence B. Randall, A Creed for Free Enterprise (Little, Brown); Clarence B. Randall, Freedom's Faith (Little, Brown).

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM G. CAPLES,
Vice President Inland Steel Co., Chicago, and Regional Vice President, NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is in reply to your letter of December 12 in which you advised us that a group of Members of Congress plan to push for enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. You submit a proposed plan and a list of books and request us to give you our opinion of them.

I have carefully examined the proposed plan as well as the list of works and authors suggested and am wholeheartedly in accord with both.

It is obvious to most people who have traveled in foreign countries that Americans or America have not succeeded in selling democracy to most foreign nations. This may be in a large part due to the fact that not enough effort has been made in the form of an educational program to place the facts before other peoples. I am sure that the plan that you suggest is a very worthy one.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. MISCHO,
International Secretary-Treasurer, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America.

DEAR SIR: I read your letter of December 12 with a great deal of interest and I believe the plan for a publication of democratic classics is an excellent one.

I am indeed sorry that I have no suggestion for any additions or corrections to the list of suggested authors and their works.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT S. SHOCKNEY,
Director of Research and Education, Laundry Workers International Union.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Please forgive my delay in responding to your letter of December 12. I was particularly interested in checking personally and through friends and educators, the list of books referred to in part 2 of your enclosure. My checking has indicated that they are all suitable for publication overseas with one exception, namely the book by von Humboldt The Sphere and Duties of Government with which I am not familiar. My reference to its elimination in no way implies that it is not suitable, but merely that it unknown to me.

In regard to the general proposal, I cannot see that it would do anything but good to distribute basic knowledge of the economic, social and political background of this country. I quite heartily concur that too often our way of life becomes an exaggeration of the rather opulent life portrayed in our moving pictures.

Sincerely,

SYDNEY E. LONGMAID,
President the Estherbrook Pen Co., Camden, N. J., and Director, NAM.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter of December 12, acknowledgment of which has been delayed by my absence. I have not had an opportunity to read a good many of the works which are listed upon the enclosure submitted with your letter. However, I have read the works by the following authors: Emerson, Hamilton and Madison, Jefferson, Kant, Lincoln, Locke, Mill, Rousseau, Thoreau, and de Tocqueville. I think that anyone who would read those particular works would secure a better understanding of our American form of government. Your courtesy in writing me on this subject is greatly appreciated.

Best personal regards.

Cordially yours,

JAMES L. DONNELLY,
Executive Vice-President, Illinois Manufacturers Association.

DEAR SIR: Answering your letter of December 12, I believe the objective in part 1 is good and the expense involved would be much less than the benefits.

With respect to part 2, Suggested Authors and Works, I have checked the authors whom I have read and approve. I am not too familiar with the works of the others, but if the substance is in keeping with the expressions of those checked, I would approve them, also.

While the selection of authors and their works will be of utmost importance and involves considerable risk if the wrong authors or works are selected, still I believe this is a matter for judicious determination by people who are in full sympathy with the spirit of the program.

Yours very truly,

GUS OTTENHEIMER,
Little Rock, Ark., Director, NAM.

Note: Authors checked and approved: Bryce, Burke, Dewey, Emerson, Hamilton and Madison, Jefferson, Lincoln, Wilson.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: With reference to your letter of December 12 regarding the publication you refer to as the "Democratic Classics," I would like to make the following comments.

First, the translating and publishing in the principal languages of the world the classic documents which served as the foundation for the American Government would, of course, be a good thing. Knowledge and understanding concerning the principal role of government in the lives of people is very limited. I believe it might also be desirable to include in this list of publications some of the more recent published works dealing with these American fundamental principles.

I am always a little bit frightened by such a movement because there is a tendency on the part of too many people to publish a watered down variety of these fundamental American principles and if the intention is to really oppose the Communists and refute the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, etc., we must use our very best and most effective writers.

I would suggest that any list of books to be selected would, necessarily, include the works of Ludwig von Mises, Frederick Hayek, Albert J. Nock, Henry C. Link, Leonard Read, William Graham Sumner, Henry G. Weaver, etc. These authors present the opposition to communism and its teaching in a forceful and effective manner. For example, I would think the list of books would include as a must, The Mainspring of Human Progress, by Henry G. Weaver; Our Enemy the State, by Albert J. Nock; The Man Versus the State, by Herbert Spencer; What Social Classes Owe to Each Other, by William Graham Sumner; Rediscovery of Morals, by Henry C. Link; The Key to Peace, by Clarence Manion; Planning for Freedom, by Ludwig von Mises; The Road to Serfdom, by Henry Hayek; Government—An Ideal Concept, by Leonard Read; and, in my judgment, copies of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Yours truly,

JOHN T. BROWN,
President, J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis., and director, NAM.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Your letter concerning proposed legislation authorizing a small basic library on democratic political philosophy came shortly before the holiday season when I did not have the time to give it that the question deserves, hence my delay in answering.

Personally, I believe your plan is well worth trying and I would anticipate that it would have very beneficial results in putting the United States before the peoples of the various countries in a more realistic and more favorable light than is now the case. Too often people of other countries form their opinion of Americans from the western and gangster type movies they see and the cheap magazines they may come across. They get too little information about our basic beliefs, our political philosophies and practices, and our ideas of democratic government. I believe it would be a big step in building international understanding among peoples, which must be done, in my opinion, if we have any hope of a lasting peace.

I cannot speak for the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, of course, but it is my belief that the members would heartily endorse your proposal, and if it comes to concrete form, I would be more than pleased to present the program for endorsement at our next biennial convention in July. Will you keep me advised?

The list of books you suggested was submitted to some of my librarian friends and they approve it. We suggest the first and second series of Emerson's Essays, Jefferson's Democracy and Lincoln's Speeches and Letters, as edited by Merwin Roe. Also, possibly the addition of Herbert Agar's The People's Choice and Norman Cousins' Treasury of Democracy.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of writing this letter on your project.

Sincerely yours,

FAYE CRAWFORD,
National Chairman, International Relations, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

Classics of American Democracy—XVI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include further letters

from representative Americans on the most interesting and vital question of stepping up our way to win the minds of men by making everywhere available in cheap and translated editions the classics of our democracy, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: Mr. Charles F. Moore, Jr., vice president of public relations of the Ford Motor Co., today had the following comments on the list of books sent to me:

"I would like to see the list include Montesquieu's The Spirit of Laws, Paine's Common Sense, and a brief folio of Supreme Court decisions which have been influential in charting the course of American democracy.

"It seems to me that the least valuable contributors in the list you distributed are von Humboldt, Kant, and Emerson. I think those might be omitted if the list is to be pruned.

"In the selected writing for Thomas Jefferson, I would include The Declaration of Independence, The Virginia Statute of Religious Liberty, 'The Framing of the Declaration' from his autobiography, his first inaugural address and three essays from his Notes on Virginia—'No Dictators,' 'Education for Democracy,' and 'Religious Freedom.'

"In the list of Lincoln's writing, I would include his first and second inaugural addresses, his Gettysburg Address, his Emancipation Proclamation, his 'House Divided' speech dated June 17, 1858, his Message to a Special Session of the Congress dated April 1, 1861, his letter to Horace Greeley dated August 22, 1862, and his Proclamation of Amnesty and Reconstruction dated December 8, 1863."

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD L. BERNAYS.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The suggestion for supplying books in foreign languages to spread knowledge of the basic nature of democratic political philosophy sounds like an excellent one.

I have not had time to make any specific suggestions but I am happy to give the entire idea my support.

While this type of material would not be read by a large number of people in foreign countries, I think that those who would read it would be apt to be quite influential in molding of opinion.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL S. PLUMER,
Managing Editor, Daily Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have looked over the suggested list of authors and works which has been put together with a view to having this material circulated through the United States Information Agency.

The list seems to me to be an excellent one and I do not believe you could go wrong in promoting its circulation. It contains a number of titles that I have never read, but I am sure I should have read them and that other people ought to.

I have no suggestions for any change in the list.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT E. CUSHMAN,
Professor, Department of Government, Cornell University.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I was, I admit, both shocked and delighted to learn of your proposal to make available, in cheap editions, the basic political and philosophical writings of our tradition. I was shocked, because it is only recently and through a discussion of your proposal that I was brought to realize that these works were not available already.

I was delighted, of course, that the Government is on the point of doing the right thing about it.

I have spent about 16 months in Europe pursuing my own studies in philosophy, and from this experience, I think it is beyond discussion that very little could enhance the reputation of our country more than a knowledge of the broad principles which lie in our background and which are taken as self-evident by us but not by all the peoples of the world. In fact, at least according to my own observations, the most general assumption even among intellectuals who should know better is that we have no philosophy and no principles beyond amassing wealth for the purposes, they suppose, of power and display. Little is more disheartening to an American abroad than this persistent failure of many Europeans, particularly those who have not traveled here or who know us largely through the movies, to grasp that there is a philosophy of rather consistent outlines behind our life. And, if they know of us only through our movies and not also through our philosophers and political thinkers, what else could they think?

I like your list of works. It surely contains some of the soundest political thinking in any language, and has the advantage of being drawn from many nations in the western tradition; with Germans, Britishers, French, Italians, and Americans all represented, it will be difficult for anyone to suppose that these writings represent a subtle form of American imperialism. It will appear to be what it is, namely, some of the best works in a continuous tradition in which we participate, and for which we are interested in gaining comprehension. I was happy to see that no sloganistic or shrill pamphlets were included. And I sincerely hope that there will not be too much bickering on the exact selection of titles. These you list are all excellent and essential; others perhaps might be added, providing they are sufficiently broad in scope. After all, it is the principles we cherish most deeply, rather than every day to day decision which may flow from them. I also like the idea of cheap editions; expensively bound works would only find their way into university libraries, which no doubt already have their copies. We must also have in mind the village schoolteachers who would like to understand what we are about, but are blocked by the inaccessibility of these sources.

I should therefore like to congratulate you and your colleagues both for discerning the problem and for doing something about it, and wish you the best success in your program.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM EARLE,
Associate Professor of Philosophy, Northwestern University.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your group's plan to provide enabling legislation for the publication of basic statements of democratic political philosophy for international circulation is a most worthy objective and I am happy to have this opportunity to comment on it in response to your recent request.

While I have not read all of the suggested authors and works on your list, they seem both basic and representative.

One thing I miss, however, is an example of the democratic truths of our way of life expressed in the simplest of terms and in the popular idom of our day. As one who has spent his career in the wholesaling of products and ideas, I am convinced that effective persuasion of large groups of people is accomplished only if they are addressed simply, directly, and in terms of their individual interests.

Accordingly, I would like to suggest consideration by your committee of these two examples of material which is popular, simple, and factual: Primer for Americans (copyright 1950 by Sigurd S. Larmon, president, Young & Rubicam, Inc); Know Your "Isms" (by Martin Dodge, chairman, board of directors, American Viewpoint, Inc., published by Farrar, Straus & Co., 1950).

It seems to me that, for every interested foreign national who reads and is moved by the books which make up the main body of your present list, many more could be influenced by the clarity and impact of works such as those I am suggesting.

Thank you again for giving me this opportunity to express myself on the approach you are making to a vital project.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES G. MORTIMER,
President, General Foods Corp.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: In response to your request for suggestions respecting the proposed preparation of a library of American political thought, I am forwarding to you a report prepared for you by Professor Arnaud B. Leavelle, our specialist in this field. I trust that you will find it helpful.

Yours truly,

JAMES T. WATKINS IV,
Executive Head, Department of Political Science, Stanford University.

Professor Leavelle's letter follows:

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Stanford, Calif., January 4, 1956.

DEAR JIM: Representative O'Hara has seized upon an excellent idea, however, there is an obvious incongruity between the stated objective of providing basic classics of American democracy and the list of books in part 2. In selecting a group of classics, these considerations, I think, should govern:

1. The works should all be by American authors. Burke, Humboldt, Kant, Mazzini, and Rousseau, do not represent characteristically American viewpoints, and their inclusion would not only confuse foreign readers, they would unwisely and unnecessarily contribute to the prevalent idea of American cultural poverty. Locke and Mill might be regarded as an exception, because of their direct reception into American constitutional and judicial documents, and Bryce and Tocqueville might be retained as the two best examples of insightful foreign commentary on American institutions.

2. There should be an honest representation of the range and diversity of American thought, including radical thought, which should appeal to the people we need to reach most. The suggestion in paragraph 2 of the first page of the enclosure that discussions of current, short-run interests of the United States should be avoided is, of course, sound, but any reader abroad (especially one familiar with the writings of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin) will know that vital political theory cannot be divorced from specific, historical, politicoeconomic problems.

With these considerations in mind, here is a tentative list:

Benjamin Franklin: Proverbs of Poor Richard's Almanac, 1757; Letter to Gov. William Shirley, December 22, 1754; Letter to Lord Kames, April 11, 1767.

Thomas Paine: Common Sense, Crisis Papers.

Jay, Hamilton, Madison: Federalist Papers.

Thomas Jefferson: First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801; Letter to Benjamin Rush, January 16, 1811; Letter to John Adams, October 28, 1813; Letter to Samuel Kercheval, July 12, 1816.

John Adams: Discourses on Davila, 1790; Letters to John Taylor and Thomas Jefferson; Farewell Address, March 4, 1837.

Ralph Waldo Emerson: Politics, 1841; The American Scholar, 1837; Self-Reliance, 1841; The Transcendentalist, 1843.

Henry David Thoreau: Civil Disobedience, 1849.

William Ellery Channing: Slavery, 1841.

John C. Calhoun: Disquisition on Government, 1850.

Abraham Lincoln: Speech to the Wisconsin Historical Society, 1859; speech at Springfield, Ill., June 26, 1857; speech at Peoria, Ill., October 16, 1854; First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1861.

Andrew Carnegie: Wealth, 1889.

William Graham Sumner: What Social Classes Owe to Each Other, 1883.

Henry George: Progress and Poverty, 1879.

Henry Demarest Lloyd: Wealth Against Commonwealth, 1894.

Herbert Croly: The Promise of American Life, 1909.

Thorstein Veblen: Theory of the Leisure Class, 1899.

Woodrow Wilson: The New Freedom, 1913.

Paul Elmer More: Aristocracy and Justice, 1915.

John Dewey: The Public and Its Problems, 1927.

Great Opinions of American Jurists: Selections from the writings of John Marshall, Roger B. Taney, J. David Brewer, Benjamin Cardozo, Oliver W. Holmes, Jr., Learned Hand.

This list provides a representation of American democratic thought in its economic and social, as well as its political and constitutional, aspects—surely of great importance and interest to non-Americans.

Sincerely,

ARNAUD B. LEAVELLE, Jr.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: With pleasure I refer to your letter of December 12, 1955.

Regarding the plan for the publication in the principal languages of the world of important works at hand which might serve as basic statements of democratic political philosophy, I agree it should be tried to get Congress interested in it, thus I am humbly recommending the following works contained in part 2 of your letter:

Bryce: The American Commonwealth, Modern Democracies.

Dewey: The Public and Its Problems.

Hand: The Spirit of Liberty.

Von Humbolt: The Sphere and Duties of Government.

Kant: Perpetual Peace.

Locke: Letters on Civil Government, Book II.

Mazzini: The Duties of Man.

Mill: Representative Government.

Thoreau: Civil Disobedience.

de Tocqueville: Democracy in America.

Wilson: The New Freedom.

Wish that you can put your plan successfully through Congress and remain.

Cordially,

ENRIQUE N. VELA,
Commander, The American Legion, Department of Puerto Rico.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Your letter of December 12 to Mr. Layton concerning the translation and publication of a list of books on American democracy by the United States Information Agency has been referred to me for reply.

We have read with interest your plan for the publication of the democratic classics and in our view this will be a welcome addition to the general overseas program of USIA. We have studied the list of suggested authors and works and in our opinion they form a suitable nucleus for the project. We wish you all possible success with your plan.

Sincerely,

L. M. CLUCAS, Jr.,
Assistant to the Director of Public Relations.

Note: Mr. Layton is vice president of Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, and director NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I reply to your letter of 12 December—received, I'm afraid, over our Christmas holidays—which takes up a matter that I consider to be of the first importance. Here are my notions, for what they are worth.

First of all I want to applaud you for your initiative in this project. The situation that it would be designed to correct is a real one, and a grave one. I would have only two reservations to enter: First of all, I would hope that your program would be proposed to Congress in such terms as to avoid further agitation of the question of USIA's competence; this is not to deny that there have been occasions for such question, but rather to indicate that in my opinion what USIA needs most of all now, along with such general guidance as your program would imply, our general strengthening and support. Second, I would question the limitation of the program to "basic texts." These we should have by all means, along the lines indicated in your tentative list. But these texts in no instances constitute fixed formulations of democratic theory; they are rather the reflections of stages in the historical democratic process. It is this fact that separates them most sharply from the documents of totalitarian theory, but that also makes me question the advisability of limiting your program to them. Along with them, it seems to me, we would need a further list of basic texts in interpretation and historical orientation. Perhaps such a secondary list has already been devised, or even already published, so that my suggestion is gratuitous. But in any case here on the attached sheet are a few items that have occurred to me as indicative of the sort of material I have in mind.

I hope that, whatever the usefulness of these suggestions, my letter will serve at least to indicate my genuine concern with this problem. I would appreciate your letting me know how your program proceeds.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. PALMER,
Editor, the Yale Review.

Following are Mr. Palmer's suggestions:

Carl Becker: Freedom and Responsibility and the American Way of Life.

Daniel Boorstin: The Genius of American Politics.

Erwin Cannon: New Frontiers for Freedom.

Russel Davenport: U. S. A.: The Permanent Revolution.

Frederick Lewis Allen: The Big Change, 1900–1950.

Ralph Gabriel: The Course of American Democratic Thought (also published in a German edition).

Altheus T. Mason: Free Government in the Making (an excellent selection of basic documents, with commentary).

Ernie Pyle: Home Country.

For a Jefferson selection, I would suggest Saul Padova's edition.

Classics of American Democracy—XVII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned on other occasions, and as is stated in the questionnaire of December 12, 1955, mailed to representative Americans, the proposal for a worldwide distribution of the classics of American democracy translated into all languages and in inexpensive editions, has been advanced by a group of Chicagoans, including the Reverend Harold Fey, executive editor of the Christian Century; Dr. Jerome Kerwin, professor of political science and chairman of the Walgreen Foundation for the Study of American Institutions at the University of Chicago; John McGinness, official of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Dr. Richard McKeon, professor of philosophy at the University of Chicago; Thomas Stauffer, educator with wide experience and contacts in the foreign field; and others. The Chicago Daily News has shown active and sympathetic interest, and in its edition of June 6, 1955, poinpointed the need by dispatches from its foreign correspondents throughout the world, showing the present inaccessibility to the average man of the classic works of our democracy.

Prof. Richard P. McKeon has been especially helpful because in addition to his deep knowledge on the subject he has the experience and practical contact with the problem as a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO. From this experience, most helpful in the present consideration, Dr. McKeon draws in his letter of January 10, 1956, which follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The last time we discussed the plan to make available, in translation into all the major languages of the world, the classics of Western political thought, I mentioned my experience with the publication project sponsored by UNESCO. It was a program that was discussed at several of the general conferences of UNESCO and was finally turned over for execution to the International Council of Philosophy and Humanistic Studies. The project was to publish the classics of tolerance and democracy in the language in which they have not yet appeared. The funds available are extremely small, and therefore the project has gone along very slowly. What encouraged me in my meetings with the group that supervises it is the number of requests that we have received for assistance in publishing such works and for participation in the program.

At the first meeting of the committee that discussed the plan, the German representative insisted on the great need for such works in German. The title which we planned to make our first title was Locke's two Letters on Toleration. He pointed out that 1 of the 2 had never been translated into German, and the 1 that had been translated had not been available for many years. The committee agreed to his request, and therefore the first volume in the series will be a German translation of Locke. Both the Italian and the Spanish representatives expressed their willingness to make arrangements for the publication of the same work in Spanish and in Italian. The Italian representative was sure that the Italian group that he was in contact with would be able to supply the subvention, and his chief interest was in the preparation of a common list of books that would appear in the major languages of the world. The Indian representative is interested in importing into India an edition of Locke priced at a level that would make large distribution possible, and in turn, he is preparing a translation into English of the Edicts of Asoko which we will add to our list for translation into other European languages.

In addition to the German, Spanish, Italian, and Hindu projects, we have had requests from the Greeks, and I have been in communication with representatives of the

Egyptian and Japanese National Commissions of UNESCO who are interested in translations into those languages. We have not had the funds for wide discussion or circulation of the idea, but it has caught on wherever it has come to the attention of people who have thought about the problem of international understanding and communication. We hope, within the current year, to have 4 books in 4 languages, either available or well on their way, and since the total fund that we have had up to this point is only $2,000, I take the experience to signify that this is a need widely recognized and one that could be satisfied with very small funds. The list of classics of Western democracy which you have sponsored in your bill is aimed at a similar need and would serve excellently to supplement the UNESCO project. I thought that the experience we have had in this very modest program would be encouraging to you in your sponsorship of the classics of Western democratic thought.

Your sincerely,

RICHARD P. MCKEON.

Other letter follows:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In response to your letter of December 12, I wish to congratulate you for your interest and personal effort in sponsoring this proposed plan for Publication of Democratic Classics.

Below are listed the books that I suggest for your committees' consideration, most of which were in your submitted list. The substitutions are predicated on the theory of a more realistic application of our American understanding of democracy.

AUTHOR AND WORK

Bryce, The American Commonwealth.
Bryce, Modern Democracies.
Dewey, The Public and Its Problems.
Emerson, Political Essays.
Hamilton and Madison, The Federalist Papers.
Hand, The Spirit of Liberty.
Jefferson, Declaration of Independence.
Jefferson, Notes on Virginia.
Kant, Perpetual Peace.
Lincoln, Gettysburg Address.
Lincoln, Cooper Union Address.
Locke, Letters on Toleration.
Locke, On Civil Government.
Mazzini, The Duties of Man.
Mill, On Liberty.
Mill, Representative Government.
Thoreau, Walden.
De Tocqueville, Democracy in America.
Wilson, The New Freedom.
Hobbes, Thomas, Of Commonwealth.
Bennett, Jesse L., The Essential American Tradition.
Becker, Carl, The Declaration of Independence.
Brogan, D. W., Politics in America.

I also wish to thank you for the courtesy extended to me and assure you of my best wishes for your success in this undertaking.

Cordially,

WALTER S. VANALSTYNE.

NORTH TONAWANDA, N. Y.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your plans for pushing enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices in the principal languages of the world a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy is splendid and has our hearty approval. Your selection of authors and works as listed is comprehensive and excellently suited to the purpose.

Any additions, omissions, or substitutions I might suggest would not, I believe, improve the overall picture. On Emerson, Jefferson, and Lincoln, where you ask which writings, I have only this to say: If you are not going to include both it would seem that the political essays of Emerson would be more pertinent than the moral ones. Among Jefferson's selected writings, the Declaration of Independence—particularly the first section—and his first inaugural are musts. From the selected papers of Lincoln you will, of course, include the preliminary and final emancipation proclamations, the Gettysburg address, the first and second inaugurals, and the senatorial nomination acceptance speech.

Best wishes for the success of your worthy project.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. W. EUGENE PHARIS,
President, League of Women Voters of Missouri.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter of December 12, has been noted and I apologize for the delay in answering it. I was away without having mail forwarded during the holidays.

I like the idea immensely of translating and publishing a select list of the timetested classical statements in their original forms in the principal languages of the world in order to make them widely available to these people.

Also, I am in no position to advise you of further items than you have listed. In my school days I know I read from many of them but in later years my activities and preoccupations have not been in such reading. I endorse the idea and realize the fine worth in the ones mentioned.

My suggestions is that as you can, some simple and interesting pamphlets or small books be made available that might have a wider reading among these peoples than the direct translations may have. I do not mean to substitute the simpler for the direct translations. I mean both so that the scholarly person will have the classics and the person of limited time to study or inclination or education can have much of the principle in an easy readable form. That will reach more people and we need to give an appeal to both groups.

I trust this idea will appeal to enough people that it may become a working force for democratic philosophy and practice in the whole world.

Sincerely yours,

GENEVIEVE L. DAVIS,
Mrs. Walter A. Davis,
President, United Church Women of South Carolina.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The idea embodied in the resolution outlined in your letter of December 12 has my warm approval. It will, I dare say, be difficult to frame a list which is both representative and acceptable to a majority of the Congress. I would suggest the addition of Milton's Areopagitica and Thomas Paine, The Rights of Man.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISE OVERACKER,
Professor of Political Science, Wellesley College.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: I was very pleased to get your letter of December 12, concerning proposed legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. This to me is a very worthwhile and interesting piece of proposed legislation. It is with pleasure that I personally indorse it.

Since the area of political philosophy is an area with which I am not as familiar as I should be, I consulted two university professors in this field. This one placed a stamp of approval on the two enclosures in their entirety. It was the opinion of the other that the book The Rise of American Civilization by Charles and Mary Beard should be included in the list. He also gave this opinion which, of course, was a personal opinion and I quote: "I do not think that Rousseau should be in this list. His influence on American institutions and democracy has been greatly exaggerated. Why not include the great volumes of Walt Whitman?"

As State president of United Church Women of New Mexico, I have submitted your letter and the documents to the 30 members of the board of directors. I shall have their reaction in probably 1 week. At that time I shall forward their reaction to you probably in a simple statement.

Thanking you for the opportunity of expressing my opinion on this proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

LUELLA MADDEN,
President, United Church Women of New Mexico.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have for acknowledgment your letter of December 12, and I wish to commend you on your plan of disseminating badly needed factual information about the basic virtues of our way of life to peoples of other countries.

We must admit that the Communists' propaganda program is being waged far more effectively than ours in capturing the minds of people everywhere, therefore the impelling need on our part to find a way of doing a better job than they if we are to successfully stop its progress. We have failed to let the world know that Russia is as much a capitalistic country as America, the difference being that in Russia the capital is in complete control of the Politburo whose conduct in the handling of the capital cannot be questioned or even criticized by the people, except at the expense of imprisonment or death, whereas our capitalistic system is in the hands of the people, under constant scrutiny by the people, subject to the imposition of restraint by the Government. Quite a contrast.

The suggested list of authors and works you mention have no doubt been carefully screened, and I regret I have no other suggestions to make.

My best wishes in your endeavor.

Yours very truly,

W. R. ARCHER,
Houston, Tex., Regional Vice President, NAM.

P. S.—May I suggest you read Dr. E. Marrill Root's new book Collectivism on the Campus?

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: Please pardon my delay in replying to your letter of December 12, 1955, with enclosures. I wanted to give the matter some study and thought.

I believe the idea which you have in mind is a splendid one, and should be effective and helpful.

I, also, commend highly the list of books; however, it is my belief that, if practical and possible, some of them should be condensed and abridged.

Only students, for example, would read Bryce's The American Commonwealth, or Mills' Representative Government in their entireties.

If I can be of any assistance in this connection, please do not hesitate to call on me.

With best wishes.

Yours very truly,

P. H. HASKELL, Jr.,
President, Holly Grove Mining Co., Birmingham, Ala.; director NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: It is my opinion that your plan to furnish books at nominal cost through the United States Information Agency is a most worthwhile project.

However, it is also my belief that the cost should be little or nothing, as too many of the Communist pamphlets are distributed free.

It is really appalling to visit Europe and to find that the majority of people, even in the better educated classes, think we are interested only in movie stars, etc.

Many years ago, I was the wife of a member of the American diplomatic corps when American prestige in Europe and the Far East was especially high. That feeling has changed so much that it is at a dangerous point. We need to impress upon the present generation the real picture of the beliefs of the ordinary individual American citizen, those beliefs and tenets which made America great through the ordinary, little man.

May all success go with you.

Yours sincerely,

DOROTHY B. (MIMI) SOUTHWICK,
President, Florida Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: Your letter concerning publication of a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy was forwarded to me here from the University of Washington, which I left some 8 years ago. I hope my reply is not too late to be of use to you.

With the general idea behind the undertaking I am heartily in accord. I can conceive, however, that at least some of the peoples of Europe might be mildly annoyed at our appropriating and distributing their classics, especially since in their own and other European countries cheap editions are often available. Moreover, it is my own view that it would be most desirable to make available works which, while dealing with the theory and practice of democracy, were either by Americans or about the United States, especially since we, who have developed democratic theory and practice rather more fully and over a longer period than other peoples, have some real ideas to export, while we are also rather seriously misunderstood and misinterpreted.

I should therefore feel inclined to keep those works which are by or about Americans and to abandon the others. I am not able to give any advice as to which Lincoln papers should be selected, but I think the little popular edition of Jefferson's selected writings, edited, as I recall, by Adrian Koch, would fill the bill very nicely.

It is conceivable that it would be worth adding to the list a more recent foreign critic and evaluator of the United States, if copyright problems do not cause difficulties. I suggest either André Siegfried or Dennis Brogan or both. I also think that for giving the spirit of American institutions as they are today, the work of Jacques Barzun, born a foreigner but long a citizen, entitled "God's Country and Mine," would be an admirable one, again if copyright difficulties did not prevent it. Likewise my own feeling is that Justic William Douglas' An Almanac of Liberty, does a good deal in brief little essays both to inform without pains about some major events in our history, and to give an interpretative viewpoint on our way of life.

There is, manifestly, a vast literature on American democracy, but a great deal of it, even when thorough, is perhaps a little too scholarly for the broader appeal which I take it you have in mind. Nevertheless, I should hope that if such an undertaking proves initially successful, it would subsequently be possible to extend the coverage and to make available what might be follow-up or supplementary books.

I venture to add one thing. While in some cities such as Rome the American Library is doing a suberb job, I do get the feeling, and not least I may add in England, my land of origin, that ever reasonably informed opinion is becoming increasingly ignorant, as well as, I fear, increasingly prejudiced about this country. At least one of the difficulties is the high cost of American books for the European scholar, and even for libraries. Anything that could be done to make serious American work available in Europe to scholars and to other interested persons would, I think, be highly valuable. And, in relation to Government expenditures generally, or our various aid programs particularly, I cannot but feel that such costs would not loom large and would have disproportionate returns.

May I wish you every success in your undertaking. If I can be of any further assistance I shall of course be delighted.

Yours sincerely,

THOMAS I. COOK,
Professor Department of Political Science, John Hopkins University.

Classics of American Democracy—XVIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include among others a letter from Arthur H. Thornhill, president of Little, Brown & Co., publishers, as follows:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: It was with considerable interest that I read of your plan to encourage legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

Certainly this agency has done a great deal to enhance the position of free nations and to disseminate information which will enlighten the relatively illiterate and oppressed populations of the world. As you probably know, we have cooperated in every instance with the various programs which implement this goal.

However, the plan to strengthen this activity by approaching the matter on a highly intellectual level makes a great deal of sense and the recommendations which have been made by your consultants are excellent ones indeed. It appears as though they have recommended the basic theses and philosophies which truly touch the heart of our way of life.

With best wishes for the success of your activity,

Sincerely yours,

AUTHUR H. THORNHILL,
President, Little, Brown & Co., Boston.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am sorry for the long delay in answering your letter of December 12.

In general, I think the idea is quite sound and good provided the USIA is given additional funds to cover the cost. I have observed the operations of this agency in a number of European countries and I feel they are doing an excellent job but that much more could be done and should be done there. I suspect the same conditions prevail in other parts of the world. I cannot criticize the list of books you have compiled but it might be useful to include a few more recent books.

Very truly yours,

HENRY Z. WALCK,
President, Oxford University Press.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I hope I may be forgiven for my tardiness in replying to your letter of December 12. Alas, December is one of my worst months in that my agenda is crowded with meetings of our managers assembled from all parts of the country, and so-called year-end sales conferences.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the translation program put forward in your letter of December 12. But I feel that care must be employed in implementing the program lest we defeat our purpose by making it possible for our enemies to declare the program nothing but propaganda.

I feel that the actual books to be injected into the program in any given country should at least appear to be selected for publication by a local publisher in the country in which we wish the book distributed in translation.

I think it important, too, that a book which we want distributed in translation in any given country be published in the normal way by a regular well-recognized publisher of that country, by which I mean that the publisher would be responsible for selecting a translator who would do a scholarly translation, the foreign publisher would be responsible too for designing the book and having it manufactured in his own country. I would not consider it appropriate under any circumstances to have the books manufactured in this country. These books, if the program is to be successful, must at least have the appearance of having been selected by the foreign publisher for publication, designed, manufactured, and merchandised by him.

Now in order to accomplish this, unquestionably the foreign publisher will have to be subsidized to make it possible for him to offer the book we want sold at the price at which it should be sold in order to acquire the widest possible market.

As I see it, what you are suggesting is quite close to the Franklin operation, which has been headed by Datus Smith, formerly the head of the Princeton University Press. As a matter of fact, I would think that your program could be implemented by Franklin at less cost than in any other way. Why not confer with Datus Smith about the possibilities of this?

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE BRITT,
President, the MacMillan Co.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am very grateful that you have given me the opportunity to comment on your plan for publication of Democratic Classics.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of this proposal; in fact, it has the kind of imaginative simplicity about it that makes one wonder why it had not been done before. I can think of no way in which the United States taxpayers could more profitably spend some of their tax dollars.

I have carefully studied the list of suggested authors and works in enclosure No. 2, and I am enclosing a separate sheet with my comments on them. Some of the works I am unfamiliar with and the fact that I leave them off my list of comments does not mean that we do not approve of them.

With every wish for the success of your project, I am,

Very truly yours,

JEAN HOLMER,
Mrs. Paul Holmer,
President, League of Women Voters of California.

Mrs. Holmer's approved list and comments follow:

I would certainly agree that the list should contain the following classics:

Bryce: The American Commonwealth and Modern Democracies.

Burke: Reflections on the Revolution in France.

Hamilton and Madison: The Federalist Papers.

Hand: The Spirit of Liberty.

Locke: Letters on Toleration.

Mill: On Liberty and Representative Government.

DeTocqueville: Democracy in America.

Wilson: The New Freedom.

As to which writings of Jefferson should be included, this presents somewhat of a problem since Jefferson did not put down in any treatise a thoroughly reasoned account of his political philosophy. Any such selections should certainly include the Declaration of Independence; a Summary View of the Rights

of Americans; Notes on Virginia; and the Inaugural Speech which is his splendid elucidation of the differences between aristocratic government and republicanism.

From the works of Lincoln, I would include: The Peroia Speech of 1854 on the Kansas-Nebraska Act, in which he gives a wonderful expression of the democratic and humanitarian viewpoint on the slavery issue; the Douglas Debates of 1858; the Cooper Union Speech. I would certainly include his poetic expressions of the democratic ideal—The Gettysburg Address; The Second Inaugural; The Emancipation Proclamation; and, The Letter to Mrs. Bixby. In addition I would include the less familiar First Inaugural Message in which Lincoln explains his basic democratic philosophy. He makes it clear that he thinks the Union is sacred because it makes possible the great experiment in government of the people.

Finally I would like to have your committee consider the addition of Montesquieu's Esprit des Lois—at least the first section dealing with law in general and forms of government. This certainly might be considered the greatest book of the French 18th century, and one of the most important ever written because of its original views on law and politics and because of the great influence it exerted upon some of the American Founding Fathers.

DEAR SIR: Your request to Mr. J. McWilliams Stone, board of directors, NAM, for opinion of the plan of the United States Information Agency to publish, for nominal prices, a smal library of the basic statements of democratic political philosophy in various languages, has been referred by him to me.

I believe the plan is an excellent one and should be of much value to anyone desiring information on this subject. I feel strongly that we should share our heritage of these inspiring classics with all mankind.

WORK AND AUTHOR
The American Commonwealth: Bryce.
Modern Democracies: Bryce.
Political Essays: Emerson.
Gettysburg Address: Lincoln.
Second Inaugural: Lincoln.
Civil Government: Locke.
On Liberty and Representative Government: Mills.
The Inequality Among Mankind: Rousseau.
Democracy in America: de Tocqueville.
The New Freedom: Wilson.
The above seem to be within the scope of this project.
Walden: Thoreau.
Revolution in France: Burke.
The above seem less desirable.
Suggested additions:
The Declaration of Independence.
The Constitution of the United States.
The Bill of Rights.
Introduction to Works of Lincoln, and a Charter of Democracy: Theodore Roosevelt.
Recent Speeches on the Dignity of Man, the Heritage of Free Man, and the Armistice Day Address: Herbert Hoover.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. GIBSON,
DuKane Corp., St. Charles, Ill.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: My delay in answering your letter of December 12 has been occasioned by a desire to give it more than passing study.

The suggested authors and their works seem to be about as fine as we could wish for and I cannot add anything to it.

Thanking you for this courtesy, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ALFRED P. GODDIN,
General Vice President, Sons of the Revolution.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This will acknowledge your letter of the 12th advising that a group of Members of Congress will push for enabling legislation directing the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices, in the principal languages of the world, a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy. It occurs to me this is a splendid idea as certainly the democratic philosophy should be known the world over.

I appreciate your kindness in bringing this to my attention, but at present I have no suggestions to offer concerning additional material, etc.

Needless to say, any legislation proposed in Congress needs the support of the people and I would suggest that you bring this matter to the attention of the Railway Labor Executive Association.

Sincerely yours,

JESSE CLARK,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE O'HARA: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of December 12, 1955, addressed to Mr. J. Paul Beadle, education director of the International Typographical Union. Mr. Beadle is the director of our bureau of education which handles our technical education program for apprentices. He has referred the letter to me.

Of course the International Typographical Union as such could make no expression of opinion on the plan that has been advanced to print and distribute among foreign countries in foreign languages "a select list of the time-tested classical statements of democratic theory in their original forms."

Part 2 is a suggested list of authors and works which might be so printed and distributed and you ask for expressions of opinion as to the plan and the selected books.

You say the plan has been approved by the President's United States Advisory Commission on Information and by the Commissions Committee on Books Abroad and by many eminent Americans mentioned in your proposal.

If you want my personal opinion on the matter I would say no doubt the plan would be helpful and any or all of the books you mentioned which have the approval of certain eminent educators would no doubt be helpful in the long run.

However, as I see the picture there is no long run at this time. We have been running too long already without delivering to the peoples of the world a clear explanation of what American capitalism is and how it differs from the capitalism that has been damned through the ages in all countries of the world.

It is my opinion that what is needed is widespread distribution of a book, in all languages, giving a grade school explanation of what American capitalism is, how it works and the results thereof. It should be copiously and graphically illustrated so that the message is in pictures as well as in words.

I might add that such an explanation of the American economy could well be published in our own country and made available in schools and even colleges. In my opinion there is a lack of such a publication even in this country or if there is one it has not come to my attention.

Trusting the above will be helpful and with kindest personal regards, I am

Cordially and sincerely,

WOODRUFF RANDOLPH,
President, International Typographical Union.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am very sorry to have been so slow in answering your letter of December 12. However, our Washington office, to which you addressed your inquiry, was closed during the holidays and the letter was forwarded to me here at my New York address only since the beginning of the year. Now that I have it, let me answer promptly and briefly. I think the plan excellent and the list of books equally so.

Sincerely,

HIRAM HAYDN,
Phi Beta Kappa and Editor the American Scholar.

MY DEAR MR. O'HARA: I wish to express, though very tardily, I regret, my endorsement of the proposal to have translated and made available at low cost to the peoples of many lands the basic text dealing with democratic political philosophy. It seems to me an excellent countermeasure to use against the weight of Communist political propaganda so easily available in other lands.

My acquaintance with such literature as is listed on enclosure 2 is too sketchy to permit me to make specific suggestions of titles or selected passages.

I think the proposed undertaking is worth the wholehearted endorsement and favorable action on the part of the Congress of the United States, and I sincerely hope it is carried out.

Sincerely yours,

LOUISE C. LINE,
Mrs. Robert C. Line,
President, Montana Council of Church Women.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is to acknowledge your very good letter of December 12, in which you solicit my opinion as to the books which Congress might publish in different foreign languages and having to do with the basic democratic political philosophy.

Enclosed is a list of the books which I would recommend. I have listed these in the order of their importance.

Sincerely yours,

J. HOWARD PEW,
Philadelphia Director, NAM.

Mr. Pew's list follows:

Mises, Ludwig von: Human Action, Yale University Press, 1949.

Hazlitt, Henry: Economics in One Lesson (1946), Foundation for Economic Education, 1952.

Paton, William: Shirtsleeve Economics, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952.

Hayek, F. A.: Road to Serfdom, University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Mises, Ludwig von: Socialism (1922), Yale University Press, 1951.

Jefferson, Thomas: The Writings of Jefferson, Modern Library, 1944.

De Tocqueville, Alexis: Democracy in America, 2 volumes (1835 and 1840), Knopf, 1945.

Locke, John: Second Treatise on Government (1690), numerous editions.

Paine, Thomas: Common Sense (1776), numerous editions.

Hamilton, Jay, and Madison: The Federalist (1788), Modern Library, 1937.

Bryce, James: The American Commonwealth (2 volumes), revised edition, Macmillan, 1924.

Burgess, John W.: The Reconcilation of Government and Liberty, Scribners, 1915.

Essays on Liberty, volume 1, 1952; volume 2, 1954, Foundation for Economic Education.

Harper, F. A.: Liberty, A Path to Its Recovery, Foundation for Economic Education, 1949.

Beston, Henry: American Memory, Farrar & Rinehart, 1937.

Emerson's Essays and Other Writings, Modern Library, 1940.

Garrett, Garet: The American Story, Regnery, 1955.

Thoreau, Henry: Walden and Other Writings, Modern Library, 1937.

Beard, Charles: The Republic, Viking, New York, 1943.

Bastiat, Frederick: The Law, Foundation for Economic Education, 1950.

Lippmann, Walter: The Good Society, Little, Brown, 1937.

Mill, John Stuart: On Liberty (1859), numerous editions.

Mill, John Stuart: Representative Government (1861).

Spencer, Herbert: The Man vs. the State (1874), Caxton Printers, 1940.

Orton, Wm. A.: The Liberal Tradition, Yale, 1945.

Weaver, Henry G.: The Mainspring of Human Progress, Talbot Books, 1947.

Ashton, T. S.: The Industrial Revolution, 1760–1830, Oxford, 1948.

Belloc, Hilaire: The Servile State (1912), Holt, New York.

Read, Leonard E.: Government—An Ideal Concept, Foundation for Economic Education, 1954.

DEAR SIR: I think it is an excellent idea for the United States Information Agency to publish for nominal prices several books outlining our political philosophy.

The suggested list of books seems most appropriate and I have no suggestions for changes. I hope these publications will be made available to our citizens as well as those of foreign countries as I feel there is a need for a better understanding of our basic principles.

I hope this legislation will be enacted.

Sincerely yours,

NINA M. RUSSELL,
Maryland Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Classics of American Democracy—XIX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include, among other communications, a letter from Roy A. Gould, of Portland, Oreg., transmitting a most interesting analytical study of the classics of American democracy it is proposed to translate into the principle languages of the world and to make available in cheap editions to peoples everywhere:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: This is with further reference to your letter of December 12 and my reply of December 29 regarding a bill to be proposed recommending that the United States publish several books in foreign languages and make available in foreign countries.

The purpose of this would be to give those people an opportunity to read obout our free-enterprise system and our way of life in this country.

As I stated in my letter of December 29, I did not have time to review these books, however, I engaged a very competent person to do so, Miss Shirley Ann Sackman.

Shirley Ann has a master's degree from Columbia University and has traveled quite extensively in Europe and taught school 2 years in Australia.

I am enclosing her analysis of the books. In reading it I note she is reluctant to state that some books should not be published because, as she explained, she did not know exactly how the program would be handled.

For example, if these books are to be placed in schools only and for the instructors to read, books could be recommended that could not be understood by the average individual in foreign countries who quit school to go to work at the age of 14.

Then, too, there are books beyond the comprehension of and, because of their style, etc., would not be read enough by teachers to make their printing worthwhile. I think Dewey's The Public and Its Problems is one of these.

You will note that Shirley Ann added to the list The Great Rehearsal, by van Doren. While I did not find time to read this, I sketched through and agree it is one that might well be added.

May I take one moment to comment on this program. The Communist countries are more active in promoting hatred for our capitalistic, democratic way of life in this country than many of us here realize. Should we simply place these books abroad in convenient places for the rank and file to pick them up and read them they would not last as long as it would take to put them there. This also goes for placing them in free school lending libraries. The only place they would be well preserved is where they are not needed. I think some books in some places would be an excellent investment, although they may disappear quite readily.

However, to try and saturate most foreign countries with our literature would be a waste of money. It may be wise to cut down on the number of books printed and try and get more current news, in printed form, into these countries; such as translating our Readers Digest, etc.

I sincerely hope this will be of some help to you.

Cordially,

DIAMOND LUMBER CO.,
ROY A. GOULD.
President of Diamond Lumber Co., of Portland, Oreg., Director, NAM.

Miss Sackman's study and comments follow:

Bryce, The American Commonwealth: Bryce listed the strongest recommendation for this book as a subject for foreign translation when he stated in the preface: The American Commonwealth was originally written with a view to European rather than American readers. The entire volume is accordingly oriented and excellently organized. Beginning with a study of the presidential powers, he evolves into cabinet, Senate, House of Representatives, congressional complexities; handling all with a concise and eminently readable style. Bryce mentions many comparisons between European and American forms of government; e. g., the "classless society." This book should provide one of the most powerful translations in the group.

Bryce, Modern Democracies: This work seems to have all the qualities of the preceding but would it not be more to the point to publish the second volume only? In itself a volume of over 600 pages, it has lengthy sections on American, Australian and New Zealand democracies which might be unavailable to Europeans, whereas governmental forms in Switzerland, ancient Athens, etc., should be obtainable information in most libraries of the world.

Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France: Would an abridged edition be possible? Burke makes many fine points but one must read pages of involved rhetoric between.

Dewey, The Public and its Problems: If this collection of political philosophies is for distribution to the reading public abroad. Dewey seems to have no place. Granted that he may have been an outstanding American philosopher; the abstractions of this work make it exceedingly hard going. I feel that this book should be deleted from the list.

Emerson, Moral and Political Essays: Politics, Prudence, The Over Soul, Self-Reliance, Spiritual Laws, New England Reformers.

Hamilton and Madison: The Federalist Papers: For this study The Enduring Federalist, in which Charles A. Beard edited and analyzed the Papers, was valuable. Though Beard abridges the documents slightly, he gives cogent arguments for their present-day significance. It seems an indispensable book on the American system of politics, especially concerning the relationship between federalism and a constitutional form of government.

Hand, The Spirit of Liberty: This seems to me a wise and beautifully composed collection. It should prove refreshing and enlightening for readers to see how the freedom and justice fought for 180 years ago, is being applied in American courts today.

Von Humboldt, The Sphere and Duties of Government: Unavailable.

Jefferson, Selected Writings:

1. A summary view of the rights of British America, August 1774.
2. A declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress Assembled, July 4, 1776.
3. Comments on the Federal Constitution, December 20, 1787.
4. Report on the privileges and restrictions on the commerce of the United States in foreign countries, December 16, 1793.
5. Program of competition for the United States Capitol, March 14, 1792.
6. The need for rebellion, January 30, 1787.
7. Notes on party policy, 1793.
8. Aristocracy and liberty, October 28, 1813.
9. Government by the people, July 12, 1816.
10. Origins of self-government, June 5, 1824.
11. Prospectus on political economy, April 6, 1816.
12. A manual of parliamentary practice, 1800.

Kant, Perpetual Peace: This magnificent writing has a theory which well could be emphasized in a study of this kind. It also has psychological import in the light of a warmongering reputation America has acquired in some countries abroad.

Lincoln, selected papers:

1. The Perpetuation of Our Political Institutions, January 27, 1838.
2. Letters to George Robertson, August 15, 1855.
3. Fremont, Buchanan, and the extension of slavery, August 27, 1856.
4. A House Divided, June 16, 1858.
5. Fragment: The Constitution, 1860?
6. Address at Cooper Institute, February 27, 1860.
7. Letter to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862.
8. Final Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863.
9. Address delivered at the dedication of the cemetery in Gettysburg, November 19, 1863.

Locke, Letters on Toleration: "* * * toleration * * * the chief characteristic mark of the true church." In this work from the Age of Reason, Locke points up practices and prejudices in the church current even today. Though many before him had argued for religious tolerance, this is probably the writing on the subject that had most influence upon the American constitutionalists. Another hint which became rock-ribbed policy in America was separation of church and state.

Locke, On Civil Government, Book II: Locke's contribution to democratic thought here seems to be his belief that government should devote itself to the preservation of man's natural rights. Furthermore, since "* * * all are equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty, or possessions." Such sentences, antedating the Preamble to the Constitution, may have helped to pave the way for the revolutions that followed.

Mazzini, The Duties of Man: In contradistinction to Locke's theory, Mazzini's conviction that the duties of man necessarily precede his rights balances subject of responsibility versus reward in the democratic state. His articles on the emancipation of women and of the working classes might have been surprising to the Europe of a cen-

tury past but may not that style be conceived the ravings of an insurrectionist today?

Mill, on Liberty: This work and the following, like the writings of Locke, Burke and Montesquieu, is definitive of democratic thought and therefore eligible for this collection. If it is being prepared for the university student of political science, well and good, but may the layman, threading Mill's style, be unable to see the forest for the trees?

Mill, Representative Government: These theories are of undoubted scholarly value and of interest to creators and students of constitutional government. It would appeal to a limited reading public.

Rousseau, The Social Contract: This book admittedly, is a basis for a great deal of modern political thought and as such should be included in any grouping of democratic political philosophy. As a literary classic, however, it is widely available in Europe. Perhaps a publication in this collection would reduce its cost.

Thoreau, Walden: These thoughts create an atmosphere of peace and loveliness, a soft contrast in reading and in spirit. According to E. W. Teale, Walden is, "without doubt, the most original work in American literature. It might impress readers with the possibilities of creative living by a man who came as near as possible to exerting freedom of will.

Thoreau, Civil Disobedience: Unavailable.

de Tocqueville, Democracy in America: Some of de Tocqueville's impressions of America, about 1834, of which he wrote to de Chabrol in France, may be anachronistic today: "The States have few soldiers, because they have no enemies, and consequently no armies; there is neither taxation nor central government. Executive power, being nonexistent, is a source neither of money nor power." Though he revised some of these opinions later, his book is important because it is a first hand study of a democratic society, of which de Tocqueville thought America the example par excellence.

Wilson, The New Freedom: These campaign speeches make interesting reading and present a picture of what one man, at least, felt the United States had become 150 years after its inception. His contrast of the power of corporations to the ideals of Jeffersonian democracy is particularly impressive. The book also seems appropriate because it illustrates some of the alterations in application of democratic theory in this country during the past century and a half.

Van Doren, The Great Rehearsal: Although this work does not appear on the list of suggested titles for this collection, I feel that it embodies in dynamic form, many of the writings and personalities involved in the making of the Constitution. When Washington wrote: "Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair" and Lincoln considered the Constitution the rock upon which American democracy was founded, it would be well to emphasize, as Carl van Doren does, the basis for our democratic way of life.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: In response to your recent letter calling our attention to the proposal that the United States Information Service translate and publish a select list of classic statements of democratic theory, we believe that it might be well to add the following works to the list:

(1) Abraham Lincoln's speeches, including the Gettysburg Address, his second inaugural address and his Cooper Union address;

(2) Benjamin Franklin's autobiography;

(3) Charles Beard's Rise of American Civilization;

(4) The Education of Henry Adams;

(5) The collected papers of Franklin D. Roosevelt;

(6) Thomas Paine's The Rights of Man.

We hope that you will find these suggestions helpful.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD R. COLEMAN,
Executive Secretary, United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers International Union.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to yours of January 11:

I think your plan for providing translations of the great books dealing with the American Idea is indeed admirable. I hope you succeed in persuading Congress to adopt it.

The only general suggestion I would make is to have each language's translation made by a conspicuous national (perhaps a university historian) of the home country of that language. Seems to me this would add greatly to the acceptance of the texts.

As for the list, it seems to me the only omission is a reprinting of some notable American documents: surely the Declaration of Independence and The Constitution (plus, as an introduction to either, the Oath of a Free Man, the first piece of printing on what is now the United States of America).

Another item, along this line, might be Heritage of Freedom (about the documents in the Freedom Train) by Frank Monaghan, published by Princeton University Press, 1947.

Also I would think Walt Whitman's Leaves of Grass would be a "must"—if scholars agree translation would not destroy its power.

Another pet idea of mine is that we should circulate regularly very many copies of Life and the Saturday Evening Post, throughout the world, as typifying the American scene * * * not in translation but as typifying what our economy offers to 10 million Americans, week by week.

Cordially,

WILLIAM REYDEL,
Senior Vice President, Cunningham-Walsh, Inc., New York.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I wish to reply to your letter of December 12, 1955, concerning a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy to be published by the United States Information Agency, if approved by Congress. I realize that Congress is now in session and that you may already have prepared your bill.

I believe that the general plan for publication of democratic classics is very desirable. The fundamentals of democracy upon which our country was founded should be helpful to citizens of other countries, and would not necessarily be apparent from current literature.

I have few improvements to make upon the suggested authors and works. I would suggest the removal of Rousseau and the addition of Hendrik Van Loon's The Story of America. I suggest that Lincoln's Selected Papers include his second inaugural address and his Emancipation Proclamation.

If you could advise me as to the most effective time to write to my Congressmen, I would like to write in support of this bill. In any case, I will follow the bill with interest. Perhaps I can judge the timing from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

LUELLA DEVLIN
Mrs. Frank Devlin,
Chairman, Committee for a State League of Women Voters, Casper, Wyo.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I do hope you will forgive the delay in answering your letter of December 12, due to the holidays and out-of-town commitments.

I would like to commend you and the other Members responsible for your plan for publication of democratic classics. It should go far toward alleviating the scarcity of books on democratic political philosophy.

Thank you for writing, and best wishes for every success in this worthwhile program.

Sincerely yours,

ETHYL YOUNG
Mrs. Basil Young,
President, League of Women Voters of Minnesota.

Classics of American Democracy—XX

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with this extension of my remarks I am concluding the first presentment to my colleagues of a poll of representative Americans in all activities of our national life on the proposal to translate the basic classics of our American democracy into the principal languages of the world and to make them easily available at reasonable prices to people everywhere. I trust these letters have proved as interesting and stimulating to my colleagues in both bodies of the Congress as they have to me. Certainly all will agree that they reflect a wide interest and an enthusiasm for a stepped-up program that eventually will make crystal clear to all the world what is the philosophy of government by which we live, the faiths that gave us national being and from which we derive our moral and spiritual strength, the secret of our well-being.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I am attracted by the proposal you outline in your letter and trust the enabling legislation can be passed to implement it.

The book list strikes me as a good one. I would raise a question about the inclusion of Rousseau's The Social Contract; it has the germ of totalitarianism in it. Since Dewey is represented a place might be made for Reinhold Niebuhr and I suggest his book The Children of the Light and the Children of Darkness. One of the best books on democracy is A. D. Lindsay's The Modern Democratic State and I commend it to your notice. Ought not something also to be on the list from the Cromwellian period, say the Putney Debates?

With every good wish for the success of the enterprise,

Yours faithfully,

R. J. MCCRACKEN,
Minister, The Riverside Church, New York.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In response to your letter of last month, may I say that I think the proposal is excellent. The suggested authors and works could not be better.

I think, however, that it would be a good idea to add a book like Abraham Lincoln by Benjamin Thomas, as well as The Epic of America, by Adams, and The Flowering of New England, by Van Wyck Brooks. Indeed, biographical sketches of great Americans like Jefferson, Washington, and Benjamin Franklin would be very important assets to the goal we seek to achieve.

There is no story of democracy which more effectively presents its greatness than the life of great Americans who grew up within

the framework of the American democracy.

Wishing you and your colleagues everything good, and assuring you, sir, that I shall be glad to help in any further way that you may request, I am

Yours faithfully,

HYMAN JUDAH SCHACHTEL,
Rabbi Congreation Beth Israel, Houston, Tex.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: Thank you for your letter and for the enclosure describing the Plan for Publication of Democratic Classics. I appreciate your request for my comments.

My experience in mass communications predisposes me to think in terms of potential markets or audiences. In my opinion such books as are suggested will be read and understood, for the most part, only by people with the equivalent of a college education. I suppose, accordingly, that the market for these books would vary widely from country to country, depending on the literacy, background, and formal education of the people. Although I do not know what languages or countries you have in mind, I would suggest that the number of colleges and universities, and the general intellectual climate of a given country, would be important considerations in estimating the probable circulation, or at least the probable understanding, of the books.

If wide circulation and understanding of the ideas in such books as those suggested is the goal, I wonder whether the initial project should not include some provision for teachers and discussion groups. It is my impression that this is an important part of the Communist success in propagating the ideas and slogans in their classical political literature.

Finally, I wonder whether the propaganda value of our political and philosophical classics will be as effective in winning the cold war as increased emphasis on the practical advantages of current American capitalism would be. I believe that the most powerful weapon in our cold war arsenal is the power of our way of life to raise the standard of living for whole populations. I would hope, therefore, that this project would not decrease the USIA's effort to tell, with increasing effectiveness, the story of our current economic programs of aid to our allies as well as to the uncommitted countries.

Having raised these points, I would like to emphasize my high respect for the authors you list. They are certainly prominent among the intellectual leaders who gave birth to the ideas on which this Nation is founded. It is certain, too, that sound intellectual leadership is important to the success of contemporary mass movements, and that these books would be of great importance in the education of intellectual leaders. But I am disturbed, as I am sure you are, by the threatening speed with which alliances, affiliations, and preferences crystalize in our time. It is my earnest hope that the full impact of our power will be applied where it will have the greatest effect for the extension of freedom and prosperity.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment, and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting System.

DEAR SIR: Your proposal that the United States Information Agency translate and publish in the principal languages of the world a select few of our basic documents explaining American Governmental theory is an excellent idea. We are all becoming more aware that one of the best ways to fight communism is through education.

I would very much like to add the following suggested authors and works to the list contained in your letter of December 12, 1955:

John Adams: A Defense of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America.

John C. Calhoun: A Disquisition on Government.

Montesquieu: The Spirit of Laws.

Jefferson's writings: 1. A Summary View of the Rights of British America. 2. Notes on the State of Virginia (portions dealing with Government). 3. The Anas.

Emerson's writings: Man, the Reformer.

Lincoln's papers: First and Second Inaugural Addresses.

Sincerely yours,

J. R. FLUOR,
Executive Vice President, the Fluor Corp., Ltd., Los Angeles.

DEAR MR O'HARA: In reply to your letter, we suggest the possible elimination of Walden and your consideration of the Americanization of Edward Bok, the Education of Henry Adams, the Almanac of Liberty by Supreme Court Justice Douglas, Tom Paine's Age of Reason, Leaves of Grass by Walt Whitman, and Benjamin Franklin's Poor Richard's Almanac, also the latter's autobiography.

Sincerely yours,

SCHWAB AND BEATTY, INC.,
Advertising, New York.

DEAR COMRADE O'HARA: Reply to yours of December 12, 1955, I will be happy to approve of your proposal as submitted to me. If you have approved of the books listed in your enclosure it is O. K. by me.

Being an old veteran of the Spanish-American War, and a former senior vice commander in chief of the Society of the Army of the Philippines, I, therefore, place my trust in you.

Yours in comradeship,

F. WARNER KARLING,
Post Commander in Chief, Society of the Army of the Philippines and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: I am delighted to support the excellent suggestion that the United States Information Agency publish a basic library of democratic classics for use abroad.

I wonder if there is another possibility that you might want to explore in this connection. It might be desirable to publish a coordinate set of volumes that could be called The Universal Truth Series. It could include such volumes as The Universal Truth Taught by Gandhi and would emphasize excerpts from his writings that condemn communism. Another volume could be The Universal Truth Taught by Confucius and Lao-tse which would emphasize precisely those items that the Communists are most interested in suppressing—this can contribute to our winning support from the overseas Chinese whom Peiping is now wooing as a potential fifth column in other lands. In essence, this concept aims to use the best in each people's tradition which could serve as ideological ammunition against communism.

Your project, in my opinion, is a very valuable one, and I am glad to see that it is being pushed so aggressively by you and your associates. I hope this additional suggestion is of some value.

Sincerely yours,

LEO CHERNE,
Executive Director, the Research Institute of America, New York.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I believe that Kurt Enoch, president of our publishing enterprise, has already written you in response to your letter of December 12. Your letter addressed to me did not arrive until just before the New Year.

I fully subscribe to Mr. Enoch's comments. It is greatly to be desired that the basic classics which have molded and interpreted the political and ethical philosophies of the United States be more widely known in the native languages of other areas of the world, especially among students, political scientists, and others destined to leadership in the future. Your current list of titles is commendable, although it certainly would be necessary to expand and adapt the list for the special interests of certain countries.

I would not want to see the carefully planned program of the USIA diluted to include this long-term translation project at the expense of its already strained budget. I served one term on the board of Franklin Publications, and came to appreciate the necessity for a somewhat more elementary translation program in some parts of the world, the Moslem countries particularly. I also regard with dismay the deterioration of the English language in such multilingual regions as the subcontinent of India, and Ceylon.

As you will note on the attached statement, American Books Abroad, which we distributed to the participants at the Princeton conference in September, the New American Library of World Literature, Inc., has been instrumental in giving wide circulation to the basic writings of the Middle East and the Orient in the United States, which we are told has done a great deal to enhance the spiritual reputation of our country in Moslem and Buddhist areas particularly. This, of course, in no way modifies the objectives of your proposed special program, but it is relevant. As specialists in inexpensive books we have, also, been participating in the USIA scheme for special inexpensive editions of pertinent books at the equivalent of 10 cents, in English, in India.

We maintain a fairly comprehensive lot of associations with scholars and universities throughout the world, and our Mentor books are used as texts and extracurricular reading from Cairo to Tokyo, and in between, almost as naturally as they are used throughout the United States and Canada. I mention this because we include quite a few of the authors suggested in your list—Tocqueville, Thoreau, Jefferson, Dewey, Emerson, and, in our Mentor Philosophers Series, Locke, Mill, Whitehead, and all of the principal western philosophers.

The rendition into other tongues of many of these writers would be very useful, and we would be happy to offer more detailed suggestions as your plan proceeds. We have great admiration and respect for Harold Fey, the Chicago Daily News group, and the University of Chicago group with whom you have been consulting.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR WEYBRIGHT,
Chairman and Editor, the New American Library of World Literature.

GREETINGS: This acknowledges your letter of December 12 with respect to the United States Information Agency publishing a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy.

To the excellent list that you supplied with your letter I would suggest that you add the following:

1. John Adams: A Defence of the Constitutions of Government of the United States of America.

2. John C. Calhoun: A Disquisition on Government.

3. Montesquieu: The Spirit of Laws.

Of Jefferson's writings, the following seem to me to be the most essential:

1. A Summary View of the Rights of British America.

2. Notes on the State of Virginia (portions dealing with Government).

3. The Anas.

Of all of Emerson's writings, in my opinion, the most important work for such a purpose as you have in mind is Man, the Reformer.

Of all of Lincoln's papers, it seems to me that the most important for this purpose are the first and second inaugural addresses.

Respectfully,

M. B. PENDLETON,
President, Plomb Tool Co., Los Angeles.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'HARA: The overall plan outlined in your letter of December 12 would unquestionably lead to a better understanding of the fundamentals of democratic political philosophy, if adequate distribution of these books could be obtained at a reasonable cost.

This, I presume, would be a part of an overall program of indoctrination to the peoples of the world, and is certainly on the constructive side.

I do not feel competent to judge the list of books enclosed with your letter, but would rather leave this to someone better qualified.

Sincerely yours,

FELIX W. COSTE,
Vice President, the Coca-Cola Co.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The idea of making available statements as to the philosophy of democracy is undoubtedly a good one. The list suggested is good, but much of it, as for instance Emerson, is rather difficult reading. What is needed are statements understandable by the very common man. More of Rousseau and perhaps something from Thomas Paine might well be added.

It is undoubtedly difficult to please everyone in a modern statement, but something of how democracy works in America today would seem to me to be most significant. At least some statement about the protections and safeguards of individual rights through our courts should be possible. And this should have the greatest appeal.

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER L. CLARK,
Mrs. LeMon Clark,
President, League of Women Voters of Arkansas.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: I have your letter of December 12 concerning the proposal that certain books on American democracy be translated for use by the United States Information Agency.

The purpose of this proposal seems to be commendable. However, I recognize that caution should be exercised in the selection of books. So often a statement which might have one meaning to us, with our background of democracy, might be interpreted very differently by one who does not have a similar background.

I am sorry that I am not conversant with all the books on your list, and therefore do not feel that I am in position to offer comments as to their worth.

Sincerely,

T. M. MARTIN,
President, Lion Oil Co., El Dorado, Ark., and Director, NAM.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of December 12, and please excuse my tardy reply.

Your purpose and objective in publishing time-tested classical statements of democratic theory in principal foreign languages is indeed an admirable one. I am wholeheartedly in favor of such a proposal.

However, the mere translation and publication of these documents offers no assurance these papers will be read. Is it not necessary to include in your proposal some method of inducing these people to actually read the manuscripts?

Some method whereby people as well as books could be sent to these countries to discuss, lecture and debate, if necessary, some of the democratic principles outlined in these very same books.

I am quite aware that publishing these documents is the first step but I would feel more enthusiastic if I knew subsequent steps were taken to keep the interest of these people always alive.

Very truly yours,

SIDNEY DRY,
President National Steel Container Corp., Director, NAM.

DEAR MR. O'HARA: In reply to your letter of December 12, 1955, regarding your plan to push legislation directed toward the publication of a small library of basic statements of democratic political philosophy, I have some thoughts on the subject.

First of all, I think it is a most worthwhile endeavor and one which should give ample repayment for the small expenditures involved.

In regard to the suggested authors and works, the selection of those books which I have read is very good. There are, of course, some that I have not read. I can still remember the strong impressions I received from Bryce, Emerson, Locke, Mill, and Rousseau during the study of political theory in college.

I think, however, that some more modern books should be included in this list, particularly some that can explain the present American democracy, and thus relate it to the theories of the earlier writers.

An excellent book on the United States Constitution and interpretation of it by Professor Corwin might well be added to this list. Unfortunately, I am unable to find my copy of the book so as to give you the complete title, but Professor Corwin, retired professor of political philosophy at Princeton University, is well enough known so that I'm certain his book can be found.

I would also like to recommend for consideration Faith and Freedom, by Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT. This book was published in 1950 by Charles Scribners Sons, New York. It seems to me also that something sound on the American free-enterprise system properly should and could be included. I call to your attention the very excellent book by Mr. Clarence B. Randall, entitled "A Creed for Free Enterprise," which was published in August 1952 by the Constitution and Free Enterprise Foundation, 210 East 43d Street, New York 17, N. Y.

I'm sure there are other good books on the subject which could be included.

I strongly urge that some basic discussion of the free-enterprise system be included.

I do hope you will have success with your proposal, since the objectives you have cannot be solved by the "mail a Sears-Roebuck catalog" school of thought.

Sincerely,

F. G. SHERMAN,
President, Elgin National Watch Co., and Director, NAM.

The Largest Corporation in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I made before the Baltimore Life Underwriters' Association, Inc., and the Maryland State Association of Life Underwriters, at their annual convention held in Baltimore on October 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LARGEST CORPORATION IN THE WORLD

(Address by JOHN J. WILLIAMS, United States Senator, of Delaware, before the Baltimore Life Underwriters' Association, Inc., and the Maryland State Association of Life Underwriters, October 14, 1955)

The Government of the United States represents the largest business corporation in the world.

The President and members of his cabinet are comparable to the president and executive management of a major corporation. The Members of Congress represent the board of directors, while the 165,000,000 Americans are the stockholders. Whenever the Government's revenues exceed its expenditures, the directors can declare a dividend—or tax reduction.

Next year as we approach the question of a tax reduction—or dividend—it is important that we first examine the financial background of this organization.

We find that in 22 of the past 25 years our Government has operated with an unbalanced budget—or red ink. Furthermore, when we subtract the surpluses in the 3 years in which we did have a balanced budget from the accumulated deficits of the other 22 years, we have a net total deficit for this period of $250 billion.

This means that during the past 25 years our Government has averaged spending in excess of its income $10 billion per year, $800 million per month, $26 million per day, or slightly over $1 million per hour for every hour during the past quarter of a century.

This $250 billion accumulated 25-year deficit has been added to the national debt or charged against the future generations, and today we are still operating with an unbalanced budget.

It is with this background that the Congress next year will approach the question of: Should we again reduce taxes?

In view of the financial record and huge debt of our Government, should our 165 million Americans — stockholders — expect their President and executive committee—the Cabinet—to recommend to the directors—Members of Congress—the payment of any dividend by a tax reduction until the balancing of the Federal budget is assured, even then should not some provision be made for paying at least a portion of the Federal debt?

There are only three methods by which a tax reduction of any description could be financed at this time.

First, would be to reduce Government expenditures to the point where there would be a surplus sufficient to finance the proposed tax cuts.

Second, would be to keep on spending, but cut taxes in the low-income groups, and transfer the load to the so-called high-income groups.

The third alternative, assuming Government spending continues, would be to borrow the money, further increase our national debt and charge the cost against the future generations.

First, I make it clear that in my opinion Government expenditures can and should be cut if the Congress and the American people only have the will to do it and it is this proposal that I shall now discuss.

On this question I am confident that the overwhelming majority of the American people would enthusiastically endorse the suggestion that Government expenditures be reduced sufficiently to balance the budget and to cut taxes. If we were to conduct a poll of the American citizens asking the question as to whether or not we should eliminate or reduce Government subsidies, I think that the overwhelming response would be in the affirmative. Yet I wonder if we are not overlooking the fact that during the recent years this principle of Government subsidies has expanded until it has

become an accepted if not a fixed part of our economic system.

The question is often raised as to whether or not, in a showdown, the American people would back up their Representatives in Congress for an abolishment of this principle. Sure, everybody would agree that all Government subsidy or support programs should be reduced or repealed—all, that is, except those which directly affect them.

The most of the criticism against Government subsidies is leveled against the Government farm-support program. The reason for this is that the Government's support of agricultural products directly affects not only the American farmer but also the budget of the millions of American housewives.

This, however, is only one of the many forms of subsidies now being financed by the Federal Government and in many instances those who are most vocal in their criticism of the farm-support program are themselves recipients of some form of Government subsidies.

For instance, the owners and officials of the airlines in this country would no doubt agree that the principle of Government subsidies is vicious; yet they are perfectly willing to accept subsidies from the Government amounting to many millions of dollars annually—subsidies which in effect guarantee their operations against loss.

Our American railroads were built and developed years ago under the principle of Government subsidies. Large grants of land were given to the promoters in the early stages of development. Today these same railroad lines are still accepting their subsidies for carrying the mail.

Our American newspaper system has been rather critical of the principle of Government subsidies in general, particularly the subsidy as related to the farm-support program. Yet I recall few instances where the members of the press have objected to their subsidies in the form of low postage rates, nor have they objected to the special earmarking of over $100 million of the ECA funds to be used to subsidize the distribution of American newspapers and magazines in continental Europe.

If we were to conduct a poll of the leading corporations in this country—a group which surely believes in the principle of free enterprise—I venture to say that almost without exception they would express opposition to the principle of Government support prices. Still we find that a large number of this same group have enthusiastically endorsed a plan to let the American taxpayers guarantee the investments of the American industries in foreign countries.

Likewise, we find that our merchant marine, another division of our free-enterprise system, is perfectly willing to have the Government continue underwriting a large percentage of the cost of the construction of its ships, nor do they object to the Government's annual contribution of several million dollars to subsidize the operations of these same vessels.

We hear a lot of discussion among prominent men, many of whom are identified with our State and local governments, expressing grave concern over the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the individual States; yet in many instances we find that these same officials are clamoring for more and more Federal aid for the construction of our State highways, our public schools and our hospitals, and for Federal aid in many other fields which were formerly recognized as inherent State functions.

Our western mining industry has been successful during the past years in having legislation passed whereby the Government will support the price of the products—oftimes at rates far in excess of the prevailing market prices. This subsidy, amounting to several million dollars annually, is also at the expense of the taxpayers.

Even our children, from the day they enter the public schools, become recipients of Government subsidies by virtue of the fact that our Federal Government makes annual contributions of several millions to the school-lunch programs.

One of the most conservative groups in this country is the American bankers; yet they had no objection to the policy of the Government guaranteeing a support at par under all Government bonds, thereby protecting their huge investments.

These are not all, but I cite them as examples to emphasize the extent to which this principle of Government subsidy has become a fixed part of our economic system. Again at the next session of Congress, instead of reducing these subsidies, the majority of the proposals which will be before the 84th Congress will be to increase them further.

My opinion is that the time is long overdue when we should start a systematic reduction of all subsidies, but until such time as Congress and the American people demonstrate their intention to do this we must recognize the fact that Government expenditures will not be reduced, nor will the budget be balanced whereby we can have a sufficient surplus to make a reasonable payment on the national debt with enough left over to finance a tax reduction.

Now, let us discuss the second proposal—that we can keep on spending, still cut taxes in the low-income group, but make up the loss in revenue by increasing the revenue rates in the upper brackets.

To explode this suggestion I point out the following statistics:

1. To raise the personal exemptions by $100 (or from $600 to $700) would result in a loss in revenue of $2,500,000,000. To make up this loss by increasing the rates in the upper brackets would necessitate a 100 percent tax rate (or complete confiscation) of every personal income in excess of $20,000.

2. To increase personal exemptions by $200 (or from $600 to $800) as was proposed at the last session of Congress, would result in a loss in revenue of $4,500,000,000 and to offset this loss it would necessitate a 100 percent tax rate (or complete confiscation) of every income in excess of $10,000.

Certainly no one in America would suggest such drastic action.

That brings us to the third alternative and one which can only be justified in the name of political expediency; and that is, to keep on spending, cut taxes, and borrow the money to make up the difference, thereby increasing our tremendous national debt and passing the responsibility of this debt on to the future generations.

This is the most politically popular proposal and the most dangerous. If we as a government cannot live within our income today during a period when we are enjoying the highest level of prosperity in the history of our country then when can we ever expect a balanced budget! And to accept the theory of permanent deficits is an open invitation to uncontrolled inflation.

Inflation resulting from the past deficits has already cut the value of the American dollar by one-half. That means that one-half the value of every savings account, every Government bond, pension account, and life insurance policy has been eaten away by the past inflationary financing policies of the Federal Government.

To illustrate this we have only to point out that 10 years ago the Federal Government sold a bond upon the basis that if we put up $3, in 10 years we would receive $4 However, the $4 which is being received today in payment of the $3 investment will not buy any more than 2 of the originally invested dollars. Actually one-third of that which they originally invested has been taken away through inflation.

A continuation of this unsound policy of planned deficit financing will only further depreciate the value of the America dollar and thereby further destroy the life savings of millions of Americans.

The most unfortunate result of this inflationary spending and deficit financing policies of the past 25 years has been the pauperizing of many of our aged and retired people. Many individuals who retired a few years ago on pensions, life insurance, or savings accounts, which they then considered to be adequate, have as a result of the depreciated dollar—or increased cost of living—found themselves in the embarrassing position where their incomes will not provide the actual necessities of life, and they are now being forced to appeal to the public for charity.

As a Member of the United States Senate and as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I am opposed to a further continuation of these unsound and inflationary deficit spending policies. I am opposed to any form of tax reduction under such circumstances. Government expenditures can and should be reduced, but until such time as the reductions have actually been authorized by the Congress and until such time as the budget is actually balanced and a reasonable payment made on our national debt, no form of tax reduction should even be considered.

My time today has permitted me to call attention to only a few of the contributing factors, domestic subsidies, which are responsible for the overwhelming debt that today threatens the solvency of our largest business organization in the world—the Government of the United States.

Other factors are foreign subsidies, unnecessary and extravagant expenditures, corruption, and inefficiency which for too long a time has prevailed in the management of this greatest corporation. A continuation of these practices will speedily bankrupt our Government and destroy our republic.

If we wish to preserve our American form of Government we must now begin to set our house in order and make America strong financially, physically, mentally, and morally, never forgetting the wise advice expressed by Thomas Jefferson:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers to pursue our independence. * * * The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money."

Bernard DeVoto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a westerner who knew and loved the West with an intensity and devotion exceeded by none has left in his death a void that never will be filled. This westerner was Bernard DeVoto. His death was a loss to all America. It was particularly a loss to my State of Montana. Bernard DeVoto knew and loved my native Bitterroot Valley and all the mountains and valleys of western Montana and Idaho.

His great book, the Course of Empire, tells of the exploits of Meriwether Lewis

and William Clark, those intrepid explorers whose westward march took them through Montana.

In the State capitol at Helena a painting by the great western artist, Charles Russell, depicts Lewis and Clark's arrival in the region 151 years ago. It is a source of pride for all Montanans.

Up the Missouri to Three Forks, across the Continental Divide to the Lemhi, up the great Bitterroot Valley, where their Shoshone guide, Sacajawea, met members of her tribe, and then across the rugged Lolo trail and on to the Pacific—this was the western course set by the explorers.

Bernard DeVoto knew that trail. He had traveled it; he had written about it—in his intense way he had relived Lewis and Clark's journey and taken thousands of readers with him. He wrote:

Whenever I go back to the Bitterroots I realize afresh that they are my country—Traveler's Rest to Lolo Pass, to Crooked Fork, to the Lochsa, and on down the works of the Clearwater. To everyone his own desire in mountains, mountain meadows, and mountain streams, but for me the best of the West is the Lochsa country. If working journalists are rewarded on the far shore, I will sometime get a long summer within a few miles of the Powell ranger station.

This region of great beauty is my region, too; my home. In words far better than those which I might summon, Bernard DeVoto described my feelings about this part of the West. His loss is a personal one for me, a personal one for many Montanans.

On January 9 I placed into the RECORD a number of editorials in praise of Bernard DeVoto and another great American author whose death was a blow to our Nation, Robert E. Sherwood. Since then my attention has been called to an article from Mr. DeVoto's home State and hometown, Ogden, Utah. In addition to this article from the Utah Historical Quarterly, I also wish to add other articles and radio scripts in praise of Bernard DeVoto:

BERNARD A. DEVOTO—RECOLLECTION AND APPRECIATION

(By Darrel J. Greenwell [1])

Because our daughter, Barbara, lives with her husband and two young sons on a beautiful ranch on the Lemhi River, 30 miles from Salmon, Idaho, my wife and I, on each annual visit to the ranch, are steeped anew in Lewis and Clark history. The reason is plain to every person who has visited the region.

Not far from the ranch is a monument marking the place where Lewis and Clark encountered the Lemhi and rejoiced over meeting, at last, waters flowing toward the Pacific Ocean. Also not far from the ranch is another monument proclaiming that Idaho's national heroine, Sacajawea, who helped guide the explorers, was born in the locality.

On leaving the Lemhi by way of the Missoula highway, one follows the route the explorers took toward the Lolo Trail. In traveling toward Butte and Helena on the one hand, and toward Bozeman on the other, one is reminded, by the well written bulletins along the highways, of Lewis and Clark associations in the magnificent headwater Missouri River country.

Even persons of little imagination are bound to be stimulated by reading the descriptions of exploration episodes, and it is not surprising if the mind's eye envisions the expedition laboriously making its way westward by river valley and mountain pass. What does surprise me, however, is that in my own vision I not only see Lewis and Clark but also none other than Bernard A. DeVoto, notebook in hand, tramping along with the others. My explanation for experiencing such an amazing vision is that DeVoto's writings and conversations about Lewis and Clark impressed me so much with their realism, attention to detail and intimacy, that I have been charmed into believing the narrator traveled with the party to provide me with a first-hand account, told with the rare are of the born story-teller.

I am indebted to Bernard DeVoto because he made frontier and pioneer figures appear to me as the very real down-to-earth men they had to be, and undoubtedly were. Accordingly, their contributions seem the greater to me because they were the accomplishments of men and not of mere fabled figures.

My enthusiasm for DeVoto's literary works was slow in its development; yet, thanks to my acquantance with him, I read him consistently from the beginning of his career.

Bernard became one of the best known pupils in Ogden High School immediately after he entered as a freshman in 1910, because he was a brash youngster who frequently debated with his teachers. He had a lot to say, and said it at some length. He had read far more books than any of his teachers or his companions. He could talk about what he read and he loved to do it.

In the year DeVoto was a freshman I was a senior and editor of the school paper. Bernard talked to me occasionally about articles for the paper, but I recall receiving only one piece which was published. After I left school, I encountered him occasionally in a book store where he worked as a part-time clerk. I recall pleasant conversations with him in the summer of 1914 in the press box at the Union League Baseball Park in Ogden when I was writing baseball, among other things, for the Salt Lake Herald-Republican, and he was a temporary reporter for the Ogden Standard. Our paths crossed again in Ogden in 1920 when he seemed to be in some doubt as to what he intended to do as a career. Our contacts were interrupted for years, and then in the depression years I talked with him on two occasions in Washington, D. C. I was in the capital on business connected with the Work Projects Administration in which I was the Utah administrator, and he was a consultant giving aid and comfort to the Writers' Project. In recent years, I enjoyed two splendid visits with him in Ogden when his writing assignments brought him back to the old hometown.

In view of school day and later associations, it was natural that I should read with some eagerness the first DeVoto novel, The Crooked Mile, which came out in 1924, but I was disappointed. The plot, I thought, lacked interest, and the characters didn't talk or act like real people. His later fiction, including his Saturday Evening Post stories, didn't satisfy me. I thought the output made difficult reading. I had about lost interest in DeVoto as a literary figure, but my attitude changed immediately upon reading his Mark Twain's America. Here, I felt, was a fresh approach to some aspects of American history and the development of our country.

My admiration for DeVoto, the historian, grew with my reading of Year of Decision which filled in so many low spots of my education about my own country and region that I shall always be grateful. Needless to say, Across the Wide Missouri and Course of Empire increased my appreciation as they improved my education.

The vast amount of work DeVoto did to provide so much fascinating information in those three classic volumes reflects his devotion to his art and testifies to his industry, thanks to which many of us who are far from being scholars benefit.

Many persons believe that DeVoto was most influential in his 20 years of writing for the Easy Chair department of Harper's, and I agree. As an editorial writer, I pay my respects to his readability and influence.

One aspect of the DeVoto career must not be neglected if this essay is to be realistic. Bernard possessed an ability to make enemies and to cause hurts. It was unfortunate, for the sake of the home town pride the communities like to have in the native sons and daughters who achieve fame in the great world, that some of those whose feelings he hurt were Utahans—offended because of his suggestions that their painting, music, literature, and general culture were not as magnificient as most believed them to be. More recently he was assailed by Utahans for taking sides with those opposed to the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument.

I am among those who say that some of DeVoto's early comments about his home State were needlessly made to sting and to offend. And I personally took issue with him on his Echo Park Dam position. Yet we can't praise DeVoto for his courageous article promoting conservation of natural resources, and then criticize him when the identical enthusiasm for conservation, which inspired the articles we like, led him to resist any desecration (as he thought) of a national monument.

As we measure and assay the entire DeVoto, we discover that the elements of greatness and goodness far outweigh the faults which some of our fellow Utahans continue to see in his life and works. These should be forgotten or forgiven as we contemplate his influence on American life and thought, recall his pride in his country and in its people, and wonder at his admiration of our region, the history of which he has enriched with his writings.

[From the National Parks Magazine of January–March 1956]

IN MEMORY OF BERNARD AUGUSTINE DEVOTO

On November 13, America lost a uniquely eloquent scholar, historian, and conservationist, when Bernard DeVoto died at the age of 58. He was author of many outstanding books on the history of America, especially of the Civil War and the West. He won the Pulitzer Prize for History in 1948, for his brilliant Across the Wide Missouri. As a journalist and editor of The Easy Chair in Harper's, he expressed forcefully and effectively his trenchant Americanism.

Few men knew the patterns of the culture of the West as did Mr. DeVoto; he insisted that the West, and the Nation, could survive only if our western resources were guarded from exploitation and saved and used wisely as national necessities. When rapacious livestockmen sought to wrest unregulated control and ownership of all Federal rangelands, DeVoto warned of the national catastrophe that would follow if they succeeded, and his article The West Against Itself aroused the Nation to defeat this notorious landgrab.

He knew and loved the national parks. Believing they are essential to the welfare of the people he brought his tremendous knowledge and perception to their service as a member of the National Parks Advisory Board and of the board of trustees of the National Parks Association, to which he belonged. When the national park system was endangered by proposals that would undermine its security, his pen was ready in its defense. His article, Shall We Let Them Ruin Our National Parks?, published in the July 22, 1950, issue of the Saturday Evening

[1] Mr. Greenwell is associate editor of the Ogden Standard-Examiner. He was a lifelong friend and fellow townsman of Bernard DeVoto.

Post, was one of the first to appear during the 6-year struggle in defense of Dinosaur National Monument.

A native of Utah, De Voto received his first degree from Harvard University, and subsequent degrees from the University of Colorado, Northeastern University, Middlebury College, and Kenyon College. He taught and lectured at Harvard and Northeastern, where his alert intelligence and ready wit endeared him to his students. In addition to the Pulitzer Prize, he was awarded the Bancroft Award in 1948, and the National Book Award in 1953. He belonged to many conservation organizations, through which he spread his influence.

ROBERT E. SHERWOOD AND BERNARD DEVOTO

(By Eric Sevareid from a broadcast over CBS Radio)

Robert E. Sherwood is dead at 59 of a heart attack. Bernard DeVoto is dead at 58 of a heart attack. The horizon looks emptier to all American writers, and especially to those whose writings grow out of their times and are designed to influence their times in the large undertakings of first principles, human brotherhood, and the freedom of the eternal individual.

They were of the true professionals, these two writers. They were writers by instinct, by severe discipline, by habit, conviction, and the love of it; seat-of-the-pants and sweat-of-the-brow writers who knew writing for what it is—the hardest work in the world—and who worked and produced prodigiously. Any one of their successes would have satisfied lesser writers, but they had the habit of success because habitually they had something to say.

Sherwood and DeVoto were intensely American writers. They were in love with their country, its long story, and its long meaning. Rather they were in love with the best America, its natural and its fashioned beauties, the grandeur of its vistas and its ideas, with its generosity, its power, and its kindliness. With the worst America—its commercial rapacity and ugliness, its tolerance of bunkum and claptrap, its dreary uniformities, its petty tyrants and its preposterous little publicity saints—with these they were at war. No writer can fight that war and not make enemies.

Both Sherwood and DeVoto must have rejoiced at times in the enemies they made. For these were both tough men in the best sense of that adulterated word. They were perfectly willing to choose their side and take what consequences there might be. They started that way. Each was a combat soldier in the First World War—Sherwood was badly wounded—and they ended that way.

DeVoto, indeed, might be described as downright pugnacious. He not only tolerated conflict, he seemed to enjoy it, to invite it. Certainly he was pugnacious on at least one matter: conservation of the natural beauties, the open spaces, and the wildlife of the American West from which he had sprung. Lose all this, he felt, mar it, cramp it, commercialize it, and America will lose something precious never to be found again. Americans themselves would never be quite the same again. Nor did DeVoto confine this special passion to God's gift across his wide Missouri. The last public fight this passion brewed concerned the rockribbed coast of Maine. He called it a "jerry-built, neon-lighted, overpopulated slum," and in Down East officialdom there was much flying of the official fur.

The only outspoken men who applaud the recent and current attempts to restrict the speaking out of other men of other persuasions are those who haven't read the books. Sherwood and DeVoto had read the books and knew the eternal lesson therein, that he who tolerates suppression of others long enough will probably be suppressed himself. They knew that suppression comes of fear; and fear was as alien to them as a lifetime habit of facing the truth could make it.

There was spaciousness in their minds. So DeVoto responded to the sweep and spaciousness he saw in the West; so Sherwood responded to the sweep and spaciousness he saw in men like Roosevelt and Churchill. Well, Sherwood and DeVoto are dead—too early—and the American space seems a little more cramped because of this.

THE VITALITY OF DEVOTO

(From the news broadcast of WGBH-TV-FM by Louis Lyons, November 14, 1955)

Bernard DeVoto was our friend and neighbor. He went to New York Sunday, as he had to do very often, and appeared on the CBS television program, "Adventure," seen everywhere except in Boston. This was at 3:30. He suffered a heart attack soon after and died at 8:30 last night. The New York Times and Herald Tribune went to press too early to chronicle his death today. So I give these details for their readers. He was only 58.

Only last week I talked of Bernard DeVoto on the publishing date of his last book, The Easy Chair. As it turned out, this was his valedictory to his host of readers—selections from his work over 20 years as the Easy Chair editor of Harper's.

I need not now repeat my recent appreciation of the many-sided genius of DeVoto as historian, writer, crusader, and especially of his superb qualities as a journalist. For a last word, I would speak of the vitality of DeVoto. He fought for his causes. He put all of himself into his work, and worked and reworked it. Whatever he produced was always his best. This was a high compliment to his readers. Benny DeVoto never believed the cliche that readers were operating on a 12-year-old level. And his readers were not. He had the great quality of getting excited about the issues and events he explored and wrote about. And he put his excitement into them so that his product was exciting. You had to share his conviction that this was important and worth getting excited about.

To very many people the world of events and the periodical discussion of it will for a long time be less exciting because it will not be seen through the penetrating eyes and blunt pen of Bernard DeVoto. He was always himself, a thorny, salty personality, always a fighter, a very human man, a warm friend. He leaves a big jagged hole in our times that will not be readily filled.

A postscript, suggested by a listener who called me this evening, on one of Mr. DeVoto's earnest long-time projects. Born in Utah, his heart was with the causes of the West—across the wide Missouri. He fought as a conservationist against putting a dam in Echo Park in the Dinosaur National Monument on the Colorado-Utah line. It would have destroyed some of the finest canyon scenery in the public domain. But it had the support of the administration and of the politicians of the region as part of the Upper Colorado development.

Only Sunday, yesterday, in the New York Times, John B. Oakes reports that the governors and Congressmen of the Mountain States met last week and decided to drop Echo Park Dam as politically unfeasible.

This was the last fight DeVoto won, and in this very definite, tangible, conclusive form. This heartening news may easily have been the last thing he read yesterday.

A man could live a long time and achieve less satisfaction.

This station has just disclosed to me a surprise they had planned for November 25, when Mr. DeVoto was to appear with me on Backgrounds. Harper's editors had arranged with WGBH to have me present him with a bound and inscribed copy of the current (November) Harper's, which observed the 20th aniversary of his occupancy of the Easy Chair.

The inscription:

"To Bernard DeVoto, seasoned practitioner of the journalistic craft, widely ranging in competence and punctual in deadlines, as resolute in his approvals as in his dislikes, partisan of sound sense and adversary of cant, friend of the public lands and enemy of the lukewarm martini, who in the 20 years he has occupied the Easy Chair has never learned to write a dull sentence.—The Editors of Harper's."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of November 15, 1955]

BERNARD DEVOTO

Bernard DeVoto never allowed his reputation as a scholar to inhibit his vigor as a journalist. There were few who knew more than he about the great westward movement of settlers and civilization across the North American continent, and none wrote about it with more color and excitement. But he will be remembered equally, we surmise, for his contentious contributions to magazines and especially for his conduct of the department in Harper's known as the Easy Chair. No. 241 of the Easy Chair appearing in the November Harper's is at once a self-appraisal and an obituary.

It was as a journalist that DeVoto preferred to think of himself. Most of what he wrote was strongly opinionated. But if he was sometimes arrogant, he was never pretentious; and his convictions were bolstered by research and understanding. He was a crusader for preservation of the public lands, for reclamation and conservation. A great range of subjects evoked his indignant comment, however—the importunities of advertising, the amenities of martini-making, the pretensions of politicians, the callowness of some aspects of American culture.

"Some battles cannot be fought after the fact," he said, "and in journalism a writer runs into some he does not care to be above." Some years ago, DeVoto had the temerity to write an Easy Chair article sharply critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This blasphemy produced a good deal of denunciation. But even among those who disagreed with what he said, there must have been many who respected his doughtiness. He was never above the battle.

[From the Portland Oregonian of November 15, 1955]

UNEASY CHAIR

"The Easy Chair" corner in Harper's magazine will probably never again have so uneasy an occupant as Bernard DeVoto, who died suddenly Sunday. Mr. DeVoto was a writer's writer, a professional to the core. He spent long and regular hours at his desk and in research, and few contemporary American authors could match his work in quality, quantity or range.

Fortunately, however, he was not "professional" in a sense implying personal indifference. He was well and affectionately known in Portland and elsewhere as the "terrible tempered" Mr. DeVoto. His well-executed phrases were hurled angrily and with stinging impact against a variety of targets. He ridiculed literary sophists, badgered careless historians, railed at wayside chefs who over-lard fried potatoes and hammered rentlessly at anything he took to be spoliation of the wilderness areas of his native West. And all the while he went about building up a shelf of historical works of such solid scholarship that there was little room for retaliation by other critics.

Mr. DeVoto's editorial voice was piercing, but it was not blatant. It will be sorely missed. It is depressing to reflect that his latest book, a collection of pieces from "The

Easy Chair" just come from the publisher, has become a memorial volume at a time when its author's service was ascendant.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of November 15, 1955]

WEST'S LITERARY ROCKET

He disliked being called controversial. But even his last words were controversial. On a television program Sunday featuring Mesa Verde National Park in Colorado, he spoke pessimistically about the future of the West which, he said, was chronically plagued by "violence." A short time later, Bernard DeVoto, one of the West's all-time greats in literature, history and criticism, was seized by a fatal heart attack.

A native of Ogden, he taught for a time in Ogden Junior High School and later at Northwestern and Harvard. It was in the fields of literature and history that he won international eminence. The author of some 20 books under his own name and considerable fiction (for grocery money) under the name of John August, he was possessor of Pulitzer and Bancroft prizes and numerous other awards.

He did not specialize in history while a student at the University of Utah and Harvard, but he made academic historians sit up and take notice with his monumental story of the American frontier, told in The Course of Empire, Across the Wide Missouri and The Year of Decision, the trilogy being written in reverse order. Mark Twain was another of his preoccupations and he served with distinction as "literary executor of the Mark Twain estate." As editor of "The Easy Chair" department in Harper's magazine, he kept the professionals in a score of fields near boiling point.

Bernard DeVoto had little academic education in botany and forestry, but he became one of the country's most vigorous and influential conservation advocates. He reported quite accurately recently that no other publication had covered the subject any where near as adequately as had Harper's with him as author. Outspoken and sometimes intemperate in his writing and lecturing, he nevertheless succeeded in stimulating conservationist-minded people throughout the country into acting to protect the public land. His "West Against Itself" theme infuriated some Westerners but it also caused many to take a second look at policies involving the region and he made complacency about parks and forests impossible.

He pulled no punches, and none were pulled when he was the target. He was described variously as "Chief Thunder on the Mountain," "a literary volcano," a "castigator of follies" and a "man who makes his points with both fists and both feet." Charles Poore, of the New York Times, wrote once that "Mr. DeVoto's normal prose style often sounds rather like that of a man who is making a speech before a crowd of ill-informed hecklers. This gives it a perspiring sort of vitality."

Harper's editors revealed the man behind the blustering exterior this month, however, when they said, "Mr. DeVoto is a sentimentalist, with a cornary melting point 14 degrees lower than maple sugar. He is incapable of saying no to anybody who sounds either needy or put-upon; so he collects underdogs the way a blue serge suit collects lint. As a consequence he spends a large chunk of his time helping people to find a job, a publisher, a sound whisky, an elusive fact, a comfortable motel, a sense of prose style, justice, or a reliable psychiatrist—all the while emitting roars of exasperation."

Prophetically, Mr. DeVoto's 20th anniversary Easy Chair column was a kind of swan song, a summing up. In it was an epitaph worthy of the great and courageous writer that he was: "I hope that what I have said has been said gracefully and that sometimes it has been amusing, or informative, or useful. No one has got me to say anything I did not want to say and no one has prevented me from saying anything I wanted to."

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard of November 15, 1955]

TWO DISTINGUISHED MEN OF LETTERS

Two of America's most distinguished literary figures died this weekend. Robert E. Sherwood, playwright and biographer, and Bernard DeVoto, essayist, critic, conservationist, historian, editor, teacher, and wonderful guy, died within a few hours of each other. Each gave something distinctive to American life and letters.

Mr. Sherwood, a playwright of renown, turned to biography to do his monumental study of Roosevelt and Hopkins, thus earning a Pulitzer Prize, 1 of 4 he claimed. His plays Abe Lincoln in Illinois, There Shall Be No Night, and Idiot's Delight are outstanding examples of modern American drama.

In the death of Benny DeVoto, we feel a personal loss. A number of delightful hours spent in his company and a correspondence reaching over nearly 4 years established him in our hearts as one of those people who can never be replaced. In thinking about him we have wondered how he will be remembered. Will he be thought of as the historian who did such a superb job on the Lewis and Clark Journals? Will he be remembered as the critic who turned out the literary criticism on the Book of Mormons? Or will it be his vast knowledge of Mark Twain that keeps his name alive? Conservation was his passion. Will that be his niche in history?

All these things will count. But more important, he was a masterful prose stylist and a great human being. He believed in human dignity and wrote of it in powerful terms. Was somebody, anybody, getting pushed round? Benny would charge to his defense with the instincts, as an associate observed last month, of a mother bear protecting her cubs. Is there in the land an unskilled chemist who tips the vermouth bottle too heavily when mixing a martini? Benny had sharp words for him, growling that the proper proportions were 3.7 to 1. This growl was just Benny's way. Actually he was a friendly cuss who could not say "no" to a sad story. As John Fischer, the editor of Harper's, observed, the growl was a protective device like the quills on the well-meaning porcupine or the armor plate on the defenseless armadillo.

The versatility of the man was amazing. It was best illustrated in "The Easy Chair," the column he had conducted for Harper's for 20 years. All culture was his province—the FBI, the martini, the powerdam, the politician, the cheap motel, the unzoned strip of highway, the juke box, the undisturbed spot in the woods, the western movie. Nothing was out of place in The Easy Chair.

Oddly enough in the current Harper's, he all but wrote his own obituary. Celebrating his 20th year as the conductor of the oldest column in American journalism, he wrote at length of his beliefs and faiths and dislikes. A book of two dozen "Easy Chair" essays is newly published.

Born in Utah, he continued to travel often "across the wide Missouri." Although he lived a stone's throw from Harvard Square in Cambridge, Mass., he thought of himself as a Westerner. His western friends thought of him that way, too.

Few living writers can equal him as a prose stylist. His stuff was simple and powerful and appealing. It was so easy to read—and so hard for him to write. He fought an uphill battle as he worked on returning the essay to its place in American letters. Only if Americans are very lucky, will his kind be seen again in our time.

Dulles and the "Verge of War"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Joseph C. Harsch:

STATE OF THE NATIONS

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

DULLES AND THE "VERGE OF WAR"

WASHINGTON.—For those puzzled by the controversy over Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' "verge of war" doctrine certain quotations from the past are relevant.

On January 15, 1953, the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate held a hearing on the prospective nomination of Mr. Dulles to the Secretaryship of State.

During that hearing Mr. Dulles was asked to reconcile passages from his campaign and from the Republican platform's foreign-policy plank (largely written by Mr. Dulles) which seemed to be in some conflict with other things he had said on other less political occasions.

The following passages occur in the Dulles response:

"Under our constitutional system we have a general election every 4 years, and at that time, under our system, as I believe it to be, there is argument presented to the American people.

"One side presents its case and the other side presents the other case, as two lawyers do when they go into court. At that sage the two parties are not judges and they are not judicial. * * *

"I admit in the campaign words are used that are somewhat more extravagant than those used in a period of judicial contemplation."

A glance at the calendar is sufficient to determine the fact that under the Dulles 4-year rule the time has come around again for expression of opinions which "are not judicial," couched in words "somewhat more extravagant" than would be desirable "in a period of judicial contemplation."

When Mr. Dulles is quoted as saying that "the ability to get to the verge of war without getting into the war is a necessary art," he was of course, being extravagant. He let himself seem to imply that he regards the technique of military blackmail as a suitable instrument of United States foreign policy.

If we strip the rehetorical verbiage away from the Dulles' words, however, we come down to a foreign-policy theory which has been evolved from bitter experience and is generally accepted in Washington. The theory is that some wars can be avoided if a country accurately defines in advance what it will do under specific circumstances.

This is based on the real possibility that Germany might never have started either World Wars I or II had it known in advance that the United States might do what it actually did do. This is the background of the postwar, bipartisan willingness of Washington to contract under its alliances to do what it knows it would do anyway without the contract. Only in Dulles rhetoric is it a brink of war technique in reality, it is the technique of knowing and saying in advance what you really intend to do.

When Mr. Dulles sponsors a theory that he three times saved the United States from war by his own words, he is being not judicial. For, as a lawyer, and an extremely able one, he well understands the judicial rule

that post hoc and propter hoc are different things. He would make mincemeat of any legal opponent who attempted to use in court against himself the type of legal argument employed in the thesis of the triple victory.

The contention, in essence, is that in the cases of the Korean war, Indochina, and the offshore islands he threatened to do certain things, after which there was no war. By implication the absence of war was the product of the threats.

This might follow if the threats had been the only factors involved. In no case were the threats the only factors, as he himself subsequently recognized.

One example suffices. In the case of the offshore islands there was the Formosa resolution followed by the dispatch of the United States 7th Fleet to the Tachen Islands. The Chinese Communists did not interfere with the evacuation of the Tachens.

But, and a very important "but," Mr. Dulles not only threatened use of United States force in event of interference. He also urgently and meticulously informed Peking through London, Moscow, and New Delhi that the movement of the 7th Fleet was strictly and exclusively for the purpose of withdrawing the Chinese Nationalist garrison from the Tachens.

Were the Chinese deterred by the threat, or did they sensibly refrain from disturbing a situation which was evolving to their advantage? Obviously, the latter.

The whole "brink of war" episode leaves behind it a rather serious question as to whether the Dulles-presumed obligation to indulge in "not judicial" partisan advocacy every fourth year should apply to a Secretary or State. Most United States Secretaries of State have regarded themselves as exempt from this obligation, in fact have tried to be nonpartisan even in campaign years.

Understanding the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the New York Times of Sunday, January 22, 1956:

UNDERSTANDING THE SOUTH—FORBEARANCE IS ASKED IN JUDGING ATTITUDE ON RACIAL PROBLEMS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer of the following letter, formerly professor of international law at Princeton, has held numerous diplomatic posts.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As a Northerner who has been privileged for several years to enjoy the courtesy and hospitality of Southerners, I regret the inability of many Northerners to understand the point of view of intelligent and high-minded Southerners concerning the racial problem. This point of view has been ably and temperately presented in the January issue of Harper's magazine by the able and conscientious editor of the Charleston News and Courier, Thomas R. Waring.

The heart of the racial problem, as I have studied it at close hand, lies in the honest conviction that local governments, under the Constitution of the United States, have the right to solve their social and economic problems in their own way. This point of view, known historically as States rights, is still of deep significance for all Americans.

The intense opposition felt in this politically Democratic section of the country to the policy of aggrandizement of power in the National Government by the New and Fair Deals was very genuine. It was shared by millions of Northerners.

The racial issue was not created by the present generation. It is a thorny bequest of several centuries. It cannot easily be solved, not even by a fiat of the Supreme Court. It requires wisdom, patience and forbearance by all concerned, including Northerners and colored folks in general.

The North has the greater need of forbearance when it sadly acknowledges its grave responsibilities for the lamentable condition of the colored people who migrated to New York and Chicago.

What I am pleading for is simple courtesy by outsiders in judging the attitude of generous-minded Southerners in their agonizing task of working out a just solution of the racial issue. They have the most concern for the welfare of the colored people, who, in last analysis, must share the responsibility for the creation of a prosperous and happier Southland.

PHILIP M. BROWN.

CHARLESTON, S. C., *January 12, 1956.*

Tom Mulrane Now Heads 78th Division Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most active veterans' organizations in the United States is the 78th Division Veterans Association. The elected president for the new year is Thomas J. Mulrane, of Jersey City, N. J.

Tom Mulrane is well known in veterans' organizations in New Jersey. He has been a conscientious and diligent worker on behalf of all veterans. His friendly manner and ever-ready smile is a familiar sight in northern New Jersey. I think the membership of the 78th Division could not have picked a better man.

I want to take this opportunity of congratulating Tom and wishing him every success in his future endeavors on behalf of the veterans, and his leadership of the 78th Division Veterans Association.

I enclose an article that appeared in the Hudson County Dispatch relating to Mr. Mulrane's election:

MULRANE TO PRESIDE OVER 78TH DIVISION VETERANS—JERSEY CITY RESIDENT ART SUPERVISOR IN DUMONT

Thomas J. Mulrane, supervisor of art in Dumont school system, recently elected to head 78th Division Veterans Association, will preside at the organization's meeting next Wednesday in Saldarini Post, VFW, headquarters, 522 38th Street, Union City.

Mulrane, who replaces outgoing President Seymour Cohen, of Springfield, served with the AEF in France during World War I as private first class, attached to Company F, 310th Infantry Regiment.

Born in New York City, Mulrane graduated from Dickinson High School and Cooper Union Institute of Fine Arts, Sculpture, Commercial Art and Design, New York. He received his master's degree in art at New York University and did further postgraduate study at Manhattan University, College of the City of New York, and Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, where he studied naval architecture.

A veteran of 28 years in the teaching profession, Mulrane previously taught at Cooper Union College, New York City; Snyder High and Dickinson Evening High School, Jersey City; and State Teachers College, Jersey City. He was a civil engineer for North Bergen from 1929 to 1932.

Mulrane and his wife, the former Grace McGuire, live at 615 Palisade Avenue, Jersey City. Their daughter, Mrs. June Murphy, teaches a second-grade class in Dumont.

Overheard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Overheard in the Library of Congress the other day was the following:

"They talk about the discrimination of man against man, why don't they talk about the discrimination of nature against man?"

"Like what?"

"We should have 4 seasons on each of the 5 continents."

"How are we going to get it?"

"Adjust the earth on its axis. Archimedes said that with a fulcrum he could move the world."

"So you think a pressure chamber with jet fission, like a sling, could circle the globe and more it?"

"If not, then maybe we'll be able to locate the pituitary gland in the mechanism of the universe that might enable us to adjust the earth to the convenience of man like we adjust the hands on a watch.

"Then maybe with 4 seasons on each continent, or with our ability to adjust the earth's line of spin we'll have fewer wars, fewer depressions and far less havoc wrought by nature's discrimination against man?"

"Yes, that should mean for each of us longer life with less pain; a life lived more creatively with less waste"—

So it went, Mr. Speaker. The conversationalists were evidently trying to make proper use of the modern world and all of its opportunities. Or were they waiting for the man with a butterfly net?

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

Appendix

Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, history records that the cabinet of our third President, Thomas Jefferson, was a most harmonious one because, in appointing its members, he had taken into account the lessons learned as Washington's Secretary of State. Therefore, while he selected wise and strong personalities, they were chosen for their complementary qualities as well as for their specific abilities in the arts of war and peace. Because they believed in small "d" democracy as did their leader, the cabinet members were able to work effectively in concert. There was no upstaging; there was discussion and agreement. As a result, at the conclusion of the two Jefferson administrations, the national debt had been reduced, trade was flourishing and taxes were lowered.

No single member of the Presidential Cabinet was more responsible for this happy state of affairs than the Swiss-born Albert Gallatin who had deported himself excellently as a Member of Congress before his appointment as Secretary of State in 1801. This talented immigrant, who had come to America at the age of 19 from Geneva where he was born on January 29, 1761, brought not only his notable fiscal talents to the service of his adopted land but his deep-seated belief in the rights of the people as well.

Since he was so concerned with distributing the benefits of his wise commercial and financial policies among all the people and because he was born abroad, Gallatin had a rough road to travel, for both these factors earned him the active ill will of the Hamiltonian forces with their pro-British and aristocratic orientation. Because he was French-speaking and democratic, his enemies—the Federalists—were quick to link him with the French revolution whose excesses, along with Jefferson he deplored, but whose basic democratic concepts he favored.

Gallatin, as a Member of the House, had already established the Ways and Means Committee to approve Government's disbursement of the people's money. As Treasurer, he worked to liquidate the public debt and lower taxes. Rigid economy and extended trade he held the best ways to progress and prosperity. Consequently, he was an opponent of commercial and military wars.

The Jeffersonians, less interested in diplomatic representation than commercial representation in foreign countries, had a staunch supporter in Gallatin who was to negotiate a number of advantageous trade agreements when, after leaving the Treasury, he was to represent his country abroad. The War of 1812 had only shortly ended when he put through a pact eliminating excessive English duties on American goods; and, in London in 1818, he worked successfully for a commercial convention.

In commemorating his birthday, I have pointed up his trade achievements purposely; for, in America's dealings with the land of Gallatin's birth, this country has departed from the trade precepts he proved so sound.

A tariff barrier must be hurdled, not by one side but by both; and in imposing restrictions on Swiss watch imports, not only the Swiss but the Americans are being hurt. United States importers and assemblers who make their livelihoods by buying goods abroad are penalized; United States exporters who ship their farm and manufactured good are hurt for the foreign nation affected tends to buy less because it can earn fewer dollars; the consumer has to pay more for the imported product.

In rescinding tariff curbs against the Swiss watch industry, we stand to gain in many ways: First, Switzerland and other foreign friends will know that we mean it when we say, "trade, not aid," is the best policy; second, goods will flow more freely between the two countries to the benefit of both their economies; and third, the people of both lands will be able to get the products each wants at fair and profitable prices.

Man of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, recently attended a meeting of the New York State Horticultural Society in the city of Rochester. New York farmers are no happier than farmers elsewhere over our farm problems. Indeed, their troubles are compounded, because many of them raise unsupported crops, while paying out of one pocket or another for the support program. So Secretary Benson was the cynosure of attention. The men who live by, and on, the soil had some tough, stubborn questions which they expected the Secretary to answer. They were not disappointed. Speaking out of his own vast experience, both as a farmer and administrator, Secretary Benson abjured slick, political explanations, and addressed himself with courage and candor to fundamental problems and remedies which his audience understood.

As the Rochester Times Union noted, in an editorial on January 18:

Those who heard him had an opportunity to savor the quality of the man, his sincerity, his profound knowledge of the overall farm problem, and his capacity to find and direct every remedy that government properly can use to restore agriculture to its rightful place. The impression was of a man of courage.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the full text of the Times Union editorial:

BENSON CONVINCING ON FARM NEEDS

Secretary of Agriculture Benson answered most of the questions New York farmers have been asking about President Eisenhower's nine-point farm program in addressing the New York State Horticultural Society at the Community War Memorial last night.

Perhaps more important than what he said was the impression he left. Fruit growers and visitors, it seemed to us, had a better understanding of why the President and those who work with him stick to Ezra Taft Benson when the political wolves set up a howl.

For those who heard him had an opportunity to savor the quality of the man, his sincerity, his profound knowledge of the overall farm problem and his capacity to find and direct every remedy that government properly can use to restore agriculture to its rightful place.

The impression was of a man of courage, confronted with problems never so baffling before, scorning cheap political trickery, rejecting quickie measures, trying with the help of Congress to build a solid agriculture not only for farmers today but for the future.

The enormity of the error of continuing wartime production stimulants too long was never clearer. The surpluses generated by these mistaken measures—$7.7 billion worth—stagger the imagination. But that farm prices last year would have been 20 percent higher without them can be easily understood.

Most important to New York farmers was that the very measures designed to prop the position of basic farmers have become a threat to all. For acres diverted from wheat and cotton shift to other crops, livestock, dairying—or orchards—and surpluses mushroom.

"The surplus problem can spread like wildfire," Benson said. "Unless we deal with it adequately now, no farmer, no matter what crops he produces can rest assured that his crop will not be the next on the surplus list."

Dairymen know that well. So do vegetable growers. Fruit growers may be next.

Getting out of the mess created by politicians' farming of the farmers will not be easy and it will not be quick. But get out we must. The courageous leadership of Benson is the best augury visible.

Inaugural Address of Gov. James P. Coleman, of Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gov. J. P. Coleman:

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the joint assembly, my friends, and fellow Mississippians, the solemn oath of office which I have just taken in your presence as the duly elected chief executive of more than two million people was sworn without mental reservation. This being my ninth time to have taken an official oath, I consider it appropriate to tell you that my mother's bible was open at the 3d and 4th verses of the 24th Psalm, which reads as follows:

"Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place?

"He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully."

Humbly grateful to my dear friends, the people of Mississippi, that they should have trusted me for these next 4 years with the great responsibilities of the governorship, I give them my solemn pledge that this administration will be kept absolutely free of those things which both defame and degrade.

SEEKS COOPERATION

I congratulate you, the members of the legislature, upon your selection to serve in the senate and in the house of representatives. From the meetings held with you immediately after our election, as well as your performance since the assumption of your duties, I have, without exception, gained an abiding faith in your patriotism, in the purity of your motives, and in the sincerity of your desire to be of unselfish service to our State in these perilous times. I know the people expect it of us that we shall at all times cooperate with each other and work together in harmony for the common good. I know you do not expect to disappoint them in this hope. That much good shall come of our work together is my fondest hope and my most earnest prayer.

It is a fact proven by political history that governors and legislators sometimes go out of office personally and politically less popular than when they went in. Possibly this fate may await us. In any event, I want to say here and now that I shall at no time, under any circumstances, play politics with the high duties conferred upon me by the will of the people of Mississippi. Regardless of all consequences, and regardless of what may hereafter be said, it is my sincere desire that the governor and the legislature during this 4-year period may lay aside all selfishness, all possible ulterior motives, and accomplish much for the general welfare of our State.

Demosthenes described the cause of Greece's downfall in these undying words: "What has ruined Greece? Envy when a man received a bribe; laughter when he confessed it; mercy to the convicted, and hatred to those who denounced the crime; all the usual accompaniments of corruption."

TIME OF CRISIS

So I say to you, the members of this joint assembly, that probably more than at any other time since 1876, the people need you; they realize they need you. Justice and good government need you. In this, I know you will not fail. Let us remember that the man who tries to do something and fails is infinitely better than he who tries to do nothing and succeeds.

Under our constitution, the Governor is the commander in chief of the armed forces of the State; he may require information in writing from the officers of the executive departments on any subject related to the duties of the respective offices; he shall, from time to time, give the legislature information of the state of the government, and he shall recommend for consideration such measures as may be deemed proper and expedient.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

In addition to the foregoing duties and powers of the Governor, section 123 of the constitution provides:

"The Governor shall see that the laws are faithfully executed."

It is interesting to note that this constitutional requirement of the Governor was included in our first constitutional requirement of the constitution of 1817. It was repeated in the constitution of 1832 and even the carpetbaggers and scalawags did not dare omit it from the constitution of 1869. It has continuously been part of the supreme law of our State from its birth to the present hour. I do not interpret this to mean that the Governor should attempt to take over in matters of purely local concern; at the same time it is clearly the solemn oath of the Governor to see to it that crime and criminals shall not oppress the God-fearing Christian people of Mississippi. My views and my past record on this subject are too well known to require emphasis here. Suffice it to say, those views and this record will unswervingly be adhered to in the next 4 years to come. Criminals and their sympathizers may as well take notice, and this notice will hold good until the day I shall go out of office.

I shall at the first appropriate opportunity deliver a special message to the legislature on the necessity of strengthening and improving all phases of our law enforcement machinery.

In view of the prompt and almost unanimous action on the recall bill, I want to congratulate the people of Mississippi for having elected a legislature which already has proven its ability to go immediately to work and act promptly upon matters which are of the greatest importance. I am deeply gratified, and I believe the people are also, that this legislature and its chosen leadership have manifested their firm intention not only to be a working legislature but to put into effect those things which the people approved at the polls last August. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for the attitude which you have taken and for the action already accomplished.

EXECUTIVE CLEMENCY

One of the great responsibilities vested in the governor is that of granting or withholding suspensions of sentence and pardons to those convicted of crime. Because of the 16 years of my life which have been devoted to the enforcement of the law and the protection of the public, I feel very deeply the importance of this subject. Our people are overwhelmingly law abiding, yet great pressures are brought to bear in behalf of pardons and suspensions for those who have not obeyed the law. It will only be in the rarest cases that executive clemency will be extended. Certainly, to prevent miscarriages of justice, I shall exercise the power of suspension and pardon. In all other cases, I hope the people kindly will not press me for something which my conscience will not permit me to do.

I shall deliver a special message at a later date on the matter of paroles, but in the meantime I want to urge this legislature to give serious consideration to the establishment of a system of adult probation. This was one of the planks in my gubernatorial platform, and legislation for this purpose has already been introduced. It was my sad duty a number of times while I was serving as circuit judge to be compelled to send men to the penitentiary whom I believed could have been thoroughly reformed and rehabilitated without being sent to the penitentiary. Again, I urge the legislature to give this subject its most serious consideration.

PUBLIC UTILITIES

In October 1954, I became the first of the candidates for governor to advocate effective State regulation of all public utilities, including electric power companies, natural gas companies, and telephone companies. All of the candidates for governor took a similar position, and I think there is no question that the overwhelming majority of both houses of this legislature keenly feel the pressing need for action in this field.

Mississippi is the only State in the Union which, to date, has made no effort from the State level to regulate electric power companies and natural gas companies. For lack of the necessary accountants, rate experts, and valuation engineers, our efforts at telephone rate regulation have been almost worthless. Under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court the legislature has no way to prevent these utilities from appealing ratemaking decisions to the courts. The only remedy for the situation, and one which is readily available to us, is to have a regulatory body so well staffed and so well trained that the rates, when fixed, will stand the test of reasonableness in the courts. If this legislature should adjourn without taking these necessary steps in behalf of the people of Mississippi, and leaving the consumer in that same attitude he has been forced to occupy in all past years, it would, in my judgment, be one of the greatest failures of your service here. From meetings and discussions already had with you on this important subject, I have no doubt that you will deal successfully with this problem.

AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY

One of the great goals of this administration must be to lead the people of our State upward to higher levels of income. This will require a most critical examination by this legislature of agricultural and industrial conditions in our State. Being myself a farmer, and being one whose people have never followed any other occupation, I am greatly distressed over the condition of our agricultural economy at this present time. Everybody in Mississippi knows that during the last few years our people have been leaving the farm by the thousands. They have not left because they did not love the land nor because they did not prefer to farm, but because it became absolutely impossible for them to make a respectable living for themselves and their families. The continuous increase in the cost of everything the farmer must buy and the continuous decline in the prices of what the farmer has to sell are rapidly approaching the disaster point. Our cotton acreage in Mississippi is now below what it was in the year 1879. We are met face to face with a most serious threat to the economy of our State. Farm prices are now the lowest since the prewar year of 1941. Yet, production costs are 30 percent above what they were in 1947. Since 1947, farm mortgage debt has doubled. The farmer today is like the man standing with one foot in a bucket of ice and the other foot in a tub of hot coals—the average temperature may be fine but there can be no doubt of his painful situation.

Since Mississippi is predominantly an agricultural State, the situation which I have described is not only a stern warning with reference to our entire economy but puts us on notice that we must practice the greatest economy and conservatism in the expenditures of the State government.

IMPROVE ECONOMY

We must devote every ounce of our skill and energy toward improving the economic position of the farmers of our State.

We must likewise leave no stone unturned in our efforts to improve the industrial position of Mississippi. Great work has been done by our BAWI Board. Economically speaking, I tremble to think of where Mississippi might have been at this time, had it not been for this splendid program and the wonderful work it has caused to be done. Despite the most excellent work of the BAWI Board, according to the figures of our State Employment Service, Mississippi in the last 2 years has suffered a decrease of 1,000 in the number of nonfarm workers in our State.

So, despite the splendid efforts of the past, Mississippi is faced with terrific decline in farm income and some decline in the number of nonfarm workers employed in our State.

What can the Governor and the legislature do to improve this situation? I strongly recommend the following:

First, that both the House and the Senate, as speedily as possible, set up special committees of their membership to deal with the economic welfare of our State, and thorough consideration to the economic conditions confronting both agriculture and industry in Mississippi.

Second, that the agricultural and industrial board, for better concentration upon the problems at hand, be divided into two separate agencies, one an agricultural board, the other an industrial commission.

EMPLOY EXPERTS

Third, that when this reorganization shall have been effected the governor and these agencies be granted sufficient funds and be authorized to employ the best experts available, whether or not they are now residents of Mississippi.

Fourth, that the agricultural board and the industrial commission be directed to make an all-out drive toward improving agriculture and attracting every possible worthwhile industry to our borders.

Fifth, that the governor, the legislature, and all responsible officials of our State conduct our government on such a high plane of service, economy, and stability as to leave no doubt in the minds of the capitalists and industrialists of the Nation that Mississippi is an outstanding, safe place in which to locate and operate, and where they will receive fair and equitable treatement under fair and just laws.

Sixth, that the education of our younger people be so encouraged and improved as to make us more capable of progress in all fields of economic employment.

We have made indescribable progress in this short quarter of a century. The challenge now is to take advantage of the infinitely greater opportunities of the next quarter of a century to come.

EDUCATION

In the recent campaign for governor I made it very plain to the people of Mississippi that I thoroughly endorsed the public-school program recently established in our State. As one who had to work and obtain his formal education in depression days, and thus knowing the true value of education, I hope I assume the governorship with the unlimited faith and confidence of the educators, the parents, and the schoolchildren of Mississippi. The progress which we are making in the education of our children should be a source of unfailing pride to all progressive Mississippians. It is likewise a complete answer to agitators who would criticize or detract from our efforts to rid ourselves of illiteracy and its consequences. Because of the interest, the sacrifice, and the support of the people of this State, I believe we can point to a record of educational progress second to none. That record of progress has been made; it cannot be challenged.

I would particularly like to direct the attention of our own Negro citizens and those outside Mississippi to the following figures:

The average salary of our white teachers has increased from $710 in 1940 to $2,447 in 1954. The average salary of Negro teachers has increased from $224 in 1940 to $1,814 in 1954, an increase of 800 percent within 14 short years. We now have over 3,000 licensed white teachers and nearly 7,000 licensed Negro school teachers in Mississippi. This year we are paying $13 million in salaries to the Negro school teachers and $19 million in salaries to the white school teachers. Moreover, where Mississippi provided transportation for no Negro children in 1939, this year we have transported Negro students in all-steel buses at a cost of almost $2 million. All children have been furnished free text books.

Insofar as lies within the power of the Governor, I am happy here and now to pledge the full resources of this administration to support, maintain, and improve our school program.

Like support will enthusiastically and devotedly be given our junior and senior colleges.

INSURANCE

Heretofore, the State of Mississippi has had no major problems insofar as insurance was concerned. Even now our problems are only with a segment of the insurance industry and my remarks and recommendations are not to be construed as an indictment against the insurance industry as a whole. On the contrary, I would like to compliment our fine Mississippi companies in the great work they are doing. Mississippi agents are among the finest in the Nation. The vast majority of foreign companies as well as their representatives operating in Mississippi are above criticism, and their business operations are indeed conducted upon a high plane.

There are other insurance companies, however, which have cast a blight on the entire industry and have wrought chaos in their own State as well as other States in which they do business. Minimum requirements have enabled speculators to organize so-called insurance companies with little or no assets, and inadequate supervisory authority has allowed them to run rampant to the detriment of the insurance-buying public. While we have had only one insurance company failure in Mississippi, I can say with pride that not one single policyholder has suffered by reason of the failure of a company domiciled in this State. Even now, however, the insurance department of a neighboring State has been forced to call an immediate examination of all home companies which, by reason of their low organizational requirements, number in the hundreds. Even now speculators from other States are considering Mississippi as their next hunting ground, depending upon the low organizational requirements of this State to enable them to organize so-called Mississippi companies with their money and under their management. I am recommending to the legislature that they carefully consider the enactment of laws that will raise the requirements of the organization of all types of insurance companies in Mississippi to a degree that will guarantee both sufficient capital and surplus so necessary for the successful operation of any business.

The greatest problem with which we are confronted is the deluge of mailed advertising from mail-order insurance companies not licensed in Mississippi. Multiplied thousands of dollars go out each month to these fly-by-night companies over which neither the State insurance department nor the State courts has jurisdiction. It would be futile to recommend State legislation to curb their activities since only the National Congress has control over their mail-order operations. My only recommendation in this instance is not to the legislature, but to the people against buying such insurance. I shall likewise recommend to our friends in the National Congress that they do everything in their power to enact Federal legislation that will give us relief from so-called fly-by-night insurance companies over which we in Mississippi have no jurisdiction.

A review and renovation of our insurance code is practically mandatory.

MY PROGRAM

The program upon which the people elected me governor was thoroughly discussed in the campaign and is well known to the members of the joint assembly. The limitations of time prevent a full disoussion of every point here. I shall have printed copies of that program placed on the desks of the individual members of the legislature; and I know you will read them.

I must take advantage of this opportunity, however, to remind you that I advocated, and I still advocate, repeal of the black-market tax, a constitutional amendment forever guaranteeing our homestead exemption program, assistance to the aged to the full extent of our financial ability, strict economy in government, the promotion of rural electrification, fair legislation toward labor and management, and a constitutional amendment limiting special sessions of the legislature to 30 days.

I must especially urge upon you the necessity for a permanent program of financial aid to our municipalities, and I know this most important problem will have your full sympathetic attention.

For reasons well known to all informed Mississippians, I most earnestly urge the necessity of repealing our absent voter laws except as to members of our Armed Forces and employees of common carriers engaged upon a scheduled run.

SEGREGATION

My friends, I come now to a discussion of that governmental question which continuously for months has been uppermost in the minds of the people of Mississippi, and which no doubt is destined greatly to vex and harass us in the years immediately ahead. I refer to maintaining the continued separation of the white and Negro races in accordance with those customs which the experience of 90 years has taught us all, white and colored alike, to be for the welfare of all concerned.

As I launch into this discussion, I address a message not only to you, my fellow laborers in the legislature, but I am also speaking directly to the white and Negro people in Mississippi. I am likewise speaking to our fellow citizens in the other 47 States of our Nation. Not only is the future well-being of every white and Negro citizen of our State bound up in what I am now about to say, but we are entitled to the sympathetic understanding of our friends in the remainder of the country. I am moved, therefore, by a deep realization of the gravity of this message.

My own personal and official attitude toward this question is well known to all Mississippians. In the gubernatorial campaign of 1955, I said in my official platform:

"There will be no necessity to abolish public schools, nor will there be any mixing of the races in any of the State operated educational institutions. I already have a record on this subject. This is no task for the amateur or the hothead."

This position was given the overwhelming support of the people of Mississippi at the ballot boxes last August.

I further told the people that if elected governor, with the cooperation of a good legislature, we would maintain the separation of the races without at the same time keeping our State, its economy, its customs, and its practices, in a daily uproar of confusion and uncertainty. I say to this audience and to those who are listening by radio and television that I have not the slightest fear that 4 years hence when my successor stands on this same spot to assume

his official oath, the separation of the races in Mississippi will be left intact and will still be in full force and effect in exactly the same manner and form as we know it today.

TIME FOR CALMNESS

I want to say to the members of the joint assembly that our services here will not be judged by those minor skirmishes which can contribute nothing to the permanent preservation of our rights. If the rules of racial separation are intact when we leave office, our place in history will be secure. If we should fail, there is nothing which will excuse that failure in the eyes of the people of Mississippi. Let us then exercise all possible soundness of judgment, sincerity of purpose, and calmness of mind, to the end that we shall not fail.

You may be called upon to consider the adoption of resolutions dealing with this problem. In the immediate future, I shall deliver a special message to the legislature on this subject; it cannot be adequately handled here. In the meantime, I am keeping in almost daily contact with the governors of the other southern States in the hope that whatever resolutions you may adopt will harmonize with those of our sister States. Unity must be preserved at all costs, and I urge the assistance and cooperation of all persons and groups to the end that we may present a united front in this all important cause.

In his message to the South Carolina legislature, delivered on last Thursday, Governor Timmerman said:

"I think it advisable that we give consideration to joining, if possible, our sister States at an appropriate time in a lawful and formal protest against the effort to destroy our form of government, but I would caution against premature action."

We have plenty of time, you will be kept fully informed of all developments, so I respectfully request that all action of this kind be withheld until you shall have heard my special message.

With the indulgence of those present, I should like now to address a word to the remainder of the Nation. I want to tell you that during the next 4 years the full weight of the government will unfailingly be used to the end that Mississippi will be a State of law and not of violence. I want to remind you that for 90 years the white and the Negro people of Mississippi have lived side by side in peace and harmony. I would like you, our friends outside Mississippi, to know that the great overwhelming majority of the white people of Mississippi are not now guilty and never intended to be guilty of any murder, violence, or any other wrongdoing toward anyone. History shows that the first white man ever to be legally hanged in Mississippi was executed for the murder of a Negro slave. I repeat that while we, the people of Mississippi, are unalterably determined as a matter of right and justice that the necessary rules of society shall be maintained, we do not any more approve of violence and lawlessness than you do.

PROBLEM ACUTE HERE

We ask you to remember that by reason of the numbers involved, this problem is more acute here than in any other State in the Union. It is not something which can be viewed with complacency or ignored, and if you lived in Mississippi and knew the full situation you would look upon it as we do.

Despite all the propaganda which has been fired at us, the country can be assured that the white people of Mississippi are not a race of Negro killers. Official statistics for the State of Mississippi for 1954 show that in that year, the last for which we have figures available, 8 white people were killed by Negroes and only 6 Negroes were killed by whites, while 182 Negroes were killed by members of their own race. In other words, there were 30 times as many Negroes killed by members of their own race as by members of the white race.

Now, for a word to those loyal Negro citizens of Mississippi who love their State and who are unwilling to be made the victims of propaganda from professional agitators.

I must remind you that when one searches the entire history of all nations, peoples, governments, and minority populations there will be found examples of extinctions, enslavements, torture, and exile, but there cannot be found one single instance where a government has forced one race against its will to integrate with another. With all due respect to the mighty power of the United States Government, it will never be able to force racial integration in Mississippi nor in any other State where the people are unwilling to have it done.

What have integrated schools in other sections been worth to the Negro? Have you ever thought about the fact that a Negro can attend a mixed school in most of those States, but few of those States will hire him as a teacher? The State of Connecticut does not have 25 Negro teachers. The city of Albany, the capital of New York, the home of Harlem, employs only 3 Negro teachers. The city of Newark employs 2,200 school teachers, but only 70 of them are Negroes, and none is a principal.

SYMPATHY FOR NEGROES

I am pledged to the maintenance of the separation of the races at all costs, but I want to say this further word to the Negroes of Mississippi. As Governor, I shall always give sympathetic consideration to any of your problems which deserve the assistance of the State government. If you accept this opportunity, it will mean better days for all of us. If you reject it, the responsibility must be yours.

Now for a word to our white citizens. When I formally opened my campaign at Ackerman on May 10 of last year, I said that "those who propose to mix the races in our public schools had might as well try to dip the Atlantic dry with a teaspooon."

I am just as confident of the correctness of this statement now as I was then. We must keep cool heads and calm judgment in the face of all the provocation which is being hurled upon us from almost every direction. The obvious intention of this propaganda is to frighten us, to throw us into panic, to destroy our judgment, and to render us incapable of defending ourselves. How devoutly it is to be hoped that a people who have had the strength, the courage, and the vision to surmount the terrifying trials of the past will not now allow themselves to fall victims to these tactics of today. The sentiment of Mississippi is unanimous—so we have nothing to fear unless it be "fear itself."

UNSPECIFIC RULING

To the few who have unjustifiably substituted fear for confidence, please let me remind them that even the United States Supreme Court did not undertake to say how or when its decision of May 17, 1954, could or would be enforced.

Let me remind them that in all the Southern States, including South Carolina and Virginia, there is not a single Negro child going to school with white children as the result of the compulsion of any court order. A few Negro children are going to school with white children in the South, but only in those miserably few districts where local authorities voluntarily allowed it to be placed into effect—no court order was involved. Even in the very cases which were heard in the United States Supreme Court itself, no mixing in the public schools in those districts has yet been accomplished, nor is there any actual prospect of it.

Our pupil assignment law, which has been on the statute books since 1954, and which has not yet been challenged, is, in my opinion, within itself, a complete remedy at the present time. We shall not be found without that resourcefulness necessary to any future remedies which may be required. I know, and you know that while there is no magic remedy for the Supreme Court decision there are multiplied means and methods, all perfectly legal, by which we can and will defeat integration of the races in our State.

The time has come for us to invoke the great principle enunciated by Thomas Jefferson when he said:

"Never let us do wrong, because our opponents did so. Let us, rather, by doing right, show them what they ought to have done, and establish as a rule the dictates of reason and conscience, rather than of angry passions."

As for myself, I face this problem, like all other problems, in the assurance given us in chapter 1, verse 7, of II Timothy:

"For God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love, and of sound mind."

NO NEED FOR FEAR

We the people of Mississippi are of sound mind; there is no occasion for the excitement of fear, and we are confident of our power.

Since May 17, 1954, the plans, approach, and legal action maintained by our State government have been completely successful. We have not begun to exhaust the resources at our command, so let us, with supreme confidence, take a leaf from the book of that great man, Elbert Hubbard, who said:

"Go as far as you can see, and when you get there you'll see farther."

As for myself, I face the future, not with fear but with confidence, not in panic, but in calmness born of the strength of our position and the weight of our power. I hope the people without surrendering any part of their alertness, will join me in this feeling.

May God, in his inexhaustible wisdom and mercy, guide us as we move forward together toward a better day in our beloved Mississippi.

The 38th Anniversary of Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an invitation extended to me by Col. Leo Z. Mazotas, president of the Lithuanian-American Citizens Club at 227 Lawrence Street, Hartford, Conn., to join in exercises commemorating the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, in Hartford on February 12, 1956.

The invitation, however, is really an earnest plea for more than sympathy, it seeks help for the wonderful Lithuanian nation and its neighbors who want again to enjoy freedoms that were promised in their independence of February 16, 1918; they seek from us, hope and encouragement that they might further persevere, awaiting the day when they can observe the restoration of all of

those sacred things that we treasure and guard, since they are God-given rights, the exercise of which have been denied by an atheist government temporarily in control.

But, Mr. Speaker, the letter speaks more eloquently than I can, and I submit it for the reading and consideration of every one of my colleagues and urge that they think of some way or means to hasten the day of real freedom and independence for Lithuania and all of the surrounding nations now under Communist enslavement.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 19, 1956.

The Honorable ANTONI N. SADLAK,
Congressman at Large, Connecticut,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At 3 p. m. on Sunday, February 12, 1956, the Lithuanians of the Greater Hartford vicinity are commemorating the 38th anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day, which date is actually February 16, 1918. Exercises will be held at the Lithuanian-American Citizens Club at 227 Lawrence Street, Hartford, Conn.

As you know the Lithuanian nation lost its independence again in June of 1940 when Lithuania and its neighbors Latvia and Estonia were occupied by Soviet forces despite all solemn promises to the contrary; despite existing friendship and nonaggression pacts between the Baltic States and Soviet Russia.

Since that time Lithuania and its neighbors have been the victims of Soviet Social Engineering (planned periodical annihilation of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia). Literally hundreds of thousands of innocent victims, men, women, and children have been brutally deported into Soviet Union slave labor camps. It is estimated that since the beginning of the annihilation program on June 13–14, 1941, the population of Lithuania has been depleted from over 3 million to 1,500,000 to 2 million. Her neighbor nations have suffered a like fate. Where in the history of the world can there be found a more vivid example of inhumanity and brutality? Where can there be found a more vivid warning of the goal of a totalitarian, avaricious force such as the communism of Soviet Russia was, is and always will be? For other examples and warnings we need only to point to the fate of Poland, China, Manchuria, Northern Korea, and Indochina. When will the free peoples of the world become convinced? Will it be too late? Let's hope not.

Lithuanians, and people of Lithuanian extraction need no further examples or warnings of Soviet communistic intentions. They, and their neighbor nationalists know only too well the result of apathy, ignorance, and inaction in the face of the communistic menace. Lithuanians will never cease their unending fight to regain their lost freedom and independence. They will never cease to endeavor to point out to the free world the ever existing menace of Soviet communism. They will never cease to urge all free peoples to become informed regarding the great threat to world freedom, to realize that the materialisitc philosophy of Soviet communism has and always will have only one unwavering goal—world revolution and the ultimate enslavement of all mankind.

Lithuanians will always set aside the period around February 16, their indepndence day, as the one period during which special emphasis will be made to keep the free peoples of the world ever reminded of the inhumane wrongs perpetrated by the Soviet Union upon Lithuanians and all the other victims. This, Lithuanians have dedicated themselves to do until Lithuania and the other enslaved nations have been restored to positions of dignity and freedom in the world and the threat of the scourge of communism has been destroyed.

Therefore, on behalf of the Lithuanian-American organizations of the Hartford area, I take great pelasure in extending to you an invitation to join with us in the February 12 exercises at the Lithuanian-American Citizens Club hall on Lawrence Street.

We would also appreciate it very much if you would follow your established precedent and read something into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or of offering some kind of a resolution designating February 18 as Lithuanian Independence Day, whichever you deem most appropriate.

Sincerely,

LEO C. MAZOTAS.

Cleaning Up the Doorway to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, as our country expands in population and industry, immense new burdens are laid upon our limited supplies of surface waters. The demand for water constantly increases. The supply is constant, however; and the supply of clean, usable water is decreasing. This is a situation which we shall ignore to our peril. There is an old saying that you never miss the water till the well runs dry. Our national water resources are not inexhaustible, however, and unless we mobilize to keep them clean and useful, the well will run dry. That is a job for the individual; for the communities; for industry; for the States, and for the Federal Government. No one can escape responsibility. Efforts to keep our surface waters clean and usuable must be constant and unremitting.

The States have a particularly large stake in this matter. One of the first questions that industry's scouts ask, when they look for new sites, is: How is the water supply? Is it adequate? Is it useful? Will it last?

Mr. Speaker, I have been actively interested in the preservation of our surface waters for many years, first as chairman of New York's Joint Committee on Interstate Cooperation, and now as a member of this body. It is a tribute to the vision of New York's citizens that they supported the enactment of a statewide water pollution control program some years ago.

Moreover, they have also supported the creation of interstate pollution control agencies, so that today, New York has cooperative interstate arrangements with every one of the States on its border, to control the pollution of its surface waters.

Among the oldest and most successful of those interstate agencies is the Interstate Sanitation Commission, comprised of representatives of the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. The Commission is now marking its 20th year of operation. When it was established, the waters around New York, the doorway to America, were swiftly deteriorating under an overload of filth. Today, through the unrelenting efforts of this tri-State agency, the never-ending battle against pollution is being won.

President Eisenhower has taken note of this significant battle in a telegram to the Commission. It is included in its 20-year report, which was released today. Calling it "the first of many interstate bodies created by the States to deal with such problems," the President has expressed the hope that its report will receive widespread attention among American citizens. "For the problem of the pollution of our waters," he points out, "is of concern to all of us."

Mr. Speaker, the work of the Interstate Sanitation Commission is important to every State in the Union, and to the District of Columbia, for it proves that the States, working together, can deal effectively with the problem of pollution control if they have the will and the determination.

At this time, there is pending before Congress legislation to strengthen and extend a program of Federal-State cooperation in the control of water pollution. The Interstate Sanitation Commission's report provides effective guidelines for such cooperation in conformance with administration's policy of keeping as much government as possible close to the people who live under it and pay for it.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include some excerpts from the Interstate Sanitation Commission's report, and I commend the entire report to the attention of the Members of this House:

CLEANING UP THE DOORWAY TO AMERICA—TWENTY YEARS OF PROGRESS IN POLLUTION CONTROL, 1936–56—INTERSTATE SANITATION COMMISSION—NEW JERSEY, NEW YORK, CONNECTICUT

Text of telegram from President Dwight D. Eisenhower to the Commission on the occasion of its 20th anniversary:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

Dr. WILLIAM C. COPE,
Chairman, the Interstate
Sanitation Commission:

Twenty years ago, the interstate compact between New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut was signed, with the approval of the Congress. It provided for their partnership in combating the growing pollution of the interstate waters around New York Harbor.

The first of many interstate bodies created by the States to deal with such problems, it has been a pioneering organization. I am therefore glad to learn of the Commission's plans for issuing a progress report. I hope it will receive widespread attention among American citizens, for the problem of the pollution of our waters is of concern to all of us.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

In the overview the commission's job is to protect the rights of the public in its varied legitimate uses of the waters of the district, by releasing the waters from their bondage of carrying waste.

Although the uses appear incompatible at first, it has long been recognized that waters serve many purposes, providing there is judicious control. This control starts with the commission's classification by desired use, (the A and B classification). These classifications were set up after public hearings, so that all interested could be heard.

Once the classifications were set up, then standards of treatment established in the compact became effective.

No treatment of wastes is perfect, and all effluent brings some pollution to the waters. But the waters have recuperative powers themselves with the action of tides, currents, sun, wind, and benevolent bacteria.

The commission's effort has been to keep the pollution low enough so that the natural recuperative powers could keep the waters in good shape.

This phase of the program is related to the directive of the compact to abate present and "control future pollution."

We measure this in terms of people served. Here is the record.

In 1936 the sewage of 7,200,000 people was being discharged untreated into the waters of the district.

Today sewage from 9,500,000 is receiving treatment. This is more than the total contributing pollution 20 years ago.

Pollution existing in 1936 has been abated.

COSTS

This program, like any other improvement, has cost money. First let us clearly state that the administrative cost of the commission is small compared to the cost of construction of sewage treatment plants and appurtenances, which total to date $300 million. The construction costs are carried by local bond issues and taxes, and the commission's job is to assure each municipality that all other municipalities will construct plants to equal the standards set, and to synchronize the program so that no municipality is unduly penalized for its efforts.

Notwithstanding the accomplishment over the 20-year period the costs of constructing these treatment plants averages about $1 per year per person served.

INDUSTRY

The importance of the waters of the area to the industry cannot be overrated. Some industries which are large employers and taxpayers in the area, utilize waters in the millions of gallons per day.

To the knowledge of the commission, no industry has left the area because of the quality of the waters for which the commission is responsible, and no undue hardships in treatment of water have been imposed.

RECREATION

Health is always first.

Despite the dysentery epidemic in Chicago from sewage pollution in the thirties, and the catastrophe of 1,100 cases of gastroenteritis following harbor water entering water mains on the west coast a few years back, the commission will not guarantee that drinking or swimming in polluted water, or eating polluted shellfish will kill you. It might, but no guarantee.

The chief engineer puts the story of polluted water in this comparison:

"Fill your bathtub with clean, warm water. Take a dipper and dip out one quart from the used but unflushed toilet bowl. Dump it in the tub. That is the equivalent of some of the bathing waters when the commission started 20 years ago."

You can bathe in that bathtub but people consider it an unpleasant idea and not up to American standards.

Today in the A areas the picture is different—like a well-known soap—99 percent plus of all discharge into the bathing area is treated and sterilized with chlorine.

In fishing and shellfishing, the commission's program of treatment has produced a gradual improvement in the waters of the district despite the fact that 2 million more people have moved into the area. This is reflected in the fact that there is now fishing in Jamaica Bay, where one doubts that were many fish 20 years ago. There have been changes in opening and closing shellfish areas. Shellfish are reported being cultured in the Hudson for transfer elsewhere for growth. The Harlem River, once a black, fetid stream, is now much improved. And so it goes down a long list of waters of the area.

THE ROAD AHEAD

As has been indicated there is a job ahead to:

1. Complete the remaining work now under way to bring treatment up to present standards.

2. Maintain an equitable use of the waters of the area through the changing years ahead.

3. Revise the standards as the purity of the waters increases, to meet new needs as populations increase, to cope with new industries and new types of pollution.

Not only are there such new problems as radioactive and chemical wastes, but the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey have delegated to the commission the task of studying whether air pollution is an interstate problem, in the New York metropolitan area, and to recommend means of control. Connecticut has enacted legislation giving its consent to the study, subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States.

This will bring a new kind of problem to the commission to study, in a new field, under an extension of the interstate compact.

The joint legislative committee on interstate cooperation regarded the work of the interstate sanitation commission "as one of the outstanding examples in the United States of an effective pollution abatement program. The success of this interstate compact demonstrates the great potentialities of interstate cooperation and the compact method in solution of interstate problems."

Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, January 22, Americans from all parts of the Nation celebrated the 38th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine.

Geographically, the Ukraine is part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but historically has stood as one of the primary bulwarks against Soviet imperilism, throughout the centuries. This unconquerable desire for national freedom is still imbued in the hearts of Ukrainian patriots whose sufferings at the hands of Communists dates back to the destruction of its churches and the Red sponsored famine of 1932–33.

The German invasion of World War II brought short lived hope for these freedom loving Ukrainians, who soon were persecuted and dominated by another imperialism. But even now, the Ukrainian Resistance Army continues to fight against Soviet attempts to destroy the peoples' burning desire for independent freedom. Brutal purges and deportations ordered by Moscow have liquidated countless numbers of Ukrainian leaders, but the spiritual and moral resources of the people produce immediate substitutes.

Ukrainian culture, centered in the capital city of Kiev, continues to flourish, and historically has been the moving force behind the nationalistic spirit of the people. Its centuries of traditions and customs represent the indefatigable struggles of a country destined to possess the same freedom enjoyed by Americans in the United States.

With over 40 million people, the Ukraine is the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, and should the Communists ever attempt actual aggression, Ukrainians can be counted as our most important and natural allies, in defeating Russian imperialism.

The struggle and goals of this freedom loving nation, like that of our forefathers should not be ignored. The continual free existence of the United States and other independent sovereignties, is contingent upon the establishment of those liberties throughout the family of nations. The Ukrainians have proven their right and demonstrated their ability to express their own free, independent voice in our family of nations.

The Best Defense, Dollar for Dollar, in Recent Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, among our other blessings today, we may count the fact that we have a President and Secretary of Defense who are shaping our military policies to meet the needs of today and tomorrow rather than yesterday.

The military have often been criticized for preparing for the last war, rather than the next one, and history has often proved the charge correct. There is some evidence that certain of our military leaders or former leaders today are suffering from that occupational hazard. Fortunately, the President and his advisers are not. They are not planning for any war. Indeed, they are making herculean efforts to build and strengthen peace. But they are meanwhile strengthening the country's defenses so that no one will misconstrue our pursuit of peace as a confession of weakness. And they are doing it with hardheaded respect for the citizen who maintains our Government and supplies the money to sustain it.

As the Buffalo Evening News pointed out, in an editorial on January 18, the military program now before Congress offers the best defense, dollar for dollar, in recent times.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that editorial.

MORE FOR THE DEFENSE DOLLAR

Our military program for the long haul is clearly outlined in President Eisenhower's budget message. Gearing of defense preparations to a long period of uncertainty rather than getting panicked by temporary crises and lulled by smiles without deeds is reemphasized. No longer will our defense be directed toward assumed dates of maximum

danger, but will be aimed at maintaining continuously the largest and best-armed ready forces in our peacetime history.

The budget defense calls for defense funds in 1957 totalling $35.5 billion, about $972 million more than provided for this year. The distribution of the new funds reflects the reorientation of defense planning to make use of the increasing availability of new weapons of unprecedented strategic and tactical importance. This refers to the increased use of atomic power for naval craft—both surface and submarine—and the continued production and activating of the latest type strategic jet bombers, interceptors, and atomic-guided missiles.

Much more than the nearly $1 billion of increased funds will go into the guided-missile and strategic aircraft program. The ammunition and vehicle stockpiling for land forces has reached a saturation point where funds that formerly went into conventional arms can be diverted to the Air Force and Navy. Maximum use of scientific and technological advances and their application to modern weapons is permitting the Armed Forces to be leveled off at a strength of 2,900,000—somewhat below the present ceiling. Meanwhile, the ready reserve is expected to reach 1,250,000 by 1957.

The President's reference to panic planning hits bluntly at those critics of the defense program who less than a year ago were demanding a crash program for the new B–52 jet bombers because of information that Russia had a similar strategic bomber. The conversion of B–36 wings to B–52 has been under way for some time and more than $6 billion in the new budget is allotted to continuation of the B–52 program and to Air Force and Navy procurement of supersonic jet interceptors.

In the major distribution of the defense budget, the Air Force is scheduled to get $15.4 billion, the Navy $10 billion, and the Army $7.7 billion. This, as well as anything, indicates the new emphasis. While the Army and Navy budgets are about the same as 1955, the Air Force is jumped $3 billion for both 1956 and 1957. The leveling off of funds for the older services and the new high for the Air Force in 1956 and 1957 set the pattern of the long haul. If Congress does not upset it too much, the program may provide the best defense—dollar for dollar—in recent times.

No Need for Apologizing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to receive permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include an editorial from the Asbury Park Evening Press, Asbury Park, N. J., entitled "No Need for Apologizing." This editorial, which refers to the controversy over the interview with Secretary of State Dulles recently published in Life magazine, expresses my sentiments in the matter, and I feel confident that the American public understands what he was driving at and approves of his attitude. I think the Asbury Park Press is to be highly commended for its straightforward editorial, which follows:

NO NEED FOR APOLOGIZING

It is regrettable that a few Republican leaders have been frightened into semi-apologetic explanations of the vigorous foreign policy ascribed to Secretary of State Dulles in a recent magazine article. Perhaps it was to have been expected that such ambitious Democrats as Adlai Stevenson would search for grounds upon which to criticize Mr. Dulles' strategy. But this strategy has been so successful in avoiding war while refusing to yield before the Communists that Republicans should confine themselves to the applause it deserves.

In a needless effort to defend Mr. Dulles' enlightened policy a few Republicans have announced that former President Truman followed a similar policy. That is paying Mr. Truman an undeserved compliment. For Mr. Truman permitted his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson to indicate that this country would not defend Korea. The Communists, quite naturally, accepted this as an invitation and marched in. Then the Truman administration reversed itself and sent American troops to defend South Korea in what proved to be one of the costliest wars in our history.

Mr. Dulles' policy calls for giving advanced notice of our intention to tackle any aggressor that thrusts itself beyond a given line. Naturally such a policy can carry us to "the brink" of war. But it is the only policy that can avoid war without subjecting this country to the dishonor of retreating and indicating a degree of weakness that will tempt the aggressor in continuing to trespass on our interests until war becomes inevitable.

The Dulles program is sound in concept and it has been effective in practice. Those Democrats who have assailed it are obviously groping for an issue where there is no room for an issue. Those Republicans who apologetically explain Mr. Dulles' program in terms that modify it are political rabbits that have been frightened by the pop-gun that Mr. Stevenson has aimed at the Secretary of State.

The Distressing Situation in the Near East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from M. H. Pilsk, of Nashville, Tenn.:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *January 4, 1956.*

The Honorable ROSS BASS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ROSS: I am deeply disturbed at the distressing situation in the Near East, namely, Israel vis-a-vis the Arab States, and the support of the Arabs by Russia and their satellites. I think it is obvious that Israel is the only democratic, westernized group in that area and is of necessity, if nothing else, an ally of our United States. It is very discouraging to note that our State Department has made no constructive moves in the direction of peace and stability, to the contrary, we seem to be condoning some of English and French colonialism and oil power politics.

Many of our friends in Nashville and middle Tennessee hope our representatives in Washington will carefully examine the facts, and without prejudice make the decision which would do the greatest good for our United States and friends. I cannot conceive that we can ever rely on the friendship of most of the Arab States, since their leadership has always been for sale and their loyalty changes with the winds. To the contrary, the leaders of these feudal states in that area have no idea of becoming democratic and there is no possible way for us to get the message of democracy to their people. I do believe that the vast majority of their population has no bone to pick with Israel and it is their leadership that has a fanatic, selfish interest in keeping the area disturbed, as well as giving themselves the best bargaining position between East and West.

A case in point, is the so-called refugee problem. This is not as much a refugee situation as it has become a tool for world sympathy at the expense of the wretched people. I would be the last person to deny these political exiles the right to a good standard of living, but many of the inhabitants of all of these surrounding states live in about the same abject poverty. It is the fact that this particular group, who left because of the mistaken idea that they would be on the winning side by leaving, and having suffered the fortunes of war, find themselves exiles.

The U. N. certainly made very sizable contributions, much of which has not reached the needy. You will find this to be pretty much the fact if you have the opportunity to investigate.

Now, I would deem it a favor personally and for the good of the western democracy that you use your best offices with the State Department to encourage the strongest possible assistance, morally and financially, and with military supplies, if needed, to the beleagured State of Israel to the effect that stability and peace may be secured in that troubled area.

With my very best wishes for a happy, healthful, and successful year for you and yours, I remain

Cordially,

M. H. PILSK.

Defeat Via Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, here is appended an editorial from a small county editor out in my district. He probably states in this editorial an accurate appraisal of public sentiment on the all-important subject of taxation. The people back home are beginning to wonder about this "charity" idea of American tax dollars in foreign countries. Mr. Huycke presents the plight of the average middle-class American and what high taxes mean to him. I commend this, his editorial:

[From the Ellsworth Reporter]

DEFEAT VIA TAXATION

Is the United States defeating itself and helping our enemies win the cold war through the taxation route? Every time Congress and State legislature meet they add another burden of taxes upon the already sagging shoulders of the average American citizen; and with the convening of Congress this term it is no different—and the Kansas

Legislature is already mapping plans whereby they can bleed another dollar out of the poor, tired, despondent wage earner, who is at the point of desperation of how he is going to meet all the emergency financial obligations in a respectable manner.

By the time he meets the bill on his Federal income tax, State income tax, real-estate tax, personal property, sales taxes, car-license plates, driver's license, gas tax, and the multitude of hidden taxes on only the bare necessities, he has very little left to save for that rainy day when he may be unable to earn. Because of the greed of taxes, the American citizen is forced to take refuge in all the insurances which have been "cooked up" for his so-called protection, each of which is only a further drain on his already depleted earnings, and an added worry, how is he going to meet all his tax obligations?

Time was when a man dared hope that somewhere along the ancestral line there might be hidden a rich uncle who someday would remember him in his will and help to meet the financial burden; but if any man is fortunate in this day and age to realize that dream, Uncle Sam is there with his eager hands extended for such a huge share of the gift that very little is left to perpetuate the joy of receiving the moneyed blessing.

The older generation will well remember how terribly sorry we felt for the defeated enemies after the First World War because their governments demanded such enormous sums of money from their people to pay taxes that many of the farmers had to haul the deflated currency in farm wagons to the collectors. We aren't in that position yet, but should the value of our currency take a nosedive, we would be exactly in that predicament.

But, despite all this, the American citizen would more cheerfully carry the huge tax burden if the money was wisely spent by those in authority to use the tax funds; but when we see such sinful, needless waste in the name of charity to foreign countries which are using this same money to build up the industries in their countries to such a high level that they are crowding us out of the world-trade market, isn't it a defeat for the United States? We're the last ones who would deny a hungry man the necessities of life; but aren't we rather forcing this charity on a lot of people in the world who have existed ages before our country was born, and who in all probability will be existing long after we have perished from the family of nations?

Our American way of life is wonderful for the United States, due to many reasons; but can we transplant these reasons to other lands and bring happiness to its natives? We have been trying to do this very thing since World War II, but so far have yet to reap the gratitude of any of the receivers. It seems to us that people of other lands are as intelligent as we Americans and definitely ought to work out their own destiny in their own way, and it would be far wiser for us to stand by, like a good friend should, ready to help when called upon, and then in such a way as will make the recipient appreciative of that help, instead of winning their almost near hatred because of our arrogant attitude in trying to win their friendship by offering them hard cold cash instead of understanding.

And the poor tired American taxpayer is the brunt of all this generosity of the men whom we send to Washington. Why not, for a change, stop playing the role of Atlas in carrying the whole world on our shoulders and, instead, ease the gigantic tax burden of our own people and, at least, make the people of one nation happy via the money route?

Please, Uncle Sam, hear the plea and supplication of your tired tax-overburdened middle-class subjects, have mercy on their tired souls, and, please, don't add that last straw to their backs which will break their already nearly broken courage, after which the way would be open for our enemy to move in and conquer so easily. Do ease our tax burden, Uncle Sam.

Grassroots Endorsement of Secretary Dulles' Foreign Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include herewith an editorial endorsing the foreign policies of Secretary of State Dulles which appeared in a recent issue of the Fond Du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter:

There appears to be very little wrong with Secretary of State Dulles that a good editor couldn't cure.

He really lives two lives. In one his is the man of action, and here his accomplishments are many. In the other he is the man of verbal statement, and in this he finds himself again and again in hot water.

One of his principal troubles seems to be that he permits too flashy a lead to be put on what he says. An example is his latest difficulty, an article in Life magazine which quotes him liberally on how the United States has met specific crises in Korea, Indochina, and Matsu-Quemoy in the last 3 years.

According to Dulles, this country three times went to the brink of war but was saved from it by threats of stern action, including atomic retaliation.

Democrats have assailed these declarations and accused Dulles not only of historical inaccuracy but of contradicting his own secret testimony before a congressional committee.

British and French diplomats likewise have questioned his accuracy, and have announced their shock that he would talk glibly of seeing the United States go to the brink of war.

The matter of Dulles' accuracy can only be settled by recourse to the documents, a process which will require days and weeks. What evidently disturbs his critics most, however, is the brink of war philosophy ascribed to him in the article.

Said Dulles: "The ability to get to the verge of war without getting into the war, is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. * * * We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face."

In the European view, no man or nation should walk that close to all-out war in this atomic age. Yet it is very likely that, as he has often done before, Dulles has overstated his case in trying to make his point. That's where the good editing ought to come in.

Nevertheless, he has a point that is fundamentally sound: Clear willingness to use force if pushed too far is a deterrent against aggression. Had we evidenced that willingness in early 1950, the Communists never would have attacked South Korea. They thought we would not fight to save it.

Furthermore, the show of force deterrent is an age-old device of European diplomacy. Britain and France did not hesitate to use it when they held power. Today we, not they, have the power and are looked to for preservation of the peace. Europe's reported shock at hearing we have employed the weapon of deterrence seems something less than a realistic response.

In standing behind Dulles as the best Secretary of State he has ever known, President Eisenhower pinned his defense on policy grounds, not Dulles' words. He stressed that America must stand firm in its program for waging peace with justice. If that be interpreted as standing at the brink, he said, then that is because other nations are creating the circumstances that produce the perilous situation.

After all, Dulles did not create the crises in Korea, Indochina, and Matsu-Quemoy. He did not lead us to the brink just to see how close we could get to war. He was concerned to avoid it, but he was convinced the way to do that was to let the enemy know exactly what he could expect from us.

It is not what Dulles has done but what he said that has brought him fresh difficulty. His choice of language has alarmed a good many. But his policy of deterrence should shock no friend of freedom. It has worked where negotiation, or silence, has failed and let us into war.

Dulles' Policy Doesn't Faze Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call public attention to the following article appearing in the Washington Merry-Go-Round by Drew Pearson:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 24, 1956]

DULLES' POLICY DOESN'T FAZE REDS

Most important question raised by all the hullabaloo over the John Foster Dulles brink-of-war statement is whether the United States is drifting into war, or can keep the peace.

All other questions are unimportant. The political feuding between Democrats and Republicans aroused by the Life magazine article doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Only important is the question of war and peace.

So let's take a careful look at the Dulles-Eisenhower score.

Before doing so, however, it might be well to recall that during the Hoover administration, when the world first started its downhill drift toward war, an internationally minded Republican Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, did his best to warn the United States and his own President that aggressors were on the march in Asia and that this might lead toward war.

Stimson saw the landing of the Japanese Army in Manchuria September 18, 1931, as the first sign of eventual world war and he tried to do exactly what Dulles says he's doing now—take a firm stand which would prevent war. Stimson wanted the fleet mobilized, approached the Canadian, Mexican, and Chilean Governments for use of bases along their coast, was ready to use the threat of force to stop the Japanese warlords.

But his President, Herbert Hoover, was opposed. So were strong isolationist elements within the Republican Party.

FIRMNESS ESSENTIAL

History showed that Stimson was right, just as Dulles is right in his basic theory that

war can be prevented if the United States takes a firm position and makes that position clearly known in advance.

However, the position must be so clear as to be completely unequivocal. There can be no vacillation.

When it came to Indochina, the Eisenhower administration vacillated all over the place, which was why we lost Indochina. It was not a "save," as Life magazine and Dulles so glibly put it. It was a tragic loss—largely because Vice President NIXON said we would use troops, Mr. Eisenhower said we would not use troops. Dulles said one thing one week and another the next, and no one could get together. Result: The Chinese Reds, knowing how confused we were, kept right on advancing.

That, however, is history. Let's look at the future.

Life magazine and Dulles also claim that war was avoided against Quemoy and Matsu as a result of the Dulles policy of boldness.

WAS DULLES BOLD?

However, it happens the Red Chinese have been building air strips and massing troops opposite Quemoy and Matsu for some time and, despite Dulles' boldness, war certainly has not yet been avoided. On the contrary, three high United States officials have just visited this area, obviously worried about war—Secretary of the Air Force Donald A. Quarles, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm. Arthur W. Radford, and Air Chief of Staff Nathan F. Twining.

Now just what is the reason for the apparent Chinese disdain for Dulles' policy of boldness?

The answer is the same as in the case of Indochina: United States indecision and vacillation.

Here, despite the Life interview, are the inside facts as to what really happened.

On September 12, 1954, the National Security Council flew to Denver for an unprecedented meeting with the President in which it urged that a definite policy of boldness be adopted toward Quemoy and Matsu, and that authorization be given to bomb the Chinese mainland in case the Red Chinese attacked.

President Eisenhower, however, refused to buy this policy.

Dulles, referring to the policy of risking war around Formosa and Korea, stated in Life: "It took a lot more courage for the President than for me. His was the ultimate decision. * * * The President never flinched for a minute on any of these decisions. He came up taut."

That, however, was not what happened. Weeks passed, then months. No decision came from the White House. Meanwhile the National Security Council kept Quemoy-Matsu up in the air. Eventually this indecision was noted in the American press, the first exclusive facts being published by Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post and Times Herald on November 8, 1954.

REDS KNEW SCORE

Long before this, however, our indecision had leaked to the Chinese Reds as a result of the many high United States officials forced to fly to Formosa to break the bad news and try to pacify Chiang Kai-shek.

Dulles himself at one time flew to Formosa to try to persuade Chiang to withdraw from the difficult-to-defend Quemoy-Matsu Islands. But he did not mention this in his Life interview.

However, the Chinese Reds knew about his attempt, for on Formosa information leaks like a sieve. So the Reds kept right on building airstrips and concentrating troops opposite Quemoy and Matsu regardless of the alleged Dulles policy of boldness.

Three months later, January 1955, Mr. Eisenhower asked for a special resolution from Congress giving him power to retaliate on the Chinese mainland, even with atomic bombs, if the Red Chinese attacked "Formosa and the Pescadores * * * this authority to include the securing and protection of such related positions and territories of that area now in friendly hands."

But even here, there was no clear-cut decision regarding Quemoy and Matsu. Dulles himself drafted the resolution which the Congress adopted. And, despite his policy of boldness, he left the resolution vague. He did not mention Quemoy and Matsu.

Perhaps that's why the Red Chinese have gone on building bases and hauling up artillery opposite Quemoy and Matsu. Obviously, they intend to test out the Dulles' policy.

And the inescapable fact about the Dulles' policy is that it will not work unless it's clear and unequivocal. It will work when it's really bold. But it won't work when backed up by vacillation, indecision, and phony boldness.

Unfortunately the present indecision over Quemoy-Matsu could plunge us into war.

For on the United States commanders who flash back first news of a Quemoy-Matsu attack will depend whether the United States unleashes the atomic bomb on the Chinese mainland, a bomb which in any event would turn millions of Asians against us and which could touch off world war III.

Jack Carley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Jack Carley has been a member of the editorial staff of the Commercial Appeal since 1923.

Prior to that he had worked on newspapers in Winnipeg, Montreal, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

His service on the Commercial Appeal has included that of police reporter, night city editor, city editor, managing editor and editorial writer—a post he has held since 1939.

Mr. Carley's chief interests as a newspaperman have been in the fields of flood control which is so essential to this particular area, and to the national security in all phases but especially that of internal safety and law enforcement.

He has been a visiting instructor at the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy at Washington since 1942 and in 1940 was given one of that agency's extremely rare certificates of appreciation for helpful assistance to the FBI.

His civic activities include membership on the Memphis and Shelby County Port Commission which is supervising development of a gigantic harbor project.

His editorials advocating a two-ocean navy, compulsory military service, and strategic outlying bases in 1939 led to national award to the Commercial Appeal of the American Legion's Stephen F. Chadwick trophy.

In 1947, Memphis Post, No. 1, of the American Legion designated him as the first recipient of the James W. Bodley memorial award. It was given to Mr. Carley because of a series of informative editorials on communism published in the Commercial Appeal in 1946 and subsequently published in a pamphlet called Listen Closely.

In 1954 the Department of the Army gave him a certificate of appreciation for patriotic civilian service. The accompanying citation set out that the award was made for (a) more than a quarter of a century of untiring efforts in the furtherance of flood control and navigational improvements on the Mississippi River; (b) assistance to the Army and its Corps of Engineers during Mississippi River floods; (c) service as a special assistant to the War Department at Washington in 1946; (d) support and service to Army Ground Forces, at home and abroad, during World War II; (e) splendid cooperation in connection with the atomic bomb project and the interest shown in the maintenance of security prior to the use of the bomb; (f) assistance as a special civilian aide to Lt. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers at Omaha during the disastrous Missouri Basin flood of 1952; (g) work in behalf of a unified authority in the Military Establishment.

On November last before a large audience of veterans of all wars and their friends which overflowed the banquet room of the Peabody Hotel in Memphis, Mr. Carley delivered a most profound address.

Under leave to extend my remarks I have the honor to include it in the RECORD.

The address follows:

A DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

Veterans Day—this anniversary which we once knew as Armistice Day—is essentially one for dear and sacred remembrance. If less than that, its real significance has been lost and it becomes meaningless.

It is a day of remembrance on which we recall the valor and the sacrifices of other years and great trials—of national tribulation and the tremendous striving of our country's men and women at arms.

It is a day when the dead of our wars become a little dearer and nearer to us—when they march with us—aye, when they speak to us again—admonishing—warning—inspiring.

Admonishing us not to let slip from memory, the ineffable quality of their devotion; warning us not to be misled and deceived by the blandishments and the guile of our enemy; inspiring us to rededicate ourselves to the causes of human freedom and man's dignity for which they died.

Theirs is a mighty, triumphant voice—this one in which they speak to us—adjuring us to be strong as they were strong—brave as they were brave—determined as they were determined that the assaults which were made against the soul of man and the fortresses of his freedom should not succeed.

This is no mean and sad occasion which brings us here. Rather is this day of remembrance a glorious day—a day of reassociation—of recollection—of story telling between old comrades—almost a shouting day of evangelical reaffirmation of our Father's faith. That, at least, is the way that I hope we who are here, together for a little while, can see it.

Those who are with us in the spirit are many. Their ranks reach from the Concord Road and Lexington to the beaches of the Pacific and the rugged, bloodstained hills of Korea. There are nearly 1 million of them—the dead of our wars. It is they who speak to us—77,000 of the Revolutionary War's first American Armed Forces; 30,000 of the War of 1812; 14,445 of the War with Mexico; 359,528

Federal dead of the Civil War, and 129,159 Confederate dead; 6,472 of the War with Spain; 173,374 of World War I; 406,828 of World War II; 33,417 of the Korean war.

There are others—the hundreds of others who died in the Indian Wars—the thousands who have died in service from one cause or another on the long road stretching from the Republic's birth to the present.

I have made no distinction between the battle dead and those who died from other causes while wearing the uniforms of their country's Armed Forces. No man or woman is mean or less significant than another if death comes honorably while he or she is so clad.

Nor is mention of them here a thing macabre or melancholy. These were the keepers of the faith. These were our comrades and it is of the faith they kept that I would speak a little. We have need of it.

There are certain beliefs which are fundamental to this Nation and a way of life which, God willing, we will not only protect but improve that we may deliver it into the hands of our children an even greater and more precious heritage.

The desire for justice has been defined as the eternal rock from which a righteous social order is erected. From the desire for justice comes law and from law comes order and social and economic progress.

It was the desire for justice and in pursuance of man's greatest aspiration, that of being free, which caused the members of the Mayflower Company to seek sanctuary in a wilderness.

It was they who laid the cornerstone in this citadel of freedom—the cornerstone of the Nation which was to be and is, and will, please God, forever be so long as men continue to cherish freedom.

When those Pilgrim seekers for freedom were nearing what was to become New England, they drew up an agreement through which majority rule was to prevail. The first words they wrote into that document were:

"IN THE NAME OF GOD, AMEN"

That was the keystone of this Nation—of this way of life which the atheistic and criminal conspiracy of communism and its handmaiden, secularism—materialism—threaten.

All of us remember this:

"When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people * * * to assume the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and Nature's God entitle them."

There again is acknowledgement of Divine authority. At another time—when the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia threatened to break up in a brawl, one delegate suggested that the convention pray. Another objected on the ground that this would inject "outside influence."

Benjamin Franklin got to his feet with this rejoiner:

"I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible that an empire can rise without His aid?"

Thereupon Washington led the convention prayer and when he had finished, turned quietly to the delegates and said "The event is in the hand of God."

And out of the hand of God came the greatest and best pattern for the governing of a decent society—the Constitution of the United States.

Soon after the event which this day originally commemorated, members of our Armed Forces met in a convention at Paris and designed the veterans organization which we know as the American Legion. And why did they associate themselves: They said it very simply:

"FOR GOD AND COUNTRY"

I do not mention the Legion to the exclusion of all other fine veterans organizations. Far be it because the same spirit motivates them. Why are we here this noon? As Americans need we be—are we ashamed to say the words:

"For God and country"?

I have emphasized the two deliberately for both are under terrible, continuing assault. All that you have fought for, all that those we remember, died for, is under sinister, insidious attack from without and within.

The God we acknowledge is defied and His name defiled.

The Constitution of the United States is being distorted and used as a cloak of protection by our infiltrating and subverting internal enemies and their pseudoliberal friends.

In the name of civil liberties and through the distortions of civil rights we deny to our security agencies legal use of scientific instruments upon which the enemy within, the subverter, the spy and the saboteur rely to carry on their treasonable and destructive activities.

It is wrong, say the legal experts, for the FBI to take stolen secret documents out of the handbag of a traitorous Judith Coplon when it lacks a search warrant's right of entry but it isn't wrong, say other legal experts, to plant a secret microphone in a room where a Federal trial jury is deliberating and then use the results publicly as was recently, shockingly done.

It is wrong for the FBI to tap the wires into a grief-stricken home from which a Bobby Greenlease has been taken and murdered but the same wires are used by the kidnaper-murderer to make his loathsome ransom demand of the parent.

You must not get proof that a Communist conspiracy exists or that Communists, subverters and espionage agents are plotting if you intend to do it with listening devices and try to go into court with your recorded proof.

Every effort of Attorneys General of the United States to obtain passage of a wiretapping statute which would permit use of wiretapped evidence in cases of crimes against the Nation and that of kidnaping has been blocked by groups either naive or deliberately obstructive.

"Don't give the security agencies a break—give it to the internal enemies and the criminals." That almost seems to be a philosophy and a slogan with those carrying an oversized, preposterous banner of self-interpreted civil rights.

Now they are using a new avenue of attack—deny to the Government—to the FBI, the CIA and the Intelligence Services of the Armed Forces, right to use the services of loyal, patriotic Americans.

On these they pin the bitter name of "informant" and they would classify all alike—the patriot and the criminal informant we know—as the "stool pigeon."

Build a wall of pseudo civil rights around the traitors and their fellow travelling friends—deny to the Government information which can come only from honest, loyal citizens and what is there left to protect us?

What are the security agencies expected to use—crystal balls, soothsayers and fortune tellers?

How stupid are we going to be?

No wonder Communism can swap a frown for a smile, no wonder a false dawn envelopes the earth. All that communism has to do is wait—wait for the termites to cut the foundations of our citadel away with the very tools which are supposed to be our strength.

The Communist Party actually has a brief before the United States Supreme Court in which it is argued that the Internal Security Act of 1950 should be held invalid because it violates their Constitutional rights. The Communists are supported by a petition of a large group of American ministers, eduactors and writers.

For pure gall that would be hard to beat.

I said that communism can afford to adopt its present sweetness and light pose. I want to read you three excerpts. The first is this:

"The Communist International has declared war upon the whole bourgeois world * * *" (capitalist.)

"Every party wishing to belong to the Communist International is obligated to offer unqualified support to every Soviet republic in its struggle against the counter-revolutionary forces. The Communist parties must carry on a cleancut propaganda for the hindering of the transportation of munitions of war to the enemies of the Soviet Republic; and, furthermore, they must use all means, legal or illegal, to carry propaganda, etc., among the troops sent to throttle the workers' republic." The third and final excerpt is this:

"The duty of spreading Communist ideas includes the special obligation to carry on a vigorous and systematic propaganda in the army. Where this agitation is forbidden by laws of exception it is to be carried on illegally. Renunciation of such activities would be the same as treason to revolutionary duty and would be incompatible with membership in the third international."

The Communist Party of the United States—the same party which dares go into the Supreme Court and ask that the country's chief security statute be set aside as violative of Communist civil rights subscribed to the quoted conditions I have just read to you.

Those are taken from the theses and statutes of the third international and are communism's basic law. They were adopted in 1920.

They were reaffirmed just this week.

They explain why, back in 1928, this sentence was written into the platform of the Communist Party: "Not a man, not a gun, not a cent for the imperialist army and navy." Of course, today they would include the air force.

"Let's be a little careful, all of us here, how we use the word "brass" in ridicule; how we join in the clamor against Armed Forces spending, how we lend our support to agitation for reductions in strength.

Sure taxes are high. Nothing ever worth having ever came easily or cheaply.

And we've got freedom, haven't we? Personally, I prefer freedom to a slave-labor camp. I went into Dachau behind the 42d and 45th Divisions and I saw Nordhausen and Landsberg with General Lear. No thank you. I'll pay the taxes and be glad to have the privilege.

At the beginning I told you of the Mayflower Compact and of those who came "in the name of God" to lay the foundation stone of our liberties. I told you that theirs was a compact whereby the minority agreed to abide by the will of the majority.

Sometimes I wonder if the reverse hasn't become true—that the majority are submitting to the capricious wills of pressure minorities.

Our trained manpower situation is a case in point. Three times within 33 years the United States had to resort to hasty and unsatisfactory draft processes because of refusal by successive Congresses to adopt a compulsory military training program even though equally successive public opinion polls showed the majority of the people to be in favor of it.

We are only a little further ahead now than we were when we had to meet the manpower demands of World Wars I and II and the Korean war.

Instead of compulsory Armed Forces training we now have the expediency of a makeshift Reserve program. It is better than nothing but far short of what every veterans' organization and all of the Armed Forces have been advocating.

Russia has compulsory training. Britain has it and so do France and Switzerland and most other alert nations. And they dare look reality in the face. They dare call it what it is—conscription.

It boils down to this—trained manpower means the difference between the quick and the dead—just that—for the individual and the Nation alike.

But the pressure minority which has succeeded in defeating every universal military training recommendation won't be found among the fighting dead—not if it can help it.

Indeed, is this a day of remembrance—of remembering more than 35 years of futile striving for that which commonsense dictates we should have—a great pool of trained manpower in being rather than in a general staff's plans cabinet.

No; we do not have universal military training and we do have a national crime picture which is a shocking national disgrace. Serious crimes have increased 62.7 percent while the population has increased only 21.3 percent. The FBI estimates that the next decade will witness a 22 percent increase in crime over present levels. Last year, more than 2 million major crimes were committed, while there were 18½ million lesser offenses.

Last year an estimated 519,000 children, aged 10 through 17 were arrested, or 1 out of every 38 boys and girls in this age group. Commenting on this terrifying picture, FBI Director Hoover says:

"The juvenile jungle has resulted from insufficient spiritual and moral training. Until youth learns to know, respect, and obey the teachings of Almighty God, we can never expect them to obey civil law or the laws of society. The crime problem is essentially a youth problem. Law enforcement and the entire community must concentrate more and more on the problem of the juvenile."

No; we do not have universal military training but we do have the world's worst crime rate and nearly 1 million juvenile delinquents. We do not claim that universal military training would be a cure-all because it wouldn't but it would provide the element of discipline so essential to a progressive, prosperous society. And all of us here know that there is no greater refining agent in the world than that represented by the Armed Forces wherein the men are separated from the boys and the gold and the dross revealed.

Lest you get the idea that I am melancholy and doleful, let me say emphatically that I am not. I believe in the goodness of God. I believe in the greatness of the American people and I believe that this Nation has a God-given destiny. It is just that I wish we would choose to follow the commonsense highways to that destiny and so be spared the agonies of repetitious crucifixions born of our unpreparedness, our forgetfulness, and our downright apathy.

Far from being fearful or doleful I believe with all my heart that if we seek our destiny with unity, courage, and morality we shall survive, come all the world or all the evils of darkness against us.

Fearing is completely out of national character. Lets have none of it.

Look back a little way on this day of remembrance. Look back only a little way to the empire builders who wrote a compact on the *Mayflower* and to those who came after.

Their tools were simple—the axe and the hammer.

With them they cleared the forests, bridged the streams, built cabins and churches and schools, worked hard, played hard, fought hard.

They stuck a primer in their back pocket, put a Bible under one arm and a rifle under the other.

With those tools they transformed a wilderness into this paradise of freedom.

Sometimes it seems almost that we into whose hands the task of guarding the national heritage has passed have forgotten both God and the rifle.

We need both.

And we need to recapture our Fathers' tremendous, dynamic faith. Faith in God's all-encompassing goodness—faith in the dignity of man—faith in this Nation so truly blessed—faith in our own ability to preserve our way of life for those who come after.

All of us were very little boys and girls once. I wonder if your mother taught you, as mine did me, a little bedtime prayer that went—

"Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray Thee
Lord my soul to keep.
If I should die before I wake, I pray Thee
Lord my soul to take."

During the Battle of Britain, a friend of mine, the late Dr. Merrick Fiefield McCarthy, a poet-professor of medicine at the University of Cincinnati rewrote it, called it the British Childrens' Prayer. It went like this—a most proper expression, I believe, of our determination to keep faith with those we have remembered today—the silent ones who are round about us:

"'Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray Thee Lord my soul to keep!"
If this night's sleep should end in rest
That is forever, keep me blest
Within Thy mercy! May I be
Child of Thy kingdom, safe and free.

"If I should wake within the night
To see the sky all red with light—
And hear the rooftops of the town
With our own walls come tumbling down—
May I not fear, O Lord, to die.

"'If I should die before I wake
I pray Thee, Lord, my soul to take!'
But should I live the long night through,
When I arise my work to do,
May I with courage seek to be
Not safe, O Lord, not safe
But free!"

Ten Years of the Polish "People's" Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pamphlet written by Dr. Richard F. Staar, professor of political science, Harding College, Searcy, Ark., in which he discusses what has been going on in Poland under the Communist regime over the past 10 years:

TEN YEARS OF THE POLISH "PEOPLE'S" REPUBLIC

(By Richard F. Staar)

No more chillingly clear picture of the Soviet pattern for gaining control of a country is available than that of Poland—a country which has been transformed, in the space of 10 years, from a vigorously free nation to a completely Communist-controlled satellite. This transformation has been carried out in two stages which can be roughly designated as (1) the period, 1944–48, when pretended support of nationalistic ambitions covered the gradual elimination of all opponents of Communist power, and (2) the period up to the present, in which the foundatitons of socialism were carefully laid.

Communist control over Poland is openly avowed, with the theory of people's democracy merely a convenient rationalization for the masses. The political structure of the country is actually based upon the U. S. S. R. prototype, while the limited retention of certain traditional terminology serves as a semantic smokescreen.

The Soviet pattern was perhaps most tangibly portrayed through the adoption of a Stalinist-type constitution which very closely resembles the 1936 basic law of the U. S. S. R. This similarly extends to the incorporation of whole passages from the latter into the Polish constitution. The 1952 basic law of Poland comprises merely a balance sheet of achievements thus far registered by that country's people's democracy and is essentially a description of the political, social, and economic structure of the state. It does not, however, elucidate the goals which the Communists expect to attain in the future. As such, the present constitution will most probably be replaced by another document, when and if socialism is officially proclaimed to have been achieved in Poland. This will certainly be done without the benefit of a national referendum or any other device for consulting the population.

In the two times that they have officially consulted public opinion to date, the Polish Communists have consistently refused to permit any freedom of expression—a freedom that was guaranteed by the Big Three at Yalta and subsequently reaffirmed at Potsdam. Since their nationwide campaign of terror and intimidation apparently could not produce desired results, the Communists resorted to falsification of the 1947 balloting for Deputies to the Polish Parliament. They also succeeded in destroying, by the end of that same year, the only legal and effectively organized political opposition—the Polish Peasant Party. Western democratic forms were discarded as no longer necessary in 1952, and the electorate was provided with no alternative to the single list of candidates offered by the Communist-dominated people's front.

Having provided themselves with a rubber-stamp parliament, the Communists have been able increasingly to implement their national policies with little regard for public opinion since Peasant Party leader Stanislaw Mikolajczyk fled Poland, in late 1947. The initial agricultural program of fostering small private farms (and the distribution of 7 million hectares of land to poor peasants) has given way to a progressively intensified collectivization drive. Despite a combination of considerable pressure and various inducements on the part of the regime, approximately only 250,000 of the three-million-odd peasant proprietors have joined collective farms over the past 6 years. (This is the official Communist figure.) It would thus seem that many more years will pass before total collectivization can be achieved in Poland at this rate.

Industry, on the other hand, has been completely nationalized on the medium- and large-scale levels. Commencing with the end of World War II, this process of nationalization has almost totally encompassed the small entrepreneur after 10 years. Capital investment is being allocated priority over consumer production, and financial assistance from the U. S. S. R. is relied upon for a successful conclusion of the current 6-year economic plan. Substantial increases in the production of all commodities and raw materials are expected by the end of 1955. The planned economy of Poland has also involved currency manipulations, which have so far twice wiped out the savings of the population.

Although the Communist program in the sphere of social work has officially equal-

ized the status of women with that of men, the former are expected to work in factories as well as to bear children for the state. By the end of the Six Year Plan (1950–55), it is expected that almost two million women will be employed in industry. Regimentation of labor in general has been introduced through the medium of the state-controlled trade union organization and by means of a series of laws. Communist-directed mass organizations have as their task the influencing of the remaining population. Most of these social groups are linked in one way or another with similar movements in other orbit countries and also with world-wide Communist organizations.

In the field of foreign affairs, Poland can hardly claim to have a policy of its own. The regime in Warsaw is a puppet of the Kremlin and, as such, loyally supports the latter. Apart from acting as a mouthpiece for the Soviets in world affairs, the Polish Communists may possibly exercise a small degree of independence in their relations with other satellite states in Eastern Europe and the Balkans. The economic aspects of these relations, however, are controlled by the Soviet-sponsored Council of Mutual Economic Assistance. On the political side, a similar role may be played by the Communist Information Bureau (Cominform). The puppets in Warsaw most probably realize that their position can be maintained only with U. S. S. R. support. A series of strategic treaties binds all satellites separately to one another and each state individually to Moscow.

Apart from these treaty obligations, Poland's defense policies are controlled by Soviet officers who fill all key positions in that country's military establishment. Here again, regulations for the armed forces are copied verbatim from the U. S. S. R., and an intensive program of Communist political education follows Soviet lines with regard to officers and enlisted men alike. This training is probably aimed at producing a military establishment that can eventually be integrated with the Soviet Army. Whether Polish troops would fight loyally on the side of their Soviet and satellite allies, in case of a war with the West, is open to question.

For all practical purposes, there is only one political party in the Poland of 1955. This Communist group is called the Polish United Workers' Party (PZPR) and is organized along the same lines as its counterpart, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The rapid growth in size of the Polish Communist movement during the postwar period is actually one of the PZPR's principal weaknesses. It indicates that at the most 1.5 percent of the membership is relatively trustworthy, having belonged to the Communist movement before 1944 when the party was illegal. Apparently aware of this, PZPR authorities purged almost 400,000 members between January 1949 and June 1952.

Another weakness is presented by the party's social composition. Despite a widely publicized drive to improve the latter, the number of industrial workers has been constantly decreasing since the end of 1948. On the other hand, the ranks of mental workers (intellectuals) within the PZPR were steadily growing until the latter part of 1950. A decrease, similar to that for industrial workers, has also been noticeable with reference to the peasantry. Over two-thirds of the latter, who hold membership in the party, have been recruited from the middle and rich—indicating the relatively weak support of communism by the poor peasants. It is also significant that only a little over one-half of the peasant Communists, living in the vicinity of collective farms in early 1953, were actually members of these "kolkhozes."

Yet another deficiency of the Polish United Workers' Party is to be found in the fact that most of its officials in the primary party organizations are intellectuals or industrial workers not engaged in production. In such capacities, they are unable to influence effectively the output of mines or factories.

Party operations consequently suffer from what is known as "bureaucratic formalism." Some of these deficiencies may be offset, to a certain extent, by the activities of the party's auxiliary youth movements.

The principal one among these is the voluntary Union of Polish Youth (ZMP), patterned after the "Komsomol" organization in the Soviet Union. Representing a key to higher education, professional advancement, better paying positions, etc., the ZMP has been able to enlist within its ranks only less than one-fourth of all eligible youth. The Union of Polish Youth itself in turn provides the leadership for a different youth organization, operated by the Communist government.

This other youth movement is organized along paramilitary lines and is known as the "Service to Poland" (SP). Membership here is compulsory for all boys and girls between the ages of 16 and 21. It has been admitted by the organization's chief commandant that ideological indoctrination of SP trainees is much more important than the auxiliary labor force which they provide. The political education of all youth through the SP would indeed seem to represent the principal objective of the Warsaw regime, since the Union of Polish Youth embraces only a fraction of that age group.

Besides the youth movements, the Polish United Workers' Party also directs two quasi-political organizations which were established for definite social segments of the adult population. These are the United Peasant and the Democratic Parties. Both have representation in the Parliament and in the Government, but it is disproportionately small in comparison with the strata of society whose interests they allegedly protect.

Directed by the Communists, these two parties have received specific assignments in the regime's drive to collectivize the peasantry and to socialize all remaining private enterprise, respectively. When these objectives will have been attained, or perhaps even prior to that time, it is probable that these two subsidiary political groupings will pass resolutions dissolving themselves. Strictly controlled, as they have been over the past few years, these parties present no danger to the Communist power position.

Actually, the only organization in the Poland of 1955 which could successfully compete with the regime for the allegiance of the population is the Roman Catholic Church. In order to eliminate any such potential threat, the Polish Communists have been employing a variety of means—with some success—to destroy the prestige of the church and to transform that body into a Government-directed group, sensitive to Communist orders.

The church itself, although its nominal adherents number almost 98 percent of the total population, is far from the tightly organized center of resistance to communization that it could have become at one time in the recent past. The maneuverings of the Communist regime have placed the church increasingly on the defensive. As the result of a Government decree on filling ecclesiastical positions, the Communists now have, in effect, a veto power over all church appointments.

At the time of this writing (early 1955), the Roman Catholic Church is making a concerted attempt to convince the Communist authorities that the latter should abide by the terms of their previous, more conciliatory church-state agreement (April 1950). On the basis of past performance, there would seem to be little hope that the regime will honor the obligations it entered into at that time.

Gain or Loss?—What Can We Expect From the New Session of Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article, appearing in the Independent Woman of January 1956, explains why so many thinking, progressive women are opposed to a lower retirement age for women than for men.

As one who has long fought for equality, and who has opposed special privileges, I am especially pleased that the Federation of Business and Professional Women are standing firmly for progress and equality.

The article is as follows:

GAIN OR LOSS?—WHAT CAN WE EXPECT FROM THE NEW SESSION OF CONGRESS?

(By Isabella J. Jones)

As it looks now, the problems most likely to obtain legislative action during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, convening January 3, 1956, are disarmament, education, health and medical research, highways, housing, and Social Security Act amendments.

As business and professional women we have a major interest in each of these areas and should watch closely to see that our national interests, and our interests as women, are furthered and safeguarded by any legislation proposed and passed in these fields. Although there is frequent newspaper and other speculation on possibilities of various tax reductions during the 1956 session of Congress, this remains speculation.

We must, however, take a long, hard look at the very real possibility that the Senate will concur with the House to pass a bill amending the Social Security Act to lower the retirement age for women only. H. R. 7225, passed by the House in July 1955, which would lower the retirement age for women to 62, passed by a majority of 372 to 31. And it must be remembered that many of our staunchest advocates of the equal-rights amendment in the House of Representatives voted for the passage of this bill.

To have voted against it would have been to vote also against many provisions within the same bill that each of these Representatives believed desirable and even urgent.

How then, can we, as a federation, best make our position clear on a uniform retirement age for men and women to those Senators who will be studying the House-passed bill, and other similar bills, and later voting upon such legislation?

First, we must clearly understand, ourselves, why a uniform retirement age is important—important to us as women seeking the simple justice of legal equality—important to us as breadwinners, as homemakers, providers.

We simply cannot afford not to think this proposed age difference through to what it actually means to us.

If women may be expected to retire at an earlier age than men, they will be at a disadvantage in seeking employment or promotion, especially in their later years when their skills and experience will be discounted in favor of men who may be counted upon to stay longer at their posts. Recently, a high administration official, who is backing the bill generally, pointed out that lowering the retirement age for women only would be a reversal of the present trend toward extending employment to older women.

A difference in the legal retirement age for men and women negates the principle of

equality for women, both in law, and in custom. Such a difference would hold us back, perhaps for years, until this legislation was revoked, from obtaining either equal rights or equal pay. It would not only hold us back; it would set us back for years—wiping out many of the hard-won gains of our long, upward climb.

On June 27, 1955, as national chairman of legislation, I filed a letter in behalf of the federation with the chairmen of both the House Ways and Means, and the Senate Committees, expressing blanket opposition of the federation to any legislation lowering the retirement age for women only. Many such bills were before the committee at that time, and H. R. 7225 had not yet passed the House.

This stand is the only one compatible with our philosophy in regard to, and our legislative endorsement of, the equal rights amendment. We stand for actual, equal legal rights, without the so-called protective laws or special privileges, which are, in fact, special drawbacks, especially affecting and injuring us in times of unemployment, or when women are proposed for equal consideration with men for promotion in their jobs, or appointment or election to positions of high responsibility.

It is well known that a discrimination or difference that first gains acceptance on a voluntary basis quickly becomes in custom and in fact an arbitrary and binding straitjacket. There is no advantage that we can gain from any retirement age difference by sex; there is only great and accumulative disadvantage. Lowering of retirement age, for reasons of hardship, regardless of sex, and many other desirable amendments to the Social Security Act retirement provisions may be among the many proposals to be studied by the Senate Finance Committee, which has this legislation under its jurisdiction.

I sincerely hope that all our membership will give immediate study to this very immediate problem. We must make it clear to our Senators and Congressmen through letters and personal contacts that we are opposed to a difference in retirement age for men and women; we are not opposed to lowering of the retirement age of both men and women.

I hope to give you within the near future an encouraging report on the 1956 status of the equal rights amendment, and the outlook for the federation-approved equal pay bills.

Some Reflections on the Subject of Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, United States Army, before The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., January 21, 1956.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF LEADERSHIP

(Address by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, before The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., January 21, 1956)

In appearing before the student body of The Citadel, with its long military tradition, I have had no reluctance in choosing a military subject for discussion. I recognize in The Citadel a cradle of the military traditions of South Carolina—indeed, of the entire South. It is an honor for me to appear before you to discuss a subject which has always been dear to my heart, the subject of military leadership.

I think that most of us have acquired from our studies of history a great interest in the distinguished military names that appear on its pages. How many of us have looked on a portrait of General Lee and wondered about the qualities which he possessed, and speculated on the reasons for his great hold on his soldiers and his success in leading them on the battlefield? Similarly, the many legends clustered about the name of Napoleon create in most of us a deep curiosity over the nature of the man and the attributes which account for his success.

Leadership in the abstract is difficult to analyze and to define. Like electricity, it can be explained by its effects more easily than by a determination of its essential nature. The results of good military leadership can be assessed in terms of victories won, of the enemy destroyed, and of missions achieved. However, it is another matter to dissect the character of the leader responsible for these effects and to extract for inspection those characteristics which explain the results he achieved.

In my talk this morning, I am going to consider only American military leaders. There was a time when we looked only abroad for examples of military leadership, when the great captains worthy of study included few, if any, of our countrymen. American military leaders, somewhat like American tenors, have been slow to gain recognition at home.

However, since the Civil War, the world-wide reputation of American soldiers has steadily increased. Oddly enough, here at home we have been the last, perhaps, to recognize the worldwide reputation of American arms. Although we are quick to boast of the highest waterfalls, of the deepest canyons, of the most automobiles, and of the tallest skyscrapers, very few of us ever extend our chests and boast of the quality of American military leadership.

Yet the facts remain that American military leaders have far excelled the military feats of the greatest of foreign leaders. General Eisenhower liberated more territory than Caesar conquered. General Clark led to victory the troops of more foreign nations than Hannibal whom past history has recorded as the master of coalition warfare. Fourteen American generals in World War II had more troops under their command than were ever under the banners of Napoleon. The United States as a nation in World War II participated in campaigns which freed areas vaster in size and more widely dispersed than the conquests of any other nation in the world's history.

Are not the men who led these campaigns worthy of the attention previously lavished on foreign models? I would say yes, that we are justified in turning to American examples for case studies in military leadership. There is the added advantage that at the same time we will be studying American troops, and probing the military characteristics of our own people.

There are a great many fallacies expressed about leadership. For example, it is said that military leaders are born and not made. I do not believe that for a moment. Our entire Army school system is a testimonial to our belief that leadership can be taught, and the success of its officer graduates testifies to the fact that it has been taught. This school system begins at West Point, extends through the many service schools teaching the techniques of the arms and services, and culminates in the Army War College and the National War College, designed to cultivate the minds of the future senior leaders of the military service. It was this school system which developed our leaders during the lean years between World Wars I and II, when the Army had few units to command and little opportunity to gain tactical experience in leadership.

Another fallacy which one encounters is that leadership expresses itself in some mysterious way through flashes of genius. One hears of the intuitive genius of Napoleon which led to the concept of the maneuver of Austerlitz. One hears of the marvelous insight of Wellington in picking the moment to order, "Up guards, and at them" for the decisive counterattack of Waterloo. I believe that a careful analysis of such situations will reveal no stroke of revelation. The good general does not await a bright light, like that which appeared to Saul on the way to Damascus, to obtain a vision of the road to victory. If he has not behind him a lifetime of professional study, if he has not brought to this campaign diligent preparation, careful anticipation of all possibilities, and a body of men believing in him as their leader, it is most improbable that he will receive a stroke of genius to bail him out in a crisis.

We hear sometimes that special gadgets or special formations—tricks, as it were—are responsible for successful leadership in battle. One reads of the magic of the double envelopment at Cannae as explaining the great success of Hannibal in annihilating the Romans. The military as well as laymen are taken in. The German strategists adopted the cult of the double envelopment before World War I and made it a fetish of their military doctrine. Similarly, the Theban phalanx of Epaminondas or the oblique order of attack of Frederick the Great are sometimes cited as examples of military formations with an intrinsic capability of assuring success. I believe that an analysis of these examples would reveal that success depended on different and more important things.

Putting aside these fallacies and related considerations of what leadership is not, let us take a positive approach and see if it is possible to agree on certain attributes which appear present in men who have evinced good leadership. If I were asked what were the most important characteristics of the great military leaders whom I have known, or have studied, I would be inclined to respond that these commanders all have had at least three characteristics in common. First, they had the gift of human understanding. Next, they were men outstanding for their obvious professional competence. And, finally, they were men of strong and independent character. Now, let me talk about each one of these characteristics in turn.

I would remind you that the American leader has rarely had the opportunity to command professional soldiers in time of war. If you look back on our history, you will see that Washington, Lee, Pershing, Eisenhower all built their armies from citizen soldiers. It has been the problem of providing leadership for the citizen soldier that has confronted every great leader in every one of our wars. Perhaps we should consider some of the characteristics of this civilian who in time of war must be converted into a soldier.

In the first place, he usually joins the Army either reluctantly or with considerable trepidation. He knows little about military life and what he has heard isn't good. Once in uniform he finds himself in a strange environment. He misses his family and his friends and feels alone among strangers. Surrounded by strange institutions and customs, he feels vaguely threatened by the unfamiliar present and even more by the uncertain future. His conception of war and battle has been distorted by misleading literature—in modern times, abetted by Hollywood. At such a troubled time, the citizen soldier needs someone in whom he can have confidence, someone who will build up the feeling that he is a protected human entity. That someone should be his military leader. If his commander does not have the capacity to fill this need, he will never get

the most from the recruit. I believe that, if you will read the pages of our history carefully, you will find that no American commander ever rose to greatness who did not have this capacity. They convinced their citizen soldiers that they put them first and prized them above all else. In other words, they have the gift of human understanding.

Few leaders in all history have had the wholehearted support of their men to the extent that the Army of Northern Virginia was devoted to their commander, Robert E. Lee. While much of this support can be attributed to the professional qualities of General Lee, a large measure of his success was due to the fact that the Army knew that General Lee did his best to provide for their welfare. He was loyal to them, and they were loyal to him. When he ordered them to dig entrenchments—work which all soldiers hate—they knew that the work was necessary and was done to protect their lives. They knew when he ordered them into battle that he had wisely planned so that they could succeed with minimum losses. Soldiers were not "cannon fodder" to General Lee. They were comrades associated in the common enterprise of defeating the enemy and serving a cause to which they were all devoted. Furthermore, his soldiers knew that this comradeship was no mere lip service, for General Lee lived just as simply as they. His table was no better their theirs and often worse. The gifts of food which he received from friends, General Lee would send to the hospitals for the wounded. The devotion which his conduct engendered in his men accounts more for his success, I believe, than the brilliance of his tactical maneuvers. General Lee enjoyed the gift of human understanding.

Our successful American leaders, through their gifts of understanding people, have demonstrated the art of welding individuals into units, where their separate strengths are multiplied as parts of a greater whole. From the time the citizen-soldier joins a unit, he must be made to feel that the unit is his home, that his fellow-soldiers are his comrades. This work of indoctrination must start from the first day of a man's service. That is the moment the alert commander will seize to convince the recruit that he is in the best outfit in the Army. He will learn its history and quickly come to feel that it is a great honor to belong to such an outfit. He will hear daily the theme: "You, the recruit, are joining a proved outfit which is glad to have you. It will look after you, but you must look after its reputation. Its past history has been paid for by the blood of the killed and wounded. It is up to you, the recruit, to live up to the record of these men who have made history."

Propaganda without substance will, of course, fail. The recruit must be able to verify in his daily living that the unit is as good as he has been told. The commander must show by his behavior that the "Old Man" is always on the job, that he sees that the rations come up in time, that the mail is never delivered late, and that he is always looking for better conditions so as to improve the lot of his men. If on all sides there is this common tie of service—of the commander serving his men, of the men serving the commander—this will be a unit truly formidable in battle.

After World War II, many studies were made to determine why men fight. Although many reasons were discovered, the outstanding one was simply this: A man fought and refused to run away because of his own self-respect and the attendant desire to retain the consideration of his comrades. Although I commanded a very proud division, the 101st Airborne, I always discovered in my conversations with my men that it was not the division's reputation particularly which stirred them to action. It was rather Baker Company, or Charlie Company, of some particular regiment, and the nexus of personal relationships between the men of the squad, of the platoon, and of the company.

I always talked to my recruits who joined this division, particularly anxious to discover why they had volunteered for parachute duty. I would go along the line talking to each man and asking why he had volunteered. Usually I got some chesty kind of reply, but on one occasion I received one which truly appealed to me. I asked this young parachutist did he like to jump out of airplanes. He came back quickly, "No, sir." Surprised, I asked, "Well, then, why did you volunteer to jump out of airplanes?" He said, "Sir, I like to be with men who do like to jump out of airplanes." I shook hands with him and said, "Soldier, that makes two of us." That response is a good answer to the question of why men fight. Men fight, not because they would not prefer to run away, but because they prefer even more the association of men who do like to fight.

A clinching evidence of the possession of human understanding on the part of a successful leader is his ability to treat men as individuals and not as Army serial numbers. American troops, in particular, resent any suggestion that they are without individuality, that they are ciphers, and not people. They want to be known for themselves and will resist any efforts to mold them into an anonymous pattern.

Every great soldier has succeeded in convincing his men that he knows and respects them as individuals. To accomplish this end he goes among his men, freely mingling with them and giving the soldiers a chance to look him over and size him up. An officer who barricades himself behind his rank is properly suspected of having weaknesses to conceal—probably more than he really has. The successful commander claims no infallibility and is not afraid to expose himself to close view. Instead, he is often seen among his men. He learns their surnames and calls them by name at every opportunity. It is said of Caesar that he never lacked a pleasant word for his soldiers. He remembered the face of anyone who had done a gallant deed and, when not in the presence of the enemy, joined his men in soldier games. Such human acts as these inspired his legionnaires with a devotion that went far to account for his success as a great captain.

A commander shows understanding of the kind we are discussing if he goes out of his way to explain the need of his orders and the reason for the actions required of his men. During the last war, most successful generals went to great pains in explaining their detailed plans in advance of asking troops to execute them. In our American landings in North Africa, Sicily, at Salerno, and in Normandy, commanders were most careful to brief their men thoroughly on what to expect and why. They remembered the words of General Von Steuben, who wrote back to Germany from America during the Revolution. "The genius of this American Nation is not the least to be compared with that of the Prussians, Austrians, or French. You say to your soldier, 'Do this' and he doeth it. But I am obliged to say, 'This is the reason why you ought to do that' and then he does it." This explaining of "why" to the troops goes beyond the need for an explanation of individual battles or campaigns. It should cover the entire question of, "Why we fight." Nothing keeps a man going in war like a strong belief in his cause. We need only recall the fervor which sustained the Southern States in the Civil War. It was the Confederate soldier's love of his cause that kept him going for 4 long years, when he was poorly equipped, seldom fed, and nearly always fighting against great odds. It was only when a similar spirit became common among the armies of the North that the tide of victory turned.

I think that this discussion of the need for human understanding as an element of successful leadership can be summed up by saying that it is the exercise of common sense in human relations. There are times to be stern; there are times to be lenient; there are times to be exacting; and there are times to be tolerant. This feeling for the right course of action to be taken with men appears, sometimes, to be instinctive in some leaders and often lacking in others. But it can be cultivated and developed by all.

The second of the trio of virtues of the successful leader is personal professional competence. The leader must know his business and the men must know that he knows. War is a terribly serious matter and our citizen-soldiers want their lives protected by experts. There may be the tendency to belittle the professional soldier in time of peace; but when war comes, our citizens want to feel that their destiny is in the hands of professionals. To become this professional, an officer must devote his life to constant study and self-improvement. He will need to prepare himself by study, by actual command of small units and, most importantly, by unending reflection on the exacting requirements of professional leadership in future war.

At West Point, I often tried to determine a relationship between cadet records and subsequent success in the Army. I would like to report that scholarship—that is, high class standing—accounts for success in the Army. I must report in all honesty that the record proves no such thing. An examination of the standing of successful World War II generals indicates that it is only a slight advantage to graduate in the upper half of the class rather than in the lower half. Even the very tail of the class—the immortal goats, as we call them—have contributed their part to American generalship. In Civil War times, George Custer and George Pickett were both last in their classes at West Point. Several of our most successful generals in World War II were in the lowest academic 10 percent. It took George Patton 5 years to complete the 4-year course.

I would say, however, that in examining the records of these outstanding individuals who had done poorly as cadets, there seems always to have been a factor present which, perhaps, accounts for their subsequent records. In most of the cases which I personally know, these officers were slow in starting but sure and steady in progress. They were men who never ceased to grow and expand. Their minds were constantly reaching out as their experience increased. I believe that the capacity and will to grow is a most important factor in postgraduate success and one difficult to evaluate in undergraduate days. Hence, it is dangerous to conclude too soon that a man has no aptitude for the military service. He may be a slow starter but one who gradually accelerates in moving toward his goal.

Even with the gifts of human understanding and of professional competence arising from careful training, our military leader will not be complete without the third attribute of greatness; namely, character—character which reflects inner strength and justified confidence in oneself. To give an impression of strength, a leader must consider his personal appearance, his physical condition, his tone of voice, his method of life—all of those things which give an impression of his character to those who follow him. This does not mean the development of an artificial personality. All of us have certain basic traits which are given us at birth. We all have a core of personality which cannot be tampered with but which

can be constantly developed. A facade of sham will not serve. If you would have your troops believe that you are strong, you must be strong. If you would teach them to be rugged, you must avoid the soft life yourself. If you would have your men be brave, you must yourself set an example of valor.

To bring the full force of his character to bear effectively upon his men, a leader must resort to every device of personal leadership. I have heard it said that the day is past in modern war when the leader can place himself in front of his men and inspire them to action in the tradition of the Civil War brigadiers who charged on foot or on horseback at the head of their men. I do not believe this for a moment. Personal leadership is still possible within limits, and within those limits it is the duty of the commander to supply it. General Doolittle electrified a discouraged allied world by his personal leadership when he flew his B–25 off the flight deck of the *Hornet* in the first retaliatory air attack on Japan. General Patton was a model to his officers and men by his personal intervention on the battlefield; there was no point on the front where he, an Army commander, did not go and show himself to his troops. Your own president, General Clark, was equally conspicuous in his personal intervention in battle and his appearance at the most perilous spot of the action.

Where a Patton impressed his character by dash and flamboyant gallantry, a Bradley was equally impressive in an entirely different way. I always remember General Bradleys final conference with his generals at Bristol in England before the takeoff for Normandy. He reviewed our plans for the campaign, conducted the tactical discussions himself, and displayed a surprisingly intimate knowledge of the proposed actions of the smallest units of his army. He gave a suggestion here and offered help there, and showed the entire gathering the extent of his personal competence as a high commander. When the meeting came to a close, he obviously felt that some words were needed to launch the greatest military enterprise in history. But General Bradley, great man that he is, is not an orator. He stood up before the gathering, clasped his hands behind his back, looked the group over, and gulped his adams apple. His eyes got a little damp as he looked about him; and then he said quietly, "Goodbye. Good luck." That was all. But his commanders went off determined to win a victory for Bradley in Normandy.

I have now discussed at some length the three qualities which I think all successful leaders have had and must have: human understanding, professional competence, and strength of character. What can the leader accomplish who develops all these attributes in felicitous combination

First and foremost, he can expect to get the best out of his troops. And American troops at their best are without equal. No foreign army can compare with ours when the latter is properly led. American soldiers have courage, physical vigor, initiative, and dash. All of these are rich talents which they bring and place at the disposal of the commander who knows how to unify them with the catalyst of true discipline. The discipline I mean is that which binds in fellowship—the kind which produces the willing and cheerful subordination of the individual to the success of the team. Do not confuse this kind of discipline with the external appearances of conventional discipline, the salute, the knock on the orderly room door, or the formula of deference to superiors—in short, military courtesy as it is prescribed in our field manuals. The latter has its place, particularly in a peacetime army. But they are not the indices of the discipline which really counts. The Army of northern Virginia would have rated very low in military discipline in this restricted sense. It would never have won a first line at a Citadel parade; but by its spirit, it won a place among the great fighting units of all times—alongside of Xenophon's Ten Thousand, Caesar's Tenth Legion, and Napoleon's Old Guard. American troops with their natural qualities, plus such discipline, are irresistible.

I would close this discussion by asking a question. Are the requirements of military leadership becoming more difficult in this changing period of warfare? And I would answer by saying: the requirements for character and human understanding have been with military leaders of every age and remain relatively constant. On the other hand, the requirements of professional competence become greater as our weapons systems become more complicated and as the possible combinations of military force become more greatly diversified.

With new advances in technology our leaders must learn more of the language of science. With a wider distribution of Army forces and interests about the world they must speak also the language of politics and diplomacy—never forgetting that they are soldiers. Thus, the attainment of professional competence is an ever-widening requirement. Hence it is that I look to civilian schools and colleges like the Citadel in the expectation that they will supplement our military-school system in providing the future leaders which the Nation will require. The Army of the future has a place for all talents, for those of the artisan, the businessman, the scientist, the scholar—yes, for the genius.

It is for this reason that I urge the adoption of a slogan reflecting the need for constantly improved military leadership. If we are to survive as a nation, we can afford only an Army which is an Army second to none, with leaders second to none. That is why I say our national slogan should be, "Let us put the best heads of America into the Army caps of tomorrow." I hope that some of these best heads in this audience of the Citadel will some day find themselves in the cap of the United States Army.

Thank you.

Acadian Bicentennial Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, we of Louisiana feel very proud of the Acadian bicentennial celebration staged so successfully in our State during 1955. This year-long observance opened with special events at the New Orleans Sugar Bowl on New Year's Day and was climaxed with a brilliant finale in Longfellow-Evangeline State Park, certainly one of the most beautiful public parks in the country, at St. Martinville, my hometown. Here the talents of several hundred of their descendents were utilized in honoring the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians to Louisiana from Nova Scotia, and large numbers of the State's outstanding musicians and dancers joined in the presentation of a most colorful folk festival.

The bicentennial year included a visit to Louisiana by a delegation from French Canada, a pilgrimage to the Mother Church of the Acadians at St. Martinville, and a reciprocal goodwill trip to Nova Scotia by a large party of prominent Louisianians.

Other events added to the great interest shared in the observance by thousands of visitors from throughout the United States and from abroad, who helped to make this the greatest statewide celebration in Louisiana's history.

We are grateful for the recognition given the bicentennial by Congress in adopting a concurrent resolution which I had the privilege of introducing in the House and which was sponsored in the Senate by United States Senators ALLEN J. ELLENDER and RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana. A similar measure was offered in the House by Representative T. A. THOMPSON.

The concurrent resolution stated that "the Congress of the United States joins the people of Louisiana in commemorating the bicentennial anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, and pays tribute to their spirit of courage, perseverence, and loyalty that has inspired the Nation."

Appreciation to all who had a part in the program has been expressed by Dr. Thomas J. Arceneaux, president of the Acadian Bicentennial Celebration Association. In behalf of the executive committee and himself, Dr. Arceneaux, dean of the College of Agriculture at Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette, a State college which is doing much to preserve the French language and picturesque Acadian customs in that section, points out that national attention has been centered on the State and fitting honor has been paid to a people who have contributed so much to Louisiana.

Realists of the VFW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Timothy J. Murphy, is one of our outstanding citizens and a valued friend of mine of years. He is serving this great American veterans' organization with great ability and outstanding tact, as well as courage.

I include with pleasure in my extension, an editorial relating to National Commander Murphy, Realists of the VFW, appearing in the Boston Post, of September 6, 1955.

REALISTS OF THE VFW

It isn't always possible to agree with all the resolutions the Veterans of Foreign Wars adopt in convention, but no American citizen can fail to admire the courage, the outspokenness, and the air of honest patriotism in which they are expressed.

These men, all of whom risked their lives to defend this country, are real believers in

the essential American system. They understand its fundamental meanings and freedoms which it insures. Having lived and fought under the iron discipline necessary in war, they appreciate the liberty which Americans exercise in peacetime.

They do not take this precious freedom for granted, either. They are alert to any threats, from within or without. And when there is even a hint of danger, they speak up boldly and with a loud voice. Because of their numbers and because of their background, they are heard with respect not only by the public but also by public officials. And there is no reason to doubt that their pronouncements are studied with care and respect in the Kremlin.

Their new national commander, Timothy J. Murphy of Milton, summed up for them in his inauguration address at the Boston convention. He promised that the VFW will remain alert, in the national interest, that they "will not be lulled by the present sweetness-and-light policy of international communism."

Mr. Murphy asked a question, in the course of the same speech. "Do you know," he asked his fellow veterans, "of any top Communist who has ever denied that the mission of communism is to destroy capitalism and achieve world conquest?"

That question has been asked before, of course. But it needs to be asked again and again. For most of the world is so desperately eager to have peace that we are apt to forget that the answer is still "No."

Because of the Russians' present "soft" policy, there is an unfortunate tendency to speak altogether too softly, as though perhaps bold honesty might do some damage. The time is now to discourage that kind of weakness.

The time is now for courageous realism in face of the Reds. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have always been courageous and realistic, too. Their organization is a great peacetime sentinel of Americanism.

Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, at Salute-to-Eisenhower Banquet in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on last Friday evening, our very distinguished and able colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] delivered an address at Philadelphia. I believe the address should be carefully read by all Members of the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Philadelphia holds many happy memories for me—of friendships and hospitable homes, of winning 2 college-crew races in 1 day on the Schuylkill—but by far the most pleasant of all is my friendship and daily contact with your two fine Senators—ED. MARTIN and JIM DUFF. Serving first as a governor with ED MARTIN, I have worked with him over the years in Washington. Later JIM DUFF and I became friends when he was your governor. That friendship and respect for him have increased in Washington. You have two conscientious, hard-working men of integrity and experience in Government representing you in the United States Senate.

This is a great week for Boston and Philadelphia. First we celebrate the 250th anniversary of Benjamin Franklin's birth and now I have the pleasure of joining you in your salute to our great President—Dwight Eisenhower.

Boston was the birthplace of Benjamin Franklin; Philadelphia became his chosen place of home and business. I suppose, when every true American thinks of Philadelphia, he hears the Liberty Bell. How symbolic is that bell in the history of our country.

Back in Massachusetts there is a story that in the latter years of Benjamin Franklin's life, not long after the town of Franklin, Mass., was incorporated, its people wrote to your great citizen and said they were building a steeple for their townhall. They told him they would be honored if he would contribute the bell to be hung in that steeple. Franklin, who was abroad at the time, replied characteristically: "Sense is better than sound," he wrote. "I am sending you a gift of books from London."

I tell this little story not to minimize the proclamation of "liberty throughout the land and unto all its inhabitants thereof" that was made by the Liberty Bell, but, being a Massachusetts man, I take some pride in the fact that Benjamin Franklin, born in our city of Boston, placed sense—good Yankee commonsense—above the ringing sounds of a fine bell.

Tonight we are gathered together to salute another great American, as great in his day as Benjamin Franklin was in that vital period of our history between 1750 and 1800. We are gathered to pay our tribute to a man of action, of great commonsense, a man of character, integrity, and patriotism.

There is perhaps no citizen within our memory who, as a civilian and as a soldier, has served our country more faithfully or with greater effect. It has been the good fortune of few to equal his career as a soldier, a diplomatic administrator, and a statesman. It is the good fortune of few to qualify as his equal in the highest office of our land.

As a soldier he was the leader of the combined free forces in fighting Hitlerism. As a soldier and as a diplomat, he was the first Commander in Chief of NATO, organized to preserve the peace that had been won at such great sacrifice and to build up a greater security against a future world war.

Now as the President of our country, he has the responsibility not only of being the Chief Executive of the United States, but also of being the head of the country recognized as the leader of the forces of freedom as they seek greater peace in the world. Truly, today, as the President of the United States, chosen by the people, Dwight Eisenhower has proved himself a political leader of enormous ability and personal appeal.

So, tonight we render him our salute. In so doing we rededicate ourselves to the task of maintaining peace in the world, achieving greater prosperity and more happiness for the people of our country. With pride we believe that he is a man fit to walk beside Benjamin Franklin and those other defenders of our freedom and our future, whose names and public serivce are engraved on our history.

Recently Mrs. Saltonstall and I completed a trip that took us into many countries as we went around the world. In almost every one of those places I saw their leaders and each time the first question that was asked of me was, "How is your great President? We hope he is getting well rapidly. We need him in his sincere effort to strengthen our security and the peace of the world. We need him as do you."

Let's look at the record as the late Governor Smith, a Democrat, used to say. But let us look at the Eisenhower record. Let us recall for a moment those objectives which persuaded Eisenhower to make himself available as a candidate for the Presidency.

The most appealing issue of the campaign of 1952 was to end the war in Korea. Eisenhower promised to do his best to do that. It has been ended.

He declared his firm intention to rout Communists out of our Government and out of our industrial life. That routing of the Reds has gone forward actively, relentlessly, and generally successfully.

Corruption in public service has been stopped. That record speaks emphatically for itself.

As a candidate Ike resolved to eliminate economic controls and thereby unshackle our economy, which he was convinced could realize undreamed-of potentials.

The year 1955 with its many new records proves the wisdom and success of that policy. Nineteen fifty-five shows a gross national product of almost $387 billions, 6 percent above 1953's, the all-time high. The average weekly wage is running as high as $76, with 63 million people employed. Just think of it. We built 7,250,000 new automobiles and installed some 7,600,000 new TV sets in 1955.

Candidate Eisenhower, as he promised faithfully to do, has established a climate in labor relations in which our industrial effort has reached these unparalleled successes because there were fewer major labor disputes and greater progress and achievement by both management and labor than has been recorded in several decades.

He pledged himself to reduce the Federal payroll, to balance the budget, and to reduce, if possible, high taxes, and thus increase the ability of men and women everywhere to have more to spend for their needs. Taxes were reduced, and we look to a balanced budget and to an ever-increasing efficiency in government.

You and I supported the President in his campaign because we believed in a restoration to the States and to the individual communities of those rights and authority properly due them. The events of every passing day give witness to this respect for local decision and local control of affairs in every area of government where the best decision is the decision made by men and women close to home.

In this era where the free peoples must be constantly alert and where strength, firmness, and unity are the foundation upon which we must build greater security and enduring peace, Candidate Eisenhower pledged a reordering of our defensive posture. As Commander in Chief, he has built, and is continuing to build, a defensive force on the ground, in the air, and on the sea that has the ability to meet the challenges of the nuclear age in which we live, and yet at the same time achieve that posture with a due respect for the health of the economy over the long pull. That is the only way upon which the foundations of our military security can be maintained.

The Air Force program—to reach 137 wings at the end of fiscal year 1957—is a little ahead of schedule, and we will have 131 wings at the end of the present fiscal year. All medium bomber wings of the Strategic Air Command are now equipped with six-jet B–47's. These B–47's, together with a very large fleet of KC–97 tankers and an extensive overseas base complex, constitute our principal ready striking force. Our forces today represent a deadly deterrent for any country considering an attack on us because of their strength, their modern equipment, and their ability to retaliate promptly with devastating effect.

Truly, Korea, communism, corruption, and change were the issues of the campaign of 1952. These issues brought pledges of action—pledges that have been kept.

What everyone of us wants in government is confidence in the integrity, admiration of the character, and reliance upon the word of those whom we vote into high office. Three

years have proved that President Eisenhower and the men whom he has chosen to work with him have kept his campaign promises to a remarkable degree—not an easy thing to do at any time, and even more difficult in these days, when crises loom suddenly at home or abroad in the East or in the West.

Now, as men and women who love our homes, are proud of the places in which we live and work, we face the challenging job ahead. We face our responsibilities determined to see it that we have a government in which we have confidence, one in which we can take real pride.

On such an occasion as this, when we salute our great President—Dwight Eisenhower—it is fitting and proper that we take a close look and a long look at that job ahead.

It is right that we ask ourselves why it is we want to maintain strongly the ideals and the policies of Ike's administration. It is timely that we rededicate ourselves right now to this program which has as its heart the maintaining of peace in the world and the creation of greater prosperity and progress for all in this great country of ours.

To maintain our security and to win greater opportunities for peace in the world is our primary objective for the future. Our success in that endeavor depends upon two great fundamentals. First, the effective enunciation of, and the persistent endeavor to carry forward, an imaginative, sound, sensible, long-range foreign policy—not to react any more than is absolutely necessary to day-to-day crises that may occur, but, rather, to sustain the confidence of the free peoples of the world in what we are trying to accomplish over the years. This requires careful planning at home and effective action on those plans in everyone of our embassies and consulates throughout the world.

I was impressed as I went around the world by the high caliber of the men and women working for us everywhere, sometimes under very difficult conditions. I was equally impressed by the knowleige that the people in these countries, as well as their leaders, have of us. They look to us for leadership. They admire us, they respect us, they envy us, and, naturally, they are going to try to get from us all that they think they can.

We on our part must give them confidence that we are going to stay with them in their efforts to gain real freedom and a better life. At the same time we must never let ourselves forget that the cornerstone upon which our foreign policy is laid is that action which will provide greater security and a better opportunity for ourselves here at home. That is the aim, I know, of the Eisenhower administration.

To back up that long-range policy, we must be strong in a military sense. Our forces must be equipped with the most modern weapons available. There must be sufficient young men efficiently trained so that they can carry out their duties with the least possible danger to themselves and for the maximum defense of this Nation. This goal requires constant research and experiment, efficient production, and an ever-increasing expense as weapons become more complicated and destructive.

In this time of tension, in this atomic age, we can no longer plan, as did the great Confederate general, Nathaniel Bedford Forrest, just to "git thar fustest with the mostest." Ours is the tougher job of "gittin thar fustest with the mostest of the bestest," if any aggressor takes the field.

Manpower alone will not prevail in modern warfare. Nuclear weapons alone will not achieve victory. What is required is a shrewd, skillful, sensible balancing of the two in such a way as to make most effective use of our Armed Forces in order that they in turn may offer the greatest possible deterrent power, whenever and wherever required. No one realizes this more clearly, no one is more determined to see that this military stature is maintained effectively than is the man in the White House today.

These are the facets of the administration concerning security and peace that play upon us at home and concern many, many peoples in many sections of the world today.

But, basic also to our own future, is the progressive and honest administration of those obligations of government which we have determined over the years to be those responsibilities that we believe government can bear better for us than we can for ourselves at home, in our towns, or in our States.

Time does not permit me, nor would you desire me to discuss these questions 1 by 1. Let us remember that the President, as a good administrator and as a loving father and grandfather, understands these problems as does every man and woman in his own home. I think they are best expressed by the statement that the President made to the 48 Republican national committeemen on September 10, 1953, in Denver, Colo., when he said: "If we are for the people, which means for the individual as such, we go first to the 10 first amendments of the Constitution—the Bill of Rights. That was written for the people. That Bill of Rights does not guarantee to each of us a profitable living. It guarantees to each of us an equal opportunity with all others to earn our living for ourselves and for our families, and to protect our future.

"We could discuss further what we mean by 'for the people,' but I refer to another quotation of Lincoln's which was generally to this effect, 'The function of government is to do for the people what the individual cannot do at all, or do so well for himself, and in all those things which the individual can do for himself, the government ought not to interfere.' "

What I have had to say about our national defense, our foreign policy, our sound economy, applies to these words of the President. There is equal application of those words to be found in the vigorous attack which this administration is making on the problem of school construction and of highway construction, in the fields of health, education, and welfare, with most immediate stress placed upon amendments to our social-security laws in order that more Americans may be included within their benefits.

It is to be found, inspiringly, in the historic, unprecedented progress that has been made in the winning of civil rights for ever more Americans. It is revealed, dramatically, in this administration's blueprinting of further campaigns of conscience against those restrictions and discriminations which have been anything but American.

When we salute President Eisenhower tonight, we salute one who believes in our history and our traditions and in our continuing progress and growth, who thinks not of himself but of what he, as long as he is in the White House, can do to better the life of each and every one of us. When we salute our President, we salute a man who has great understanding of world problems and a unique experience in dealing with the leaders of the world. He wants peace. He wants progress and he will do everything in his power to continue to work for that peace and that progress.

His epochal speech to the General Assembly of the United Nations in December 1953 radiated that confidence and his sincere determination to work toward these objectives among the peoples of the world, whatever their racial origin, wherever they may live.

Truly, we can go home tonight firm in the realization that this administration is determined to achieve peace with honor, peace with security, peace with prosperity, peace with progress, and a leadership of our affairs at home that will offer greater opportunities for every American.

This dinner is of and by itself a salute to a great American. It represents also a gathering of patriotic citizens who recognize that still more is required of each of us—in our hearts, in our minds, and in our daily devotion to duty as we tackle the job ahead under the leadership of this man we salute tonight. That job can be done and will be done.

Let me conclude with the words of that great man who was born in our Boston 250 years ago this week and became your great Philadelphian:

"It is undoubtedly the duty of all persons to serve the country they live in, according to their abilities. Let it suffice, that I now take up a resolution, to do for the future all that lies in my way for the service of my countrymen."

Dwight D. Eisenhower fulfills admirably today that patriotic sentiment of Benjamin Franklin's spoken over 200 years ago.

The Aerotrain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. DUFF

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of Mr. J. M. Symes, president, the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., at the aerotrain dinner in Philadelphia, Pa., on January 5, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends of the Pennsylvania Railroad, we are indeed happy to have you as our guests this evening.

I am sure that the General Motors officers who are with us tonight join us of the Pennsylvania Railroad in congratulating their new train on the distinguished clientele which it drew for its inaugural run. We are flattered, and I am sure they are, by the interest you have shown, the questions you have asked—and for the time you have given to make this first trip a memorable one.

As I look around this room I see many people that I have talked to at various times about the railroad business. On occasion, as some of you know, I have come armed for those talks with statistics—and charts—and pages of presentation. Let me assure you that I am not going to talk about the railroads at any great length tonight. Although I will say, as an aside, that there is certainly a temptation—before this particular audience—to get in some licks on some of the things that should be done about some of our problems. I feel a little bit like being loose at Fort Knox with directions that I must not touch anything.

One thing I do want to do is to praise General Motors for the courage, skill, and cooperation which has characterized their research and which has brought so many benefits to the railroad industry—to the American economy generally—and which promise to continue to the mutual advantage of all concerned.

We have witnessed today their latest contribution—a low-cost, lightweight train—and it is a very significant contribution.

No one knows what is going to be the final solution for the equipment side of the railroad passenger problem. No one knows yet what the final answers will be—either in engineering, comfort, or convenience. I am

sure you all know that the train we rode today is not a final product. In building it General Motors have already learned two or three things which, if they were doing it again, they could change and improve. But in this initial development they have contributed significantly—both on the engineering side and on the economic side—toward finding a way to build railroad passenger coaches which will help us meet the service and economic conditions of the future.

Without going into details about the problem railroads face in the future of their passenger service, I will simply mention a few of the facts with which a railroad must live if it is to be successful in operating passenger service at a profit in the future:

1. The speed of the airplane.
2. The price of bus transportation.
3. The convenience of the private automobile—which also has an immediate low-cost appeal in that a large part of its total operating costs have already been incurred before a decision is made to take any particular trip.
4. The taxes on railroad stations and other passenger facilities—as opposed to publicly owned and operated terminals.
5. The tax on railroad tickets—notwithstanding the huge operating deficit from passenger service.
6. The fluctuating demand for rail-passenger transportation from season to season, day to day, and hour to hour.
7. The standby nature of the service—to protect the deficiencies as a result of weather.

And last, but not least by any means, the prospect of still higher wages as the standard of living and economic progress of the Nation continues to go up through the years ahead.

None of these represents a little problem—and in combination they have discouraged many people, inside and outside of the railroad industry, from making an all-out attempt to find the kind of train equipment—type of service—pricing, and the kind of merchandising and advertising—which will meet all the engineering, economic, and competitive conditions at a profit.

It doesn't look easy. Yet on the other hand the rewards for finding the right answers are great—and the penalty, not only to the railroad industry but to the Nation generally, for failing to find them is even greater.

With this train General Motors is helping the railroad industry to find the answers. We have worked with the General Motors engineers almost continuously since this train was just a gleam in Dezendorf's eye. But, in saying that, let me emphasize that this is entirely their train. They made all of the decisions, all of the experiments, all of the tests—and incidentally and importantly—they put up all of the money.

Certainly they are to be commended for that kind of private enterprise—and the progress it produces.

Personally, I am optimistic that we are going to find some, if not all, of the answers we are looking for—and I am also quite certain that the contribution General Motors has made in producing this Aerotrain is going to help substantially in finding some of the answers of engineering and economics. As you all know, there are several other new types of trains in the shops at the moment—and later on this year you will see some of them introduced into revenue service. All of them will permit new types of testing—both engineering and economic—which have not been available before. I am sure that each will contribute something to the knowledge we need to get the right answers about the equipment part of our passenger problem.

One more brief thought and I am finished—on the surface it may appear that our only motive in this experimental program is to help ourselves as a business. That is certainly our immediate motive. But you must remember that helping ourselves means helping a good many millions of people. It means making our railroads better able to provide good livelihoods for our million or so of direct railroad employees—and the millions of employees of other businesses who earn at least part of their living supplying us with everything from rock ballast and spikes to dining-car food—and to the still more millions of employees in farming, mining, and manufacturing generally whose welfare depends in part on low-cost rail transportation. This is apart from the job we do in getting millions of people to and from work every day, or whom we transport for business or pleasure trips. That is work we want to keep doing, but to do so, we have to find the answers I've mentioned—or else we shall imperil our very existence as a self-supporting, tax-paying, job-and-business-generating industry.

I wish to thank the officers of General Motors for the help they have provided in the past—and for building their new-type passenger train which we rode for the first time today—and which eventually will be a great success—as have their many other developments.

I would like to ask Cy Osborne to accept those thanks on behalf of his great company.

Christian Amendment to Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement with regard to what has come to be called the Christian amendment, written by the Reverend A. J. McFarland, of Sterling, Kans.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHRISTIAN AMENDMENT FLYER

(Rev. A. J. McFarland, Sterling, Kans.)

There is a movement in our Nation to place in the Constitution of the United States an acknowledgment of the Lord Jesus Christ as our Nation's Savior and King, that this Nation under God might have a new birth of freedom. The headquarters of the movement are at 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh 21, Pa.

The proposed amendment is as follows:

"SECTION 1. This Nation devoutly recognizes the authority and law of Jesus Christ, Savior and ruler of nations, through whom are bestowed the blessings of Almighty God.

"SEC. 2. This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization, or in the abridgment of the rights of religious freedom or freedom of speech or press, or of peaceful assemblage.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power, in such cases as it may deem proper, to provide a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unqualified allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended."

SECTION 1

Section 1 is the amendment proper. In considering this section let us note the real value to be gained by having such an amendment.

1. It will bring our Government into line with the moral law of God

According to Holy Scripture civil government is an ordinance of God for the enforcement of justice in human society. (Roman 13: 1–6.) All legitimate governmental authority is derived from Almighty God, through the divine human mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, who has supreme authority over the entire universe. (Psalm 2: 6–12; Matthew 28: 18–20.)

Inasmuch as Christ's supremacy over the universe is absolute and complete, no area of existence can claim exemption from His authority. Therefore, the Government of the United States is bound to make proper recognition and carry on its functions subject to that authority. For a nation to refuse to do so is to be guilty of rebellion against God. To be in rebellion against God, by refusing to obey His revealed will, is to violate the first commandment, thereby violating the whole moral law of God (James 2: 10). To continue violating the moral law of God will result inevitably in incurring the wrath and judgment of God.

The corporate life of the Nation must be distinguished from the life of the individual citizen. The Nation is an organism, a personality. It is capable of acts and attitudes for which no individual can be held entirely responsible. The Nation owes an allegiance to Christ in its own right.

Abraham Lincoln in his proclamation of March 30, 1863, said:

"It is the duty of nations, as well as individuals, to own their dependence upon the overruling power of God, to confess their sins in humble sorrow, and to recognize the sublime truth announced in Holy Scripture and proven in all history that those nations only are blessed whose God is the Lord."

2. It will recognize Christ's claim upon America

The late Dr. Peter Marshall, former Chaplain of the Senate of the United States, preached a sermon on the need of Christ in our Government. On July 10, 1947, this sermon was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A few sentences from the sermon follow:

"It is strange, and I believe tragic, that the Constitution makes no reference to God. * * * Public criticism * * * forced the Congress to make constitutional provision for the rights of man, but no amendment has yet acknowledged the rights of God. * * *

"Forty-three of our States have already written into their constitutions vague religious acknowledgments. All make some reference to a higher power, but not one State honors Jesus Christ.

"Christ said, 'All authority hath been given Me, both in heaven and on earth.' He said again, 'He that honoreth not the Son honoreth not the Father which hath sent Him.' God can be honored only through His Son, the Lord Jesus Christ. All pious, vague affirmations about God as the Supreme Being, etc., are vain unless supreme honor is specifically given to Jesus Christ."

The late Frances E. Willard, first international president of the WCTU, said:

"The organization over which I preside has one organic thought, one absorbing purpose, one underlying enthusiasm—that Christ shall be the world's King—of its camps and its commerce—of its colleges and its cloisters; King of its courts and constitution; Christ and His law the basis of all true government and the supreme authority in individual and national life."

3. It will bring our written Constitution into line with our unwritten constitution

Th Supreme Court in 1892, in the case of *The Church of the Holy Trinity* v. *The United States* (143 U. S. 457, 471), ruled that this is a Christian Nation. The following is part of what was said:

"If we examine the constitutions of the various States, we find in them a constant recognition of religious obligations. Every constitution of every 1 of the 44 States contains language which either directly or by clear implication recognizes a profound reverence for religion, and an assumption that its influence in all human affairs is essential to the well-being of the community.

"There is no dissonance in these declarations, there is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious Nation. These are not individual sayings, nor declarations of private persons; they are the utterances of organic bodies, they speak the voice of the entire people.

"If we pass beyond these matters to view American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. * * * These and many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances to show that this is a Christian Nation."

This being true, let us say so in our written Constitution.

4. It will help to counteract the danger we face in not having such an acknowledgment in our written Constitution

On February 15, 1871, the Honorable William Strong, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States said (Christian Statesman, February 1871, p. 82):

"There is no political document so all important to the American statesman and the American citizen as the Constitution of the United States. All customs, laws, and all forms of administration are shaped by it. Our statesmen, our whole people, are learning their Americanism as to its letter and spirit from that great instrument. That is as it should be. This was intended from the beginning.

"But at the same time it is a serious matter if that Constitution should be found wanting in any principle or matter of fact. Error in the Constitution will work as powerfully as truth, and what is left out of it may one day be formally declared un-American. And one such serious matter there is; one unnecessary and most unfortunate omission. God and Christianity are not once alluded to although the Constitution is itself the product of a Christian civilization and purports to represent the mind of a Christian people. * * * Hence it is that all laws of this country in favor of a Christian morality are enacted outside the Constitution. They rest only on the basis of what is called common law. * * * And as matters seem to be going it will soon be discovered and decreed that common law is only another name for custom which has no binding force. And then where are we? In atheism, corruption, and anarchy."

5. It will prepare our Nation for meeting the present world situation

William Penn said many years ago, "Men will be governed by God, or they will be ruled by tyrants." The present world tragedy has come upon us because the nations of the world have separated God from government. When the Nazi leaders repudiated Christ and Christianity it was easy then for Hitler to move into the moral vacuum created in that government. But we face the same danger. Our Government acknowledges no higher authority than "we, the people" and we cannot lift ourselves by our own bootstraps.

Many nations have learned the hard way that it is God who ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever He will. Recent events have shown that nations which reject God tend to make gods of themselves and become inhuman tyrants. If Christ were put at the foundation of our Government it would be the greatest thing that has happened in our Nation since the Constitution was written. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (I Corinthian 3: 11.)

The Marxian program presents a unified self-confident philosophy of life, a complete world view, but it is godless. How much stronger would be our position if we presented, in opposition, the splendid realities of a God-made, a God-governed, and a God-redeemed world. Let America lead the nations, as nations, to look to Christ as the only way of forgiveness for their sins, and as Lord over all. Then we can with confidence look to Him for deliverance from the enemy within and without.

SECTION 2

The chief purpose of section 2 is to make certain that church and state shall remain separate when this amendment is adopted. The first sentence in this section reads:

"This amendment shall not be interpreted so as to result in the establishment of any particular ecclesiastical organization."

In the constitution of the Christian Amendment Movement there is a section entitled "Basic Principles." The first two points under these basic principles are as follows:

"In the light of Holy Scripture and history, we hold these principles to be true: (a) That church and state, having their origin from God, are both divine institutions; (b) that church and state are distinct and separate in their appropriate and divinely prescribed powers, and therefore control of the state by the church, or control of the church by the state, is contrary to divine design."

1. The meaning of the first amendment to the United States Constitution

The first amendment of the Constitution reads thus:

"Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The first amendment is designed to prohibit the control of Government by any religious organization as the State religion of this country, and also to remove from Government the power to discriminate against persons or institutions on the grounds of their religious belief. It does not mean that the State is to be irreligious; nor that it is to be indifferent to the religious practices of its people. It does not mean to infer that the State is a purely secular institution, utterly removed from the sanctions of moral law and order.

If we can conceive of our Government as a human institution only, we will approach the situation where the supreme authority in our Government will be the ability of the majority to enforce its will, even to the infringement of the basic rights of the minority.

In the 32d and 33d Congresses, a strong effort was made to abolish the office of Chaplain in the Army, the Navy, and the two Houses of Congress, on the ground that they constituted an infringement of the principle of separation of church and State. The effort failed.

The following is taken from the report of the committee to which the petition was referred—report of the Committee on the Judiciary on Chaplains in Congress and in the Army and Navy, House of Representatives (33d Cong., 1st sess., March 27, 1854, Doc. 124):

"Had the people, during the Revolution, had a suspicion of any attempt to war against Christianity, that revolution would have been strangled in the cradle. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution and the amendments, the universal sentiment was that Christianity should be encouraged—not any sect.

"Any attempt to level or discard all religion would have been viewed with universal indignation. * * *

"Your committee concede that the ecclesiastical and civil powers have been and should continue to be entirely divorced from each other. But we beg leave to secure ourselves from the interpretation of asserting religion is not needed to the safety of civil society. It must be considered as the foundation on which the whole structure rests. Laws will not have permanence or power without the sanction of religious sentiment—without the firm belief that there is a power above us that will reward our virtues and punish our sins. In this age there can be no substitute for Christianity. * * *

"That was the religion of the founders of the Republic, and they expected it to remain the religion of their descendants."

2. Christ in government is not the same as church in government

To unite church and state would be a corruption of both. Union of church and state in other countries has warned us of this. Where union exists three things usually result: (a) ownership of church property by the state; (b) employees of church paid out of taxes; (c) administrations of the two organizations are more or less fused.

But this is not involved in any way in the proposed amendment. There would be no support of any denomination by taxation, no fusing of the government of any church with our Federal Government. We acknowledge the Supreme Being in almost all of our State constitutions, and this does not unite any church with any of those States.

No church would tell the state what to do if we had this Christian amendment. Officials would rule as statesmen, not as churchmen. They might be of many religious denominations, but their business as statesmen would be to know what God would have a Christian state to do, and act accordingly. There would be no more union of church and state than right now.

3. Church and state must cooperate in overcoming evil

If Christ were at the head of our Government, and our statesmen looked to Him for guidance and settled all moral problems as He would have them settled, then great things would happen in our Nation. When our institutions become Christian, then the people will be lifted. But when Government, business, the scholastic world, the press and the amusement world are of the earth, earthy, and know little or nothing of Christ, then a good share of the work of the church is canceled. The church and the state must cooperate in combating evils. The church has tried valiantly to lift the people of this Nation into the light that is Christ, but it needs the help of the state.

The thumb and forefinger with which you hold this paper both come out of the hand, both draw their power from the hand, both obey the hand. The church and the state draw their power from Christ, not from one another; both should acknowledge and obey Him. They should cooperate with each other on all moral matters, but neither should rule the other.

SECTION 3

Section 3 protects the rights of minorities.

There is no thought of taking away liberty by this amendment, but only to put it on a firm foundation. The rights of the non-Christian are to be respected. Freedom of speech, press, and worship will be even more secure. This section provides a suitable oath or affirmation for citizens whose religious scruples prevent them from giving unquali-

fied allegiance to the Constitution as herein amended.

It has been said that the adoption of this amendment will make non-Christians second-class citizens. On the other hand, where is the sincere Christian placed when Christ is left out? Christ isn't a mere citizen. He is King of kings, the Saviour of the world, the Prince of peace, the governor among the nations, the Prince of the kings of the earth, the one upon whose shoulder the governments of the world rest. (Isiah 9: 6, 7.) He is the one to whom God has given all authority. Suppose the Government should ask the Christian to do something that he feels is in conflict wih Christ's commands, would he be a second-class citizen if he asked for a modification of the Government's request? Since all authority is given to Christ, what class of citizen would a Christian citizen be in Christ's eyes, if he did nothing about having that authority recognized in the Federal Constitution?

Sections 2 and 3 of the proposed amendment show how carefully the religious scruples of the non-Christian would be respected under a Christian government. But respect for the rights of men must never be made an excuse for ignoring the rights of God.

Three representatives of the Christian amendment group went to call upon the leaders of the American Jewish Committee in New York City. These leaders were told by the representatives that they came as Christians representing a Christian organization and that there was no anti-Semitism in the organization they represented. Dr. Moses Jung, one of the leaders of the American Jewish Committee, stopped the men and said, "Gentlemen, no true Christian can be anti-Semitic." How true. And just as truly no Christian nation can be anti-Semitic.

The Honorable BROOKS HAYS, one of our esteemed Congressmen, stated in a speech recently that he was visiting with a distinguished American rabbi, who told Congressman HAYS of a question he was asked by one of the youth leaders at their meeting in Oslo in 1947. This leader asked the rabbi: "Do you have any message for the Christian youth of today?" The rabbi replied:

"Yes, tell your friends to go home from this conference determined to build a Christian world. If the world in which Hitler lived had been a Christian world, 6 million of my people would not have been done to death."

CALL FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION

An individual doesn't wait until he is perfect before he makes a public profession of faith in Christ; neither is a nation to wait until everyone is Christian before it makes its Christian profession. It isn't hypocritical to have laws against murder on our statute books, even though thousands of murders are committed each year. If someone from outside were to force this Christian amendment upon us, it might be hypocritical, but since it would be the voluntary act of a free people, expressing ourselves collectively, there would be no hypocrisy. It would have to be by a legislative process, of course, since that is the only means a nation has of expressing itself.

CONCLUSION

When Queen Victoria was crowned Queen of the British Empire, the great choir was to sing Handel's Messiah in the coronation ceremony. It was the custom of the British audience to rise when the choir came to the Hallelujah Chorus, but the ladies in waiting, who were preparing the young Queen for her part in the ceremony, told her that being Queen, it would not be proper for her to rise; she should remain seated.

So when the choir began to sing that great chorus, the audience arose but the Queen remained seated; but when they came to that great burst of song, "King of kings and Lord of lords," the Queen quietly arose and bowed her crowned head in expression of the fact that she, as Queen of that mighty empire, was a humble and obedient servant of the King of kings.

Surely America needs to give like obeisance if she is to live and continue as the great leader of the nations of the world.

Report of United States-Israel Relations—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on pages A659, A660, and A661 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 23, 1956, appears part I of the Report on United States-Israel Relations, by Attorney General Jacob K. Javits, of the State of New York, who is a former Member of the House of Representatives. This first part deals with the economic and financial situation.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD part II, which pertains to Israel's international position.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON UNITED STATES-ISRAEL RELATIONS—PART II

(By Attorney General Jacob K. Javits, of New York)

INTERNATIONAL POSITION—PROGRESS TOWARD SECURITY

Present emergency

There is grim realization in Israel that the unrestricted sale of arms by the Communists to Egypt is a grave menace to national survival. Israel recognizes that the border between Israel and Egypt, the Gaza strip, has now become a crucial sector in the anti-Communist front. The country is apprehensive of the danger of another Korea, unless the Government and people are ready and prepared to resist aggressive action. Finally, the Israel political climate is dominated by wide acceptance of the proposition that Israel's orientation in international relations is irrevocably with the United States and the free world.

The Israelis seem to be convinced that they are confronted by total Arab intransigence and that there is no real hope of any negotiations which would affect the immediate situation. Accordingly, they are alarmed by our tendency to credit reports of imminent "negotiations" and the possibility of securing agreements prior to a decision on our part as to how we will answer the current challenge of unrestricted arms sales to Egypt. For, while the Israelis have confidence in the fact that the United States has no desire to let them down, they fear that wishful speculation about agreements may immobilize us and dangerously delay help from the United States which, they feel, they must have immediately if they are to survive. I believe that acts of military reprisal by Israel which have been on occasion severely criticized abroad and by the U. N., have been the product of the frustration of almost continuous Arab harassment and infiltration as well as a feeling that Israel was being made to stand too much alone.

Israelis ask us to compare our view of the hope of agreement with the Japanese right after Pearl Harbor with what they think now of Arab intransigeance toward seeking peace.

I found no desire on the part of Israel to seek territorial expansion. Indeed, it is not indicated by Israel population expectations which can be amply served by the irrigation and development of the Negev, and I found no real or substantial desire for any preventive war because of the wide recognition that any kind of war is disastrous for them, preventive or otherwise. What American opinion should understand, however, is that the people of Israel are unanimous in the fear that the present issue is one of survival. We should realize that for the first time since the 1948–49 war with the Arab States, the people are gravely alarmed. They feel directy threatened by the Communists' unrestricted arms sales to Egypt, by Great Britain's arms shipments to Egypt, and by Israel's own inability up to now to get arms for legitimate self-defense from the United States.

The tripartite declaration of May 1950 of the United States, United Kingdom and France guaranteeing the inviolability of the Israel-Arab armistice lines is appreciated in Israel. But it is pointed out that should Egypt become an aggressor with its newfound modern weapons, small Israel could be overrun in hours or days before the tripartite undertaking could be implemented.

Israel takes an emphatically negative view of the so-called British peace initiative, which is regarded as a British gesture of appeasement at Israel's expense in another vain effort by Britain to ingratiate herself with the Arab States who have so often rebuffed her in the last two decades.

The Israelis contend that the British offer them nothing but the proposition that they give up valuable rights in territory absolutely indispensable to their future without the remotest assurance that such a costly sacrifice would secure a settlement.

The Israelis see that British proposals that Israel cede territory to the Arabs as the price for peace have not seemed to abate Arab intransigence, on the contrary, they seem to tend to encourage the Arabs to believe that the deal with the Communists may pay off—even at the expense of Israel's future.

Military strength, a major fact in any assessment of the current Near East situation, is Israel's defense potential. Israel is estimated to have an integrated ground and air force with some navy complement of 200,000 to 250,000 fully mobilizable within 30 days. Her armed forces are tough, well trained and have battle seasoning. Military service is compulsory, both for young men, and young women. There are liberal exemptions to women for marital status, etc., but practically no exemptions for men. The armed forces teach not only military skills but also citizenship orientation. They continue to be the greatest medium for integrating the inmigrants into Israel and they turn out good soldiers and citizens. Israel's armed services command is more oriented to United States training, ideas and equipment than ever. Many Israel officers are studying in United States military schools and this is entirely in accord with Israel policy. The regular armed forces are backed up by a very high order of civilian morale, a very extensive reserve complement built on 10 years of intensive military training for very large sections of the population and by an excellent industrial workshop.

Military circles appear to be impressed with the fact that the Israelis must get the means to defend themselves if they are to survive. The estimate of time when Egypt and other Arab States may be able to use their newly acquired Communist arms against Israel is considered to be very short. Israel circles estimate it to be 6 to 9 months. It is stated that the jet aircraft, submarines, tanks and other weapons which are being

obtained from the Communists by Egypt (and centurion tanks from Britain) are so greatly superior to conventional weapons with which the Israel military forces are supplied that, even if badly operated, their superiority will still be immediate and manifest.

Infrastructure

It seemed very clear to me that, should the United States be interested in any infrastructure arrangement in Israel for the construction of roads, airfields, ports and other installations, these facilities would be available to the United States in the event of any threat to free-world security in that area of the world. Furthermore, these installations would be backed up by the best industrial workshop in the whole Near East. Also, I am convinced that this policy would be accepted politically as a fact without challenge by political groups of all shades of opinion except the Communists (who represent less than 5 percent of the vote and have only 5 members in Knesset, 4 of whom are Arabs).

The Israel forces appear to be quite ready and able to undertake any mission to assure security for free-world military installations in Israel and also appear to be fully prepared for integration into any appropriate regional security organization.

Palestine-Arab refugees

The resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees, heretofore considered to be the most nettling problem in the area, is now of necessity taking second place in view of the acute tension along the borders which has from time to time flared up in guerrilla as well as organized military action. So too, is the economic bridge—about which our President feels so deeply—which we are endeavoring to build between Israel and the Arab States through the outstanding activities of Ambassador Eric Johnston, the President's personal representative, on the Jordan River water plan. These areas of activity remain just as valid today as they did yesterday but, for the moment, are overshadowed by the security crisis.

It is indeed essential that the immediate emergency be dispelled, if at all possible, so that we may get back to the effort to bring about settlement of what are as much world issues as issues between the Arab States and Israel and to the pacification and stabilization of the whole area.

Indeed, if we are to do anything about the Palestine-Arab refugees now it must be done on a plan analogous to the way the DP's were handled after World War II by resettlement under general free world leadership. U. N. agencies have already spent $208,414,859 on this problem from December 1948 to June 30, 1955, of which the United States has contributed $141,150,000 and other nations the balance. But only 10 percent of this sum, $21,950,988, has been spent for rehabilitation and resettlement, to which the United States has pledged an additional $30 million.

With respect to the Palestine-Arab refugees, it is pointed out that the Arab States have not followed through on the resettlement projects which looked so promising; notably, the project in the Sinai Desert to resettle 50,000 to which Egypt had in effect committed herself and the project related to the Jordan River waters to resettle 200,000 on which the Arab States have held back after the negotiations had been practically completed by President Eisenhower and Ambassador Johnston.

Israelis point out that they have received about 400,000 Jews from Moslem countries in Asia and Africa who were ejected by the Arab States, or whose continuance in the Arab States was made impossible by conditions there. Many of these Jews were stripped of all their property but have been fully resettled in Israel while the 600,000 Arabs who left the territory of Israel continue a dead-end existence in the refugee camps (in which there are now 900,000), and are dependent on the international community.

The example which Israel is setting by making the stony and inhospitable land of the Near East, after centuries of neglect, productive again and by showing how to develop industrialization and organize a modern state constitutes a revolutionary demonstration project for the Arab lands and Arab peoples. It is a ferment which can neither be hidden nor explained away and it is bound ultimately to have a permanent and a decisively beneficial effect for the free world.

CONCLUSIONS

1. By virtue of the unrestricted sales of arms by the Communists to Egypt, the United States is faced with a new situation which requires a decisive revision in United States-Near East policy on the highest priority to include:

(a) Israel's inclusion in a regional security arrangement to which the United States is a party or in a mutual defense agreement with the United States, and the same parallel opportunity to the Arab States;

(b) A commitment for the supply of arms for legitimate self-defense to Israel through such arrangement or agreement;

(c) Arrangements for establishing road, airfields, ports or other installations (infrastructure) within Israel to be available to the free world in the event of a threat to free world security;

(d) Suitable consideration for stock-pilinb of strategic reserves in Israel.

2. Efforts to resettle the Palestine-Arab refugees should be made as an international responsibility not confined to resettlement in the Near East alone.

3. Economic and technical assistance to the Arab States and Israel should be continued, including efforts to effectuate the Jordan River water plan, to bring about construction of the Aswan Dam in Egypt and to carry on major projects in land reclamation and irrigation in Arab lands and to bring about major improvements in health and education.

4. The tripartite declaration of May 1950 by the United States, United Kingdom and France against aggression over the Arab-Israel armistice lines should be reaffirmed and the United States should express its determination to implement the declaration and should invite the other parties to the declaration and the U. N. to do the same as an effective means to prevent war.

The Constitutional Conventions of New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address on the subject The constitutional conventions of New Hampshire, which was delivered by our former colleague, Hon. Robert W. Upton, of New Hampshire, who is president of the 13th constitutional convention of New Hampshire. The address was delivered before the New Hampshire Legislature on July 14, 1955.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the cost of printing the address will be $187. Nevertheless, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

(Address by Robert W. Upton, president of the 13th constitutional convention, delivered before the New Hampshire Legislature on July 14, 1955)

Mr. Speaker, members of the honorable senate and house of representatives, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your generous introduction, which went far beyond my deserts. I am happy to have the opportunity to appear before the members of the honorable senate and the house in joint session, to talk about the constitutional convention. You, Mr. Speaker, have the privilege of presiding over the largest legislative body of any State of the United States. It is a matter for mutual congratulations that over the years the large house and relatively small senate have worked together to give our State good laws. We have been hearing much in recent weeks about meetings at the summit. This meeting, Mr. Speaker, lacks the characteristics of a summit meeting, but it does permit me to bring greetings to you and to the members of the legislature from the 13th constitutional convention. This convention is not in session but it is in being, as it adjourned subject to the call of the president. The large number of delegates before me suggests the presence of a quorum, but I have no thought of reconvening the convention. I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate you upon the fairness, skill, and ability with which you have performed the duties of your important office.

The 13th constitutional convention was held pursuant to the provisions of the constitution, which provide that the sense of the legally qualified voters shall be taken every 7 years on the need for a revision of the constitution. If it shall appear that a majority of the qualified voters present and voting are of the opinion that a revision of the constitution is necessary, then the general court is directed to call a convention. The general court has observed this mandate with the result that 13 constitutional conventions have now been held and a call has issued for the 14th convention to be held next year. The constitutional convention is the only public agency or body authorized to propose amendments to the State constitution, and no amendment is effective unless ratified by a two-thirds vote of the qualified voters who vote on the amendment.

The 13th constitutional convention was convened on May 12 and adjourned on June 4, 1948. The report of the committee on credentials disclosed 453 members, which made it the largest body of its kind to be convened in the United States. The convention was organized on a nonpartisan basis without caucuses or other political machinery. The principal officers, president, secretary, and assistant secretary, were chosen on nominations made from the floor, but it was more than a coincidence that a Republican was chosen to be president and a Democrat to be secretary. The organization of the convention was perfected through a committee on credentials, a committee on permanent organization, and a committee on rules, each consisting of 24 members. The committee on permanent organization had the duty of nominating the remaining officers and attachés of the convention, and in performing this duty the committee chose its nominees largely from the experienced

staff of the house and senate. The committee on rules recommended the adoption of the rules of procedure of the previous convention with minor changes. We enlarged the number of standing committees from 9 to 10 and the members of each committee from 24 to 30, so that as many delegates as possible might have special assignments in the work of the convention. In all some 372 delegates were assigned to committees and others given special assignments during the session, but not all could receive the recognition their due.

Within the time fixed by the rules, a total of 62 resolutions to amend the constitution were introduced and referred to committees. A hearing was held on each resolution by the committee to which referred, and final action was taken upon all resolutions by the convention before adjournment. In all, 11 amendments were agreed to by the convention, which were divided into two classes for submission to the voters for ratification. The first group, consisting of six amendments making vital changes in the constitution, was submitted to the voters at the biennial election of 1948 through specific questions printed on the ballot, directly referring to the amendments. The other group consisting of five amendments striking out obsolete provisions of the constitution were submitted 2 years later at the biennial election of 1950. The amendments submitted in 1948 were rejected with the exception of an amendment increasing the period over which either the house or senate may adjourn, from 2 to 5 days. Why this amendment was ratified and the others rejected I do not pretend to know. Of the 5 amendments rejected 3 related to the taxing power, 1 would have made changes in procedure for calling constitutional conventions, and the other would have authorized a representative for every town and ward without increasing the total number of representatives.

The five amendments striking out obsolete provisions of the Constitution fared no better, as only the amendment striking out the reference to pounds and shillings was ratified. There was no public discussion of these amendments for they were noncontroversial and the voters evidently formed their judgment on the amendments from the questions appearing on the ballot. The convention might have submitted these amendments together with a simple statement of their purposes to be printed on the ballot, but for this there was no precedent and the need for such statement was not realized by the delegates. It may be hoped that the next convention will profit by our experience and submit similar amendments with an explanatory statement of their purpose. The work of this like other Conventions was not necessarily wasted, even though the principal amendments were rejected, as the Convention served to direct the attention of the people to the constitution and its significance in their daily life.

New Hampshire was the first among the colonies to adopt a written constitution. On the eve of the conflict with Great Britain the Colonial House of Representatives on May 28, 1774 created a Committee on Correspondence ostensibly to communicate with other similar committees but actually to organize resistance to British oppression. This committee, formed over the protest of Governor Wentworth, issued the call for the First Provincial Congress, which met at Exeter on July 21, 1774. Due to the urgency of the times the Second and Third Congresses followed in quick succession and gradually assumed full legislative powers. The Fourth Congress met on May 17, 1775 and, before adjournment, created a Committee on Safety and delegated to it the powers of the Congress when not in session. The Fifth Provincial Congress met at Exeter on December 21, 1775, pursuant to a call which, among other things, stated that the delegates would consider the establishment of a form of government for the duration of the struggle with Great Britain. The Congress, accordingly, appointed a committee to draft a new constitution and thus became the first constitutional convention. The constitution submitted by the committee was adopted on January 5, 1776, and provided a simple frame of government in which executive and legislative powers were vested in the legislature consisting of a council of 12 members chosen from the counties and a house of representatives chosen from the towns and parishes. The council was empowered to choose a president from among its own members, who by virtue of his position was the head of the government. The members of the council and of the house were chosen annually at elections held throughout the State. When the legislature was not in session the powers of the government were delegated to the committee on safety. For more than 8 years and until the adoption of the present constitution this government not only prosecuted the war but enacted the large volume of legislation made necessary by the times.

Matthew Thornton was the president of the first constitutional convention, but is known best as a patriot and a signer of the Declaration of Independence. He was a successful physician but early entered public life. He presided over the important fourth and fifth provincial congresses, was a delegate to the Continental Congress, and ended his public career as a judge of the superior court, serving from 1776 to 1782. He was not devoid of wit, as indicated by an incident which occurred while he was presiding with an associate over a jury trial. During the closing arguments, counsel addressing the jury noted that the presiding justice was reading from a book and that his associate was sleeping. He turned to the jury and with emphasis remarked, "Gentlemen, my client has no hope but in your attention since the court in their wisdom will not condescend to hear his case." Judge Thornton looked up from his book and remarked, "When you have anything to offer which is pertinent to the case on trial the court will be happy to hear you. In the meantime, I may as well resume my reading." In spite of his lack of legal training, his administration as judge is reputed to have been impartial and satisfactory.

The need for a permanent constitution resulted in a second convention being held at Concord in June 1778, pursuant to a call issued by the legislature, which provided that any constitution adopted by the convention be submitted to the people for ratification by a three-fourths vote. Meshech Weare, although not a delegate, was chosen to preside over this convention. He was then president of the council, a member of the committee on safety, and chief justice of the superior court, and in these high offices exercised legislative, judicial, and executive powers. These high offices, however, are not the full measure of his public service. He held other positions of trust and confidence, including Speaker of the Colonial House of Representatives. On his retirement from the bench, he was elected governor, then-styled president, in 1784 and became the first to serve under our present Constitution. His notable career still awaits a competent biographer.

The constitution adopted by the convention over which he presided failed of ratification and the third constitutional convention was convened in 1781. This convention submitted two constitutions which were rejected but a third constitution, submitted in 1783, was ratified by the people and went into effect in June 1784. This Constitution provided the form of government which we have today. The amendments have been numerous, but have not changed its essential features.

The fourth convention, convened in 1791, undertook a general revision under the leadership of William Plumer, submitting 72 amendments for ratification. When the convention was reconvened to canvass the vote it was found that 46 amendments had been ratified and 26 rejected. Many of the amendments rejected were so related to the amendments ratified that neither could be effective without the other. The convention accordingly decided to resubmit these amendments in bloc, and in this form they were finally ratified. The amendments did not change the basic principles of the constitution.

It may be observed that from the beginning a small senate and a large house found favor in this State. The size of the senate was originally fixed at 12 members chosen by districts. The representatives were apportioned among the towns and parishes on the basis of rate or taxpayers, and the first house of representatives had 91 members.

The constitution had the approval of the people, as shown by the rejection of proposals for the holding of a convention for more than 50 years. However, the referendum in 1848 resulted in a decisive vote for a convention, and so the fifth constitutional convention was convened in 1850. Franklin Pierce was elected president, and Thomas J. Whipple secretary of this convention, both veterans of the Mexican War. Mr. Pierce 2 years later was elected President of the United States and Mr. Whipple had a distinguished record during the Civil War, finally serving as colonel of the Fourth New Hampshire Regiment. The convention agreed to many changes in the Constitution, and the proposed amendments were submitted to the people by 15 questions, all of which were rejected. The convention on reassembling to canvass the vote decided to resubmit three of the amendments which had been rejected. These amendments would have stricken from the constitution the religious and property tests as qualifications for elective offices and would have empowered the legislature to submit for ratification amendments to the constitution adopted at two successive sessions. Of these three amendments, only the amendment abolishing the property test was ratified.

The sixth constitutional convention was held in 1876. This convention submitted 13 amendments for ratification, making notable changes in the constitution, all but 2 being ratified. The more important of these amendments substituted biennial elections for annual elections, enlarged the senate from 12 to 24 members, reduced the size of the house of representatives by changing the method of apportionment, and struck from the constitution the religious test as a qualification for public office.

The seventh constitutional convention was held in 1889 and submitted seven amendments for ratification, of which five were ratified. One of these amendments changed the time for the meeting of the legislature from June to January and made a like change in the commencement of the terms of the governor and other elective officers. Another amendment provided that towns not having the requisite population to elect a representative be allowed representation in the house of representatives a proportionate part of the time during each apportionment instead of being classed together or united for the purpose of providing the population necessary to elect a representative regularly as had been the practice under the constitution.

We have now reviewed two periods in the development of our constitutional system of government. The formative years were covered by the four conventions which were held during the last quarter of the 18th century and resulted in the constitution under which we live. The three conventions held during the 19th century were devoted to the revision of the constitution to bring the government closer to the people by abolishing

the property and religious tests as qualifications for elective office and by the substitution of population for rate or taxpayers in the apportionment of representatives. These seven conventions were held over a period of 125 years. In contrast, during the present century 6 conventions have been held in less than 50 years. The first convention held in 1902 was characterized by a critical and studied survey of the constitution, but the later conventions have largely been given over to problems peculiar to the times.

The important matters likely to command the attention of the next convention are indicated by the proceedings of the previous conventions. The size of the house of representatives and the apportionment of its members has occupied a commanding place in every constitutional convention. From the beginning of constitutional government in the State, representation in the house has been based upon the towns and wards or parishes, but the rule for apportionment has varied, although a pattern is discernible even here. The constitution of 1784 required for the first representative 150 tax or rate payers, and for each additional representative, 300 rate payers. The legislature was empowered to class together or unite towns having less than the requisite number of taxpayers so as to obtain he number necessary to elect a representative. Under this system of apportionment the first house of representatives, as we have seen, had 91 members. No change in apportionment was made until the convention of 1876, when the house had grown to 393 members. The amendment adopted by this convention made population the basis for apportionment, and provided that for the first representative a town or ward must have 600 inhabitants and for each additional representative, 1,200 inhabitants. This amendment was ratified and reduced the size of the house to approximately 280 members. The convention of 1889 adopted an amendment providing that a town having less than the minimum number of inhabitants required for a representative might be represented a proportionate part of the time during the period covered by an apportionment instead of being classed or united with another town for the election of a representative. This amendment was ratified by the people and has not been changed.

However, the membership of the house continued to increase with the growth in population and by 1900 it had again reached approximately 400. The first four conventions held since the turn of the century adopted five amendments reducing the size of the house, all of which failed of ratification, possibly because these amendments, with a single exception, would have made the reduction at the expense of the cities and larger towns. The convention of 1938 at its first session proposed no amendment reducing the size of the house presumably because the amendments proposed by the four preceding conventions had been rejected. But the census of 1940 disclosed another substantial increase in population with the result that the apportionment made by the legislature of 1941 provided for a house of approximately 450 members. The president of the convention, the late George H. Moses, advised the legislature that he would reconvene the convention for the purpose of reducing the size of the house, if the necessary appropriation was made to cover the costs. As a result the convention was reconvened in September 1941 and adopted an amendment which provided that the house consist of not less than 375 nor more than 400 members and that the number of inhabitants necessary to entitle a town or ward to representative additional to the first shall for each additional representative be twice the number required for the first representative. The convention also proposed two other amendments authorizing absentee voting and the special assessment of standing wood and timber. All three amendments were ratified by the people.

It will be observed that from the beginning the rule or formula for the apportionment of representatives among the towns and wards has been weighted in favor of the smaller towns. In general the same relation between first and additional representatives has been maintained, although the formula has been twice changed. In each of the rules for apportionment twice as many rate payers or inhabitants have been required for an additional representative as for the first. The record indicates that any amendment reducing the size of the house which departs materially from this rule is not likely to be ratified.

The representation of towns having less than the population necessary for a representative has been continued on a proportionate or part-time basis. Apportionments are made by the legislature every 10 years and cover 5 sessions of the legislature. Under the present apportionment, there are more than 100 towns which send representatives a proportionate number of the sessions and of these approximately 50 towns send representatives to only 2 of the 5 sessions. Many of these towns are contiguous and without hardship two or more could be classed together to provide the minimum population necessary for a representative, thus giving continuous representation to the inhabitants of such towns. The next convention presumably will have before it amendments to empower the legislature to unite these towns for the purpose of choosing a representative where it can be done without hardship.

The heavy burden of taxation will undoubtedly result in a determined effort to revise the constitution to confer greater authority on the legislature in the levy and assessment of taxes. This ought not to be necessary as the provisions of the constitution are sufficiently broad to confer all needed power upon the legislature. The constitution was drafted when New Hampshire was an independent State bound to the other States only by the loose ties of the Confederation. The framers of the constitution conferred upon the legislative and the executive departments ample powers for war and peace. For nearly 50 years following the adoption of the constitution, the legislature levied a great variety of taxes and assessments including excises, and placed a practical construction upon the provisions of the constitution relating to taxation, sufficiently broad to meet the requirements of our highly complex society. However, in a series of cases beginning with *Railroad* v. *State* (60 N. H. 87), decided in 1880, the Supreme Court adopted a strict construction of the constitution which practically excluded all forms of taxation except the general property tax. The constitutional amendment of 1902 opened the way for the levy of taxes on inheritances, franchises, and other classes of property, including property passing by sale and property received as income. However, the rule enunciated in *Railroad* v. *State* that all property must be assessed at a uniform valuation and a uniform rate within the taxing district excludes graduated taxes and leaves in doubt the authority of the legislature to classify property according to kind or use for the purpose of taxation. While the legislature now clearly has broad power in the field of taxation, as indicated by the recent decisions and advisory opinions of the Supreme Court, amendments to confer greater authority, including the power to levy graduated taxes on incomes and inheritances, will undoubtedly be among the important measures considered by the next convention.

Since 1900, six conventions have been held and the seventh is to be convened next May. The great majority of the amendments proposed by these conventions have been rejected. Some of the conventions have been held when there was no clearly defined interest in constitutional revision. This has been due to the peculiar provisions of the constitution providing that the sense of the people shall be taken every 7 years on the need for revision of the constitution, and since 1900 the vote has been unfailingly for a convention. Thomas Jefferson strongly favored the holding of frequent conventions, claiming that a constitution ought to be rewritten by each generation. However, our experience indicates that the period between referendums might be increased from 7 to 10 years, or even more, consistently with the public good. Governor Dwinell has proposed that the legislature be empowered to adopt amendments to the constitution to be effective upon ratification by the people. The great majority of State constitutions provide that amendments may be adopted either by the legislature or by constitutional conventions subject to ratification. In those States, the constitutional convention is usually convened only when a general revision of the constitution is deemed necessary. The mode of amending the constitution will be among the important issues before the next convention.

In this outline of amendments likely to be brought before the next convention I have touched upon those of general public interest. In the light of the record of recent conventions, we may assume that other important amendments will be proposed requiring studied consideration. The record of these conventions also discloses that amendments which encounter strong opposition within the convention, if finally submitted to the people, commonly fail to receive the two-thirds vote necessary for ratification.

The constitution of our State is rightly regarded as a priceless heritage. The framers of this constitution met in convention while the war for independence was still undecided, but they viewed the future with confidence. In drafting the constitution, they sought to establish a strong government while preserving to the individual those rights which they deemed inalienable. In keeping with this purpose they finally drafted a constitution providing for a government of limited powers. To prevent abuse in their exercise, the essential powers, legislative, executive and judicial, were delegated to three departments, with the injunction that they "be kept as separate from and independent of each other as the nature of a free government will admit." This delegation of powers was preceded by a bill of rights which, with much particularity, guarantees to the individual, natural and unalienable rights even as against his own government. Among these rights are freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, the right of assembly, the right to acquire and hold property, and the right to trial by jury in both civil and criminal proceedings. In criminal proceedings, the bill of rights assures to the accused the right to have the charges against him stated fully and substantially, the right to be confronted by the witnesses against him, and the right not to be placed twice in jeopardy for the same crime or offense. He is also accorded the privilege against self-incrimination in terms as broad as the fifth amendment to the Federal Constitution. I have referred to these rights and privileges to indicate the broad guarantee of personal rights embodied in the bill of rights, but not to define them. It may suffice to say that these broad guarantees of personal rights constitute a secure foundation for free government by free men.

In this time of trouble characterized by the rule of dictators over much of the world, our constitution takes on a new significance. The government founded thereon has main-

tained order, established justice, insured the general welfare and preserved the freedom of our people. The constitution comes to us from the historic past, but it derives its force as law from the living present. It provides for a government of laws, but it depends for its implementation and validity upon each generation. We thus have the high privilege to maintain our constitutional form of government and, in so doing, to assure freedom under law to those who come after us.

Role of Civil Affairs Military Government Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 7 issue of the Army Times, entitled "Growing Pains Prove CAMG Branch Is a Hefty Offspring." This article, written by Col. Steve Tillman, points up the vital role being played by the newly established Civil Affairs Military Government branch of our armed services in our national defense system.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWING PAINS PROVE CAMG BRANCH IS A HEFTY OFFSPRING

(By Steve Tillman)

WASHINGTON.—Like any infant, the Army's latest baby is going through growing pains, but is adding weight and lung power. I refer to the new Civil Affairs Military Government branch. Launched last August, the branch is primarily for Reserve officers not on active duty.

Before the growing job can be completed there is a tremendous administrative job to be done by Maj. Gen. C. K. Gailey, chief of CAMG, and his staff. Each Reserve officer now with military government units must file an application for transfer to the branch. All MG assignments in the past have been on a branch-immaterial basis.

Army Regulations 140–108 say that these officers will be continued in such assignments if they do not transfer, but that all future assignments will require that the individual be a CAMG officer. The belief of top level leaders in the CAMG field, however, is that all should be members of the corps.

Their feeling is that any new branch or corps of the Army needs the fullest support from its members. Only through this positive type of approach can CAMG truly be made effective, they say.

CAMG has its own school at Camp Gordon, Ga. The first school came into being in 1942 at the University of Virginia and was followed by 12 additional schools at other universities. The school at Camp Gordon became active in 1951, when a CAMG department was established at the Provost Marshal General's school.

Functional activities of CAMG cover such fields as labor, public education, public welfare, public finance, public works and utilities, communications, economics, public safety, etc.

Outstanding public and academic officials with these backgrounds now make up most of the MG officer personnel. One such officer—and the highest ranking one—is Brig. Gen. STROM THURMOND, United States Army Reserve, former governor of South Carolina, and now United States Senator from that State. Another, Col. Charles H. Kraus, of Washington, D. C., another officer, is an authority on international law.

Colonel Kraus, who commands 1 of the 3 highest type units in CAMG—a military government area headquarters—tells me that the organization can be compared to that of a State political body—the headquarters commander as a governor, his chief of labor as a State commissioner of labor, etc.

The inactive duty training of his unit is carried out at Georgetown University here in Washington. Training subjects cover geopolitics, international relations, alien ideologies and economics, comparative government, and studies of foreign countries. Using a meet-the-press technique, the unit had instructors during 1955 who included top level representatives of many foreign embassies.

Military government units range from separate platoons and companies on up to the three area headquarters. The latter are for theater function and would take over occupied territory as the combat area moves on.

The philosophy of our Government is that we do not fight the people of an enemy country, but rather the ideology of the enemy country. But if the occupied area should not be governed by our forces the war could be lost. Hence MG takes over and operates with wide latitude, on American ideologies.

Considerable discussion has taken place among CAMG Reserve officers over the need for greater recognition, in the overall pattern of the Army organization, for their units. This is especially true of the three area headquarters unit. The feeling among informed Reservists is that these units should have brigadier generals rather than colonels, as commanders. They point to the fact that Army has quite a few logistical commands commanded by general-grade officers, rather than colonels.

Early recognition of such a proposal is bound to have a healthy influence on the growing pains of CAMG and place the three units in their rightful sphere, these leaders tell me. There is much to what they contend.

The only Reserve brigadier general now in CAMG is assigned for mobilization purposes to the office of the chief of CAMG as the deputy. With the acceptance of the proposal to give the area headquarters a brigadier general in 1956, CAMG would then have four Reserve general-grade officers.

While the President Convalesces, Bitter Factions Fight for Control of Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the January 1956 issue of the Democratic Digest, entitled "While the President Convalesces, Bitter Factions Fight for Control of Republican Party."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHILE THE PRESIDENT CONVALESCES, BITTER FACTIONS FIGHT FOR CONTROL OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

Fourteen days before President Eisenhower suffered his heart attack, he spoke to Republican Party leaders at a Denver breakfast which has assumed increasing meaning in the light of subsequent events. It was, as a matter of fact, the last time in 1955 when the illusion of Republican Party unity seemed to have some foundation.

To many observers, Mr. Eisenhower's half-hour speech to the 48 Republican State chairmen on that occasion carried overtones of a farewell address. Warning his party against excessive reliance on any indispensable man, he said:

"* * * Humans are frail—and they are mortal. * * * You never pin your flag so tightly to one mast that if a ship sinks you cannot rip it off and nail it to another. It is sometimes good to remember that."

The President's earnest discourse on this theme brought a sobering, if not a chilling shift from the light note on which the meeting had begun. Republican National Chairman Leonard W. Hall, in introducing the President, had alluded to a question often asked him as to what Republicans would do if Mr. Eisenhower did not run for reelection in 1956. Mr. Hall quoted one State chairman, whom he did not name, as providing this answer:

"When I come to that bridge, I'll jump off it."

Mr. Eisenhower joined in the laughter provoked by that quip, but the presidential address which followed was throughout a solemn message—an urgent warning to his party that it faced deep trouble if it must depend on one individual to hold it together.

"If a political party is not held together by a common faith, a common conviction, in certain fundamentals," the President said, "it is not a true political party, but is merely a conspiracy to gain power."

Now, 100 days and innumerable Republican conflicts later, it is abundantly clear that the GO has "jumped off the bridge" into the churning waters of factional warfare.

Despite the restraint on political activity which the President's illness has decreed, the weeks since Mr. Eisenhower was stricken September 24 have been filled with evidences of political maneuvering by leaders of rival GOP groups. Headlines in the daily press record a revival of the quarrels which rocked the party before General Eisenhower's nomination and during the first 2 years of his administration.

For example:

"GOP right wing is stirring again." (New York Times, November 6, 1955.)

"Knowland coalition plan is revealed." (Washington Daily News, November 15, 1955.)

"Ike would be unfair to run, MCCARTHY says." (Washington Daily News, November 15, 1955.)

"Rumblings within the GOP." (Washington Evening Star, November 15.)

"Drift of GOP wings apparent in capital." (Christian Science Monitor, November 14, 1955.)

"GOP leader slaps at Ike—'not Republican.'" (Milwaukee Journal, November 16, 1955.)

The feud between California's Gov. Goodwin Knight and Vice President Nixon, and the rivalry between Nixon and Senator William F. Knowland, of California, are but two of the Republican splits which have widened perceptibly in the anxious days while the Chief Executive has been immobilized.

Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams and Attorney General Brownell have also taken hands in the game of restraining ambitious

Mr. NIXON. They put a quick damper on any move to define Presidential powers which the Vice President might assume during the period of the President's incapacity. Adams' skill in keeping a rein on the Vice President, and, in fact, running the President's office from Mr. Eisenhower's bedside, has considerably advanced his own cause as a major contender in the final GOP showdown over the 1956 nomination prize.

The Adams or White House strategy in playing a "waiting game" on Eisenhower—keeping the country and the politicians guessing as to Mr. Eisenhower's final decision on the 1956 race—has to some degree backfired. While it has had the effect of imposing a prolonged mark time on the Eisenhower wing, it has placed no such inhibition on the rival GOP faction. The swift reactivation of the Old Guard is recorded in press accounts of the new Knowland coalition plan revolving around such rightwing stalwarts as Senate Minority Leader KNOWLAND; Senator BRICKER, of Ohio; Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois; Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin; and Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee.

According to the new rightwing publication, the National Review, the coalition's goal is to tie up 250 delegates to the San Francisco convention in August through a drive in presidential-primary States where the Old Guard still is dominant.

As William S. White reports in the New York Times, the conservatives are confident they have the power to shape if not actually control the 1956 convention, even if the President should designate a White House choice. At the very worst, they would expect to get NIXON, the all-America opportunist. Mr. NIXON now appears to be last on the Old Guard's list of favorite sons, but he still has one foot far enough in the right-wing camp to make all genuine moderates exceedingly unhappy.

Meanwhile, Senator KNOWLAND has been promoting himself vigorously as the white hope of the ultra-conservatives—the designated heir of the Taft following. He is again restating foreign policy views which have brought him into frequent conflict with Mr. Eisenhower. Calling for redemption of the GOP's 1952 liberation policy plank, he recently declared. "I believed then and still believe that this platform pledge was a solemn covenant with the American people, not mere campaign oratory."

At the same time that he reminds his party of his devotion to Old Guard shibboleths, Senator KNOWLAND takes potshots in passing at his great rival from California—NIXON. At an early stage of Mr. Eisenhower's illness, when the press was speculating whether the President would give NIXON the nod as his successor, Senator KNOWLAND remarked that he didn't regard "a Pepsodent smile, a ready quip, an actor's perfection in lines, nor an ability to avoid issues, as a qualification for high office." He has coupled that with insistence that there must be a "wide-open primary" and that the President should announce before January 1 whether or not he would run again.

There are strong indications that Thomas E. Dewey will return to the political battles.

The animosity between Taft and Dewey wings, which produied the famous brawl at the 1952 GOP convention, has not been diluted by the Eisenhower mildness. While this old factional cleavage continues, Republican differences are spreading in other areas.

One of the chief bones of Republican contention is the Eisenhower farm program. Republican varsity members Brownell, Stassen and Summerfield recently were identified in the press as the prime factors in a Cabinet move to dump Agriculture Secretary Benson—an uprising that reportedly was curbed only by Presidential intervention.

However, the anti-Benson pressure continued to mount, prompting the White House to take more energetic measures in an an effort to squelch the insurrection. On November 21, the White House issued a statement that the President "has never entertained at any time any suggestion whatsoever that the Secretary of Agriculture be replaced."

Meanwhile, congressional Republicans in the Midwest and Republican governors in the Farm Belt trumpet their unhappiness over Benson and the administration's lowered price-support program. The Republican National Committee publication, Straight From the Shoulder, recently assailed the Senate Agriculture Committee's nationwide hearings on farm legislation as a political vehicle. That charge drew a quick repudiation from GOP Senators YOUNG, of North Dakota; THYE, of Minnesota; and SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas.

Republican division over labor policy also is crackling. The rightwing led off with an attack on union leaders by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee. As many observers have noted, he is reviving the divide-and-conquer strategy used by the late Senator Taft. His offensive drew quick support from Senator KNOWLAND and National GOP Chairman Hall.

On the other hand, a number of prominent Eisenhower Republicans—among them Labor Secretary Mitchell, White House aid Howard Pyle, Maryland's Governor McKeldin, and Kansas' Gov. Fred Hall—have spoken out sharply against these antilabor utterances. Declaring that Senator GOLDWATER is not expressing administration policy, Labor Secretary Mitchell indicates he will take the dispute direct to the President.

Even the budget balancing effort is producing new turmoil in Ike's team. On one side is Treasury Secretary Humphrey, Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., and International Cooperation Director John Hollister, all reported holding out for reduced foreign-aid programs at a time when the Soviet Union is reaching boldly for the initiative in this field. Against them, according to Drew Pearson, is Harold Stassen, Mr. Eisenhower's new "Secretary of Peace," and many State Department officials.

Another difference develops over the administration's attempt to formulate a program for aiding distressed communities and industries in this country. Washington columnist Robert S. Allen reports Labor Secretary Mitchell and Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks are divided on important details of the proposed program. Meanwhile, the wide difference between Weeks and Mitchell on administration labor policy remains unresolved.

Sharpening of the administration's conflict over labor policy is reflected further in the abrupt dropping of Lothair Teetor from his post as Assistant Secretary of Commerce. His antiunion bias had made him a target of wide criticism. Before Weeks brought him to Washington, Teetor was head of the Perfect Circle Corp., a company which has waged a bitter struggle against unions in its Indiana plants.

The area of Republican squabbles was widened again just the other day when Attorney General Brownell accused the Small Business Administration of operating in an "indirect and haphazard" manner, and failing to place enough curbs on possible monopolies. Capitol reporters were unable to recall another instance since the administration took office when one Federal agency has officially rebuked another. Observers of what is happening in Washington wonder more and more what basis there is for the frequent Republican boasts that the team is running everything beautifully while the President regains his strength.

An internal struggle over the administration's discredited Federal employees security system boiled to a new high point late in November when Attorney General Brownell formally asked the Subversive Activities Control Board to consider bias and prejudice charges against an Eisenhower appointee to the Board, Harry P. Cain. Cain, a former GOP Senator from Washington State, earlier got unshirted hell from Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams over his outspoken criticism of the system. Cain told a reporter "I tried to explain the merits of my criticism of the security program, but he [Adams] snorted: 'To hell with the merits * * * this is a team, and you are expected to play on it.'"

Senator MCCARTHY is pumping hard again on the anti-Eisenhower bellows. His recent broadcasting of Communist infiltration charges against the Eisenhower National Labor Relations Board opens a new run of the smear bucket brigade. MCCARTHY's recent declaration that the President would be unfair to both himself and the American people if he runs again sets the undisputed low for rude gratuitous advice to the ailing Chief Executive.

Other Republican extremists are unable to repress their eagerness to retire Ike. "Eisenhower is no more a Republican than Stalin," declared Edgar C. Bundy, of Chicago, president of the Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club, in a mid-November address to the Milwaukee branch of his organization. Members of his audience cheered as he praised the late Senator Taft, Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Gov. J. Bracken Lee of Utah. They booed at mention of Thomas E. Dewey, Harold E. Stassen, Sherman Adamas and Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin.

Utah's Governor Lee, who apparently wants to repeal the entire 20th century, feels encouraged these days to make fresh exhibitions of his disaproval of Eisenhower's Washington. In view of the way things now are turning in his party, he has some right to feel that he was a reliable prophet last February when he touched off the revolt against Eisenhower at the Chicago rally of the Old Guard.

The Bracken Lees and the Bundys of the party get comfort in their intemperate line from some of the highest Republican circles in Washington. They cannot fail to note that a statement from GOP Senators welcoming the President back to Washington from Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Denver, carried the signatures of only 29 of the 47 Republican Members of the Upper Chamber.

From Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, Mr. Eisenhower's home State, comes the only spirited protest which an important GOP leader has uttered to date against Republican disloyalty to the President. Speaking November 16 at a dinner of the National Republican Club, New York City, Governor Hall said that a basic Republican difficulty today is that so many Republicans are out of step with the President, and with the people who voted for him in 1952.

"At a time when we can ill afford the loss of a vote we are alienating the support of millions of Americans, particularly those of labor and agriculture," he added. "We are fighting with the farmers. We are fighting with labor."

His defense of the President drew angry retorts from conservative Republican organs like the Chicago Tribune and the New York Daily News. Hall's isolated position in the family quarrel is but another manifestation of the Eisenhower wing's virtual eclipse—a phenomenon which columnist Doris Fleeson terms "one of the political mysteries of the last 3 years." Mr. Eisenhower's own stature and wide public acceptance have tended to obscure the "failure of the Eisenhower wing to assert itself more strongly than it has," she observes. But, she adds, it is a fact that

the President himself "and a few people close to him have been the Eisenhower bloc so far as power and purpose are concerned."

Only now, as the Republican contest for succession to the supreme authority quickens, is the country beginning to perceive how remarkably light an impression the Eisenhower image actually has made on his party. While fresh incidents of Republican discord on the national level remind us daily that the GOP has not accepted the moderate philosophy which Mr. Eisenhower has sought to exemplify, there are multiplying signs that the GOP disunity extends to the farthest reaches of the organization.

One of the more acute Republican internal disorders rages in the Western State—California—which has produced three of the principal figures in the national contention for the Eisenhower succession. Another agitated Republican State is Kansas. Governor Hall's fight to put some fire in the Eisenhower crusade is seriously complicated by his bitter struggle back home with the faction headed by Republican National Committeeeman Harry Darby and Senator FRANK CARLSON. In Wisconsin, the McCarthyites are aiming to unhorse Senator WILEY for his support of President Eisenhower. New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut—the list of sore spots runs long.

Republican awareness of their party's wasting internal sickness has now become intense, as a result of the President's illness, and their panic accounts for the mounting pressure on Mr. Eisenhower to run again at all costs. Their mood is accurately described by the Kansas City Star's publisher-editor, Roy A. Roberts, who writes that the Republican Party "is apt to be sicker than the President himself" if he doesn't run again.

Whatever Mr. Eisenhower decides, the record shows that the Republican Party never wanted to follow the Eisenhower moderate course, and still doesn't. Moreover, the record shows that even Mr. Eisenhower's great magnetism is not strong enough to unite his dissident party, nor potent enough to bring the GOP old guard into the 20th century. For the first 2 years of his term, he meekly accepted interference, harassment, embarrassment from the right wing. The result was chaos, and drift in the National Government, and the Republican Party's badgering of its own President did not come to a halt until the people elected a Democratic Congress, which proceeded to restore the constitutional balance in Washington.

The national peril growing out of the anarchic state in the Republican Party was discussed by Walter Lippmann in an article that appeared some 2 months before the President fell ill. He observed that Democratic control of Congress had enabled President Eisenhower to act like the President, and warned of what would happen if the GOP extremists returned to power.

"If Mr. Eisenhower decides to run again, one of his big headaches will come from the fact that as party leader he must work for a Republican Congress and frown upon the Democrats," Mr. Lippmann wrote. "Yet as President he needs a Democratic Congress. I know it is looking very far into the unknown future to say this. But it looks to me that in a second term Mr. Eisenhower would need a Democratic Congress as much, perhaps even more, than he needs it today."

As Mr. Lippmann noted, if the Republicans were to ride Ike's coattails back to control of Congress, the power on Capitol Hill would return to the same willful band which made a nightmare of Mr. Eisenhower's first 2 years. And, because of the 2-term Presidential limitation which the GOP invented, they would feel under even less compulsion to respect the White House than they did in 1953 and 1954. With the impairment of Mr. Eisenhower's health which has since come about, the chances for compounding a national tragedy with a great personal tragedy obviously are enormous in the circumstances.

Whether or not Mr. Eisenhower had a premonition at Denver last September 10 when he warned the 48 GOP State chairmen that a President is a frail mortal, this fact is clear: He had, as of that date, come to the end of the road with the Republican Party—a party which has shown that it cannot or will not heed his advice that it must have a common faith, a common conviction in certain fundamentals. It now is paying the penalty reserved for all parties which have degenerated into a mere conspiracy to gain power.

Facts About Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Facts About Gas," which appeared in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of January 23, 1956. The Chicago Daily Sun-Times is a very well-edited, liberal, independent paper, and the editorial, two full columns in length, discusses the Harris-Fulbright bill. It is a very well reasoned editorial and is, I think, of general interest.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT GAS

Chicago householders who heat their homes with gas and the 125,000 families on the waiting list for such service should have a special interest in the gas debate now going on in the United States Senate.

The debate centers on the Harris-Fulbright bill. It would exempt producers of natural gas—the owners of gas wells—from Federal regulation as public utilities. It would restore a condition that existed prior to June 1954, when a Supreme Court decision forced the Government to take over regulation of the wells.

Opponents of the bill, who want the Government to set strict price controls on gas at the wellhead, argue that if the Harris-Fullbright bill passes, the price of gas to homeowners will be raised unconscionably. Supporters of the bill deny this and point out that from 1938 to 1953, during a period when there was no Federal control, prices rose only 7 percent while the cost of living generally went up 90 percent. Today gas is the best heating buy on the market—and that's why there's such a waiting list for gas service. Only 10 percent of the consumer's bill goes to the gas well owner. The rest goes to pipelines and local gas companies.

A careful examination of the issues has convinced us that the best interests of producers and consumers will be served if the Senate approves the bill and the President signs it. The House has already passed it.

Public utility price controls over gas producers are, in our opinion, both unfair and unworkable. This Nation never has put such controls on natural gas until the Supreme Court decision of 1954.

It must be understood the Supreme Court did not pass judgment on the arguments for or against Federal control. It simply decided that the wording of a 1938 act of Congress showed Congress intended that there should be such control. In 1950, Congress passed a bill saying it intended no such thing, but President Truman vetoed it. The issue is up again this week.

One of the arguments for controls goes like this: The consumer's furnace actually is connected with the gas well. The price the consumer pays the gas company is regulated (because the gas company is a monopoly); the price the company pays the pipeline is regulated by the Federal Power Commission, so the price the pipeline pays the producer should be regulated.

Your electric lights are tied to a coal mine, too, but no one is advocating putting coal under Federal price control because it is hauled by a regulated railroad to a regulated electric company to be burned to produce electricity for your lights.

The rates charged by the electric, gas, and telephone companies are set by State commissions because they are monopolies. They are granted monopolies because it would be nonsensical to have several competing companies tearing up the streets. The rate generally set is cost plus 6-percent profit. Telephone rates are regulated too. But no one (except an outright Socialist) would argue that copper prices should be regulated because telephone wires are made of copper.

Gas producers—like coal and copper producers—are in a different category. They are entrepreneurs. They invest their money in searching for gas wells. One such entrepreneur might spend $2 million on 20 wells before hitting a producer. Another might sink one well and strike gas. The well might produce both gas and oil. How could the cost-plus-6-percent formula be set fairly in these cases?

The Harris-Fulbright bill does protect the consumer by retaining a degree of Federal control over the price paid to the producer. It requires the power commission to place a ceiling of a reasonable market price on the amount pipelines may pay. This will prevent unconscionable gouging.

This is a concession and a compromise to those who fear gas producers might try to raise their prices to the point where they would get as much for their product as coal operators get for theirs. The reasonable price compromise would allow contracts that were frozen by the Supreme Court order in 1954 to go back into effect.

To insure continued supplies to homeowners who have invested in gas heating equipment, gas line companies must, by law, have 20-year contracts with gas producers. Some of these contracts contain an escalator clause to protect the producer against increases in costs, just as many union labor contracts protect workers against cost-of-living changes.

In some cases, gas producers, to meet competition and begin cashing in quickly on their investments, set thier prices very low for the first few years of the contract. The Supreme Court freeze has forced them to continue these prices and prevented them from getting the fair over-all return they had bargained for.

Rather than operate under such conditions many of the producers have decided to restrict their sales to gas users within their own States. Such sales have no price regulations. As a consequence, gas that normally might be flowing to Chicago householders now is being used in factories or in electric powerplants in Oklahoma.

John E. Swearington, Standard Oil Co. (Ind.) vice chairman, last week revealed that controls have caused the cancellation of many new pipeline projects. One, he said, would have brought to Chicago 150 million cubic feet of gas a day, enough to take care of the 125,000 Chicagoans on the waiting list.

Government price-fixing, therefore, already is making Chicago more gas-starved than it ought to be. Increasing use and volume sales have kept prices in line. If such

expansion does not continue it is likely the cost of gas to the consumer will go up despite Government controls.

If the controls are lifted by passage of the Harris-Fulbright bill, how much would costs go up under the working of the free enterprise system? One opponent of the bill estimated producers would raise their prices 5 cents per 1,000 cubic feet. That would amount to $11.65 a year for the average home heated with gas. This is only slightly more than the new city tax on gas recently voted by the city council.

So, we might have to pay a little more for gas if the bill passes. But if it doesn't we will have to pay a good deal more—in Government principles as well as dollars.

Problem of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most interesting and informative article which appeared in the Daily News of Miami, Fla., on January 3, 1956. The article was written by Mr. Walter Locke.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROBLEM OF THE AGED: THE OLD, OLD QUESTION

(By Walter Locke)

Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very heaven.

Old question for the new year: Suppose you are old and poor and allowed no work to do. What bliss to be alive on any day?

The famous American, Joseph Choate, said 50 years ago: People were their happiest after 70 years. He urged us to hurry to reach that golden age. He himself went on to the bliss of 85.

Another wise man, Robert Browning, had Rabbi Ben Ezra saying: Grow old along with me; the best is yet to be; the last of life for which the first was made.

Since the days of Robert Browning and Joseph Choate, times have greatly changed. Old age isn't what it used to be.

The world is now less hospitable to age. There are more old to wrestle with a less friendly world.

NO CHORES TO KEEP BUSY

The last census found 13 million people among us aged 65 or more, an increase of 50 percent since the census of 10 years before.

Science keeps us alive to a far greater age than we managed, 50 years ago, to reach. One-third of all who are above the age of 65 are 75 or more. We keep the old longer alive only to torture them?

This was still, when Joseph Choate spoke, a rural society. Old folks on farms and in villages can putter around according to their strength, do chores, and so keep happily busy and earn their keep. Now hardly a fifth of the old folk live in rural homes. They are in cities, with no chores to do.

Thirty-six percent of the people over 65 have now no means at all. Why did they not save for their old age?

Old folk now 75 have twice seen their savings swallowed up in depressions, with their bank failures and bankruptcies. Thrice their savings have been cut in half, as after each World War, by inflation. Their savings failed them.

IN OUR SPEEDING LIFE

Anyway, with or without reason or excuse, here are our 13 million old folks, more than one-third of them penniless, and will rich America let them suffer from hunger or from fear?

Our free enterprise denies them jobs. Aged musicles and slowed hands cannot keep pace with our new machinery. In fact, now that wealth is produced in torrents by machines, with men merely pushing buttons, should the oldsers need to work to have the means to live?

The city invades the countryside. One who happens to own the land in its path finds himself of a sudden, by unearned increment, a millionaire. Now he, nor his children, nor his children's children, will never need work more. If some can live without work, why not others? One who has worked three score years, should he need, in order to eat, to work at all?

The old folk who work have been for half a century diminishing. They do not work because, in our speeding life, there are no jobs for them. We will not let them work. What then?

The aged, with their less money, have the more need of it. Our sicknesses increase with age. The old have twice the disabling diseases of those under 65.

The aged sick need the hospital. But only 2 out of 5 of them in the hospital have money to pay for their care. About as many as go to the hospitals stay away, when sick, for lack of funds for the service of the hospital.

VICTIMS OF INFLATION

Thirty-six percent of the aged, 65 or more, have no income at all. The means of as many more are less than $1,000 a year. Only 1 in 7 of the aged has as much as $2,000 on which to support themselves and family.

The old rule: The children should care for the old folks. That is the oldest way. In the modern world that doesn't seem to work. The problem remains: To let age be still the happy time proclaimed by a Browning, a Choate (they were both wealthy men).

A happy age means age with self-respect, age without fear. With age denied this boon there can be no self-respect even for youth, no escape from our own fear.

We have let inflation halve the blessing of social security. Only one-third of our aged receive Government or private retirement funds. Still the aged increase. Still the problem presses, grows. Till the problem is solved, what a cynical pretense is our boasted prosperity.

A New Executive Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article by Clark R. Mollenhoff of the Washington bureau of the Des Moines Register and Tribune and the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, entitled "A New Executive Secrecy." This brings to our attention an article that is important to all of us, and I recommend it for further study by my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW EXECUTIVE SECRECY—EISENHOWER LETTER TO SECRETARY WILSON FORBIDDING JOHN G. ADAMS FROM TESTIFYING IN ARMY-MCCARTHY HEARINGS PROVIDES DANGEROUS PRECEDENTS—COULD SHUT OFF CONGRESS AND PRESS FROM INFORMATION—MIGHT HIDE SCANDALS EVEN FROM THE PRESIDENT HIMSELF

(By Clark R. Mollenhoff)

Within the last 2 years a precedent has been established which I believe constitutes one of the greatest threats to freedom of the press in the United States in our time.

I speak of the May 17, 1954, letter written by President Eisenhower to Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson. It was written during the Army-McCarthy hearings to prevent Army Counsel John G. Adams from testifying as to conversations with Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers and Sherman Adams, assistant to the President.

The letter was only a broad statement on the rights of the executive branch of the Government to keep certain things confidential and out of the scope of congressional inquiry. It was the broad statement on confidential records that made the precedent dangerous. The application of this letter by a number of agency heads clearly shows why the press should be concerned.

BEHIND THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Budget Director Rowland Hughes refused to allow certain witnesses to be questioned and certain papers produced in connection with the handling of the Dixon-Yates contract. Hughes declared that under the May 17, 1954, letter it was his opinion that Congress was entitled to the decisions of the agency, but could not go behind those decisions since papers and conversations involved in formulating policy were confidential.

Normally, the ability of the press to penetrate executive agencies is pretty much contingent on the power of congressional committees to penetrate those agencies.

Fortunately most agency heads have too great an appreciation of their public responsibility to use this precedent. However, enough have used it to make it completely clear how great is the potential danger.

Dozens of times, witnesses before congressional committees have commented: "We consider that information to be confidential under the President's May 17, 1954, letter to Defense Secretary Wilson."

Congress, newspaper reporters and the public they both serve should be able to go behind the decisions of Government agencies to find the specific actions and motives that went into these decisions.

"THREAT TO THE PRESS"

The precedent of the presidential letter is shifting the burden of proof on access to Government records. Under this precedent, the Government need not prove why information is confidential. You must prove why information is not confidential.

This is not an effort to paint this Administration as any worse than past administrations. It is difficult to generalize about whether one administration had a better or worse information policy. My own experience indicates that some agencies are better, and some are worse.

The fact that you can get as much, or even more information from some Government agency today makes the precedent no less a threat to the press. As long as the precedent remains, the press can be closed out at any time on the whim of the agency head.

The Dixon-Yates hearings provided example after example of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Securities Exchange Commission arbitrarily declaring information beyond the bounds of congressional committees.

Senator MCCLELLAN's special Senate investigating subcommittee has run into the same roadblock. A similar experience has

been had by the House Government Operations Subcommittee investigating the Interior Department's power policy.

These agencies did not plead that security of the Nation was involved. They did not plead that loyalty files, diplomatic papers or raw investigative files were involved. They arbitrarily drew the line beyond which it was contended Congress could not go.

WHAT THE LETTER DID NOT SAY

We should consistently take the position that Congress is entitled to the maximum information unless clear reasons are shown why public policy dictates that the information should not be available.

I would not propose to allow Congress to interfere with the operation of the Government by the executive branch of the Government. However, when the executive agency has made its decisions, the Congress and the press should be entitled to know what factors went into those decisions. If we are ever barred from going behind decisions, the door is open for the fixers.

The open-record policy can save executive agencies from betrayal from within.

I was disturbed by the Eisenhower-Wilson letter, not because of any argument with what it said. My complaint was with the inference left by what that letter did not say.

No specific reason was given for the refusal to let Mr. Adams testify. There was only the generalized reason that certain things in the executive department were confidential. It seemed to me that this would allow each agency head to decide what records or conversations could be hidden from Congress as "confidential."

POSSIBLE COVERUP FOR SCANDALS

It seemed that this was an extension of the confidential orbit to a degree that it would be possible to block nearly any congressional inquiry before it got started.

If John G. Adams could refuse to testify as to his conversations, Cabinet members and others could seek the same refuge of confidential communication when they wanted to cover mistakes or even crimes. The Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding and the tax scandals of the Truman administrations could have been buried under such a policy.

I had assumed that the members of the press would react sharply to such a precedent. I was surprised to pick up well-known and respected newspapers and read editorials lauding the President's letter for its doctrine of separation of powers.

The press was helping to solidify a policy that could throttle the press if the Government ever fell into evil hands.

Some "Impartial Reporting" Depends on What Political Party Is in Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Charleston Gazette, Charleston, W. Va., of January 21, 1956, entitled "Some 'Impartial Reporting' Depends on What Political Party Is in Power."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME "IPMARTIAL REPORTING" DEPENDS ON WHAT POLITICAL PARTY IS IN POWER

Time magazine long has boasted of its objective, impartial reporting of significant happenings.

To many, however, it is felt that the objectiveness and impartiality to which Time so often refers depends in no small degree upon which candidate or which political party it currently is supporting.

An indication of this editorializing in its news columns can be found simply by checking the treatment given certain issues and certain personalities over a period of years. Thus, it was on October 16, 1950 in discussing George E. Allen, a Government official in the Truman administration, that Time said:

"For 18 years, roly-poly George E. Allen bobbed around Washington like a pneumatic rubber hose."

Or going back further to August 12, 1946, the magazine commented: "George is all the more remarkable because, to the naked eye, he is a clown."

But in the December 14, 1954 edition a slight change is noted: "Last week * * * the President (Eisenhower) chatted quietly with * * * golfing companion George E. Allen, Washington lawyer and friend of Presidents."

One of Time's more sparkling editorial crusades in its news columns over the years concerned the Fair Deal under the Democrats:

"In this best of all Democratic worlds he (Truman) had something for everybody. For the businessman, he had his new program of Government insurance and other aids to small business. For the farmer and consumer, he had the Brannan plan. For everyone else, there was a whole grab-bag of social and economic promises."

Under President Eisenhower fair dealism is handled like this: "Through the departmentalized details of his (Eisenhower's) proposals runs a clear consistent thread, joining each fact and each measure with all the others. The thread is the general good. He has not thrown together a hodgepodge of group interests. Every proposal seems to be tested by the standard of the whole Nation's interest."

Yet another controversial aspect of national importance is the income tax due every spring. Under Truman the income tax to the average American, a fellow whom Time is able to describe with amazing knowledge and to whom it constantly alludes, comes out so:

"This week once again, the American taxpayer * * * was working over his income-tax return. He did not do the job happily * * * The blow, in full and crushing measure, now lands each March 15 on the chin of a fellow named John Q."

Three years later under Eisenhower, the same person goes about the task in this manner: "* * * 60 million Americans have by this week signed their 1954 income-tax forms. * * * They did this, wonderful to tell, without riots or protest. * * * It has become more and more unfashionable to criticize the income-tax level."

The economic health of the Nation has received startlingly different interpretations in the magazine's efforts to be impartial and objective. The April 2, 1951 (Democrats in power) Time said: "Never in United States history had the cost of living been so high. Between January 15 and February 15 the consumer's price index jumped 1.3 percent to 183.8."

On July 4, 1955 (Republicans in control and the consumer price index at 192.3) Time commented: "After a considerable shift in domestic economic policy, the United States is more prosperous than ever before."

From these examples it would appear that Time's marshaling of facts into objective, impartial reports is a matter, as its title, suggests, of time.

Gabriel G. Kajeckas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a 5-minute speech delivered by Gabriel G. Kajeckas, a 16-year-old honor student of Gonzaga High School in Washington, D. C., in the school elimination in which he took top honors in the I Speak for Democracy contest, sponsored by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, and the Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association.

In the District of Columbia elimination this young student was again successful in representing Gonzaga High School, entitling him to compete in the national contest.

As a result of the contest he was selected as one of the 12 semifinalists of winners from 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Hawaii. The top 4 winners have not been selected as yet, but announcement is due momentarily. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Kajeckas. His father is counselor for the Free Lithuanian Legation. Gabriel was born in Koenigsberg, Germany, and came to this country as an infant with his parents. He attended Sacred Heart School before entering Gonzaga. He hopes to attend Holy Cross College in Worcester, Mass., this fall.

THE ETERNAL ENGRAVING

(By Gabriel G. Kajeckas, age 16, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C.)

"Democracy cannot be defined." How many times have we heard this statement, and how many times have we agreed? Yet, we find that such is not the case; for democracy can be defined—here in my hand I hold its definition. It is small and insignificant, and yet it represents America, it symbolizes our way of life, it speaks for democracy.

What is it, you ask, that can be held in my hand, and yet represent the unlimitedness of America? The answer is simple, but so often overlooked. The answer is a mere coin—a penny.

But how can a penny define democracy? How can something we take so much for granted—how can it speak for democracy? Because engraved on this little copper coin is the definition of democracy. Look at it, and you will understand.

On it, the first thing we see is the strong, determined profile of a great man—the man who made all men in this country free and equal, and without whom we would never have been one and indivisible—Abraham Lincoln.

Then we see the word "liberty" engraved on the metallic surface—liberty, that gives my father the right to operate a restaurant if he so chooses—that gives your brother the right to be a printer—that gives each and every one of us the right to worship as we please, vote as we choose, and live as we wish. Indeed, this is more than just the word "liberty" engraved on a small coin—this is a way of life for the American people.

Next, we turn our gaze to the words "E Pluribus Unum"—an ancient phrase, brought to life in our lives, meaning "one from many"—existing as a country of diverse interests, and yet a country of one in unity. But how can a country be unified in which there is a fruit stand next to a jewelry store, where 160 million people of different nationalities, races, and creeds are intermingled—where 9 million of these people can exist in a concrete maze of tall buildings and winding streets—where a general and a rail-splitter can become President—where a youth can address an adult audience with his own thoughts and can be heard with attention? This is a gigantic dream come true, a living miracle. And this, my friends, is the miracle of America. And the reason for this miracle—why we are the United States—is also stamped on this small copper penny. The reason for this miracle is God. Therefore, "In God We Trust"—and it is in this trust that we are one, that we are free, that we have life, that we have the miracle that is America. These are the ideas generated by a small coin—a coin that we pass through our hands daily. These are the ideas that add up to our definition of democracy; our democracy of freedom, equality, unity, and trust in God.

Democracy, my friends, is an old idea. But having been betrayed by so many ancient lands, it was brought to a new land—a land of red men and virgin forests, a land of peaceful rivers and fruitful plains inhabited only by the buffalo. And in this land, through the tearful sufferings of Valley Forge and the sweat and blood of Bunker Hill, this spirit was fanned into a roaring fire of freedom which became—our democracy.

This spirit that has made our country the greatest Nation on earth is as old as the human race. But the forces of hate, lust, and greed are also as old as the human race, and from time immemorial have opposed all honor, justice, and law in the world.

And so, my friends, these representations of justice, honor, and law on this little coin are not enough to preserve our way of life. We, as the inheritors of this coin and its defined freedom—we must take these words from the coin and inscribe them on our hearts, and in our spirit—and then, through the common usage of a small coin, realizing its value as representative of our way of life—we can continue this flaming spirit of democracy.

And then, this little coin alone won't speak for democracy—then, we will speak for democracy, and if we speak for democracy, then the eternal engraving of the American people will read:

"There will always be a democracy—
And there will always be an America."

Flood Control Protection for Worcester, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include at this time the statement I presented last Thursday to the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee at their hearing on the supplemental appropriations bill.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very grateful for the opportunity to appear even briefly before you today.

Mindful of your tremendous committee schedule and burdens, together with your personal office duties, I have no intention of entering upon any long, extended discussion or recitation of figures on general flood control projects with which we are all concerned. I realize full well that statistical facts and figures are available to you from our efficient Corps of Army Engineers. Also, my most able and distinguished friend and colleague, from my neighboring district, Representative PHILBIN, is here to speak on behalf of the Massachusetts State Flood Control Committee, and no one can explain our overall flood control problems better than he.

I would, therefore, like to confine my remarks at the moment to the particular project, commonly described as the Worcester Diversionary Tunnel, so vitally necessary to the life, safety, and property protection of the citizens of my native city and for which, as you all know, there has been included a sum of $60,000 in this bill to enable the Army engineers to complete a resurvey of the area and planning involved.

Very briefly, the project, in essence, provides for an intake structure for flood water to enter and then a tunnel and channel, with a total length of slightly less than 3 miles. Its purpose will be to conduct part of the flood water flow that normally passes through the city of Worcester directly into the Blackstone River lying south of Worcester. As I have said, the specific technical facts and figures are before you in the reports.

Now, while it is true that Federal participation in this project was authorized in 1944, it is not so true to have the impression casually conveyed and casually accepted that our city refused or turned the Federal authorization down. No official city action of that nature was ever taken. It is more completely the truth to realize that the intention of the city was to hold the project in abeyance because of the imminence and impact of staggering war costs. Also, no one then, including the Army engineers or our best weather experts, could foresee that by 1955 our fair city and area would be adjudged by our professional weather people to stand in the "path of hurricanes." It is indeed idle to currently speculate on what could have been past done, and it would be a punishment beyond the fault, if any there was, to reproach a people for the order in which they listed local problems for solution, when the threat of repetitive natural disasters could not be then scientifically known or suspected. Those of you who come from areas that have been unfortunately visited by these floods and other natural disasters are, I am sure, well aware of the practicalities of human nature which often impractically delay decisions, and in the light of the terrible tragedies and damage that descended upon us through our floods of August 1955, and the widespread destruction and ruin similarly wrought upon so many other sections of the country in most recent months and years, will, I am confident, be sympathetic toward any community in the Nation seeking to sensibly protect themselves from any additional sudden catastrophe from the changing weather, winds, and patterns.

The city of Worcester governing body has already taken the official action required for municipal participation in cooperation with the Federal Government. The State legislature is at this moment attempting to expedite the enactment of the necessary legislative approval of which you must be assured. No one knows better than we do that the legislative machinery sometimes may grind with exceeding slowness and irritation. I am informed that the particular measure includes all of the projects proposed for the State of Massachusetts and some in cooperation with neighboring States and its comprehensiveness further enables us to understand a reasonably lengthy consideration of an inevitably cumbersome measure. However, I am also informed that the Governor himself and the leaders of the legislative branches are doing all in their power to speed the action and if absolutely necessary, to formulate and approve a special bill for our particular Worcester project. May I, therefore, pray your patience on this score, with the assurance that the requirements of the law and this committee will be met at the earliest possible moment.

The essentiality of this project to the continuing welfare of Worcester is undoubted by anyone. Prayerfully remembering the personal sorrow and human tragedy which cannot be materially valued, it has been reliably but conservatively estimated that the presence of this tunnel during our most recent flood disaster would have prevented approximately $15 million of the property damage that was done. The Army Corps of Engineers has repeatedly and authoritatively stated that the tunnel is a vitally needed protection and it will do the job within reason. They have also testified that the project is well justified economically, inasmuch as the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and that the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is exceedingly good. The President has included and requested the funds for this flood control work, and in order to initiate the resurvey that must be accomplished before actual construction is started, which is planned for 1957, there remains only the approval of this committee; without your approval, the whole project could encounter tragic disruption.

I most sincerely urge that you give this item, the only one in our area for which funds are here allotted, your very sympathetic consideration, and if your precedents and policies demand, you will approve it with the proviso that the resurvey not begin until the assurances required are of record, and they will, I pledge, be presented for your official technical record within the very reasonable future.

May I thank you, Mr. Chairman and committee members, for your courtesy and attention.

Airliner Bars Deplored in Editorials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., December 14, 1955, by Godfrey Sperling, Jr., a staff correspondent. I have introduced in the House H. R. 7922, which would prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to passengers on aircraft in flight.

AIRLINER BARS DEPLORED IN EDITORIALS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—Some measure of the success being registered in the campaign against the serving of liquor on airlines is now available in the editorial columns of the press.

Newspapers from coast to coast each day are adding new voices to the protest against airborne bars.

Says the Philadelphia Inquirer: "It would be better if the American air carriers would recognize that this is not a situation calling for half measures. They are certainly aware of the legislation pending in Congress * * * banning all serving of liquor on com-

mercial flights. That seems to be the sensible answer to the problem."

The Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser makes it plain that it feels the problem is no little one. "We can easily see why stewards and stewardesses are upset," it states. "But, instead of enacting rules applying only to upper air, why not simply equip passenger planes with parachutes marked 'For Bouncing Use Only?' "

"When a passenger gets a snoot full and makes a nuisance of himself, buckle on a bounce chute and give him the air."

The Post-Tribune in Gary, Ind., sees no problem in banning liquor on planes—even from the viewpoint of airline executives. "The ban would add at least somewhat to the air safety factor," the paper asserts, "and it's worthwhile for that reason. We doubt any great uproar from the public if liquor is outlawed on the planes, or any loss of business for the airlines. There are more substantial reasons for flying than the opportunity to patronize an aerial bar."

From the South, the Robesonia of Lumberton, N. C., offers a suggestion for the liquor industry: "It looks as though the liquor industry would do itself a favor by stepping into the situation with a demand for drying up the airlines.

"For every now and then an airliner crashes and kills everybody aboard, without any apparent reason for the mishap. Whenever it is known that liquor is served on such a plane, there is a tendency to wonder if this may have had something to do with the accident."

And some advice for the drinkers, themselves, from the Bridgeton, (N. J.) News: "Plain commonsense would dictate the enactment of such a law. Even drinkers themselves should favor such a law as a safety move to preserve their own lives."

On the subject of liquor regulation versus prohibition, aloft, the Spokane (Wash.) Chronicle is most eloquent: "it is strange to what lengths some officials would go to regulate liquor traffic aloft when the problem could be solved by a single expedient—banning it altogether.

"If the men and women who operate airplanes and care for the passengers' well-being think that liquor has no place on planes, that itself should be enough to settle it."

The Herald-Review, Grand Rapids, Minn., focuses its attention on the behavior of the airlines executives: "This is not a necessary service. It adds nothing to the pleasure of plane travel to the great part of the people who do not wish to drink in the air. Its introduction has been a sad commentary upon the leadership of the airlines and indicates a lack of sense and character both so essential to safety in the sky."

The problem of the one who indulges is given some attention in the comments of the Jackson (Miss.) News: "Refraining from a martini during the relatively short time they travel by air should be no ordeal for the average man. He can take a drink at his destination if he feels he must have one."

In somewhat the same vein, the Sioux City, Iowa, Journal-Tribune notes: "Giving the service every benefit of every doubt, it still seems rather unnecessary. If a man is too parched to go along a few hours without a drink, he is in need of a good deal more than an airplane flight."

The Republican-Press, Salamanca, N. Y., is primarily interested in the safety factor involved: "The public on whose patronage the airlines depend has a right—and duty—to insist that all reasonable safety measures be taken for the protection of passengers on commercial planes.

"Allegations by the stewards and stewardesses on these planes that drunkenness on planes is a menace cannot be dismissed lightly. More than consideration is needed; there should be action."

From the Salem, Ohio, News: "The passengers and crew members on a commercial flight share the hazard wth confidence because they have faith in discipline—the discipline of pilots, crews, weather observers, and their fellow passengers. Confidence vanishes when discipline is broken. It is hard to think of a quicker way to undermine discipline among fellow passengers than to expose them to the behaviorisms of intoxicated persons in airplanes."

The Rockford, Ill., Star: "The serving of liquor on airlines is hazardous as well as an affront to a great many passengers. Airline service does not call for barroom operations. They should be stopped."

And from the Columbia, S. C., State: "We can see no reason to turn a plane into a bar or a cocktail lounge. At best the quarters are limited, and the possibility of an unruly passenger is always present if liquor is served. * * * There are enough potential dangers in flying without adding the possibility of the complications of the obnoxious drunk."

Loss of High Dam at Hells Canyon Will Weaken Flood-Control Program in Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the need for increased flood-control activity in the Columbia River Basin has been tragically illustrated in Oregon by events of recent weeks. Storm conditions, coupled with a decline in the moisture-retaining capacity of major watersheds, has again focused attention on problems of sound natural resource development.

It is ironic that, as floodwaters recede in many parts of Oregon, work proceeds on an Idaho Power Co. project in Hells Canyon which will slash nearly 3 million acre-feet of storage capacity from the Corps of Army Engineers main control plan for Columbia River watershed floods. There are ominous indications that the frequency and extent of flood damage is on the increase in the Pacific Northwest. Yet, in the face of this danger, the administration yields to private interests the benefits of such great sites as Hells Canyon, and the plans for obtaining needed flood-control storage in Canada remain snarled in international negotiations. What is the hope for obtaining the flood prevention needed in the Columbia Basin, if such policies continue to prevail?

Mr. President, an analysis of the advantages gained from Federal construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon was recently prepared by Mr. Ron Ross, managing editor of the magazine, Public Power. The facts contained therein, especially in the accompanying table, illustrate the contrasting multiple-purpose results of Federal and private plans for Hells Canyon development. I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article by Mr. Ross which appeared in the January 1956 issue of Public Power.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELLS CANYON DECISION FACES CONGRESS—FPC HAS APPROVED LOW DAMS, BUT CONGRESS OR COURTS COULD SAVE PROJECT

(By Ron Ross)

Although overshadowed in advance speculation, legislation on Hells Canyon could be one of the most significant actions in the 2d session of the 84th Congress which convened this month.

Bills to authorize a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon were approved by subcommittees in both the Senate and House last year. Meanwhile, the Federal Power Commission has issued a license to the Idaho Power Co. for a series of three smaller dams in the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. This decision has been appealed to the courts.

Stakes in the battle to control the raging waters of the Snake River as they race through the deepest gorge on the continent are high. Unless the courts reverse FPC's decision or Congress authorizes Hells Canyon Dam:

A block of power equivalent to the prime power output of Bonneville Dam will be lost to the power-short Pacific Northwest.

The comprehensive plan for development of the water resources of the Columbia Basin will be seriously and perhaps irreparably breached.

A pattern will be set for piecemeal private exploitation of the Nation's untapped hydroelectric resources, a block of power greater than the country's entire installed capacity as recently as 1951.

The issue at Hells Canyon has been tragically—albeit at times intentionally—misstated. Hells Canyon is not basically a private versus public or Federal versus private power problem. The fundamental question at Hells Canyon is not who? but what?

High Hells Canyon Dam was planned as an important element of the comprehensive development of the vast water resources of the Columbia Basin. As the largest project on the largest tributary of the Columbia, Hells Canyon Dam would make a major contribution to the region's power, flood control, and navigation program, providing not only a large block of power at the dam site but adding power and other benefits downstream.

As a poor substitute for the high dam, Idaho Power Co. has proposed building three smaller dams in the same stretch of the Snake. These dams would provide less total power in the aggregate than the high dam at the site and provide only minimal benefits downstream.

HISTORIC POLICY HIT

Idaho Power's plan for staking out a section of a great river basin for its own private exploitation would reverse a trend begun nearly half a century ago when President Theodore Roosevelt and his chief forester, Gifford Pinchot, expounded the policy of comprehensive development of our water resources.

In his first message to Congress, Theodore Roosevelt declared, "Great storage works are necessary to equalize the flow of streams and to save the floodwaters. Their construction has been conclusively shown to be an undertaking too vast for private effort." The validity of this conclusion has been reaffirmed. One of the best known private utility engineers testified at the Federal Power Commission hearings, "No investor-financed company would undertake Hells Canyon."

The case for comprehensive basinwide development of the Nation's rivers was stated in the President's Water Resources Policy Commission report of 1950 which concluded, "This Commission is convinced that the next step forward must be the application of unified responsibility to the planning of multiple-purpose basinwide developments."

The Commission's first recommendation on hydroelectric power was, "Full development of the Nation's undeveloped water power resources, as an integral part of comprehensive basin programs, should be considered a major Federal responsibility, to be exercised in such a way as to assure ample supplies of hydroelectric energy well in advance of expanding regional and national needs."

This points up the gravest peril of the piece-meal, partial plan Idaho Power is proposing for the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake. The Federal Power Commission's estimates indicate that the United States has upwards of 80 million kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric capacity. While it is conceded that some of this total may never be realized, it is no less true that great blocks of hydro in every region of the country could be expected from comprehensive basin-wide water resource programs.

Much of this capacity will never come on the line if the pattern of Idaho Power's Hells Canyon plan is followed.

Uncoordinated, partial projects such as Idaho Power offers at Hells Canyon will fragmentize comprehensive plans and effectively block the large-scale development of our rivers' hydro potential. Private power companies will be able to frustrate any major Federal hydro program with lesser single-purpose projects.

Nor is this reversal of 50 years' policy and experience an idle threat. Private power companies already are lined up at the FPC. A combine of four private power companies in the Northwest—Pacific Northwest Power Co.—has applied for licenses for projects at the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley sites downstream from Hells Canyon. These projects would block construction of the proposed Federal high Nez Perce Dam just as effectively as Idaho Power would preclude high Hells Canyon, and the results in terms of power production and other benefits would be similar.

If the FPC's Hells Canyon decision is upheld, it is difficult to see how these other applications will be rejected. What is not difficult to see is an emerging pattern by which private power companies in all parts of the country will be able to block virtually all future Federal multiple-purpose projects providing hydroelectric power by substituting smaller single-purpose power plants.

HIGH VERSUS LOW BENEFITS

Rising 722 feet from the floor of the deepest gorge on the continent, high Hells Canyon Dam would be the second highest dam in the world, a bare 4 feet under Hoover Dam. The reservoir, stretching 93 miles upstream past the sites of two of Idaho Power's proposed low dams, would store 4,400,000 acre-feet of water, of which 3,880,000 acre-feet is listed as usable storage.

In sharp contrast, Idaho Power proposes a lower, run-of-the-river dam at the Hells Canyon site and two other low dams. Oxbow and Brownlee, upstream at sites which would be flooded in the reservoir of the proposed high dam. Brownlee would have a useful storage of approximately 1 million acre-feet.

There is a striking parallel between these proposals and the situation 30 years ago when Washington Water Power Co. proposed to construct a dam at the Kettle Falls site on the Columbia. The company applied for an FPC license for Kettle Falls in 1925, and the application was finally rejected by the Commission in 1933. Today the Kettle Falls site happily lies submerged beneath the reservoir created by Grand Coulee Dam, despite the claims of power company spokesmen that jackrabbits would provide the only market for Grand Coulee's power output.

The installed capacity of the 3 lower dams would total 783,400 kilowatts, only 16,600 kilowatts less than the initial installed capacity of 800,000 kilowatts for high Hells Canyon. But these figures are misleading in comparing the power benefits. The test of their power production is in prime power, the firm power capacity available at all times including the lowest water levels of record. The high dam would provide 688,000 kilowatts of prime power at the site, plus adding 436,000 kilowatts of prime power at downstream Federal dams existing or authorized. Against this total prime power capacity of 1,124,000 kilowatts which would be added to the Columbia hydroelectric system, the private dams would provide 577,000 kilowatts at site and 103,000 kilowatts to dams downstream, a total of only 680,000 kilowatts of prime power.

The high dam would add 444,000 kilowatts more of prime power than the company projects, a block of power roughly equivalent to the prime power capacity of Bonneville Dam.

More shocking than the loss of the equivalent of Bonneville Dam's prime power output would be the price of power from the company's plan.

Power could be produced at high Hells Canyon for about 2.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. The staff of the Federal Power Commission has estimated that the cost of power from Idaho Power's three dams will be 6.69 mills per kilowatt-hour, more than double the cost of energy from the high dam. Power from Brownlee, largest of the three dams would cost 7.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

ATOMIC POWER COMPETITION?

Speaking in Washington May 24, 1954, Francis K. McCune, a vice president of General Electric Co., said that a 300,000-kilowatt atomic steam reactor similar to one General Electric was then developing, could produce energy at a cost of 6.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. This 19-month-old estimate for atomic power was only one one-hundredth of a mill per kilowatt-hour less than the FPC staff figure for Idaho Power's three small dams and nine-tenths of a mill per kilowatt-hour under the cost of power from Brownlee.

Thus, it would appear that Idaho Power could save well over $1 million per year by constructing an atomic powerplant instead of Brownlee Dam.

The tragedy of the high power costs of the low dams will be felt most directly by Idaho Power consumers. Large blocks of power from high Hells Canyon Dam could be sold to Idaho Power for Bonneville Power Administration's wholesale rate of 2.34 mills per kilowatt-hour, only a little more than a third the cost of power from the company's own proposed dams.

Although it now foresees a power pinch in the next few years if it does not add new capacity, Idaho Power in the past has boasted that no power shortage has existed in its area, while shortages have plagued nearby Washington and Oregon which depend on the great Federal dams on the Columbia for large blocks of their electric energy. Cost of power, of course, is one reason why Idaho Power has had no shortages—and is unlikely to, if it is permitted to construct its high-power-cost dams.

A residential consumer in Boise, the largest city served by Idaho Power, pays a monthly bill of $6.95 for only 250 kilowatt-hours. In Spokane, Wash., also served by a private power company but located in the area where low-cost Federal hydro has been available, the same residential user would pay $6.36, 59 cents less, for 500 kilowatt-hours, twice as much power. And residential consumers served by the municipal systems on Puget Sound pay even less—$5.14 for 500 kilowatt-hours in Seattle and $5.42 in Tacoma.

Low-cost power means far more to an area than smaller light bills, as the development of the aluminum industry in Washington has demonstrated. Abundant, low-cost power means jobs and wealth. In Idaho, the failure to develop potential low-cost power sources would not only retard local development but would forestall the production of urgently needed, low-cost fertilizer. This is because approximately 60 percent of the Nation's reserves of phosphate rock lie in and around southeastern Idaho. These deposits are largely undeveloped while alarm is growing at the problem of supplying farmers with their mounting needs for phosphate fertilizer.

Most of these deposts cannot be economically developed without low-cost electric energy. Farmers in the Midwest as well as in the Mountain States and the Far West could enjoy lower costs for fertilizer if low-cost electric energy were available from high Hells Canyon for phosphate production. With the lower dams, power costs will continue to be prohibitive.

Although power from the three lower dams would cost more than twice as much to produce as from the high dam, the estimates of costs for the company projects are based on a surprisingly low construction bid. An official of Morrison-Knudsen Construction Co. testified at the FPC hearings that his firm would construct the company's 3 dams for $132,643,553. Bureau of Reclamation engineers estimated that the three dams would cost more than twice as much.

COST DISPUTE CONTINUES

Last month the cost argument was renewed when Representative A. L. MILLER (Republican, Nebraska), released comments he had received from Reclamation engineers to questions he had raised after the FPC decision was announced in August. L. G. Puls, C. I. Hoisington and J. C. Riter said they believe that the Morrison-Knudsen bid may be comparable to the successful bid submitted by the firm in conjunction with other contractors for construction of the Bureau's Hungry Horse Dam. That bid was for $43,413,000, but the final cost estimate for the project, now virtually completed, is $101,660,000.

On this basis, the Bureau engineers suggested that the $132,643,553 bid on the 3 Idaho Power dams would indicate a total cost to the company of $311,220,000. This suggestion was protested by counsel for Idaho Power, who described the contractor's bid as a "turnkey" contract for "complete and going plants."

At the same time, the Reclamation engineers said that on the basis of experience at Hungry Horse, they would reduce their cost estimate for high Hells Canyon from $383,600,000 to $331,607,000.

These latest estimates would widen the already broad gap in power costs between the company project and the Federal dam, increasing the power cost of the company dams and lowering the power cost for the high dam.

The company plan would not only produce far less power at far higher cost, but also would provide a minimum of other benefits—notably water storage to control floods.

Hells Canyon is an ideal flood-control site. Unlike most major flood control projects, the high dam's large reservoir would flood little if any useful land in a gorge 2,000 feet deeper than the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. High Hells Canyon's 3,880,000 acre-feet of useful storage represents about one-seventh of the water storage planned for the C–2 (1960–70) phase of the master control plan for the Columbia Basin.

Since Idaho Power's Brownlee project would store only 1 million acre-feet, the company and advocates of its plan have argued that the difference of 2,680,000 acre-feet of storage could be supplied at some other site. One scheme for making up this storage deficiency resulting from the Idaho power plan already has collapsed. Late in 1953, investigations were begun to determine if a major storage project could be constructed at the Mountain Sheep site downstream from Hells Canyon. High Mountain Sheep fell under the blows of a geologist's hammer. ("Even the apparently sound blocks are so weakened * * * that they break apart under light hammer blows,"

it was reported.) The report concluded that the cliffs would not support a high dam at the Mountain Sheep site and proposed a low dam, for which a permit now is being requested by a group of private power companies.

A more drastic alternative to flood control at high Hells Canyon was proposed at the FPC hearings by E. Robert de Luccia, vice president of Pacific Power & Light Co. Mr. de Luccia suggested that payments to victims of floods would be cheaper than building high dams. When asked about paying for the fatalities in the 1948 floods on the Columbia, he denied any lives had been lost. Mr. de Luccia's failure to remember the deaths of 36 persons in the 1948 floods may have been due to the fact that he was not located in the region at the time, as he was then the chief of the FPC's Bureau of Power.

Navigation on the lower reaches of the Columbia and Snake Rivers also will depend on the controlled storage of water upstream at sites such as Hells Canyon. Loss of 2,880,000 acre-feet of storage at Hells Canyon jeopardizes the development of the 500-mile inland navigation system contemplated in the comprehensive plan for the Columbia Basin.

Although Hells Canyon would not provide water for irrigation, power revenues from the high dam could finance the opening of important new areas for irrigation. "The irrigation aspect alone of the Hells Canyon proposal would justify a Commission recommendation for Federal development," declared the intervener's brief filed with FPC by advocates of the high dam.

As the second highest dam in the world, high Hells Canyon would attract some 650,000 visitors a year, according to estimates of the Park Service. These visitors—far more each year than the population of the entire State of Idaho—would spend large sums in the area for food, shelter, gasoline, etc.

A measure of the relative recreational benefits from the rival plans is provided by the fact that the Federal project includes $1 million for initial recreational facilities, while the company proposes only $95,000 for its entire recreational development.

Idaho Power's "little plan for a big river" would produce less power, flood control, navigation, irrigation, and recreational benefits than the proposed Federal project, but the supreme irony is the likelihood that the Federal Government might help finance the company's low dams. Idaho Power has applied for certificates of necessity for rapid amortization for tax purposes on Brownlee and Oxbow. If these certificates are granted, as seems probable under present policies, the company may be expected to make an application for its low Hells Canyon Dam as well.

These certificates would permit the company to write off, for tax purposes, large portions of the costs of the dams within 5 years. The effect has been described by FPC as that of interest-free loans by the Government. It makes available sums to the company over the life of the project, and the benefits may exceed the total cost of the project.

Thus, while the American people are deprived of the benefits of full development of a great natural resource, they may also be placed in a position of subsidizing exploitation by a private power company.

Hells Canyon boxscore

	Federal Hells Canyon high dam	Idaho Power Co., 3 dams
Initial installed capacity, kilowatts	800,000	783,400
Prime power at site, kilowatts	688,000	577,000
Prime power at other sites, kilowatts	436,000	103,000
Total prime power, kilowatts	1,124,000	680,000
Cost of power per kilowatt-hour, mills	2.71	6.69

George M. Humphrey, the Star of Ike's Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of Look magazine, entitled "George M. Humphrey, the Star of Ike's Team."

While I have differed with the Secretary of the Treasury in some matters of policy, I regard him as one of the ablest men in prominent Government position during my service in the Senate, and a man of high patriotic purpose.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE M. HUMPHREY, THE STAR OF IKE'S TEAM

(By Fletcher Knebel)

At one of President Eisenhower's White House stag dinners, the businessmen guests were discussing a recent presidential nomination.

"That's your best appointment, Mr. President, except one," volunteered one of the guests.

"Who's the exception?" asked Ike.

"George Humphrey," was the reply.

"I agree," said Ike. He grinned. "Humphrey was my best."

Many Republicans take a similar view of George Magoffin Humphrey, the rugged Secretary of the Treasury, who manages to look a decade younger than his 65 years. Senator PRESCOTT BUSH (Republican, of Connecticut), has voiced the widespread GOP feeling: "If we had our choice of any man in the United States for Secretary of the Treasury, we could not improve on George Humphrey."

Democrats are inclined to agree on the magnitude of Humphrey's star, even though they see it from a radically different angle. One day, in Senate debate, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS (Democrat, of Illinois), posed this question:

"Is it not true that the Secretary of the Treasury, with his real abilities, and they are real, tends to have a restricted view of the welfare of the people of the Nation? He looks at the wealthy and judges the prosperity of the Nation by the condition of the wealthy."

Another Democratic Senator, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, says that George Humphrey is the administration's chief advocate of the "trickle-down" economic theory, where benefits reaped by the rich trickle down to the less affluent. "He's Trickle-Down George," says Senator HUMPHREY. "I'm Percolate-Up HUBERT."

Each of these estimates of George Humphrey underlines the growing Washington belief that the man who guards your dollar has become the most powerful man in the capital, the strong man of the Cabinet. His influence has been felt in realms far removed from the traditional debt-and-deficit bailiwick of the Treasury. His voice is potent in decisions of defense, foreign policy, economics and politics.

"One of Humphrey's conditions when he accepted the job from President Eisenhower," said a close friend, "was that he be consulted on decisions where a price tag is involved. And what activity of government does not involve a price tag?"

The reasons for Humphrey's vast influence are not hard to find. He owns one of the warmest and most expansive personalities in Washington. His brain is as cold as the steel produced by the M. A. Hanna Co., a titan of iron ore, coal, steel and plastics, which Humphrey's business genius raised to power and riches.

"If you get all the facts," Humphrey is fond of saying, "it's easy to see what you ought to do."

His ardor for facts and his contempt for Government double-talk frightened some young Treasury lawyers before they got to know him. "Frankly, I don't get what you're talking about," he'd say. "I want simple facts."

"Don't start using those big words," he warned more than once. "I don't understand them."

President Eisenhower is given credit for asking that knotty Government problems be condensed for him on one page. Actually, the real passion for brevity is Humphrey's.

"One page, hell," says an associate. "Humphrey wants it in one paragraph."

Humphrey never philosophizes, seldom generalizes. "What's the problem before us?" is his motto. This enthusiasm for quick decisions delights the businessmen who flocked to Washington to help Ike run the Government, but even they are slightly appalled now and then. "George wants to do it right now," says one assistant, "and you've got to restrain him at times. You can't always do it right now in government."

Two years ago, Ike expressed high admiration for Humphrey. He hasn't changed his mind. If anything, the two men have grown closer. The Eisenhower comradeship with Humphrey seems to have replaced the budding one with Robert A. Taft that was nipped by the Ohio Senator's death.

HUMPHREY BRUSHED UP ON HIS BRIDGE

Ike has twice visited the Humphrey farm, Milestone, near Thomasville, Ga., to shoot quail. Once, he accompanied Humphrey for duck hunting to the exclusive Cedar Point Club (10 members, 10 beds, 10 lockers) in the Lake Erie marshes near Toledo.

Humphrey, until Ike became ill, often went to the White House after dinner to make a fourth at bridge. This in itself was a token of the high esteem in which the President holds Humphrey, for he was not renowned as a bridge player back in Cleveland and Ike usually frets at mediocre bridge. "But George," according to Ike, "has learned to play pretty well since he came to Washington."

The Cabinet strong man is a husky fellow. He's five feet 10½ inches tall and weighs 190 pounds. He was a football player in high school and he always has been an ardent horseman. At various times in almost 60 years of riding, he has broken both arms, both legs, his collar bone and sundry ribs. "He ought to be grounded," said his son, Gilbert W. Humphrey, a vice president of Hanna.

A talent for persuading people to follow his leadership—the real essence of successful politics—has been the No. 1 Humphrey quality. Not since the days of Andrew Mellon has the Secretary of the Treasury been a power in Washington. The Roosevelt and Truman Treasury chiefs contented themselves with the job of borrowing enough money to pay the bills of the Federal spending colossus. Humphrey, on the other hand—at Eisenhower's special invitation—sits with the National Security Council, which blueprints American global policy. There, he gives his horsesense opinions, not as Secretary of the Treasury, but as George Humphrey.

Toward the close of 1953, the Eisenhower team reached general agreement to trim the ground forces, cut defense spending and emphasize air and atomic weapons. But early

in December, Humphrey learned that the military budget proposed the same Army-manpower levels. For a week, he shuttled between the White House and Pentagon, working to get the previous agreement bolted down in budget figures. Then he flew to a NATO meeting in Paris. "If the decision blows up," he said, "I'll take the first plane back." The decision stood firm. The defense budget was cut $3.8 billion, and ground forces—along with Navy manpower—were trimmed by almost 400,000 men.

It was Humphrey, again, who threw his weight behind the previously agreed program for further cuts in the ground forces last winter. The military suggested an increase in defense spending. Humphrey sided with his old friend, Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, for continuing the program to cut the ground forces. Gen. Matthew Ridgway, then Army Chief of Staff, objected strenuously. But President Eisenhower ordered continuation of the program, which meant a cut of 200,000 men in the land forces and held overall Pentagon spending to $34 billion.

Humphrey received his first major policy setback this fall, after Ike's heart attack, when Wilson declined to cut defense spending by another $1 billion to balance the budget. But Humphrey will try other avenues. He's determined to cut outgo down to match income.

More than any other man in the Cabinet, Humphrey was responsible for the Eisenhower team's refusal to go into Government pump priming during the 1954 recession. Democrats were clamoring for emergency Government spending to relieve unemployment. Even some Eisenhower advisers urged Government action.

Humphrey stood rocklike in opposition. "If we go into some type of New Deal project," he warned his colleagues, "we'll lose the confidence of the country overnight. It was tried for years and never did succeed in making any real jobs until war broke out."

In the spring of 1954, he telephoned leading businessmen around the country, became convinced that an upturn was in sight. "The quickest and surest way to recovery is to stick to sound policies and wait it out," he advised Cabinet colleagues. Wait it out, they did. Business not only picked up. It boomed.

* * * * *

No item is too small for Humphrey. At one meeting, an official asked Humphrey's view on a project. "Of course, it only costs $200,000," he said. Humphrey asked him to eliminate the word "only." "If it's going to cost anything at all," said the manager of the taxpayer's dollar, "we ought to discuss it."

The Washington story that Humphrey is a novice in politics is a myth. He kept in close touch with the Capital's inside maneuvers for almost two decades. As early as the midthirties, he was raising big money for Ohio Republicans. He drummed up cash among industrialists for Taft's first Senate campaign and helped raise funds for Harold H. Burton, now Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, when Burton ran succesfully for mayor of Cleveland. Humphrey, a wizard at the political cash box, once raised $200,000 for the Republicans in a single day of telephone calls to about 100 businessmen around Ohio.

This is all very much in the Hanna tradition. The Hanna empire has always been deep in politics. Of the Hannas who were in business in Ohio, Marcus Alonzo Hanna became the most famous politician of his day. He put President William McKinley in the White House in 1897, served as Republican National Chairman, appeared in cartoons throughout the country as "Boss Hanna" in a vest sprinkled with dollar signs, and wound up his career in the United States Senate.

HE TANGLED WITH OHIO'S GOVERNOR

While George Humphrey stayed out of political headlines, his company once got into a battle royal with Gov. Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio. Hanna had gone into the profitable strip-mining business. In 1944, the company mined 6 million tons of open-pit coal in the Cadiz-St. Clairsville area of Ohio. It left raw, ugly scars as though some angry monster had tried to claw the land to death. Lausche made a political issue out of a fight to control strip mining and make the companies restore the land. Hanna fought the bills, helped finance an Ohio coal producers' lobby in Columbus run by Robert E. Scott. Scott kept open house for legislators in a Columbus hotel suite. There were food and whisky for the asking, even a free hotel room should a legislator care for one.

After a long battle, Hanna and other coal companies compromised, agreed to restore the land they had gnawed away. Humphrey's company lived up to its bargain, and, in 1952, Lausche praised Hanna for its restoration progress in Harrison County. Humphrey frankly admits today that Hanna's fight against strip-mine control was a mistake. Humphrey is not one to waste time today trying to prove himself right yesterday.

The Eisenhower administration hasn't balanced the budget yet, but Humphrey has been a key figure in keeping deficits within hailing distance of the break-even point. His policies have helped keep the dollar stable. Within a fraction of 1 percent, the dollar will buy as much for you now as on the day the Eisenhower administration took office. The cost of living has stopped going up.

Humphrey and his Treasury aids worked with Representative DAN REED, Republican, of New York, to evolve the first major revision of the tax laws in 75 years. Democrats decried the 1954 revision bill as a boon for the wealthy. It is true that it cut taxes for those who receive dividends and gave a variety of tax breaks to business, but it also brought advantages to low-income groups by easing tax hardships for millions.

Humphrey worked hard for the tax-revision bill because, among other reasons, he believes that the more incentives there are for business and industry, the more jobs and earning power there will be for the mass of Americans. He also believes that our competitive production system operates best when there is a minimum of interference from the Government.

Democrats, lampooning this as the trickle-down theory, contend that the best way to get the economy roaring is to put money into the hands of the workers themselves, using the power of the Government to do so if necessary. There is a fundamental cleavage in economic creed. Perhaps it is the only major difference between the modern Democratic and Republican Parties.

Humphrey thrives on attacks. He refuses to be shaken in his belief that Americans want a strong defense, a solvent government, and a profit-motive, competitive production system that makes jobs. Here's what he says on these three points:

Defense: "We will need real strength for a long time. Nobody pays much attention to the fellow who comes around with his hat in his hand."

Solvent government: "We must have a dollar that will buy at least at much 10 years from now as it did, yesterday."

Business and jobs: "Productive jobs that pay good wages and create new and better goods for better living are made by industry, big and small, and not by the Government. The Government can't do much to help, except to create a proper climate in which jobs are made. But it can do a lot to hinder."

To pursue his objectives, Humphrey sets his alarm clock for 7 a. m. weekdays in his rented Washington mansion; it's at 1800 Foxhall Road, on a tree-shaded hill with a fine view of the city. Built in 1780, Uplands was once owned by Mrs. Borden Harriman, was rented before the Humphreys by Perle Mesta, Democratic party-giver, and Averell Harriman, Democratic Governor of New York.

Walls and tables of the Uplands living room hold a homey clutter of family pictures and trinkets, including the portraits of 40 people, 14 horses, 4 dogs, and 2 elephants. In one photograph, Humphrey sits astride his hunter, Richmond. A blue cushion displays a red-embroidered slogan: "Never complain, never explain."

HE IS A QUICK STARTER

Humphrey breakfasts with his wife, Pam, on prunes, oatmeal, and an occasional egg. "He hasn't varied that breakfast in 40 years," says Mrs. Humphrey. The Secretary drives his own 1952 Buick down to the Treasury Department. There, he faces a day of more than 100 letters and memos, as many as 50 phone calls—including some on the direct White House line—and a series of talks with his associates. He never worries about work at home, but his mind starts clicking early. By 9 a. m., he has a scratch pad filled with notes on action he wants taken that day.

Humphrey scorns regular staff conferences. (He thinks they waste time by encouraging people to talk about projects they ought to be acting on.) He lunches daily with Treasury officials, however, and invites Congressmen, Senators, and administration officials as guests. Humphrey and aids split the costs, about $1 per man a lunch.

The Secretary scatters notes all over Washington, scrawled with a cheap ball-point pen. He signs them: "G. M. H." Frequently, before Ike's illness, he sent letters over to the President that indicated how folks were thinking about the administration. Humphrey wrote a little note on these and signed them, "George."

Except for Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Marion B. Folsom, Humphrey is the only Eisenhower Cabinet officer to list his telephone number in the Washington directory. If he's home, he answers the phone, just as he used to do in his Hanna office in Cleveland.

One night, a high-school boy called up and asked the meaning of the pyramid and the eye on the back of the dollar bill. Mrs. Humphrey caught the opening of the conservation on another phone.

"Don't you dare tell that boy you don't know," she called to her husband. "The first Republican Secretary of the Treasury in 20 years is supposed to know everything about money."

Humphrey promised to call back, kept after minor Treasury officials that night until he got the answer for his young caller. The pyramid, he told him, represents strength, the eye represents the all-seeing Deity, and the unfinished condition of the pyramid indicates the belief of the Founding Fathers that American still had much work to do.

Like most men of great energy, Humphrey has his own methods of keeping fit. He doesn't smoke. He quit suddenly many years ago when he couldn't find a match. With one of those swift Humphrey decisions, he announced to his wife that smoking was a waste of time. He rarely drinks; whiskey makes him sneeze.

On their nights at home, the Humphreys play scrabble or gin rummy. They don't bother to bet. "He always wins anyway," says Mrs. Humphrey. The Secretary doesn't read much for pleasure. He prefers books on horse breeding.

Humphrey may well be the richest man in the Eisenhower "millionnaire" Cabinet. He owns a 3,000-acre estate at Thomasville, Ga., a country home at Kirtland Hills near Cleveland, 10 brood mares, 4 yearlings, and an interest in the champion stallion Heliopolis, which gets a $5,000 stud fee.

He has stock in the M. A. Hanna Co., the Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., the National Steel Corp., and the Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co., all of which he helped to build. His salaries and bonuses before he came to Wash-

ington were in excess of $300,000 a year, now replaced by the $22,500 salary of the Secretary of the Treasury. He also receives dividends in excess of $300,000 a year.

Estimates of the Humphrey family fortune range up to many millions. Whatever the exact total, it is clear that, aside from representing business success, a fortune, to Humphrey's mind, is something that permits a man to have bird dogs and riding horses on an estate in southern Georgia.

At Milestone, his Georgia preserve, Humphrey has a farmhouse, which he calls the administration building, and 3 surrounding cottages, 1 for each of his children and their offspring. Milestone is staffed by a maid, a cook and Rufus Davis, the dog handler for quail shooting. Milestone specializes in informality. Dog handler Davis bid goodby to President Eisenhower after his first visit there by saying he was "sure proud to have had the chance to handle you for 2 days."

In World War II, Humphrey teamed up with the Hollinger interests of Canada to exploit huge iron-ore deposits in Labrador, 300-odd miles north of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Humphrey raised $261 million from steel companies and insurance firms, under the Hanna banner, for this giant undertaking. A railroad was built over incredible terrain, a town was constructed and iron mines were opened. After more than a decade of hard labor, the first load of ore came to Sept Iles (Seven Islands), at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, in the summer of 1954. By 1957, 10 million tons of ore will be coming out of the mine every year.

Humphrey flew up to Canada to see the first ore emerge, and then hurried back to Washington for another round in the battle of the $60 billion budget and another day in his hard-bottom chair in the Treasury Department.

"I always preferred hard-bottom chairs," he said, "visitor's don't stay in them so long."

Massive Retaliation Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the latest in a series of careful analytical examinations of our policy of so-called massive retaliation has been the celebrated article by Mr. Paul H. Nitze. Mr. Nitze was formerly the Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department from 1950 to 1953, and is now president of the Foreign Services Education Foundation.

His article concludes on a note that could not be more pertinent to the statements attributed today to Mr. Dulles:

The more we can bring our action policy and our declaratory policy into line with each other the more effective both become.

I ask unanimous consent to have this outstanding article, slightly condensed, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMS, STRATEGY, AND POLICY
(By Paul H. Nitze)

After much use in political debate, words tend to become leathery and pliable in the meanings they suggest. Perhaps they gain something in richness of implication but they lose in precision. For example, the word "policy" is used in two related but different senses. In one sense, the action sense, it refers to the general guidelines which we believe should and will in fact govern our actions in various contingencies. In the other sense, the declaratory sense, it refers to policy statements which have as their aim political and psychological effects.

Much of the discussion of recent months concerning Western atomic policy has been on the issue of massive retaliation versus graduated deterrence. The phrase "massive retaliation" has been used by Secretary Dulles to describe a policy of relying for our security "primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate, instantly, by means and at places of our choosing." The phrase "graduated deterrence" has been used to describe a policy of "limiting wars (in weapons, targets, area, and time) to the minimum force necessary to deter and repel aggression." The main point at issue between the two concepts is the reliance which should be placed upon the capacity to bomb centers of population and industry with nuclear weapons.

The discussion of the two concepts would attain greater clarity if a distinction were maintained between the two meanings of the word "policy."

Our action policy has been, is, and, I believe, will continue to be one of graduated deterrence. We do not wish or intend to use means beyond those which are necessary for the achievement of any given objective. It is obviously to the interest of the West that war, and especially atomic war in any form, be avoided if that is possible without submitting to even greater evils. Furthermore, it is to the West's interest, if atomic war becomes unavoidable, that atomic weapons of the smallest sizes be used in the smallest areas and against the most restricted target systems possible, while still achieving for the West the particular objective which is at issue. * * * Our basic action policy must therefore be one of graduated deterrence.

But how about our declaratory policy—the statements of policy which we make for political effect? There may have been very good reason for leaving the Soviet leaders in no doubt that we do not propose to be nibbled to death; that they cannot blithely choose areas and means of aggression as they see fit without running very real risks that we will be forced to expand the means or area of action as may be necessary to redress the aggression. The difficulty with the massive-retaliation statement, however, was that to many people on our side it suggested that we would no longer take the measures necessary to contain local aggression with graduated means but would choose unlimited city-to-city atomic retaliation the moment we were given an excuse. Some people, in reaction to the massive-retaliation statement, are urging that we declare our firm intention not to use hydrogen weapons except in retaliation for their prior use by an enemy. Some are suggesting other forms of self-limiting declaration. Others are persuaded that while we maintain a stiff upper lip and give the Russians no reason to believe we would lack the will to meet a crisis they will never test that will.

The difficulty with declaratory policy is that it tends to be ineffective in its political and psychological consequences if it deviates too far from action policy. To be clear as to the wisdom of a declaratory policy, one must be sure first that the action policy it suggests is one which is, and will continue to be, in conformity with our interests and with basic realities, and secondly that the political and psychological consequences of the declaration will in fact be favorable.

Let us go back, therefore, and examine some of the developments in the weapons field and their impacts on both military and political strategy to see whether this throws any light on the type of action policy we can live with. Later we can look at the problem of what it might be wise to declare about it.

II

Many writers have suggested that an atomic stalemate has developed or is about to develop. The thought seems to be that as the Russian stockpile of atomic weapons grows both sides will realize that in an all-out nuclear war neither side can win and that therefore atomic peace (aside from some irrational action) is assured. I would suggest that the situation is more complex

In the first place the growth of the Russian atomic stockpile and delivery systems (the bases, planes, missiles, crews, radars, etc., necessary to deliver them on target) does not tend to inhibit action by the Soviets. It merely inhibits the possibility of action by ourselves. If the western monopoly was for many years a force for peace it is hard to see how the loss of that monopoly can, by itself, be a force for stability. It would seem much more plausible to look to the other development which has been proceeding concurrently with growth of the Russian stockpile—that is, to the great general advance in atomic-weapon systems technology—for those forces in the weapons field which may be tending toward increasing stability.

During the past 5 years the power of individual weapons, the number of weapons available, and the variety and flexibility of means for their delivery have expanded more rapidly than anyone at the beginning of that period thought possible. * * * It is this change in the order of magnitude of offensive potential which increasingly raises the question as to whether anyone can win an all-out nuclear war.

But the word win is another of our leathery words which can stand reexamination for precision of meaning. In one connotation the word win is used to suggest a comparison of the immediate postwar position of a country with its prewar position. In this sense none of the initial contestants won in the First World War or in the Second World War. It is probable that no one could win a third world war, in the sense of being richer, happier, or better off after such a war than before it, even if no atomic weapons were used. If atomic weapons were used in all-out, city-to-city attack by both sides the conclusion is certain.

In another connotation the word "win" is used to suggest a comparison of the postwar position of one of the adversaries with the postwar position of the other adversary. In this sense it is quite possible that in a general nuclear war one side or the other could win decisively. Even a small initial imbalance in relative capabilities, other things being equal, could grow rapidly into a decisive imbalance as the war progressed.

* * * * *

Some have argued that the destruction in an all-out nuclear war would be so great that nothing would remain, that life on this planet would be impossible, and that there would be no one left to win, even in the second sense of the word. This is technically conceivable. The number of high-yield thermonuclear weapons which can be exploded in a short space of time without producing general lethal contamination of the atmosphere is finite. But it is a large number, one not likely to be reached unless the war is fought in an entirely irrational way.

If the above line of reasoning is correct, then in a nuclear war fought with some degree of reason one side may very well win in this second comparative sense and the other side lose. The victor will be in a position to issue orders to the loser and the loser will have to obey them or face complete chaos or extinction. The victor will then go on to organize what remains of the world as best he can. Certainly he will try to see to it that there is never again a possibility that the loser possesses nuclear weapons.

These two meanings of the word "win" epitomize the two main lines of considerations which flow from the present state of atomic technology. The first meaning brings out the horror and destruction which both sides in the contest, and mankind as a whole, would face in an all-out nuclear war—horror and destruction having as its upper limit the destruction of all life on this planet and as its lower limit such great losses even for the victor as to make any meaningful comparison with his prewar status impossible. It is this meaning of the word which brings out the reasons why it is of the utmost importance that nuclear war should not occur. We could not possibly win in this first sense. And we hope the enemy also realizes that he could not win in this sense either. The second meaning of the word "win," the comparison between the postwar position of the victor and the defeated, brings out why it is also of the utmost importance that the West maintain a sufficient margin of superior capability so that if general war were to occur, we could win in the second sense. The greater that margin (and the more clearly the Communists understand that we have a margin) the less likely it is that nuclear war will ever occur. The greater that margin the greater are our chances of seeing to it that nuclear war, if it does come, is fought rationally and that the resulting destruction is kept to the lowest levels feasible.

III

Now is it possible for the West to maintain a position of sufficient superiority so that it could "win" in the second sense if the necessity arose? The answer would seem to be in the affirmative provided we take the necessary measures. This would be so even if we assume that technology, both in nuclear processes and in delivery systems, will tend in the long run to equality between East and West.

As the number of weapons possessed by the Soviet Union increases, the importance of mere superiority in numbers diminishes. As the significance of superiority in numbers diminishes, the importance of superiority in delivery systems increases. As the Soviets approach closer to equality in delivery systems, the significance of superiority in this factor also decreases. But if one assumes the existence of roughly equivalent capabilities in delivery systems, the significance of the geographic factor increases.

The United States is vulnerable to direct attack only from bases on the Eurasian land mass and from submarines. The U. S. S. R. is vulnerable to attack not only from North American bases but also from bases closer in on the periphery of the Eurasian land mass itself and from seas controlled by the navies of the West. Given anything approaching equality in numbers and quality of planes, missiles and the other elements of modern delivery systems, the geographic factor should give the West the possibility of a continuing and decisive margin of superiority. The very important emphasis which the Soviets are placing on this factor both in their diplomacy and in their propaganda indicates that they also recognize its importance.

On this line of reasoning, the controlling question is whether the West's geographic advantage can in fact be preserved in peace and asserted in the event of war. Can the West maintain, even in the face of smiling Russian tactics or renewed Soviet pressure and threats, sufficient cohesion in its alliances to make the geographic factor really count? The land bases ringing the U. S. S. R., close in, are subject to the sovereign control not of the United States but of the countries on whose territory they are located. A military policy which contributes to neutralism in those countries may rob the West of that geographic advantage which is potentially its greatest strength.

IV

The full significance of the geographic factor becomes evident only if one also bears in mind two other sets of considerations. One of these concerns the probable target systems in the initial period of a nuclear war. The other concerns the element of surprise.

A strong case can be made that no rational body of men would initiate a general atomic war unless they believed that the power of their initial atomic attack and its immediate effects on the enemy would be so great as to assure that the subsequent phases of the war would be substantially one-sided. In order to achieve such a one-sided result, the attacking side (either Russia in an initial attack, or the West in response to an aggression by Russia or China which could be met only by general war) would logically concentrate the full power of its initial atomic attack on the military—primarily the retaliatory—capabilities of the other side. The attacker's object would be to destroy, in the initial blow, a large proportion of the base structure from which the defender must launch his retaliatory action (including the planes or missiles on the bases and the submarines and carriers which might support the main retaliatory action). The attacker would attempt to destroy a sufficient large proportion of this base structure to reduce the power of the defender's retaliatory action to a level which the attacker's own defense system could contain. If he should succeed in this attempt he will have assured that the remaining phases of the war will be substantially one-sided. Once he has gained effective control of the intercontinental air space, then his adversary's entire country, including cities, industries, means of communication and remaining military capabilities, will lie open to his will. He will presumably have much in mind the postwar problem of building a world which he can control and manage. He will want destruction of that world to be held within reasonable limits. He will wish his own country to be spared as far as possible. He will also want to destroy only as much of the enemy territory as is necessary for him to impose his will and get on with the job of making of the world what he wants and can make of it.

The side which has lost effective control of the intercontinental airspaces will face a truly agonizing decision. It may still have the capability of destroying a few of the enemy's cities. But the damage it could inflict would be indecisive and out of all proportion to the annihilation which its own cities could expect to receive in return.

Whether one side or the other could hope to achieve substantial control of the air during the initial phase of the war depends further on a number of factors additional to those already mentioned. One of these is base dispersal—the number and geographic distribution of air, missile, and supporting bases. Another is air defense capability.

If the bases from which a Western strike can be mounted are 30 in number, the enemy will have a far easier task in establishing air control than if those bases are 300 or 3,000 in number and if they are geographically well dispersed and varied in character.

Of equal importance is the factor of air defense. If the Western early warning, radar, interceptor, and defensive missile system is such that it can contain a coordinated Soviet surprise attack of 1,000 planes, that is quite a different thing than if it can contain a coordinated attack of only 100 planes. The point is that the technology of defense has also been making strides in recent years. From the technological standpoint, it is quite possible to conceive air defense systems which will have a very high probability of destroying all, or nearly all, planes of a small-scale attack. The problem is to design one that could stop a very high percentage of a large coordinated attack. This problem may not be insoluble. It is possible to foresee defenses even against intercontinental ballistic missiles, as Secretary of the Air Force Quarles recently announced.

This brings us to a discussion of the element of surprise and the advantage accruing to the side which strikes the first blow. If side A's base structure consists of a small number of bases and if side B's air defense system is able to contain a fairly substantial enemy retaliatory attack, then the advantage to side B of striking the first blow may be very great indeed. For the West to permit such a situation to develop in favor of the U. S. S. R. would be to encourage a dangerous instability in the air-atomic situation.

Sheer geographical extent is one of the elements necessary both for adequate base dispersal and for a comprehensive air defense system. This would seem to reenforce the point made earlier that the West has every prospect of being able to maintain a superior position in the nuclear attack-defense equations, but only if its available geographic advantages can be maintained as a vital element.

* * * * *

Col. George A. Lincoln of the West Point faculty makes the further point that whether or not atomic weapons are ever again used in warfare, the very fact of their existence, the possibility that they could be used, will affect all future wars. In this sense Korea was an atomic war even though no atomic weapons were used. In this sense even the cold war is an atomic cold war. The situation is analogous to a game of chess. The atomic queens may never be brought into play; they may never actually take one of the opponent's pieces. But the position of the atomic queens may still have a decisive bearing on which side can safely advance a limited-war bishop or even a cold-war pawn. The advance of a cold-war pawn may even disclose a check of the opponent's king by a well-positioned atomic queen.

V

What action policy do these considerations suggest for the United States? To me they suggest the following:

(a) It is important that the West maintain indefinitely a position of nuclear attack-defense superiority versus the Soviet Union and its satellites.

(b) It is within the reasonable limits of what is physically possible for the West to maintain such a position indefinitely.

(c) To do so, the West will need to maintain at least equality, and if possible superiority, in atomic and weapons technology. It will need to maintain at least equality, and if possible superiority, in the manifold elements of effective atomic offensive and defensive weapons systems.

(d) In order to maintain a sufficient margin of superiority, so that even a surprise attack would give the enemy no prospect of achieving a one-sided result, the West must realize its geographic potential. Three corollaries flow from this proposition. We should develop an air defense system which makes full use of the West's geographic advantages. We should develop that widely dispersed base system which the West's geographic situation makes possible. But, above all, we must maintain in full working order the system of alliances and those working relations with our allies without which the West will have no geographic advantage at all.

(e) In order to maintain the western system of alliances we must, among many other things, develop a policy with respect to the conditions under which we would use atomic weapons in war—an action policy which we really intend to follow—which is consistent both with our own interests and those of our allies.

What might be the important elements of such a use policy, consistent with both our own interests and those of our allies? Its starting point would be our common interest in collective security. An attack on one ally must be considered an attack on all. We must not permit any ally who actively resists aggression to be overrun. We must have developed and be willing to use the strength necessary to restore the situation in the event of aggression. The elements of a common policy governing our use of atomic weapons might be the following:

(a) We should endeavor to meet aggression and restore the situation without the use of atomic weapons wherever this is possible.

(b) We should extend hostilities to other areas only if there is no other way effectively to restore the situation.

(c) Even if it becomes necessary to engage the U. S. S. R. in atomic warfare, we should limit ourselves to military objectives, primarily to those which are necessary to achieve control of the air. We should not initiate the bombing of industrial or population centers.

(d) We should attempt to build nonatomic elements of strength and to encourage our allies to do likewise so that the residual reliance which must be placed upon atomic weapons for our common security is reduced as far as may be feasible.

VI

Let us now discuss a few of the objections which might be raised to such an action policy.

Would we have any assurance that the enemy would not attack the cities of the West first? Obviously we would have no absolute assurance on this point. But assuming a maintenance of Western nuclear attack-defense superiority, it would seem wholly irrational for the enemy to do so. Every weapon he wasted on a city would be a weapon he could not use against our dispersed retaliatory base structure and a further contribution to the overwhelming destruction of his own cities which his attack would have invited.

Could we be sure that during the period that it took us to gain effective air control, and before the enemy had accepted defeat, he would not lash out to do what damage he could to our cities? Obviously we could not be sure. But the more thoroughly we had concentrated on his air-atomic capabilities, the greater the prospect that his attack would be disorganized and reduced to a scale which our air defense system could contain.

Is it possible to draw a distinction between industrial and population centers and air-atomic bases? Such a distinction presents real difficulties, but the importance of overcoming them is so great that it should be possible to do so. There is no reason why we, and the enemy as well, cannot locate military air bases more than a given distance, say 20 miles, from major population centers. There is no reason why high-yield thermonuclear weapons need to be used against base targets. Certainly, smaller population centers might be destroyed by near misses or other accidents. But is this not wholly different from the purposeful mass destruction of the urban populations of the world?

Would it not be expensive to create and maintain the military establishment required for air-atomic superiority in this sense? Certainly it would be expensive, but it would not be more expensive than we should and can afford. Today the West's expenditures for defense and gross capital formation are under 25 percent of gross national product. The Soviet expenditures for these categories are over 40 percent. Certainly the West could afford to allocate an additional 2 to 5 percent of its gross national products to defense if this is essential to survival. An effort short of what is adequate may obtain no useful results at all. The last 10 to 20 percent of the resources expended may be the ones that really count and validate the entire investment.

Would it not be even more expensive for us and our allies to carry, in addition, the costs of nonatomic defenses required to reduce the pressure on our atomic defenses? It would be. Europe, for instance, probably cannot carry the full costs of both atomic and nonatomic defenses.

In order for Europe to acquire an adequate defensive posture within its means it will probably have to rely on the help that tactical atomic firepower gives to the defense as well as on the backing of the strategic airpower of the United States. But if we expect NATO to continue as a vital organization we should lose no time in spreading the air-defense system to Europe. Nike batteries would offer substantial protection now, and later technological developments should improve it. And, above all, Europe must understand that war is not synonymous with Armageddon. We should make it clear that, if we all stick togeher, war is unlikely—that city-to-city air attacks are not part of our policy—and that, even in the event of atomic war, Soviet attacks on metropolitan centers would be only a final act of desperation and irrationality against which as effective defenses as are technologically possible will have been provided.

Would an action policy as described above serve to defend Asia and the Middle East? If we were clear in our minds that there is no easy way of defending Asia and the Middle East merely by statements threatening "massive retaliation," we might find it easier to address ourselves to the realistic actions which would in fact strengthen those areas. But when all is said and done, we probably must continue to rely in part on our nuclear attack-defense superiority. The Soviets must be left in no doubt that if there were to be an outbreak of massive military aggression in either area, and if the situation could not be restored by mobilization of the nonatomic strengths available, rather than accept defeat without fighting, we will fight and from a superior nuclear attack-defense position.

VII

If some such action policy is one with which we could live, what should our declaratory policy be? This question should be decided only after we had taken the necessary measures to make our action policy operable and had fully consulted with our allies. It is quite possible that taking the actions necessary to implement such a policy would be more impressive to the Russians than any declaration we might make. The more we can bring our action policy and our declaratory policy into line with each other the more effective both become.

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Our Great President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey, a great American statesman, has paid a perfect tribute to another great American statesman, President Dwight David Eisenhower.

Under leave to extend, heretofore granted, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the address of the Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey delivered at the New York-New Jersey Salute to Eisenhower dinner at Madison Square Garden, January 20, 1956:

We are here tonight to salute the greatest American of our time—Dwight David Eisenhower.

History may ultimately record him as the greatest man of many times, but it is clearly evident at the moment that he is beyond doubt the outstanding figure in the world today.

Never before in history have the hopes of so many millions of people throughout the world been centered on the shoulders of one man. Never before in history has a man stricken with illness had the fervent prayers for his recovery from so many millions of people all over the world.

One reason for this great attachment of so many millions to our President is the fact that he has become a symbol for peace. A military man for most of his life, President Eisenhower has fought valiantly for peace and against war during the past three decades.

His military service in the Philippines and later in Africa and in Europe brought him into intimate contact with the people of many nations. His warm personality, remarkable good will, great wisdom, enormous patience, and devotion to duty have become well known to both the leaders and the ordinary citizens of many countries on a close personal basis.

IN WORLD WAR II HE WAS THE CONQUERING HERO

In World War II he was the conquering hero who led the forces which repelled the armies of the dictators and eventually won peace and freedom for the overrun nations. He returned to Europe to head the drive for a NATO structure again to protect the free world from another threat to peace and freedom.

During the last 3 years as President of this great land, President Eisenhower has become increasingly in the eyes of the world the great hope for a just and lasting peace. He has become the embodiment of the fervent hopes of millions of the world's people for the eventual day of just peace among nations.

So, I am humbly proud, and I know that you too are proud, to be among the vast numbers of American citizens who tonight are saluting President Eisenhower.

His character is reflected in the objectives he has held and worked for during his term of office and the depth of his sincerity has imbued his associates with those same objectives and enthusiasm for their accomplishment. His objectives are few and simple. They can be characterized with but a single word—progress—steady, insistent, persistent progress in three fundamental directions.

Toward a just and lasting peace throughout the world.

Toward a widespread and continuing prosperity.

Toward greater freedom for the individual in his pursuit of happiness and protection from the ravages of adversity for all mankind.

SEES HIS IDEALS ROOTED IN PRACTICABILITY

His high ideals are firmly rooted on the solid foundation of practicability. He is no idle dreamer. He wants and works for his dreams to come true. How far he has succeeded is history, but it is worth reviewing for just a few moments tonight.

His accomplishments toward peace have recently been described at length in the state of the Union message to the Congress. The problems are enormous. The broad highway to accomplishment is not clear and it is beset with frustrations and difficulties at every turn, but the bare fact remains that within a few months after he took office the shooting stopped in Korea and no American mothers have had to worry about their sons and daughters since then in a shooting war.

Crises continually beset us and will continue to do so but we can all rest assured that we have a wise, cool head directing a firm hand on the tiller to steer our ship of state as carefully as it can be done between the rocks and shoals of war and aggression, but forward—always forward, pressing forward toward a just and lasting peace.

His accomplishments toward a widespread and continuing prosperity are here before our eyes to see on almost every hand. Only a part of our farm population is still suffering from the burdensome surpluses accumulated under past laws ill devised to bring on anything but the very burdens which are now bearing so heavily on farm crops, production, and prices in some fields. Practical, workable relief in that area is of first concern, and no problem is receiving greater attention. But it is the result of an accumulation of years of bad practice and cannot be soundly corrected all at once.

Everywhere else on almost every side we are having the greatest employment, the most jobs, the best pay, the lowest percentage of people unemployed, the highest earnings, and the best times, by any measure, that this country has ever seen with new high records in almost every line.

It is no accident that this great economic achievement has come about under the leadership of President Eisenhower. We have achieved prosperity without the bloody cost of war, and without the false promise of inflation. The American people today enjoy not only a record economy but a sound one. This achievement in economic integrity is no surprise to anyone who knows the President. It reflects the integrity of the man.

It is a subject, next to peace, that is closest to his heart, and closest to your welfare.

I am asked many times why we in the Eisenhower administration have given such very great importance to balancing the budget and stopping inflation.

Balancing the budget in prosperous times is the prime requisite of financial integrity.

We have made financial integrity and stability in the cost of living, one of our foremost goals.

We have not done this out of any academic concern. It isn't just a matter of accounting or bookkeeping or businessman's fetish.

Money has no value except as it affects people. We are so concerned about the value of the dollar because it is the people's money we are collecting, spending—and defending, and because stability in the cost of living so vitally affects each of us.

WE ARE DETERMINED TO AVOID INFLATION

We are determined to avoid inflation, as well as to prevent deflation. Either can jeopardize the happiness, the hopes, and the well-being of all the 167 million people of this great Nation.

Inflation can steal away your savings, your pension, and the value of your wages.

Deflation can endanger millions of jobs.

The integrity—the staying power—of the value of the dollar is of primary importance to each and every one of us no matter what our condition. Rich or poor—old or young—on a salary or a daily wage, or living on a pension or an insurance policy, we are all concerned, not only as it affects our current cost of living but our very jobs are at stake.

A job is the most important thing in America.

Whether you are working for yourself, in a profession or in a factory, in a mine, in transportation, in some form of service, or on a farm, it is all the same.

To have a job you must have tools, power and machines to work with, and someone must save and invest to supply them. We have a rapidly growing population and over a million new jobs must be created every year to supply our needs. That means new tools—new factories—new mines—new trucks and trains, and all kinds of things to work with.

That means more and more investment to buy them; and who will invest if the value of their money is uncertain? Who will buy the big bond issues? Who will make the mortgage loans? You all are involved. Not only is your job at stake but your home is also. Who will make the loans that permit you to buy your home or your car on time if the value of money is uncertain?

MILLIONS OF YOU ARE ALSO INVESTORS

Moreover, millions of you are also investors. It is not the rich who supply the funds today. The great investors in this country are not only the millions of small individual investors, but are the small savers who through the insurance companies, the pension funds, the savings banks, union and fraternal funds, and the other ways of saving buy the stocks, bonds, and mortgages and make the other loans.

Sound money is the incentive that keeps men doing their best. That spurs their imagination to do research and make new inventions. That underlies our great industrial machine. That will modernize the old jobs and make the new jobs to make the new and better and cheaper things we all need to continually increase our scale of living. That will induce the savings and investment of savings of the millions of Americans who have confidence in our free system and the soundness of our finances.

These are the material reasons why a balanced budget, financial responsibility, and the soundness of the dollar are of fundamental importance to each and every one of us, no matter who we are, nor where we are.

Bad money, like a bad apple, will rot the whole barrel.

A government that adopts inflation as a policy to achieve its ends leads its people into false land.

FALSE MONEY LEADS TO THE SLAVE STATE

When you tinker with a value so basic as the value of money—when you induce inflation and make it a policy to give the people more and more income of less and less buying power—falseness in all other things must follow.

The government which adopts a policy of inflation must preempt to itself an ever-growing web of other powers with which it can hide the falseness of its money and smother the complaints of the people as they see the buying power of their savings and life insurance being stolen away, as the prices of food, clothing, and shelter rise faster than more false money can supply.

False money leads to the slave state.

The buying power of the dollar dropped from 100 cents to only 52 cents in just 15 years preceding the election of this administration. But the long trend of inflation that had been eating away at the value of your dollar hos now been halted, and there has been no significant loss in the buying power of the dollar now for over 3 full years.

This means that when your incomes are increased—and they are now at record highs—you have a real raise, not merely a raise to match the higher cost of living that was for so long the order of the day. This has been a real "Eisenhower extra."

WHO WANTS TO GO BACK?

You all remember their slogans in the last campaign "You never had it so good" and "Don't let them take it away." You can ask them now "Who wants to go back?"

Now how did this all happen? What were some of the specific moves by the Eisenhower administration which contributed to this result?

Total Government spending was cut sharply. Spending now is $10 billion under 3 years ago, and $14 billion less than had been planned by the final budget of the previous administration.

We at long last have balanced the budget, the surest index to thrifty management in a home, in a business, or in the Federal Government.

And, we have made the largest dollar tax cut in the history of this country. This great tax reduction of almost $7,500 million was a mighty assist in the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

The Eisenhower administration has also accomplished much toward greater freedom for the individual in his pursuit of happiness and from the ravages of adversity. Artificial controls, rationing, price fixing, and all manner of directives and decisions from Washington were promptly removed in nearly everything but farm programs, where rigid laws prevented. Ten million additional people were included in social-security benefits. The minimum wage was increased. Additional health research is assisting in the prevention and treatment of disease. Large-scale integrated Federal road and school building programs are proposed. The scale of living of 167 million Americans is higher than ever in our history.

SAYS SLAVE STATES MULTIPLY ON INFLATION

These, then are some of the ways that the administration of President Eisenhower has contributed toward peace, defended the value of your work and savings, and increased your freedom of opportunity and free choice.

We can never take for granted the preservation of our free way of life. Only a people of high integrity can deserve freedom. No people, however great, can preserve integrity if it must transact its business, measure its worth, in a false, inflated currency. Prudence, thrift, honest work, and honest government must all go hand in hand.

And make no mistake about it. It is no coincidence that since the scourge of inflation was let loose on the modern world slave states have multiplied.

In the slave state, men do things under the lash of the whip of "do it or else." They have been robbed of the honest values that spur men in the free world to work, to save, and to build a better life. We are determined here on preserving those values, so that in our country men will never lack the incentive to do the things in freedom that make for a fuller and better life—and do them far better than they can ever be done in any slave state.

IN THESE TIMES OF DEADLY CONTEST

These basic incentives to honesty, thrift, hard work, and production cannot fail to inspire—as it has inspired—thrifty, hard-working government. And it cannot fail to preserve among our people those qualities of prudence, thrift, industry, and spirit of self-betterment that have made them the greatest and best provided people on this earth.

In these times of deadly contest between our way of freedom and the reactionary ways of the Communist slave state, it behooves us all to keep intact and vigorous all our qualities of greatness. Only if we do so can we remain a great beacon light of freedom and promise in the free world, an encouragement to all others to pursue our way of freedom, and avoid seduction into slavery.

The large measure of success in restoring freedom from war and financial integrity and progress in the pursuit of happiness for all the people are truly the proudest accomplishments of the great leader we salute tonight.

It reflects, as perhaps nothing else can, the basic honesty and high character of the President himself.

There is no more fitting time than this to pledge that we shall not falter in this great task, nor shall we ever be driven from it by men who would ignore tomorrow's doom for today's advantage.

Talk, Not Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD an article from the Democratic Digest of December 1955 dealing with the tariff situation. The article follows:

TALK, NOT TRADE

"Can the Republican Party break away from its high-tariff past, and adopt the traditional Democratic position in favor of low barriers to international trade? Or is it impossible to obtain leadership for a liberal foreign-trade policy from the Republicans?"

This question, posed by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, has been hanging in the minds of many observers of both political parties ever since the Republicans were elected to office in 1952. There was a general recognition of the historic unanimity among Republicans in Congress in opposition to lower trade barriers. But there was hope in the unequivocal protrade statements of General Eisenhower, both as a presidential candidate and as President—hope that his prestige and popularity might succeed in pulling his party away from die-hard protectionism.

After 3 years, however, there is little hope left among those who favor expanded trade. In 1955, Republicans in Congress were about as solidly protectionist as they had been in 1953, when President Eisenhower first came to office. If anything, their opposition to the President on this issue is more intense than ever.

But it is not so much the stubborn protectionism of the Republicans in Congress that gives rise to despair; it is the reluctant realization that, despite its bold statements on behalf of freer trade, the administration itself is, at heart, protectionist. And because the real impetus for expanded trade cannot come from Congress, but must come from the executive branch, friends of freer trade know that if the administration abdicates leadership in the trade field, there will be no leadership.

All through the administration's first 2 years in office, there were signs that the high-tariff forces were important, if not dominant, within the administration circles: The half-hearted testimony of Cabinet officers in 1953 in favor of continuing the reciprocal-trade program; the appointment of known protectionists to the vital Tariff Commission; the President's refusal to press his trade program against GOP protectionist opposition in 1954. Yet these danger signals were accompanied by the most emphatic and unqualified statements from the White House and other administration leaders about the importance of more liberal trade. "If we fail in our trade policy," the President told Congress in 1954, "we may fail in all."

But in July 1954, came the first overt and serious antitrade action by the administration when it yielded to the pleadings of the American watch industry, and raised the tariff on imported watches (mostly Swiss) by 50 percent.

Since then, two other major administration actions have jolted our friends abroad and supporters of freer trade at home:

A 50 percent hike in the tariff on bicycles.

The rejection of a British bid to furnish generators for the Chief Joseph Dam in Washington State, although their bid was substantially below the American bid which won the award.

These actions were in such direct conflict with everything the administration had been saying about our trade policy that the press reacted with unusual sharpness. "Dishonest and hypocritical," the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer called the generator decision. "Is Uncle Sam a Hypocrite on Foreign Trade Policy?" was the title of a Louisville Courier-Journal editorial. "Is it not time to end this hypocrisy?" asked the Washington Post.

The Nashville Tennessean noted the damage to United States prestige in the world as a result of the discrepancy between words and action. "Hereafter," commented the Tennessean, "when administration spokesmen talk about free trade, assuming that they will have the nerve to do so, they are not entitled to be taken seriously here at home or overseas."

What distressed many observers was that the administration had seemed to base each of its three major protectionist actions on the flimsiest of reasons. For example, the increase in watch tariffs was justified as necessary to keep the United States watch industry alive in case of a national defense emergency. But it was later revealed that the Defense Department itself had rejected the national defense argument prior to the watch decision.

As to the rejection of the British bid for generators, Neal Stanford, writing in the Christian Science Monitor, points out that "while the Eisenhower administration is constantly reporting new highs in employment, the Nation's economy, American income, etc., it rejects a British low bid (for generators) on the argument of (local United States) unemployment." And the Cleveland Plain Dealer noted that the net profits of a Cleveland bicycle maker in 1948, when imports supposedly began to hurt, were nearly 5 times what they were in 1946.

There was a feeling that if there had been any real determination within the administration to resist the protectionist pressures within the GOP, the decisions could easily have gone the other way. After all, as the Christian Science Monitor points out, President Eisenhower's predecessor, Mr. Truman, had turned down a requested tariff boost on watches just 2 years before Mr. Eisenhower approved the increase.

One high-tariff lobbyist in Washington remarked recently, "Why does everybody get so excited just because they raise the tariff on a silly item like bicycles?" The answer appeared in two sharply diverse publications. Wrote E. F. Tompkins in the New York Journal-American, now that the bicycle industry has won its tariff increase, "other injured industries may now rightfully expect similar relief." And the London Economist commented, "The paramount point for the Americans to realize is that in this country, the long-delayed bicycle decision has always been regarded as a test case."

William H. Draper, Jr., formerly our foreign aid Ambassador in Europe, explains the effect of our unpredictable tariff policy on businessmen abroad.

"Actually," writes Draper, "as foreign businessmen will readily tell you, the rate (tariff) on any item, high or low, is secondary; what's really important is that once the rate is fixed it should stay fixed." No American businessman would deal with a concern that refused to sign a contract unless it contained a proviso that could be broken at any time. "Yet we, as a Nation, insist on behaving this way when we trade with other nations." Draper proposes negotiating treaties with other countries whereby both countries guarantee not to raise tariffs on certain goods for 10 years. That way, he says, foreign businessmen will be more likely to go to the effort and expense involved in entering the American market.

Ambassador Draper also points out that the Communists have benefitted substantially from our erratic trade policy by "shrewdly offering to buy from our allies the very items we exclude from our markets by variable tariff rates and quotas." The results:

Free-world trade with Red China increased nearly $100 million in a single year.

West Germany and France tripled trade with Red China.

Argentina signed a $200 milion trade pact with Russia.

"At every major (1954) diplomatic conference," writes Draper, American representatives have been handicapped because they couldn't compete with trade offers shrewdly injected into the discussions by Communist delegates."

President Eisenhower himself pointed out another major reason for maintaining and expanding our trade with other nations. "For our own economic growth we must have continuously expanding free markets," he told Congress in 1954. The Department of Commerce estimates that some 3 million workers are employed in the production of United States exports, directly or indirectly. A shrinkage of exports could mean substantial increases in United States unemployment.

Looking back, some observers recall Mr. Hoover's failure to recognize the importance of world trade for United States prosperity, as symbolized by his acceptance of the radical Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930.

Illinois Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, formerly a distinguished professor of economics, recalls that he was 1 of 1,028 economists who signed a petition urging President Hoover to veto the Smoot-Hawley bill on the grounds that it would only deepen the depression that was already 8 months old. Despite their plea, Hoover signed the bill. "Everything that we had prophesied came true," DOUGLAS recalls. "Our exports fell off. European countries imposed retaliatory tariffs * * * we drifted into a state of economic anarchy."

Neither DOUGLAS nor any other observer feels that anything as bad as that will happen this time, but the future of our foreign trade policy remains very much a question as long as the vacuum of leadership in the trade field continues.

There Is Need for a Long-Term Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there is a compelling need today, it appears to me, for a sound, long-term foreign economic policy as part of our foreign policy. Limited authorization for long-term aid would provide the President with the flexibility he needs for such projects as the Aswan Dam, which is of imaginative and dramatic interest to the people in the area it will affect. It is not in our national interest for the President's hands to be rigidly tied in this field.

Authorization is not appropriation, of course, and the Congress must retain its ability to review each year's requests. However, authorization would give renewed courage to our friends in the free world as demonstration of the fact that we are in this fight to win. The contest with the Soviets which we now face requires the ability for long-term planning.

I urgently hope the administration will maintain its position on this vital subject.

I would like to call the attention of the Congress to a statement by 17 House Democrats on this subject, made last weekend. May I also point out the eloquent editorial in this morning's Washington Post and Times Hearld, entitled "On Planning Ahead."

JOINT STATEMENT BY 17 DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON LONG-RANGE FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

The attached release is issued by the following Democratic Members of Congress, including two members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—Congressmen A. S. J. CARNAHAN and HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.—VICTOR L. ANFUSO, New York; THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ohio; JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Missouri; CHET HOLIFIELD, California; LESTER HOLTZMAN, New York; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; RICHARD E. LANKFORD, Maryland; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; TORBERT H. MACDONALD, Massachusetts; ADAM C. POWELL, JR., New York; JAMES M. QUIGLEY, Pennsylvania; HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; FRANK THOMPSON, JR., New Jersey; HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey.

JOINT STATEMENT—FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

The shift in the Soviet foreign policy from primary emphasis on military encroachment to emphasis on economic, political, and psychological penetration of the free world has been obvious for some time. A primary reason for the shift has been the success of the United States bipartisan policy of developing the military strength of the free world.

This success argues strongly for the continued maintenance of our military strength, but at the same time we must recognize the new challenge we face and develop policies to forward the free world's interests and combat the Communists' tactical shift. Indeed, we should recognize the shift of Soviet tactics as providing the West with a great new opportunity. If the contest between tyranny and freedom is to be pursued on economic, political, and psychological grounds, we have a clear advantage. Our system of political freedom and an expanding economy which benefits all is clearly superior to the Soviet system of regimentation and forced economic advance. But this advantage is ours only if we use it.

One of the best tools in the arsenal of freedom is a sound, long-range foreign economic policy. We must tell the world, through a statement of principle in the Congress, that America is in the fight for freedom to stay and that we are prepared to continue our offers of help to those free countries which are prepared to help themselves advance economically and politically toward freedom.

We therefore join in urging that such a statement of principle be written into the mutual security legislation this year. We believe this statement should make clear that it is the bipartisan policy of the United States to resist aggressive communism but also, and equally important, to further the opportunities of all men to realize their legitimate aspirations for freedom and economic progress.

Moreover, we look with favor on providing authority in this year's legislation for the President to make certain advance commitments of economic development funds for a period not exceeding 5 years. Within a reasonable limit this will increase, not reduce, the flexibility of our aid program by permitting the Executive to meet emergency situations as they arise.

We recognize, of course, that apropriations for each year's expenditures must and should be reviewed by each Congress. However, we believe a statement of the intent of the American people, speaking through their elected representatives, that we are in this fight to win would assist in offsetting the gains the Soviets are attempting to achieve in those areas striving for economic and political advancement. We believe our friends in those areas would take renewed confidence in their ability to resist Communist encroachment and their capacity to achieve their legitimate aspirations within the framework of freedom if they have tangible evidence that the United States is prepared to assist them as long as such assistance is necessary.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of January 24, 1956]

ON PLANNING AHEAD

It is unfortunate that Secretary Dulles' dance on the diplomatic brink has influenced the discussion of long-term foreign aid commitments. Reverberations over the magazine article about Mr. Dulles continue to demonstrate the baneful effects of the indiscretion, more because of the bald and smug overstatement that because of disagreement with the basic doctrine of deterrence of aggression. A return to perspective is not much helped by the assumption on the part of some of Mr. Dulles' champions that it was perfectly all right to release a campaign document which, incidentally, scared the free world, but that it is dastardly politics to question the wisdom and propriety of this sort of performance by the Secretary of State.

Be this as it may, the country simply cannot afford to let the discussion of its long-term interests in foreign affairs be diverted by massive retaliation against Mr. Dulles. Especially for that reason, the courageous statement of 17 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives in support of the principle of advance commitment of certain foreign aid funds is noteworthy and commendable. America's interest in economic aid as an instrument of free world policy goes far beyond partisan politics; and the Democrats' own record in supporting such aid against right-wing Republican opposition is creditable.

Critics can point to a good many instances in which narrow-minded actions within the Republican administration have worked against the very principles it is now promoting. Chalmers Roberts' story in this newspaper Sunday about how Burma was rebuffed last summer when it sought to pay for American technical aid with surplus rice pointed to incredible shortsightedness. It is in just this sort of problem—the adaptation of techniques to suit the needs of individual countries such as Burma—that the Soviet Union has scored a propaganda success.

Administration mistakes quite apart, however, the new Russian campaign designed to neutralize large areas of the free world faces this country with an immediate challenge. Obviously, even so strong a capitalist economy as ours could not stand the cost of attempting to counter every Machiavellian maneuver of the Soviet masters. They are free to promise without regard to public opinion at home or the needs of their own people. If we are to meet the challenge we need to place our emphasis, not on efforts to outbid the Russians frontally, but on skillful application of flexible and selective techniques.

Beyond the grant-and-loan type of aid, we probably ought to devise means of absorbing the surpluses of the countries we are trying to help, either through preclusive buying or a sort of brokerage system. But long-range commitment authority, although it is by no means the whole answer, is indispensable to a flexible approach. We ought to be in a position to encourage countries we are trying to help to plan ahead on specific projects of open economic benefit, such as dams and roads, with the assurance that they can be carried through.

The fact that one Congress cannot bind another need not prejudice this kind of flexibility if legislators will adapt the military aid contract authorization formula to the economic aid program. New appropriations would always be subject to congressional check. Economic warfare of the sort now forced upon us requires broad advance planning of the sort that would be impossible on a year-to-year basis. The economic challenge will remain long after the 1956 campaign and Mr. Dulles' boasts have been forgotten; and this is the point that both the administration and Congress need to keep in mind.

Truman's Memoirs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald, Tuesday, January 24, 1956, in which the paper discusses and comments on the parts played by former President Truman and Gen. George C. Marshall with respect to Chiang Kai-shek and the loss of China to the Communists:

The second installment of the Truman memoirs, the abridgment of which begins in Life magazine, is bound to revive the "Who lost China?" argument. Mr. Truman is in no doubt it. The government of Chiang Kai-shek did not command the respect and support of the Chinese people. Chiang's attitude was that of an old-fashioned warlord. His commanders had a walled-city complex, and would not heed the advice first of General Marshall and then of our military mission in Nanking. In short Mr. Truman implies, quite rightly, the Chinese themselves lost China, and, specifically the Nationalist Government under Chiang Kai-shek.

All this is well attested history, told in Mr. Truman's customary crisp fashion. Nevertheless, Mr. Truman's account is bound to fan the embers of controversy. Fiction has become fact to many of the leather-lunged China Firsters. Mr. Truman's account occurs in the course of a long defense of his dispatch of the Marshall mission to China in 1945–46. The defense is well taken. Chiang had already come to a formal agreement with the Chinese Communists to work toward national unity. All that General Marshall tried to do, all that he was commissioned to do in our national interest (which was to keep China from being split by civil war) was to encourage the development of a Nationalist-Communist coalition government. In those days, Mr. Truman says, all of us were for it, including Generals Wedemeyer and Hurley, who subsequently alined themselves with the anti-Trumanites (though General Wedemeyer has denied Mr. Truman's version). To be sure General Marshall failed in his task, but it was a gallant failure, and the effort was worthwhile as a diplomatic venture.

Mr. Truman thinks that "If Chiang had been a little more conciliatory, an understanding could have been reached." Surely he is oversanguine to the point of naivete. Chiang's Kuomintang by that time was thoroughly bankrupt, and the "mandate of

heaven," as the Chinese put it, had already passed to the Communists. Far from being responsible for Chiang's downfall through denial of enough United States materiel we actually speeded it, for the arms we gave were regarded merely as counters in a game of panicky and wholesale surrender to the Communists. In those days the Communists called Chiang Kai-shek their supply sergeant.

In this chapter the former President asseverates that he was not credulous about the Communists. He says he knew what they were up to. "Neither Marshall nor I" was ever taken in by the assertion that they were merely agrarian reformers. Nor did Mr. Truman believe Stalin at Potsdam when he said that the Chinese Communists were not proper Communists. These are simply polemical points. The fact is that the Chinese Communists happened to be the spearhead of one of the mightiest revolutions of all time which was fed by a rural discontent in an immeasurable degree. The Truman memoirs would read more like history if Mr. Truman (who, by the way, ought really to eschew all his foolish cracks about hindsight) had included the fifty-odd reports General Marshall sent him from China. These would indeed be a contribution to the history of the period.

A Creed for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include in my extension of remarks an editorial containing a beautiful and all-embracive prayer, made in the Massachusetts House of Representatives some weeks ago by Rev. (Father) Christopher P. Griffin, chaplain of the House of Representatives in Massachusetts. This beautiful prayer should be widely read:

[From the Boston Daily Record of September 12, 1955]

A CREED FOR ALL

Not everything that is said on Beacon Hill is worth remembering, and many of the speeches, especially those made in the heat of debate, had best be forgotten.

The conspicuously notable exception was the prayer offered last Thursday by the Rev. Christopher P. Griffin, chaplain of the house of representatives.

We cannot inscribe this prayer on the marble walls of the hall of flags for all to see, now and forevermore. But we can and are going to print it here—as follows:

"Almighty God, whose divine sovereignty and whose authority we can neither question nor deny, we pray that we may faithfully and fearlessly try to do what You have commanded. The first law is that we 'Love the Lord our God with our whole hearts, and minds and souls, and Thy second was like it, that we love our neighbors as ourselves.' This is the immutable, the eternal, the divine law, written on the tablets of Moses, and carved irrevocably on the fleshly tables of the hearts of men. Hatred campaign against Jews, persecutions of Catholics, baiting of Protestants—these are contrary to the divine will.

"There are theological and dogmatic differences that separate us, but there can be no justification for race hatred. The walls and fences of hatred and bitterness can do to America what neither Hitler, Stalin, or all the world's dictators could never do. If there is hatred for Jew, or Catholic, or Protestant, let it be in the name of Satan, not under the blasphemous cloak of religious mockery.

"It is not out of order, nor is there a better time to start here in this spot sacred to human and divine law, blessed in its service to religious freedom, that all of us in fulfillment of the divine mandate, as well as in response to our noble impulses, do not merely try to understand Jews and Protestants and Catholics, not merely tolerate them, but love them with all the fervor of our hearts and would welcome the opportunity to prove that love by the very sacrifice of our lives for them. Amen."

We hope that all teachers will clip this beautiful prayer and read it to their pupils many times throughout the year.

The child who adopts these principles and patterns his life according to them cannot fail to grow up to be a great American.

Optimism Over Geneva Cools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Second Look Cools Optimism Over Geneva," which was published in the November 1955 issue of Democratic Digest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS REAPPRAISES SUMMIT TALKS—SECOND LOOK COOLS OPTIMISM OVER GENEVA

In the fading atmosphere of Geneva, the Nation's press took a second look at the Big Four Conference. The verdict is not reassuring, for many columnists and editors are concerned by the gains which the Russians are scoring in the aftermath of the summit meeting.

"On balance," said James Reston of the New York Times, "it is hard to deny that the Communists are making more progress in the cool war than they ever did in the cold war."

The Russians have won "victory for a smile," said the Wall Street Journal.

"The Soviet objective seems to be to relieve something of the tension of the cold war, but to do nothing positive and decisive about removing the causes of the cold war," wrote Roscoe Drummond in the Herald Tribune. The Kremlin, he said, has "now got all it wants for nothing (that is, for some inexpensive smiles)."

Why were these commentators so concerned? What were the Russian gains which aroused widespread misgivings?

The most dramatic Russian success during the Geneva aftermath came out of Chancellor Adenauer's trip to Moscow, which the New York Times called "a fantastic political and diplomatic defeat" for the West.

Before Geneva the Chancellor had been outspokenly mistrustful of the Soviet regime. On the surface he had seemed unchanged by the new warmth in the atmosphere.

During the post-Geneva interval before Adenauer left for Moscow, the Government of West Germany continued to talk a tough line: diplomatic relations with the Russians would be established only if they would lead to the reunification of Germany and the release of the 100,000 prisoners who had been held by the Russians since World War II.

But once Adenauer arrived in Moscow, said the Times, "the whole concept of dealing with the Soviet Union from strength collapsed overnight," and the Chancellor agreed to diplomatic relations in exchange for no more than a verbal assurance that Russia would release 10 percent of the prisoners.

"The Soviet Union got precisely what it wanted out of the negotiations here with West Germany," wrote Marguerite Higgins from Moscow, "* * * one more step toward general acceptance of the status quo in Europe. The Russians can keep what they have, and at the same time open up prospects for a great deal more trade."

The German collapse, serious as it was, was only the latest sign of weakening in Western defenses. Within less than a month after the Geneva meeting, the Milwaukee Journal listed in its wake these "unhappy" developments:

"The drive to rearm West Germany has slowed down.

"Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are seeking to lessen their military commitments.

"France has scrapped a program to modernize its army. Worried about revolt in north African possessions, it is stripping a NATO military contribution which never reached promised levels.

"Sections of the British press are demanding a cut in draft calls. Italy's defense program is slowing to a standstill.

"The Balkan alliance of Yugoslavia, Turkey, and Greece is falling apart as the result of Tito's new friendship with Moscow.

"Britain, Greece, and Turkey are at odds over the future of Cyprus.

"Progress on an anti-Communist alliance in the Near East has halted."

To this list, the New York Times added the disheartening news that "the Communists are using the smiling photographs of President Eisenhower and Premier Bulganin to their own advantage. They are being circulated in Italy to give the Communists a new respectability. They are being widely distributed in Eastern Europe to prove that the leaders of the two most powerful nations have really made up and it will do no good to agitate for any change.

There is no secret about the cause of this erosion in Western strength. It stems from the "Geneva spirit" which millions of people took as a signal that the cold war was all but over.

The developments of the last 3 months are a natural consequence of the relaxation induced by that impression.

The mounting American reaction to Geneva was not directed against holding the meeting, or even against dealing with the Russians in a courteous way. The criticism boiled down to the United States having encouraged a friendly spirit to the exclusion of everything else. In short, many observers now feel that in order to make the conference appear successful, there was a tendency to gloss over and ignore all the real problems while the talks at the Summit were going on.

When the President returned to America, he reported that we had made a beginning toward something of great benefit to mankind. He noted that specific agreements on disarmament and German reunification were yet to come, but the President himself was hopeful that we could keep alive the spirit ignited at Geneva. For this, he said, was "the most shining opportunity ever possessed by Americans."

Looking back, nearly everybody sees that this optimism prompted a widespread reaction. Indeed, some diplomats began worrying about this while the conference was still in progress.

Four days after the meeting, Ludwell Denny of the Scripps-Howard papers re-

ported the fear of professional diplomats that America's role had "unintentionally made it harder for them to fight communism and neutralism at home."

The London Spectator reported that "Sir Anthony Eden is worried about the way in which the Geneva talks went. * * * There is no doubt that the Russians have scored an immense advantage from the Geneva talks. As the British newspapers show, they have gone a long way toward making the West soft."

The concern of American newspapers stemmed from the same cause. The West was relaxiing, even though the Russians had made no concessions of substance on German reunification. European security, or disarmament. Back in Moscow 2 weeks after the Geneva Conference, Bulganin reported to the Supreme Soviet that Russia had yielded no ground on its insistence that American troops must be withdrawn from the Continent of Europe, while last month, Russian party boss Nikita Khrushchev told the East German delegation in Moscow that the Russians would give up Marx and Lenin when the shrimp learns to whistle. Long before then, he predicted, there would be a Communist victory over capitalism, for capitalism is the way of the blind.

After a month of post-Geneva Russian successes, administration leaders became alarmed over the public's second look at Geneva.

Toward the end of August, the administration suddenly abandoned its own Geneva confidence in the Russians. The President warned the world against the pottage of a false peace. In a follow-up speech the next day, Vice President NIXON spelled out America's conditions for a cold-war settlement: Free elections and unification of Germany and Korea, freeing the satellites, and so forth.

Why, asked the press, had this not been made clear at Geneva, instead of many weeks later?

"There never was any excuse," wrote Walter Lippmann, "for letting the impression arise that Geneva would soon be followed by a settlement of the big issues of the cold war. There was never any excuse for raising the false hope that the Soviets were about to surrender their main position in Europe.

"The main result of the zigzag is to give an effect of instability, of uncertainty and immaturity in United States foreign policy."

But despite the admonition of Mr. Lippmann and other critics it was soon apparent that the speeches about getting-tough-again were not being translated into policy. For administration warnings against complacency were promptly followed by plans for more cuts in the defense budget.

"Time to relax?" asked the Washington Post. "If the administration is genuinely worried about excessive optimism resulting from the Summit conference, it had better look first to its own actions. Nothing could be better calculated to lull Americans to sleep and tell our European allies to relax than a large cut in the military budget." Our allies were further lulled when the State Department described Adenauer's agreement with the Russians as a victory for the West.

This optimistic claim "bore almost no resemblance to the analysis of the Moscow-Bonn talks cabled to the State Department by the United States Embassy in Moscow," the New York Times reported. As a consequence "the State Department was being criticized for claiming 'victories' which its own top officials doubted * * *"

This was not the first time the administration has been criticized for excessive optimism in foreign policy. As the New York Times said:

"Any objective and well-informed person who makes a careful analysis of the results of the four great international conferences of the last 6 months—at Bandung, Belgrade, Geneva, and the Soviet-German conference in Moscow—will be appalled if he compares them with the general impression created by United States official statements and United States news reports at the time of those conferences."

Still a Need for Minutemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to an important statement by Robert C. Crane, editor and publisher of the highly respected Elizabeth Daily Journal, a newspaper which recently celebrated its 175th anniversary. Mr. Crane points up a truth which every generation must learn anew, sometimes at great cost—that freedom is never finally secured. It must be preserved and fought for over and over again. We must not let apathy obscure the fact that we are currently living in another great era when freedom must be preserved through readiness for its active defense. The program which Mr. Crane discusses in this excellent statement is vital to that preservation and, if need be, active defense.

The statement follows:

[From the Elizabeth Daily Journal of January 20, 1956]

STILL A NEED FOR MINUTEMEN

Long, long ago, on the night of April 18, 1775, a thousand British troops marched from Boston to seize ammunition stored at Concord, 20 miles away. Then and there, a legend was born—the heroic legend of Paul Revere and the patriotic Minutemen he spurred into action. The citizen-soldiers of the Colonies fired the "shot heard around the world," and, in striking the first blow for liberty, not only assured our great heritage but set a courageous example of selfless service as well.

From that day to this, American dependence upon the citizen-soldier to fight its battles and defend its freedom has been virtually absolute. But this has been a peace-loving Nation, and a military career has never had much appeal. Warfare is repugnant. Taking up arms is just about the last choice of every eligible male.

Thus, we've achieved a remarkable success story among the world family of nations. We train to build more bridges and tall buildings, manufacture the sleekest automobiles, raise bountiful crops of life-giving food, combat the various diseases that plague mankind—with little thought given to training for the defense of all we have achieved. Yet we've won the costliest wars, the deadliest battles and defeated the best trained, professional warriors at every turn. It's a record to be proud of. However, in the light of a changing world—can we depend on the record in the next battle, if it is to come?

Figuratively speaking, distance consuming monsters of the land, sea and air have shrunken our margin of safety and our time for preparedness. The vast oceans no longer present a sufficient barrier. The skies have become international thruways. Foreign countries may still be foreign in comparative terms of ideological theory and practice, but they are no longer foreign in terms of time and distance.

Consider, if you will, these thought-provoking words spoken by Charles C. Finucane, Under Secretary of the Army, in an address before the Milwaukee Civic Alliance, Milwaukee, Wis., October 25, 1955:

"The military posture we have set for our Armed Forces has fluctuated feverishly with the climate of world affairs. These figures tell their own story.

"The freedom we needed 250,000 men to win in the Revolutionary War, we entrusted to an Army of only 80 soldiers when the Continental Army was disbanded.

"In 1812, we called nearly 300,000 to the colors. Following the war, we sent home all but 5,000.

"Sixteen thousand was the effective Army force with which we began the war to save the Union. Eventually, 2 million from the North faced more than a million in the Confederacy. After peace was won, we had but 25,000 to keep it.

"In 1917, 200,000 men were available to meet a crisis that needed 4 million to resolve.

"We had 190,000 Regulars on guard in 1939. Some 10,420,000 took up arms in that service before our security was temporarily restored.

"Seven times we studied the same lesson—studied it to our enormous cost in blood and treasure—and seven times we threw away the book.

"For when war thundered down from the hills of North Korea, the lesson remained to be learned. Over 600,000 men who had faced fire in World War II were called on by all services to receive that baptism a second time. Yet more than a million and a half nonveterans who had since come of age were never called because they could not be made ready in time.

"Our country paid in the desperate effort by which we clawed our way back from the brink of humiliating—and potentially disastrous—defeat."

At one and the same time, that record is both glorious and shabby. It reveals the true strength of democratic unity in the face of insurmountable odds, and the weakness that engenders apathy when there is no challenge. Perhaps it is time that we charted our course by the light of the stars in the firmament rather than by the lights of passing ships. Perhaps it is time we paid attention to the real need for an adequately trained, Ready Reserve of manpower and charted our course accordingly.

What good are the latest weapons and the latest in defense tactics if no one is trained to use them? What good is a military unit if it is nothing more than a scrap of paper on the planning board?

Rather than forsake our historic pattern of operation for something quite radical, it is for us to strengthen what we have and what we have always relied upon to such good effect—an Armed Forces Reserve program—one which accentuates and rewards the patriotic concept of volunteer service, lest in the last analysis we should have to resort to universal military training with its resultant disregard of individual choice and need.

We are in an era of military disenchantment and deemphasis despite our military expenditures. It is for us to reverse that trend and, applying all our democratic genius, set this Reserve program in motion before it is too late. The Reserve Forces Act of 1955 provides the basis for this turning point.

For those enlisting in the Reserve prior to draft age, there are the following benefits:

1. Elimination of uncertainty as to the future.
2. A choice of branch of service to best suit individual aptitude and future career.
3. Pay for participation.
4. Opportunity for promotion as work warrants.

5. Credit toward future retirement pay.
6. Valuable experience, helpful in any civilian pursuit.

This act offers the youth of this country between 17 and 18½ years of age a means of discharging their military obligations without disrupting their careers or education.

To the employer who cooperates in the training program, it offers among other things a better satisfied labor force, more responsible employees, and fewer men required to be away from the job for 30 to 45 days of old-time annual training.

To the United States it offers the assurance of a fully manned, well equipped, and adequately trained Ready Reserve.

Lt. Gen. Thomas W. Herren, in a recent address before the New Jersey Armed Forces Advisory Committee, stated quite bluntly that we seem to be teaching children everything but their patriotic obligation to protect the great heritage we have fought so hard to hand on to them unfettered. Perhaps, with the combined effort of parents, educators, businessmen and the military, this new act which offers five different choices of active and reserve duty to a young man of 17 years can be discussed candidly and effectively in the home, in the schoolroom and on the shop floor to the benefit of all concerned. For, to become an operational success, the program must first be understood. We hope we have contributed to that aim.

Scope of the Canning Industry of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, last evening—January 23—the Committee on Agriculture of the California delegation met with the canners of California.

These meetings started many years ago, usually following the national convention of the Canners League. Mr. Richmond, of San Jose, would usually talk for the canners and review for us the record of the canners in the year just passed and also tell us about the problems facing the canning industry for the coming year. He was an exceptional man and really schooled us on canning problems.

Later our then colleague, Jack Anderson, a very successful pear grower and a farmer who had a broad grasp and understanding of the problems of all of agriculture in California, took charge of these meetings and continued to do so till he left Congress. He did a magnificent job in developing good relations between the canners and the Members of Congress. The meetings were absolutely nonpartisan and were short and snappy, and mixed fun with serious discussion.

My constituents, Dale Hollenbeck and Ted Clark, were regular attendants at these meetings and still are.

Under permission granted me to include extraneous matter, I include a statement entitled "Scope of the Canning Industry of California":

SCOPE OF THE CANNING INDUSTRY OF CALIFORNIA

Over 20,000 California farm families, or an estimated 60,000 to 80,000 persons, depend upon the growing of canning crops for their livelihood.

Between 30,000 to 35,000 agricultural workers are employed in California in harvesting canning crops at the peak of their season.

Between 85,000 and 90,000 cannery workers are employed at the peak season.

Many more thousands of workers depend annually for a living upon producing for California's canning and preserving industry: (a) 400,000 tons of tinplate in steel mills; (b) 3,600,000,000 tin cans in can manufacturing plants; (c) 1,100,000,000 glass jars in glass factories; (d) 100 million fiber shipping containers in box making plants; (e) 1 million miles of labels in lithograph plants; (f) thousands of tons of seeds and seasoning; (g) over 250 million pounds of sugar in refineries; (h) many carloads of food-processing machinery; (i) transportation (rail-truck-water) for over 75,000 carloads of canned foods; (j) operation of warehouses, cold-storage plants, banking facilities, nad advertising agencies; (k) wholesale and retail outlets distributing around $700 million worth of California canned foods.

California farmers receive for their canning crops between $125 million and $150 million per year. The annual cannery labor payroll is between $150 million and $175 million.

All of this is activated through the operation of some 250 California canning plants, which pack nearly 100 different items of canned fruits, vegetables, juices, olives, and citrus.

It is one of the State's three largest industries.

Sixty-two percent of the canning tomatoes in the United States were produced in California in 1955.

George Dixon's "Palsied Poem"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem which appeared in George Dixon's column, Washington Post and Times Herald, Tuesday, January 24, 1956, which Mr. Dixon tags "Palsied Poem":

Palsied poem resulting from a nightmare peopled by such impossibly jumbled characters as John Foster "Three Brinks" Dulles, Secretary of State; Carl W. "Kid Sieve" McCardle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs in Charge of Leaking News to Favored Publications; Assistant Secretary of State Henry F. Holland, and the recently apprehended armored car bandits:

Said Fearless Foster at the brink;
"Things nearly went upon the blink."
Said Carl McCardle, looking rife:
"As Henry Luce would say, 'That's Life!' "
"Let's fortify ourselves," said John,
"I feel an ordeal coming on."
Said Carl: "I have that feeling, too,
"So what do you propose to do?"
"Let's eat," the great man answer made,
"But what to eat, my tight-lipped aide?"
"Well, at the Summit, on the peaks,
"The newest fad is cream of leaks,
"And for a side dish, dearest boss,
"Disparaged tips with Holland's sauce."
I couldn't stand the horrid dream,
And woke up with a piercing scream.
I lay there in a soaking sweat,
And monade: "These brinks will get me yet.
"They have too much at brinks, methinks.
"They used to just have thefts at Brink's."

The 38th Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1956, was the observance of the 38th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. This day offers the American people a wonderful opportunity to reaffirm their faith in the eventual liberation of the Ukrainian nation from Communist tyranny.

Freedom has been eliminated in the Ukraine. The Soviets have denied the people their civil liberties and have destroyed their democratic institutions. The objectives of the Soviet regime are obvious, for with the denial of human rights and the destruction of Ukrainian culture Moscow hopes that resistance to tyranny will be crushed.

Tangible evidence that despotism exists is the eyewitness testimony of mass murders, starvation, and persecution received from Ukrainian victims of Soviet atrocities given to the House Select Committee on Communist Aggression a couple of years ago.

However, despite these ruthless tactics employed by the oppressor, the Ukrainians have remained faithful to their homeland and its traditions and continue to fight for their ideals. The Soviet press itself acknowledges the existence and activity of the Ukrainian nationalists whose goal is to separate the Ukraine from Russia. This admission is evidence of the growth of the resistance movement and that the Soviets fear what it can do.

There are over 1½ million Americans of Ukrainian birth or descent who are conscious of and have a strong interest in this struggle. It is appropriate on the occasion of the celebration of the 38th anniversary of Ukrainian independence that all Americans join with them in hoping and praying that in the not too distant future the enslaved Ukrainians will once more enjoy the liberty for which they are so valiantly struggling.

These feelings of sympathy, which we in America share for the gallant people of the Ukraine, must not be limited to mere well-wishing. Although this date calls attention to both the joy and sorrow of the Ukraine, the chains which bind the Ukranian people bind many other millions of peoples in other lands; and

we must remember that freedom is assured for none until all are free. Only by rescuing others from serfdom to the Soviet may we then in America be able to devote ourselves to the fullest development of our own economic and cultural heritage.

With these things in mind, America must press vigorously for the right of those countries behind the Iron Curtain to self determination at the earliest possible date, and to see to it that the captive lands are able to enjoy free elections at as early a date as possible. We must continue to help with economic aid, and with weapons, those who courageously fight against Soviet domination in the Ukraine, Poland and other nations held captive.

The principle of early free elections is set forth in both the Atlantic Charter and in the Yalta agreement. Indeed, these two documents specifically guarantee early free elections to most of the peoples held captive by the Russians.

I call upon the President to make it an inflexible policy of this country to press continuously and vigorously for liberation of all the countries detained against the will of their people by the Soviets, by all means short of war. We must make liberation of these countries one of the principal topics of each and every future meeting between representatives of this country and Russia. All our economic and diplomatic pressure must aim at early and truly free elections within all the countries of Eastern Europe.

The Ukranian people, and the others enslaved behind the Iron Curtain, look to us for help in their struggle for freedom and justice. Never let it be said that America has turned its back on those who cry for liberty.

Objects To Supporting Coffee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a letter and a clipping that I received from Mr. Lawrence Coyer, of Knapp, Wis.

Mr. Coyer's letter is as follows:

Enclosed find clipping from Time magazine. I am sorry to learn that I have to help bolster Latin American governments with my coffee dollars. But I would like some of the same kind of support for my 9-cent hogs and below-parity eggs and milk that I produce.

The clipping from the January 18 issue of Time magazine reads:

THE AMERICAS—COFFEE, BLACK

Circulating in Latin American capitals last week was a gloomy report labeled "For Governments Only." Subject: Coffee. Gist of the document, drafted by an Inter-American Economic and Social Council Committee: A growing surplus threatens to bring a disastrous slump in world coffee prices unless the governments concerned take drastic action.

Coffeemen already knew that a menacing surplus was piling up (Time, June 20). What surprised them was the fact that the United States State Department's representative on the committee joined the Latin experts in signing a report calling for export quotas and stockpiling to keep coffee prices from sinking through the floor. Main reason for the softening of the State Department's longtime opposition to international coffee-price props is that coffee is, after all, Latin America's No. 1 export. It accounts for 97 percent of El Salvador's exports to the United States, 90 percent of Colombia's, more than 80 percent of Brazil's and Guatemala's, lesser but still important percentages for half a dozen other countries. A steep price fall might bring on dangerous economic and political crises, with tempting opportunities for local strongmen or Communist mischief-makers.

Faced with that prospect, United States officials dealing with Latin American affairs may try to sell the Cabinet and Congress on some kind of price-support program. If so, they will have to be supersalesmen. Congress is well aware that among United States consumers the memory of the 1953–54 coffee-price gouge still rankles.

Secretary Dulles Has Blundered One Too Many Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Boston Post, Wednesday, January 18, 1956, in which this paper takes Secretary Dulles to task for his brink-of-war statements which came to light in a recent article in Life magazine:

Granting that Secretary John Foster Dulles knew what he was talking about when he said that three times the United States was taken to the brink of war by the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy, which has proved a great surprise to the American people and to the Congress, there is still a compelling need to censure a Secretary of State who permits these things to become known through the babbling of a press secretary.

It isn't true that the country was taken anywhere near war by either Secretary Dulles or President Eisenhower, as careful examination of the record will show. But it is true that Secretary Dulles' press secretary said these things to a magazine correspondent, and the record has been permitted by Dulles to stand attesting to falsehoods.

Perhaps it hasn't been borne home to Dulles that in his statement that the country was three times taken near to war during the past 3 years that he is providing the strongest kind of argument for the Bricker amendment and similar legislation limiting the power of the President to take such risks without consulting the Congress.

It is also somewhat amusing to see Vice President Nixon and "Secretary of Peace" Harold Stassen blasting away at critics of Dulles, for these twain have been responsible for more deviations from Dulles policies than any others in the administration higher echelons. Their reactions—proving their spineless expediency—offer the strongest kind of an argument for the long overdue great debate on American foreign policy and a thorough examination of it as a campaign issue.

Secretary Dulles now has the support of some newspapers which excel in talking out of both sides of the mouth. The burden of their argument is that it was all a result of Secretary Dulles' ineptitude with the spoken word and that his deeds are much more important than his words. If this is the proper evaluation of Dulles' blunder, why is he still Secretary of State? The basic and essential skill required of the skilled diplomat is the ability to conduct a diplomatic discourse with great style and trenchancy without actually committing one's country to an inflexible policy or giving offense to friendly powers.

The late Cordell Hull denounced the Japanese diplomats in ringing words when he accused them of infamy in prolonging the discussions until the Japanese fleet was ready to strike at Pearl Harbor. If the declarations attributed to Dulles by his press secretary are a true exposition of Dulles' policy then they are also infamous.

The great debate on foreign policy is long overdue. It should have taken place during the first year of the 84th Congress. But, in any case, the debate must now be held. Secretary Dulles has blundered one too many times.

Husband-Wife Precinct Team Finds Victory Formula—How To Win in 40 Hours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the December 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest contains an interesting article about a husband-wife precinct committeeman team in Michigan. It is entitled "How To Win in 40 Hours." Under unanimous consent, I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

HUSBAND-WIFE PRECINCT TEAM FINDS VICTORY FORMULA—HOW TO WIN IN 40 HOURS

"Democrats couldn't lose an election," says Mel Bleich, "if there were a Democrat in every precinct working 40 hours a year for the party."

Mel Bleich's precinct shows what work will do. The Democrats lost in 1952; they took only 40 percent of the vote in 1953, but they took 61 percent of the vote in 1955.

"The Democrats can't lose. There are more Democrats than Republicans in the country, in Michigan and in my precinct for the simple reason that we have a better program. Our problem is to get them out to vote." That is Mel Bleich's formula for victory.

The Bleich's (Mel and Joan) live in the 17th district of Wayne County (ward 22, precinct 258, Detroit). They live in a pretty but small house on a street lined with pretty and small houses. They have lived in their present home for 7 years. Mel is an advertising man. They have always been interested in public affairs, but they did not become active politically until 1952.

In July of 1952, they were on a vacation in the East where they met a Republican committeewoman from New York, a woman full of dedication to her job. She told the

Bleichs about some of her activities—poll watching, canvassing, get-out-the-vote drives, things Mel and Joan had never heard of. In some alarm the Bleichs returned to Michigan and called Democratic headquarters to volunteer their services. The next day their 17th District chairman, Al Meyers, came to call and their political activity really began.

Mel decided to run for precinct delegate as a write-in candidate. It was too late to file a petition. Joan typed up 3-by-5 cards asking people to vote for Mel. They distributed the cards in the neighborhood. Mel was elected.

It was during this first election that Joan and Mel found out what poll watching meant. They went to the class for challengers sponsored by the 17th District. They also began attending district meetings. Here they learned how a political party works.

Mel and Joan began canvassing their precinct. They set up a card file first. Then they divided up the precinct—Mel taking the blocks farther away and Joan canvassing the streets in their immediate neighborhood. The Bleichs have three children, ages 10, 5, and 3. It was easier for Joan to work close by.

Mel and Joan work out their own system for canvassing. Mel uses a small notebook into which he puts various cryptic signs. R equals Republican; D equals Democrat; Reg means registered; a number indicates the number of eligible voters in the household. Joan uses a larger form. Whichever way, they get the information.

They usually canvass during a registration drive. "I am Mel Bleich, your Democratic precinct delegate. There is an election coming up and we wonder if you are registered to vote." Then they go on to find out the political affiliation. "Would you mind telling me how you plan to vote in November?" They find out how many eligible voters there are in the household. They also pick up information on how to build a terrace, tips on gardening, and new recipes. These last bits of information are not put in their card file but the political information is.

When the canvass is completed they know who the Democrats are, who the independents are. They know who is registered and who isn't. Mel keeps after the nonregistered Democrats and independents until they are registered. The Republicans he leaves to the Republican precinct delegate. Because people move in and out of the precinct all the time, the canvassing and registration job is a constant one. With each campaign Mel and Joan get to know their precinct better and can do a more effective job.

Canvassing is a basic job, in Mel's opinion. And it is fun. He and Joan now know the people in their neighborhood, regardless of political affiliation. There are over 600 voters in the precinct and the Bleichs have knocked on every door. Many people had never been called on before by a member of either party. They were pleased.

We asked Joan and Mel what they did on election day to get out the vote in their precinct. The reply was complete.

They distribute literature broadside in the precinct. This is a family project and one the children delight in. Off and on during the day Mel spotchecks his polling booth to be sure that proper instructions are being given to voters. The rest of the day he and Joan go door to door urging the people at home to go and vote early. At 4 o'clock on election day, Mel goes to the polling places and copies the list of those who have voted. He and Joan compare this list with their file of Democrats and independents. By 5 o'clock, they are calling every Democrat and independent who hasn't voted. They have several neighbors lined up to take people to the polls or babysit if that is needed. They keep calling until the polls close.

In the evening Mel goes over to watch the ballots counted and to challenge. Joan goes to another precinct—wherever her services are needed by the district. They watch the counting and make sure the Democrats get every vote that is coming to them. In Michigan, elections have been won or lost on the basis of as little as one-half to one-fourth vote per precinct.

In addition to the canvassing, get out the vote and challenging, were there other things they did which contributed to the increase in the Democratic vote? There were.

During the campaign, Joan gave a tea for Mrs. G. Mennen Williams. She put 40 people in her living room. We looked around and didn't think this was possible. But it was. She borrowed chairs and coffee urns, cups and silverware from her neighbors—many of them Republicans. Not only that, she invited them to the tea to meet the lovely wife of Michigan's Governor and they came.

In 1954, their local PTA group sponsored a Meet Your Candidate Night. It was the first PTA to undertake an activity of this sort and Mel and Joan worked with the other members to make it a success. It was a bipartisan affair. It put on the same platform the candidates of both parties. "Sometimes," says Joan, "it is good to let the Republicans see who they are voting for. We had candidates we could be proud of." (All of the Democratic candidates won.)

Joan passes out literature and gets petitions signed at the local supermarket. Mel is part of the "tack-up squad" on the poster detail. They have candidates come into their home and invite in the neighbors for a bull session on issues. Currently, Mel and Joan are getting prepared to canvass their precinct for the Democratic dollars drive in Wayne County.

Democratic leaders in Michigan are proud of what the Bleichs have done. And because their work and the work of others like them is so important to the party's future, national leaders like Democratic Chairman Paul M. Butler are trying to find a Joan and Mel Bleich in every precinct and put them to work in 1956.

Crisis in Education Is Concern of All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the last century the people of the United States developed the finest public and private educational system in the world. Our educational system and those who are responsible for its functional operations have served us well in peace and in war. Most students of American affairs believe that our educational system has contributed much to giving our Nation an informed and enlightened citizenry.

In keeping with our concept of the vital role of public education we have retained control and financing of public schools at the local level to assure maximum democratic management. The philosophy of local control and responsibility explains why at the present time only 3 percent of all school funds are contributed by the Federal Government. Local communities pay 55 percent of the Nation's school bill, and the remaining 42 percent comes from State governments. However, since World War II local governments have had more than their share of difficulties in meeting financial responsibilities to maintain and expand school facilities.

The financial difficulties of local and State governments stems from the fact that for a number of years the Federal Government collects more than 75 percent of all tax money. Our State and local governments must get along with what is left. No one will dispute the fact that the Federal Government has had to collect the bulk of taxes to wage a war and prepare for defense in the tense years since the end of World War II. Expenditures for war and defense have left education without fiscal parity since 1940.

I am not an educator, but—as a parent, citizen, and interested layman—I am concerned about the crisis in our educational system. I believe, for a number of reasons, that the crisis in education is the concern of every person. I believe that Congress must enact legislation to provide for Federal aid to education. There is too much at stake to ignore any longer the crisis in education.

During and since World War II a growing number of educators, PTA members and other interested laymen have pointed out the lack of classrooms, shortage of teachers, and other problems rising out of overcrowded classrooms and use of obsolete buildings.

Since 1950 a total of 5,600,000 children have been added to our school population. It is estimated that our annual increase in school population for the next 5 years will be 1,350,000. According to educational authorities, elementary school enrollment in 1960 will be 68 percent above 1946 and 28 percent above that of 1954. Secondary schools also face a crisis, for by 1969 the children already born will push secondary school enrollment to more than 70 percent above the 1954 level.

The increase in school population comes at a time when 56 percent of the Nation's classrooms are overcrowded. The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—in an estimate released on January 12, 1956—states that at least 470,000 new classrooms are needed in the next 5 years. Of this total, 180,000 are needed to replace worn out classrooms of questionable safety. The other 210,000 classrooms are needed to take care of estimated new enrollment. Surveys show that 47 percent of our public-school buildings are over 30 years old, and 22 percent of our school buildings are over 50 years old.

While the proposed legislation deals only with Federal aid for school construction, I believe that some mention must also be made of the teacher-shortage situation. At present we need an additional 140,000 teachers. There will be need for 500,000 more teachers in 1965 than we have today. In other words, we must find 16 new teachers for every 10 that are now teaching.

I presume that one of the main reasons for the shortage of teachers is the low pay. For example, in 1954 the Na-

tion's teachers' colleges graduated 100,000 teachers. Only 63,000 out of the 100,000 graduates were willing to take positions teaching. Our financially hard-pressed State and local governments cannot raise enough money to build schools and increase teachers' salaries. It is pertinent to point out that State and local governments spent almost $2.5 billion on school construction in 1955 as compared to about $1 billion in 1949–50.

Before I close there is one other aspect of our educational crisis that I wish to mention. Earlier in these remarks I stated that our educational system has served us well in peace and war. While I believe we have the finest educational system in the world, I am very much disturbed over reports about the number of scientists and engineers that are being graduated in Soviet Russia.

In 1954, for instance, Russia graduated 54,000 scientists and engineers as compared to about 20,000 in the United States. In a few years Russia will be graduating each year 80,000 scientists and engineers. I need not emphasize the importance of scientists and engineers in the event the world is plunged into a nuclear weapon war. As Admiral Rickover said recently, "if the crisis in education is not met, we will be in danger of losing the cold war by default."

In the event that this comes to pass there will be no Congress in which we—as freemen—can debate the question of Federal aid for education. If we lose by default—and thus fall under the iron heel of a dictator—there will be no opportunity to debate segregation, desegregation, Federal or local responsibility in education.

For this and other reasons, I believe we must act now. I urge my colleagues to temper their thinking with the cold and hard facts of the crisis in education—we may not have too many opportunities to consider this question if we fail to act now for one reason or another.

Mrs. Min Lurye Matheson Testifies on Distressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Willard Shelton which appeared in the AFL–CIO News, Saturday, January 7, 1956, in which Mr. Shelton discusses the testimony given by Mrs. Min Lurye Matheson, manager, ILGWU, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., before Senator Douglas' Subcommittee on Distressed Areas:

Once in a while, in the routine of covering congressional hearings, the observer hears a witness who makes him realize that the deeper problems of America are human problems, that there may be something far beyond narrow self-interest or group interest when a citizen sits with distinguished Senators to discuss pending legislation.

Such a situation occurred when Mrs. Min Lurye Matheson, district manager of the Ladies' Garment Workers in the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania, testified before the DOUGLAS Senate subcommittee on distressed areas.

The subcommittee was considering a bill sponsored by Senator DOUGLAS, Democrat of Illinois, and seven other Democrats to establish a depressed areas administration in the Federal Government, with authority to lend up to $100 million for construction of industries in areas where mines have petered out or companies have run away.

Several Senators and Members of the House appeared to testify in behalf of the bill. Their statements were persuasive, their marshaling of statistics about unemployment and the number of people on relief in their areas were impressive.

Then Mrs. Matheson appeared, and it turned out that she was not there to ask for help for members of her own union, the women workers in more than 100 plants in her county, the 20,000 members of the Garment Workers who are serviced by the Wilkes-Barre health center.

She talked to the Senators about what was happening to the men of the wornout anthracite areas, the husbands, brothers and sons of the women workers who, through their union, she represents.

She pointed out that it was hard to retrain a veteran coal miner to run a delicate machine processing fragile materials—although some coal miners have tried a training course and a few of them have learned how to operate the machines.

"These men don't want relief," she said. "They don't want Government surplus foods. They don't want their wives to go out and work in a factory while they themselves, despite their industrial ability and skill, are unemployed and do the housework, the shopping and tend to the children in a complete reversal of the normal pattern of family life.

"Idle factories can stand for years and then be reconditioned and opened up," she continued, "but human beings are different, the human spirit once destroyed can never be restored.

"Every day, women members of our union call me and tell of a husband unemployed and beg, 'Can you get a job for him? Anything that will make it possible for him to remain here and earn a living?'

"Women have sought employment in garment factories, becoming the breadwinners, while in the homes men ready and able to work eat their hearts out in idleness and futility. They go away to find jobs and that means a broken home. Or they suffer the frustrations, the terrible deterioration, the corroding effects on their self-confidence which long years of joblessness mean."

Mrs. Matheson thinks the women she represents are pretty well paid. They have their union, there is an actual shortage of women workers, they earn perhaps $100 a week. She was not before the subcommittee to ask anything for them—except for the simple provisions of the Douglas bill that might help restore a community, give jobs and new hope to men who will never be dues-paying members of the garment workers.

Mrs. Matheson association with the ILGWU is a family one. Six years ago her brother, an organizer, was stabbed to death in a New York West 35th Street telephone booth in the midst of an organizing drive. The man accused of the murder, Benedicto Macri, was acquitted—and has totally disappeared.

The Douglas bill is a moderate approach to the needs of depressed areas. In addition to authorizing loans to communities for new industries, it would lengthen unemployment compensation periods for workers in retraining programs. It would offer research facilities, technical information and tax relief to assist towns where there are cast-off workers. This seems about the least the Federal Government could do to aid dozens of communities where as many as one-sixth of the skilled workers are on relief, where some veterans of World War II have never had decent jobs. The guess here is that Mrs. Matheson's testimony was the kind that might propel the bill through Congress, where previously we have had sympathetic words.

Report by Senator Lehman to the People of New York State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a radio report I made to the people of New York State on January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORKER'S REPORT ON THE NATION

(Text of Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN's first radio report to the people of New York State during the 2d session 84th Cong.)

Fellow New Yorkers, greetings from the Nation's Capital. I am resuming my periodic radio reports to the people of New York State. I want you to know what your Senator is thinking and doing in the course of this critical congressional session. Many important issues and legislative proposals, vitally affecting the interests of our State, will be before the Congress this year. I want your help and guidance in representing the interests of New York. So write and tell me what you think, too.

As in the past, I will report to you every 4 weeks over this station. And I want to express my appreciation to the station to which you are listening for carrying these reports.

As you know, Congress convened on January 3, and, as I speak to you today, the legislative work of the session has just about gotten under way. We heard the President's state of the Union message on January 5, his special message on farm problems on January 12, and his budget message on January 16. Our work is now cut out for us.

President Eisenhower's state of the Union message contained some fine words and fine sentiments with many of which I agree. But these sentiments were strangely different from those which have been expressed in the recent past by the congressional spokesmen for the President's own political party. The President's message has been described as a New Deal document. I wouldn't go that far. I wouldn't say that the President has become a New Dealer.

No; he has just borrowed a little of the liberalism some of us have been preaching for a great many years. He borrowed some of our sentiments, and our phraseology—about the welfare of the people and the need for the Government to do for the people what the people cannot do for themselves, with regard to the people's health, and security, and well-being.

Yes, the President said some very fine things. But what does his administration propose to do, to translate those sentiments into actions and programs? Will the Eisenhower administration support sound legislation? Will it fight for amendments to the

McCarran-Walter Act, and for civil rights legislation, for Federal appropriations for school construction and medical research? Will the administration oppose giveaways of our natural resources and the ever-increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of monopolies? Will the administration work to extend social security coverage and to make social security available to the disabled? Will the administration fight for the interests of the consumer against the forces of special privilege? Will it put the welfare of the average farmer and the average worker and the small-business man above the interest of the processor and the great corporations?

Well, we will see. By the deeds of the Eisenhower administration, not its words, shall we know them.

I am going to report to you today on some of the legislation which I think this Congress must pass, and which this administration should support, and some of the legislation which Congress should defeat and the administration should oppose. I am going to talk not so much in generalities as in particulars.

But first, I want to say a word about the world scene, and to comment on the strange story of the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and his recent interview with Life magazine.

This interview has been much discussed in the public press and on the floor of Congress. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has charged that what Secretary Dulles told in Life magazine about last year's great international crises, in Korea, in Indochina, and with regard to the islands of Quemoy and Matsu off the coast of China * * * what Secretary Dulles described as his own policy in these three critical situations, was quite different from what Secretary Dulles had told the Foreign Relations Committee, in confidence, about these same situations.

There is a question of fact involved here. Secretary Dulles owes the Foreign Relations Committee an explanation, and he owes an explanation to the American people.

Did Secretary Dulles deliberately take us right up to the brink of war, as he told Life magazine? Was he, in fact, ready to plunge this country into war, without the consent of Congress, and without even the consent of President Eisenhower, as far as we know?

Who authorized these warlike actions, and these decisions to risk war? Had the American people authorized Secretary Dulles to take these risks, to stake the fate of our civilization on his own wisdom and discretion?

Is this administration seeking peace or war? Is the policy of this administration the one enunciated by President Eisenhower at Geneva or the one enunciated by Secretary Dulles in Life magazine?

In fact, my friends, I believe that we avoided war because of our allies, and not in spite of them. We avoided war because of the strength and unity of the free world, a strength and unity established under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, despite the reckless policies of Secretary Dulles, which almost broke up the unity of the free world, and almost got us into war. And today, that unity was never more strained, and placed under greater pressure than it has been by Secretary Dulles' unfortunate and ill-timed statements to Life magazine.

Our allies are embarrassed and indignant at the evident distortion of history in which Secretary Dulles has indulged. And our enemies are rubbing their hands with glee, reprinting and rebroadcasting with obvious relish the statements made to Life magazine by Mr. Dulles.

Mr. Dulles claims full and sole credit for deterring the Communist power, in Korea and Indochina and in Quemoy and Matsu. Let him beware. He has resurrected the specter of massive retaliation. He brandishes the hydrogen bomb. He indicts our country as one willing to risk atomic war to gain its objectives, or, at least, Mr. Dulles' objectives.

Mr. Dulles should remember that he who claims credit for the wind must also accept blame for the storm.

Much more remains to be said on this score. It will be said in the months ahead. I hope and pray that no permanent harm has been done our country, and the cause of free world unity and peace by these rash and self-serving assertions by Mr. Dulles. The cause of a nonpartisan foreign policy has been struck a heavy blow.

But back to Congress and its prospects for constructive legislative action.

There is one bill before the Congress which is being hotly debated which I would not call constructive legislation. Quite the contrary. I refer to the natural gas bill, the so-called Harris-Fulbright bill, the bill to take the price of natural gas—the gas that lights your ovens and heats your homes—out from under the regulation of the Federal Power Commission.

The Harris-Fulbright bill would exempt producers of natural gas from rate regulation. The Supreme Court decided not long ago that these natural gas producers were subject, under the law, to Federal Power Commission rate regulation. The purpose of the Harris-Fulbright bill is to set aside the decision of the Supreme Court, and to give the natural gas producers the unquestioned right to charge for natural gas whatever the traffic will bear.

The producers quite frankly admit that as soon as rate regulation is abolished, the price will go up. Who will pay? The consumers will pay. We in New York State will pay.

It will cost the consumers of the Nation from a quarter to a half billion dollars a year. We in New York State will pay our share, to enable the 35 great companies which control 70 percent of the total production of natural gas to increase their already great profits. And these profits are not subject to the ordinary rates of taxation which apply to other business profits. No; these profits get the benefit of a notorious tax loophole, the 27 percent depletion allowance.

I am going to fight against this bill. I am going to oppose it as hard as I can. But what is the administration doing about this bill? What is their attitude? There was no word about it in the President's state of the Union message. There is still today no word from the White House as to President Eisenhower's attitude. There is only an eloquent silence.

I hope this bill will be defeated in the Senate. It has already passed the House. Only you, the consumers—the general public—can prevent this bill from passing. You can express yourself, to your representatives in Congress, and to the President. You can tell them how you feel about this proposed outrage upon the consumers of America.

Then there is the subject of juvenile delinquency, which is very close to my heart, and on which congressional action is urgently needed.

I must mention, too, the need for legislation to provide a system of flood and disaster insurance. The people of New York State, and of Connecticut, and Massachusetts, and Rhode Island and Pennsylvania know how desperately such insurance is needed. I will do my best to see that such legislation is enacted.

I would like to talk at length about the need to amend the McCarran-Walter Act, and the Refugee Relief Act. I need not tell you of my interest in that legislation. I haven't time today but I can tell you that we have a fight ahead on this, too.

And civil rights. If there is one front that calls for legislative action, it is this one. How long can we endure the continued denial of basic human rights to some of our citizens? How long can we tolerate the denial of the right to vote to the Negroes in great parts of the South? How long can we tolerate the brutal physical violence, the reign of terror which is now underway in some parts of the South against Negroes and whites who dare to join in the fight for equal rights, for human rights?

Here is a front that demands action. Here is a test of the good will of the administration, and of its courage and sincerity. I hope that all men of good will, of both parties, and without regard to party, will respond to this challenge and take the necessary action, without further delay. Yes, there is much more to be said, but no time to say it in.

Goodby and good luck, to all of you. I will be talking to you again, over this station, 4 weeks from now with my next report to New York.

Wilderness Manners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have heard extensive discussion on the floor of the Senate about the preservation of some of our great wilderness areas. For the benefit of those who may not have had an opportunity to visit such areas, or who are visiting them for the first time, the Friends of the Wilderness, of Side Lake, Minn., has published and is distributing an interesting article entitled "Wilderness Manners," by Sig Olson, president of the National Parks Association.

I digress to say that Mr. Olson is truly one of the Nation's leading conservationists. He is a very dear friend of mine. If any of my colleagues would like to have a good duck dinner—and I do not mean one of those tame grocery store ducks, but a duck in the northern Minnesota style—I think I could arrange it with Sig Olson.

Because the article presents an effective description of what the wilderness areas mean to us and why they should be preserved, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I surely would like to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

Even though we are in the midst of winter, we are anxiously looking forward to the visits of any Members of the Senate and their families to the greatest recreation area in the world—the State of Minnesota. It is nice even in the wintertime.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Talking about manners among men is a dangerous thing and when you infer that a man is a boor, you must do it with a smile or come out shooting. I have come to the conclusion that the majority of men out in the wilderness are instinctively courteous and considerate of the rights of others. I

have also found that there is always a small minority who forget that good manners are as important there as in civilized surroundings.

Most men when they leave the restrictions of urban living carry with them enough innate respect for the rights of others so that living in the wilderness does not materially change their slant on life, but there are moments even with the best of them when the new found freedom of the wilds invites thoughtlessness.

With those who have a real feeling for the country, these moments are rare, but there are some, who when the bars of convention are down, revert swiftly to the status of their primitive ancestry before the unwritten laws were made for harmonious living with others.

Modern man, no longer sees the wilderness as something to be feared and overcome. He sees it now as a source of physical and spiritual rejuvenation and goes to it as a sick man goes to his doctor to heal the wounds life may have dealt him. No more does he have to go as a primitive hunter to slaughter game or face death and starvation. The odds are no longer that desperate.

Today the wilderness means recreation and the enjoyment of it is actually more of a spiritual than a physical experience. Our attitude toward it is entirely different than it once was, that is until men slip back into a primitive perspective. When that happens, they no longer see it with appreciation or understanding. Then it is every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost. I believe that a man loses his ability to enjoy the wilderness in direct proportion to how completely he reverts to the outlook of his ancestors.

None of us are far removed from the old grooves of racial experience and it is actually easier to slip back into them than stay out. I have often felt after being in the bush for a while, that my own civilized life was just a short interruption in a long wilderness existence. Going back to the old ways of thinking is the normal thing to do because the ancient grooves are far deeper than the new. This is why it is so easy to violate the tenets of good behavior when there is no public censure.

One of the most delightful wilderness customs in the north was never locking a cabin or a cache. Ranger stations, and trappers' cabins were always open to a man who needed shelter or food. A carry over from frontier days, hospitality was the expected thing. In those little woods cabins, there was always a little firewood stacked up neatly beside the stove, a pair of blankets hanging from a rafter, some tea, flour, perhaps a chunk of salt pork in a can. These places were a godsend when the going was tough and there were times when finding them was a matter of life and death.

When a traveller departed, he was expected to leave the cabin immaculate, with dry kindling ready for a swift blaze and a good supply of wood. The same went for food but it was permissable to replace whatever had been used with any surplus on hand. But then came travellers who began to violate the spirit of these friendly shelters. They failed to replace wood and fuel, left refuse and filthy confusion behind them. Then for the first time in history, cabins were locked and bolted all over the wilderness. Bad manners on the part of a few had ruined the pleasure of many and destroyed a phase of backwoods hospitality that may never return.

Campsites are even more sacred than cabins because they have been used for hundreds of years. Chosen because of their strategic location, they are usually found at the end of a day's travel from some well known starting point. Since the memory of man, they have marked a day's progress by canoe, dog team, or on foot, and once established, became wilderness homes that belonged to all who passed.

To violate such a place is as bad as violating the home of a friend. Those who do, have simply forgotten the meaning of consideration and courtesy and the fact that they are not alone in their enjoyment of the wilderness. Such individuals peel birch trees, try their axes on living trees, break off balsam boughs for overnight beds right on the campsites instead of going back in, leave empty tins and bottles and debris strewn around, clean their fish at the landings, leave a hundred evidences of slovenliness to welcome the next comer.

The real woodsman would never dream of leaving his personal garbage around, would burn everything possible and bury the rest far from camp. He would sink bottles and cans in the deepest part of the lake, and before leaving pick up every offending bit of string, tinfoil, or paper, even throw a handful of pine needles over the drenches ashes of his fireplace to lend the illusion of no one having been there. He would leave dry wood and lay the fire so that whoever comes will have a pleasant welcome. Tentpoles would be stacked and pegs and stones piled neatly where the next camper can find them. By leaving his camp as he himself would want to find it, he creates a rapport between himself and those who follow that is one of the joys of wilderness experience.

Privacy should be as sacred in the wilds as in the towns. A campsite once occupied is as inviolate as one's home and no traveller should move in except by invitation. Even so the courteous thing to do is refuse. The primitive who has forgotten his manners may insist that he has as much right to the site as anyone else. But by so doing he is robbing himself of enjoyment and setting up an atmosphere of selfish hostility that has no place in the wilderness of today.

What applies to campsites, applies to an area's landmarks, its places of historic and scientific interest. Such places belong to everyone, not only to this generation but to the generations to come. They give a country character and individuality and should never be defaced or marred. Those who do not understand this leave a trail of vandalism wherever they go, names carved or painted on beautiful cliffs, Indian pictographs chipped for souvenirs, ancient graves disfigured. These thoughtless ones are divorced from tradition, have no knowledge of things of the spirit, no reverence, respect, or love for the country and what it means.

Wilderness travelers look forward to making friends with the whisky jacks, the chipmunks and red squirrels on the campsites; creatures who have lost all timidity and fear. They come immediately when campers arrive, explore packs and duffle as though it was their right, wait for the tidbits they know will come. It seems incredible, but there are some who think it sport to use these campsite friends as targets, thereby depriving all who come of the real companionship and pleasure they afford. Such minds have no conception of the meaning of communion with living things.

But far more important than how a man acts away from civilization is how he feels toward a wilderness way of life. If he sees it only as a way of getting good fishing or hunting, or as a physical workout with no holds barred, then he is missing the real essence of the experienced. If he goes into the wilds with reverence and a certain awe, realizing that here is country still unchanged by man, the enjoyment of which is not only a privilege but a great spiritual adventure, then it will mean what it should. With such an outlook there is no question of wilderness manners. They are as much a part of the wilderness as quiet and solitude.

Adequate Highways: How and When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address made by me before the 54th annual convention of the American Road Builders' Association, at Miami Beach, Fla., on January 13, 1956:

It is always a pleasure to attend a national convention of the American Road Builders' Association—and this is one of the best. The atmosphere is informal, the company is genial, and the main discussion is one that's close to my heart.

Having been a roadbuilder myself and having spent many a long hour on highway legislation in Congress, it is not hard for me to understand the mutual problems that bring you together. I think I can share the sentiments you feel about a business that is one of the toughest and, yet, one of the most rewarding in the world.

I am a firm believer in the application of private enterprise methods to highway construction. I'm glad to say it and you can mark it down: ARBA is the champion when it comes to supporting this viewpoint. The ingenuity and thoroughness with which most of America's roads are being built today is evidence of the effectiveness of the contract method of doing business.

When men are pitted against each other in competitive bidding, as required by most of our State and city highway departments, the best in each comes to the top. The public gets the benefit—in lower costs and higher quality.

The leadership that America has earned in the know-how of roadbuilding comes from this unique teamwork of public officials, engineers, and businessmen.

Right now, the vital issue facing our industry is what Congress will do about the need for a national highway program. For months, my colleagues and I have wrestled with this problem at close range. It is a subject surrounded with complications and opinions.

A frequent question that comes up, is: "Can the highway industry, without economic dislocation, expand to handle a larger construction program?"

ARBA has always answered that question to my satisfaction, and I am sure, to the satisfaction of most Members of Congress. We are not so far from World War II that we cannot remember how quickly industry can expand its capacity. That is particularly true if wise planning has eliminated some of the uncertainties from the picture.

I think you should always be prepared to appraise your own strength—and I'm glad to hear you are now making a reappraisal—and to give Congress the benefit of your expert findings. We have learned to rely upon ARBA's knowledge of the roadbuilding industry and the capacity of each segment to produce the kind of highways America needs—and in the time and volume they are needed. We will need your help in this session, as in other sessions, to answer some of the still unresolved problems that hamper adoption of a greatly expanded roadbuilding program.

I would like to divert for just a moment and pay my respects to the officers and staff of the American Road Builders Association, in their endeavors that the country may

have adequate highways. To you, Mr. President Robertson, you have done an excellent job, Bert Miller, Bob Smith, and all of the other staff members have been most helpful and most courteous, however, today we do miss one who has been of great assistance not only to your present speaker but to the problem of the road industry and America as a whole. I am referring to my distinguished friend, the late Tom Keefe, who departed from this world a few months ago. Tom is not with us in body but his activities and the results of his endeavors will long be remembered by all of us.

It was my pleasure to address you a year ago on the subject, President Eisenhower's Highway Challenge. A great deal has happened since then, some of it dismaying—some of it highly encouraging. You have followed the progress of Federal legislation closely throughout the past 12 months and it is not necessary to review the defeat of what many Members of Congress considered a reasonable, workable solution to the problem of financing a long-range road program. It is pointless to dwell upon what might have been, or to quail before the job that must be done now to get our highways into shape. The important thing is to keep our mind on the increasing need and seek fresh solutions.

The grand plan presented by our beloved President, speaking in the interests of all America, may have lost some of its trimmings, but his noble objective is intact. Thanks to the boldness of our Preesident's proposal and to the farsightedness of highway leaders, we are thinking today in terms of money for road construction far larger than ever before. That contribution—in imagination and leadership—must be acknowledged, for it has played a major part in advancing the national good roads cause—farther than any other one action in history.

Some of us who have worked in legislative harness for highway development in this country for many years can appreciate better than others that last year was not a year lost. It was actually a gain. We went through a legislative shakedown and we all learned a lot.

Two years ago, it was my responsibility to serve as chairman of the House Subcommittee on Roads. For weeks, that committee heard the testimony of witness after witness lay bare the highway dilemma facing the Nation. It became apparent to all of us that, on one hand, the automotive age had almost overwhelmed the country and, on the other hand, highway construction had not kept pace. It was reported that automobiles and trucks manufactured in the last 10 years, if parked bumper to bumper, would occupy 4 times as many vehicle lanes as new highways built to accommodate them.

This disturbing imbalance was brought home to us at our hearings 2 years ago. It became obvious that Congress must step up Federal assistance to the States to build expressways, cross-country throughways, and farm-to-market roads. This we did in the Case-McGregor Act. Federal aid was boosted 52 percent above the act of 1952 to $875 million annually.

Soon after that, when President Eisenhower advanced his grand plan for a multi-billion-dollar-road program, many of us knew that the proposal was not unreasonable nor overly ambitious. The burden of testimony before our committee had all said otherwise. The pro and con arguments were still there, of course. But there was no doubt of the need. Not any longer.

Today, the need simply grows greater. Last year, our assembly plants turned out 8 million motor vehicles. It has been estimated that 4½ million more will be produced in the current 6-month period. Those of you who are dealing with traffic problems know what that means.

Traffic accidents continue to mount as the number of automobiles, trucks, and buses on our streets and highways increases. Some 38,500 lives were lost last year. The Christmas holiday traffic slaughter was a nightmare. There is no valid excuse in a nation as advanced as ours for such preventable loss in human life. Where inadequate highways are at fault, they must be expanded or rebuilt to safer standards. Other stern measures must be taken. How can we do otherwise?

Economic losses are secondary to the loss of lives, and the toll of injuries, but they are significant. Here's a flat statement: Inefficient highways are costing the American people entirely too much money. Maybe those who won't be moved by crushed bones and spilt blood, will feel a twinge in the pocketbook. But this is no joke.

Every morning and evening literally millions of safe-driving people are forced to waste precious hours driving or riding to work on congested, overtaxed streets. Where is our vaunted national efficiency?

Economic advisers tell us that America is expanding at a tremendous rate and that our transportation facilities will be strained to the limit within the next few years. Highway transportation, which serves the Nation so well, must not be held in stalemate during this expansion period. Roadbuilding must go ahead—fast—so that this form of transportation can keep pace with demand.

These are pressing reasons for immediate, realistic action.

The question is: "What will Congress do about it?"

I wish I could answer that question positively for you. I know that in the roadbuilding business, the uncertainty during legislative debate can be discouraging and sometimes costly.

Most of us in Congress who have studied the highway needs of America for years know exactly where we stand. Some of our colleagues, and I say this kindly, are just becoming re-educated on this new and greater road problem and are just now realizing in full the urgency for new highways. I know that the number of advocates of realistic roads is increasing. It may be a slower process than we would like, but it is the only right way for problems of such scope to be properly handled. The legislation that finally starts America into an era of unprecedented roadbuilding will be better because of that process.

I am sure that men of good will can sit down together and resolve their differences. I am sure they will do so in this case. If one man can help, I assure you I'm ready and willing to cooperate—to the hilt—right now.

We who are privileged to hold responsible posts on the House committee are fully aware that the next move is ours. You may be sure it occupies the time and thought of all of us. I assure you that my most conscientious effort will be to help draft the kind of legislation that will bring America's highways up to the high standards required.

May I quote from President Eisenhower's state of the Union message to Congress January 5, 1956.

"In my message of February 22, 1955, I urged that measures be taken to complete the vital 40,000-mile interstate system over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of approximately $25 billion. No program was adopted."

Continuing my quote from the President's message, "If we are ever to solve our mounting traffic problem, the whole interstate system must be authorized as one project to be completed approximately within the specified time. * * * Furthermore, as I pointed out last year, the pressing nature of this problem must not lead us to solutions outside the bounds of sound fiscal management. As in the case of other pressing problems, there must be an adequate plan of financing. To continue the drastically needed improvement in other national highway systems, I recommend the continuation of the Federal Highway Act."

That, ladies and gentlemen, was a statement of the President of the United States and I am in accord with it 100 percent. I want to make it perfectly clar that I favor and will do everything I can to put into a law an adequate highway program, both for the interstate and the intrastate and I will be for a reasonable program whether it goes into effect as a one-package bill, or the interstate and intrastate in separate pieces of legislation.

The 1954 Highway Act, which it was my privilege to author, is a biennial highway authorization, and it expires June 30, 1956. This bill authorized $315 million primary, $210 million secondary, $175 million urban, and $175 million interstate, plus various amounts for forest highways, roads and trails, parkways, Indian reservation roads, etc. This total amount approximately equals the amount of revenue brought in by the 2-cent-per-gallon Federal gas tax.

This authorization is financed by taxes now in existence, and no additional taxes would be necessary if the existing law, 1954 Highway Act—Public Law 350—would be reenacted. Additional amounts or allocations could be added to each system, possibly $100 million total, and we would still be within the limits of the revenue brought in by existing taxes. I am of the firm conviction that this law could be reenacted with very little opposition. You know the history of the Clay committee bill, as well as the so-called Democrat, or Fallon, bill, that was before the last session of Congress. Both bills were defeated, and, in my opinion, because of the financing involved. Some refused to accept the Clay committee bond recommendation, which called for $25 billion worth of bonds for highway purposes extending over a period of years. The Congress also defeated the so-called Democrat, or Fallon, bill, because many felt that the revenue-raising features or taxes were not equitable. Regardless of the arguments pro or con, the program was defeated. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the interstate highway program, which is to be financed by an entirely new financial program, the question arises, Shall the interstate system, with a new financial program requiring additional taxes, be incorporated in the same legislation that includes the intrastate system primary, urban, and secondary roads when the financing is already established and no new taxes are necessary.

I hear the same arguments, and some new ones, on the floor of Congress and on the Hill that I heard last August. No one seems to object to the intrastate bill but most everyone seems to object to the interstate proposal financing program. Most everyone, with some exceptions, wants an interstate highway but they want the other person to pay for it. I hear some old arguments renewed, with more emphasis relative to financing the highway program and I am referring to the Governor's Conference group, and others, insisting that the roads, both interstate and intrastate, should be financed from revenue derived by the Federal Government from existing excise taxes on automotive products paid by highway users. A very fetching appeal. I would like, however, to point out some of the facts of life regarding this approach. Excise taxes levied by the Federal Government have been and are now levied and justified as a source of revenue for the general support of government. I know as well as you that while the Federal gas tax was never levied as a highway user charge, that developments over the past 10 years have more and more led to its being accepted as such and I think we all understand the reasons behind this acceptance. The excise fuel tax yields approximately $1 billion a year. The total excise yield to the Government from this and related automotive excises now reaches $2.5

billion. I question seriously whether we are entitled to consider these excise taxes as highway user charges, certainly those taxes beyond the Federal fuel tax and lubricating oil taxes. I question the physical soundness of a move in this direction, at least beyond the Federal fuel tax. The other excises can, by no stretch of the imagination, be considered a fair measure of highway use. Congress at no time by legislative action has ever identified these excise taxes as highway user charges.

To earmark the total yield of the automotive excise taxes for highway purposes, as some are recommending, would deprive the general revenue now used for support of the Government of an additional $1½ to $2 billion over and above the fuel tax yield. This would unbalance our Federal budget to the tune of $1½ to $2 billion and would have to be made up from other tax sources if the budget is to be balanced and, ladies and gentlemen, the budget is balanced for the first time in many years. I am asking you would you deplete our existing general revenue fund by that amount of money to build highways? If you would, what tax would you recommend to take its place to make up this deficit? Would you want me to support or would you, if you were in my position, support an increase in the income tax, for example? Faced with this choice, it would seem to me—and I hope that you will agree—to be a sounder financial procedure to consider the levying of additional equitable charges on the highway users, who are the direct beneficiaries of a greatly expanded system, in some manner related to the benefits they derive.

May I again quote from the President, who has said on numerous occasions, "A sound Federal highway program, I believe, can and should stand on its own feet with highway users providing the total dollars necessary for improvements and new construction."

Another important factor should be considered when we are even thinking of depleting the general revenue fund. We all know that the general tax funds of all levels of our Government—Federal, State, and local—are presently drained nearly dry and with our tremendous increase of population, the burden placed on the revenues in the forseeable future will require all the talent and ingenuity we have to prevent the complete destruction of our various government structures. The increasing demand for schools, hospitals, welfare, social security, sanitation, public buildings, and playgrounds presents us with a general revenue problem of staggering proportions. So, before your organizations or any of you individually propose to deplete the revenue fund by $1½ to $2 billion for highway purposes, give consideration to the other urgent and, yes, vital needs.

It is never possible to devise a tax acceptable in full degree to those upon whom the tax is imposed. No tax that this Congress or any other Congress may devise will be completely painless to that individual or group upon whom the increase falls. I, personally, believe that there is equity and fairness in the theory that the highway-user-charge principle should be applied on the basis of benefits derived. I state positively and publicly that I do not believe that such a user charge should be punitive. The justification of levying a tax is to soundly finance an adequate highway program and not to exterminate or discriminate unfairly against a legitimate highway user.

I have endeavored to explain my position relative to a new financing program. You can readily see that it is controversial and subject to a great deal of discussion but remember one thing, ladies and gentlemen, if you are going to build highways somebody has to pay for them.

The controversial subject of financing the new program for the interstate system is not applicable to the existing law which was passed by nearly a unanimous vote of the Congress in 1954 and which I authored. It is known as the Highway Act of 1954. It expires June 30, 1956. I have previously given to you the amount of money that it spends for highways. It can be renewed and no new taxes required over the existing taxes. I repeat, why jeopardize this program now in effect by incorporating in the same legislation a 10- or 15-year highway construction program newly and entirely differently financed and which, in my opinion, will jeopardize the passing of the existing law.

I firmly believe in an adequate highway program including the interstate system as well as the intrastate system but I do not want the existing highway program destroyed and scuttled because of the insistence of some to incorporate into the legislation, soon to be before the Congress, new ideas including financing and distribution. I think the interstate system is strong enough to stand on its own merits in its own legislation and I think the proponents of the interstate system are weakening their position when they are attempting to have it carried in the program of the existing law. Let us not jeopardize the existing program that is working so well. Let us have a 10-year or 12-year interstate program in separate legislation and let us continue our intrastate highway program, bringing it before Congress once every 2 years for a look-see by the membership of Congress at that time.

Admiral Burke Restates Old Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from the San Diego Union of January 18, 1956:

ADMIRAL BURKE RESTATES OLD TRUTHS

Implicit in the public expressions of Adm. Arleigh Burke during his San Diego visit last week is a forceful restatement of some old principles of national strategy.

As the United States Navy's professional chief, Admiral Burke would be expected to present a strong advocacy of its mission and needs. His argument is most persuasive, however, in that it rests not on a defeatist estimate of the United States naval position but an inventory of Russia's formidable—and surprising—naval capabilities.

What gives the Soviet Navy its contemporary power and menace is that, as Admiral Burke pointed out, it has a limited specialized mission and as being single-mindedly equipped to fill that mission.

Communist sea power is directed at being able to control the coastal waters of Europe and Asia and the "narrow seas" of those continents. It has no aircraft carriers but 4,000 shore-based planes (Mig 15's and Mig 17's; medium attack and patrol bombers), which are under the sole operation control of the fleet commanders. Russia has no big-gunned cruisers. But those of the *Sverdlovsk* class—its most modern—are swift, maneuverable, well-armored and equipped for mine-laying, torpedo and anti-aircraft missions.

Russian submarines are reported to be mostly medium-range types, equipped for mine-laying. Some are probably using hydrogen-peroxide turbines for submerged cruising.

By 1957 the current Russian construction program will build up its navy to 30 cruisers, 150 destroyers, 500 submarines (current production is about 1 a week), 500 PT boats and 1,000 minesweepers. Use of Chinese ports such as Tsingtao amplifies the power of this fleet.

What are the principles of strategy in Admiral Burke's statements? They were enunciated 75 years ago by Adm. Alfred Thayer Mahan: Control of the "narrow seas" plays a vital role; the great end of a war fleet is to close the oceanic highways; naval power exerts profound influence in peace as well as war.

Few will deny the deterrent power and the pacifying potency of the United States nuclear arsenal. But what if our employment of these weapons were out of proportion to the provocation? Or to the target? Russia has an old-fashioned navy but the mission for which it is intended could be crucial. It is reassuring to learn that Admiral Burke believes that this force could not keep us away from the shores of Europe and Asia.

Admiral Mahan was convinced that his principles of naval strategy would "remain, as though laid upon a rock." This fact would make for old-fashioned sea campaigns.

Can civilization afford any other kind?

Arab and Jew Have Mixed History—Reds Increased Peril for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George E. Sokolsky has given an historic account of Israel in the following 2 articles which appeared in the New York Journal-American for January 16 and 17, 1956. I call them to the attention of our colleagues:

[From the New York Journal-American of January 16, 1956]

ARAB AND JEW HAVE MIXED HISTORY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The Arabs and the Jews are, by tradition, kinfolk, whether one accepts their descent from Noah or from Abraham. Whichever tradition is accepted, both Arabs and Jews are basically Semitic, that is, they trace their beginnings to Noah's eldest son, Shem; they speak cognate languages, Hebrew, Arabic, and Aramaic, and these have been their languages from the earliest times we know anything about; they have related religions, the Koran accepting the authority of the Bible, although up to the seventh century, the Arabs were pagans, worshipping spirits or jinns. The history of the Jews and Arabs is intermixed.

Where the Arabs originated has not been determined by modern scientific methods. There have been many theories on this subject, but none of them add too much to our knowledge of present problems. What we do see is that there is a crescent of fertility which nearly surrounds a vast desert. In this crescent, from time to time, many nations have formed and all the great conquering countries in ancient and modern times have sought to own the Arabian nations and often succeeded. The southern Arabs mingled freely with African peoples; the northern Arabs intermingled with Syriac and Persian peoples. Among all these, there have always been some Jews.

The Arabs themselves make a distinction between the pure Arabs who descend from Kahtan and the others who descend from Ishmael. However, the Arabs have so often been conquered and the population of this entire area is so fluid that racial purity is not to be expected, except that all these peoples are so closely akin.

NOT STRICTLY ARABIAN

Palestine which is now called Israel is one of the countries of the crescent of fertility surrounding the Arabian Desert. It is part of the Syrian area. It lies close to Egypt which is not strictly an Arabian country but is composed of a large number of mixed peoples. The present culture of Egypt is Arabic and the dominant political element in the country is Arabic; nevertheless the Egyptians are a mixed people, including various Mediterranean and African components.

In modern times, most of the Arab world had been conquered by the Osmanli Turks, a nomadic people out of Kansu Province in China—probably the Hsiungnu of whom there is so much in Chinese history. While it is true that the Turks were influenced by Arabic as they were by Persian cultures, by the time of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520–66), not only the Mediterranean but the Black Sea was a Turkish lake. Turkish power extended in North Africa from Egypt to Morocco. The Turks became Moslem perhaps as early as the 10th or 11th Century.

World War I destroyed the Turkish Empire and a numer of Arabic countries came into existence as sovereign states. During the period between World War I and World War II, Great Britain and Germany vied with each other for the control of these countries and during World War II, Germany nearly had them. It was the discovery of the world's largest oil reserve that made these otherwise practically barren countries so important economically and politically. After World War II, the United States made enormous investments in these oil operations.

ALLIANCE FAILED

The organization of the Arab League, under the leadership of Egypt, has been an effort to form an alliance not only to include all Arab countries but all Moslem countries into a powerful political unit from Pakistan to Morocco, from the borders of Soviet Russia to the Indian Ocean. This effort has failed because such Moslem countries as Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Pakistan are not prepared to submit to Egyptian influence.

Furthermore, just as before World War II, Germany played an important role in the Arab world, so at the present time, Soviet Russia has moved into this area. It is to be remembered that a very large part of the Soviet population is Moslem and that many of the so-called Soviet Republics are inhabited by vestiges of Turkish peoples, who, although they are not Arabs, are closer to Arab than to Russian culture. It is to be expected that Soviet Russia will exploit these relationships to American disadvantage.

Involved further in this situation is the existence of Israel which as a Western enclave in the Arabic world becomes a serious problem to the Arabs.

[From the New York Journal-American of January 17, 1956]

REDS INCREASED PERIL FOR ISRAEL

(By George E. Sokolsky)

There never has been a time in Jewish history when the land, now called Israel, was not the focus of the affections of the Jewish people. Abraham came into this land; Moses returned his people to it from Egypt. Zion, as it has often been called by prophet and psalmist, is the land to which Jewish memories are dedicated. When the captives sat by the rivers of Babylon, they said, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning."

In A. D. 70 the Jews lost Palestine and their temple was burned. Their scholars gathered in Babylonian cities (Nehardea and Pumbedita were two) in the hope of keeping the people together and the sacred tradition of the Torah alive in the memory of man. Actually many of the Jews scattered among the Mediterranean peoples and eventually to every country of every continent. For many centuries, Zion remained a symbol of affection for an ancient land. It was not until the Nineteenth Century that practical steps were taken to restore Israel to the Jewish people.

At first, colonization plans were made and some were carried through to fruition. This was part of a program of restoring the Jew to agriculture which was his original way of life. But under the leadership of Dr. Theodor Herzl, a Viennese journalist, Zionism took on a political nature. At the Basle Congress (1897), the first time Jews from all countries were brought together to consider their condition, Herzl's concept of political Zionism was accepted and the Zionist movement was launched. There was considerable opposition inside world Jewry, but over the years the opposition died down and where it still exists, it is so unpopular as generally to be hidden away. In the United States, opposition to Israel among Jews is negligible.

HOMELAND SEEMED ASSURED

Up to World War I, the Zionist movement made certain progress but it was not until the Balfour Declaration was issued by Great Britain in 1917, as a result of the please of Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the inventor of TNT, that the hope for a home land for the Jews in Palestine seemed assured. The Balfour Declaration said:

"His Majesty's Government view with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

Palestine, prior to World War I, was Turkish territory and as the Turks and Jews got on well together, there was no question of antagonism. After World War I, Palestine was mandated to Great Britain and this led to considerable trouble as the British were anxious to hold the Arabs in line and the Arabs were anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish. This conflict continued in many forms until 1949 when the United Nations recognized Israel as a sovereign state. In this recognition, the United States, Great Britain and Soviet Russia joined.

The way of Israel, however, has not been smooth. Arab, particularly Egyptian, opposition to the existence of Israel has produced almost constant warfare between Israel and some Arab country. In recent months, the violent anti-Israel attitude of Soviet Russia has increased the peril for Israel.

GOP Governor Scores Dixon-Yates Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, lest we confuse principle with partisan politics, I think it is well to remind ourselves that such issues as the Dixon-Yates deal, the Hoover Commission recommendations on public power, and the overall question of utilizing our natural water resources for the public good are or should be resolved on the matter of principle rather than partisan politics.

A Republican governor has most recently emphasized that thought. Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, according to an article in the New York Times of today, has some interesting things to say on the public-power question and I desire that the report of his remarks be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

DIXON-YATES SCORED BY GOP GOVERNOR

ST. LOUIS, January 23.—Gov. Fred Hall, of Kansas, a Republican, declared today that the Eisenhower administration's decisions on the Dixon-Yates power contract and Hells Canyon Dam were "prime examples" of a "mistaken philosophy."

Mr. Hall addressed the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

"Somebody really sold somebody a bill of goods on Dixon-Yates and Hells Canyon," he declared.

The now canceled Dixon-Yates contract and the Hells Canyon power proposal should not have been decided alone on the principle of keeping the Government out of business, Mr. Hall said, adding:

"They should have been decided primarily on the principle that the public interest outweighed private interest.

"This whole situation is further aggravated by the Hoover Commission recommendations which, in the case of water resources, completely confused the principle of freedom of enterprise, and the principle of regulation of free enterprise and public ownership for the great public interest."

Rewriting History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of January 21, 1956:

REWRITING HISTORY

Former President Truman, in the current Life magazine installment of his memoirs, makes a bold effort to rewrite history in defense of one of the blackest marks against his administration: its contribution to the loss of China to international communism.

He does this chiefly by blaming Chiang Kai-shek at every unfavorable turn of events in that dreary period, by defending the fateful mission of Gen. George Marshall to China—and by weighty omissions.

General Marshall went to China under a directive as loaded as a block-buster. Though redrafted several times, in the end it stemmed from memos prepared by the China "expert," John Carter Vincent. Mr. Truman does not mention that, nor the fact that Mr. Vincent, though cleared in loyalty hearings, subsequently was required to resign from the State Department.

The directive required General Marshall to make every effort to bring about a "coalition" government in China, with Chiang Kai-shek accepting the Communist bosses on an equal basis in his cabinet. This, despite bitter ex-

perience of Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, where so-called coalition governments had paved the way for complete Communist control.

Unless Chiang bowed to our State Department wishes, it was made clear, all American aid was to be cut off. Eventually it was, as Chiang stood his ground, and nobody knows what vast quantities of ammunition, weapons and even planes earmarked for the Nationalist Government actually were destroyed. Mr. Truman says nothing about that.

Meanwhile the Communist forces were arming themselves from the huge stores of munitions taken by the Russians from Japan's overrun Kwantung army in Manchuria. Red guerilla bands were formed into formidable fighting forces, and as they plunged southward the Communists no longer were interested in a mere share of Chiang's government. That was one of the turning points of the whole affair—yet it is notably omitted in the Truman account.

Neither does Mr. Truman identify the "Treasury experts" who blocked a $500 million loan to the Nationalist Government evidently because Chiang wouldn't lay down his arms. "They were correct," says Mr. Truman, but who were "they"? Could "they" have included the late Harry Dexter White, later named as a Communist spy, who then had a guiding hand in Treasury Department policy?

Before the final directive to General Marshall had been framed, the views of our three Far Eastern commanders were sought on his mission. They were Generals MacArthur and Wedemeyer and Admiral Spruance. Though they agreed as to the general objective of the mission, all three later were to make separate denials of any intention to favor an attempt to force a "coalition" on Chiang.

And Mr. Truman does not mention that.

Mr. Truman says flatly he sent General Marshall to China in the interests of a "coalition government" between the Nationalists and the Commies. "Neither Marshall nor I," he writes, "was ever taken in by the talk about Chinese Communists being just 'agrarian reformers.' "

Yet on March 11, 1948, 2 years later, he was telling a press conference emphatically that the United States never had favored inclusion of the Reds in the Chinese Government.

In his view, he said, "broadening Chiang's government does not mean taking in Communists but it does mean taking in Chinese liberals."

In such fashion does Harry Truman re-jiggle history.

Freedom for the Ukraine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under permission given me to extend my remarks, it is my purpose to speak briefly about freedom for the Ukraine, in connection with the 38th anniversary, January 22, of Ukraine independence.

In my district, last Sunday, several thousand Americans whose ancestral origin is in the Ukraine, gathered in their churches, and afterward in their fraternal halls and in their homes, to take appropriate recognition of this day, which commemorates a joyous but unfortunately only a briefly fulfilled achievement in the centuries-old struggle for freedom and independence on the part of the Ukrainian nation.

I wish that all Americans might have shared in some way in the recognition of Ukrainian Independence Day, because if the hope of every one of us for the expanding of freedom to include every human being throughout the world is to be realized, Ukraine as soon as possible must take its place as a sovereign and equal partner in the buttressing of a free Europe and a free world.

The Ukrainian people are 40 million strong. They comprise the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain. They admire the American people, and they are the friends of the United States of America. But, unfortunately, they are the captives of Soviet imperialism, and in the last 38 years they have been made many times the most conspicuous victims of that imperialism translated into shameful tyranny.

The Soviet lexicon calls the Ukraine a "republic" in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, but this is a mockery of the term, as is the membership of the Ukraine in the United Nations, where it is recognized as a satellite, and where it is known by everyone that its delegates, like all of the officers of the "republic" are but tools of Moscow.

The determination of the Ukrainian people to be really free and independent, however, is stronger than any bonds which temporarily may restrain them. Have they not struggled for centuries for freedom and independence, and having won it, and then lost it, are they not using every resource which is theirs, to win it again?

When the shackles that bind the loftiest aspirations of many noble peoples in Europe are broken at last, the Ukrainian people will have an important part in that achievement, and they will be our allies and our partners in making a better world.

Dulles States Basic Truths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of January 19, 1956:

POLICY DISPUTE: DULLES STATES BASIC TRUTHS

If this Nation is to avert war, it must take some calculated risks. It must let the enemy know it will not retreat. This is part of the price of peace.

This, in general, is what State Secreary Dulles has said in his press conference and in a controversial magazine article. To us he appears to state basic truths.

Unfortunately Mr. Dulles' words have been twisted and perverted by opponents of present United States policy.

The foreign policy chief has been careful to point out that in seeking peace, a primary consideration in United States foreign policy has been to let the enemy know that if he goes too far he will endanger his own welfare.

It was a lack of such a warning regarding which lead the Communists to think the United States would not oppose aggression in South Korea. A public statement in 1950 by former State Secretary Acheson laid down a United States line of interest which excluded the Korean peninsula.

Part of the present controversy over Mr. Dulles' statements concerns whether the United States has been on the brink of war. This can be interpreted several ways, but, realistically, it must be said that the United States position was made so definite to the aggressors that had the Communists gone too far in Indochina or Formosa this country would have been obligated to strike back or surrender self-respect. The alternative to this position was appeasement.

The carefully calculated risks resulted in peace.

During a nonpresidential election year, 1954, Mr. Dulles wrote an article for Foreign Affairs magazine stating the same position he now relates. He reasoned:

"A would-be aggressor will hesitate to commit aggression if he knows in advance that he thereby not only exposes those particular forces which he chooses to use for his aggression, but also deprives his other assets of sanctuary status.

"That does not mean turning every local war into a world war. It does not mean that if there is a Communist attack somewhere in Asia, atom or hydrogen bombs will necessarily be dropped on the great industrial centers of China or Russia.

"It does mean that the free world must maintain the collective means and be willing to use them in the way which most effectively makes aggression too risky and expensive to be tempting."

It long ago was proved that appeasement leads to war. A nation which refuses to stand firm in this era of power politics will be defeated. And a nation which fails to make its stand known invites enemy miscalculation.

Cotton Production Cost Study by Twin City Farm Bureau Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRINCE H. PRESTON, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite to the attention of the Members a cost of production study on cotton made by members of the Twin City Farm Bureau in Emanuel County, Ga. This study, which clearly demonstrates that even under favorable conditions a cotton farmer cannot make expenses on his crop, is the more impressive because it was made by cotton farmers themselves.

Of course, I do not discount the studies made by Government research agencies, foundations and other specialized groups, but I think the findings of the farmers themselves are most impressive. They are the ones who spent their money on fertilizer, seed and insect poison. They are the ones who had to raise the cash to pay for the chopping and the picking of this staple commodity.

These figures show conclusively that even with a yield of 350 per lint to the acre, well above the average, they lost

almost $6 an acre on the cotton they produced. Their less fortunate neighbors who did not make such a good yield lost even more, for the cost of seed, fertilizer, poison, and other expenses were high even though their production was low.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD this brief study made by J. E. Brown, W. B. West, and Floyd Wimberly, of the Twin City (Ga.) Farm Bureau. This compilation was sent to me by Mr. J. L. Moore, who is president of this farm bureau chapter:

REPORT OF THE STUDY ON THE COST OF PRODUCING COTTON MADE BY A COMMITTEE OF FARM BUREAU MEMBERS

How much does it cost to produce an acre of cotton?

What are the net returns that a farmer may expect from an acre of cotton?

Cost of producing an acre of cotton

Rent	$7.00
Tractor and equipment	29.75
Seed	4.30
Fertilizer	16.40
Soda	2.95
Poison	10.80
Harvesting	42.00
Ginning	6.72
Man labor	17.00
Transportation	2.00
Marketing	1.00
Total	139.92

Receipts from an acre of cotton

350 pounds of lint, at 34.26	$119.96
700 pounds seed, $40 per ton	14.00
Total	133.96
Loss per acre	5.96

In addition to the expenses listed above most farmers have other problems that add to the cost of production. Droughts, storms, and excessive rainfall can seriously damage a cotton crop. Many farmers this year report that their cotton was damaged to the extent that it was a total loss, and in other cases the quality was below United States Government grades.

Many of our farmers are cultivating nonmarginal land and do not produce 350 pounds of lint per acre. Members of these families must do all the harvesting and furnish all the other labor to survive.

It is the opinion of this committee that there is not enough difference between the cost of production and the price received for farm products to give the farmer a decent income. We need legislation that will give us this protection.

Respectfully submitted.

J. E. BROWN.
W. B. BEST.
FLOYD WIMBERLY.

Ten-Year-Old Hoover Plan Still Valid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following article by Mr. Ezekiel Rabinowitz, veteran Yiddish publicist and correspondent, which appeared in the December 1955 issue of the American Zionist:

ARAB REFUGEES: A SOLUTION BY ENGINEERING—10-YEAR-OLD HOOVER PLAN STILL VALID

(By Ezekiel Rabinowitz)

The problem of the Arab refugees is being exploited by the Arab States and the enemies of Israel in this country for political ends in a most cunning manner. The very Arab rulers who demand the return of the refugees refuse even now to concede Israel's right to exist and openly avow their intention to destroy the State. A veritable smoke screen of propaganda and hatred has been let loose around this question.

The preoccupation of the world with this problem underscores the paramount significance of a plan by former President Herbert Hoover which, although submitted 10 years ago, remains as current and as challenging as ever.

At the time the plan was submitted by the former American President, public opinion in the United States was deeply concerned with the question of the displaced Jews in Europe and their resettlement in Palestine, where they would be able to rebuild their national homeland.

Liberal minded Christians who were anxious to wipe out one of the darkest blots on our civilization, the persecution of the Jewish people, assailed the then proposed Anglo-American Commission of Inquiry of Palestine as a shameful act of appeasement of British imperialism and feudal Arab chieftains. They appealed to the White House to support the Wagner-Taft resolution in the United States Congress for a Jewish national home in Palestine.

In response to an inquiry by the New York World Telegram, former President Hoover approached the entire problem from an engineering point of view. In his reply, on November 19, 1945, he made a very constructive, practical and humanitarian proposal which aimed to subordinate the emotional, racial, and political aspects of the problem to a process by which Jews and Arabs would benefit materially. In his reply the former President stated as follows:

"There is a possible plan of settling the Palestine question and providing ample Jewish refuge. * * *

"In ancient times the irrigation of the Tigris and Euphrates valleys supported probably 10 million people in the kingdom of Babylon and Ninevah. The deterioration and destruction of their irrigation works by the Mongol invasion centuries ago, and their neglect for ages are responsible for the shrinkage of the population to about 3½ million people in modern Iraq.

"Some 30 years ago Sir William Willcocks, an eminent British engineer, completed a study of the restoration of the old irrigation system. He estimated that about 2,800,000 acres of most fertile land in the world could be recovered at the cost of under $150 million. * * *

"My own suggestion is that Iraq might be financed to complete this great land development on the consideration that it be made the scene of resettlement of the Arabs from Palestine.

"This would clear Palestine completely for a large Jewish emigration and colonization. A suggestion of transfer of the Arab people of Palestine was made by the British Labor Party in December 1944, but no adequate plan was proposed as to where or how they are to go. * * *

"There is room for many more Arabs in such a development in Iraq than the total of Arabs in Palestine. The soil is more fertile. They would be among their own race, which is Arab-speaking and Mohammedan.

"The Arab population of Palestine would be the gainer from better lands in exchange for their present holdings. Iraq would be the gainer, for it badly needs agricultural population. * * *

"Today millions of people are being moved from one land to another. If the lands were organized and homes provided, this particular movement could be made the model migration of history. It would be a solution by engineering instead of by conflict. * * *

"I realize that the plan offers a challenge both to the statesmanship of the Great Powers as well as to the goodwill of the parties concerned. However, I submit it, and it does offer a method of settlement with both honor and wisdom."

Mr. Hoover's view was confirmed by Walter Clay Lowdermilk, then the Assistant Chief, Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, who made the following statement in his book Palestine, Land of Promise:

"In the great alluvial plain of the Tigris and Euphrates Valley there is land enough for vast numbers of immigrants. Centuries of neglect of their lands demonstrate that the Arabs have not shown the genius or ability to restore the Holy Lands to their possibilities. But the Jews by their magnificent examples in colonization have demonstrated their ability to reclaim and redeem waste lands from desolation to high productivity."

We can see that the Hoover plan for resettlement as a means for solving the Palestine question came at a time when close to a million Arabs were part of the Palestine population.

Simultaneously, Iraq was on record that they were badly in need of more population. The Prime Minister of Iraq, Jafar Pasha Al-Askari, so stated in a paper to the Royal Asia Society in London, in 1926. Said the Iraqi Prime Minister:

"The size of our country is 150,000 square miles, about 3 times that of England and Wales, and the population is only 3 million. What Iraq wants above everything else is more population."

It is worth while remembering that at the time Mr. Hoover submitted his plan, the present problem of the Arab refugees did not even exist. The former President suggested the financing of a plan whereby Palestine would be completely cleared for a large Jewish emigration and colonization:

"The Arab population of Palestine would be the gainer from better lands in exchange for their present holdings. * * * They would be among their own race which is Arab speaking and Mohammedan."

The Hoover plan also reflected the desire of the American people to help the Jews in their movement for a national home in Palestine. The movement was endorsed in both party platforms in 1944.

A resolution jointly sponsored by Senator Robert F. Wagner (Democrat, New York) and Senator Robert A. Taft (Republican, Ohio) was adopted by the Senate on December 17, 1945, and by the House on December 19, 1945.

The resolution commended the President for his attempts to secure the admission of greater numbers of Jews into Palestine. It recommended that the United States use its good offices with Great Britain "to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development, so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish national home."

Two years later, on November 30, 1947, the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations authorized the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. As a challenge to this decision, the Arab States sent their armed forces to crush the new State of Israel. Simultaneously, Arab propagandists urged the Arabs living in Palestine to flee the country and join the invading armies. Threats were made that if the Arab population failed to join the attackers, they

would be severely punished after the invasion forces had successfully completed their mission to drive the Israelis into the sea.

The armed forces of the Arab countries were badly defeated. The great majority of the Arab population in Palestine, heeding the threats of their Arab brethren in Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, and Saudi-Arabia, left the country, thus creating the problem of the Arab refugees; refugees by their own will, refugees by the advice and management of their own leaders and the leaders of their neighbors.

In 1949, the U. N. established its Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees in order to alleviate their plight, and to find ways and means for their rehabilitation. All these efforts have been steadfastly thwarted by obstacles created by the Arab nations.

In his report to the Ad Hoc Political Committee (see Ad Hoc Political Committee, 28th meeting, November 16, 1954), Mr. Henry R. Labouisse, director of the U. N. Relief and Work Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, admitted that little progress had been made toward finding a permanent solution to the problem.

Mr. Labouisse stated as follows:

"The third important factor affecting the Agency's work was the attitude of the contributing states. They would evidently like to see an end to the problem, not only because of human suffering involved and the political tensions which have been generated, but also because their legislatures were naturally restive at continued appropriations of funds for a problem which shows no signs of being solved."

Mr. Wadsworth, the United States delegate, stated:

"If prompt action was not forthcoming the United States Government must inevitably reconsider its attitude, as it would continue to support the Agency only if there was tangible evidence of progress * * *.

"The extension of the UNWRA program would give satisfactory results only if the host governments cooperate effectively with the Director of the Agency in settling the issues remaining before it."

Looking back 10 years it is indeed remarkable that Mr. Hoover characterized his plan as a "challenge to the statesmanship of the great powers." He suggested that Iraq, badly in need of land development, should be financed on the consideration that it be made the scene of resettlement of all the Arabs in Palestine, close to a million in number. At this moment the U. N. is confronted with a problem of resettling some eight hundred thousand Arab refugees among 40 million of their kin in eight sovereign states; states with unexploited land and water resources, with huge oil revenues coupled with international funds and assistance available in generous measure.

A New Life for Old Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address which I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, December 17, 1955.

The address follows:

A NEW LIFE FOR OLD CITIES

American cities are faced with a serious challenge.

That challenge is: How to do the modernizing job that has been postponed time and time again, until now it can be postponed no longer.

Cities have not yet broken with the outmoded past. In many cases they have not succeeded in adjusting themselves to the present. Few of them are thinking of the future.

The downtown areas of cities were designed for a bygone age. Every development since then has been expected to fit into this rigid mold.

Of course this has been impossible.

Cities are belatedly waking up to the fact that they must adapt themselves to the needs of motor cars and electric power. They cannot expect progress to operate in the channels and according to the patterns that were good enough for the 19th century, but are inadequate for the dynamic needs of today.

Both people and industries are in flight from the cities to the suburbs.

A big city like New York tried to meet the challenge by vertical development but this has obvious limitations.

Industry cannot function in skyscrapers.

And huge apartment houses are not the best places in which to bring up families.

People want more room for living and more room for working.

When a conservative organization like the United States Chamber of Commerce recognizes the problem as urgent, we can believe that it is.

The Federal Government has alerted itself to the problem by making some Federal aids available for the redevelopment of cities. More help will be forthcoming, as the pressure for change becomes inevitable.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, as a result of an exploration of community problems by local chambers, has issued an urban-development guidebook which is a pioneer in its field.

It is recommended for all civic-minded people who are interested in the problems of community growth and change.

As the chamber observes, and I quote: "For many generations, the physical structure of the city remained the same. It had rectangular blocks with narrow building lots on them. It was designed to be compact. Its supply of power and its means of transportation made compactness necessary. The waterwheel and the steam engine, the horse and buggy, and foot travel, did not permit a community to spread out. At the turn of this century, the motor age and the age of electric power began to pull apart the time-honored city structure. The radius of men's activities multiplied several times. Today, after 50 years, our cities are in an urban crisis. Basically, this crisis is created by the process of finding more room in which to do things. But we cannot get more room within the old structure of our cities. These structures have to be broken apart and recreated, and this is what we are in the process of doing. As a result of our urban crisis, a new community is emerging out of the old community."

Congestion, blight, inadequate public finance—these are the three major headaches of every city and town.

The typical community is threatened by suffocation.

Take one example.

Worcester, Mass., had a population of about 100,000 in 1900. By 1954 this had more than doubled. For transportation, at the turn of the century, Worcester had 16,000 horses. By 1954, with the same downtown street layout, over 67,000 motor vehicles were crowding for passage, and at a faster speed.

New York City has estimated that traffic delays cost its citizens more than $1 billion a year, or about two-thirds of the city's budget.

This is driving business, industry, and residents out of town, lowering property values and damaging the tax base.

The third factor, urban blight, may be defined as deterioration. It affects commercial and industrial properties, as well as residential. This failure to maintain properties or improve them, makes them less inviting for use. Neither people nor industries will put up with rundown houses or factories.

Nearly every city or town in the country is faced with increasing difficulties in its public finances, frequently amounting to crises. Hardly enough revenue is coming in from the one source—real-estate taxes—to keep up municipal services. The result is a shortage of funds to cope with the problems of congestion and blight.

In the last analysis, it is up to all the people of a given community to cooperate in the renovation of their city or town, so that it will keep step with progress.

Of course, a wide base of citizen participation is necessary to prevent any few individuals or small groups from exploiting a city's redevelopment program for their own selfish interests, instead of working for the community at large.

Since the early 1930's, most American cities have been receiving direct financial aid from other governments, but principally from the State government. This aid most commonly takes the form of shared taxes and of annual grants, to be used mainly for highways, public welfare, and schools.

Since 1949, direct Federal financial aid has been available for slum clearance and urban redevelopment. The Housing Act of 1954 has considerably widened the range of Federal participation in dealing with slums and blighted areas.

The Congress, in providing funds for urban renewal, emphasized the fact that the communities themselves must assume the main initiative and responsibility.

There is no justification for Federal assistance except to cities which will face up to the whole process of urban decal and undertake long-range programs.

As soon as a community proves that it has developed a so-called workable program for dealing with the problems of slums and blight, it may qualify for the following types of Federal aid:

1. The urban renewal service. The chief purpose of this service is to provide technical and professional assistance in preparing the workable program, and in planning and developing urban renewal programs.

2. Advances for surveys and plans.

3. Temporary loans for urban renewal projects.

4. Definitive (long-term) loans for urban renewal projects for use when project land is leased rather than sold for development.

5. Capital grants for urban renewal projects—up to two-thirds of net project cost.

6. Special grants for demonstration projects in urban renewal—also on a two-thirds basis.

7. Special grants for urban planning assistance. Of importance to the smaller cities and towns and to metropolitan areas, in the field of community planning.

8. Special provisions for FHA mortgage insurance to provide easier financing for building or rehabilitating residential property.

9. Special mortgage-insurance provisions to facilitate construction or rehabilitation of low-priced residential accommodations to rehouse families displaced, either by urban renewal projects, or by other governmental action.

10. Provision for low-rent public housing to be used in connection with rehousing displaced families that cannot pay for adequate private housing.

In cases where blighted housing is redeveloped to commercial or industrial use, of course, the revenues received by the city are

usually substantially greater than would result from residential use of the land. This, in turn, eases the load of all other real-estate taxpayers.

Project treatment of blight often benefits the community by helping keep its central area economically strong by removing an important cause of the migration of residents, business, and industry to areas beyond corporate limits. In many instances, those who move would prefer central-area locations except for nearby unpleasant or profit-inhibiting conditions.

In many instances, the judicious selection of project areas near the downtown district, and the careful replanning of land uses and street patterns in these areas, serves to loosen up and spread out the area and thus provide more space for traffic movement and for parking.

Slum areas are not only firetraps, health hazards, and traffic bottlenecks, but cost a city more in terms of municipal services, than they pay in taxes. When torn down and replaced by modern facilities tailored to the automobile age, they not only pay their share of the tax load, but considerably more.

Sacramento, Calif. (population 163,000), is an example of a city that is working hard on slum clearance, the elimination of traffic congestion, and in the establishment of industrial areas to provide locations for new industries.

How is this being financed?

The Sacramento Redevelopment Agency is pioneering a new type of revenue bond which is permissible under the California community redevelopment law. It is expected that this bond arrangement will provide the necessary one-third local grant-in-aid which, combined with a two-thirds Federal grant, will meet net project costs.

These bonds will be secured primarily by the increased tax revenue derived from the new buildings in the redeveloped project, which may be pledged under California law by the city council to pay local cost of that development project.

In Nashville, Tenn., the congested central business district is not far from the State capitol buildings and grounds, but has long been separated from them by residential slums and blight. The rundown area of about 70 acres is now being cleared for redevelopment, mainly for commercial use. Improved highways and off-street parking will ease the traffic flow. It is evpected that, within a few years, the business district itself will occupy substantially more space than at present. This will mean greater economic activity and greater income, for a city that is liberated from the seedy slums that once held back its progress

There is no city or town in the United States that cannot improve itself if its people cooperate in a program of urban redevelopment.

We have some public and private means to do the job.

If necessary, we can devise new and better ones.

But any means unused are as good as none.

A new life for old cities can be created only by citizen interest and citizen action.

The Ridgway Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the Charlotte News on January 20, 1956. I think the advice given in this editorial is sound and I commend it to the consideration of all Members of Congress.

The editorial is as follows:

AFTER THE SIDESHOW, BACK TO BUSINESS

General Ridgway's revelation about political skulduggery in the shaping of the administration's defense policy was welcomed with whoops of joy by the Democrats. But it was little more than a noisy diversion, contributing nothing to a particularly serious problem requiring sober bipartisan attention.

General Ridgway's ideas on the subject were never really in doubt. It was not necessary to buy a copy of the Saturday Evening Post to gage the depth of his dicontent. He has protested manpower cuts in the Army privately and not-so-privately for quite a time. It was not even any particular secret that he had testified before a congressional committee (behind closed doors) that the new reduced strengths of the Armed Forces fixed by the President were never submitted to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for approval. This information was published in a Washington newspaper last February.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson confirmed at a press conference Tuesday that in his recollection General Ridgway had in fact "continually advocated a higher strength for the Army than the other chiefs." He was just unable to sell his colleagues.

Now that practically everyone involved has issued a statement and impressed the voting public with his political virtue and patriotism, we suggest that the administration and Congress knuckle down to the business of planning future United States defense policy with as much objectivity and realism as possible.

The means and the mechanism must be provided to meet changing conditions in the world. Make no mistake about it. Conditions have changed and changed profoundly—including strategy, the economics of strategy and the nature of war. That is what makes the task so difficult and so demanding of the best thinking the Nation can muster. We must have a defense policy to keep the Nation from being nibbled to death on the periphery by "brush-fire" wars. The policy must not exclude a continuing need for infantry and sea forces. At the same time, the Nation must have the means to trigger a full-scale atomic counterblow if and when needed—including an adequate missile program.

If this type of versatile defense sounds expensive that is because it is expensive. But in these years of crisis it is a necessary expense.

Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H. R. 8491, would carry out the President's recommendation, in the state of the Union message, to "help deal with the pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar the Nation's general industrial prosperity."

In spite of the prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole, some of our communities are suffering from chronic unemployment. For example, in my congressional district, the city of Lowell, Mass., has had severe, continued unemployment resulting from a loss of basic industries.

While many of these situations are due to special causes of a local character, the whole Nation has an interest in helping the affected areas to achieve sound and lasting improvement in their economic condition. Federal assistance should be provided, because the particular localities most seriously affected may be most handicapped in financing their own redevelopment. However, emphasis should be on helping the communities to help themselves. Federal participation should be kept within modest limits and in conjunction with State and local programs.

The plan is simple. A State having an area of substantial and persistent unemployment may apply for Federal assistance. The Secretary of Labor would then certify the area as one eligible for assistance upon finding certain objective conditions as to the duration and amount of unemployment in the area. Federal assistance would then be provided in research and planning to rehabilitate the local economy; the construction or improvement of industrial plants and facilities, and related community facilities such as water and sewage systems; and the training or retraining of workers in skills necessary to take advantage of new employment opportunities and to supply the labor requirements of new industries. Financial aid for plant construction or improvement would be in the form of loans.

General administration of the program would be assigned to an area assistance administrator in the Department of Commerce. Technical assistance in programs to increase the employability of the labor force for specific job opportunities would be provided by the Secretary of Labor, with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare providing assistance to State vocational education agencies in their programs. An advisory board with the Secretary of Commerce as chairman, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, Treasury, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Administrators of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Small Business Administration as regular members, would advise the Secretary of Commerce in carrying out the policies of the act.

Communists in United States Back Arab Line Against Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Messrs. Guy Richards and Jeffrey Roche, which appeared in the January 18, 1956, issue of the New York Journal-American:

COMMUNIST IN UNITED STATES BACK ARAB LINE AGAINST ISRAEL

(By Guy Richards and Jeffrey Roche)

Communists in the United States and elsewhere have swung over bodily to the Arabs' propaganda line in attacking Israel and its supporters, it was learned today.

The Communists' new line follows the announcement by Egypt, on September 27, of its deal for large shipments of Czech arms.

In that respect, its timing coincides with the current attempts by Arab propagandists here to blame American Jews for the growing Arab-Israeli tension in the Middle East.

The Arab propaganda drive in this country was described in an exclusive story in Monday's New York Journal-American. The story revealed that the Arab Information Center at 445 Park Avenue, armed with a $700,000 slush fund, had launched a nationwide propaganda campaign in the United States against America's aid and ties to Israel.

DAILY WORKER CITED

Evidence of the Reds' shift can be found in many recent issues of their party organ, the Daily Worker.

Similar pro-Arab tirades can also be discovered on the pages of such professional antisemitic publications as Gerald K. Smith's Cross and the Flag, and Common Sense, long a breeding ground for antisemitism.

Long accustomed to ideological swerves when Moscow calls the tune, the Daily Worker is evincing no perceptible signs of embarrassment at finding that in taking up the cudgels for the Arab attitude toward Israel it discovers itself in the same editorial pew with publications it has in the past branded as viciously Fascist.

Thus, the American Reds, with the Daily Worker bucking the line for them, have in recent weeks launched a campaign to accuse Israel of being a war-minded aggressor against Egypt and the Arabs; to charge that Israel wants to start world war III at an early date; to paint Israel as the docile victim of "British and Washington imperialists" who aspire to use the Israelis as leverage to make desperate gains in the cold war.

EVIDENCE BOLSTERED

Overwhelming evidence that the new line was fashioned in Moscow was underlined by a recent International News Service dispatch from Paris. It quoted the Paris office of the American Jewish Committee as reporting that another anti-Semitic campaign may be in the making behind the Iron Curtain. It continued:

"Newspaper reports that emphasize Jewish names of persons supposed to have committed crimes against the Soviet system have again appeared in the Russian press in what may be the portent of new attacks against Jews in the U. S. S. R.

"The arrest of Jews in the U. S. S. R. on grounds that they were in possession of Zionist literature is ominous, particularly in the light of the new turn of Soviet policy in regard to Egypt and the Middle East."

The AJC added that the publication of such arrests "by Soviet papers, where nothing is left to chance, is a danger signal that cannot be ignored."

ARTICLE QUOTED

In a policy article by Joseph Clark, the Daily Worker of January 15 describes Israel as a pawn in the cold war. Clark writes:

"The Baghdad Pact was formed as an upper tier alliance against the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the State Department has been trying to use Israel as well as the Arab States as pawns in the cold war. This has, of course, brought nothing but grief to the State of Israel, which needs peace above all to build up its struggling new state."

Two days before, this same Joseph Clark, in the same Daily Worker, wrote:

"The fighting in the Gaza area and elsewhere would stop immediately if the spirit of Geneva was carried over into the Middle East," but he then put the blame on Washington for preventing this 'spirit' from traveling to the borders of Israel.

"* * * Dulles and the State Department persist," he stated, "in building pacts and tiers against the Soviet Union. It insists on trying to enlist the Middle East as pawns in this struggle. It insisted, in U. N., on getting together only with the Western Powers and excluding the Soviet Union in consideration of the Syrian-Israeli dispute.

SHOWN BY FILES

(Soviet Russia has been supporting Syrian efforts in the U. N. to invoke severe penalties against Israel for the December 11 Israeli assault on a Syrian outpost near the Sea of Galilee.)

Traveling backward in time, through December, November, and October—ever since the Czech-Egyptian arms deal was proclaimed at the end of September—evidence in the files of the Daily Worker shows how they have jumped to the Arabs' side of the fence.

Typical Daily Worker quotes:

America is "pushing Israel into an aggressive and bloody war against Egypt."

"The trade agreement between Czechoslovakia and Egypt will strengthen the resistance of Egypt to anti-Soviet war blocs."

Press commentators closest to the State Department "are making it increasingly clear that a Middle East peace is being blocked by the desperate desire of our Nation's ruling circles to keep the Soviet Union isolated in that area."

"It is generally recognized that the use of Israel as a pawn by the State Department along with its efforts to build an Arab bloc against the Soviet Union—climaxed by the Baghdad Pact—only increases tension and creates dangers for Israel."

Debate on "Brink" Holds Peril—Renouncing Policy of Deterrence Could Imply Unwillingness to Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a column by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of Monday, January 23, 1956, which sheds some very interesting light on the "brink of war" debate.

DEBATE ON "BRINK" HOLDS PERIL—RENOUNCING POLICY OF DETERRENCE COULD IMPLY UNWILLINGNESS TO FIGHT

If, as now indicated, there's to be a political debate in the Senate on foreign policy and the brink of war doctrine, the Democrats might well reread a most interesting speech that Adlai Stevenson, Democratic candidate for the presidency, made in Chicago on September 29, 1952. Here is what he said:

"We all know that when the Communists attacked across the 38th parallel that was the testing point for freedom throughout the world.

"The men in the Kremlin thought they would be unopposed, and, if they were, the whole question of the future could be settled in one blow. If they had been allowed to conquer free people in Korea, they could have picked away at the free world and engulfed millions, piece by piece, 1 by 1.

"Sooner or later we would have had to fight and the later we made our stand the bigger and the harder the war would have been. * * *"

Significantly, Mr. Stevenson concedes that the "men in the Kremlin thought they would be unopposed" if they attacked in Korea. But why did they think so? Why weren't they warned by the United States Department of State that, if they did attack, it would bring them to the brink of war?

The answer generally given is that Dean Acheson, Secretary of State in the Truman administration, did the opposite. He revealed publicly in a speech on January 12, 1950, that Korea was not within "the defensive perimeter" of the United States, which he defined as running from the Aleutian Islands to Japan to the Philippines.

He excluded Korea when he said that if any attack occurred on any country outside the "defensive perimeter," the power of the United Nations would have to be invoked and he didn't think it had proved a weak reed to lean upon by any people who are determined to protect their independence against outside aggression.

But Soviet Russia never thought the U. N., or, specifically, the United States, would intervene and it so happened that only 6 months after that speech was delivered the Moscow government's delegation happened not to be present at the Security Council meeting in New York City to exercise a veto when the U. N., on the initiative of the United States, did order collective resistance to the aggression in Korea.

Hence the Soviet miscalculated twice—about America and the U. N. itself. Had the United States, however, enunciated a policy of deterrence such as Secretary of State Dulles has been espousing, namely to warn clearly in advance what will be done to repel aggression, it is conceivable that the Korean war might have been prevented altogether.

The 140,000 American casualties might have been saved and also the millions of Korean, Red Chinese, and European casualties, to say nothing of the $10 billion or more spent by the people of the United States in the Korean war.

There is no misunderstanding of the Dulles policy by thoughtful observers in Europe. On January 17—in the midst of the furor over the Life article—the London Daily Telegraph was saying editorially about that article:

"No one can deny that in Korea and Indochina the Communists were challenging Western interests and that over Formosa they were threatening to do so. If the deterrent policy is not a complete sham, it therefore stands to reason that the United States was, as Mr. Dulles affirmed, brought to the brink of war. In each case the possibility of the United States declaring war in China was a major factor affecting, if not determining, Chinese policy. To deny this or to attack Mr. Dulles for affirming it, is to weaken by implication the whole conception of the deterrent policy on which Western security rests. * * *

"But is it in substance so very different from the policy which Sir Winston Churchill was urging on the Chamberlain government in 1938—except that Mr. Dulles has a real saber to rattle whereas Chamberlain's scabbard was empty?

"Since the summit conference at Geneva, it has been fashionable to talk about war having been outlawed by common consent. This gives a profoundly misleading impression. What happened at Geneva was that both sides understood each other to have renounced ambitions which might lead to war. From renewed Russian toughness it is possible that Moscow is confusing these two impressions.

"No doubt China, whose conduct in recent months has been noticably mild, needs little encouragement to follow suit. That is why the hysterical outburst against Mr. Dulles' reference to war is doubly dangerous.

"If it were to confirm Russia's happy confidence that Geneva had cleared away the great deterrent, or if it were to encourage China to start probing again, then our distaste for hearing Mr. Dulles mention the awful word now might make us face the reality of war later."

The Daily Telegraph points out further that "to allow these marginal complaints" about the Life article "to provoke us into denouncing the central burden of his (Mr. Dulles') argument—that peace has depended in the past, and still depends, on America's willingness to fight—is to cut off England's nose to spite Mr. Dulles' face."

The idea may be paraphrased for American domestic politics this way: For Democrats to denounce the Dulles doctrine for captious reasons and to imply an unwillingness of the United States to fight when it becomes necessary, would be to cut off America's nose to spite a Republican Secretary of State. It could push the United States over the brink into war.

Oil Feudalism: "Where Wealth Accumulates and Men Decay"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the January 7, 1956, issue of Labor. I direct it to the attention of our colleagues:

OIL FEUDALISM: "WHERE WEALTH ACCUMULATES AND MEN DECAY"

Twenty years of rule by an Arab king and American oil companies have produced a "police state," moral corruption, fabulous wealth for a few, slavery and misery for the common people, "decay and doom" which open the way for communism. That sums up an article on Saudi Arabia, carried recently in the conservative magazine Time.

Saudi Arabia is a big Arab country with the richest oil deposits in the world, completely controlled by Aramco, a subsidiary of four giant oil corporations. They are Standard of New Jersey, Standard of California, the Texas Co., and Socony-Vacuum, another Standard concern. Aramco pays oil royalties of about $200 million a year to King Saud, one of the last remaining "absolute monarchs."

Since World War II, the article says, King Saud has run through $1.4 billion paid him by the oil companies. Where has it all gone? Certainly not much of it to better the lot of the country's 5 million citizens, says Time. It cites this record:

"Life expectancy in Saudi Arabia is only 33 years; tuberculosis is prevalent; 70 percent of the population have trachoma (a serious eye disease), and at least 40 percent suffer from syphilis. In 1950, the per capita income was $45. As many as a quarter of a million Saudi Arabians may actually be living in slavery."

In shocking contrast, the article points out, "322 princes of the royal blood get $32,000 a year apiece, plus expenses—upkeep of palaces, car and travel allowances. Those who hold office get $320,000 a year each, plus expenses.

"Three new air-conditioned palaces now under construction will bring the King's personal total of palaces to 24. Though the country boasts only 200 miles of surfaced roads, it continues to rate as the best Cadillac market east of Suez. In a country which must import half its food, the most noteworthy farm project is 1,800 acres operated primarily for the benefit of the royal family tables."

Almost all the oil wealth, the article says, "has gone down the drain in vast private fortunes, vast expenditures by princes and officials," and lavish squandering by King Saud.

For example, when he visited the neighbor country of Iran this year, Saud presented the Queen with diamond jewelry worth $900,000. After attending the 1953 coronation of King Feisal, he presented the Iraquis who looked after him with a fabulous tip—$80,000 in cash, two Cadillacs and a Chevrolet.

At Simla (India), he gave $400 for one cup of tea, and when his car flattened a farmer's chicken, the owner received $40 in kingly recompence. At Aligarh, he gave $600 to his car drivers. During a few days in New Delhi, his party spent $100,000 for gold-braided cloth, sandalwood and ivory bric-a-brac for the wives back home.

"As the profligacy of King Saud's household has increased, his tyranny has tightened," the article says. "This is the surest sign of the regime's decay and doom.

"Wealth has become the only criterion of merit. The common thief still forfeits his hand, the common adulterer his head. But the higher spheres of society, where speculation and vice are practiced, live their lives with complete immunity from censure. A police state has usurped the functions of the Islamic law.

"The fountain of Arab chivalry has been fouled with oil," the article says. "The mouths of the preachers and prophets have been stopped with gold." And it's gold from American oil companies.

Statement by Hon. Abraham J. Multer, of New York, to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of our colleagues to the following statement which I presented on December 30, 1955, to the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, permit me first to thank you for the opportunity to present this statement to you.

I know only too well the tremendous task that confronts you in trying to get at the facts concerning the automobile industry and all of its facets.

Manufacturing and assembling, wholesale and retail selling, transporting, financing, servicing, repairing, are all part of the overall problem.

Not the least of the problem is the fact that what we are dealing with in the final analysis is the automobile which is undoubtedly one of man's most modern vehicles of progress. At the same time it can easily be, even in the hands of a good and thoroughly experienced driver, as described by the late Justice Holmes, "a lethal weapon," a veritable juggernaut of destruction.

Many an inexplicable accident is caused by defective vehicles. The blame should rest on the manufacturer. He passes his responsibility on to his dealers. They cannot assume it or begin to fulfill the obligation.

There was a time when every auto leaving the assembly line was thoroughly inspected and tested. That time has long since passed. Today no manufacturer and no assembler of cars does more than spot check them. Sometimes 1 in 10, ofttimes 1 in 20.

All the public ever hears about is the stock car that stood up under all sorts of road tests for thousands of miles. We never are told how few of the total number of cars made or assembled are so tested.

The companies' warranties today are practically worthless. Cars leaving the assembly lines have all sorts of defects. The burden is placed on the dealer to deliver a car in good running order and to service it, if it is not.

With price competition what it is, the dealer gives a minimum of service until the guaranty period runs out, after which he can charge the consumer for his service.

There is a very simple remedy for this. Enact a law that no automobile may be sold, transported, or used interstate unless accompanied by a certificate from the manufacturer or assembler of the car that it has been inspected and found in good working order and further, that it has been road tested and found in good operating order after at least 100 miles at each of the speeds of 15, 30, 45, 60, and 75 miles per hour.

For the sake of brevity I will not repeat the details of much of the testimony already presented to this committee. I know that you appreciate that most dealers dare not come before you and tell the full facts as they exist in this industry.

The pressures exerted upon them are terrific.

They are required to buy and stock accessories they know they will never sell.

They are required to receive and dispose of automobiles they do not want to order and did not order.

Most of these cars, like those they do order, are shipped into the dealers with accessories, which are billed as extras. These extras are built into the car and the dealer has no choice as to whether he or his customer wants them.

For instance, every car comes with a hole in the dashboard for a cigarette lighter; but the lighter is an extra.

Most cars are specified as equipped with a vacuum windshield wiper. The cars, however, are shipped in with electric wipers as as extra.

There are any number of other items affixed and shipped similarly.

The dealers must pay for advertising literature they do not want and would not order. It is sent in to the dealer in such quantities as the manufacturer thinks he should distribute. The dealer is billed and must pay for that literature even though he throws most of it into the waste basket.

The dealers must pay a fixed sum per car to the manufacturers toward the cost of advertising. The dealer's name and address is never part of that advertising, only the product is mentioned.

The dealer must handle only genuine parts and accessories with the manufacturer's name, which is not made by, but is sold by the auto manufacturer to the dealer at top prices. The dealer could buy the same parts much cheaper from the actual

manufacturer thereof, but does not dare do so.

The dealer who complains about those things will not be a dealer very long.

The manufacturer and assembler charge the dealer for freight and taxes on the freight in accordance with the fixed tariff of the most expensive carrier and ship the auto at the dealer's risk by the cheapest means of transportation. The manufacturer pockets the difference, including a sum in excess of the tax paid to the United States Government.

That racket can easily be destroyed by prohibiting the phony charge and requiring the tax to be paid on the amount collected for freight regardless of the amount paid by the manufacturer.

Lump sum bills should be prohibited and complete itemization should be required of both manufacturer and dealer and no sum should be collectible by either for extras unless ordered in writing signed by the buyer.

As long as the manufacturers want to have dealers under contract to handle only particular makes of cars, the manufacturers should be required to sell only to such dealers and to prohibit bootlegging. The manufacturers should be required to cancel the franchises of bootleggers.

The exaggerated and fraudulent advertising by dealers is encouraged, and practically demanded by the manufactures. Make all such advertising the responsibility of the manufacturer and it will cease overnight.

The last matter I wish to touch on involves the now well-known adage: What is good for General Motors is good for the country.

You will see in a moment that we can now change that to "What is bad for the insurance companies is not bad for the automobile companies."

On September 8, 1955, I wrote to Secretary of Defense Wilson calling his attention to a scheme by which armed service personnel returning to this country are being duped and mulcted of thousands of dollars in connection with the sale to them of new automobiles.

I indicated that the matter had been called to the attention of the automobile manufacturers but they have failed to do anything to prevent these practices.

I further stated that the Secretary of Defense need not make any determination of whether these practices are fraudulent or merely unethical, but urged him to direct all commanding officers to alert their men to these practices to afford them an opportunity to protect themselves accordingly.

My letter of September 8, 1955, is exhibit A, annexed.

I received an answer dated September 23, 1955, a copy of which is annexed as exhibit B, in which the Department of Defense refused to take any action.

I replied by letter of September 28, 1955, a copy of which is annexed as exhibit C, again indicating the need for departmental action.

No answer has been received to my last letter.

Now let us see what happened when the Department's attention was called to similar fraudulent practices by insurance salesmen. No General Motors was involved.

An investigation was instituted which confirmed the charges.

A complete set of regulations was promulgated by the Defense Department, including a directive to commanders of all bases, making them responsible for protection of the men against such frauds.

Another reason for different treatment of the phony automobile salesmen is that the fraudulent business is so profitable that the automobile manufacturers have sent their own direct representatives overseas to grab this business.

Thank you, gentlemen, for permitting me to make this statement to you.

EXHIBIT A

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time Members of Congress have been receiving complaints about the tactics being used by various dealers in selling new automobiles to members of the Armed Forces returning from posts outside of the country.

It seems that some of these retailers have sent representatives abroad who through fraud and deceit induce these men who are about to return to the United States to sign contracts, and to pay deposits for the delivery of new automobiles to them at the port of their arrival in this country. As part of this scheme these retailers have made exclusive rental agreements for offices in the hotels in this country at which these men and their families are temporarily lodged upon their arrival here. The deceptive practices are continued at those places until the delivery of a new automobile is made and payment obtained.

No purpose can be served by setting forth in this letter the nature of the fraudulent representations that are made, nor is it necessary for the purpose of this letter to determine whether or not these practices are actually fradulent or merely unethical business practices. The result of all of these practices is that these men are being duped and taken advantage of. They are paying more for these automobiles than if they bought them in their home towns or, for that matter, if they bought them at the port of arrival. They are paying higher finance charges than they would pay if they took the opportunitiy of financing their automobiles in their home towns or in the city in which they are discharged from the service, and they are being deprived of the inspection and service that ordinarily goes with a new-car purchase when made in their home towns.

The automobile manufacturers, when apprised of these practices, have taken the position that these retailing practices are no concern of theirs.

I believe you will agree with me that in the absence of the manufacturers undertaking to prevent these practices, something must be done to help these men.

My suggestion is that you immediately issue a directive requiring commanding officers in all stations outside of this country to alert the men under their command to this situation, and to advise those men that it is inadvisable for them to make such purchases while abroad, or, for that matter, even at the place of arrival in this country, or the place of discharge from the service in this country, and that their best interests will be served by their making such purchases from dealers in their home communities. The hometown dealers, in almost every instance, can arrange for the delivery of a new automobile to them at their point of arrival or discharge in this country, which would then be available for them for transportation to their home towns.

I hope you will agree with me that such a directive will serve a very useful purpose. As a matter of fact, the directive and the notice from the local commanding officer can be appropriately worded so that neither manufacturers nor retailers need be accused of any wrong doing or impropriety, and yet provide some measure of protection to the members of our armed forces.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

EXHIBIT B

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., September 23, 1955.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MULTER: This is in reply to your letter of September 8 concerning certain practices of automobile dealers in selling to members of the Armed Forces returning from overseas posts.

You appreciate, I am sure, that no agency of the Department of Defense sponsors any plan of automobile sales such as you describe, and the Department is therefore without jurisdiction to discontinue it. The selection of an automobile salesman or sales contract is a matter of individual choice.

Overseas representatives of United States automobile dealers are not amenable to military control. So long as they comply with the laws of the locality in which they do business they can offer their merchandise for sale to both civilian and military. Control of this group like their contemporaries at the port would appear to rest with the automobile dealers, their trade associations, and perhaps the manufacturers.

I believe that the directive you suggest would be more restrictive than is appropriate for issuance by this Department and that it might effect the legitimate activities of firms and dealers who render real service to our personnel. I believe that the objective we seek, the use of caution and judgment by servicemen in their purchases from unknown vendors, can best be accomplished by a continuation of the present normal counseling given by commanders to their troops. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of your letter to the military departments.

Your interest in the welfare of our Armed Forces personnel is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

CARTER L. BURGESS.

EXHIBIT C

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., September 28, 1955.

CARTER L. BURGESS,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: Receipt is acknowledged with thanks of yours of September 23.

I fail to understand how the directive as suggested by me is in any manner restrictive. It does not require the Department or any commanding officer to take a position on the matter, nor in any manner to interfere with automobile dealers in this country or abroad. It has always been proper for the Defense Department to alert the members of the Armed Forces against dangers that they may encounter, whether physical, moral, or financial.

Alerting these men to these practices is in direct line with such procedure.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

Habeas Corpus Bill Upheld

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter which was printed in the New York Times of January 24, 1956:

HABEAS CORPUS BILL UPHELD—CONGRESSMAN DEFENDS LEGISLATION AS SEEKING TO END ABUSE OF WRIT

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The letter from A. Philip Randolph, president, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, published January 16, contained a critical view of a bill, then pending in the House of Representatives, relating to habeas corpus applications.

In the letter Mr. Randolph stated that the proposed legislation, if enacted, would "place such crippling restrictions" on the writ that it would become "unavailable and useless as a remedy except in very exceptional circumstances." He also stated that it will put "wage earners and Negro citizens in situations where it would be difficult for them to vindicate their Federal constitutional rights and to secure their personal liberty."

Such statements, as well as the entire letter, give an incorrect, if not completely false, impression of the purpose of this legislation. The letter is so written that it leads the reader into believing that the legislation is designed to discriminate against minority groups because of their race, color, or creed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

RACIAL BIAS DENIED

Even Thurgood Marshall, special counsel for the NAACP, recognized that such was not the case. While he testified in opposition to the bill, he nevertheless stated that the legislation had "no special racial significance" and contained "no threat of racial discrimination."

The purpose of the bill, H. R. 5649, is to restrain the abuse of the use of habeas corpus in our Federal courts by prisoners who have been convicted in State courts of State crimes. Until recent years a court having jurisdiction of the defendant and of the crime could render a judgment which was binding until reversed on appeal.

A person imprisoned under such a judgment could be released on habeas corpus only on a showing that the court was without jurisdiction to render it. Recent decisions of the Supreme Court, however, have held that even though a court may have had jurisdiction at the inception of a case it may lose jurisdiction during the course of the proceedings as a result of some violation of the defendant's constitutional rights.

This expansion of habeas corpus by the Supreme Court led almost at once to flagrant abuse of the writ, especially by persons imprisoned under judgments of State courts. Prisoners began to use the writ to appeal, as it were, their State convictions in the lower Federal courts. Simply by alleging a violation of a constitutional right a prisoner could seek to have a lower Federal court review the entire State court proceedings even where the conviction had been confirmed by the highest court of the State and certiorari denied by the United States Supreme Court.

The great writ of habeas corpus is one of the most important safeguards of individual liberty; but it was never designed as a writ of review in the Federal courts or anywhere else. The purpose of the proposed legislation is to restrict State prisoners to State courts, and require them to first exhaust available State remedies such as habeas corpus proceedings in the State courts before they will be permitted to make application to the Federal courts.

APPROVAL OF JUDICIARY

It is worthy of note that this legislation has the support of both Federal and State authorities. It has been approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States, composed of the Chief Justice of the United States (Justice Warren) and the Chief Judges of the Federal courts of appeal, the Conference of Chief Justices of the States, composed of the senior judge of the highest court of each State, the Association of State Attorneys General and the Section on Judicial Administration of the American Bar Association. It also has the support and approval of the United States Department of Justice.

Yet in the face of this considered judgment by our learned legal authorities Mr. Randolph implies that the legislation is unconstitutional.

Actually the legislation takes away the use of the writ from no one. The right is guaranteed under the Constitution. No one can suspend the writ; the Constitution forbids it. In those cases where there is a miscarriage of justice the writ will still be available. No matter what injustice there may be, there will be no denial whatsoever of the application for the writ under this legislation. But the application must be properly channeled and there must be proper supervision.

On January 19 this legislation passed the House of Representatives without opposition. This additional approval by the membership clearly indicates its worthiness, from a legal standpoint as well as from the standpoint of justice.

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

Albert Gallatin, a Great Swiss-American Patriot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we are approaching January 29, the birth date of Albert Gallatin.

From the very inception of the democratic way of life on our shores there have come from across the seas men and women whose contribution it was to help build America into a nation that is today the freest, richest, and most powerful on earth.

Some came in time of war and others came in time of peace. The illustrious names of Lafayette, Kosciusko, Von Steuben, Rochambeau are known to all of us as the heroes whose assistance on the fields of battle or on the high seas helped the colonials throw off the yoke of the foreign oppressor. Their military feats are forever enshrined in the memories of our people.

But after the birth of the Nation came the growth of the Nation. It was then the young republic turned to heroes of another sort, men whose job it was to fill out the democratic framework which had been erected at such cost.

Such a man was the young Swiss-born Albert Gallatin, a youth of 13 in Geneva when our great Revolutionary War began. Born on January 29, 1761, and an immigrant at 19, Gallatin, as Senator, Congressman, and Secretary of the Treasury, was destined to fulfill himself nobly as an American and to earn for himself, in the company of such giants as Washington, Jefferson, Madison, John Adams, the title of Founding Fathers.

His history as an American began in 1780 when he landed in Boston, fired with the concept of democracy he was never to forget, even in the most provoking circumstances.

For Gallatin, whom Jefferson called a man "of a pure integrity, and as zealously devoted to the liberties and interests of our country as its most affectionate native citizen," was, during his early political career, to be submitted to the most outrageous attacks because of his foreign birth.

When Gallatin entered Congress in 1795 and had the temerity to challenge the fiscal operations of the United States under the Federalists, Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton was in power. And, smarting under the demand that the Treasury must account to the people for its expenditures, Hamilton and his associates unleashed their attack on Gallatin who, nonetheless, achieved his purpose by keeping a cool head on his shoulders and fighting with the immense financial learning he commanded.

In 1801, when the Federalists were defeated by Jefferson and Gallatin was named Secretary of the Treasury, the Federalist attack on Gallatin was renewed; but he was to weather it, and, in the course of his tenure, substantially reduce the national debt, lower taxes, and develop and extend the credit and commercial relations of his adopted land in the markets of Europe.

Idealism, tempered by a respect for thrift and work, made Gallatin an ideal addition to the party of Jefferson and Madison. His early and exacting training in Switzerland, plus a natural aptitude for finance, were the very leaven his party needed to achieve the prosperity which, along with its democratic ideas, won and kept the support of the people.

Sound commercial relations—not war—offered the key to prosperity in Gallatin's thinking; and his policies were to bring the young Republic enormous dividends, and even the friendship of England with which he negotiated a commercial treaty following the War of 1812 which abolished all discriminatory duties.

In this light, it might be well to reevaluate some of our Government's recent decisions to place pitfalls in the way of commercial harmony. I refer especially to the increase in the watch tariff last year which affects the country of Gallatin's birth and our own country as well.

A successful working through of this tariff problem, in the light of Gallatin's precepts, is one way America can now profit from the exemplary life of this devoted adopted son.

The 38th Birthday of Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, January 22 marked the 38th anniversary of the in-

dependence declared by the gallant people of Ukraine.

In spite of Communist occupation and conquest, their devotion to freedom lives on, as strong and as imperishable as their Christian faith.

It is the light that never fails.

Communism has employed every torture and oppression to crush their spirit without success.

With all their material power the Communists are uneasy.

Why?

Because they know they are powerless to overcome the eternal spirit that glows in the hearts of 40 million Ukrainians. Having rejected the divinity that is in man, communism has alienated itself from the people.

Reading between the lines of Communist strategy, we detect this weakness.

Under one pretext or another, they seek to have the United States recognize the status quo in Eastern Europe and thus legitimize their brutal conquests.

That cunning plan is doomed in advance.

For the avowed and undeviating policy of the United States is to achieve by peaceful methods, the eventual liberation of every country held captive behind the Iron Curtain.

Peace can never be established on the shifting sands of expediency or appeasement.

It must be built on the firm foundations of moral principle, freedom, justice, honor.

Free Ukrainians the world over reverently observe the 38th anniversary of their independence.

In so doing they remind us of our own struggle to win freedom and of our responsibility to give every assistance possible to others seeking this same objective.

To the Ukrainians in the United States, and to their relatives overseas, we send greetings.

Although the times are dark, their day will come when the sun will also smile over a free, self-governing, and happy people who are proud to be Ukrainians.

Cyprus and American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we are all greatly concerned about the tense situation in the Middle East and about developments regarding Cyprus. I wish to call the attention of the Congress to a statement which may be helpful in formulating intelligent conclusions on the subject, in the hope of eventual solution.

The statement follows:

CYPRUS AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Gene Rossides)

If Moscow had been directing the British diplomatic moves concerning Cyprus, a better job of weakening the West's position, militarily and politically, could not have been done. Even a cursory analysis reveals that Great Britain is the ally primarily to blame for weakening NATO, shattering Greek-Turkish relations and seriously jeopardizing American interests and those of the free world. If Britain is to qualify for her role as a leader in diplomacy in the Middle East then she will certainly have to show greater responsibility, foresight, and ingenuity than she is exhibiting over Cyprus.

For years Britain refused even to discuss the situation with the Greek Government or with the Cypriot people themselves. When Britain persisted in her refusal to negotiate, Greece informed her in early 1954 that she would be forced to bring the issue to the UN in the fall unless Britain agreed to private talks. Britain continued her policy of indifference. In the July 28, 1954 parliamentary debate the Conservative Government, through its Minister of State for Colonial Affairs, Mr. Hopkinson, aggravated the situation by saying that Cyprus "can never expect to be fully independent" (official report, July 28, 1954; vol. 531, chs. 507–508). Time magazine commented that "never" is a word British diplomats are never supposed to use (Time, Jan. 9, 1956, p. 26). There were many other statements uttered during that debate which added to the inflammatory situation. The remarks of the outgoing Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, belittling Greece, can only be characterized as irresponsible especially when one recalls that it was Greece who stood by England in "her darkest hour" and with American help is the only member of NATO to have defeated the Communists by force of arms.

There can be no doubt that the above statements by high-ranking members of the Conservative Government severely hampered a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem in 1954. Time magazine in referring to the Hopkinson statement wrote "his indiscretion was a signal that diplomatic pleading would not be enough" (Time, Jan. 9, 1956, p. 26). It is to be noted also that Mr. Hopkinson's "indiscretion" was repeated, in substance, as late as May 5, 1955, in the House of Commons debate and endorsed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Mr. Alan Lennox-Boyd (official report, May 5, 1955; vol. 540, chs. 1912–2000).

Even more irresponsible than refusing to negotiate is that at the same time Britain was privately conducting talks with Turkey designed to obtain the open opposition of Turkey to a plebiscite on the island. As Mr. C. L. Sulzberger stated in his column Foreign Affairs (the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1955):

"The British privately encouraged the Turks to express their interest. That was all Ankara needed. Ever since Turkey has been whipping itself into a frenzy over Cyprus. Instead of being dismayed, the British Foreign Office—which had taken over the hot potato from the colonial office—was pleased to cite Turkey's arguments as further excuse for doing nothing about changing the island's status."

It is significant to recall that 6 days after Greece submitted the Cyprus issue to the U. N., the British and Turks issued a communique from Istanbul that they would follow the same line on Cyprus (the New York Times, Aug. 28, 1954). It was only natural that the Turkish leaders with serious economic and political troubles internally would welcome the chance to divert attention to a foreign issue.

This is not all. In an effort to obtain American support the British Colonial Office deliberately misrepresented the factual situation on the island. The British suggested that the agitation was nothing more than a church-inspired movement imposed from above by a few church leaders for self-gain. Then the colonial office stated that the Communists were fomenting the discord. Even a slight familiarity with the Cyprus issue would demonstrate the falsity of these assertions. The truth is (1) the Communists have no voice in the nationalist movement; (2) that a plebiscite giving independence and union with Greece would strip the church of its lands and much of its prerogatives and outlaw the Communist Party. (A future essay will discuss fully the coddling of the Communists by the British.)

On June 30, 1955, less than 2 months after the May 5 debate, Prime Minister Eden announced a complete reversal of the no-talk policy by calling for a conference on the Cyprus issue. He invited not only Greece but also, for some reason, Turkey. The Cypriots were not invited on the excuse that this was now an international issues. At the conference Greece further modified the demands of the Cypriots concerning the timing of self-determination from immediate to within a reasonable time. Britain, in substance, repeated its previous position and refused to recognize the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination while the Turks, whose only legitimate interest is minority rights, had the effrontery to say she wanted no change in the status quo; that if there was to be a legislative assembly the 17.5 percent Moslem minority must have 50 percent representation and that if there was any change in sovereignty it should revert to Turkey. As a result the conference broke down.

British motives in calling this conference are not above suspicion for several reasons: (1) the calling of a public conference versus the traditional British preference for secret negotiations; (2) the alternatives were clear—accept the offer of military bases and agree to self-determination either immediately or in the near future; (3) the failure to invite the Cypriots; (4) yet inviting Turkey whose only legitimate interest was and is minority rights; (5) Britain's attempt at the conference to give the appearance of a mediator. If Britain was not prepared to modify its extreme position why did she call the conference? Edward R. Murrow said in part the following in his CBS radio broadcast (September 9, 1955):

"Now in hindsight one can say it would have been better never to have held it [the conference]. The Greeks now are sure the British invited the Turks so as to hide the real issue, which was between Greece and Britain. The British made it appear that they were there mediating between Greece and Turkey. If this was the British intention, it didn't work. An unpleasant situation wasn't bypassed; instead a dangerous hostility was produced between two allies. This, of course, is what the Kremlin is working day and night to bring about. Now this much has been accomplished without Soviet help. The men in the Kremlin must be not a little gratified."

In the parliamentary debate of December 5, 1955, the British apparently withdrew Mr. Hopkinson's "never" and appear to have replaced it with a "sometime under certain conditions" but still refused to say when. The debate was hampered as the Government requested that they not be pressed as private negotiations with the Cypriots were in progress (official report, December 5, 1955). It appears from the news reports that these negotiations are still continuing.

The United States is highly interested in inducing Greece and Turkey to resume friendly relations and make their alliance what it once was. We are also interested in keeping England our stanch ally. What is the solution? A year and a half ago, before Turkey was injected into the dispute, the New York Times, in an editorial, suggested the following (the New York Times, August 20, 1954):

"As the British acknowledged in respect to Suez, the value of any base depends on the friendship and cooperation of the surrounding people, whose enmity would turn the base into a liability. This recognition would

seem to open the way to a compromise, which is also urged in the British press. Such a compromise might well envisage titular Greek sovereignty and self-government in Cyprus under an ironclad and irrevocable treaty providing for British bases on the island and a secure British occupation of them. The first should satisfy Greek patriotism, the second should meet British strategic requirements."

As regards American relations with England the Cyprus question is a reflection of the broader American problem of preaching an anticolonial policy on the one hand yet supporting allies who are colonialists. In the case of Cyprus there is no reason why our stand on colonialism should be different from that on Russian colonialism in the satellite countries.

Traditionally, the United States and Greece have been the closest of friends. Daniel Webster in his famous speech in the House of Representatives, January 19, 1824, on the Greek War of Independence, noted that the United States was the first Nation to support the movement of the Greeks to regain their freedom. In the present era of struggle between the West and the Communists, American aid to Greece was eminently justified when the Greeks defeated the Communists by force of arms. In addition, Greece, as a member of the Balkan alliance, contributes to the defense of the free world.

Today Greece stands on Russia's doorstep a symbol of freedom, and it is vital to the United States that she so continue. Greece can undoubtedly be convinced to renew an active role in the relatively dormant Balkan alliance. However, Greece's resumption of normal relations within the Balkan alliance will depend primarily on Turkey because of the staged anti-Greek riots of last September which devastated the Christian and Jewish communities in Turkey. The full extent of these riots, so reminiscent of Turkey's 19th century massacres, has yet to be revealed. In this connection mention must be made of the identical letters sent after those riots to Greece and Turkey by our State Department. The reaction to those letters appears in the following quote from Mr. C. L. Sulzberger (the New York Times, Sept. 24, 1955):

"Now the United States, thanks to maladroit public diplomacy is rapidly losing favor [in Greece].

"Mr. Dulles sent identical messages to Athens and Ankara telling both allies to be good boys and recalling how much aid we had given them. The Greeks felt as if, having been beaten up in an unprovoked fight, they were being hailed into the same dock as the bully who assaulted them.

"The two most serious Athens newspapers reacted as follows: 'Mr. Dulles places criminals and victims on the same level. He has not felt either the moral or the political necessity to condemn the atrocities of Izmir and Istanbul and instead mentions financial aid, suggesting it will cease unless we comply with his instructions.' And: 'His message is a revolting and unacceptable composition of cynicism, guilty falsification of reality and insolent behavior toward an honest people. Silence would have been a thousand times preferable.'"

With Greece, American diplomatic strategy could be quite simple. Adhere to traditional American concepts of freedom and opposition to colonial rule and we retain stature. Depart from such policies, or give the appearance of departing from them, and we do ourselves, and the free world, great injury. Such is not the case regarding Turkey. She would have us support Britain's colonial rule of the island and even further suggests that the island should revert to Turkey because of prior conquest, giving no thought to the fact that over 80 percent of the population is Greek and that the Turkish minority is about 17.5 percent. If one carries Turkey's argument to its logical conclusion then all of the Middle East and Greece should revert. The United States should not tolerate such a position. This is especially true when one realizes that the prime reason Turkey seized the opportunity to voice its objections was to divert attention from serious political and economic troubles at home to a foreign issue.

The United States should oppose continued colonial rule of Cyprus for the following reasons among others:

1. The British themselves are sharply divided. Both the Labor Party and Liberal Party have repeatedly criticized the Eden government on this issue, and most of the editorial comment in England and quite a few members of the Conservative Party favor the acceptance of the compromise position.

2. NATO would be strengthened by a plebiscite as whatever value the base has would be increased by a friendly rather than a hostile population plus additional manpower (at least three divisions) from amongst the Cypriots.

3. The Cypriots, a mature, civilized people, could govern themselves today.

4. The rights of the Turkish minority can be fully protected.

5. There is no problem of the Communists getting control as, among other points, union with Greece would outlaw them.

England's serious errors over the island of Cyprus have badly damaged the American and western defense system in that area and lowered sharply American political prestige. The United States is not faced with her usual postwar dilemma of supporting the colonial power versus a reactionary local government or the Communist-led aspirations of subjugated people. In the case of Cyprus human rights and political expediency combine. American self-interest is best served by a position designed to make the British Conservative Government accept the compromise position of British bases and self-determination at some determinate time in the near future. If Britain accepts the compromise offer it would go a long way to restrengthening NATO and the free world and help in reestablishing the normal functioning of the Balkan alliance. In this connection it is worth noting the following from Time magazine (Time, January 9, 1956, p. 26):

"But the special tragedy of Cyprus is that it involves friends, and that the suffering should be so simply avoidable. A clear statement from the British Government promising the right of self-determination at a definite time in the near future to Cyprus' 520,000 people could halt overnight a conflict that daily grows more violent and more dangerous. Week by week it becomes more apparent that Britain's release of control of Cyprus to its inhabitants is not only the just solution, but the inevitable one."

Must Tariff Reduction Be a Strictly American Move?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the January 22 issue of the Charlotte Observer. While stimulation of world trade is a most desirable objective, this editorial contains a timely reminder that we are practically a free-trade country with respect to all commodities we buy in quantities and that our markets are wide open to any country that wants to sell us something we do not have in exchange for something they do not have. I trust our negotiators at Geneva will keep these facts in mind.

The editorial follows:

American newsmen covering the tariff conferences at Geneva are sending dispatches to their papers saying that the division of the 26 nations paticipating seems to put the United States on one side and all the rest on the other.

This is hardly surprising, because the previous conferences under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade seemed to have the same cleavage. This organization, in fact, has given the impression of a general offensive against American tariffs. This is the first time, however, that the division has been described so candidly.

All the delegates know that the Eisenhower administration has been given authority to lower tariffs by as much as 5 percent a year for 3 years, and their chief object at the conference apparently is to see that Mr. Eisenhower does it.

They are carefully avoiding one other circumstance: that the United States began lowering tariffs by Executive order 20 years ago, and as a result of this the country now has one of the lowest tariff schedules in the world.

For all commodities that we can buy in quantity, we are practically a free-trade country. It is only on those goods that we produce in abundance and that we do not need to buy abroad that we maintain a protective tariff.

We need to protect our textiles, for example, because no other textile producing country in the world pays its workers such high wages as we do. Japan pays its textile workers only one-tenth what the American worker gets. It is to protect those wages that we keep tariffs on goods that we do not need to buy from other countries.

But our market is wide open to any country that wants to sell us something we do not have in exchange for something they do not have.

The GATT requires that, when two nations negotiate a bilateral agreement reducing tariffs to each other, this agreement is automatically extended to all other members, even if they do not negotiate for them.

Few of the nations represented at Geneva in the current conference are showing any interest in reducing their own tariffs. Neither do they indicate that they will remove other trade barriers like import quotas and pegged currencies that have the same effect as high tariffs.

The United States is the only country represented at Geneva that is willing to negotiate tariff reductions with all the others. The line-up, however, remains the same. All the rest appear to be standing by, waiting for President Eisenhower to reduce American tariffs.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Need for Youthful Spirit in Government and Private Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was privileged last Sunday to address the Green Bay Junior Chamber of Commerce of the subject of the need for youthful spirit in government and private affairs. I ask unanimous consent that my address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY STRESSES THE NEED FOR YOUTHFUL SPIRIT IN UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE AFFAIRS—SAYS YOUTHFUL SPIRIT "WILLING TO TAKE CAREFULLY CALCULATED RISKS" IS ESSENTIAL IN AIR-ATOMIC AGE

(Excerpts of address delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, before Green Bay Junior Chamber of Commerce, January 22, 1956, Beaumont Hotel)

It is a real privilege for me to be present at this distinguished service award banquet.

Wisconsin is proud of the Jaysee movement. And Green Bay has every reason to be particularly proud of the award tonight to the most outstanding young man who has best served this fine community.

VALUE OF GRASSROOTS LEADERSHIP IN COMMUNITY

Awards of this nature serve to spotlight the most responsible type of grassroots citizenship.

They give a wonderful shot in the arm to those fine folks who, known and unknown, 365 days a year, are trying to make Green Bay and other Wisconsin and American communities real garden places.

I mean the sort of flourishing community in which we most enjoy raising our children—a wholesome community, appealing, friendly, clean, forward looking.

SPIRIT OF YOUTH ESSENTIAL FOR FOUR REASONS

The fact that you have selected your outstanding young man serves as the keynote for my comments tonight.

Why? Because America needs the spirit of youth, as much or more now than at any previous time in our history. Let me prove that point by four basic reasons:

1. We need the spirit of youth which recognizes the new realities of the air-atomic age, the realities of the contracted world of the 20th century.

I shall have more to say about this later on.

YOUTHFUL SPIRIT VITAL IN SCIENCE

2. Second, we need youth, because this is a scientific age. And in this age we urgently need the young mind, the growing mind, the fresh mind, which is curious, which is inquiring, which seeks to come up with answers to the great, great scientific problems of the universe.

What science? All science—physical science and social science, "pure" science and applied science.

I refer particularly to nuclear science, to electronic science, to physics, chemistry, biology, as well as to astronomy, geology, and yes, very definitely the social sciences as well.

Man today is reaching out billions of light-years into outer space.

He is preparing to fling a space satellite hundreds of miles into the sky, there to circle the earth in its orbit, and to transmit data on cosmic waves and other phenomena.

Meanwhile, too, man is reaching down to the most minute form of matter and energy within the atom. He seeks to harness forces so tiny that not even man's highest-powered electronic microscope can see them.

And so, in this quest of the infinite, man needs a youthful, dynamic spirit.

In our great atomic laboratories it is not unusual to find young 30-year-old geniuses directing operations that may critically affect the peace and well-being of the globe.

MANY YOUNG CIVILIANS IN GOVERNMENT

So, too, I may add, in our United States Government in Washington—in nonscientific pursuits as well—we have been bringing in an increasing number of able young leaders.

We have had a 27-year-old Assistant Secretary of Health, a 33-year-old Assistant Secretary of Labor, a new 37-year-old member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

We have literally dozens of young men, serving as "right hands" to top Cabinet and agency officials. These young men come from the grassroots of America.

UNPRECEDENTED MASS OF YOUNG LEADERS IN WASHINGTON

Comparative studies are not readily available as regards the total number of young men appointed down through the years, by the executive branch of the Government.

But I have seen impressive lists of the enormous number of young people who have been appointed to very high office in Washington since January 1953.

And I believe that there is good ground to estimate that, probably at no previous time in American history, have more qualified young men been appointed in such numbers and to such high positions, in virtually every single Cabinet department and agency of our Government, than the past few years.

From the ranks of these young men will come the Cabinet officers and agency heads of tomorrow. From their ranks in the Department of Defense will come, as well, America's military leadership in years to come.

YOUNG AND OLD WOULD SUFFER IN WAR

It has long been said that "young men fight the Nation's wars, but older men are responsible for handling the Nation's affairs at peace."

Well, the facts show that, today, young people are high up in the effort as well, to keep this Nation at peace. That is as it should be.

Of course, the burden of the next war, if ever it comes, would not simply fall on the young people in combat ranks, it would fall on our entire population.

War must not come; it need not come, and I don't believe it will come.

AMERICA'S GROWING PEACETIME NEEDS

3. Now, let us continue on the need for youth.

Thirdly, we need the spirit of youth to meet the dynamically growing peacetime needs of our people.

We number, as you know, 165 million people today.

We will number 220 million people by 1975. This tremendous increase in population means that we need a youthful spirit which will help provide us with more housing, more jobs, more schools, more playgrounds, more hospitals, more roads, yes, more parking space, more suburban communities, more of all the good things of life.

Our gross national product today is $400 billion. It will reach the half-trillion-dollar mark in the not too distant future. But that will take work—and a youthful spirit.

TEAMWORK ESSENTIAL

4. Finally, and perhaps most important, we need the spirit of youth in teamwork.

Young folks—on and off the athletic field—particularly enjoy working together, playing together, growing together; and that is what we need today.

We are a country of competitive individualists, but we need cooperation.

We need it between the 48 States. We need it between regions—North and South, East and Midwest and Far West.

We need it between labor and management. (If you or I want to see grim examples of the results of lack of cooperation and understanding, you and I need only look to communities very close to us, to see the tragic consequences.)

THE AIR-ATOMIC FACTS—KEY TO SURVIVAL

But, my friends, I should like to turn back now to the very first phrase to which I referred.

You will remember that I mentioned that we need the spirit of youth in the air-atomic age.

Why? Because upon such spirit depends our very survival.

If you were to ask me: "Senator WILEY, what is your most important job in Washington? What do you regard as your greatest obligation?" My answer would be simply this— in one word: "Survival."

I mean that this Republic must endure; it must protect itself. That is the first law of nature—self-preservation.

You are all familiar with the overall Communist threat—a military-diplomatic-economic threat to our beloved country.

It is the most serious threat in world history.

Why, particularly, the military threat?

NATURAL BARRIERS NO LONGER EXIST

The answer is simple: It is because natural barriers no longer exist against possible lightninglike destruction of our country.

What were those barriers?

They were two: First, the barrier of space.

Second, the barrier of time.

Today, because of man's ingenuity and inventiveness, there is virtually no space or time barrier between ourselves and the potential enemy.

The Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have been shrunken to the size of mere ponds. And the north polar area has been shrunken as well.

I have said from one end of Wisconsin to another, and I say to you tonight: We, in Green Bay, are actually closer than is the east coast to enemy attack—across the polar route—from Soviet bases in Siberia.

The fastest jet bomber from Soviet bases can reach us in less than 6 hours. Is it any wonder that our neighbor city of Milwaukee is today being ringed with Nike guided missile sites for purposes of defense against aerial onslaught?

And if there is developed—in 1 year—or 5 years an intercontinental ballistic or guided missile, it may reach us—not in 6 hours—but in less than half an hour. I repeat, less than half an hour.

In less than 30 minutes, a Soviet guided missile—with a nuclear warhead—could come crashing down on us, from over the Arctic roof of the world.

So, I ask, can we dare underestimate the need for fresh minds, youthful minds, open minds to cope with this terrific defense problem?

YOUTH NOT A MATTER OF CHRONOLOGICAL AGE

You will note that I do not refer necessarily to young people, alone, as such.

Why? Because youth is not really a matter of chronological age. The truly young person is the person who is young in spirit.

There are so-called elderly men and women who genuinely have the youthful spirit, as much as a bright-eyed young person of 25 or 30. That is precisely what we need in this air-atomic age—alert eyes, alert minds—dynamic outlooks, peering into the future.

NO ENTANGLING ALLIANCES—AN OBSOLETE CONCEPT

Now, just as the facts of the air-atomic age have changed the strategy and tactics of war, so they have changed international diplomacy.

For years we Americans had prided ourselves on our avoidance of entangling alliances.

But now we have found that even if we wanted to continue that policy it would be hopelessly obsolete; it would no longer protect us.

So if some of us tend to look backward instead of forward, we must take the blinders off our eyes. We must recognize the new and dangerous world in which we live.

A great American President, Abraham Lincoln, once said: "The dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present. * * * As our case is new, we must think anew and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves and we will save our Nation."

THE REPUBLIC—MY PARAMOUNT INTEREST

Thus, in my work as senior Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have sought to make sure that we follow up-to-date policies which will truly save our Nation.

My interest, as you know, has always been this Republic—yours and mine—first and foremost.

But I have recognized—as you, my friends, should, that, because the globe has been contracted, we must try to prevent wars before—not after—they flare up in far corners of the world.

Of course, we must not try to take on all the world's burdens, but we must be willing to carry our share. We must not be mental shirkers or slackers.

Youth has courage. Youth is willing to face the facts. That is the spirit we need.

SAMPLES OF KEY QUESTIONS TODAY

What are the facts? Where are the dangers in the world today? What can we do—what should we do, if anything, about them?

These are vital questions. They deserve study.

What about our attitude toward the riots in North Africa, so near our strategic air bases?

What should be our position on the explosive Middle East problem, between the Arabs and the Israelis?

What about the growing Communist threats inside countries ranging as far apart as France and Indonesia?

What should be the level of appropriations in next year's mutual-security bill? How much can we really afford? How much is necesary? What safeguards, what restrictions, should be written in the bill? Should aid be limited to 1 year? What should be our attitude, as regards aid to neutralist powers?

These are not easy questions. But they are not questions which we can duck.

Reality is still reality, whether we ignore it or not. And we dare not ignore it, if we would survive; as we must, and as we will.

It is not I, alone, who must come up with sound answers to these questions: it is you and you and you who must help me, and help all our legislators and our Chief Executive to find and to stay on the right path to peace.

THE BRINK-OF-WAR CONTROVERSY

Now, you have all heard about the recent criticism of our Secretary of State because he is said to have asserted that we have been close to the edge of war on three occasions.

These criticisms of Secretary Dulles are, in my judgment, unfair and unfounded.

It is not he who brought us close to conflict, nor President Eisenhower, but the leaders of the Kremlin. Secretary Dulles merely responded to the Red danger; he did not create it. He responded firmly and forthrightly, precisely as the American people and the Congress desired.

In this world, we cannot escape danger.

Let no one fool himself into thinking that there is any easy, nondangerous way to avoid global conflict.

War requires sacrifices and risks, and avoidance of war requires sacrifices and risks.

These are perilous times. The unhappy fact of the world in which we live, is that perhaps for the rest of our lifetimes, whether we like it or not, we are going to live close to danger.

That does not mean that war would be actually imminent at any time, but it does mean that, so long as the Soviet Union continues to desire to conquer the world, we have no alternative but to be ready and vigilant every single hour of every single day and year.

Our vigilance helps to prevent war. Our firmness reduces the danger of war. It is not the taking of risks which brings war closer; it would be a policy of timid appeasement—a policy of so-called no risk—which would really be the greatest danger of all the riskiest of all alternatives. Why? Because the Reds grow fat and strong on their enemies' weakness.

We want peace. We despise war. But we will not be appeasers. We will not throw a little nation to the Red wolf, or a big nation. We will and we must stand firmly against Red aggression.

This is the answer of America's young and old alike.

CONCLUSION

It has been a great pleasure to be with you tonight, as you salute the outstanding young man of Green Bay.

I want to reiterate my tribute to the Jaycee movement of Wisconsin and the Nation.

I hope that this occasion will serve as a great stimulus to the young folks who did not gain this coveted award tonight.

They should feel encouraged to carry on their work, because whether they win a prize or not, they can feel real satisfaction for jobs well done, on behalf of a greater Green Bay and greater America.

Arabs Open Hate Drive Here Against Israelis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the nationwide campaign of the Arab Information Center—an adjunct of the Arab League—against this country's aid or ties to Israel is aptly described by Messrs. Guy Richards and Jeffrey Roche in the following article which appeared in the New York Journal-American for January 16, 1956:

ARABS OPEN HATE DRIVE HERE AGAINST ISRAELIS

(By Guy Richards and Jeffrey Roche)

Armed with a $700,000 slush fund, the Arab Information Center has launched a nationwide propaganda campaign in the United States against this country's aid and ties to Israel, it was learned today.

The main strategem of the Arabs' new propaganda campaign here is to attack Israel's supporters in the United States of America by spreading anti-Semitic literature and endeavoring to influence public opinion in countless other ways.

STUDENTS ORGANIZED

Headquarters of the drive are on the 12th floor of the shiny, metal-edged Universal Pictures Building at 445 Park Avenue.

With the recent Arab-Soviet arms deals, and the effect of this on American public opinion, the Arabs have made the following moves here:

They have organized 3,500 Arab exchange students in the United States to serve the dual functions of community propaganda agents and intelligence collectors.

They have retained the services of a Washington legal firm at a $6,000-a-year fee. Douglas Whitlock, partner of Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock, and Markey, registered his services with the foreign agents section of the Department of Justice on August 8.

Louis A. Gravelle of the firm said that "we are only handling legal matters" for the Arab Information Center. He denied the firm was acting as "lobbyists."

The Arab group retained the services of Chester S. Williams, a New York public relations counsel of 350 5th Avenue, who prepared a 150-page report suggesting various subtle approaches to influence public opinion here.

His total compensation for time and expense for less than 8 months' work was $14,986. For a while the Arabs followed his "kid-gloves" approach; then ended it and began a bolder, more violent campaign, spearheaded by anti-Semitic propaganda reminiscent of Hitler's Nazi techniques, Williams no longer works for them.

They have hired Mahmoud L. Hawari, an experienced Egyptian newspaperman, as a full-time press officer. One of his main assignments is to woo American newspapermen and columnists.

They have developed new contacts with radio commentators and started dickering for a possible TV outlet.

SPEECHES DISTRIBUTED

They have begun a monthly newsletter, a weekly press digest and a weekly newssheet. The latter is aimed at providing newspapers with "filler" material antagonistic to Israel and Jewry in general, and favorable to the

eight Arab States—Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Yemen.

They have sent out in a wide reprint distribution every one of the more than 120 speeches made by Arab League or Arab Information Center principals. The recipients included more than 50,000 persons throughout the nation.

They have established a relationship with several notorious anti-Semitic agitators here.

Their diplomats—when they thought they were in civic assemblages not covered by the press—have launched the type of tirades not heard from foreign officials since the days of the Hitler regime.

The Arab Information Center in New York, an adjunct of the Arab League with offices in several parts of the world, has been granted a special operating fund of $700,000 to conduct its propaganda activities against Israel and American Jewry.

Of this total, two of the richest members of the league, Egypt and Saudi Arabia, have contributed, respectively, $140,000 and $70,000. Reliable but unconfirmed reports have Saudi Arabia putting up an additional $180,000 in the last week or two. The Arab League's own treasury has subscribed the remainder.

The collaboration of Egypt and Saudi Arabia in carrying the major load of the Arab propaganda drive in the United States of America is in line with similar action on the military front. The two nations recently agreed with Syria to an overall unified command of their military forces facing Israel's frontiers.

In another move on the economic front, Saudi Arabia has barred its nationals from trading with any American business firm whose officers are of the Jewish faith.

URBANE DIRECTOR

The New York office of the Arab Information Center opened last January under the direction of the urbane and jovial Kamil Abdul Rahim. For several years this moustachioed Egyptian was King Farouk's Ambassador to the United States. Rahim knows his way around Washington and New York.

Until the last few months, the Arab organization was distinguished by few signs of public activity.

During this period, Williams, the public-relations man, was preparing his survey of the American scene as the Arabs should view it.

We made five attempts to interview Williams. Two brief telephone calls were the closest we got.

He admitted being hired by the AIC, but stated that his relationship with it was "confidential." He readily conceded that he had done a 150-page "survey" for the Arabs and as readily declined our offer to submit extracts from it in our possession to be checked for authenticity.

REGISTERED AS AGENT

Williams also declined to discuss the work he did for the AIC, and the fees paid him, as "confidential" matters between himself and his client.

Documents he filed with the foreign registration section of the Department of Justice, however, shed light on these matters. As president of World Information, Inc., he registered on March 8, 1955 as an agent of the Arab Information Center.

In reports filed later, he stated that his services terminated on May 31, 1955.

We have checked the authenticity of the extracts from Williams' report that he declined to talk about. Williams' recommendations for influencing American opinion were subtle and all-encompassing. Among factors he outlined for "smooth functioning" of an Arab propaganda campaign in the United States of America were the following:

"The primary purpose of the Arab Information Center should be to open channels of communication with influential Americans.

"Contributions by American citizens to Israel should be taxable.

"American guidance on content emphasis (in pro-Arab literature, brochures, etc.), form of presentation, editing, is imperative. Make use of Americans who know how to enter the channels of communication."

STIMULATION URGED

The role of the 3,500 Arab exchange students now is much stronger than anything suggested by Williams.

He recommended: "Stimulate Arab students' activities in American universities and colleges. Someone would have to be directly responsible for supplying students with well-thought out material, discussing the Arab students' talents as speakers, organizers, and putting them to work."

But what has actually happened with the Arab students in recent months has far surpassed the scope of Williams' blueprint. Starting last May, Arab students have received two letters in Arabic, one of which an Arab Information Center spokesman identified as coming from his office, the other of which he repudiated.

This newspaper has been assured by Arnold Foster, general counsel for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, at 515 Madison Avenue, that the second letter as well as the first was authorized and distributed by the Arab Information Center. (The ADL has been investigating the Arab campaign.)

DIRECTIONS QUOTED

The first, acknowledged by AIC as its own, tells the students that "the Arab homeland should have the greatest share of your idle time that you may dedicate to its service and to the defense of its cause," and says it will supply necessary material.

The second tells the students that among the most important work cut out for them are:

"Writing articles and letters to newspaper editors in your university and local newspapers and magazines in defense of the Arabs and their cause. Sending to us reports on these efforts and on the doings of Zionists in your area, and on the stand taken by the press, radio, and television toward the Arab question."

A Cairo broadcast on the eve of the Czech-Egyptian arms deal tends to bear out the authenticity of the letter repudiated by the AIC, the letter which directs the students to be both propaganda and intelligence agents.

On August 8, the United States Foreign Information Service monitored the following bulletin from the Cairo radio:

"The Arab League is endeavoring to mobilize the efforts of the Arab students studying abroad, particularly in the United States, and to direct them in a patriotic way on Arab questions.

"It has distributed pamphlets among them and has provided them with the information required to combat Zionism.

"It has also asked them to perform the duty of making propaganda in favor of their countries through speeches and articles in and outside of their universities."

Considering that Egypt's Premier Nasser made public announcement of his arms deal with the Czechs on September 27, and that it was being negotiated for weeks before, the August 8 date of that Cairo broadcast about the students becomes doubly interesting.

That is the precise day that Douglas Whitlock registered as legal adviser in Washington for the AIC.

It was not long after Nasser's announcement that abundant evidence developed that the Arabs here had decided to throw away all restraints in attacking Jews in general in order to combat American support for Israel.

On November 14, at a luncheon of the Women's National Democratic Club of Washington, D. C., Syrian Ambassador Farid Zeineddine launched one of the most intemperate attacks on Jewry that members of the club had ever heard. It turned out that he believed no reporters were covering the event. He was wrong.

He warned that an American security pact with Israel might bring "American youths fighting against Arab youths in great bloodshed."

He alleged that Israel had "pushed Arab refugees out of their homeland," and in a reference to the number of Jews living in New York asked sarcastically:

"Why not let New York be a homeland for the Jews?"

His speech brought a formal protest of Secretary of State Dulles, signed by a number of non-Jewish Americans.

But Premier Nasser's decision to buy weapons behind the Iron Curtain not only served to strip all restraint from some Arab spokesmen here.

It seemed to trigger into action a new pro-Arab campaign by several notorious American anti-Semites who began to favor the Arab cause in their literature.

St. Louis Federal Jury Turns Against Injustice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHELF

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "St. Louis Federal Jury Turns Against Injustice" that appeared in the Florence Morning News, Florence, S. C., on Tuesday morning, January 24, 1956, concerning the indictments of Matt Connelly and Lamar Caudle. Also a copy of a wire that I sent to the Messenger and Intelligencer at Wadesboro, N. C., on December 2, 1955, with respect to the same subject matter.

As a former chairman of the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee that conducted an investigation of the Justice Department in 1952, I agree with this editorial. In my opinion the indictment of Caudle will boomerang on the Republican Party because it is strictly political. A Democratic and Republican investigation of Caudle in 1952 and again in 1953 found nothing about which to indict Caudle. Why all this action on the eve of the 1956 presidential election?

The matters follow:

[From the Florence (S. C.) News of January 24, 1956]

ST. LOUIS FEDERAL JURY TURNS AGAINST INJUSTICE

The Federal grand jury in St. Louis is giving confirmation to strong statements of opinion that have been voiced over the past few weeks.

Matt Connelly and Lamar Caudle of the Truman administration have been indicted in St. Louis on a tax fraud conspiracy charge. The charge has all the obvious earmarks of a political effort to make Democrats bad and Republicans good. In a "frame" of this kind, where could the Republicans find two better men than Caudle and Connelly?

Now the jury has charged that much of what has happened is political; that the Government almost ordered the indictments; and, that things are going slow as a matter of election timing—not as a matter of justice.

Caudle has been hounded for years.

Previous hearings and investigations have demonstrated that this Justice Department tax official exemplified something of a high point in political naivete. They can prove he didn't use good judgment in some instances, but they haven't been able to prove he was dishonest—and they have worked with this same charge before.

If Caudle were not honest, any prosecutor able to pass a bar exam would have been able to prove it by now. The effort expended has been amazing.

Why try again?

Because he is a good gimmick.

His name has been tied to "Democratic corruption." Lamar Caudle has been associated with all of the evil connotations of Trumanism. This is election year and the Republicans made such a hit with their anvil chorus of crime and corruption at least election time that they are playing for a repeat.

Since the last time the Republicans burned a "Truman witch" a few of their 14 carat gold crusaders have tarnished. Men like Talbott, Wenzell and Strobel have pointed out that all Republicans aren't proper public servants.

The Republicans needed a real quick deal to get back in the headlines as champions of justice. They have done so by making justice a part of party politics.

From St. Louis comes the word that some members of the grand jury want out. Both Democrats and Republicans have protested the tactics being used and have been quoted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch as believing the investigation is being handled so that any further indictments will be spaced at long intervals until November to serve the Republican Party rather than the interests of justice.

It would seem that the Republicans have enough to answer for without using the Justice Department as a means of stuffing the ballot boxes.

There is something more than sinister, worse than unjust, about using a man—already persecuted past reason—to serve partisan political advantage.

No one has been able to demonstrate that Lamar Caudle has been anything other than naive and kindhearted—neither of which seem to be acceptable in government. If we could feel that the government was honest in seeking conviction, then there would be little complaint; but there is the obvious evidence that the government is doing nothing more than using a well-worn name in an old game to win a new election.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *December 2, 1955.*
MESSENGER AND INTELLIGENCER,
Wadesboro, N. C.:

While I have not and shall not criticize a grand jury or court for any action or judgment, nevertheless, I believe I am one person who can say that your fellow-citizen, Lamar Caudle, has been really investigated. If after that investigation our subcommittee had thought he should have been jailed we would have said so in no mistaken language. After a thorough, searching and relentless study and examination of the record and of the facts, the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the House investigating the Department of Justice in 1952 said among other things the following about Lamar Caudle:

"Every member of the subcommittee and its staff who observed Caudle and listened to his testimony over a long period shares in the opinion that he is an honorably motivated man. This does not rule out his shortcomings * * *. He made errors of judgment, some of which played their part in destroying public confidence in the Government he served; and he swallowed more in the name of personal loyalty than any man should stomach, but Caudle never sold himself for riches or for power. If indeed he so much as skirted the edges of venality and corruption, he did more soul-searching about it than many of his associates who have emerged with unscathed reputations. And in every instance where the choice was clearly black or white, Caudle's choice appears to have been impeccably correct.

"The career of this man from his start as an eager young United States attorney to his final inglorious demise as a scapegoat is the most accurate reflection of decay within the Department of Justice that this subcommittee has come upon."

I am of the opinion that the leadership of the Republican Party wants to use both Caudle and Connelly as scapegoats to divert the attention of the country from the miserable record of Ezra Benson who has without any effort at all in less than 3 years, almost ruined every farmer in America. The GOP leadership wants us to forget such names as Adolphe Wenzell, Peter A. Strobel, and former Secretary of Air Talbott, and others who have been forced out of the present administration.

As a young prosecuting attorney I found it was much easier to indict a man than to convict him. As a young lawyer I also discovered it was far easier to sue a man in court than to get a judgment against him. It requires only words to indict or sue but thank God under our democratic judicial system it takes proof to convict in a criminal court or to get a judgment in a civil court. Last summer when the Justice Department requested the House Judiciary Committee to furnish it with our confidential files of our 1952 investigation, as the former chairman of the subcommittee that investigated the Department of Justice, I was unanimously named by the full committee to study the old records and to recommend to the committee whether they should allow the Justice Department to have these files. Although I knew at the time that "Justice" was on a hunting and fishing expedition, nevertheless, I recommended to the full committee that they allow the Department to have free access to all the files. In reading the old records this past summer I found nothing that would have changed my mind, thinking, opinion or judgment in the Caudle case and for that matter any other individual investigated by us. Remember, the fellow heading the Department of Justice at the present once intimated that former President Harry S. Truman was a "traitor" to his country. Just how partisan can one get? In my opinion Lamar Caudle is being castigated, eradicated, and "politicated." Therefore, in the interim, between now and the time of trial, I urge the good people of Wadesboro, Anson County, and North Carolina, where Lamar Caudle was born, raised, and educated, to reserve judgment of their fellow-citizen. Don't let anybody sell your hometown boy short.

FRANK CHELF,
Member of Congress, Former Chairman, Chelf Subcommittee.

Hospital at Wise Monument to Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. PAT JENNINGS
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bristol Herald-Courier, of recent date, in regard to he forthcoming opening of a new hospital at Wise, Va. This hospital has been constructed by the United Mine Workers of America to care for miners and their families in the area around Wise.

The editorial is as follows:

HOSPITAL AT WISE MONUMENT TO MINERS

The modern, magnificent hospital which the UMW has constructed at Wise, Va., simply as a utilitarian structure, is a tremendously vital addition to the lives of southwest Virginians.

But, more than that, the hospital is a monument to the coal miner.

It reflects his perserverance in the face of day-to-day dangers and adversities. It bespeaks the quality of his faith in a better day tomorrow, and the day after, and the day after. It portrays his concern for the health and happiness of himself, his family, and his fellow citizens.

The new hospital, however, will not be a monument of cold stone; it will not be just a commemorative bit of architecture.

Rather, the new hospital will be a living tribute. It will issue forth life in the newborn; it will offer solace and treatment for the sick and injured; it will give hope to the critically ill; it will embrace the span of mortal man from the first rasping cry to the last deep sigh.

So we join with the UMW and all the citizens of southwest Virginia in warmly welcoming this new institution into our midst. Its dedication will be an historic monument in the annals of this area and we are certain the years ahead will add luster to the pages on which that history is written.

An Amendment to the National Banking Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to commend to the attention of the membership of this body a resolution which was adopted on January 17 by the Common Council of the city of Wauwatosa, Wis.

The resolution pertains to H. R. 8622 and any related measures which would enable commercial banks to deal in public revenue bonds. It is my understanding that this legislation is presently pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House. It is my hope that early hearings will be held on this proposal so that this legislation may be considered by the full House in the near future.

The resolution follows:

Whereas an amendment to the National Banking Act permitting commercial banks to deal and trade in public revenue bonds has been proposed in the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas United States Senate hearings on the proposed amendment are scheduled to begin in the spring of this year; and

Whereas the hereinabove proposed amendment to the National Banking Act would promote the best interests and general welfare of the city of Wauwatosa: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Wauwatosa, That the city of Wauwatosa be recorded in favor of the passage

of the proposed amendment to the National Banking Act permitting commercial banks to deal and trade in public revenue bonds now pending in the Congress of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That the city of Wauwatosa strongly urges our national representatives in Washington to support and vote for this legislation; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be and he is hereby authorized and directed to mail certified copies of this resolution to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY and Congressman CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, National Capitol, Washington, D. C.

Passed and dated January 17, 1956.

P. H. RIEMER,
City Clerk.

Approved January 17, 1956.

WM. B. KNUESE,
Mayor.

A Good Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, our country certainly does not have an overabundance of good-will emissaries traveling abroad in our behalf and it is most heartening to note the work being done by that extraordinary young man, Evangelist Billy Graham. His unselfish devotion to his God and his country is indeed inspiring. More and more of our people are coming to appreciate this man and to regard him as a truly dedicated person. One of the major newspapers in my congressional district, the Bedford Daily Times-Mail, recently saw fit to devote its lead editorial to Mr. Graham, and I would like herewith to insert that fine editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WE SEND A GOOD AMBASSADOR ABROAD

We had a letter from Billy Graham last week, and we suspect that just about every other American editor got the same thing. Billy is starting a trip to the Orient. The first stop is India, where he will spend 3 weeks, holding meetings in Bombay, Kottayam, Palamcottah, New Delhi, and Calcutta.

With scarcely a breathing spell, the evangelist will move on to Manila, Hong Kong, Taipai, Tokyo, and Seoul.

The letter was so unusual that we read it over a third time, expecting that it was primarily an offer to sell a series of articles which Graham would write while in the Far East. Frankly, we rather hoped there would be such an offer, as we admire the man and would have been a hot prospect were such articles available.

"We are making this tour," wrote Reverend Graham, "with two objectives in mind; first, to present Christianity; and second, to try and build some good will for the United States." He then went on to point out the tremendous propaganda results of the visit to India by Russia's Khrushchev and Bulganin. "They were smart enough to go over the heads of the state and appeal directly to the people," added Graham.

Graham expressed the hope that he would have from 50,000 to 100,000 people a day at his meetings, and that more than a million would hear him at his various stops. He wrote: "We are hoping the people of India will realize that we in the United States have something of moral and spiritual value to offer, as well as economic aid and engineering know-how."

Right there it seems to us that Graham has touched on the most grievous error in our approach to India, China, and the other lands now struggling against fear, poverty, and disease. We have been generous with money, technical aid, and advice but there has been no intimation that such acts were prompted by conscience, rather they have been a part of our program of national defense.

The human appeal simply could not be there in our aid to India, as the transactions have all been through governments, and governments think in terms of plans and patterns rather than in terms of people and the present.

Our programs have reached only the leaders and the intellectuals; we certainly have failed to win them. In view of the current riots in Bombay, perhaps the Indian leaders themselves have not reached the people. Cries of "Down with Nehru" are heard openly, more frequently, and by more people.

Most of our efforts have been of the do-good type, with no small touch of condescension. Instead of gaining good will we have been resented as interferers with Indian conceptions of law and procedure. This has been made manifest many times by statements of Nehru that he knows what India needs and wants, and he neither asks nor accepts advice from others. The result has been that we have poured in millions of dollars and got back ill will from the chief beneficiaries—the high Government officials—and in the meantime, we have lost all contact with the masses of the Indian people. From any viewpoint, India does not stand out as a bright spot, nor an added argument, for more foreign aid; at least, aid of the type which has been doled out for the past 8 years.

Krushchev and Bulganin paid scant attention to the Indian Government leaders. Nehru was very much miffed by the antics of the Russians, and especially their success in using the public appearances for anti-Western denunciations. What else could be expected? Had he studied previous Russian visits, he should have known. This one followed the usual pattern—and it is a good pattern too for them. The technique of appealing direct to the people has been worked very successfully in this country. Franklin Roosevelt was a master at it. Why shouldn't it work in India? It did—but for the Russians.

Billy Graham believes that without a spiritual presentation of what inspire America, made directly to the people, the most lavish programs of aid will fail. There is nothing in them which touches the heart. And men do not live by bread alone.

So the Western World will watch Billy Graham. He may well turn out to be the most effective—and the least expensive—bit of foreign aid we have used since the war. He will not take us to the brink of war; he will offer something firm, substantial, something of the human spirit, which is still the most important—and the most effective—force even in this world of confusion, distrust, and cold war. Keep your eye on Billy.

Albert Gallatin and Our Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, 160 years ago there was elected to our House of Representatives from western Pennsylvania the young Swiss-American Albert Gallatin who, as a Congressman, Secretary of the Treasury, and minister to European lands, was to establish his reputation indelibly in the history of this country to such a degree that he is ranked in the annals of America as one of the Founding Fathers, along with Washington, Jefferson, John Adams, and Madison. Gallatin was born in Geneva on January 29, 1761, and I believe it is fitting that we who have succeeded him as Congressmen celebrate his birthday today.

In his diary, Juljan Ursyn Niemcewicz, famous Polish writer and poet who accompanied Revolutionary War hero General Kosciuszko on a visit to America in 1797, early makes mention of the young Gallatin. He wrote:

Our stay in Philadelphia brought me countless friendships. I made friends with many Members of Congress and citizens of Philadelphia—among them Jefferson, whom I had met when he was American Ambassador to France, and Gallatin, born in Geneva and one of the finest Members of Congress.

The youth of 19 who landed in Boston in 1780 was not fleeing Europe in the sense that he personally was oppressed; but it was in America that he felt he had the greatest opportunity to work out those principles of democracy which he was to hold so high throughout his valuable life.

Before embarking upon his successful and distinguished career as a public official, Gallatin fought in the Revolutionary War, taught at Harvard, and farmed in western Pennsylvania. He read extensively and was largely self-taught. It is in a sense surprising to read that his command of the English language was poor, and that he spoke with a heavy accent throughout his many years in this country. He himself complained to Jefferson that he could not write even a decent letter without great labor. In spite of these difficulties, he became distinguished as an excellent debater, and well-known for his logic and his tremendous knowledge and understanding of financial matters.

In the realm of finance, he was to institute two major reforms which were to give the people greater control over the Nation's finances. With Jefferson, he instituted a system of strict accounting and submission to Congress of all appropriations. This was to earn him the enmity of the aristocratic Hamiltonian forces who held the contrary view that there was time enough to tell the Congress about disbursements after the money had been spent.

Gallatin's management of the public debt earned him the gratitude of the American people during the first decade of the 19th century. Under the Federalists, public debt had risen to some $83 million—which was better than 9 times the total annual income of the Federal Government. Yet Gallatin, upon entering into office of the Secretary of the Treasury, made careful plans and estimated that the entire debt could be repaid in 17 years. During the 8 years of the Jefferson administrations—when the total revenues of the Government averaged $12 million a year—he lived up to his promise and managed to retire

$57 million of the public debt. That is a record difficult to better.

For his financial acumen and democratic principles, Gallatin earned himself the hatred of the Federalist Party which was to abuse him for his foreign birth and accent. But he had the love of the people, the confidence of Jefferson and the unshaken belief that America's way was the democratic way.

The reduction of taxes and the promotion of trade were the basis of Gallatin's policy throughout his political career; and, in negotiations with foreign lands, he worked to end discriminatory tariffs to further the development of commerce. In this respect, he was one of the earliest proponents of the policy of "trade, not aid," either for his own country or for others.

It is regretfully that I recall now that just over a year ago this country ran counter to Gallatin's ideas in its dealings with Switzerland, land of his birth, in blocking the road to harmonious trade relations with that friendly trade partner.

Shortsightedly, we imposed higher tariffs on the imports of watches which largely emanate from Gallatin's native city—Geneva. A blow thereby was struck, not only against the Swiss watchmakers, but against America's exporters who value highly this cash market, and the American consumer who must pay more for his watch—results Gallatin would not countenance.

Few persons seem to remember that Switzerland, which has received no economic aid from us, has been our best cash customer in Europe. Since World War II, they purchased more from us than we bought from them. Our export surplus to Switzerland during this period amounted to $500 million. The annual volume of trade between our two countries has been very substantial. In 1954, for instance, we exported over $150 million worth of agricultural, manufacturing, and mineral commodities to Switzerland. Of this total, almost $3 million came from the State of Wisconsin.

Now if we are going to close our markets to Swiss goods, we are simultaneously curtailing their ability to purchase our products. We are hampering an exchange which is beneficial to both countries. It would be well, I believe, if we would reconsider the effects of our recent actions in the light of Gallatin's sensible precepts put forward nearly two centuries ago.

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday evening I had the pleasure of attending a banquet at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., wherein a great number of Ukrainian folks and friends of all nationalities gathered to commemorate the 38th anniversary of the declaration of Ukrainian independence. The unfortunate nations behind the Iron Curtain can be assured that Ukrainians living in this country will continue the fight for freedom and self-government until victory is attained. The continuation of Ukrainian struggle for liberation has not abated since enslavement by the Communist tyrant.

After the breaking up of tsarist Russia in 1917, the declaration of the independence of the Ukrainian State was solemnly proclaimed on January 22, 1918, by the will of the entire Ukrainian people. This meant the resurrection of that independent state of the Ukrainian people which had formerly existed for more than 500 years and had reached a high state of culture under the name of Kievan Rus. This had been ruined in the 13th century by the Mongol invasion. It arose again under the name of the Ukrainian Kozak State and was destroyed by tsarist Moscow. In January 1918, the aggressive invasion of the Moscow Bolshevik army, which poured from the north into Ukraine, precipitated the Ukrainian-Muscovite war. After 4 years of bloody struggle the Muscovite aggressors succeeded in again occupying Ukraine and with barbaric violence liquidating the revived Ukrainian State. In the place of a Ukrainian government, freely elected by the Ukrainian people, Bolshevik Moscow placed in power its own subordinate colonal administration composed of Muscovites and a handful of Ukrainan Quislings.

But the Ukrainian people never became reconciled to the violent seizure by Moscow and did not give up their political aspirations which they showed in the declaration of January 22, 1918. Again and again revolts broke out against Moscow's forces of occupation in Ukraine. Even that handful of Ukrainian Quislings who had been fascinated by the doctrine of communsm and had therefore become collaborators with Bolshevik Moscow, at the end of the twenties, broadcast the slogan, "away from Moscow" and called for the creation of a Communist Ukrainian State, but one completely independent from Moscow and as a result Moscow liquidated almost all the recent Ukrainian Communist leaders.

It is thus clear that if even the recent Ukrainian Communist Quislings took the path of independence from Moscow and sought to rid Ukraine of the occupation by Moscow, the Ukrainian anti-Bolsheviks defended their right to an independent Ukrainian state even more vigorously. They stood for their ideal in all possible ways and in all fields of life. As an example, in science in January 1928, the vice president of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, Prof. K. Voblyn, gave a lecture at a scholarly meeting in Kiev on the subject that Ukraine should become an independent economic unit and that it had all the resources for a separate and independent development; and another Ukrainian scholar, Volobuyiv, published at the same time in the Bolshevik of Ukraine an article on the Problem of the Ukraine Economy and openly alluded to the colonial exploitation of Ukraine by Moscow in the older and the most modern times and drew the conclusion that the Ukrainian people could have a free economic development and correct social conditions only in their own separate state completely independent of Moscow. The same efforts and desires for independence from the occupation of Moscow were shown in literature by the Ukrainian writers and poets. The Ukrainian social and political workers organized an underground Centre of Revolt to revive the armed struggle against occupying Moscow and after the discovery of this center by the Bolshevik secret police and its liquidation in 1924, the Union for the Liberation of Ukraine with its youth division, the Union of Ukrainian Youth.

The Muscovite forces of occupation attacked these consistent efforts of the Ukrainians to recover their national political independence with the most savage measures. They ruthlessly liquidated not only the Ukrainian political leaders but they shot or tortured in the prisons with the methods of the medieval Inquisition dozens of Ukrainian scholars, writers, and poets. During the so-called Yezhovshchyna, Moscow liquidated, shot, or banished to concentration camps for efforts to separate Ukraine from Moscow even all the members of the Tsk-KP(b)U and replaced them with satraps brought from Moscow, Nikita Khrushchev, A. Korotchenko, and so forth, and thus emphasized the complete colonial dependence of Ukraine upon Moscow in the system of the U. S. S. R. The entire Ukrainian people showed their desires for independence from the occupation by Moscow and to break this, the Moscow Communist Government organized in 1932–33 an artificial famine in Ukraine by collecting from the Ukrainian people and removing from Ukraine all the food supplies and thus starved about 4 million Ukrainians. As a manifestation of protest against this unprecedented barbaric crime of genocide committed by the Moscow Communist Government against the Ukrainian people, a member of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists—OUN—made an attempt on the life of the representative of the Moscow Bolshevik government.

This Organization of Ukrainan Nationalists—OUN—was an underground organization which took the further leadership of the struggle of the Ukrainian people for liberation from the occupation by Moscow and the restoration of an independent Ukrainian State.

On June 30, 1941, when the Moscow forces of occupation left Lviv, the capital of western Ukraine, the revival of the independent Ukrainian State was proclaimed. The German Nazis attacked the independent Ukrainian State. The German Gestapo arrested the members of the government of the revived Ukrainian State and thousands of Ukrainian patriots and sent them to German concentration camps. But this did not discourage the Ukrainians. They created for the armed revolutionary struggle against Germany the Ukrainian Insurgent Army—UPA—and continued the fight for fredom.

When in 1944 the Germans retreated from Ukraine and the country was again

occupied by the Moscow Bolsheviks, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army turned its armed revolutionary struggle against them and appealed to the civilized world to aid the Ukrainian people in defending the independence of the Ukrainian state. But the Western World was then deaf to the appeals of the Ukrainian patriots and allowed themselves to be duped by the peace-loving false declarations of the Moscow Bolsheviks. The Ukrainian patriots continued their armed struggle under the banners of the UPA to defend the independence of the Ukrainian State which was being brutally enslaved by Bolshevik Moscow. They had to carry on the struggle alone without any help from the freedom-loving world which was completely indifferent. In this heroic struggle for the independence of their state and for freedom from occupation by Moscow tyranny, after the ending of World War II thousands of Ukrainian patriots perished including the organizer and commander in chief of the UPA, General Taras Chuprynka—in civil life, Engineer Roman Shukevych—who fell in battle in March 1950 in a suburb of Lviv.

All these facts show that the Ukrainian people are consistently struggling for the return of their own national state independence proclaimed on January 22, 1918 and reaffirmed on June 30, 1941. They have not stopped their fight for an independent Ukrainian state even under the most difficult conditions but are continuing it unbroken to the present day. Most recently the Western World has heard of this struggle from the Germans, English, Americans, French, et cetera, who have been released from Bolshevik concentration camps and who met during their confinement millions of Ukrainian patriots who had been banished from their opposition to the occupational forces of Moscow to the Moscow Bolshevik concentration camps.

This natural desire of the Ukrainian people, as of every other people, to revive their national state independence must be fully supported by the Western world both in the name of their respect for freedom and also because an independent Ukrainian state will be a natural defensive barrier for Europe against aggression from Moscow. The existence of an independent Ukrainian state is an assurance of the security of Europe against the aggression of Moscow and is therefore in the interest of the entire Western World.

Truman, Farm Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press of January 16, 1956:

TRUMAN, FARM EXPERT

Harry Truman in St. Paul Saturday made a political speech about the farm question.

He said the failure of agriculture to keep up with the rest of the booming economy was all the fault of Ezra Benson and President Eisenhower. Farm prices have slumped, said Truman, because Ike and Secretary Benson planned it that way.

Truman might disagree with the Benson farm policies on logical grounds. But when he accuses the hard-working Agriculture Secretary of deliberately driving down farm policies, he is just talking to hear the words run out. Truman knows better, and that makes his statements all the more outlandish and imprudent.

Politics Forced Some Action on the Farmers' Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial entitled "Politics Forced Some Action on the Farmers' Problem" that appeared in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Wednesday, January 11, 1956:

After 3 years, the Eisenhower administration has had to admit prosperity is not "just around the corner" for the Nation's farmers.

Stirred by the growing volume of protests from some of the Nation's most efficient producers, the Corn Belt farmers, President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson finally have proposed action looking toward relief for the farmers.

As many of the farm-States legislators were quick to point out, the proposals contained in President Eisenhower's farm message offer the farmer little hope for 1956. They can only hope that Mr. Benson really intends to carry out the pork and beef buying program he has said will begin sometime next month.

The nine-point program which was offered to Congress rests heavily upon the idea of a soil bank. And this is merely a new name for the production restriction program that once was called the Agriculture Adjustment Act.

There is considerable doubt about the effectiveness of the soil bank ideas. If farmers are to be paid for taking some of their land out of production, it is reasonable to suppose that they will abandon their poorest acres and use the Government payments to increase the production of crops on their remaining land.

But even assuming that this scheme will result in some reduction of farm production, it is a curious sort of proposal to come from an administration which has argued so long and so forcefully against regimentation of farmers under Government programs. Surely the policing of farms that cooperate in this program will be one of the most stringent forms of regimentation our farmers yet have seen in peacetime.

One point among the nine offered to Congress deals with disposal of the accumulated Government stocks of farm products. While the administration here finally admits the desirability of such disposal, its proposal still is weak. Except for the suggestion that sales of these commodities be permitted at somewhat lower prices than the law now permits, it consists mainly of more coordination and study rather than direct action at present.

It should be pointed out here that if Secretary Benson had been more diligent in disposing of these Government stocks when the pile first began gathering 3 years ago, it would not now be the problem it is. It was his stubborn refusal to act or to get permission to act on this matter early that caused the hoard to grow and farm prices to sink constantly lower.

There are those who deplore the fact that the farm problem has gotten into politics. But had it not been for the fact that the farmer's plight became a political issue, the administration still would be standing idly by, preaching its curious mixture of 19th century economics and atomic age science as the solution to the problem.

Let us hope that the administration in its desperate hours before the 1956 elections will become even more aware of the political importance of the farm problem so that even more substantial support is forthcoming for the farmers.

Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on Ukrainian Independence Day by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, a branch of which is in Lyndora, Pa., in my congressional district.

This year, like in previous years, Americans of Ukrainian descent observed the 38th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Ukraine on January 22.

The statement follows:

The universal proclamation of the Government and Parliament of Ukraine was issued in the capital city of Kiev on January 22, 1918, and the new state was recognized as the legitimate nation of the Ukrainian people by many foreign governments, including that of Soviet Russia, the latter, however, almost simultaneously with recognition, declared war and began hostilities against the new Ukrainian Republic.

Since that day in January 1918 Ukraine has spent about 35 years enslaved under the yoke of the Communist Soviet Russian empire without, however, surrendering in spirit or giving up hope of eventual liberation and complete independence. During this period of enslavement, Ukrainian armed resistance has been going on without interruption and as a matter of course. This has been attested to by a foremost American journalist, Mr. Stewart Alsop who, in his report on a trip to the Soviet Union in the summer of 1955 mentions the fact of the killing of a Russian colonel in Ukraine and says that he had been killed "by the Ukrainian nationalist underground." Mr. Alsop was surprised that his relator said it "as though it were the most natural thing in the world for a Russian colonel to be killed, 4 years after the end of the war, by underground resistance fighters." (Saturday Evening Post, December 31, 1955, p. 66.)

It is also the almost unanimous testimony of recently returning German war prisoners that the Ukrainians constitute the largest absolute and relative number of inmates of slave and concentration camps and that the

Ukrainians, along with other non-Russians, are the organizers and leaders of the anti-Communist resistance movement throughout the Soviet Union, the concentration camps included.

Underground resistance is only one of the many facets of opposition on the part of Ukrainians and other non-Russians to the enslavement and exploitation conducted by the Communist imperialists of the Kremlin. Refusal to be converted to atheism and perseverance in their religious beliefs is another area where the godless Kremlin rulers have been helpless against the people whom they would deprive of a faith in God.

This struggle of the non-Russian people, among whom the Ukrainians are the most numerous and most determined, is vitally important to the entire free world and particularly to our own United States, now the recognized leader of this free world. Our President and our Secretary of State have properly recognized this fact and have unequivocally reaffirmed the unwavering position of all good Americans by promising never to acquiesce to the continued and permanent enslavement of all captive nations.

This 38th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence was the best occasion to repeat and make known to the world once again that Ukraine and the other so-called Union Republics of the Soviet Union have been jailed on the Soviet prison of nations for the longest time and that they deserve priority of liberation in the interests of peace and security of the whole peace-loving world, and primarily in the interests of the United States of America.

Word for an Unnamed Editor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. KARSTEN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for January 23 in reference to the recent apology of editor in chief of Life magazine, Henry R. Luce:

WORD FOR AN UNNAMED EDITOR

Editor in Chief Henry R. Luce has apologized for Life magazine's unfortunate brink-of-war headlines on the authorized interview with Secretary of State Dulles, and for the caption on the cover, "Three Times at Brink of War—How Dulles Gambled and Won." Thus Mr. Luce in effect blames some unnamed editor who handled the article or arranged its presentation.

The unnamed headline writer certainly did not write into the article that Dulles and the Eisenhower administration had walked to the verge of war three times and averted it by strong action. That was the news in the article and that is what the headline was based on.

It lacks a lot of being fair to make an editor the goat for the effect of the Life article. The trouble caused by the article was not caused by any headlines but by what Mr. Dulles said.

Mr. Luce's defense of Secretary Dulles could probably be well summed up in the following four lines:

Billy, in his bright new sashes,
Fell in the fire and was burned to ashes;
Now, although the room grows chilly,
I haven't the heart to poke poor Billy.

Tito Suggests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. McVEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an editorial from the pages of the Chicago Tribune entitled "Tito Suggests." We shall soon have before us the mutual security appropriation which, in more understandable terms to the public, means our foreign aid spending program. The appropriation asked for this year is about $2 billion in excess of the amount appropriated during the last session. To those of us who have voted consistently against the foreign-aid program in previous years, this amount seems excessive.

Particularly are we opposed to spending of the type that has been appropriated heretofore for Yugoslavia. That country adheres to the Communist doctrine. Tito, himself, has openly espoused that philosophy. There can be no doubt on this question. Nevertheless, we have aided that country in cold cash to the tune of approximately $689,316,000, in addition to substantial loans and credits.

The Federal Government has no money except what it draws from the taxpayers of this country. In my judgment, there is no justification for taking taxpayers' dollars to help support a Communist country in any part of the world.

Other governments receiving our aid are using such funds to balance their budgets and reduce taxes while we continue on the road of deficit spending. Our expenditures in our various foreign aid programs, without interest charges, now total $108,847,779,000. Think what a splendid fiscal position we would enjoy if even a considerable portion of that expenditure could have been used to discharge our own obligations.

Anyone who feels we can buy friendship with money is doomed to disappointment. Ideologies are not for sale. We can only hope to win out over Communist philosophy by setting an example to the world of a better form of government, and even in that case, we shall not always win. Take for example, China. That country, not including Formosa, has received aid from this country to the extent of $2,476,260,000. Yet everyone is acquainted with the controversies continually raging between China and the United States.

It is difficult for the average individual to understand the impact on our economy of this foreign aid spending program. If one should undertake to spread this cost over the householders of the Nation, it would be found that for every family of four, this program has cost or will cost approximately four thousand dollars. The working men and women, as well as the corporations, will carry this burdensome taxload, much of which is hidden in the excise taxes we pay everyday. We meet these taxes at every turn, and it is important that workers become conscious of the inroad of taxes upon their earnings.

The following editorial deals with only one aspect of our foreign-aid program, but it is well worth reading:

TITO SUGGESTS

Hardly had Secretary of State Dulles and his delegation to the United Nations discovered that we are now primarily in social and economic competition with the Soviet Union for the favor of fence sitting countries than Marshal Tito of Communist Yugoslavia professed to discover the same thing.

In a speech at Belgrade he called upon the big powers to gain the sympathy of underdeveloped countries through economic aid rather than treaties of military alliance. He coupled this statement with a denunciation of the Baghdad Pact, in which the United States has a sympathetic interest. This treaty alines Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey, and Britain in a defensive coalition against Soviet incursions into the Middle East.

When Tito called upon the big powers to give unselfishly, he was obviously mindful of two things. One is that he has collected a billion dollars in aid from the United States; the other, that he has refused to join 14 non-Communist nations in the North Atlantic Treaty organization for defense against Russia.

The possibility cannot be excluded that Tito sees some profit to himself in supporting the notion that the most agreeable rivalry between the United States and the Russians is a competition in handouts. He stands to collect from both sides, and, on performance, he can expect to collect more handsomely from the United States. This commits him to nothing, which is very much to his taste, for his renewed friendship with the Soviet Union in the last year suggests that it is not in his temperament to side against his fellow Communists in a quarrel.

Report of the Second Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a resolution received from the Las Vegas Junior Chamber of Commerce concerning the Second Hoover Commission report.

Their action herein is but one of a number of indication in my State of a growing awareness of the continuing need for efficiency and economy in government and adherence to constitutional principles:

Be it resolved, That the Las Vegas Chapter of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce endorse and support the principles of Federal efficiency, economy, and adherence to constitutional precepts and hereby urge our Representatives in Washington to give full study and consideration to the report of the Second Hoover Commission as a possible blueprint for securing better government at a better price.

In particular, I would like to commend Mr. Dave Boyer, chairman of the Las Vegas Jaycees committee on Your Stake in Better Government, and the members of his committee for the efforts they have expended in studying this complex report and their work at a grassroots level to obtain better government.

Brink of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Huntington (Ind.) Herald-Press of January 21, 1956:

BRINK OF WAR

Before Secretary Dulles' time many American public men have made themselves popular by preserving the peace against odds. Teddy Roosevelt was loudly applauded for "carrying a big stick" and it has been long regarded as sound American doctrine to "keep your powder dry" so it will be ready for quick use if somebody else does not want peace as honestly as we do.

Secretary Dulles, however, finds himself in the midst of controversy because of a phrase used to describe how the Nation was kept out of war. The "brink of war" phrase, of course, was not his own. It was neatly turned by a Life magazine writer to embellish an article about the Secretary and the State Department. But there is nothing wrong with the phrase except that this is a presidential election year and any phrase that yields to distortion is quickly and expertly distorted by partisans.

The Dulles' article joins the complaints of General Ridgway that his Army budget recommendations were rejected as an example of what can happen to anything said in a politically electrified year. The critics of Secretary Dulles seem to be in a rather tangled position, however, when at the same time they cry out in support of General Ridgway's demands for larger military expenditures. The general's purpose was to build an armed establishment so strong that its very strength deters any aggressive designs of a potential foe. Those who support the general's viewpoint are, in fact, supporting the proposition that the United States maintain an armed force so great that if aggression of another nation brings us to the brink of war our might will prevent aggression from becoming war.

The reason Ridgway's fears can be discounted is that the avoidance of war after approaching its verge proves that we now possess the strength to discourage aggressors from attack. The military defense of this country, even though it does not consume the total of national expenditures that a very articulate group says it should, is not being neglected. The military and economic strength of the United States is being carefully maintained for this very purpose of establishing a might sufficient to assure peace of the world. Secretary Dulles' report that the peace has been maintained after coming to the brink of war removes cause for further worry that we cannot arrive at that position of security unless General Ridgway's figures are accepted in full.

After all, how in the current state of the world when there is no substance behind the smiles of fleetingly recurring episodes such as last year's Geneva spirit, can peace be maintained without the physical and moral courage to advance to the brink of war? If another phrase was coined in the words of diplomacy it would amount to the same thing as this controversial phrase coined in the words of journalism. The Reds have not yet at least attacked Formosa because the United States has naval forces in the waters between that island and the Chinese mainland of such might that it can stand at the brink of war to keep peace. The conception behind NATO was to establish a force for the protection of Western Europe sufficient to stand at the brink of war to discourage Communist aggression.

Dean Acheson tragically demonstrated that peace cannot be maintained by refusal to go to the brink of war for its preservation. By telling the world, which includes the Russians, that Korea was without the defense perimeter of the United States he invited an armed invasion that forced the United States into its most tragic and unrewarding resort to hostilities. If the United States had been willing and able to go to the brink of war then the tragedy of Korea might have been averted.

What other alternative to brink of war, or call it by any other name, is there other than appeasement? This, in its final deduction, was the Acheson policy, which so bankrupted United States foreign policy. Appeasement is a losing, delaying tactic. It neither frightens enemies nor holds the respect of friends. A lot is being said in the current controversy about friends. There certainly has been adequate demonstration in years past that appeased friends are not friends to be counted upon. Something better was demanded of the most powerful nation on earth than Acheson had to offer. Fitting American policy to cope with new aggressions over the world as the Russians called the tune was a losing cold-war tactic. A constant state of cold war is not a pleasant world condition in which to live, and waging it is not 100-percent efficient in the State Department or anywhere else, but it is much better to keep out of hot war by approaching the brink of war than getting into hot war by surrender or appeasement.

Fighting the Immigration Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a very timely editorial entitled "Fighting the Immigration Act," which appeared in the Malden Evening News and Medford Daily Mercury, two of the leading newspapers in my congressional district.

As one who desires a complete reevaluation of our immigration policy, I am in absolute accord with the position taken by Mr. David Brickman, well-known editor and publisher of the Malden Evening News and Medford Daily Mercury. The editorial makes clear that our immigration laws need to be thoroughly revised. I agree wholeheartedly and feel that the time has arrived when we must stop shadowboxing on this vital issue. It is absolutely essential for our Nation's self-interest that the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act be abolished and be immediately replaced by one without racial and national bias. I once again point out that the leadership of both parties should take immediate action on this problem.

The views expressed in Mr. Brickman's editorial should be of great significance to all Americans:

FIGHTING THE IMMIGRATION ACT

No section of the country has a greater interest in revision of the pernicious provisions of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952 than New England.

President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message last Thursday, pointed out the need for revision of the immigration and nationality laws that have been codified under this act of a few years ago, an act which was vetoed by then President Truman when passed, and then enacted over his veto.

President Eisenhower's opposition, one of long standing, taking into account the discrimination written into the McCarran-Walter Act, asks two vital changes: That the number of persons admitted to this country annually be based not on the 1920 census but on the 1950 census; and to balance this, that greater flexibility of quotas be introduced, so that if one country does not use its share, another may, under certain rules to be laid down.

New England's interest in the act stems from the strong devotion to liberty here, and equally to an appreciation of what contributions immigrant stocks have made not alone to our area in culture, economy, and devotion to American ideals, but also to the rest of the United States. Yet the McCarran-Walter bill wrote a sordid chapter of discrimination and contempt into American law, so that it has been the object of Presidents from both parties to do something to ameliorate its effect. They have widespread support in this aim.

Yet success is dubious because of a shocking indifference in enough circles of influence to the act's more outrageous provisions.

As President, Mr. Eisenhower in April 1953 cited "injustices" in the act and later in the same month asked legislation to admit 240,000 above-quota immigrants in the 2 ensuing years. In a series of off-the-floor compromises the refugee legislation was substantially accepted while revision of the omnibus immigration act was postponed.

The McCarran-Walter Act establishes an annual total immigration quota of 154,657. It reaffirms a provision of the Immigration Act of 1924 which, with some exceptions, based immigration quotas on the ratios of foreign-born in the white population of the United States in 1920. New York Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN'S bill in 1952 would have based quotas on such ratios in 1950.

Of the total McCarran Act quota, almost 43 percent goes to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and this allotment goes largely unused. Germany has a quota of 16.6 percent; Eire (Ireland), 11.5 percent. Italy has 3.6 percent of the total quota, less than Poland, with 4.1 percent.

Pierce J. Gerety, director of the refugee program, pointed out on December 31 that, whereas under its special provisions, the United States has been admitting about 25,000 immigrants from Italy yearly and about 6,500 from Greece, the normal Italian quota is only 5,645 and the Greek quota only 308. "We are approaching the point, in Italy and Greece particularly," said Gerety, "where we are going to be closing the door on immigration."

If immigration quotas were based on the 1950 census rather than that of 1920, the total number of immigrants would be reduced unless the percentage of entrants was raised. The 1950 census listed only 10,161,168 foreign born, as against 13,712,748 in 1920.

On the other hand, the quota distribution would be altered drastically. In 1920 England and all of Ireland accounted for 15.9 percent of all the foreign-born white population; in 1950, their proportion was only 13.4 percent. But in 1950, 14 percent of all foreign born were of Italian extraction, as against 11.7 percent in 1920.

The President proposes a pooling of quotas, so that unused allowances for Great Britain, Germany, and Austria, for example, could go to Italy and Greece. A bill sponsored by Senator LEHMAN and 12 other Democratic Senators would go even farther, abolishing the whole national-origins system and establishing a world-wide annual quota of 250,000. The fight goes on.

Tribute to 50 Years of Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following historical summary of the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent on the occasion of its 50th anniversary. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to this outstanding newspaper which has performed admirably its civic responsibility through 50 years of service to the people of the Greater Wilkes-Barre area. I wish Tom Heffernan and his organization the best of success in the years that are ahead.

A MAN, A NEWSPAPER, AND 50 YEARS

Fifty years, measured by the flow of printer's ink, can cover a lot of events and a lot of changes.

Back in 1905, Wilkes-Barre was getting ready to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the start of the city as a borough. Fred C. Kirkendall was mayor; trolley cars were doing a thriving business; there were no parking problems; and the movies were threatening to do to legitimate theaters, the same thing now, 50 years later, television is doing to the motion-picture houses.

One of the heights' most prominent residents was John Maloney, whose home on East South Street adjoined the dwelling of the late James H. Shea, then one of Luzerne County's most prominent lawyers. Both men were interested in civic affairs, politics, and whatever of interest was happening in the community.

During one of their frequent front-porch visits, Mr. Maloney expressed the belief that Wilkes-Barre should have a Sunday newspaper of its own. He had some experience in the newspaper business and felt that people would be interested in reading—and buying—a weekly newspaper that would serve them in their long leisurely weekends.

MUCH URGING UNNECESSARY

Attorney Shea was to tell later how he encouraged his friend and neighbor to try out the idea. Mr. Maloney did not require much further urging and began to assemble his newspaper organization.

First he had to get an appealing name for his unborn newspaper. Mr. Shea suggested "Independent" and Mr. Maloney promptly settled on "Sunday Independent." So far, so good.

How about getting somebody to write the news; solicit the merchants for advertising? Mr. Maloney said he would handle the writing and editing with some extra help on Saturday night. He would hire somebody to call on the merchants.

Then, what about getting the paper printed? The new publisher decided that could be answered by renting the plant and equipment of one of the daily newspapers for one night each week—Saturday night. Buying costly new equipment was out of the question.

Mr. Maloney approached John A. Hourigan, Sr., publisher of the Evening News, and placed his proposition. The Evening News had its business office on North Maine Street, close to Public Square, and its composing room and press room were located in a rear building along Butler Alley. The two men reached an agreement on terms and Wilkes-Barre's own newspaper—the Sunday Independent—was in business.

EARLY YEARS NIP AND TUCK

The editorial and business offices were set up in a single room over what is now Leo Matus' newsstand on Public Square at North Main Street. There the news stories would be written, hustled back through Butler Alley to the composing room and put into type.

The early years were nip and tuck but Mr. Maloney's newspaper kept inching along, getting a little foothold and gaining public confidence along the way. Meanwhile, it had some competition from William Leslie's Elmira Telegram. The Telegram was printed in Elmira and shipped here by railroad. Each Sunday it contained a lengthy news letter in which Mr. Leslie thundered his wrath and editorial opinions freely and with gusto. For a long time Mr. Leslie's opinions on politics, religion and civic progress created a profound impression on a lot of older readers. But it was not a local paper.

In 1913 Mr. Maloney decided to retire from the newspaper business. He approached his fellow newspaperman, Thomas F. Heffernan and wanted to know if the latter might be interested in buying the Sunday Independent. Mr. Heffernan was and the Independent had a new owner.

HAD WIDE EXPERIENCE

Mr. Heffernan had considerable previous experience in the newspaper business. Starting out in Plymouth as a correspondent for the Wilkes-Barre Record, he got the smell of printer's ink early in life and it remained with him throughout his days. After spending some years as apprentice writer in the Plymouth office, Mr. Heffernan had been transferred to the Wilkes-Barre office of the Record in the early 1900's. Some time later he and John A. Hourigan, Sr., took over and began publishing the Evening News, which had been converted from a morning newspaper.

One of Mr. Heffernan's first moves after purchasing the Sunday Independent was to seek larger, more commodious space as an editorial and business office. That was accomplished by moving across Public Square to a second-floor suite over the original Colombo Cigar Shop, present site of Bartikowsky's Jewelry Store.

The Sunday Independent took over the entire second floor of the building, which now gave it 2½ rooms instead of 1. A United Press wire was installed. Mr. Heffernan appointed his two brothers, John V. Heffernan as managing editor and George P. Heffernan as advertising manager. Through a new arrangement the Sunday Independent then began doing its printing at the West Market Street plant of the Times-Leader, then published by Fred C. Kirkendall and Col. Ernest G. Smith.

OPINIONS WERE QUOTED

Under the direction of Thomas F. Heffernan, the Independent made steady progress and its opinions began to be repeated more and more wherever people gathered. The masthead on the editorial page stated its policy: "A conservative newspaper for select readers."

News gathering was quite an acrobatic feat in those days. Taxicabs and automobiles were not too prevalent and reporters, for the most part, had to rely on the trolley cars or travel on foot. But reporters of those days had a helpful ally who no longer exists—the friendly telephone operator. Instead of one system as at present, Wilkes-Barre had two telephone systems—the Bell and the Consolidated. Quite frequently a telephone operator who had "somehow overheard" a phone conversation, could pass a helpful hint about a news story along to the reporter. (That source of information ended with the dial system.)

While the Sunday Independent continued to gain slowly but surely, the problem of meeting the payroll every week was one of Publisher Heffernan's biggest headaches. Advertising and circulation sales were increasing but the costs of publication were growing even more rapidly.

Fortunate it was for Wilkes-Barre's young Sunday newspaper that a short time earlier Mr. Heffernan had been appointed postmaster of Wilkes-Barre. Frequently the postmaster's entire salary check would be turned into the Independent's bank account just in time to meet the payroll.

DISPLAY ADS APPEAR

Files of the Sunday Independent for the year 1923 show how the newspaper gained stature during Mr. Heffernan's first 10 years as publisher and editor.

The advertising columns carried large displays for all of the leading merchants including some whose business had since passed into other hands. Among the leading advertisers 30 years ago were the Boston Store, MacWilliam's (now Pomeroy's), Lazarus, Bergman's, Weitzenkorn's Duncan & Howmer, Joseph S. Coons & Co., Murray-Smith Co., and others.

And Percy A. Brown started the new year of 1923 cheerfully by declaring in his advertisement: "You'll be interested to know that for Christmas and New Year's we sold 43,725 pounds of poultry. The time in which this tremendous amount was sold was from December 20 to December 30—enough to fill eleven 2-ton trucks."

Theatergoers learned from the amusement page that vaudeville was in full swing at Poli's theater (now the Penn) and also at the Capitol (now the Comerford); there were stage plays at the Grand Opera House and the Nesbitt; the principal motion picture house, the Savoy (site of the present Paramount) was offering East Is West, while down at the Majestic Theater the burlesque girls were featured in some entertainment called the Wrinkle Wreckers.

TWO OUTSTANDING COLUMNS

Two of the outstanding columns in the newspaper were Mike Bernstein's Sifting the Sport Sieve and Publisher Heffernan's Political Comment. It was back in those days that Bernstein developed his sportswriting style that has made him a long-recognized authority. Some time later Bernstein conjured his ghost pugilist "Battling Bevo." (Whatever happened to him?)

Publisher Heffernan's Political Comment on the editorial page was unique and authoritative because his articles were drawn from his own political contacts as Luzerne County Republican chairman, plus his personal acquaintance with some of Pennsylvania's political leaders who have become legendary. There was always great interest in his anecdotes concerning Senator Boise Penrose, Matt Quay, Senator Sterling Catlin, and the Vares, of Philadelphia.

Present-day television viewers can imagine the thrill the following item created when it appeared in the January 7, 1923, issue of the Independent: "When Governor Pinchot delivers his inaugural address on the steps of the capitol next Tuesday at high noon his words will be heard by people over the eastern half of the United States. The loudspeaker projector, plus the telephone, plus the radio, have made this marvelous scientific feat possible."

Editorials in those days pleaded for "a new bridge at South Street," and chidded automobile owners with the fact that "we boast of an automobile association but only a few of the leading spirits in it take any interest in road improvements."

It was just before that time when Mr. Heffernan decided to have his paper in its own

plant, and to that end he bought the property at 22 South Washington Street, which extended back to South State. On Washington was a 3-story building, with a storeroom on the first floor and 2 apartments above. The storeroom was used to house the business, advertising, circulation, and news departments on the Sunday Independent. Then, to contain the press to be purchased on the first floor, and the composing room and stereotyping department on the second, a new brick building was erected to the rear. In 1922 the Sunday Independent moved in.

It is still there, but some changes have been made. The first floor of the South Washington Street building now contains the advertising and business departments. On the second floor is the news department, while the third floor contains the circulation department's clerical office, with circulation handled by the Durkin Distributing Co.

The building, built in 1921 and 1922, still holds the press on its first floor, while the composing room has taken over the entire second floor. The stereotyping department now is just to the rear, on the second floor of a new building built a few years ago. The first floor of this latest building is used for newsprint storage.

Back in 1922 the building which fronts on South State Street held a poolroom on the first floor operated by Brown and Rasper—known also for catering. That first floor now is the mailing room and working space for the circulation department. The second floor is rented by the Barre Engraying Co., headed by William Butcher.

Mr. Heffernan continued as editor of the Sunday Independent until his death in 1951—a few days before what would have been his 80th birthday. He was succeeded by his son, Thomas E. Heffernan, who had joined the paper permanently in 1922.

Not all of those who should be on hand to help mark the Sunday Independent's 50th anniversary—in proper recognition of the splendid service they gave the paper—can be with us today. Death has visited and the loss was great.

Two names are coupled—Peter A. Golden and Owen Durkin. Partners first as circulation chiefs of the old Times-Leader, they first handled the Sunday Independent on weekends, then came as full-time operators of this paper's circulation. The services they rendered a struggling newspaper were tremendous.

They remained until the death of Mr. Durkin in 1944. Several years before, in December of 1941, Mr. Durkin's son, Eugene F., had come into the organization and he carried on then and after the death in 1948 of Mr. Golden.

Original employee of the Independent was the late Joseph P. Rusnock, who spent his life as mechanical superintendent. Native of Freeland, he took the position while John Maloney was publisher and remained until his death in 1949. Joe Rusnock is part of the paper's tradition.

A particularly sad death visited the Independent in 1947 when Howard W. Davis was claimed. One of the most promising young newspapermen the city had produced he was but 33. Starting as a copy boy while still in school, he moved in full time as soon as he graduated from Coughlin High and became one of the best-informed and best-liked sports writers Wyoming Valley ever knew.

GEORGE P. HEFFERNAN

Joining the paper a few years after it had been acquired by his brother, T. F. Heffernan, George P. Heffernan joined the staff as advertising director, a post he held until his untimely and sudden death in 1953.

A native of Plymouth, he was graduated in the law at Cornell University but turned soon to the line of activity that was to be his life's work. He came back to Wilkes-Barre to serve the Independent in 1920.

A Tribute—Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article by A. V. Burrowes, editor of the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press, one of the fine newspapers of the great middlewest. Although this tribute to nine men was published in the News-Press last October when the Congress was not in session, I feel that its perpetuation in the RECORD is justified not only as a well earned tribute to the individuals named, but also as a word of thanks and encouragement from a grateful Nation to the thousands of fine citizens all over the land who uncomplainingly and generally without recognition, have assumed the arduous and often unpleasant duties of serving on our selective service boards:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

PERSONAL

This is a tribute to nine men. We prefer to offer it while they are living. We wish all were. But one is gone. Five of those nine are still in the service. It is so much more satisfying to toss a bouquet while the recipient can catch it, rather than lay gorgeous roses on the bier in chapel or mortuary. This column arises from a few lines that passed over this editor's desk just this morning. For in the News-Press tomorrow morning in Turning Back the Pages to 15 years ago there is recorded that the three Buchanan selective-service boards were underway and prepared for the first peacetime lottery in all American history. That drawing of names for draftees from this city and county was to be undertaken October 30, 1940.

Here are the men who comprised those first draft boards: Board No. 1 (meeting place, city hall): W. Fairleigh Enright, chairman; members, Everett Hillyard and J. Ham McCord. Board No. 2 (meeting place, Federal Building): Robert G. Clayton, chairman; members, Melvin Binswanger and L. Earl Stephenson. Board No. 3 (meeting place, Transit House): Walter H. Laubach, chairman; members, Charles Feeney and Michael O'Malley. The last named comprised all south side and rural Buchanan County.

This writer knows perhaps better than any man in St. Joseph just what those boards did and do. And the reason for that knowledge is that this writer served with Chairman Jack Stapleton, of Albany, Mo., on Missouri Appeal Board No. 1, comprising the 33 counties of north Missouri, and Buchanan County boards No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 came under our jurisdiction. That appeal board continued 7 years, 1 year prior to the opening of World War II and 2 years after the surrender to General MasArthur on board the U. S. S. *Missouri* in Far East waters. Appeals now are handled at Army headquarters in Jefferson City.

There was not a board in all our wide jurisdiction—from St. Joseph to Hannibal and from the Iowa line to and including North Kansas City and Excelsior Springs, that functioned with more wisdom, the judgment, the integrity and the forbearance than did those three Buchanan County boards. What a tale they could unfold. Glamorous heroism covered with the modesty of sterling young Missouri Americanism. And to dastardly cowardice, yellowback draft-dodging by the depraved; utterly unscrupulous. What a volume could be written jointly by those three chairmen: Bob Clayton, Fairleigh Enright, and Walter Baubach. Humanity at sublime heights. Humanity at ugly cesspool level.

Winston Churchill once said of the RAF that never in all history was so much owed by so many to so few. On our local scene this writer personally believes that never in his long memory of public servants in this city—Federal, State, local, has there been a continuing monumental task of so noble proportions, so magnificently carried to the ultimate ideal—the perfect, as was given by Selective Service Boards, 1, 2, and 3 preceding, during and following World War II. A strong statement, yes. True, every word.

We gladly offer these orchids because 5 of those 9 still are serving. For absolutely not a penny, the unhappy long,wearying dragging processing of men into the service of Uncle Sam goes on. Gone is the glory of warfare. Now remains the drudgery only of peacetime conscription. There are no town bands playing martial airs in depots while civilian groups serve doughnuts and coffee. Now is the cold, undramatic tapping of this, that or the other young man. "Uncle Sam wants you." These five St. Joseph citizens carry on as faithfully as they did when the drafts were heavy and when glory was waiting St. Joseph men in all parts of the world.

Many months after the close of World War II there was a reorganization of the Selective Service, and St. Joseph now has one board. Mike O'Malley had died; Earl Stephenson had gone to Kansas City, where he is an executive vice president in City National Bank, one of the Kemper brother's towering institutions known all over the Middle West. The present members of selective-service board No. 11, as it is known today, comprises Mr. Clayton, as chairman, and as his members Mr. Enright, Mr. Feeney, Mr. Binswanger, and Mr. Laubach.

Talk about your bronze and your marble to commemorate our great. Our Federal Government should erect somewhere here in old St. Jo town a lasting monument to these 9 men, 5 of whom still serve. We of the appeal board had play in comparison. Ours was merely a review of official papers coming up from local boards. For under the law no appellant could appear before that appeal board. Nor could he send a dependant mother or father, nor could any attorney, paid or gratis, come before us.

That did not hold and does not hold with the local selective-service boards. They get it all. We wonder how many times Edward and Alvah Clayton have wanted to call down maledictions on the head of that President for naming their elder brother to that draft system way back in October of the year 1940. For Bob, as chairman, has borne the heaviest load. That's not said in disparagement to the others. Our friends Fairleigh and Melvin and Charley and Walter would be the first four citizens to insist this fact be made known. But there is glory enough for all, the five still in service and the others who have served in earlier years.

So, gentlemen, please accept on behalf of a knowing public, if not always a spontaneously speaking public, our thanks. You have done and are doing a grand job. No man in public office here—post office, courthouse, police station, library, firehouse, city hall, school district—gets salary enough to compensate truly and accurately what you men deserve. Our deepest admiration, sirs. And also, men, let us say there is a personal joy in this writer in the 15-year-old assignment you took willingly from Franklin Delano Roosevelt on nomination of Gov. Lloyd C. Stark that brisk autumnal day of October 1940.—A. V. B.

National Defense Without National Bankruptcy—An Answer to General Ridgway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO E. ALLEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Newsweek dated January 30, 1956:

NATIONAL DEFENSE WITHOUT NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY

(By Gen. Carl Spaatz, U. S. Air Force, retired)

Gen. Matthew Ridgway has raised the question of the proper force level for the United States Army. In the first of his series of articles for the Saturday Evening Post, he argued that the one million-man ground force to which the Eisenhower administration is now committed is not large enough to meet the Nation's requirements in various parts of the world.

He warns that such a meager total force won't permit the United States to maintain more than a thin line of defense against the Soviet Union across northwestern Europe, for example. Even with atomic artillery and rockets spaced at 25-mile intervals along this line, he points out, the line will be vulnerable to attack by the numerically superior Soviet infantry.

These statements are completely correct. But the conclusions General Ridgway draws from them are faulty. It is perfectly true that the thin line of American infantry in Europe is not adequate to withstand an assault in force by Soviet ground divisions. It never can be. We haven't enough manpower resources to make it so, even if we were willing to spend the United States into bankruptcy to maintain a vast standing army in Europe—and elsewhere.

Fortunately, our global defense strategy doesn't depend upon our ability to match the Soviet Union in ground forces. What we must depend upon primarily for our defense is our air-atomic striking power. We have the talents and resources to excel in this kind of power.

We, of course, need ground and sea forces and Allies. We also need to maintain ground units in foreign outposts, including Western Europe. They serve the necessary purpose of reassuring our Allies that we stand with them and of serving notice on our potential enemies that an attack on our Allies is an attack on us.

But the massive ground forces are not required to perform these cold-war tasks. Relatively small units are sufficient.

During the many years that the British Empire kept order in the world, it relied upon naval superiority and limited overseas garrisons. Now the United States and its allies are trying to keep watch over the part of the world not already dominated by the Kremlin. Since the U. S. S. R. and its satellites are operating within the confines of a large land mass, what we need are small garrisons spaced around the perimeter of their territory—and unquestionable air superiority. In the cold war ahead the free world must rely primarily on its economic staying power, shielded by superior air power.

Economic power must be husbanded meanwhile. The present Federal budget calls for an outlay of $35 billion for defense. This represents more than half the Government's total expenditures. It should be enough to provide our Nation with its share of the military forces essential for the free world—and it would be if it could be wisely spent. Unfortunately, the present organization of our Army, Navy, and Air Force prevents true economy. We do not get the maximum value in military power for the defense dollars appropriated.

COMPETE

Four services—the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force—will compete for the $35 billion with overlapping and redundant services. Each, for example, will build its own air force and three of the services will carry on experiments in rocket development. The Navy, competing with the Air Force for strategic striking power, will build its sixth supercostly supercarrier and the atomic plant for a seventh, even though the utility of the first is still in question.

The defense dollar could be made to go 25 percent farther than it will go if it could be wisely and prudently spent. However, for this to be possible we need true unification of the services—not the partial and half-hearted unification we now have. All branches of the Armed Forces should be placed under the Secretary of Defense with a chief of staff and a general staff, carefully selected from outstanding graduates of the National War College. Personnel should be dressed in one uniform except for ceremonial occasions. Then traditional dress uniforms of the individual services should be worn. Career personnel of any service should have freedom to transfer to another service without loss of rank. The opportunities thus created would make career service more attractive and increase efficiency.

Eventually, this would eliminate the service rivalries which keep obscuring the primary defense problem, which is to maintain an Air Force capable of taking and keeping command of the air any time, any place in the world. This kind of unification would permit the Nation to establish an adequate defense system and to maintain it indefinitely without overtaxing the national economy.

Flood Control and Hurricane Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a resolution, approved unanimously by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, in special session, memorializing the Congress to aid the program of flood control and hurricane protection.

House Joint Resolution 6

Resolution memorializing Congress to aid in a program of flood control and hurricane protection

Whereas hurricanes and floods have become a serious menace to life and property in Connecticut; and

Whereas Connecticut is a highly industrialized State, and an important part of the national economy and national defense, ranking fifth in the per capita payment of Federal taxes, so that disruption of its production and commerce adversely affects the Nation as a whole as well as the people of Connecticut; and

Whereas these hurricanes and floods are occurring with increasing frequency and violence, and the State of Connecticut is not able to finance adequate corrective and protective measures to meet the threat of future hurricanes and floods. The floods of August and October 1955, alone, have caused personal and property damage estimated in excess of 200 million dollars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this General Assembly believes it of the utmost importance that the Congress of the United States take immediate action to provide adequate funds to carry out a program of flood control and hurricane protection measures which will protect the State of Connecticut against future disasters of this nature; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate shall cause a copy of this resolution to be sent to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the President of the Senate, the chairmen of appropriate committees in the House and Senate, and the Connecticut Senators and Representatives in Congress.

ALFRED A. TOSCANO,
Clerk of the Senate.
JOHN WASSUNG,
Clerk of the House.
[SEAL] MILDRED P. ALLEN,
Secretary of State.
HARTFORD, CONN., *December 15, 1955.*

Swede Nelson Award—A Saga in Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include herein several articles from Boston newspapers dated January 8, 1956, regarding the presentation of the annual Swede Nelson Award.

This award is given every year by the celebrated Gridiron Club of Boston to a contemporary football player, who, during the current season, by his conduct on the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree.

It was given this year to Quarterback Don Holleder of the Army team for his unselfishness in accepting assignment as quarterback, notwithstanding that he was an outstanding all-American end, in order to further the interests of his team.

A very significant thing about this award is that it is given in the name of N. V. "Swede" Nelson, prominent cotton broker, sportsman, and former outstanding Harvard football star, to the young American college football player, who, in the judgment of the board of judges, best exemplifies those qualities of character and sportsmanship which "Swede" Nelson himself exemplified during his football career and throughout his life.

"Swede" Nelson was a teammate of mine at Harvard and I, therefore, am in a position to appreciate the sterling qualities upon which the Nelson award is predicated. In my opinion, it would not be possible for anyone to excel the

sportsmanship or idealism of "Swede" Nelson. A great player himself, extraordinarily devoted to the game, he has ever preserved a very high sense of values, not only in football, but in all his varied activities.

He has enjoyed great success in athletics, in business and in civic achievement. But his greatest triumphs have been in human relationships, in his vigorous, impressive work to improve the opportunities of youth and to stimulate the spirit of fair play and toleration in American life.

"Swede" Nelson has worked with incredible zeal to spread his gospel of sportsmanship and fair dealing. Without a peer as an after dinner speaker, wit, and humorist, throughout the years he has given unselfishly of his great talents and of himself to every good cause. His contributions to youth have been tremendous and have invaluably assisted in opening the door of opportunity to a great many young men. His noble work of spreading high standards of sportsmanship, tolerance and patriotism cannot adequately be evaluated here.

"Swede" Nelson has never turned down a plea in behalf of the cause of youth, of charity, of philanthropy or any other worthy objective and it is most fitting that, in his name, this annual Gridiron Club award should be made to an American college football player, who, in an unselfish way, carries out the spirit of this great American.

Of rugged ancestry and proud heritage, he has intelligently and effectively labored to inculcate into American youth the solid precepts that he learned in the bosom of his own family from his late, esteemed father and from his beloved mother who, at the age of 93, is still, as ever, an inspiration to him and to all those who know her. And in his invaluable work, he has likewise been inspired and assisted by his gracious wife, lovely daughter and her family.

"Swede" Nelson has often said: "American football is not concerned with a man's race, religion or station in life, but rather with his merits, his loyalty and his ability to deliver." If that fine creed could find universal respect, our Nation would be all the stronger for it.

His personality, his philosophy of life, his concern for others, his willingness to serve and help his fellow man indelibly stamp him as a great citizen, bringing gladness and sunlight into the lives of others and spreading the gospel of understanding, tolerance, and loyalty to America.

Millions of football fans throughout the country. and large numbers of our people, join me, I know, in hailing "Swede" Nelson for his high ideals and his peerless service to American sportsmanship and in extending him and his family our heartiest congratulations and best wishes for continued good health, success and happiness in his great work.

The articles referred to follow:

[From the Boston American of January 8, 1956]

HOLLEDER HAILED AT NELSON FETE

Don Holleder, Army's All-American end who unselfishly moved to quarterback last fall for the good of the team was acclaimed before a Sheraton Plaza gathering of 600 as he received the 10th annual Nils V. "Swede" Nelson sportsmanship award last night.

The modest West Pointer, who singled this occasion out as the happiest moment of his life, stated there were two major reasons for his thrill in being so honored.

"It's wonderful to have my name listed with the previous great football players who have won this award and secondly, the award is given for good sportsmanship which has been my aim since I started in athletics.

And, around this standout athlete, most of the speakers built their themes. Capt. Felix "Doc" Blanchard, Army plebe coach and former All-American who was representing West Point, lauded Don as a great athlete. Harry Stuhldreher, quarterback of the Four Horsemen and now a United States Steel vice president, was the featured speaker and brought out the fact that Holleder had the three ingredients necessary for success in sports or business—hard work, teamwork, and loyalty.

Nils V. "Swede" Nelson praised Holleder for his ability and leadership which is so vital in sports and in democracy. Nelson then made the presentation of a replica of a huge plaque to Holleder.

[From the Boston Globe of January 8, 1956]

GAVE UP ALL-AMERICA HONORS—HOLLEDER RECEIVES NELSON AWARD

(By Bob Holbrook)

Don Holleder, Army's All-America end who gladly gave up his honors to become a T-quarterback, last night became the 10th recipient of the Nelson award for sportsmanship, at a dinner held in the Sheraton-Plaza.

Ramrod-straight in his uniform, Cadet Holleder made a striking impression on 600 guests as he accepted the award from Nils V. "Swede" Nelson, for whom the honor is named.

Holleder said, "Truly, this is one of the happiest moments of my life. I say this for two reasons:

"One, that I am fortunate enough to join the list of outstanding football players who have preceded me in this award.

"Secondly, the award is for good sportsmanship. And that is something I have been striving for all my life. This award is a tribute to my coach, Col. Earl Blaik, a fine man, my teammates and the Academy.

"I accept this award with pride, humility, and gratitude," he concluded.

PRAISED FOR LEADERSHIP

Holleder heard words of praise from Nelson, Capt. Felix "Doc" Blanchard, and Harry Stuhldreher, former coach and Notre Dame great.

"We need men with leadership like yours," Nelson said. "I am proud to welcome you to the Gridiron Club family."

Blanchard, Army's immortal "Mr. Inside," extended the congratulations of the military academy.

Stuhldreher, who quarterbacked the famed Four Horsemen of Notre Dame and now is a vice president of United States Steel, gave a hard-hitting talk.

He said, "The scoreboard doesn't tell the full story, as some people think. It is what leads up to the final score and what comes afterward that is important.

"There are three vital elements in football and he (Holleder) fits them all. First is hard work. Certainly, Don has had his share of that.

"Second is teamwork. Now he proved his willingness for teamwork when he made this transition. Third is loyalty. Now I ask you where you'd find a better example of loyalty than what this young man demonstrated this past season. * * *

"I think the greatest tribute to Holleder was paid by Navy's George Welsh. He said, 'I've been a quarterback all my life and I'm still learning the position. That'll give you an idea what Don Holleder had to do this year.' "

Dr. Roy Heffernan served as toastmaster. The head table included: Walter Brown, D. Leo Daley, Rev. Joseph Glavin, Louis Pierini, Mayor Hynes, Stuhldreher, Dr. Heffernan, Holleder, Joseph C. Tomasello, general chairman; Blanchard, Henry Hormel, Rev. Alexander Henderson, Joseph Madden, Les Smith, Arthur Sampson, and Rabbi Shubow.

Previous Nelson award winners were: Perry Moss, Illinois; Everett Dorr, Boston University; Gordon Long, Arkansas; Doak Walker, Southern Methodist University; Bob Williams, Notre Dame; John Bright, Drake; Joseph Mitinger, Yale; Don King, Clemson; and Arthur Luppino, University of Arizona.

[From the Boston Sunday Post of January 8, 1956]

SIX HUNDRED HAIL NELSON AWARD WINNER—HOLLEDER IN TRIBUTE TO COACH

(By Will Cloney)

Spick and span in the gold-braided dress uniform of a cadet captain, Don Holleder of West Point, last night became the 10th recipient of the Gridiron Club's Swede Nelson Sportsmanship Award, as an audience of more than 600 applauded, misty-eyed, in the main ballroom of the Sheraton Plaza.

"I accept the award with great pride, humility, and gratitude," said the clean-cut all-American from upstate New York. "Personally, this is one of the happiest moments of my life, for two reasons. First of all, it is a tremendous honor to have my name added to the list of men who have won it.

"Second, and even more important, is the fact that this award is given for sportsmanship, and sportsmanship has been what I have hoped to achieve from the first time I participated in athletics."

In his neat, firmly spoken acceptance speech, the former all-Catholic interscholastic all-American from Aquinas Institute shared the Nelson honor. "I want particularly to pay tribute to my coach, Col. Red Blaik, a fine man as well as a fine coach, and to my teammates, who stuck with me in my darkest moments and gave me the extra encouragement I needed."

STUHLDREHER HAILS STAR

Holleder qualified for the award for switching from his all-American role at end to the trouble spot in the Army backfield, quarterback, in an effort to help his team. Don received an engraved wristwatch and a permanent plaque, while Capt. Felix "Doc" Blanchard, representing the Military Academy, accepted the huge bronze perpetual trophy that will remain at West Point for a year.

Harry Stuhldreher, former Notre Dame great and Wisconsin coach, paid particular tribute to Holleder in the principal address of the affair. "Almost everybody thinks that the scoreboard tells the true story of a game," said Stuhldreher, "but those of us close to sports know that the real story lies in what leads up to and down from those figures on the scoreboard.

"Behind that score are the elements that Don Holleder has exemplified—hard work, teamwork, and loyalty—the loyalty to his staff, his teammates and his institution that made him happy to sacrifice his personal glory. Those three elements are necessary to success in any business or individual endeavor. Don deserve all the credit in the world, and is a better all-American for it."

The inimitable Swede Nelson, for whom the annual award is named, hailed Holleder. "Few among us will give up something we have for something we know nothing about," said Swede. "Here is one of the greatest pass receivers in college football giving up fame and glory for the team, and one of the fundamentals of our citizenship is being a member of the team.

ILLUSTRIOUS GROUP

"We welcome Don to the Gridiron family."

Nelson and Gridiron president, Henry Hormel, made the presentations. Dr. Roy Heffernan, making his bow as a Gridiron toastmaster, kept the program moving smoothly through a list of speakers that included Mayor Hynes, the Reverend Joseph A. Glavin, S. J., Rabbi Leo Shubow, the Reverend Alexander Henderson, and humorist Joe Madden.

Other highlights on the program set up by general chairman, Joseph C. Tomasello, were parodies by John Buckley. At the head table, in addition to the speakers, were Walter A. Brown, D. Lou Perini, Les Smith, and Arthur Sampson.

The 1955 winner joins an illustrious band that started with Perry Moss of Illinois, in 1946, and since then has added Everett Dorr of Boston University, Gordon Long of Arkansas, Doak Walker of Southern Methodist, Bob Williams of Notre Dame, John Bright of Drake, Joseph Mitinger of Yale, Don King of Clemson, and Arthur Luppino of Arizona.

[From the Boston Herald of January 8, 1956]

ARMY STAR SACRIFICED FAME FOR THE UNKNOWN—HOLLEDER'S SPORTSMANSHIP WINS PRAISE FROM NELSON

(By Joe Looney)

Personable Don Holleder, resplendent in the dress uniform of a West Point cadet captain, accepted the Nils V. "Swede" Nelson sportsmanship award with pride, humility and gratitude, last night at the 10th annual dinner attended by 600 football enthusiasts at the Hotel Sheraton-Plaza.

HAPPIEST OCCASION

After receiving the award from Nelson, Holleder said: "This is one of the happiest occasions in my life. First, it is a great distinction to have my name added to the list of great athletes who have been previously honored by this fine organization. Secondly, I will always cherish this award because it represents sportsmanship, and a sportsman is something I've always tried to be."

Continued Holleder, "I wish to thank my coach, Col. Earl Blaik, his staff and my teammates who worked with me throughout the trying season we just had. I accept the award on behalf of the United States Military Academy with great pride, humility and gratitude."

Nelson praised the 21-year-old end-quarterback from Webster, N. Y., suburb of Rochester, as "a great sportsman by any standard, anywhere. Few of us give up something we already have for something we know nothing about."

"Don gave up definite fame and glory as an All-American end to become a quarterback because it was for the best interests of his team. What he did makes us proud to be able to welcome him into the Gridiron Club family."

Harry Stuhldreher, quarterback of Notre Dame's Four Horsemen, and United States Steel Corporation vice president, lauded Holleder as one exemplifying the best traditions of football success—hard work, teamwork, and loyalty.

STUHLDREHER RECALLS COMMENT BY WALSH

Stuhldreher declared, "The best tribute to Holleder was given by George Welsh of Navy who said, I've been playing quarterback all my life and am still learning. You can imagine what Holleder went through and accomplished in 1 year."

Capt. "Doc" Blanchard, West Point's freshman coach, termed Holleder "a great team player, a great all-around athlete and a person held in high esteem by everybody at the Academy."

Other speakers were Rev. Joseph A. Glavin, S.J., Rev. Alexander Henderson, Rabbi Leo Shubow, Boston's Mayor John B. Hynes, Gridiron Club President Henry Hormel, Boston Herald football expert Arthur Sampson, humorist Joe (Uncle Dinny) Madden, and Joseph C. Tomasello, dinner chairman.

Dr. Roy J. Heffernan was toastmaster, while Johnny Buckley of Hyde Park led the parody singing. Head table guests included Walter Brown, D. Leo Daley, Lou Perini and Les Smith.

The Nelson award for sportsmanship is an annual award by the Gridiron Club of Boston on a basis of the following requirements:

"To the player who, by his conduct on the gridiron, demonstrates a high esteem for the football code and exemplifies sportsmanship to an outstanding degree."

Holleder, who made the transition from All-America end to the new role of quarterback to help his team, was chosen as the winner after nominations from teams all over the Nation had been considered.

Soviet Underground in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared on the front page of the Wikes-Barre Record, Saturday, January 21, 1956, which states that Soviet authorities broadcast an appeal by radio to anti-Communists still at large in Lithuania to give themselves up and have offered amnesty to those that do. Mr. Speaker, this is just another graphic example of the extent that the Soviet authorities will go in order to carry out their treachery and barbarism on mankind. I fervently hope that no one will fall for this insidious and phony appeal:

LONDON, January 20.—Soviet authorities broadcast an appeal over the Vilnyus radio today to anti-Communists still at large in Lithuania to come in and give themselves up.

This constitutes an admission that still—15 years after the Soviet occupation of the Baltic republics and more than 10 years after the end of World War II—there is an anti-Soviet underground in Lithuania.

The Soviet Union absorbed the three Baltic republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940, and little has been heard from them since.

The Lithuanian State Security Committee urged in the broadcast that "those few persons still in hiding" take advantage of a Soviet amnesty announced last September for those who "through lack of courage or ignorance, became involved in collaboration with the occupying forces during World War II." A similar appeal was issued in Latvia January 11.

The broadcast in Lithuania follows the pattern of appeals to Soviet emigrees abroad to return to the U. S. S. R., where, it is said, they will be "pardoned for their crimes."

In earlier stages of Soviet history, similar appeals have been directed to anti-Communists to take advantage of amnesty terms. Russian emigree leaders say that always after voluntary surrenders of anti-Communists under such terms, the Kremlin has eventually liquidated them under other pretexts.

Dispatches from Moscow yesterday revealed the dismissal of the long-time Premier of Lithuania, M. A. Gedvilas, and his replacement by a Communist Party secretary of the republic, M. Y. Shumauskas.

The United States has never recognized the Soviet seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, which took place in the early period of World War II, when the Soviet Government was working in alliance with Hitler.

Mr. Dulles, on the Brink

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include an editorial which appeared in the Richmond News Leader, of Richmond, Va., on January 17, 1956, and an article by Mr. James Marlow, of the Associated Press, which appeared in the same newspaper on the same date.

The editorial and article are as follows:

MR. DULLES, ON THE BRINK

The preposterous story of how Mr. Dulles personally averted three wars in as many years could be ignored or laughed into merciful oblivion as just another Life extravaganza, if it were not for one thing: the overwhelming evidence that it was based, as its author, James Shepley, specifically declares, "on information provided by the Secretary and the State Department."

True, the picture of Mr Dulles marching repeatedly to the brink of war is not quite as funny as the one the Russians used to paint of him standing on the 38th parallel, starting the Korean conflict backwards. In fact it isn't funny at all. Because it is Mr. Dulles' job to make our foreign policy, we are entitled to expect that his decisions—which may mean the difference between life and death to all of us—are based on facts and not on theories. Any evidence that he is making the facts fit the theory, particularly an egomaniac brink of war theory, brings his competence for the job into the most serious question.

And it is certainly fair to say that in his story of how he averted war in Korea, Indochina, and Formosa, a thoroughly sloppy job of evaluating the facts has been done.

In dealing with the crisis that was precipitated by Syngman Rhee's release of all the Chinese and North Korean prisoners, a dramatic story is made of the reprisals, atomic and otherwise, that were ready to be launched if the Chinese renewed the war. But it is also stated as a fact that the armistice negotiations had then reached the stage where it was necessary for the Communists to retreat on the PW issue if a resumption of the war was to be avoided, and it was necessary to allow them to retreat without losing face if possible.

"It was while the negotiators were searching for a back way out of this dangerous impasse," the Life article states, that Syngman Rhee took his arbitrary action. If this is so, it is at least arguable that the much maligned Dr. Rhee did as much to bring the Korean war to an end—by providing the Chinese with what was certainly a face-saving way out of the PW impasse—as Mr. Dulles did with his threat of atomic reprisals.

The strong action Mr. Dulles took to prevent the Chinese from sending their armies into Indochina is never made very clear to the reader. In the first place, no proof is offered that the Chinese ever intended to send their armies into Indochina and the fact is

ignored that there was not, after Dienbienphu certainly, the slightest need for them to do so, unless the United States went in first. And no mention whatever is made of the United States refusal to go it alone with the French, after the British declined to buy Mr. Dulles' plan for allied action. It was this refusal that undoubtedly determined France to seek, and get, a Korean-type settlement at Geneva.

In the account of the Formosa crisis 9 months ago, Mr. Dulles is on firmer ground, but not much firmer. He says he never had any doubt of the President's intention to intervene massively in the Chinese civil war last spring if Red China attacked the offshore islands, and from this he concludes that war was again diverted. This may be so. But at least two other explanations are equally plausible. First, we may seriously doubt whether Red China was ready to attack the offshore islands last year. Second, the diplomatic pressure brought to bear on Red China by all the Asiatic and Arab powers at Bandung could have played a very large part in relaxing the tension in the Pacific at that time.

Most of us are numbed to the idea of the United States standing perpetually ready to plunge the world into an atomic war to prevent Communist aggression. It is not a pretty idea, but it is not new. Never to our knowledge, however, has the threat been so boastfully declared by any acknowledgment, at home or abroad, of the deterrent effect of our atomic and hydrogen weapons.

What is so terrifying about the threat in this instance, is the insufficient evidence and faulty logic on which Mr. Dulles apparently bases his belief in its omnipotence. In Mr. Dulles' job, particularly if he is going to regard diplomacy as the art of getting to the verge without getting into the war, it is imperative that he make no smallest mistake about the relation of cause to effect. All he has to do is to misjudge the enemy's probable reaction once, and the bell will ring.

THE WORLD TODAY—DULLES' VIEW MAY SURPRISE COMMUNISTS OF INDOCHINA

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON, January 17.—Secretary of State Dulles, who seems to have a sunny nature, is able to look back upon his part in events with pride and contentment although the same events may have left others shaken and gloomy.

It may come as a surprise to the Communists that Dulles, recalling his role in the Indochina war, seems to think he scared the daylights out of them although they won half of Vietnam.

Life magazine, in an interview with Dulles, quotes him as saying—and he says the quotes are substantially correct—the United States has been brought to the brink of war three times in 18 months, once in Indochina.

Dulles seems to think that getting up to the edge and teetering on it, is artistic. He said, "The ability to get to the verge without getting into the war is the necessary art."

How he came to think this way needs a little explaining:

After World War II the French, who had held Indochina almost 100 years and exploited it, still refused the people their independence. The revolt which broke out came under the control of the Indochinese Reds.

The rebels were only guerrillas, but in a war which lasted from 1946 to 1954, the French couldn't rally the rest of the Vietnamese. They saw little sense in fighting to perpetuate French colonialism.

While this war was staggering along, the Eisenhower administration in the fall of 1953 announced its "new look" for the military forces: less money for better protection, the administration said.

Dulles, on January 12, 1954, attempted to explain the "new look." It was designed, he said, to depend "primarily upon a great capacity to retaliate massively."

SCARED UNITED STATES ALLIES

This may have scared the Reds—although they kept right on fighting the Indochina war. It certainly scared American allies who had visions of themselves being led into war by this country.

Dulles tried some more explaining. So did other members of the administration. There was a lot of confusion for some weeks. Vice President Nixon said United States troops might have to be used in Indochina.

But President Eisenhower said it would be tragic for American forces to become involved there. Senator KNOWLAND, of California, the Senate Republican leader, said he could give "categorical assurance" there was no intention of sending American troops to Indochina.

At a foreign ministers' meeting in Berlin on February 18, 1954, the French pressured Dulles into agreeing to meet with the British, French, Russians, and Red Chinese in Geneva on April 26 to discuss the southeast Asian problem.

At this point, the Indochinese Reds opened an attack on the French at Dien Bien Phu. By March 29 Dulles was badly worried. He said the free world should take "united action" to save Indochina. This was a long way from going it alone.

NOTHING DOING

Since this was his plan for saving Indochina, he hurried to Britain and France. Would they join? Nothing doing.

They wanted to wait to see what happened at Geneva in April about ending the war. Dulles left Geneva while the French let the Reds have half of Vietnam as a price of peace.

Soviet Lithuania Changes Premier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the New York Times, Friday, January 20, 1956, that states that Mechislovas A. Gedvilas, Premier of Soviet Lithuania since 1943, has been relieved of his post and replaced by a local Communist Party leader:

GEDVILAS, TOP MAN IN BALTIC STATE SINCE WORLD WAR II, REPLACED BY SHUMAUSKAS

Moscow, January 19.—Mechislovas A. Gedvilas, Premier of Soviet Lithuania since 1943, has been relieved of his post and replaced by a local Communist Party leader, according to the January 16 issue of the newspaper Soviet Lithuania, received here today.

The new Premier of the Baltic Soviet Republic is Moteyus Shumauskas, a secretary of the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party.

The change was announced in a decree issued by the Presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet. No reason was given, nor was there any indication of Mr. Gedvilas' future position. The Lithuanian Soviet newspaper did not name any successor to Mr. Shumauskas in the party post.

This is the latest in a series of changes in Communist Party organization that are interpreted by some observers as preliminary moves for the all-Soviet party congress opening here February 14.

Another local Premier, Nuritdin Mukhitdinov of Uzbekistan (Soviet Central Asia) was last month switched to the post of first secretary of the Uzbekistan Communist Party. The change was announced soon after Premier Nikolai A. Bulganin and the first secretary of the Communist Party, Nikita S. Krushchev, visited the region. Mr. Mukhitdinov took the place of A. I. Niyazov, who was ousted. Sabir Kamalov was appointed Premier.

Both Mr. Gedvilas and Mr. Niyazov were elected to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party in 1952, Mr. Niyazov as a full member and Mr. Gedvilas as a candidate (nonvoting) member.

MOSCOW DISSATISFACTION

(By Harry Schwartz)

The replacing of Mr. Gedvilas seems to fit in with recent indications of Moscow's dissatisfaction with the economic and political situation in Lithuania.

Last year's Lithuanian harvest was apparently unsatisfactory, in part because of poor weather. Production of corn, sponsored nationally in the Soviet Union by Party Chief Khrushchev, was apparently particularly disappointing after the area devoted to that crop had been sharply expanded in Lithuania.

Falling under Soviet control in 1940 and thereby the conclusion of World War II, Lithuania is apparently inadequately Sovietized from Moscow's viewpoint. Since 1945 there have been large-scale movements of Russians into Lithuania and deportings of many Lithuanians.

Complaints about the political situation in Lithuania voiced in the Soviet press in recent months have made these points:

There is still much "bourgeois nationalism"—that is, aspiration for Lithuanian independence and opposition to Soviet rule.

The collective farms in Lithuania are operating poorly. Farmers there were collectivized only a few years ago and many of them show what the Soviet press calls poor labor discipline. The fact that most Lithuanian farmers live on their own scattered holdings rather than in collective villages is apparently another factor that has created difficulties for the collectives.

The Roman Catholic Church is said to continue to exert an important influence on the Lithuanian people, including many young people. The Roman Catholic Church is regarded by Soviet authorities as one of the worst enemies of the Soviet system, so that great pains have been taken to try to wipe out its influence in this traditionally Catholic area.

Indicative of the continued independent spirit in Lithuania was the recent complaint that a group of students at Vilna University had circulated a manuscript journal entitled "Fig Leaf," in which they published "vulgar decadent" verse. Such independent effort is virtually unheard of elsewhere in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Gedvilas' ouster as Premier presumably means he will not be reelected to his post as an alternate member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party at the Party Congress in February. Half a dozen members of the Central Committee have been removed from key positions in the last few months.

These removals have seemed to suggest a purge in which the present ruling faction of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Communist Party is eliminating beforehand persons who might prove troublesome.

The Associated Press says Mr. Gedvilas, 51 years old, headed the Partisan movement in Lithuania against the Germans during World War II. He holds the Order of Lenin and other medals.

Tributes to Hon. John White Stevenson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on December 9, 1955, it was my pleasure to participate in ceremonies sponsored by the Christopher Gist Historical Society of the Covington and Newport area in Kentucky. These ceremonies were held to commemorate the memory of one of Kentucky's greatest statesman—John White Stevenson.

One of the highlights of the program dedicated to John White Stevenson was the unveiling of an historic marker of granite, containing a steel time capsule. In it were placed a number of important historical papers, a quotation pertaining to Governor Stevenson's career from the Biography of American Congressmen, a report on the history of the land, today marked by the granite monument, and which was once the site of Stevenson's mansion, which dates back to 1751; a number of current, local newspapers, and other documents in which any reader of the future would be interested.

John White Stevenson served with great distinction as Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, a Representative in the United States Congress, and as a Member of this great body.

Because of the contributions made by John White Stevenson to both the State and Federal Governments, I ask unanimous consent to have the proceedings of the dedication ceremony and of the remarks made upon that occasion, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I am informed by the Public Printer that the proceedings are estimated to make 2¼ pages of the RECORD at a cost of $180. Notwithstanding the fact that the manuscript exceeds by a quarter of page what is permitted to be printed customarily, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, following the proceedings to which I have referred, I ask that there also be printed in the RECORD the address which I had the privilege of making before a meeting of the Christopher Gist Historical Society on the same occasion.

There being no objection, the proceedings and address were ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The proceedings and the address by Mr. CLEMENTS are as follows:

A REVIEW OF THE CEREMONY COMMEMORATING THE LIFE, TIMES, AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF JOHN WHITE STEVENSON, HELD DECEMBER 9, 1955, AT COVINGTON AND FORT MITCHELL, KY.

(By Charles B. Truesdell, secretary, Christopher Gist Historical Society)

The program honoring the memory of John White Stevenson, former Governor, former member of the National House of Representatives, and former United States Senator, held Friday afternoon and evening, December 9, 1955, was under the sponsorship of the offices and members of the Christopher Gist Historical Society of the Covington-Newport area of Kentucky.

At 4 p. m. Friday, December 9, history was reenacted when the historical marker of granite, about 4 feet high, with a bronze inlay—giving the highlights of Governor and Senator Stevenson's career was unveiled. The marker stands at the northeast corner of Fourth and Garrard Streets in Covington, Ky., the site of Governor Stevenson's mansion until recently, when it was razed to make way for the construction of a new Kentucky State office building.

Records, prepared by the Christopher Gist Society's document committee, were placed in a steel box inside the marker by Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS and Judge James B. Milliken, Cold Springs, Ky., chief justice, Kentucky Court of Appeals.

This phase of the program was attended by numerous city, county, and State and Federal officials, as well as local citizens, including Russell S. Clark, assistant principal of the John G. Carlisle School, Covington, and city clerk of the city of Park Hills, Kenton County, Ky., chairman of the board of management of the Christopher Gist Historical Society, who presided; the Reverend John F. Murphy, president of the Villa Madonna College of Covington; Charles B. Truesdell, secretary of the Christopher Gist Historical Society; Prof. Charles E. Stevenson, South Fort Mitchell, associate professor of law at the College of Law of the University of Cincinnati, Ohio.

In commencing the afternoon program, Chairman Clark said: "Ladies and gentlemen, as chairman of the board of management of the Christopher Gist Historical Society, permit me to give you a warm welcome on this cold and snowy afternoon. We appreciate your interest in this event which has led you to brave this rather inclement weather to witness this historic event of the unveiling of a marker to the memory of John White Stevenson, whose former home stood upon this site and which now is in the process of becoming a State office building."

Chairman Clark then presented the Honorable James B. Milliken. In his introduction of Judge Milliken, Chairman Clark said: "Now may I present to you the Honorable James B. Milliken, who lives and whose home is in Cold Spring, in our adjoining county of Campbell, a member of the Kentucky Court of Appeals, who will soon become the chief justice of that court on January 1, next. I take great pride in presenting Judge Milliken, who will speak on the career of John W. Stevenson, whose memory we honor today."

In his statement, Judge Milliken told those in attendance at the ceremony: "With us today to mark the site of the home of John White Stevenson are two of his grandchildren. In the truest sense, history and memory mingle here in a common cause—to commemorate the homesite of a great man.

"If 'the use of history is to give value to the present hour and its duty,' as Emerson once remarked, then the traffic which swirls about us now might well pause to appreciate the fact that the man who once lived here, as a boy, knew Thomas Jefferson, and came here upon the advice of James Madison. Born in Richmond, Va., in 1812, the son of an able statesman and former Ambassador to Great Britain, and graduated from the University of Virginia at Charlottesville, in 1832, John White Stevenson came west imbued with the ideas and ideals of the Founding Fathers of this Nation, and promply put them into practice on the local scene. Soon after his arrival here he became a member of the Covington City Council and shortly afterward was county attorney.

"Imemdiately after the Mexican War he was elected to three successive terms in the State Legislature, was a delegate to the Constitutional Convention of 1849, and was a member of the committee of three who adopted a civil and criminal code of practice for use in the courts of the State. The criminal code is still in use with few changes, and the civil code largely remained in effect until the adoption of the new civil rules patterned after the new Federal rules in 1953.

"It was natural that a man of his ability and experience should be called into the national orbit. He was a delegate to the Democratic national conventions of 1848, 1852, and 1856, and was a Member of Congress from 1857 until the outbreak of the Civil War in 1861. As a disciple of Jefferson and Madison he strove to save the Union, but when war came his sympathy was with his friends and kin in the South, a position forced upon many of his southern contemporaries by the crushing course of events.

"When the Civil War was over Kentucky called him back into service as Lieutenant Governor in 1867. He restored civil order by dissolving renegade bands of former soldiers who marauded the countryside and took determined measures to get the schools back into operation. From the Governorship he went to the United States Senate in 1871 where he served with marked distinction until 1877. He refused to stand for reelection in order to return to the practice of law in the hope of bolstering his dwindling finances.

"Successful as he was in private practice—he was general counsel of the Kentucky Central Railroad, now a part of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad—John White Stevenson always responded to the call of public service. He taught law at the Cincinnati Law College, taught a 'quizz' class for young men who were about to take their bar examinations, and he was chairman of the Democratic National Convention which met in Cincinnati in 1880.

"At the time of his death in 1886 he was known as one of the pioneer spirits and a former president of the American Bar Association. Rich in background, rich in talent and character, he served and prospered in the best American tradition.

"In honoring his memory today we pay tribute to liberty under law, to hope, and dedicate ourselves anew to the great American proposition that government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Following Judge Milliken's remarks, Chairman Clark then asked for the historical documents, prepared by the document committee of the Christopher Gist Historical Society, to be placed in the steel container later sealed within the marker by Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS and Judge James B. Milliken.

Statements made by various civic, commercial, historical, religious organizations, and churches predicting what the Kenton-Campbell County area would be like in the year 2055 were also enclosed in the bronze marker. Organizations submitting statements were: Kiwanis Club of Covington, Thomas Sullivan, chairman of the education committee; the Kenton County chapter of the American Red Cross, Mrs. Genevieve H. Runner, executive secretary; the Ludlow Business Men's Club, Paul J. Blanford; the Colonel Aerie of Eagles of Dayton, Fred H. Blakely, secretary; the Simon Kenton chapter of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Mrs. Alberta Stevenson (W. Baxter) Harrison, chapter registrar; the Young Men's Christian Association of Covington, Willard L. Wade, general secretary; the Covington Protestant Children's Home, Robert R. Shepherd, superintendent; Kenton County Ministerial Association, Rev. Jesse L. Murrell, executive secretary; the Trinity Episcopal Church of Covington, Rev. Bruce A. Weatherly, rector; the Covington Retail Merchants Association, Mrs. Mildred Hitch, secretary; the Kiwanis Club of Latonia, Kentucky Historical Society, Bayless R. Hardin, secretary-treasurer; the Listening Post of Kenton County, Mrs. Frances Glas-

cock, acting secretary and counselor; the Jaycee Wives, Mrs. P. Summe, president; the Covington Lions Club, Edward Wimmer, president; the Covington Optimist Club, R. Clark; the Opti-Miss Club, Mrs. Bernard Klosterman; the Covington Rotary Club, Edward Williams, president; the Covington Ro-Anns, Mrs. Edward Williams, president; the Covington-Kenton County Chamber of Commerce, Col. John G. Cox, executive director; the Northern Kentucky Druggist Association, W. Nie, president, and Mrs. Nie; the Covington Art Club, Mrs. Homer Snook, president; the Covington Business and Professional Woman's Club, Mrs. Ida C. Dyas, news director; the Boy Scouts of America, C. T. Alexander; Licking area council Girl Scouts of America, Katherine Boyce; the Chamber of Commerce of Campbell County, Miss Lenora Bacon, executive secretary; the Latonia Kiwanis Club, Stanley Chrisman; the Covington Kiwanis Club, Dr. Sullivan; the Fort Wright Civic Club, the Park Hills Civic Association, Harry Hamilton; the Kersten-O'Day Post Veterans of Foreign Wars, Dayton, Kentucky; the Kenton County Taxpayers Association, Earl Metcalfe, secretary; the Daughters of Isabella, Mary Moser; Kenton County Bar Association, Harry K. Aurandt, president; Kenton County Realtors Association, John Krumpelman, president; and others.

The November issue of the Kentucky Historical Society Communique, Bayless E. Hardin, editor, was placed in the box; also a roster of the members of the Christopher Gist Historical Society; also the first issue of the Gist of Things, Mrs. Ida C. Dyas, editor, official publication of the Christopher Gist Historical Society, issued on November 15, 1955; also the 1954 issue of the bound volume of monthly papers read at the society's meeting, this one being written and read by Mrs. Stephens L. Blakely, on the subject: Chronicles of Old Trinity (Trinity Episcopal Church of Covington), which carried an article relative to Governor Stevenson who was an ardent member of that church.

In addition to these statements, a history of the land on which the marker stands was sealed within the marker. It read as follows: "Within this envelop is to be found a report of the owners of the land whereon the Governor John W. Stevenson Mansion was located from 1751 until the present time (1955), and now owned by the State Property and Building Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. (1751) The Ohio Land Company of Virginia first owned the land under provisions of a survey made by Capt. Christopher Gist, in March 1751, under patent granted by the Colony of Virginia. Later owners of the property were Col. Stephen Trigg, Col. John Todd, Jr., and Col. William Christian, from 1780 until 1782; James Welch, 1785; Col. George Muse, 1788; Col. James Taylor, 1798; Thomas Kennedy, 1801; Gen. John S. Gano, Richard Gano, and Thomas D. Carneal, 1815; Uriel Sebree, Alfred Sanford, Joseph Kennedy, William Ruddle, and John C. Buckner, first trustees of the town of Covington, 1815; Thomas Carneal, 1818; John W. King and wife, Ann, 1818–19; Herman J. and his wife, Rosina E. Groesbeck, 1838; John P. Winston and his wife, Julia P. Winston, 1852; John W. and his wife, Sibella Winston Stevenson, 1855; on December 14, 1914 the property passed from the family ownership, at which time a conveyance was made from John W. Stevenson, a widower, Mary W. Stevenson Colston and Edward Colston, her husband, Judith Stevenson Winslow, a widow, Judith Braxton Colston, unmarried, Sally Colston Mitchell, and Mary L. Mitchell, to E. B. Sayers, 1914, and finally the State Property and Building Commission of the Commonwealth of Kentucky—the report was compiled by Attorneys John R. Blakely, John H. Klette, Jr., Dr. Charles G. Talbert, Attorney Orie S. Ware, Bayless E. Hardin, secretary of the Kentucky Historical Society, and C. B. Truesdell, chairman of the document committee.

"Other documents placed in envelopes and handed to Senator CLEMENTS and Judge Milliken were extracts from the Cincinnati Commercial Gazette, August 11, 12, and 13, 1886, relative to the death of Governor Stevenson; also extracts from the Cincinnati Enquirer, of August 11, 1886, relative to the death of Governnor Stevenson. Also, copy from Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1949, by Harrison, relative to Governor and Senator Stevenson, 1812–86; also copy of the same directory relative to Andrew Stevenson, father of John White Stevenson, 1784–1857. Also copy of an article taken from the American Biography relative to John White Stevenson.

"Also, copy of the inscription on the face and side of the marker; copy of the records of Spring Grove Cemetery, Cincinnati, Ohio, where Governor Stevenson is buried; copy of a letter under date of July 7, 1955, from Miss Judith Braxton Colston, granddaughter of Governor Stevenson, to C. B. Truesdell, secretary of the Kentucky Historical Society, relative to her grandfather and the Governor Stevenson Mansion; also, copy of program at both the site of the Governor Stevenson Mansion in Covington and at the Fort Mitchell Country Club; also copies of the Kentucky Post, the Kentucky edition of the Cincinnati Enquirer, the Kentucky Times Star, and the Louisville Courier-Journal, covering a period of the last month which contained articles relative to the program; also a photo of Governor Stevenson and an etching made from the photo of Governor Stevenson and an etching made from the photo of Governor Stevenson by Mayor John J. Moloney of Covington."

Promptly at 6:30 p. m., Friday, December 9, the second phase of the commemorative program sponsored by the Christopher Gist Historical Society in honor of former Governor and Senator John White Stevenson commenced with a reception at the beautiful Fort Mitchell Country Club, Fort Mitchell, Kenton County, Ky. Mr. Eugene E. Druly, chairman of the reception committee was in charge of greeting and introducing the more than 150 members and guests of the Christopher Gist Historical Society.

Robert S. Tate, president of the Christopher Gist Historical Society, presided over the evening meeting and commenced his opening remarks by stating that, "The purpose of this meeting, as you well know, is for the purpose of paying homage and tribute to a very distinguished Kentuckian and Kenton Countian, of our own area; a former State governor and a former United States Senator—John White Stevenson."

Mr. Tate then introduced Mr. Gilbert W. Kingsbury, who served as master of ceremonies and toastmaster for the rest of the program. Mr. Kingsbury, prior to introducing the speakers for the evening said:

"Our objective is to make our fellow citizens more aware of our heritage. And we do have a heritage—as the flags before us on the table indicate. We were claimed by the French, governed by the British, contributed to the Confederacy and the Union, and we pay our allegiance today to the flag of the Commonwealth and the Stars and Stripes.

"We have given our State and Nation many a man of whom we can be proud, in addition to John White Stevenson, the man we honor today. There are Richard P. Ernst, John Fisk, John G. Carlisle, William Goebel, Maj. Samuel Woodfill, Brent Spence, who has served in Congress longer than any Kentuckian in our history.

"With us, here tonight, to help in calling attention to our glorious past, are two granddaughters of Governor Stevenson, Miss Braxton Colston and Mrs. Mark L. Mitchell, of Cincinnati. Also with us are two great grandsons of that illustrious man, Mark Mitchell, Jr. and Edward Mitchell.

"I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to Mr. John C. Morrell who helped us in constructing the monument dedicated this afternoon. At times we feared that the job would not be completed in time for this event but I reckoned without the skill and know-how of this engineer. I must also pay tribute to William Judy, executive director of the State building commission who, from the beginning has given us his great help in planning the dedication.

"This afternoon we heard from a fellow-northern Kentuckian, Judge James B. Milliken, who, on January 1, will become chief justice of the State. I would have to look up the records to find out the last time we have been so honored. Judge Milliken adds another star to our crown.

"Tonight we hear from another student of law. Charles E. Stevenson has been a friend of mine since we attended Covington High School. Today, I told him in considerable awe for his attainments as a scholar. He is associate professor of law at the University of Cincinnati, where once taught Governor Stevenson. Soon, Professor Stevenson will be Dr. Stevenson, and tonight he is going to trace the teaching career, at the same college of law, where Governor Stevenson once held forth. Professor Stevenson of Kentucky and the University of Cincinnati College of Law."

REMARKS OF GOV. JOHN WHITE STEVENSON'S CAREER AS A LAW PROFESSOR

(By Charles E. Stevenson, associate professor of law, College of Law, University of Cincinnati)

It is indeed a privilege and a pleasure to be asked to represent the College of Law of the University of Cincinnati in this program honoring the memory of one of its distinguished faculty members, John White Stevenson.

When I was asked to speak of Governor Stevenson and his career as a law professor, my feeling at first was that I should decline, as such a talk by me would be out of tune with the trend of today. For some reason in the recent years of our time, we are not accustomed to hear one Stevenson speak well of another, but rather have come to expect to hear only of Stevensons for Eiesnhower.

After I had overcome this first reluctance and accepted the commission, I recalled some of the personal problems Governor Stevenson had posed for me in the past. For many years in my childhood, I lived within two blocks of the Stevenson home at Fourth and Garrard Streets. Often I had heard others speak of the Stevenson Mansion, and long and fruitlessly I puzzled as to why, if this were the Stevenson Mansion, my family never went there. And this problem of mine was further complicated by the fact that although everyone spoke of the large brick building on the corner as the Stevenson Mansion, it bore over its door in large and unmistakable letters the name "Lafayette." Why was this? It just did not come to make sense to me, and as nearly as I can recall, I never did solve the mystery.

Later on when I attended Trinity Church, I at first thought a special welcome had been prepared for me, for I chanced to sit in a pew bearing the name "Stevenson." I became somewhat suspicious of this conclusion, however, when I noticed a window dedicated to the memory of John White Sevenson. After I had taught at the College of Law of the University of Cincinnati for a time, I learned that Governor Stevenson had preceded me there also.

The teaching career of Governor Stevenson at the Cincinnati Law School started in 1878 and lasted until 1886; 8 years. During those years the law school was located on Walnut Street between Fourth and Fifth,

at the present location of the Mercantile Library Building. The law-school bulletins of those days indicate that the classes ran from the Thursday after the second Tuesday in October until the second Wednesday in May. The regular course of study lasted 2 years, with the optional third-year postgraduate course. No particular previous course of study was required of the students. The student body average about 130 persons. The faculty was composed of some six men. Governor Stevenson taught the courses in commercial law and contracts.

The Cincinnati Law School traces its history back to 1833, and is the oldest law school west of the Allegheny Mountains. The faculty of the law school has included many prominent men, jurists, judges, governors, and one President. In general, the order of procedure was for the members of the faculty to go from the law school into public life. In the case of Governor Stevenson this order was reversed and he brought with him to his teaching all the practical experience gained from a lifetime of service as jurist, Congressman, Senator, and governor.

It has been said that the teacher is the only craftsman whose raw material has a soul. To him is given an opportunity not given to others. How well he performs his function, the development of this raw material—often will be unknown to the teacher for a long time. Indeed, it may never be known to him and may be but dimly perceived by others. Governor Stevenson's teaching career came at the end of a lifetime of public service and it is to be regretted that he did not live long enough to observe in the lives of his students the fruits of this career.

It would be impossible to list here the names and accomplishments of all the students who came within the orbit of Governor Stevenson's teaching, or even of the Kentucky students who attended the law school during this period. Indeed, it is impossible to tell with certainty the extent of the influence Governor Stevenson exerted on any individual. It is clear, however, that many of the students who sat at the feet of Governor Stevenson later rose to prominence and were imbued with his spirit of public service.

Some of Stevenson's school students from Kentucky, whose names will be recalled by many of you here, were Alex D. Simrail, James Pryor Tarvin, Lewis Conner Yager, John Flavel Fisk, John Galvin, George Benjamin Ranshaw, Benjamin F. Braziana (the family of this student later acquired the site of the Stevenson mansion, and it was from them that the Commonwealth of Kentucky purchased the land. It also may be of interest to an historical society that the firm of attorneys who represented the vendor in this latter transaction traces its decent from the firm founded by Governor Stevenson.) and Senator Richard P. Ernst, who lived diagonally across the street from the Stevenson home. Senator Ernst, perhaps the prize student of all, had a lifetime of public service—known to all of us—that emulated that of his teacher.

When I started this subject of the teaching career of Governor Stevenson, I assumed that none of his former students would still be alive. However, on November 25, 1955, the Cincinnati Enquirer carried a notice of the death of one David Woodmansee, 96, a graduate of the Cincinnati Law School, class of 1885. It is entirely possible that others of this period are still alive who recall from their personal experience the teachings of Governor Stevenson. Within the lives of these two men—teacher and student—the present had contact with a large portion of the history of this area. Our country is indeed young from the standpoint of history. It is entirely possible for someone alive today to have had personal contact in his childhood with another who lived during the American Revolution. Although we today, consciously or unconsciously, are guided by the ideals and wisdom of those who have gone before, it is well to recall always that the history of our country largely lies before us.

Through the students who studied under him to the present generation and through them to the future, undoubtedly will pass some of the inspiration of Governor Stevenson. It can be said with confidence that he did not waste his talent, but rather made the most of his opportunity to mould this "raw material with a soul."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EARLE C. CLEMENTS BEFORE THE CHRISTOPHER GIST HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF THE COVINGTON AND NEWPORT AREA IN KENTUCKY, DECEMBER 9, 1955

Following the address by Professor Stevenson, Mr. Kingsbury introduced Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, as follows:

"It is fitting that our senior Senator from Kentucky make this dedicatory address for he is the political heir of Governor Stevenson. Like Mr. Stevenson, he has served as a Member of the House of Representatives, he has occupied the Governor's Mansion at Frankfort, and today he is the assistant majority leader in the United States Senate where he follows closely in the footsteps of another great Kentuckian, ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

"Time does not permit a recitation of his accomplishments during the 5 years he has been in the Senate, nor the listing of the honors his senatorial colleagues have heaped upon him. However, it was the New York Times, I believe, which last summer described him as a Senator's Senator. And that, I feel, is praise indeed.

"I now have the honor of presenting Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky."

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the Christopher Gist Historical Society, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it has been said that some men are born great, others achieve greatness, and still others have greatness thrust upon them.

John White Stevenson was a great man. Moreover, he was destined to be great for this time—and with this man—destiny took no chances.

Usually fickle—wholly whimsical—swayed by passing fancies and sudden enthusiasms—and ever inscrutable—destiny sometimes kind, other times tragically cruel—always is unpredictable.

But—somehow—not with John White Stevenson. On all three counts—birth, achievement, and fortutious circumstances—Destiny qualified and foreordained him to be great. This time destiny was resolute—clearly evidenced throughout his 74 years—was to make John White Stevenson a great American—a great Kentuckian—a great man.

First, destiny saw to it that John White Stevenson was born great.

On the 4th day of May in the trouble-tossed year of 1812, with the Nation on the verge of war, he was born at Richmond, Va., the son of Andrew Stevenson, who himself was a man of parts, having served as the Speaker of the National House of Representatives at Washington, and as Minister to the Court of Saint James at London.

Secondly, destiny decreed it so that the time was propitious for the man named John White Stevenson to achieve greatness. The period between 1812 and 1877, when by his own choice and decision, he terminated his public career, were years of challenge. And, to make doubly certain that the man and the time came together, destiny scheduled several meetings for young Stevenson, where he met and knew and listened to greatness, to men like Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. History records that it was Madison who urged young Stevenson to go west; Madison spoke the words, but every Kentuckian has every good reason to believe that destiny inspired them. John White Stevenson took that advice, and headed west from his native Virginia to Vicksburg, Miss., where he nailed up a shiny, new lawyer's shingle, and entered the practice of law. But not for long. He had an appointment elsewhere, and destiny made sure he kept it by prodding him to partially retrace his steps East, to the place where all of the plans for him were to unfold, on to our own, lovely Covington, Ky.

He arrived in 1841, a young man, tall, lean, strong; a man full of vitality, interest, and the urge to be useful, a man just right for a brand new county named Kenton, that had come into being only the year before his arrival. Now everything was neatly in place, the right man born at the right historical time, and at only 29 settled in the right place.

It was almost natural that John White Stevenson was quickly and favorably noticed. Almost immediately he had his foot on the first rung of the ladder of public service, as the representative of the first ward of the Covington City Council. His term of office on that council was outstanding, and his fellow citizens happily encouraged him to the next rung of the ladder, by electing him attorney of Kenton County.

The years passed quickly, and with them came additional success as the young lawyer steadily rose to achieve greatness.

Let's briefly sketch his climb up the ladder of public service.

In 1845 he was elected to Kentucky's house of representatives, where he served with distinction until 1849, when he was a delegate to the State constitutional convention, where he became one of the architects of that great legal structure, which, with some subsequent modifications, continues to serve us today.

In 1850, John White Stevenson was appointed one of the three commissioners to revise Kentucky's civil and criminal codes.

In 1848—in 1852—and again in 1856—he was a delegate to the Democratic National Conventions.

In 1857 destiny was growing impatient, and the voters ended that impatience by electing him to the United States House of Representatives, and he served in the 35th and 36th Congresses.

In 1861, the Nation trembled, was a house divided against itself. Darkly, the shadows of civil strife fell across the land, and with war, again came dark and bloody ground.

On January 30, 1861, John White Stevenson rose in the House of Representatives at Washington. He plead for an end to the threat that hung over the Nation, divided, split, shaken to its very foundation. His words were charged with the fervor of high patriotism and deep devotion to the Union. The speech, which was hailed as one of the greatest of the session, was a valiant appeal that rang with the honesty of Stevenson's own convictions, but not great enough to clear the national atmosphere of the tension and bitterness that simultaneously gripped and divided the people, now to disperse the emotional thunderheads then rumbling over the length and breadth of the country. Nevertheless that speech publicly and nationally marks John White Stevenson as a man having the courage of his convictions even though as he knew it would, in the next election, it cost him his seat in Congress.

In 1867, John White Stevenson was elected Lieutenant Governor of Kentucky, and now, suddenly, he had greatness thrust upon him, because 5 days after taking the oath of office, Gov. John L. Helm died, and John White Stevenson became the 25th Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky and, by virtue of subsequent reelection, served in that capacity until 1871, when he resigned, having been elected to the United States Senate.

When in 1867, John White Stevenson became Chief Executive of the Commonwealth, it was a raw, lusty time but he, who, himself

had been born in another violent period, in 1812, brought all of his talents, all of his great gifts of leadership to bear on the solution of the tense and trying problems of the day, to restore balance and order. Yet, it was a time of peace, but an uneasy one, not unlike our own in that respect, and men's hearts were not yet free of the awful hurts and aftermath of 4 bloody years of Civil War. The house divided was now one, on the blueprints at least, but in Washington, the House of Representatives had adopted a resolution to impeach President Andrew Johnson for high crimes and misdemeanor. The tragic year, the blight and vengeance of so called reconstruction years, had descended like a pall over the still bleeding heart and soul of the South.

But there were other things, other headlines—some of them good news. On March 2, 1868, the State legislature appropriated money in the amount of $4,000 to clear and improve the Cumberland districts. Kentucky's riverways had been discovered as passages to the interior of the United States—when Texas cowhands rode steamboats—not broncos—up to Louisville—then herded them north—to high profit. Jesse James had not yet become a legend—in the time of John White Stevenson; on March 20, 1868, Jesse and his outlaw band stormed into Russellville and robbed the bank and in Owen County a woman was charged with being a witch—but good news was made when oil was discovered at Boyd Creek near Glasgow in Warren County.

But behind this hodgepodge of news, other work—good work—was going forward. Right here in Covington, in September 1869, a waterworks was authorized, and funds in the amount of $300,000 were appropriated to build the Holly waterworks—and in December of that same year, Governor Stevenson notified the State legislature that he had leased, for 50 years, at $1,500 annually the locks and dams on the Kentucky River and in 1871 the newspapers recorded the tobacco crop as outstanding—106 million pounds.

Now, those who really know, need not be told that no scholar am I, always having preferred the field to the bleachers, and so I want to thank you for the opportunity your invitation has afforded me to take a close and detailed look at the statesman, John White Stevenson, to whom we are paying tribute today. In the preparation of this talk, I have come to see him in sharp focus. I have come to recognize him not only as a predecessor of mine, but to visualize him as a familiar figure in the same places I have served, in our State legislature, where I, too. have served; in the Governor's office, and in the marble halls of Congress, in both Houses of which I, also, have served. Not that this is at all unique. In the interests of factual information as well as modesty, let me add that in 1953, my distinguished colleague, Senator FRANK CARLSON (with whom I served in the National House of Representatives, and whose services as Governor of Kansas paralleled mine as Governor of Kentucky and, needless to say, we are contemporaries in the United States Senate) compiled a complete historical list of all the men who have occupied the offices of Governor, Congressman, and United States Senator.

Of all the States, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has the signal honor of having more men to have occupied all three offices than any other State. Seven men, all together, from our Commonwealth, have been so honored. In addition to John White Stevenson, and myself, there were John Adair, John J. Crittenden, James B. McCreary, Thomas Metcalfe, A. O. Stanley, all of whom served Kentucky as governor, Congressman, and United States Senator.

My friends, every period has its problems, its challenges, and certainly ours is no exception—indeed, ours may well be described as a period of utmost challenge. For a very long time the old adage that contended two conclusions had been definitely established, (1) history repeats itself; and (2) there is nothing new under the sun—stood without fear of contradiction; but entirely not so any longer—there is something new under the sun, atomic energy—first the atomic bomb and now, even more terrifying, the hydrogen bomb, which is no longer our secret. The mauve shadow, the veiled threat of the vast, mushroom-shaped explosion, hangs over the entire world, and because of it, through continued superior military strength, inspired diplomacy, plus the wisest use of the facilities of the United Nations, we must cope with and successfully meet this supreme challenge of our period, the equal of which does not appear in the annals of recorded history. Probably not in our day, but eventually, humanity, in sheer self-defense, must meet the supreme challenge of atomic destruction, and remove and erase that specter from the horizons of the world.

Beneath that shadow in southeast Asia this supreme challenge manifests itself indirectly—almost stealthily. Under that shadow teeming millions, long dormant, are arousing, restlessly stirring, awakening to their inalienable rights, demanding self-rule and a better way of life.

Last June it was my privilege to visit the Far East—Korea, Formosa, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Burma—and talk with the leaders of those hordes of awakening peoples who are desperately hungry, not for food alone, but for learning, for opportunity, for tools, for medicine, for privacy, for strength to develop and defend their newly won independence, for time to master the difficult art of self-government, and last, but not least, hungry for acceptance—by us and the other and more fortunate advanced nations of the world. These gnawing hungers, now rising from the ancient, troubled soil of Asia, gradually must be assuaged and eventually satisfied, through the continued aid and cooperation of the older free nations of the world. By denoting these dangers, the free world will make certain that the vast populations of southeast Asia will not, in the urgency of their duress, turn from sustenance to the demoralizing pap of communism. Were that to happen, the Iron Curtain would ring down on all of Asia, and the hope for peace would, indeed, grow dim.

There is also the challenge of the crises in the Middle East—of which we are all aware.

Here at home, there are problems too, that add to the pressure of this period of the supreme challenge.

There is, for example, the ironic situation that confronts us in agriculture. There was one, and not so long ago, the challenge of providing enough food for ourselves. We met that challenge and reversed it until today there is the challenge of plenty of abundance, of what has become known as surpluses. It will take wisdom to provide a solution, to cope with this current challenge, the sardonic challenge of plenty.

In a few weeks the second session of the 84th Congress will convene and the representatives of the American people will return to the seats in Congress with high hopes and renewed determination to cope with and meet the challenge of our time at home and abroad.

We will, for example, devote ourselves anew to finding a legislative solution to the current farm crisis—that now threatens to again undermine as it did back in the 1920's the entire economic and financial structure of the Nation.

We will consider, and I hope enact, legislation to provide veterans' survivorship benefits, to simplfy customs, to build more schools, to build additional highways, to further the development of peacetime atomic energy, aid and lend further impetus to the development of medical science, to improve the health of the Nation, to erect necessary additional houses, and to liberalize and expand our social security system.

These are a few items that I submit to you tonight as a kind of bill of particulars on the activities of the forthcoming session.

We will do our courageous best to meet the challenge of our times, knowing all too well that there are too few John White Stevensons to assist us.

In closing I want to congratulate the officers and members of the Christopher Gist Historical Society on their efforts toward creating a greater awareness of Covington's adopted distnguished son, John White Stevenson. In this you are making a significant and magnificent contribution because our youth of today will be mindful of another great Kentuckian, giving them one more heroic figure to add to the long list of Kentuckians who have gallantly served our Commonwealth and our Nation wholly deserving of praise and emulation.

A State nurtured, influenced, encouraged, and developed by men of the intellectual attainments, courageous vision, and exceptional stature of John White Stevenson can look back with pride and forward with confidence; Kentucky and the Nation need not be alarmed about the future. As we go forward to meet the supreme challenge of our time let us remember that other men of other times successfully met the challenge of their time and that as they did, so must we.

CONCLUSION OF PROCEEDINGS

Following the address on Governor Stevenson by Senator CLEMENTS, Toastmaster Kingsbury thanked the many individuals who had helped to make the program possible, and turned the meeting over to Robert S. Tate, who extended his appreciation to various members of the society who had helped plan and organize both the afternoon and evening ceremonies honoring John White Stevenson.

President Tate also paid tribute to the activities and work of Attorney Stephens L. Blakely, one of the organizers of the local historical society and its first president, who has served continuously as a devoted worker and officer. He also paid tribute to Mr. Irle R. Hicks, Sr., the society's clerk and treasurer, and to Mrs. Calvin S. Weakley, a charter member, who has been a member of the board of management since the society was organized. President Tate, who is also referred to as "Colonel" Tate, by having served on the staff of former Governor Wetherby, of Kentucky, also paid tribute to other officers of the historical society for the work they had done, naming specifically Professor William A. Fitzgerald, assistant secretary, a member of the faculty of Holmes High School, Covington, and mayor of Florence, Ky.; Attorney W. Baxter Harrison, a member of the board of management, who served as the second president of the society, and Mrs. Vincent Reuscher, the society's librarian.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin of Pennsylvania Before State Highway Officials

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered be-

fore the 41st annual meeting of the American Association of State Highway Officials at New Orleans, La., on December 6, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, DELIVERED BEFORE THE 41ST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS AT NEW ORLEANS, LA., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1955

I am highly honored by your invitation to come to the historic city of New Orleans, the metropolis of the rich and charming State of Louisiana.

Courageous and God-fearing people of many nationalities have developed this area into a great empire of commerce, industry and agriculture, combined with the highest cultural and spiritual attainments.

I want to take this opportunity to express my high regard for my distinguished colleagues in the Senate from Louisiana, ALLEN ELLENDER and RUSSELL LONG. Although we are on opposite sides politically, I admire them greatly as sincere and patriotic American statesmen.

It is a great honor to appear before this association. Here are assembled the road builders of America. Much of the future progress of our country depends upon you because transportation is the lifeline of our expansion and roads are the backbone of transportation.

Transportation has always been and still is one of America's big problems. It is a problem we must face with the same courageous spirit that our ancestors met the difficulties of their day.

Roads are today, as always, the basic means of transportation. The other systems—railroads, waterways, the air and pipelines—aid and supplement the highways just as the auxiliary branches of the armed services help the "doughboy" gain and hold his objective.

We have spent an enormous amount of money for transportation in the United States as the following figures show:

In highways, 1931 through 1955, we have spent $75,230,000,000 distributed as follows: Federal, $11½ billion; State, $43 billion; local, $21½ billion.

In waterways, 1931 through 1955, the Federal Government has spent $1,450,000,000. It will take $2½ billion more to complete our waterways system.

In railroads, fully owned by the people, there is invested, $33,581,000,000. Enormous expansion is being made in this service to keep up with the public demand.

In airlines there is invested by Government $2,200,000,000. Practically every city is improving its airport facilities.

In pipelines, fully owned by the people, there is invested $10 billion. The "big inch" lines now have as many miles as the railroads and are continually increasing this mileage.

The last half century has seen more progress in transportation than all the rest of recorded history. In that period we developed what we were proud to call the finest highway system in the world. That is true. Our highway system is superior in quality and mileage to any other in the world. At the same time we have 75 percent of all of the passenger cars and 50 percent of all the trucks in the world. Nevertheless the tragic fact remains that highway development, as we all know, has fallen far behind the rising needs of our vastly increased volume of traffic. Our roads are now what they should have been 10 years ago.

It is true, of course, that part of our highway difficulties can be blamed on the necessary suspension of roadbuilding activities during the war years. But more than anything else, the problem has been aggravated by our phenomenal national expansion.

One of the most spectacular developments has been the surprising increase in our population. According to the latest Census Bureau estimates we are now a Nation of more than 165 million people. We did not expect to reach that number for many years to come. It represents an increase of more than 33 million, or 25 percent, in less than 15 years since the general census of 1940.

Translated into terms of human needs this amazing population increase has imposed upon us many great problems in addition to the problem of our inadequate and hazardous highways.

We need more schools to educate the growing army of young people. We need more housing. We need expanded recreational facilities. We need more hospitals. We must build more churches of every denomination.

Each of these vital needs is an essential part of the American way of life. They must be paid for, either with private funds accumulated by hard work and thrift, or by public funds raised by taxation.

It is no exaggeration to say that President Eisenhower's call for bold new steps to solve the highway problem has made the Nation highway conscious. The President performed an outstanding service to the Nation when he centered attention on this vital problem. I am convinced that when the next session of Congress convenes it will be bombarded from all sections of the country with demands for prompt action.

We need the roads. There is no question about that. We must have them if we are to have an expanding economy.

We need them for our industrial, cultural, and spiritual advancement.

We need them for national and civilian defense.

We need them to reduce the frightful toll of lives taken each year by accidents on our highways.

We need them to bring the people of every section closer together and thus provide the means for a better understanding of our great country and its problems. My study of the War Between the States convinces me that if we had had a good system of highways and better means of communication the war might have been avoided.

The big decisions we must now make are how the highways shall be financed, where they will be built; how they will be built; how they will be policed; and how they will be maintained.

It's up to the American people to decide, for they must pay the bills.

The President's proposal was, of course, the most ambitious highway construction program ever visualized for this country or any other country. At no time were its broad objectives the subject of controversy.

Every phase of the situation was examined with the greatest care by the subcommittee on roads of the Senate Public Works Committee under the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. GORE. The printed record of hearings held by that subcommittee comprises a volume of 1072 pages. It includes the views and opinions of every element concerned with the planning, construction, financing, and administration of highways. The subcommittee heard testimony from State governors, the mayors of numerous cities, outstanding engineers, contractors, highway safety experts and many others.

The hearings disclosed that it will probably take 2 years to get the program fully underway. It will be necessary to increase the number of engineers working on road projects. Contractors will have to enlarge their organizations. More road building equipment will be required and the production of road building materials will have to be expanded. But we were assured that within 2 years we can have an adequate engineering personnel, an adequate number of qualified contractors and adequate materials available to do the job.

In this most comprehensive presentation of the highway situation there was virtually unanimous endorsement of President Eisenhower's broad concept of a vastly expanded and strengthened national highway system.

The principal area of disagreement was the method for financing the program. That is the big problem before us today.

At this point I would like to recall the statement of President Eisenhower issued on July 28, the day following the defeat of the Fallon bill in the House.

Expressing disappointment over the rejection of the legislation the President said, and I quote:

"The Nation badly needs new highways. The good of our people, of our economy, and of our defense, requires that construction of these highways be undertaken at once.

"There is a difference of conviction, I realize, over means of financing this construction. I have proposed one plan of financing which I consider sound. Others have proposed other methods.

"Adequate financing there must be," the President continued, "but," he added, and this is the important part, "contention over the method of financing should not be permitted to deny our people these critically needed roads."

You are all aware, of course, that I supported the corporation-bond plan regardless of the fact that for a half century in public life I have favored the pay-as-you-go principle. In order to get the roads built I would again support a bond plan. However, in view of the opposition to that plan, particularly among many fine conservative people who stand against deficit financing of any kind, I would give my support to any reasonable compromise that will assure prompt action.

In this connection it is worth noting that 75 percent of the State and local bond issues proposed to finance road building and other projects were defeated at this year's elections. There was a real revolt by the voters who approved only about $470 million of the proposals. More than $982 million were turned down. This reversed the pattern of recent years since World War II in which the voters ratified an average of 85 percent of the bond proposals submitted for their consideration.

Recently I received a brochure prepared by the American Municipal Association which disclosed some startling facts. It stated that the failure of Congress to enact an expanded Federal-aid program for highways has delayed up to 10 years the construction of expressways, arterials, and bypass routes that are needed now to alleviate the traffic strangulation of existing city streets.

A survey by the association revealed that in 85 cities representing 38 States and the District of Columbia, 129 projects, with a total estimated cost of $5½ billion, are or will be adversely affected by the absence of a national highway program.

Here are a few examples:

Detroit is holding up the construction of 6 expressways involving more than $363 million pending Federal action.

New York City has plans for a $600 million network of roads and bridges but cannot proceed without assurance of expanded Federal aid.

Chicago wants to complete 33½ miles of expressways which will cost over $350 million.

In Pennsylvania much work has already been done in the cities of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia. Philadelphia has a limited access road where the speed limit is 60 miles per hour, from Fairmont Park to the Pennsylvania turnpike. These 32 miles cost over $100 million.

The parkway in Pittsburgh is almost completed. The 33 miles cost $118 million. In

both Pittsburgh and Philadelphia the Federal and State government paid about 95 percent of the cost.

I have mentioned only a few samples. There are many more. They point out very clearly that the longer the accelerated highway program is delayed the more it will cost in higher prices for right-of-way and construction as well as economic losses from traffic congestion.

It goes without saying that under any plan that may be adopted the people will pay the bill through new and higher taxes.

Some day a great genius may arise among us who will devise a system of taxation that will meet with universal approval. But until that day arrives every tax proposal that may be advanced will bring opposition from some source. Therefore it must be our constant aim to impose such new taxes as may be required in as fair and equitable a manner as is humanly possible.

There is no doubt in my mind that the financing problem related to highway development can be solved in a way that will distribute the costs on a fair and equitable basis.

Such a solution will not be difficult if all parties concerned approach the problem in the American way and that means placing the National interest above sectional advantage. It will require strong and resolute resistance to those groups who seek to exert political or other pressure in their desire to gain selfish advantage.

Now let us look at some of the financial aspects of the highway situation.

Federal, State and local governments are spending annually on roads and streets about $7½ billion.

The three levels of government are collecting taxes related to the use of roads of more than $8 billion.

The Federal Government collects more than $2½ billion in taxes on gasoline and excise taxes on motor vehicles, parts and tires.

This is twice the amount of taxes collected by the Federal Government from all sources before World War I.

There is general agreement that the national system of interstate highways is a prime responsibility of the Federal Government.

The interstate system, as you know, is a specially designated network of 40,000 miles. It was carefully laid out to meet the military, civilian defense and industrial needs of the country. To serve these purposes it will connect 42 State capitals and 90 percent of all the cities of over 50,000 population. It will have controlled access and will bypass large centers of population. It will take about $25 billion to complete it.

How can this expenditure be financed? Some proposals that could be considered are as follows:

An additional 1 cent Federal tax on gasoline which would yield annually more than $500 million. This year 15 States have already raised their gas tax.

The present tax on rubber might be increased to yield an annual total of $300 million.

A Federal license fee on trucks and buses using the interstate system to yield $300 million.

Increased appropriations from the general fund and some matching funds from the States.

The collection of tolls on tunnels, bridges, and perhaps some sections of road on the interstate system could yield $300 million. In this connection there is being discussed the possibility of charging tolls for the use of the locks and dams, built with Federal funds, on our waterways. It is a sound principle of government to make governmental projects, as far as possible, self-liquidating. This principle has been applied with great success to reclamation and irrigation projects.

Although emphasis is placed on completing the interstate system in a 10 or 15 year period we must always provide for the needs of the primary, secondary, urban and other roads. They have increasing importance in our general highway plan.

In any national road program we must keep our economy strong.

Taxes and spending must be carefully planned to keep local government in a healthy financial condition.

Balanced budgets at all levels of government, Federal, State and local, are essential to our economic progress.

It now appears that we will have a balanced budget through increased revenues and economies in government departments and agencies. That means that highway money can be taken from the general fund provided the present level of taxes is maintained.

Personally I do not think there should be a reduction in taxes until the budget is balanced and a start is made in cutting down the enormous Federal debt.

All of these fundamentals of government finance are tied in with the vast expenditures that must be made to give the United States a modern, safe and efficient highway system.

The completion of the interstate highways will be a monumental achievement. Our first objective must be to get the job started. I am confident that the next session of Congress will clear the way.

The Parity Level of Dairy Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered over radio station WTMJ on January 22, 1956, on the subject of the raising of the parity level on dairy products to that of the six basic commodities.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES PROMPT ACTION ON RAISING DAIRY PARITY TO LEVEL OF SIX BASIC COMMODITIES—PRESENTS OTHER SUGGESTIONS TO ACHIEVE SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE

(Excerpts of remarks delivered by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, over WTMJ farm program, Milwaukee, Wis., January 22, 1956)

Congress is definitely going to enact a new and effective farm law to help raise dairy and other farm income.

ACTION MAY COME IN FEBRUARY

By the middle of February, the Senate Agriculture Committee is expected to report out its version of the new bill. The House of Representatives had already passed its version, last year, designed to raise parity to 90 percent. The Senate version will undoubtedly be offering a compromise figure.

One thing is sure, and that is, that increased income assistance for the dairyman is and must be on the way.

THE IRONIC CONTRAST OF FARM HARDSHIP TODAY

Why? Well, just note this unfortunate contrast:

Dairy income has been skidding or holding at low levels, while almost all other segments of our economy are at the highest levels of our history.

The dairyman's hardship has resulted in lower purchasing power all over Wisconsin. That means that everyone is hurt, including the consumers, when the farmer is hurt.

Our aim, of course, is definitely to eliminate the cost-price squeeze on the farmer.

The prices of machinery, labor, and equipment have skyrocketed. Meanwhile, price of milk, pork, beef and other products have been at low or declining levels. Today, as a whole, the farmer is getting only around 40 cents out of the consumer's average food dollar. We must close this gap between the farmer's small return and the ultimate sale-prices so as to provide for the farmer a sound basis of operation—that, is, his cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

How are we going to do this?

FAIR TREATMENT UNDER THE PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM

We must all remember that the price-support program—imperfect as it is—serves at least as a temporary implement to help sustain our farmers.

Our ultimate objective, of course, must be a program that does not depend upon Government support to maintain a stable and profitable price level.

We must aim to reestablish farming on its own healthy plane, independent as much as possible, receiving its full share of our national prosperity.

Meanwhile, we must make sure that milk gets the same parity level as other so-called basic products.

MILK AS BASIC AS ANY PRODUCT

Milk is just as basic as cotton, tobacco, wheat, or corn. It must not be discriminated against or treated as a step-child.

Cheese, butter, milk powder, ice cream, none of these essential dairy products must be allowed to suffer—as regards price, production, or consumption.

PRODUCTION HIGHER

Today, milk production is at the 124½ billion pound per year mark.

The so-called milk surplus has fortunately been declining. It would actually be eliminated entirely if we were all to drink more milk each day.

ESTABLISH A SUPPLY-DEMAND BALANCE

One of the first things we must do is to attempt to establish a supply-demand balance. Many folks have said that we are suffering from overproduction. I don't think so. Instead, I believe that our problem is underconsumption.

Until the surplus problem is solved, however, it may be necessary to adjust our production as well as attempt to increase consumption.

NEW MEANS OF FOOD DISPERSAL

Basically, we must be more enterprising in figuring out ways of dispersing and utilizing foods. I will list some of the means by which this can be done:

1. We must develop new distribution channels, both foreign and domestic, to increase consumption of our so-called surplus foods;

2. We must constantly improve sales promotion, to educate the public in the uses of dairy foods; and

3. We must expand our research program. As you know, I have introduced a bill (S. 788) for a Dairy Research Laboratory in Madison, to provide research into new and different uses of our dairy products.

DISPOSING OF SURPLUS FOODS

Meanwhile, let's not keep our dairy and other farm products sitting in warehouses. Let's get them out to the people to be consumed.

Merely providing warehouse space for our stockpiles of surpluses—of corn, wheat, etc.—is costing us $1 million a day for stor-

age. We have got to eliminate the governmental redtape and foot dragging on surplus disposal. We've got to move this cheese, butter, milk powder and other products into the stomachs of hungry people.

The dietary standards of many people can be greatly improved if we disburse these so-called surplus foods wisely, and perhaps profitably, to those in the world who need it.

This can be achieved by:

1. Stimulating the sale—not just give away—of surplus products held in storage by the Department of Agriculture. During 1955, for example, the Department sold—I emphasize—sold $1.2 billion worth of surplus products.

2. Expanding distribution of milk, cheese, milk powder, and other foods, through school lunches, the Armed Forces, and relief to distressed people; and

3. Encouraging the use of surplus foods in foreign policy, as strategic weapons in the economic warfare against communism.

FOOD STORAGE

A program of permanent food storage should be an important consideration for any plan for the future.

Our great, cosmopolitan cities, depending to a large degree on perishable foodstuffs, are only a few days away from potential food storage. Consequently, we must take a new look at our storage practices, to determine how to keep sufficient food on hand for local, regional, or national emergencies, as well as for normal modern use.

LEGISLATION

As we all recognize, there is no blanket cure for the current farm crisis.

Instead of hunting for a cure-all, we must deal realistically and individually with each phase of the problem.

Our legislative pattern in Congress for 1956 must be guided by this philosophy. The dairying problems, for instance, will have to be resolved according to today's needs of the dairymen, and according to tomorrow's production and consumption prospects.

In the new Congress, I have so far introduced three bills of significance to the dairy farmer:

School milk: The first two bills provide for expansion of the school-milk program for this year and for 1957. It would bring more milk and health to the school children of Wisconsin and America.

Bang's disease: I have also introduced a bill to provide sufficient funds to continue expanding the program for eradicating dread brucellosis which has cost such severe economic loss for the farmer.

Seaway: In addition, my bill, S. 171, to expand and deepen the connecting channels of the St. Lawrence seaway is coming up before a Senate committee this month. This great seaway, upon completion, will provide speedier and more inexpensive domestic and foreign markets for the agricultural products of Wisconsin and all of the great Middle West.

I shall, of course, introduce additional legislation in the Congress as new situations arise, or as we find solutions to our present problems.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

A prominent feature of any program must be long-range planning, to provide a stable future for our farmers. Important aspects of such planning are:

First, we must develop long-range farm studies, with the objective of changing over production from surplus commodities to products in short supply.

This would help use our productive capacity over a more varied field. We would provide new and different products, which would result in a better living for all of us. We would help to eliminate the recurring cycles of surplus foods and price depression.

Second, we must establish a soil-bank program to preserve the fertility of the land. This plan would involve safeguards to prohibit nondairy farmers from using acres diverted say, from wheat and cotton to production of dairy products for commercial purposes. Such diversion would, if unchecked, only serve to increase the dairy surplus.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that these proposals are designed not simply to help the farmer, but also to help the storekeeper, farm-implement dealer, professional man, and all of the other Americans who are dependent upon the buying power of the farmer. I include, too, the housewife who wants vitamin-rich, nutritious products for her children and family.

Yugoslavia in the Security Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release issued by me on December 20, 1955, entitled "Yugoslavia in the Security Council."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YUGOSLAVIA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

It is deeply humiliating to any true American to see the representative of the United States at the UN taking part in a deal over whether the Philippine Islands should have the vacant seat on the Security Council.

The Philippine Islands are perhaps our closest friends as a nation. They were our allies in a cruel war and bore the heaviest brunt of the battle, while the Soviet Union, which contributed no men to the Pacific War, took all the spoils. The Filipinos are our friends in the struggle to preserve freedom and international morality against Communist hate and barbarism. We know that in another war against totalitarian brutality our fighting men can count on them to stand beside us in the fray.

What is Yugoslavia to us? The Yugoslavs shot down American airmen on a peaceful mission and sneered at our demands for an apology. What was Tito doing while the Filipinos were fighting a bloody fight for every inch of their soil? Tito was a traitor to his own country, hiding in Moscow until the danger was over and he could come back in safety and murder our valiant ally, Mihaelovitch and his brave men. Let us not forget in passing that Mihaelovitch's guerrillas destroyed the Nazi supply trains which were to equip Rommel's armies in Africa. Our men who fought in Africa have reason to remember.

Does anyone in the United States believe American fighting men could count on Tito's armies to fight beside them, if we are forced into another war with totalitarianism? I hope our representative to the U. N. is not so innocent to believe that.

Let me remind you of the real reason why the Soviet Union is determined to prevent the Philippines from taking their seat on the Security Council. When the Bandung Conference opened, the Soviet Union and Red China were confident that Nehru could manage it as they wished into innocuous desuetude. Their little plan did not work because the wise and brave anti-Communist nations of Asia and Africa spoke out with all their force against the new colonialism of the Communists. The grand climax of that great conference was the speech by Carlos Romulo, in which he told the people of Asia to forget some of their hatred for the colonial power on whose flag the sun never sets and face the immediate threat from the new colonial powers on which the sun never rises.

The Soviet Union never forgives and never forgets. The Philippines must be humiliated because they spoke out as freemen.

But what of the United States? Do we not have enough courage to support, without stint, the brave and far-sighted Philippine nation, which spoke at Bandung as America used to speak.

The choice of the Philippines for the Security Council is an issue of principle and we must watch while the delegate from the United States consents to decide an issue of principle by drawing straws.

Imagine George Washington agreeing with the British to draw straws over who would win at Valley Forge. Imagine General Pershing drawing straws with the Germans over the battle of Belleau Wood. Imagine, if you can, General Eisenhower drawing straws with the Nazi leaders over the Battle of the Bulge.

What has happened to our country? The answer to our stupid weakness over the Philippines is the same as the answer to our stupid weakness over Outer Mongolia. It is the same as our stupid weakness over the clever move of the U. S. S. R. to pair by its veto, the desert province of Outer Mongolia with the 90 million highly productive people of Japan. The trouble is that our representative in the U. N. does not represent the people of the United States. He does not represent the Government of the United States, including Congress. He receives his instructions from, and represents only, the permanent elite established within our Government by the New Deal, whose real policy is firmly to establish a collectivist international, in which the United States will be one obedient province.

The plan was carefully laid to put over both the package deal on Outer Mongolia, and the defeat of the Philippines, in the shadows while the Geneva Conference was theatrically lit up to hold our attention away from the U. N. It was a clever plan but it failed. Free China's courage bought us time.

Yesterday I said that Congress must look into the question of our representative's fantastic role in opposition to Dr. Tsiang of Nationalist China and in support of Soviet bulldozing tactics. Today I say again, Congress must look at our fantastic role in the fight to reward a brave leader of the anti-Communist Afro-Asian nations, with a well-deserved seat of honor on the Security Council.

In both cases we will find the same dominant role of the permanent elite over our foreign policy.

If the American people are ever to have a voice in the United Nations or in any other aspect of our foreign policy, Congress must cut down the power of this nonelected cabal and restore government by the people in place of government by leviathan.

Progress Under the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday night it was my pleasure to attend

the gala salute to Eisenhower dinner held in Milwaukee.

This dinner, like companion rallies all over our Nation, evidenced the enthusiastic support of the Republican Party for the President of the United States—support which is, I know, shared by the overwhelming mass of the American people.

We heard a splendid address from the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Sinclair Weeks.

Secretary Weeks presented point by point the proof of the great and constructive change which has occurred since Dwight D. Eisenhower took office on January 20, 1953.

He commented, of course, as well, on the future opportunity for the Republican Party's service to our Nation.

I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of Secretary Weeks' remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPLETE U-TURN IN GOVERNMENT

(Address delivered by Hon. Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce, at the salute to Eisenhower dinner January 20, 1956, Pfister Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.)

I am most happy to be with you tonight and to participate in your salute to one of the greatest Americans in history—our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The most gratifying experience of my life is to be a member of his Cabinet and to attempt to carry out his policies to the best of my ability.

Sufficient time has elapsed since the President's inauguration, exactly 3 years ago today, for the American people to pass judgment on his character, his leadership, and his brand of dynamic conservatism.

THREE SHORT YEARS AGO

Three short years ago American families were receiving heart-breaking telegrams announcing that a father or a son had perished in Korea.

The people of this State remember with solemn pride and sorrow that 723 Wisconsin boys were killed and 1,936 were wounded. Thanks to President Eisenhower's leadership, those tragic days are over.

Three short years ago people were talking about corruption and security risks. They were waiting eagerly for the new administration to clean up the mess. And it has.

Three short years ago inflation was pushing up the cost of living. Today we have a stable dollar in an era of unprecedented prosperity.

Why the change?

The American most responsible for today's peace, prosperity, and individual well-being is the leader whom we salute tonight, our President.

CLASH OF DIFFERENT IDEOLOGIES

I propose to cite chapter and verse on some of the accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration. But before I do so I believe it might help pin point the political situation if I described the difference between Eisenhower principles and those practiced in an election year by the current spokesmen of the opposition party.

I allude to spokesmen rather than rank-and-file Democrats. I do so because—as the 1952 election and every nationwide poll thereafter indicate—millions of Democrats are united with millions of independents and Republicans in wholehearted support of the President. And if—as we all hope and pray—President Eisenhower runs again, he will win by an even greater landslide.

Nevertheless, the professional politicians in the opposition party, who lack popular issues, are doing everything in their power to wiggle back into the White House and to greater control of the Congress. In a nutshell most of these old "pros" have three basic political principles—utterly different from the ideals of Eisenhower supporters.

First of all, to them politics is just a game.

Second, to them the Federal Government is a combination of Great White Father and Simon Legree.

Third, to them the only right course is toward the left.

Let me explain in more detail.

HIT-AND-RUN ACCUSATIONS

1. To them politics is just a game. To us politics is serious business, affecting the welfare of the Nation and future generations. Because they look upon politics as parlor tricks you will find many normally responsible men temporarily abdicating responsibility and making hit-and-run accusations about the administration or expressing opinions on public questions which at heart they do not believe.

To many of them—I regret to say—the art of election-year politics is to try to get away with as many reckless charges and fake promises as possible. They have their tongue in cheek so much that it is a wonder they don't choke.

In my opinion, however, the average voter today is too smart and too fair to be deceived by false charges which seem to be the election year stock in trade of altogether too many headline-hunting politicians.

WHY PEOPLE TRUST PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

In contrast, I believe that one of the chief reasons why the people of America and the people of the world trust President Eisenhower is because of his great sincerity.

Can anyone recall a single instance in which he has thrown mud at a critic or hit an opponent below the belt?

Can anyone point to his ever taking a stand which he did not believe was in the best interest of all the American people?

GREAT WHITE FATHER

2. To many of our professional opponents, the Federal Government is a sort of two-faced creature; one moment squandering vast sums of the people's money on unnecessary projects in the role of the Great White Father; the next, cracking down on business and other groups with the slave whip of Simon Legree. Both moves are aimed at wangling the votes of special interests.

DISHED UP BY SOCIALISTIC COOKS

3. To many of our professional opponents the only right course for government is toward the left. So they have scant interest in the success of private enterprise and a mouth-watering hunger for any radical scheme dished up by Socialistic short-order cooks. Such things as socialized medicine, bureaucratic-electric power monopoly instead of private power, and other pink concoctions.

Study the record and you will find that the inevitable result of unsound left-wing doctrines are back-breaking taxes, colossal debts, increasing deficits, grave injustices, wastes, scandals, bureaucratic browbeating, chains on business and class warfare—all bad for the American people.

Do you think the American people want to junk the current prosperity of private enterprise for that sort of throwback?

COMPLETE U-TURN IN GOVERNMENT

The Eisenhower conception of the role of the Federal Government is quite different from what it had been for 20 years. In fact during the past 3 years the American people have witnessed a complete U-turn in Government. Because the change in direction has been accomplished without the squeaking of brakes and the blowout of tires, some people do not quite understand yet what has been happening.

This is what has happened: For two decades the thinking at top Government levels was that economic stability was impossible without huge, continuous Government expenditures and without Government nursemaiding the entire economy.

President Eisenhower completely changed that kind of negative thinking. His administration operates on the theory that the role of Government is to create and maintain conditions favorable to private initiative. Instead of having economic decisions made by distant bureaucrats, our policy is to encourage millions of private individuals to make their own economic decisions.

TIED TO THE APRON STRINGS OF GOVERNMENT

The Eisenhower administration withdrew the heavy hand of Government from the economy and substituted the friendly hand of encouragement. We turned our back on socialism and took the path to freedom. Instead of a weakling economy tied to the apron strings of Government, we now have a self-managed, self-supporting economy, encouraged by an understanding Government, which is producing the greatest prosperity in the experience of all mankind.

FACED A FINANCIAL JUNGLE IN 1953

In the words of Al Smith, "Let's look at the record."

Three years ago the incoming administration faced a financial jungle far worse than we had suspected during the campaign.

The inherited budget, left on our doorstep by the previous administration, was estimated at $77.9 billion. The estimated revenues were $68 billion—leaving a deficit of $9.9 billion.

We found obligations to spend around $80 billion with no provision for payment. The value of the dollar had shrunk in purchasing power in 15 years from 100 cents to 52 cents—an inflation which was eating up pay raises and the savings and pensions of individuals. A further indication of the price paid by the public is shown by the increase in the cost-of-living index from August 1945 to January 1953. In the 7½ years immediately following the war it climbed 47 percent. But from January 1953 to the present, it has risen only 1 percent.

This from a previous administration whose spokesmen this year are begging for a second chance to plunge this Nation into the monetary swamp again.

Had the former state of affairs continued we would have suffered a fiscal debacle. Not only would our economy have been seriously weakened but its slump would have dragged down national security, which depends on a vigorous economy to support atomic defense.

WENT TO WORK WITH THE PRUNING SHEARS

The President determined to take drastic measures to cure the situation. His entire team went to work with the pruning shears, lopping off waste and extravagance in Government.

Since fiscal 1953 Government spending has been reduced by $10.5 billion. This made possible the largest tax cut in history. Almost $7.5 billion were kept by business and people to spend or save as they pleased and not, as formerly, handed over in taxes for Government to spend. The reduction helped every single taxpayer in the country with almost two-thirds of the savings going directly to individuals—a fact which accounts for their current record income.

TWO YEARS OF BALANCED BUDGETS IN SIGHT

Only 3 years ago we started with a terrible financial handicap. Today we look forward to a balanced budget for this fiscal year and next year and to another year of prosperity.

Today inflation-breeding deficits have been replaced by modest surpluses, despite new obligations for defense, agriculture, health, and programs to enhance opportunities for human well-being and economic growth.

Has any administration in history ever cured financial troubles so fast and stimulated prosperity so widely? When critics complain about flyspecks, the Eisenhower

administration proudly points to its record.

All this and peace, too.

HELP FOR AREAS OF CHRONIC UNEMPLOYMENT

But although the majority of Americans never had it so good, this administration will not ease up in our endeavors to nudge the economy until our farmers and people in areas of chronic unemployment share more of the general prosperity.

I should like to describe briefly our plans for area redevelopment because it is one of the Commerce Department programs to foster a stronger economy.

For quite a number of years areas dependent on a single local resource or single industrial activity often have been hard hit when their major asset failed. Previous administrations neglected them. At the Commerce Department we established an Office of Area Development which gave local communities expert advice in finding ways to increase local industry and employment. But despite this practical assistance, the operation was limited. We requested additional funds last year from Congress which were denied.

This year we are asking for much greater authority and appropriations to assist communities in wiping out chronic unemployment and in getting back on their feet. Among the benefits planned are greater technical assistance; grants to educational institutions and public authorities for surveys of local conditions; training in new job skills and adequate loans to supplement local efforts for self-improvement.

I think the program is typical of the Eisenhower administration approach to economic problems—a humanitarian effort to lift the burden of worry and privation from the families of the unemployed—a sound economic program to help communities to help themselves. Thus they will again become productive units, adding to the stability and growth of the overall economy.

This is just one example of the things the Eisenhower administration is doing.

We want this type of administration to continue. We do not want to go back. Who will decide this?

WHERE ELECTION WILL BE DECIDED

I believe that the 1956 presidential election will not be decided by the sour grapes arguments of leftwing columnists or the revived New Deal brain trust or the professional Calamity Janes or the antiadministration politicians, whose sales pitch—as usual—will be playing up gripes and greeds.

The 1956 election will be decided in the grocery store by housewives who know from bitter experience that the cost of living doubled during the 15 years before the Eisenhower administration.

It is stable today, and has been since January 1953.

The election will be decided by families who now can have new washing machines, new do-it-yourself kits, new television sets, new cars, and new homes.

The election will be decided by rank and file labor-union members who in a Republican administration have more overtime pay, better working conditions, and less time lost through strikes.

The election will be decided around the fireside where elderly people, the disabled and victims of adversity will remember that an Eisenhower administration extended social security to additional millions and encouraged States to expand unemployment insurance and other economic security measures.

The election will be decided in the home, where the family circle no longer is broken by war but now is united and happy.

The election will be decided on the Eisenhower Republican record and on the program which this administration will set in action unless blocked by a Democratic-controlled Congress.

FIVE MORE YEARS OF EISENHOWER?

In the time at my disposal I have described briefly some of the wreckage left by the previous administration; some of the measures by which the current administration cleared away that wreckage and brought healthy economic recovery, which eventually developed into the greatest prosperity in the history of mankind—a prosperity without war and without inflation.

But the fortunate economic state of the union is more than material plenty. It is the reflection of the executive ability and the moral stature of the greatest American of our age, the best liked President of the century.

To what heights of peace and prosperity this Nation can go, if we have 5 more years of President Eisenhower.

In conclusion, I repeat my expression of pleasure for this opportunity to join you in saluting the President of the United States. You will find in his recent state of the Union message not only his accounting of stewardship and future programs but also a clear insight into his fine character.

STATE OF THE UNION

Let me refresh your memory with the first paragraph of that inspiring message:

"The opening of this new year must arouse in us all grateful thanks to a kind providence whose protection has been ever present and whose bounty has been manifold and abundant. The state of the Union today demonstrates what can be accomplished under God by a free people; by their vision, their understanding of national problems, their initiative, their self-reliance, their capacity for work, and by their willingness to sacrifice whenever sacrifice is needed."

The best tribute we can pay the President is the pledge of our active support.

Conditions in the Farm Belt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was called from the floor a moment ago. Before he left he asked me to request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the texts of two statements published by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, of St. Paul, Minn., and I now make that request.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEDNESDAY, *January 18, 1956.*

Hog prices, as every farmer knows, are not very good these days. But, Secretary of Agriculture Benson thinks they are. Now, the Secretary will have a chance to explain what he means. He has been asked, by Congress, to explain why his pork-buying program has not strengthened hog prices. The President of the United States, you may remember, was quoted in one of his messages as saying that Benson's pork-buying program was helping hog prices, and he liked the idea. Now, the members of the subcommittee of the House Farm Committee in Congress have Benson on the carpet. They want him to tell his story.

To bring you up to date on the Benson pork-buying program, he started it last fall. Hog prices were around $11 a hundred pounds. So, after Republicans from farm areas got him off dead center, Benson set out to buy pork. He had $85 million in the lard can. He was as happy as a bear in honey. But, what's happened? Hogs still sell for around $11—maybe $12, if you have choice No. 1 lightweights.

Representative POAGE, of Texas—he's chairman of the House Agricultural Committee—is not satisfied. He has called on top officials of the Department of Agriculture to explain why they pay higher prices to packers for finished pork, while packers still pay bottom prices for live hogs. POAGE is a Democrat, but two Iowa Republicans—Representatives GROSS and JENSEN—feel the same way. They want Benson to explain why he buys from packing companies, instead of buying hogs from farmers so they would benefit. Representative GROSS said cold storage of pork is at such a low point that it amounts to "buying on order by the packers."

That has a lot of farmers puzzled. Why don't hog prices go up, when supplies of pork in packing plant cold storage are so low? What holds the hog market down? House subcommittee members will ask Secretary Benson and other top officials of the Department of Agriculture, who are supposed to know. They are supposed to have ways of finding the answers. Congress wants to know. There's one more answer Congressmen want to find out. They want to know where the $85 million of hog money is going. It was earmarked to help farmers by raising live hog prices, but it goes to packers for finished pork products. Live hog prices don't come up. Farmers don't get the benefit. Who does?

Maybe Congress can dig out the facts, but that's hindsight. What's needed to strengthen farm prices is foresight and courage. A new overall farm program—bold measures, designed to raise farm prices and bring net incomes of family farmers up with the rest of the economy.

It takes a long time to get such a program, and lots of hard work. But, that's why grain farmers start planning years ahead, and building for tomorrow, GTA, the co-op way.

FRIDAY, *January 20, 1956.*

As we broadcast from St. Paul today, GTA's general manager, M. W. Thatcher, is testifying in Washington before the farm committee of the United States Senate. As a veteran of more than a quarter of a century in the struggle for economic equality for agriculture, and from his long experience representing grain farmers of the Midwest, he is giving a studied opinion of features that should be included in 1956 farm legislation.

Twelve points stand out in Mr. Thatcher's testimony, and here, in brief, is what they are:

First, price supports should immediately be raised to full 100 percent of parity. And, the old parity formula should be continued for basic crops until a new up-to-date formula can be devised by Congress. These measures are necessary because farm income is at least $8 billion below what it should be, with little hope of a rise in 1956.

Second, there must be permanent "set-asides" of feed grains. That is not being done at present. Mr. Thatcher is urging that a 4-month supply of feed grains be kept on hand at all times.

Third, to cut back the feed supply substantially, soil-bank payments must be high enough to be effcetive in high-yield areas.

Fourth, the acreage reserve program, for whatever crop it is used, should return to farmers parity income from diverted acres.

Fifth, corn must be kept as a basic commodity, not removed from the basic list as recommended by President Eisenhower, nor

should corn price supports be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Sixth, Government sales of crop surpluses in the domestic market should not be made at less than 105 percent of the support price plus carrying charges. Lowering that figure, as recommended by the President, would undercut market prices.

Seventh, arbitrary deductions for prepaid storage, now taken off parity loan rates, and private "swapping" of grain between Commodity Credit Corporation and processors, should be outlawed.

Eighth, about $4½ billion a year is now collected in excise taxes on tobacco, sugar, and alcohol. These and other farm crop tax revenues should be used to finance the farm program.

Ninth, a food stamp plan should be started immediately, and the cost charged to the national welfare, to feed underprivileged people in this country.

Tenth, emergency loans should be made available now to save the farm homes of hard-pressed family farmers.

Eleventh, present Federal housing aid discriminates against farm homes, and a special program to modernize or replace substandard farm homes is needed.

Twelfth, recommendations to the Department of Agriculture by special advisory committees, now kept secret, should be made public.

Mr. Thatcher also urged the Congressmen to make full use of GTA family farm survey results. This cost and income study, made in 1955, has been printed in book form, and copies furnished to the Congressmen. It is a graphic, realistic portrayal, county by county, of the postwar downward trend in farm income, covering the years 1950 through 1954. "With the present depressed condition of farm prices," Mr. Thatcher told the Congressmen, "many more fram homes will be wiped out unless the positive steps I have outlined are taken to aid family farmers."

And, that is the parity message that United States Senators received today from the bountiful Midwest farm belt. It is the voice of the farmer, and it is heard in Washington today through GTA, the co-op way.

Package Deal on New U. N. Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a news release issued by me on December 19, 1955, entitled "Package Deal on New U. N. Members."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACKAGE DEAL ON NEW U. N. MEMBERS

I warmly congratulate the representative of Nationalist China in the United Nations for his fearless veto of the admission of Outer Mongolia as an independent state.

Everyone who loves freedom owes a debt of gratitude to Dr. Tsiang and to free China, for this courageous refusal to bow the neck to the demand of Soviet Russia, that every nation must defer to her bullying, or all pending applicants would be barred from membership in the United Nations. Dr. Tsiang has performed a service for the United States, for all independent nations, and for those pitiful men and women who still love freedom though they dwell in the darkness of the new colonial slavery.

I only wish Dr. Tsiang had gone further, and used his veto against admission of the Communist governments of the four captive nations.

It is a matter of the deepest shame to most Americans that the delegate from the United States did not stand beside free China, and publicly refuse to yield to the threats of Soviet Russia.

Our Government pretended to abstain from taking any position. But for 2,000 years Pontius Pilate, who washed his hands of responsibility, has been the symbol of the lowest form of moral cowardice.

I do not know by what process the American Government committed itself to acecpt the Canadian proposal for a package deal on admission of new member nations into the United Nations. It is obvious, if the requirements of the charter have any significance that each nation seeking admission should be voted on individually. We have always in the past insisted on careful examination of the qualifications of each applicant for membership. To agree to a package deal on any terms was to make a major concession to the Soviet Union. In this instance we had to accept the ridiculous pretension that Outer Mongolia is either a nation or free, when it is neither. It is a dependency of the Soviet Union as well as legally part of the territory of China.

This package deal also permitted the Soviet Union to win recognition by the U. N. of four bastard governments, set up by Soviet arms and Soviet guile, to misrepresent the free people of Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania. William Z. Foster has told us why the Soviet Union is so eager to get additional votes in the U. N. Its aim is to add to the voting strength of the Soviet leviathan in its war of votes against the United States in the U. N. He does not tell us why the United States should accept such a hostile proposal. But we know, from Geneva, that consent of the United States to obliteration of the last vestiges of once free nations, is a step in the insidious campaign to inveigle us into full acceptance of the status quo in Europe, and desertion of the liberty-loving people of the captive nations.

I am therefore deeply shocked to learn that statements have appeared in the press attributed to American Government sources, and carrying the tone of a threat, saying that Nationalist China would be voted out of the U. N. if it dared to oppose the Soviet deal on this question. This is a strange new doctrine. The American people ought to understand clearly what it means. It means that a nation which uses its legal veto, against the will of the Communist leadership, is to be dismissed from the U. N. Such warnings indicate a subservience to the threats and bluster of the Soviet Union which is almost beyond belief. If this is what the spirit of Geneva is leading us to, let us face it now.

I hope that no member of the American Government will support, by any slightest approval, this threat to a free and fearless nation. I shall consider it a matter of the greatest importance to Congress if it appears that American officials have condoned attempts to punish free nations which do not bow to the commands of the Soviet Union.

I hope that Congress will give its early attention to the question of American policy in the United Nations. It must make absolutely certain that our American representatives accept no secret proposals to strengthen the Communist bloc. Rather let us insist now and always that any spokesman for the American people at any conference of the United Nations or its subsidiary organizations, speak out with the true voice of America in defense of all those who love freedom.

Current Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the January 12, 1956, issue of the Gallatin (Mo.) Democrat, entitled, "Mostly Negative—Gloom of Current Farm Situation Seen In Answers To Questionnaire."

The Missouri Farmers Association, representing more than 150,000 members in Missouri, asked 100 farmers and bankers the question, "How would you advise a young man in good health that had $25,000 and wanted to start farming?"

I believe my colleagues will be interested in the answers received, as shown by this news article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOSTLY NEGATIVE—GLOOM OF CURRENT FARM SITUATION SEEN IN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

How would you advise a young man in good health that had $25,000 and wanted to start farming? This question was recently asked by the Missouri Farmers Association of approximately 100 farmers and bankers.

The replies from this area included a variety of recommendations. For example P. W. Peterson, R. F. D. 1, Trenton, suggested "He could invest in a 'game of chance' at a Las Vegas casino, with some slight chance of hitting the jackpot. His farming venture would result in a somewhat slower, but much more certain loss, with no chance at a quick kill."

William M. Quinn, veteran member of the Missouri State Senate and the operator of a large farm advised, "Keep his $25,000 in cash in some good bank or banks, until the farm economy improves to the point where he could expect a fair return on his labor and investment, which he could not expect to do under present prices and conditions." Quinn added, "Having been actively engaged in farming for the past 40 to 45 years, I am convinced the national economy will in a few years, reach somewhere near the level of those engaged in farming, or vice versa."

Glenn Maize of Pattonsburg explained, "If he wants to keep his money together he had better stay out of farming."

W. R. Kendrick of Albany writes, "He had better get a job for a year or so and leave his money in the bank. * * * I think he would lose part of his investment and all of his labor."

Bob Hill, of Columbia, is executive manager of the Missouri Bankers Association. Hill is a graduate of the Missouri College of Agriculture and operates a farm near Columbia. He is a past president of Rotary International and a great booster of country cured ham. Hill wrote, "I would urge him not to start farming. He cannot make a fair return on his investment."

J. W. Waitman, of Tina, wrote, "In view of present conditions my advice to this young man is to invest his $25,000 in E bonds, postal savings, savings-bank account, or any other place where his capital will be safe and accessible. Then, if he must farm, obtain a job as a farmhand."

Richard Morris, Gilman City, says, "Take it easy and invest only a small part of his capital. Rent a farm, use a minimum of used machinery. Specialize in sheep and dairy cows. The farming situation should improve in 2 or 3 years."

Grayson McCrea, of Maysville, answered, "Some of we old hands at the business are having trouble showing a profit. Could be that you should counsel your young man to dig a small flower garden, let the weeds take it, find industrial work, invest nothing but his time, sit on the $25,000, and save a lot of worry."

Benton Brabtree, of Bethany, answered, "Buy a farm and rent it to a good operator to farm on grain shares."

Don W. Schooler, vice president of a Chillicothe bank, said, "If this young man insists on going into farming at this time, I would recommend that he try to lease some good land, a unit of from 200 to 300 acres, and go into crop production and forget about livestock at the present time."

E. R. Vyrostek, Gallatin, told of the heartbreaks that go with farming. He explained that he was 75 years old and had gone broke 3 times but that he raised 5 boys and 1 girl. They are all married and have places of their own. He concluded, "A young couple, that really like farming, can make a go of it and make money even in the face of coming events, and enjoy life."

The Committee for an Effective Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news release issued by me on December 30, 1955, entitled "The Committee for an Effective Congress."

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMITTEE FOR AN EFFECTIVE CONGRESS

The so-called Committee for an Effective Congress, which has displayed marked hostility to anti-Communist Members of Congress, has issued a violent denunciation of certain Senators who do not agree with its left-wing policies. This denunciation is worth careful study because it gives us the program which the left-wing collectivist faction has worked on to win control of Congress in 1956.

Properly to understand the aims of this committee, it is necessary to translate their statements from the "double-speak" of 1984, which they habitually employ, into simple English.

The name of the Committee for an Effective Congress is double-speak for "Committee for a Left-Wing Congress." The committee has operated over the last 8 years giving research assistance and funds to those Members of Congress who support the measures leading to a collectivist welfare state at home, and a collectivist one world in foreign policy.

Among the directors of the committee are Stringfellow Barr, George Biddle, Oscar Hammerstein II, Marshall MacDuffie, Robert Nathan, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Telford Taylor, Sumner Welles, and Maurice Rosenblatt, its campaign director.

This so-called nonpartison Committee for an Effective Congress is working, as I said, for the election of a left-wing Congress. It is also working for election of a centrally dominated Congress, whose members will obey the orders of their mentors, regardless of the people of their districts. The committee asks for contributions to provide its obedient Congressmen with research and technical assistance during the session, and financial aid in the campaign. The committee is, of course, serenely indifferent to the sentiments of the voters in the Congressional districts. It believes in the domination of both parties from some mysterious center, and in insuring the election of its supporters by heavy expenditures of funds and clever publicity, to overwhelm public opinion in the districts.

The committee is also working for a minority-dominated Congress. It hopes to control the election of enough members in key districts, to dominate the work of both parties and ignore the vast majority of the American people.

The committee is part of the "apparat" which is working to bring about in this country a single monolithic party, directed and managed from above, but presented to the people behind two different masks, one labeled "Democratic" and the other labeled "Republican," but both forced by this hidden minority to move ever farther to the left.

The plan is to name leftwing candidates in both parties in key districts, so that the voters will be confronted with Hobson's choice between two leftwing candidates with different labels. Whether the voters vote for a leftwing candidate, or stay at home, a minority will have won control of the district and an important advantage in control of the next Congress.

By dangling promises of support, or warnings of opposition, before present-day Members of Congress, the committee is building up a bloc of members who will vote for leftwing measures in the hope of leftwing support for reelection. Thus they gain leverage control of the Congress in office and use it to elect their bloc in the coming Congress.

The Committee for an Effective Congress is afraid and it tells us what it is afraid of, in double speech. It is afraid of what it calls "the hard core who voted against the censure of the junior Senator from Wisconsin." They are afraid this group of Senators will "hamstring both Republican and Democratic Presidents in the area of foreign policy." Translated into American English, this means the committee is desperately afraid some of the Republican Senators will speak out against our Achesonian foreign policy, and the double-speak peace of Geneva.

It is afraid Members of Congress will insist on an impartial investigation of the fund for the Republic.

It is afraid the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will carry on its investigation of Communists, even if they have penetrated into the sacred precincts of newspapers which have blatantly supported the left-wing blocs in our political life.

It is afraid Congress will make a real investigation of the Government security system and find out why it has been so very difficult to remove important pro-Communists from Government offices.

The committee admits—in double speech—that it wants to keep discussion in Congress sidetracked on matters like farm prices, electric power, school construction, and insignificant tax reductions because it is afraid if Congress is permitted to discuss what it calls "Geneva, another Yalta," or the crisis with Red China, or, to quote them again, "subversion rampant," the committee's leverage control will vanish.

What we are confronted with here is something more than a left-wing bloc trying to elect a handful of left-wing Congressmen. This is a carefully designed strategic program for the subversion of the Congress and of the legislative power. If the committee succeeds in its aims, the Congress will represent a militant left-wing minority group. The American people will be helpless.

I believe Congress must deal with this threat to the Constitution at once.

I propose to introduce in this Senate a resolution paralleling that of Representative Clardy, calling for appointment of a special Senate committee to investigate the Committee for an Effective Congress and bring in a report before the close of this session on the following points, among others:

Funds of the committee.

Sources of its funds.

Interlocking relation with other bodies, including Communist fronts.

Attempts to influence the legislative program of the Congress.

Attempts to bring about the election or defeat of individual Members of Congress.

Influence upon the power of the people in their districts to control the choice of their Representatives.

Influence upon the independence of the legislative branch and the legislative process.

Influences designed to weaken the two-party system or set up hidden controls by which parties which appeared independent could be made by the leverage principle to operate as one.

Congress has tolerated for years attempts from many directions to undermine its influence, weaken its independence, smear its loyal and patriotic Members, and render it helpless to carry out its constitutional duties.

It is time Congress struck back.

The Committee for an Effective Congress has provided us with a challenge to the independence of Congress which we dare not ignore.

The Lesson of December 7, 1941

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short statement and two of the editorial comments which appeared in the newspapers of Missouri on December 7, 1955.

The first is a column, Timely Observations, by Mr. Arthur Burrowes, editor of the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press. Honored this last year by the Missouri School of Journalism as one of the outstanding newspapers of America, the St. Joseph News-Press has given news and editorial leadership for more than half a century.

The second editorial is by Robert M. White, II, editor of the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger. On October 11, tribute was paid to the Mexico Ledger on the completion of 100 years of service to its community. It is numbered among the great small-town papers of America. Its editor, Bob White, is a member of the freedom of information committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

These two editorials remind us of the lesson we should have learned on December 7, 1941, a lesson we should never forget.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of December 7, 1955]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Today is the day of sorrow. December 7. Never in all American history has this Nation, founded in the last quarter of the 18th century, suffered so humiliating a defeat. The majestic Winston Churchill, master of rhetoric, who made history and wrote history, has not—amidst all his lofty language so gorgeously rich—given the world anything quite so colorful, quite so expressive as three simple words from the mouth of another golden-tongued statesman. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt called December 7, 1941, the "day of infamy" he spoke the thought of America's millions.

Never in our history has the proud flag, defended by General Jackson at New Orleans, been so insulted as in that sneak attack of the imperial Japanese forces against the might and the glory of this land of the Star Spangled Banner. Never in all our history, even in George Washington's sorriest meditations at Valley Forge, or Abraham Lincoln's melancholy after Bull Run, have American hearts been as heavy.

When President Roosevelt gave forth utterance to that word-trinity stigmatizing December 7, 1941, he did more than declare infamous a certain date. He indicted a vast people, whose war lords were steeped in most scarlet international vice. For in those very days that the secret war plans were going forward in the Isle of Nippon, peace plenepotentiaries from the Land of the Rising Sun were making mock of America in the capital city of Washington.

It is as if it were yesterday, though it is now 14 years ago. And those of us who will live long enough will remember the awfulness of that day though decades may have passed. Pearl Harbor, who ever can forget that name? Pearl Harbor, the spot of America's most terrifying degradation. Men could not believe their radios. Men read with frenzied gasps their newspapers the next morning. For be it recalled "the day of infamy" ironically, was a Sunday.

The Pacific Fleet was at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Hawaii, most colorful diadem of all America's splendid jewels, known as our territorial possessions. Eighty-six ships of our United States Navy were at anchor there that December 7. At 7:55 a. m. Hawaiian time, 12:55 p. m. St. Joseph time, American men, women, and children were between church and home. They had been to morning worship of the God of our fathers known of old to whom the unnamed laureate poet of England, Rudyard Kipling, paid noble homage in The Recessional.

More than 100 Japanese planes and a number of midget submarines attacked that Pacific Fleet. Totally lost was the Battleship *Arizona*, now a national monument to our gallant dead. Severely damaged were battleships *Oklahoma, Nevada, California, West Virginia*, 3 destroyers, 1 target ship, 1 minelayer. Damaged and then repaired were battleships *Pennsylvania, Maryland*, and *Tennessee*, cruisers *Helena, Honolulu*, and *Raleigh*.

Millions of dollars were lost when the Japanese invaders destroyed 80 Navy airplanes and 97 Army airplanes. The human casualties of that December 7 were Navy, 2,117 officers and men killed, 876 wounded; Army, 228 officers and men killed, 396 wounded. No less ignoble, though less dramatic, was the simultaneous bombing of the Philippines. Less than a month later came the Death March of Bataan, the glory of brave men, bravest of the brave. There the surrender of 15,000 United States troops, 40,000 in the Philippine Army and 100,000 Philippine reservists.

Volumes could be written, yet the world does not yet know, just what preceded the infamy of Pearl Harbor. We do know that a handful of men in the Pentagon this day silently and secretly commemorate another day, December 4, 1941. For that was the day a code message was received that a portion of the Japanese fleet had left its home base and was "sailing toward some objective eastward."

It is written for the historian if he will look that this December 4 warning was received at the United States Army communications center in Washington, D. C. Forever unexplained are the circumstances that instead of an alert immediately to the commanders at Pearl Harbor, all was kept a dead secret until shortly before noon December 7, 1941. Alas that it must be recorded, Japan already was bombing the American targets at Pearl Harbor.

Nothing can wipe out the ignominy of Pearl Harbor. That ignominy must stand on our escutscheon forever, notwithstanding that in this month of December and on this 7th day, that anniversary, defeated Japan is our friend, defeated Germany is our friend. It is the irony of all our history. Let us rename this day. Let it be the Day of Recollection. Let December 7, 1941, be forever imprinted in our minds that never again shall we be unprepared, off guard, asleep. Let us dedicate our Nation's hopes for peace with honor to that same Diety Rudyard Kipling implored. Day of Recollection.

"Far-called, our navies melt away
On dune and headland sinks the fire.
Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Ninavah and Tyre.
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—Lest we forget.

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger of December 7, 1955]

NEARLY ALL OF THE DEAD HAD BEEN BURIED

Inside the B–24 there in the bright morning sky, were the weird sounds of man's valiant efforts to fly. There was the heavy growl of the four motors. There was the clanking, unsteadiness of the constant vibration. There was the uselessness of trying to shout above the clamor, the uselessness of worry by the twenty-odd passengers who had flown through the night—worry wouldn't keep the plane in the air.

But now the B–24 was slowly letting down. Ahead on the horizon was the dark shoulder of the Hawaiian mountains—the first land we had seen since looking down through the cracks around the bomb-bay when we took off, to see the blur of lights and the blackness of the earth of our homeland blending into the darkness of the night.

We were not to see that homeland again for almost 3 years. Some of us had seen it for the last time, there, through the bomb-bay cracks.

And then the crew chief came back from the pilot's compartment and told us to sit down. We were landing. Of course there weren't anything like safety belts. And after bouncing once, tottering slightly on one wheel, we were bumping down the runway on the first of a hundred bloodstained islands to come.

The time was August 1942.

The place was Hickam Field, T. H.

Hickam had won its place in history by then.

It won its place on an earlier sunny morning when Japanese planes whined out of the windswept sky above the sparkling waters below to scrawl in blood Pearl Harbor.

Hickam, that morning in August, was still bulletmarked from the strafing. Was still pocked by the bombing. Only the dead had been buried.

And later at nearby Pearl Harbor we saw the great lifeless corpse of capsized ships, twisted steel rigging, bent cranes—low monuments of vomiting enemy guns, screaming ricochets, the corruption of an exploded bomb.

There, even the dead hadn't been buried.

Some were still inside the lifeless hulls of the once-mighty ships.

That was August 1942.

Some of those dead—one was the son of a fellow with us—are still unburied. Just as the lesson of Pearl Harbor must never be buried either.

The lesson is "Be prepared."

Don't let the blood of our youth by wishful thinking, by selfish, political efforts to win votes through denying youth proper training and weapons.

Don't risk freedom on earth—let alone at home—by not bothering to know your potential enemy well enough, by assuming you are stronger than you are, that he is weaker than he is.

For if we don't remember the lesson of Pearl Harbor, another plane will cross the endless sky. This time in the deadly silence of speed faster than sound. And inside it will be still another Mexico boy off to the first of a hundred bloody islands. A boy who today may be in Mexico High, or Hardin, or Eugene Field, McMillan, Hawthorne.

The Problem of Large Political Campaign Contributions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many people have long been justifiably concerned about a serious problem in American politics—the importance of large political campaign contributions to the carrying out of our essential electoral processes.

Last year Mr. Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, undertook a very commendable project of encouraging small campaign contributions from millions of individual citizens so as to relieve the reliance of our national parties on sources of large contributions. The project was to be carried out with the help of the Advertising Council of America. The first step in organizing this program in time for the 1956 elections was to be the formation of an 8-man committee to represent the 2 major political parties. The Democratic Party selected its four committee members. The Republican Party failed to appoint four members. As a result of this simple stalling, this public-spirited project has now had to be abandoned by the advertising council.

Last week 1 of the 2 national parties announced that it was able to raise $5 million in a single night by $100-a-plate dinners throughout the country. I think it indicates the nature of the problem confronting our form of popular government that no American would have any doubt which party can raise a $5-million-campaign fund overnight in this fashion. And that same party evidently has found it impossible to participate in a project for raising necessary campaign expenses in tiny contributions by millions of individual citizens themselves.

As a result, a very worth-while experiment in political democracy has had to

be abandoned. I hope it may be revived for elections to come in future years.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the New York Times of January 25, 1956, discussing this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUTLER SAYS GOP UPSET FUNDS PLAN—DEMOCRATIC LEADER CHARGES FOE SABOTAGED PACT TO PROMOTE CONTRIBUTIONS

(By W. H. Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The Democratic national chairman charged today that Republican leaders had sabotaged a $10 million bipartisan advertising campaign to encourage political campaign contributions in 1956.

Paul M. Butler told a luncheon conference the Republicans had failed to nominate half of a bipartisan sponsoring committee required by the Advertising Council of America before it would undertake the effort.

That the project has been dropped was confirmed by Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post and Times Herald, who had undertaken to organize the campaign on behalf of the advertising council.

Mr. Graham also confirmed that there had been an earlier agreement between Mr. Butler and his Republican opposite number, Leonard W. Hall, on principles and policies of the effort directed at having Americans make contributions "to the political party of your choice."

REPUBLICANS SILENT

There was no comment from Republican headquarters. Their highest officials, including Chairman Hall and L. Richard Guylay, publicity director, were en route to San Francisco by plane. The central idea behind the campaign was that the advertising council would make available about $10 million worth of advertising time and space in all media, including radio, television, newspapers, magazines, and outdoor advertising signs.

These advertisements, beginning 4 weeks before the national conventions and continuing for about 10 days after candidates had been selected, would urge every citizen to make some campaign fund contribution to help the parties do their job. There would have been no mixing of funds, but each party would have received the amount sent to it.

The project would have been carried out under sponsorship of an eight-man committee, equally divided between Republicans and Democrats and selected by the parties. The Democrats picked their committee, but the Republicans told Mr. Graham they had not been able to find four persons willing to serve on the group.

It was understood the original idea had been to have former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman serve on the group.

Mr. Truman agreed but Mr. Hoover refused, although he was urged to give consent both by Mr. Hall and by Sherman Adams, the President's principal deputy, who spoke in the name of the White House.

MARTIN ALSO DECLINES

A subsequent suggestion was that Representative Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House, might head the GOP sponsoring committee. But he declined on grounds that the program was not properly organized.

Mr. Graham declined to be drawn into a discussion as to the causes of failure.

"We simply could not organize the proper bipartisan sponsoring committee," he said. "The Advertising Council takes on only truly noncontroversial and nonpolitical projects."

Mr. Butler said the Republicans had dropped out of the Graham plan after it had become apparent that their "Salute to Eisenhower" dinners would raise about $5 million for the 1956 campaigns. A single political committee is limited by law to $3 million a year.

Mr. Butler said the Democrats had hoped to raise about $1,500,000 as their share from the Advertising Council campaign. He expressed confidence that the Democrats would raise the money, but said "it will be harder and more expensive."

The Democratic chairman estimated that about $7,500,000 would be required to finance the Democratic electoral effort in 1956 through a series of committees, including the national committee, the House and Senate campaign committees, and an independent group for the eventual party nominee.

Speaking of advertising agencies, Mr. Butler said his party now had found an agency to handle its campaign. Earlier, he said heads of "about 25 advertising agencies told me their clients would not like it if they handled the Democratic account." He did not name the agency that agreed to handle it.

1956 Economic Report of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's 1956 Economic Report clearly indicates that the goals of maximum employment, production and purchasing power envisioned by the Employment Act of 1946, were achieved by the economy in 1955. As the President indicated, we are now upon the threshold of a $400 billion economy. Of particular interest and concern to all of us is the fact that our economic achievements in 1955 in terms of increased output and employment were accomplished without price inflation.

Mr. Speaker, the dollar value of all goods and services created by the economy in 1955 gives a clear indication of the very rapid advances made in the recovery and expansion phases of the business cycle. The Gross National Product which is a measure of the value of the production created was $387.4 billion in 1955. This was nearly $27 billion above the value of all goods and services produced in 1954. It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the economic projections of the prophets of gloom and doom missed their mark by wide margins, and I am sure as the economy continues to expand in 1956, that the people will realize the political nature of their prophecies which we can also expect to magnify out of proportion the soft spots which always are present, even in an expanding economy.

I am sure all of us are greatly cheered by the President's statement that total employment rose by over 3 million and unemployment declined by one-half million between the last 3 months of 1954 and the corresponding months of 1955. As you already are aware, Mr. Speaker, total employment during 1955 reached an alltime record high of 65 million. This in spite of the fact that additions to the civilian labor force increased by over 2½ million.

One indicator of the general prosperity which prevailed in 1955 and which accompanied this steady increase in employment was the increase in the average workweek. This resulted in considerable overtime work, especially in the latter part of 1955. These two factors, combined with a steady rise in average weekly earnings, brought labors' income earnings to record levels in almost all industries.

But of equal importance, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that unemployment as a percentage of the civilian labor force declined from 5.2 percent during the first quarter of 1955, to 3.4 percent for the last 2 quarters of the year. This is the level of unemployment, Mr. Speaker, which is below that which most economists point out is normal for years in which the country is free from war or severe economic recessions. The 2.3 million unemployed during the last quarter of 1955, although regrettable, consists primarily of new entrants into the labor force and those in the process of changing or shifting jobs to new industries or occupations because of technological advancements. The simple facts are that unemployment is near an irreducible minimum.

Another indicator of the well being of the economy is measured by the purchasing power which people have to buy goods and services. In 1955 disposable incomes, that is that income which people have to spend or save after paying all taxes, increased by $14.4 billion over that prevailing in 1954, setting a new record of $268.2 billion. But most important of all, Mr. Speaker, was the fact that although disposable income and resulting expenditures reached new levels, the price level index remained relatively stable.

It is small wonder that President Eisenhower was able to report to the American people in his 1956 economic report that—

Full employment, rising incomes, and a stable dollar have been cherished goals of our society. The practical attainment of these ideals during 1955 was the year's greatest economic achievement.

The President's statement—

It is reasonable to expect that high levels of production, employment, and income will be broadly sustained during the coming year.

Is equally encouraging.

Somewhat Confusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Los Angeles Herald-Express of January 19, 1956:

SOMEWHAT CONFUSING

The President has called for farm legislation the core of which is the "soil bank" and other methods of inducing farmers to cut back on their production.

But the President also recommended that Congress act to authorize construction of the upper Colorado River basin water storage dams to throw open half a million new farm acres to agriculture.

We are told that our Government storage bins are filled to overflowing with surplus farm products which must be sold here or abroad, even in Iron Curtain countries, and that is why we must pay farmers to stop production on a good part of their acreage.

If the upper Colorado project is built at a cost of billions of dollars it will take away water that should come to southern California from the lower Colorado and that is a major concern of everyone in this section of the country.

California's Republican Congress CRAIG HOSMER, of Long Beach, has thrown another monkey wrench into the confusion machinery by announcing that he will present to the House evidence that nearly 21 million acres of the best American croplands are lying idle and unused for any purpose.

"With millions of acres of the best farmland awaiting the plow in areas where the rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation would force this great new burden of the upper Colorado River project on the American taxpayers," HOSMER stated.

HOSMER said that the cost of bringing the millions of idle farm acres into full production would run only from $15 to $150 an acre.

"Compare that with the $5,000 an acre cost of building the upper Colorado project," he added, "and you see how inconceivable the Reclamation Bureau's scheme is."

It would seem that while we are talking about a "soil bank" for the farmers already having their land in full production, we should think a little about keeping these virgin lands around the upper Colorado project locked in their present "soil bank" until we have use for them.

Your Congressman Wants a Piece of Your Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Ruth Boyer Scott entitled "Your Congressman Wants a Piece of Your Mind" from the current issue of the Family Circle magazine. I am sure that many of my colleagues will be interested in the article which follows:

YOUR CONGRESSMAN WANTS A PIECE OF YOUR MIND

(By Ruth Boyer Scott)

"You're wasting your time, writing Congress about legislation," Bill said to his neighbor. "An individual hasn't a chance. It takes a big organization to put over a letter campaign." I listened for the reply.

"Maybe so, maybe not," John answered. "To make sure, I'm going to put the facts as I see them in a letter to my congressman."

What happens to letters like John's? I decided to follow the mail into the offices of Senators and Representatives to learn for myself how effective letters are from individual men and women. The best way to gage this is to listen to the persons who receive your letters.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON, Republican Congresswomen from Ohio since 1940, talks about Mrs. Anna V. Coleman, "Cleveland's battling widow," who once wrote suggesting legislation to end taxes levied on pensions of widows of policemen and firemen.

"Widows receive such a pittance," Mrs. Coleman wrote, "that surely they should not be required to pay taxes on it."

"I was glad to introduce a bill at her request," says Mrs. BOLTON. "Its provisions were incorporated in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954—exempting up to $1,200 of pensions and annuities from income taxes of all persons."

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, of Alabama, Democratic candidate for Vice President in 1952, tells of veterans in his State who wrote that they'd tried to buy GI housing in rural areas but couldn't get mortgage lenders.

"Their letters," he says, "helped to bring about the direct loan on GI houses, which I sponsored and which has helped thousands to get homes who couldn't have otherwise." By this legislation certain areas of the country are designated as 'direct-loan areas' for GI housing.

HOW TO GET ACTION

What kind of letters bring about such immediate action? The heart of what I learned is that your letters will get attention if they are legible, specific, clear, and brief, stating what you're for or against, and why.

While your idea won't go automatically into a law and may never inspire a separate law, many such ideas are incorporated into the big general laws, like housing, taxation, and social security.

A typewritten letter is preferable, but many handwritten letters command respect because of their constructive ideas. But be sure that the writing is easily read, and take extra pains to be brief. It's the 6- to 10-page illegibly handwritten letter that is a waste of effort.

Mimeographed letters are also discouraging. As one Congressman put it, "We don't know whether John Smith intended to send the letter or merely signed it as a favor to his organization's legilsative chairman, who passed out 200 copies at a meeting."

Keep in mind the tremendous demand on a Congressman's time. If he reaches his office at 9 a. m. (some come earlier, some later), he has only an hour till 10 a. m. committee meetings to read mail, see visitors, review pending legislation, and sign letters. So 5 or 6 rambling pages may destroy the value of your letter. Your Representative may read his short letters and put yours aside for more time that may never come.

Being brief will also help you to be specific. If a person writes, "I wish you'd do something about my housing," the recipient doesn't know whether the writer is concerned with rental housing, house buying, or house building.

WHERE TO SEND IT

Whom do you write? Because the liaison between Senate and House is far from perfect, you're wise to write both to your own Representative and your two Senators.

The advantages in doing so are that they have a personal interest in your vote and so will probably refer your letter to the congressional committee concerned. They can give it added weight if, instead of sending it with a formal note, they write the committee, "We think this suggestion merits your attention." It's an extra asset if your Senator or Representative is on the committee concerned. He may himself introduce your idea into the legislation.

"Write each person a separate letter," one Congressman warned. "It's only human, when a letter is marked copy," he said, "for each party to discount its importance, assuming the other recipient has given it full attention."

It's particularly effective to present your ideas for legislation directly to a chairman of a committee. That way they will certainly go to the committee staff, which culls the ideas from all letters, puts like ideas together, and works some into actual wording of legislation. It makes no difference to most committee staffs whether the writers are people of prominence or ordinary folks. The well-thought-out letter is judged on its merit. As one committee staff member told me, "Little people can have big ideas."

Any library or Government office has the blue-bound Congressional Directory, with the names of committee chairmen and all Members of House and Senate. There's a separate listing of committee assignments of all Members of Congress.

Sometimes it's a puzzler to find which committee has a bill. If you don't know, you can write first to find out, or write to the most probable committee, trusting that your letter will be forwarded, if necessary.

You can assume in writing that the Congress Member or committee chairman is friendly. The crank letter or the vituperative letter may be answered formally but is unlikely to influence legislation. Also, the perennial letter writer may lose his effectiveness over the years unless he takes care that each letter presents a sound what and why.

PUTTING IDEALS TO WORK

Citizens propose new laws on a wide variety of topics. Some have such merit that a Congressman goes into action on it at once.

A constituent of Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, wrote to recommend that pensions be taken away from Government workers found guilty of subversion. "I introduced such a bill," Senator MUNDT relates, "and it became a law in 1954."

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, recalls Mr. Charlie Crump, of De Kalb, Tex., who, while John Dillinger was causing gangster terror through the Midwest, wrote: "Why don't you offer a bill by which the Attorney General could offer a reward for capture or information leading to capture of such criminals?"

Mr. PATMAN introduced such a bill, which became law on June 6, 1934. "The law," he says, "aided directly in stopping the criminal careers of Dillinger and others like him."

Representative RUSSELL V. MACK, Republican, of Washington, cites a couple of cases from the numerous ones where he found letters from home helpful.

"A lot of writers," he says, "protested to me about the junk mail crowding their mailboxes. As a result of combined efforts, junk mail is apparently junked.

Congressman MACK also tells of veterans who wrote him about the injustice of not getting social-security credit while in service. This could mean loss of a pension for lack of enough quarters of coverage. The law was changed to allow those who served between September 1940, and June 1953, to get social-security credit if they were not getting other retirement credit during that period.

WORDS INTO PRINT

As a citizen you even have the power to be a legislative witness—without ever going to Washington, D. C. You can write a committee asking that your statement be published in the collected hearings on a particular bill. These publications are widely and carefully studied. Probably less effective a method is to ask your Congressman to incorporate your statement for or against legislation in the appendix of the Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

You can also try to influence legislation through the executive branch of the Government—such as the Post Office or Treasury Departments or the Veterans' Administra-

tion. But you may be spreading your effort a little thin by doing so. It's true that some legislation originates with a draft in the executive agencies, but your Congressmen are elected to make your laws.

You can also take official stands on pending laws through various organizations you're allied with. Such views may be communicated officially at committee meetings. This holds true for State, county, and local laws as well as national ones.

You needn't be uneasy about breaking a law by writing your Congressman. I nailed that fear with with official statement: "Lobbying laws apply only to those who are paid for attempting to influence legislation." As a private citizen you are unrestricted in decent expression of your opinion.

In fact, if you write a letter to Congress, you're exercising the oldest constitutional privilege in the Bill of Rights—guaranteeing your right "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Even the simplest letter expressing a view on legislation is a petition. It may have only one signature, but as a petition it commands respect if it contains sound and clearly expressed ideas. Just be sure to take this capsule advice of Representative CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat of California: "Don't talk in generalities. Say, 'I'm for (or against) this for these reasons—1, 2, 3, 4.'" Such a letter helps make democracy work.

Address by Thomas E. Dewey at Salute-To-Eisenhower Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last Friday I had the pleasure of hearing an address by the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey at the salute-to-Eisenhower dinner in Baltimore.

It was obvious at the time that the hundreds of guests were as impressed by the speech as I was, so I announced that I felt it should be given wider distribution through inclusion in the Appendix to the RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the address included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE THOMAS E. DEWEY AT THE SALUTE-TO-EISENHOWER DINNER IN BALTIMORE, MD., ON JANUARY 20, 1956

Tonight we celebrate one of the great moments in American history—the third anniversary of the inauguration of Dwight Eisenhower as President of the United States. This happy meeting is one of many in the Nation through which the feeling of admiration, confidence, respect and personal affection for Dwight Eisenhower is expressed by the American people. I am sure you are as happy as I am to join in this nationwide expression of our confidence and esteem for the man who is leading our country with unparalleled success.

In recent months I saw at firsthand that this confidence and esteem is shared by people all over the world.

Sometimes you have to get a long way from home to see things in perspective. Sometimes you have to get outside the forest to see how far one tree can rise above all others.

Last fall I traveled around the world and visited a good many Asian nations between Istanbul and Tokyo. It was immediately after the outset of that trip that the President's illness occurred and I encountered the full reaction in a dozen countries. Some of those countries are friendly allies of the United States. Some are so neutral that they often seem to lean to the Communist side. In every one of them, not only the leaders, but the people expressed a sense of intense personal dismay and concern. The clergy of every important religious faith in the world prayed for the recovery of President Eisenhower. The newspapers of every shade of opinion throughout the free world expressed their prayerful hopes for his recovery. The people of many nations had almost the same sense of personal concern as did every American.

It was inspiring and deeply moving to find that the head of the Government of the United States was so cherished and beloved personally in so many lands.

You can explain this phenomenon in many ways. One that interested me particularly appeared in a newspaper in India. The paper is on the left and has rarely been kindly in its comments on the United States. The reporter who attended the Geneva Conference of the great powers reflected the views of his paper. Yet in summarizing the Conference he wrote this remarkable statement:

"President Eisenhower arrived at the meeting at the Summit and by sheer force of personal character he dragged all the others up to the summit with him."

It is this kind of feeling which has permeated the world.

Dwight Eisenhower has rendered a similar service to America. He has lifted the science of government and political leadership far above any level we have seen in our time. He has refused to be partisan. Under the most intense strains and tension he has maintained his position as President of all the people and his dedication to the welfare of every one of them. He has welded a new sense of unity among our people.

I can remember discussing this subject of national unity myself on a few occasions back in 1948 but there weren't enough people who agreed with me.

At this moment we are reading violent speeches by some who seem determined to destroy the unity of our bipartisan foreign policy. There are some eager candidates who would like to isolate and attack a word or a phrase attributed to the Secretary of State to divert attention from the peace and prosperity our Nation is enjoying. I am sure you have been profoundly impressed, as I have, by the sudden flowering on the front pages of this crop of experts in foreign affairs of whose experience in that area we had not previously been aware. I am sad to report to you that closer examination will reveal that their expertness lies in the parsing of sentences and not in saving the peace of the world.

Fortunately there are not many of these folks. A large majority of the Members of both parties in both Houses of the Congress have given stanch support to our policies around the world. The Congress has often acted almost unanimously on these matters. As a result our Government has been immensely successful in resisting the Red conquests. It would be most regrettable if ambition should lead any officeseeker to undermine our national position to the point where the Kremlin would attempt to resume its conquest of the free world piece by piece.

How do these critics propose to prevent the Russians from resuming their march of conquest? Do they suggest that we return to ancient policies of weakness and isolation? If not, what do they propose, if anything at all? Up to now they have done nothing but raise a ruckus because our Government has displayed the courage, character, and strength to stop one war and prevent others.

The streets of history are littered with the bones of people who did not have the fortitude to defend themselves when aggressors attacked. The peoples who were obliterated by the Chengis Khans of succeeding centuries all too often had one thing in common: They had the kind of faltering political leadership which was unable to build alliances, unwilling to face danger, and unable to repel it. I suggest to you that the American people want no such epitaph. So long as the policies of Dwight Eisenhower prevail, this will never be our epitaph.

I am old enough to remember the time when it was said that America was too proud to fight. The Kaiser believed it and while we were at peace his submarines torpedoed American ships. So America was plunged into war. History has now established that if the Kaiser had ever dreamed that he would be opposed by the might of the United States, World War I would never have been launched.

The dismal 1930's brought forth all kinds of freak pacifist movements. They also brought forth political leadership which refused to listen when Hitler screamed his intentions to conquer the world. There was no political leadership in power which said "Be strong, be unafraid and you will remain free." Winston Churchill was a voice in the wilderness crying his warning to all who would listen and not enough did. So, once again, the aggressors felt safe to attack without fear of effective opposition. It is not alone the verdict of Winston Churchill but the solemn verdict of history that if Britain and the United States had been strong and courageous in advance, World War II would never have occurred.

Now, once again we are asked to listen to those who believe that by turning our backs and shutting our eyes we can keep our freedom and that of the free world. Is this counsel right today when it has been wrong through all history? Just the last 15 years is strewn with the bodies of enslaved Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania, Rumania, Hungary and Tibet among others and, of course, the catastrophic fall of China.

Should it be necessary to remind anyone that such a march, if continued, would cover the earth? Would these new experts we are hearing from resume the policies of 1950? Surely they must remember that our Government then in power officially announced that Korea was outside our defense perimeter and within 5 months the Russians accepted that invitation to conquest.

I supported then and I still admire the courage and decisiveness with which our Government entered that conflict after it started. But I would have admired much more a government which had the courage to face up to realities and issue no invitations to war.

We now have a leader and a Government who issues no invitations to war by creating power vacuums.

Three years ago today when Dwight Eisenhower took the oath of office our Nation was still engaged in that apparently unending and unendable war in Korea. The free world was threatened with the loss of the balance of power in oil by a mad premier in Iran. Italy and Yugoslavia were threatening to go to war over Trieste. Egypt and Britain were at swords point over the Suez Canal. French Indochina was torn by a struggle between the Communists and the Vietnamese. Ratification of a European Defense Community was already failing. It appeared that Austria would never be rid of

its Russian occupation. Even the Americas had been successfully invaded: The Russians had established their first satellite in this hemisphere by conquering Guatemala from within.

Then the Eisenhower administration took over and went to work. Soon the madman of Iran was deposed and a strong friendly government was established. We achieved a North Atlantic Treaty Alliance with a strong, free German Republic as a partner. The Trieste question was patiently negotiated and peaceably settled and there was no war between Italy and Yugoslavia. The Suez Canal crisis was peacefully solved. Under the worst possible handicaps, half of Vietnam was saved. Guatemala was liberated by its own people and the Russian stronghold in our hemisphere has been cleansed. A peace treaty was finally negotiated for Austria and for the first time in nearly a generation her people are now free.

Personally I am proud to be a supporter of a Government with such a record of achievement for peace and human freedom. Never in history has the liberty of so many people been preserved or won without war and by courage, skill, and great statesmanship alone. I cannot follow the advice of those who wish to return to the tragic policies of the past. I cannot accept the reasoning of those who wish to return to weakness, with surrender of the free world inch by inch, island by island, nation by nation.

The great difference between this administration and its recent predecessors is that it understands the course of history. It has the skill and the foresight to be a leader and not a victim in the shaping of history.

Of course the fundamental is that dictators do not embark on wars unless they expect to win. If they know they will be opposed by overwhelming force they do not risk their necks in aggression. The great change of the past 3 years is that the aggressor knows, at last, that if he starts a conquest he will be opposed by overwhelming force. He knows we are strong, united and unfraid. He knows he cannot win.

That is why the Soviets now sing of peace, of trade, of peaceful coexistence. The political weakness of the free world has come to an end.

We are proud tonight to salute the kind of courage that has put out the fires of war time and again because the aggressor knows today that we are neither craven nor helpless. The struggle for peace is not won yet. It will last a long time and ultimate victory will call for the best that is in us. I believe the kind of Government we now have is what our people want in a time when America has been called to leadership and the peace of the world rests upon us.

We are going through a curious political period. A presidential election is coming along and for the first time in a great many years we Republicans find ourselves in a very happy position. We have done for our country what others failed to do. We are witnessing the mournful spectacle of eager candidates for the opposition nomination who cannot scrape up an issue. There really is nothing so sad as a candidate without an issue, except a whole collection of candidates without an issue among them.

More Americans are at work today producing more, earning more, and investing more than ever before. The Eisenhower administration has proved that our country can enjoy prosperity and peace at the same time.

The Eisenhower administration has brought to our Government a new and refreshing faith in the American people. As a result, price controls, wage controls, and a monumental bureaucracy were lifted from the backs of our people.

That faith in the people has been rewarded and we have just had the extraordinary experience of seeing a balanced budget presented by the President of the United States.

The largest tax reductions in history were enacted under the Eisenhower administration, under the novel theory that the American people were entitled to spend more of their own money.

Unemployment insurance has been extended to 4 million additional workers and social security has been extended to 10 million additional Americans. The Government has been getting out of business and turning it back to the people.

Whichever issue you select—prosperity, peace, honesty in government, loyalty, security, and social progress—the Eisenhower administration has served the people well. It has served them better than they have ever been served before, and it is heartwarming to feel that they know it and are grateful.

Once again there is opportunity and an unlimited future for our children. There is opportunity in a world at peace and an America more prosperous than ever before.

Almighty God has smiled on us and on our beloved country. We are all grateful indeed that He has blessed us with the rich and devoted leadership of the man we honor here tonight, the President of the United States, Dwight Eisenhower.

The Extension of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the western United States and particularly the State of Washington has a vital stake in extension of the Sugar Act.

How the increase in domestic sugar consumption is apportioned between domestic and foreign producers is an important question for thousands of World War II and Korean veterans writing a stirring chapter in western reclamation on Columbia Basin lands.

Recognizing the effort these veterans have made and the importance of an equitable solution in this matter, my colleague from the State of Washington, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has fought long and hard to insure western sugar beet acreage getting proper consideration when this problem of apportionment ultimately is solved.

His efforts have been recognized not only by the sugar industry nationally, but especially by the veterans who moved on to new land in the Columbia Basin area of our State of Washington and in other reclamation projects of the West only to find that adequate protection had not been given previously. Recognition of my colleague's service and efforts has not only been voiced by the veterans farming this new acreage, but by many of the newspapers who serve these growing areas. One such reference was published in the Seattle Times of Friday, January 20, and I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be published in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELP FOR SUGAR-BEET FARMERS WOULD BENEFIT ENTIRE STATE

This State has an important stake in legislation which has been the subject of recent hearings in the United States Senate, designed to revise Federal regulations of the sugar industry. The Senate Finance Committee is studying a measure that would extend the Sugar Act of 1948 and giving American sugar producers a larger share in this country's annual consumption of sugar.

This State is vitally interested because its sugar-beet farmers, who last year produced some 660,000 tons of sugar beets—more than 1,800,000 hundred-pound bags of sugar, worth some $18 million—could add substantially larger sums to the State's wealth if present inequitable Federal restrictions were favorably revised.

The 1948 law established quotas for consumption of sugar under which the domestic sugar-beet industry was permitted to contribute no more than 1,800,000 tons of sugar a year to the United States market. Quotas were established also on domestic cane sugar and on sugar from Cuba, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, and the Philippines.

Since 1948, consumption of sugar in this country has increased more than 1 million tons. But because the domestic quotas were frozen, none of this increase has been allotted to American sugar producers. Under the existing law, Cuba has received 96 percent of the increase. The other 4 percent went to foreign sugar producers.

The measure the Senate is considering would allot to domestic sugar producers a ratio of 55 percent of the annual increase in sugar consumption. Washington State sugar farmers thus would be enabled to plant more of their acreage in beets and gain a larger share of the money the American public spends for sugar.

The Senate bill has been indorsed in principle by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce, which also is on record in support of an amendment proposed by this State's Senator WARREN MAGNUSON. His amendment would recognize the right to an equitable quota of new beet-growing areas, such as may be opened as development of the Columbia Basin irrigation project progresses.

The House of Representatives passed a new sugar bill last year, but the Senate version offers greater advantages to the Washington sugar industry. In any event, some revision of the 1948 act providing for a more equitable sugar-quota system seems likely to be enacted during the present session of Congress. If that can be accomplished, the whole State stands to benefit along with its relatively youthful but flourishing sugar industry.

Address by George Meany on the Occasion of His Receiving the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws at Seton Hall University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following address by George Meany which was delivered on the occasion of his receiving the honorary degree of doctor of laws from Seton Hall University. The speech, I am happy to say, was received with enthusiasm. The Honorable Maurice Brady, member of the State Legislature of New Jersey, who was pres-

ent, informs me that the people will long remember Mr. Meany's stirring address.

Receiving an honorary degree of LLD at the same time from Seton Hall University was AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer William F. Schnitzler.

The speech is as follows:

In behalf of my colleague, William Schnitzler, and for myself, I express to you deep appreciation. The honor you have conferred upon us is, above all, a timely tribute to the growing vision, influence, and responsibility of more than 15 million American workers in their new unity.

We, as officers of the AFL-CIO, welcome this great honor. It will encourage us to greater devotion to the highest ideals and worthiest aims of the free labor movement. These are closely interrelated with the ideals and principles of the church.

Very few of us are blessed to live 100 years. But, from generation to generation, many of us are blessed because institutions like yours live and grow century after century. Over the years, the lives of the many are likewise enriched by the endeavors of the truly illustrious few. Bishop James Roosevelt Bayley demonstrated courageous initiative, reflected the spirit of growth of his times, and responded to the needs of the day when, on September 1, 1856, he threw open the doors of Seton Hall—the first Catholic institution of higher learning in New Jersey.

Yours have been years of notable progress. You have already established the first medical and dental college in your State. Your progress spells progress for all America. No nation can long continue in honor, freedom, and well-being without benefit of the moral principles instilled by your center of learning.

Whether we are workers or employers, farmers or merchants, scientists, priests, or laymen—no matter what our religion may be—we can all subscribe to these principles. They are based on the fundamental concepts of morality. It is in this vein that distinguished ministers, rabbis, priests, and laymen agreed, 10 years ago, on a pattern for social justice in our country. They agreed that the profit motive must be subordinated to the moral law. They affirmed that workers have an inviolable right to join a union. Some leading Catholic authorities on the social encyclicals maintain that workingmen and women have a duty to join a union.

Enlightened American industrialists and businessmen can only welcome, not seek to weaken or destroy, the American trade-union movement. It is a built-in guaranty of security for America and the American way of life. The AFL-CIO is dedicated to making American democracy more vital and more effective. We want an alert and intelligent and not an inert and uninformed electorate. We want our country to have more and better schools. We want better homes for the American people. We want healthier and happier communities. We shall use every democratic means to invigorate and improve the free institutions of our country and to promote its common welfare.

The AFL-CIO constitution provides that the united federation serve the interests of all American people. It pledges our membership to "the strengthening and extension of our way of life and the fundamental freedoms which are the basis of our democratic society." Our stirring preamble claims:

"We shall combat resolutely the forces which seek to undermine the democratic institutions of our Nation and to enslave the human soul. We shall strive always to win full respect for the dignity of the human individual whom our unions serve. With divine guidance, grateful for the fine traditions of the past, confident of meeting the challenge of the future, we proclaim this constitution."

We of American labor firmly oppose all forms of dictatorship. We vigorously support our free system of Government. We realize that, without a free system of Government, there can be neither free labor nor free enterprise. Communism and every other totalitarian despotism is the deadly enemy of free labor unions. Free labor unionism and totalitarianism simply cannot coexist. They negate each other. Where a Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Peron or Khrushchev rules, where free labor unions are ruined. When such dictatorships begin, free labor unions are finished. We are their first target because we are their sworn enemies. Our new unity means greater strength in protecting our American labor movement against any and all corrupt influences. It means strengthened determination to defeat the undermining efforts of Communist agencies and all others who are opposed to the basic principles of our democracy and free and democratic trade unionism.

Nor can I emphasize sufficiently that Communism is likewise the mortal foe of private capital, private ownership and the private management of industry.

To me, it is inspiring and interesting that Seton Hall celebrates its first centenary in 1956. It is also the year when our country is significantly marking the 100th anniversary of the birth of a renowned educator and outstanding President of our Republic. It was Woodrow Wilson, with his concept of the New Freedom, who declared more than forty years ago: "The commands of democracy are as imperative as its privileges, and its opportunities are wide and generous." In this spirit, he sought to lead our Nation in the front lines of world responsibility. It is from this viewpoint that I want to consider your vital role in the profound crisis now gripping mankind.

You are not merely students. You are not merely teachers. Yours is not merely an institution within whose walls the learning and experience of yesterday are studied for the benefit of today and tomorrow. In the present grave world situation, you are in the front line of the fight for human freedom and enduring peace. Today, our schools of higher learning can and must be fortresses of freedom.

Our country is a democracy. Our country is democratic, despite all its imperfections, some of which are painful. It is a command of democracy for every citizen to contribute to the building of America into an ever better and ever stronger democracy—free from all racialism, discrimination, economic and social injustice. This command is all the more urgent today because our Nation's foreign policy now plays so great a role in the life of each and every one of us.

In the last resort, the foreign policy of every nation must reflect its domestic ideals and principles. The faith which other nations will place in our country's devotion to peace and human freedom is, in great measure, dependent on how we manage our affairs at home, on whether we treat our citizenry without regard to race, color, national origin or economic status.

Any government which distrusts its own people, which, like Moscow and Peiping, wages war on the rights and standards of its own people, cannot—for long—be trusted to treat other peoples justly and peacefully. Violence, injustice, and social immorality at home inevitably lead to aggression, injustice, and indecency in the treatment of peoples abroad. A government which denies its own people freedom of conscience cannot long be good neighbors with other peoples. Such a government cannot, in good conscience, respect their liberties, their freedom to worship God, their freedom to think and their right to preserve their national ideals, beliefs, and culture. This applies to every type of dictatorship, to the Nazi no less than to the Communist, and to the Communist no less than to the Falangist.

It is to the highest credit of the students of the University of Madrid that, in their great majority, they recently expressed their opposition to falangism. The academic community in our own country and in the entire free world has every reason to be proud of this reaction by the Spanish students to an officially sponsored poll.

Here is an inspiring tribute to the vitality of freedom as an ideal and to the love of liberty as a human force which cannot be extinguished by despotism. It behooves us of the ranks of labor and you of the ranks of learning to see to it that such healthy reactions are not exploited and perverted by Communist demagogs. We can do that best by making our democracy a living faith, by giving reality to our democratic ideals in the context of the present world situation.

We can go a long way in meeting the Communist menace and challenge by combining highly deterrent military strength with social, economic, and educational measures for improving the conditions of the people in the economically underdeveloped countries. Our country has more than industrial skills and material strength. Above all else, we have the ideals and the ideas. We can and must find better ways of sharing with other peoples these great assets of civilization. These are assets which must be universal, if they are to survive the terrible impact of the tidal waves of Communist reaction and slavery now threatening to engulf all mankind.

When I think of this menace, I also think of the opportunity before us. It is high time for our Government, for our schools and colleges, for the great voluntary organizations of our land—like those of labor, learning, management, science, and agriculture to get together and plan for training teachers, scientists, managers, organizers, technicians, and others—especially for utilizing their skills and talents through rendering service in foreign lands. We Americans have much experience in pioneering. The spirit of the pioneer continues very strong in our life today. We are rightly proud of this creative spirit. Let us infuse our efforts to aid other peoples, now menaced by Communist subversion and Soviet aggression, with this spirit of the American pioneer.

I am confident that this spirit would go a much longer way in strengthening the cause of peace, freedom and human betterment than would the mere handing out of dollars. In the current crisis, a combination of the American pioneer spirit and generosity is vital. It might well be decisive. I am not afraid of communism winning the world through helping other people. So far, communism has never gained a position anywhere except by fraud, force and terror. In spite of all its loud propaganda to the contrary, communism has never given any people anything free. So far, Moscow has done infinitely more taking from—than giving—to other peoples. The Kremlin has not really helped others. Actually, it has only helped itself at the expense of other countries. Look at the captive peoples of Europe. Who of us can forget how Soviet Russia plundered Manchuria? Yes, Bolsheviks do barter—many big promises with little performance in exchange for much in return.

Our country can well afford to challenge Moscow to match us dollar for dollar and service for service in Egypt, India or anywhere else, in saving people from hunger and disease, in helping people build anew and build better. Of course, we should never say we will merely match Moscow's efforts to help and merely match its aid to others. At best, that would mean that we would do next to nothing. That would really mean turning our back on needy nations.

I see no reason for our diplomats getting panicky because Moscow talks big about helping others. There is not the slightest

evidence that Moscow has veered even an inch from its policy of building an ever bigger war machine, an ever more deadly terror machine against its people at home and an ever more expanded and expensive fifth-column apparatus. These are costly and crushing burdens forced on the Russian people by their Communist rulers.

We must never forget we have no quarrels with the Russian people. We have only friendship and heartfelt sympathy for the Russian people, for they are the first and heaviest sufferers of Communist dictatorship. Nor dare we forget that the captive peoples of the European satellite lands and on the Chinese mainland have been suffering cruel hardships. When I speak of such crushing burdens, I speak not only of suffering in a physical sense. I have in mind especially the spiritual and moral losses. I am thinking of the missionaries, of the great scholars, hounded, tortured and forced to flee from Communist China because they would not sell their souls nor debase their intellect.

I can never forget the shocking revelations recently made by the Reverend Dr. Bradshaw after his release from the Chinese Communist "paradise." That is why I find it hard to believe—and least of all to fear—that Moscow and its puppets have suddenly become great humanitarians and will match the genuine and generous help we have been giving and should be prepared to give in the future. Where is the slightest evidence of even the faintest beginning of such a miraculous transformation of the ruthless Kremlin dictatorship?

The time has arrived for our Government to reexamine and study our country's last decade of experience in foreign aid. No doubt we have made mistakes. No doubt we must do some things better than we have done to date. No doubt we should even stop doing some of the things we have been doing. No doubt we must meet new tasks in the foreign-aid field. But let us not get panicky and rush to drown rubles with dollars. We should be ready to help where there is need and when we can, help the needy rather than their oppressors. We must always be ready to help where the cause of peace and freedom can be served and strengthened.

We must likewise reject every effort or scheme to appease and assist the Communist aggressors through business deals with them. Neither peace, nor freedom, can be bought that cheap. Doing business as usual with Khrushchev is basically just as bad and unsound as was doing business with Hitler. Shortsightedness in commercial relations never really pays. Such deals with Communist Russia and Communist China only help the plunderers and oppressors of the Russian, Chinese, and the other peoples to tighten their dictatorial grip, to build their war machines and to secure new channels of subversion. No profit garnered in any such deal can ever make up for the damage and the tragedy it causes.

Of course, what I say about business as usual also applies to cultural relations as usual. There can never be real freedom of genuine cultural relations between the American and Russian peoples until the Russians can have free relations—cultural and other—among themselves.

We are living in an age of profound crisis. For that very reason, we are also living in an age of consecration. We of the free labor movement—and I am sure you of the free academic world—can find no more worthy ideal than to consecrate ourselves to the promotion and protection of our freedom. This great task is inseparable from and indispensable to consecrating ourselves to aiding others, to helping others whose fundamental human rights have been taken from them by the most total and brutal concentration of power in all human history.

How timely then was the wisdom of Woodrow Wilson about the privileges, opportunities and commands of democracy being wide and generous. I know that men of your calling and learning realize fully that freedom to think, freedom of conscience, freedom to worship God, to associate, assemble, and organize are a priceless heritage. This great heritage cannot be preserved and promoted merely by praising it and enjoying it—while the enjoying lasts. We have to work at freedom. We have to practice it. We have to nurse and nourish it. We have to live it so that it may live and thrive.

We Americans are a privileged people. We were born free. Twice we fought fratricidal conflicts to assure and advance our freedom. Twice we fought on global scale in foreign lands in order to safeguard the security of our own free land and the freedom menaced by foreign forms of tyranny and pernicious aggression. I do not despair. I am confident we and the free world with us have the faith and the courage, the idealism and the ideas, the capacity and the will to organize our lives and our international associations so that we can cooperate for the good of mankind; so that we can unite our forces for deterring and, if need be, defeating aggression. Then mankind can and will be saved from an atomic world war.

In this light, all of us can only welcome heartily the plea made recently by Pope Pius XII for the world to agree on renouncing nuclear weapons and assure compliance with this agreement through a system of effective control. We have repeatedly demanded the same. We hail the Holy Father's plea for its emphasis on the necessity of effective control and on the need to include all steps, and not merely an agreement, to end military nuclear experimentation.

The furtherance of this noble goal fanatically challenged and menaced by the Godless hordes of communism, is the highest command of American democracy. It is also your—and my—most imperative privilege. As Americans, from factory bench and school bench, from office and classroom, let us dedicate and consecrate ourselves to this task. Like you here at Seton Hall, we of American labor are entering a new era. Be with us, as we face the future with confidence that with God's help, we shall not fail in our responsibilities or accomplishments.

Milk: Nature's Perfect Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 26, 1955, the Springfield (Mass.) Sunday Republican published an article entitled "Nature's Perfect Food Aids Later Aches, Pains." The article specifies the great benefits which middle-aged women may derive from drinking milk, and is as timely today as it was last summer; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURE'S PERFECT FOOD AIDS LATER ACHES, PAINS

(By Hazel B. Corliss)

Since June is being observed as National Dairy Month, let's consider milk. The experts tell us that it is nature's most perfect food. I believe that the real cause of the present dairy controversy is not overproduction, but underconsumption. If people would drink the amount of milk they actually need for proper nourishment, surpluses would be unknown.

ADULTS NEED MILK

It is an accepted fact that babies and children require plenty of milk for proper growth. But all too often it is rejected by the teen-ager, and the adult. They fear over-weight; and other beverages are the vogue.

I feel that the middle-aged woman is the key figure in persuading people to drink more milk. Her influence is felt by every child, from infancy to adulthood. The bride usually adopts her mother's housekeeping pattern when she begins her new homelife; and the food habits are repeated.

The various promotion programs have tried to convince the middle-aged woman that milk is a nutritive food for all ages. Yet she may be like her little Johnny, who refuses to drink his milk when merely told that it is good for him. He has to have a more personal reason. He doesn't hesitate after hearing that milk will make his arms strong, and his legs swift, for his beloved ball game. Likewise, Johnny's mother needs to be persuaded through her own most vulnerable points.

BENEFITS NOT SKIN DEEP

For centuries, the middle-aged woman has fought valiantly to keep herself youthful looking. She not only needed to please her family, but to boost her own morale. She has spent millions of dollars for clothes and cosmetics, striving to achieve this worthy goal. However, clothes wear out, or lose their style, and cosmetics have only a superficial "face" value.

The benefits to be derived from drinking lots of milk are not just "skin deep." By consuming a quart daily, the middle-aged woman would attain a truly permanent health foundation. Her skin would have a velvety texture and a rozy glow; her eyes would sparkle brightly; her hair would have a lovely sheen; and her body, strength and vitality, for working, and for resisting disease.

How do I know all this? From my own experience, I, too, am a middle-aged woman. During our 20 years of city living, we made other sacrifices in order to buy extra milk. We were the carrier's best customer, on our street. Our health rewards have been very worth while. In addition to our greater sense of physical well-being, we saved a great many dentist and doctor bills.

Since coming to our small farm in Vermont, we have been able to enjoy still more milk. At first, we had only one cow. During her 2 months' dry period, when we had no milk to drink, we noticed a great difference in our general health.

The wife of the small farmer has long hours of hard work daily. When faltering with fatigue, I have found a glass of milk the most sustaining and quickest lift.

NOT FATTENING

Milk is no more fattening than many other foods which fail to give comparable health stamina. Most popular beverages are flavorful and refreshing, but they have no food value; instead, their high sugar content gives people weight-producing calories.

Often the middle-aged woman does know the health value of milk, but she feels that she cannot afford to buy as much as she would like to. Yet, as she very well knows, clothes and cosmetics are expensive. If she drank a quart of milk daily she would radiate glowing health and youthfulness, in the simplest attire. No beauty aids would be necessary. Her family would admire proudly; and her own higher spirits would contribute to the happiness of everyone she contacted.

As she grows older, and her body begins to degenerate, the middle-aged woman is often plagued by various aches and pains. The large amount of calcium in milk makes it one of the best protective foods. My own arthritis was much more painful during the period when we were without milk.

We do not sell milk. I am merely passing around a little of the milk of human kindness in sharing my own secrets. When friends say that I look younger than my years, I know that milk has been my benefactor.

So, for her own personal reasons, I appeal to my sister, the middle-aged woman, to drink from the Fountain of Youth. Milk is a bargain in buoyant health and youthful beauty.

One Hundred and Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the letter which was received by each Member of Congress, enclosing an address by Basil Brewer, publisher, New Bedford Standard-Times, commemorating the 175th anniversary of the State constitution. This was distributed by the Massachusetts heritage program of the Massachusetts Bar Association.

The address follows:

THE CONSTITUTION OF MASSACHUSETTS AND ITS IMPACT UPON THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Basil Brewer)

Non-New Englanders, and particularly such Missouri Yankees as myself, are steeped in the lore of the Pilgrims of Plymouth and of that tremendous ship, the *Mayflower*, which landed briefly at Provincetown on November 21, 1620, and a month later at the historic rock at Plymouth.

I say that "tremendous ship," for else how could it have housed the ancestors of most of the prominent families of the Midwest of my boyhood, as well as of New England, and nowadays of even the Far West?

So stamped on my boyhood mind was the story of lovely Priscilla and John Alden that I think I may have reached almost young manhood before I stopped hoping some one of the lovely young ladies I met would say shyly to me, "Why don't you speak for yourself, Basil?"

PILGRIMAGE RECALLED

May I recall to you that other and truly great occasion which this one so clearly brings to my mind, the pilgrimage to Plymouth sponsored by the Plymouth County Republican Club July 29, 1951.

Many present today were at that Plymouth meeting, including our guest of honor, Senator SALTONSTALL. It was an all-day and an unforgettable ceremony and pageant. The beginnings of Plymouth were recalled and the basic principles of the Pilgrim Fathers were emphasized.

Many speakers, including the two guests of honor, the late Senator Robert A. Taft, and our own JOSEPH W. MARTIN, then Speaker of the House, called for a return to basic Pilgrim principles. Bob Taft spoke with great seriousness and conviction, as did Speaker MARTIN, to audiences which included those of both the television and radio networks of the National Broadcasting Co.

For the first time in history, half the Nation saw the harbor of Plymouth sprinkled with small craft listening to the program and the great audience standing or seated in the natural amphitheater which faces the platform above Plymouth Rock.

TAFT IS QUOTED

I must quote again the words of the deceased Bob Taft with reference to the Pilgrims on that occasion.

"We have come here to celebrate the record of the Pilgrim Fathers, and to rededicate ourselves to the ideals which inspired one of the great adventures of all time. * * *

"They were guided by the most rigid religious and moral principles which sustained them in adversity and inspired them to determined effort. They believed in God from the bottom of their souls. As said by Baylies, 'They in pursuit of religious freedom, established civil liberty; meaning only to found a church, gave birth to a nation; in settling a town, they commenced an empire.'"

But there was another small ship of design similar to the *Mayflower* to which history for some reason has given much less attention. In its importance to the then small Bay Colony of Massachusetts, however, this ship may have in some ways rivaled the *Mayflower*. This was the ship *Arbella*, which arrived at Salem, June 12, 1630, approximately 10 years after the arrival of the *Mayflower* at Plymouth.

On this ship was Gov. John Winthrop, who just had been appointed Governor of the Bay Colony of Massachusetts. Winthrop had accepted only under the condition that the government be transferred to the colony. With him were the Reverend George Phillips and Sir Richmond Saltonstall, who brought with them a charter from Charles I, a charter which gave the infant colony its first semblance of self-government.

FOREGOES TITLE

Sir Richard Saltonstall, of course, was the ancestor of our distinguished guest of honor, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL. Due, however, to the provisions of both Federal and State constitutions which came 150 years later, LEVERETT has had to forego his ancestral title, contenting himself with such modest substitutes as speaker of the house of governor of the commonwealth, and three times elected United States Senator.

The charter which the *Arbella* brought vested the governing power in a governor, a court of assistance and freemen, which later included all, and I quote, "respectable landholders." These soon started sending representatives to attend meetings and thus was evolved the general court of the commonwealth.

This charter of 1629 remained in effect in the colony for 54 years, giving the then Bay Colony of Massachusetts perhaps the first and longest period of substantial self-government of any of the colonies.

The experience in self-government and the devotion to freedom thus gained were to exert a tremendous influence, not only on the history of the Commonwealth and of others of the colonies, but on the grave decisions which brought the War of the Revolution and the independence of the country.

CHARTER VACATED

But the process of self-government of the Bay Colony received a rude interruption when the charter of 1629 was vacated by King James II in 1684. The Bay Colony was by this act deprived of all political rights whatsoever and became the absolute property of the king to govern as he saw fit.

Sir Edmund Andros was made governor of all the territory of New England, which had been joined with that of New York and New Jersey and the two colonies to the south.

Massachusetts not only no longer had law-making or executive power of her own, but every land title which went back to the authority of the old charter was declared invalid.

But this was not for long. Timing their action to the return of William of Orange and the flight of James II on April 18, 1689, "armed men were abroad" in the streets of Boston.

GIVEN LITTLE NOTICE

John Nelson headed a party of men who, armed with small cannon, proceeded to the fort on Fort Hill to which Governor Andros had fled. Andros was ordered to surrender, which he did.

Thus ended the first revolution against the British by the Bay Colony of Massachusetts, to which historians seem to have given all too little attention. It restored the charter of 1629. And again, after a lapse of 5 years, the Bay Colony enjoyed a measure of self-government.

The bloodless revolution of 1689 was a rehearsal for the long and bloody War of the Revolution 85 years later. As John Fisk puts it in the last sentence of Beginnings of New England: "In the events we have here passed in review, it may be seen, so plainly that he who runs may read, how the spirit of 1776 was foreshadowed in 1689."

If revolt and war were brewing in the colony at this early date, the pressure of great events was developing a new and a different race which was to prove equal to its responsibilities. This was no where so well described as by Samuel E. Morison in his "Builders of the Bay Colony."

Morison wrote, "The race was not Anglo-Saxon or Irish * * * It was Yankee, a new Nordic amalgam on an English Puritan base; already in 1750 as different in its character and its dialect from the English as the Australians are today. A tough but nervous, tenacious but restless race; materially ambitious, yet prone to introspection, and subject to waves of religious emotion. Conservative in its ideas of property and religion, yet radical in business and government.

"A people with few social graces, yet capable of deep friendships and abiding loyalties; law-abiding yet individualistic, and impatient of restraint by government or regulation in business; ever attempting to repress certain traits of human nature, but finding an outlet in broad, crude humor and deep sea voyages.

"A race whose typical member is eternally torn between a passion for righteousness and a desire to get on in the world. Religion and climate, soil and sea, here brewed of mixed stock a new people."

WAR OF SURVIVAL

With the coronation of William III and the flight of Jomes II to France, again quoting Fisk, "began the 70-year struggle between France and England for the primacy of the world," both the Old World and the New. It was a struggle "far grander than the struggle between Rome and Carthage 2,000 years earlier."

This 70 years of war was as much upon American as upon European ground. It was a war of survival for the colonies as well as for Britain and great were the sacrifices in men, material, and money on the part of the colonies.

The far-flung battlefield extended from Fort Duquesne in the Ohio territory, where Braddock died and George Washington got his first experience in serious fighting, to the final defeat of General Montcalm on the Plains of Abraham in front of Quebec by British General Wolfe, which decided the fate of Canada.

If the War of the Revolution was foreshadowed by the surrender of Governor Andros in Boston in 1689, the wars against France in which the colonists so ably participated—from Florida, the Carolinas, and Virginia to Massachusetts and Maine—were

a stern training school for Lexington, Concord, Bunker Hill, and for Brandywine, Valley Forge and the ultimate surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown.

George Washington and other generals gained their first military experience in the French and Indian Wars. The veterans of these wars and their sons were the core of the Continental Army.

APTITUDE FOR LAW

Experienced in self-government, including its difficulties and defeats, fully devoted and dedicated to the cause of liberty, and trained in three or more generations of bloody warfare, the colonists, and particularly those of Massachusetts, possessed another aptitude without which the foregoing might have lost its meaning.

This was an ability to think and act in terms of the law, a quality by no means confined to those who were educated in the law. For many years there was such a scarcity of barristers in Massachusetts that legal training was not required of those who represented litigants. One of the most able pleaders at one early date was an apothecary.

Thus it was no coincidence that, as the people of the colony were preparing to defend their liberty by war if necessary, they also were prepared, mentally and spiritually, to establish a pattern of fundamental law which would preserve that liberty "for themselves and their posterity," once it was secured.

As it was said by the farmers of western Massachusetts, they wanted a constitution "which would protect them from themselves."

The Sugar Act of 1764, the Stamp Act of 1765, the Writs of Assistance and the Townshend Acts of 1767, the Tea Tax of 1770 and the Tea Act of 1773—all brought bitter opposition. But, equally important, they brought litigation which was a 10-year rehearsal of what to do and what not to do, and especially what to guard against—in the formation of a constitution.

LEADERS DEVELOPED

Of course, this ferment of events developed leaders.

One of these, James Otis from West Barnstable, is so well known to every up-and-coming schoolboy that his name hardly needs to be mentioned. It was on a dull day in February 1761 that James Otis argued for hours in the old State House against the Writs of Assistance.

There "sat the five judges with all the barristers of Boston and Middlesex County." Among them was a young lawyer, John Adams, "who was to be profoundly impressed."

Adams described himself as sitting in the courtroom "lost in admiration" and looking like a "short, thick archbishop of Canterbury." Fifty years later he was to write, "Here this day, in the Old Council Chamber, the Child Independence was born."

Lord Acton, an Englishman and "a scholar among scholars" said, "James Otis spoke and lifted the question to a different level in one of the memorable speeches in political history."

PHILOSOPHY OF GOVERNMENT

James Otis, himself, in his Rights of the British Colonies in 1764, thus described his far-reaching governmental philosophy: "Government * * * most evidently founded on the circumstances of our nature. It is by no means an arbitrary thing depending merely upon a compact or human will for its existence * * *. Supreme absolute power is originally and ultimately in the people * * *. Tyranny of all kinds is to be abhorred whether it be in the hands of one, or a few or of many.

"The end of government being the good of mankind points out its great duties; it is above all things to provide for the security, quiet, and the happy enjoyment of life, liberty and property * * *. Men cannot live apart or independent of each other * * * and yet they cannot live together without contests. These contests require some arbitrator to determine them. The necessity of a common, indifferent and impartial judge makes all men seek one.

"The same law of nature and of reason is equally obligatory on a democracy, aristocracy and a monarchy * * *. The grand political problem in all ages has been to invent the best combination or distribution of the supreme powers of legislation and execution."

CONSTITUTION DRAFTED

All of this was familiar to John Adams, Theophilus Parsons and other constitutional thinkers when they were directed by the convention of 1779 to frame a constitution for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts following the movement of the people in the towns outlined in the proclamation.

This convention of 1779–1780 had the greatest task of any constitutional convention in the history of the colonies, and performed it under peculiarly difficulty circumstances.

The period of its sessions, from September 1, 1779, to June 16, 1780, was perhaps the darkest of the Revolutionary War. A joint naval and military expedition, brought together by the State at great cost to dislodge the enemy from Maine, had ended in complete disaster. Sir Henry Clinton was conquering the Carolinas. Our French allies had not yet sent Rochambeau's Army or De Grasse's Navy.

Washington was stalemated on the Hudson, his Army undermined by sickness and desertion. State and Nation were on the verge of bankruptcy. The Tories were taking heart and the neutrals going over to their side.

Yet at this crisis the State was able to assemble a convention of 312 members, which, judged by its results, must unquestionably be called the greatest in its history.

COMMITTEE OF 30

"At its first session, in the Meeting House in Cambridge, the convention organized, adopted a set of 10 rules and orders, elected a committee of 30 to prepare a draft, spent a day in 'a general and free conversation' on the constitution, 'which lasted till sunset,' and adjourned on September 7 to October 28.

"The committee of 30 met at the new court house in Boston, on the site of the present city hall. It delegated its duties to a subcommittee consisting of James Bowdoin and the two Adamses; and the committee left the entire task to John Adams.

"No better selection could have been made. John Adams was in his 45th year, at the height of his powers, and one of the highest authorities on political science in America. Long a student of government, his advice had been sought by the framers of the early constitutions in the Southern States. He was highly equipped as a lawyer and a practical politician. As a patriot leader in the provincial government and the Continental Congress, and as a Minister to France, his political experience was extensive. It was the task of John Adams to construct a government on the ruins of what his cousin, Samuel Adams, had done so much to destroy."

Charles Francis Adams, the grandson of John and the American Ambassador to Britain during our Civil War, summed up his grandfather as follows: "Not at all suited to be a chief, when much depends upon a spirit of accommodation to the whims or the longings of individuals held together by fleeting considerations of personal or public interest, he was yet eminently qualified to stand forth the exponent of a clear, strong, and noble plan of action in a time of danger.

"The constitution went into effect October 25, 1780, when John Hancock was inaugurated the first governor of the Commonwealth. At the foot of his proclamations appeared for the first time the now-familiar formula, 'God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'."

BILL OF RIGHTS

If John Adams was the father of the constitution of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, he was equally the father of the Federal Constitution, approved by the convention in 1787 and which became effective in 1789, when adopted by 9 of the 13 States.

The Bill of Rights of the Federal Constitution is an almost verbatim copy of the declaration of rights of the Massachusetts constitution.

Freedom of speech, religion, and press, right to a jury trial, protection against excessive bail or punishment, preservation of private property and other guaranties of the United States Constitution were copied virtually word for word from the constitution of Massachusetts.

The preambles of the two documents vary in wording, but they are almost identical in their meaning.

Says the United States Constitution: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated."

Says the Massachusetts constitution: "Every subject has a right to be secure from all unreasonable searches and seizures of his person, his houses, his papers and all his possessions."

Says the United States Constitution: "Nor shall he be compelled to be a witness against himself."

Says the Massachusetts constitution: "Or be compelled to accuse or furnish evidence against himself."

Says the United States Constitution: "Any accused is entitled to be confronted with the witnesses against him."

Says the Massachusetts constitution: "Any accused is entitled to meet the witnesses against him face to face."

Says the United States Constitution: "The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments."

Says the Massachusetts constitution: "The Senate shall * * * hear and determine all impeachments."

When it came to outlining the extent of the Senate's powers in impeachment cases, the United States Constitution states such powers "shall not extend further than to removal from office and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust or profit." This is word for word from the Massachusetts constitution.

Says the United States Constitution: "No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner."

Says the Massachusetts constitution: "In time of peace, no soldier ought to be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner."

The United States Constitution's celebrated provision, reserving for the people all rights not expressly delegated to the Federal Government, was taken verbatim from a statement of such principle in the Massachusetts constitution.

In enunciation of high principles, limitation of powers and scope, the Federal Constitution is patterned after that of Massachusetts, more often than not in the same language. No greater tribute to the timelessness of the Massachusetts constitution and its influence in making the United States Government one of laws, not of men, can be cited.

PERILS TO CONSTITUTION

As recently as in January 1944, a President of the United States asked Congress to pass a so-called Federal voting bill which would qualify a person in the armed services to vote for President and Vice President, regard-

less of whether such person was duly qualified to vote in the State of his residence.

This clearly would violate provisions of State and Federal Constitutions, which give to the States exclusively the right to determine the qualifications of electors.

In attempting to defend his position, President Roosevelt made the following astonishing statement: "Certainly it (the Federal voting bill) does not violate States rights any more than Public Law 712, which passed by a substantial majority of the Congress in September 1942." [1]

Commenting on this measure, which was urged by President Roosevelt, Senator Millard Tydings, Democrat of Maryland, said on the Senate floor, January 14, 1944, "If our servicemen are fighting in far-off places to destroy the Constitution of the United States and all that it holds for them, there is not one of them who knows it. Yet, while they are fighting in far-off places for America, for its Constitution, and for all that it means, there are those who are seeking to set aside our democratic and constitutional processes and erect instead a government on a Hitlerian model, by denying to our servicemen the Constitution for which they are contending."

Thus by the acts of a President we are reminded of the stern necessity of being constantly on guard if we are to hand down to posterity the liberties which have been preserved to us in our State and Federal Constitutions.

Thomas Jefferson wrote, "In questions of power, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution.

WASHINGTON'S WARNING

In a similar vein are the well-known words of Washington's Farewell Address: "If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates.

"But let there be no change by usurpation, for though this in one instance may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

The Founding Fathers in their wisdom placed the following provision in the Federal Constitution:

"Article 6, paragraph 2: This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

With the perspective of 156 years ago, probably neither John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, nor Washington, himself, could conceive of a treaty such as the United Nations treaty of 10 years ago. This was a volume of 600 pages which few, if any, Senators could fully comprehend in the 6 days of Senate discussion on the 111-article document.

LEGISLATION BY TREATY

Certainly Washington, who had advised the infant Nation to avoid all foreign alliances, could not foresee a treaty which would attempt to legislate on such subjects as "human rights" and "women's political rights," for the United States as well as for other members of the United Nations.

Nevertheless, out of our yearning for peace and security, we have, through the U. N. and the treaty provisions of our Federal Constitution, placed ourselves in the most serious situation in the history of our constitutional Government.

Only the refusal of the United States Senate and the President to approve certain U. N. treaty provisions already pending prevents States' rights being swept away before our very eyes.

Already in some minor matters the Supreme Court has indicated, clearly under the treaty provisions of the Federal Constitution, it would have no choice but to approve any provision of the U. N. which had Senate and Presidential approval. This is the Supreme Court's position, any State or Federal constitutional provision to the contrary notwithstanding.

I happen to know that our guest of honor, Senator SALTONSTALL, is greatly disturbed by this problem and is striving sincerely and courageously to find a solution.

For my part, I am in favor of sharing the provisions of our constitutions with every honest seeker for freedom. I favor financial help and military assistance within our means. I favor cooperation with our Allies, so long as they do not tie our hands nor tamper with our liberties or our ability to defend ourselves.

But I would, if necessary, toss out the United Nations, NATO or any other foreign treaty or agreement overnight, rather than forfeit one iota of the freedoms and the guaranties of our State and Federal Constitutions.

[1] The so-called Federal voting bill for which President Roosevelt sought approval in 1944 passed the Senate, but failed to pass in the House and did not become law.

On August 1, 1955, the United States Senate voted 56 to 22 to repeal Public Law 712, which Mr. Roosevelt had cited in defense of the 1944 legislation. The House concurred in the Senate action and Public Law 712 is no longer law.

Here again the influence of Massachusetts, through Senator SALTONSTALL, was effective in restoring to the States the right to determine the qualifications of their electors.

Petition to the President of the United States re the Discharge of Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, at its 14th annual constitutional convention on July 31, 1955, the Inland Empire District Council, No. 10, International Woodworkers of America, CIO, adopted the following resolution:

PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RE THE DISCHARGE OF DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

RESOLUTION 6

Whereas we, the woodworkers of Montana, Idaho, and Washington are familiar with Mr. McKay, because he comes from our own area in the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas he has been completely repudiated by the people of his own State of Oregon, who elected RICHARD L. NEUBERGER to the United States Senate; and

Whereas Douglas McKay has failed and refused to protect the natural resources properly and has allowed big timber corporations to gouge the Indians on their timber prices, and recently tried to turn over O. & C. lands to the larger operators; and

Whereas McKay has spread the rumor in the recent past that the Alaska Railroad was not making a profit, with obvious political intent to either close it down or give it away to private interests, in spite of its profitable operating record; and

Whereas the people of his own area obviously repose no trust in him, because of his record and attempted political shenanigans; And now, be it therefore

Resolved, That the Inland Empire District Council, No. 10, IWA–CIO, petition the President to act before any further looting of the public domain can occur, by giving Mr. McKay his time and sending him down the road to political oblivion as he sooner or later surely will be; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this petition be sent to Congressman LEE METCALF, Congresswoman GRACIE PFOST, and Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, with the request that it be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WESLEY SEDY,
IWA Local 10–296.
BEN H. LARSON,
IWA Local 10–364.
KENNETH EVANS,
IWA Local 10–239.
LLOYD E. RAY,
IWA Local 10–179.
GORDON B. TAYLOR,
IWA Local 10–361.
WILLIAM C. HOOP,
IWA Local 10–295.
LONNIE GENTRY,
IWA Local 10–119.

Adopted by the 14th annual constitutional convention, July 31, 1955.

Reorganizing the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD H. POFF
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the September 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest contained an article critical of the operations of the second Hoover Commission. When Hon. Herbert Hoover questioned the conclusions of the article, he was invited to submit a summary of his own views on the Commission's work. The first article has been inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, and in fairness to all concerned, I think Mr. Hoover's article should be also inserted. That article, entitled "Reorganizing the Government as Mr. Hoover Sees It," is herewith quoted in full:

The Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was created by unanimous action of the Congress in 1953. Its members were appointed by the Speaker for the House, by the Vice President for the Senate, and by the President for the administration. They included members of both political parties.

It was the expressed determination of the Commission from the first day of its existence that party politics should not enter into its conclusions. The Commission never divided on political grounds. I never even heard mentioned a reference to political party effect of any conclusion. A precedent for that had been set by the First Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government of 1947–49, over which I also presided.

Every member of this Second Commission had long public experience. There were naturally divided opinions on the best methods of accomplishing our purpose. But every recommendation was voted by a majority—and usually by more—of the members of the Commission. And all of them were voted for by members of both political parties.

No inquiry into party affiliations of Task Force members was ever made; however, they did embrace members of both parties. There was a Republican complaint that there were three former Democratic Cabinet members and six former Assistant Secretaries on the Task Forces. The fact was that the Republicans had been out of office for 20 years and had no reserve of such officials. There were a number of Federal and State Supreme Court Judges among the Task Force members—and the number was about even betwen the two parties. On the Task Force on Federal Medical Services, which dealt with questions concerning veterans, there were 80 percent veterans, and I presume from their geographic spread contained members of both parties. However, all Task Force members were selected for their experience and ability. Something over 100 of them had been in Federal service at one time or another, mostly in Democratic administrations.

Out of the 314 recommendations designed to obtain greater efficiency and economy in the executive branch, there were some 16 percent of them that were bound to provide controversy, especially from pressure groups, and 84 percent that are winning general acceptance. Of the total recommendations some 145 were administrative—that is that they can be put into effect by the Departments without legislation. More than 50 have already been adopted, and under President Eisenhower's direction special machinery has been set up in the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense to effectuate more of them. A single one of the administrative recommendations already adopted is saving the taxpayers the total cost of the Commission at the rate of five times every year.

Some 141 of the recommendations require legislation. Already more than 200 bills have been introduced into the Congress for this purpose. They came too late at the busy end of the last session for action although an important one passed the Senate. It required 5 years to complete some 72 percent of the recommendations which were adopted from the First Commission of 1947–49.

There was criticism from pressure groups at that time—just as there is now. Much of the criticism is based upon lack of knowledge by the critics of the workings of the Government, and too often it arises from misunderstanding or misconstruction of the recommendations themselves, and of course criticisms comes from special interests affected.

For instance, I have seen it stated that the Commission would deprive the farmers of their loans from the Government on their commodities pending their sale. No such recommendation was made. The intermediate credit banks were supported by the Commission. Nowhere were the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support such loans opposed. A method of simplification and economy was recommended which was approved by officials of that Corporation.

Another instance is the hospitalization of destitute veterans with nonservice connected sickness. The Commission supported this as a public obligation but proposed a method to stop "gold bricking" which the veterans' organizations themselves have denounced.

Another instance is the recommendation as to the Rural Electrification Administration, where it has been represented that the Commission was trying to destroy that service. We did not recommend its termination or the limitation of its operations; but we did recommend its reorganization to put it on a more businesslike basis. Nor did the Commission attempt to destroy housing programs. It did recommend a simplification in Federal action that would not stop a single project. I myself had brought about the first Federal action in this area 23 years ago, and the Commission supported its continuance.

The Water Resources Task Force was not packed with special interests. It comprised 15 engineers, 5 lawyers, 3 governors or former governors, and a public accountant. They included members of both parties.

When a motion was made in the Commission to place three persons on the task force "who believe in the principle of Federal Public Power development," it was tabled by a vote of 10 to 1, in which three Democrats concurred, on the ground that such action would necessitate appointment of three persons also to represent the public utility interests. Instead the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the task force to hold public hearings at which individuals and representatives of groups could present their views.

These public hearings were held throughout the country. A total of 261 statements were presented to the task force, representing all points of view, and making 5,000 pages of testimony. These statements received due consideration in the task force's findings.

No one with 40 years experience in public life expects the opposition to a particular idea always to be fair. However, a method of balancing the budget and substantially reducing taxes by the elimination of waste would not seem an unworthy program for both political parties.

H. R. 446, a National Pension Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following open letter to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee from Mr. Bradford W. Thurston, president, National Pension Federation, Inc., concerning H. R. 446, a measure I have sponsored for the purpose of amending our Social Security Act, and to provide our older citizens with adequate security.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL PENSION FEDERATION, INC.,
Washington, D. C.

OPEN LETTER

TO CHAIRMAN OF THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE:

As president of the National Pension Federation Inc., with offices at 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., I am writing this open appeal to your honorable committee in regard to the age group not wanted by business and classed as "too old to work, but not old enough to die."

This same group of citizens have helped build this country by paying taxes and hard work, to be passed on to their sons and daughters so that they may take up where their parents had to give up.

Many in this group have raised families and tried to give them a good education so as to become good and useful citizens.

In the last 50 years, Uncle Sam has had to reach out in need of your sons and daughters to fight to protect our country and the American way of life.

This particular age group that I have referred to have had their sons and daughters die on the field of battle, some in hospitals, and others to remain crippled for life, leaving mother and dad to get along the best they can through depressions and high taxes. They have not been able to save enough to take care of themselves when they have come to the age where business says, on a little yellow slip, "we cannot use you any longer." a polite way of saying, "too old."

Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, from Massachusetts, has presented a bill to Congress which is now in the hands of your committee, that will help this group of being "too old to work, but too young to die."

H. R. 446 will do all of this and not cost the Government one cent.

This bill enacted into a law by Congress would, in a way, repay the sons and daughters who gave their lives for their country. Mothers, fathers, and future generations could live without having to appeal for welfare or old age assistance to live. In some States, an appeal for welfare or old age assistance classifies this group as paupers and they lose their rights to vote.

H. R. 446 enacted as a law in the United States and Territories would treat all citizens as equals—not sex against sex on account of age in receiving payments, or discriminating against age in working privileges. Also, each State be equal, not the South one rate and the North, East, and West another.

The Social Security Act has been in operation since 1937, and to date has paid all of its claims and operating expense. It does not cost the Government one cent—so we have been told.

This has been done by collecting the funds by the payroll withholding taxes paid by the employee and employer in American dollars and cents. We were told about 1 year ago, that after paying all claims, there was over $22 billion surplus in the social-security insurance fund. This was paid and collected for one purpose, and should be used for that purpose only.

A pension of at least $100 per month be paid to each American citizen at 65 years of age, and put a stop to sending social-security payments outside of the United States to persons who, in many cases, have never been an American citizen. They have worked here in covered employment long enough to receive payments, then returning to their native country and our social security office will send them their monthly payments including the wife who may never have been in the United States. No other country will do this to an American citizen.

Give all American citizens a national pension by amending the Social Security Act of at least $100 per month.

Such an amendment would do away with costly old-age assistance operated in a different manner in nearly every State.

I beg of your committee to give H. R. 446 your early consideration. Please do not use it as a political issue as done in the past—granting $5 increase in social-security payments only to have the State take it to reduce the old-age assistance payments, therefore, the person it was intended for never gets the increase.

I want to thank your committee, and a Government that we can appeal to, and trust God in hoping for justice to our elders.

Sincerely,

BRADFORD W. THURSTON,
President.

Girls on Parole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, Miss Katharine Sullivan, a neighbor of mine

in Cambridge, Mass., and an able public official of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, is also a distinguished author. For more than 10 years she has been on the Massachusetts Parole Board, and out of her experiences has come a new book which I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the United States House of Representatives. It is entitled "Girls on Parole," and a study on the parole system; how it works and how it can be improved.

I do not think that most of us realize that 95 percent of the people who go to prison come out again. That they sit next to us in the subway, that they pass us on the street, and that they hold down responsible jobs. The problem of assisting these people to again take their places in society is one of paramount importance to all of us. Miss Sullivan's study is expert, understanding and sympathetic. Her interesting account of the lives of those being restored to freedom, and of the effectiveness of the parole system should not be missed. It is real worthwhile reading, and I am sure that all of you wil enjoy the book and profit by what Miss Sullivan has to say.

On Dividing Farmers and Consumers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the January 26 issue of the Machinist. The article—which is titled "You Pay A Pretty Penny For Fancy Meat Wrappings"—was written by Sidney Margolius.

I was interested in this article because our Secretary of Agriculture in the course of the last 3 years has contributed much in the way of creating confusion in the minds of farmers and city consumers. Perhaps there is a purpose in this policy of dividing city consumers and farmers.

For example, as far back as April of 1953 the Secretary of Agriculture was busy building up consumer opposition against higher farm support prices. The New York Times carries a story with the headline "Consumer Revolt Feared By Benson." The New York Times is based on Secretary Benson's speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

I am also reminded of Secretary Benson's statement before a Senate committee on January 18, 1954, when he said:

> At what point will the 140 million Americans who do not live on farms rise up—as they did in the potato fiasco of a few years ago—and demand not revision but outright elimination of all direct aid to agriculture.

The Secretary of Agriculture's remarks made the newspaper headlines, and they also served to arouse city consumers against farmers. All of this was done in ample time before we voted on the farm bill in 1954.

In recent months, on the basis of newspaper stories, the Secretary of Agriculture is casting sly remarks against labor costs—thus hoping to turn farmers against labor. It is a slick trick, but I feel that a great many people are now catching on as to what is happening with respect to this divide-and-rule strategy.

For this reason I draw my colleagues' attention to the article in the Machinist. The full text is as follows:

With many basic expenses edging up, moderate-income families will have to shop wisely in this period to hold down living costs. Unfortunately, consumers aren't getting full help from the heavy supply and sharp price drop on livestock. For one reason, merchandisers are outthinking housewives.

More meats are now sold under packers' brand names for as much as 25 percent more than the same quality of just plain meat in the store's own wrapper. Packages are getting fancier, too. Some meats are prepacked not only in cellophane but fluted cardboard trays, which makes a mighty pretty package but isn't very edible. And cold cuts and other specialty meats are being widely sold at self-service counters in 6-ounce packages.

If you've ever wondered why so many of these packages are 6 ounces, note that many housewives seem to assume 6 ounces is half a pound. It isn't, of course. A pound is 16 ounces. A 6-ounce package marked 27 cents may seem reasonable if you don't realize you are actually paying 72 cents a pound for just bologna.

The United States Agriculture Department has issued a number of contradictory explanations about why retail prices remain high despite the drop in farm prices.

The facts are, retail food prices are less than 2 percent below a year ago, while the Dun & Bradstreet wholesale food price index is now 12 percent below a year ago, and, in fact, the lowest it's been since 1950. By the Agriculture Department's own figures, 61 cents of the consumer's food dollar now goes for marketing costs, compared with 58 in 1954 and a low of 47 in 1945. In particular, the public is not getting full benefit from the price drop in meat. Only about half the recent reduction in livestock prices has been passed on to consumers.

Nor do the explanations of the Agriculture Department and processors stand up. They claim one reason retail prices remain high is because housewives are buying more semi-prepared foods (cake mixes, frozen foods, and the like).

But this explanation covers only a small part of the food a family buys. A cut of raw pork or beef provides no more "built-in maid service" today than a year ago. In fact, Agriculture Secretary Benson has contradicted himself on this point. His department has said "built-in maid service" (they love that phrase) is a leading reason for the widening marketing spread. But in one speech before newspaper food editors, Secretary Benson praised the "built-in maid service" and said "the additional cost is small."

MORE PROFITS

The other frequent explanation is labor costs. In a protest of this department's previous protest against the high food prices, a spokesman for Grocery Manufacturers of America, Inc., pointed out that the food industry is employing more workers and paying higher wages.

The fact is that from 1953 to 1954, food workers' hourly earnings rose less than 4 percent, while their entire compensation rose only 3 percent (the industry employed fewer people in 1954 than 1953, not more). In contrast, the National City Bank's compilation shows profits of 25 major food manufacturers went up 25 percent in 1954. And, to its credit, the Grocery Manufacturers itself recently reported that increased productivity has held actual unit labor costs to only three-fifths of the advance in wage rates since 1947.

"Built-in maid service" and increased costs of labor, transportation, etc., explain only part of the widening marketing margin. A family that understands this is better able to buy wisely.

For one policy, avoid branded packages that cost significantly more. A survey by this Department finds frankfurters under a packer's brand name are 59 cents a pound, but in the store's own package, 49 cents. Bacon under brand names runs up to 53 cents, but can be bought for 39 to 45 in stores' own packs. Brand-name sausage is 39 cents, but only 29 when sold as just sausage.

For a second money-saving policy, buy the larger cuts and use for several meals. Buy a loin of pork instead of chops which cost more per pound. Buy the whole or half ham at less cost than slices.

Pork this winter is comparatively reasonable. But note how much lean you get for your money. The heavy use of bacon among some families is a money waster.

FEBRUARY SALES

Chief February sales are the annual furniture and rug sales. Furniture prices have already gone up 6 percent in the past year, but the trade expects another 3-percent hike soon. Rug prices have firmed up too, and there are not as many cut-price specials this year as last.

List prices of some appliances are being forced down by the action last month of one big manufacturer in cutting list prices on its canister vacuum cleaner and electrical housewares. One manufacturer has cut its automatic toaster from $19.95 to $17.95, while another has reduced its steam iron from $17.95 to $14.95.

A Tax Ceiling or Limitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, one important tax reform we propose to make is to place a tax ceiling or limit of 25 percent upon all Federal income taxes, corporation taxes, and estate taxes. Why should this be done? In 1848, 100 years ago, Karl Marx announced a two-point program for the destruction of capitalism and the promotion of communism. His two-point program was:

First. All estates should be confiscated through a 100-percent inheritance tax so that the State would eventually become sole owner of all land, buildings, factories, and business enterprises.

Second. A graduated income tax should be levied, which should increase progressively to the point of confiscation, whereupon all private initiative, private capital, and private property would cease to exist.

Mr. Speaker, under the New Deal we have traveled a long way upon the road that Karl Marx laid out. True we have

not yet reached the 100-percent confiscation of inheritances, but we do go up as high as 70-percent inheritance tax; we have reached 91-percent confiscation of all large incomes; and we now have reached a 52-percent confiscation of corporate incomes. So, if we are to avoid Government ownership and operation of all American business and industry, we must adopt a tax limitation amendment to our Constitution.

Excessively high tax rates today are drying up the streams of investment capital. Industrial expansion, the creation of more jobs, and the production of more goods are being curtailed. American industry is now being forced to go to Washington with tin cup in hand to beg the Government for the capital it needs and must have for expansion. This eventually means Government supervision, Government control, and Government ownership. That is socialism.

Mr. Speaker, the experience of England should be a warning to us. England's heavy graduated income tax, coupled with her confiscatory inheritance taxes, forced her into Government ownership and socialism. We are traveling down the self-same road. It is time to call a halt.

Our tax limitation proposal, House Joint Resolution 68, seeks to establish a tentative or proposed 25 percent ceiling upon all income taxes—except in time of war.

The question immediately arises, can the Treasury stand the loss of revenues that such a tax ceiling would bring about? Judging the future by the past—and that is the only way we can judge it—the answer to that question is an emphatic "Yes." With a tax ceiling today of 25 percent receipts, almost $50 billion would still flow into the Federal Treasury—a sum much greater than any sum ever collected by the Federal Government up until 1952, 3 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent editorial taken from the January issue of the Town Journal magazine, entitled "Strangling the Golden Goose." It's central theme is, "The power to tax is the power to destroy"—a timely, pertinent discussion of the need for tax limitation.

STRANGLING THE GOLDEN GOOSE

A serious threat to the continuance of our Nation's growth and prosperity lies in our present outmoded and destructive system of taxation. Our so-called progressive system of taxation says in effect to the ambitious individual, "You're free to work hard to advance yourself, but if you succeed, you will have to pay most of it in taxes," and to the businessman trying to build his business, it says "Try to make your business grow and thus create jobs for more people, but if you do, you will be penalized severely."

This is an amazing and incomprehensible attitude, for it is directly contrary to the very things upon which our Nation's growth has been built—industry, self-reliance, thrift, the willingness to risk one's savings. It discourages and represses those very virtues that made millions of people from other lands flock to our shores.

Under our present tax laws, there is a basic tax rate of 20 percent paid by all those who pay taxes. In addition, there is a surtax paid by everybody with more than $2,000 of taxable income. This surtax starts at 2 percent but progresses rapidly until it finally reaches 71 percent. This is on top of the 20 percent basic tax—a total of 91 percent.

Some will say that such high rates are necessary because it takes a lot of money to operate our Government. But they are usually amazed when they learn that of the entire $29.4 billion derived from the individual income tax, only 16 percent comes from the surtax, which involves everyone with more than $2,000 taxable income. The remaining $24.7 billion—84 percent—comes from the basic 20 percent tax rate. In other words, millions of taxpayers are unfairly overtaxed for the sake of a relatively small part of the total tax revenue. So the high rates are actually more destructive of income than productive of revenue.

The increasing rates fall with especial severity on the middle-income groups—small-business men, lawyers, accountants, many farmers, salesmen, technicians, and skilled craftsmen.

Economists know that lower taxes actually produce more revenue for the Government. Let us say the individual and corporate surtax were reduced gradually each year for 5 years, until both were down to a 35-percent maximum. These reductions would not only mean lower taxes for all income groups, even as low as $2,000—but should also prove an effective stimulus to our whole economy, because of the greater amount of money available for spending by individuals and industry. And this greater prosperity would in turn produce greater tax revenues for the Government.

It is interesting to note that a recent Gallup poll showed that 53 percent of the public favors this 35-percent limitation on income taxation. And it is certain that even more people would favor it if they realized the small amount of revenue that today's excessive rates produce and the bad effect they have on investment and job-making. Truly, the power to tax is the power to destroy.

GRAHAM PATTERSON,
Publisher.

Bette Davis: An Actress With the Ability and Integrity of Her Native New England

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Bette Davis has made every role she has played in films—67 motion pictures in a quarter of a century—glow with character.

Lawrence J. Quirk, another New Englander, has written a memorable profile of her career in the lead-off article in Films in Review of December 1955.

Her inner intensity and radiance, her forceful nature and career drive, and her striking ability to illuminate mere words have brought a new dimension to this wonderful world of entertainment.

Bette Davis represents the determination and the fine craftsmanship that should be an inspiring example to every young person who aspires to a career in this field.

Mr. Quirk has done a fine job in selecting and presenting the qualities that brought Miss Davis to stardom.

I recommend to you the talents of these two New Englanders. The result is most enjoyable.

Here is Mr. Quirk's article on Bette Davis:

BETTE DAVIS—HER FIRST QUARTER CENTURY ON THE SCREEN DEMONSTRATES THE POWER OF THE WILL

(By Lawrence J. Quirk)

Bette Davis first went to Hollywood in December of 1930. In the quarter century since then she has appeared in 67 motion pictures and is soon to be in a 68th.

Her career falls into 4 parts: apprenticeship (1930–33); recognition (1934–38); fame (1939–45); and the spotty decade since.

She was born in the mill city of Lowell, Mass., on April 5, 1908, and was christened Ruth Elizabeth. Her mother's maiden name was Ruth Favor; her father, Harlow Davis, was a lawyer. There was one other child, Barbara, a younger sister, now Mrs. Robert Pelgram.

Two childhood events are supposed to have affected Bette Davis' psychology. When she was 8 her parents were divorced—because of incompatibility, apparently. A few years later Bette almost lost her eyesight in a Christmas-tree fire.

After the divorce, Mrs. Davis, whom her daughters called Ruthie, supplemented the alimony she received by working as a house mother in girls' boarding schools in New England and New York. Later she studied photography and earned money at that. She and her 2 girls became birds of passage, and in the space of a few years lived at 75 different addresses.

In an autobiographical article written in 1941 Bette Davis says that by the time she was 12 she was sufficiently stubborn and headstrong for her mother to notice "this imbalance of temperament." Miss Davis added: "From that time on I would brook no interference in anything I was determined to do." She thinks this intransigeance "may have given me false courage at times, but balancing its benefits against its disadvantages, the results have been satisfactory."

She was sent for a time to a boarding school in Massachusetts, then to the Newton, Mass., High School (where she met Harmon Nelson, later a bandleader and her first husband), and finally to Cushing Academy at Ashburnham, Mass.

In the summer of 1925 she accompanied her mother to Peterborough, N. H., where Mrs. Davis hoped to photograph vacationing theatrical people. It so happened that the Mariarden School of Dancing was enjoying a profitable summer in Peterborough under the aegis of an Englishwoman who called herself Roshanara (she had lived in India). This devotee of so-called modern interpretive dancing, who died a few months later, agreed to teach the 17-year-old Bette Davis free of charge. What she taught her is supposed to have produced the graceful movements and the lithe gestures which are two of Davis' acting trademarks.

According to Miss Davis, her future was decided at about that time by a conversation between her mother and the well-known stage—and later screen—actor, Frank Conroy.

"Throughout my life," Conroy told Mrs. Davis, "I have religiously abstained from advising a mother to put her daughter on the stage. But Bette has something you can't buy and can't imitate. Even if she doesn't open her mouth she has the quality that draws the audience to her. I think that some day, if she works hard, she will be a fine actress."

"And that," says Davis, "is why I became an actress, whether or not you like it."

She became obsessed with theatricals in her final year at Cushing Academy. "I learned lines easily," she says, "and I liked the labored hours of rehearsal, the develop-

ment of characters, the final polishing and later the unveiling. I was the star of our senior play (1926), playing Lola Pratt in Tarkington's Seventeen to Ham Nelson's Uncle Googikins."

After her graduation Frank Conroy suggested that Mrs. Davis enroll Bette, now 18, in Eva LaGallienne's drama school in New York. But Miss LeGallienne, after hearing Bette read some lines, told her she did not take acting seriously enough.

"There is nothing I would rather do than report that Miss LeGallienne was crushed by a realization of her lack of foresight when I did attain some prominence," wrote Miss Davis in 1941. "But she wasn't. Even the almost universal observation by the critics when I was on tour with Ibsen that I was 'a young LeGallienne' left her unperturbed. When we met backstage during one performance she didn't even remember me."

Mrs. Davis took her offspring over to John Murray Anderson's dramatic school, where, between 1926 and 1928, Bette won two scholarships and attracted the attention of Arthur Hornblow, Jr., whose father was dean of the school. The younger Hornblow later arranged a screen test for her, but nothing came of it. In the January 1928 examination play, The Famous Mrs. Fair, directed by James Light, Bette had the part Margalo Gillmore had created a decade before.

Bette left Anderson's that year and Frank Conroy gave her a letter to George Cukor, then directing a repertory company in Rochester, N. Y. After reading the letter, Cukor said curtly: "O. K., we can use you." But after a few roles, including a one-liner in Broadway, Cukor let her go because he saw no future for her.

"It is human to be skeptical about the ability of people you have nursed during the formative years of a career," Miss Davis wrote in 1941. "Warner Bros. brought me out of obscurity and as a result it took them years to become convinced I was worthy of their big pictures. Cukor hired me as a green and unknown ingenue. When I felt (years later) that I was a logical contender for the role of Scarlett O'Hara in Gone With the Wind, apparently he saw only the groping youngster he had fired in Rochester. I have always felt those weeks as Cukor's ingenue prevented me from getting the role which I wanted very much to play." (Cukor's reason for rejecting Davis for Gone With the Wind was reported to be that she had no sex appeal, and David O. Selznick is said to have been against her on general principles.)

Davis' stock-company experience was not wasted, for, as she later said: "It is in stock that the foundation of an acting career is laid. There is no thought of type casting or consideration of whether you can deliver a good performance in any particular part. You simply do it."

Of the period following the Cukor debacle, she said: "You work. You take advantage of every break. People are kind to you and help you, or they are arrogant and petty. Walk-ons grow into bits and bits into important minor roles. Suddenly you realize you are an actress, and you exclaim, with as much surprise as satisfaction, 'I've done it.'"

In late 1928 she and her mother persuaded James Light to take her on at the Provincetown Playhouse in New York, and her first role was in The Earth Between. Said Brooks Atkinson: "Miss Davis, who is making her first professional appearance, is an interesting creature who plays in a soft, unassertive style." Burns Mantle: "The performances are good, particularly that of Bette Davis, playing a wraith of a child with true emotional insight."

Ibsen's Wild Duck followed, after which came Broken Dishes with Donald Meek on Broadway. It opened November 5, 1929, and a few weeks later Samuel Goldwyn saw her picture in a newspaper and had her tested for a part in a Ronald Colman picture.

"It was ghastly," wrote Miss Davis in 1941. "I wonder how Hollywood ever discovers anyone. Actors with no knowledge of the screen are shoved in front of a lens and told to act. No thought is given to makeup. I suppose they reason that if the result is remotely favorable, you will be a sensation after they have worked on you. I had a crooked tooth of which I was aware, but I had no idea that it would stand out like a locomotive. I was badly dressed for the camera. The lighting was awful. For that matter, the lighting was awful for my first 2 years in Hollywood."

Davis went back to Broken Dishes, and after almost 200 performances went on the road with it. The next fall (1930) she opened with Richard Bennett in The Solid South.

About that time Universal wanted a new leading woman for the film version of Preston Sturges' successful play, Strictly Dishonorable, and David Werner, Universal's New York talent scout, thought she might be suitable. After not a little hesitancy, he decided to ship her West on a 3-month option. Werner told her she had no figure, no legs, no looks, and no sex appeal, and was the greatest gamble he had ever sent to Hollywood. But she had, he said, a hard-to-analyze inner intensity and radiance that might come across on film. "If it does," he said, "you'll go a long way in Hollywood."

Her mother accompanied her to Hollywood.

Universal quickly decided they did not share Werner's opinion. Carl Laemmle, Jr.'s reaction was typical: "I can't imagine anyone giving her a tumble." Nevertheless, since they had paid to get her to the coast, Universal used her in minor roles in such films as Bad Sister, Seed, and Waterloo Bridge. She was usually a virtuous sister of a hell-raising heroine, or a wispy girl friend who applauds from the sidelines.

By the fall of 1931 Universal was lending her to other studios. She had a small part in Pandro Berman's Way Back Home for RKO; sank to a poverty-row flicker, Hell's House; rose to a Columbia quickie called The Menace.

But 1932 had good things in store. George Arliss heard of her through Murray Kinnell, who had played with her in The Menace. Arliss' new film, The Man Who Played God, was being cast at Warners and he needed a stage-trained leading woman. He sent for her, and took her.

Said Arliss in My Ten Years in the Studios: "I think that only 2 or 3 times in my experience have I ever got from an actor at rehersal something beyond what I realized was in the part. Bette Davis proved to be one of those exceptions. I knew she had a nice little part important to me—so I hoped for the best. I did not expect anything but a nice little performance. But when we rehearsed she startled me; the nice little part became a deep and vivid creation, and I felt rather humbled that this young girl had been able to discover and portray something that my imagination had failed to conceive. She startled me because quite unexpectedly I got from her a flash that illuminated mere words and inspired them with passion and emotion. That is the kind of light that cannot be hidden under a bushel, and I am not in the least surprised that Bette Davis is now [1940] the most important star on the screen."

Arliss' films enjoyed considerable prestige in the Hollywood of the early 1930's and Davis says: "It is probable the Man Who Played God was my most important picture. I did others that I liked better, and which were more significant, but there was something about appearing as Mr. Arliss' leading lady that gave me standing."

Warners gave her a contract and in 1932 she had supporting roles in So Big, starring Barbara Stanwyck, and in the Rich Are Always With Us, starring Ruth Chatterton; a lead with Warren William in the Dark Horse; and a meaty part with Richard Barthelmess in Cabin in the Cotton; a good supporting one in Three on a Match; a solid role opposite Spencer Tracy in 20,000 Years in Sing Sing; and a good part in Parachute Jumper with Douglas Fairbanks, Jr.

By this time she had bleached her hair blonde and radiated a sleek, almost brazen, self-assurance. The prominence of her eyes was accentuated by more skillful makeup and mannerisms were integrated into a style—always intense, sometimes electric.

Davis' first starring role was as a platinum-blonde man-killer in Ex-Lady. The critics, who had rooted for her up to that point, didn't like her in Ex-Lady and said she overacted and should tone down her mannerisms and wasn't ready for stardom.

Davis shrewdly retreated into a supporting role in George Arliss' the Working Man—her one worthwhile cinematic achievement in 1933. After finishing that Arliss film she toured with a group of Warner stars on a nationwide tub-thumping jaunt on behalf of the filmusical 42nd Street. It lasted 16 days, and although she was married to Harmon Nelson,[1] gosisp linked her with quite a few names.

Davis made use of this gossip. She got Warners' publicity department to let her appear at the premiere of the Edward G. Robinson-Kay Francis film, I Loved a Woman, escorted by all eight of the men she had been rumored to be romancing with.

Davis now tripled her efforts to make her mark in Hollywood. She was aware she was not beautiful and that only her talent, intelligence and intensity would carry her forward, and she began, in 1934, to fight with almost masculine strength for the parts that would get her the recognition she craved.

She was 26: Garbo had arrived at 21, Crawford at 21, Shearer at 23.

The part that Davis regards as "the turning point of my life on screen" was that of Mildred in the unforgettable film version of Somerset Maugham's Of Human Bondage which John Cromwell directed in 1934. Davis portrayed to the life all the phases of that bitter, grasping, deceitful and ultimately degraded little Cockney. Part and player seemed one. For many it is still Davis' greatest performance. It won her an Academy award nomination (she lost to Claudette Colbert's almost acting-less role in It Happened One Night).

A depressed Davis started 1935 with more "programmers." Warners, it seemed, felt Of Human Bondage had been a one-time thing. After a reasonably strong role as the homicide-minded wife in Bordertown, she appeared in three turkeys which made her fighting mad. The titles tell their stories—Girl From Tenth Avenue, Special Agent, and Front Page Woman.

Then, by sheer will and acting ability, Davis made something of a part in a soap-operish drama called Dangerous. As a brilliant stage actress felled by complexes, neu-

---

[1] They had married in August 1932. Davis once said: "Ham is a big, brown, faithful pet." Around 1937–38 he gave up band leading to be a Holywood agent, but after their divorce in 1938 he went back to it. Davis saved her money even in those days and lived in rented furnished houses—the Coldwater Canyon home of actor Robert Armstrong for the most part, though she once rented a Brentwood house because it had been occupied by her idol, Garbo. Davis at that time had a fear of possessions ("I shiver each time I see an auction of a star's personal things advertised in the papers") and wanted nothing that can't be packed in a trunk. She went to few parties, was rarely seen in nightclubs, and lived sensibly. She was, however, hipped on dogs, and later became president of the Tailwagger Foundation and founded a Tailwagger Institute (which trained dogs to aid the blind), and a free emergency hospital in Hollywood for injured animals.

roses and alcoholism, she got the Academy Award she had deserved the year before.

Davis was sure the Warners would now give her a little Shearer-Crawford-Garbo mounting, and her next part, with Leslie Howard in The Petrified Forest, won good notices. But she was then pushed into two program fluffs—The Golden Arrow and Satan Met a Lady. The latter made Davis revolt.

She went to England with her husband and announced she would make two carefully chosen vehicles for Ludovico Toeplitz. Warners filed suit for violation of contract and she and they battled it out in the British courts. When an unsympathetic judge declared "this young lady wants more money," Davis cried out that she only wanted parts worthy of her fully ripened talents. She was 28 years old, she said, and by the time her contract would expire she would be an old woman. She estimated later that the row had cost her $100,000.

Nearly broke, she returned, with high-strung resignation, to fulfill her contract with Warners. Fortunately for her, Warners had concluded she might be right about deserving good parts. Their new attitude was not immediately noticeable, but her parts got stronger. Marked Woman gave her a meaty underworld role; Kid Galahad cast her interestingly and sympathetically in a robust prizefight melodrama with Edward G. Robinson and Wayne Morris; That Certain Woman, remodelel from Gloria Swanson's 1929 talkie hit, The Trespasser, and directed by Edmund Goulding, had a taste of soap about it but provided some dramatic range and had Henry Fonda and Donald Crisp in support. In the summer of 1937 she starred with Leslie Howard in It's Love I'm After, an amusing comedy about temperamental actors.

Late that year she was directed by William Wyler in her first costume role—in Jezebel with Henry Fonda and George Brent. Warners provided a glossy mounting, and Davis did very well as a spoiled, wilful Southern belle who reveals nobility in a crisis. She got her second Academy Award for this performance.

Warners next gave her another well-mounted period piece, The Sisters, with Errol Flynn for costar and Anatole Litvak to direct. Even the San Francisco earthquake of 1906 was used to set off her talents. But to get this part she had had to take a brief suspension for refusing to play in Comet Over Broadway and Garden of the Moon. Neither of those films did the studio any credit when they were released with other stars.

In her next picture, Dark Victory, directed by Edmund Goulding, she was much-admired as a neurotic heiress dying of a brain tumor, and was again nominated for an academy award, which, however, was won by Vivien Leigh for her portrayal of Scarlett O'Hara in Gone With the Wind—the role Davis had coveted.

In Juarez, as Carlotta, Davis grandiloquently flounced through a series of vignettes ranging from romatic interludes with Brian Aherne (Maximilian) to mad scenes. Paul Muni, who played the title role, and Davis were never in the same scene.

Then came a picture for which she cared little, but which proved popular. Her opinion of The Old Maid is puzzling, for many consider it a pivotal film in her career. Sensitively directed by Edmund Goulding, ably acted by a fine cast that included Miriam Hopkins, George Brent and Donald Crisp, possessed of one of Max Steiner's best scores, and lavishly produced, this film version of the 1935 Pulitzer Prize play by Zoe Akins allowed Davis to run the gamut from youthful ingenuousness to embittered maturity. In the film's first half she was so photographed that she seemed to be imbued with the glamour of the top MGM stars she had always envied. The Old Maid was unanimously praised by the critics and is still frequently revived. Many Davis partisans think it Davis' zenith.

She next appeared in the screen version of Maxwell Anderson's rather dull The Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex. Errol Flynn as Essex was a great liability, and so was the uninspired direction of Michael Curtiz. Most critics thought Davis' performance as the aging Elizabeth dallying with a man 25 years younger than herself was better than the film.

Warners were now willing to give her almost anything she asked for, and chief among her demands were extra-good technicians. For many years thereafter she was photographed by Ernie Haller (her favorite cameraman) and Tony Gaudio. She was equally discriminating over who made her up. This carefulness paid off, and Davis had more on-screen glamour between 1939 and 1944 than she had before or has had since.

The scripts handed her were, by and large, of superior quality. In 1940, for example, she did All This and Heaven, Too with Charles Boyer, and an excellent screen version of Somerset Maugham's The Letter, directed by William Wyler.

The following year she had one real success—The Little Foxes, directed by Wyler and produced by Samuel Goldwyn. Davis and Wyler, however, quarreled over how her role should be played. In the end Davis deferred to Wyler's wishes and played it as Tallulah Bankhead had on Broadway 2 years before. Wyler had insisted the original play was a complete entity and that Davis must submerge her personality. When the film was released one critic observed: "The screen's foremost dramatic acress not only acts like Tallulah, but looks like her." Most critics extravagantly praised The Little Foxes—to Miss Davis' surprise.

Her other pictures in 1941 were neither noteworthy nor failures: The Great Lie, The Bride Came C. O. D., and The Man Who Came to Dinner. But on November 7 of that year she was elected president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, succeeding Walter Wanger. She was the first, and so far the only, actress to hold that office. Here is Academy President Davis' opinion of the movies:

"They are the ultimate in the art of the theater for they start where the stage ends. That statement will be challenged by the 'defenders of the faith,' but as one who has worked in both mediums, I believe it. The screen knows no boundaries—its only limitation is the capacity of the audience to understand and accept. The stage has the warmth of living people, but the screen has all the reality that is outside and beyond the stage's proscenium arch."

The following year she was a very overblown bad girl in In This Our Life, one of John Huston's earlier directorial attempts, and a haunting ugly duckling who finds spiritual freedom and strength through love, in Now, Voyager.

In 1943 she again did box office duty for Warners by playing Paul Lukas' wife in Watch on the Rhine, showed she could portray self-sacrifice in Old Acquaintance, and sang one song and did a jitterbug dance in the first of her two wartime service films, Thank Your Lucky Stars.

Her other wartime service film was Hollywood Canteen, in which she appeared in her capacity as president of the canteen and described its work. "The Hollywood Canteen," she wrote at that time, "was created with one idea in mind—to give the men in the Armed Forces fun and a chance to meet personally the people of the entertainment world in Hollywood. We feel that the loyalty and unselfishness that has gone into our canteen is a great tribute to the people in the entertainment industry of Hollywood, and also a tribute to their faith in the American way of life."

She made one feature film in 1944—Mr. Skeffington, directed by Vincent Sherman. Ably supported by Claude Rains, she played a vain and unloving wife who ultimately receives her comeuppance.

The following year she gave a mature and very effective performance in the part in the Corn Is Green that Ethel Barrymore had created on the stage. It was Bette Davis' last unqualified critical success for some years.

Miss Davis then prevailed on Warners to let her produce and she elected to remake Elisabeth Bergner's European film success, A Stolen Life, with Curtis Bernhardt directing and Glenn Ford, fresh out of the Marines, playing opposite her. Since the story concerned the love of twin sisters, 1 good and 1 bad, for the same man, Davis had 2 roles. A Stolen Life was a better than adequate programmer and made a little money.

Deception, released late in 1946, was chiefly notable for Claude Rains' bravura performance as a neurotic composer and for a splendiferous scene in which Davis, stunningly gowned, shot Rains at the top of a flight of stairs. After Deception Davis retired to await the birth of her baby in May 1947.

She returned to the studio in the fall and went into three bad films in a row.

Winter Meeting, directed by Bretaigne Windust, a director recruited from the stage, was an unlikely story about an inhibited poetess and a naval officer who wanted to be a priest. Miss Davis seemed considerably aged. June Bride, a comedy, did more for Robert Montgomery than for Bette Davis. Beyond the Forest, with Joseph Cotten, is widely considered Davis' nadir. She herself has always maintained it contained some of her best acting, but her admirers winced at her maladroit makeup, and black wig, and flagrant overacting. Davis blamed the production code for her failure to be entertaining as a pleasure-mad, unfaithful wife of a small town Wisconsin doctor. One deleted scene she thought would have been helpful showed her plunging down an embarkment to induce abortion.

Reading the handwriting on the wall, Davis decided to beat the worried Warners to the draw and asked to be released from her contract. The Warners were pleased to accede. Whereupon she contracted with Jack Skirball and Bruce Manning at RKO to star in Story of a Divorce, with Curtis Bernhardt directing and Barry Sullivan for leading man. Jane Cowl, in one of her final appearances, was in the cast. The picture was retitled Payment on Demand and was not released until early 1951.

There was good reason for the delay. After Payment on Demand was finished Davis had gone on to the 20th Century-Fox to make All About Eve, which resulted in her becoming boxoffice once more, and thus enabled Payment to make more money than it would have otherwise. Eve had a most apposite part for Davis—that of a fading stage luminary. It also had a good script and a fine cast, including Anne Baxter, George Sanders, Celeste Holm, Hugh Marlowe, and Davis' present husband, Gary Merrill.

Parts like the one she had in Eve do not turn up every day, and she went to England with Gary Merrill to appear in a murder melodrama with Emlyn Williams which Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., and his partner, Daniel Angel, were producing. This was Another Man's Poison. It did indifferent business in the United States.

In 1952 Davis was one of a group of stars participating in 20th Century-Fox's episode-melodrama Phone Call From a Stranger. Her role was brief, but very well played. Later in the year she repeated the role of a faded theatrical luminary in the Star, which won her an academy award nomination.

Then she made a great mistake—she decided to star in a Broadway musical, Two's Company. After many trials in tryout towns,

it limped along on Broadway from December 1952 to March 1953 on Davis' drawing power. Her admirers squirmed at the sight of her disporting herself unbecomingly in unsuitable singing and dancing numbers. To add to her troubles, she was suffering from ostiomyelitis in her jaw. After the show closed she was operated on and went to Maine. She and her husband bought a house in Cape Elizabeth, suburb of Portland.

Then, in 1954, she learned that Richard Todd would star in Sir Walter Raleigh for 20th Century-Fox. She began negotiating with Darryl Zanuck for the role of Elizabeth I, whom she had portrayed 15 years before. Zanuck had the script rewritten to build up her part and changed the title to The Virgin Queen. Davis shaved her head to better simulate Bess' baldness. The film was shot in 11 days. Said Robert Downing in Films in Review: "Miss Davis' latest portrayal of Elizabeth I is better than her interpretation of that personage in Elizabeth and Essex. In The Virgin Queen Elizabeth is an elderly, watchful, suspicious, carping, greedy, lonely, proud, vicious, and dangerous woman. Davis portrays all these human facets and royal ones as well. Her performance is a composition of shrewd intuitions about the complex sovereign who ruled an island kingdom that was being metamorphosed into an empire."

This year Davis had the lead in the forthcoming film originally called The Librarian and now known as Storm Center. It concerns a library employee who refuses to remove a controversial book from the shelves and was directed by Daniel Taradash, who also was one of the producers. Taradash wrote the script of From Here to Eternity.

Early in November it was announced that Davis and Ernest Borgnine would be Debbie Reynolds parents in a screen version of Paddy Chayevsky's TV play The Catered Affair.

Bette Davis has had four husbands.

When she divorced Ham Nelson in 1938, she explained that "emotional differences, not a lagging in the faith and admiration I have for Ham Nelson, are responsible."

On December 31, 1940, she married Arthur Farnsworth at the Arizona ranch of Mr. and Mrs. Justin Dart.[2] Farnsworth and she had met in 1939 while she was vacationing at Littleton, N. H., where Farnsworth was assistant manager of a resort hotel. Later he was a commercial flyer and aircraft executive, and they bought a home in Littleton. The marriage, so far as is known, was reasonably happy. But on August 25, 1943, Farnsworth died while walking on a Hollywood street. Several months before he had fallen in their New Hampshire home and injured his head.

Miss Davis remained a widow for 2 years. Then, in the fall of 1945, she married William Grant Sherry, a painter and amateur boxer. Unlike her previous husbands, "Sherry," as she called him, matched her in "artistic temperament" and this marriage was stormy. It produced one child, Barbara Davis Sherry, born May 1, 1947, by caesarean section (Miss Davis was 39).

Two years later Davis secured a court order restraining her husband from inflicting physical injury on her and filed for divorce, charging abuse and most of the usual complaints. "Sherry" appeared on the set of Story of a Divorce (later retitled Payment on Demand) and reportedly one-two-ed Barry Sullivan, whom he suspected of alienating his wife's affections. The final divorce decree followed. Thereafter "Sherry" married the governess he and Miss Davis had hired for Barbara and sued his ex-wife for alimony.

On July 28, 1950, Miss Davis married Gary Merrill, her leading man in All About Eve. They adopted two children—Margo, 4, and Michael, 3, and Gary offered to adopt Barbara, but "Sherry" would not consent. Merrill so far seems to "understand" his wife's forceful nature and career drive.

They live in a large, three-storied stone and wood structure they call "Witch Way." It is in a clearing along the Maine shore and is reached by a winding country lane. There are huge picture windows through which one can see a bay. The furnishings are antiques.

Bette Davis talks a good deal now about taking root and being a wife and mother. Recently, standing on her sun porch, which overlooks a barbecue oven and stacked lobster pots, she told an interviewer:

"It was bound to happen—my coming here. I've always believed most native New Englanders come home, in one way or another. Oddly enough, we used to summer here as kids—Merrill across the bay at Prout's Neck, and I at Ocean Park."

Then an afterthought occurred to her and she quickly added: "But don't get me wrong, we're not anti-Hollywood."

THE BETTE DAVIS FILMS

The dates below are the release dates. The names that follow the dates are those of the directors. The names following the directors are those of the principal players.

1. Bad Sister. Universal. April 1931. Hobart Henley. Sidney Fox, Conrad Nagel, Humphrey Bogart. In her first film, a programmer, a mousy Bette had a secondary part as a good sister admonishing a more colorful bad sister (Sidney Fox). Humphrey Bogart's "menace" style was little in evidence.

2. Seed. Universal. May 1931. John M. Stahl. John Boles, Lois Wilson, Genevieve Tobin. Bette was merely one of the five children of John Boles and Lois Wilson.

3. Waterloo Bridge. Universal. August 1931. James Whale. Mae Clarke, Kent Douglass (later Douglass Montgomery), Doris Lloyd. In this first talkie version of the Robert E. Sherwood play Davis was almost inconspicuous in the role of Janet.

4. Way Back Home. RKO. November 1931. William A. Seiter. Phillips Lord, Frank Albertson, Effie Palmer. A small part as Albertson's love interest.

5. The Menace. Columbia. January 1932. Roy William Neill, Walter Byron, H. B. Warner. A pointless pot-boiling role in an adaptation of The Feathered Serpent.

6. Hell's House. Capital Films. Feburary 1932. Howard Higgin. Pat O'Brien, Junior Durkin. A dreary crime story produced on poverty row.

7. The Man Who Played God. Warners. February 1932. John Adolfi. George Arliss, Violet Heming. This film changed the course of Davis' career and got her a contract with Warners. She played a young girl infatuated with a famed violinist (Arliss).

8. So Big. Warners. May 1932. William A. Wellman. Barbara Stanwyck, Dickie Moore, Hardie Albright. Davis played Dallas O'Hara in the first of her many "program apprenticeship" films for Warners.

9. The Rich Are Always With Us. Warners. May 1932. Alfred E. Green. Ruth Chatterton, George Brent, John Miljan. Davis had only a fair supporting role.

10. The Dark Horse. Warners. June 1932. Alfred E. Green. Warren William, Guy Kibbee, Frank McHugh. Davis played a girl secretary involved in the political schenanigans of a dumb candidate (Kibbee).

11. Cabin in the Cotton. Warners. October 1932. Michael Curtis. Richard Barthelmess, Dorothy Jordan, Henry B. Walthall. As a rich planter's daughter, Davis loved but lost a land reformer (Barthelmess). This was one of Barthelmess' last major pictures. Davis was grateful for his kindly attitude and encouragement.

12. Three on a Match. Warners. October 1932. Mervyn LeRoy, Ann Dvorak, Warren William, Joan Blondell. Cast as one of three girls who separate and later meet again and light three cigarettes with one match, (to fulfill the old superstition that "three on a match means one will die soon"). Davis played a prosaic stenographer.

13. 20,000 Years in Sing-Sing. Warners. January 1933. Michael Curtis, Spencer Tracy, Lyle Talbot, Sheila Terry. Cast opposite Spencer Tracy for the first and only time. Davis got good notices as his moll.

14. Parachute Jumper. Warners. January 1933. Alfred E. Green, Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., Frank McHugh, Leo Carrillo. Though the typist-mistress of a racketeer, Davis paired off romantically with Fairbanks, a former Marine pilot turned adventurer.

15. The Working Man. Warners. April 1933. John Adolfi, George Arliss, Hardie Albright, Gordon Westcott. In her second and last film with Arliss, Davis appeared to advantage as the spoiled daughter of a dead tycoon whose former business rival (Arliss) brings order out of the family chaos.

16. Ex-lady. Warners. May 1933. Robert Florey. Gene Raymond, Frank McHugh, Monroe Owsley. In her first starring vehicle, a banal programer, Davis played a lady artist with advanced ideas about love and marriage who finally marries her lover (Raymond), gets bored, takes up with a philanderer (Owsley).

17. Bureau of Missing Persons. Warners. September 1933. Roy Del Ruth. Pat O'Brien, Glenda Farrell, Lewis Stone. The title tells all.

18. Fashion Follies of 1934. Warners. January 1934. William Dieterle. William Powell, Frank McHugh, Verree Teasdale. As a fashion designer who assists a bogus business promoter (Powell) to copy Paris fashions, Davis did herself little good.

19. The Big Shakedown. Warners. February 1934. John Francis Dillon. Charles Farrell, Ricardo Cortez, Glenda Farrell. Davis loses her baby when her husband (Farrell) deals in worthless drugs.

20. Jimmy the Gent. Warners. March 1934. Michael Curtiz. James Cagney, Alice White, Allen Jenkins. Her first picture with Cagney was 90 percent Cagney, 10 percent Davis.

21. Fog Over 'Frisco. Warners. June 1934. William Dieterle. Donald Woods, Margaret Lindsay, Lyle Talbot. Another program melodrama in which Davis died before the fadeout.

22. Of Human Bondage. RKO. June 1934. John Cromwell. Leslie Howard, Frances Dee, Kay Johnson. She was nominated for an Academy Award for her performance as Mildred, which began her real stardom.

23. Housewife. Warners. August 1934. Alfred E. Green. George Brent, Ann Dvorak, John Halliday. Davis played around with George Brent, husband of Ann Dvorak, who got him back in the final reel.

24. Bordertown. Warners. January 1935. Archie Mayo. Paul Muni, Margaret Lindsay, Eugene Pallette. In a role later played by Ida Lupino in They Drive by Night (1940), Bette killed her husband in a gas-filled garage, but did not thereby get Muni.

25. Girl From Tenth Avenue. Warners. May 1935. Alfred E. Green. Ian Hunter, Colin Clive, Alison Skipworth. As a girl from the wrong side of the tracks who marries a society playboy on the rebound.

26. Front Page Woman. Warners. July 1935. Michael Curtiz. George Brent, Roscoe Karns, Wini Shaw. She tries to prove women do not make bad newspapermen.

27. Special Agent. Warners. September 1935. William Keighley. George Brent, Ricardo Cortez, Jack LaRue. The kind of fare the title implies. Davis had inherited George

[2] Mrs. Dart was the former Jane Bryan, whose screen career Bette Davis aided with advice, counsel, and front-office boosts. After appearing with Miss Davis in several films, most notably as her daughter in The Old Maid, Miss Bryan married.

Brent as a leading man from Ruth Chatterton, and it was rumored she might also inherit him as a husband.

28. Dangerous. Warners. December 1935. Alfred E. Green. Franchot Tone, Margaret Lindsay, Alison Skipworth. She got her first Academy Award for her performance as a dipsomanic actress. It was photographed by Ernie Haller.

29. The Petrified Forest. Warners. January 1936. Archie Mayo. Leslie Howard, Genevieve Tobin, Dick Foran, Humphrey Bogart. Davis was the waitress, Howard the poet-philosopher, and Bogart as the gangster stole the show.

30. The Golden Arrow. Warners. May 1936. Alfred E. Green. George Brent, Eugene Pallette, Dick Foran. The advertising billed her over the title, but the film did nothing else for her.

31. Satan Met a Lady. Warners. July 1936. William Dieterle. Warren William, Alison Skipworth, Marie Wilson. The second version of the Maltese Falcon (preceding by 5 years the John Huston film with Humphrey Bogart) made Davis so unhappy she revolted and went to England.

32. Marked Woman. Warners. February 1937. Lloyd Bacon. Humphrey Bogart, Jane Bryan, John Litel, Eduardo Ciannelli. She was a clipjoint hostess whose face is marked up by the racketeers. Bogart was a district attorney. Her first picture after the litigation in England, it was better than what Warners had been giving her.

33. Kid Kalahad. Warners. May 1937, Michael Curtiz. Edward G. Robinson, Humphrey Bogart, Wayne Morris. As the girl friend of a fight manager (Robinson) training a new fight star (Morris) Davis was not exactly in the center of things. Robinson was billed above her, and newcomer Morris got the lion's share of attention.

34. It's Love I'm After. Warners. July 1937. Archie Mayo. Leslie Howard, Olivia de Havilland, Eric Blore. For the third time Davis and Howard played together, this time as stage stars amid romatic complications.

35. That Certain Woman. Warners. August 1937. Edmund Goulding. Henry Fonda, Ian Hunter, Anita Louise. As a gangster's widow whose marriage to a rich man's son is annulled. A child complicated things, but happiness is achieved. Davis got good notices.

36. Jezebel. Warners. March 1938. William Wyler. Henry Fonda, George Brent, Margaret Lindsay. Davis' first costume role, and her first well-mounted picture, brought her a second Academy Award.

37. The Sisters. Warners. October 1938. Anatole Litvak. Errol Flynn, Anita Louise, Ian Hunter. Made after her suspension for refusing to do two inferior stories. She played the lovelorn wife of a newspaperman afflicted with wanderlust (Flynn), and was catapulted into the 1906 San Francisco quake (well staged).

38. Dark Victory. Warners. March 1939. Edmund Goulding. George Brent, Humphrey Bogart, Geraldine Fitzgerald. Davis' poignant characterization of a dying heiress who has been a spoiled child was highly praised.

39. Juarez. Warners. April 1939. William Dieterle. Paul Muni, Brian Aheren, Claude Rains. Grandiloquently costumed, and expertly lighted by Tony Gaudio, Davis was the mad Empress Carlotta of Mexico. She and Muni (Juarez) never appeared in the same scene.

40. The Old Maid. Warners. August 1939. Edmund Goulding. Miriam Hopkins, George Brent, Donald Crisp. A handsomely mounted and expertly photographed (by Tony Gaudio) version of the Pulitzer prize play. Davis was brilliant as a frustrated woman unable to acknowledge her child by a dead lover.

41. The Private Lives of Elizabeth and Essex. Warners. December 1939. Michael Curtiz, Earl Flynn, Olivia de Havilland, Donald Crisp. Davis, in the full flowering of success, was resplendent and credible as Queen Elizabeth. Color photography by Sol Polito. Music by Erich Wolfgang Korngold.

42. All This and Heaven, Too. Warners. June 1940. Anatole Litvak. Charles Boyer, Jeffrey Lynn, Barbara O'Neill. Davis played the governess in love with the married Duc de Praslin (Boyer) in 1847 in Paris. Warners gave it a lavish Hollywood premiere.

43. The Letter. Warners. November 1940. William Wyler. Herbert Marshall, James Stevenson, Gale Sondergaard. One of her biggest hits, she was helped by the Maugham plot, Wyler direction, and Gaudio photography.

44. The Great Lie. Warners. April 1941. Edmund Goulding. George Brent, Mary Astor, Lucille Watson. Davis rested on her laurels and Mary Astor, as a colorful concert pianist, stole the show.

45. The Bride Came C. O. D. Warners. July 1941. William Keighley. James Cagney, Stuart Erwin, Eugene Pallette. A silly comedy with Davis as a wacky heiress and Cagney as a commercial pilot. Their last film together. Cagney got top billing.

46. The Little Foxes. Samuel Goldwyn. August 1941. William Wyler. Herbert Marshall, Teresa Wright, Richard Carlson. Davis' quarrels with Wyler didn't prevent her from giving (perhaps caused her to give) one of her best performances in the Tallulah Bankhead role of Regina Giddens. Gregg Toland photographed her very skillfully.

47. The Man Who Came To Dinner. Warners. December 1941. William Keighley. Ann Sheridan, Monty Woolley, Richard Travis. To bolster a good picture, and Monty Woolley, she played a secondary role of secretary, but took top billing.

48. In This Our Life. Warners. May 1942. John Huston. Olivia de Haviland, George Brent, Dennis Morgan. Davis stole her sister's husband, wreaked family havoc, died violently. Effective in spots, but overwrought, and not a successful film.

49. Now, Voyager. Warners. October 1942. Irving Rapper. Paul Henreid, Claude Rains, Gladys Cooper. One of Davis' most telling and appealing roles. Steiner's music won him an academy award. Casey Robinson did the screen play from the Olive Higgins Prouty novel.

50. Watch on the Rhine. Warners. August 1943. Herman Shumlin. Paul Lukas, Geraldine Fitzgerald, Donald Woods. More box office duty this time—to help Paul Lukas. But her restrained, compassionate portrait of the wife—an unusual role—was intelligently done.

51. Thank Your Lucky Stars. Warners. September 1943. David Butler. All-star Warner cast. First of her two wartime all-star service films. She appeared briefly, sang "They're Either Too Young or Too Old," and did a jitterbug number.

52. Old Acquaintance. Warners. November 1943. Vincent Sherman. Miriam Hopkins, Gig Young, John Loder. Davis exuded self-sacrifice and womanly heroism in a tale about two writers, friends for years, and their romantic complications.

53. Mr. Skeffington. Warners. May 1944. Vincent Sherman. Claude Rains, Walter Abel, Richard Waring. A fairly successful version of the story by Elizabeth about a vain coquette who loses her looks. Ernie Haller's camerawork and Franz Waxman's score helped.

54. Hollywood Canteen. Warners. December 1944. Delmer Daves. All-star cast. Davis appeared as herself, and described the work of the famous canteen, of which she was president.

55. The Corn Is Green. Warners. March 1945. Irving Rapper. John Dall, Joan Lorring, Nigel Bruce. She played the Ethel Barrymore part of a schoolteacher who inspires a coal miner with ambition. Widely praised as one of her best performances.

56. A Stolen Life. Warners. May 1946. Curtis Bernhardt. Glenn Ford, Dane Clark, Walter Brennan. Produced by Miss Davis personally. She played twin sisters in love with the same man (Ford). The bar sister wins temporarily, the good one eventually.

57. Deception. Warner's. October 1946. Irving Rapper. Paul Henreid, Claude Rains. Melodrama albeit well-mounted and tasteful, about a concert pianist who fears her lover (Henreid) will guess the truth about her former relationship with a famed composer (Rains).

58. Winter Meeting. Warner's. April 1948. Bretaigne Windust. Jim Davis, Janis Paige, John Hoyt. Ponderous nonsense about a poetess and a naval officer.

59. June Bride. Warner's. October 1948. Bretaigne Windust. Robert Montgomery, Fay Bainter. Montgomery, a past master of comedy, stole it from under Davis' nose.

60. Beyond the Forest. Warner's. October 1949. King Vidor. Joseph Cotten, David Brian. Even Vidor's trenchant direction couldn't save this mordant study of a selfish female from Davis' overacting. Her last picture for Warner's.

61. All About Eve. 20th Century-Fox. November 1950. Joseph L. Mankiewicz. Anne Baxter, George Sanders, Celeste Holm, Gary Merrill. This brilliant film stayed Davis' box-office decline.

62. Payment on Demand. RKO. February 1951. Curtis Bernhardt. Barry Sullivan, Jane Cowl. It profited from All About Eve's success, but was also an effective drama of marriage and divorce on its own, with Davis acting her best.

63. Another Man's Poison. United Artists December 1951. Irving Rapper. Emlyn Williams, Gary Merrill. Produced in England by Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., and Daniel Angel. An inconsequential mystery-melodrama in which Emlyn Williams outplayed her.

64. Phone Call from a Stranger. 20th-Fox. February 1952. Jean Negulesco. Gary Merrill, Shelley Winters, Keenan Wynn. Davis had a small part in the episode starring her husband (Gary Merrill).

65. The Star. 20th-Fox. December 1952. Stuart Heisler. Sterling Hayden, Warner Anderson, Minor Watson. She got an Academy Award nomination for her performance as a fading film star with comeback illusions.

66. The Virgin Queen. 20th-Fox. August 1955. Henry Koster. Richard Todd, Joan Collins. Her first film in nearly 3 years, she played an aging Queen Elizabeth so effectively she took the picture away from Todd.

67. Storm Center. Columbia 1956. Daniel Taradash. Davis as a librarian who refuses to exclude a controversial book.

68. The Catered Affair. MGM 1956 (?). Debbie Reynolds, Ernest Borgnine. A screen version of Paddy Chayevsky's TV play about a middle-class Irish family in the Bronx.

Unification of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, January 22, 1956, regarding the article received by Mr. William James Conlon, of

23 Breed Street, Lynn, Mass., from a friend in his native Belfast, Ireland.

Mr. Conlon has long advocated and worked like all of Ireland's friends in America toward gaining partition of Ireland. It lifts my heart to know that in the Congress of the United States, as among the people everywhere, Ireland has willing and devoted friends who will intensify their efforts for the unification of Ireland.

The article follows:

CONLON SAYS ELECTION OF MITCHELL UPHELD

William James Conlon, of 23 Breed Street, received the following article from a friend in his native Belfast, Ireland, this week.

The article advocates the six counties of Northern Ireland, now ruled by England, be united with the remainder of the country and be governed by the Irish Dail in Dublin.

It explains that the Select Committee of the British House of Commons recently upheld the election of Thomas Mitchell, an imprisoned Irish patriot, as a member of the British Parliament from Northern Ireland, over his rival, Charles Beattie, a supporter of British rule. However, it states, the committee has recommended no legislation to validate the imprisoned Mitchell's election.

The article follows:

"UP FREEDOM FOR ALL IRELAND

"A remarkable tangle has arisen for the Stormount False government. The Unionist, who has twice sought to defeat the young Irishman now in Belfast Prison, serving a 10-year sentence, has suffered a hard blow of disapointment. He has been ousted because the Select Committee of the British House of Commons has found that the election of Charles Beattie as Unionist member of Parliament is invalid.

"What quite mystifies Beattie is that the committee recommends that there be no legislation enacted to validate his election.

"If Thomas Mitchell, in prison, has heard this British decision, you may be sure that he is treating his heart to a wholesome bit of patriotic joy.

"Think of it—a man in prison, with no opportunity to campaign for himself, has twice won the election over his rival, Charles Beattie, the Unionist, the fanatic supporter of the foreign government usurping control of the six stolen northern counties of the Irish Republic.

"In the first eletcion, the Irish patriot, Mitchell, now serving a 10-year sentence in Belfast jail, won the election with a 260-vote majority. In the byelection, ordered by the Stormount 6 county courts, Mitchell won out by 806 votes. Even so, the six county courts declared the Irishman to be disqualified for an M. P. seat.

"Mitchell, held in a desolate Belfast jail on a charge of 'treason-felony,' couldn't very well take his seat in London's House of Commons. What's more, the prisoner wouldn't take it even if freed to do so. He is a loyal Irishman through and through. He wants no association with Britain's Parliament nor the false Unionist government.

"Another election? Members of the six county courts frankly admit that another election would be worthless for they know that no Unionist nominee could win over the Irish vote.

"Where on earth, outside this wondrous island nation, can we find greater determination among the people to be free from foreign rule and domination by England? A young Irishman, helpless to speak a word to further his own campaign, wins out twice at the polls, and the skulking non-Irish element, the Unionists, are afraid to make a third election attempt to seat their candidate.

"It was this man Beattie who petitioned, after his two defeats at the polls, that Thomas Mitchell be unseated.

"Well now, Westminster has declared Beattie himself to be unqualified for an M. P. seat. How true it is 'that the mills of the gods grind slowly, yet they grind exceedingly small. Though, with patience, He stands waiting, with exactness, grinds He all.'"

The Soil Bank and Payment in Surplus Commodities Tried in Early 1930's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, attached is an article appearing in the Sacramento Bee of January 21, 1956, regarding a discussion of the present proposals to help the farm surplus situation. Dr. Murray R. Benedict, who gave the speech referred to, is a professor of agricultural economics in the Giannini Foundation at the University of California at Berkeley. Of special interest is his comment on the soil bank idea, which was tried in 1933, and also farmers taking surplus cotton, which was tried in the early 1930's. I believe that Dr. Benedict's thoughtful comments will be of interest to the Members who are presently dealing with this difficult problem.

THE SOIL BANK PLAN: IS IT LEGAL? HOW IT WORKED FIRST TIME 20 YEARS AGO

(By Hamilton L. Hintz)

How about the soil bank plan which shortly will be considered by Congress as a part of a program to solve the problems of the farmers?

Is it new? How will it work? What are its chances of success? Can its framers hurdle an apparently formidable legal barrier?

These are questions which come to the minds of people connected with agriculture and to those who have the welfare of the farmers and the country at heart.

INSIGHT IS GIVEN

Some light was shed on the answers to these questions in an interview this week with Dr. Murray R. Benedict, professor of agricultural economics in the Giannini Foundation at the University of California at Berkeley.

He recently completed a study of the origin and development of farm policies of the United States since 1790 for the Twentieth Century Fund, resulting in the publishing of two books by the fund.

TRIED FIRST IN 1933

"A program somewhat similar to the soil bank plan was tried in the middle 1930's," said Dr. Benedict.

"Under authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 the Government entered into contracts with the growers of cotton, wheat, corn, and tobacco to pay rental on acreage withheld from production.

"A separate program was instituted for hogs with the aim of preventing depressing surpluses going to market."

ELEMENTS OF SIMILARITY

He pointed out the present soil bank proposal and the 1933 plan are similar in that farmers would be paid for taking land out of production in surplus crops and the Government would make soil conservation payments for soil-building practices.

Another point of similarity is that the new plan, like the old one, would provide the option of the farmer taking surplus crops from the Government in lieu of cash payments.

PROVED SPECULATIVE

"Farmers taking surplus cotton for payment was tried in the early 1930's," said Dr. Benedict. "The record shows that some farmers made money by a rise in price after they took payment in crops. Presumably the architects of the new legislation would provied suitable curbs for speculative use of surplus crops."

The economist pointed out three areas of dissimilarity, saying:

"The new proposal is unlike the old program in that it provides for agreements between the Government and the growers for periods of 5 to 10 years, whereas the earlier deal mostly was on a year-to-year contractual basis.

"Also under the new proposal lands diverted from surplus crops could not be used in the production of other crops which would create new surpluses elsewhere.

TREASURY PAYMENTS

"Another change is that under the system of the thirties the money for benefit payments to growers was derived from a processing tax whereas the new plan would make the payments directly out of the Federal Treasury."

Dr. Benedict termed the soil bank plan of the thirties as not entirely successful although being of some help in reducing acreage and surpluses in wheat, corn, tobacco and cotton.

The greatest factor in leveling off the situation were the droughts of 1933 and 1934 which wiped out the formidable wheat and cotton surpluses of the 1931–32 period and had the United States on a wheat importing basis by the end of 1934.

LEGAL BARRIER?

The legal fate of the 1933 soil bank plan poses a question in the consideration of a revival of the idea.

"After operating for 3 years," points out Dr. Benedict, "the Supreme Court in 1936 declared the crop adjustment plan unconstitutional on the grounds the Government could not tax the processors and could not enter into contracts with individual farmers in connection with the land rental feature.

"The present soil bank proposal has individual contractual provisions similar to the contracts ruled unconstitutional in 1936. Possibly, however, the framers of the new legislation can keep it within the bounds of the 1936 decision, or hope for a more favorable interpretation in the light of present-day conditions."

LESS CALIFORNIA EFFECT

Dr. Benedict believes a soil bank might be helpful in some degree in the present situation, but figures California will be less affected than most other parts of the country.

Wheat, cotton and rice are the principal California crops which might be affected. There would be no effect, for instance, on the $500 million California fruit crop.

Here are other of his observations:

There is really only one of two alternatives out of the present situation—either cut production severely or find abnormal markets for the surplus.

TOO MUCH WHEAT

There is too much land of all kinds, and particularly too much submarginal land, planted to wheat which should be converted to grazing.

The chief thing which has brought on surpluses is greatly increased yield. The potato glut came with only one-half the acreage in production as formerly. Cotton production is up, but acreage is smaller.

While a two price system or its equivalent is being used now on some crops it is not workable in most crops. For a two price system to work there must be a private or Government monopoly of the crop.

BETTER DISTRIBUTION

The food-stamp plan might help in distributing surplus food to the needy. There may be possibilities in utilizing some of the surplus through using it for foreign aid wisely and in domestic distribution.

More attention should be given to purchase of submarginal lands, retiring them from production and converting them to grazing lands. This was tried in a small way in the thirties in the plains area, resulting in some local benefit but having no important effect on the overall national picture.

Chicago's Fight Against Blight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous request, I am extending my remarks to include excerpts from an address on urban renewal by T. V. Houser, chairman of the board, Sears, Roebuck & Co., before the Better Business Bureau of Chicago, as follows:

Now, because as business leaders you are interested in community matters, I would like to move on to a discussion of a problem that faces us here in Chicago—a problem which we as businessmen can and must help solve. The problem is that of stopping the spread of neighborhood decay and arresting the gradual downward slide of large sections of our city toward slum conditions.

This seems to me an appropriate meeting for the discussion of this problem. After all, membership in an organization such as the Better Business Bureau indicates a willingness to accept responsibility and provide leadership. The magnitude of the task of urban renewal in the Chicago area certainly requires the knowledge, energy, and leadership ability which men such as yourselves are in a position to provide.

I think that all of us in Chicago can be proud of the position our city holds as a production center. In a recent article, the Chicago Daily News stated that Chicago is the world's largest producer of steel, first in the production of fabricated metal products, first in the production of nonelectrical machinery, first in the production of railroad equipment, and first in the manufacture of electrical and electronic products.

The future looks extremely bright with the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project and the accompanying development of the Cal Sag area. There can be little doubt that Chicago has developed industrial and business opportunity to a tremendous degree, and because of this many people have been attracted to Chicago as a place to work. But there is one serious blot in this picture, the condition of our housing.

The city of Chicago has an area of about 211 square miles. Of this total, 23 square miles consists of hopelessly blighted slums, and another 56 square miles is in the process of becoming blighted, although not yet at the hopeless stage. In other words, about 37 percent of the total area occupied by the city of Chicago is already in slum status or beginning to approach slum status. This is a situation which should be of very great concern to us as businessmen and as citizens.

The problem is as serious as it is because we have not faced up to it, either as businessmen or as citizens. On the contrary, we have tried to walk away from it. As the city neighborhoods in which many of us first lived grew older and began to grow a little run down, we moved to the suburbs, frequently the close-in suburbs which in due course came to feel the touch of blight themselves, whereupon many of us moved on to more distant and still untouched areas. As we moved, behind us followed others, themselves seeking to escape from neighborhoods where blight had progressed somewhat further; and behind them still others at successively lower rungs of the economic ladder, everyone seeking to escape the consequences of varying degrees of blight by the simple expedient of packing up and moving away. To some extent, the same thing has occurred with many of our business enterprises. Frequently, of course, there are important economic and other advantages in moving plants to suburban or small-town areas, but often these very advantages loom large simply because of the progressive decay of the city itself.

But while an individual household or an individual businessman can solve his own immediate problems by packing up and moving away, the city cannot. And for that matter, realistically speaking, neither can the householder or the businessman however more pleasant he may find the new surroundings into which his family or his plant has moved. The consequences of blight are not limited to the blighted areas themselves, but spread like a pall over the entire community. In our comfortable neighborhoods, we feel those consequences in the form of the higher tax rates needed to subsidize areas which do not produce enough tax revenue to support their essential services or to produce the extra fire and police protection required by the social conditions created by the blight. We feel the consequences in the alarming state of juvenile delinquency and the prevalence of crime in those areas where people grow up and live under slum and near slum conditions.

The problem involves leadership from business as well as from political, educational, and religious groups. But how effective has the leadership of business executives been when their social and family life is so far removed? As businessmen, we paint the glories of the American way of life in glowing terms. Do the realities of living conditions of large numbers of our people come up to their expectations and aspirations? We are distressed that our own employees often do not share our enthusiasm for the virtues of free enterprise and often respond to leadership—political and otherwise—which is critical of free enterprise as we know it and understand it. I submit that it is unrealistic on our part to expect enthusiastic support for the American economic system from people whose attitude is influenced by their undesirable surroundings.

In this connection, the plight of the Negro is particularly serious. The city of Chicago is on the receiving end of a tremendous surge of Negro migration from the South. In large part, this surge is a result of the demand of Chicago industry for a supply of labor to meet its constantly growing needs. Whatever the underlying causes, the massive influx of Negroes into this area, coupled with the limits imposed by custom, prejudice, and economic levels on their freedom of location, have gravely aggravated what was already a problem of major proportions. We cannot afford to have grow up in our midst a substantial group of citizens who are likely to become increasingly antagonistic toward our social, political, and economic institutions because of the degrading conditions of the housing and neighborhoods in which they live. I cite the problem of the Negro and Negro housing, not to explore it in detail or to suggest solutions, but to illustrate the seriousness of urban decay and the imperative necessity for doing something about it.

Actually, considerable is already being done here in Chicago, but a great deal more must be done if we are to avoid the consequences of too little and too late.

We have, I think, adequate governmental machinery for dealing with problems that must be attacked from a governmental level. How well that machinery is operated, how properly it is financed, and how strongly it is supported by public opinion is another matter. I have been greatly impressed with the leadership of Mayor Daley is providing in this field and the vigor with which he is dealing with the various phases of what, by its very nature, must be a complex undertaking. One thing which we as citizens and businessmen can do is to give him the support and encouragement he has shown he deserves—and insist, through the cultivation of an intelligent and active public opinion, that the various agencies of the city government perform in the manner and with the effectiveness he and we expect them to perform.

These governmental agencies deal primarily, although by no means exclusively, with problems of slum and near-slum neighborhoods, problems which have been allowed to fester to a point where only government can deal with them. But there are other tasks which can be handled far more effectively—and efficiently—by nongovernmental means.

These are tasks which lie in the general area of arresting neighborhood decay and preventing the formation of slums. Slum clearance is a massive and expensive undertaking that is largely beyond the reach of private endeavor. But slum prevention is not only within the scope of voluntary action; by and large, it can only be achieved by that means.

Chicago has at least 35 private, voluntary citizen organizations dealing with one phase or another of the problem of arresting neighborhood decay. Most of these are local community organizations set up to deal with specific local situations and conditions. The metropolitan housing and planning council, however, takes the entire Chicago metropolitan region as its sphere of activity and is not only working with the State, county, and local governmental agencies but is also promoting voluntary civic action, especially at the neighborhood level.

As a businessman, it is the possibility of effective action at the neighborhood level that appeals most strongly. Our company, for example, is deeply concerned with the condition of the neighborhood on the west side of Chicago where our national headquarters are located, our largest mail order plant, and one of our largest retail stores. This area, known as Lawndale, has already been touched by blight, and unless prompt and vigorous corrective action is taken, it is inevitable that conditions will grow progressively worse. More and more, our own employees have been moving away from the Lawndale community, creating among other things serious problems of transportation in getting to and from work. We have a real economic stake in maintaining a stable, prosperous area in which our retail store can do business. And as a corporate citizen, we have a vital civic stake in the caliber and character of the community which is home for so important a segment of our company's operations.

We have been concerned for a number of years at the gradual deterioration of our home community. At one time we gave serious thought to transferring our headquarters—our parent organization—elsewhere, perhaps to some pleasant location in the suburbs. Our total operations on the west side occupy an area of about 40 acres, and our total floor space is in excess of 4,500,000 square feet, most of it built around 1905. Only at prohibitive loss would it be possible to relocate the mail order plant and the retail store in another area, but we could and did think seriously of relocating our national headquarters.

But after reviewing the matter carefully, we decided not to move. The launching of the Congress Street superhighway, with all

its promise of improvement for the entire area, was an important factor in reaching this decision. But we also felt we had a responsibility for the area, one that we should not try to walk away from. And we had faith in the future of that section of Chicago, a future we felt we could help mold by doing what lay within our power to help improve the community.

On the basis of that decision, we have moved ahead with plans to air condition and modernize our buildings. We have expanded our land holdings by purchasing substandard housing, clearing the property, and converting it into parking lots. By the time our modernization plans are completed, we will have invested an additional $5,500,000 in our west-side properties. This is a measure of our faith in the essential soundness of our home community.

In addition, to direct investments of this type, we are lending support and encouragment to the Greater Lawndale Conservation Commission, a voluntary organization created by the citizens of the community to help deal with the specific problems of the area. This is a relatively new organization, but it has great promise. The Back of the Yards Council and the South East Chicago Commission in their own particular areas have shown what concerted, voluntary civic effort can accomplish. In its own way and in respect to its own conditions, we hope that the Lawndale organization can be equally successful. As citizens of the community, we accept our full share of the responsibility for supporting its efforts to that end.

Our interest in this subject is not confined to the Lawndale area. We are cooperating with similar groups which have been organized in other areas of the city. And we are urging our local store managers and other company executives in all of the cities where we are located to associate themselves with and lend active support to the voluntary civic movements set up to deal with the similar problems of their own communities.

We have a long tradition at Sears that our executives are expected to take an active part in local civic affairs. The participation of men such as Gordon Metcalf and other Sears executives before him in the work of the Better Business Bureau is a case in point. Sears men are particularly active in the work of the community fund, the Red Cross, the YMCA, boys clubs, chambers of commerce, merchants associations, and other welfare, business and civic enterprises. We are now in the process of urging that they expand the area of their interest and activity to include that of urban renewal. We are hopeful that their training and experience and the backing they have from top management will enable them to make a real contribution in communities across the Nation. We not only have an important economic stake in this entire matter, but a civic stake as well. We are anxious to serve them both.

The membership of the Chicago Better Business Bureau is drawn from all sections of this city. Many or you, like Sears, may have plants or other facilities located in semiblighted or blighted areas. If you do, you will know from personal experience something about the problems I have been describing. And if that is the case, I hope you will recognize your business and civic stake in doing something about it.

As businessmen, you are uniquely qualified to assume a leadership role in this matter of urban renewal. Your business experience qualifies you for such a role, and you have a responsibility to your business and your community to accept it.

Congressman Macdonald's Service to His Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the job which Members of the House of Representatives can perform through travel to other parts of the world has frequently been misunderstood. Important media of public information such as our newspapers, have sometimes given prominence to critical surveys of the travel itineraries of congressional committees or individual Congressmen. The positive accomplishment of the trips which have been made by our colleagues is often under-emphasized.

It is particularly gratifying to see the public recognition accorded to the service performed by our colleague, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, of Massachusetts, as a result of his recent journey to Alaska, Japan, and southeast Asia with members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The Everett Leader-Herald and News-Gazette, of Mr. MACDONALD'S district has paid editorial tribute to the Congressman's diligent attention to his constituents in sharing his experiences and observations with them immediately upon his return from the Far East. Mr. MACDONALD made some 125 speeches to groups of many ages and interest, so that his trip, in the words of the editorial "paid rich dividends to thousands of persons" in his district.

As a welcome expression of appreciation for the benefits derived from the trip of one of our energetic young colleagues, I should like to include the text of the editorial as part of my remarks. The editorial follows:

CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD'S SERVICE

Whatever expense was incurred in the Far East tour made by Congressman TORBERT H. MACDONALD and his colleagues on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, it emphatically has paid rich dividends to thousands of persons in the Eighth Congressional District.

When Congressman MACDONALD returned from the trip he did not sit on a wealth of information which accrued to him in his travels from Alaska to Japan to China and to southeast Asia. He returns to Washington for the opening of Congress with the knowledge that in some 125 speeches he has alerted his constituents to the dangers our country faces in Asia.

It's not easy to move the people at home to an awareness of problems which beset the Nation in farflung places. But in this age of guided missiles, planned launching of satellites from the earth, the atomic bomb with planes that can travel 800 miles an hour, and a cold war which waxes hot quickly, we must be aware of the dangers which face us all over the universe.

Congressman MACDONALD carried his message to civic organizations, veterans groups, social organizations, and hundreds of high school and college students. He brought home the fact that we must be alert to colonial problems in Asia; to the many racial problems, and to the ever-harassing dangers of communism.

The trip not only enables Congressman MACDONALD to take a vital role in discussing such problems in Congress, but it leaves an invaluable lesson to thousands to whom he spoke. They in turn will alert many thousands.

By taking the platform sometimes as many as five times in a day and night to share his information with his constituents while still travel weary, Congressman MACDONALD has rendered a distinct service to everyone in the Eighth Congressional District. And he did it in the wholesome spirit of service without political connotation.

Drastic Measures Proposed To Stabilize Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Drastic Measures Proposed To Stabilize Agriculture," which appeared in the January 19, 1956, issue of the Leitchfield Gazette, of Leitchfield, Ky.:

DRASTIC MEASURES PROPOSED TO STABILIZE AGRICULTURE

The soil-bank plan proposed by President Eisenhower and presumably drawn up by Secretary Benson, differs little from payments made to farmers for taking land out of production during Franklin D. Roosevelt's administration. The objections to one are just as valid against the other. Democrats cannot now deride the effort unless they also were opposed to the previous plan to improve the lot of farmers. After casting about for some way to assist agriculture, this seems to be the only method that is practical although it takes part of the farmer's independence and costs taxpayers money too.

Low prices for farm products are attributed to overproduction, so to bring prices up, production must be limited. But who is going to tell individual farmers how much to limit production and see to it that they do? That is where the Government could be authoritarian and parcel out quotas, but incentive payments are made to accomplish the purpose without in so many words ordering individual farmers to stay within quotas.

It was known 3 years ago that there was an oversupply of farm products, supposedly caused by increased demands that stimulated production during the Korean war. The surplus has remained in practically all products with an increase in some. Moves to lower the surplus have been ineffectual so far as helping the economic condition of farmers is concerned. It will take drastic measures to restore economic balance, and finally the administration appears to have awakened to the need for action. That it occurred in an election year might be mere coincidence.

Taking land out of production is not a complete solution, because intensive farming on fewer acres will result in production just as great. This has been proven in the tobacco belt as acreage has been cut lower and lower, yet surpluses remain. Marketing

quotas in addition to fewer acres in production are needed until the annual carryover reaches a normal stage. It will take years to make any plan effective, so for the best of all concerned both major parties should agree on a program with as little political skulduggery as possible.

The Challenge of Political Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, during the past week I have been reading with much pleasure the recent book entitled "Profiles in Courage," which has been written by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. It is indeed an interesting and excellent study of those inherent traits of courage which a public official is frequently called upon to muster. In the general approval of this worthwhile book, I hope that an article by the Senator from Massachusetts, on the subject the Challenge of Poltical Courage, as it appeared in the New York Times magazine section on December 18, 1955, will not be overlooked, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF POLITICAL COURAGE

(By JOHN F. KENNEDY)

"People don't give a damn," a syndicated columnist told millions of readers not so many year ago, "what the average Senator or Congressman says. The reason they don't care is that they know what you hear in Congress is 99-percent tripe, ignorance, and demagogery and not to be relied upon."

Earlier a member of the Cabinet had recorded in his diary: "While I am reluctant to believe in the total depravity of the Senate, I place but little dependence on the honesty and truthfulness of a large portion of the Senators. A majority of them are small lights, mentally weak, and wholly unfit to be Senators. Some are vulgar demagogs * * * some are men of wealth who have purchased their position * * * some are men of narrow intellect, limited comprehension, and low partisan prejudice."

And still earlier a Member of the Senate itself told his colleagues that "the confidence of the people is departing from us, owing to our unreasonable delays."

The Senate knows that many Americans today share these sentiments. Senators, we hear, must be politicians—and politicians must be concerned only with winning votes, not with statesmanship or courage. Mothers may still want their favorite sons to grow up to be President, but, according to a famous Gallup poll of some years ago, they do not want them to become politicians in the process.

Does this current rash of criticism and disrespect mean the quality of the Senate has declined? Certainly not. For of the three statements quoted above, the first was made in the twentieth century, the second in the nineteenth and the third in the eighteenth (when the first Senate, barely under way, was debating where the Capitol should be located).

Does it mean then, that the Senate can no longer boast of men of courage?

Walter Lippmann, after nearly half a century of careful observation, rendered in his recent book a harsh judgment both on the politician and the electorate: "With exceptions so rare they are regarded as miracles of nature, successful democratic politicians are insecure and intimidated men. They advance politically only as they placate, appease, bribe, seduce, bamboozle, or otherwise manage to manipulate the demanding, threatening elements in their constituencies. The decisive consideration is not whether the proposition is good but whether it is popular—not whether it will work well and prove itself, but whether the active-talking constituents like it immediately."

I am not so sure, after nearly 10 years of living and working in the midst of "successful democratic politicians," that they are all "insecure and intimidated men." I am convinced that the complication of public business and the competition for the public's attention have obscured innumerable acts of political courage—large and small—performed almost daily in the Senate Chamber. I am convinced that the decline—if there has been a decline—has been less in the Senate than in the public's appreciation of the art of politics, of the nature and necessity for compromise and balance and of the nature of the Senate as a legislative chamber.

And, finally, I am convinced that we have criticized those who have followed the crowd—and at the same time criticized those who have defied it—because we have not fully understood the responsibility of a Senator to his constituents or recognized the difficulty facing a politician conscientiously desiring, in Webster's words, "to push [his] skiff from the shore alone" into a hostile and turbulent sea. Perhaps if the American people more fully comprehended the terrible pressures which discourage acts of political courage, which drive a Senator to abandon or subdue his conscience, then they might be less critical of those who take the easier road—and more appreciative of those still able to follow the path of courage.

The first pressure is a form of pressure rarely recognized by the general public. Americans want to be liked—and Senators are no excéption. Realizing that the path of the conscientious insurgent must frequently be a lonely one, we are anxious to get along with our fellow legislators, our fellow members of the club, to abide by the clubhouse rules and patterns, not to pursue a unique and independent course which would embarrass or irritate the other members. We realize moreover, that our influence in the club—and the extent to which we can accomplish our objectives and those of our constituents—are dependent in some measure on the esteem with which we are regarded by other Senators. "The way to get along," I was told when I entered Congress, "is to go along."

Going along, it was clear, included fulfillment of my obligation to follow the party leadership whom I had helped select. All of us in the Congress are made fully aware of the importance of party unity (what sins have been committed in that name) and the adverse effect upon our party's chances in the next election which any rebellious conduct might bring. Even the success of legislation in which a Senator is interested depends in part on the extent to which his support of his party's programs has won him the assistance of his party's leaders.

Finally, the Senator who follows the independent course of conscience is likely to discover that he has earned the disdain not only of his colleagues in the Senate and his associates in his party but also of the all-important contributors to his campaign fund.

It is the thinking of that next campaign—the desire to be reelected—that provides the second pressure on the conscientious Senator. It should not automatically be assumed that this is a wholly selfish motive—although it is not unnatural that those who have chosen politics as their profession should seek to continue their careers—for Senators who go down to defeat in a vain defense of a single principle will not be on hand to fight for that or any other principle in the future.

Defeat moreover is not only a setback for the Senator himself—he is also obligated to consider the effect upon the party he supports, upon his friends and supporters who have gone out on a limb for him or invested their savings in his career, and even upon the wife and children whose happiness and security—often depending at least in part upon his success in office—may mean more to him than anything else.

Where else, in a nontotalitarian country, but in the political profession is the individual expected to sacrifice all—including his own career—for the national good? In private life, as in industry, we expect the individual to advance his own enlightened self-interest—within the limitations of the law—in order to achieve overall progress. But in public life we expect individuals to sacrifice their private interests to permit the national good to progress.

In no other occupation but politics is it expected that a man will sacrifice honors, prestige and his chosen career on a single issue. Lawyers, businessmen, teachers, doctors, all face difficult personal decisions involving their integrity—but few, if any, face them in the glare of the spotlight as do those in public office. Few, if any, face the same dread finality of decision that confronts a Senator facing an important call of the roll. He may want more time for his decision—he may believe there is something to be said for both sides—he may feel that a slight amendment could remove all difficulties—but when that roll is called he cannot hide, he cannot equivocate, he cannot delay—and he senses that his constituency, like the raven in Poe's poem, is perched there on his Senate desk, croaking "Nevermore" as he casts the vote that stakes his political future.

Few Senators "retire to Pocatello" by choice. The virus of Potomac fever, which rages everywhere in Washington, breeds nowhere in more virulent form than on the Senate floor. The prospect of forced retirement from "the most exclusive club in the world," the possibilities of giving up the interesting work, the fascinating trappings, and the impressive prerogatives of congressional office, can cause even the most courageous politician serious loss of sleep.

Thus perhaps without realizing it, some Senators tend to take the easier, less troublesome path to harmonize or rationalize what at first appears to be a conflict between their conscience—or the result of their deliberations—and the majority opinion of their constituents. Such Senators are not political cowards—they have simply developed the habit of sincerely reaching conclusions inevitably in accordance with popular opinion.

Still other Senators have not developed that habit—they have neither conditioned nor subdued their consciences—but they feel, sincerely and without cynicism, that they must leave considerations of conscience aside if they are to be effective. Not all Senators agree with them—but few would deny that the desire to be re-elected exercises a strong brake on independent courage.

The third and most significant source of pressures which discourage political courage in the conscientious Senator or Congressman—and practically all of the problems described apply equally to Members of both Houses—is the pressure of his constituency, the interest groups, the organized letter-writers, the economic blocs and even the average voter. To cope with such pressures,

to defy them or even to satisfy them, is a formidable task. All of us occasionally have the urge to follow the example of Congressman JOHN STEVEN MCGROARTY of California, who wrote a constituent in 1935:

"One of the countless drawbacks of being in Congress is that I am compelled to receive impertinent letters from a jackass like you in which you say I promised to have the Sierra Madre mountains reforested and I have been in Congress 2 months and haven't done it. Will you please take two running jumps and go to hell."

Fortunately or unfortunately, few follow that urge—but the provocation is there, not only from unreasonable letters and impossible requests, but also from hopelessly inconsistent demands and endlessly unsatisfied grievances.

To my office, for example, comes a delegation representing New England textile mills, an industry essential to our prosperity. They want the tariff lowered on the imported wool they buy from Australia—but they want the tariff raised on the finished woolen goods imported from England with which they must compete. One of my southern colleagues told me that a similar group visited him the same day with the same requests—but further urging that he take steps to (1) end the low-wage competition from Japan and (2) prevent the Congress from ending—through a higher minimum wage—the low-wage advantage they themselves enjoy to the dismay of my constituents.

Recently, two groups called me off the Senate floor—the first was a group of businessmen seeking to have a local Government activity closed as unfair competition for private enterprise; and the other was a group representing the men who work in that Government installation and who are worried about their jobs.

All of us in the Senate meet endless examples of such conflicting pressures, which only reflect the inconsistencies inevitable in our complex economy. If we tell our constituents frankly that we can do nothing, they feel we are unsympathetic or inadequate. If we try and fail—usually meeting a counteraction from other Senators representing other interests—they say we are like all the rest of the politicians. All we can do is retreat into the cloakroom and weep on the shoulder of a sympathetic colleague—or go home and snarl at our wives.

We may tell ourselves that these pressure groups and letterwriters represent only a small percentage of the voters—and this is true. But they are the articulate few whose views cannot be ignored and who constitute the greater part of our contacts with the public at large, whose opinions we cannot know, whose vote we must obtain and yet who in all probability have only a limited idea of what we are trying to do.

These then, are some of the pressures which confront a man of conscience. He cannot ignore the pressure groups, his constituents, his party, the comradeship of his colleagues, the needs of his family, his own pride in office, the necessity for compromise and the importance of remaining in office. He must judge for himself which path to choose, which step will most help or hinder the ideals to which he is committed.

He realizes that once he begins to weigh each issue in terms of his chances for reelection, once he begins to compromise away his principles on one issue after another for fear that to do otherwise would halt his career and prevent future fights for principle, then he has lost the very freedom of conscience which justifies his continuance in office. But to decide at which point and on which issue he will risk his career is an overwhelming and frightening responsibility.

Why, then, does any man resist these pressures and speak out with courage and conscience? Perhaps those Senators whose acts of political courage are recounted in my forthcoming book were men who forgot all about themselves in their dedication to the public good. But, on the other hand, it is perhaps more likely that John Adams, surely as disinterested a public servant as we ever had, came much nearer to the truth when he wrote: "It is not true, in fact, that any people ever existed who love the public better than themselves."

If this be true, what then caused such statesmen to act as they did? It was not, it seems to me, because they loved the public better than themselves. On the contrary, it was precisely because they did love themselves—because each one's need to maintain his own respect for himself was more important to him than his popularity with others—because his desire to maintain a reputation for integrity was stronger than his desire to maintain his office—because his conscience, his personal standard of ethics, his integrity or morality, call it what you will, was stronger than the pressures of public disapproval—because his faith that his course was the best one, and would ultimately be vindicated, outweighed his fear of public reprisal.

When the politician loves neither the public good nor himself, or when his love for himself is limited and is satisfied by the trappings of office, then the public interest is badly served. But when his regard for himself is so high that his own self-respect demands he follow the path of courage and conscience, all benefit.

Today, the challenge of political courage looms larger than ever before. For our everyday life is becoming so saturated with the tremendous power of mass communications that any unpopular or unorthodox course arouses a storm of protests. Our political life is becoming so expensive, so mechanized, and so dominated by professional politicians and public-relations men that the idealist who dreams of independent statesmanship is rudely awakened by the necessities of election and accomplishment.

And our public life is becoming so increasingly centered upon that seemingly unending war to which we have given the curious epithet "cold" that we tend to encourage rigid ideological unity and orthodox patterns of thought and to frown on insurgent individualism.

Thus, in the days ahead, only the very courageous will be able to take the hard and unpopular decisions necessary for our survival in the struggle with a powerful enemy; an enemy with leaders who need give little thought to the popularity of their course, who need pay little tribute to the public opinion they themselves manipulate, and who may force, without fear of retaliation at polls, their citizens to sacrifice present laughter for future glory. And only the very courageous will be able to keep alive the spirit of individualism and dissent which gave birth to this Nation, nourished it as an infant, and carried it through its severest tests upon the attainment of its maturity.

Time For Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer on January 21, 1956:

TIME FOR ACTION

According to a wire service report, the President has asked the Civil Aeronautics Board to review the application of Pan American World Airways for a great circle route to the Orient.

The CAB, more than a year ago, recommended that the application be denied, but last February the President announced that he was holding his decision in abeyance.

We do not know the nature of the new circumstances to which the President refers in asking for a review on the part of CAB. But we feel that Ike is right in trying to get some action in the matter.

The current situation recalls that the P-I has urged, and will continue to urge, the very maximum air service for Seattle and the Pacific Northwest. Regardless of air routes serving Seattle, as in most other things, there is no progress in standing pat.

If Seattle is going to fulfill its oft-discussed future as an important crossroads on tomorrow's international airlanes, then we should seek action and forego conversation. We should act decisively to support every possible new or expanded air service that may be offered or proposed.

We should ask the Civil Aeronautic Board to move swiftly in response to the President's request.

Greek Letters Week Proclamation Issued by Governor of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am very happy to include a proclamation issued by the Governor of Massachusetts designating this week as Greek Letters Week. My very good friend Father Stephen J. Anthony, of the Assumption Greek Orthodox Church in Somerville, Mass., was instrumental in bringing about this celebration, and I commend to the attention of my colleagues here in the House this thoughtful tribute to the Greek Orthodox communities of Massachusetts and of our Nation.

Whereas the Greek Orthodox Church communities of our commonwealth along with all the other Greek Orthodox communities throughout the Nation, will observe Greek Press, Radio, and Letters Week, with appropriate exercises and programs, during the week of January the 22d; and

Whereas the Greek language is the language of their ancestors, to whom they are greatly indebted and of whom they are especially proud; and

Whereas the Greek language is the first and an outstanding classical language of the world, and as such the medium through which Greek literature, philosophy and the beginnings of modern science have been recorded; and

Whereas the vast knowledge and wisdom contained in the books written in the Greek language have influenced the thought, religion and actions of nations in the past, and continue to do so today; and

Whereas scholars and scientists, the world over, look to the Greek language with respect and esteem, and seminaries of every Christian faith honor Greek as the tongue through which the ringing message of Christianity itself was given to the world:

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby proclaim the week of January the 22d through January the 29th, as Greek Letters Week and urge all the citizens of our commonwealth to take part wherever possible in the annual observance by the various Greek Orthodox communities and thus show our appreciation of the contributions made by the Greek language, not only to the world of Christendom, but to the culture and civilization of mankind as well.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 16th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1956, and the independence of the United States of America, the 180th.

By His Excellency the Governor, Christian A. Herter.

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Keep Religion Out of Public Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Bernard Twersky, of New York City, associate editor of the World Union Press, has written a pointed answer to the proposal by the New York Board of Superintendents for the introduction of religion into the public schools.

Rabbi Twersky, a member of one of the most famous rabbinical families of Europe and Israel, has been active for some years in the English-Jewish journalistic field. His extensive travels abroad have brought him in touch with many leaders in government, religious, and welfare organizations.

I direct the attention of our colleagues to his article entitled "Keep Religion Out of Public Schools," which appears in the December 30, 1955, issue of the Examiner, a weekly publication.

The article follows:

The statement on moral and spiritual values of the board of superintendents has stirred up a controversy of major proportions. The board of superintendents, in effect, advocates the introduction of religion into the public school system. They would have the teachers inculcate religious values and ideas as part of the educational process. Although this plan may appear superficially to be worthy, it in effect represents a serious threat to a continued growth and development of spiritual life in the Jewish community.

The intrusion of religion in the schools can only be considered a violation of the cherished American principle of the separation of church and state. The state should in no way be a party to the propagation of religious beliefs or dogma in public institutions of learning.

Americans have enjoyed the blessings of freedom and individual liberty because the state and church have operated within their own respective spheres of endeavor. The Prime Minister of Israel, David Ben-Gurion aptly expressed the rationale of the American raison d'etre for the separation of church and state as follows: "America has adopted the convenient solution of separating church from state, not for antireligious reasons, but on the contrary, because of a deep attachment to religion and the desire to secure freedom for each and every citizen."

BASIC PRINCIPLE

This basic principle of separation was well expressed in the following excerpt from a decision by Supreme Court Justice Black: "Neither (church or state) can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

"Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organization or group, and vice versa. In the words of Jefferson, the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state."

One of the functions of the public school system is to foster a spirit of unity between the diverse groups that make up our community. This very important function is jeopardized when religion is brought into the classroom. It is very unlikely that a teacher can disseminate the teachings of religion without injecting a note of partiality, sectarianism, or even unconscious bias.

NO OBJECTIVE SYSTEM

There is no such thing as objectivity in spreading the meaning of a system of religious values, since the religious emphasis of the different faiths is markedly diverse in nature. We also must recognize the fact that teachers are not trained to impart fundamental religious principles to students.

Furthermore, we must realize that there are qualified teachers who are not religionists. Should it therefore follow that such teachers be dismissed because they do not wish to impart religious ideas to their students? By expecting teachers to give religious instruction, we are in effect imposing a religious test in deciding upon the qualifications and ability of a person to teach.

RIGHTS OF PARENTS

We must also reckon with the fact that there are parents who do not wish their children exposed to any specific religious teachings. Should such children be denied the privilege of free public education? Let us recall that the United States Supreme Court in the Barnett case held the view that even saluting the flag cannot be imposed on those to whom it is a violation of their religious beliefs.

The home, synagogue and church are the proper agencies and institutions to develop a firmer and more substantial understanding and reverence for that which is religious and spiritual. All religious groups are making great strides in gaining more adherents.

NO NEED

They do not need the assistance of the secular authorities to continue this favorable trend. George Dugan reported in the New York Times of December 10, 1955, that churches and synagogues in the New York area have invested $250 million in building projects since 1950. Religion is not retrogressing and does not require the school to install its great and priceless heritage. The schools are performing their tasks in the realm of moral development of our youth with commendable efficiency.

The New York Board of Rabbis under the dynamic leadership of its president, Rabbi Emanuel Rackman, its general secretary, Rabbi Harold H. Gordon, as well as the Social Action Committee headed by Rabbi Edward Klein are vigorously opposing the implementation of the board of superintendents' recommendations.

The New York Board of Rabbis has won the moral support of all the major Jewish organizations interested in this problem, as well as the entire Jewish community. This is one issue in which the American Jewish Congress and the American Jewish Committee, organizations of divergent attitudes, are in complete accord.

HISTORIC PRINCIPLE

In this struggle to preserve the historic principle of the separation of church and state, the New York Board of Rabbis deserves the appreciation of all people desirous of seeing that the American tradition of liberty and freedom be perpetuated.

This problem however does not affect the Jewish community alone, as is evidenced by the fact that the United Parents Association, the Teacher's Guild and many prominent Protestant clergymen have taken up this struggle to preserve our free school system.

Lord Bryce observed over a half century ago that America has managed to steer clear of the bitter struggle between religion and the state. Let us dedicate ourselves to the greater fulfillment of the wonderful vision of a society based on the full and unhindered development of human freedom.

Progress in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Mr. Bernard L. Hegeman, president of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board, Inc., at the 51st anniversary banquet of the board held at the Hotel St. George, Brooklyn, on Saturday evening, January 14, 1956:

Years ago, the remarks made by the Brooklyn board president at the annual banquet consisted of a complete résumé of what had happened in real estate during the past year, and a statement of what the president hoped to accomplish in the year to come.

Frankly, I used to feel that the talks were too long and many of you have told me you felt the same way. So in furtherance of the idea of giving you the kind of banquet that you want, my remarks will be very brief. I'll just hit the high spots.

Many of the men who know me describe me as an optimist. Well, I am an optimist and today I am more optimistic than ever. Why? Well, I see many things taking place in Brooklyn—changes, which augur well for the future. I feel that it is time for all of us to reexamine this great borough of Brooklyn and begin to "tell the world" about the fine things that we have here and that are happening here.

Look at the civic center. Here in a short space of time, you are seeing a new "heart of Brooklyn" being created. The Red Cross Building, the Welfare Department Building, and the Domestic Relations Building are already completed. Now, we can see the new Supreme Court Building taking shape.

Less than a month ago, I had the honor of going before the city planning commission and asking for approval of plans for an underground parking garage to be built in the civic center. Also there, in support of the same plan, were representatives of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Brooklyn Association, the civic council and other civic bodies. It made me feel proud to see officials of outstanding Brooklyn organizations taking time to go over to city hall for the purpose of seeing that worthwhile improvements were made in Brooklyn. Such a spirit speaks well for the future.

Besides the transformation taking place in the civic center area, we are about to see another big improvement take form before our eyes. This one may well mark the beginning of a new era for this great borough of ours. I am referring, of course, to the $85 million waterfront-development program which is about to be inaugurated by the Port of New York Authority. This improvement, gigantic in conception and in scope is going to rejuvenate the waterfront from Fulton Ferry to Red Hook. The new ultramodern piers will permit our present steamship companies to remain in Brooklyn and I am sure that they will induce others to locate here. As businessmen, I do not have to tell you how important our waterfront and industrial areas are to the lifeblood of Brooklyn. Without thriving industry and healthy shipping activities, Brooklyn soon would stagnate. Gentlemen, this is not going to happen. I am telling you tonight that we are going places. A new and better Brooklyn is emerging.

People talk and worry about industry leaving Brooklyn. It is true some companies have moved to bigger and better quarters out of town. However, what has happened to their former plants here in Brooklyn? Practically all the space has been absorbed by other concerns.

The Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce conducted a survey of 100 companies who had moved out of town, in order to find out what the main reasons were for their moving away. A total of 81 percent stated that lack of proper space or proper sites was a major factor in their removal.

We have practically no unrestricted plots available for development here in Brooklyn.

A year ago I spoke about the need for industrial sites within the city limits, where a manufacturer could build a one-story building on a landscaped plot, like the ones we see in Nassau County, or Suffolk, or over in Jersey, or up in Connecticut, with plenty of off-street parking for employee cars. No traffic congestion. Plenty of light and air. The area that I mentioned last year, between Linden Boulevard and the Belt Parkway, and near the terminal yards of the IRT and Independent subways is still available—acres of vacant land, mostly filled, with no streets, sewers, water, or sidewalks. Practically all of it owned by the city. But in order to make it usable for industry the city has got to develop it. Rezone it—it's now residential. Put sanitary sewers and water in some of the streets. Pave those streets. Make large blocks, say 400 feet by 700 feet.

Let the board of estimate put half a million dollars in a revolving fund to cover the cost of these public improvements, with the money to be repaid when the property is sold.

Then let industry know that Brooklyn has available industrial sites. Set auction upset prices low enough so as to be competitive with land in the nearby suburbs.

The city couldn't lose on the deal and I am positive that the one-half million fund would prove to be a bonanza. What I am asking is that city of New York act like all other towns and cities—work on getting and keeping industry.

All we have to do is provide a place where expanding industries can build bigger and more morern plants and most of them will be delighted to stay here.

I've talked with many of the industrialists who have moved and everything isn't as wonderful as they hoped it was going to be out of town.

Last year I warned about the danger of an increase in real estate taxes. Well, the real estate tax in Brooklyn has been increased from $3.79 per $100 of assessed valuation to $3.95 per $100. Controller Gerosa has warned us that the rate will go to $5 unless the city economizes. Another increase is in sight unless the property owners make up their minds to fight. Last fall they did become aroused and defeated the plan to put an additional sewer tax on property owners. The cost of this would have been in addition to the special sewer tax which was put into effect a few years ago.

Owners of real estate are still plagued with rent control. I can see no need at all for rent control in business, office and industrial space. These laws should not be renewed by the State legislature this year.

Residential rent control became a political football at the last session of the State legislature and such fair and equitabe modifications as the pass-along theory, and decontrol of luxury apartments were scrapped, and the law extended until June 30, 1957.

As a result some of the better type owners became discouraged and sold their apartment holdings. In some instances the buyer was the chiseling, conniving type of owner who spends little or nothing for maintenance, gives as little service as he can without risking a jail term and, for whose misconduct, realtors and decent property owners have to suffer because of the antagonism created in the mind of the general public against landlords.

While I'm on the subject, I would like to give you my nomination for the prime cause of the down-grading of neighborhoods and the development of slums. Gentlemen, my nominee is residential rent control. Think about it. I'm sure you will agree with me.

I spoke a moment or two ago about how Brooklyn civic and business organizations were cooperating by their appearance at Board of Estimate meetings where new improvements for Brooklyn were under consideration. A few weeks ago it appeared as if a project for the elimination of the transit bottleneck at the DeKalb Avenue BMT Station might be in danger of defeat. We were all there to fight for the approval of the project if open opposition developed. Fortunately, it did not materialize.

Now a controversy has developed about the extension of the subway along Nostrand Avenue. This is a plan which was talked about before and I thought it had been settled with the approval of a $500 million bond issue for this purpose a few years ago. It is not my purpose tonight to discuss this controversy, other than to say that Brooklyn needs the Nostrand Avenue extension and it should be approved.

At the beginning of my remarks, ladies and gentlemen, I told you that I am an optimist. I mentioned the Civic Center, and The Port Authority's pier improvement program. They certainly are things to be optimistic about—things that will outlive and outlast rent controls and the other annoyances of the day.

We have a great borough, we are going to make it a greater borough.

I am optimistic as to the future of Brooklyn. Thank you.

The Brink of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a statement made by Henry R. Luce, editor in chief of Life magazine, explaining the background and intent of the highly publicized "brink of war" article attributed to Secretary of State Dulles.

Mr. Luce makes a salient point when he states:

We are bound to say that any fault of ours was furiously compounded by those, who for the moment put prejudice or personal advantage above the best interests of the United States.

Bipartisanship in foreign policy in these critical times is as necessary to our national security as is the maintenance of our Armed Forces. Playing politics with foreign policy is a dangerous, if not unpatriotic, practice. There is a heavy line dividing honest criticism from election-year politicking, and it is difficult to cross this line without intent.

No matter how ripe the issue seems for plucking, the voting public is not unaware of the political motivations of those who exploit the issue beyond all proportion.

I commend to my colleagues this statement by a gentleman, a great editor, an outstanding patriot:

In view of the attacks made on Secretary of State John Foster Dulles because of an article in Life entitled "How Dulles Averted War," I believe it is necessary and appropriate for me to make a few simple points.

First, the article as a whole was not an "interview" and it was not cleared by the Secretary or any other official. The article was based on background conversation with the Secretary and on our own review of the historical record.

ARTICLE SHORTENED, EDITED

Second, the article originally written by Life's Washington bureau chief was much too long for publication. It was shortened and edited, then approved by me. Responsibility for the published article, both as to substance and phraseology, belongs to the editors of Life and to no others.

Third, most of the attacks on Secretary Dulles are based on one paragraph of direct quotation from the secretary containing the words "verge of war" and "brink.". Taken in the context of the whole article, there is nothing in Secretary Dulles' words which is contrary to common sense. For the secretary is stating in vivid terms the perils of appeasement which should be understood by free men everywhere. Nevertheless our use of these particular words in the headlines was unfortunate in that they did not fully reflect the main emphasis of the lengthy conversation which was on the administration's vigorous pursuit of peace.

Ever since its first year of publication in 1937 when war was already raging in Asia, Life has devoted its major effort to helping its readers achieve a clear view of the world crisis. We have always believed, even in darkest moments, that crisis can be overcome. Realistic analysis of the facts. This is one of the principles which has guided Secretary Dulles and which we desired to make plain. That President Eisenhower, advised by Secretary Dulles, did avert war we have no doubt. And that their courageous action achieved other objectives is also plain as day.

If anything in our account of the secretary's position caused any misunderstanding among our readers or the public, we heartily regret it. At the same time, we are bound to say that any fault of ours was furiously compounded by those who, for the moment, put prejudice or personal advantage above the best interests of the United States.

APPEASEMENT REJECTED

The basis of American foreign policy remains clear. The New York Times put it as follows: "As constantly emphasized by both President Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles, the

United States is ready to adopt every honorable course to avoid war and achieve a just and lasting peace. But, as also emphasized by both the President and the Secretary, the United States rejects appeasement and is determined to resist aggression whenever basic moral values and its own vital interests are involved, even to the cost of calculated risk. Our Government further believes that the best way is to make its position known in advance to prevent fateful miscalculations on the part of a potential aggressor."

That is the general theme to which Life's article gave concrete and vivid meaning.

The Price Paid for a Vacillating Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Drew Pearson, entitled "Ike and Dulles on Indochina." The article appeared in the January 21 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and it illustrates the price exacted by a weak and vacillating foreign policy:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

IKE AND DULLES ON INDOCHINA

The big question touched off by the Dulles verge-of-war interview in Life magazine should not degenerate into a row between Democrats and Republicans over what Dulles said or didn't say, what he meant or didn't mean, or how near the brink of war he took us. The big questions should be:

1. Is the Eisenhower administration efficient and competent in its handling of foreign affairs?

2. Is John Foster Dulles qualified to be Secretary of State?

Press squabbles and political rows are inevitable in any administration, and the question of whether Life magazine got a scoop or whether Dulles was correctly quoted is not particularly important. What is important to your children and mine is the vital question of peace or war.

Unquestionably, Dulles is right that one of the best ways to prevent war is to give a potential enemy a clear-cut, emphatic warning that, if he goes too far we will fight. This points up one of the great mistakes the Allies made with Hitler. The Allies were divided and vacillating. France and England debated all day, March 7, 1936, when Hitler moved into the Ruhr, but couldn't decide whether to mobilize. If they had, we now know Hitler would have retreated. For he had given his troops an order to retreat in case of French resistance.

Eisenhower's warnings

However, let's look at the Eisenhower-Dulles warnings in regard to Indochina and see just how effective they were in stopping the Red Chinese advance into Indochina.

August 4, 1953, Mr. Eisenhower, fearing a Chinese attack on Indochina, gave the Governors' Conference in Seattle an indirect warning aimed at China, plus a note of preparation to the American people.

But the Red Chinese, unmindful, continued their preparations to take Indochina. Half a year passed and Mr. Eisenhower got tougher.

"President Eisenhower said that we simply cannot afford to lose Indochina," he was quoted as saying at his press conference of April 7, 1954.

Reading this, the Red Chinese should have taken pause. They should have realized that this meant the United States was ready for possible war. However, the Red Chinese are known to read the newspapers carefully. And on February 10, just 2 months before, there had appeared in the New York Times and other American newspapers this statement from the same President Eisenhower:

"No one could be more bitterly opposed to ever getting the United States involved in a hot war in that region (Indochina) than I am. Every move I make is calculated to make certain that does not happen."

Ike hesitates

So the Red Chinese knew that the Eisenhower administration was vacillating somewhat as the French and British did regarding Hitler.

If they read the American press further, as they undoubtedly did, they also would have found Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assuring Senators on February 16 that "American involvement in the Indochina war will stop short of sending United States combat troops and pilots."

The heart of Secretary Dulles' idea that we could avoid war by being willing to risk war is that the administration in power must be united, must know what it wants, so the enemy will know we're not bluffing.

But the Eisenhower administration obviously was not united, obviously didn't know what it wanted.

On April 16, 1954, Vice President NIXON told the American Society of Newspaper Editors: "If, to avoid further Communist expansion in Asia and Indochina we must take the risk now by putting our boys in, I think the Executive has to take the politically unpopular decision and do it."

But, 4 days later, Dulles, who now says he stood firm and ready to go to war, repudiated NIXON. The New York Times reported him as follows:

"Dulles said, after conferring with President Eisenhower, that he thought it unlikely that American combat troops would be sent to Indochina."

Thus the Red Chinese could read two different views by two very high officials of the Eisenhower administration. Plus a statement by Eisenhower himself that the United States would not get involved in a hot war in that region.

In addition, the Red Chinese obviously had watched the Eisenhower election campaign. And they knew that Candidate Eisenhower had been critical of the Korean war, had promised to end the Korean war, had made a dramatic promise to go to Korea himself to end the Korean war.

Having campaigned on this issue, the Red Chinese didn't need to be overly smart to figure it was extremely unlikely Mr. Eisenhower would get the United States of America into another Far Eastern war in Indochina.

So, unfazed by the deluge of scolding statements that rained down on their heads from Ike officials, they kept pushing ahead in Indochina.

Finally, even the precocious and somewhat bellicose NIXON pulled in his horns regarding the use of American troops in Indochina. On April 28, just 12 days after his April 16 statement, NIXON was quoted in the New York Herald Tribune:

"Vice President NIXON said the administration intends to avoid sending American troops to fight in Indochina or anywhere else if we can."

This probably ended all doubt in the Red Chinese mind—if there ever was any. So all that was left for Dulles to do was to go to Geneva and set in on a compromise favorable to the Chinese Reds. It was an ignominious diplomatic defeat which Dulles now blames on the British.

Life magazine and Dulles have made it appear that his tough verge-of-war tactics saved most of Indochina. But the real fact is that most of Indochina is now Communist.

In brief, the variegated, conflicting statements of the administration's highest officials, from the President himself down, may have taken us to the verge of war, but they did so without gaining us anything except defeat in Southeast Asia.

Secretary Dulles may not realize or admit this. But all Asia knows it, which is one reason we have lost so much face in Asia today.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 63 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle.
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*——
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*——3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*——
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Bennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, ———, ———, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Granahan, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Reed of Illinois, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, and Scott.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, ———, Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3–5700		Emerson 3–6017

Circuit Judges

E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700 Oliver 2–3263
Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700 North 7–8109
David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700 Emerson 2–0544
Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700 Emerson 3–6267
George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700 Adams 2–6327
John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700 District 7–4704
Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3–5700
Vacancy

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8–4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7–0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5–6700

Chief Judge—Robert E. Quinn
Judge—George W. Latimer
Judge—Vacancy
Commissioner—Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk—Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*-------
Bell, John J., *Tex*---------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*--------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*---------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-The Congressional
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*---------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House
Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*------
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*---------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*-----
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Granahan, William T., *Pa*--
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2241 48th St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*-----
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------The Woodner
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.

McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., Jr., *Calif*
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.

O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4201 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Prost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*

Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Chauncey W., *Ill*—2009 Glen Ross Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—2750 32d St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6201 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—3605 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*

Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 225 17th St. NE.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Address by Senator Neuberger at the Madison Avenue Baptist Church, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on January 25, 1956, it was my privilege to address a dinner of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church in New York City under the auspices of one of the most outstanding religious leaders ever to serve in my State.

This man is Dr. Ralph B. Walker, formerly of the White Temple, of Portland, Oreg. I knew Dr. Walker and his charming wife when they were in our own State. Dr. Walker has combined humanitarian and progressive views with deep spiritual feeling and an ability to exalt his listeners. Portland's loss is New York's gain.

On the occasion of addressing Dr. Walker's congregation in the city of New York I also had the privilege of meeting many former residents of Oregon, such as Mr. and Mrs. Owen A. MacGill, formerly of McMinnville; Mr. and Mrs. Ronald S. Callvert, formerly of Portland; Mrs. Lurline Green, a registered nurse, formerly of Portland; and Mr. S. D. Buell, likewise formerly of Portland. These people all told me what a distinction it was to have a pastor like Ralph Walker in the greatest city of our land.

I had the pleasure of discussing my desire to have more young people enter public life, in which connection I explained the $500 scholarship which I have presented to Linfield College to encourage idealistic students with an ambition to work in government. This scholarship is the result of a $500 award which I received from the Democratic clubs of Long Island in 1955 as "Democrat of the Year." I had the honor of formally presenting it to Linfield College in October, through Linfield's outstanding president, Dr. Harry L. Dillon. Incidentally, Dr. Dillon concurs in my hopes that more young men and young women can be induced to make government their careers.

Mr. President, because of the high value which Dr. Ralph Walker places on good government, I spoke January 25, 1956, on the urgent need to control the vast political slush funds which threaten and imperil the free exercise of government in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement to the press, summarizing that speech, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

Multi-million-dollar political campaigns are a threat to democracy, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Democrat of Oregon, told a banquet meeting of the Madison Avenue Baptist Church in New York City Wednesday night. The Oregon Senator said legislative safeguards were urgently needed to prevent any candidate or political party from "buying public offices like baubles in a jewelry store."

NEUBERGER suggested to his audience that, eventually, the only feasible solution might be some form of a proposal made originally in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt, recommending that the Government take over the financing of political parties.

"This probably sounds revolutionary," declared NEUBERGER, "and yet it came first from a man as devoted to Americanism as Teddy Roosevelt, who led the Rough Riders up San Juan Hill. He realized that large-scale political contributions from special interests were incompatible with free and untrammeled service in the highest offices in the land."

NEUBERGER also proposed that the conflict of interests statute should apply to Members of Congress, as well as to officials of the executive branch of the Government. "We are inclined to place elective people on a pedestal above other mere mortals—and without justification," he claimed.

NEUBERGER pointed out that, in his State, it was illegal for a State liquor inspector to accept a gift of a few bottles of whisky, but that a man running for Governor could accept thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from men who own distilleries. "This sort of double standard makes absolutely no sense from the standpoint of logic and ethics," he added.

The 43-year-old Oregon Senator announced that he soon would introduce "far-reaching" legislation dealing with the whole question of campaign contribution in national political campaigns "in time for 1956."

Casein and Powdered Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the serious situation affecting users of the American milk product, casein, has been brought to my attention.

It would appear that shortages of casein have developed for sometime past and American users in the plastic and other industries have been required to pay much higher prices to foreign producers taking advantage of shortages of this product. I am informed that in recent months New Zealand and the Argentine, largest producers of casein have increased their prices of the product by about 50 percent. This has occasioned great added expense to all American industries using casein.

The incredible part of this situation is that at the same time this Government is holding a very large supply of powdered milk purchased under the support-price program. There is evidently no present market for this powdered milk and it is not expected that there will be. Thus it would seem to be a complete loss to the Government and, what is worse, a willful, terrible waste of a valuable raw material which, if properly handled, could be profitably utilized by American industry.

This is just another instance of the uneconomic waste and extravagance that has flowed from ill-considered Government programs. I brought the matter to the attention of the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture and have requested him to see whether or not some way could be worked out by which surplus milk could be used to make casein thus supplying necessary supplies of this product to American users who need it and hence would be able to procure it at reasonable prices without suffering from additional international "squeeze plays."

It is my hope that some program can be evolved which will more profitably utilize surplus milk and at the same time supply casein to American industry.

I have requested the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Office of Defense Mobilization, as well as the President's office to give careful consideration to this matter to see whether some suitable solution can be effected by which American casein consumers will be relieved from shortages and exploitation and whereby surplus milk can be converted into marketable casein instead of being manufactured into powder which is placed in the warehouses to deteriorate and rot.

One Hundred and Ninety-fifth Anniversary of the Birth of Albert Gallatin, a Great American of Swiss Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, 195 years ago, on January 29 of this

year, there was born in Switzerland a man who was destined to become a great American, who served with great honor in the United States Congress and in executive positions of these United States.

A precocious youth of 19 landed on America's shores in 1780, speaking English in the heavy French-Swiss accent he was never to lose; but by the time he was 35, Albert Gallatin, was to have achieved renown as one of the most distinguished and perhaps the most controversial of the new republic's political figures.

Born on January 29, 1761, in Geneva, Gallatin did not, as so many other Europeans, have to leave his native home to find his material fortune. The son of one of Switzerland's leading families and a brilliant scholar at the Geneva Academy, the future of the young man was assured. But, fired with a belief in American democracy which he was never to give up even in time of greatest political trial, Gallatin chose to share in the development of the political experiment on the other side of the Atlantic. He was, in the words of the American historian, Claude Bowers, a born democrat.

That his and Jefferson's ideas for building a brave new world coincided so perfectly proved singularly advantageous for our country and its third President. For, among the Jeffersonians, only Gallatin was capable of dealing intelligently with the Hamilton financial system which took little cognizance of the people's wishes in its functioning.

Restoring the power of the purse to Congress was the first step in Gallatin's plans to create a sound and democratic fiscal system for America. As a Member of Congress and founder of the House Ways and Means Committee, Gallatin was to achieve his purpose and win the respect and affection of Jefferson who made him Secretary of the Treasury upon assuming the Presidency in 1801.

That this step earned him the wrath and scorn of the Hamiltonian forces did not daunt Gallatin in his determination. The epithet of "foreigner," though it must have hurt this man whom Jefferson was to find as zealously devoted to the liberties and interest of our country as its most affectionate citizen, did not stop him from working to liquidate the national debt, reduce taxes and hold Government expenditures at a minimum.

The development of commerce and the establishment of rigorous methods in the conduct of the Treasury Department were contributions of Gallatin which earned the once weak young Republic respect throughout the world.

It is of the essence that America always commands such respect, but it is especially important now. It was Gallatin's belief that the path to progress and prosperity is paved with commercial understanding. And, in seeming accord, the present administration brought forth its trade, not aid, program not very long ago.

But, despite its good intentions, the executive branch of the Government has departed from this path on several occasions since announcing this policy, perhaps most seriously when it imposed additional restrictions on watch imports from Switzerland—land of Gallatin's birth and, incidentally, America's best cash customer in Europe.

A misstep such as this, or the recent tariff boost on foreign bicycles, can act to harm not only the material interests of our country but its moral interests as well. How morally damaging such ill-considered moves can be, is evident from the very unfavorable reaction they received in the press of the United States and of the entire world. And the economic damage affects, besides the Swiss exporters and the American watch importers, American farmers and manufacturers who have been doing good cash business with Switzerland and who want to continue and enlarge it.

In memory both of this great Swiss-born American who contributed so much to his adopted land and the valuable Swiss-American Treaty of Peace and Commerce signed by our two countries 105 years ago, I would like to see a restoration of happier commercial relations. And the sooner, the better.

Clarence P. Quimby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am prompted by the report of the impending retirement of Headmaster Clarence Quimby, of Cushing Academy, Ashburnham, Mass., in my district, to make a few pertinent observations concerning his most praiseworthy service.

Clarence Quimby has ably and faithfully served Cushing Academy, one of America's best preparatory schools, for the past 23 years. He is beloved by all who have ever come in contact with him.

He brought to his important work in education an impressive background of academic achievement. His scholarly attainments are marked—a graduate of Bates College with the degree of bachelor of arts; Harvard, master of education, recipient of an advanced honorary doctorate from Bates and other acknowledgments of academic distinction.

Descendant of a solid, highly esteemed New England family, he early realized certain true values of life—faith in the Creator, independence of mind, fellowship of the spirit and eagerness to work. Of rugged, individualistic makeup, his horizons were broad and lofty; his talents recognized by all who came in touch with him. Inevitably, he made steady advancement in his chosen profession of education and his career reached a happy, distinguished climax at Cushing Academy, where his administration was characterized by progress, soundness, integrity and character building.

He is the type of master genuinely interested in those trustingly committed to his care and guidance. With fervor, zeal, and high purpose, he unselfishly pursued his tasks every day of his life. Generations of Cushing graduates and their families well know the debt they owe him. Every community in which he lived was enriched by his presence. His untiring civic, patriotic and public contributions were noteworthy and deeply appreciated by his fellow citizens.

Clarence Quimby has truly found his way into the hearts of his students, his teachers and the many men and women his activities have touched. He has gained their trust, admiration, affection, and confidence.

Confirmed in his love of clean sportsmanship as an integral part of American education, he built up a dynamic athletic program at Cushing and has plans in being for its further extension.

As I indicated at the outset of my remarks, Headmaster Quimby was exceptionally well trained, as he was admirably fitted, for work in academic life. But he had other qualities and qualifications not always found in leading educators, which were perhaps the truest mark of his greatness. He was an excellent administrator. Under his wise supervision, Cushing has grown and expanded in size and prestige. Because of his vision, ability, and unflagging energy, even greater progress is planned and in immediate prospect.

Great as his achievements were, however, it is in his human relations that Clarence Quimby secured his greatest victories. Possessed of a stern New England sense of duty, and an aptitude for working around the clock, yet he always found time for meticulous attention to even the slightest detail of his work. Aways on the job, he knows his faculty and student body intimately. He is virtually the hub around which the life of Cushing—educational, cultural, social, and spiritual—revolves, and it was under his farsighted, devoted leadership that Cushing recorded the noteworthy advances of the last generation.

It would be a happy circumstance indeed, if every institution in the land could be infused with the spirit of patriotism, love of humanity, enthusiasm for work, unselfish devotion to students, school, and Nation, which Clarence Quimby has exemplified at Cushing.

I have been privileged to observe at close range Clarence Quimby's continued outstanding work, and to know him as a great educator and a great human being. It is not surprising at all that he should have the respect, admiration, and gratitude of all those interested in sound, sensible, forward-moving American education abreast of all modern development, but bound fast to the rock of fundamental principle. A true patriot in thought, word, and action, he is never given to narrow provincialism, hysterical fanfare or eccentric theory. His powerful influence for good will long be felt in the field in which he worked, and I feel proud indeed to have in my district, and I may say for a friend, this beloved teacher and leader, who is such a great credit and great asset to our educational system and our country.

As I know him and as others know him, he is not ready for retirement because he is still in every respect in the prime of his manly vigor. It would be my wish

that he may continue at Cushing, where he has done such outstanding work. In any event, I hope that he will by all means continue in the field of education where his wisdom, understanding, ability, and deep knowledge of the problems of our youth so commendably and admirably fit him for future service.

I extend to him and to his devoted helpmate, Mrs. Quimby, who has been loyally and magnificiently by his side in all his endeavors, my heartiest congratulations for their very many contributions to the educational, cultural, and business and civic life of my district and State and wish them both many years of continued constructive effort and happiness.

The nation that has men like Clarence Quimby among its leaders, working for the enlightment and advancement of its youth, need have no fears for the future.

[From the Worcester Gazette of December 23, 1955]

CUSHING HEAD IN ASHBURNHAM WILL RETIRE

(By Lawrence J. Nee)

ASHBURNHAM, December 23.—Clarence P. Quimby, Cushing Academy headmaster, today announced he would retire in June from the position he has held for the past 23 years. He has reached the compulsory retirement age.

He became principal of Cushing in 1933, in the depths of the depression, when only 70 boarding students were registered at the school. Cushing was able to retain its experienced faculty and to keep financially stable.

It took a door-to-door campaign to obtain enrollments with calls on alumni and friends to interest young people in the advantages of attending the School on the Hill. The current enrollment of boarding students is 200, equal to the dormitory capacity.

BUILDING PROGRAM

A long range building program is in progress. Work on a new gymnasium will begin in March or April by Columbus & Berg, Gardner contractors.

Widely known as the "Yankee Schoolmaster," Headmaster Quimby often speaks before educational and civic groups and has given nearly 300 graduation and baccalaureate addresses. He traditionally delivers the Sunday morning commencement talk to the graduating class.

In all his speaking engagements, he has supported the coeducational philosophy of Cushing.

PAST BUILDING

During the time he has headed the school, a new dormitory for 75 girls has been built, the dining hall has been increased in size to accommodate 230, a new athletic field with spacious bleachers has been constructed and the heating plant has been converted to low pressure with oil. An outdoor riding ring and an improved ski slope are among the sports facilities added at the school.

In addition to his school duties, Headmaster Quimby was town moderator of Ashburnham, an official in the Ashburnham Community Church, president of Gardner Rotary Club, president of North Worcester County Principals' Association and, for many years, a member of the October Conference in New Hampshire.

After graduating from Bates College in his native Maine, headmaster Quimby was principal of the Hampstead, N. H., Academy 2 years, principal of Cony High School in Augusta, Maine, 3 years, master at Mitchel Military School for Boys, principal of Manchester (Conn.) High School 10 years, and president 6 years of Westbrook Seminary, now Westbrook Junior College.

FUTURE PLANS

His future plans, though not definite, include public speaking and literary work.

Three of the four children of headmaster and Mrs. Quimby will be at their home for the holidays.

Their daughters, Mrs. Betty Holt, of Northampton, and Mrs. Althea Spencer, of Gonic, N. H., their son, Clarence P. Quimby, Jr., and their families will be present. A third daughter, Mrs. Barbara Watson of Willamette, Ill., will be unable to attend the reunion.

CHRISTMAS MESSAGE OF CLARENCE AND LILLIAN QUIMBY

We have just had our delightful candlelight vesper program in the school chapel—before that we had attended the annual fire-lighting ritual in the new dormitory—all symbolic of the warmth and joy of Noel. These make us think of our friends whom we care for all through the year, but especially remember at Christmas.

Since our time for retirement has arrived, these will be our last greetings from Cushing Academy and Jewett Hall. While our plans for the future are not defintie, they will surely include long continued good wishes for you. From Bates to Ashburnham via Portland, Augusta, and Manchester, our path has been a happy one—made more cheerful by the contacts with and memories of our friends.

Sitting here by the glowing fireplace around which we and our children have gathered for the past 23 years, we again send you hearty greetings of the season. May health and happiness attend you and yours in the year to come.

CLARENCE AND LILLIAN QUIMBY.

CHRISTMAS 1955.

Address by the Vice President at Salute-to-Eisenhower Dinner in Chicago

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very superb address delivered by our distinguished Vice President at the salute-to-Eisenhower dinner in Chicago on January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

May I tell you first some of the reasons why I am so honored to be speaking at this dinner.

Because Illinois has one of the Nation's outstanding Republican Governors in Bill Stratton; one of the great Republican Senators in EVERETT DIRKSEN; and 13 fine Republican Congressmen, including the whip of the House, LES ARENDS.

Because this Chicago dinner, considering the area it has to draw from, has surpassed every city in America in the number of its guests honoring President Eisenhower.

Because right here in this very hall, the magnificent crusade of the man we honor tonight was launched just 3½ years ago.

So many Americans owe so much to President Eisenhower's leadership that the time allotted to me, as you can imagine, is completely inadequate to do the subject justice. With your permission, I would like to touch tonight on only the high spots of four great general questions.

The condition the Eisenhower administration found the country in when we went to Washington just 3 years ago today.

The condition the country is in today after 3 years of Eisenhower leadership.

Some of the major complaints of the critics of the administration.

The great vista for the future if Eisenhower Republican principles continue to guide this country in the 4 years ahead.

Three years ago this is what we found: There was a war in Korea. Controls shackled the economy. The people's purchasing power was going down every day. The previous administration had proposed plans for socialization and federalization of America's farmers, medical profession, housing, schools, and power, including the atom.

Most distressing of all, we found that a great majority of the American people, Democrats and Republicans alike, had lost faith in the honesty, the integrity, and the security of those who served them in government.

After 3 years of Eisenhower leadership and Eisenhower Republican policy, this is the situation we find today.

The world is at peace for the first time in 15 years.

Controls have been taken off the economy.

The American people have had the biggest tax cut in history.

For the first time since the Republican 80th Congress, we not only have a balanced budget for this year, but the President has submitted a balanced budget for the next year as well.

As a result of these economic policies we find America enjoying its greatest prospecity in history with gross national product, personal income, consumer expenditures, individual assets, and scores of other economic indicators at alltime highs.

The plans for socializing basic American institutions have been thrown into the ash can, and the Eisenhower Republican program, offered in the state of the Union message this year, if enacted by the Congress will produce more schools, more highways, more hospitals, more child welfare services, more medical research, more health insurance, better working conditions and wage standards, more homes, than our predecessors ever dreamed of.

And, probably most important, honesty, integrity, and dignity have been restored to Government in Washington, D. C.

On the basis of this record, I am going to make some categorical claims which I do not think can be questioned.

Never has an administration kept its promises more faithfully than this administration.

Never has an administration done a better job for all the people than this administration.

Never have the American people had more reason to be grateful to the leadership of a President than they are to President Eisenhower today.

What then are the major criticisms of the administration and the answers to those criticisms?

There are, of course, those who at the present time are criticizing the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy.

A recent Democratic governor of this great State seems to be leading that chorus. He calls for the repudiation and resignation of Secretary of State Dulles.

There is a short answer to his suggestion. What does he offer? Nothing except a return to the Acheson foreign policy. What is the test of the success or failure of foreign policy? Whether it brings war or peace.

As far as the American people are concerned, I think they care less about what was said, or why, about policy than they do about the net results. And this they know. The Truman-Acheson policy got us into war, and the Eisenhower-Dulles policy got us out

of war. And on that issue there is no question but that there will be an overwhelming vote of confidence for a continuation of that policy for 4 more years.

But let us analyze for a moment more closely the background of the man who opposes the Eisenhower-Dulles policy. We find:

This is the man who criticized President Eisenhower when he suggested during the campaign of 1952 that he should go to Korea and who in turn offered nothing but a continuation of that desperate, endless struggle.

This is the man who quavered over our strong stand when the Chinese Communists threatened Quemoy and Matsu and suggested that perhaps we had better force our allies to give up these areas in order to avoid the risk of war.

This is the man who quibbled about our policy in Indochina without offering any constructive alternative as to what might be done.

And this is the man who sniped at President Eisenhower when he went to Geneva—where I say the President rendered magnificent service to the free world on two counts.

This was the first conference ever held with the Russians at the head of state level in which the United States surrendered neither principle nor territory.

The President, for the first time since World War II, got the United States off the defensive and on the offensive on the great issue of peace before the world.

I have just been thinking what would have happened if Mr. Stevenson had been President these last 3 years. We, of course, do not know the answer to that question, but of these principles I am sure.

Indecision, weakness, retreat, and surrender do not bring peace in dealing with dictatorial, aggressive communism.

We tried that in Korea. Secretary Acheson said that Korea was outside our defense zone and the Communists attacked 6 months later. I say the American people indicated they had enough of the Acheson policy in 1952—they don't want to return to it now.

If there is uncertainty in the minds of potential enemies as to what the United States will do if put to the test by aggressive action, we really run the risk of war.

If the kind of talk Mr. Stevenson has been indulging in has given the impression to the world that we were bluffing or that we might not carry out our intentions, it can have only one effect—increase the risk of war.

If we want peace, the world must understand that we have the capability to defend ourselves against aggression and that we have the intention and will to take appropriate action against a potential enemy if it engages in aggression.

We must recognize that there are risks in waging war, and that there are also risks that must be taken in waging peace. The only way you can avoid risks in waging either war or peace is to surrender, and surrender is not in the vocabulary of the Eisenhower administration.

On the contrary, we not only will never agree to the surrender of our own freedom, but as Americans we can never acquiesce in the denial of freedom to others. As the President recently said: "The peaceful liberation of the captive peoples has been, is, and, until success is achieved, will continue to be a major goal of United States foreign policy."

Strength, firmness, and courage is the way to peace without surrender. And the American people want 4 more years of that kind of decisive leadership.

I would suggest that if Mr. Stevenson has nothing more constructive to suggest than criticism, he join with millions of his fellow Democrats in the country and some of the outstanding Democrats in the Senate who have so loyally supported, and are supporting the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy—a policy which deserves support because it got us out of one war, has kept us out of others, and provides the best chance for peace without surrender in the years ahead.

A second criticism that is often made of this administration is that we are only interested in big business—that we are against the little fellow.

I suggest that just for a moment we examine the record of this administration, not in terms of what is good for businessmen but solely in terms of whether its policies have been in the best interests of the 65 million American wage earners. What does the wage earner want?

He wants a job.

He wants high wages.

He wants purchasing power.

He wants a sound security program for the future.

Today, America's wage earners have more jobs at higher wages, with greater purchasing power, sounder security, and fewer strikes than at any time in history, and they have peace to boot.

I have been rather amused by the controversy which has been raging over whether union leaders should or should not take part in political campaigns. Just to express a personal point of view, I welcome their participation. And I urge that they compare the record of this administration and its predecessor on the basis of this test.

Under which administration have union members had it the best?

If that test is applied, they will find that union members have it better today than they have ever had it at any time in their history. And I submit that if they act on the basis of what has proved to be best for their members every union leader in America will be out stumping for 4 more years of the Eisenhower administration in 1956.

What is there then to the claim that this is a business administration?

It is true to this extent. The Government of the United States is the biggest business in the world. As such, President Eisenhower believes it ought to have the best management in the world.

And no achievement of this administration has been more in the national interest than getting businessmen the caliber of Secretary Humphrey and Secretary Wilson, and scores like them, to come to Washington to provide that kind of management.

Another criticism of this administration is that farmers have not shared in the Nation's increased prosperity.

The charge is correct, but let us examine the reason for it.

What in essence is the farmer's problem? It is the fact that considering his costs farm prices are too low.

Why are farm prices low? The major reason is the tremendous farm surpluses which hang over the market. Our economists have estimated that these inherited surpluses reduced farm income by a whopping $2 billion in 1955 alone. In other words, if we had not had the surpluses farmers would have had their best year in history in 1955.

What caused the surpluses? The demands for high production in wartime. The high rigid support program of the previous administration.

We got rid of one of the causes for high surpluses by ending the Korean war and I don't think you will find one farmer in the country who would not say that war is too high a price to pay for any temporary prosperity on the farm or anywhere else.

We got rid of the other cause of surpluses by adopting the flexible price-support program.

Now, however, we still have to deal with the $6 billion in surplus we inherited. We have to see that the farmer gets some immediate help. And we have to see that we don't get into this surplus jam again.

Here are the highlights of the program which we think will do that job.

The soil-bank system to use surplus commodities to retire unneeded acres from excess production.

A surplus-disposal plan to help move surplus stocks out the front door while the soil bank reduces what comes in the back door.

An intensive drive for export markets.

Strengthened commodity programs for individual products such as corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and dairy products.

An expanded rural-development program for the low-income farm families.

Research increases to help us find new crops, new markets, and new uses for our agricultural abundance.

And a dollar limit in price-support payments to any individual or farm, so as to help the family farm without giving windfall profits to large-scale corporate agriculture.

In bringing this program to the Congress and to the country, let me tell you the philosophy behind it:

For the past 25 years we have never had real prosperity on the farm except at a time when production was stimulated as a result of war or shortages created by war.

This administration believes in building for the future on the basis of peacetime rather than wartime demands. We believe there is a way to have prosperity on the farm and everywhere else in peacetime.

As far as the farm is concerned, we believe that our new program combined with what we have already done provides the answer to the problem.

I can assure this audience that there is no problem which more concerns the President and his administration than the problem of raising farm income. We believe we have the answer to it and we are going to leave no stone unturned to see to it that our legislative proposals are approved by the Congress at the earliest possible date.

Finally, there is another group who criticize this administration on an entirely different ground. We hear people from time to time say, "The Eisenhower administration is too liberal, too New Dealish. What we thought we were voting for and working for was a real conservative administration."

May I at this point talk to you very frankly and forthrightly about the Republican Party and what I believe it stands for.

First, to be practical, we must consider the alternative. The choice is not between the Eisenhower program and something more conservative, but between the Eisenhower program and something far more radical.

The American people are not going to stand still. They want progress. And they want an administration which does not look to the past or is satisfied with the present, but one which offers new and greater hope for the future.

The Republican Party in its greatest days has always been, is now, and must continue to be the party of progress. If you don't believe this is true, read the speeches and the biographies of Abraham Lincoln, of Theodore Roosevelt, and of Herbert Hoover.

Let us consider what some of America's needs are for the next 10 years if we are to continue to have progress. Here are some estimated goals in the fields of power, roads, schools, hospitals, and slum clearance.

In the next 10 years America will need: 101 million kilowatts of power at a cost of approximately $20 billion; 3,348,000 miles of highway at a cost of $100 billion; 927,000 primary and secondary classrooms at a cost of $30 billion; 1,288,000 hospital beds at a cost of $22 billion; the replacement of 5 million housing units, and the reconditioning of 15 million more at a total cost of $24 billion; and a program which will remove discrimination in employment, opportunity, and education on the American scene so that we

will quit losing $30 billion a year, which is the economic cost of discrimination today.

Now, the question arises, How do we meet these needs? Our New Deal friends had a very simple answer to such questions. They would say, "Let the Government do it."

If there was unemployment, the Government should make jobs.

If there was a need for houses, the Government should build them.

If better medical care was needed, the Government should provide it.

Their programs all sounded good. The only trouble with them was that they wouldn't work.

But right at this point, as Republicans, let us do a little soul searching.

We have to recognize that at times in the past we have allowed the advocates of big Government to "steal the ball" from us on the issue of progress and run away with it. We opposed the means without offering an adequate alternative. The people therefore assumed that we opposed the end as well.

And I say tonight that one of the greatest services that has been rendered by President Eisenhower and his administration is in showing the American people again that you can be progressive and humanitarian without being socialistic.

He has given the Republican Party the forward look and it is our New Deal friends who now are in the position of wanting to turn back to discredited economic policies which were never able to provide prosperity except in wartime.

But some might well ask, how do our programs differ from those of our predecessors if our goals are the same?

The major difference is that we believe the way to real progress and prosperity is through programs which rely primarily on private rather than Government enterprise.

We believe the Federal Government should step in only where the job cannot be done more effectively by private enterprise or State and local government.

We know that to rely on Federal Government programs to meet the needs is wrong on several counts. But it is primarily wrong because federalized programs are not adequate to do the job.

All the resources of America must be tapped if we are to meet the needs which spell progress for the next 10 years. The Eisenhower program which is based on the principle of the Federal Government working in partnership with private enterprise and local and State governments is designed to do just that, and that is why it will succeed where the Federal program is doomed to failure.

In other words, we oppose the programs of our predecessors, not because they were too high, but because they were too low.

Our aim is a gross national product of $500 billion by 1965. If we attain that goal, the resources will be available to build the schools, roads, houses, and to meet the other great social needs of the American people—and to add approximately $1,000 a year to the income of every family of 4 in America.

What a great goal for a party and for a Nation. It is one which will catch the imagination of all of the American people. And it is one that we can attain without compromising American principles in the process.

I realize that there is one other great question on the minds of every person here. And this is, Will the President run again?

I do not have the authority or knowledge to answer that question. But of this much we can be sure. The President will make the right decision at the right time, and whatever that decision is it will be made with the best interests of America in mind. Regardless of what that decision may be, let us dedicate ourselves tonight to these propositions, without qualification.

There must be 4 more years of our Republican stewardship at Washington—years of peace, progress, and prosperity for our country and for the world as a result of what President Eisenhower has so nobly begun.

We owe it to our President to assure the completion of his program by electing the men and women who are committed to its purposes from the bottom to the very top of our Republican tickets next November.

Whatever President Eisenhower himself may decide, we must make certain that there is another term for those principles for which he stands and for those Americans who owe him the great debt of gratitude and loyalty which I have strived, however, inadequately, to express tonight.

There must be another term for the American boys who did not die in Korea, because President Eisenhower stopped the shooting war in the Far East and steered the course of peace and friendship in Asia and in Europe.

There must be another term for the millions of American wage earners who have made the greatest gains in the history of labor under President Eisenhower's fair and friendly policy.

There must be another term for the small-business man and the white-collar workers whose taxes have been lowered and whose savings have been protected against the inflation which had plagued the Nation for almost a generation.

There must be another term for our 16 million Negro citizens who have experienced the greatest gains in removing discrimination in travel, education, opportunity, and civil rights of any 3-year period in the history of America.

And there must be another term for the millions of men and women throughout the Americas and all over the free world who see in President Eisenhower the architect of peace, the statesman who turned back the fatal trend toward the unimaginable disaster of atomic warfare.

And above all there must be another term for the simple personal creed of the man in the White House as he voiced it in his message to Congress 2 years ago this very month:

"This administration believes that no American—no one group of Americans—can truly prosper unless all Americans prosper. We must not become a nation divided into factions or special groups and hostile cliques. We are one family made up of millions of Americans with the same hopes for a full and happy life."

Address by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., at Salute-to-Eisenhower Dinner at Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on January 20, 1956, at Pittsburgh, Pa., our former colleague, the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, delivered a very able and interesting address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To one who has seen at first hand the influence of Pennsylvania in national Republican affairs, the chance to speak here in the great city of Pittsburgh is a memorable event.

Its meaning is enhanced by the thought that I have served in the United States Senate with two men, both of whom come from western Pennsylvania. One is Senator EDWARD MARTIN, whose patriotism, courtesy and sincerity are well known to you all. The other is Senator JIM DUFF, who is a special friend of mine—not only in the Senate, but particularly in the campaign to secure the Republican nomination for General Eisenhower in 1952. In that effort JIM DUFF's sure political instinct, his brilliance and his boldness were indispensable.

Nor can I be in Pennsylvania without extending congratulations to all Pennsylvanians on the fact that they are having as a fellow citizen a new voter in Gettysburg.

Gettysburg suggests Pennsylvania; it suggests Dwight Eisenhower; it suggests Abraham Lincoln. So for all of these reasons this is a noteworthy Republican occasion.

It is perhaps natural for me, speaking after 3 years of service in President Eisenhower's Cabinet and also as his spokesman in the United Nations, to talk tonight in terms of foreign relations. It is also proper, I think, that as the party which is in power in the executive branch (the other party having organized the Congress), we should not engage in attack or in defense, but present the record to the people and leave it up to them to judge. We can say in all truth that we present this record with honest pride and with appreciation for the important bipartisan support of the last 3 years.

Now as to foreign policy. There may be a few things within the responsibility of government, such as a flood or a raging polio epidenmic, which affect the citizen's life as closely as the issue of foreign policy. But nothing affects him more closely than does the challenge of preventing the unutterable woe of another war and, if there is one, of having arranged matters so that he will have allies to help him carry the load. In its barest sense, this is what foreign policy is about.

Foreign policy springs from the soil of national strength. What happens to us at home affects what happens to us abroad.

When, therefore, we move toward ending segregation in schools and restaurants; when we refuse to allow companies which do business with the Government to discriminate because of race or color; and when we read statements such as that of my friend Ralph Bunche, the distinguished American Negro who is Under Secretary General of the United Nations, in the CIO News, the official union paper, that: "I would now live in Washington, D. C., because of the remarkable changes in the Nation's Capital"—we are doing and seeing things which are widely noticed abroad and which have a beneficial effect on our foreign relations.

When it comes about that we have 65 million jobs in America—remembering that the statement some years back that America could provide 60 million seemed so radical at the time—we first say to ourselves that the Ike policies are not too liberal, as some ultraconservatives say they are, and that they are not too conservative either. But we must also recognize that here is something which impresses the rest of the world more than any amount of oratory and propaganda. Our 65 million jobs are a stupendous fact which many countries wish to emulate.

When we see our record of steady expansion of social services—on Lincoln's basis of where needed—to help solve the problems of old age, maternity and child welfare, health and education, we see something the importance of which is vividly understood abroad.

The great overriding fact that we have prosperity without inflation, without waste, and with an excellent chance of a balanced budget; and that we are having this prosperity without war and without war orders—is the most effective rebuttal there is to the charges which Communist propaganda makes against us.

There are some who do not share the general prosperity—and all elements in our country certainly should share it. As far as farmers are concerned, a new and effective program is underway to help solve their hard problems. I am confident that the program will do big things. The farmer is the backbone of American society. What helps the farmer helps the Nation.

The fact which stands out most clearly in any view of foreign policy is that we are at peace. We no longer have the agonizing experience of reading casualty lists from Korea—or from anywhere else—in our daily papers.

But this is not all that there is to report to you. There is a list which I would like to submit—not in a partisan spirit, because there is no partisan politics in foreign policy as far as we are concerned—a list of events in which the United States in recent years has played an important, and sometimes a vital, part. It is as follows:

American Hemisphere: The defeat of communism in Guatemala and prevention of its spread to other parts of Central America; the Caracas Conference, which established hemispheric unity against Communist subversion; and the application of the Rio Pact to the troubles in Costa Rica.

Europe: The settlement of the stubborn dispute over Trieste; the signing of the Austrian Treaty by the Soviet Union; and the membership of West Germany in the Atlantic community. We have also steadfastly refused to "outrage our own consciences" and "assure future conflict" as the President says, by condoning the bondage which Communist colonialism has fastened on the satellite nations.

Near and Middle East: The "northern tier" defense pact which has been joined by Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, and Turkey; the agreements to strengthen the defense of Pakistan and Iraq; the settlement of the Iranian oil issue; the Anglo-Egyptian agreement on the bitter Suez Canal dispute; and the maintenance of the Israel-Arab Armistice Agreements—although the situation there is still explosive and the sending of weapons by the Communists is portentous.

Far East: In addition to making peace in Korea, the nations of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia have been helped to evolve from colonialism to freedom; the Manila Pact has been achieved for the security of Asian and Pacific peoples; and our firm action regarding Formosa and the Pescadores has so far avoided both war and Communist expansion.

United Nations: President Eisenhower's leadership has been especially marked in the atoms-for-peace program, which has so conspicuously brightened America's imagine before the world; and his patient leadership which gave the United Nations a chance to render a uniquely distinguished service in bringing about the liberation of our 15 captive fliers from Communist China.

At the United Nations also attempts to seat the Chinese Communists have been beaten down on 27 public occasions since I have been the United States representative, and in each one of these attempts the United States has very properly taken the lead. It remains our policy that Communist China cannot shoot her way into the United Nations and that as long as she is an aggressor and as long as her behavior is in flagrant disregard of accepted international standards of conduct, that she should not be a member. When we ponder on how some of our prisoners were treated and when we see the pictures of missionaries such as Mr. and Mrs. Bradshaw, we realize how far we still are from a condition in which Communist China can validly lay claim to respectability.

At the United Nations too every single American employee has been screened in accordance with the FBI and Civil Service Commission procedures for the simple reason that when there are so many good Americans to choose from, their is absolutely no excuse for employing one single American Communist.

Added to these developments has been the vital work of the United Nations as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations.

President Eisenhower's "open sky" proposal for aerial inspection of each other's military installations will, if it is put into effect, end the prospect of a major surprise assault on our country and on other free nations. As a country which will never be the aggressor, we and the other free nations with us have the greatest stake in protection against a surprise attack. It was therefore a great day for us when the United Nations General Assembly, by a vote of 56 to 7, endorsed President Eisenhower's "open sky" plan. The only nations voting against it were the Soviet Union and its satellites. It received the support of all the so-called neutralist countries. May this mean that before long these aerial "sentinels of peace" will be giving us security from aggression and pave the way toward real disarmament.

Thanks to the efforts of President Eisenhower at Geneva, the harm which adverse propaganda had done to our country has been completely overturned and our standing throughout the world is higher than it has ever been in history. At the Foreign Ministers' meeting of last autumn the hard facts of the Soviet position were brought out in sharp focus. Unpalatable though these facts are, it is vital to know the truth. It is a real gain to ward off the danger of wishful thinking. It makes possible a sound posture of year-in and year-out national alertness—a posture which we can live with all the time and which does not ruinously build us up to D-days which could well mean war or bankruptcy or a mass of obsolescent weapons—if not all three at once.

Whatever we do now in foreign affairs we do from a position of national strength, both military and economic. A large element of strength has been the broad congressional support of foreign policy, regardless of which party had organized the Congress, and for which both the President and Congress deserve credit.

One very large question in the field of foreign policy which every American should ask himself is this: Can it be said that in the last 10 years we have learned any new truth concerning the cure for war—as doctors have in the past discovered new truths which lead them on to the cure of a deadly disease? Or are we all merely in a squirrel's cage of writing memos to each other and moving from one greater or lesser crisis to another?

I think we have learned two lessons. The first appears vividly in the United Nations, which has acquired huge influence not by using legal power, but by becoming the most potent single instrument in the world for affecting public opinion. This first new truth then is that influence which grows naturally and rapidly in accordance with events is more effective than law which is not obeyed. Influence often underlies law and, in fact, if the forces of opinion which make influence are contrary to the letter of the law, the law becomes a dead letter.

Some years ago many favored the "hitch your wagon to a star" approach, whereby governments made legal commitments in the vague hope that this would somehow improve matters, even though it was plain that such commitments would not be lived up to when the test came. It is clear today that the approach to world peace does not lie in surrendering sovereignty and in making commitments in disregard of future military, strategic, and political realities, but in working through world opinion. Thus we may ultimately move toward a world sense of justice on which alone world peace can be dependably based.

Certainly no man in modern times has shown himself more expert at leading and inspiring world opinion and making it an effective force in the world than President Eisenhower. He constantly points out that, although military and economic strength are necessary for the successful conduct of foreign policy, the spiritual is the greatest strength and that America is most influential when she lives up to the ideals which gave her birth. The ideals of the Declaration of Independence and of Abraham Lincoln may, we hope, at least help to bring the world someday to a commonsense of justice.

The second lesson which we have learned in the last 10 years about a cure for war impels us to turn again to President Eisenhower. This lesson can be summed up in the words "flexibility" and "firmness."

When the United States was first conscious of the fact that it had become a world power, some tended to be doctrinaire. We were so determined not to be so-called isolationists that we became ritualistic internationalists, and tried to conduct foreign relations in accordance with abstractions and generalizations.

All of this was a well intentioned beginning, but we now have learned that you cannot be rigid and doctrinaire in dealing with the manifold realities of world politics. Under the pressure of experience, we have learned to be flexible on details without losing sight of our basic objectives. For instance:

Last summer at Geneva, President Eisenhower was flexible both in the fact that he went to Geneva and in his attitude toward the details of the agreements that might be reached; but his seizing of the initiative by means of his "open sky" plan to prevent surprise attack and to open the gate leading to disarmament was a sign, not only of inventiveness, but of firmness and constancy as well.

Secretary Dulles, during the same summer, in his suggestion that the United States would be willing to assume a part of the costs of compensating and settling the Arab refugees, and in his parallel proposals for settling the conflict between Israel and the Arab states, was flexible and imaginative in his pursuit of our firm and fixed goal of building a sound security system in the Middle East. This is typical of his imaginative, wise and idealistic service as Secretary of State.

On Communist China, our foreign policy has required that we avoid being caught in the many traps that have been laid for us in that area. This called for flexibility, which we have shown. But this should also be noted: we not only have sacrificed nothing of substance; we have also not become involved in a Far Eastern war.

On President Eisenhower's desk in the White House is a small sign which reads: "Suaviter In Mode; Fortiter In Re"—which might be roughly translated as "flexible in method; strong in substance." This motto of the President's seems truly to have inspired the conduct of our foreign relations.

These two ways of striving for peace—through working on world opinion and through flexibility of method—must be considered in the light of the probability that the Soviet Union is sufficiently appalled by the nature of atomic war not to want another world war, however little it may object to—and, in fact, may seek to stimulate—peripheral wars. We therefore may be having a real chance to take some fundamental steps toward durable peace. We must certainly never stop trying.

To sum up:

With the country freed from red tape and political bickering, the Eisenhower leadership has created an atmosphere in which Americans appreciate each other, resulting in more work and wages than ever before. The Eisenhower leadership also opposes waste, inflation, and socialism; it favors

needed Government help to the citizen; and it fights for civil rights. In the world struggle between freedom and communism, the United States is stronger than ever—and without American casualty lists, either from Korea or elsewhere.

This kind of Reupblican leadership gives every American his greatest chance to live live the full life and to make the most of all that Providence has vouchsafed him.

I remember the old jibe that the Republican Party is a class party. What class is hurt by the record which I have just cited? What class is hurt by prosperity? What class is hurt by peace? Mr. Chairman, Dwight Eisenhower is making the Republican Party into every man's party, because every man prizes his civil rights, every man prizes his economic welfare, every man is opposed to waste and inflation, and every man wants peace.

In some countries of the Old World it is commonly said that one group can only advance at the expense of other groups. We in America know that no group is really and lastingly helped except by measures which help all groups. In some countries abroad the citizen is told on all sides that he faces two choices: either of getting a few driblets of wealth from the table of big-business monopoly or else of having the wealth divided for him by politicians. In America we have learned that the citizen is not at all restricted to these two unattractive alternatives. What we see in America is a huge increase in opportunity for all the people to earn—not driblets from the table of selfish big business; not driblets from the hands of selfish big politicians—but wealth which comes directly to the citizen from all the different places and under all the different conditions in which wealth is created in ever increasing measure. As a representative of the United States who is in daily contact with representatives of other lands, I can say that it is this direct increase in earning and production of wealth which makes us the envy of the world—and the despair of Communist theorists.

We believe in our wonderful two-party system because competition in politics makes for better politics just as competition in business makes for better business. We in particular are proud of the Republican record of service. But modern Americans do not believe that the party system should be carried to the point where it destroys national unity.

The big fight today is not between Republicans and Democrats.

In this dangerous world the big struggle is between us Americans with our allies who love freedom on the one side, and, on the other side, the Communist rulers who would destroy us. This was true when Stalin ruled in Moscow; it is true today; and prudence demands that we expect it to be true in the future.

In this struggle we need the leadership of Dwight Eisenhower. Thank God that his recovery is progressing so well. May he be completely returned to health and lead us for another 4 years.

If you will forgive a personal note in closing: I have all my life believed in Abraham Lincoln and the Republican Party, and, since 1941, when I first met Colonel Eisenhower on the Army maneuvers in Louisiana, I have believed in Dwight Eisenhower. What a godsend he has been to America. I wish also that I had the ability to describe the sadness which swept over the United Nations when news came of his illness. Men of every race, creed, and color felt a possessive sense of grief. We appreciate their good wishes. We also cherish the warmth and sincerity of the wishes expressed by the Democratic leaders and by Americans generally, regardless of party.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, we can indeed say in conclusion that both the Republican Party and Dwight Eisenhower have come through magnificently. It is a thrill and a privilege for us all to have a hand in this great adventure under the leadership of President Eisenhower.

Housing Problems in New York—Joseph P. McMurray, New York State Housing Commissioner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles published in today's New York Times. One of them was written by Mr. Warren Weaver, Jr., and the other by Mr. Charles Grutzner. Both articles refer to a man who is well known to the Senate of the United States. He is Joseph F. McMurray, who is the Commissioner of Housing of the State of New York. He served long and with great distinction as a staff member of the United States Senate.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE HOUSING AID ASKED IN REPORT—McMURRAY INFORMS GOVERNOR MIDDLE-INCOME PROGRAM FALLS SHORT OF NEEDS

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

ALBANY, January 25.—The State's new $50-million middle-income housing program can provide adequate dwellings for only 4,000 of the 140,000 families in that salary group who need them, Governor Harriman was told yesterday.

Before the State money was made available on January 1 for loans to finance middle-income housing, preliminary applications had been made under the program for projects costing more than $250 million, he was informed. This information was reported to the Governor by Joseph P. McMurray, State Housing Commissioner.

He urged the administration to make more funds available for the program "if it is intended to meet in any significant measure the actual need."

In last fall's election the voters approved by a narrow margin the use of $50 million of a $200 million housing bond issue for loans to limited profit companies ready to build middle-income projects. Tax exemptions as long as 30 years are available under the program.

Studies by the State Division of Housing show that there are 1,458,000 families in the State earning between $3,750 and $5,900 a year, Mr. McMurray said. This group constitutes the middle third of the State's families classified by income.

ESTIMATES NEEDS

Of this group, the commissioner reported, about 140,000 families live now in "units that are dilapidated or lack adequate plumbing." This represents about one-fifth of the substandard housing in the State.

According to Mr. McMurray, middle-income families can afford to pay $52 to $82 a month for rent if they budget one-sixth of income, or $63 to $98 if they budget one-fifth. Very little housing is being built at these rental levels, he said.

"The magnitude of the existing need for middle-income housing is shown by the amount of money needed to provide decent housing for this group," he declared. "Considering only the 140,000 units which are dilapidated or lack proper plumbing, and which are occupied by middle-income families, an expenditure of about $1,800 million would be required."

The report stated that "no significant supply" of new rental housing was available in New York City at less than $120 a month for a 1-bedroom apartment or $150 for a 2-bedroom unit.

To afford such housing, Mr. McMurray said, a family should be earning between $7,200 and $10,800 a year depending on its budget, thus putting virtually all available New York City apartments out of reach of middle-income families.

The commissioner estimated that housing built by limited-profit companies under the new program would rent for about $36 less a month than a similar nonsubsidized unit. If a nonprofit cooperative built the apartments under the plan, the saving would be about $52 a month.

HIS GOAL IS DECENT HOMES FOR ALL—MIDDLE-INCOME GROUP IS HOUSING CHIEF'S TARGET FOR AID—McMURRAY GOT STATE POST AFTER SERVICE IN WASHINGTON

(By Charles Grutzner)

Nearly half the family income went for rent when Joseph P. McMurray, State housing commissioner, was a boy in the Bronx.

The McMurrays were paying $35 a month in a 2-family frame dwelling on Decatur Avenue when Joe's father was getting $18 a week as a clerk in Wall Street. When Mr. McMurray's salary reached $33 a week, before the Wall Street crash, the family moved into a $55 apartment.

Commissioner McMurray's report on the middle-income housing problem, made public yesterday by Governor Harriman, says that no family should pay more than one-fifth of its income as rent.

Mr. McMurray wants to make it possible for every family to live in a decent home in a good neighborhood. He has, for instance, pushed up the low-income definition so that more families with an income of $100 a week can qualify, if they have several children, for public housing. And now he is trying to interest private and quasi-public money in putting up middle-income housing at reasonable rents.

The commissioner, who will be 44 years old next March 4, has served as aide to many Washington committees and was executive director of the New York City Housing Authority for 5 months before Mr. Harriman, as Governor-elect, tapped him for the State post in December, 1954.

Pictures of Mr. McMurray's 4 sons and 2 daughters, their ages from 13 years to 4½ years, stand on his desk at the State Division of Housing office, 270 Broadway. The McMurrays—his wife is the former Isabelle C. Kenny—live at 184 Beach 145th St., Neponsit, Queens.

Working after school and during vacations, Joseph McMurray was successively a grocer's delivery boy, a newsboy for the Bronx Home News, drug clerk, and copy boy for the Wall Street News Bureau. He decided to become a professor of economics. So, on graduation from Jamaica High School, he got a job as runner for a Wall Street house. The family had by then moved to Queens Village, Queens.

The brokerage firm for which he worked went out of business the same day the elder Mr. McMurray lost his job on the street. Whereupon Mr. McMurray decided he had to get a college education. He often walked, to save the nickel bus fare, to Jamaica, where he took the elevated to Brooklyn. He earned his A. B. at Brooklyn College, took 3 years of

graduate work in economics at the New School for Social Research, and participated in the Columbia University study on State and City Sales Tax in 1933 and 1935.

Civil-service examinations took him to Washington as statistician and economist in a succession of Government agencies, including the Department of Commerce, Federal Works Agency, National Resources Planning Board, and Bureau of Labor Statistics.

He was administrative assistant in 1947–48 to the late Senator Robert F. Wagner.

As economic consultant and staff director to the Senate Banking Committee from 1948 to 1954, he made a study of housing in England, Scandinavia, Holland, Francee, and Switzerland in 1949, and later of Federal housing programs in the United States.

When he was about to leave Washington for the New York City housing post, a dozen Senators made speeches about his services to the Government. Typical were the remarks of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who said:

"Joe McMurray seems to me to be a model public servant. I have always found his statements of fact to be accurate, unprejudiced and unbiased and his knowledge of the legislation under his study to be thorough and complete. He is a tireless worker; he is completely devoted to the public, and has a fine sense of humor and the gift of his race in getting along with people."

This appraisal was shared by Senators as different politically from Mr. DOUGLAS as, for example, HOMER CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana.

The Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the natural-gas bill.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tulsa Tribune of January 23, 1956]

THE NATURAL GAS BILL

Effects of the Harris-Fulbright bill being debated in the United States Senate are not limited to natural gas producers and consumers. They go much deeper in relation to our form of government.

The big question at issue is shall Congress establish an entirely new governmental policy by permitting a Federal agency, for the first time in peacetime history, to wield price-fixing power over a competitively produced commodity at its point of production.

If this policy is permitted to stand, there is nothing to prevent the Government from fixing the price, at the source, of coal, oil, lumber, iron ore, lead, or any other commodity.

The measure does not relieve producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. It does not open the way for a skyrocketing of prices. It does protect the gas consumer from unreasonable prices.

The main things involved in the matter are: The production of natural gas either is or is not a public utility function; and, the producer price of natural gas either is or is not a big part of the consumer's gas bill.

The real issue involved is not whether the producer of natural gas shall be regulated but what type of regulation will be imposed.

Contrary to widespread belief, the Harris-Fulbright bill does not remove natural gas producers from Federal regulation. It simply changes the type of regulation.

Instead of the Federal Power Commission having power and authority to regulate at the wellhead the price of all natural gas which eventually enters into interstate commerce, the Harris-Fulbright bill gives the FPC jurisdiction over the amount the interstate carrier can pay the producer for the gas and this amount must be a reasonable market price as determined by the commission under practical guides.

In other words, instead of having price-fixing powers, as at present, over 8,100 producers of natural gas, the Commission would have jurisdiction over the amount 100 interstate transporters of natural gas may pay producers.

The interstate transporter of gas and the distributor are classed as utilities and, as such, enjoy numerous advantages including marketing franchises as sole suppliers in areas they serve, which eliminated all competition from their operations.

While natural-gas producers have been placed in the category of utilities they do not enjoy the advantages of a utility status. Their business is still intensely competitive.

The Natural Gas Act specifically exempted producers and gatherers of natural gas from provisions of the act and jurisdiction of FPC. It states "provisions of this act shall not apply to the production or gathering of natural gas."

For 16 years after passage of the act, it was generally believed the act did not cover sales of natural gas by independent producers and the FPC so ruled on 11 separate occasions.

On June 7, 1954, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision in a case against Phillips Petroleum Co. in which the court instructed FPC to regulate prices at the wellhead of all natural gas which eventually entered into interstate commerce. About 4,000 producers, mostly oilmen, who did not own or have any interest in interstate transportation facilities, automatically were brought under regulation of FPC, as far as their natural-gas prices were concerned.

Supreme Court Justice Douglas stated the history and language of the Natural Gas Act are against direct Federal jurisdiction over the sale of natural gas at its point of production.

A Presidential Advisory Committee on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy reported "we believe the Federal Government should not control the production, gathering, processing, or sale of natural gas prior to its entry into an interstate transmission line."

Opponents of the Harris-Fulbright bill claim its passage will remove natural gas producers from Federal regulation and that, as a result, natural gas prices will increase up to $800 million a year.

Such statements are entirely contrary to all facts and logic.

The Harris-Fulbright bill is not a decontrol measure. It restores competition by removing from producers the utility type regulation imposed by the Supreme Court decision and substitutes consumer protection features that authorize the FPC to prevent pipeline companies from paying producers more than a reasonable market price for their gas.

The United States Bureau of Mines reports that for 1954, producers of natural gas in the United States were paid an average rate of 10.1 cents per thousand cubic feet for all gas supplied to residential consumers.

To increase the gas bill of the residential consumer by even $750 million a year, the producer price would have to be at least 50 cents a thousand cubic feet, or about five times the price in 1954.

Can anyone really believe the FPC would approve such an increase?

Natural gas is used largely for heating purposes and, as such, is competitive with coal, fuel oil, and electricity. Any substantial increase in gas prices would result immediately in many consumers changing over to coal, oil, or electricity.

Without any regulation whatever, the competitive price situation in fuels would prevent any material increase in natural gas prices by producers.

[From the Albany Knickerbocker News of January 19, 1956]

BASIC QUESTIONS RAISED BY NATURAL GAS DEBATE

Almost by definition—though there are notable exceptions—Government agencies are in favor of Government regulation. Particularly is this true of an agency engaged in the business of regulating, as with the Public Service Commission of New York State.

In a sense, that is an entirely proper function of such an agency—to present the case for controls in any situation involving public utilities.

New York PSC has taken a vigorous, almost militant, stand against the Fulbright bill, now being debated in the United States Senate. Purpose of this bill (already passed by the House as the Harris bill) is to remove from Federal control the sale of natural gas at the wellhead.

Obviously this is not a simple, uncomplicated issue, as the House vote—209 to 203—clearly indicates. The so-called consumer States, mostly in the Northeast, are supposed to be afraid of price gouging if there is no regulation of gas prices at the producer level. They cite what they call an escalator clause in most natural gas contracts under which all producers are guaranteed the same price paid to any producer in that particular field; point out also that this applies only to raising prices, not to lowering them. This pegs all natural gas, they insist, at the price level which must be demanded by the least efficient producer.

Genesis of this dispute is a Supreme Court decision of June 1954 which brought wellhead prices of natural gas under Federal regulation. What Senator FULBRIGHT and his allies seek to do is nullify the Court's decision by legislation.

We raise the question, though, Doesn't the argument for regulation collapse against the following facts?

Prior to the Supreme Court ruling, the price of gas at the producer level had not been regulated.

The so-called escalator clause had been a common (though not universal) practice in the gasfields prior to the Court decision.

Logically, then, it would follow that prices to consumers would have gone down after the regulations were imposed.

That didn't happen. The pattern of prices to consumers underwent no significant change when the Government regulators moved in.

But something else did happen: The number of new gas wells being tapped dropped off by about 10 percent. Also, there was a clear disposition on the part of producers to avoid interstate sales and to lure big users of natural gas, manufacturing plants, for example, into their home States. And surely the memory of World War II is fresh enough in our minds to recall how controls defeat their own end by drying up supplies.

Lamar Ratliff, Mississippi Farm Youth, Wins $1,000 Check for Corn Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently a Mississippi youth broke the world's record in the production of corn per acre, when he produced during the crop year 1945 a total of 304.38 bushels per acre.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "State Farm Youth Wins $1,000 Check," that appeared in the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion Ledger on January 19, 1956.

Lamar Ratliff, of Baldwyn, Miss., is a young man who deserves special recognition for an outstanding achievement. He has established a world corn-production record of 304.38 bushels of corn per acre. This achievement represents many, many hours of hard work, study, and planning by this 4–H Club member.

Progress in the production of agricultural commodities is as important today as in the past, despite the fact we now have surpluses. Can we expect to feed and clothe the future generations without planning and research today? As long as we have young people interested in agriculture, forestry, and conservation, we can face the future with confidence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE FARM YOUTH WINS $1,000 CHECK

A 16-year-old Mississippi farm boy who, with the help of a mule named Dolly, accomplished a feat no full-grown man ever matched, collected $1,000 today.

Lamar Ratliff, of Baldwyn, Miss., set a new world's record last fall by harvesting 304 bushels of corn from 1 acre of land.

He journeyed to Chicago where Wheeler McMillen, vice president of Farm Journal, handed him a check for $1,000.

The presentation climaxed 9 years of study and striving by various farmers. And McMillen compared young Lamar's accomplishment with running a 4-minute mile or climbing Mount Everest. McMillen said:

"One day in the summer of 1946 while walking around the grounds at White Sulphur Springs in company with Joe Schrock, of Congerville, Ill., we got to talking about the potential practicability of irrigation for the corn crop in the semi-humid areas of the country."

The conversation, he said, led to an experiment by 2 farmers in Iowa, 2 in Illinois, and 1 in Indiana—which resulted in a high of 115.23 bushels an acre. But this was topped by another farmer who raised his yield to 191 bushels, then a record high. McMillen said:

"Somewhere along the line we named the idea the 300-bushel corn adventure."

Meanwhile, down in Baldwyn, Miss., Lamar won a $20 prize in 1950 when he was a 10-year-old 4–H boy. Hooking a Georgia stock plow to his mule, Dolly, he cultivated an acre patch of sandy soil in a hollow of his dad's place and produced 179 bushels of corn.

Twenty dollars was presented to him by Seth Pounds, vice president of the Peoples Bank and Trust Co., in Booneville, Miss.

And with the 1955 grand prize-winning crop, Lamar, with the same mule but more know-how, planted 32,000 plants, thinned it by hand to an actual count of 25,850 plants when the corn came up and cultivated it twice during the growing process.

The result was the dreamed of 300 bushels.

In presenting Lamar with the award check, McMillen said:

"It is quite natural that at a time when surpluses are on the public mind someone should ask what is the point of producing 300 bushels of corn per acre.

"The answer is that there are no advantages in ignorance. Every step toward opening the frontiers of knowledge is a step in the right direction."

The Mississippi youth plans to use his money to help finance his college education. His father, Paul Ratliff, was presented with a $1,000 check, too, for anything he wants to buy to improve his 170-acre farm.

Traffic Jam in the Sky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine editorial published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of January 16, 1956. It is entitled "Traffic Jam in the Sky."

The editorial deals with the failure of the Department of Commerce to recognize the fact that a national crisis exists, and that the only suggestion still being made is for additional studies on an existing crisis.

I deeply regret that it is impossible to publish cartoons in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because the cartoon accompanying this editorial, by Mr. Fitspatrick, one of the all-time greats of cartooning, shows an airplane landing on an airport with terrific speed, while a man labeled "Commerce Department" is trying to flag it in with a flag labeled "Peanut Politics."

As a result of hearings held thus far, we have found nothing but peanut politics being played with the air safety of this Nation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAFFIC JAM IN THE SKY

Danger of midair collision on the Nation's commercial airways is so great as to amount to a daily threat to lives of airliner passengers. That is the outstanding and alarming point made by a special Government advisory group of eight men who are qualified in the aviation field. The peril cited in their report to Rowland Hughes, Director of the Budget, has been stressed several times in recent years by other men and other groups equally well qualified to speak. They got little attention.

The Air Line Pilots Association, whose members fly the planes of the scheduled airlines, has emphasized the collision hazard since 1945. The International Air Transportation Association, made up of 74 domestic and foreign carriers, adopted a resolution last October calling for action in the United States and abroad to make the airways safer.

Now the office of the Director of the Budget, which in the past has red-penciled Civil Aeronautics Administration requests for funds to improve air traffic control, is told that urgent action is necessary. The report says "even more dangerous conditions can be anticipated" unless aviation facilities are brought in line with air traffic growth and aircraft development.

These "even more dangerous conditions" must have been what Lt. Gen. Joseph Smith, head of the Military Air Transport Service, had in mind last fall when he said:

"I understand that lack of progress has been due to inability of the air traffic control agency to obtain necessary funds. The cost of a midair collision of one of our B–47s and a passenger-laden Super Connie would buy a lot of high-altitude control."

The committee's suggestion that the immediate remedy lies in appointment of a figure of national renown to head a complete review of aviation problems and then draw up a master 20-year plan for integrated development of all aviation facilities is an excellent one. But there is good reason to believe that this very leadership could have come from the CAA had the CAA been an independent agency and not responsible to the Commerce Department.

Senator MONRONEY of Oklahoma, whose Senate Aviation Subcommittee is investigating the sudden ouster by Secretary Weeks of Frederick B. Lee as head of the CAA, contends that the committee report proves the dangers aloft are "the direct result of Week's pennypinching policies." Mr. Lee, in his testimony at the inquiry and on his record, builds a convincing case for his contention that his plans for improving air traffic control were stifled by his superiors.

Mr. Lee's criticism of the Commerce Department is reinforced by the testimony of J. B. Hartranft, Jr., president of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, who declared the CAA had become a "ridiculous beanbag" of the Commerce Department. And it is indeed strange that the last three CAA heads have averaged only 21 months in office.

Aviation transportation has suddenly become a lusty young giant crowding into the bigtime circle of industry alongside steel, shipping, automobiles, and railroads. Yet its great piston-driven airfleets are operating under an outmoded air traffic control system that endangers lives. That control system cannot even attempt to handle the jet transportation era that will begin in 1959. This deplorable state of affairs demands an explanation as well as action from Secretary of Commerce Weeks himself.

National Gallery of Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, about a month ago a commemorative stamp in honor of Andrew William Mellon, former Secretary of the Treasury, and the founder of the National Gallery of Art, was issued, and a ceremony in connection therewith was held. There was much comment with regard to it, and I have in my hand a short poem which was written relative to the use of the National Gallery of Art.

I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

(By Albert W. Dowling, in the Washington Evening Star)

How often I have come to seek
Within these walls, where beauty lies,
An hour to hear an artist speak
A text from some Madonna's eyes.

Here have I come in search of truth
To store against a barren day,
Or fill my eye with endless youth
Which laughs at time, forever May.

Here have I glimpsed and been a part
Of history's exciting span,
And marveled at the world's great art
And left these halls, a wiser man.

Stop Whispering: Proclaim United States Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer, Friday, January 20, 1956, which states that the United States has a selling job to do—to sell our country and all it means to the people of the world:

America has a selling job to do. That job is to sell our country and all it means to the peoples of the world.

For many decades the United States of America was a beacon in the minds of men. Our country was held high as a friend of the oppressed, helper of the needy, champion of human liberty.

Today all that is changed. We seem to have fewer friends abroad with each succeeding year. What friends we have too often are in high places; the peoples seem to have lost touch. They appear ready to believe Communist lies that distort American ideals. Never in human history has a country done so much to assist others as ours, only to be misunderstood and maligned.

The Inquirer believes there is one basic reason for this grave state of affairs: Failure to get the real story of the real America directly to the peoples of other countries.

That failure is the more lamentable when we realize that salesmanship has long been one of our strong points. We can sell United States cars, United States films, United States music, United States goods almost anywhere. But we have slipped up badly on selling the great Nation which produced those goods—and so much more that is precious in the world today.

Because citizens of the United States have not been conditioned to regard propaganda as a major and normal function of government, our country's information agencies have been working in slow motion, with inadequate funds, insufficient personnel and indifferent public support. Even now the Voice of America is a whisper, not a shout.

Lacking, above all, has been that spirit of dedication to our cause which the Communists pour out in such measure in behalf of their campaign to enslave mankind.

Many United States Information Agency workers are doing a valiant job. But they struggle not only against their opposite numbers in Red agencies but against the work of Communists who have infiltrated schools, colleges, and other institutions, especially in Asia and the Middle East.

At a time when the cold war is being renewed by Moscow with redoubled vigor—even on our Latin-American doorstep—it is time for Americans to face facts. It is just as important for us to win this war for the minds of men as it would be to win a war waged with guns, bombs, and planes. The stakes are just as high. Yet we would not expect to win a shooting war with a piggy-bank budget. How, then, can we expect to win the cold war with that same sort of small-change financing?

We have been spending, with hardly any question, for defense and foreign aid. The new budget includes over $40 billion for those two categories. Proportionately, the job of selling the American story is almost ignored. Surely if we were to allocate for that purpose only one-half of 1 percent of that sum—or about $200 million—it would not be too much. General Motors alone spends an estimated $100 million a year to advertise and promote its products.

A drastically stepped-up expenditure to sell the American Way would, in itself, be a valuable adjunct to the defense and foreign aid programs themselves. They are all part of the same struggle: to keep the free world free, and preserve our own freedom thereby.

The Inquirer believes that getting the truth about the United States to the peoples of other lands is one of the most urgent tasks we face. That is why a broadly expanded program should become part of our bipartisan foreign policy.

That is why we hope both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms for 1956 will include a pledge to that end.

We must stop whispering. We must proclaim the truth—in words that will be heard, and understand clearly, throughout the world.

Another Iowa Chamber of Commerce Demands Economic Justice for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, another Iowa chamber of commerce has rightly expressed concern over the injustices presently being heaped on Midwest farmers.

In an excellent resolution which fully recognizes the seriousness of the situation on Iowa farms, the board of directors of the Waverly (Iowa) Chamber of Commerce urges that immediate action be taken to bolster sagging livestock prices and that measures be adopted to assist farmers in obtaining equitable prices for all their products.

Mr. Speaker, I agree wholeheartedly with this resolution, which follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the board of directors of the Waverly Chamber of Commerce fully realizes the great importance of the farmers in the Waverly trade area to Waverly merchants; and

Whereas the directors note with concern the continued downward trend of farm prices which is taking place while the price of the articles the farmer has to purchase is rising; and

Whereas recent predictions by some leading economists indicate a further drop in farm income in 1956, but a continued increase in other business; and

Whereas no evidence is noted that anything concrete has been done in Washington to alleviate and correct the above discrepancies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the said board of directors of the Waverly Chamber of Commerce, in meeting assembled in Waverly this 11th day of January 1956, do hereby urge the administration and Congress to immediately put into effect such temporary measures as may be necessary to assure farmers of fair hog and cattle prices during the present emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge the administration and Congress to prepare, pass, and put into effect, with as much celerity as circumstances will permit, legislation that will assure farmers of equitable prices for their products in times of maladjustment without instituting any permanent controls that would limit their freedom of operations and opportunity; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Eisenhower, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, Senators Hickenlooper and Martin, to Congressman H. R. Gross, to Governor Leo Hoegh, to Bremer County Farm Bureau officials, and to Waverly newspapers.

In witness whereof the following officers of the said organization hereto attach their signatures.

HEBERT L. DORFMAN,
President.
ROBERT L. BENCK,
Vice President.
M. R. LACKOR,
Executive Director.

City of the Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include a poem written by the poet laureate of the State of Colorado, Mr. Milford E. Shields, of Durango, Colo.

The poem is entitled "City of the Free," and was written by Mr. Shields to commemorate the 165th anniversary of the laying out of the city of Washington. It was on January 24, 1791, that George Washington set surveyors to work on the site of our Capital City.

The poem follows:

CITY OF THE FREE—WASHINGTON, D. C.

(By Milford E. Shields)

There is a city filled with light,
The city of the free;
She is a beacon shining bright—
Our Washington, D. C.

She is the glory of our land,
And beauty to behold,
The city built by heart and hand,
More precious than pure gold.

There is a city filled with hope
That is man's fondest dream;
The stars alone contain the scope
Of her transcendent gleam.

We will preserve our city fair,
Her splendor shall not die,
For all America glows there,
By grace of God on high.

There is a city filled with light,
The city of the free,
Most precious jewel in God's sight—
Our Washington, D. C.

Growing Threat of Foreign Import

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Boston Sunday Herald annual textile review, January 22, 1956, by Mr. William F. Sullivan, president of Northern Textile Association.

This article well analyzes the complex problems of the textile industry, and the need of our Government to establish import quotas on textiles and apparel adequate to maintain the jobs of American textile workers and safeguard the billions invested in these industries:

FOREIGN IMPORT RATE THREATENS TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(By William F. Sullivan, president, Northern Textile Association)

Last year New England textile manufacturers continued to move on many fronts in their efforts to maintain competitive operations in this area.

During most of the year, the industry was in the depression which began in 1954 but which has alleviated somewhat during the last half of 1955.

Although liquidations of some New England mills continued to occur during 1955, the remainder of the mills continued to actively promote a program to bring about equality of operating costs between Northern and Southern mills and to protect themselves against the imports of low wage foreign textiles. Action was undertaken to keep the costs of raw material from getting out of line with competitors and to prevent future losses from floods and other disasters.

The mills continue to work on regional problems with a realistic awareness of their importance. The test for everything undertaken by the mills and their association has been—"Will it improve the chances for successful operations in New England?"

The New England mills ever conscious of their vulnerability have looked on the growing threat of foreign exports principally from Japan as a primary problem, not only in 1955, but also in 1956. Last June, the United States reduced duties on most cotton textile items an average of 25 percent, and in some cases, as high as 50 percent. This was done principally for the advantage of Japan. Actually, the duties before the reduction were so low that Japanese goods made by labor earning about an average of less than 15 cents an hour had no difficulty in entering this country, duty paid, at prices less than the cost of American goods.

Foreign manufacturers are also able to purchase foreign grown cotton at prices below that which the American manufacturer must pay for American cotton.

With this two-edge differential in labor costs and raw materials, plus the greatly reduced duties, Japanese goods have been flowing into the United States at an ever-increasing rate. Imports of cotton cloth in 1955 will amount to about 130 million square yards as compared with imports of 64 million in 1953.

There has been an increasing tendency for these imports to be concentrated in certain lines and particularly the finer goods made by the New England mills. Japanese imports of velveteens have jumped from 134,000 yards in all of 1954 to over 5 million yards in the first 9 months of 1955.

Similarly, ginghams, which are made in New England, the Japanese have increased their imports to such a degree that they now import about one-third of the American production. Equally important, the Japanese have also begun to concentrate on apparel. Their imports of cotton shirts have tripled since 1954 and cotton wearing apparel imports have increased tenfold.

This problem is so serious that all branches of the industry are earnestly endeavoring to work out a solution which will prove practical, prevent serious unemployment, and at the same time not jeopardize United States relations with Japan.

Secretary of State Dulles has stated that he has personally advised representatives of the Japanese Government that they should exercise restraint in their exports and not attempt to capture so much of the American market that an American industry will be injured.

The Japanese have announced some voluntary controls on their exports of cotton goods to the United States, but because of the ease with which Japanese goods can be transshipped from third countries and the uncertainty of one-sided controls by the Japanese, New England and other American textile manufacturers are urging the establishment of quotas on foreign imports on a basis which would be equitable and enforceable. The United States textile manufacturers have suggested a liberal annual quota of 150 percent of the average imports for 1953–54.

The next 6 months will be crucial for the industry in its efforts to prevent curtailment and unemployment caused by the importation of foreign goods. Congress will be asked to help in working out a solution. The New England governors have already transmitted to the President and the New England congressional delegation a resolution urging our Government "to establish as promptly as possible import quotas on textiles and apparel adequate to maintain the jobs of American textile workers and safeguard the billions invested in these industries." Sixteen southern governors have taken similar action.

MINIMUM WAGES

Last year was marked by success in the New England textile manufacturers' efforts to raise the minimum wage in the industry.

The $1-per-hour minimum under the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act established for the textile industry in early 1953 by the Secretary of Labor had been enjoined in the courts by a group of southern mills. On December 1, 1955 the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia ruled against the southern mills and in favor of the position adopted by the Secretary of Labor and the northern mills.

Congress also raised the minimum wage to $1 effective next March 1. All New England mills pay over $1 an hour. Southern mills which pay less than that amount will have to raise their wages next March. This should reduce somewhat the wage differential between northern and southern mills, although it alone will not eliminate the differential in labor cost. The minimum-wage increase was actively supported by the New England congressional delegation and the New England governors.

FREIGHT RATES

The New England cotton mills were faced with the problem of an increase in the differential in freight rates on raw cotton shipped to New England and immediately took action with the New England and southwestern railroads to eliminate the increased differential and maintain the historical relationship in rates.

A delegation of New England manufacturers went to St. Louis where the southwestern lines agreed to maintain the old rate relationship on cotton to New England.

A petition is presently pending with the Southern Railroad to grant to New England mills the same reduction already granted to southern mills. The support of the New England railroads has either been promised or is expected for these proposals.

AREA COOPERATION

The textile industry in the area takes the point of view that in addition to individual mill activities in research, modernization, manufacturing, and selling the industry as such must continue to present to the public and those who represent the area in State and Federal Governments the facts about the industry and the policies and actions which are essential to its welfare.

Awareness of common problems and a willingness to make the effort to find solutions adds immeasurably to the industry's chances of success in the future.

The New England governors and the New England congressional delegation have been generous with their time and efforts in working on many complex problems.

The New England Senators meet regularly to consider regional problems. A special committee of the New England Representatives in Congress under the chairmanship of THOMAS LANE, of Lawrence, has been established to meet and work with the New England governors' textile committee, headed by Dr. Seymour E. Harris, of Harvard.

Russian Unrest Key Weapon, Krajcovic Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsstory which appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner, Monday, January 23, 1956, which relates the statements of Dr. V. Stefan Krajcovic, one-time underground agent in Europe and now chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia. Dr. Krajcovic said that the most powerful weapon America could use in its world contest with communism "is the effective beaming of hope for liberation to the suppressed nationalities groups within Russia":

LOS ANGELES VISITOR URGES FREE WORLD STIR REVOLT IN SOVIET UNION

Effective beaming of hope for liberation to the suppressed nationalists groups within Russia itself would be the most powerful weapon America could forge in its world contest with communism.

That opinion was expressed here yesterday by Dr. V. Stefan Krajcovic, one-time underground agent in Europe and now chairman of the National Committee for Liberation of Slovakia.

"If we create enough disorder inside Russia itself, they would be so busy with this penetration or infiltration that they would not have time to stir up hostilities in the free world as they are now doing in the Near East," he said at the Biltmore.

STATUS

"In the Soviet Union, half the people are not Russians but are Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Cossacks, Mongol, Baltic, and other homogeneous peoples living in semicolonial status.

"And that," he commented, "is the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union.

"For the United States to properly develop it, using the American principle of the right of self-determination for all enslaved people, would, I feel, be potentially more devastatingly to Russia than the atomic or hydrogen bomb."

But so far, Dr. Krajcovic said, United States policy has seemed reluctant to use this weapon, presumably because it still adheres to noninterference with the prewar status quo, including "the colonial system on which the whole devilish Communist system is based."

UNREST

Simultaneously, with the campaign directed toward the Russian nationalist groups, the visitor stated, the free world should step up its efforts to foster increasing unrest in the satellite nations.

Both of these campaigns, he declared, should be assigned exclusively to "private means," he remarked, "as it is only by such means that we can defeat communism.

"Perhaps," he suggested, "to meet their so-called Communist Internationale, we should set up a Democratic Internationale."

Krajcovic, whose headquarters are in Washington, D. C., said reports which reached him there, showed the Geneva Conference "harmed the underground very much."

"It seemed to seal the status quo of the satellites," he explained. "But now that American has found out the falseness of the Russian attitude the movement is resurgent."

Should We Block or Help Japanese Textile Trade?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, January 22, 1956, entitled "Should We Block or Help Japanese Textile Trade?"

The article follows:

SHOULD WE BLOCK OR HELP JAPANESE TEXTILE TRADE?

(By Herbert Bratter)

Deploring the interference of domestic policies with foreign policy, former Ambassador George F. Kennan finds that "selfishness and shortsightedness ride supreme" between wars. A case in point is the current clamor by textile and other interests to limit imports of cheap Japanese goods, such as cotton fabrics and blouses, which have been arriving in mounting quantities.

Before World War II we brought economic pressure on Japan by quotas and gentlemen's agreements limiting their shipments here. Later these were supplemented by limitation of our exports of strategic commodities to Japan. When Japan turned toward the Asiatic mainland we sought to checkmate her there as well. The Japanese answered at Pearl Harbor. Have we really learned anything from that experience?

United States textile spokesmen view with alarm the growth of imports from Japan from 1.5 million yards of cloth in 1952 to an estimated 75.9 million yards in 1955. Not only piece goods were imported, but sheets, pillowslips, blouses and other items, the products of low wage rates and elasticity of operating hours. Against the imports, says the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, our weakened tariffs are of little avail. Although Japan has voluntarily undertaken to limit future exports and to avoid price cutting, our industry insists that the Government impose strict quotas.

TWO-PERCENT IMPACT

A recent survey of 20 American industries indicates that the most prosperous of all has been textiles and apparel. Since Japanese goods, even at the present rate of imports, equals only about 2 percent of total United States textile output, the manufacturers demanding import quotas obviously are more concerned with the future than the present Japanese competition.

Two questions are posed by the clamor for quotas. First, is the injury caused by imports of Japanese textiles and apparel such that a sympathetic nation should give that industry greater protection? Second, if we rigidly restrict Japanese earnings in this market will the economic consequences on Japan in turn have political consequences that may be even more costly to this Nation?

The "cheap Japanese labor" argument so often heard can be taken with a grain of salt. Back in 1937, when similar fears of Japanese trade competition swept the United States textile industry, Dr. Claudius Murchison, now economic adviser of the American Cotton Manufacturers' Institute, negotiated in Japan a far-reaching gentlemen's agreement that limited Japanese textile exports. Then, to correct some false notions, he pointed out that "it is not generally true that the Japanese industry operates at excessively long hours and without recognition of customary days of rest. * * * We derived no impression that they (the workers) were subjects of exploitation. * * * In our competition with the Japanese textile industry we are not competing with labor exploitation or with lower living standards. * * * I have undergone an intensive educational process."

That was in 1937. Since then Japanese labor unions have learned a lot from us. The workers' standards have improved. In 1954 per capita real income in Japan was 6.2 percent above prewar. We fear Japan's cheap labor, but the country with the cheapest labor in the world per unit of output is the United States, which helps explain why so many countries raise tariff barriers against our goods.

THIRD BEST CUSTOMER

Japanese workers' productivity in textiles, according to Japanese data, is less than half that here; in farming, a third to a half; in steel and electric power, a fourth; and in coal mining only a tenth.

In considering imposition of quotas on Japanese textiles—a step which, incidentally, would certainly stimulate demands for quotas on various other import items—the Nation looks at more than just the profits of a single industry. Since VJ-Day we have spent an estimated $2 billion on aid for Japan. The Japanese are among the proudest people of the world. They prefer to earn their own living by trading. If they sell much goods here, they buy still more.

They are our third best customer, buying here three times as much as they sell us.

Yet, despite the country's dire economic need, Japan, cowed by American cotton mill pressure on the Congress, in December voluntarily decided to limit cotton fabric exports to the United States to 150 million square yards in 1956. Blouse exports will be held to 2.5 million dozen and other restrictions and safeguards will be maintained.

The American drive for import quotas is up against the determined opposition of the Administration, as detailed in Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' letter to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, published in December. The Secretary based his opposition on economic grounds. He might also have cited history.

Since great wars have multiple causes it may be too much to attribute Pearl Harbor solely to economic factors. But it is certainly true that the economic and other pressures put on Japan, not alone by the United States but by western countries generally, contributed importantly to the tightening of the noose around Japan's neck and therefore to the ascendency of the military in formulating Japan's foreign policy.

Japan is one of the most crowded countries in the world, a mountainous land of limited arable soil and industrial raw material resources. For the surplus population, emigration (excepting to the nearby Chinese mainland) offered no solution in view of the immigration barriers of other countries. Exports of low-priced textiles and other manufactures, as noted above, were limited not only as to the United States, but also many other countries including the trade-important British commonwealth and colonies. Japanese goods were no more welcomed by competing interests in Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada or Africa than by those here.

TURN TO MANCHURIA

The Japanese sought the economic resources of Manchuria and the markets of China, then a politically disordered land of war lords and civil conflicts. But, as we well know, that proved to be a big mistake on Japan's part, for it aroused not only the United States textile and light-bulb industries, but all those whose purpose it was to bring American might to China's defense.

For generations we had taken China's side, despite anti-American boycotts and anti-foreignism in China. After the Boxers slaughtered foreigners in Peking and elsewhere, we devoted the Boxer indemnity to friendly education. Because of the large missionary and business population of Americans resident in and propagandizing for China, we maintained there for generations the largest consular and diplomatic establishment anywhere; marines and infantry, and a large naval establishment in the Far East, including gunboats on the Yangtze River.

We had, we were told, to protect the great China trade, although in the year of the "China Incident," 1937, the gross value of our exports to China was only 0.16 of 1 percent of our output of movable goods. Our really important trade with Japan required only routine diplomatic facilities. Our intervention against the Japanese in China failed, however, to shut the Japanese up in their islands. War ensued, although it did not produce the results sought by prewar Chinese leaders and their American friends.

Another Pearl Harbor blow by Japan is not likely soon. But United States economic pressure against Japanese goods is sure to push Japan toward relations with Communist countries on the Asian mainland. That would strengthen the Soviet area economically and militarily.

Natural Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, my interest in the legislative efforts to correct the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case is more than a desire to correct an injustice to one of the large industries of my State. It is a determination to overcome a new and dangerous philosophy announced in the Supreme Court's decision.

Why should natural gas, the product of an intensely competitive and high risk industry, be singled out as the only commodity so produced to be brought under direct Federal price-fixing while in the hands of the producer?

If a bureau in Washington can fix the price of gas, on an arbitrary basis, can it not just as easily fix the price of other products?

If natural gas is singled out for direct Federal price-fixing today, might it not be oil or cattle or cotton or dairy products—or all of them—tomorrow?

If there is any doubt that natural gas is a commodity produced by a highly competitive industry—far removed from the utility status—let us takt a look at some of the facts about the demand-supply-price picture. They will show not only that the industry is competitive, but also that the consumer of natural gas inevitably receives his greatest protection from competitive activity.

First, there is a great and growing demand, natural gas customers have tripled and natural gas delivered to residential consumers has quintupled since 1938.

Consumption of natural gas has just about tripled since World War II. Today more than 27 million gas customers are residential users, including those using mixed, manufactured and LPG as well as natural gas. The American Gas Association estimates that an additional 1.2 million users will be added in 1956 if supplies are available. Countless other potential customers are anxious to see their communities served by natural gas.

Obviously, the efficiency and clealiness of this fuel contributed to its popularity. Obviously, also, its reasonable prices have been considered among its advantages to the constantly growing gas consuming public.

Competition between producers of gas—as well as between them and other fuels—has been evidenced by the refusal of prices of natural gas to react to inflationary conditions as sharply as have the prices of other fuels. Natural gas is one of the few items in the family budget for which price has remained comparatively stable.

Based on 1935 to 1939 averages compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, natural gas used by residential consumers for range and automatic water heater use in 1954 had an index of 93.6 or well under average prices for the 1935 to 1939 period. Contrast this with 222.6 for anthracite coal, 212.9 for bituminous coal, and 207.7 for No. 2 fuel oil. Contrast this also with the 192 overall cost-of-living index for 1954.

If the tremendous demand is not matched by a similar rise in supply, the price of natural gas naturally will tend to rise. But this increase will be even larger if the producers' prices are regulated on a cost-plus utility basis. Supply is the great consideration, and price-fixing regulations will have a tendency to reduce, rather than increase, the search for new supplies. They also will tend to divert more of the supply from the interstate market into the intrastate, which even now represents half of the total marketed production. Intrastate sales were not made subject to Federal control by the Phillips decision.

With the tremendous expansion of the market made possible by the many large interstate lines built since World War II, the ratio of supply to net production has diminished rapidly. Even so, the industry has proved up new gas supply at the rate of almost 2 trillion cubic feet for each trillion produced since 1954. During that year, new supply barely exceeded actual production.

Which represents the greater need—to fix prices with a hope of keeping costs to consumers down, as long as the present supply lasts; or to rely on time-tested free competition to encourage wider search for greater reserves to supply the present consuming public and the millions who hope to join today's fortunate consumers?

Developments of recent years clearly show that all reserves possible are essential to meet future needs. Roughly speaking, we have about 22 years of supply at the current rate of withdrawal, but that rate of withdrawal may continue to grow.

Certainly an adequate price is essential to prevent waste of casing-head gas, which is produced with oil. Prices for natural gas must be at least enough to pay for the expense of conservation measures. Adequate price also is essential to promote production from wells whose primary product is gas. Leading geologists are convinced that we have not reached the limit in our discoveries of oil and gas. However, the incentive provided will determine to what extent we are able to make additional discoveries.

Because of joint costs and the infinite number of variables, it is impossible to determine a regulated price based on a cost formula, such as would be necessary if gas producing is considered a utility. Gas must be allowed to seek its true price level through free competition with competitive fuels, or it will be found necessary to regulate the prices of these fuels, also, and thus establish a Federal bureau control over all of our energy resources.

If reserves are to keep pace with demand, every producer—not just a few big companies—must have price incentive to search for and produce more gas. The minor or independent producer is the typical wildcatter. He finds the big majority of new fields, and we cannot meet our needs without him. He needs incentive.

There are thousands of these independents in action today. The number is not less than 13,000 and may be as many as 15,000 or even more. The picture some would paint of a monopoly industry controlled by a few large companies is far from true. Of all the extractive industries, bituminous coal is the only one in which leading companies produce as small a portion of the total as in the natural-gas industry. Compared with manufacturers of all kinds, natural gas is less concentrated in the hands of a few companies than 382 out of the total of 452 studied.

The picture for gas production is: First 4 companies, 17 percent; first 8, 28; first 20, 46; first 50, 66; and first 100, 78. There also is a gradual gradation from one size to the next in order, a condition ideal for competitive behavior. Seekers of monopoly can look elsewhere.

The ease of entry into production of natural gas is a sure sign of the absence of monopoly. Natural-gas companies even seek additional competitors, frequently looking for partners because of limitation of funds when they spend so much on exploration, title clearance, and leasing.

Competition definitely is present when the producer or gatherer meets the interstate pipeline or transmission company at the bargaining table. The pipeline companies are not so numerous as the producers, but between them they have an interconnecting network of lines covering the large producing areas of the Southwest. With one exception, the various large lines all are connected either directly or indirectly with most of the producing areas of the Southwest. Thus they have widely scattered supply sources to which they can turn if one source prices itself out of the market. Neither the seller nor the buyer has the other "over a barrel."

These active competitive conditions which prevail are pointed up by the price behavior of natural gas. Prices have shown great flexibility and continually have lagged behind the rising cost of living.

Indicating their responsiveness to competitive conditions, prices paid under contracts executed in 1954 ranged from 4 to 14 cents in Kansas and from 4 to 16 cents in Louisiana and Texas.

The increased rates paid by consumers today are not due primarily to higher field prices, but to generally higher prices of everything that enters into the distribution, transmission, and production of gas. These include sharp rises in the cost of steel, labor, taxes, and many other expenses. Only about a tenth of the total cost to the residential consumer is represented by the price received by the producer for natural gas at the wellhead.

Under free competition, the natural gas producing industry has met every test of service to the consumer. What sound reason is there for fixing on a cost-plus utility basis the wellhead price that a producer may get for his gas?

Regulating only the larger producers is no answer to the problem. Who is the larger producer? What if royalty owners, owners of divided interests, small producers feeding into a single gatherer

or natural gasoline plant, and others demand payment in kind and insist on separate sales?

Price fixing is not in the long-range interest of the consumer. Putting gas production on a utility status would bring staggering problems and costs, with no benefits and very probably some definite losses.

Consider the staff necessary and the expenses involved if the Federal Power Commission must review 30,000 separate sales transactions, with thousands more each year. Consider the insurmountable difficulties in trying to determine prices on a cost basis. What about loss of incentive to producers? Futility compounded.

No five men can solve all the problems that have been solved by millions of individual decisions from day to day. The vast machinery for direct regulation of prices for thousands of producers would be only one of many costs, both tangible and intangible. The consumer will pay the price, both in taxes and in increased charges for the gas itself.

Direct regulation in the form of price-fixing is not the answer. The consumer's greatest protection is competitive activity. His true interest lies with a continuing supply. He deserves the benefits of competition.

The Fulbright-Harris bill will reinstate this free and fair competition in natural gas production, which has worked so well through the years for everyone concerned, including consumers. In addition to this best of all regulators, competion, the bill provides extra assurance for consumers through indirect controls which will see that wellhead prices are reasonable, even under the most unusual circumstances.

It will be good for producers. It will be good for consumers. It will be good for our country.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Ukrainian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the black shadow of imperialistic communism has enveloped many peoples, but none, perhaps, have been so forgotten in this hideous picture of selfish and diabolic aggression than the people of the Ukraine. Here, chained by the blood shackles of Soviet aggression, are more than 40 million men, women, and children, the vast majority of whom, even today, pray for release and freedom and independence. History records that 38 years ago the Ukrainians declared their independence only to be struck down into abject slavery by the Red fist of communism, which they abhored and fought and tried in vain to reject forever.

The flag of the Ukraine is of blue and gold. I venture to describe it as blue for hope in their eventual release and gold to signify the precious spirit of honest democracy that still burns within the hearts of the true patriots of that forgotten nation.

But as long as justice lives within our world, the Ukraine shall not and must not be forgotten. Many of our American citizens of Ukrainian derivation will not allow the story of the heroic struggle of these people to be buried beneath the massive lie that emanates from the dark confines of Moscow's Kremlin.

I join with our citizens of Ukrainian descent in helping to remind America and all the free world that the Ukraine is a captive country. I join with millions of other lovers of liberty and honor and self-determination in the hope that we shall all live to see the day when the Ukraine takes her rightful place among the nations of the free world.

George S. Holmes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I read a poem to the House written by my friend, the late George Sanford Holmes. Many of the Members knew Mr. Holmes and for them and for those who may have appreciated his poem, I should like to include his obituary as it appeared in the Daily Sentinel, of Grand Junction, Colo., and also an editorial from the same paper commenting upon his career. This material will give more of an insight into his life, but it cannot show the dedication he had to his calling, or the example it forms of the value of a free press.

To Mr. Holmes news was an entity of its own. The establishment and dissemination of news, to his mind, proceeded solely upon the facts. If opinion was to be deduced, it was to be deduced from the facts established. Nothing gave him more cause for anguish than sloppy reporting or careless editorializing. His work followed the great tenets of clarity, conciseness, and correctness. I regret that my ability with words is so far short of his own that I cannot do justice to him. I can say no more than that he was a great journalist in the best sense of that term.

The article and editorial follow:

CORRESPONDENT FOR SENTINEL GEORGE S. HOLMES DIES—VETERAN STATE NEWSMAN

George Sanford Holmes, the Sentinel's Washington correspondent, died Sunday at his Yorktown Village, Md., home of a heart ailment.

Mr. Holmes had been ill for several months, but had apparently been on the road to recovery. He was 71.

His death ends a distinguished journalistic career which stretched over a half century.

Mr. Holmes was graduated from Brown University, Providence, R. I., in 1904. He was a member of Phi Beta Kappa and Alpha Tau Omega. He began newspaper work as a reporter on the Providence Tribune and later became city editor.

In 1908 he joined the Rocky Mountain News in Denver and was reporter, political writer, city editor, and, from 1925 to 1928, managing editor. He left Denver in 1928 to become associated with the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance staff in Washington, D. C.

During his 10 years with Scripps-Howard Mr. Holmes specialized in covering issues and personalities of particular interest to the Rocky Mountain area—experience which made him particularly valuable to the Sentinel in recent years.

Mr. Holmes became director of information for the National Youth Administration in 1938. Two years later he became Chief of the Bureau of Public Relations for the construction Division of the Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army. He continued in posts under Gen. Brehon Somervell throughout World War II.

After the war he became Chief of Public Relations for the Real Property Disposal Division of the War Assets Administration, and in 1949 transferred to the Defense Electric Power Administration, Department of the Interior.

He left Government service in 1953 to become affiliated with The Sentinel full time. He had supplied special articles from Washington to The Sentinel for 20 years or more.

He was a member of the Senate Press Gallery and a specialist in covering events pertaining to the development of resources of the West. Mr. Holmes covered in detail, with expert knowledge, the legislation on water matters of particular importance to this area. He had followed the Colorado River storage project from its inception and was acquainted with both the open and behind-the-scenes moves which affected it. Mr. Holmes was widely acquainted with the Members of the United States Senate and House, and was highly regarded by them.

In 1949, Mr. Holmes published a book of poems about Washington called "Yes, This Is Washington." The volume was a piquant view of life in Washington, ranging from satire to heart-felt sonnets. It was widely hailed by critics all over the country.

He also published The Story of Walter Scott Lenox, the Blind Potter, and wrote a daily column, Off the Record, for Scripps-Howard.

Mr. Holmes was a member of Palestine Lodge No. 151, A. F. & A. M., Denver; Mile High Club, Denver; Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C.; National Press Club, Washington; Brown University Alumni Assn.; and Colorado State Society. He was a past president of the Denver Kiwanis Club, and a life member of Kiwanis.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Hortense Belcher Holmes, and a daughter, Mrs. Herman Russell of Baltimore.

Funeral services are scheduled for Wednesday.

WE LOSE A FINE REPORTER AND FRIEND

Grand Junction and all the intermountain region have lost a good friend in the death of George Sanford Holmes who has been The Sentinel's Washington correspondent for a number of years. Mr. Holmes was at one time managing editor of the Rocky Mountain News. In 1928 he joined the Washington staff of the Scripps-Howard organization. From that vantage point he was able to gain general and inside information about and interpret Washington movements that were related to the Rocky Mountain region.

While his newspapering was interrupted by several years' service in a Government information post, George Sanford Holmes' interest in and concern for this region never lagged. So not surprisingly at the end of his Government service he again became Washington correspondent for a selected few newspapers, among them The Sentinel. And our readers developed a high regard for his in-

formative reports on what was going on in Washington that was of especial import to the western slope and all Colorado.

But expert newsman that he was, George Holmes also found time to write of many other things; of things that were not of the type to make headlines. He had published many poems of sentiment and satire.

He also authored several books and many articles on topics of interest to Americans seeking behind-the-lines information. We shall miss his ever-dependable reports from the Nation's Capital as we shall miss George Sanford Holmes as a friend and fellow newspaperman.

Maryland and the Middle of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin spoke at a luncheon meeting of the officers of the Maryland State Society of Washington, D. C., and gave us an interesting report on the state of our beloved Free State.

Under leave granted, I herewith insert his address:

ADDRESS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND

Whenever the 48 States of the Union are listed in order of population, of wealth, of per capita income, of industrial production, or of almost anything else except area, you will find Maryland somewhere between 21st and 27th place. That is to say, it is always in the middle, give or take 2 or 3 places. In area it drops to 41st place, but in nothing else.

In 1888 Maryland voted for Cleveland, the Democrat, but he lost. In 1948 Maryland voted for Dewey, the Republican, and he lost. But in the intervening 60 years Maryland had voted for the winner in every presidential election, and in 1952 she resumed the habit. This is at least a strong suggestion that Maryland thinking is pretty close to what the average American thinks.

If that is true, it is well worthwhile to consider for a few minutes what Maryland thinks of one of the most controversial phrases now current in American politics. I do not assert that what Maryland thinks is always right, but I do claim that it furnishes a fairly accurate guide to what most Americans are thinking on the same subject, and that is worth knowing.

The phrase I have in mind is middle-of-the-road man. When President Eisenhower so described himself, his overwhelming personal popularity was just rising to its crest. It goes without saying that if the most popular figure in the country was a middle-of-the-road man, every ambitious politician in the country was going to describe himself in the same words. But our ambitious politicians include men of the most widely diverse types, and the result is that we hear the term "middle-of-the-road man" applied to themselves by people so utterly different that if one is telling the truth the other can't be. We need a standard of measurement by which we can judge when a man's claim to the title has some color of truth, and when it is preposterous.

It seems to me that a standard accepted by a middle-of-the-road State may reasonably be assumed to be a correct measurement of of a middle-of-the-road man. Since Maryland, except in area, is conspicuously a middle State, I am going to discuss what we accept as a middle-of-the-road man in the region between Oakland and Ocean City.

To begin with, I shall admit that Maryland, like other States, has its quota of bitter partisans, who can see nothing in any opponent except a Fascist or a Communist. But I do think that in Maryland they constitute a minority so small and so unimportant that they may be dismissed in any serious discussion of the spirit of the State. So, having acknowledged that they do exist, I shall say no more about them.

I think I may say without hesitation that in Maryland we regard a middle-of-the-road man as one who marches there, not one who sits down in the middle of the road and refuses to budge, either forward or backward The very essence of history is movement, which means change; it is a law of life over which we have no control and to deny it is folly. The man who refuses to conform to the necessity of change is not a middle-of-the-road man or any other kind of man. He is not a man at all, he is a mummy.

I think I may make another claim that you, who know Maryland, will grant without hesitation. We regard the middle-of-the-road man as one who is not only moving, but moving in the direction taken by the mass of mankind. The man who is bent on going back to George Washington may be in the very center of the highway, but he is engaged in a hopeless endeavor and neither his wishes nor his ideas count for very much. He, too, may be dismissed from further consideration.

But what is the direction that the mass of mankind is taking? Right there is where our troubles begin. That is the point that gives rise to parties and factions and disputes in Maryland. We make no claim to be a population of soothsayers, and we have no more certain knowledge of the future than any of our neighbors. But I believe that the bulk of our people are optimistic enough to think that the general course of our history has been forward, toward more even-handed justion, or a century, the advance is perceptible. toward a finer civilization.

It cannot be denied that our progress has been slow and wavering. We have not marched forward in a straight line, but in zig-zag fashion, or rather, in a series of looping curves that sometimes seemed to be going backward. Which way we are going today, or tomorrow, or this week is uncertain; but when you take for your yardstick a generation, or a century, the advance is perceptible. So, at least, we believe.

Take, for example, the attitude of the State toward the most perplexing of current problems, that of racial desegregation. Recent decisions of the Supreme Court have disrupted a social pattern that had existed in Maryland for a long time. Any such disruption gives rise to difficulties and perplexities. Whether the pattern is essetnially bad or good is beside the point; if it is an old one, its sudden disruption produces dangerous tensions.

It has produced them in Maryland, and it is idle to deny it. I see no point in trying to deny it for, like John Milton, "I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed," by a struggle with a real problem. I cannot praise the marvelous tolerance of those communities that never had a race problem. Most of us can be as tolerant as the angels above about conditions that we do not have to face. If there were not a Negro, a Catholic, a Jew, a Japanese, a Mexican, or a Puerto Rican in all Maryland, would we be troubled by race or religious prejudice? And would our freedom from trouble be any credit to us?

In the matter of desegregation my pride in Maryland is not that it has given us no trouble, but that we have tried to meet that trouble in a fashion worthy of civilized men. I do not speak in any holier-than-thou spirit. I do not claim that our methods have been ideal and I am not certain that they are the best that could have been devised. I am aware that the problem in some other States has been more difficult than it was in our case, and if they have been less successful in handling it, it is possible that their effort has been as praiseworthy as ours.

What does entitle us to credit is our prompt acceptance of equality of opportunity for all citizens as an American ideal to be striven for regardless of the difficulties it may entail. We have not wavered in that faith, and we shall not waver; nor will the efforts of wise men of all races be defeated. It may take time. It has already taken hard labor and hard thinking. But in the end we shall work this thing out in such a manner as to distribute justice more evenly and to make it easier for every citizen of every race to develop to the highest extent such talents as God has given him.

This belief that the man who keeps step with the best judgment and highest aspirations of the American people does move forward, however slowly, is the justification of the middle-of-the-road philosophy. However, it is no justification of complacency. The road of history is indeed a winding trail. If you take your stand at any point sufficiently far back, say in 1776, the date of our origin as a politically free people, and draw your line of sight to the year 1956, you will find that the middle of the road has been sometimes far to the right, and at others equally far to the left of that line.

More than that, there have been incessant divergences. People have been constantly darting off, now to the right, now to the left, some even backward. Out of every 20 who thus depart from the main body, fully 19 wind up in bogs or brambles and get nowhere. But the 20th must be regarded as the salt of the earth, for the 20th darts ahead. Guided by some inspiration that passeth understanding, he cuts across a looping curve followed by the main body and arrives at a point far in advance long before the rest of us get there.

These are the men to whom in later years we erect statues in the hall of fame. They are the ones whose lives add luster to the national history, and whose words we quote when we wish to inspire the youth of the land. They are the Washingtons and Lincolns, the Franklins and Jeffersons; yet in their own generations vast numbers of their fellow citizens listed each of them among the 19 whose divergences were folly.

Here is the consideration that has led Maryland, the middle State, to set a high value on tolerance. We do not forget that when George Calvert wrote into the charter of Maryland, and his son rigorously enforced, the principle of religious freedom, both were accused by extremists of being wicked subversives. Catholic fanatic and Protestant fanatic, at war on all else, were completely agreed that religious freedom would overthrow the British constitution and bring both king and country to ruin.

But Maryland tried it, and it worked. The record shows that we tried it somewhat reluctantly, perhaps as reluctantly as we are now trying desegregation. But try it we did, and it proved to be in line with the march of history.

It is a curious fact, too often ignored, that religious freedom worked out profitably materially, as well as morally. Pennsylvania, founded 50 years later on the same principle, and Maryland, were the only 2 of the 13 Colonies that paid a handsome financial return to their founders and continued to pay it right up to the Revolution. The farsighted wisdom of the Calverts and the Penns paid off in cash as well as in fame; and I, for one, am convinced that Maryland's legacy of tolerance is to this day adding to the material prosperity as well as to the honor of the State.

Tolerance is a dangerous thing. All history attests it, and it is folly to deny it. But intolerance is not merely dangerous, it is

suicidal. Tolerance is one aspect of freedom, and freedom is always dangerous. But the Nation that abolishes freedom in the hope of attaining security is like a man who would commit suicide to avoid being murdered. In freedom there is a chance of prosperity and peace; in tyranny there is no chance of either.

I think I may say, therefore, that in Maryland our idea of a middle-of-the-road man is one who moves in the direction being taken by the mass of his fellows. He is distrustful of those who dart away because he is convinced that, in most instances and in the long run, the wisdom of the whole people is greater than that of any individual.

But he remains keenly aware that in some specific instance, and in the short run, a really great man may be wiser than the Nation, although he will not seem so at the time. Hence your Marylander is reluctant to suppress any deviationist, for while the chances are that he is a fool, it is always possible that he is a prophet, and it is far better to permit 19 fools to gabble folly than to prevent 1 sage from uttering wisdom. Folly soon defeats itself, but it is by the small remnant of wisdom in the public clamor that the Nation is sustained and maintained and raised to greatness.

Far be it from me to proclaim the spirit of Maryland as the summation and glorious end of all philosophy. My claim for it is much more modest; I present it as a homely wisdom best suited to men who do not aspire to shake the world, but who wish to enjoy an opportunity to live their own lives undisturbed and who are willing to grant the same privilege to their neighbors.

This may sound simple, but in reality it is an extremely complicated problem, and the worst of the complications are those brought on not by any human wickedness or folly but by the course of events that no man can control. Like most of th Eastern States, Maryland at present is experiencing a population growth less like expansion than like explosion. All our public facilities and utilities, schools, roads, water supply, transportation, power lines, are being taxed to the limit of their capacity and some are failing, not through mismanagement but through the sudden increase of the demands upon them.

One of the most serious of all our problems is one that many people never stop to consider, and can hardly understand when they are reminded of it. It is the strain that rapid growth throws, not on the physical plant, but on the organizational system of our public services. The physical failure is plain to the dullest. When a community that formerly consisted of a hundred houses is invaded by developers who build an additional 900 houses it is evident that the water main that formerly served that community will no longer be big enough. Simple Simon can understand that.

What sometimes escapes people a great deal wiser than Simple Simon is the fact that when the same thing is happening, not in one community but in scores and hundreds at the same time, it may easily happen that more than the water mains will prove too small. The whole organization controlling water supply may have to be rebuilt.

I have deliberately chosen water supply to illustrate my point because that is one thing for which the State government has relatively little responsibility, and I do not wish my words here today to be applied to any specific department of the State government. But you can see what I mean. We have recently had trouble in more than one department. Some of it, perhaps, may be attributable to misconduct, but that constitutes no great threat, for we know how to handle misconduct. What is far more serious is the fact that some departments are breaking down simply because their organization was never designed to carry the load now thrown upon it.

Here is a problem that cannot be solved by the simple process of adding more people to the payroll. Every businessman knows that if you neglect your organization the time comes when adding more people means only that they will get in each other's way. The larger the organization, the more complex is the problem of arranging its relations for efficient operation. Much praise has been lavished on the New England system of the town meeting as a perfect expression of democracy. So it was, when 250 people were involved; but try to run a commonwealth of two and a half million people on the town meeting system and all you will get is chaos.

This is the point at which Maryland's preference for the middle of the road creates difficulties. We have, let us say, a department that has functioned reasonably well under a system of organization devised 50 years ago. The people of Maryland approve the principle of letting well enough alone; so when the machinery of that department begins to creak and groan, and perhaps grind to a halt, the first assumption of our people is that there must be a monkey-wrench thrower around, and if he can be eliminated all will be well.

It is a matter of no small difficulty to persuade them that it may be necessary to redesign the whole machine—to shift, so to speak, from propellors to jet propulsion. Yet surely nothing can be plainer than the fact that when the load is increased enormously the machinery may break down without any sabotage at all. Nevertheless, a governor who proposes anything like a thoroughgoing overhaul of the system of organization is certain to be accused, on the one hand, of trying to introduce socialism into Maryland, and, on the other, of trying to set up a dictatorship.

There is nothing partisan in this. I have encountered the difficulty, but so did my predecessors of the other party. It is simply the deep-laid and, to tell the truth, usually well-grounded suspicion of the people that any leader who deviates from the accustomed course is probably wrong.

Yet I do not complain of this, for the people of Maryland are not immovable. It is hard to move them, but it is not impossible. Like my predecessors, I have suggested a great many more improvements than have actually been put into effect; but some have been adopted, and there is great hope that the next session of the legislature will adopt still more. In some things, for example, in care for the mentally ill, Maryland is moving into the van; in very few does she still linger in the rearguard. She is still conspicuously a conservative State, but she moves.

This leisurely tempo is hard on a Governor who by virtue of his office is kept informed of the innumerable things that ought to be done, many of which are unknown to the average citizen; but if it makes the Governor's work harder, it also makes the State's progress safer. As I look back over the years during which I have held the office of Governor, I realize that a great many things that I consider wise and necessary, and which I have advocated vigorously, have not been done; but I also know that what has been done will never have to be undone. So if I am inclined to boast it is not so much about the number of forward steps we have taken under my administrations, as about the fact that we have never had to retrieve a false step.

There, I believe, is an accurate report of Maryland's state of mind at this hour. I know that on such occasions as this it is customary for a speaker to spend most of his time on the glories of the past and the beauty and bounty of nature. You know all that as well as I do. We have brought the frigate *Constellation* back to Baltimore. The Star Spangled Banner still floats over Fort McHenry. Nobody has forgotten John Eager Howard, or the other heroes and sages of the past. The Chesapeake Bay and the Blue Ridge Mountains remain as beautiful as they ever were and still "the clustered spires of Frederick stand green-walled by the hills of Maryland."

So I have simply taken all that for granted today and have tried to give you, instead of a laudation of the past, a sober report on how the State is prepared to face the future in a world that is fumbling its way through such fog and darkness as it has rarely encountered. I think I can assure you that the report is encouraging. I believe that Maryland today is as steady as any State in the Union. Oh, certainly, we have a few Jeremiahs who can see nothing ahead but woe and ruin, and they are balanced by a few Pollyannas who can see nothing wrong in the best of all possible worlds.

But the Jeremiahs and the Pollyannas put together are a small minority of our people. The temper of Maryland at this moment is neither terrified nor elated. If difficulties lie ahead, we are ready to face them; if great opportunities lie ahead, we are ready to seize them. We do not claim to be miracle workers. We do not deny that, as the Prayer Book puts it, "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done; and we have done those things which we ought not to have done" many times. Yet I believe I can say in all honesty that if the need comes for a great deed we are not incapable today any more than we were long ago when the Maryland line was the backbone of that forlorn hope that George Washington transformed into the triumph of the ages.

A Bill To Extend Rural Mail Routes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which gives authority to the Postmaster General, subject to the postal laws and regulations, the right to extend rural mail routes. This bill, if it becomes a law, would give rural mail delivery, as nearly as practicable, to the entire rural population of the United States.

I previously had introduced a bill similar to this making it mandatory that all be given rural mail service. It has been proven to me, Mr. Speaker, that my previous mandatory bill would not be equitable or workable, as in some areas of our country it would be nearly impossible to be in compliance with that mandatory clause.

I am reintroducing the bill, and I have been assured by those in control that everything would be done wherever at all possible to see that the intent of the law be carried out. This legislation, Mr. Speaker, will probably require realinements of routes; but when this is done, I feel certain that practically all will have rural mail service to their property, and it will cost our Federal Government only a very small amount. After all, Mr. Speaker, we are all citizens and are entitled to equitable service and treatment, regardless of where we live.

Senator McClellan as Chairman of Permanent Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, one of the most important responsibilities of the Congress is the responsibility of investigation. It involves a power which, when used wisely, redounds to the benefit of our country but which, when used unwisely, can lead to unfortunate consequences.

I doubt whether the power to investigate has ever been lodged in abler hands than those of our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

Senator MCCLELLAN, as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, has established a reputation surpassed by none. His inquiries have been strict but fair; thorough but not time-wasting. And at all times, they have been directed to the objective of improving our Government and assuring our people the utmost in efficiency.

As a Senator, I am very proud of my association with such a distinguished American. As a man, I am very happy to have him as a friend.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Let the Record Speak," written by Mr. Leslie Carpenter and published in the Sunday magazine of the Arkansas Gazette on August 21, 1955. The article deals with the investigating methods used by Senator MCCLELLAN—methods which have been universally approved for their fairness and their effectiveness.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET THE RECORD SPEAK

(By Leslie Carpenter)

When Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN replaced the most controversial man in the United States Senate—Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Republican, of Wisconsin—as chairman of the Senate permanent Subcommittee on Investigations last January, the Arkansan told a newspaperman what he had in mind for the investigatingest subcommittee of the Congress.

"The subcommittee," MCCLELLAN said, "will make a record, and that record will speak for itself."

No political promise has ever been better kept.

Under the chairmanship of the serious and smart Arkansan, the subcommittee has made a record of fact gathering and fair play.

Gone is the sensational circuslike atmosphere of MCCARTHY's heyday. No longer do Capitol policemen have to throw spectators out of a kleig-lighted hearing room for demonstrating. No longer do witnesses shout at Senators. No longer do Senators shout at witnesses.

It is like a different place—perhaps not as interesting, but definitely an atmosphere in which the people of a democracy can take pride rather than shame.

The reason for this difference is MCCLELLAN. MCCARTHY is, of course, still around—still around as the ranking Republican of the subcommittee, in fact. But MCCARTHY is a different man. And that is because of MCCLELLAN, too.

It is an accepted fact that MCCLELLAN is the man most responsible for MCCARTHY's downfall, unless the credit for it is given to MCCARTHY himself.

Liberals of the Democratic Party who have always considered MCCLELLAN to be something of a villain within their party's ranks because of his HARRY BYRD-like conservative attitude toward social and economic reforms have applauded MCCLELLAN the loudest for his performance during the Army-McCarthy hearings in 1954.

More than anyone, MCCLELLAN was the one whose piercing questions brought out the essential facts. He demanded and got what order there was during the razzle-dazzle of the hearing. MCCLELLAN already was a Senator known nationally. But he became even better known during the hearings which were televised and projected onto millions of screens throughout the Nation.

MCCARTHY now, censured by the Senate and plagued with bad health and a loss of prestige, generally permits MCCLELLAN to run the subcommittee his own way. MCCARTHY, like other political foes of MCCLELLAN in the past, realizes that's the safest way to do it. MCCLELLAN is a fighter and knows how to take care of his enemies.

The subcommittee—actually a branch of the Senate Government Operations Committee, of which MCCLELLAN is also chairman—was born in the days when Harry S. Truman was a Senator and organized it to look into war contracts.

The subcommittee served such a useful purpose then that it was later given permanent status as an investigating group—the only one in the Senate which is officially "permanent." Other investigating groups have only a temporary status.

There are no limits imposed on the scope of what the subcommittee can investigate. Literally, it has the run of the Government. But its role can perhaps best be described as a sort of congressional conscience to weigh various delicate situations in Uncle Sam's big government and determine if they are good or bad. Most often this involves some phase of wrong-doing in Government.

The flamboyant MCCARTHY, who craved publicity and attention, ran the subcommittee as a prosecutor, hungry for scandal and determined to land a conviction—at least in the eyes of the public—in every case which was brought up. This meant at times that witnesses before the subcommittee were stripped of rights to offer a defense or to justify their side of the case.

MCCLELLAN, on the other hand, considers the subcommittee to be a fact-finding group. And, as he said in January, the facts will speak for themselves.

MCCLELLAN does not consider himself a prosecutor as the subcommittee chairman and does not behave as one.

Take, for instance, the subcommittee's brief public hearings on the Talbott case last month. The facts were brought out about Secretary of Air Force Harold Talbott's partnership in the firm of Paul B. Mulligan & Co., which represented companies doing business with the Air Force. Four days after the public hearings ended—and the facts were gathered—Talbott resigned.

MCCLELLAN never grasped for headlines demanding that Talbott be fired, but he brought out facts which made that course inevitable. There are some partisan Democrats who think MCCLELLAN could have made more political hay out of the Talbott case. But the Arkansan's supporters counter that MCCLELLAN exhibited the sort of good conduct which is expected of a Senator—that to have performed otherwise would have been to parallel what would have been expected from MCCARTHY.

Another example was the Peress case. No one ever bothered to count the many times MCCARTHY demanded to know in press releases, press conferences, and interviews who promoted Peress?

When MCCLELLAN assumed the subcommittee chairmanship this year after the Democrats won control of the Senate, MCCLELLAN asked that same question—but he asked it of the Army, rather than through the newspapers.

And he found out who did promote the one-time Army dentist who refused to say whether or not he had held membership in the Communist Party. The facts, as developed by MCCLELLAN, revealed that the Army made 48 errors in handling the Peress promotion and discharge. MCCLELLAN got the facts, and the Army has undertaken to revise administrative procedures so that none of the mistakes will happen again.

To the newspaper correspondents of Washington, the 59-year-old Senator from Arkansas is something of a riddle. He is the complete opposite of MCCARTHY from the standpoint of news coverage. MCCARTHY had an appetite for headlines that was in an extreme. Seemingly, MCCLELLAN would prefer it if his name stayed out of the newspapers as much as possible. MCCLELLAN may be the only Senator who never issues a press release.

MCCLELLAN tries to go out of his way to be helpful to a newspaper reporter when a reporter seeks him out. (MCCLELLAN would never seek out a reporter.) But MCCLELLAN does not understand the reporters and their problems as other Senators do. MCCLELLAN understands well that he is conducting public business, but he does not like to be quoted in an interview. He is always willing to give facts frankly "for your background," as he will tell a reporter. But he will often make his comments and the information he has revealed "off the record"—that is, not to be quoted or attributed to him.

This is the reason why MCCLELLAN, one of the Nation's best known Senators, is so rarely quoted, except for speeches he makes in the Senate Chamber.

MCCLELLAN is something of a one-man operator in the Senate. A man with little formal education, he has a razor sharp mind. He makes all his own decisions without consulting dozens of other Senators like many of his colleagues. The Senate is often called the world's most exclusive club—a band of palsy-walsy extroverts. MCCLELLAN holds his own in this group with brains, because he is without the warm, back-slapping personality of an average politician.

On the national scene, MCCLELLAN is known primarily as an investigator and one of the leaders of the Southern conservative school of thought.

In Arkansas, he is perhaps best known as the man able to bring home the bacon—the Federal bacon—for the State.

MCCLELLAN's skill in being certain that Arkansas gets its share—or more—of Federal expenditures has been demonstrated many, many times. The best example this year was when he wrote into the law a provision requiring the Army to reopen the Army-Navy Hospital at Hot Springs after the Army had refused to keep it in operation otherwise.

But there is a long, long list of flood control and navigation improvements on the State's rivers which have been constructed or are under construction now primarily because of MCCLELLAN. Certainly, one of the large Federal dams in the State will one day be named for MCCLELLAN as a tribute to the work he has done to develop the natural resources of Arkansas.

It is true, of course, that MCCLELLAN has operated from a point of advantage in securing hundreds of millions of dollars for improving the State's streams. MCCLELLAN is a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and is a member of that com-

mittee's Public Works Subcommittee which decides which water projects are to have money and how much. It is also true that the Senate is more generous with money for water work than is the House of Representatives which always originates such bills.

But it is obvious that Arkansas would not have been so fortunate in recent years had not MCCLELLAN worked himself into this point of advantage and made full use of it to the benefit of the State.

MCCLELLAN may be well remembered by the Arkansas taxpayer each year when he fills out his income-tax form. It was MCCLELLAN who fought a long battle to extend to all States the split-income (community property) tax benefits which for a long time were enjoyed by only a few States, notably Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona, and California. MCCLELLAN finally succeeded in getting this written into the tax laws in 1948 after losing his first effort to do it the year before by four votes on a rollcall. MCCLELLAN believes this has saved Arkansas taxpayers $40 million in 17 years.

MCCLELLAN has been active with a wide variety of legislation over a long period. He has a bill authorizing Federal aid to school construction which may be one of the major issues to face the next session of Congress. Also due to come up next year is his bill making it possible for any taxpaying citizen to bring a suit to test the constitutionality of the right of the Tennessee Valley Authority to build steam powerplants with unappropriated funds derived from power sales when the plants involved are not related to Government services or for firming up hydroelectric power. If such a practice is constitutional, MCCLELLAN maintains, then he would like for Arkansas to have some of those steam plants. If not, he says, then the TVA has no right to continue building them.

MCCLELLAN has served on both Hoover Commissions—although he is apparently not as enthusiastic about the reports submitted by the second commission this year as he was about the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission. He was the author of most of the legislation which put into effect the proposals of the first Hoover Commission.

MCCLELLAN was the author of legislation making it possible for States to acquire surplus property for educational and public-health purposes. He wrote the provision in the 1953 foreign-aid bill requiring America's allies to take a large share of the aid in the form of surplus United States farm products.

Since coming to the Senate in January 1943, MCCLELLAN has been the sponsor of a large volume of additional legislation.

When I asked him what he is proudest of during his service in Congress—first for 2 years in the House, and then for 13 years in the Senate—he parried the question.

In typical fashion, he said he would rather not comment on that.

But there are a number of things he could well take pride in—because he is a hard worker who knows how to get things done.

The Plight of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Call, Paterson, N. J., of January 24, 1956.

THE PLIGHT OF THE AGED

With reports of record-breaking wages earned in this country in the past year, with statements of the almost incredible prosperity which is being enjoyed, it comes as something of a shock to read a report just issued by the Twentieth Century Fund, entitled "Economic Needs of Older People," the survey has brought to light the disturbing information that almost three-quarters of the people in the United States who are more than 65 years of age either have no incomes at all or have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. In view of the overall income figures, it seems unbelievable that a segment of the population can share so meagerly in the country's wealth.

Some of this, of course, is due to the fact that employment is almost impossible to find by the older folk. A gradual rise begins at the age of 44 and increases until by 65 only about 30 percent of the people have jobs, the survey points out.

Such information will give pause to all who are interested in helping to meet the problems of the elderly. With the increased span of life vouchsafed through the miracles of modern medical care, the inescapable fact emerges that whereas additional years are being granted there is at the same time inadequate provision to make those extra years worth living.

Each decade sees an increase in older folk in relation to the rest of the Nation. There are now four times as many persons over 65 in this country as there were in 1900, while the total population has only doubled. This means there will be no diminution of the problem, for which, of course, social security in time will provide a partial answer. Perhaps, in addition, a revision of thinking is indicated on moving along the accepted compulsory retirement age to 70.

Iron Curtain Closeup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, made a very constructive trip last year, the details of which are outlined below. I commend Congressman HILLINGS for having the nerve to put in writing all the opinions he formulated on his trip:

HILLINGS TELLS TOUR DRAWBACKS IN U. S. S. R.

(By Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California)

Moscow, September 3.—Anyone who has traveled abroad is in for a lot of surprises when he becomes a tourist in Russia.

It takes a bigger chunk of initiative and adventure to be a tourist here than almost anywhere else in the world.

First there is no guide book to Russia. In fact, there is hardly any tourist information at all available outside. It is not much different once you are here.

The Soviets do not even sell a street map of Moscow, Leningrad, or Kiev.

Once you land in the U. S. S. R. you are in the hands of Intourist, the state travel agency.

MONOPOLY

They own the only hotels in which the ordinary tourist can stay in the big cities and they supply the guides and interpreters.

It is a state monopoly without any competition.

Surprisingly enough, Intourist does not twist your arm to see certain things. They do not even volunteer suggestions about what you can visit.

Unlike tourist agencies in other places, Intourist never says "wouldn't you like to go here? Wouldn't you like to see this or that?"

The closest they ever come is an occasional "What would you like to do?"

You should decide the first day what you want to see and have Intourist get started right away on arrangements.

LONG DELAYS

Whether it is just plain inefficiency or whether everything has to be checked with the proper authorities, arranging anything here takes infinitely longer than anywhere else.

But tourists will find that most of their reasonable requests are taken care of—eventually. Then it is likely to come with a rush, like my visit to the Moscow film studio.

After waiting several days for Intourist to arrange the visit the service bureau telephoned Monday afternoon without warning and announced "a guide and a car will be ready in 10 minutes to take you to Mosfilm."

What should you plan to see in Moscow?

Firstly, the Kremlin and the Lenin-Stalin mausoleum should be on everyone's "must" list. You would not want to miss them.

The Kremlin—hilltop citadel of czars and commissars—has a wonderful museum, a big old cannon, and a huge cracked bell said to be the biggest ever cast.

But when you ask to see the offices of the government you are told "it is forbidden to go there."

WAIT AT TOMB

At the Lenin-Stalin tomb they put you near the head of the long line of people waiting to see the embalmed bodies of Soviet Russia's founding fathers.

Ahead of you are official delegations and perhaps a group of peace partisans. But even this 40-minute wait on Red Square is interesting. You see people from all over the world with flowers and wreaths who have come to pay their respects.

Secondly, a collective farm. Make this request early. It takes a lot of time to organize. The Moscow region is now in the middle of the harvest season and some tourists who ask to see a collective are told that the manager is too busy.

Thirdly, the Stalin Auto Works or some other factory. You will probably spend, as I did, more time being told about and shown the cultural and recreational side of factory life than about the working and living conditions, but it is still very interesting.

GREAT VIEW

Fourthly, don't miss the view of the city at night from the Lenin Hills Bluff overlooking the Moscow River. Here is one that Intourist would never even think to suggest. The guides, as state tourist agnecy employees, are officials of the Government. But they do not try to inject the propaganda line into everything they say.

The hotel in which I stayed in Moscow—the National—seems the best of the three Intourist hotels in the capital—all of which were built before the revolution. The National is furnished in its original mid-Victorian style but it is surprisingly clean and comfortable.

The food is not bad. But the tourist should not expect great variety. Intourist restaurants either have special menus in English or four-language menus in Russian, English, French, and German.

NO BARGAINS

The official ruble rate of four to the dollar makes it almost impossible to get good values in souvenirs. Most things I have seen in the shops appear to be second-class mer-

chandise with prices three times what we would pay for first class.

Intourist does, however, provide an all expense plan for $19 a day. You can buy vouchers either in New York, European capitals, or in the U. S. S. R. itself after you get here.

Under this plan I have what would be about a $10 room in an American hotel (plus a million dollar view of the Kremlin and Red Square), 3 meals, and a tea-time snack which are valued at about 55 rubles, (some $14 at the official rate) and 2 hours of guided sightseeing with a car.

But meals outside the Intourist hotels, laundry and other incidentals, bring the figure to about $30 a day.

DOUBTFUL BOON

For anyone who ever felt he would like to take a vacation without newspapers, radio, and TV this is perhaps an ideal spot.

No Soviet newstand carries any Western newspaper or magazine and you really feel cut off from the news.

Leningrad, Moscow, and Kiev offer practically open house for photographers. You cannot snap bridges or anything of a military nature.

If you have any doubts you can find out whether the subject you would like to take is off limits for snapshooting by asking the nearest policeman.

IRON CURTAIN CLOSEUP—REPRESENTATIVE HILLINGS SAYS SATELLITE COUNTRIES LIKE "BIG PRISON"

(By Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California)

For nearly 3 weeks traveling through the Soviet Union and 4 satellite countries, I felt I was in a "big prison."

I talked not only with Communist leaders but also with average people. In fact, I went out of my way to strike up conversations with the ordinary people to sound out their feelings, their hopes.

From my talks with various people in Russia, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, I am convinced that some of our best friends are living behind the Iron Curtain.

I firmly believe that 90 percent—possibly more—of the people living in the satellites are against Soviet Communism. They are dissatisfied with life under the Red rulers.

REVOLT UNLIKELY

However, I feel there is little likelihood of the oppressed people living behind the Iron Curtain rising up and throwing off the yoke of communism—unless some great dramatic event should occur.

In the satellite nations I was approached several times by individuals who asked to talk to me privately.

Fortunately I speak enough German to carry on a conversation and many people in the satellites, as well as in Russia, know some German.

This enabled me to get closer to the people than most Western visitors.

I used a couple of American gadgets to strike up conversations. One was a vest pocket radio and the other a camera which takes and delivers a photograph in 60 seconds.

POCKET RADIO

These two things broke the ice for me with many people, even in Russia, where they are more afraid to talk with foreigners than the satellite peoples are.

One evening in Budapest, while sitting in a cafe, I took out my pocket radio, placed it on the table and turned up the volume.

Everyone searched the room for the music, finally centering their attention on me and the tiny radio, which is about the size of a package of cigarettes.

Finally, a man at the next table leaned over and asked in English with a heavy accent:

"Are you American?"

When I said yes, he looked around, then asked:

"When will the day come when we will be free again?"

I could say no more than, "I dont' know, but I hope it will be soon."

INTERRUPTION

Just then a heavy built, dark-looking man entered the cafe and peered around the room. My friend at the next table turned back to his friends and began hurridely talking with them.

The rest of the people in the cafe, who had been watching the radio and my conversation, also busied themselves with their food and drinks.

After the dark man had left the cafe, my friend at the next table again leaned over, saying:

"What are you doing in Budapest?"

When I told him I had come to Hungary to see how the people were living, he bitterly replied:

"As you can plainly see, not very well."

Again and again people in the satellite nations would ask me:

"When are you Americans going to help us?"

"When are we going to be free?"

DON'T WANT WAR

People in the satellites are worried, worried that the West will forget them, abandon them to live eternally under Moscow's rule.

The Geneva conference of the Big Four, particularly caused this feeling of despondency to increase among the people in the satellites.

Yet the Russian people, after the Geneva conference, heaved a huge sigh of relief, because they felt it meant the chances of a war had been thrust far away—and they do not want a war.

People in the satellites are much easier to talk to than the Russian people.

Several times, while traveling through the satellites, I was discreetly approached by individuals who asked me to meet them privately.

SECRET MEETING

One night in a Romanian cafe, I took a picture of the waiter with my 60-second camera and handed him the print, causing a great deal of excitement.

After the entire cafe had exclaimed over the "Amerikanski" camera, a young man asked if I would take his picture with his fiancee.

Afterwards I was called to the telephone in the basement. There was no call for me, just the same young man who whispered in broken English:

"Can I see you tomorrow privately?"

We made a date for a cafe the next afternoon. He met me and we sat close to the window to keep an eye out for secret police.

He told me he was a doctor and had learned English in school. After explaining how they needed American medical supplies, he asked if I had any American newspapers or magazines.

WANT MAGAZINES

I went back to the hotel and brought back what I had and started to hand them to him. He stopped me abruptly with a glance of fear.

"Just sit on them, and leave them when you get up," he said.

All over the satellites I found that the people are desperately hungry for information about America. They always asked us for whatever papers and magazines we had.

IRON CURTAIN CLOSEUP—RED LEADERS LIVE HIGH WHILE PEOPLE SLAVE, SAYS HILLINGS

(By Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California)

The Communist rulers are deliberately keeping living conditions poor in order to control and further communize the people.

This is my firm conviction after touring the Soviet Union, Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

The Reds have put the improvement of living conditions in second place.

Food, shelter, and clothing are all tactical weapons which the Communist rulers are using to make sure the people are fully "sovietized"—particularly in the satellites.

The Red leaders want to make the people completely dependent on the Communist government for everything.

OPPRESSION IS AIM

They are more concerned with shaping the people's minds along Communist lines than they are in actually improving conditions for the masses.

If the Communist rulers really wanted to improve living conditions for their people, there are many thing they could do much faster than they are now being done.

They even put blocks in the way of individuals who try to improve things for themselves.

I talked with an old woman in Poland who had to save for 3 years just to buy a shoddy raincoat.

The Red rulers are putting far more emphasis on the so-called cultural construction—subways, monuments, and government buildings—than on housing.

And in the Soviet orbit, housing is one of the biggest problems they have.

In Russia and in the four satellites, I saw monuments and government buildings being constructed, subways being rushed to completion.

They are working furiously on the Leningrad subway to complete it by November. It will have stations, lined in marble and alabaster, loking like temples.

NEW ELITE CLASS

Meanwhile, the people are living in dingy 1-room apartments, and many have to share that 1 room with another family.

The personal interests of the people seem to be secondary to the Communist leaders.

The leaders seem to like those showpiece subways. But they could use the money and energy instead for building more apartment houses for the people.

Yet there is the new class of people in Russia and the satellites who are living off the fat of the land. They are Communist Party officials and the military men.

I felt a certain smoldering resentment among the people—even in Russia—against this new class which enjoys far more rights and privileges than the old-time capitalists ever enjoyed.

For example, while visiting a department store in Leningrad, I saw a crowd in the fur department.

Finding a man who spoke German, I asked:

"How can they afford to buy such expensive furs?"

When he answered me, I sensed in his tone of voice a feeling of guarded bitterness. He pointed to a Red army major and said:

"He can buy furs for his wife or girl friend."

EXCLUSIVE

Another time, I asked a man in Moscow what the special lanes down the center of each main boulevard were for. Each was marked with two white lines and traffic was kept out of them.

He told me:

"Those are for the leaders' cars only."

Later I found out that the rulers drive without regard to traffic regulations down those specially marked center lanes.

Nowhere in the free world do the Government leaders reserve parts of the streets for themselves. So this was another example of how the new ruling class in the Soviet orbit places the interest of the people behind its own interests.

Curiously, although they are doing a good deal of construction in the Soviet bloc, I never saw a man with a paint brush in his

hand. Even rather new buildings began to look run down quickly.

The American Embassy in Moscow, which is leased from the Soviet Government and is a comparatively new building, is run down and needs repair.

The only solid, permanent type of construction I saw seemed to be statues and monuments of Communist leaders.

IRON CURTAIN CLOSEUP—REDS RESENT CRITICISM

(By Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California)

The Soviet and satellite leaders I met were terribly sensitive to criticism, particularly by the West.

They seemed to think the world was against them—especially the American press.

They just cannot seem to get through their heads that we allow people in the United States to critize our Government and that it is possible for us to criticize other governments.

I am convinced this is a dangerous aspect of the Communist mentality because it is obvious that their misinterpretation of the American press and the American political scene might cause some Russian official to make a rash decision.

And his decision possibly would create great troubles in the world.

MISINTERPRETED

I think we must do a great deal to convince the Communist leaders what the free system of information and freedom of expression in America really means.

I kept trying to explain this to the Soviet and satellite leaders whom I met—but had little success.

I asked them if they didn't have enough confidence in the people in their countries to differentiate between various kinds of information.

They generally replied:

"We just don't want to expose them to lies and propaganda."

In Romania, the Acting Foreign Minister told me:

"We often let the British Broadcasting System news reports come through without jamming because we feel they are more accurate in reporting news of the United States than the Voice of America is."

I argued with him, but he countered that the VOA contained propaganda.

BRITAIN PRAISED

"Well it's reporting news of America. If we tell what happens on the American scene that is news, not propaganda," I stated.

He answered that he still believed the British were better than the Americans in reporting what's going on in the United States.

Then he asked me:

"Why do American Congressmen go off half-cocked when they criticize the Soviet Union and the people's democracies?"

I told him the Communists made it so difficult for us to get information about their lands that it is hard to know what is true and what is not.

Grinning, he called in an aid with the July 25, 1955, copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and showed me an article.

Incidentally, he had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copy just a few weeks after it had been printed, which shows you how they can easily get information about America.

Showing me a speech made by KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, a Republican Congresswoman from New York, he commented:

"Here is the case of an American Congressman condoning violence."

In her speech Congresswoman ST. GEORGE had taken the side of Rumanian refugees who had besieged the Rumanian Communist legation in Berne, Switzerland, some months ago.

"We are concerned with freedom and encouraging the people to have the opportunity to enjoy freedom," I pointed out.

Another Soviet official also showed how close they keep tabs on American Congressmen.

Soviet Acting Foreign Minister Valerian Zorin threw back into my face a quote from a speech I had made in Akron, Ohio, in June this year. But he misquoted me.

RECALLS SPEECH

I was discussing with Zorin how we could further reduce tensions when he suddenly said:

"Well now, for example, Mr. HILLINGS, you said the Soviet Union is the greatest threat to world peace."

But I distinctly remembered that speech. I had said "The armed might of the Soviet Union poses the greatest threat to world peace."

I tried to explain the difference to him but without much luck.

IRON CURTAIN CLOSEUP—REDS MAKE IT TOUGH FOR UNITED STATES ENVOYS

(By Representative PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California)

America's diplomats working and living in the Soviet orbit under horrible conditions are truly "unsung heroes" of freedom.

They are harassed economically. Communist governments make them change their dollars into local currencies at fantastic rates which make living costs unbelievable.

Red regimes either refuse or delay helping American diplomats get living quarters.

The Rumanian Government took its own sweet time about helping one American Foreign Service officer find quarters for his family.

For months he had to live in a hotel, paying the exorbitant price of approximately $60 a day.

EXCHANGE "HOLDUP"

In Russia, the Soviet Government keeps the exchange rate at four rubles for $1 when the rate, according to real values, should be something like 30 rubles to $1.

I asked Soviet Acting Foreign Minister Valerian Zorin if there was any chance of his Government improving this rate of exchange so our diplomats, and visitors, would not have to spend so much money just to live.

He said he didn't think there would be any change.

To me, this is more proof that the "Geneva smile" on the Soviet face doesn't go very deep.

In Bucharest, at the airport, I bought three cups of coffee. Cost? About $2.16 each at the official rate of exchange.

The Reds are making it as difficult as possible for our American diplomats.

MUST STAND GUARD

In Romania the Red regime refuses to provide housing for marine guards. In Czechoslovakia, the Communists arbitrarily limit the number of American diplomats to 13. This makes it impossible to have marines for guard duty there also.

As a result, Foreign Service officers after a full day's work—often 10 or 11 hours—have to buckle on a pistol, take a box lunch, and stand guard in the United States Embassy or Legation for the entire night.

Frequently a diplomat will have to stand guard every third or fourth night.

In other satellites, the Communist Government refuses to give enough housing for secretaries and stenographers. So the diplomats have to do all their own clerical work.

This means that the American taxpayer, who is paying a Foreign Service officer for high-quality work, is losing money. The more time the diplomat has to spend on typing, the less he can apply to his original job.

We should be very proud of our American diplomats serving us behind the Iron Curtain.

SHOULD HAVE BEST

At the same time we owe it to them to put more pressure on the Red governments to make things easier for our diplomats so that the living hardships could be alleviated.

In Washington, the Soviet and satellite diplomats live in luxurious mansions. They never have to worry about hot water.

Nor do they have to walk up 9 flights of stairs 1 week every month like the American Ambassador in Moscow has to do.

We should try to make it possible for the American representatives in the Red orbit to live decently.

In many cases they don't—they only "exist."

I think we should provide our diplomats behind the Iron Curtain with the very best and latest American cars with all modern gadgets.

CHANGE NEEDED

We also should provide them with other modern conveniences which so clearly illustrate the high American standard of living.

These things, cars and other modern items, are marvelous showpieces.

Everywhere I went in Russia and the satellites, crowds would collect to stare at the American diplomatic cars.

And some of the old cars we have provided our diplomats are simply ridiculous.

The Communists could show good faith by allowing American diplomats to live decently in the Soviet Union and satellites.

The School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 26, 1956:

THE SCHOOL BILL

The first major piece of legislation to be taken up in the House this year is the proposal to give substantial Federal aid to the public schools. The Kelley bill, reported by the Education and Labor Committee last July, is now being considered for clearance to the House floor by the Rules Committee. On the other side of the Capitol, Senator SMITH of New Jersey has introduced a bill embodying the revised program put forward early this month by President Eisenhower.

The two measures differ in scope, but only to a limited degree in philosophy. The Kelley bill would provide a total of $1.6 billion in grants-in-aid to the States for school construction over a 4-year period. This compares with $1.25 billion over 5 years under the Eisenhower plan. Both proposals wisely require matching appropriations by the States. The difference in amounts is considerable, but it is not so great that a compromise could not be reached; and in fact both sums—huge though they are—would provide only a fraction of the construction necessary to meet the present classroom shortage. Both measures allocate $750 million in Federal credits for the purchase of bonds of school districts that are unable to sell them at reasonable rates.

The major philosophical difference between the two bills is in the method of distributing the Federal grants among the var-

ious States. The Kelley bill would make a flat grant, based on the number of school-age children in each State. The Eisenhower method of apportioning Federal aid is more complicated and, in our view, more equable. It would distribute the funds according to a formula that takes into consideration the relative wealth of the respective States, the number of pupils, and also, to some extent, the degree to which they have done their part to support public education out of their own resources.

The practical difference between the flat grant principle in the Kelley bill and the equalization principle in the Eisenhower program is illustrated by figures showing, very roughly, what would happen in New York. Under the former measure New York State would receive over $32 million per annum from the Federal Government; under the Eisenhower plan New York would get only some $12 million. We favor the latter program in principle for the simple reason that it seems far more sensible to give Federal aid roughly according to need than merely to redistribute tax money on a per capita basis without any reference to the financial ability of the respective States to meet their own school construction problems. It must never be forgotten—and the Eisenhower program emphasizes the point—that school matters are essentially and primarily a local responsibility; but the present crisis is so great that the Federal Government must step in for temporary help.

Honest disagreement over questions such as this can be ironed out. But what we fear cannot be ironed out in conjunction with a Federal school aid bill is dispute over the segregation issue. While one can sympathize with the desire to deny Federal aid to school districts that fail to integrate their schools in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court, it is basically irrelevant to the fundamental purpose of the pending legislation. Furthermore, it is so charged with emotion that once an antisegregation amendment becomes attached to any school aid bill we fear that school aid in general will be doomed to defeat.

President Eisenhower was perfectly right yesterday in stating that "the need of the American children for schools is right now, immediately, today," and for suggesting that the segregation issue would delay passage of any such measure. It would not only delay it; it would very probably kill it. The Supreme Court has described its own wise method for ridding this country of the curse of segregated education. That is one problem; Federal aid to education is another. If we want the latter, let us get it without amendments that—no matter how sincere and praiseworthy their purpose—would in all probability kill it.

Has the Farmer Learned His Lesson?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article from Honeywell News, Local 1145, United Electrical Workers, Minneapolis, Minn., entitled "Has the Farmer Learned His Lesson?"

The article follows:

HAS THE FARMER LEARNED HIS LESSON?

A few years ago in Minnesota, the farmer used to be the stanchest supporter of Republican candidates for office. A recent survey by the Minnesota poll shows that today that support has dwindled until he is the worse supporter of the Republican office seekers. Why is this? He learned his lesson.

The farmer had to learn his lesson the hard way. In 1952, for example, Republican politicians promised the farmer that they should have 100 percent of parity. Republican politicians said, "90 percent isn't enough—you ought to have 100 percent." The farmer fell for this in 1952.

The result was that we got a national Republican administration and we got a State Republican administration and the farmer, instead of getting 100 percent of parity, would have been very happy to keep what he had.

Yes, the farmer, in 1952, in Minnesota at least and certainly in a lot of other States, voted on the basis of the promise of better things. In the last 3 years, he has learned his lesson the real hard way—through the pocketbook. Today, as we said before, he is refusing to support or vote for the broken promise party.

THE SAME TREATMENT FOR EVERYONE

Of course, this kind of treatment that the farmer got is not limited to the farmer alone. The Republican national administration, as they had promised, cut taxes, but where did they cut the taxes? On big corporations, on large incomes. There was no tax relief, however, for the small income people who really needed the tax relief very badly.

Now when the Democrats in Congress, like Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, talked about cutting taxes on the small income group, the hue and cry from the Republican national administration was, "we have got to balance the budget."

There was no talk of balance budget, however, when they cut taxes on the high income group. The facts are, they cut the taxes on that group without balancing the budget and the only thing the millionnaire, George Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, advocated was to increase the national debt limit. During this same period when the Government employees asked for a much-needed wage raise and when Congress, and a Democratic Congress, voted the wage increase for Government employees, the national administration vetoed that wage increase, saying that they couldn't afford to pay it, while, as we said before, cutting taxes on large income groups.

NOT ONLY FARMERS

Yes, it was not only the farmers who got it between the neck, but what kind of an administration can you expect that has a Cabinet loaded with millionnaires—men of the type of George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, and Charlie Wilson, former head of the largest corporation of the world, General Motors, and a millionnaire in his own right. They just don't represent the common people of America.

It should be borne in mind when we speak about Charlie Wilson, former head of General Motors, that that's the same General Motors that kept the General Motors workers out on strike for 113 days while their families went without bread and butter, in an attempt to keep that union from getting a decent wage increase for the workers of General Motors. These people just don't talk the workers' or the farmers' language.

Three years of office have shown the national Republican administration as representing just what everybody should have known they were going to represent—the people of wealth of America. Yes, the dirt farmer learned his lesson. The question is: How many others learned their lesson?

Statement of Principles of GI Farmers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of principles from the GI Farmers of America, Webster City, Iowa:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES OF GI FARMERS OF AMERICA

As a member of the GI Farmers of America and as an honorably discharged veteran of the Armed Forces of the United States of America, I do hereby subscribe to the following statement of principles and beliefs:

I believe that the concepts announced in the Constitution of the United States of America are essential to the prosperity and welfare of all farmers and to the agricultural community.

I believe that through concerted individual effort and governmental cooperation, the economic condition of all farmers can be improved.

I believe that a strong agriculture is essential to the defense and prosperity of the United States of America.

I believe that in periods of economic adversity, the individual farmer should join with his Government in encouraging control of farm markets.

This organization was originally formed for two reasons:

1. The severe distress of the small farmer.
2. Help initiate a workable program for agriculture.

We are composed of the veterans of the Armed Forces of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. This organization is less than 1 month old, but our views have been readily accepted by many farmers of this great farming area.

As in the twenties and thirties, the veterans of World War I bore the brunt of the depression. Their families were underfed, underhoused, and underclothed. Today this same situation is developing. The farmer veterans of World War II and the Korean war are in a situation that could lead to another general depression. In the early thirties, through trial and error, it was found that by legislation this situation could be alleviated to a great extent. The Congress must do everything in its power to avert a recurrence of the farm depression.

Through lack of operating capital, many young tenant farmers (veteran or otherwise) are being forced off their farms. One more year of this financial pressure will eliminate many more. Their individual cases would not indicate lack of proficiency, but rather lack of economic power to overcome adverse markets. Today these farmers are being shoved off their farms by larger interests under the cloak of claimed inefficiency, on the part of the small farmer. This charge is untrue.

The responsibility for the present market is equally upon the Department of Agriculture, the agricultural colleges and the farmers themselves. Production has outstripped practical demand and thus indicates a need for general cutbacks of production. This can be achieved only by intervention by the Congress, since the Department of Agriculture is committed to inaction.

Production of commodities to feed our Nation and its allies can only be achieved if

the small farmers can operate on a profitable basis. The alternative is ridiculous overproduction, which will lead to agricultural bankruptcy.

Parity is equality. We ask only 90 percent of equality under such controls as the Congress deems wise.

VOLUNTARY COMPULSION

Our theory is based on the fact that we are Americans first and farmers second. Every farmer (veteran or otherwise) is guilty of doing his part in overproduction of most commodities produced in this vast Nation. With this in mind, we must at this time of economic adversity join hands and every farmer work together to meet a common problem.

If every farmer accepts controls for a period of 1 year we feel sure our oversupply of feed grain would readily return to a normal supply as outlined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Overproduction of feed grains caused oversupply of livestock, resulting in financial disaster unheard of in the history of this great Nation. Cross compliance between States producing different commodities is essential.

Corn is the basic crop of the Midwest and at this time is not considered in surplus. This position must be protected from surplus feed being shipped into the Corn Belt area. Ultimately the result would be new livestock lows. We feel that an exchange of certificates for grain in lieu of cash under the proposed soil-bank plan would result in greater livestock production.

As the soil-bank, or idle-land program is tentatively set, the reduction of approximately 20 percent will defeat its own purpose. Taking 20 percent of tillable land on one-quarter section out of production would create undue financial distress. Many farmers will decline to participate in this sort of program. It would mean slow finaicial destruction to the average tenant farmer.

Under our proposal, with every farmer participating, idle land on each farm could be held to a minimum. The percentage of land laid idle would not in any way create undue hardship on individuals participating. Every man—veteran or otherwise—would be doing his share in solving and reducing this overabundance of feed grain and livestock. A farmer farming 160 acres does not expect to have the standard of living comparable to a man on 640 acres. However, each should be willing to accept this reduction if on an equal percentage basis. This percentage of idle land, 8, 9, or 10 percent, could easily be adjusted by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Lands taken out of production under control regulations would be seeded and left lay for a period of 3 years, subject only to harvesting of nurse crop and clipping for weed control. This land would also be available for feed or grazing if severe drought conditions were to develop. This could be subject to ASC discretion.

Every man with equal acreage should be treated the same. (Farms with under 80 acres should not be cut proportionately to larger farms.) If the Congress requests the President of the United States to ask American farmers to help the Government, the real American would not turn this down.

Because of great dislike for some farm organizations in various parts of the country by individuals, we feel that veterans and other individuals could be contacted through ASC offices and volunteer their services. Extension service should be very willing to cooperate. Each farm cooperating with the leaders of this Nation could be given a sign reading, "I am cooperating with the the Department of Agriculture."

Most younger farmers, and many older farmers, realize that the time has come for the rank and file to ask for some type of controls. The family sized farm must be preserved. We must be willing to help ourselves.

The defense potential of the United States is based on the reservoir of manpower and commodities of the family sized farm. Its loss would cost dearly in the national effort.

CORN

Since corn is the basic crop in the Midwest and the basis for farm programs in this area, we recommend the discontinuance of using past history in arriving at acreage allotments. Instead it is urged that the basis of such allotments be made on tillable acres. Discrimination was practiced in the past against those who voluntarily reduced and controlled their production.

We recommend bushel quotas per farm, based on State, county, and township fertility levels, and in accordance with land prices in said counties. Each farm equal in fertility and equal in acres would receive the same bushel and acreage allotment. Because of the great desire for most farmers to overproduce, the bushel quota and acreage allotment system would tend to alleviate the Government storage situation.

The incentive for feeding should not be reduced. It is imperative that men selling their grain should accept an additional reduction either in the acreage allotments, or by leaving an additional percent lay idle. A limit of $25,000 be placed on the amount one individual could receive supports on.

Our long-range corn plan is in direct support of the program submitted by President Eisenhower as his alternate corn program. We feel that this plan should not go into effect for 1 year. Our reasoning is based on the fact that a feed surplus situation prevails. We believe that the Corn Belt should be willing to do their share in relieving this situation. In solution the price of corn should return to 90 percent of parity.

By using the idle acreage principle, corn allotments could be dropped by the year 1957. Soybeans, oats, hay, and other feeds in the Corn Belt would be reduced proportionately on most diversified farms. The rotation plans would continue as normal.

ASC offices could easily evaluate the problems of marginal and submarginal farms. Each office in individual countries are familiar with the soils and problems of the area.

An ever-normal supply of corn as set by the Secretary of Agriculture is primarily essential to the welfare and diet of this Nation. Ample supplies must be available in event of drought, plant and insert hazards, feed for the livestock producer, and national defense.

SWINE

Directly in line with the oversupply of feed grain came oversupply of hogs. It is imperative that a floor (temporary) of 16 cents per pound (live) at terminal markets be established. This floor would be retroactive to a period of comparable prices.

Sixteen dollars per hundredweight on top hogs (190–220) would tend to act as a floor rather than a ceiling.

With a return to normal on feed grains, hogs would never be in serious financial distress.

If this floor is attained and retroactive subsidy paid, each swine producer would automatically cut back his production 8 to 10 percent as outlined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

One producer would never be supported by government subsidy over 1 hog per acre or 100 head. One hundred head would be a maximum per individual or group of individuals. Partnership feeding which is quite common in the Midwest would permit one-half hog per acre up to 100 head each.

CATTLE

Cattle feeding operations in the Midwest are probably in a more disastrous financial condition than swine. However the operation itself is not as widespread or concentrated on the farms. At the present time it is not being dramatized as in the case of pork.

We recommend a floor of $24 per hundredweight on choice cattle at terminal markets. This floor would create little incentive to over-produce if the feed grain situation were normal.

Retroactive payments would be very difficult to obtain due to the wide difference in the grades of beef. If a program is adopted the beef producers (ranchers and feeders) could easily govern their projects by the price of feed grains supported at 90 percent of parity.

We feel that there is a widespread support for requiring packers to stop all feeding operations.

FINANCE

The extension of credit alone would not solve the financial problems faced by the young farmers (veterans or otherwise). Credit plus reasonable interest rates, however, are of major importance. Temporary relief must be enacted, but credit alone could place a burden on individuals that could not be escaped.

We feel that farm loans should be granted on an equality basis with urban loans. Loans on city property are readily available. It seems unfair that farm loans should require a higher percentage of downpayment than urban loans. Marginal and submarginal land loans are available to some extent; however, these loans should also cover soils of high fertility.

We feel that veterans especially should be accommodated. Their record of repayment on loans has been outstanding.

SURPLUS PROBLEM

We recommend that agricultural surpluses be traded on the world market for strategic materials. These materials could be stockpiled and used in the event of a national emergency. Any attempt to use these materials to lower domestic prices of said items should be blocked by law.

Imports of agricultural commodities already in excess in this country should be held to the lowest possible percentage under existing agreements.

Foreign aid should include products already in excess of normal supply needed to fill our own market requirements. Expanding foreign aid should include a larger proportion of our agricultural products.

Classics of Democracy—Index A–Z

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include an index of the letters from representative Americans appearing in the extensions of my remarks in the general heading of "Classics of American Democracy." The columns on the right give the page and date of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which the letters appear:

	Page No.	Date
A		
Allen Abrams, Rothschild, Wis., vice president, Marathon Corp.; director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Jan. 19
The Advertising Council, Inc., New York, N. Y.:		
See George P. Ludlam, vice president	A604	Jan. 20
See Theodore S. Reipplier, president	A605	Do.
Robert W. Akers, Beaumont, Tex., editor in chief, Enterprise and Journal	A491	Jan. 18
W. A. Alexander & Co., Chicago, Ill.:		
See Harve G. Badgerow, vice president	A605	Jan. 20
Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, Detroit, Mich.:		
See O. J. Mischo, international secretary-treasurer	A667	Jan. 23
American Academy of Political Science:		
See William Anderson, past president	A494	Jan. 20
American Association of Advertising Agencies, New York, N. Y.:		
See Frederic R. Gamble, president	A604	Do.
American Broadcasting Co., New York, N. Y.:		
See Robert E. Kintner, president	A490	Jan. 18
American Federation of Hosiery Workers, Philadelphia, Pa.:		
See John J. McCoy, editor, The Hosiery Worker	A584	Jan. 19
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Madison, Wis.:		
See John P. Caldwell, director, education and publications	A584	Do.
American Federation of Technical Engineers, Washington, D. C.:		
See Edward J. Coughlin, assistant to the president	A585	Do.
American Institute of Public Opinion, Princeton, N. J.:		
See George Gallup, director	A605	Jan. 20
American Legion:		
See Stephen F. Chadwick, past national commander	A602	Do.
See Harry W. Colmery, past national commander	A602	Do.
See Ray Murphy, past national commander	A666	Jan. 23
See James F. O'Neil, publisher	A603	Jan. 20
See Lynn V. Stambaugh, past national commander	A602	Do.
See A. J. Thomas, Jr., commander, Department of Florida	A603	Do.
See Enrique N. Vela, commander, Department of Puerto Rico	A669	Jan. 23
American Library Association, Chicago, Ill.:		
See David H. Clift, executive secretary	A586	Jan. 19
See Ralph R. Shaw, president-elect	A586	Do.
American Mutual Life Insurance Co., Des Moines, Iowa:		
See Marmaduke Corbyn, Sr., general agent	A605	Jan. 20
American Newspaper Publishers Association, Inc., New York, N. Y.:		
See Harold S. Barnes, director, bureau of advertising	A604	Do.
American Political Science Association:		
See Ralph J. Bunche, past president	A492	Jan. 18
See Quincy Wright, past president	A493	Do.
American Zinc, Lead, & Smelting Co., St. Louis, Mo.:		
See Howard I. Young, president	A583	Jan. 19
Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.:		
See Karl Loewenstein, William Nelson Cromwell professor of jurisprudence and political science	A495	Jan. 18
William Anderson, Minneapolis, Minn., professor of political science, University of Minnesota, past president, American Academy of Political Science	A494	Do.
Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass.:		
See Herbert Gezork, president	A581	Jan. 19
William R. Archer, Houston, Tex., regional vice president, National Association of Manufacturers	A670	Jan. 23
Armstrong Cork Co., Lancaster, Pa.:		
See H. W. Prentis, Jr., chairman of the board	A582	Jan. 19
Associated Industries of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky.:		
See Rayburn Watkins, managing director	A583	Do.
Association for Education in Journalism, Minneapolis, Minn.:		
See Raymond B. Nixon, editor, Journalism Quarterly	A490	Jan. 18
B		
Harve G. Badgerow, Chicago, Ill., vice president, W. A. Alexander & Co., member, Sons of the Revolution	A605	Jan. 20
Susan H. Baker, Philadelphia, Pa., president, League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania	A588	Jan. 19
William R. Baker, Jr., New York, N. Y., chairman of the board, Benton & Bowles, Inc	A604	Jan. 20
Margaret Barnard, Albany, N. Y., president, Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State	A587	Jan. 19
Harold S. Barnes, New York, N. Y., director, Bureau of Advertising of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, Inc	A604	Jan. 20
Benton & Bowles, Inc., New York, N. Y.:		
See William R. Baker, Jr., chairman of the board	A604	Do.
Edward L. Bernays, New York, N. Y., chairman, National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program	A605	Do.
	A667	Jan. 23
The Borden Co., New York, N. Y.:		
See Stuart Peabody, assistant vice president	A603	Jan. 20
George Britt, president, the Macmillan Co	A671	Jan. 23
John T. Brown, Racine, Wis., president, J. I. Case Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers	A667	Do.
Margaret E. Bruce, Boston, Mass., president, League of Women Voters of Massachusetts	A588	Jan. 19
Herbert Brucker, Hartford, Conn., editor, the Hartford Courant	A491	Jan. 18
Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N. Y., editorial of Jan. 13, 1956	A492	Do.
Building Service Employees' International Union:		
See Anthony G. Weinlein, director	A585	Jan. 19
Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary, United Nations; past president, American Political Science Association	A492	Jan. 18
Edward H. Butler, Buffalo, N. Y., editorial of Jan. 13, 1956	A492	Do.
C		
John P. Caldwell, Madison, Wis., director, education and publications, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees	A584	Jan. 19
Calvary Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.:		
See S. M. Shoemaker, Rector	A581	Do.
Erwin D. Canham, Boston, Mass., editor, Christian Science Monitor	A490	Jan. 18
William G. Caples, Chicago, Ill., vice president, Inland Steel Co.; regional vice president, National Association of Manufacturers	A666	Jan 23
J. I. Case Co., Racine, Wis.:		
See John T. Brown, president	A667	Do.
Stephen F. Chadwick, Seattle, Wash., past national commander, American Legion	A602	Jan 20
Scott B. Chambers, New Castle, Ind., editor and publisher, the Courier-Times	A490	Jan 18
Leo Cherne, New York, N. Y., executive director, Research Institute of America	A675	Jan. 23
Chicago City Junior College, Chicago, Ill.:		
See James M. McAllister, dean, Woodrow Wilson Branch	A494	Jan. 18
Chicago Sun-Times, Chicago, Ill.:		
See Robert E. Kennedy, chief editorial writer	A489	Do.
Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass.:		
See Erwin D. Canham, editor	A490	Do.
Church Street Methodist Church, Knoxville, Tenn.:		
See George H. Smith, pastor	A581	Jan. 19
City College of New York, New York, N. Y.:		
See Hans Kohn, professor	A493	Jan. 18
Esther L. Clark, president, League of Women Voters of Arkansas	A676	Jan. 23
Jesse Clark, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen	A672	Do.
David H. Clift, Chicago, Ill., executive secretary, American Library Association	A586	Jan. 19
L. M. Clucas, Jr., San Francisco, Calif., assistant to the director of public relations, Crown Zellerbach Corp	A669	Jan. 23
Coca-Cola Co., Atlanta, Ga.:		
See Felix W. Coste, vice president	A676	Do.
Mrs. Harry Coggins, Aurora, Nebr., president, Nebraska Council of United Church Women	A587	Jan. 19
R. Taylor Cole, Durham, N. C., professor of political science, Duke University	A493	Jan. 18
Gerald R. Coleman, executive secretary, United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers International Union	A674	Jan. 23
Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.:		
See Rodney L. Mott, director, division of social sciences	A606	Jan. 20
Harry W. Colmery, Topeka, Kans., past national commander, American Legion	A602	Do.
Columbia Broadcasting System, New York, N. Y.:		
See Frank Stanton, president	A675	Jan. 23
Columbia University, New York, N. Y.:		
See John N. Hazard, professor	A493	Jan. 18
Communications Workers of America:		
See Jules Pagano, director of education	A584	Jan. 19
Congregation Beth Israel, Houston, Tex.:		
See Hyman Judah Schachtel, rabbi	A674	Jan. 23
Congregation Rodfel Zedek, Chicago, Ill.:		
See Ralph Simon, rabbi	A581	Jan. 19
Congregation Shaare Emeth, St. Louis, Mo.:		
See Joseph R. Rosenbloom, rabbi	A582	Do.
Thomas I. Cook, Baltimore, Md., professor, department of political science, Johns Hopkins University	A671	Jan. 23
Marmaduke Corbyn, Sr., Oklahoma City, Okla., American Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Oklahoma State president, Sons of the Revolution	A605	Jan. 20
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.:		
See Robert E. Cushman, professor, department of government	A668	Jan. 23
Felix W. Coste, vice president, Coca-Cola Co	A676	Jan. 23
Edward S. Corwin, Princeton, N. J., Princeton University	A494	Jan. 18
Edward J. Coughlin, Washington, D. C., assistant to the president, American Federation of Technical Engineers	A585	Jan. 19
Council Bluffs Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa:		
See A. M. Piper, editor	A490	Jan. 18
Council of Church Women:		
See Louise C. Line, president, Montana council	A672	Jan. 23
See Sara T. Wentworth, president, Maine council	A587	Jan. 19
Courier-Times, New Castle, Ind.:		
See Scott B. Chambers (editor and publisher)	A490	Jan. 18
Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia, Pa.:		
See Edwin O. Lewis, president judge	A605	Jan. 20
Gardner Cowles, New York, N. Y., president and editor, Look	A489	Jan. 18
Paul F. Craig, Springfield, Mass., managing editor, the Springfield Union	A490	Do.
Faye Crawford, New York, N. Y., national chairman, international relations, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc	A667	Jan. 23
Crown Zellerbach Corp., San Francisco, Calif.:		
See L. M. Clucas, Jr., assistant to the director of public relations	A669	Do.
Cunningham-Walsh, Inc., New York, N. Y.:		
See William Reydel, senior vice president	A674	Do.
Curtis Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pa.:		
See Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board	A583	Jan. 19
See Ben Hibbs, editor, Saturday Evening Post	A489	Jan. 18
Robert E. Cushman, Ithaca, N. Y., professor, department of government, Cornell University	A668	Jan. 23
D		
Robert A. Dahl, New Haven, Conn., Eugene Meyer professor of political science, Yale University	A607	Jan. 20
Daily Kennebec Journal, Augusta, Maine:		
See Paul S. Plumer, managing editor	A668	Jan. 23
Daily Republican Eagle, Red Wing, Minn.:		
See Albert M. Marshal, editor-publisher	A490	Jan. 18
Dallas Morning News, Dallas, Tex.:		
See William B. Ruggles, editor, editorial page	A491	Do.
F. K. Dashiell, Washington, D. C., Labor's League for Political Education	A584	Jan. 19
Genevieve L. Davis, Charleston, S. C., president, United Church Women of South Carolina	A670	Jan. 23
Luelle Devlin, Casper, Wyo., chairman, Committee for a State League of Women Voters	A674	Do.
Diamond Lumber Co., Portland, Oreg.:		
See Roy A. Gould, president	A583	Jan. 19
	A673	Jan. 23
See Shirley Ann Sackman	A673	Do.
William S. Dix, Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Library, Chairman, International Relations Board	A586	Jan. 19

	Page No.	Date
James L. Donnelly, Chicago, Ill., executive vice president, Illinois Manufacturers Association	A667	Jan. 23
Sidney Dry, president, National Steel Container Corp., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A676	Do.
Duke University, Durham, N. C.:		
See R. Taylor Cole, professor of political science	A493	Jan. 18
DuKane Corp., St. Charles, Ill.:		
See D. A. Gibson	A672	Jan. 23
E		
William Earle, Evanston, Ill., associate professor, department of philosophy, Northwestern University	A668	Do.
Kermit Eby, Chicago, Ill., professor, the University of Chicago	A492	Jan. 18
Editorials:		
Buffalo Evening News (Jan. 13, 1956)	A492	Do.
Fresno Bee (Dec. 29, 1955)	A492	Do.
Milwaukee Journal (Dec. 22, 1955)	A491	Do.
Modesto Bee (Dec. 29, 1955)	A492	Do.
Sacramento Bee (Dec. 29, 1955)	A492	Do.
Elgin National Watch Co., Elgin, Ill.:		
See F. G. Shennan, president	A676	Jan. 23
Enterprise and Journal, Beaumont, Tex.:		
See Robert W. Akers, editor in chief	A491	Jan. 18
B. C. Essig, Denver, Colo., Gardner-Denver Co., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Jan. 19
Esterbrook Pen Co., Camden, N. J.:		
See Sydney E. Longmaid, president	A667	Jan. 23
Mary S. Etter, Waynesboro, Va., State president, Virginia Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc	A587	Jan. 19
Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D. C.:		
See Lynn V. Stambaugh, first vice president	A602	Jan. 20
F		
Harold E. Fellows, Washington, D. C., president and chairman of board, National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters	A604	Do.
Nels F. S. Ferre, Nashville, Tenn., school of religion, Vanderbilt University	A581	Jan. 19
John Fischer, New York, N. Y., editor, Harper's magazine	A489	Jan. 18
J. R. Fluor, Los Angeles, Calif., executive vice president, Fluor Corp., Ltd	A675	Jan. 23
Fred C. Foy, Pittsburgh, Pa., president, Koppers Co., Inc., regional vice president, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Jan. 19
Fresno Bee, Fresno, Calif., editorial of Dec. 29, 1955	A492	Jan. 18
Herbert A. Friedman, New York, N. Y., executive vice chairman, United Jewish Appeal	A582	Jan. 19
Walter D. Fuller, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the board, Curtis Publishing Co., past president, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Do.
G		
Marion T. Gaines, Pensacola, Fla., editor, Pensacola News-Journal	A490	Jan. 18
Samuel O. Gale, Minneapolis, Minn., vice president and director, General Mills, Inc	A604	Jan. 20
George Gallup, Princeton, N. J., director, American Institute of Public Opinion	A605	Do.
Frederic R. Gamble, New York, N. Y., president, American Association of Advertising Agencies	A604	Do.
Gardner-Denver Co., Denver, Colo.:		
See B. C. Essig	A583	Jan. 19
General Foods Corp., White Plains, N. Y.:		
See Charles G. Mortimer, president	A668	Jan. 23
General Mills, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.:		
See Samuel C. Gale, vice president and director	A604	Jan. 20
E. G. Gerbic, New Brunswick, N. J., vice president, Johnson & Johnson	A604	Do.
Norman Gerstenfeld, Washington, D. C., rabbi, Washington Hebrew Congregation	A581	Jan. 19
Herbert Gezork, Newton Centre, Mass., president, Andover Newton Theological School	A581	Do.
D. A. Gibson, St. Charles, Ill., DuKane Corp	A672	Jan. 23
Alfred P. Goddin, general vice president, Sons of the Revolution	A672	Do.
Charles Francis Gosnell, Albany, N. Y., State librarian of New York	A586	Jan. 19
Gould-National Batteries, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.:		
See E. I. Whyatt, assistant to the president	A584	Do.
Roy A. Gould, Portland, Oreg., president, Diamond Lumber Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Do.
Philip L. Graham, Washington, D. C., publisher, The Washington Post and Times Herald	A673	Jan. 23
John E. Gregg, Jackson, Miss., executive vice president, Mississippi Manufacturers Association	A489	Jan. 18
H	A583	Jan. 19
Frank G. Hahn, Union City, N. J., commander, department of New Jersey, Veterans of Foreign Wars	A603	Jan. 20
Harper's Magazine, New York, N. Y.:		
See John Fischer, editor	A489	Jan. 18
The Hartford Courant, Hartford, Conn.:		
See Herbert Brucker, editor	A491	Do.
P. H. Haskell, Jr., Birmingham, Ala., president, Holly Grove Mining Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers	A670	Jan. 23
Hiram Hayden, editor, The American Scholar	A672	Do.
John N. Hazard, New York, N. Y., professor, Columbia University	A493	Jan. 18
Ferinand A. Hermens, South Bend, Ind., professor of political science, University of Notre Dame	A606	Jan. 20
Ben Hibbs, Philadelphia, Pa., editor, Saturday Evening Post	A489	Jan. 18
Lindsay Hobin, Milwaukee, Wis., vice president and editorial editor, the Milwaukee Journal	A491	Do.
Holly Grove Mining Co., Birmingham, Ala.:		
See P. H. Haskell, Jr., president	A670	Jan. 23
Jean Holmer, president, League of Women Voters of California	A671	Do.
Rollo Ewing Hutchison, Chicago, Ill., board of managers, Sons of the Revolution	A605	Jan. 20
Charles S. Hyneman, Evanston, Ill., professor of political science, Northwestern University	A492	Jan. 18

	Page No.	Date
I		
Illinois Manufacturers Association, Chicago, Ill.:		
See James L. Donnelly, executive vice president	A667	Jan. 23
Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.:		
See Newton P. Stallknecht, chairman, department of philosophy	A492	Jan. 18
Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.:		
See William G. Caples, vice president	A666	Jan. 23
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, New York, N. Y.:		
See Mark Starr, educational director	A585	Jan. 19
International Relations Board:		
See William S. Dix, chairman	A586	Do.
International Typographical Union:		
See Woodruff Randolph, president	A672	Jan. 23
International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Detroit, Mich.:		
See Brendan Sexton, director of education	A584	Jan. 19
International Woodworkers of America, Portland, Oreg.:		
See E. W. Kenney, director, research and education	A585	Do.
J		
Curtis M. Jewell, Columbus, Ohio, commander, department of Ohio, Veterans of Foreign Wars	A603	Jan. 20
The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.:		
See Thomas I. Cook, professor, department of political science	A671	Jan. 23
See Carl B. Swisher, professor	A494	Jan. 18
Johnson & Johnson, New Brunswick, N. J.:		
See E. G. Gerbic, vice president	A604	Jan. 20
C. W. Johnson, Springfield, Mo., managing editor, Springfield Newspapers, Inc	A491	Jan. 18
Walter P. Jones, editor, the McClatchy Newspapers	A492	Do.
K		
K. A. M. Temple, Chicago, Ill.:		
See Jacob Weinstein, rabbi	A582	Jan. 19
F. Warner Karling, past commander in chief (1911-13), Society of the Army of the Philippines; Veterans of Foreign Wars	A675	Jan. 23
Gerald Kennedy, Los Angeles, Calif., bishop, the Methodist Church	A582	Jan. 19
Robert E. Kennedy, Chicago, Ill., chief editorial writer, Chicago Sun-Times	A489	Jan. 18
E. W. Kenney, Portland, Oreg., director, research and education, International Woodworkers of America	A585	Jan. 19
William P. Kent, Salt Lake City, Utah, associate professor of philosophy, University of Utah	A494	Jan. 18
Robert E. Kintner, New York, N. Y., president, American Broadcasting Co	A490	Do.
D. L. Kirk, Spokane, Wash., chief editorial writer, Spokane Daily Chronicle	A491	Do.
Hans Kohn, New York 31, N. Y., professor, City College of New York	A493	Do.
Koppers Co., Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.:		
See Fred C. Foy, president	A583	Jan. 19
Bertram W. Korn, Philadelphia, Pa., rabbi, Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel	A581	Do.
L		
Labor's League for Political Education, Washington, D. C.:		
See F. K. Dashiell	A584	Do.
Helen B. Latimer, Washington, D. C., director, League of Women Voters	A588	Do.
Laundry Workers International Union:		
See Herbert S. Shockney, director of research and education	A667	Jan. 23
League of Women Voters:		
See Susan H. Baker, State president, Pennsylvania	A588	Jan. 19
See Margaret E. Bruce, State president, Massachusetts	A588	Do.
See Esther L. Clark, State president, Arkansas	A676	Jan. 23
See Lucila Devlin, State president, Wyoming	A674	Do.
See Jean Holmer, State president, California	A671	Do.
See Helen B. Latimer, director	A588	Jan. 19
See Ruth M. Lurie, director	A587	Do.
See Edna J. Marshall, State president, Nebraska	A587	Do.
See Marjorie Pharis, State president, Missouri	A670	Jan. 23
See Nelle S. Reese, State president, West Virginia	A587	Jan. 19
See Zella P. Ruebhausen, director, New York	A587	Do.
See Doris Stephens, director, Oklahoma City	A586	Do.
See Ethel Young, State president, Minnesota	A674	Jan. 23
Arnaud B. Leavelle, Jr., Palo Alto, Calif., professor, department of political science, Stanford University	A585	Jan. 19
Wallace J. Legge, Jr., Washington, D. C., chairman of labor education, National Postal Transport Association	A585	Do.
Albert Lepawsky, Berkeley, Calif., professor of political science, University of California	A495	Jan. 18
Clyde A. Lewis, Plattsburgh, N. Y., past national commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars	A666	Jan. 23
Edwin O. Lewis, Philadelphia, Pa., president judge, court of common pleas, honorary general president, Sons of the Revolution	A605	Jan. 20
Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.		
See L. Quincy Mumford, librarian	A585	Jan. 19
Louise C. Line, president, Montana Council of Church Women	A672	Jan. 23
Lion Oil Co., El Dorado, Ark.:		
See T. M. Martin, president	A676	Do.
Little, Brown & Co., Boston, Mass.:		
See Arthur H. Thornhill, president	A671	Do.
Karl Loewenstein, Amherst, Mass., William Nelson Cromwell professor of jurisprudence and political science, Amherst College	A495	Jan. 18
Sydney E. Longmaid, president, Esterbrook Pen Co., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A667	Jan. 23
Look, New York, N. Y.:		
See Gardner Cowles, president and editor	A489	Jan. 18
J. E. Loving, St. Louis, Mo., director, educational bureau, Order of Railroad Telegraphers	A585	Jan. 19
Arnold Hilmar Lowe, Minneapolis, Minn., minister, Westminster Presbyterian Church	A582	Do.

	Page No.	Date
George P. Ludlam, New York, N. Y., vice president, The Advertising Council, Inc	A604	Jan. 20
Ruth M. Lurie, Belmont, Mass., director, League of Women Voters	A587	Jan. 19
M		
MacMillan Co.:		
See George Britt, president	A671	Jan. 23
Luella Madden, Portales, N. Mex., president, United Church Women of New Mexico	A670	Do.
Marathon Corp., Rothschild, Wis.:		
See Allen Abrams, vice president	A583	Jan. 19
Madison Marine, Malverne, N. Y., board of managers, Sons of the Revolution	A605	Jan. 20
Albert M. Marshall, Red Wing, Minn., editor-publisher, Daily Republican Eagle	A490	Jan. 18
Edna J. Marshall, Omaha Nebr., State president, League of Women Voters of Nebraska	A587	Jan. 19
T. M. Martin, El Dorado, N. Mex., president, Lion Oil Co., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A676	Jan. 23
Frank E. Masland, Jr., Carlisle, Pa., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Jan. 19
Margaret N. Matheny, New York, N. Y., national chairman, program coordination committee, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc	A587	Do.
Benjamin E. Mays, Atlanta, Ga., president, Morehouse College	A493	Jan. 18
James M. McAllister, Chicago, Ill., dean, Woodrow Wilson Branch, Chicago City Junior College	A493	Do.
Mrs. Seymour Y. McAllister, Ogden, Utah	A587	Jan. 19
John J. McCoy, Philadelphia, Pa., editor, the Hosiery Worker, American Federation of Hosiery Workers	A584	Do.
R. J. McCracken, New York, N. Y., minister, Riverside Church	A674	Jan. 23
Richard P. McKeon, Chicago, Ill., professor of philosophy, the University of Chicago	A669	Do.
Methodist Church:		
See Gerald Kennedy, bishop	A582	Jan. 19
See G. Bromley Oxnam, bishop	A581	Do.
Milwaukee Journal, Milwaukee, Wis., editorial of Dec. 22, 1955	A491	Jan. 18
See Lindsay Hoben, vice president and editorial editor	A491	Do.
O. J. Mischo, Detroit, Mich., international secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America	A667	Jan. 23
Mississippi Manufacturers Association, Jackson, Miss.:		
See John E. Gregg, executive vice president	A583	Jan. 19
Modesto Bee, Modesto, Calif., editorial of Dec. 29, 1955	A492	Jan. 18
Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga.:		
See Benjamin E. Mays, president	A493	Do.
Charles G. Mortimer, White Plains, N. Y., president, General Foods Corp	A668	Jan. 23
Rodney L. Mott, Hamilton, N. Y., director, division of social sciences, Colgate University	A606	Jan. 20
Mount Zion Temple, St. Paul, Minn.:		
See W. Gunther Plant, rabbi	A582	Jan. 19
L. Quincy Mumford, Washington, D. C., Librarian of Congress	A585	Do.
Ray Murphy, New York, N. Y., past national commander, American Legion	A666	Jan. 23
Earl B. Musser, Kansas City, Mo., secretary-treasurer, Sons of the Revolution	A605	Jan. 20
N		
National Association of Manufacturers:		
See Allen Abrams, director	A583	Jan. 19
See William R. Archer, regional vice president	A670	Jan. 23
See John T. Brown, director	A667	Do.
See William G. Caples, regional vice president	A666	Do.
See Sidney Dry, director	A676	Do.
See B. C. Essig, director	A583	Jan. 19
See Fred C. Foy, regional vice president	A583	Do.
See Walter D. Fuller, past president	A583	Do.
See Roy A. Gould, director	A583	Do.
See P. H. Haskell, Jr., director	A673	Jan. 23
See Sydney E. Longmaid, director	A670	Do.
See T. M. Martin, director	A667	Do.
See Frank E. Masland, Jr., director	A676	Do.
See George Olmsted, Jr., director	A583	Jan. 19
See Gus Ottenheimer, director	A583	Do.
See J. Howard Pew, director	A667	Jan. 23
See H. W. Prentis, Jr., past president	A672	Do.
See F. G. Shennan, director	A582	Jan. 19
See J. Clifton Yaun, director	A676	Do.
See Howard I. Young, director	A583	Do.
National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, Washington, D. C.:		
See Harold E. Fellows, president and chairman of board	----	----
National Better Business Bureau:		
See William G. Werner, director	A605	Jan. 20
National Committee for an Adequate Overseas United States Information Program, New York, N. Y.:		
See Edward L. Bernays, chairman	A605	Do.
	A667	Jan. 23
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.:		
See Margaret Barnard, State president, New York	A587	Jan. 19
See Faye Crawford, national chairman, International Relations	A667	Jan. 23
See Mary S. Etter, State president, Virginia	A587	Jan. 19
See Margaret N. Matheny, national chairman, program coordination committee	A587	Do.
See Nina M. Russell, Maryland Federation	A672	Jan. 23
See Dorothy B. Southwick, State president, Florida	A670	Do.
See Margaret Wilkinson, Tennessee	A587	Jan. 19
National Postal Transport Association, Washington, D. C.:		
See Wallace J. Legge, Jr., chairman of labor education	A585	Do.
National Steel Container Corp.:		
See Sidney Dry, president	A676	Jan. 23
New American Library of World Literature:		
See Victor Weybright, chairman and editor	A675	Do.
New York State Library, Albany, N. Y.:		
See Charles Francis Gosnell, State librarian	A586	Jan. 19
Raymond B. Nixon, Minneapolis, Minn., editor, Journalism Quarterly, Association for Education in Journalism	A490	Jan. 18
Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.:		
See William Earle, associate professor, department of philosophy	A668	Jan. 23
See Charles S. Hyneman, professor of political science	A492	Jan. 18
O		
Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union, C. I. O., Denver, Colo.:		
See E. E. Phelps, director, research and education division	A584	Jan. 19
George Olmsted, Jr., Boston, Mass., S. D. Warren Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Do.
James F. O'Neil, New York, N. Y., publisher, the American Legion magazine	A603	Jan. 20
Order of Railroad Telegraphers, St. Louis, Mo.:		
See J. E. Loving, director, education bureau	A585	Jan. 19
Gus Ottenheimer, Little Rock, Ark., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A667	Jan. 23
Louise Overacker, Wellesley, Mass., professor of political science, Wellesley College	A670	Do.
Oxford University Press:		
See Henry Z. Walck, president	A671	Do.
G. Bromley Oxnam, Washington, D. C., bishop, the Methodist Church	A581	Jan. 19
P		
Paducah Sun-Democrat, Paducah, Ky.:		
See E. J. Paxton, Jr., associate editor	A491	Jan 18
Jules Pagano, Baltimore, Md., director of education, Communications Workers of America	A584	Jan. 19
J. E. Palmer, New Haven, Conn., editor, the Yale Review	A669	Jan. 23
Edward M. Passano, State president of Maryland, Sons of the Revolution	A606	Jan. 20
E. J. Paxton, Jr., Paducah, Ky., associate editor, Sun-Democrat	A491	Jan. 18
Stuart Peabody, New York, N. Y., assistant vice president, the Borden Co	A603	Jan. 20
M. B. Pendleton, Los Angeles, Calif., president, Plomb Tool Co	A675	Jan. 23
Pensacola News-Journal, Pensacola, Fla.:		
See Marion T. Gaines, editor	A490	Jan. 18
J. Howard Pew, Philadelphia, Pa., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A672	Jan. 23
Marjorie Pharis, St. Louis, Mo., president, League of Women Voters of Missouri	A670	Do.
E. E. Phelps, Denver, Colo., director, research and education department, Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers International Union	A584	Jan. 19
A. M. Piper, Council Bluffs, Iowa, editor, Council Bluffs Nonpareil	A490	Jan. 18
W. Gunther Plant, St. Paul, Minn., rabbi, Mount Zion Temple	A582	Jan. 19
Plomb Tool Co., Los Angeles, Calif.:		
See M. B. Pendleton, president	A675	Jan. 23
Paul S. Plumer, Augusta, Maine, managing editor, Daily Kennebec Journal	A668	Do.
H. W. Prentis, Jr., Lancaster, Pa., chairman of the board, Armstrong Cork Co.; past president, National Association of Manufacturers	A582	Jan. 19
Princeton University:		
See Edward S. Corwin	A494	Jan. 18
See William S. Dix	A586	Jan. 19
Procter & Gamble Co., Cincinnati, Ohio:		
See William G. Werner, director, public and legal services	A605	Jan. 20
R		
Woodruff Randolph, president, International Typographical Union	A672	Jan. 23
Theodore S. Repplier, Washington, D. C., president, The Advertising Council, Inc	A605	Jan. 20
Charles L. Reese, Jr., Wilmington, Del., president, Wilmington News-Journal	A491	Jan. 18
Nelle S. Reese, Mortantown, W. Va., president, League of Women Voters of West Virginia	A587	Jan. 19
Reform Congregation Keneseth Israel, Philadelphia, Pa.:		
See Bertram W. Korn, rabbi	A581	Do.
Research Institute of America, New York, N. Y.:		
See Leo Cherne, executive director	A675	Jan. 23
William Reydel, New York, N. Y., senior vice president, Cunningham-Walsh, Inc	A674	Do.
Riverside Church, New York, N. Y.:		
See R. J. McCracken, minister	A674	Do.
Eleanor Roosevelt, New York, N. Y	A586	Jan. 19
Joseph R. Rosenbloom, St. Louis, Mo., rabbi, Congregation Shaare Emeth	A582	Do.
Zella P. Ruebhausen, New York, N. Y., director, League of Women Voters	A587	Do.
William B. Ruggles, Dallas, Tex., editor, editorial page, Dallas Morning News	A491	Jan. 18
Selwyn D. Ruslander, Dayton, Ohio, rabbi, Temple Israel	A582	Jan. 19
Nina M. Russell, Maryland Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs	A672	Jan. 23
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.:		
See Ralph R. Shaw	A586	Jan. 19
S		
Shirley Ann Sackman, Portland, Oreg., Diamond Lumber Co	A673	Jan. 23
Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif., editorial of Dec. 29, 1955	A492	Jan. 18
Saturday Evening Post, Philadelphia, Pa.:		
See Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board	A583	Jan. 19
See Ben Hibbs, editor	A489	Jan. 18
Hyman Judah Schachtel, Houston, Tex., rabbi, Congregation Beth Israel	A674	Jan. 23
Schwab & Beatty, Inc., New York, N. Y	A675	Do.

	Page No.	Date
Brendan Sexton, Detroit, Mich., director of education, International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft & Agricultural Implement Workers of America	A584	Jan. 19
J. B. Shannon, Lexington, Ky., professor of political science, University of Kentucky	A492	Jan. 18
Ralph R. Shaw, New Brunswick, N. J., Rutgers University, president-elect, American Library Association	A586	Jan. 19
F. G. Shennan, Elgin, Ill., president, Elgin National Watch Co., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A676	Jan. 23
Herbert S. Shockney, Indianapolis, Ind., director of research and education, Laundry Workers International Union	A667	Do.
S. M. Shoemaker, Pittsburgh, Pa., rector, Calvary Episcopal Church	A581	Jan. 19
Ralph Simon, Chicago, Ill., rabbi, Congregation Rodfel Zedek	A581	Do
George H. Smith, Knoxville, Tenn., pastor, Church Street Methodist Church	A581	Do
Society of the Army of the Philippines:		
See F. Warren Karling, past commander in chief	A675	Jan. 23
Sons of the American Revolution:		
See Harve G. Badgerow (member)	A605	Jan. 20
See Marmaduke Corbyn, Sr., State president, Oklahoma	A605	Do
See Alfred P. Goddin, general vice president	A672	Jan. 23
See Rollo E. Hutchison, board of managers	A605	Jan. 20
See Edwin O. Lewis, honorary general president	A605	Do
See Madison Marine, board of managers	A605	Do
See Earl B. Musser, secretary-treasurer	A605	Do
See Edward M. Passano, State president, Maryland	A606	Do
Dorothy B. Southwick, Lake Worth, Fla., president, Florida Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs	A670	Jan. 23
Spokane Daily Chronicle, Spokane, Wash.:		
See D. L. Kirk, chief editorial writer	A491	Jan. 18
Springfield Newspapers, Springfield, Mo.:		
See C. W. Johnson, managing editor	A491	Do.
Springfield Union, Springfield, Mass.:		
See Paul F. Craig, managing editor	A490	Do.
Newton P. Stallknecht, Bloomington, Ind., chairman, department of philosophy, Indiana University	A492	Do.
Lynn V. Stanbaugh, first vice president, Export-Import Bank; past national commander, American Legion	A602	Jan. 20
Stanford University:		
See Arnaud B. Leavelle, Jr., professor	A668	Jan. 23
See James T. Watkins IV, executive head, department of political science	A668	Do.
Frank Stanton, president, Columbia Broadcasting System	A675	Do.
Mark Starr, educational director, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union	A585	Jan. 19
Doris Stephens, Oklahoma City, Okla., director, League of Women Voters	A587	Do.
J. McWilliams Stone, director, National Association of Manufacturers	A672	Jan. 23
Sun-Democrat, Paducah, Ky.:		
See E. J. Paxton, Jr., associate editor	A491	Jan. 18
Carl B. Swisher, Baltimore, Md., professor, the Johns Hopkins University	A494	Do.
T		
Temple Emeth, Ardmore, Okla.:		
See Joseph Utschen, rabbi	A582	Jan. 19
Temple Israel, Dayton, Ohio:		
See Selwyn D. Ruslander, rabbi	A582	Do.
A. J. Thomas, Jr., commander, department of Florida, American Legion	A603	Jan. 20
Arthur H. Thornhill, Boston, Mass., president, Little, Brown & Co	A671	Jan. 23
U		
United Church Women:		
See Mrs. Harry Coggins, president, Nebraska council	A587	Jan. 19
Genevieve L. Davis, president, South Carolina	A670	Jan. 23
See Luella Madden, president, New Mexico	A670	Do.
United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International Union:		
See Gerald R. Coleman, executive secretary	A674	Do.
United Jewish Appeal, New York, N. Y.:		
See Herbert A. Friedman, executive vice chairman	A582	Jan. 19
United Nations, New York, N. Y.:		
See Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary	A492	Jan. 18
University of California, Berkeley, Calif.:		
See Albert Lepawsky, professor of political science	A495	Do.
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.:		
See Kermit Eby, professor	A492	Do.
See Richard P. McKeon, professor of philosophy	A669	Jan. 23
See Warner A. Wick, associate professor of philosophy	A606	Jan. 20
See Quincy Wright, professor	A493	Jan. 18
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.:		
See Eugene H. Wilson, director of libraries	A586	Jan. 19
University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.:		
See Francis G. Wilson, professor	A493	Jan. 18
University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.:		
See J. B. Shannon, professor of political science	A492	Do.
University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.:		
See Ferdinand A. Hermans, professor of political science	A606	Jan. 20
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah:		
See William P. Kent, associate professor of philosophy	A494	Jan. 18
Joseph Utschen, Ardmore, Okla., rabbi, Temple Emeth	A582	Jan. 19
V		
Walter S. Van Alstyne, North Tonawanda, N. Y.	A670	Jan. 23
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.:		
See Nels F. S. Ferre, school of religion	A581	Jan. 19
Enrique N. Vela, San Juan, P. R., commander, department of Puerto Rico, American Legion	A669	Jan. 23
Veterans of Foreign Wars:		
See Frank G. Hahn, commander, department of New Jersey	A603	Jan. 20
See Curtis M. Jewell, commander, department of Ohio	A603	Do.
See F. Warner Karling	A675	Jan. 23
See Clyde A. Lewis, past commander in chief	A666	Do.
W		
Henry Z. Walck, president, Oxford University Press	A671	Do.
S. D. Warren Co., Boston, Mass.:		
See George Olmsted, Jr	A583	Jan. 19
Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D. C.:		
See Norman Gerstenfeld, rabbi	A581	Do.
Washington Post and Times Herald, Washington 5, D. C.:		
See Philip L. Graham, publisher	A489	Jan. 18
See James Russell Wiggins, executive editor	A490	Do.
James T. Watkins IV, Palo Alto, Calif., executive head, department of political science, Stanford University	A668	Jan. 23
Rayburn Watkins, Louisville, Ky., managing director, Associated Industries of Kentucky	A583	Jan. 19
Waverly Press, Inc., Baltimore, Md.:		
See Edward M. Passano, executive vice president and treasurer	A606	Jan. 20
Anthony G. Weinlein, Chicago, Ill., director, Building Service Employees International Union	A585	Jan. 19
Jacob Weinstein, Chicago, Ill., rabbi, K. A. M. Temple	A582	Do.
Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.:		
See Louise Overacker, professor of political science	A670	Jan. 23
Sara T. Wentworth, Orono, Maine, president, Maine Council of Church Women	A587	Jan. 19
William G. Werner, Cincinnati, Ohio, director, public and legal services, Proctor & Gamble Co.; director, National Better Business Bureau	A605	Jan. 20
Westminster Presbyterian Church, Minneapolis, Minn.:		
See Arnold H. Lowe, minister	A582	Jan. 19
Victor Weybright, chairman and editor, New American Library of World Literature	A675	Jan. 23
E. I. Whyatt, St. Paul, Minn., assistant to the president, Gould-National Batteries, Inc	A584	Jan. 19
Warner A. Wick, Chicago, Ill., associate professor of philosophy, the University of Chicago	A606	Jan. 20
James Russell Wiggins, Washington, D. C., executive editor, the Washington Post and Times-Herald	A490	Jan. 18
Margaret Wilkinson, Memphis, Tenn., National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc	A587	Jan. 19
Wilmington News-Journal, Wilmington, Del.:		
See Charles L. Reese, Jr., president	A491	Jan. 18
Eugene H. Wilson, Boulder, Colo., director of libraries, University of Colorado	A586	Jan. 19
Francis G. Wilson, Urbana, Ill., professor, University of Illinois	A493	Jan. 18
Quincy Wright, Chicago, Ill., professor, the University of Chicago	A493	Do.
Y		
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.:		
See Robert A. Dahl, Eugene Meyer professor of political science	A607	Jan. 20
See J. E. Palmer, editor, Yale Review	A669	Jan. 23
J. Clifton Yaun, Baton Rouge, La., director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Jan. 19
Ethel Young, president, League of Women Voters of Minnesota	A674	Jan. 23
Howard I. Young, St. Louis, Mo., president, American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co.; director, National Association of Manufacturers	A583	Jan. 19

Corporation Mergers and the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a statement I made before the New York State Bar Association, on January 25, 1956:

CORPORATION MERGERS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

(Address by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, before the New York State Bar Association, January 25, 1956)

I have been looking forward to this happy reunion with so many good friends. I see in this audience a number of experts on the problems generated by mergers and the enforcement of the antitrust laws. It is, of course, like the proverbial carrying of coals to Newcastle to remind such a sophisticated group that the number of corporate marriages, the urge to merge, has caused national concern.

Consider that in the year just ended the number of mergers set a 25-year record and proceeded at a rate four times that of 1949. Consider also that through mergers, giant corporations have swallowed up small competitors on a wholesale scale. Indeed, in the last 5 years over 3,000 concerns have disappeared in this unrelenting process. This trend has taken many different forms.

Through so-called conglomerate mergers, huge corporations, not content to dominate one industry, are penetrating many other industries where the product or service offered is wholly unrelated to their original field. This is necessary, some spokesmen say, to provide greater diversification or round out a product line. Possibly so. But when this happens, the sheer economic power and vast financial resources of the giant entering the new industry threatens the continued existence of smaller competitors.

At times the pattern resembles a crazy quilt. Philadelphia & Reading Corp., a lead-

ing hard coal producer, announces plans to purchase the assets of the Union Underwear Co. Textron-American—itself the product of a multiple merger—has entered the electronics business and is prepared to take over the international cable business of Western Union Telegraph Co. ACF-Brill Motors, of Philadelphia, also a product of previous mergers, has recently taken over a food wholesaler and three food chains in Michigan and Oklahoma, reputedly to avoid taxation of its bus operations disposal.[1]

A rumor is now going around in financial circles—apocryphal, I am sure—that Worthington Pump will soon merge with International Nickel. The new entity I suppose will be known as Pumpernickel.

It is no wonder that the Wall Street Journal commented that the type of merger now going on strikes an old fogey with a sense of complete bewilderment. Rail equipment builders enter the road machinery and electronics field. A chemical concern proposes marriage to a washing machine maker. A coal mining organization acquires oil, shipping construction machinery, and machine tool firms. A construction contractor acquires a steel mill and a paint maker.

There is the human factor, too. Frequently, a plant is closed when a company is taken over, throwing people out of work and reducing the economic wealth of the community. Take the textile industry, for example. Many mills have been shut down in the wake of mergers. This has often caused aggravated hardship to mill employees and to the communities in which the closed plants are located. Thousands of displaced workers can not find jobs of any kind. In many instances, the closed mills formed the economic heart of the community upon which local governments, jobs, stores, professions, services, and churches depended for income.[2]

Not all mergers have had these unfortunate consequences. Many—those in the automobile industry are typical—have helped competition by strengthening the market position of the combined companies and their ability to compete more vigorously. Also on the positive side of the ledger some corporations have averted bankruptcy in this way. And some have assured themselves of adequate supplies during periods when materials are scarce and of guaranteed product outlets in periods of recession.

But the story does not end there. I think it is fair to say that many mergers can be attributed to the voracious appetite of certain giant organizations; their acquisitions, which are sometimes motivated by personal factors of prestige, are on the increase. On the other hand acquisitions by small corporations have declined significantly.[3]

What about the characteristics of the concerns that have been taken over? Have the corporations that have been engulfed in the current wave, been the financially weak, the unsound organizations that needed rescue? Were they, in the main, too highly specialized, poorly organized, or inefficiently managed? The answer is, no. Even a casual glance at their identity reveals that many were growing, efficient, profitable, vigorously competitive businesses.

In dealing with this problem there are, I think, a few obvious fundamentals which are sometimes lost sight of, if not ignored entirely. The basic objective of the antitrust laws is the preservation of a free competitive enterprise system in which economic activity is controlled so far as possible by the market and not by men. Those who enacted our antitrust laws believed that the market should control business decisions, not businessmen the market. They strove to safeguard and preserve genuinely workable, effective competition, the kind where prices, output, wages and other rewards depend not on the decisions of a few but result from the day-to-day actions of rival business firms, independently motivated. This decentralized brand of decision-making, they knew, would insure a maximum not only of individual opportunity, but of political liberty.

These familiar landmarks may be obvious but they are sometimes taken for granted. Recall the report of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. Although it was prepared by a group of illustrious lawyers and economists, it does not, in my opinion, come to grips with some of these fundamentals. As one member pointed out, it did not "consider the vast changes in industrial structure that have occurred since the enactment of the Sherman Act—and the significance of these changes to the functioning of markets—nor did it consider the relationship of the law and its interpretation to these changes."[4] The majority version of this highly publicized document chooses to ignore the great combination movement at the turn of the century, the less spectacular movement of the 1920's, and the similar movement now taking place. Critics point out that the majority nowhere uses the term "merger movement" or discusses its significance.[5]

Yet the fact is that the basic objective of the antitrust laws has been frustrated in considerable part by mergers which have resulted in giant aggregations that have obtained economic power to control price and supply, yes to dominate many industries.

The growing domination of the market place by the larger corporations was recently highlighted by the Senate Small Business Committee which reported these facts:

"While the prosperity of 1955 brought a profit rate of 14.4 percent to the biggest corporations (those with assets over $100 million) the smallest group (those with assets of less than $250,000) reported earnings in the first 6 months of but 4.45 percent. * * * Between the first halves of 1952 and 1955, while the giant companies earnings 'went through the roof' the smallest manufacturing plants profits headed for the cellar. Expressed in percentages the earnings of the small concerns fell off 27.4 percent between the two periods while the earnings of the large companies increased by 58.5 percent.

* * * * *

"There is an ominous significance," the report concludes, "in an economic atmosphere which makes it possible for the Nation's mammoth corporations to reap record profits while the general run of small enterprises are worse off than they were 3 years ago."[6]

What is more, the trend in industry after industry is in the direction of fewer companies of greater size. The fact is that the long-term rise in industrial concentration in this country is to a considerable extent due to what my economist friends refer to as external expansion of business, which is another name for mergers. Indeed, the power of the industrial leaders in steel, copper, cans, dairy products, to name but a few, is primarily attributable to this reaching out and buying up other concerns, not to natural growth. Many major companies in this country actually acquired nearly all their assets by merger. I am not overlooking, of course, the part tax considerations have played in pushing forward the merger movement.

A 1955 Federal Trade Commission report observed that recent merger activity has been most marked in the machinery, food, chemicals, fabricated metals, transportation equipment, and textile industries. In each of these fields, there were over 100 consolidations in the period from 1948 to 1954.[7] It is significant that these industries are not the more heavily concentrated ones. This is readily understandable. Mergers in industries where concentration has existed historically, have not been more widespread simply because there are only a few small concerns available for purchase to begin with. The point is that when you find a large number of consolidations in a given industry, you will also find that a good deal of competitive enterprise existed up to that time.

Another aspect is that many mergers have a competitive effect that mushrooms out. The impact reaches small firms which may have to compete with a consolidated corporation; it reaches customers of the acquired enterprise, who have found their former source of supply cut off; it reaches former suppliers of either of the combining corporations who find that their products or services are no longer needed; and it reaches firms who have lost an important outlet for their products as a result of the acquiring corporation's decision to have its products sold exclusively to the marketing organization of the acquired corporation.[8]

These are some of the reasons why Congress has been deeply concerned about the direction in which merger movements are reorienting our system of free-competitive enterprise. And this is why the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act was placed on the statute books in 1950.[9]

The act, as you are aware, closed a widely exploited loophole in the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914. This loophole existed because section 7 of that act applied only to corporate mergers accomplished by stock purchases. Companies could circumvent the law by the simple device of buying up the plant or other assets of a second concern—thus leaving the enforcement agencies powerless. The Celler-Kefauver Act, among other things, plugged this convenient gap by amending section 7 to forbid corporate mergers no matter if accomplished by asset purchase or stock purchase if the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to monopoly in any section of the country.

I hasten to add that this new law does not prohibit all mergers; nor does it prohibit mergers between competitors where the effect on competition is not substantial. Imbedded in the legislative history is the principle that consolidations which enable smaller concerns in an industry to compete more effectively are in the public interest.[10] At the same time the act does not legalize mergers which were illegal under old section 7. Changes made by the new law were intended to enlarge th coverage of that section to apply to all types of corporate mergers and acquisitions—horizontal, vertical and conglomerate—which have the specified effects of competition.[11]

I recognize that it is a difficult task to ascertain the probable effect upon competition of a particular transaction. Certainly there is no infallible answer to the problem of screening out so-called good mergers from those that are bad. However, I insist that every effort must be made to find out.

Some contend that no action should be taken or even that no inquiry should be made because the percentage of bad mergers may be comparatively small. I reject this argument. The percentage of motorists who violate traffic laws is likewise small; so is the incidence of homicide. Nonetheless, I fell that we should constantly strive to reduce the margin still further by continuous and thorough scrutiny, by seeking ever better preventive measures, and by more vigilant enforcement.

The problem may easily be oversimplified. The most voluble but least helpful are those critics who see the issue only in terms of black or white. Some contend that all mergers are bad. Exponents of this view are

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

anyone in this second group would concede that any proposed, highly profitable business merger could ever be potentially damaging to competition. From their point of view, most every merger strengthens competition few in number. Many more subscribe to the theory that all mergers are good. Certainly it would come as a decided shock if or is indispensable for technological progress.

It is sometimes convenient to forget, however, that normally news of strengthened competition is interpreted to mean lower profit margins and therefore a decline in stock market prices. How account then for the almost invariable increase in stock market prices when these so-called "competition strengthening" combinations occur?

Nor is it demonstrably true that the concentration of research expenditures in large firms results in important product and process innovations by these firms.[12] On the contrary there appears to be no necessary correlation between giant size and technological advance.[13]

Frequently, I am asked: What criteria determine whether a particular transaction would be in violation of the Celler-Kefauver act. A good starting point in my judgment is afforded by the House and Senate Committee reports on the bill. As these reports indicate, the act is addressed to situations in which large enterprises extend their power by successive small acquisitions. The cumulative effect of this process may be to convert an industry from one of intense competition among many enterprises, to one where 2 or 3 large concerns produce the entire supply.[14]

The law may be violated in other ways: by eliminating in whole or material part the competitive activity of an enterprise which has been a substantial factor in competition; by increasing the relative size of the enterprise making the acquisition to such a point that its advantage over its competitors threatens to be decisive; by unduly reducing the number of competing enterprises; or by establishing relationships between buyers and sellers which deprive their rivals of a fair opportunity to compete.

The Senate report summarizes the legislative objective in a few words: it is "to cope with monopolistic tendencies in their incipiency and well before they have attained such effects as would justify a Sherman Act proceeding."[16] In short, the necessary inference may be drawn if the future competitive effect may be shown to be adverse, even though the actual anticompetitive result cannot be demonstrated. This statement of legislative intent is important in resolving this basic question: What quantum of evidence is necessary to satisfy the test of illegality where a leading company in a market acquires a competing concern whose share of the market is likewise substantial?

Two approaches are possible. The first is to regard these facts alone as sufficient to support the inference of potential damage. The alternative is to open the door to a Sherman Act "rule of reason" type of inquiry. This means looking into all the economic factors including the competitive pattern of the industry as a whole and its markets, the acquiring company's market position, the market position of the acquired company, and the market position of its major competitors.

It is helpful to bear in mind that the new section 7 (Celler-Kefauver) test of illegality is identical with the test under other sections of the Clayton Act, section 3 for example. Both sections predicate illegality upon whether the "effect may be substantially to lessen competition." True, section 3 is focused upon exclusive dealing and requirement contracts, that is arrangements whereby sellers prevent their distributors from handling competitors' goods. But the point is that such arrangements have the same effect as mergers in shutting off part of the market to competition.

Indeed, comparatively speaking, a merger operates as a more basic restraint upon competition than control of distribution outlets. As one economist put it, "a set of requirement contracts are a loose and revocable form of association; they exclude from the market between the contracting parties all other parties for a limited period. A merger through the purchase of stock or assets is permanent, and excludes all others for good."[17]

These considerations alone would indicate that the tests used by the courts in construing the effects clause of section 3 should be persuasive in interpreting the same clause of section 7. In addition, the House Judiciary report on the new section 7 specifically points out that the tests of illegality "are intended to be similar to those which the courts have applied in interpreting the same language in other sections of the Clayton Act."[18]

In this context the Standard Stations[19] decision of the Supreme Court, handed down only 2 months before the House Judiciary report was published, takes on added importance. There the Court was called upon to construe the "effects" clause of section 3; it held that a system of exclusive dealing contracts employed by a leading company in the market and covering a segment of the market that is substantial, is illegal without more. In this view, it was unnecessary to consider evidence of the actual effects of these contracts or the economic justification for their use. This case makes it clear that to require proof that competition has actually diminished or to insist upon a general rule of reason inquiry into the effect of these exclusive supply contracts, would in the Court's words "be to stultify the force of Congress' declaration that requirement contracts are to be prohibited wherever their effect 'may be' to substantially lessen competition."[20]

I am aware that the Standard stations approach even in its own realm of exclusive dealing arrangements has been viewed with alarm by some commentators—the words "extreme, unsound, and insupportable in law or economics" have been used to characterize the decision.[21] By the same token, these commentators view with even greater alarm—they consider "catastrophic"—any doctrine that deviates from a rule of reason inquiry even in Clayton Act merger cases.[22] This view is apparently shared by the Federal Trade Commission as well, to judge from its decision in the Pillsbury case,[23] the first and only decision under the new Antimerger Act.

That case, it will be recalled, involved corporate acquisitions by Pillsbury Mills (the largest in the Southeast and the second largest in the Nation) of two substantial competitors. Although these transactions enabled Pillsbury to move into first place nationally in the mix market and to increase its leading share in the Southeast from about 23 percent to 45 percent, the Commission held, in an opinion written by former Chairman Howrey, that the Standard Stations decision had no application to the new antimerger law; instead the Commission said "there must be a case by case examination of all relevant economic factors in order to ascertain the probable economic consequences of corporate mergers and acquisitions."

I would make no secret of my sharp disagreement with the rationale the Commission developed in this case. Its line of reasoning, I believe, blurs the distinction between the Sherman Act and the Celler-Kefauver Act and weakens the Celler-Kefauver Act as an effective weapon for dealing with mergers. Consequently, the members of our Antitrust Subcommittee—and I think I may include the Department of Justice also—cannot go along with the Commission on this score. We believe, in contrast, that when a leading concern merges with an important competitor, an inference of potential danger to competition may be drawn without further inquiry. When the body economic suffers a severe paralytic stroke, it is scarcely credible that Congress desired treatment to be delayed while extended argument takes place as to whether the patient is in danger.[24]

Because of the scope and extent of economic evidence the Federal Trade Commission permitted, the Pillsbury case bids fair to become another *Jarndyce* v. *Jarndyce*. Over 2 years have already elapsed since the initial decision; I understand that evidence is still being taken and that the end is nowhere in sight. If a final adjudication takes place in the courts less than 4 years from now, I would be greatly surprised. The possibility of restoring the competitive situation and providing adequate relief will certainly have disappeared too, since by this time the assets of the combined firms have become thoroughly commingled. This makes the task of unscrambling them a virtual impossibility.

If force and effect is to be given the congressional intent, the Commission must, of course, reexamine its Pillsbury doctrine at the first opportunity. It must also make it clear that it is not conducting extensive economic investigations for the purpose of adding to the general fund of knowledge—as it seems to be doing now.

I should not want this disagreement construed as personal criticism. As a matter of fact, I have the highest regard for former Chairman Howrey, for Judge Gwynne, the present Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and for Judge Barnes, who heads the Antitrust Division.

Beyond that, as our antitrust subcommittee pointed out, merger enforcement activity has been seriously hampered by lack of funds. It is highly gratifying, therefore, that the subcommittee's recommendation that the Congress grant substantial increases to the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission for merger work, has been incorporated in the President's budget message, in terms of a specific request for a 25 percent increase in funds for the Federal Trade Commission to be used solely for this purpose.

Apart from an increase in funds, 5 years of experience in administering the Celler-Kefauver Act have demonstrated a need for additional statutory authorization in order to improve enforcement procedures. To begin with, a needed amendment is one that would make mandatory the advance notification and reporting of mergers involving larger concerns. The Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission now learn of proposed or pending mergers by scanning financial periodicals, trade journals and other publications. Needless to say, this is a horse-and-buggy procedure. Many important mergers may be consummated without adequate or timely notice in the press. Furthermore, there is a drain on the energy and funds of the Government agencies in order to compile economic data in the face of a contemplated merger, to determine whether a full-scale investigation should be undertaken.

While I am not wedded to the form a bill should take, I am strongly in favor of premerger notification and reporting legislation, covering corporations whose combined as-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

sets exceed $10 million. They should be required to file notice of the proposal with the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, 90 days in advance of the transaction. An additional provision should require the companies to furnish the enforcement agencies with such information as they may request. This would not be a particular burden on the companies since the data necessary would be of a type that is readily available to them.

To avoid any possible confusion, let me make it clear that none of the bills being considered by our committee would require proposed mergers to be cleared or approved in advance by Government agencies. That is not the purpose of premerger notification and reporting provisions .

There is also need, I believe, for a corollary amendment that would give the Federal Trade Commission authority, similar to that now in the hands of the Attorney General, to seek a preliminary court injunction restraining consummation of any corporate merger pending final adjudication. This would preserve the status quo until the merger legality was determined.

For the past week our Antitrust Subcommittee has held hearings on three bills dealing with these special problems, one sponsored by Representative PATMAN and two by myself. Representative KEATING also introduced a bill dealing with premerger notification and reporting.

With the support of organizations such as yours, I am extremely hopeful that appropriate legislation can and will be enacted during this session of the Congress.

It would be well to understand the significance of the intensive acceleration of mergers. What is at stake here is the economic vitality of our country itself.

---

[1] See statement of Jack T. Jennings, Cooperative League of the U. S. A., January 18, 1956, hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 6748, 7229, and 8332, 84th Cong. 2d sess., verbatim transcript, p. 104.

[2] The Merger Movement in the Textile Industry. A staff report to the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary (1955), p. 32.

[3] During the period from 1940 to 1954, acquiring corporations with assets over $50 million accounted for about 29 percent of all mergers. In 1955, over 33 percent of the mergers completed involved corporations having assets of over $50 million. By way of contrast, acquisitions by corporations under $1 million dropped from approximately 12 percent in the 1940–54 period to 1.8 percent in 1955. Statement of John W. Gwynne, Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, January 16, 1956, hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 6748, 7229, and 8332, 84th Cong. 2d sess., verbatim transcript, p. 45.

[4] Stocking The Attorney General's Committee's Report: The Businessman's Guide Through Antitrust, 44 Georgetown Law Journal, 13.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Sixth annual report of the Senate Committee on Small Business (1955), p. 3.

[7] Federal Trade Commission report on corporate mergers and acquisitions (1955).

[8] See statement of Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, January 18, 1956, hearings before Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary on H. R. 6748, 7229, and 8332, 84th Congress, 2nd session. Verbatim transcript, p. 73.

[9] 64 Stat. 1125; Public Law 899, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950); 15 U. S. C., sec. 18.

[10] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 6–8.

[11] Ibid.

[12] See statement of Dr. Edwin B. George, director, department of economics, Dun & Bradstreet, hearings before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, January 1955 Economic Report of the President, 84th Cong., 1st sess., p. 509.

[13] See Adams, Monopoly in America (1955).

[14] S. Rept. No. 1775, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950), pp. 4–5.

[15] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong. 2d sess. (1949), p. 8.

[17] Adelman, Proceedings of the American Bar Association, section of antitrust law, August 26–27, 1953, p. 113.

[18] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong. 1st sess. (1949), p. 8.

[19] *United States* v. *Standard Oil Co. of Calif.* (337 U. S. 310 (1949)).

[20] Supra, p. 313. In the *Standard Fashion Co.* v. *Magrane-Houston Co.* (258 U. S. 346 (1922)), the High Court held that section 3 of the Clayton act was transgressed by exclusive dealing arrangements between a pattern manufacturer and retail establishments, upon a showing without more that the manufacturer controlled about two-fifths of the pattern outlets of the country. The Court rejected arguments advocating a broad Sherman Act type rule of reason inquiry into economic consequences which, it was urged, was necessary to ascertain the actual effects of the exclusive arrangement.

[21] See for example Handler, Monopolies, Mergers, and Markets: A New Focus, trade regulation symposium, trade regulation committee, Federal Bar Association, 1954, pp. 33–34. One argument usually made by these commentators is that the House Judiciary report on the Celler-Kefauver bill "approved" *International Shoe Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (280 U. S. 291 (1930)). That case involved a merger of two leading shoe manufacturers who, according to the Court, did not substantially compete with each other in more than 5 percent of the relevant markets. The Court refused to hold the transaction illegal under old section 7, for the reason among others, that the companies were not in substantial competition with each other. In the opinion of the Court section 7 dealt with such acquisitions as probably will result in lessening competition to a substantial degree—that is, to such a degree as will seriously injure the public. The decision obliterated the distinction between the Sherman and Clayton Acts test of illegality. See *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (282 Fed. 81 (1922)), *United States* v. *Republic Steel Corp.* (11 Fed. Supp. 117 (1935)). See also Schwartz, *Potential Impairment of Competition* (98 U. Pa. Law Review 33 (1949)).

While it is correct that the House Judiciary report cited International Shoe (H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 7) the reason is quite different than that suggested by some of the critics to whom I am referring. The report cited the case to make it clear that the Celler-Kefauver bill would not make illegal mergers between small companies, which afford greater competition to large companies. The context in which the discussion of International Shoe occurs indicates that since direct competition between the two companies involved in International Shoe was not substantial, the case could be regarded for illustrative purposes as analogous to a merger between small companies. That the House Judiciary Committee hardly intended to have its bill merely duplicate the Sherman Act is plain from the report which states that "it is not the purpose of this committee to recommend duplication of existing legislation."

Any lingering doubts about this were put to rest by the later Senate report on the bill (S. Rept. No. 1775, 81st Cong., 2d sess. (1950)). The Senate committee commented on the "tendency of the courts in cases under (old section 7) to revert to the Sherman Act test" (p. 4), and stated that it wished "to make it clear that the bill is not intended to revert to the Sherman Act test." The Senate report contains a sharp reminder that "the intent here as in other parts of the Clayton Act, is to cope with monopolistic tendencies in their incipiency and well before they have attained such effects as would justify a Sherman Act proceeding" (pp. 4–5). Also the report noted that "a requirement of certainty and actuality of injury to competition is incompatible with any effort to supplement the Sherman Act by reading incipient restraints" (p. 6).

Those who insist on inflexible application of the rule of reason under the new act, it may be concluded, would not only ignore the congressional mandate, but favor standards that are all but indistinguishable from those of the Sherman Act. The ultimate result of such logic would be to render the new act a dead letter for all practical purposes.

[22] Ibid.

[23] In the Matter of Pillsbury Mills, FTC Docket 6000, December 28, 1953.

[24] In order that there be no misunderstanding about my position, let me make it clear that if the merging concerns are not leading ones, a rule of reason type of inquiry may be entirely appropriate even though the volume of trade affected is quantitatively substantial. But that is not the kind of situation to which I am now addressing myself.

Politics, Writers, and Artists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting address was given by the Honorable Carmine G. DeSapio, secretary of state of the State of New York, before the Dutch Treat Club of New York City at a luncheon on January 17, 1956:

POLITICS, WRITERS, AND ARTISTS

It is a great pleasure for me to visit with the members and friends of the Dutch Treat Club. I very much appreciate this opportunity to join with you today, although I must confess that I am not a little apprehensive about addressing such an audience. You people—with your words, your music, your drawings—with the art which you create and the culture which you inspire, give really articulate expression to the times in which we live, and to the history which each exciting new day makes.

You are the people who not only interpret public thinking, but to a very large degree, shape public opinion. And for the most part, you are the vigilantes of good government, at the same time that you are the barometers of the public attitude.

I haven't had sufficient time to check the enrollments of all those present here this afternoon, but on the rare chance that there may be a few Republicans in the audience, I will exercise the utmost restraint and try to keep my comments on as nonpartisan a level as possible.

It is not very easy, these days, to determine just why people become involved in the efforts and activities of one of the major political parties as against the other. I would guess that for the most part, the se-

lection of a party or dedication to its work, is the result of little more than pure chance. I have never researched the matter, but it is my feeling that most of us originally became Democrats because our parents were Democrats; or Republicans because our friends or neighbors were Republicans.

Certainly, there is no question that millions of people vote other than a straight party ticket, and other millions change their political allegiance from election to election. For as issues change, as platforms adjust themselves to the new problems of new eras, so too do the votes of large groups of American citizens change. The farmer, more often than not, votes as a farmer, and supports that party which he feels represents his best interests as a farmer. The same is true of city workers, professionals, union leaders, businessmen, and most other segments of our population. And I suppose, when you get down to basics, that is why both parties try to sell their programs to as large a cross section of the American electorate as possible. And if it so happens that one of the parties, philosophically or even traditionally should happen to lean more sympathetically to one group in our population than to another, you may be sure that that party will make every effort to conceal the fact, at the same time that the opposing party makes every effort to proclaim it.

This, my friends, is where you, you who mold public opinion, have a unique and a rare opportunity. Your interests need not be partisan. Your efforts need not be aimed at the achievement of particular election results. Yours is the happy and constructive lot of being able to call the turns as you see them, without regard for political consequences.

Nor does this mean to suggest that politicians necessarily are completely selfish and biased. For although it is quite true that to the politician, winning the election is paramount, it is equally true that with very rare exception, the American politician is as patriotically devoted to his country as any good American would want to be.

But I would be the first to admit that politicians are perfectly fallible, and that our political parties are nothing more nor less than the men and women who constitute them—just as government is nothing more nor less than a reflection of the programs and the attitudes of the political parties in office.

And I suppose, that so long as there is politics, and so long as there are political parties, there will be axes to grind and there will be biased views. There will be arguments and debate. There will be praise and vilification. There will be applause and derision. There will be accolade and insult. There will be confusion and contradiction.

But it is also true that so long as there are opposing political parties, America will be great and strong.

We have witnessed a strange phenomenon in American politics in recent years—one which was brought into dramatic focus the other day, by the President's state of the Union message. For in that message, was defined what is at least an expressed acknowledgment on the part of the Republican Party of the need for social legislation and for recognition of the responsibility of Government to help those who are unable to help themselves.

I have heard many people in both parties characterize the President's state of the Union message as "New Deal" both in tone and in aim, and as being in keeping with what has long been the democratic philosophy of government. And in the absence of any evident rebellion from such Republican stalwarts as Senators JENNER, GOLDWATER, CAPEHART, and BRICKER, it is fair to conclude that the President set forth the new policy of the Grand Old Party. When you review this message in the light of statements of principles which have been made by the Republican legislative leaders in New York, and by other Republican spokesmen throughout the country, you must come to the conclusion that if the Republicans haven't actually accepted a program of liberal government, they at least believe that this is what the people want.

Now you and I know that our country can never be the long-term beneficiary of the kind of campaign strategy in which both parties seek to out-promise each other. And we know too, that the two-party system loses much of its strength and meaning if both parties claim to seek the same thing, differing only on the question as to who could accomplish them quicker and better.

Our security as a Nation—indeed, the very safeguarding of our liberty—depends upon the acknowledgement and forthright declaration that there are fundamental differences between the two parties—differences in psychology, in philosophy, in tradition, in approach, in ideas and in objective.

Now I don't mean to suggest that the Democrats should claim a monopoly on social reform, any more than the Republicans have a right to claim a monopoly on sound economics. I don't believe that either party has an exclusive franchise on sincerity, on integrity, or on dedication.

But I do believe that the character of our governments—whether local, State, or Federal—should be appraised in terms of their achievements; as well as in terms of the history, the backgrounds and the philosophies of the men who administer these governments to say nothing of the tradition of the particular party in office.

And just as honest debate and vocal difference of opinion is necessary to the preservation of our system of government, so is it extremely dangerous to take the myopic view, if you are a Democrat, that everything the Republicans do should be attacked, or if you are a Republican, that everything the Democrats do should be ridiculed.

Changing times bring changing challenges and different needs. No party, no system, no government can survive the determination to stand still either in reflection on the glories of the past, or in fear of new experiments. We have no choice but to move forward, for it is impossible to stand still in today's moving world. Static thinking has no place in a dynamic era, and certainly not in the age of the atom.

You are the last people in the world I need remind that we stand on the precipice of disaster. But, by the same token, we stand too, on the threshold of new wonder, of new glory, of new advancement. For just as the atom is an awesome force of destruction, so too, is it a wondrous source of creation. And which of these it shall be, depends entirely on the decisions which are made in the next few years.

It is perfectly true—and has been true through the ages—that the people are possessed of infinite wisdom. They need only to be armed with the facts, to give expression to their inherent sense of humanity and to their natural instinct for being correct. This truism poses for you, my good friends—you who are gathered in this room today, together with your counterparts throughout the country—a responsibility of incalculable magnitude.

The people read your writings and are influenced by what you say. They listen to your analyses and they accept your authority. They study your pictures and drawings, and their judgments are formed. They look to you—as leaders in the arts—for objective guidance for accurate portrayal and for honest leadership.

Whether or not the people obtain these, is for your own consciences to decide. From politicians they get—as they expect—partisan propaganda. From the newspapers, from magazines, from radio, from television they expect—and should get—the unvarnished; the uncolored truth.

When the politician guesses incorrectly—when he fails to anticipate and understand the people's wishes—his mistake becomes graphically evident on election day. He is then faced with 1 or 2 alternatives. He can invite disaster for himself by seeking to impose his thinking on the people and hope to have better luck next time, or he can adjust his policies and his program to conform to the voter's wishes.

But he cannot lure public interest with a dramatic presentation which subtly conveys a particular viewpoint. He cannot attract an audience to his thinking through comic strips or entertaining columns, or because he is a needed and necessary source of information on what is going on in the world. The politician cannot reach the voter every day with a cartoon that carries both interest and impact.

He is limited to the distribution of partisan literature, or to the delivery of partisan speeches. And he is almost always dependent upon you people to help get his message to the public. He can never hope to get into the homes and the minds and the hearts of the people every day—as you do—and even if he could, the chances are his message would be one-sided and slanted.

Now the question presents itself: Are the editors and writers and commentators and artists to deny themselves the same right to human thought and emotion with which the politician should like everyone to believe he is possessed? Don't they have ideas and tastes and individuality of thought and opinion? The answer obviously, is yes. But they have one other thing—they have an overbearingly profound responsibility as teachers of the people.

My friends, would you tolerate the partisan teaching of our children in the schools? And I ask, Aren't the people of letters, in fact the teachers of history, in the classroom of the world?

Needless to say, it would be sheer folly to deny the right of editorial expression to any American, least of all to a person in the arts. But in your case, there is an added—an awesome—responsibility. It is for you to dispel confusion. It is for you to fulfill the right of the American people to know all of the facts—to know where they have been; where they are; and where they are going.

There is a distinction between exposition and explanation, as against interpretation and opinion. There is a world of difference between stating the facts and then expressing a judgment; and misstating or misemphasizing the facts in order to prove a judgment.

President Eisenhower, Governor Harriman, Mayor Wagner, and other public officials everywhere will tell you how difficult it is to attract outstanding men and women to public service. The salaries are low; the hours are long; the work is hard. And instead of honor and respect and appreciation for their sacrifices, they live in constant fear of attack and vilification. Leonard Hall and Paul Butler—and party leaders throughout the country—know how difficult it is to attract men and women to political activity, because the politician too often is depicted as a sinister, evil disciple of corruption and greed.

And yet, where would America be, where would the world be without politics, without men and women who recognize that it is not enough for a citizen merely to cast his ballot, but rather that it is the duty of every citizen to be a part of and an influence upon his party and its decisions? And just as our bad public officials, and bad politicians, and bad businessmen, and bad labor leaders, and bad newspapermen should be exposed and turned out of positions of trust, so too, should no group be maligned; no segment of our society be forced to carry the cross of the minority of maldoers in its particular field.

I would strip the halo from the hypocrites, and I would strip the mask from the phonies. But to condemn a politician or a party, either because of the wrongdoings of a few, or by the application of ancient history, is to condemn our American system of government.

I hope you will pardon the probable presumptuousness of what I say, and understand that when I suggest that some of those who have the responsibility for disseminating public knowledge may not be doing so with complete fairness, I allude to a small minority, the kind of minority which exists in my profession, as well as in yours, and in all others.

But I feel, as you must, that there is no place for politics as usual in these perilous times. Our children, their children, and their descendants for generations to come will never forgive the mistakes we make today, assuming that those mistakes do not foreclose the existence of future generations.

It is as unsound as it is precarious for our teachers—for you—to take the view, in January of 1956, that whoever the Republicans nominate should be defeated, or that whoever the Democrats nominate will be no good. It is, rather, for all of us—Republicans and Democrats alike—to agree on one simple principle, and that is that the most vital responsibility which both parties owe to America and to the world, is to nominate the best possible candidates for the overwhelming important office of President.

My friends, if both parties put forward the best possible candidates, the people will win the election.

And, although, as partisans, it is our privilege—if not our duty—to believe in the party of our choice; to believe in its program; to believe in its leaders and to believe in its heritage, it is our first duty as Americans, to safeguard the welfare of our country.

The election campaign which we approach will be unprecedented in many ways, not the least of which will be in enthusiasm on the one hand, and in bitterness on the other. I am sure that none of us need fear the consequences of the campaign in terms of the future of our world position, because history has proved that every free election makes every democracy so much the stronger, at the same time that it brings to the world a new lesson in the meaning of freedom.

But we can dramatize this lesson at the same time that we render great public service by assuring that the people will hear all sides of all questions in free and frank discussion.

In modern times, the complexion and character of election campaigns have changed to the point where both parties are very largely dependent upon radio and television for reaching the voters with their messages.

You people know better than I, how expensive this is. I read recently where the Republican Party has budgeted more than $8 million for radio and television alone, and this naturally places a similar onus on the Democratic Party, for it too, must seek to reach the same number of people, the same number of times. Where do these vast sums of money come from? Obviously from the contributions of party supporters. And, needless to say, many of those who make substantial contributions to the party of their choice, expect to benefit in some manner. This benefit may be in the nature of an appointment to the cabinet or in some other form of favor and recognition.

The extent to which a political party is beholden to large contributors is the very extent of the weakness of our governmental structure. And that is why it may be well for us to consider the advisability of consolidating a large part of the public service time, which our radio and television networks so generously apportion throughout the year, to the period of an important campaign. The less money the party feels compelled to spend, the less it will depend on large contributions and the more it can appeal to the general public for support. No person has the right to buy, and no group has the right to own a political party. No political leader should be beholden to a contributor, because our political parties belong only to the people and not to any individual or group of individuals. And assuring this too, my friends, becomes your responsibility, as well as the responsibility of our political leaders.

I thank you for your patience and courtesy. I thank you, too, for your gracious invitation to join with you today. You will pardon me, I am sure, if I was somewhat partisan, but I don't think you would expect me to be otherwise. It is on two-party partisanship that our Nation grew strong. And it is on awareness and enlightenment that our Nation will grow even stronger.

Who Made the Money on Your Hogs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY W. WIER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include items from two publications, one from the Farm Journal, a Pew publication of Philadelphia, Pa., and the other from the Packinghouse Worker of Chicago, Ill., both being issues of January 1956.

For some time back the consumers have been wondering when they are going to get the benefit of the lower prices the farmers have been "enjoying" the past 3 years. The article from the Farm Journal at least indicates where some of it is going. It will be of further interest when we learn that what the chainstores take out of the cut as they, too, are now in the packing business as well as retail distribution.

Of course, the Farm Journal could hardly be expected to discuss any problem of economics without taking a crack at labor. They do not give any percentages as to the added percentage returned to labor. They just generalize, which perhaps is better to serve their needs. They represent a philosophy that must convince the consumers in the cities that the farmer with his price supports is the cause of their high cost of living. In turn the farmer must be convinced that his difficulties arise from the "exorbitant" rise of labor's wage.

No doubt this will be more noticeable from now on until November. There will be no figures on a percentage on labor return as over 1953 or 1954, neither will there be any on the percentage increase on the productivity of labor through automation. For that reason I am requesting the permission to insert both articles.

The article from the Farm Journal follows:

WHO MADE THE MONEY ON YOUR HOGS?

Hog prices in 1955 skidded to the lowest level in 14 years—while the margin between farm hog prices and retail pork prices ballooned to the highest levels on record. Beef margins also widened. We now have better figures on who got the money.

Remember "Who's Making the Money on Your Hogs?" in December Farm Journal? Dean Wolf reported that organized labor all along the line was doing considerably better, but he had trouble learning just how well packers and meat counters were doing.

This will help complete the picture—now that six major packing companies have reported earnings to their stockholders (however, all their earnings aren't made on meat):

Swift & Co.: Sales tonnage reached a new high; net income topped $22 million—a 20 percent increase over 1954.

Armour & Co.; Net is $10.1 million—5½ times more than in 1954.

Wilson & Co.: Declared its first dividend on common stock since 1952. Last year it cleared $3.1 million; is expected to clear more than $4 million for 1955.

Cudahy Packing Co.: Net earnings in 1955—$2.7 million—are the highest since 1950.

Geo. A. Hormel & Co.: Dollar sales hit a new record; net earnings reached $3.7 million—more than double a year earlier.

John Morrell & Co.: Sales up considerably; net reached $2.7 million—an increase of more than 4 times over last year.

"Some of the companies didn't do very well in 1954," reports an observer close to the scene, "but they did a great deal better in 1955."

It's still too early to know how the food chains did last year, but they'll be reporting earnings soon. Their meat counters account for about a fourth of their volume.

The Packinghouse Worker article follows:

COMING SOON: THE FULLY AUTOMATED SAUSAGE

We have seen plenty of mechanization already. What we are about to see is automation.

What's the difference? To put it as simply as possible, when machines start running the regular machines—that's automation.

The question is, what about the people? It has been tough enough to struggle with the problems tossed in our laps when a single new machine comes along, a wienie peeler for example. How big will the headache be when the wienie peeler is hitched into a series of machines to run product straight from the sausage grinder, through the stuffer, the smokehouse, and on past the packaging units directly to the shipping room?

The only operator left will be the person who pushes the button marked "franks" or the one marked "salami."

MEAT INSTITUTE

All this was discussed very pointedly at the most recent session of the American Meat Institute. Some 6,500 of our bosses were there to trade ideas and get "hep" to the very latest.

As a result of a speech by C. E. Evanson, one of the country's leading engineers specializing in automation, you may be sure that your own plant superintendent is looking at his sausage room and his entire smoked meat operation with a new light in his eyes.

"Today, any company can have an automated kitchen," said Evanson. At the same time he warned his listeners that "the non-automated plants will be the 'also-rans,' getting the crumbs left over from the more efficiently run organizations, constantly combatting uncontrollable seasonable ups-and-downs, and living from one period of layoffs to another."

Evanson laid it on the line to the industry monguls. "It readily becomes apparent," he said, "that the companies which automate first have the best opportunity to get

the lion's share of our expanding market. They will be the ones who will have the greater sales potentials through increased production, improved quality, reduced cost and stabilized employment."

Getting down to cases, Evanson plunged into a practical discussion of the automation possibilities in meat packing, scolding the industry as he did so for being asleep, so far, to its biggest opportunities.

"When one outside your field sees what other companies and other industries are doing in automation—companies which do not have the volume, do not have the assured markets, or the stable product which you people are so fortunate to have—it becomes difficult for many of us in automation engineering to understand why your great industry does not do more in the field of automation," Evanson said.

AUTOMATIC CONTROLS

Every sausage department has a diversified range of products, different products, different formulas, and different operations. These problems can dismay the uninitiated who have not encountered and surmounted similar problems in similar industries, but once the various formulas have been developed and have been based upon factors which can be measured, then it does not matter how many formulas you have or what balance of ingredients you use, because whatever the balance requires, you have a formula for it.

Controls developed for your processing will enable you to produce your product according to your formula more positively and more consistently than with any skilled operator. In other words, you use the skill and experience once to develop the formula and formulation.

From then on you allow the equipment to do the work and use the controls to see that the equipment adheres to the process. The same principle applies all along the production line. When certain formulas need more time for cooking or require different temperatures, the equipment is preset at the same time at which the formula was decided upon. Once established the equipment maintains its setting through feed-back control.

PUNCHED CARD

Today, any company can have an automated kitchen. The only limitation to automatic continuous processing is the present status of the stuffing operation. As you know, a great deal of time and effort is being put forth currently to develop a casing which can be fed and stuffed continuously and automatically.

When this is accomplished the manufacture of sausage will be completely automated from the beginning of the kitchen operation through the packaging because automatic means already have been developed for linking, handling, weighing, and packaging the product.

With proper electrical and electronic controls, the sausage maker who produces relatively small quantities of various sausage can be automated as efficiently as the larger producer who manufactures one type of sausage on each production line. Just as electrical test circuits can be changed instantaneously by inserting a punched card into a reader in place of a differently punched card, so can the smaller sausage kitchen, which has many small runs of different formulas, change from one formula to another.

Each card represents a formula and process, which, when used, carries the product through its particular operations and controls the formula, weight, temperature, and time, etc. Naturally, a different card is required for dry sausage than, for example, for domestic sausage.

AUTOMATING BACON

It is not necessary that a product be a fluid or semifluid to be adaptable for automation. Neither is it necessary that a product be completely uniform. As another example of how a product can be automated, consider the nonuniform bacon belly. Instead of cured bellies being weighed and segregated manually, hung on hooks manually, hung on trees and pushed into smokehouses manually, pushed into coolers manually, allowed to take up valuable space while being cooled, loaded into presses manually, transferred to slicers manually, separated into groups manually, graded manually, weighed manually, and wrapped and packed manually, in the not too distant future a line will be unveiled which will segregate the bellies according to weight automatically, transport them through the automatic smokehouse and into a quick chill unit.

From the quick chill unit they will be transferred automatically to a press and without the aid of human hands will proceed directly through the slicing operations. The slices will be counted automatically and weighed automatically. Finally, the drafts will be packaged and packed automatically.

It is anticipated that an automatic line will produce 2 to 3 times as much as what is known today as a standard bacon production line. More than 2 full days of production time will be saved in the process. Finally, and perhaps most important, a closer control and a more uniform and higher quality product will be produced from such a line because the product is no longer subject to the vagaries of human inefficiency and disinterest.

Naturally, a program of this type is not put into operation overnight. It is done step by step, but as each step is installed, it is installed according to the preconceived overall plan. A program such as this costs money, a good deal of money, but actually it costs absolutely nothing. It costs nothing because the savings in waste, the improvement in quality, the upgrading of the product, and the greater production per unit of labor add up to additional profit which will pay for the initial investment many times over. In some instances, an automated line can pay for itself in less than a year. In any case, a well-conceived, thought-through, and properly planned program of automation will pay for itself in 2, 3, or 4 years.

Actually in many cases it costs more not to automate because any plant or department within a plant which can be automated and is not is paying for automation without receiving the benefits of automation. With automation less space is required per unit of product produced, less inventory in process is required, less labor per unit of product is required, less spoilage, and less waste per unit is encountered. With automation you will have a higher quality, more uniform product, less arduous work for the employees, lower costs and better control over your entire production process.

Second Hoover Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a resolution adopted by the directors of the New Hampshire Junior Chamber of Commerce submitted to me by Mr. Charles L. Manos, of Claremont, N. H., secretary of the New Hampshire Junior Chamber of Commerce, in support of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BIPARTISAN EFFORTS OF THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

Whereas the efficient and economical conduct of governmental affairs is vitally important to the maintenance of our American tradition of free self-government; and

Whereas the first bipartisan Commission of Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover report) made a study of Government (1947–49) which resulted in many important improvements and economies in Federal operations; and

Whereas the bipartisan new Hoover Commission, created by Congress in 1953, has completed a 2-year study of the Federal Government and has submitted a report containing specific recommendations for reducing waste and duplication, increasing efficiency, and eliminating needless Government competition with private business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the directors, of the New Hampshire Junior Chamber of Commerce assembled this 11th day of December 1955, endorse and command the objectives of the Hoover Commission and urge the administration and Congress to work together, on a bipartisan basis, toward prompt and full consideration of the recommendations of the Commission.

I would like to commend Mr. Manos and the members of the New Hampshire Chamber of Commerce for the efforts they have expended in this connection, and their work at a grassroots level to obtain better government. Their action is but one of a number of indications in my State of New Hampshire of a growing awareness of the continuing need for efficiency and economy in government.

Proposal for Establishment of a Military Airbase in Northeastern Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, at a time when all of us are striving to save Federal funds I am greatly concerned about a Defense Department proposal for a new Air Reserve base in northeastern Ohio which would, it seems to me, constitute a sizable waste of funds.

I am advised the Navy is surveying 2 or 3 sites in the Cleveland-Canton-Akron area with a view to building a new base for Air Reserve activities. This is a proposal that was abandoned last year by the Air Force. My concern arises from the fact that adequate facilities for both services could be made available with a small expenditure to enlarge Akron-Canton Airport, thus saving for the

taxpayers most of the $15 to $20 millions a new base would cost.

Under unanimous consent, I include herewith a letter on this subject from the chairman of the Akron-Canton Airport Agency, Mr. C. Blake McDowell, Sr., of Akron:

AKRON-CANTON AIRPORT,
January 17, 1956.

United States Representative FRANK T. BOW,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BOW: In view of conflicting announcements made last week by United States Representative M. J. KIRWAN, of Youngstown, and United States Representative W. H. AYRES, of Akron, relative to the establishment of a military air base in northeastern Ohio, we, the members of the Akron-Canton Airport Agency, request that more serious consideration be given to the Navy using existing facilities.

Representative KIRWAN announced January 12 that the Navy base will be constructed in the Youngstown vicinity.

Representative AYRES said January 13 that the base will be built in Medina County.

After careful and arduous scrutiny of both proposals, we would like to say once again that a new airbase anywhere in northeastern Ohio seems highly illogical.

As you know, Ohio is the crossroads of all cross-country air traffic, both military and civilian. The Civil Aeronautics Administraton is greatly disturbed about the high density of air traffic between Akron, Youngstown, and Cleveland. A separate new air base anywhere in the proposed locations will result in causing an already hazardous air traffic control problem to become even worse.

We point out that the Navy's existing air reserve training facilities are located at Akron Municipal Airport, only 7 miles north of Akron-Canton Airport.

Akron-Canton was built at a cost of $2,500,000 under the Federal Government's development of landing areas for national defense program. That program was designed to provide facilities for joint use of the Navy, Air Force, and commercial and civil aviation.

Only a portion of the 1,172 acres owned by Akron-Canton is now in use. There is adequate acreage for military development for the Navy's proposed program, and more than enough land to meet any other military and civil air needs in the foreseeable future.

The present number of aircraft movements at Akron-Canton Airport utilize only a small percentage of our total air traffic potential.

Poor weather conditions which frequently force other airports to close are practically non-existent at Akron-Canton due to its ideal location and elevation.

More than 1 million people live within a 35-mile radius of Akron-Canton, which provides a large pool from which the Navy could draw its reserve personnel.

The major cities in this area and the Ohio Highway Department are in the process of building a network of super highways that will cut in half the amount of driving time from these cities to Akron-Canton Airport.

When the freeways are completed, Akron and Canton will be only 15 minutes from the bicounty airport. Cleveland and Youngstown will be only a 1 hour's drive.

We also feel that if the Navy base is established at our airport, it will not only help the military's national defense program but will be of valuable assistance to commercial aviation serving the residents in this area.

It would provide a runway development program the communities otherwise could not afford and at the same time open new avenues for industrial growth.

With the addition of the Navy here, it would become possible to obtain navigational safety aids, including surveillance radar and high intensity approach and runway lighting, which normally would not be provided by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for civil operations alone.

The payroll of military personnel and goods they would use here, would also bolster the area's economy. The communities would benefit from any capital improvements made at Akron-Canton by the Navy.

Announcements concerning the establishment of a new Navy base near Youngstown or in Medina County have implied that the Navy would spend only $4 million for the air base.

However, since you are familiar with rising construction costs, you can readily see that before the proposed base was completed it would entail an expenditure of ten to fifteen million dollars. On the other hand, the only expenditure that would be necessary for the Navy to move in at Akron-Canton would be to expand the present runway system and construct the buildings, which would amount to only a fraction of the cost proposed for a separate airbase.

The Government, as we pointed out before, already has spent $2½ million, when construction costs were much lower, to develop Akron-Canton Airport.

It would be folly, indeed, to construct a separate Navy airbase, inasmuch as our Federal officials, including the military branches, have said they are trying to reduce defense spending where it is possible to balance the national budget.

We believe that since adequate existing facilities are available to the Navy here at Akron-Canton Airport it would be unfeasible, illogical, and impracticable for the Federal Government to squander taxpayers' money for an unneeded airbase in northeastern Ohio.

Thanking you for your consideration and cooperation in this matter, we remain,

Respectfully yours,
AKRON-CANTON AIRPORT AGENCY,
C. BLAKE MCDOWELL, Sr.,
Chairman.

Tribute to the Los Angeles Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a resolution in behalf of many of my colleagues of the California delegation in the House of Representatives in tribute to the Los Angeles Times on the occasion of its 75th anniversary. The resolution follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE LOS ANGELES TIMES

Whereas for three-quarters of a century the splendid progressive journalism exemplified by the Los Angeles Times has been a strong influence for the common good in the city and county of Los Angeles and that influence has indeed extended into the State of California and the Nation; and

Whereas the Los Angeles Times has throughout its history shown the vigor of American enterprise, independence, and courage in maintaining the standards of a free press: Therefore be it

Resolved by the undersigned members of the California delegation in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, That they extend their congratulations and best wishes to the Los Angeles Times on this, its 75th anniversary, wishing it continuing prosperity and influence in the lives of the people of Los Angeles, Calif., and the Nation.

CARL HINSHAW, 20th District; HARRY R. SHEPPARD, 27th District; CECIL R. KING, 17th District; JOHN PHILLIPS, 29th District; LEROY JOHNSON, 11th District; CLAIR ENGLE, 2d District; GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, 15th District; JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., 7th District; HUBERT B. SCUDDER, 1st District; PAT HILLINGS, 25th District; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, 9th District; W. S. MAILLIARD, 4th District; EDGAR W. HIESTAND, 21st District; JAMES B. UTT, 28th District; CHARLES S. GUBSER, 10th District; JOE HOLT, 22d District; CRAIG HOSMER, 18th District; BOB WILSON, 30th District; GLEN LIPSCOMB, 24th District; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, 13th District; JOHN F. BALDWIN, 6th District; DONALD L. JACKSON, 16th District.

Repeal or Renovate the Present Tax Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am today inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a newspaper article from the Roanoke World-News, Roanoke, Va., which reports on a speech made by Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, who just recently resigned as Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service. I think it is worthy of note that Mr. Andrews is speaking out against our present income tax laws as being complicated, confusing, and incomprehensible to the average citizen, and "probably should be repealed."

This is extremely interesting to me, since I remember so well that the 1954 Internal Revenue Code was passed by Republicans and was hailed by them as a great simplification of the tax law. This praise of the 1954 code came not only from Republican Members of Congress, but also from Administration officials, including Mr. Andrews' former boss, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey. Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their majority report on this bill, described it as including "a rearrangement of the provisions to place them in more logical sequence, the deletion of obsolete material, and an attempt to express the Internal Revenue laws in a more understandable manner."

In accordance with this newspaper account, Mr. Andrews, in referring to the fact that the present administration tried hard to simplify the tax laws in the 1954 code, states "but they didn't accomplish their objective."

It is most interesting to me that the man who was Commissioner of Internal Revenue at the time this code was being written should now describe it in such terms. His feelings about the 1954 code certainly could not be the result of any new discoveries he has made since he left the Service on November 30, 1955.

If Mr. Andrews felt that the 1954 code was such a complicated piece of legislation why did he not let his views be known to us on the Committee on Ways and Means and to the Senate Committee on Finance? We would have been delighted to have him present his views on the subject.

I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of my reaction and that of the Democratic Members on the Committee on Ways and Means to the 1954 code, which you will find in our minority report thereon. After pointing out in our report that the staffs of the Treasury Department and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation spent over 2 years preparing recommendations for the bill, we stated:

In contrast, the committee deliberated on this bill for only one month and a half. In our opinion, such a complete overhauling as this, involving the most complicated laws which the Congress has ever written, would require at least 1 year to fully understand the change proposed and to intelligently approve existing law as being as nearly perfect as it can be made.

We frankly admit that we do not fully understand or comprehend many of the changes proposed in the bill. Many tax lawyers spend their entire lives keeping posted on certain narrow fields of taxes. In many instances, we were not even given a draft of the proposed changes in the law until the committee began considering them.

We fear, that, in the hasty manner in which this most complicated legislation has been handled, we will have to spend many weeks straightening out the law in the future, if the bill becomes law.

My only comment at this point is that I am very glad to know that Mr. Andrews now agrees with us on the 1954 code. I am only sorry that he did not take the trouble to study the views of the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means and let his views be known to the Congress when the legislation was being considered. I must give Mr. Andrews credit for one thing, however. He certainly possesses discretion, for it takes a great deal of talent in this direction to be able to spend 3 years as Commissioner of Internal Revenue, without ever once giving any indication that he entertained such views about our tax laws. Discretion is a fine thing, but in this instance I think it might have been more helpful if Mr. Andrews had voiced his recommendations on the subject of tax revision while it was his job to do so, instead of waiting until after he resigned.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to reminding the House that we Democrats can now say to the Republicans, "We told you so," I would like to again point out that the 1954 code by far gave the majority of the tax relief it provided to higher income groups, and the Republican's trickle-down theory of taxation is rampand throughout the code. The most glaring example of all is the dividend exclusion and credit provision. Now mind you, Mr. Speaker, this is tax relief for persons with unearned income. One would think that if any tax relief were to be given, it at least would have been given to persons who earned their income. But, no, this is not the way the Republican trickle-down theory of tax relief works. People who must earn their living with their hands and with their minds, under this Republican plan of taxation must await that time when by some theory which I have never been able to understand, tax relief at the top eventually trickles down to the masses of the people at the bottom. It is now estimated by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the dividend exclusion and credit provisions cost $420 million a year alone. Just consider this as compared to the piddling relief which this Republican tax bill gave to deserving people. For example, the estimates of the relief provided in the retirement income credit provision in the majority report on the 1954 code indicates that for fiscal year 1955, it would amount to $125 million. This is the largest item of relief provided for taxpayers generally, and it amounts to barely more than one-fourth that provided for coupon clippers. The next largest item of relief was $80 million in additional medical expense deductions. In the case of expenses for working mothers, $40 million in relief was provided.

Mr. Speaker, when you add up all of the relief provided for individual income-tax payers generally in this Republican tax bill, you find that it does not equal the amount which the coupon clippers got.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Congress should in this session repeal the dividend credit and exclusion provision, and enact a bill for the relief of the millions of persons who barely got any relief at all under the 1954 Republican tax bill.

Following is the newspaper article referred to:

[From the Roanoke (Va.) World-News of December 9, 1955]

ANDREWS SAYS TAX LAW NEEDS TO BE SIMPLIFIED

The former United States Commissioner of Internal Revenue said here today the present United States income tax law is complicated, confusing, and in comprehensible to the average citizens and "probably should be repealed."

"There are many people," declared T. Coleman Andrews, "Who think there are simplier and more effective ways to raise money to defray the cost of Government than the methods now being used."

He said the income-tax law is becoming more and more complicated and should be rewritten.

"And it will become more and more complicated until something really drastic is done about it," he said.

Andrews elaborated today on a talk he gave before the Roanoke Rotary Club last night at Hotel Roanoke.

Although his main criticism was aimed at the income-tax law, he also was critical of two other tax laws—the gambling laws and the extension of social security to household servants.

"Many people wonder whether Congress ever meant these laws to be enforced," he said.

In his criticism of the income-tax law, Andrews said:

"Any tax law the average citizen can't comply with, without having to go to the expense of employing professional assistance, is a bad law."

He said the present administration and Congress tried "very hard" to simplify the law in working out the 1954 tax code.

"But they didn't accomplish their objective," he said.

"This law probably should be repealed," Andrews said. "In any event after 42 years of growing complication and obfuscation, it's high time for Congress to begin some research to see if there isn't something better instead of just continuing to patch up the old and highly unsafe boiler."

He said he believes the time has come for an objective look at the United States tax system.

The former United States tax chief also scored today's taxes as being too high—much too high and unjust and confiscatory.

These high taxes, he said, will destroy any country in any but the most prosperous times. And, he noted, even with the present high taxes the Federal budget still has not been balanced.

"Senator BYRD rightly asked when we can ever expect to balance the budet," Andrews said.

If we can't balance it in the present time of unprecedented prosperity, the fact is that with the public debt and spending at present levels no more than a mild recession might throw this country into a spin that would make the depression of the thirties look like good times.

Andrews also said the United States has too many tax laws.

"Congress," he said, "enacts tax laws that present enormous enforcement problems and makes no provision for additional manpower needed for enforcement."

Two good examples of such laws, Andrews said, are the gambling tax laws and the extension of social security to household servants.

Andrews, who recently retired from the top tax post to which he was appointed by President Eisenhower in January of 1953, said he is "happy to be home again in Virginia."

"This was one case where the realization was greater than the anticipation," he said.

He is now chairman of the board of the American Fidelity & Casualty Co.

Ducks Can Lay Golden Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the utilization of lands diverted from control-crop production is most essential to our farmers. The Wynne Progress, of Wynne, Ark., carried a splendid editorial in a recent issue of that fine newspaper, titled "Ducks Can Lay Golden Eggs." I include this editorial for the information of the Members of the Congress:

DUCKS CAN LAY GOLDEN EGGS

Rice farmers, like other farmers, would like to find a new crop for their land. They want something that is in strong demand, that is highly profitable, that is easy and cheap to raise, that is drought and floodproof, that is in no danger from acreage controls and can be harvested while sitting on the back porch whittling or just settin'.

Does it sound like wishful thinking? It isn't. There is such a crop, and it can be raised right here in Cross County. The crop is ducks.

Many progressive rice farmers in the Hickory Ridge and Fair Oaks areas have already

seen the possibilities. All they do is get together with groups of sportsmen, either local or from out of State, agree to keep their rice fields flooded during duck season and lease their rice fields for the season. Many of them are making profits as high as seven to ten dollars an acre just for the few weeks when their land is otherwise idle.

It doesn't take any extra investment. The rice fields are usable as duck pounds just as they are. The only extra cost is in reflooding the land after the rice is harvested and in keeping it flooded.

It does not interfere with rice production. Most rice men who have tried "farming" ducks say the extra flooding helps kill out weeds, adds fertility and keeps the land in production longer. Some lands around Fair Oaks have been in a rice-duck rotation for 5 years and are still producing like "new" ground.

Bringing duckhunters into this area is a service to the community. Most of the hunters are business leaders. They get an opportunity to see the possibilities of this rich and industrially undeveloped area.

Duckhunters are good business for everybody. They have money to spend, are in a frame of mind to spend it, and they need housing, food, supplies, and equipment.

Sound like it has possibilities?

County Agent Troy Jennings has agreed to act as a registrar for farmers who want to get in contact with hunters. If you have land that can be used, tell Mr. Jennings the amount of land, location, and ask him to give some of these pond-hungry hunters your name. Then make your own deal, after consulting your lawyers.

If every acre of riceland in the county were kept flooded all during the duck season, it would not overcrowd the field. In fact, the more land under water, the better the hunting. It looks like a rice farmer's dream, and it is.

There Is Need for a Permanent Program for the Relief of Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have sponsored legislation designed to provide relief to those areas of the Nation that have become victims of economic dislocation with the result they have a labor surplus which classifies them as critical or depressed areas.

In support of such legislation the following statement was made by me before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, January 26, 1956, at which time I stressed the need for a permanent Federal program for depressed areas. The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON JANUARY 26, 1956, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE REGARDING THE NEED FOR A PERMANENT PROGRAM FOR THE RELIEF OF DEPRESSED AREAS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the privilege of appearing before this committee for the purpose of discussing legislation designed to assist depressed areas.

As you probably know, I introduced legislation on the subject in the 83d Congress and reintroduced the same bill in the 84th Congress.

Speaking frankly, I was amazed at the lack of interest in this subject as far as the House of Representatives is concerned as I was unable to secure hearings on the legislation.

I was told in answer to my request that there was more important legislation on the agenda.

The result is that no action has been taken on my initial bill, H. R. 860, introduced when the 84th Congress convened January 5, 1955.

On January 9 of this year I introduced H. R. 8223, an administration bill which in my opinion is an improvement over H. R. 860 which I introduced last year.

At the moment, I am in touch with the chairman and Members of the House Banking and Currency Committee and have a commitment that hearings will be held on the general subject of depressed areas probably in March.

I am not here to claim pride of authorship for legislation to aid depressed areas but rather to give my support to any legislative proposal that will provide relief to those areas.

If you want my frank opinion, I think that legislation designed to relieve distressed areas is just as important as a lot of the legislation that today is being given front-page coverage by the newspapers of the Nation.

As many of you know, I represent a congressional district in Pennsylvania whose economy is dependent upon the coal and railroad industries.

Testimony taken in my congressional district at a public hearing of the Neely subcommittee last year described the plight of American citizens who find themselves unemployed and forced to exist on unemployment insurance, public-assistance benefits, and surplus commodities.

Since the end of the Korean war due to the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy in the central Pennsylvania area for a period of over a year we had over 18 percent of our employables unemployed. This condition brought hardship and suffering to thousands of good American families. Happily, we have experienced a marked recovery and today unemployment is less than 5 percent in my congressional district.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I could be charged with base ingratitude if I failed to mention the coperation we received from various agencies of the Federal Government, as well as industries, in our efforts to restore our economy. But most of all, I want to salute the courage of the people themselves who united in forming community organizations with the result that they effected recovery literally by their own bootstraps.

The job of recovery, however, is not 100-percent complete for we still have the scars of depression, in ghost towns, dilapidated dwellings, blighted areas, and good Americans forced to live on public assistance and surplus commodities. To complete the job we require patience and an understanding of the problem by Government both at the State and National level.

As mentioned previously, I am glad to have the opportunity to testify to the immediate need of a Federal program to assist depressed areas, and if I am of any assistance in helping to focus attention on distressed areas I feel my time has been well spent.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, while it is true that the unemployment problem in my congressional district is not as acute as it was following the Korean war, and is improving generally throughout the Nation, in this pushbutton era, who knows when distressed areas will mushroom again and plague us with their evils of want, privation, and sorrow.

Therefore, by assisting the present group of depressed areas through the establishment of a permanent Federal program we are fortifying this Nation against area depressions at a time when the rest of the country is in a prosperous condition.

It is for that reason that I support any legislative proposal that will provide relief for depressed areas.

Urgent and Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial from the Boston Evening American of January 17, 1956, entitled "Urgent and Essential." I believe that it expresses sentiments widely held in the district which I represent. The editorial follows:

URGENT AND ESSENTIAL

An important piece of unfinished business has been called to the attention of Congress by President Eisenhower.

It concerns proposed changes in our immigration laws.

Specifically, it concerns the discriminations inherent in certain provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, generally known as the McCarran-Walter Act.

This legislation was in many ways constructive, and it contains many good features (screening out Communists who would sneak into the United States, for instance) favored by virtually all Americans.

But it also has provisions which create an urgent need for revision of the law, as the President put it in his state of the Union message. And it should be kept in mind that in calling for a revision of the act neither President Eisenhower nor this newspaper is urging or favors outright repeal of the McCarren-Walter measure. The distinction between "revision" and "repeal" is, we hope, clear to everyone interested in seeing that such an important act reflects the ageless principles of true Americanism.

The most pressing need is for revision of that section of the act containing the formula setting immigration quotas.

Whatever the original purpose of this formula may have been, it is in effect discriminatory.

Under the act as now written, immigration quotas are set up according to the national origins of the white population in the United States at the time of the 1920 census.

The practical result of this formula has been to assign about 82 percent of the annual immigration quota to the nations of northern and western Europe, and to discriminate cruelly against the others.

Another result of the present law has been to hold the immigration ceiling at the abnormally low figure of 154,000 a year, whereas we could, and should, admit more. (The figure of 251,000 has been suggested as suitable to the country's needs and capacities.)

What the present law says, in effect, is that an Englishman or a German, for instance, is welcome in the United States, but that a Greek, or an Italian, or a Jew from eastern Europe is not.

This, obviously, is notoriously contrary to the American concept of judging a man by his individual worth, not by his nationality or religion, and the contrast is so stark that the Communists have seized upon it to make propaganda against America all over the world.

Ironically, the present act is keeping out of this country literally thousands of worthy and distressed human beings—many of them fugitives from Communist oppression—whose presence in this country would be an asset to the Nation.

The refuge of our shores is withheld from those who need it, and held out to those who don't. Britain, to cite an example, now has an annual quota of 65,000, of which about 8,000 a year come in. Greece has a quota of 300—with more than 20,000 Greeks registered for immigration.

President Eisenhower wisely proposes that the Immigration Act be brought up to date so that the quotas are assigned on the basis of the 1950 census rather than that of 1920. And he has further urged that provision should be made to allow for greater flexibility in the use of quotas, so if one country does not use its share, the vacancies may be made available for the use of qualified individuals from other countries.

We hope Congress will act favorably on his recommendations.

Report of the Second Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert a resolution received from the Troy Junior Chamber of Commerce concerning the second Hoover Commission report.

Their action herein is but one of a number of indications in my State of a growing awareness of the continuing need for efficiency and economy in Government, and adherence to constitutional principles:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BIPARTISAN EFFORTS OF THE CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

Whereas the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, better known as the Hoover Commission, now has completed a series of bipartisan reports on the Federal Government; and

Whereas these nonpolitical reports offer the means of saving the United States billions of dollars while increasing efficiency; and

Whereas the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce in the past has spearheaded a great national project to publicize the Hoover Commission findings and to gain support for them; and

Whereas better government will result if the findings of the Hoover Commission are given wide dissemination among the public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Troy Junior Chamber of Commerce and its members assembled in Troy this 28th day of November 1955, endorse and commend the objectives of the Hoover Commission, and urge the administration and Congress to work together, on a bipartisan basis, toward prompt and full consideration of the recommendations of the commission.

In particular I would like to commend Mr. A. Arthur McKew, Jr., State chairman of the New Hampshire Junior Chamber of Commerce Committee on Your State and Better Government, and the members of his committee for the efforts they have expended in studying this complex report and their work at a grassroots level to obtain better government.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under previously granted permission, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, my own remarks, and include an article by Raymond Moley, entitled "The MacArthur Epic."

Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of a great American, Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I am sure freedom-loving people all over the world join in wishing him many happy returns of the day.

His services to the country have never been fully recorded. The Congress should, without further delay, bestow upon him the coveted general of the Armies of the United States. He has earned and deserves this title.

[From Newsweek of January 30, 1956]

THE MACARTHUR EPIC

(By Raymond Moley)

The initial Communist thrust into South Korea was confronted by only a poorly trained constabulary force of South Koreans. The only other forces of the free world within thousands of miles were the American occupation troops in Japan and some elements of the American Navy and Air Force. But fate decreed that there was available a military genius whose peer has not been seen in our time. The test which faced MacArthur was twofold. He was compelled to use his slender forces in Korea and at the same time to continue the remarkable progress he had made in peacefully returning Japan to normal conditions. He was well on the way to a brilliant success in these efforts when the Red Chinese projected seven armies into the conflict. Once more, as in the early days of the Pacific war, MacArthur had to improvise a fresh formula for victory.

The fate of that formula, the virtue of which few except violent partisans of the Truman-Acheson regime will now deny, was the culminating act in a massive drama which originated at Bataan. A loyal and informed witness, Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, tells this story in his book, MacArthur, His Rendezvous With History.

Not the least of the marks of a military genius is his capacity to bend both subordinates and superiors to his plans of action. This stands out everywhere until MacArthur's last, fatal (to our prestige in Asia) conflict with the brass and the bureaucracy in Washington. Even F. D. R., who was no partisan of MacArthur, was won over in the famous 1944 meeting in Honolulu.

Moreover, MacArthur's opposite numbers in the Navy paid him the compliment of agreement except in a few notable cases. Concerning these instances, in which 2 high commands and 2 great traditions were at odds, there will always be dispute. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that Whitney should fail at times to give the Navy marks for its contribution to victory.

Ultimately there was glory enough for all. In meeting the acute problems of the occupation MacArthur was compelled to cope with the Soviet Union, the British, our own State Department, and the Japanese. The irony of it all is that he had the least trouble with and the greatest cooperation from the late enemy, the Japanese.

The war in Korea will always stand out as a cloudy page in American history, but a recital of its story adds new stature to the commander. His audacious delaying tactics before the Pusan perimeter meant the difference between maintaining a foothold on the peninsula and retreat to Japan. The Inchon operation was MacArthur's and MacArthur's alone. Against almost united opposition from Washington he won grudging consent to attempt what was praised by the British Chiefs of Staff as among the finest strategic achivements in military history.

Whitney's indictment of our State Department goes beyond a mere recital of the appeasement and fear which held back the arm of the commander after the Red Chinese hordes attacked our forces. The greater sin is that in some way the Red Chinese were able to commit their armies with the assurance that they would suffer no injury beyond the Yalu. Strong circumstantial evidence exists that Burgess in the British Embassy in Washington and MacLean in the United States section of the Foreign Office in London had a hand in this business.

MacArthur's final ordeal was the frustration of his plan for complete victory by Acheson, Marshall, the British, and Truman. Their substitute proved to be profound humiliation for American arms. But the views of MacArthur were left behind in the minds and spirits of Ridgway, Van Fleet, Stratemeyer, and Admiral Joy. Joy has this to say:

"Serious consideration was being given to extending United Nations Command military operations into Red China. Thus at the last, the one negotiating factor that Communists respect above all else was beginning to appear: Naked, massive power and the willingness to use that power. * * * It was as simple as that."

The Meat Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch showing that notwithstanding the enormous military buildup set in motion by the Korean war and the pledges of economy and $40-billion retrenchment made in the last presidential campaign, the average Truman budget for nonwar expenditures was $20.1 billion and the average Eisenhower budget for nonwar expenditures is $21.7 billion. The meat ax we have heard so much about is being used all right. But it is being used on the Treasury instead of the budget.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch says:

SPEAKING OF SPENDING

As the Eisenhower administration passed its third anniversary in office last Friday, one thing at least was clear about its place in history. Whatever else may be said of it, this was the administration that formally signalized national acceptance of an active social, welfare, and economic role for the Federal Government.

For 20 years the Republican Party had attacked (except during election campaigns) the principles of social security, public housing, minimum-wage laws, support of farm income, compensatory fiscal policy, resource development, Federal activity in education, and medical care. Now, as President Eisenhower's state of the Union message made so clear, all these pillars of the welfare state are not only accepted but claimed almost as original discoveries.

Not that differences have ceased to exist. There are differences of emphasis, of degree, of administrative technique, and of substance, as on public power. The Humphreys, Bensons, and Weekses do not apply welfare-state principles in the same way as men like Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Presidential Assistant Stassen. And certainly experience shows that attachment to a liberal welfare policy is stronger in election years than in between.

Yet the existence of a broad base of agreement on general principles cannot be denied. Perhaps the most impressive manifestation of it is to be found in the Federal budget.

One of Mr. Eisenhower's principal campaign themes in 1952 was government economy. He loved to hold up an egg and tell how many taxes it carried. He lashed out at waste and foolishness, such as issuing official pamphlets on dishwashing. He talked of cutting expenditures by $40 billion within 3 years. But what is the record? In the last 8 Federal budgets, 4 under Democratic and 4 under Republican control, expenditures have run as follows, in billions of dollars:

Truman	
1950	39.6
1951	44.0
1952	65.4
1953	74.2
Eisenhower	
1954	67.7
1955	64.5
1956	64.2
1957	65.8

Seven of these 8 budgets were dominated by the Korean war and the enormous military buildup set in motion by it. The record shows that the Eisenhower administration's smallest budget is just $10 billion (not 40 billion) below the Truman administration's biggest budget. It shows that all of the difference is accounted for by reduction in military and foreign policy spending, while other expenditures have actually risen.

Eliminating expenditures for defense and international affairs—described in the budget as the "cost of national protection"—the Truman and Eisenhower budgets for other expenditures compare as follows, in billions of dollars:

Truman	
1950	22.0
1951	17.9
1952	18.7
1953	21.7
Average	20.1
Eisenhower	
1954	19.1
1955	21.8
1956	22.8
1957	23.4
Average	21.7

Thus the Eisenhower administration succeeded in cutting nondefense, domestic expenditures in its first year only. As planned for 1957, its expenditures of this type will exceed the 1950 peak.

As compared with 1950, the administration next year expects to spend $1 billion more for "labor and welfare," $600 million more for agriculture, $100 million less for commerce and housing, $600 million more for general government, $1,200,000,000 more for interest and $1,800,000,000 less for veterans' benefits.

Altogether, the net increase exclusive of the last two items, which are not readily controllable, amounts to more than $2 billion, or about 10 percent.

These figures do not mean that the Eisenhower administration did not try to economize. It did try. It brought in for the effort business executives who had been saying for years that the job could be done given competence and a desire to do it. Some administrative economies undoubtedly were accomplished, and they are all to the good. But the record shows that even under the most favorable circumstances big government cannot be distilled into small government.

The people expect their Government to perform a wide range of social and economic functions. Both political parties support the expectation. The Federal budget inevitably reflects it. How long will it take for political debate to catch up with these facts of life?

Truman Explains It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in order to shed some light on the facts surrounding former President Truman's explanation of the loss of China during his administration, to the Communists, I am inserting an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 20, 1956, and David Lawrence's column of the same date:

[From the Philadelphia Enquirer of January 20, 1956]

TRUMAN EXPLAINS IT ALL

Former President Truman has launched a new installment of his memoirs, appearing in Life, with some startling explanations of his own for the loss of China to the Communists.

He chooses to lay most of the blame on Chiang Kai-shek's refusal to join a coalition government with the Chinese Reds, as urged upon him by Mr. Truman's emissary, Gen. George C. Marshall.

If Chiang had only been "a little more conciliatory," the former President states, he is sure an "understanding" could have been reached with the Communists. And he adds that if a coalition had been formed, there was no reason why Chiang could not have won out over the Reds in the long run.

In view of the world's sad experience with attempted appeasement of the Reds, including the formation of coalition governments, it is amazing to find Mr. Truman still upholding such a forlorn policy. Ironclad Soviet control of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, to mention only a few countries, began with the coalition of Communists with democratic elements in their governments. The folly of trying to conciliate the Communists by opening the door to their seizure of power had been demonstrated in Europe prior to Mr. Truman's decision to force Chiang into collaboration with the Chinese Reds.

The Nationalist leader refused to go along on this surrender, but the Truman policy inevitably strengthened Chiang's foes. It was not long afterward that the Red tidal wave engulfed all the mainland.

That it could have been stayed by Chiang joining hands with the Communists simply does not make sense.

FINDS TRUMAN VERIFYING BETRAYAL OF CHIANG

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—"O that mine enemy might write a book"—it's an old slogan and has its application to the 1956 Presidential campaign. For the latest installment of the memoirs of former President Truman seeking to defend the loss of China to the free world is about as useful a piece of political ammunition as the Republicans could acquire this year.

When, as Mr. Truman declares in the current installment published in Life magazine, the loss of China is due to the fact that Chiang Kai-shek wasn't conciliatory enough toward the Chinese Communists, the whole issue surrounding the Democratic administration's tragic policies in the Far East is revived.

The American people have not only been brought to the brink of a war in Formosa, but they lost 140,000 casualties in Korea in an actual war because the policies of the Truman administration turned out to be to the advantage of the Communist government in China.

Mr. Truman says that General Marshall tried to get Chiang Kai-shek to agree to a coalition government. The General, to be sure, was acting on the basis of detailed instructions prepared for him by experts in the Department of State whose fidelity to the best interests of the United States versus Soviet Russia came into question later in hearings before congressional committees. Nobody with a sense of fairness has ever suggested that General Marshall knew the sinister influence at work in the Department of State. For, as a good soldier, he followed orders. But the fact is that the idea of a coalition government in which the Communists and the Nationalists would participate was a hoax from beginning to end.

The coalition idea had already resulted in the sell-out of the people of Poland through the Yalta agreements, and it isn't hindsight, as Mr. Truman argues now, to recall that point. For the whole world knew the Communists were using the coalition trick to gain military supremacy. Indeed, they notified the American negotiators in China that they wouldn't integrate their armies under any circumstances. How could Chiang Kai-shek agree to a coalition government while his enemies were maintaining an armed force to continue their military pressures?

Mr. Truman says, in effect, that the Nationalists should have surrendered because they didn't have a chance militarily to win, and General Marshall thought so, too, but the opinion of other observers, including the American Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, an educator of wide experience in China, was that the failure of American aid to come at the opportune momment was the real cause of the weakness of the Nationalists and the disintegration of their armies.

The late Harry Dexter White, named in congressional hearings as a Communist spy, sat in the Treasury Department with full power to say when the money promised Chiang Kai-shek would be forwarded or held back. The former President commended Harry Dexter White in writing on April 30, 1946, even after J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, had in November 1945, and February 1946 called the President's attention to the questionable record of White's relations to the Communists.

On the subject of the loan, Mr. Truman doesn't identify the "Treasury experts" who held it up, but he writes:

"General Marshall devoted his brief stay in Washington (March–April 1946) to talks with Government officials regarding loans for China and aid in the form of shipping and surplus property. I instructed the Treasury Department to cooperate with him in every way, and an agreement was reached for an immediate loan to China of $500 million. Unfortunately, when nothing but the Chinese signature was lacking on this document, Chiang Kai-shek's representative, the Chinese Ambassador in Washington, insisted on changes before he would sign. And to complicate the matter further, the Generalissimo on the same day made a speech in China that was in effect a call to arms. It is no wonder that the Treasury experts felt that it would not be in line with our policy to make a loan if political settlement was not forthcoming in China. They were correct."

This is by no means all of the story, but it is a sensational paragraph nonetheless. It shows that Mr. Truman either didn't know how the loan was being squelched by some persons in the Treasury Department friendly to the Communists, or else that he naively accepted the superficial explanation which he now repeats.

Liberalization of Agricultural Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, basically agriculture, in spite of low prices and declining farm income of the last few years, is in a relatively sound condition. For example, the market value of total farm assets is nearly $163 billion. This, Mr. Speaker, is only $3 billion less than the total of all farm assets in the peak year of 1955. Compared with total farm assets of $163 billion, total debt obligations of all farms is only 11 percent of the total assets, about $18 billion.

Also, Mr. Speaker, only 3 out of every 10 farmers have mortgage debt obligations, and over one-half of all farms mortgaged are mortgaged for less than 30 percent of their marekt value. In 1955, according to the administrative office of the Federal court system, only 386 bankruptcy cases out of some 59,404 involved farmers. Farm bankruptcies for the last 5 years have comprised less than one percent of the annual number of such proceedings. I believe, Mr. Speaker, these facts indicate the basically sound financial position of American agriculture.

However, Mr. Speaker, certain storm warning signals are beginning to appear which make it prudent for us to consider legislation at this time to help good farmers who cannot obtain credit from private of cooperative sources. For example, farmers in 1955 had to borrow $487 million from the Federal Lank Bank System and their 1,100 local farm loan associations. This was an increase of 59 percent in the amount of such loans over 1954. Also, $338 million of this money loaned in 1955 was "new money borrowed"—a 50 percent increase over 1954.

During the first 10 months of 1955, 498 production credit associations lent their farmer-members some $1.1 billion. As you know, Mr. Speaker, these associations lend funds obtained from investors in obligations held by the Federal intermediate credit banks.

You can see, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that even those farmers who have adequate collateral and satisfactory credit ratings are beginning to borrow in increasing amounts and at an increased rate. The Farmers' Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, has had the difficult responsibility of extending credit to good farmers who for various reasons simply cannot meet the standards set by commercial credit institutions, including the local loan and production credit associations I just referred to. The cost-price squeeze that farmers have been experiencing since 1951 has had the greatest effect upon farmers who find themselves in this unenviable position. But as Secretary Benson said at his address of last October 15, before the National Association of Mutual Credit Companies at St. Louis, Mo.:

When disaster strikes in agriculture, credit is urgently needed. If there is real distress, farmers often cannot meet the standards of commercial credit. Collateral is insufficient, terms needed for repayment are too long, and administrative costs are too great. It is in the interest of these farmers—and the Nation's interest—to help them get onto their feet. These farmers are good credit risks if the lender can afford to wait. Our Farmers Home Administration makes substantial loans to farmers who cannot meet the standards of commercial credit. Their records of 9 years of operation show 93 percent of the principal repaid.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, F. H. A. borrowers, as they are called in general are good farmers and they are good credit risks provided they are given adequate repayment conditions commensurate with their ability to repay. But many FHA borrowers throughout the country are having extreme difficulty meeting their present obligations. Many other would-be FHA borrowers, especially among the younger farmers, are not going to stay in agriculture unless they can obtain FHA loans on more liberal terms than the Farmers' Home Administration has authority to make at the present time. With these farmers in particular experiencing a great intensive negative effect due to the cost-price squeeze, it is essential that the terms of FHA loans be more readily adapted to meet their needs. Especially is this true in drought disaster areas such as those which have been designated in Utah.

Therefore, I send to the desk two bills for introduction and proper referral, which will expand the Farmers Home Administration's loan program.

The first would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, to—

First. Make or insure loans for the purpose of refinancing, consolidating, renewing, or extending all, or part, of the existing debts of the applicant for farm operating and subsistence expenses, whether secured or unsecured by real or personal property.

Second. Such loans are to be made to farmers operating family type farms who are unable to repay their existing indebtedness in accordance with present repayment schedules and who cannot secure refinancing through private or cooperative sources on terms that they could be expected to meet under present circumstances.

Third. Such loans are to be repaid when it appears that the borrower can obtain a loan from cooperatives or private sources, including the local loan associations and Production Credit Associations under the terms borrowers can meet.

Fourth. Such loans are to carry such interest rates and conditions of repayment as the Secretary of Agriculture deems advisable under the circumstances, provided, however, that the total principal indebtedness of a borrower shall not exceed the fair value based on earning capacity or the normal market value of the farm.

Fifth. The aggregate total of such loans shall not exceed $45 million in any 1 fiscal year.

The second bill, Mr. Speaker, will permit the Farmers Home Administration to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers by providing that—

First. The term of any such loan shall not exceed 11 years from the date the original loan was made. This extends from 7 to 11 years the repayment period.

Second. No person who has failed to liquidate his indebtedness in 11 consecutive years shall be eligible for additional loans until such indebtedness has been paid.

Why Tax North for Schools in Defiant and Shirking South?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the Members of the House of an editorial appearing in the Milwaukee Journal of Friday, January 13, 1956.

The editorial follows:

WHY TAX NORTH FOR SCHOOLS IN DEFIANT AND SHIRKING SOUTH?

In proposing a $2 billion Federal school building aid program, President Eisenhower says in effect that this violates sound principle but that the school emergency justifies that violation. There is no question but that he is right on the first score.

"Responsibility for public education rests with States and local communities," he reiterates, and "Federal action which infringes upon this is alien to our system." But he goes on to add that the American classroom shortage is one of those problems which States and communities alone cannot solve fully or rapidly enough.

There are many reasons to doubt that. In localities where little or nothing is being done to replace inadequate schools and provide needed new ones, it is rarely because States and communities together couldn't do it if they were willing to make the necessary sacrifice. Admittedly the sacrifice may be greater for some than for others.

The truth is that some of the "poor" States want new industries more than they want schools. So they use low taxes, freedom from taxes, free sites, etc., to lure industry from Wisconsin and other States which tax industries and individuals heavily to build schools.

Federal matching money now and for the next 5 years would often reward the laggards and penalize those who have already dug deep to provide good schools. And the President is utterly naive in believing that this Federal aid program could be ended, as he proposes, at the end of 5 years. The first 2 billion would just whet the appetites for more money wherever more school buildings and better ones were desired.

The President neatly avoids the school segregation issue which is bound to some up when Congress considers the school building aid question. Those very States and communities which are defying Federal authority to force desegregation of schools are the ones which would get the greatest relative benefits of Federal aid for their schools under President Eisenhower's proposal. Yet if Federal aid were to be denied them, because of their defiance, that aid would go largely to States which don't need it. Even by the President's plan much would go to States which do far better to keep school buildings dollars at home, without a depleting trip to Washington and back.

The principle that the Federal Government should keep out of the public school field as completely as possible is still sound in this time of abnormal school needs. And the sooner that State and communities know they won't get easy money from Washington, the sooner they will buckle down to doing the school job themselves.

Fluoridation of Public Drinking Water in New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a copy of a letter from Frederick B. Exner, M. D., Medical and Dental Building, Seattle, Wash., to the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, regarding the fluoridation of public drinking water in New York City.

The letter follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *January 20, 1956.*

The Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER,
Mayor, the City of New York,
City Hall, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MAYOR WAGNER: I want to call your attention that, in its recent report to you on fluoridation for New York City, your board of health made no investigation of the facts behind the promises of safety and effectiveness. Even as regards the admitted mottling of the teeth of children in nearby Newburgh (which will become more disfiguring as the children become older), your board made no investigation to determine whether the disfigurement is, in fact, unobjectionable to those who suffer it, or merely to the experimenters.

Instead, the board accepted the unsupported word of the experimenters, which is in conflict with their own data; and the word of a chemist from Arizona who had been permitted to examine representative children from each class.

Moreover the theoretical grounds on which danger is denied are based on such distorted concepts of physiology, toxicology, chemistry, and mathematics, that they can only be regarded as pseudoscience.

The report is a mere rehash of the already discredited claims of discredited proponents of fluoridation. One of these, known as "the father of fluordiation" testified last November before the California Public Utilities Commission. He offered in evidence some charts alleged to show what happens to teeth in communities with varying amounts of fluorine in the water. Under cross-examination, he was forced to admit that he knew when he made the charts that figures on which they were based were worthless.

Your board had been offered proofs of the worthlessness of these figures, but nevertheless accepts at face value the conclusions therefrom.

After the same hearing, another proponent of fluoridation came to me and said that false figures as to his own findings, which he published in the Journal of the American Dental Association in 1948, were a mistake in copying, and that he had not been aware of the mistake till I told Congress about them in May 1954. When I pointed out that he had more than a year in which to publicly acknowledge the error, he had nothing to say.

Again your board had been informed of the falsity of the published figures, yet conclusions drawn therefrom are contained in the board's report.

You will remember that during the period of the board's study, I sent you a carefully documented analysis of the "case for fluoridation" for the use of the board of health. Original sources and data were given throughout, so there was no need to take my unsupported word for anything.

Practically every statement in the recent report was refuted in my analysis; and I proved beyond reasonable question that there is no shred of respectable scientific evidence to support any part of the claims for the safety or effectiveness of fluoridation. I will send you, herewith, a copy for your own inspection.

My analysis was subsequently published by Northwest Medicine, and reprinted. It is highly regarded, and in great demand all over the world. In less than 2 months, a second reprinting is now in process.

Your board made no attempt to deny any part of my charges. My analysis and its content were simply ignored. This is nothing new. In fact, no statement of mine on fluoridation, in this report, in my testimony to Congress, or elsewhere, has ever been seriously challenged, much less refuted. Like your board, the rest of the fluoridators try to pretend I don't exist. Apparently they hope that, if they ignore me and my facts, we will go away. We won't.

Even your board, however, must know that eventually the chickens must come home to roost. Children will be disfigured. Later there will be systemic poisoning; and they will be responsible. They hope to avoid liability, for themselves and the city, through an opinion of the attorney general. They quote him as follows:

"No negligence could be attributed to * * * the city * * * on the introduction of fluorine into a city water supply * * * if the amount of fluorine introduced is only such as has been found by scientific studies to be safe."

This will not avail when it is shown that the board negligently failed to investigate the evidence offered in my analysis. If the board had investigated, it would know that there is no scientific evidence that any amount of fluoride in the water is safe for the users thereof. Fluorine poisoning is found where there is no fluoride in the water, and any at all that is added to whatever may be naturally present, is just that much too much.

I hope you do not mind if I make this an open letter. The public is entitled to these facts, and, if I make this letter public, it will save you whatever embarrassment there might be to you if you were to have to do so.

Sincerely yours,

F. B. EXNER, M. D., F. A. C. R.

Integration and Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Monday, January 23, 1956, issue of the Washington Evening Star carried a most interesting editorial on page A–8 thereof.

The proponents of integration in our schools have for years argued that integration in the schools would materially alleviate the shortage of teachers and furthermore would decrease the cost of education. The opponents of integration have always denied those arguments. For some months now, the Washington public schools have been integrated, and apparently the school commissioners have found now that integration has multiplied their problems instead of decreasing their problems as promised, as will be found from that editorial.

That editorial reads as follows:

INTEGRATION AND TEACHERS

There may be no really new problem facing Washington's public schools. Integration, however, and the results of city-wide tests that emphasize an extraordinary variation in pupil achievement, have placed an old problem in new light. More teachers are needed to cope with it. More teachers must be supplied. The probability that they will be supplied depends in large measure upon the ability of the Board of Education and the school officials to present a convincing case.

They were not able to convince the Commissioners, harassed by the facts of deficit financing and unimpressed by the somewhat hazy and confused estimates of teacher needs as presented to them by the schools. There has been, moreover, a seemingly delayed recogntion, by school administrators, of what Dr. Corning now describes as "a new situation * * * which requires reconsideration of former practices."

Former practices have included estimating teacher needs on the basis of arithmetical average ratios of total teachers to total pupils, resulting in such slovenly generalizations as a finding that as high school classes average only 22 or 23 pupils per teacher—without considering the actual size of classes in basic academic subjects—there is an excess of high school teachers. As the school officials entrapped themselves by this unrealistic method of estimating teacher requirements, it is small wonder that they confused the Commissioners.

The chief reason supporting a substantial increase in teachers, aside from the growth of school population, is that our standards of educational achievement must

be raised. When tests show that of 4,155 tenth-grade (first-year high school) pupils enrolled last fall, 1,004 of them had reached only a sixth grade or under level in reading; that of 3,979 tenth-grade pupils, 1,798 had reached only a sixth grade or under level in arithmetic, it is obvious that educational standards are going to suffer unless this dangerous situation is remedied. The real issue now, as Dr. Corning told the Board of Education last week, is the "unquestionable need for additional teachers so that all the schools will be adequately staffed to serve ever increasing numbers of children with extremely varying abilities and achievement." The mere size of classes is not the real issue.

In presenting the need for more teachers to Congress, the effect of integration on hitherto accepted educational standards in the public schools should be presented in complete candor. The problem is realistic and requires realistic understanding and approach. The school authorities must get down to brass tacks in presenting the picture as it is, and in outlining a precise and detailed plan of how they propose to deal with it. That is the only way by which they can get the teachers they need.

The President, in congratulating the Commissioners and others on the speed with which they effected integration in Washington, following the Supreme Court decision, suggested that our progress in this regard should be a model for the country. It is not going to be any such model if it results in lowering educational standards because of a lack of the additional teachers now required to maintain such standards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears that Washington has found from experience that it was mislead and that integration was not the Utopia as previously pictured. Washington has learned, as all communities will learn, that their educational standards are now suffering, inasmuch as they are now being confronted with the fact that those rosy promises were completely unrealistic, and that they now must get more teachers because integration has brought "ever increasing numbers of children with extremely varying abilities and achievement."

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that anybody with a reasonably fair degree of intelligence would have known that integration would bring those problems. It is amazing to realize that anyone could not have foreseen the inevitable result. Will we profit by the experience in Washington, or will this country continue to rush headlong into destruction. We yet have time to prevent this horrible but inevitable experience, if the people wish to preserve their school system.

Farmers' Income Down, Industrial Workers' Income Up—Due to Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Honeywell News, Local 1145, United Electrical Workers, Minneapolis, Minn., entitled "Farmers' Income Down, Industrial Workers' Income Up—Due to Unions."

The article follows:

FARMERS' INCOME DOWN, INDUSTRIAL WORKERS' INCOME UP—DUE TO UNIONS

Much has been printed about the steady decline in the farmers' income in America. There is no question about it—the farmers' income has dropped considerably within the last few years and many farmers, particularly the small farmers, are in very bad way.

This is not good for anybody in this country. Farmers, unable to buy the product of the industrial worker in the city, can eventually mean the prelude to a real recession unless this condition is corrected, and at once, by the administration in Washington.

WHERE WOULD WE BE?

With this situation affecting the farmer, every American worker in a factory, every industrial worker, should recognize where he would be if it were not for the unions in America. I don't care whether he is organized or unorganized, the trade union movement of America is the only protection for the working people of this country against what the farmer is faced with today.

The organized worker, through negotiations with his employer, has steadily raised his wage rates—commensurate with the ability of the employer to pay. Even the unorganized worker has felt the effect of the trade union movement. He has felt it for two reasons: (1) His employer has been forced to raise wages to keep his employees; and (2) many of them have raised wages to prevent his employees from being organized.

There is no question about it. Wage rates would be considerably below what they are today in America if it were not for the trade union movement, both in the organized and unorganized shops. In fact, the industrial worker today would be worse off than the farmer if it were not for his unions.

This is made abundantly clear when we see what happened from 1925–29 when the worker in the factory was not organized. In that 4-year period, his wage rates rose a few cents an hour when they should have risen considerably more than that, as they have in the past 4 years.

GOOD FOR AMERICA

The raising of wage rates in America has been good for everyone. It has made the American worker capable of buying back the things that he produces. He has kept the wheels of industry and commerce operating through his purchasing ability.

Farm prices would even be down considerably lower if it were not for the ability of the worker to buy as much food as he does buy. However, we believe the main problem on that is that there is too great a disparity between what the farmer gets for his product and what the worker actually pays for it after it has gone through the processors and the food handlers.

The farmer sells pork as $15 a hundredweight while the worker pays 75 cents a pound for pork chops. Over production? Some people have said there is overproduction. There is certainly no overproduction in the world. There is no overproduction of foodstuffs while millions of people in the world are going hungry.

Something is wrong with commerce; something is wrong with the international situation. Yes, even here in America, millions of people suffer from malnutrition in the very low income groups. Even here in America there are many families living on less than $1,200 a year and those families making less than $1,200 a year aren't buying enough meat and dairy products.

Overproduction? Too much underconsumption.

Power for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following speech titled "Power for Freedom" delivered by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's Forum on National Security, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 20, 1956:

POWER FOR FREEDOM

(Address by Adm. Arthur Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the Women's Forum on National Security, Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 20, 1956)

Good morning. Yesterday I returned from an extensive trip overseas where I visited and consulted with the national leaders and the United States advisors in some of the countries in Europe, in the Middle East, and in the Far East—areas where we share so many security interests in common.

Wherever I went, I was impressed with the fact that the United States has friends—good friends. By instances large and small, this was made apparent to me.

I was also impressed by some of the apprehensions expressed by our friends abroad. In some places, our allies actually fear we lack the elements of perseverance and stability in our efforts. They fear inconstancy may impair our resolution, and cause us to default in our commitments.

And while our allies fear inconstancy, the Communists seem to bank on it. They do not believe we are capable of the determination required to continuously and successfully contest their claims of invincibility for the future. They are not sure we have such determination even now. Nor, for that matter, are they sure that we don't.

For my own part, I believe that our greatest security lies, as it always has, in the hearts and the minds of people, both at home and overseas. It lies in their true unity of purpose and firm resolution; and in their willingness to make sacrifices, commit resources, and incur risks for the common good.

But, if we can be confused and divided; if we can be made to doubt the desirability of helping one another; if we can be brought to doubt the necessity for maintaining our own defenses; and if we can be made to cease being resolute—then we will be softened up.

The United States does not want war. What we really want is peace. Yet, we must constantly be prepared against the possibility of aggression of any kind.

In this sense, we must have power for peace, and power for freedom. We must constantly look to the improvement of our defenses—and do so now, not after a war has started.

DANGERS WE FACE

When I consider the security problems now before us, I see no reason for alarm but plenty of reason for us to be realistically concerned about the next 10 years.

We live in a world of turmoil. Constant struggle is the keynote of the Soviet orbit, and this struggle is worldwide. Its peoples are endlessly driven forward by their masters to more technical learning, higher production, and a more relentless opposition to free nations. Its leaders like to build up the idea that communism is inevitable—that it is the "wave of the future."

During recent years, there have been Communist aggressions in Korea, Indochina, and Malaya. Now the Communists utilize the more flexible tactics of cultural, economic, diplomatic, and technical assistance.

The danger to us is not lessened by their use of these devices. In fact, the danger may be even greater since the threat is not so readily apparent.

Today the Soviet Union is armed with nuclear weapons, and it is ringed by satellites. Communist forces are building airfields in North Korea in violation of the armistice. They are trying to infiltrate South Korea, southeast Asia, Africa, and South America. They are penetrating the Middle East with military and economic missions.

In addition, they are working to unrig American bases overseas, and they are constantly maneuvering to undermine the defense alliances which free nations have had to create for their own protection.

In the next 10 years, Soviet nuclear weapons will become more powerful. Their aircraft will go faster than sound. Their guided missiles will become increasingly effective weapons of destruction.

And their tactics probably again will be subject to change. We must never permit preoccupation with any one tactic to exclude from our consideration the other tactics open to them.

By contrast, our tactics are perfectly clear. We are steadfast in the defense of freedom, and we are continuing our work in the pursuit of peace.

For these purposes, our collective resources, United States and allied, are tremendous. But abundant resources could become liabilities rather than assets if we were to count upon them instead of upon the moral strength and resolve of free peoples.

The past years have had their perilous aspects, but even greater dangers could lie ahead, not entirely because of what our enemies may do to us, but because of what we may fail to do for ourselves. Will free nations maintain the resolution to keep themselves collectively strong for the long-term pull? Can we be sure we will not lose the technological race? Are we prone to take freedom too much for granted?

WHAT MUST WE DO?

These are some of the dangers we face. Now, what can we do to minimize them?

The determination of what we do is part and parcel to the development of national security policy. It involves somewhat a complex process, and is affected by many factors—by public opinion, foreign affairs, domestic needs, and by our traditions and beliefs.

In our democracy, military men do not make national policy. Due to the dangers which confront free nations, however, military and nonmilitary factors have become almost inseparable aspects of security planning. This is manifested in large military budgets and in policy planning in which military considerations have an important part.

First of our military criteria is: What is needed for defense?

At the same time, however, we do not forget that the economic health of our Nation is a prime military asset of the free world. Tensions do not constitute licenses for extravagance. For if the United States is to maintain long-term military power, then it must assume a position it can support—not just for a year or two, but for a decade or more. We have to be prepared for the "long watch."

With this in mind, and in answer to the 3 dangers just cited, 3 major tasks loom in our future:

First, let us always insure that free nations maintain a superior defensive strength—one which has the stamina and the skill to discourage and, if need be, to counter enemy surprise moves with convincing force.

Second, let us do more than just keep in step with scientific advances. Let us always keep ourselves ahead in this technological race.

Third, let us work hard to perpetuate our freedoms.

All three tasks emphasize the importance of a constancy and a stability that are unaffected in the main by short-term swings in the world situation—and are not materially disturbed by every psychological effort of unfriendly nations or by wishful thinking on our part.

I. MILITARY AID AND COLLECTIVE STRENGTH

The reason we must fulfill the first task—and have strong military forces over the long-term future—is primarily because of the massive military power, the pronouncements, and the demonstrated ambitions of nations which are basically unfriendly.

This became particularly obvious when Communist forces invaded South Korea in 1950. We could not find the pathway to peace by retreating from the danger, and military strength seemed to be one substantive item that an aggressor could readily understand.

Accordingly, we initiated not only a program to rearm, but also a program of greater association in partnerships. We made additional mutual security arrangements with other nations. We advanced billions in military and economic aid, and we provided equipment and training assistance to help fill deficiencies in the resources of our allies.

In the past year, free nations have experienced major gains in collective security: The addition of the Federal Republic of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the development of cooperation under the Southeast Asia Defense Treaty; and the formation of the Baghdad Pact.

Thus, the growing strength of the United States and its friends has become a key factor in improving the outlook for peace. It has become a persuasive argument to materially minded Communist leaders, and has served as a stabilizing influence.

It may interest you to know that we have been building this collective strength—land, sea, and air—in such a way that allied forces now complement each other, and generally constitute balanced forces on a global scale.

Were it not for this strength, generated by free nations collectively with the material help of our military-aid programs, the requirements for our own defense program would have to be much larger.

Resolutely, we must continue to build this strength. We must continue to encourage all nations to demonstrate collective unity and preparedness for self-defense. And in the final analysis, our own resolution and steadfastness must remain above reproach.

II. TECHNOLOGICAL RACE

Our next important task is to stay ahead in the technological race.

Perhaps the most insidious weakness a nation can have is complacency. This is the belief that we can do everything better than anyone else. It is something like the popular song called, Anything You Can Do, I Can Do Better. We propagandize ourselves in this belief in all sorts of media—advertising month after month that our products are the best and the finest.

To those who would subscribe to this, I would cite the recent Soviet advances in the development of modern long-range bombers, submarines, jet engines, and nuclear weapons.

Then I would add that: Any conclusion based on a premise that Soviet engineers are not as well qualified as ours just will not hold water. In fact, as I see it, there are no rational grounds to presuppose that American defense technology is invincible.

One of the more unpleasant facts recently became known is in the field of scientific and engineering education. Here, our main competitor, the Soviet Union, is passing us in their numbers of graduates.

According to our estimates, the Soviet system for increasing her scientific and engineering talent is more efficient than ours. It is estimated that within the next 10 years, she will have more engineers and scientists than we.

So far, the skills of their graduates have been largely invested in the development of modern bomber forces, warships, and nuclear weapons. In the meantime, their peoples must wait for that great millenium that the Soviet leaders hold out as a promised reward for their current sacrifices.

But because of their enforced concentration of technological skills, there is always the grave possibility that the Soviets could develop in some particular field, a weapon more radically advanced than what we have.

This makes the continuous flow of superior weapons to our military forces a tremendous challenge. It means our research and development programs will have to be prosecuted with even greater vigor.

Sometimes I am asked: "On whose side is time?"

My answer is that time is conspicuously impartial. It is not necessarily always on the side of those who are right. Nor has it always favored the civilized and just, over the evil hordes. No useful purpose would be served if I should intone: "Time is on our side." Time is only on the side which best knows how to use it.

This being the case, we need not be unduly discouraged or downhearted. There is nothing wrong with just plain hard work, and lots of it.

We must work hard to insure that our military programs meet the needs of the day. To maintain less would expose us to aggression. To build excessively could impair our long-term national well-being. Hence, it is best for us to organize our forces wisely and prudently, and then equip them with all the ingenuity we have.

For example, the United States must remain the No. 1, predominant airpower in the world. Nothing could be more important to our security in this air age.

Keeping ourselves the foremost airpower in the world does not envisage, nor require, the greatest airplanes in quality, the best aircraft carriers, the most efficient guided missiles, the finest crews, and a comprehensive system of bases.

In addition to the further modernization of our combat airpower, there should be increases in the capabilities of other selected forces. No one single element of power can provide the complete deterrent to every aggressive action. Just as there is no one pat answer to all our world problems, so is there no one easy way to stop an evil force.

Therefore we still envisage and require strong Army, Navy, and Marine forces—high-quality armored, airborne, antiaircraft, antisubmarine, and amphibious forces. We still envisage and require strong, ready Reserve forces to meet today's needs for rapid mobilization. All these forces are important to the total military strength of the Nation.

In essence, our military programs seek qualitative forces. We are not engaged in a quantity arms race. We have leveled off our military strengths for the long pull, and we seek to maintain a qualitative superiority in men, weapons, and equipment. In particular, we are striving to stay ahead in this decade's technological race.

WORK FOR FREEDOM

This leads to my final point. Let no one of us ever sit back and take our freedom for granted. Instead, recognize that for each freedom we enjoy there is a concomitant responsibility to be met. Each of us must highly resolve personally to meet that obligation.

Freedom is not free. Its costs have been high in human sacrifice, and unless we become militant about our liberty, we could

lose it. We are the children of freedom, and we cannot feel safe except in an environment of freedom.

Nor is our heritage inexhaustible. Our free institutions will survive only if they are constantly replenished by the faith that gave them birth.

The way to freedom and peace will sometimes be too hard a path to be traveled by the fainthearted who despair and are easily deceived by phony mirages of peace.

It can become too rough a path to be traveled by the impatient whose resolution must be recharged each fiscal year.

It may be too steep a path to be traveled by those who value their personal comforts more than they value their freedom.

Recently, President Eisenhower issued a widely publicized executive order to announce a code of conduct for the members of the Armed Forces. This code is even now being spread far and wide through the Armed Forces.

But has there been enough attention given to the necessary actions leading to a code for our conduct? Have we in our homes, schools, and churches a sufficient grounding in the basic fundamentals of liberty?

I am not certain we have.

Without question, we in the Armed Forces must do our part. In fact we have underway right now, programs to help fill the gaps we know exist today.

But this is not enough. It is not a task for the Armed Forces alone. It is an All-American task. It is, for example, a task for each and every Women's Organization represented here today.

In essence, we must call on the good influences of every American organization, and the home, church and school as well, in order to develop the sound minds and dedicated spirits upon which our national security is fundamentally based.

In this fashion, we can point up a liberty in which all people can believe. We can develop a method by which these principles can be explained as opposed to those of a totalitarian state. And we can emphasize that freedom and security belong to those who are militant in their convictions of liberty.

Freedoms are like plants. They do not grow unless they are cultivated and nourished by all the means we are provided. The Freedom gardens, committed by our forefathers to our stewardship, must be fed by our beliefs and eternal vigilance, cultivated by our actions, and weeded of complacency by continuous self-examination.

Finally, no garden is of value unless it yields a harvest. Our Freedom gardens must yield themselves in terms of Christion faith, and the good works we do for mankind. Let us always preserve the strength and the power to look at Freedom as the wave of our future.

Grain Dealers Association of Iowa Urges Action To Relieve Farm Price-Cost Squeeze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, following is the farm resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa at its 52d annual convention held in Des Moines (Iowa) on January 23, 24, 25, 1956:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *January 26, 1956.*
Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Following is farm resolution adopted by the Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa at its 52d annual convention held in Des Moines, Iowa, January 23, 24, 25, 1956:

"We believe the most important resolution of this convention is the one that deals with the economic problems that now face the farmers of this Nation. It may be later than we think.

"There are many aspects now very similar to late 1928. Many of you remember it was then a dangerous situation. At that time we were in the midst of a great building boom and industry was enjoying unusual prosperity. That building wave ended in May of 1929 and the panic started in October.

"We urge that Congress immediately accelerate their efforts in solving the farm problem. This cost price squeeze must be ironed out now before our whole economy suffers from its tragic effects.

"The theorists in the USDA say that the population increase will take care of the situation within a few years. But a lot of farmers will perish in the economic quicksands of overproduction and low farm income before they ever reach the point where our consumptive capacity will equal our productive capacity. At the present time—

"Food production is increasing slightly faster than population growth, and there is no evidence to show that the Nation's population will increase faster than its food-producing capacity in the foreseeable future.

"The dollar received for Iowa hogs this winter has had very little more purchasing power than in the low times of the early thirties.

"The present farm parity index number is 80. This number continues to decline, and unless we have a bold new farm policy the end is not yet in sight. This present drifting can only lead to one end and that is disaster for agriculture and general economic stability.

"In 1947 the gross national income was $232 billion.

"In 1947 the gross national farm income was $17 billion.

"In 1955 the gross national income was almost $400 billion.

"In 1955 the gross national farm income was just over $10 billion.

"There has been a decline of about 40 percent in net farm income since 1951. Few people in any business can stand that without being hurt and demanding action.

"The world level of food and fiber stocks is now at the highest point in history.

"To meet this situation farmers must do the same as industry; that is produce to meet the effective demand and set up proper reserves against poor crop years and national disasters.

"We strongly urge Congress and the President to do the following:

"1. Adopt a soil fertility reserve or land rental plan that provides enough money to induce farmers to retire the needed number of acres from production. There is more sense in storing surplus crops in the soil than piling them up in warehouse. It would help achieve a sound social and economic purpose and aid in making the adjustment we have yet to complete, that is from a wartime to a strategic policy of long time strength and stability. The acres retired from production be used only for soil conservation and other natural resources. No crops to be harvested or pastured except in emergency areas.

"2. Install a rigid cross compliance policy to prevent shifting of surpluses of one crop to another or from one producing area to another. Some method should be devised to protect producers of basic crops from competition with so-called noncommercial areas. Diverted acres should be used only for soil building and conservation practices.

"3. Make crop loans at 90 percent of parity on basic crops. Farmers are entitled to an income comparable to their investment and hazards involved.

"4. Increase the school lunch especially on milk and other perishable commodities. Excess foods should be made available to welfare agencies and to the needy even in greater abundance.

"5. Make supplemental payments to farmers who have sold hogs since last October 1. These payments be made to bring the prices up to 90 percent of parity, and further that farmers receiving such payments comply in 1956 by reducing their hog numbers by an equitable reduction formula which would achieve a reduction of 10 percent with special consideration to be given to hardship cases and also comply with the 1956 corn acreage allotment.

"6. Continue to agressively explore all the possibilities of exporting grains and foods to other countries of the world.

"7. Eliminate the Federal tax on gas used in farm tractors."

MILFORD M. BEEGHLY,
President, Farmers Grain Dealers Association of Iowa.

Cotton Must Fight Back for Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, County Agent Keith Bilbrey, of Mississippi County, Ark., points up some vital suggestions which, if heeded and put into effect, would increase the consumption of cotton. According to Mr. Bilbrey, finished cotton goods are not adequately marked or laveled. The story of the quality strength and wearability of cotton is not being conveyed to the consuming public.

The Blytheville (Ark.) Daily News carried a most enlightening article in its issue of January 11 entitled "Cotton Must Fight Back for Markets." This fine editorial is included as follows:

COTTON MUST FIGHT BACK FOR MARKETS

Our own beloved cotton is being outpromoted. In spite of the best efforts of the National Cotton Council and other interested groups King Cotton is taking a beating where it hurts most—across the counter.

Recently County Agent Keith Bilbrey and others interested in things like this, toured Blytheville's top dry goods stores. They gave particular attention to the way cotton is labeled and sold and the way salespeople told or didn't tell the story of cotton's better qualities.

It was here, in cotton's own capital, that they learned of the whipping our product is taking. They found it is often impossible to find cotton labeled as such. They found that synthetic fibers are riding on cotton's back. They found, in cases, it nearly impossible to tell just what fabric was composed of which fibers.

In Blytheville and elsewhere today shirts made up of cotton and synthetic blends are being sold for cotton. The labels often don't give even a clue, and honest salespeople sometimes frankly answer they aren't sure if

the article is all cotton, part cotton, or not cotton at all.

But the saddest feature of all their probings was the fact that cotton isn't selling itself. It isn't even trying. For instance, a bath towel, with only a thin nylon rib running around the outside, bears a tag which literally screams, "Nylon."

Ninety-nine percent of the material was fine cotton, able to withstand repeated washings. No tag pointed out this fact. Nylon, rayon, and other synthetics are boastfully labeled to contain those fibers. But they also point out, on labels and tags, that, though their fabric is launderable it must be done in lukewarm suds and mustn't be touched by a hot iron.

In other words, the synthetics, by their very shortcomings, are forced to list their liabilities as a fabric. Otherwise, the darned things would likely disintegrate.

On only one item did Bilbrey and his friends find any mention of cotton's launderability, and this an all-too-modest reference. Most cotton goods bore no tags or labels calling to the attention of the buyer that the product was made of cotton. There were no other mentions on tags of cotton's strong points—it can be washed in boiling lye and ironed with a Sherman tank.

And that's where the lack of promotion is most important. It's here that the sale is clinched. The entire cotton industry must increase its efforts to sell more cotton. Promotion can't be overlooked. Look what the synthetics have done with it, even though they must admit that their fibers simply aren't as good under all conditions as cotton.

Stop Whispering: Proclaim United States Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on January 20, 1956. The United States Information Agency is doing a fine job and is deserving of our support.

The editorial follows:

STOP WHISPERING: PROCLAIM UNITED STATES STORY

America has a selling job to do. That job is to "sell" our country and all it means to the peoples of the world.

For many decades the United States of America was a beacon in the minds of men. Our country was held high as a friend of the oppressed, helper of the needy, champion of human liberty.

Today all that is changed. We seem to have fewer friends abroad with each succeeding year. What friends we have too often are in high places; the peoples seem to have lost touch. They appear ready to believe Communist lies that distort American ideals. Never in human history has a country done so much to assist others as ours—only to be misunderstood and maligned.

The Inquirer believes there is one basic reason for this grave state of affairs: Failure to get the real story of the real America directly to the peoples of other countries.

That failure is the more lamentable when we realize that salesmanship has long been one of our strong points. We can sell United States cars, United States films, United States music, United States goods almost anywhere. But we have slipped up badly on selling the great Nation which produced those goods—and so much more that is precious in the world today.

Because citizens of the United States have not been conditioned to regard propaganda as a major and normal function of government, our country's information agencies have been working in slow motion, with inadequate funds, insufficient personnel, and indifferent public support. Even now the Voice of America is a whisper, not a shout.

Lacking, above all, has been that spirit of dedication to our cause which the Communists pour out in such measure in behalf of their campaign to enslave mankind.

Many United States Information Agency workers are doing a valiant job. But they struggle not only against their opposite numbers in Red agencies but against the work of Communists who have infiltrated schools, colleges and other institutions, especially in Asia and the Middle East.

At a time when the cold war is being renewed by Moscow with redoubled vigor—even on our Latin-American doorstep—it is time for Americans to face facts. It is just as important for us to win this war for the minds of men as it would be to win a war waged with guns, bombs and planes. The stakes are just as high. Yet we would not expect to win a shooting war with a piggybank budget. How, then, can we expect to win the cold war with that same sort of small-change financing?

We have been spending, with hardly any question, for defense and foreign aid. The new budget includes over $40 billion for those 2 categories. Proportionately, the job of selling the American story is almost ignored. Surely if we were to allocate for that purpose only one-half of 1 percent of that sum—or about $200 million—it would not be too much. General Motors alone spends an estimated $100 million a year to advertise and promote its products.

A drastically stepped-up expenditure to sell the American way would, in itself, be a valuable adjunct to the defense and foreign aid programs themselves. They are all part of the same struggle: to keep the free world free, and preserve our own freedom thereby.

The Inquirer believes that getting the truth about the United States to the peoples of other lands is one of the most urgent tasks we face. That is why a broadly expanded program should become part of our bipartisan foreign policy.

That is why we hope both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms for 1956 will include a pledge to that end.

We must stop whispering. We must proclaim the truth—in words that will be heard, and understood clearly, throughout the world.

Federal Surplus Property for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article by W. T. Frazier, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Federal Surplus Property for Education." This article appears in the January 1956 monthly issue of the publication Higher Education.

It is very gratifying to me to learn that our higher education facilities are receiving large and much-needed assistance pursuant to the bill I introduced last session and which became Public Law 61.

The article follows:

FEDERAL SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR EDUCATION

(By W. T. Frazier, Chief, Division of Surplus Property Utilization, Office of Field Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

Donations of Federal surplus property for education and health purposes have recently hit a new high. Since the passage of Public Law 61, approved by the President on June 3, 1955, allocations of personal property have increased from $13 million per month to $18 million, an increase of nearly 40 percent. Public Law 61 (84th Cong.) makes stock-fund property held by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies available for donation before being offered for sale. Prior to June 3, stock-fund property was sold when it became surplus, and the receipts were deposited to the working capital or stock-fund account. This change in the law is particularly significant because stock funds cover items in common use, nearly all of which are usable for health or educational purposes.

Colleges and universities are now obtaining valuable equipment and supplies, much of which is new and unused and of types that have not been available for many years. This property includes jet engines, aircraft, laboratory equipment, electronic equipment of all types, textiles, machine tools, hand tools, maintenance supplies such as paint and hardware, office machines, surveying instruments, boats for marine research, construction material, and vehicles of all types.

SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Southern Illinois University reports that it has received well over one-half million dollars worth of surplus personal property, in addition to many buildings now being used for shops and for housing. The university representative says, "In fact, if all surplus items now used by the university were to be withdrawn without replacement, at least 50 percent of our operations would be brought to a standstill."

Floodlights formerly used by the Voice of America are now used in the Yale University Audio-Visual Center in teaching cinematography. Cornell University obtained a viscometer, when none were available on the open market, for use in the rubber research program of the School of Chemical Engineering. The College of Engineering of Princeton University is utilizing a surplus plastics extruder to conduct research in the field of plastics. Fordham University has converted a surplus Army searchlight into a solar-ray furnace. A carburetor test stand and a sheet metal brake with a 6-foot blade have made valuable additions to the laboratories of Clemson Agricultural College.

Atomic Energy Commission equipment has been donated to universities offering courses in nuclear physics. The University of Florida and the University of North Carolina have received AEC measuring systems. At the University of Maryland, a supersonic wind tunnel has been constructed by members of the Aeronautical Engineering Department from parts of a former Japanese wind tunnel and two large steel tanks formerly used by the Navy in conducting a diving school.

Expensive machine tools are being added to the college machine shops. Oregon State College has received a Cincinnati metal working shaper; the University of California, a Cincinnati No. 2 milling machine and a LeBlond lathe; and the University of Wash-

ington, three Fuller compressors for use in the construction of a combination transonic and supersonic wind tunnel.

Allocations of personal property are made by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the various State agencies for surplus property, which in turn distribute the property to the eligible institutions. The pamphlet Acquiring Surplus Property for Health or Educational Use (for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., 15 cents a copy) explains in some detail the procedure followed by institutions in obtaining surplus property. This pamphlet also contains a directory of the Department and State agency offices.

REAL PROPERTY

Real property, consisting of land, land and buildings, or buildings for removal from site, is also available for educational and health purposes. Transfers are being made at the rate of about $1.5 million a month for school sites, additions to college campuses, student and faculty housing, vocational agriculture, forest management, and other types of educational and health programs. The volume of real property available is increasing because all Government agencies are being urged to dispose of property no longer needed for Federal purposes.

The University of Tennessee has obtained 27 buildings from Camp Breckinridge, Ky., for housing of married students. The University of North Dakota has obtained title to a small tract of land, with 4 buildings, formerly used by the United States Bureau of Mines in experimenting on lignite coal.

Three buildings from Love Field at Dallas, Tex., were transferred to the Southwestern Christian College to replace dormitories and faculty housing destroyed by fire.

Many colleges and universities have received their entire real property from Government surplus. The University of Corpus Christi occupies a former naval air station at Corpus Christi, Tex. The American Institute of Foreign Trade began its operations at the former Thunder Bird Field No. 1, near Phoenix, Ariz. St. Michael's College obtained a part of Bruns General Hospital at Santa Fe, N. Mex., to begin a new school. The Northington campus of the University of Alabama was a former Army hospital, and the Santa Barbara branch of the University of California was used previously as a marine air base.

A number of universities have obtained tracts of surplus land for experimental farming and research work. The University of Iowa conducts experiments on a part of the former Des Moines ordnance plant. The University of Minnesota established the Rosemont Research Center at the Gopher ordnance plant. Oregon State College experimental farm is a part of a former Army camp, while the University of Florida has established its forestry branch at a former naval air station.

The University of Utah has expanded its campus by taking over Fort Douglas. The Temple University Dental and Pharmaceutical School is housed in a former industrial plant in Philadelphia. The Norman campus of the University of Oklahoma is situated on a former naval air station; the College of Charleston and the Medical College of South Carolina share the former Fort Johnson property for research programs.

CONCLUSION

In the last 10 years more than $1.5 billion of Federal property has been transferred for health and educational purposes. This program of secondary utilization of Federal property by tax-supported or tax-exempt health and educational institutions is now recognized as one of the important Federal-aid programs for health and education.

If a college or university is not receiving its share of Federal surplus property, it should communicate with the appropriate State agency or HEW regional office and find out how it can participate.

Memorial to Senator David I. Walsh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very remarkable, able, and significant sermon delivered by the distinguished Msgr. Oscar O'Gorman at the new chapel at Brandeis University on November 27, 1955.

Monsignor O'Gorman's remarks vividly bring to mind the extraordinary contributions of our late dear friend, Senator Walsh, for so long the first citizen of my hometown of Clinton and Massachusetts, and one of the most outstanding statesmen in American history.

The tribute paid by this eminent divine, powerful intellect, and eloquent voice, Monsignor O'Gorman, was delivered in the solemnity of a memorial mass for our late and beloved, distinguished friend.

It compresses into a relatively short address, brilliantly conceived and eloquently delivered, some salient qualities which marked Senator Walsh during his life and during his long political career. Senator Walsh had many God-given gifts, which inevitably brought him fame, respect, and admiration, and many personal qualities which endeared him to all those who ever had the privilege of knowing him. Foremost among these qualities was his profound spirituality and his broad spirit of tolerance. It was that spirit and the manner in which it was exemplified during his life that Monsignor O'Gorman so admirably treated.

To Senator Walsh, a man of deepest faith, irreligion, atheism, agnosticism, skepticism, and the whole range of materialistic philosophies which exclude belief in the living God, were puzzling, incredible, and greatly deplored. Senator Walsh's reliance in the Creator, his attachment to fundamental American principles, were distinguishing characteristics of this great man, whose toleration for others was never constricted or distorted by bigotry, narrowness or provincialism.

The warm friendship of Senator Walsh for the Jewish people which was memorialized on the occasion of Monsignor O'Gorman's admirable address was manifested in many ways during his life and it exemplified his deep-rooted spirit of toleration for all groups and for humanity as a whole. But it also pointed up some concrete instances of that friendship, particularly Senator Walsh's relationship to the late, esteemed Mr. Justice Brandeis—a relationship that endured for many years and that found these great men working together for great, human causes having to do with the betterment and improvement of the downtrodden and the underprivileged, with the rights of religious and racial minorities and the constitutional guaranties of individual freedom so highly prized and zealously guarded by these illustrious public servants.

If Senator Walsh's life of brilliant public achievement can be interpreted in any significant way, it demonstrated beyond doubt that a great man of public affairs could be an even greater citizen because of his religious faith and his love of God and his fellow man. Senator Walsh lived by his faith and his beliefs. He remained loyal to them to the end. He never faltered and he was never swerved from his high purpose.

These attributes not only marked him as a man of religious faith but as a believer in the American creed that enabled him to reach the lofty pinnacle in statescraft and thus add to the luster of American patriotism. It is fitting indeed that Monsignor O'Gorman's brilliant address should emphasize the nobility and greatness of Senator David I. Walsh.

The text of Monsignor O'Gorman's address follows:

MEMORIAL TO SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH

(Sermon delivered by Msgr. Oscar O'Gorman at David I. Walsh memorial mass November 27, 1955, Bethlehem Chapel, Brandeis University)

May I say a brief word of congratulation. This, as you know, is a memorial Mass offered by us all in prayerful memory of Senator David Ignatius Walsh. It is, of course, the ideal tribute, the very tribute Senator Walsh himself would have considered ideal while he was living, the tribute that he most certainly now considers even more perfect. It is a Mass offered in thanksgiving to God for a great leader and a great friend, offered also for the eternal repose of his immortal soul. And it is offered in a chapel on the grounds of a university named for one to whom Senator Walsh was a true friend and stanch supporter, a chapel which you have generously befriended in Senator Walsh's name, and in remembrance of his friendship for Mr. Justice Brandeis.

One who never knew Senator Walsh would inevitably be impressed by your remembrance. Men are not often so devotedly held in memory through the years. When faithful friends, themselves men of stature and intelligence, do prove so uniquely loyal, this is in itself no uncertain clew to the stature, the integrity, and the character of him who has engendered such loyalty. As for yourselves, some are friends while a man is living, while he is in power, while there is something to be gained from his friendship—you are friends without any of these things, most generous friends, lasting friends. God will surely bless your loyalty—it does you honor.

As we come here today we are no doubt struck, as indeed the whole Nation has been, by the meaningful juxtaposition of the three chapels of different religious faiths grouped together here in one spot. To everyone it symbolizes the important belief that in this Nation divergent faiths can coexist and live side by side in mutual respect. Here, as it were, a true picture is given by architectural arrangement. The differences and separation between the faiths are not concealed. But the great degree of their unity is also happily emphasized. While there is divergence there is also unity, unity which is precious to this Nation.

Difference in faith offers no real threat to our national strength and this fact deserves emphasis. There are well-intentioned

people today so impressed with the need of complete civic unity that they would have us give up even fundamental beliefs and practices in the interest of that unity. They would substitute for faith a pale and meaningless and, indeed, a fatal nonsectarianism. Nonsectarianism has become almost a religion with them—a manmade religion. They appear to believe that perfect unity is essential to the national welfare, that anything in the way of it must go, and though they may not say so, they really think that a religion that stands for anything is in the way. I submit to you that this is simply not true, that there is no great danger from our differences. We have always had differences and always will—if not in religion, in something else. But men of different faiths have lived and worked side by side throughout our history and our country has gone ever forward to unparalleled strength and unparalleled unity. The real threat to our well-being, and even to unity, lies not in the difference in our religious beliefs but in the fact that so many have no beliefs. The real danger is irreligion. And it is fatal to urge upon men unity at the price of religion. Nonsectarianism, which always labors under a handicap because it must be silent about the most important things, is necessary in some areas of our living. But when it invades the field of religious belief it becomes a contradiction, actually a betrayal of faith.

The relationship between Senator Walsh and Mr. Justice Brandeis well illustrates the point that the danger of religious differences can be greatly overestimated. I do not need to tell you that the Senator was a Catholic beyond the ordinary implications of the word. He was an exceptionally faithful and conscientious son of the church. More than most he knew and appreciated her. More than most he helped her. More than most he sought her guidance. Throughout life he paid a great price for his fidelity to her. His interest in her was keen, his association with her constant. None who ever spent even a minimum of time in his company could fail to realize this. Yet he found nothing in his religion which prevented his advocating the appointment of Louis Brandeis to the Supreme Court of the United States. Rather he found much that told him such advocacy of Mr. Brandeis' candidacy was his duty. It is of course but one of countless examples given by public men throughout our history proving that unity between men of different faiths has always been possible and has always been a fact. Nor is such unity confined to individuals. For years and years many large religious groups lived together here in our own community. During those years there were none of the deep-down, ugly trends such as threaten every neighborhood and whole Nation today. (Need I say that these present trends are not superinduced by religion?) The difficulties that did crop up in the past were, moreover, largely due to racial and cultural prejudice rather than to religion. The life of our Nation has never been seriously threatened by religious division.

Our religious differences exist and will continue to exist. They are real differences on important questions, and no one should pretend they are not. But we have religious unity, too. We think exactly alike on many important questions, and this is a matter of the greatest value. Many things will be sacred while we so agree. Our differences constitute no danger, and our agreements are a most valuable asset to the Nation. That is really the present situation.

But there is a danger: it is not religious difference, it is religious indifference—which has no standards, and, therefore, no conscience, no compassion, no possible basis, actually, for lasting unity. When for the sake of unity you set nonsectarianism above religion, you inevitably destroy religion. You produce indifferentism and irreligion, which are the real blight on the face of this Nation today. It is indifferentism and irreligion that spawn the conscienceless, wholly uncontrolled individuals and the ungodly hordes that prey upon the body politic. Among them any sort of disunity, of subversion, and of treachery is both possible and probable. Make no mistake: the current enthusiasm for unity at any cost, even at the cost of our most sacred religious convictions, would destroy the very things it seeks to save.

Let us not then be overafraid of our religious differences. Let us rather be on our guard against a nonsectarianism that would eviscerate all religion. Like the three chapels here, let us have our differences but let us also each sincerely stand for something. There will be much in what we all stand for, in our unities, that will be priceless to this Nation.

We do well to remember both Senator Walsh and Mr. Justice Brandeis this morning. No one who really knew Senator Walsh will doubt that his faith was actually the cornerstone of his whole personality. It permeated his mind, his heart, his conscience, and the very marrow of his bones. It informed and to a very real extent shaped his every decision, his every utterance. He lived in that faith and for that faith, he suffered for it, he died in it. His faith indeed more than any other single factor, made him the man that he was, a great American. Most probably there are those who can say much the same of Mr. Justice Brandeis with regard to his faith. If America is to remain great, there must be other Americans who are great not because they minimize or have only the vaguest ideas of their responsibility to God, but great first of all because they do walk humbly before God, because their convictions and decisions and whole course of action are rooted in a fervent belief in their direct responsibility not to some vague deity but to a definitely personal God. A personal God who has taught the world in some detail the right way of living, and clearly distinguished it from the wrong way. A personal God whose holy will is the basis of all morality, a morality that is therefore unchanging and unchangeable. A personal God whose values are eternal, and whose values must be our values, too. A God who is the only source of real religion. A God who can and does say, "Heaven and earth shall pass away but My words shall not pass away."

We need never fear men of such stamp. America has been built upon them. Though they have differed, they have been united in most fundamental and sacred matters. There has been difference, but there has been unity too. Let us not fear the differences of honest belief. Let us rather fear the indifferentism which undermines all standards and therefore destroys. Beware of any demand for unity which would incline you to place it above religious principle and practice. The friendship between Senator Walsh and Justice Brandeis, and these three chapels symbolically grouped here, may well remind us of the true situation and help us keep our perspective. "The just man liveth by faith." And true faith is no menace to this country but, rather, its richest asset.

San Juan Rabbits Threatened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, in recent months there has been some agitation to pass Federal legislation banning the interstate or intrastate shipment of San Juan rabbits. Some proposals call for a Federal law to exterminate the rabbits.

The San Juan rabbits were originally brought into the San Juan Islands by British troops when these islands were occupied by them prior to the Oregon Treaty of 1846. Since that time the San Juan Islands, located in upper Puget Sound in the State of Washington and included in the Second Congressional District of that State, have supported great numbers of these San Juan rabbits.

These rabbits have provided pleasure both as sport and food for the people of the islands. The attitude of the people on the islands to the proposed legislation is shown by the following letter from a resident of the San Juans:

In regard to the article in the Times about the San Juan rabbits, these rabbits are a source of income for many people on San Juan. They are excellent eating and serve as meat for many people. As to the nuisance value the farmers that don't want them allow hunting and they have practically disappeared in certain localities. Others protect them for a cash crop. The size of these rabbits has been much exaggerated; they weigh between 3 and 4 pounds when fully grown. There are no natural enemies here to destroy them as foxes, etc., which is the reason we have them. We have had letters and read articles from Pennsylvania that these rabbits have not proved a nuisance there on account of the hunting pressure and predators and can't stand the cold winters.

We hope Representative CUNNINGHAM, of Iowa, knows all the facts about these rabbits before preparing a bill to outlaw them. As a farmer and taxpayer of San Juan Island, we would appreciate very much if you would do what you can to discourage this bill for shipment in interstate commerce. Please advise if there is anything we can do about this matter.

Yours sincerely,

K. F. DOUGHERTY,
Friday Harbor, Wash.

Don't Pick on Your Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the following remarks were sent me by James J. Flynn, doctor of philosophy, chairman of the department of social studies at Fordham University, who delivered them at the opening of a discussion session of the Fordham forum. It would be interesting to know what were the reactions of the students.

DON'T PICK ON YOUR CONGRESSMAN

(By James J. Flynn, Ph. D, associate professor of American Government, Fordham University)

The press, radio, and television have headlined the fact that the 84th Congress has voted to raise its own pay. The voice of the people in our daily newspapers have been filled with letters highly critical of what they call a salary grab. The panic is on, it is open

season on Congress. It appears as if anyone who can corral a publisher, a 3-cent stamp, or a soapbox will take a slap at our Nation's lawmakers.

It is not unusual to cast aspersions on the Senate of the United States or the House of Representatives as the "chowderhead clique" or the "windbag brigade." This approach seems always to assure an audience. It is possible that some of these that throw brickbats are sincere. Some are just simply abusive. But all of them suggest that Congressmen are jokers, loafers or just plain incompetent.

Accepting the position that Congress is not as efficient as it might be, it appears time that someone place the reason where it belongs—on the people.

Granting that what we say and think about the Senate and House are correct, then it must follow that the people who elect its members are equally to blame. If you bought your car the way you choose your Congressman you would probably blame yourself when the motor fell out. Before you signed the contract you would want a test ride. It is conceivable that you ask questions about gas consumption, tires, motor performance, and a hundred other things. But the average American voter spends little or no time attempting to know the man or woman who will represent him in Washington on such vital matters as peace or war, taxation, social security or his financial future.

The chance is better than average that most voters do not know how their Congressman stands on foreign affairs, or on the big domestic issues of the day. What is worse is that when some Congressmen try to discover how their constituents feel on national and international affairs they are fortunate if 25 percent of the questionnaires sent are returned. The real wonder is that in such a hit and miss system we get so many able men and women to represent us in Congress.

When the voter suddenly awakens to the realization that his Congressman has failed to vote some national or international issue as he thought he should, the voter does not blame himself. His normal reaction is: "What can you expect from a cheap politician?" In fact, he expects plenty from his representative. He thinks of his Congressman as an employment agency, errand boy, and lonely hearts adviser. He rushes to his Congressman to get his brother-in-law a job, get his boy into West Point, discover where his cousin is on a civil-service list, get him an introduction to Marilyn Monroe, and to buy tickets on his club raffle.

When John Q. Public comes to Washington he expects his Congressman to feed, clothe, and board him until he gets what he came for. If he goes broke while in the Nation's Capital the elected representative is expected to pay the carfare home. Some Congressmen claim as much as $3,000 is spent of their income yearly contributing to charity for their constituents.

The average visitor to Washington visits his Congressman and feels hurt if his elected representative is not prepared to spend the day with him. If he meets his Congressman as he is going toward his respective chamber for the opening of Congress at noon, he will expect to be taken to lunch. If he is going to visit a Government bureau to get a job, or land a contract he will demand that his Congressman come with him to plead his case. If he is in Washington on a vacation he expects his representative to entertain him by talking about anything from Formosa to Freddie Fitch, the home town character. It certainly appears as if he believes that his Congressman, like himself, has nothing to do.

Most constituents, if they think of it at all, believe that their Congressmen live a life made up of cocktail parties, dances, and White House dinners. Nothing could be further from the truth. Your Congressman works hard at his job. The number of deaths in the last Congress is grim proof of the truth of that statement. The average Congressman belongs to one major committee which might meet 4 or 5 times a week. If the Congress meets at noon, as is fairly common, committees must meet in the morning, or in the evening, or during the weekend when the Congress is no in session. A Congressman belongs to three of more minor committees which meet less frequently. From noon until 5 or 6 he attends debates on the floor of the House or Senate and discusses legislation with his colleagues or interested parties.

When a Congressman can get an evening at home he must expect to spend it reading legislation, mail from his constituents, or committee reports. A good part of a Congressman's evenings are spent going to dinners, dances, and receptions—for which he pays. Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, of North Carolina, discussing the night life of a Congressman states: "I kept up the rounds for a week, just to see what it cost a Congressman to live in proper style while performing his duties to the people * * * when the week ended I found I spent $500, and it just occurred to me that I would have to abruptly end this profligate system of expense, or I could not live in that fashion on $15,000 annually."

Most Congressmen receive from 100 to 200 letters a day from their constituents. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER states that when he first entered Congress he was told by Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN that the most important single item in his work was to answer his constituents' mail. The mail will be from a farmer who has not received his check from the Agriculture Department, or from a young veteran who has not been able to clear his GI bill claims. There are a few letters from constituents who have been enlisted by a pressure group, and who demand to get a statement as to where the Congressman stands on certain pending legislation. Some constituents want free seeds, maps, or publications put out by various Government departments or bureaus. A budding inventor sends a new gadget and wants it patented. A hometown Carrie Nation will write to ask if it is true that her Congressman keeps a little liquor in his office.

Regardless of the type of letter it must be answered. Many of the letters require telephoning and legwork to get the answer. Some threaten openly that unless the answer is right they will get even at the polls.

All this indicates that there is little time left for a Congressman to do the real work he came to Congress for—legislate. In the 83d Congress 15,432 bills were introduced. This does not include resolutions which totaled 2,204. Such a volume would indicate that lawmaking is a full-time job.

In 1946 the Congress passed legislation that was supposed to streamline the legislative process. The new legislation cut the number of committees in both Houses, and gave appropriate staff aid to cut the errand boy work on the legislators. It has not proved too successful because a Congressman's constituents will expect him to give most of his time doing unimportant errands.

There is little true comprehension of what a Congressman is supposed to do by a constitutent who wants him to present the winner's trophy at the local golf club. Or the hometown songwriter who wants his latest opus copyrighted.

Freshman Congressmen quickly lose their energy and vigor to do a good job when they face such continuous badgering. The cynical attitude of constitutents toward their Congressmen is very often matched by an equally strong cynical attitude of the Congressmen for his constituents.

Congressmen work hard. The figures of the 83d Congress prove this fact. Congress was in session in the Senate for 294 days; in the House for 240 days. In this period of time 1,783 bills passed, of which only 52 were vetoed. Those figures are not unlike the work of other Congresses. A large amount of Federal legislation is enacted by each Congress.

Congressmen realize the importance of answering their mail. As one Congressman expressed it when asked the question, "What is the secret of long congressional tenure?" "It is a simple one. Give close and prompt attention to your mail." Some Congressmen write friendly notes on constitutents birthdays, send them notes when they travel outside the United States, and never forget a death of a sick cow, or a fire that burns down the old homestead.

Our form of government has placed the responsibility for action in the hands of elected officials. Aside from the President and Vice President these elected officials are primarily the 531 Members of House and Senate. It is the work of our Congressmen to maintain the balance of power. If they cease to do the job then be prepared for some type of presidential control.

The Constitution places the Congress of the United States in the No. 1 position in our Government—Article I is the legislative article. The Founding Fathers saw the future of our country in representative government. It will not survive if Congressmen must play down national welfare to be nursemaids to their constitutents. Congressmen will vote in blocs and as lobbyist direct, if they are not given time to study legislation. Because the people back home want special individual attention; they will pay for it in poorer laws.

The time has arrived when the public must begin to take their Congress seriously. The 531 men and women that we send to Washington are not the comic strip characters portrayed in Hollywood or the press. These hard-working people have in their hands your future—yes, your very destiny. They make war and peace—and at a time like the present should not be burdened with work that an ordinary businessman would assign to an office boy. The time is long past for the public to look upon the political career for their children as a black mark on the family's good name, "Politician" must become a word as attractive as doctor, executive, dentist. Our schools must encourage the student to make politics a career. You can't get good men and women to give up their lives in public service unless you make the career attractive.

Congress could stand a few changes that might make it a better place to work, and a place where its Members could feel as if they had performed a job well done. The recent salary increase is a step in the right direction. It might also be helpful to lengthen the term of Members of the House to 4 years. Most Members of the House spend the first year mending fences to be reelected in the second year. After the first 2 years they pretty well know the ropes. If a Member is not reelected it is a complete waste. Voters would think more seriously if they are to have a Congressman for 4 years than they appear to do under the present system.

It might be better to limit congressional terms to two and in that way clear the deadwood out of Congress. It would help make way for young men and women to become a part of the big job of making representative government work. Ex-President Truman has this to say on the subject:

"House Members should have a period of service of 4 years. That is, the House of Representatives should be elected with the President for a 4-year term of service. Then the country would be able to vote into or out of power a President, a legislative majority, and one-third of the Senate at every general election.

"A 12-year limitation for Members of the House and Senate would prevent the fossilization of the key committees.

"We would cure senility and seniority—both terrible legislative diseases nationally—if 12 years were the limit."

It is the public's obligation to permit Congress to do the job it has been elected to do. Congress will do that job when their constituents give them the time and desire to protect the Nation from creeping bureaucracy. With a higher wage the public can more carefully select the Members of our Federal Legislature who will face the domestic and international question with a new vitality.

North Dakota Needs Forest Research Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have here a resolution setting forth the need of a forest research center in North Dakota, and requesting funds for its establishment. Establishment of such a center has been long overdue in this Plains State. The resolution speaks for itself; the names of those who signed it testify to the statewide support this project has:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERAL FOREST RESEARCH CENTER IN NORTH DAKOTA

Whereas the value of trees for the protection of farm buildings, fields, and watersheds, for recreation, wildlife habitat and the availability of wood products, and for the enhancement of rural surroundings on the plains has long been recognized; and

Whereas such values have been a material factor in increasing the area of forest and established plantations in the State at a rate of more than 6 million trees per year; and

Whereas the problems of plains forestry are so distinct as to require special attention, including such studies as:

1. Develop planting methods and species arrangements better adapted to soils and climate.

2. Determine definite site requirements for each species.

3. Learn how to reduce damage from insects and disease.

4. Develop drought-resistant varieties through tree breeding and selection.

5. Find new uses for native woods such as elm, cottonwood, aspen and other species.

6. Determine the most effective plantings for watershed protection and the relation of North Dakota forest cover to stream flow; and

Whereas authority for the establishment of such research center is contained in the so-called McNary-McSweeney Act; and

Whereas no forest research program is conducted in North Dakota because of lack of funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned representing the respective statewide agencies listed, meeting in the State Capitol, in Bismarck, N. Dak., January 12, 1956, That the Congress be, and it is hereby respectfully petitioned and urged to provide funds for the establishment of a Plains Forest research center in North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That copies hereof be mailed to the President; Hon. Rowland R. Hughes; Director, Bureau of the Budget; Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary, Department of Agriculture; Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; Hon. CARL HAYDEN, Senate Committee on Appropriations; Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG; and Representatives USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER.

Robert Ellsworth, North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Eckman; Fred J. Fredrickson, Greater North Dakota Association, Valley City; Norman Brunsdale, governor, North Dakota State Soil Conservation Committee, Bismarck; Norman Brunsdale, governor, North Dakota State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck; Art Moehlman, Taylor Nursery, Taylor; C. L. Jensen, Jensen Evergreens, Esmond; Harold Souer, State Crop Improvement Association, Washburn; C. N. Nelson, president, State School of Forestry, Bottineau; Nick N. Boehm, Park Hill Nurseries, Bismarck; Lawrence Schubert, Oscar H. Will Co., Bismarck; Al P. Simon, Soo Line Railroad, Bismarck; J. I. Rovig, North Dakota Reclamation Association, Mandan; H. R. Morgan, commissioner, Game and Fish Commissioner, Bismarck; Art Thoraldson, North Dakota Wildlife Federation, Grand Forks; George A. Kary, North Dakota Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Fort Lincoln Nursery, Bismarck; Kenneth R. Norell, Northern Pacific Railway Co., St. Paul; Glenn J. Talbott, president, Farmers Union, Jamestown; Milo W. Hoisvenn, engineer, State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck; G. J. Stafne, secretary, Farm Bureau, Fargo; E. M. Gregory, agricultural agent, Great Northern Railway Co., Fargo.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the strength of our Air Force in the future and the progress of civil aviation is being determined today on the drawing boards and in the wind tunnels of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Ames Laboratory at Moffett Feld, Calif., is one of the principal installations of the NACA. Since it is in my district I am very interested in its operation. I therefore asked its director, Mr. Smith J. De France, for a report on the effect which Federal pay has upon his recruitment of scientific personnel. He has answered my inquiry with the letter which I submit herewith:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS,
AMES AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY,
Moffett Field, Calif., December 28, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES S. GUBSER,
Congressman, 10th District, California, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GUBSER: I greatly appreciate the opportunity to answer your letter of December 15, 1955, by providing information on how the Government pay scale affects the recruiting of scientific personnel and the retention of the higher-salaried scientists at the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory.

As you know, the Ames Laboratory is 1 of 3 laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Since August 1939, Congress has most generously appropriated approximately $64 million for the construction, at the Ames Laboratory, of the finest and most modern aeronautical research facilities in the world. During this same period of time, we have built up an outstanding staff of scientists, many of whom are acknowledged national and international authorities. To effectively and efficiently utilize this fine research equipment we must maintain a professionally competent staff by retaining our outstanding scientists and by recruiting high-caliber college graduates; even the finest research equipment is worthless without the proper manpower to use it.

The unprecedented growth of the aeronautical industry in the past several years, coupled with a critical shortage of scientific and engineering graduates, has resulted in spirited bidding within the industry for the services of competent graduates. This bidding, which has greatly increased the average salary for technical graduates, plus the many fringe benefits, such as increased leave, educational opportunities, and increased freedom in conduct of research, which are now offered by industry has made it increasingly difficult for us to recruit college graduates and virtually impossible to recruit the outstanding graduates.

During fiscal year 1955 we were able to recruit only 33 scientists in grades GS–5 and GS–7 and none of those were in the upper portion of their graduating class. The predominate reason for our inability to recruit, not only the desired numbers but quality, was the disparity in the starting salaries offered by industry and the Government pay scale. Last spring when we were recruiting at the universities, the highest salaries we could offer were $3,410 for a GS–5 and $4,205 for a GS–7 position. Shortly before June graduation, the Civil Service Commission authorized the starting salaries in those grades to be increased to $4.345 and $4,930, respectively. At the same time the aircraft industry was offering as starting salaries $4,860 for graduates with a bachelors degree (equivalent to the Civil Service Commission requirements for a GS–5 position) and $5,940 for graduates with a masters degree (GS–7 equivalent). For outstanding graduates, bidding between companies further increased this starting salary and offers as high as $5,700 for a graduate with a bachelors degree and $6,850 for a graduate with a masters degree were documented in the spring of 1955. Not only were we unable to compete with the aeronautical industry on a salary basis, we were required to offer less than State, county and city governments. For engineering graduates with a bachelors degree, the State of California was offering $4,752; the city and county of Los Angeles, $5,232; and the city and county of San Francisco, $4,860.

An indication that the spring of 1955 differential in starting salaries offered by the Federal Government and the aeronautical industry still exists was apparent during our most recent recruiting last month when two students graduating in June 1956 with a bachelors degree refused our offer of $4,345 for offers by industry of $6,000 and $4,980.

As I mentioned, the problem of maintaining a professionally competent staff not only depends upon our ability to recruit outstanding college graduates, but also upon our ability to retain our leading scientists and engineers. The retention of this top-caliber scientific group intact is vital to the very existence of the laboratory since these specialists not only command the professional respect of each other, thereby creating the healthy research atmosphere with

high morale and technical strength which has characterized the NACA since its inception, but their presence also acts to enlist other specialists and to recruit outstanding college graduates to work with scientists having international recognition. Retaining this nucleus is becoming increasingly difficult because of offers currently being made to them by the aeronautical industry. I would like to cite a few of the offers, of which I am aware, that have been made in the past year:

A GS–15 at $12,150 has been offered 3 positions, one at $16,000 plus a $2,500 bonus, one at $16,000, and one at $15,000. A GS–15 at $11,880 has been offered full professorships at 4 prominent universities throughout the country, but because he was not interested salary was not discussed, and a position with an aircraft concern at a salary between $13,000 and $17,000 depending upon negotiations which he refused to enter. A similar offer of $13,000 to $17,000, depending upon negotiations, was also made to another GS–15 at $11,610. A GS–14 at $10,750 was offered $20,000; a GS–14 at $10,535 was offered $14,500; a GS–14 at $10,320 was offered $15,000; and a GS–12 at $7,570 has been offered a position at $11,000. Generally speaking, the offers to our top men amount to an increase of about 50 percent of their present salary.

All of these offers came from old and well-established companies. To date we have been able to hold the people to whom the above offers were made; however, we have lost in the last year 13 scientists in grades GS–9 through GS–13. All of these resignations resulted to accept higher salaries offered by the aircraft industry.

It is evident from the few resignations we have experienced in the higher grades that the opportunity to work with competent colleagues of national and international reputation utilizing excellent research facilities has, up to now, offset the premium offers by industry. However, since the difference between Government salaries and the offers of industry has been increasing with time, eventually some of our top men will be approached with an offer which they will not be able to refuse in all fairness to themselves and their families. Should we lose even a few of these scientists, it is my firm belief that other top men would follow and that a chain reaction of resignations would result extending to the scientists in the lower grades who are remaining solely because of the association with and the atmosphere created by this top group. If such a general exodus occurs, irreparable damage to the Nation's research effort would result. The competent staff and high morale that we now have would immediately disintegrate, and it would take many years of effort and much higher salaries to rebuild the organization to its present high standard.

The disparity between Government salaries and those offered by the aircraft industry and the effect upon the research efforts of the NACA was recognized by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government on page 73 of the Subcommittee Report on Research Activities, dated April 1955, which states:

"The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics laboratories, for years, have had a competent staff and high morale. In recent years, the tremendous growth of the aeronautic industry, its demands for scientists and engineers, and the attractive pay levels established have combined to present a most difficult personnel problem to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. There is great need of higher levels of pay for its civil-service professional staff and a larger number of higher level positions. Unless the compensation levels of professional positions in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics laboratories can be increased to a level more nearly competitive with industry, the quality of these laboratories will suffer."

The inequality of the scientific salaries of Government and the aircraft industry should be forcibly brought to the attention of the Congress especially since the same Government in reality is paying both salaries.

Sincerely,

SMITH J. DEFRANCE,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is too serious to trifle with. I have introduced legislation which will correct this problem and I urge the House to consider it or any other legislation which will make it possible to immediately recruit sufficient and adequate scientific personnel.

Hometown Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present my views on the UHF–VHF problem with special emphasis on the situation insofar as Massachusetts is concerned because there is an urgent need to get established a clear, realistic overall FCC policy on the assignment of television channels.

I think that certain facts ought to be carefully considered in connection with television channel allocations.

That it is most desirable—

(a) To have uniformity of reception in television sets so that as nearly as possible everyone in the country owning a television set can enjoy all of the programs.

(b) To provide a system whereby each community in its choice and discretion shall have a television outlet for its own culture and established patterns including an opportunity for the expression of political views and the conduct of charitable, social, and educational work. In the present situation which involves conflict, disputes, and controversy between the networks for position and markets, this important public service feature is in jeopardy.

I would address a few words to my own county of Worcester, Mass. For your information, this is a very important area combining industrial, mercantile, residential, and some farming areas. There is a single TV station located in the county, the signal of which cannot be received by the set owners without special technical adaptation entailing considerable expense. Of course, in such an area most of the popular programs of one of the major networks should be available.

I have read the brief filed by the Committee for Home Town Television on some of these points, and believe it contains suggestions as to how the above results can be accomplished without adversely affecting, but rather, effectively implementing, existing priorities.

Unquestionably, monopolistic groups are seeking to control the television field in some areas, and this would clearly be very harmful to the small local stations which could otherwise perform such valuable functions. Another anachronism in this picture is the present total number of unused channels as a result of the daily schedule for some stations which, when they go off the air, leave channels entirely unused. The effect of this is to add to the number of major cities in Massachusetts with no local outlets, and we are facing a situation which may result in greatly impairing television service in our State.

I think that the FCC has an obligation to correct such abuses in the television field and, obviously, if it fails in that primary obligation, Congress should act.

There are 22 potential UHF channels available to Massachusetts. About half of these channels have already been assigned by the FCC, but actually only four of these stations are now operating. Of these four, it is exremely doubtful that any one station is operating in the black. The financial outlook for these telecasters is far from encouraging in the face of entrenched VHF competition offering a varied fare of network programing. These stations are losing money, but they remain on the air with the hope that the FCC will allow more VHF channel assignments and that their past record of public service as an UHF station might perhaps work in their favor when a VHF channel is being assigned.

One UHF station, channel 14, WWOR–TV, of Worcester, up until recently provided programs of distinct interest to central Massachusetts. The station carried some network programing, but much of its telecasting was of a distinct community interest. Now, WWOR–TV is off the air after several months' operation in the red because it was unable to cope with the VHF competition from the Boston, Providence, and Manchester stations. All these VHF stations have good signals which can be picked up by viewers with regular television sets. WWOR–TV, while it did its best to offer worthwhile program material, was faced with this problem: How to get the average viewer to spend anywhere from $50 to $100 to convert his present television set and receiving antenna so as to pick up the UHF picture. The problem was doubly difficult for WWOR–TV because these same viewers could watch top network programing from the nearby VHF stations without any additional expenditures for special adapters or special antennas.

Actually, all UHF stations in Massachusetts, despite the huge television viewing audience, are still in the pioneering stage and are facing the same problems which beset our Boston VHF stations, WBZ–TV and WNAC–TV, several years ago. These two stations also operated in the red during those early days of television when a television receiver was truly a luxury. WBZ–TV and WNAC–TV rendered outstanding public service in those early days and are continuing this splendid public service tradition to this day.

The problems which face the UHF stations in Massachusetts are the same that have held back UHF programing all over

the country where VHF channels are already providing service: only a small proportion of the TV audience have sets to receive the UHF broadcast, networks are not too desirous to affiliate with them, and advertisers are loath to support them because of the small audience. Without network affiliations and advertising, UHF stations lose money, and without money they cannot offer the quality of local programing to build up an audience.

The only hope of the UHF stations to stay on the air is to obtain VHF channel assignments from the FCC. These stations already have the know-how, the technical people, the transmitters, the towers, and local program features to serve community interest.

I hope that the FCC will not longer delay the assignment of VHF channels to the UHF pioneers who have their personal fortunes and the money of their stockholders tied up in a losing battle. When these channels are made available, a new competitive era will begin in the television broadcasting industry to the distinct advantage of the viewers.

I urge continued consideration by the Congress of these matters and hope that in the not too distant future the present problems of the television industry will be adjusted so that it can more capably and adequately serve the public interest.

The foregoing is in substance my statement which I submitted today to the Subcommittee on Communications of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The subcommittee is holding hearings on the allocation of television channels under the chairmanship of United States Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, who is rendering outstanding service in trying to adjust this situation.

Liquor and the Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an article entitled, "Liquor and the Airlines," by Godfrey Sperling, Jr., which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Boston, Mass., on January 13, 1956.

The article is as follows:

An open letter to officials of the airlines that serve liquor:

Have you noticed the latest statement by the man who speaks for your stewards and stewardesses? Rowland K. Quinn says that for years the airlines were aware that a sabotage bomb explosion might occur. It was a real danger, he said; yet nothing was done to avert it—even after an incident of this nature occurred in Canada. Then came United's tragedy, and only now is some effort being made to prevent such incidents in the future.

Similarly, Mr. Quinn, president of the Airlines Stewards and Stewardesses Association, asserts that the airlines are fully aware of the dangers involved in serving liquor to passengers. But, he charges, "they will do nothing about it until we have some great liquor-caused plane tragedy."

Mr. Quinn expresses the opinion, gentlemen, of those who serve your liquor and care for your passengers. Your pilots, as you know, have taken the same firm position against the serving of liquor.

I should like to cite a statement from a letter by Ross Rizley, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board. Says Mr. Rizley in reply to Representative Thomas J. Lane's query on why no action has been taken by the CAB to outlaw liquor service on planes:

"Virtually all correspondence from the public on this matter is based on grounds of morality, good taste, or religion, and safety considerations appear to have been appended as a 'scare' factor to influence the board to regulate the practice on grounds of safety."

What sort of evidence does Mr. Rizley want? And what sort of evidence do you want, gentlemen, since you, too, take the position that safety has not been endangered? In fact, one of your releases to the public says this: "Transportation agencies have no right to prohibit the use of alcoholic beverages unless there is proof that such prohibition is required in the interest of safety. * * *"

Mr. Quinn, together with numerous stewardesses and pilots, can cite lists of incidents that mount up to a mighty indictment on safety ground of those responsible for the serving of liquor on planes. There are pilots who have had to land to get rid of drunks; drunks who have locked themselves in lavatories where they easily could start fires; and drunks who have gone berserk among the passengers. (Just recently a drunk drew a switch-blade knife on his seat-mate.)

The safety threat is compounded when you add to the most flagrant cases the daily incidents of ordinary drunks who harass their fellow passengers and the stewardesses.

Writes Mr. Quinn in his organization's magazine:

"Passenger control is more of a problem with nearly 100 passengers than it was with 21. The modern aircraft is a complex machine. The cockpit crew should not be expected to double as bouncer in the cocktail lounge.

"As a general rule, stewardesses today are younger and less mature than they were even a few years ago, when all applicants were required to be trained nurses. It is unreasonable to expect a young woman barely 20 years old to function as the enforcement agency in their flying saloons."

But back to a passage from Mr. Rizley's letter:

"When the board has received complaints in the past which indicate the slightest possibility of an adverse effect of drinking upon air safety, the board has investigated them; and as a result of these investigations we have found no evidence to show that safety of flight is jeopardized through present practices in this regard."

What kind of evidence does Mr. Rizley want?

Mr. Quinn says it is certainly tragic if we must wait for a case which shows conclusively the presence of the liquor factor in a plane disaster.

Further, he and his capable colleagues are not convinced that the liquor factor is likely to show up on an investigation of a plane wreck. "These probes are concentrated in the cockpit area," he says, "and the investigators are looking primarily for (1) pilot error or (2) engine failure. The plane-wrecking activity of a drunk would probably never come to their attention."

Mr. Quinn points out that in the recent bomb-explosion aloft there was an immediate suspicion of sabotage—a suspicion that directed the probe from the outset along unusual routes of inquiry. This suspicion probably would not be present in a liquor-caused disaster, he contends.

Thus, the terrible evidence the airlines and CAB seem to want may be a long time in coming. Perhaps, it is suggested, the drunk-caused accident will always come under the investigative heading: "Cause of Accident: Unknown."

What are your weighty arguments for serving liquor, gentlemen? Mr. Quinn says that he was to appear recently on a town-meeting-type program in Toledo, Ohio—a program on this very subject that was to be broadcast. Yet, at the last minute, the debate had to be canceled. Reason: No one, absolutely no one, was willing to argue on the side of serving liquor on our airlines.

You airlines' executives usually speak of competition when you explain your position on the liquor issue. T. F. Armstrong, president of Eastern Air Lines, expresses it this way: "Since we are a service organization catering to the public, we must give our passengers what they demand or they will go to competition where they can get it, and that would not be good for the future of our employees or our stockholders."

Yet we all know some airlines do very well without serving liquor. Moreover, if all liquor serving were barred on safety grounds no question of competition would arise.

Mr. Quinn says there is no connection between the serving of liquor to passengers and the use of the airlines by the traveling public. He feels that the "airlines have a special transportation service to give, one that no other mode of transportation can provide. That special service, not liquor, is what attracts the business."

"In fact," he adds, "I would naturally persist in my campaign against liquor on planes, for the safety factor is terribly important to us; but I would be deeply troubled if I thought for a moment that our position in this would, with victory, lead to a cut in airline business. That would mean fewer and fewer stewards and stewardesses, and we wouldn't like that."

But back to Mr. Armstrong. He was speaking about meeting competition by serving liquor aloft lest Eastern's customers go elsewhere. This leads to a final and what we feel to be a very pertinent observation: If the serving of liquor is a serious threat to safety, and there is ample evidence to support this view, isn't there an even bigger question that should be asked—and answered?

Gentlemen, I would like to know if you can conscientiously say that the continued serving of liquor on planes is good for the future of your crew members and your passengers?

I feel confident that once you clearly see that the choice can be reduced to these bare dimensions—making money as opposed to acting in the best interest of your crews and your passengers—you will take the right course of action.

It's Time To Push Ahead on Mental Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the September 1955 issue of the Democratic Digest carried a most thought-provoking article entitled "It's Time To Push Ahead on Mental Health." Under

leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include that article:

OUR MINDS ARE OUR STRENGTH—IT'S TIME TO PUSH AHEAD ON MENTAL HEALTH

Jim Piersall, 22-year-old rookie with the Boston Red Sox, was reporting for spring training in Florida in January of 1952. He had played good baseball and was popular with the fans, but he was a problem child as far as his team was concerned.

"Sometimes I stormed and screamed if I couldn't play," he wrote in his book, Fear Struck Out, "and once I even cried in public like a baby." Then suddenly the world crashed around him. "I went berserk one day," he candidly admits, "and ended up in a mental institution."

Jim Piersall's story is a revealing one, dating back to a childhood filled with fears and conflicts. Its happy ending is told on the sports pages of the Boston Globe at the close of the baseball season in 1953, in these words: "More than any other player, the comeback big leaguer of 1953 is Jim Piersall, 23-year-old Red Sox right fielder. He came from farther back than any of them."

How many others will come back from that bleak, confused world of the mentally ill? How many can be saved before it is too late?

The National Mental Health Committee, a citizens' organization dedicated to promoting further research and more trained personnel in the field of mental disease, reports these statistics:

An estimated 9 million people in the United States—more than 1 in every 17 persons—are suffering from some form of mental illness.

More than half of the hospital patients in 1953 were suffering from mental and nervous disorders.

Unless new treatments and cures are found, more than 13 million people—one out of every 12 persons—will spend some part of their lives in a mental hospital.

Science now holds new hope that many of the tortured souls presently languishing behind the cold walls of a mental institution will be able to "come back," that many of the 250,000 men, women and children who slip into the disturbed and bewildered world of the mentally ill each year can be helped before it is too late.

Dr. William C. Menninger, the noted psychiatrist, reports that most mental illness, perhaps 90 percent, can be cured if treated properly and in time. He describes mental illness as the number one problem—number one in magnitude and neglect. "In many mental hospitals there is one doctor to every 311 patients," he reported recently. "Out of every 100 patients who enter institutions, 60 will never leave."

Dr. Menninger says: "It doesn't have to be this way."

There is tangible proof that it doesn't have to be this way in the operation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, located in Congress Heights in the District of Columbia, a short drive from the Nation's Capital.

Supported by Federal funds, and under the able administration of Dr. Winfred Overholser, its capacity is 7,500, presently filled. Since Congress has generally granted its requests for appropriations, St. Elizabeths has the specialists and trained personnel to administer newly discovered treatments; it has an excellent therapy program with an adequate staff, all adding up to the unusual and gratifying result of releasing two out of three patients admitted.

This is in contrast to the average State mental hospital where about 60 percent of the patients have been there from 5 to 45 years or longer; 25 percent have been there between 1 and 5 years; and only 15 percent have been there less than a year.

This situation can be explained partly by the fact that only in recent years has the increasing incidence of mental illness provoked widespread concern. Much of the recent interest was generated by passage of the Federal Mental Health Act in 1946. Authored by Democratic Representative PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee, the law established the National Mental Health Institute in Bethesda, Md., in an effort to seek new treatment and cures through research.

Today, all 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the 4 Territories have mental health programs, while only 24 States had programs before enactment of the law. Forty-six State governors (excepting Bracken Lee, of Utah, and Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio) have joined with the National Mental Health Committee, with Mrs. Albert D. Lasker and Mrs. Florence Mahoney as cochairmen, in an effort to solve the problem on a national scale.

Working with the National Institutes of Health, the Public Health Service, and other Government and voluntary agencies, their emphasis is on "more funds for research from Federal and State Governments, and voluntary agencies" as one of the urgent needs in the mental health field.

The committee points out that research money brought the victory over polio and that additional expenditures in the mental health field will produce the means for reducing the number of people developing serious mental disorders. Emphasis is also given to the need for training additional psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, and nurses, to help treat the increasing numbers of mentally ill.

Stimulation on the Federal level is rarely a one-way street. Since the first Federal grant in 1947, State and local funds for community mental health have steadily increased. In 1947 Federal grant funds of $3 million were matched by State and local funds of only $2.5 million. But by 1953, Federal funds of $2,325,000 were matched by $12,275,000 in State and local funds—nearly 5 times the 1947 figure.

Recently, workers in the mental health field have been hailing as almost a miracle the development of two new drugs—chlorpromazine and reserpine—the result of painstaking research and experimental work, which give bright promise of revolutionizing the treatment of the mentally ill.

In commenting on the success achieved with these new drugs, Albert Q. Maisel, well-known medical author, raises the question as to whether the war on mental disease is "to produce a major victory in the next few years—or only one that will help generations yet unborn."

Writing in the February Woman's Home Companion, he stated: "Strangely enough, the answer probably doesn't lie entirely in the laboratories of the new psychiatrist-biologist pharmacologist teams. These teams have no dearth of research leads. They know, by now, where they are headed. But the speed with which they move toward their goal depends upon the funds available for research."

While there is almost unanimous agreement that research be given top priority, many a State budget is being strained to build new asylums and facilities for the mentally ill in the face of the constantly increasing incidence.

Democratic Gov. Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey recently pointed out that a new mental hospital just opened in his State will be filled to capacity in a matter of months. Placing the need for research at the top of the list of requirements, Governor Meyner said that "many of our mental patients are merely in custody, meaning that they are fed, clothed and housed behind locked doors. They are not being treated at all. Indeed, for lack of personnel, even certain primary decencies of custody are being neglected."

In Pennsylvania, the administration of Gov. George M. Leader has recently called for $212,328,268 for a public construction program, with nearly three-fourths of the funds requested for new mental hospitals and improvements to existing institutions to meet the increasing hospital load.

In Michigan, Republican legislators retreated a step recently in their economy drive by restoring $808,407 of the $2,467,000 slashed from Democratic Gov. G. Mennen Williams' recommended budget for mental health.

More and more, the States are trying to cope with the problem, looking hopefully toward new treatments and cures.

In May of this year, the Nation observed Mental Health Week during which time appeals were made to contribute to the 1955 Mental Health fund, and newspapers around the country publicized the need for more funds to help combat the almost epidemic proportions of mental illness.

To mark the observance, the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mrs. Hobby, participated in a ceremony at the Department building in the Nation's Capital.

To signify the progress that has been made, Mrs. Hobby, in a dramatic gesture, rang the Mental Bell, a 300-pound bell cast from chains once used to shackle mental patients, with the hope that its message would "awaken a response in the hearts of all Americans."

To the struggling scientists and devoted workers seeking to develop new treatments to alleviate the immense suffering and torture of mental illness on both patients and their loved ones, Mrs. Hobby's ringing of the mental-health bell made a hollow sound.

The National Institute of Mental Health of the United States Public Health Service had requests on hand totaling $22,253,128 from 49 institutions throughout the country to increase their laboratory facilities for research in mental illness. The Institute was unable to fill these requests, since no funds were appropriated in fiscal 1954 for this purpose. President Eisenhower, during his first year in office, recommended a 37-percent cut in the Democratic budget request for mental health.

The efforts to economize at the expense of the Nation's health brought sharp criticism from even the Republican-dominated Hoover Commission. In a departure from its consistent pattern of recommending drastic cuts in many Federal programs, the Hoover Commission took the Eisenhower administration to task for economy in the health field. It pointed out that actual Federal expenditure applicable to basic research in the medical field is less than 1 percent of the total Government research and development expenditures; that there is a backlog of 723 projects totaling more than $7 million, which the National Institutes of Health predict will not be undertaken by them in fiscal 1956 because funds have not been requested by the Eisenhower Administration.

The Commission charges that this negligence suggests "a tendency to deemphasize basic and medical research." Underscoring the seriousness of this failure, it cites the dramatic results of research achieved in the discovery of the Salk vaccine and in the continuing quest for more effective methods of dealing with cancer and mental illness.

On June 6 the Democratic-controlled Senate voted favorably on a bill that would do more for medical research, hospital and health facilities, and public health than any bill ever reported. For mental health, the sum voted was $21,850,000, with new emphasis on research projects.

"This is a problem for the Nation as a whole," the Hoover Commission stated in criticizing the Eisenhower administration for its negligence in the health field. It recommended "that greater Federal support be given to basic and medical research."

In an address at the dedication of the New York University-Bellevue Medical Center June 3, Adlai Stevenson put it this way:

"The stakes are people's lives, and I hope it isn't heresy for a people's Government to take an interest in people's lives.

"We have answered willingly leadership's call for crash programs to build better instruments of death," Governor Stevenson continued. "And now we ask humbly for leadership—from the profession and the Government—for programs to build better instruments of life."

Naming Naval Vessel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should preface these remarks by saying I firmly believe Congress should avoid attempting to name specific naval vessels by legislative action. That prerogative properly should be left to the Department of the Navy; although the overall plan or pattern as to type of name to be given to various classes of ships, of course, is well within the scope of appropriate congressional legislative jurisdiction.

Had I not held to such an opinion, I would have long since introduced a measure here authorizing the name of the city of Seattle to be given to the newly proposed 11,000 ton nuclear-powered cruiser. Instead, I have asked the Secretary of the Navy to give consideration to my request that our first atomic-powered surface ship be named the Seattle.

About 1902, the citizens of Seattle by public subscription raised a large sum for those days to underwrite a cost differential so that a local shipbuilder by the name of Moran could obtain the contract to build the old battleship *Nebraska*. I remember when I was a small boy she was launched—because there was a city holiday and a big celebration. Since then the people of Seattle have been enthusiastic about our Navy. The headquarters of the Thirteenth Naval District are located there and a year or so ago when Secretary Thomas addressed a Seattle Chamber of Commerce luncheon held on the hanger deck of a carrier, 1,800 businessmen came to hear him speak and a great many had to be turned away. That indicates the way Seattle people feel toward the Navy. Altoghether, it would be most fitting and most gratifying to these citizens to have a modern cruiser bear the name of their city.

Personally, I firmly believe that combat vessels of the Pacific Fleet should regularly be based in the Pacific Northwest. That day will come. Meanwhile, units of the fleet will be visting Puget Sound periodically, which pleases the local citizens. In Seattle and other Puget Sound cities, we are always glad to welcome the officers and enlisted personnel of the fleet.

The old armored cruiser No. 11, the ex-U. S. S. *Washington*, was called the *Seattle*. She was stricken from the list July 17, 1946. She had been authorized by Congress in 1902. She was built at Camden, N. J., at a cost of $4,035,000. In 1916, the name of the *Washington* was changed to *Seattle*. She was the first American warship to arrive in France after we entered World War I. In 1919, she joined the Pacific Fleet at Seattle, and for a number of years made visits to her namesake city on Puget Sound. The people of Seattle took pride in her and were always glad to have her visit that port.

The Chief of the Bureau of Ships, Admiral Mumma, mentioned to me once that the old *Seattle* was the first ship in which he served. She was the flagship of the Pacific Fleet in 1923. But, as I said, Mr. Speaker, the *Seattle* was stricken July 17, 1946, and rightfully and hopefully, the citizens of a great community earnestly hope the Secretary of the Navy will consider giving the newest modern cruiser which is expected to be authorized in fiscal 1957 the honored name of *Seattle*.

Plan for U. N. Commission To Seek Solution of Arab Refugee Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 29, 1955, during the debate in this House on the Mutual Security Act, I discussed the situation in the Middle East and our military and economic programs in that area. At that time. I warned against embarking upon a policy of appeasement in the Middle East to gain Arab favor. I called attention to the fact that Israel, our bastion of freedom in that area was being isolated politically and economically; that its national security was being threatened militarly by the Arab countries; and that, in fact, its very existence was at stake as the Arab States grew stronger militarily.

Mr. Speaker, that was the situation before Egypt had concluded its agreement with the Soviet bloc to obtain arms from the Communist countries. It has grown considerably worse in the last few months since the Communists are pouring arms into the Middle East. The military balance of this strategic area has been upset. If it leads to a renewal of the Arab-Israel conflict in the region, it would constitute a great blow to us and our allies because it would weaken a vital spot in our defense structure against communism.

Last June I urged our Government to take two steps. First, to grant military aid to Israel in order to maintain a balance of power in the Middle East and to give Israel the necessary arms for defense in the event of agrression against her. Second, to conclude a mutual defense pact between the United States and Israel whereby the security of the latter would be guaranteed and the integrity of its borders respected.

In the light of events which have taken place since last June, these two proposals are even more timely and necessary today. They are fair and just. They make sense. I am convinced that if these proposals are accepted and fulfilled, the tension in the Middle East will subside, the stability of the region will be strengthened, and a peaceful settlement on honorable terms could then be attained between Israel and the Arab States.

There is, however, one other major problem in the area which should be dealt with on a more practical and more realistic basis than it has been done until now. I refer to the problem of the Arab refugees which should be solved as soon as possible. This is a festering wound which is adding to the unrest and the instability of the area and is preventing a reasonable approach toward a peaceful settlement. I feel that if a sound and practical plan can be worked out toward a solution of the Arab refugee problem, the whole situation in the Middle East would become more hopeful as regards the future.

Consequently, I should like to propose that the United States suggest to the United Nations that it appoint a commission which shall undertake a study of the Arab refugee problem with the purpose of developing a new approach to this problem. This U. N. Commission is to visit the refugee camps in the Middle East, confer with the leaders of the refugees, as well as with the Arab governments in which the camps are located. The refugee problem should also be taken up with the Government of Israel.

The solution of the refugee problem should proceed somewhat along the following lines: Israel is to permit the repatriation of a limited number of former Arab residents, consonant with its security regulations and the possibility of integrating these people within its economy. Israel is to pay compensation to the other refugees who cannot be returned, and for this purpose an international loan is to be made to Israel on the basis suggested by Secretary of State Dulles in his address of August 26, 1955. The Arabs who cannot be repatriated should be resettled permanently in the Arab States. It is most advisable for the U. N. Commission to recommend plans for their permanent resettlement in those countries, and not to have to maintain these people on a permanent charity basis as is being done at the present time and prevent them from being used as pawns by the Communists to foment trouble in that area.

This is a problem for the United Nations. The U. N. must exert all efforts to solve it. In so doing, it will make a great contribution toward peace in the Middle East. To foment trouble and unrest in a given area is the Communist way. The American way is to find a solution through direct negotations with the parties concerned.

In the near future, I plan to introduce a resolution in Congress advocating the appointment of such a commission by the United Nations. In the meantime, I desire to bring the idea to the attention of the Congress.

Gas Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editoral that appeared in the Wednesday, January 25, 1956, issue of the Boston Evening American, of Boston, Mass. It has some interesting facts that I believe are worthy of consideration. It is as follows:

GAS FACTS

Fundamental facts of interest to the consumer are being obscured in the Senate controversy over Federal control of the natural-gas industry.

The natural-gas business falls in three divisions—producers who obtain the fuel at the wells and who operate mainly in six States; interstate pipelines which transport natural gas to consumer markets, the bulk of which are situated in 33 large importing States; and distributors, or in plain language, local gas companies. Pipelines and local gas companies operate as monopolies.

To protect the public local gas companies are regulated under State laws as public utilities. The Federal Government has no jurisdiction in this field.

Further to protect the public, Congress in 1938 passed the Natural Gas Act, giving the Federal Power Commission authority over the pipeline engaged in interstate commerce. The act specifically exempted producers at the well from Federal regulation.

In June 1954, the Supreme Court ruled, by a split decision, that producers were also subject to Federal control if any part of their production was sold across State lines.

In sum, the Court held that a law passed by Congress contained something that Congress had not put in the law.

This as in the preceding matter of oil-bearing tidelands, was a case of the Federal judiciary invading the legislative powers of Congress.

Congress nullified the earlier decision by passing a law that returned the tidelands seized by the Federal Government to the States which had owned them for 100 years without dispute.

Following that precedent, the Harris-Fulbright bill was introduced in Congress to rescind the natural gas decision and was passed by the lower House last year. The bill is now pending in the Senate.

The basic issue, therefore, is that legislative powers under the Federal Constitution belong solely to Congress and may not be usurped by either the executive or judicial branch.

Obviously, if the Federal Government has power to "regulate" the production of natural gas, then, as Senator BRIDGES has said:

"We must also extend Government control to the production of coal, lead, zinc, copper, and all other mining."

Opponents of the Fulbright bill assert that the production of natural gas is a monopoly from which the public must be protected by Federal intervention.

No reliable facts are offered to support this contention.

It is true that 197 companies produce 90 percent of the natural gas supply. But of these 197 companies competing with each other, none controls 5 percent of the total production. Moreover, in this highly competitive industry there are actually 8,000 producers operating 71,000 gas wells in 28 States.

That is hardly a monopoly.

Opponents of the Fulbright bill also allege that the consuming public is the victim of price extortion by the natural-gas companies.

There are some 25 million residential natural-gas consumers, mostly in the large cities, and the millions of families who read the Hearst newspapers are among them. Naturally, we are on their side; always have been and always will be.

But here are some facts:

Prices vary geographically, but taking New England for an example:

The producer averages only 10 cents per 1,000 cubic feet for natural gas piped into New England. The pipelines get only 50 cents. But the average home price in New England is $2.40 per 1,000 cubic feet, the local distributor getting $1.80. The distributor's price is thus 2,400 percent of the producer's price.

In Washington, D. C., a residential consumer pays $1.31 for natural gas for which the producer receives 12½ cents.

According to a congressional estimate, a local utility company collects 18 cents for delivering 2 cents worth of natural gas.

Plainly, the high costs to consumers are attributable much more to local service and distribution than to exploitation by producers; and local utilities are subject to State or municipal regulation.

Opponents of the Fulbright bill contend that Federal regulation, as unconstitutionally decreed by the Supreme Court, will increase the market supply of natural gas and reduce consumer prices.

Market statistics indicate exactly the opposite effects.

Expanding potential markets demand expanding supplies.

But the interstate supply is diminishing. Because of Federal regulation at the wellheads, many independent producers are selling their product only within their own States; where Federal control is absent. Likewise, "wildcatting," or bringing in new wells, is declining.

The long-range result of Federal control must be a future market shortage and high consumer prices.

I am also inserting herewith an interesting editorial from the Marshall News Messenger of Marshall, Tex., for January 22, 1956, as follows:

GAS BILL IS TOP DOMESTIC ISSUE

In an editorial this week the Saturday Evening Post observes that "there is a shocking absence of understanding about the potentially destructive results of governmental regulation of individual enterprise." It was referring to the Fulbright bill now being debated in the United States Senate, and its headline reads: "If Gas Can Be Regulated, So Can the Corner Grocer."

Under this bill, closely similar to one passed by the House last year, the Federal Power Commission would be stopped from regulating the price and production of natural gas at the wellhead. Congress never intended to grant this power to any Federal agency, and the FPC itself refused for years to seize the power, as the advocates of more and more Federal regulation and regimentation urged it to do. But the United States Supreme Court, that supergovernment which comes more and more to regulate our downsit-FPC should take over the regulation of natural gas anyhow, on the ground that since it moves to interstate commerce it is the Federal Government's duty to regulate its production and control the price at which it comes out of the earth.

Supporters of the bills to take this authority away from Federal bureaucracy argue that far from helping gas consumers in the big cities, it will tend to raise the price because it will adversely affect production, and thus cut down supply.

There is no Federal bureaucratic control of any other mineral in the same direct way FPC controls gas production, but as the Post argues if this unique and unprecedented policing of natural gas isn't stopped now, the time will come when even the corner grocer can be told exactly what he can do or cannot do.

The debate may drag on for weeks, but if in the end it means an end to a dangerous precedent in regulatory power it will have been worth the time and effort. No more important issue faces the country on the domestic front today.

Dulles' Policy of Boldness Vacillates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was not completely honest in the exclusive interview which he gave to Henry Luce's Life magazine in which he semed to be attempting to establish a political beachhead for the November elections.

His brink-of-war statement was full of misrepresentations conceived by the Secretary to cover up vacillations and bungling which lost Indochina, destroyed the confidence of our allies and gave to the Soviets the initiative in the cold war—a cold war, which Dulles turned into a "hot peace."

Secretary Dulles failed to give credit where credit was due—to congressional leaders. It was the alertness of leaders to Congress who rescued Dulles and Eisenhower when they were about to go over the brink in the Eisenhower plan for United States participation in the Indochina war in 1954. Dulles would have been over the brink and into war if congressional leaders had not applied the brakes.

Members of this House heard our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, relate over a year ago how the Eisenhower administration favored United States intervention on the side of the French in Indochina. But congressional leaders, meeting in Secretary Dulles' office in April 1954 advised Dulles and Admiral Radford to "come up with a full package" including agreement with Great Britain and France on what course to take. With no encouragement from the congressional leaders, Dulles was saved from going over the brink.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include herewith an article by Drew Pearson, which appeared in the Evening Telegraph of Alton, Ill., on Tuesday, January 23. It follows:

POLICY OF BOLDNESS VACILLATES

WASHINGTON.—Most important question raised by all the hullabaloo over the John

Foster Dulles brink-of-war statement is whether the United States is drifting into war, or can keep the peace.

All other questions are unimportant. The political feuding between Democrats and Republicans aroused by the Life magazine article doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Only important is the question of war and peace.

So let's take a careful look at the Dulles-Eisenhower score.

Before doing so, however, it might be well to recall that during the Hoover administration, when the world first started its downhill drift toward war, an internationally minded Republican Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, did his best to warn the United States and his own President that aggressors were on the march in Asia, and that this might lead toward war.

Stimson saw the landing of the Japanese Army in Manchuria September 18, 1931, as the first sign of eventual world war and he tried to do exactly what Dulles says he's doing now—take a firm stand which would prevent war. Stimson wanted the fleet mobilized, approached the Canadian, Mexican, and Chilean Governments for use of bases along their coast, was ready to use the threat of force to stop the Jap warlords.

But his President, Herbert Hoover, was opposed. So were strong isolationist elements within the Republican Party. In move after move proposed by Stimson, he was stopped by his own President and his own party.

History showed that Stimson was right, just as Dulles is right in his basic theory that war can be prevented if the United States takes a firm position and makes that position clearly known in advance.

However, the position must be so clear as to be completely unequivocal. There can be no vacillation.

When it came to Indochina, the Eisenhower administration vacillated all over the place, which was why we lost Indochina. It was not a save, as Life magazine and Dulles so glibly put it. It was a tragic loss, largely because NIXON said we would use troops, Eisenhower said we would not use troops. Dulles said one thing one week and another the next, and no one could get together. Result: The Chinese Reds, knowing how confused we were, kept right on advancing.

That, however, is history. Let's look at the future.

Life magazine and Dulles also claim that war was avoided against Quemoy and Matsu as a result of the Dulles' policy of boldness.

WAS DULLES BOLD?

However, it happens that the Red Chinese have been building airstrips and massing troops opposite Quemoy and Matsu for some time and despite Dulles' boldness, war certainly has not yet been avoided. On the contrary, three high United States officials have just visited this area, obviously worried about war—Secretary of the Air Force Quarles, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Radford, and Air Chief of Staff Twining.

Now just what is the reason for the apparent Chinese disdain for Dulles' policy of boldness?

The answer is the same as in the case of Indochina: United States indecision and vacillation.

Here, despite the Life interview, are the inside facts as to what really happened:

On September 12, 1954, the National Security Council flew to Denver for an unprecedented meeting with the President in which it urged that a definite policy of boldness be adopted toward Quemoy and Matsu, and that authorization be given to bomb the Chinese mainland in case the Red Chinese attacked.

President Eisenhower, however, refused to buy this policy. He postponed any decision. It was a difficult one to make, and like Herbert Hoover, when pressed by Stimson in regard to Manchuria in 1931, he sidestepped.

Dulles, referring to the policy of risking war around Formosa and Korea, stated in Life: "It took a lot more courage for the President than for me. His was the ultimate decision. The President never flinched for a minute on any of these decisions. He came up taut."

That, however, was not what happened. Weeks passed, then months. No decision came from the White House. Meanwhile the National Security Council kept Quemoy-Matsu up in the air. Eventually this indecision was noted in the American press, the first exclusive facts being published by Chalmers Roberts of the Washington Post November 8, 1954.

Over-60 Employment Service of Northern Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the Soroptimist International of Arlington will launch the opening of the Over-60 Employment Service of Northern Virginia on Monday, January 23, 1956, at the Recreation Department, 915 North Jackson Street, phone Jackson 7-8888.

This service will seek to place all men and women over 60 who desire employment in full time, part time, or seasonal employment. The Virginia State Employment Service of Arlington and the recreation department have cooperated with the Soroptimist Club to set up this service. The State employment service is acting in an advisory capacity and the recreation department is furnishing the office space and phones.

The employment service office will be open each Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 1:30 p. m. to 3:30 p. m. for over-60 applicants to register and to receive job orders. The office will be staffed by members of the Silver Age Group and supervised by the Soroptimist Club.

To date there has been no employment service or voluntary agency specializing in placement of the older age group of men and women in the northern Virginia area. The opening of this new employment service affords the businessmen of this area an opportunity to fill many personnel gaps.

In Virginia alone, 1 person in every 12 is 65. By 1960 it is estimated there will be 300,000 persons over 60 in the State. This group is one of our greatest untapped sources of employment and their usefulness is becoming increasingly recognized. They can make a contribution to the economy and regain the feeling of well-being that work brings, if the employers of northern Virginia will utilize their skills.

During World War II it was established that older workers lost less time for illness and other reasons than those employees in the younger brackets. They were more conscientious on the job and turned out, as a whole, a better day's work.

There is a definite need in northern Virginia for such an employment service and with its opening comes a challenge to the businessmen to make use of this great untapped source of experienced workers.

What does America's senior citizen want? Survey after survey emphasizes he or she has two fundamental desires: to continue to work in some form—to be active and useful and to be independent and maintain his own home. Through our employment service we can help them attain their goals.

Remarks Delivered by Rabbi Osher Zilberstein, of Los Angeles, at the Conference of Jewish Organizations at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., January 18, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of our colleagues the following speech, delivered by Rabbi Osher Zilberstein of Los Angeles, Calif., at the Conference of Jewish Organizations at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on January 18, 1956. Rabbi Zilberstein is the dean of and principal orthodox rabbi of Los Angeles:

This is the 250th birthday of Benjamin Franklin, one of the founders of American liberty.

The Saturday Evening Post, which he founded, bears on its cover this week one of his famous statements or proverbs. It reads:

"If all printers were determined not to print anything till they were sure it would offend nobody, there would be very little printed."

To paraphrase Benjamin Franklin, let me say that if the Jewish people do not press their cause lest they offend the powers of the world, there will be little said and our cause may be lost.

You will remember that in 1894, when a military clique of France, out of racial motives, maliciously accused Captain Dreyfus of high treason and sentenced him for life to Devil's Island, Emile Zola, the forthright champion of justice, published his famous open letter to the President of France titled "I Accuse."

The impact of that letter reverberated throughout France and the entire civilized world. It took some time and justice was restored. Would it not be appropriate, then, for this worthy assembly, practically representing United States Jewry, at this crucial hour of Israel's adversity, to shout out from the depth of our anguish and distress, "We accuse"?

To the United Nations we should say:

"On November 29, 1947, you courageously proclaimed a sovereign Jewish state in Palestine.

"After 7 years of the existence of Israel, during which it has been attacked on so many occasions by its surrounding Arab antagonists, you could not, with all of your political and diplomatic facilities, determine who was the aggressor: Israel, who has always stretched out its hands in peace, or

Egypt and its cohorts, who speak incessantly of war with and annihilation of Israel.

"Now it appears that you are setting a new policy to tacitly permit Arab aggression but vigorously censure Israel retaliation.

"Why do you follow a course as though Arab aggression does not endanger peace in the Middle East but that Jewish retaliation does—unless it is because you have arrived at the insidious premise that peace in the Middle East can only come by the destruction of Israel, and consequently each retaliation on the side of Israel is destructive to that so-called peace?

"Has it been forgotten that the League of Nations, to which the Arabs owe so much for their present existence as sovereign states, mandated (as ratified by the United States Congress) all of Palestine on both sides of the Jordan as a Jewish homeland, not alone the present boundaries fixed by Israel's victory in battle?"

To our beloved country, the United States of America, to whom we owe so much, we should say:

"On May 15, 1948, the very day of Israel's founding, you solemnly ratified the existence of the Jewish state.

"Why, then, when that state is struggling desperately for its continued existence and stretches its hands to you for rescue, imploring you to permit it to purchase arms for defense, do you say that that will start an arms' race?

"But an arms' race is already in progress. England is racing with Soviet Russia to see who will find more grace in the eyes of Egypt.

"Doesn't this very fact eliminate the contentions that the arms granted Egypt are intended, first, for peaceful purposes and, second, as a bulwark against communism?

"Isn't it more realistic to believe that arms for the Arabs are intended for the destruction of Israel?"

Will this country, which has recently fought two wars for justice, for the good of humanity, and for the protection of smaller and weaker nations, be a partner to this political and moral outrage, by refusing to give arms to Israel for defense and refusing Israel political guaranty and protection?

I am sure that the founders of this great country of ours, if alive, would join in our cry: "We accuse."

Truman, China, and History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in Life magazine:

TRUMAN, CHINA AND HISTORY

Mr. Truman resumes his Memoirs with his account of the Marshall mission to China. That mission, itself a failure, laid the base for the archfailure of the whole Truman foreign policy, the loss of the Asian mainland to communism. Thus his version will arouse strong feelings on the part of all who opposed his Asia policy at the time—including the editors of Life.

Mr. Truman's account can be criticized for its omissions. For instance, he ignores the obvious reason why the Chinese Communists welcomed and for a time observed the truce which Marshall negotiated in China's civil war in early 1946. It was during those very months that the Soviet Army delayed its withdrawals from Manchuria to enable the Chinese Communists, unharassed by Nationalist troops, to take over this key province, including vast quantities of Japanese arms. But the main shortcoming of Mr. Truman's account need not be sought in its omissions. It is in his own words.

Mr. Truman outlaws "hindsight" in judging the reasons for Marshall's failure. But one of our valued ex-President's most valuable habits, so he often tells us, is the reading of history for its lessons. The Marshall mission, so read, contained the three major American mistakes which by 1949 had led to the communization of China.

The first major mistake was not to take communism seriously enough soon enough. A State Department memorandum, appended to Marshall's directive, called the Chinese Reds "the so-called Communists." Mr. Truman says that neither he nor Marshall was subject to this then fashionable illusion; in that case their mistake was fearful rather than wishful thinking. Marshall was afraid that the Soviets, despite Stalin's public and private promise, would come to the support of their fellow Communists. He urged withdrawing the United States Marines "to avoid the inevitable Russian recriminations similar to those today regarding the British troops in Greece." But only a year later, when the British had to withdraw from Greece, Mr. Truman correctly and courageously took over the British role in that civil war, Russian recriminations and all; and General Van Fleet helped the free Greeks win it without Soviet reprisal. Had the same determination prevailed in China in 1946, that civil war could have been won, too. The whole world picture today would be entirely different if, in 1946, we had had in China a General Van Fleeet with the right instructions instead of a General Marshall with the wrong ones.

The second major mistake was not to take China seriously enough, either then or later. Mr. Truman tells us that there was no authoritative Chinese Government after 1911—which, if true, was even truer before 1911. But, of course, there was a Chinese Government, grounded in the Sun Yat-sen revolution, battered by 8 years of war against Japan, weary but proved. Since 1937 this Government's internal weaknesses and external retreats show a rough inverse correspondence with the degree of support it has received from the United States. During the Marshall year this support reached its nadir.

As Mr. Truman relates, a $500 million loan was withheld (arms shipments were also embargoed) because the Chinese Government insisted on fighting the Reds. This reasoning sounds fantastic today. Behind it lay not only some pro-communism in the State Department, but, what was equally serious, an official defeatism and deafness toward Asia which extended from the Presidency down. Marshall was once heard to say he could not decide whether the Chinese masses were an asset or a liability to the free world. The Communists never had such doubts.

The third major mistake was to permit a personal distaste for Chiang Kai-shek to influence United States policy toward his government. This distaste shows through the scolding letter from Truman on page 90. From the beginning the Marshall pacification strategy treated Chiang and Chou En-lai as equals in status and wound up urging a "coalition" government. This strategy not only abetted the Communist purpose (as Czechoslovakia later showed) but was an insult to the legitimate head of a government against which the Reds were in armed rebellion.

What Chiang then needed was full moral and physical support, such as we now give him in his Formosan stronghold. Since 1946, to defend him and the free periphery of Asia, we have spent far more in lives and treasure than Mr. Truman says the American people would not have stood for at that time. It is hindsight to say this, but it is also a history lesson, similar to that of the Cumean Sibyl in ancient Rome. When King Tarquin thought she asked too much for 9 books of prophecy, she burned 3 and offered him the other 6 at the same price. Again refused, she burned 3 more, and Tarquin finally bought them for the same sum that might have purchased 9. Chiang Kai-shek is still considered untouchable by Mr. Truman, who still blames him and extremists on each side for Marshall's failure. But the smaller grows Chiang's realm, the larger he grows as the tragic hero of history's Asian tale, and the better look the bargains we refused to make a few short years ago.

In 1948 we called Mr. Truman's China policy one of "disastrous neglect half-hidden by irrelevant sermonizing." It still reads that way in his Memoirs. And the question of China is by no means settled. Even now the drive to scuttle Chiang's government from the U. N. and to recognize Mao's gathers force in the diplomatic world. The mistakes begun in Marshall's mission have persisted too long already. If history does not teach us anything, what is the use of reading it—or writing it—at all?

Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, to let go by without mention the birthday anniversary of Albert Gallatin, Congressman, great Secretary of the Treasury in Jefferson's time, banker, and resident of my State in his later years, is something I feel we in the House cannot do.

Member of our House of Representatives, Senator, Treasurer, foreign minister, banker, ethnologist, historian and writer, this illustrious and eminently useful citizen came to America at the age of 19 from Geneva, Switzerland, where he was born on January 29, 1761. At the age of 35, he was the acknowledged intellectual leader of the Jeffersonian Party in the House and the only man in his party competent to return to the people the right to determine how the Nation's money is spent. That he was able to do so, in the face of enormous opposition by Hamilton's Federalist Party, was a tribute both to his talents and to his fortitude.

The development of commerce in an atmosphere of peace was Gallatin's yardstick for the prosperity of the people of his adopted land. All wars, commercial or other, he called fatal to progress, though he was to experience both kinds during his life of service and to rectify some of the evil results which followed them.

Shortly after the War of 1812 with England was over, Gallatin succeeded in negotiating a treaty with America's former enemy ending all discriminatory tariffs. In 1818 he assisted United States Minister to England Rush in concluding a commercial convention.

As a result of his efforts in fiscal and foreign trade matters, the credit and

prestige of the United States in the opening decades of the 19th century were at a peak. And, it is at such a peak that I know all of us here want to keep them.

However, there have been some dips of late as a result of certain ill-conceived departures by the current administration from its own "trade, not aid" policy. In a period when it must be our considered aim to win as many new friends as possible, alienating the affections of our old ones cannot be condoned. Most especially, we have erred in offending the Swiss, excellent trade partners since 1850 when the Swiss-American Treaty of Friendship and Commerce was signed. Boosting the duty on watch imports and threatening other discriminatory tariff actions is certainly no way to hold the affection of our best cash customer in Europe. Moreover, this attitude upset our other foreign friends who were dismayed and made apprehensive.

As a Congressman from the State of New York, where most of the watch importing and assembly firms are found, I am more aware than most of the bad effects the imposition of the new tariff barriers on watch imports is having—or is threatening to have—on the legitimate businesses of a major segment of the American jewelry industry. For, since less than 5 percent of the total gross retail price of a watch returns to Switzerland, it is obvious that American importers, assemblers, and wholsesale and retail jewelers must bear the brunt of any discriminatory action which limits watch imports. And, because watches constitute the most important commodity group exported by Switzerland to the United States, any diminution of imports is bound to curtail Swiss spending for American products.

If we can learn from Gallatin's career the one thing of value which has particular relevance today, it is that harmonious commercial dealings with foreign lands provide our best insurance for peace and prosperity.

NATO Is a Strong Deterrent Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, in July 1955 you paid me a distinct honor by appointing me as one of the six Members of the House of Representatives to serve as delegates to the NATO—North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Parliamentary Conference, which took place in Paris July 18 through 22. I am very grateful to you, sir, for this signal honor. My colleagues on that delegation were the distinguished Members of this House, WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, FRANK J. BECKER, of New York, S. J. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana, LEROY JOHNSON, of California, and STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona.

This was the first NATO parliamentary conference of its kind in which the representatives of the 15 countries associated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization met together to exchange views and opinions pertaining to the maintenance of peace and security of the nations concerned, as well as to obtain closer economic, social and cultural relations between the peoples of the Atlantic community. There we had the opportunity to meet with many of the Western European leaders and statesmen with whom we discussed the present international scene. We were also privileged to be briefed by the top military leaders of NATO, including Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, General Eisenhower's successor as Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, as to the military position of the NATO countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell at length on the proceedings of that conference at this time, or the role played by our delegation. That was already done by our distinguished colleague, Representative WAYNE L. HAYS, who so ably served as the chairman of our delegation, in a report which he submitted to this body on August 1, 1955. I merely wish to share some thoughts and observations which I have developed during and after that conference when I visited several Western European countries and had the opportunity to meet and discuss mutual problems with leading statesmen in those countries.

My tour of Europe lasted from July 18, when I arrived in Paris, until August 31, when I embarked from Spain for the United States. I visited France, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain. I paid official visits to SHAPE headquarters in Paris and the Allied Forces Southern Europe headquarters in Naples, where I was briefed by the Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Frank N. Roberts, United States Army, and officers of his staff, regarding the latest developments in NATO.

In my talks with European government leaders, parliamentarians, diplomats, military leaders and heads of major political parties, I stressed the deep and abiding interest of the American people in world peace and the security of the free nations. At the same time, however, I emphasized the urgent need for maintaining the military power and strength of the free world to assure its continued freedom. I noted that NATO constituted a strong force and a deterrent against communism in Europe and, hence, should be strengthened.

In each of these countries I emphasized that the presence of allied troops in the NATO countries is to prevent future invasion by Soviet Russia and to contain the Russian and satellite armies in Eastern Europe. "The soldiers from these 15 NATO countries are, in reality, 'soldiers of peace' and they should be welcomed by the people of those countries," I told our friends abroad.

Furthermore, I made certain specific suggestions which were received with considerable interest by our allies. For example, both in Paris and in Rome I recommended that some of the huge agricultural surplus in the United States be stockpiled in the NATO countries to be used in the event of war, also in cases of emergency—floods, earthquakes, famines, and other disasters—and for the purpose of strengthening European defense now.

At the time I was in Europe during July and August, the spirit of Geneva was in full bloom. It was on everyone's mind. People everywhere asked: Is it sincere, or is it a mask of falsity to cover up Soviet plans and maneuvers? They wondered whether Russia was in earnest in her desire for world peace, or was it merely a stalling device?

Today we pretty well know the answers to those questions. We are a bit older, though nonetheless wiser. The spirit of Geneva evaporated much sooner than even the most optimistic among us had expected. Even the most naive will admit today that Russian smiles and charm tactics cannot, and should not, be taken at face value. It was only a grand hoax to deceive the people of the world who are hungry for genuine peace. Russia's smiling diplomacy did not constitute a fundamental change in Communist tactics. It was only a temporary shift in the well-known zigzag line which Moscow pursues periodically for tactical reasons. These changes disappear as abruptly as they come. The leopard does not change his spots, he can only camouflage them for a while.

I am inclined to agree with the viewpoint recently expressed by General Gruenther, who feels that we should be cheered rather than depressed by the end of the spirit of Geneva. General Gruenther had become worried by the readiness of many Allied nations to reduce their defense efforts because of a few false Communist smiles. It is incredible how much damage was caused to NATO—to its morale and its physical structure—during the short-lived and unlamented period in which the spirit of Geneva was thriving. Who knows how much more serious and irreparable damage would have been caused to the security of the Western World if this will-o'-the-wisp spirit had lasted another 6 months. It was all built on deception. It was intended to give us a false sense of security, to cause us to relax our guard, to weaken our resistance, to prepare us for the time when communism could give the free world a final coup de grace.

The end of that elusive spirit is, therefore, not a cause for alarm; on the contrary, it is much more desirable this way, because it helps us to see the enemy of the free world in his true colors. It helps us realize the danger in which we find ourselves and to prepare for it. And this is where NATO comes in.

Fundamentally, NATO is a defense organization. According to the agreement signed by the NATO nations, "they are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security." With the development of nuclear weapons—over which we still maintain supremacy—with the establishment of strategic naval and air bases throughout the world, and with full command of the air and the seas—we are in a position militarily to contain

the Soviet empire. The 15 NATO nations are in a position today to strike at Soviet Russia and its satellites from any direction and to destroy its ability to wage war.

The Soviet leaders know this and for that reason they have made the dissolution of NATO the number one objective of Soviet foreign policy. Ever since the formation of NATO in 1949 the Soviet Union has been trying, first by the threat of force and later by cajoling and charming smiles, to destroy it. Let us not be deceived: the crippling of NATO still remains Russia's primary target.

May I remind all of my colleagues in this House that NATO was brought into being during the administration of former President Harry S. Truman, who acted quickly in response to the need of the hour and appointed Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as its first military head. The reason President Truman supported NATO was because he realized that Soviet imperialism was threatening to occupy by force the remainder of Europe. The creation of NATO was a major factor in stopping the imminent Russian advance across Europe.

We must continue to maintain this advantage afforded us by NATO. We must continue to help strengthen our allies, both militarily and economically because strength is the only thing which Soviet Russia understands, fears, and respects. As long as we have the power to restrain and contain the Russians, as long as we have the means and the strength to destroy them—they will never attack us. Furthermore, only if we maintain a strong position can we hope to negotiate with the Russians on an equal basis. When we are weak, they will talk with us from time to time and even sign agreements—but it is for the purpose of deriving more concessions from us. Besides, their agreements are worthless anyhow, as the history of the last decade shows so vividly.

Today 15 nations are united in a defense pact under the auspices of NATO. Each of these nations is contributing manpower, equipment, and resources. American generals wear the insignia of NATO which indicates that they lead men in 45 different uniforms—the army, navy, and air forces of the 15 countries. There is perfect harmony and understanding in this amalgamation of military power which is bent on preventing world war III. I believe that this spirit of unity and cooperation on both sides of the Atlantic constitutes one of the strongest influences for peace in the world today and one of the major deterrents against communism. I further believe that we would be wise in creating a similar organization in the Pacific area.

As I toured the countries of Western Europe and talked with the men who are trying to fulfill the NATO program and to make it work, I had the feeling that here were dedicated men who had seen all that they wanted to see of war and bloodshed, and that they would do anything in their power to prevent another world conflagration. I was pleased to learn that NATO was a practical organization, that it was geared for immediate and collective action, and not only in the military field but also in the political, social, and economic fields. And may I add at this point that both the Allied Command and NATO are prepared to use all their resources for the defense not only of Europe, but also of North and South America. All of our allies readily understand how important it is for our production plants in the United States to be protected at all costs.

I have come away from Europe with the conviction that the Russian bear is still a great menace and a tremendous challenge to the free world. It would be folly for us to relax our efforts even for one moment. Let us not be deceived by false smiles and sudden displays of friendship, which are turned on or off by the masters in the Kremlin to suit their desires. Yesterday, the lukewarm faucet was on, today we are getting the cold shower again and its stinging needles of hatred.

During the period of the great smile, Russia was busily engaged in consolidating its position in Europe all the way from Finland, through Germany, Austria, and Yugoslavia to the Mediterranean area. She sought, and to some extent, succeeded in neutralizing these countries, to alienate them from the free world, to divide the West, and to cripple the NATO organization, and all of it was done with the aid of a few smiles and honeyed words. Following the Summit Conference at Geneva, the Communist cry in many parts of Europe was: "See, the Big Four are now at peace, so let down your guard and let us all be friends." I have seen this type of operation, this new system of subversion and subtle sabotage, at work in France and Italy.

How are we to combat such tactics? Let me make a few suggestions and summarize my views on the basis of what I have observed abroad:

First and foremost, the Western Powers must develop a greater degree of realism concerning the present Russian leaders, their techniques, their ultimate goals. Unless we do so, we may suddenly discover that their methods and their ways of thinking are much more devious and treacherous than those of Stalin.

Second, it is most essential that we strive for greater unity of purpose, action and cooperation on the part of the free world, in order to act with resoluteness when dealing with Communist Russia. We have been outtalked, outmaneuvered and outbargained each time we sat down with its representatives to discuss world affairs, whether in Geneva or the United Nations.

Third, we must continue to strengthen ourselves and to strengthen our allies, militarily and economically, because only a position of strength will afford us the necessary security and enable us to survive.

Fourth, we should seek to develop diplomatic cooperation within the NATO organization. This idea was originally suggested by the Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak, who believes that the NATO countries should discuss among themselves their respective differences and difficulties in an effort to present a common diplomatic front to the rest of the world. This diplomatic or political function would supplement the present military and economic structure of NATO and would serve as a means for diplomatic defense through consultation and cooperation among the Atlantic nations, just as 6 years ago it became urgent for them to pool their armed forces for common defense. In this complex world in which we live, more than military considerations are necessary to devise satisfactory defense. I believe that if NATO had had impartial working committees to investigate problems among its member-nations, many of these problems could have been resolved more satisfactorily and we could have avoided a good deal of the damage caused. The problem of Cyprus involving three NATO members, Britain, Greece, and Turkey, should have been handled by NATO. Perhaps also France's difficulties in North Africa. Potential difficulties between France and West Germany over the Saar is another case for NATO.

Fifth. I would like to see the establishment of a quasi-government agency which is to be entrusted with the task of disposing of some of our agricultural surpluses abroad to government agencies and private welfare organizations. This is to be done in a manner and only to such agencies that will aid the forces which are fighting communism. In our desire to help suffering people everywhere, we sometimes pour our help into the wrong places and to the wrong people. Those who accept our gifts must know that they come from the people of the United States and not from the Kremlin masters who want to enslave them. Let me cite one example. In Italy, where our aid is given on a government-to-government basis, there are about 2,500 local towns and communes which are controlled by the Communists. They receive a share of this help. Thus, we are helping them to stay in power and to control important areas, where actually it is not our intention to do so. Perhaps it would be best if we had committees in the various communities, including American members, to handle the distribution of our surplus commodities. Such committees would see to it that the United States got the credit and only the communities cooperating with the free world would receive such assistance.

Sixth. I believe the time has come to set up a private international organization to aid political parties and democratic institutions throughout the free world in their efforts to combat communism. This organization is to be composed of men and women, individuals and groups, institutions and foundations—in fact, every facet of life and activity of the free nations which can provide the necessary resources and the wealth to aid the forces of freedom in every country threatened by communism. Again let me cite the example in Italy which I observed during my trip. There is only one political party in Italy today, the Christian Democratic Party, which is capable of assuming power and preventing a Communist-controlled govern-

ment from taking over. With limited financial aid, this group and other like-minded groups in that country could drive the Communists out and preserve Italy on the democratic side. I am not suggesting a one-party government there. I am merely pointing out that with a little help this party, which is the largest democratic group in Italy, could accomplish the task. Unfortunately, other groups are too small or insignificant to undertake this job.

These are some of the ways and methods through which we can provide the free world with the mechanism to match the Communist propaganda machine, the deceiving smile and the cold war hatred. The observations and suggestions I have made here are not intended as a cure-all, but rather as a beginning, a basis from which to develop additional methods to deal with Communist infiltration tactics and subtle sabotage. They are intended to encourage our friends everywhere to build strong governments, solidly established, which will be able to resist Communist imperialism.

Shall we continue to talk and to negotiate with the Russians? Certainly, but let us remember at all times to have a gun at our side, while Russia carries a dagger.

Soviet Russia is dedicated to the philosophy of conquering and subjugating the world by war, subversion, and infiltration. Our philosophy of government is not to enslave, not to subjugate, but to guarantee to all men their individual freedom, their dignity as human beings, the right of each person to choose his own destiny under a benevolent form of government which extends equal opportunities to all.

In conclusion, let me say that our delegation to the NATO Conference was of the opinion that the interchange of ideas among the representatives of the parliamentary bodies of the 15 NATO countries was beneficial and constructive. It is our view that our country and this legislative body should participate in future meetings of this type to discuss problems of mutual interest and to seek greater understanding among the nations concerned. I appreciate the privilege extended to me to represent the United States House of Representatives at the NATO Parliamentary Conference.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

The Voice of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, recently the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Galax, Va., conducted a contest entitled "I Speak for Democracy." I ask unanimous consent that the winning essay, written by Miss Barbara Ward, of Galax, Va., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIZE-WINNING ESSAY WRITTEN BY MISS WARD ON DEMOCRACY

(Published below is the essay on the Voice of Democracy, written by Miss Barbara Ward, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Lonnie Ward, Galax, and which won for her the first prize, a $25 United States savings bond, in the recent I Speak for Democracy contest conducted by the Galax Junior Chamber of Commerce.—EDITOR.)

I am the voice of democracy. Listen to me, America; I am your heritage. You fought bloody battles to win me; bloodier ones to retain me. You deemed no price too high that would insure my being ever-prevalent with you. Scores of you were called to guard me, and I watched as life after life was given for my sake. Yet, it was good; for, though the loss was great, the gain was greater; and the sacrifices made for me established my place of prominence among the governments of the world.

How is it that you have managed to keep me alive these 150 years? No other nation which ever enjoyed a similar standard of living has been able to combat and crush the forces opposing my existence. How? And again, I ask you how? But wait * * * I know the answer. I cannot endure when great masses are poverty-stricken and illiterate, and where a chosen few are the rulers of many. Nor can I thrive where there are greed and malice. Rather, America, my being stems from your faith in God; your will to be free; and your determination which prompted one of yours sons to declare, "I would not be slave, so I would not be master."

In me you hold the secret to world peace. In me is no fear; no want; no ignorance. In me is security; happiness. In me lies the last hope for a dying world.

Count your blessings, America. In you I have wrought a miracle—a miracle that begins with a handful of native soil, the grains of which reflect a Nation of contrasts, the never-ending horizons of sweeping plains, burning deserts and rolling prairies; the tranquillity of snug harbors, quiet valleys, and shining lakes; the energy of thundering waterfalls, roaring cities, and the flaming red sky of steel mills. The neighborliness of old rail fences, railroads and highways tying a Nation together; the challenge of snow-capped mountains and giant, towering trees; the bountiful fields of waving grain; the light of a great city at night; the voice of factory whistles calling a Nation to work. * * * In this endless procession of your blessings is magnified many fold the self-evident truths of equality and the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Because of me you may speak your mind openly and boldly. You may be freely taught, and free to inquire and to learn. You may vote according to the dictates of your heart, and you may worship God as you choose without feeling terror. You may live without fear that the coming moments may be your last.

Yes, America, you have truly been blessed with treasures of infinite value, the worth of which can never be expressed in dollars and cents. You are the Nation favored of God, not because he chose you, but because you chose Him as your Lord and leader. Yet, be cautious, lest you rely on your own strength, forgetting the strength upon whom I depend.

Listen well, America. I do not pride myself in what I am, but what you have made of me. There is no glory in my name alone; only in your application of the principles for which I stand.

I am yours to lose or to maintain; yours to hallow or to desecrate. My fate is in your hands and your future in mine. Together, we must see that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people never perishes from the earth.

Salmon Runs Can Be Increased

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, my colleagues are aware of the hearings which the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held in Alaska, and along the west coast last fall. Shortly Senators will be hearing more about those hearings and recommendations in the form of legislation.

Two main problems confront our fisheries resource in the western United States and the North Pacific. One is what to do about the declining of salmon runs and the diminishing salmon pack; the other concerns our tuna and trawler fishing fleet, which have been discriminated against time and again through import agreements reached by our State Department.

Just as research has pointed the way for industry and agriculture, it holds tremendous promise in restoring our North Pacific salmon runs. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles on this subject, one written by Fergus Hoffman, financial editor of the Seattle Post Intelligencer and published in the October 16 edition of that newspaper, and another written by Paul Dumas:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH, WILDLIFE SERVICE FAILS TO ACT ON SALMON

(By Fergus Hoffman)

Buried deep in the files of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Washington, D. C., is a highly technical report which says, in effect, that something could be done about Alaska's diminishing salmon runs—if anybody wanted to do something about them.

The Service, which has been charged with responsibility for Alaska fish conservation for these many years, has given the report no publicity and no action. It was written by a Service researcher who made a scientific study of the problem and came up with some solid suggestions.

Why no action has been taken is a mystery. It would seem that the Fish and Wildlife Service, which cannot show that despite the millions of dollars it has spent it has added a single salmon to the Alaska pack, would be willing to try anything. Year in and year out, under Republicans and under Democrats, the Alaska salmon pack has suffered.

With the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, chairmanned by Washington's WARREN G. MAGNUSON, scheduled to open hearings in Seattle this Monday afternoon on rehabilitation of the salmon industry, perhaps some light can be shed on the technical and scientific aspects of maintaining what was once a tremendous natural resource.

It may even be possible to determine why nothing has been done toward adopting the procedure suggested by the Fish and Wildlife's own researcher.

The problem is not a simple one, admittedly, but the theory put forward in the scientific report is not difficult to understand. The salmon waters, it points out, are literally fertilized by the decaying carcasses of the parent salmon which ascend the rivers to spawn and die.

The carcasses, decaying into their component chemicals, provide nourishment for the native marine growths, the minute, sometimes microscopic plankton. These plankton in turn provide food for other plankton upon which salmon fry feed and flourish.

When a run is depleted, the natural food balance of the spawning area is depleted. The less salmon, the less food, the less salmon the next time. It is a vicious circle.

Each area will vary in its resources, of course. Food deficiencies resulting from an insufficient supply of certain mineral elements may be charted scientifically by testing each area. In some cases the deficiency will be almost entirely represented by the lack of a single chemical—so slight in amount but so vital in growth effect that perhaps 100 pounds of the mineral would be enough to restore the water's natural balance.

In other words, it is feasible to fertilize a salmon spawning ground just as a farmer fertilizes his fields. An area can be made to produce additional pounds of salmon just as a rancher can get additional bushels of wheat from his acres. Well nourished, the salmon will mature faster and will leave the stream earlier to feed in the sea—and return earlier to be caught and canned.

This is only one aspect of farming the sea, a sound, scientific project which could return many times its initial cost. Present conservation practice is—and has been since

1922—to allow some salmon to go upstream to spawn while the rest are packed. The theory is, "One for the stream and one for the can."

The result has been a steadily diminishing supply of nutrients in Alaska's salmon-spawning grounds—and a steadily diminishing Alaska salmon pack.

ALASKA FISH TRAPS FACE ELIMINATION

(By Paul Dumas)

JUNEAU, ALASKA, October 15.—Endorsement by Secretary of the Interior McKay of a bill providing gradual elimination of fish traps in Alaska presages a stiff battle between the Fish and Wildlife Service and trap operators when they meet for final hearings on 1956 fishing regulations in Seattle next week.

Concern about a possible gear dispute was expressed in Juneau yesterday by Don McKernan, FWS Commercial Fisheries Administrator. He said he feared one feature of the bill threatens his proposal that the 2-year-old 50-percent curtailment of total fishing effort be continued another year.

BILL ENDORSED

McKay last week endorsed a bill, authored by Alaska Delegate E. L. BARTLETT, which provides that established fish traps would be eliminated gradually over a 5-year period. It would become effective next year. McKay's endorsement adds weight to the probability the bill will be enacted in the next Congress.

When the FWS proposed a curtailed fishing-effort program 3 years ago, trap operators cooperated for two reasons:

1. Obvious necessity of permitting more salmon to reach stream beds for spawning purposes.

2. A promise by the FWS that once the salmon fishery showed signs of coming back rigid regulations of traps would be relaxed.

PENALIZED

Under the term "established" fish traps, operators owning traps inoperative next year through the FWS hold-the-line proposal would find themselves penalized and closed traps would be considered outside the established category and, therefore, permanently eliminated.

In 1953, when the traps moratorium program became effective, there were about 375 traps in Alaska, of which 256 were in southeastern waters. In the southeast, under the curtailed program, only 118 operated in the past 2 years. Others remained closed. A curtailment of 50 percent in the fishing effort by traps—and purse seiners—was possible because owners cooperated voluntarily.

Taxpayers Versus Pressure Groups

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 20, 1956, Mr. George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president of the Thomas A. Edison Co., made an address before the Chamber of Commerce of Bloomfield, N. J., entitled "Taxpayers Versus Pressure Groups." This address is a tribute to former President Hoover and his Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

As a personal friend of Mr. Stringfellow, and as one who is very much interested in the furthering of the important series of reports issued by Mr. Hoover's Commission, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAXPAYERS VERSUS PRESSURE GROUPS

(Address by George E. Stringfellow, senior vice president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and longtime business associate of the late Thomas Alva Edison, before the Chamber of Commerce of Bloomfield, N. J., January 20, 1956)

The questions which I have selected as my subject are those posed by Mr. Herbert Hoover's Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of our Federal Government.

No matter what any of you have thought of Herbert Hoover as a political figure, I am sure that you will agree that today, as a nonpolitical figure, giving abundantly of his time and strength to serve his country under both a Democratic and a Republican administration without pay, he is worth listening to. He is a conservative and does not go off half-cocked.

He was able to line up 325 able, distinguished, experienced citizens for his task forces, dealing with the various phases of the Federal Government's activities. They took time away from their businesses and professions and worked for many months without compensation. He didn't ask any one of them what political party he belonged to, but subsequent inquiry shows they have been about equally divided between the two parties. At any rate, neither their investigations nor their reports to the Commission have been in the slightest degree affected by any partisanship nor have they shown any division along party lines.

And those men, leaders in their respective fields, are in agreement as to the enormous sums which can be saved, and how the savings are to be effected.

The Commission has made 314 recommendations designed to obtain greater efficiency and economy in the executive branch. Hon. James A. Farley, a member of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report, stated that "If fully applied these recommendations would yield eventual savings of more than $5 billion a year—enough to balance the Federal budget," he concluded.

Since 1949, through the adoption of 84 percent of these recommendations $7 billion has already been saved. This represents an annual savings of $1,750,000,000, leaving $3,250,000 still to be saved annually. It is obvious that the 84 percent represents only the small leaks. The biggest savings, yet to be accomplished, are meeting opposition from pressure and special interest groups.

Mr. Hoover tells us that much of the criticism from pressure groups is based on mere lack of knowledge arising from misunderstanding of the recommendations. The opposition has always vanished in the light of information and real understanding, and that is one place where each of you can help.

But some of the criticism comes from special interests which are, or consider themselves to be, affected, and is selfish rather than patriotic.

I need not tell you that many, if not most Members of Congress are influenced by the pressures that they encounter, especially when there is a strong, persistent, active pressure on the side of some well-financed, expertly lobbied, special interest. But Members of Congress want to get reelected, and although they are apt to listen to the siren voices of the pressure groups, they will also pay attention to the sweet tunes of the voters—and the general public. That is where you come in—to tune up your own sweet and convincing voices and those of your friends and neighbors, so that your Senators and your Representatives will get busy and complete the job that almost everybody, including all the unselfishly motivated citizens, think must be done and done soon. Congressmen are not going to resist selfish pressures unless they hear from the voters. That means you.

In that connection there is already a good start. Your fellow citizens all over the country have already organized on a big basis to back up the Hoover Commission's recommendations. Many of you have undoubtedly read about it. Some of you have already joined up. The name of this organization is the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report. They have prepared a series of short research memorandums, each on a separate phase of Federal activity, telling the story in a most readable and convincing manner and giving the names of the members of each task force and of the Senate and House committees which have jurisdiction over the various activities. The citizens committee will send you copies, and they want to join them.

I intend to give you a few rather striking examples of the Hoover recommendations and the situations that have occasioned them. However, you as good citizens must read some of the reports to get the whole picture. They will give you some laughs and some of them will make you want to weep when you realize what a beating you have been taking as taxpayers.

Everybody loves the veterans—nearly every family has one. The Congressmen both love and fear them, because they have lots of votes and are well represented in Washington. The Hoover Commission has recommended that every sick and really indigent veteran should be provided care in Veterans' Administration hospitals, even though his sickness is not related to his war service, and that regardless of his ability to pay, he should have free hospitalization if it was service connected. This alone runs into billions of dollars.

But the Commission has made a recommendation against what is known as goldbricking, which is free hospitalization to veterans able to pay for illness or injuries not connected with their war service. The Commission regards that as the greatest of all problems respecting our provisions for veterans.

Congress has enacted a law which limits the non-service-connected hospitalization to veterans who make a sworn declaration of inability to pay. But with a joker. The Veterans' Administration is prohibited from challenging the veteran's statement. A bill eliminating that joker and protecting your pocketbooks and the pocketbooks of millions of honest veteran taxpayers was defeated as a result of pressure on weak Members of Congress who had not heard from you independent, civic-minded taxpayers. Here is what Mr. Hoover said recently on that subject:

"The pressure groups, of course, are very vocal, and sometimes they atrociously misrepresent our recommendations. The veterans, for example, passed 12 resolutions of denunciation, 5 of which were absolutely false. We had never suggested anything of the kind. Four of these resolutions were distortions of what we recommended. That's the sort of stuff you have to meet."

I can in my limited time give you only a few out of hundreds of such "bugs" in our Federal administration needing your voices demanding their extermination. Here is a funny one:

It is a legitimate governmental function to pay for the transportation of the baggage and other goods of a Federal employee transferred to a distant station. But the Commission reports that millions are being

wasted through failure to adopt and enforce commonsense regulations. For example, an elaborate wooden packing crate was made to order to ship one old overshoe overseas. The cost of the crate was many times the value of the shoe. The records do not disclose whether the employee was a one-legged man (or woman) or what the official action was respecting the other shoe, if there was another one.

A wooden crate was especially made to ship a 10-cent store lamp and another crate was made to ship the paper shade which went with it.

While the Army was shipping 807,000 pounds of canned tomatoes from California to New York, the Navy was shipping 775,000 pounds of identical canned tomatoes from the East to California. I am more inclined to weep than to laugh at that one, perhaps because the figures are larger; but the figures run into millions even on the little funny ones when you multiply them by a few million similar instances.

The Commission estimates that $282 million a year can be saved merely by the disposal of unneeded storage facilities; another $50 million through avoiding the excessive rotation in the armed services which tend to make too many of the personnel, both military and civilian, into jacks-of-all trades, rather than developing specialized competence.

Nobody disputes that it would be crushingly expensive to lose the cold war. The cost in dollars would run into untold billions, besides tragic costs not measurable in dollars. Neither the Hoover Commission nor any other sane person objects to such foeign aid as really helps us with the cold war, and we have to leave to the President and to the State Department and Congress the selection of the objects of such expenditures. But, as Senator BYRD pointed out recently, the foreign aid we have recently been sending to Denmark has been applied to reducing the Danish national debt, and the foreign aid we have been sending to England has enabled her to reduce her taxes even though England's economy has been getting healthier at the previous existing level of taxes.

The Hoover report points out that we have been sending a billion dollars a year in general economic aid to countries which have already reached their peak of industrial activity.

The three armed services are supposed to "cross service" the beds in their hospitals. Yet in 1954 the Commission found only 2,255 cases of cross servicing in hospitals with a total of 102,280 beds, when more than half, or to be exact 52,760 of those beds were unoccupied. That sort of waste and inefficiency doesn't help toward winning the cold war or strengthen us for a possible hot war.

Small dry-cell flashlight batteries have, as you know, a relatively short shelf life. Yet the Army Signal Corps authorized an 8½-year supply of these.

I could keep going for hours, but here's just one more, and this is a big one: The Federal Government now has a capital investment of over $10 billion in industrial facilities—shipyards and railroads. Most of these were originally acquired as a war emergency. Some of them will continue to be necessary even in times of cold war or in times of peace. But the Commisison found that a very large percentage of these facilities are being continued merely because Government never likes to let go of a thing once it has got hold of it. The operating costs of these facilities total over $770 million a year.

Not only could we recover an impressive fraction of this money by disposing of what we don't really need, and save an impressive fraction of the huge operating cost, but we would be collecting taxes from their private purchasers and operators with whom the Government is now competing.

These instances and hundreds of other instances of unnecessary spending, that don't help win the cold war or help in any other way, add up to this:

The billions saved would:

1. Easily balance the budget without hazard to the Nation's survival and without impairing the efficiency either of governmental operations or of our national economy.

2. Reduce our national debt, without increasing taxes,

3. Avoid inflation, and

4. At the same time lower the enormous annual "debt service" which is now greater each year than the entire cost of Government was a few decades ago.

So let me end with this plea: Get the pamphlets from the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, 777 14th Street NW., Washington 5. D. C..

Write to your Senators and your Congressmen. Get your friends to write.

Write to some of the members of the Senate and House Committees whom you may perhaps know personally.

Join the Citizens' Committee and get your friends to join.

Narcotics, Father and Son

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News, January 24, 1956:

NARCOTICS, FATHER AND SON

Bitter irony and retribution indeed is the fate visited on a Newark man, long sought as an important kingpin of a major narcotics ring and finally caught up with.

Police had gone to the home of Thomas Campisi to arrest a youth, Peter, age 18, on robbery charges. Under the bed, they found the fugitive father, who broke away but was captured.

Facing the boy was a charge far more serious than robbery, wherein enters the bitter irony. In his pocket, he had a hypodermic needle and a packet of heroin. A wailing mother pleaded with the boy to tell where he got it.

Now he is held not only on suspicion of robbery, but for illegal possession of the narcotics and equipment.

The robbery angle is probably easy to explain. As in most such cases, the drug user turns to robbery to get the money to buy the drugs. The more of them he uses, the greater grows his desperation. Robbery follows robbery, then as the grip of the narcotics more tighly envelops him, murder is often at the end of the road.

And what of the father?

He is held on two Federal warrants charging unlawful sale of $30,000 worth of narcotics in Newark and Brooklyn.

Who knows how many helpless and hapless victims were served by the narcotics the elder had sold along with his gang? Or the countless counterparts of his own son who became addicted to narcotics use because of his nefarious practices and turned to crime to pay the sky-high price these miserable characters exacted as they pushed the drugs?

The story says that the father glared at the son as they faced each other in police court.

Why did he glare? Because the son had turned to drugs? Or was it because of self-pity and of remonstrance because of the son's carelessness in being caught so that the father, too, could be ensnared?

Tragic it all is, indeed.

Prison will probably beckon to this depraved father whose very drugs could have caught up with a young son now traveling the road to jail and even worse.

But sordid as is the thought, perhaps his worst penalty would be to witness the suffering of the boy he sired into the world begging and pleading for drugs to fill his craving.

There is certainly no penalty too severe for this type of human vulture.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on "Brink of War" Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last evening it was my pleasure to address the safe deposit section of the District of Columbia Bankers' Association. My subject was the so-called "brink of war" controversy.

I send to the desk the text of my address, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY URGES END OF "BRINK OF WAR" SQUABBLE, SAYS WE MUST GET ON TO MORE SUBSTANTIAL REVIEW OF OUR PROGRAMS AHEAD

I am pleased to address the members of this section on a subject which I know is of deep interest to you, as it is, of course, to all other thinking Americans.

I refer, of course, to the foreign policy of our country.

It will be my aim tonight to confine my remarks to but a few of the more basic problems confronting us.

THE MANY CRISIS AREAS ON THE WORLD SCENE

If time were to permit, it would be a pleasure for me to take a detailed view of some of the more crucial individual settings on the world stage.

One could devote an entire evening just to exploring such highly significant areas of crises, as those I will mention now:

North Africa, scene of continued serious tension and disturbances, as Morocco and Algeria move toward more self-government; North Africa, where our own strategic air bases represent a vital deterrent against world war III;

The ever-ominous Taiwan (Formosa) Strait area, where recent Red artillery bombardment, air and naval action, may indicate the possibility of the reemergence of the Formosa-Pescadores, Quemoy-Matsu problem to the No. 1 position of crisis on the world scene;

Troubled India, where civil strife over the states' reorganization has offered another example of treacherous Red meddling in disturbed waters;

The powder keg Middle East, where hands are still close to triggers on both sides of the Arab-Israeli borders, while arms shipments pour in from Soviet bloc and other areas;

Our ally, France, where the Communists are cunningly maneuvering to capitalize on

their 152-vote bloc so to form a so-called popular-front government in the badly splintered National Assembly;

Indonesia, where the Communists are also maneuvering to exploit differences within and between Moslem parties' ranks and thereby get a Red toehold in a new coalition cabinet;

South America, which, while fortunately not in crisis, per se, is studying the significant trade bait, dangled by Soviet Premier Bulganin; this is the latest instance of Red peaceful-coexistence strategy—penetration through "rubles now, revolution later."

PROBLEMS BEFORE CONGRESS

Or, getting still closer to home, one could review in detail the policy problems in the Congress, regarding mutual security legislation, key questions such as: "Should Congress write in a long-range declaration of intent, as regards future aid, or should it attempt the more unprecedented step of a direct, long-range commitment, as such, or should it cut out economic aid entirely, or what it should do?"

Or, too, one could refer to the proposed welcome increase in the appropriations for the United States Information Agency—an issue on which the President of the United States feels very strongly—an issue on which I personally feel very keenly, too, for USIA is our principal instrument in the worldwide battle for men's minds and, as such, the move to strengthen it is long overdue. USIA has had its ups and downs. Time after time, it has been pulled up from the roots, examined, investigated, cut, and then thrust back into the earth, as if it could quickly take hold once again, in its worldwide operations for the truth.

And one could refer to dozens of other specific problems as well.

WHY THESE PROBLEMS CONCERN US

Now, of course, I know that passing through your minds, as I have mentioned this brief list, may have been the question, "Senator WILEY, why should we be concerned with all these far-distant places? What business is it of ours if two far-off countries are quarreling over some bit of territory, say, the Saar, or Dutch New Guinea, or Kashmir, or if there are civil disturbances in some land?"

The answer is, I feel, very clear. The answer is that any situation which endangers the peace of any part of the world, may endanger the peace of the whole world.

There is no part of the world today so far distant from any other part as to be of no interest to us, and to other men of good will.

You and I read every day in our newspapers that the world has been shrunken by men's inventiveness. General Taylor has told how we have been developing a guided missile with a 200-mile range. Both the U. S. S. R. and ourselves have been pushing forward to develop the dreaded intercontinental missile, a ballistic—free—missile, or a guided missile controlled by electronic means.

Meanwhile, planes have been piercing the barrier of sound at better than 1,000 miles an hour. Jet planes are being introduced as well into commercial aviation, shrinking the oceans and land distances, still further.

All of these, and a hundred other factors in today's world, necessitate our close attention to once remote developments in the world scene.

BANKERS CONSERVE, WARS DESTROY LIFE

It is natural that you, in particular, as bankers, should be interested in this subject, because it is the banker's obligation to conserve. He is, of course, a trustee of other peoples' funds—funds which represent not only their life's resources, but their very lives themselves.

Nothing could be more contrary to the idea of conservation than war.

The 140,000 United States lives which we expended—in deaths and wounds in Korea—the $22 billion which were exploded on that peninsula on behalf of the defense of a free people—these are but the smallest symbols of infinitely worse costs which would be borne in the event of a third world war.

THE BASIC QUESTION BEFORE US

We come now, then, to the basic question of the evening: "Are we on the right path? Are we moving in the right direction toward heading off such a war?"

Has the foreign policy of your country and mine been a sound one, or has it, as some of its critics contend, been full of blunders?

Have we needlessly pushed to the brink of war, as some people falsely interpret and unsoundly contend?

The answer is as follows:

OUR COURSE IS SOUND

The basic foreign policy of our land is sound. It is sound because it has been molded and reviewed and refined by the best minds, the best hearts, the best capacities available to our Republic. Not just Republican leadership, but Democratic leadership as well, have contributed to every single major step which we have taken in recent years.

Under the great leadership of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, we have basically moved not toward war, but toward an endurable and just peace.

Of course, we have been in danger. Of course, we have been at the edge of war at times.

But we have never been pushed to the edge by the design of any American.

On those occasions when we have been admittedly close to war, it has not been because of any American's foolhardy desire to get close to it. Rather, we have been pushed to the edge because of the reckless, aggressive actions of the Soviet Union and Red China.

Under those circumstances, we had the alternative of either retreating in panic, that is, committing an act of appeasement, or standing still in paralysis, tonguetied, unable to even speak our position.

Or we had the alternative of standing firm and announcing clearly and definitely that we would take whatever action we deemed necessary in our national interest and in the interest of the cause of freedom.

Thus, we proved we had no intention of retreating. We had no intention and never will have any intention of committing an aggressive act. But we did not propose and do not propose to run from danger like a coward or a slacker or a fool.

And, so, by our words and deeds of firmness, we have prevented war.

Our enemy respects nothing but firmness. Our enemy despises weakness. Our enemy capitalizes on indecision on its opponent's part.

All that we need do today is announce or imply that we have no intention of standing firm when the next crisis comes; that we will retreat pellmell in panic, and you can be sure that our enemy will immediately seize upon such explicit or implicit position, and commit some new acts of aggression.

That is why it is so absolutely essential that this brink of war controversy be dispensed with—promptly and completely. That is why we American must quit quibbling over the language used by a reporter in a magazine article, and get down to hard cases and hard issues and hard choices.

LET US HEAR OF ANY SPECIAL ALTERNATIVES

In recent days in the Senate we have heard a great many criticisms of the administration's foreign policy. We have heard a great many assertions to the effect that our foreign policy has no new ideas; it is not dynamic; it is not flexible, etc.

But we have not heard one single solitary word of recommendation of a constructive and specific alternative. We have not seen one single instance where any member of the opposition has stated that we should be doing something specifically which we are not doing now, either with some country or some group of countries or with the free world, as a whole or the Soviet bloc as a whole.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GEORGE

Lest my remarks be misconstrued, I repeat this point: In the past 3 years, we could not have made the progress that we have genuinely made without the magnificent help of outstanding leaders of the Democratic Party and the mass of Democratic legislators, as well.

Of course, I refer in particular to the universally esteemed work of the chairman of our own committee, Georgia's statesman, America's distinguished champion, Senator WALTER GEORGE.

Whatever foreign policy differences he may have with the administration—pale into insignificance before the strength of his basic teamwork in the past and, I am certain, his continuing, invaluable teamwork in the future.

This Sunday, he celebrates his 78th milestone. I know that the best wishes of the Nation are with him and with his dear wife.

And, if I may be permitted a word regarding what is, of course, an internal decision of a great State of Dixie, I know that the hopes of this Nation are that Georgia and America will continue to be represented by him in the years to come.

VITAL NEW PROBLEMS CONFRONT UNITED STATES

A mass of old and new international problems loom up before him and before all of us now—problems of America's participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation; problems of advancing President Eisenhower's open-sky proposals in the U. N. Disarmament Commission; problems of strengthening SEATO; of preventing any erosion in the Middle East Treaty Organization (because in part of the disturbances in Jordan, whose possible entry into the Organization had previously been thought feasible, in some quarters).

We and our friends confront other problems, as well. There are internal difficulties like Turkey's domestic economic troubles; Greece's election struggle; the United Kingdom's trade gap; the Republic of Korea's heavy economic problems burdened by the awful destruction of the war she so bravely fought in defense of her freedom.

These are real problems, substantial, continuing problems, the sort of problems which should genuinely engage our and our friends' attention, rather than will-o'-the-wisp problems of interpreting an article in Life magazine.

What good will further bickering over the Life article serve?

THE HARM OF THE BRINK-OF-WAR CONTROVERSY

In point of fact, such bickering could do a great deal of harm.

Thinking Americans may genuinely be concerned lest Moscow and Peking misinterpret this whole controversy as allegedly signifying that part of the leadership of the United States is toying with the idea of spurning firm steps in protecting our national interests.

I say it will be a sad day for the world if the aggressive cliques in Moscow and Peking may get this false idea that many American leaders can be presumed so gunshy, so fearful about the chance of conflict, that they will want us to retreat pellmell in the event the Reds poise to throw their forces once more into some new aggression, as in Korea.

If the ruling cliques in Peking and Moscow get that notion in their head, then both local and international peace may be seriously endangered.

The fact of the matter is that my Democratic friends will soon realize, if they do not now, that we must not give any such false impression to Peking and Moscow.

Neither the responsible leadership of the Democratic Party nor of the Republican Party, of course, proposes to appease the Soviet Union.

Neither responsible leadership will sacrifice any land, as Czechoslovakia was sacrificed at Munich.

As you have noted, I do not want to prolong the "brink of war" controversy. But I feel I would be remiss if I did not set it into proper perspective by pointing out one further historical fact.

AN INTERESTING QUOTE DURING THE FORMOSA DEBATE

Many of us were interested in the remarks recently made by my eloquent friend from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY.

But it was also interesting to recall that back on January 28, 1955, at the time the Formosa-Pescadores resolution was approved so overwhelmingly by the Senate, that Senator HUMPHREY—then, as now, exceedingly active—said this on the floor of the Senate, as recorded on page 787 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Although the resolution involves a firm commitment—and we must realize it could lead to war—I believe that basically it represents high diplomacy backed up by strength."

I repeat, Senator HUMPHREY frankly said "it could lead to war."

The Formosa resolution could indeed have led to war, as its could still conceivably lead to war.

But war could not and would not have been the decision on our part; it would be the decision of Peking and Moscow. We don't want war. Do they?

Yes, Senator HUMPHREY was right. The Formosa resolution was, indeed, an act of "high diplomacy backed up by strength." It was and is a resolution to prevent war, not to bring war, a resolution of firmness—to prevent the world from plunging over the brink of war, if at all possible.

And exactly whose "high diplomacy" did the Formosa resolution represent? The high diplomacy, principally, of the Secretary of State of the United States, the very man whom my friend from Minnesota now takes to task.

It is good to take this look at the record; but it is even better to make our remarks today consistent with our words and deeds of yesterday.

The Secretary of State has been consistent, and he has been right in his consistency. He has stated time and again, in effect, that unless we post notice to an aggressor that his aggression will not go unpunished, we may anticipate that the aggressor may be willing to risk war.

We must make sure that the aggressor feels that there is definitely more to lose than to gain from his aggression; and then he will not dare ignite the spark that could lead to local war, and possibly to international war.

My friend from Minnesota has a great deal of constructive work to perform. He is, for instance, chairman of a very important disarmament subcommittee, and he has other pressing tasks, worthy of his energy and talents.

The Nation can benefit from his constructive work on constructive issues—issues of substance, and not of language, issues well justified for review from every national standpoint.

Of course, foreign policy is always susceptible to review. It is always subject to constructive changes. Our diplomacy is not and could not be infallible.

But, if there is to be a review, let it be a review worthy of this great Nation, worthy of its challenge, worthy of this critical hour, a review of substance, a review in which specific alternatives are suggested by those who choose to criticize and are carefully evaluated by all men of good will.

A legislator—Republican or Democratic—serves his party best as he serves his Nation best. My Democratic friends will bring greatest credit on their party as they bring, as many of them have brought so often in the past, credit on their Nation.

They have been, by and large, good teammates on our foreign policy, since the Republican regime took over in January 1953. I hope their teamwork will continue—uninterrupted. We need them, we want them. That is the message of our President and of our Secretary of State and of all responsible thought inside the Republican Party.

CONCLUSION

I have tried to review some of the principal challenges facing our country tonight. I have touched briefly upon some of the specific areas in which our country is heavily engaged.

I have not attempted to make my remarks on the brink of war issue all-inclusive, because they could not possibly do justice in complete detail to this subject.

I hope, however, that I have spelled out for you why it is so essential that we move beyond this issue; why we must keep united; why we must continue to advance with a firm, sure, foreign policy—one based upon the President's dynamic leadership and upon dynamic nonpartisan teamwork.

Thirty-eighth Anniversary of Ukraine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following salute to Ukraine on the recent observance of its 38th anniversary of its proclamation of independence:

Concerned as we are with our own efforts to seek out paths of action that will lead the world to peace, we must pause a while to salute those nations, which, although bound by the chains of Communist enslavement refuse to surrender in spirit, and fight, dream, and die for that hour when once again they shall be free.

Such a nation is Ukraine, which recently marked the 38th anniversary of its proclamation of independence.

The universal proclamation of the government and parliament of Ukraine was issued in the capital city of Kiev on January 22, 1918, and the new state was recognized as the legitimate nation of the Ukrainian people by many foreign governments, including Soviet Russia. But almost simultaneously, in spite of the fact that it had recognized the new government, Russia declared war and began hostilities against the Ukrainian Republic.

Since that day in 1918, Ukraine has spent about 35 years under the Russian yoke, but through all those long and bitter years, the determination of her people to be free has never faltered. The Ukraine underground is a strong, vital force, and it continues to fight even though its members know that death or the still worse confines of Russian slave and concentration camps are the fate of those luckless enough to be exposed.

In testimony recently brought back by returned German war prisoners, the fact was brought out that the Ukrainians constitute the largest number of inmates of Russian slave camps, and that the Ukrainians along with other non-Russians in these camps, are most active in organizing and leading anti-Communist resistance movements throughout the Soviet Union. As such they are a dynamic factor in the universal struggle to achieve a just and lasting peace for all nations.

The 38th anniversary of the proclamation of Ukrainian independence gives us an opportunity to again call to the attention of the free world, that Ukraine, and so many of the so-called republics of the Soviet Union, long bound by the chains of Soviet enslavement, deserve the support and encouragement of all of us who enjoy and know freedom and peace. May the day of their liberation be not too far distant.

Early Returns From Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, all too often we think of western reclamation projects from the standpoint of cost, engineering, long-range planning without taking stock and keeping abreast of the results as they become evident.

Last week, an editorial from the Seattle Daily Times of Monday, January 16, came to my desk which I should like to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This editorial proves the wisdom my colleagues of the United States Senate displayed when they said yes, the Columbia Basin reclamation project should come into being and proceeded to loan the money through appropriations so that eastern Washington's rich soil could contribute to the Nation's market place.

What has happened since my fellow Senators provided this loan, which, incidentally, is being repaid ahead of schedule? At this point, I ask unanimous consent to spread upon the record the Seattle Times editorial of Monday, January 16.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRRIGATION IN COLUMBIA BASIN ALREADY PAYING BIG DIVIDENDS

This State is beginning to reap the benefits of reclamation of thousands of acres of land in the Columbia Basin irrigation project. That was indicated by the Washington State Research Council's recent report showing substantial increases in assessed valuations of property and tax-collections in 20 eastern Washington counties.

According to the research council's calculations, real property taxes in these 20 counties will be 19 percent higher this year

than in 1955, and they will be based on assessed valuations which are up 4.9 percent above those of a year ago. The 1956 tax collections will be up 43 percent over those of 1952.

The increases are not attributable to any general lifting of standards of property evaluation and assessment, though in some of the counties, notably Spokane, improved assessment programs have been in force. Increases in school revenues, produced by the new State law requiring property valuations by the State tax commission rather than county assessors for school levies, may be partly responsible. But the tremendous new developments in the Columbia Basin and the neighboring tricity area along the Columbia River must constitute the chief factor in the changing tax picture east of the mountains.

In the Columbia Basin project, more than 104,000 acres of fertile land have been brought under irrigation. The gross value of agricultural crops in the Columbia Basin area in 1954 was $16,253,000, an increase of 79 percent over 1953. The average value per acre was $155.43. When it is considered that only a few years ago most of this land was virtually a sagebrush desert, it is not surprising that property values have soared and tax collections with them.

The Columbia Basin reclamation and irrigation project ultimately will embrace an area of some 600,000 acres. Already it is possible to contemplate what the completion of this huge undertaking will mean to the economy of the entire State.

Address by E. Smythe Gambrell, Atlanta, Ga., President of the American Bar Association, at Banquet of the Georgia Bar Association in His Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. E. Smythe Gambrell, of Atlanta, Ga., is serving during the current year as president of the American Bar Association, the great national organization of the legal profession. The fine talents of Mr. Gambrell are recognized not only in his home city and State, but nationally, and by those in other professions and in all walks of life.

On December 8, 1955, in Atlanta Mr. Gambrell spoke at a banquet given in his honor by the Georgia Bar Association, and sponsored by the Atlanta Clearing House Banks. His address on that occasion was one which demonstrated in high degree the eloquence, the learning, the integrity, and the devotion to principles of sound government which have characterized this outstanding lawyer during his career at the bar.

In his address Mr. Gambrell has reemphasized to us that Government should be kept close to the people; that the National Government should not be called upon by the States to do for them those things which can do themselves, and that no government should do for a man what that man can do for himself. He points out in eloquent but understandable language that our separate departments of Government should be independent, and neither should be servile to the other, and that through the power of patronage of the executive department and paternalism, the independence of the legislative department is being destroyed.

He eloquently pleads for recognition of the constitutional rights of the States.

I have obtained permission of President Gambrell to place this very worthwhile address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Pursuant to unanimous consent previously granted, I take pleasure in inserting the address herewith:

President Bowden, Mr. Floyd, Mr. Smith, my lawyer and banker friends and neighbors, ladies and gentlemen, this lovely and beautiful gathering is a gracious gesture on the part of two great professors, the lawyers and the bankers of this city and State. The occasion is too much and too meaningful to belong to any one of us, it belongs to us all.

May I at the outset disabuse your minds of any possible misunderstanding as to the facts behind this meeting. Bob Troutman and our other fine bar leaders, with equal or greater justifications, could have advanced many Georgians other than me for the national recognition which this year was due the progressive bar of this State. The honor and the responsibility of this year's leadership of the American Bar Association belong to all the lawyers of Georgia, and I am so grateful for the splendid way they have rallied to the undertaking.

I take it we are here in an attitude of thanksgiving, because the Almighty has cast our lives in happy circumstances, has given us unlimited challenges and opportunities and the talents and stout hearts to make good in our beloved Georgia. It is not srange that bankers and lawyers who have worked side by side for hundreds of years contributing orderliness, regularity, and responsibility to our way of life should meet together on such an occasion as this.

I wish absent ones could have been here with us tonight. I wish all the great lawyers of Georgia, past and present, could have been here—they whose work and achievements over the years are at the heart of this celebration.

This State and the entire South are on the march—in law, in banking, in medicine, in agriculture, in industry, in education, and in other fields of endeavor. More and more this area is giving to our Nation and to mankind the pace setters in the things that count.

I wish Henry Grady could have been here—Grady, the great spirit, the great voice, who, before his untimely passing at 38, had bound up the wounds of the Confederacy, had lifted the faces of our broken people from the ashes left by Sherman, had renewed their courage and their self-respect, and had pointed the way to glorious contemporary achievements. In New York City in 1836 he said in part:

"I want to say to General Sherman * * * that from the ashes he left us in 1864 we have raised a brave and beautiful city; that somehow or other we have caught the sunshine in the bricks and mortar of our homes; and have builded therein not one ignoble prejudice or memory.

"* * * we have sowed towns and cities in the place of theories and put business above politics. * * * We have fallen in love with work. We have restored comfort to homes from which culture and elegance never departed. * * *

"The new South is enamored of her new work. * * * She is thrilling with the consciousness of growing power and prosperity."

I wish that he and many other great Georgians of the past and present could have been with us tonight—for this is their party, their celebration, too. This lovely gathering, so beautifully arranged by the Georgia Bar Association, and so graciously sponsored by the Atlanta clearinghouse banks, is equally a tribute to the great men and women of our State who have lived and wrought and passed on, and to the many who are still achieving.

I can only stand here with a heart full of humility and gratitude that it has been granted me to live here and now and in such a setting. It is easy to see that we all are parts of one great procession. We are but passing instruments of a process that outlives this fleeting hour. Whether in common law or in civil law, and in whatever land, we serve as one great priesthood the common cause of justice. Ours is the happy privilege of calling men everywhere to worship at the shrine of liberty under law.

Tonight one thinks back to August 1878 and Saratoga Springs, where the American Bar Association had its modest beginning. Savannah's Gen. Alexander R. Lawton and George A. Mercer, Macon's L. N. Whittle, and Atlanta's N. J. Hammond and James J. Hook were in attendance at the organization meeting. And one remembers that General Lawton 4 years later was to become president and that Savannah's Gen. Peter W. Meldrim followed in his footsteps in 1914. One thinks of William Howard Taft, Elihu Root, John W. Davis, Charles Evans Hughes, and the more than 70 other presidents who over the years made their contributions to the ABA and left their imprints upon it.

Tonight many thoughts well up out of a lifetime and seek expression: My early days as a young lawyer in Georgia, and how gracious and helpful the older lawyers and judges and all the people were to me, how Emory took a chance and made me a law professor 33 years ago, and how warm and stimulating has been the fellowship in local, State, and national bar organizations over the years. I'd like to make some acknowledgments for all of this—but time will not permit. I've never had a dull moment; it all has been challenging, exciting, and rewarding, and my only regret is that the sun already is setting and there is so little time to enjoy one's friends and have a part in all that is going on around us.

I particularly would like to say something tonight about our Atlanta banker friends, the great work they are doing and the celebration they will have here next year—and what is going on in so many other important groups in this State. But this is not the time or place.

My remarks tonight must be about law and the legal profession. And on an occasion such as this, one can only generalize and state a point of view.

In the history of the common law, society discovered its need for lawyers 10 centuries ago and gave us an exclusive status, conferring special privileges and charging us with important responsibilities. We point with pride to the fact that we are not tradesmen in the market place but a learned profession working in the spirit of public service. As lawyers, we have a public duty to see that law and its administration keep pace with rapid developments in life about us. In a democracy lawyers are more than craftsmen in the service of their clients—they are the natural leaders from whom and whose conduct the attitude of the community toward the law ought largely to be derived. The prestige and authority of law as a social force at any time is very much what the lawyers make it. They should be stirred by an enlightened self-interest, for the people will neither patronize nor endure a system of justice that is tardy, inefficient, or insincere.

We occasionally are heard to challenge the right of enterprising laymen to encroach on what we call our exclusive domain. We should be reminded that the legal profession exists for the benefit of the public and must justify itself by its service to the public, not overlooking the fact that in the long run the

public will purchase service in any particular field from those who provide the best service regardless of whether they belong to a profession or are laymen. We should ask ourselves how well we as a profession are keeping abreast of the times, how seriously we are considering the convenience, tastes, and growing needs of the public. Are lawyers, in the spirit of the times, conducting research to keep legal services responsive to current requirements; are we as much concerned about pleasing and satisfying those we serve as the manufacturers are about their customers? If not, we are in default.

It hardly can be denied that if we lawyers claim an exclusive privilege in the rendering of certain services in and out of courts, in derogation of the common right of everyone to work, we must be able to demonstrate that the public will best be served by the limitation of that right. We would do well to remember that we have no divine right to practice law—that long ago society created our profession to meet social needs, and that society can and should eliminate us if, in character or in competency or in the convenient availability of our services, we fail to measure up to what is expected of us. It is a sad commentary on the legal profession that 75 percent of the people who need legal services never go to a lawyer.

Whether we as an exclusive profession are to continue in existence in the face of rivalry of imaginative laymen in various activities depends upon what we as the organized bar of America do about it. It is within our power to preserve the legal profession if we wake up to our responsibilities and keep in mind that, in return for the exclusive privilege which soceity has granted us, we are under a lasting obligation to maintain our character and our services at the highest possible level.

Spasmodic and single-handed efforts on our part are not enough. Beyond our fine local and State bar organizations we need a robust and all-inclusive national organization. Broad and intensive research and many other bar activities must be conducted on a national scale at costs beyond the resources of the smaller groups. The American Bar Association seeks to rescue the profession from lethargy and guide it into a future of broader and richer service and usefulness. It is now the largest organization of lawyers in the entire world, but the 24 percent of the American lawyers who are now members of the association cannot do the job. It is a matter of deep concern to us that lawyers are woefully behind members of other professions in group organization and group action on a national basis. It is startling to discover that in sharp contrast with our 24 percent in the ABA, the doctors stand at 83 percent, the dentists 86 percent, the accountants 50 percent, and even the osteopaths 72 percent in membership in the national organizations. We need more than 58,000 of the 241,000 American lawyers; we need more than 1,000 of the 4,500 lawyers in Georgia; we need the personal participation of a substantial majority to claim public respect, to have influence and to finance the continuing legal education, research and publications which are so vital to our great objectives.

There is no room for snobbishness in the national organization of the legal profession. We cannot consistently say that a licensed lawyer whom the State holds out to the public as trustworthy is not good enough to associate with us in our efforts to improve the bar and the administration of justice. We Georgians, during this year of our leadership, are determined to broaden the base and the outlook of the ABA. We are determined to help the ABA do a better job in helping rank and file lawyers of this country serve their clients.

Under current Georgia leadership, the American Bar Association has embarked upon a campaign to double its membership and its personal and financial resources before March 1, 1956. This dramatic movement is the most far reaching and significant in the 77-year history of the ABA, and the universal enthusiasm with which the lawyers throughout the length and breadth of our country have rallied behind it assures its success.

The growth of law and legal service must be as unceasing as life itself. Law depends upon social progress, and social progress, in a very real sense, depends upon the correct creation, interpretation, and administration of law. In my current travels, I am endeavoring to discuss with American lawyers everywhere the many problems which now beset our profession and the public. Human freedom transcends all else in importance. The deepest issue of our time is whether civilized peoples can and will maintain a free society.

The history of Western civilization is essentially the history of the development of human freedom. The common law is the law of free peoples. It has never flourished except in nations which are free and I don't believe it can be received by any nation until that nation has come into full enjoyment of liberty. While in England last month, making plans for our 1957 London meeting, I revisited Runnymede—the scene of Magna Carta—with a view to our placing a granite marker there to be unveiled as a feature of our 1957 pilgrimage in recognition of our great common-law heritage of liberty under law.

Why is it that only the people occupying less than 10 percent of the surface of the earth have had what might be termed adequate food and clothing and the other comforts of a full life? The answer is that they are the people who set themselves free—free from physical restraint; free from ignorance and superstitutions; free from the illusion that rulers had infinite wisdom; free from political doctrines that held men in bondage to governments; free to work out their own destiny with their own minds and their own hands and in their own way, subject only to rules that would prevent them from interfering with the freedom of others. In the process of the emancipation of that portion of humanity, there has been released in society a driving force, an individual initiative, and an aggregate accomplishment previously unknown in the history of mankind.

For 300 years the American people have cherished the spiritual concept that the rights of man to freedom are personal to him from the Creator, not from the state. It was written in our Declaration of Independence. This concept has guided us not only to a life of human dignity, but to material abundance.

The great truths of humanity do not spring newborn to each new generation. They emerge from long experience. They are the gathered wisdom of the ages. They are renewed in times of conflict and danger. In this sense, the current challenge to our political institutions may prove to be a kind of blessing in disguise. If the times in which we are now living do not bring a further understanding of the great traditions of our civilization and a deeper desire to affirm them, we are not worthy of our heritage.

The American creed is premised upon a simple belief; that each human being is a creature of God and endowed by Him with the dignity of individuality. Each must be free to shape his own integrity and to seek his own destiny. It follows that he may not be treated as a statistic on an economic or sociological chart. Respecting this right of the individual man to realize his own potential, we have pledged ourselves in the most solemn compacts of government to allow to our fellows the greatest freedom of choice possible in the exigencies of living together. Where choice must be limited to preserve the freedom of others, we have sought to assure that each shall have the greatest possible voice in making the collective decisions that will control his life, by keeping the powers of government as close as circumstances will permit to those subjected to the power. We have chosen to erect the structures of government in the belief that no national government should do what the States can do, that no State should do what the local government can do, and that no government should do what a man can do for himself. The movement for home rule for municipalities, the concern for States' rights, and the demand for limitations of the Federal treaty power, all are variations on this persistent theme—that government should not be removed from the hands of the governed, that choices which must be made collectively and not individually should be made by the smallest feasible group according to its own needs.

It is almost trite to observe once more that these principles were enshrined in the Constitution by the wise men who gathered to lay the foundations for the Government under which freedom has flourished and our people have prospered. The Central Government was to be entrusted with limited and specifically delegated powers. Only those matters that required uniform treatment, only those problems that demanded a national solution, were delivered up to the centralized power.

The great catalog of human liberties contained in the first 10 amendments to the Constitution endeavored to transmute the dignity of man into a living reality. In the turmoil of our time several of these inalienable rights have been brought to the forefront of our national conscience. Freedom of speech and of the press, the right to assemble peaceably and the privilege against self-incrimination have all found their stanch and vocal advocates. We have heard much of the first 8 amendments, but in the clamor of controversy over these our people seem to have suffered from a mass amnesia concerning the 9th and 10th amendments.

A power most frequently and most flagrantly abused in the circumvention of the limitations on the Federal Government is the power of taxation. Only by the most elaborate and disingenuous pretense can we maintain that many so-called taxes have any relation to supplying revenues for the legitimate operations of government. Still our courts have replied that if an exaction appears on its face to be a tax, we must close our eyes to its motive. To me the gravest of the threats to American ideals is presented by the inordinate and pervasive power of the purse, the power of bounty, the power to spend. Tax collections far exceed the legitimate costs of operating the Federal Government within its delegated bounds.

Government by largesse has begotten a centralized authority of monstrous proportions, and it has at the same time broken down the fundamental design within that Central Government for forestalling the corruption of absolute power. The doctrine of separation of powers, the system of checks and balances, teaches that neither the legislature nor the executive should be servile to the other. It was our plan that the legislative branch, representative of and responsive to the popular will, would formulate policies which the executive would put into effect. But through the power of patronage, the plums of public works, and the bounties of benevolent paternalism, the legislature has been brought to heel. Too often the executive has determined the national policy, and at best the legislature has become a censor of his programs, and at worst, a rubber stamp. Ironic though it may be, the powers by which the administrator has brought down the legislator were conferred by that same legislator.

At the same time, the powers constitutionally reserved to the States have been

gradually usurped through this power to disburse, through what are euphimistically referred to as "grants-in-aid." Under more than 40 separate programs, the governments of the States have been offered the bounty of the Federal Treasury in return for the surrender of their constitutional rights to provide for the interests of their peoples. It is an affront to the dignity of the States, and in contempt of the principles of the Federal system, to assume the States to be incompetent to handle their own affairs. And the notion that the Central Government is somehow providing aid when it drains the sources of tax revenue and doles out a minor share to the States upon bureaucratic conditions is a mischievous fiction. A government is not a productive enterprise—it does not create wealth, it does not contribute to the sum total of economic goods. If there is a single well to fill a community's needs for water, the man who drains it dry and then distributes the water to his fellows upon conditions he chooses to lay down is not providing aid to his neighbors. Recognizing this simple truth, the Legislature of the State of Indiana in 1947 resolved:

"We have decided that there is no such thing as Federal aid. We know that there is no wealth to tax that is not already within the boundaries of the 48 States. So we propose henceforth to tax ourselves and take care of ourselves. We are fed up with subsidies, doles, and paternalism."

Ideally, each person, or more accurately each family, should control the spending of what it has earned. In the long run, no one else can comprehend as well the family's needs and aspirations, and no one can see to it that the fruits of their labor are put to better use. Responsibility for earning begets responsibility in spending. The further the power to spend is removed from the person whose toil and sweat created the power, the greater the likelihood of economic waste, to the detriment of our common standard of living and to the benefit of no one. The concentration of vast wealth in the hands of a remote and centralized government penalizes thrift and encourages waste. The money is there to be spent, the thinking runs, and unless we get our share someone else will. A community which would reject out of hand a proposal that a public building should be financed by voluntary contributions or by a tax laid by the townspeople upon themselves will nevertheless clamor for Federal funds for the purpose. It is difficult to respect money that has come from someone else's pocket.

Today there are still uncharted frontiers—physical, spiritual, and intellectual—standing as our constant challenge. We may well lose our will and our ability to cope with these challenges if we develop and accept the habit of being satisfied with the meager crumbs of material security which some form of benevolent government would dole out to us. To the extent that we permit ourselves to be so dependent upon government that we can no longer think or achieve on our own, dependent on government for those things which traditionally we have provided for ourselves, we defeat the very meaning of democracy and permit government to rule rather than to serve the individual. By every step we take toward making the government caretaker of our lives, we move toward making it our master.

Let us not fall into the error of thinking that the outcome of the struggle between communism and freedom will be determined by military and economic power alone. The greater war is the war of ideas, a spiritual war of moral and religious values. In this war we must deal with the minds and hearts of men and women and demonstrate to them the blessings and satisfactions that come from freedom. They must learn that man is not a slave of the State but that the State is his servant.

Liberal education is the keystone of freedom. The search for truth is, as it has always been, the noblest experience of the human spirit. We are false to ourselves and to our best instincts if we turn our backs on truth or close our eyes when it beckons.

But the recent White House Conference on Education troubles me. Well intentioned, no doubt, it poses a serious threat to democracy and freedom. Although we may have great respect and genuine affection for the present occupant of the White House, we should remember that changes do take place, and we should ponder well the lessons to be learned from Hitler's complete domination of the German people through the perversion of education.

Although the unequal distribution of wealth throughout the 48 States might constitute some argument for a limited program of Federal aid to education, it would be error to deliver the direction of the educational systems of the several States to a Federal board or bureau which ultimately would supervise teachers, prescribe curricula and subject matter, and otherwise condition the education of our oncoming generations. I feel very deeply that the independence of education is essential to the life of a democracy.

The best safeguard against the constant threat of the enemies of liberty to pervert and enslave the minds of our youth by mass propaganda is to support a sound program of public education on a decentralized basis, under the control of the several States, counties, and local school districts—keep it free from mass manipulations, free from subversive control.

Reassurances that State and local schools receiving Federal support will be protected in their autonomy are not enough. The folly of relying on such is indelibly written in the shameful abuse and misuse of Federal powers in the past 25 years. Someone long ago wisely observed: "Whose bread I eat, whose song I sing." To allow our fine independent public-school system to become hopelessly addicted to, or dependent upon, Federal aid would be nothing short of a national calamity.

History teaches that liberties are seldom lost in a frontal attack leveled against them. The threat lies not in open challenge, but in apathy and complacency. Unused, our great freedoms may atrophy and weaken, and their enemies, through cunning propaganda and small but constant steps, may overtake us unaware. We should not be so much concerned, then, about the danger to those liberties for which the defense has already been rallied. But there are other principles, no less basic to our form of government, which have been largely ignored.

We have submitted more and more in recent years to governmental control of the pursuit of our livelihoods. We look more and more to government to satisfy our every want and need. And we are relinquishing the precious right of a man to make those choices which, if he is to be a man, he must make for himself. The right of man to be let alone has been relegated to a lower order in the scale of our common values. But it is a fundamental article of our national faith that we shall not destroy the ancient landmarks in our effort to accommodate the demands for government authority to cope with modern needs. Our principles of freedom must stand as fixed and immovable monuments above the ebb and flow of the currents of change. Paramount and above all other considerations, we must channel the flow of progress within the order and limits of the law; the bulwark of the rule of law must hold firm.

I do not mean to paint the picture too darkly. The people of America still enjoy a degree of liberty unsurpassed among the nations of the world, and they share a material abundance unknown to the past. There are signs of a returning sense of responsibility and of a renewed respect for principle in the Federal administration and among the leaders of both great political parties.

But we can glean small comfort when we recall how easily and how quickly the basic propositions of government gave way in the recent past. The teachings of experience are plain. Our hopes are futile if we entrust our liberties to the written word alone; the Constitution alone is not our salvation. Nor can the courts forever stem the tide. It has fallen to the lawyers, trained in the traditions of government of law and imbued with its spirit, to preserve for all the world the light of human liberty, set with such shining promise by our forebears. We must not only reaffirm our faith in the social and moral order which has made us a great Nation, but we must go out and implement that faith with action. As Thomas Paine said: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

Now on behalf of all who are so fortunate as to be here tonight, may I again thank the Citizens and Southern National Bank, the First National Bank, the Fulton National Bank, and the Trust Company of Georgia for their gracious sponsorship of this lavish hospitality, and may I from the bottom of my heart thank the Georgia Bar Association and all the lawyers of this State for this magnificent expression of friendship and good will. I shall never forget it.

Our Strategic Stockpile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this 84th Congress will wrestle long and mightily with the farm problem. Some will raise the question of surpluses and their effect upon the agricultural economy of our Nation.

Others will contend that those surpluses constitute one of the greatest weapons at our comand now and in the future. In this vein, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Our Strategic Stockpile," from the Lynden Tribune of December 29.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR STRATEGIC STOCKPILE

While the Russians grinned at peace discussions during 1955 they were building submarines and jet bombers as fast as they could. Your Uncle Samuel hasn't been exactly asleep himself, yet he might follow the suggestion of one wise Lynden farmer in regard to storing his strategic stockpile of food.

Much of this strategic stockpile of food is commonly referred to as farm surplus now overflowing in Government warehouses. If a war were to break out, these warehouses would be emptied practically overnight and this food would be needed by our allies.

Our farmer friend asks why the Government doesn't play it wise and ship some of this strategic food and fiber stockpile to England to have it close at hand in case hostilities begin. In every war in modern times the strategy has been to try to starve England out. Why not send it over now, creating a rotating stockpile that can be used by the British people?

During World War II docks were congested with food and munitions. Many lives were lost in the sinking of ships bringing vital cargoes of food to England.

Our farmer friends suggests that such a stockpile in England might add sufficient strength to induce an enemy to think twice before attempting a blockade. The farmer may have an idea that isn't as full of straw as the barnyard where he thought it up.

Incapacity Not Shown—Drawbacks on Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the Members of the House two editorials, one appearing in the Wausau Daily Record-Herald, Wausau, Wis., January 21, 1956, and one appearing in the Shawano Evening Leader, Shawano, Wis., under date of January 25, 1956.

The editorial follows:

INCAPACITY NOT SHOWN

In a nationwide poll of the 48 States on the question of Federal aid to education, the Associated Press obtained these results from ranking officials:

Those in 22 States said the people in their States need or want help from the Federal Government to build more schools.

Those in 20 States said they either do not want or see no present need in their States for Federal aid.

Those in six States refused to take a stand.

One of the States where ranking officials were listed as seeing both a need and desire for Federal aid for schools was New York.

Recent news dispatches from that State have revealed, however, that both the Democrats and Republicans in government in New York State have announced plans for cutting State taxes by $50 million.

It looks from here that any State which can afford to cut taxes $50 million can afford to spend more to meet its educational needs.

The New York situation appears to give emphasis to the finding of the White House Conference on Education that no State has demonstrated financial incapacity to build its schools.

DRAWBACKS ON FEDERAL AID

Since President Eisenhower proposed his Federal school-aid program there has been outcry from the political left of "too little, too late."

The President suggested $250 million in school aid each year for 5 years.

Now comes Mr. George Meany, of the AFL–CIO, with the demand that Congress vote four times that amount in Federal aid for the schools; he called on the Congress to provide at least a billion dollars a year for the next 5 years, with the money to be used to assist States and local school districts build needed facilities.

"Labor believes that stinting the schools is the height of false economy," Meany said. "Since the State and communities cannot cope with this immense problem on their own, the Federal Government must assume its fair share of the burden."

The union chief knows well that Uncle Sam can deliver in school aids only what he first seizes in the way of taxes; in fact, the Federal Government connot even return to the localities as much as it seizes, for who does not know the fabulous inefficiency of Federal administration?

A federalizer even more aggressive than Mr. Heany is Mrs. Agnes Meyer, of the Washington Post, a sort of second Eleanor. She suggested to an education association that teachers become politically active, obtain the help of liberal friends and they could get classrooms and almost anything else they desired. She would have teachers press unceasingly for all-out Federal aid to schools.

Mr. Meany and Mrs. Meyer need to be reminded that if the history of Federal aid shows anything, it shows conclusively that where there is Federal money, there is Federal control.

Federal aid for school building implies Federal control—control of the curriculum, standards of teaching, administration, as well as building supervision.

Educators do not want this. It would be saddled on them, however, if the Meany-Meyer attitude were to prevail in the Congress.

United States Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks I wish to present herewith an editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times of Wednesday, January 25, entitled "It's No Time To Skimp on the United States Air Force." I feel this editorial presents important views and I commend it to the attention of the Members of Congress.

IT'S NO TIME TO SKIMP ON THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Congress should not shrug off the charge, made by two aviation magazines this week, that the sum allocated for the Air Force in President Eisenhower's budget is inadequate. This is no time to permit skimping on vital Air Force needs.

To the layman, the $16½ billion allotted to the Air Force is a tremendous sum which ought to buy a vast array of air defense.

However, Aviation Week declares that the defense budget "is not a budget of airpower progress as billed by Defense Secretary Wilson but a budget of airpower stagnation followed by inevitable retrogression." Aviation Week adds that if Congress does not increase the Air Force allocation "it will serve notice to the Communists that our military airpower is again on the decline and that our policy of massive retaliation is being built on bluff and bluster rather than superior weapons."

These opinions may not be valid. But in view of our country's past failure to maintain its airpower, notably in the period from 1930 to World War II, Congress should not indulge in the assumption that the budget figure is sufficient.

If the will of the American people were heeded, the budget for the Air Force would lean toward the side of overstrength rather than toward the minimums deemed essential by the budget makers. Whenever Americans have had a chance to express their views, over the past three decades, they have emphatically declared for Air Force supremacy over any possible enemy.

That is unquestionably what they want now, and the military committees of Congress should make sure that sufficient Air Force funds are contained in coming appropriations recommended to the two Houses. Let any doubts which may exist be resolved in favor of a solid margin of the security which dominant airpower provides.

The Senate's New Investigator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I believe that every Senator—regardless of his affiliations—feels a warm glow when deserved tribute is paid to a Member of this body for public service of the highest order.

Such tribute has been paid in increasing volume to our beloved colleague the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Senator McCLELLAN is a quiet man, an unassuming man, a modest man. But he has a mind as keen as a surgeon's scalpel, an integrity as solid as granite, and a moral fiber strong as the finest steel.

These qualities have elevated him to a leading position in public life. He has used that position in such a way as to reflect credit upon his State, his country, and the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post some time ago. It sets forth the qualities of Senator McCLELLAN which have made him so beloved by his colleagues and so respected by his fellow Americans.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article will make approximately 3¼ pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $260.

There being no objection, the article was printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE'S NEW INVESTIGATOR

(By Milton MacKaye)

Arkansas has changed a lot in 40-odd years, but there have been no changes for the better in the temperatures of its July afternoons. In 1954, JOHN L. McCLELLAN, running for a third term in the United States Senate, fought for his political life in a statewide primary. A veteran in politics, he had once traveled from crossroads to crossroads by horse and buggy; now he traveled from town to town by helicopter. Science had abbreviated distances, but when the helicopter came to rest in a courthouse square or a cow pasture, Arkansas was just as hot as it had been back in 1912.

On a blistering July afternoon in that year, 16-year-old JOHN McCLELLAN was playing third base for the Sheridan town team. Sheridan was opposing a club from Saline County, the Black Hawks. It was the 9th inning. Two men were out and there was a runner on second; Sheridan led 4 to 3. On the first pitch to the next batter, the base runner bolted for third and the catcher threw. McCLELLAN covered the bag, caught the throw and tagged at the runner. Yelled the umpire, "You're out"

The runner protested at once. He said McCLELLAN had not touched him with the ball. The umpire stood firm until the third

baseman walked over and said, "He's right. I did miss him." The runner was then declared safe. The batter then hit a home run and Sheridan lost the game 5 to 4.

This story was told me by the man—hardly a promising rookie any more—who pitched the homerun ball. Since that hot, sticky, remembered day, he said, he had never questioned the honesty or fairness of JOHN MCCLELLAN.

Partisan politics being what it is in Arkansas—a sort of legalized knife fight and perpetual stomping contest—the ethical judgment of one man is certain to be disputed by a legion of others. Dissent is usually considered the constitutional right of a minority; in Arkansas dissent is so habitual that the articulate minority often finds itself an embarrassed majority. Yet last year enough people shared the opinion of JOHN MCCLELLAN'S boyhood friend—or had other compelling opinions of their own—to send him back to the Senate and to his present post as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

Before its redoubtable days under the chairmanship of Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, this was a quiet, useful, and somewhat obscure committee. MCCLELLAN was a useful and somewhat obscure Senator—at least insofar as the general public was concerned—until the Army-McCarthy hearings last year rocked the national airwaves. As spokesman for the Democrats at that zany carnival, MCCLELLAN did not remain obscure long; millions of Americans at their television sets came to know him well.

They may recall him as a man of dour visage, of dark and funereal aspect—the camera, unlike the dog, is not every man's best friend—but they also recall him as one actor in that unlikely melodrama who continuously made sense. He did not preen himself when the magic lens turned his way, but, with a trained prosecutor's skill, he usually managed at each session to elicit at least one cogent bit of evidence. Whenever the hearings went haywire, as they did daily, his was the muezzin voice which called the participants not to prayer—although that might not have been a bad idea—but back to the factual points at issue.

The Senator's voice is a memorable one. Washington Reporter, Mary McGrory once called it the voice of doom. It is as deep as that of a bass singer in a Baptist choir—the Senator is a Baptist—and, in a day of microphones, needs no mechanical stepping up to be heard in any company. The Senator, however, is no declaimer; ordinarily he speaks in level, moderate tones. Perhaps his success lies in intangibles. A famous actress of a generation ago, asked for her secret of reaching topmost galleries, said, simply, "I carry." MCCLELLAN carries.

Since MCCLELLAN succeeded MCCARTHY this year as chairman of a much-publicized committee, he has been a judicial and patient moderator. He has not dramatized himself; he has not hankered after sensation, and he has not called witnesses solely to make headlines. There has been no bullying of witnesses, and the gavel has seldom sounded when there was amiable laughter in the hearing room. It has sounded when there was disorder or when a point was being worried. In a congressional inquiry points are predestined to be worried. MCCLELLAN likes to get on.

But given a recalcitrant witness, a foolishly jaunty one or a plain wrongdoer, MCCLELLAN'S voice takes on the authority of an Old Testament prophet or a southern revivalist explaining the doctrine of original sin. There is in his Biblical and lawbook rhetoric a hint of the imminence of Armageddon, and in his deep-set eyes a glimpse of the controlled and banked fires within the man himself.

The Arkansas Senator has been in Congress now for almost 17 years, he served 2 terms in the House of Representatives during the 1930's, but it would be difficult to find a colleague who could honestly say he knew him intimately or well. This is not to suggest that MCCLELLAN is withdrawn or is anything approaching, to use an overworked phrase, a mystery man. His relations with the brethren he sees every day are casual and friendly. He has few close associates on Capitol Hill, and he simply keeps his own counsel.

There can be little doubt that, under the fumed-oak protective coloring that most individuals in public affairs take on JOHN MCCLELLAN is one of the most complex and contradictory personalities in the Senate, and one of the most interesting.

Arkansas during his boyhood was part of the South and part of the frontier. The McClellans were Scotch-Irish and sharecroppers. "So far as I know," the Senator told me, "my grandfather never owned a foot of land in his lifetime. But he plowed a whole field when he was 75." The family emigrated from Mississippi and avoided the rich delta coton lands of Arkansas where Negroes did the work. They chose a hill section where a white sharecropper was lucky to get a bale of cotton to 10 acres, but could be independent.

The Senator's mother died when he was 3 weeks old, and he went to live with his grandparents. In later years their place was to be a second home and he remembers the struggle to bring in cash money. His grandfather managed it from timber. Hickory could be fashioned into ax handles, pine into planks and shingles. Young JOHN would go into the woods with his grandfather for white-oak saplings. When these were split, thin lengths of 8 to 10 inches could be cut from the soft, pliant wood. His grandfather wove these into baskets worth cash or credit at the crossroads store. Home handiwork required sharp, cared-for tools—each in its place—and the Senator credits his own disciplined work habits to the strict orderliness his grandfather demanded of him.

But the stronger influence was that of his father, who wanted something more than farm drudgery in a backwoods community for himself and his son. Between crops of corn, cotton, and potatoes Isaac McClellan served as a country schoolteacher, studied borrowed lawbooks when he had a chance, and reveled in the robust politics of the era. When JOHN was three his father remarried and the youngster went to live in the new household.

"I felt sorry for that little motherless boy of mine," Isaac McClellan, now 84 years old, told me not long ago. "When I was teaching I took him to school with me. He would listen to the older classes recite—they were all in 1 room—and when he was 4 he could read, write, and do some arithmetic. When he was six he was in the fourth grade. And then I taught him at home at night; I pushed him."

Life, events, and his own dauntless, driving ambition were to continue to push JOHN MCCLELLAN for a good many years and to give him little peace. Rivals in his own State often accuse him of being vindictive toward trampled opponents, and the Senator answers the charge with a sardonic smile and a shrug: "Well, it is true that when I'm unjustly attacked, I do not forget." The frontier campaigning he knew as a boy saw little quarter asked and less than that given.

Politics in ruder, simpler days was an emotional outlet for the public, and the idol of MCCLELLAN'S youth was Jeff Davis, three times governor and a crowd swayer of monumental proportions. Davis, though no kin of Jefferson Davis, President of the Confederacy, always wore a sombrero and Prince Albert suit made of Confederate gray material. His simple platform: "I am a hard-shell Baptist in religion. I believe in foot washing, saving your seed potatoes, and paying your honest debts."

It was Jeff Davis, long before the day of Harry S. Truman, who said, "To me, my friends are always right." His friends were the farmers, the mountaineers, the boys at the creek forks, and, including himself in their ranks, he admiringly called them "rednecks," "hillbillies," the "Wool Hat Brigade." He made it an article of sectional faith that the best of all possible supper menus is hog jowls, turnip greens, hot cornbread, and cold buttermilk.

Davis believed in large families, pointer dogs, the malevolence of the rich. He once said of the esteemed Arkansas Gazette, oldest newspaper west of the Mississippi River, and one with which MCCLELLAN later was to feud, "I'd rather be found with a dead polecat in my pocket." A favorite of many students of Davisiana is a statement he made concerning the domestic crisis in the governor's mansion during a period of high—and thus conspiratorial—meat prices.

"Now you take bacon," he said. "I just buy one little slice, hang it up by a long string, and let my eight kids jump and grease their mouths and then go to bed."

When JOHN MCCLELLAN was 8 years old, his father took him to a rally at which Davis was the principal speaker. Under the spell of that sonorous presence, watching wool hats sail in the air when Davis made a telling blow, the boy had rosy visions of his own future. The next day his father discovered him in the back yard, surrounded by upright sticks of stove wood. JOHN stood on the "chop block" reciting to the stove wood—his audience—an impressive reprise of the Jeff Davis speech.

From there to an inexorable decision required only a brief interval. Isaac McClellan's bright party loyalty was evidenced by his christening habits. JOHN LITTLE MCCLELLAN was named for John S. Little, Arkansas Governor and Congressman. As JOHN'S half brothers came along, one was named for the late Senator Joe T. Robinson, another for William Jennings Bryan, and a third for Woodrow Wilson. In Arkansas, Democrats might abuse, defame, and scandalize one another, but they stood as one man against the common enemy. At the close of a summer session of school there were always class-day exercises. JOHN'S teacher suggested the boy recite a standard southern selection, The Georgia Volunteer. But Isaac McClellan would have none of it. For reasons now forgotten, the male teacher had recently given JOHN a whipping—and the teacher was a Republican.

Outraged that any Republican should lay a hand on a birthright Democrat, the father wrote for the son a partisan speech which was calculated to, and did, make the schoolhouse rafters ring. A national election was almost at hand and the speech, as written, ended with the clarion call: "Vote for William Randolph Hearst, a great and noble man." But the Democratic National Convention of 1904, meeting a few days before the school exercises, failed to nominate Hearst. Young JOHN'S speech, like many another in political history, was hastily revised to name another great and noble man, Judge Alton B. Parker, who subsequently ran against Republican T. Roosevelt.

Nevertheless the occasion was a great success. JOHN gave the speech again at the Democratic county convention, and a copy of it was sent to Congressman Little. In a letter, Little predicted that someday the boy would succeed him in Washington. MCCLELLAN never forgot.

Rarely has a man chosen his career so early and stayed with it so stubbornly. The Senator dedicated himself to politics at the tender age of 8, and to the legal profession at the mature age of 12. Recently, sitting in his Washington office, he confessed smilingly that the inception of his love affair with the law was not entirely selfless. A sawmill company owed his father $200 for

the wood rights on a plot of land. When the company changed hands, Ike McClellan decided to send a young attorney to Pine Bluff to collect the debt. The lawyer left Sheridan in the morning, came back in the evening with the money and received from the elder McClellan a $25 fee.

"Up to that time," the Senator told me, "I had had only one ride on a train. The idea that anyone could make $25 in 1 day, and also have his expenses paid for a train trip, opened up rich, new horizons of which a country boy had not dreamed."

Soon after that his father was himself admitted to the bar, and the boy had the run of his office. The joy and fascination other adolescents of the period found in Jules Verne and G. A. Henty, JOHN MCCLELLAN found in Blackstone and the Arkansas statutes, Wigmore on evidence, and Story on constitutional law. His father, like other lawyers in that vicinity, traveled a judicial circuit of three county seats, and the son frequently went along. At 13 he was a veteran of jury trials and a familiar of the courts. At 14 he could argue abstruse points with respectful elders, and, out of school hours, was doing most of his father's abstracting and paperwork.

In Arkansas, at that time, a court could remove the "disabilities" of a minor and permit him to stand for examination for the bar. In 1913 Ike McClellan took his son to Benton, a nearby town where court was in session, and asked the presiding judge to appoint a committee of lawyers to examine him. "Don't shirk your duty," Ike said confidently. "Put it to him all you want to." The lawyers did, and reported later he had come up with the best oral examination of their experience. As a result, JOHN MCCLELLAN, then 17, became the youngest practicing lawyer in Arkansas history, and his father's partner.

Four years later, World War I took the boy out of the small town and some of the small town out of the boy. MCCLELLAN credits his Army experience with teaching him a self-reliance he had not known before. In 1917 he was accepted at Officers Training School. Most of the candidates were college graduates; although he was an attorney, his formal schooling was about equivalent to a 10th-grade education. He had never seen a military drill. Yet, somewhat to his own surprise, he emerged with the silver bar of a first lieutenant—1 of 96 men out of a class of 226 who received commissions. He saw most of his Infantry service in Texas, and was mustered out in 1919.

Once at home, MCCLELLAN had an overpowering desire for independence. Purchasing—for $125 down—the library of a recently deceased judge, he opened practice on his own in Malvern, 25 miles from Sheridan. He had few acquaintances and no political backing in the new county, but he soon made his presence known. In 1926 he was elected prosecutor of the judicial circuit and in 4 years of office created a solid reputation for himself and a loyal political following.

Friends recall with amusement that father and son not infrequently found themselves on opposing sides in a courtroom, and that no punches were pulled. Father and son, however, continued affectionate and loyal, and are today. Ike McClellan, whom I interviewed at Sheridan, has served as county judge, but is now retired. He has never visited Washington. "JOHN asks me," he said, "but I just don't want to go."

The Senator is now 59, and his love affair with the law persists. Those who have watched MCCLELLAN in action agree that he is admirably equipped, always painstaking in preparation, quickly analytical, fast on his feet. A fierce fighter in a courtroom or a public hearing, a searching prosecutor, he has also that singular respect for due process of law which belongs to advocates who have steeped themselves in the Anglo-American judicial tradition.

These attributes made him unusually valuable to the Democratic Party when the decision was made to close ranks on JOE MCCARTHY. As the recognized spokesman for the minority, during the Army-McCarthy hearings, he handled himself with wisdom, dignity, and imagination. And yet the situation had, for political observers, a sardonic and humorous aspect. A few years before, the name of JOHN MCCLELLAN would have been anathema to a good many of the so-called liberal Democrats who, as anti-McCarthyites, now found themselves in his cheering section.

The real reason for the antipathy of the Fair Dealers was MCCLELLAN'S unyielding enmity to President Truman during the greater part of Truman's administration. This is evidenced by the remarkable number of times he voted with the Republicans between 1946 and 1952. There is a story behind this vendetta. In the Democratic National Convention of 1944, conservative Democrats built up favorite-son strength hoping to block the renomination of Henry Wallace for Vice President. On the second ballot, MCCLELLAN switched Arkansas' votes from Bankhead, of Alabama, to Harry Truman, and the landslide began. "I'll never forget this," MCCLELLAN quotes Truman as saying.

It is the Senator's contention that Truman not only forgot that but also private political pledges made to him. The Senator has an elephant's memory for what he considers broken pledges. He refused to campaign for Truman in 1948; although he was running on the same ticket; his close friend, former Gov. Ben Laney, of Arkansas, was one of the organizers of the Dixiecrat revolt. In 1949, MCCLELLAN proposed reduction of Truman's foreign-aid program and the slicing of his domestic budget by $2 billion.

On foreign policy, however, MCCLELLAN, like most southerners, has generally gone along with the internationalists. A friend said, probably accurately: "He wants to cooperate with the rest of the world if it doesn't cost too much money."

MCCLELLAN first went to Washington in 1935. In depression-haunted Arkansas men who were willing to work for 50 cents a day could not find jobs. In the House of Representatives he supported most of the early New Deal measures, including the Wagner Act. Later, fear of a controlled economy began to chill his enthusiasms and turn him gradually to the right.

In 1938 MCCLELLAN announced for the Senate in opposition to the incumbent lady, Senator Hattie W. Caraway. MCCLELLAN had little money going into the campaign, and he had a good deal less when it ended. Sam Watkins, one of the Senator's oldest and most loyal friends in Little Rock, remembers that one of McClellan's creditors of the 1938 campaign received a check every month for 4 years—sometimes as small as $25—until the total obligation was paid off. This bleeding of family prosperity for public office is more common among politicians than the public suspects. Even today MCCLELLAN is a relatively poor man; he owns prosperous business properties in Malvern, but, outside that, has only his salary.

Mrs. Caraway won the primary by about 10,000 votes. She was actively supported by President Roosevelt, and reporters surmised that the ballots of most of the State's 50,000 WPA workers went her way. After the defeat, MCCLELLAN was invited to join a prominent law firm in Camden, and there he practiced, happily and profitably, for the next 4 years.

The year 1942 saw him back on the hustlings. Again he was handicapped by lack of campaign finances—he spent $17,000 and owed $5,000 of that—but this time he was elected. His earlier adversary, Mrs. Caraway, was defeated for reelection 2 years later by the present junior Senator, J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT. It may interest those who accuse MCCLELLAN of grudge-holding that it was he who went to the White House, pounded on Roosevelt's desk, and demanded that a post in the Federal Government be found for the elderly and indigent lady who had been so loyal to the New Deal. She was appointed to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, a job she held until her death.

There was no opposition to the Senator's renomination in 1948, but storm signals had been flying a long time when MCCLELLAN went into last year's primary. His chief opponent was Sidney S. McMath, twice governor, a personable and magnetic World War II veteran, an audience pleaser and campaigner of no mean talent.

Politics is full of ironies. When McMath was discharged from the Marines as a lieutenant colonel, he came into MCCLELLAN'S Washington office to announce that he was going home to enter politics. The Senator was favorably impressed; at the time he was dallying with the idea of leaving public life in a few years. When McMath departed, MCCLELLAN strolled out of his office and said to his administrative assistant, "That young man might very well succeed me in this job."

The flame of friendship flared briefly, then died. Actually the two men espoused diametrically opposed philosophies of government and a head-on collision probably was inevitable. Three years ago, convinced that McMath had his political destruction in mind, MCCLELLAN threw his influence to McMath's opposition and helped defeat him for a third term as governor

Weighing the situation in 1954, MCCLELLAN decided McMath would enter the primary with 100,000 to 125,000 assured votes. McMath would possess organized labor; MCCLELLAN had voted for the Taft-Hartley Act. McMath would have the Ozark farm cooperatives and a heavy percentage of the younger progressive voters. Few Negroes had taken part in earlier primaries, but in 1954 some 60,000 were voting and the Senator expected little help from them. His own rock-bound strength would come from Main Street, the business interests of the State, and the cotton planters of east Arkansas.

The McCarthy hearings ended June 22. The primary was set for July 27. MCCLELLAN had about a month to raise money and woo the voters. After his quiet years in Senate halls MCCLELLAN had dreaded the physical beating a vigorous campaign entails. Temperatures in Arkansas were 102 to 114 degrees in the shade, and his plastic-enclosed helicopter was a flying bake oven. ("Cost $4,500 to rent, and worth that in publicity alone," said the Senator.) MCCLELLAN didn't depend on radio and television to do his campaigning; he delivered just as many stump speeches as he would have delivered 30 years before. Visiting 7 or 8 towns a day, with a speech for every town, MCCLELLAN found that, instead of wasting away, he had gained 5 pounds.

The Senator was running on his record. Arkansas is one of the have-not States, and Federal assistance is important. The record showed Washington had appropriated $225 million for flood control and water-resources development during MCCLELLAN'S 12 years in the Senate. He had assisted in obtaining over $350 million for defense plants, Air Force installations, and the veterans' hospital at Little Rock.

The campaign was slam-bang, but there were surprises for both candidates. It was an open secret that McMath, who has a genius for needling and attack, expected the repressed but high-tempered Senator to blow his top before the campaign ended. The Senator never did. McMath made light of MCCLELLAN'S role as MCCARTHY'S adversary, but the electorate was impressed when all except three of the Democratic Senators in Washington signed a letter commending MCCLELLAN'S work in the hearings, an unprecedented thing in a party primary.

McMath was the avowed enemy of the Arkansas Power & Light Co. and he pictured

McCLELLAN as the friend and tool of the utility. The A. P. & L., in a monumental blooper of utility diplomacy, chose to raise its rates in the dying days of the campaign, and the dismal new monthly bills reached the voters as they were about to go to the polls. This undoubtedly cost McCLELLAN many votes.

Sid McMath polled about 128,000 votes, McCLELLAN about 164,000, and 2 minor opponents about 32,000 between them. This gave McCLELLAN a majority of nearly 4,000 over his 3 adversaries. A recount made minor adjustments in the figures, but no McClellan-McMath run-off was necessary.

All his life McCLELLAN has been as independent as an Arkansas razorback on ice. He welcomes information, but his associates know he does not welcome too much advice, and they are chary with it. He decides issues for himself. He has an almost irrational revulsion to the fictional and to make-believe dramatics.

This was evidenced last fall when the minority—Democratic—report on the Army-McCarthy hearings was released. McCLELLAN and Senators JACKSON and SYMINGTON had already signed it. Then the photographers gathered at McCLELLAN'S office for a reenactment of the signing. This is a customary Washington tableau—long hallowed by White House custom. McCLELLAN would have none of it. It was phony.

This, perhaps, represents a delicacy in ethics difficult for coarser spirits to understand. But the Senator himself is no easy riddle, and life has not treated him gently.

McCLELLAN married as a high-school boy; the marriage was unhappy and ended in divorce. His first wife died many years ago. There were two children, Max and Doris—now Mrs. Dale Elliott. After his removal to Malvern he married Lucille Smith; they had three children, John L., James, and Mary Alice.

In 1936 Congress held on into the summer, and Mrs. McClellan decided to drive the children home to Arkansas herself. The second night of the trip they stopped at the home of kinfolk near Memphis. Mary Alice shared a bed with her mother, and she remembers, although she was only five, that she could not wake her next morning. Mrs. McClellan was taken to a Memphis hospital in a coma and died of spinal meningitis.

After Lucille McClellan's tragic death, the then Congressman drew further into himself. He no longer had any interest in a personal social life. Work was the answer. Office associates of the time tell me he ate two meals a day—a sandwich at his desk for lunch and a sandwich at his desk for dinner. And long after the office staff left, his lights burned on at Capitol Hill. The children remained at the modest bungalow in Malvern, where they could live a small-town life among friends and relatives, under the care of Mrs. Willia Ritchie, a practical nurse and housekeeper to whom the Senator still feels deeply obligated. This regime—he got home as often as possible—lasted 3 years.

His eldest son, Max, an infantry corporal, died of illness during the north African campaign. His second son, John L., Jr., served in the Navy in the Pacific and was in his last year of law at the University of Arkansas in 1947 when Max's body was brought home for reburial in Sheridan. John L., Jr., and his father were very close; both had a dream of a law partnership. The night before the military funeral at Sheridan, John L. was injured in a traffic accident. His injuries were at first considered superficial, but a few days later he died.

The Senator's present wife is the former Norma Myers Cheatham, known affectionately to his children as Bittie. They now have been married 17 years. Mrs. McClellan, a North Carolinian, was a widow with a young daughter when they met in Washington. Today, with the children grown and married, the McClellans live in an apartment at the Fairfax Hotel, which Mrs. McClellan has furnished charmingly. She is a collector of old silver and fine china, but not of the spotlight. At one Army-McCarthy hearing she discovered she had been hunted out by the television camera, and never went again.

Norma McCelllan is a small, pretty, vivacious woman. When the heavy schedule of a politician's wife permits, she is an indefatigable player of bridge and a confusing card game called Bolivia, which is presently engaging many Senate ladies. In Arkansas last summer she helped to organize a woman's movement to support her husband's candidacy, and, to her surprise, even made several speeches. In fact, the whole family was active. Jim, the Senator's only surviving son, commuted in a friend's small plane between headquarters and the university at Fayetteville. Jim, now 27, went to West Point for 2 years and then married. From 1950 to 1953 he was in the Army in Germany, serving as a liaison pilot along the Czech border. He was graduated in law last autumn, and now he and Mary Alice's husband, Harry E. McDermott, share bandbox offices as a fledgling firm of Little Rock attorneys.

The McClellans had learned earlier that the demands of constituents are unfathomable, but the visit of one 11-year-old boy during the war still remains a high water mark in their memory. His arrival was preceded by a telegram from his physician-father asking the Senator to meet the youngster at the station. The McClellans did not know the boy and they did not think they knew the father. In this they were right; he was a Texan who had just moved to Arkansas.

It quickly became evident the boy intended to spend his Washington holiday with the McClellans. In the smallish house they then occupied there were 3 teen-age children. Maids were unobtainable; Mrs. McClellan was doing all the cooking. The boy had $2.50 in cash and no ration tickets. A tactful inquiry about the length of his stay brought the careless reply, "Oh, until I get tired."

One of the McClellan sons, under parental pressure, grumpily gave up his bed to the little wayfarer. Each morning Mrs. McClellan handed the boy $3.50 and put him on a sightseeing bus. After a week, the Senator made a desperation telephone call to the Arkansas doctor. He said truthfully that Mrs. McClellan was ill and about to undergo surgery at the Mayo Clinic. What should they do with the boy?

"Send him home," was the cheerful answer.

"But he has no railroad ticket."

"Don't worry about that," said the father of the 11-year-old. "He'll write you a check. And it'll be good."

It was.

By reason of his seniority and his leadership in the investigatory arm of the Senate, JOHN McCLELLAN has now become an important national figure. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and is chairman of the Government Operations Committee.

The latter is the parent committee of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, of which he is also chairman. The original job of the subcommittee was not to hunt down and lasso Communists, that's what the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, once headed by JENNER, of Indiana, and now by EASTLAND, of Mississippi, was set up to do, McCLELLAN'S subcommittee, on the other hand, was designed to investigate improper procedures and graft in Government departments. It was JOSEPH McCARTHY who sent it hallooing off in other directions. Under McCLELLAN'S leadership the subcommittee achieves fewer headlines, but it now sticks closely to its proper task, and under revised rules which protect the rights of witnesses, and which have abolished one-man control.

The Senator from Arkansas is still a man whose chief interest is work. Recently, he and his wife have gone out more, and he shows visible evidence of thawing. His schedule is just the same. He breakfasts at 7 a. m., is off to work at 8, returns home at 7 or 7:30, never earlier. Unless the Senator and his wife are going out, they dine on trays before the TV set, and then he goes back to the documents and reports he has brought home.

Arkansas reporters told me the Senator was as brave as a lion in his campaign helicopter, even when there was, on one occasion, a forced landing. But he is nervous in a motorcar. Mrs. McClellan usually does the family driving, but not long ago she left the car at the Senate garage and asked McCLELLAN to drive it home. Pondering some issue of the day, he found himself in the middle of an intersection before he saw the red light. When a policeman reprimanded him, the Senator said simply and with resolution, "Officer, if you will let me get it home, I won't drive this car again." He is a man of his word. He hasn't.

Religion and Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the latest issue of the Goal magazine, Editor Lawrence W. Neff published a talk which he made to a men's Bible class on the subject of Religion and Race.

His approach to the question to separation of the races is from a standpoint of religion and Christianity. I was so impressed with his handling of the subject that I have asked Mr. Neff's permission, which he has kindly given, to insert this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Pursuant to unanimous consent previously granted, I insert this article on Religion and Race herewith:

RELIGION AND RACE

(A talk by the editor to a men's Bible class)

If I had been consulted about being restored to the teaching staff of this class, I would have advised against it. The trouble seems to be that I have never learned how to shoot off a gun easy. Today I shall try to do it, with some misgivings.

Fifty years ago this month I was in process of deciding whether to take religion seriously or continue to play along with it in the approved manner. A few weeks later I was enrolled in a school of theology, where I found the study of religion so interesting and exciting that I have kept it up ever since.

I may add that during more than 30 years of membership in this class I have got more light on some crucial subjects through our informal discussions than ever from any other source. Last Sunday, for example, there were several good impromptu sermons.

From the beginning of my new life I formed the habit of putting as much truth as I could in the fewest possible words, writing them down for future reference.

Now I have a barrel of them, and do nearly all my thinking in that form.

The one thing I abominate above all others is contradictions. No authentic fact ever contradicted another fact. So, I have spent a great deal of time attempting to weed out discrepancies, with some small measure of success.

The memoranda I have made pertaining to Jesus would fill a considerable book. Since the topic for today is "The Meaning of the Master," we will begin with a brief look at some of these notes.

First, a few of the things Jesus was not, despite ancient and bewhiskered teaching to the contrary:

He was not a goody-goody sentimentalist, or a shallow optimist. No one ever faced the stark realities of existence so frankly and fearlessly as he. Narrow was the way, he said, and strait the gate that leads to life, and few there are that find it. That is perhaps the saddest truth ever put into words.

Jesus was not a spectacular wonder-worker, but turned away from many more than he healed. He poured contempt on miraculous signs and those who craved them. Religion can have no weaker foundation than miracles, which cannot be proved and would not prove anything if they could.

Jesus was not a lamb led to the slaughter as a sacrifice. Do you suppose the Scribes and the Pharisees and the Herodians and the money-changers regarded him as a lamb, or rather as a dangerous revolutionist? I cannot imagine a less lamb-like person.

I am persuaded he was not, as the Christian cults have taught since the third century, though not before that time, the second segment of a three-way split personality, sitting on his own right hand and pleading with himself in our behalf, with groanings that cannot be uttered.

Instead, he was just himself—an integral personality—the most glorious personality imagination can picture—and the one peculiar glory of our human nature is the privilege of becoming even a little like him.

To understand him adequately we would have to be equal to him.

He was immeasurably greater than the fragmentary records of his ministry, which but dimly convey the tremendous impact of his personality.

He put eternity into the present tense, and placed the seal of immortality upon the human spirit.

The thing I claim for him, and the most I know how to claim, is that he was in step with the eternal purpose, attuned to the divine goodness, possessed of a compassionate understanding of all human needs.

My utmost hope is to touch the healing hem of His garment.

If He had not come, I would not want to be here.

On a practical level, we must accept the pronouncement of Matthew Arnold, a great scholar and an avowed skeptic, that the truest test of right and wrong is whether Jesus would approve or disapprove what was done.

I accept that challenge unreservedly. The first and last question about any course of conduct is, "What would Jesus do, here and now?" But I am going to give it an application which, alas, some may find unpalatable.

The people of the South, and indeed some other portions of our country, are agitated over a word that has recently come to the forefront—a perfectly innocent word that has taken on a strained and sinister meaning. The word is "segregation." It merely means selective separation.

We exercise that faculty habitually and even unconsciously. If Jack Spratt eats no fat and his wife eats no lean, each is simply segregating the undesirable.

If you find limburger cheese a bit too rancid for consumption, you segregate it. I knew a very fine man in this community—he often taught this class—who dearly doted on limburger. But he had to wait until his family had gone visiting to bring it into the home.

Some topics of discussion are like that—including the one I am about to introduce.

Two key words function in any fair consideration of human rights.

The first is opportunity. I declare without hesitation that I am heartily in favor of full and equal opportunity for every individual of whatever race or color. Furthermore, they should all be encouraged to achieve their possible best.

The second and far more important word is "fitness." Privileges or opportunities that fail to flower in fitness become doubly dangerous. We must clarify the two terms in our thinking.

Segregation, or selective separation, is a privilege we exercise constantly.

A few days ago I decided that I needed a minor surgical operation, intended solely to improve my looks, because they needed improvement.

Did I go out on the street and ask the first man I met to see what he could do for me with his pocketknife? Presumably he had as much sense as I did, maybe more. All he lacked was the opportunity to prove it. If he messed up my face learning, maybe he could do better for the next victim. Just give him a chance. But I discriminated against him. I was unfair to him. In fact, I segregated him, and turned instead to a skillful surgeon, who happened to be the president of our class, with fine results.

If we planned to found a university, and wanted to be perfectly fair about it, we should go down to the slums for our faculty. They are natively as intelligent as our doctors of philosophy, we are assured by the doctors themselves, and in time would learn to operate a fine university, if they had the chance. But we just don't do it that way.

The acid test is always fitness. It was constantly in the mind and on the lips of Jesus as the goal of all high endeavor. The man who put his hand to the plow and looked backward was not fit. The 1 lone talent was taken from the unfit individual and given to the one who already had 10 talents. To him who had, much would be given, because of his fitness.

The primal law of life is survival by reason of fitness.

God seems more concerned about quality than quantity.

Now, we face the decisive question: "What would Jesus do about segregation?" Whatever the answer, it is what we must do.

The integrationists have shifted the emphasis to religion. Very well.

They speak smugly about the example of the gentle Galileean. Right here in this room I heard one declare solemnly, "That does not sound like the Man of Nazareth." We get it on all sides, from every direction.

The fact is, they have got many of our best people on their knees at the mourners bench repenting of imaginary transgressions. Even the very elect may sometimes be deceived, or deceive themselves.

If we had to conjecture and speculate about what Jesus would do, this course might be defensible. But such is not the case. We have records so clear and unanswerable that he may run that reads.

I affirm calmly and deliberately that Jesus was the most consistent and the most inflexible segregationist the world has ever known. From many instances in the gospels I take only a few illustrative examples.

There is no record of more than the most casual contact of Jesus with any non-Jew. He avoided them studiously. The purported conversation with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well is recognized by such authorities as Dr. Schweitzer, and many others, as a pure invention of second century Greeks. So, we may drop it.

In commissioning the 12 immediately after they were chosen, and sending them forth to proclaim his gospel—his good news—he said to them: "Go not to the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter not."

So far as the records show, the only Gentile who was healed by Jesus and then begged to join the inner circle of the disciples was positively turned away, with the admonition to go to his own home and friends—his own people—and tell them what God had done for him. This might well serve as a hint to some who are trying desperately to break out of their own group and into another.

The avowed goal of integration is intermarriage.

Jesus would have turned you and me away, just as he did the Gadarene, and for the same reason.

As a climax, there is His astounding declaration that He was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. That puzzled and worried me for long years. It was here, in this class, that the satisfying explanation was found.

Jesus came to earth for a specific purpose. He came to the Jews because no other people would have received Him. In Athens, Alexandria, or Rome he would have failed so signally that we would never so much as have heard His name. Even among the Jews He must segregate the multitude and concentrate on a dozen men.

Human progress has always gone forward on the feet of a meager minority.

We of the South—and, in rapidly growing measure, those of other sections—are confronted by a dilemma similar to that which Jesus faced and settled so decisively.

We have a great work to do, despite any and all interference. For me, the South is a land of sunshine and song and high aspiration—a land to love, and live for, and, if so be, to die for.

Sometimes they refer to us as the Bible Belt. It is barely possible that America needs a Bible Belt, to replace its Babel Belt.

Ours is the most wholesome social and spiritual heritage on earth, and we do not purpose to throw it away.

I have good friends among the Negroes. Some of them wave at me as far as they can recognize me, and I am happy to wave back.

The nub of the race problem—as of many others—is the attempt to deal with it through mass, rather than individual, adjustments.

We believe that if a horde of colored boys and girls, however deserving of opportunity, were injected into the white schools of Atlanta, the schools would be set back 50 years, if not wrecked—probably the latter. The same thing will prove true everywhere it is tried.

Nothing could bring greater joy to the Communists and other subversives.

This is far more than a sectional, or even national problem. Very interestingly and vitally, the whole world is facing up to it, in confusion. The United Nations, supposedly the citadel of freedom, is actually the bulwark of segregation. As the backward peoples clamor for their rights, the Caucasian group hold the whip hand through the arbitrary power of the veto, which we would never dream of surrendering.

You may now be surprised when I say that, so far as we of the South are concerned, the facts I have stated are of but transient importance. Our dilemma not only will settle itself, but is already far on the way to an interim solution through economic and social forces. Much of our disquietude appears to be vain.

What we think, or say, or do, is almost irrelevant.

I learned this truth from a man whom all of us have known and admired and loved—who taught this class often and helpfully. That man was the late Dr. Franklin Parker—university professor, dean, and chancellor; twice elected to the office of bishop and twice refusing it.

We had a number of conversations on race relations. I deeply respected his character, and ability, his wide experience, and lifelong intimate familiarity with the subject. He grew up in Louisiana.

It was in our last conversation before his passing that he spoke the half dozen words which took my breath away, but gave me a much clearer perspective.

Looking earnestly into my face, he said with deep feeling and conviction:

"The Negro will leave the South."

If that is true—and it is—a vastly different situation is presented.

The departure will be voluntary, though somewhat induced, and apparently inevitable.

Several controlling factors will contribute to that result. I mention a few:

One is the growing economic revolution. Whenever a big plantation operator buys a cottonpicking machine, 20 field hands are thrown out of work. So of tractors and other mechanical equipment. The obvious recourse of the workers is a move to the great industrial centers. Millions have gone, and more millions are on the way.

Generations of good will between the races is already giving place to agitation and hostility, foreshadowing an immediate cold war, with some already very warm spots steadily heating. If integration of schools is rammed down our throats, it will get hot in a hurry, as widespread violence flares. The impulse to go elsewhere will be irresistible.

After all, a move to a more favorable environment is not necessarily objectionable. Abraham set the pattern in Ur of the Chaldees more than 3,500 years ago. In reconstruction days my parents went from Kentucky to Texas in a covered wagon. Forty-two years ago I moved 2,000 miles to live in Georgia, and I have not been mad at anybody about it.

In their new home the Negroes may hope to enjoy a measure of freedom unattainable here.

The natural, logical and desirable sequence is that they, as a group, seek the fulfillment of that hope in a more auspicious setting.

I add, however, that the problem is not being solved, but merely moved.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate hearings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the official reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix, but this rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed.

10. *Official reporters.*—The official reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this restriction shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. The Public Printer or the official reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Illustrations.*—Pursuant to section 182b, title 44, United States Code (as shown above), requests for authority to insert an illustration in the RECORD should be submitted to the Joint Committee on Printing through the chairman of the Committee on Printing of the respective House in which the speech desired to be illustrated may be delivered. Illustrations shall not exceed in size a page of the RECORD and shall be linecuts only. Copy for illustrations must be furnished to the Public Printer not later than 12:30 o'clock p. m. of the day preceding publication.

13. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

Appendix

The Successful Martin Family of Princess Anne, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, America continues to be the land of opportunity. As evidence of this lasting tradition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a very heartwarming article entitled "Degrees by the Dozen on $40 a Week," which was contained in the September 19, 1955, issue of Life magazine. This is the amazing story of the family of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Martin, of Princess Ann, Md., and it forcefully demonstrates the perseverance, sacrifice, and spirit of a family which have made this Nation great.

The Public Printer informs me that the cost of printing this article in the RECORD is $214. Nonetheless, the story is so remarkable in its narrative of family life in the face of obstacles and difficulties,, that I ask it be printed in the Appendix, and recommend it to my colleagues for their reading.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEGREES BY THE DOZEN ON $40 A WEEK

(By William Brinkley)

To Mr. and Mrs. Louis Martin, who live on a small farm near Princess Anne, Md., an incident that happened last week would seem routine were it not for the fact that it is the culmination of an extraordinary achievement. The Martins' youngest child, Grant Bartholomew, age 21, registered for his senior year at Maryland State Teachers College in Bowie, Md. What made an exception of this seemingly ordinary September event was the fact that completion of Grant's senior year will swell the total of college graduates among the Martin children to 10 and the number of degrees to 13, 3 of which are master's.

This record is one which even an affluent family could consider remarkable. But for the Martins the record approaches the miraculous since Louis Martin, who is 66, has worked most of his life at a salary not in excess of $80 a week—and a good deal of it for only $30.

The Martin parents have always believed in one thing above all, namely: "Life is a struggle. But it is good to have a struggle. It strengthens your character." This is a theme many philosophers have challenged, but the Martins are one brilliant case for the affirmative. The feat would never have been performed at all had not they—and their children as well—been able to endure almost continuous lifelong doses of character strengthening.

Louis Martin's character strengthening started almost at infancy. His father died when Louis was 3, and shortly after that he was helping his mother support the other five children. When Louis was 10, his mother died too and the boy was deposited in the Eighth Ward Settlement House in Philadelphia's industrial section. Despite its rather forbidding name, this institution in no way resembled the classic Oliver Twist orphanage depicted by Dickens. Supported by a businessman named William Frazier, the settlement house was conducted by Miss Frances Bartholomew, a young Philadelphia Main Liner who had scandalous ideas, for the year 1899, concerning the upbringing of orphan children. "Ma Thol" took her orphan charges to operas and taught them to waltz and two-step. On two subjects she had really fanatic views. It was upon the intersection of these two subjects that Louis Martin was to make his life.

"Now, you children must get an education," Miss Bartholomew was incessantly telling her orphans. "And by education I mean all the education you can get." Her other bug was that city children should get out of the city. In the summers she hustled them off to a large farm near Willow Grove Park owned by "Daddy" Frazier, who had set aside a stone house called "Happyland" for the children. Before his first visit to Happyland at age 11, Louis had never spent an hour outside Philadelphia. Inhaling his first deep breaths of unsooted air was the equivalent for him of a high-school girl's first slug of champagne. "I felt as if I was running on air," he recalls.

By going to night as well as day school under Ma Thol's prodding, Louis was ready at 19 for Hampton Institute in Hampton, Va., where he majored in agriculture. He was a bright student and after graduation found himself with several job offers. Some were relatively comfortable teaching positions. But the one that promised the least comfort interested him most.

This job under the University of Maryland extension service and the United States Department of Agriculture entailed working with the Negro farmers of the Eastern Shore of Maryland, getting them to use scientific farming methods and improve their living conditions. Farm extension work was new in those days and farmers resented "young educated foreigners" who tried to teach them what they had been doing all their lives. Louis would be the State's first Negro county agent and his province would be vast—the entire Eastern Shore, 9 counties stretching some 125 by 40 miles from the Chesapeake Bay to Delaware and the Atlantic Ocean. Four hours after he was offered the job Martin took it.

He married Irene Polk, 1 of 10 children in an Eastern Shore family. She had worked her way through a home economics major at Hampton over the objections of her mother who did not think it worth while since she had not gone to college herself. Martin had bought a model T and the newlyweds took off for Princess Anne, Md., and Martin's $1,000-a-year job.

On the Eastern Shore in 1916 most of the Negro farms were on the brink of ruin. The crop yields were fantastically low. An average acre of corn yielded a miserable 19½ bushels, an acre of sweetpotatoes only 16 bushels. The hogs were scrub razorbacks. Mongrel chickens laid when they felt like it. Rags or old coats were stuck in place of windowpanes, brush grew around the houses, the yards were littered with tin cans.

When Martin arrived the farmers were in a state of panic. Hog cholera, a disease for which the farmers knew no remedy, was ravaging the shore. Hogs were dying by the thousands. The cholera had spread to the farm adjoining Col. Harry Waters', a lawyer, a "Princess Anne blueblood" and a gentleman farmer. The colonel heard that a Negro county agent had just arrived, and sent for Martin, who told him about the new serum which had been successful in preventing cholera—Martin had used the serum on pigs at the Hampton farm. Soon Louis Martin was shooting the colonel's shoats and brooding sows with serum. When several days passed and none of Colonel Waters' hogs developed cholera, the word of this magic spread through the countryside. No one spread it more eagerly than Colonel Waters himself.

Overnight Louis Martin became the most sought-after man on the shore. Assisted by the "hog cholera minutemen" which he organized—teams of farmers whom he taught to administer the serum—he inoculated thousands of hogs and the epidemic was broken.

This success put Martin high in the graces of the farmers of the eastern shore. Shortly his happiness was doubled. At Hampton, Mr. and Mrs. Martin had decided that they would have one dozen children and that each of them should go to college. The day before Independence Day 1917 they were off to a running start on at least the first section of this ambitious program. Louis Frazier Martin was born, followed 10 minutes later, to the Martins' surprise, by Lourene Frances Martin. Like all the children, Louis and Lourene were born at home for reasons of economy. For the same reason Martin, as he did with all of them, served as hot-water carrier and general assistant.

The happy Louis Martin set out with great enthusiasm to change the fast-fading land. On the wave of the proof furnished by the hog cholera serum, he visualized sailing right in and inducing the farmer to use modern methods all the way around.

He was quickly set to rights. Up and down the land, a familiar figure in his Model T stopping off at farms, Martin gave his pitch about rotation, seed selection, liming, tree pruning and purebred lines. Up and down it he found himself smack against a phenomenal prejudice. With their hogs the farmers had been desperate, but all this new-fangled stuff was something else. He was a foreigner; and what was worse, a young foreigner; and what was worse, an educated young foreigner.

For a year he experienced nothing but defeat. The Nation had gone to war. Prices soared but Martin's salary kept its low-slung course. One night after he had come in at 1 o'clock in the morning from a farmers' meeting, Martin and his wife sat over an oil lamp in their kitchen at Princess Anne.

"My salary is so small," Martin began to talk, "and we can't begin to get all the things we need—we need and the children need. The children now—and the ones we want to have. I've tried, or I think I've tried, but I'm walking in the same spot I was when we first came. Up north," he said slowly, "I hear the war factories are paying big wages. Eight dollars a day I hear—three times what I'm making here."

Then he got it out, quickly. "Would you rather we just stopped all this and went north?"

Her husband was not a man who discouraged easily and to Mrs. Martin this was an alarming measure of his sense of defeat. But across the kitchen table she looked him squarely in the eye.

"Mr. Martin," she said firmly, "we didn't go to school so you could work in a factory."

October 31, 1918, Mary Alice. December 2, 1919, Walter Theodore. October 19, 1921, Martha Rebecca.

As the little Martins came swiftly on, the two big Martins found their character being strengthened from all sides.

They bought no clothes. Mrs. Martin made them all. Except for staples such as flour and sugar they bought no food. Mrs. Martin was able to make a daily family stew which was both elastic and nourishing. The meat part came from pigs (purebred) which they raised at Mrs. Martin's father's place nearby. The rest of the stew came from Martin's agile diplomacy on his rounds with the farmers.

"My, those wonderful tomatoes." he would exclaim, studying a row of plants. "Such elegant onions. That delightful-looking cabbage. Such good eating they must make, I would imagine."

"You mean you don't have any of these things?" the farmer would say in sympathetic tones. "You mean all that family of yours, and—here, now, let me get a basket."

Martin would come home bearing a basketload of wonderful tomatoes, elegent onions and delightful-looking cabbage—pointing out adroitly to the farmer as he took them that the farmer would raise even more of them if he would only apply these modern, scientific.

At home Mrs. Martin seized the products and let no morsel go to waste: "We either ate it, dried it, brined it or canned it." Every year there were 1,500 jars of sweet potatoes, white potatoes, turnips, onions, peppers, string beans, lima beans, Henderson beans, corn, squash, broccoli, okra, eggplant, cucumbers, celery, cauliflower, asparagus, cowpeas, black-eyed peas, apples, peaches, kale, collards, Swiss chard, beet and turnip greens and pork loin.

"Mercy, if you don't feed a child while he's growing you might as well not feed him," Mrs. Martin has always believed, "because then it won't do any good."

With all their improvisation Martin was obliged to adopt a system of financial maneuvering which brought his only serious disagreement with his wife. Mrs. Martin looked upon credit as the machination of the devil. To Martin cash only was a lovely idea—but what if there was no cash? Being unanswerable, this logic prevailed. After a dozen or so bills had racked up, Martin would take off for a bank and execute a loan to pay them all off. Then he would devote the next few months to paying back the loan, meantime amassing more debts to a point where he must repeat the system. Martin estimates he has negotiated literally hundreds of bank loans in his life.

The financial gymnastics of bringing up a platoon of children on $28.75 a week was very simple, as Martin recalls it. "If I had ever sat down and listed my income on one side of a page and my expenses on the other, I would have been scared to death. Therefore I never troubled to list them. I just scraped around."

But by the time the sixth child was en route, Martin had begun to have his qualms about the great goal. When he had to start breaking in two the penny lemon sticks he always brought home to the children it came over him that perhaps a dozen would be carrying things too far.

March 9, 1924, June Celestial.

Martin decided they would have to get farther out in the country to keep pace with the mounting food consumption. He bought an uncleared 18-acre tract near Princess Anne with a 3-room cabin on it—1 room for himself and Mrs. Martin, 1 for the boys, 1 for the girls. The cabin had no plumbing, no lights, and no heat but Martin christened it after the place outside Philadelphia where the orphanage children had visited summers—Happyland. Through the years it was to improve, with a bathroom, electricity, added rooms with added children.

May 16, 1925. Harry Bosworth.

Meanwhile, the other Martin battle—with the farmers—was in full clamor. Martin knew only too well that the farmer was set in his ways. But what about the farmer's son, he wondered, who would one day take over the farm?

Presently Martin began organizing the farmers' sons into clubs and talking to them about modern farm methods. Instead of stubbornness and suspicion he found the boys eagerly insterested. Martin then persuaded local businessmen to lend farmboys the money to buy something the boy could call his very own, namely a purebred pig. When a year passed and the boys' purebred pigs tripled the fathers' scrub razorbacks in meat production, the effect on the grownup farmers was quite arresting.

Riding his advantage, Martin talked several farmers into letting their sons buy purebred hens. When these hens outlaid the fathers' mongrel hens 2 to 1, the effect was electrifying. Then he persuaded several farmers to give their sons 1 acre and let them plant it according to Martin's methods. When 1 son got 33 bushels of corn on his acre compared with his father's 17 alongside it, the effect was almost revoluntionary.

All of a sudden, as Martin covered the countryside in his Model T, he began to notice strange sights—grownup farmers liming their fields, pruning their trees, planting in vetch or clover after the harvest instead of leaving the land dry and unnourished.

It was not until a meeting in a Methodist church on the lower part of the shore, however, that Martin was sure. As the chairman of the meeting rose to introduce the speaker, Martin suddenly became aware that he was being described in the most glowing terms. "Friends," the chairman concluded solemnly, "we are very happy to have our famour farm demonstrator with us today, Mister Doctor Professor Martin."

This was the long-awaited breakthrough.

After Mister Dr. Professor Martin gave his half-hour talk on hog cholera, its history and prevention, a wizened old man popped to his feet. "I had 2 or 3 of my best setting hens fall off their nests dead," he blurted out. "Professor Martin, do you know what's the cause of that?"

Another farmer jumped up. "Professor Martin. My cow got bloated all of a sudden. What can I do?"

"Professor Martin. My chickens, they all seem to get naked. No feathers on their backs."

For 3 hours Martin answered questions—and where he could not answer he said he would check on it and let them know. The meeting ended on a sonorous singing of Beulah Land, and the people pressed forward eagerly to shake the professor's hand. Martin sang all the way home in his model T:

"I've reached the land of corn and wine,
And all its riches freely mine;
Here shines undimmed one blissful day,
For all my night has passed away.
O Beulah Land, sweet Beulah Land,
As on thy highest mount I stand,
I look away across the sea,
Where mansions are prepared for me."

February 17, 1927, Jewel Elizabeth. December 2, 1928, Elbert Hubbard.

Steadily the Martins moved toward their family goal.

"We were going to do everything we could do," Martin remembers the plan. "The children would do everything they could do. And the Lord would just have to take care of the rest."

The children's part was working as soon as they were able to pick a bean. Louis started picking strawberries in farmers' fields when he was 5. At that age he would eat greedily as he picked but even so he would harvest 10 quarts of strawberries a day, which swelled the family treasury by 20 cents.

The days in the fields began early, as Lourene, who is now an Army captain of nurses, very distinctly remembers.

"It would be 2:30 in the morning. And there Daddy would be standing over us. 'O. K., kids, let's go,' he'd say. 'It's picking time!' "

The Martin children don't remember objecting to this program. "The reason," says Lourene, "was Daddy and Mama. 'There is dignity in work'—I'll never forget Daddy saying that. It wasn't just a saying. They were always to bed after us and always up before us. Lots of times Daddy would be up all night with some farmer's sick hog or calf. Mama never had any stockings because we always had them. She wore the same coat for 20 years. When food was short she'd say, 'You take mine. I'm not hungry.' But the main thing was they somehow made us understand, even at a very early age, that college was at the end of the bean rows."

When the family couldn't afford to have someone come in and plow their land with a mule, Daddy, Mama and eight or nine small Martins energetically hitched themselves to the plow. Sometimes the children joined in the battle for survival with actual gusto.

"In winters," remembers Walter, who today is working on his doctorate, "Harry and I would go down to the railroad tracks about 300 yards from the house. We'd get a pile of rocks ready. When the freight train came by we'd let go with them at the engine. Quite a volley would be returned at us by the fireman. We'd pick up the chunks of coal and have heat for the house."

At night the Martins would sit around their dining room antique mahogany table, a gift from "Daddy" Frazier, shelling beans for the local huckster at 3 cents a quart. The Martins are a very singing family and they would govern their rate of shelling by their singing. If they wanted to shell faster they sang a molto allegro like You're Gonna Reap Just What You Sow. When they needed a coasting period they took a slow number like He's Got the Whole World in His Hand.

HARVARD CLASSICS AND NO BATHROOM

Frequently during a beanshelling session Martin or one of the older children would read to all hands from the Harvard Classics. Some of the beanpicking money had gone to purchase this set, which Martin picked up second hand and was paying for $5 down and $5 a month. The Martins never thought of books as a luxury, buying them sometimes when they were hardest up. The 3-room house had no bathroom for a long while but it had Shakespeare and Dickens and Thackeray, Robert Burns, and Robert Louis Stevenson and Mark Twain and Aesop's Fables and several sets of encyclopedias.

Believe it or not, the children found time and energy to get into scrapes. There was the day when Martin came upon 6 of them atop the 60-foot water tower in Princess Anne, and with a horrified crowd gathered below. Some of the children were gymnastically swinging by one hand and one foot from the tower, above an open steam well which adjoined it. Martin's voice summoning them down shook through the town like the sound of cannon. Simultaneously with their descent he began removing his favorite weapon of discipline, his belt. It may have been during one of the lean-eating days. In any case Martin's pants fell to the ground.

Recovering them with some dignity, he belted up again and dispatched the six

children for a switch each. After that he always used switches.

Often, instead of corporal punishment, the Martin children received something they considered infinitely worse, called whipping our consciences. If they had stolen the forbidden apples from the family trees instead of being content with the ones that had fallen to the ground, Martin would take the children aside.

"We are all struggling to care for all of us," he would say in his quietest tones. "We have to share with one another. The apples are for the benefit of us all, so your Mama can make applesauce and apple pies—for all of us. Don't you think," he would say, his voice almost mournful "that it is very selfish of you just to satisfy your own stomach?"

Pretty soon the offending Martin child would be bawling at the top of his lungs.

Always Martin preached the value of education. "If you're going to dig a ditch" he would tell his children, "you can dig a better ditch for having an education."

Louis was barely eight before he wanted to be, not a cowboy or a fireman, but something that Daddy made sound very wonderful called a "Ph. D." Today he is on his way to being one. Walter was so hipped up about school that when he was 3 he was sneaking into the kindergarten operated for the faculty children at Princess Anne Academy, now Maryland State College.

April 5, 1930, Oswald Edward. September 18, 1931, Justelma Houston.

Just as Martin was barreling along in both departments—his family and the farmers—the great depression smashed down like a tidal wave.

Martin's work was doubled. He ranged the countryside studying markets with the farmers, visiting banks to stall them out of farm foreclosures. At the same time his own salary was cut. The prices the children got for their work plummeted. The Martin family dug in.

Providentially, around this time feed sacks were beginning to come in print patterns as well as in white and when they were empty of chicken mash they were filled up with Martins. One feed sack made a dress for a small Martin, two or more for a larger Martin. Other feed sacks became tablecloths, placements and napkins. Several sewed together became sheets.

Many families, fighting to exist, now took their children out of school during the picking season or sent them to work in the canneries. But the Martin children did their picking first and then went to school, and after school picked again until dark.

As if to strengthen the family's character further, the main highway north that ran in front of their house was filled with men roaming the land, seeking work, seeking a sandwich. The children got used to seeing 2, 3, or 4 hollow-cheeked strangers sharing their already overtaxed family stew. "Mama would never have even thought of turning anyone away," Lourene remembers. "And she always fed the stranger the most heartily of all." The last Martin dollar often went to some farmer Martin considered worse off than themselves.

May 26, 1934, Grant Bartholomew.

The first section of the Martin's family program, a dozen children, drew to a close.

Almost simultaneously, at probably the hardest point in the family's life, the time came to start the second section. The first two children were ready for college.

Martin sold his last 4 purebred shoats for $35 each. Paying their tuition with the money, he packed Louis and Lourene off to Hampton.

Now, with the fresh avalanches of college expenses, Martin found himself making a record number of trips, even for him, into bank offices, where he would begin his conversation with the banker. "My son Louis needs" or "My daughter Lourene needs." Louis and Lourene worked at college, Louis stevedoring on the Hampton Roads docks and Lourene working as a nurse's assistant. To keep them in college the children at home got up earlier and stayed up later, picked more cucumbers, shelled more beans, hoed corn, did maid work, felled trees, worked in the canneries, went out selling strawberries from their own garden and apples from their own trees.

As their turns came, others of the children went off to college. Each time it got harder.

Almost bottom level was reached after Lourene had entered Mercy Hospital in Philadelphia to study nursing. One day she wrote home that she had only 19 cents left.

"I got a letter back from Daddy," Lourene recalls. "He said he had only 15 cents right then but he was enclosing a dime of it. He wrote that there would be some more along as soon as everyone shelled some beans tonight. That was the only time I ever sat down and cried."

PICKING BEANS AND FELLING TREES

Summertime all the Martins worked furiously. One day found Louis picking cucumbers at Elliott, a few miles from home; Lourene doing housework in one home at Salisbury, 6 miles away, and Mary Alice in another; Walter pitchforking bean hulls at Dulany's food factory; Martha and June caring for children in a migratory workers' camp on the far side of the shore; Harry in the swamps felling trees for a lumber mill; Jewel picking lima beans; Elbert and Oswald hoeing corn; Justelma and Grant picking string beans.

And finally the day came. The Martins went to their first commencement.

"We sat there," Martin remembers that day, "and watched Louis walk across the stage in his cap and gown and we remembered the time he had picked strawberries when he was 5 years old and eaten more than he picked—then we remembered that he had, at that, picked 10 quarts for 20 cents and some of that 20 cents was right up there on that stage."

As Louis walked off the stage clutching his bachelor of science diploma, Mrs. Martin whispered to her husband.

"Mr. Martin," she said, "just 11 more to go."

The first ones "out," the original Martin plan went into its next stage of operation. These began helping the younger ones through school. Louis helped send June; Lourene helped send Harry; Walter helped send Jewel; Martha helped send Justelma, the younger ones also continuing to help themselves by summer work in the canneries and the fields. Martin constantly primed the flow of help from the older ones by letters which began, "Your poor old dad has a little financial problem for June needs * * *" or "I wonder if I could borrow a few pennies from you since Justelma needs. * * *" The word "borrow" was a great family joke along with what the Martin children long ago adopted as their family motto: "Daddy's always broke."

With the plan now at full throttle the Martin children were knocking off degrees wholesale in a half-dozen colleges and universities, including Maryland State College, Maryland State Teachers College at Bowie, State Teachers College at Elizabeth City, N. C., Michigan State College, the University of Illinois, and Columbia University. The Martin parents became commencement habitués. Among their neighbors there was soon a regular question along about May: "Well, how many do you have coming out this year?"

Today, everyone else having gone to college, Grant, as the baby of the family and the target of help of all of them, is finding himself living quite high off the hog. When, for example, he needs a new suit for a prom, Grant will dispatch identical letters to 9 or 10 sisters and brothers. From a given set of letters he will customarily receive three or four times enough to cover the specified item, since he has learned not to let his sister know what his brother doeth.

Recently Martin retired from his county agent job. If he were inclined to look for eulogy on that part of his life, which he is not, he need only look about him. Today the Eastern Shore farms that had been on the brink of ruin when he came upon them are virtually bursting with their bounty of tomatoes and strawberries, asparagus and broccoli, beans and peas. The pens are full of fat hogs and the brooder houses a swarm of purebred poultry.

And the children?

Louis: a master's degree in agriculture, teaching horticulture at Florida A. and M. University, still working with beans. Only now, instead of picking them he is crossing them to make them better.

Lourene: captain of nurses in the United States Army.

Mary Alice: a bachelor's degree in home economics, married to a businessman on the Eastern Shore.

Walter: a master's degree in agriculture, teaching mathematics and science at Denton, Md. high school and working toward his doctorate.

Martha: a master's in home economics, teaching at Savannah (Ga.) State College.

June: a bachelor's degree in home economics, married and working as a school dietitian.

Harry: a bachelor's degree in agriculture and certificate in elementary education, teaching grade school at Pumphrey, Md. and doing farm youth work.

Jewel: a bachelor's degree in education, married to a State Department employee and working there herself.

Elbert Hubbard: the maverick in this family, went to college for a year "just to keep up the record" and then decided he wanted to be a barber. Soon he hopes to have his own shop in Washington. He is known among the other children as "our businessman."

Oswald: a bachelor's degree in building construction, a construction engineer in Bellevue, Md.

Justelma: a bachelor's degree in science, married to a high school teacher and doing substitute teaching.

Grant: the "one more to go," a college senior studying to be a teacher.

And Mrs. Martin? Well, she has been going to college again herself at Maryland State, studying "family relations."

"Oh, mercy," she says, "the older I grow the more I see that there is to be learned. You can never get enough education."

The Sermon of the Red Mass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an inspiring sermon that should be as widely read as possible, delivered at the red Mass on Sunday, January 29, 1956, at St. Matthews Cathedral in Washington, D. C., by the Reverend Father Robert J. White, J. C. D., rear ad-

miral, Chaplain Corps, United States Navy, retired, and former dean of the Catholic University Law School.

The red mass is formally known as the solemn votive Mass of the Holy Spirit, and has been celebrated since the 13th century, having its inception in European countries and later in other countries to invoke God's blessing on the administration of government and upon all public officials in the performance of their duties in the interests of their people. It is a Mass which is usually celebrated at the opening of a governmental year.

The celebrant of the solemn votive Mass of the Holy Spirit celebrated last Sunday was the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, D. D., archbishop of Washington.

The sermon follows:

THE SERMON OF THE RED MASS

(By Rev. Robert J. White, J. C. D., rear admiral, Chaplain Corps, U. S. Navy (retired), St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D. C., January 29, 1956)

Once again we welcome you as friends to join with us in the observance of the ancient tradition of the red Mass. In a brief respite from the urgency of our daily tasks, we pause to meditate together upon the enduring meaning of our labors in the law. In humble acknowledgement of our human frailty and intellectual limitations, we pray earnestly together for new strength and enlightenment from Almighty God, the true source of all wisdom, government, and law.

As the colorful red vestments of the holy mass symbolize the flaming love and divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit, so, too, the music and prayers of the liturgy speak with reassuring hope of God's promise of enlightenment to those who humbly seek His wisdom and dutifully walk in His law. To them, the Holy Gospel of the mass promises the bread for which men most hunger, His peace that the world cannot give, and His heartening counsel, "Let not your heart be troubled nor let it be afraid."

Now manifestly God has ordained that man work out his life and destiny in civil society, for only thus can the individual provide himself with the necessities of life and develop his mental and moral faculties. Since authority is necessary to direct such efforts for man's good, law and government trace their source to God himself. Consequently, the great responsibilities which your fellow citizens have entrusted to you as makers, interpreters, and administrators of the law carry indeed a divine sanction and, when well and honestly performed, merit God's benediction.

Happily you need no argument to convince you of the powerful religious influence through faith in God and through the recognition of the divine positive and the natural law in American history. Our needs of today call for a strong reaffirmance of that traditional guiding principle, for contemporary problems of the law and government present many formidable difficulties. The seeming paradox is true—that even our blessings, the richness and diversity of our natural resources, the complexity of our economy, our startling scientific advances, and, finally, our position among the nations of the world—add heavy burdens and pose novel and difficult problems upon legislation and government. Indeed these tasks appear sometimes so overwhelming that men of little faith and courage become weary and afraid to grapple with the resulting legal and governmental problems of such complexity and magnitude. But, fortunately, they are only the faint-hearted few who have forgotten the surpassing achievements of American Government "Under God and the law."

Considering the long span of human history, this Nation is still a relatively new experiment of Federalism with its unique contribution of the Bill of Rights. Yet such a constitutional democracy was envisaged in religious and moral terms centuries before it assumed a political terminology. Our glory is that these basic ideals of government have endured and shaped the course and the development of American law.

For one notable example: What other nation in its entire history has accomplished—by peaceful steps through the force of law—the forward measures of social justice enacted into law by our American Government in the last half century? Such a Christian and humane advance—peacefully through the force of law—to meet and to overcome the hazards of employment, the afflictions of physical and mental infirmities, and the destitution of old age writes an illustrious chapter for our Nation in the history of humanity. Nor does this achievement lose its bright luster because such advances seemed sometimes painful and slow. Nor should religion be blamed because some mistaken or even evil men sought to block social reform and to perpetuate an unconscionable status quo by distorting the true meaning and application of the natural law.

Patently, such evils are not the exclusive property of any group or time. Shifting balances of power between political parties, and shifting balances of power between capital and labor, bring similar temptations to men who in their selfishness would trample underfoot the basic truth that our Government must always be an equal partnership of all its citizens in law and in justice and never degenerate into a complex of competing selfish interests devoid of a moral imperative.

For another example of American progress: In contrast to today's tragic violence in some other countries because of racial differences, our progress—though admittedly slow and, as yet, far from perfect—gives eloquent testimony of the power of peaceful steps through the force of law in establishing as a reality the American constitutional profession, founded upon the Christian teaching that "All men are created equal."

Conceding as we must that this laudable progress in American Government was brought about by many forces and individuals, we still may rightfully maintain that the basic ideal of this social justice and of this racial equality was rooted in the Christian belief in the inviolable dignity and eternal worth of every individual created in the image of his Maker. The enduring power of this religious ideal is but one of many examples of the salutary influence of our Christian constitutional heritage upon succeeding generations, even upon those who neglect or even deny the duty of formal religious worship.

Happily there is evidence on many sides of a renaissance of religious faith and restoration of the Christian teaching of moral values. Even intellectuals who rejected the authority of the divine positive and natural law, after the long dark night of groping among intellectual shadows, have seen as in the full brightness of the morning light the universal truth that man is not sufficient unto himself and that the moral ordering of society is accessible to human reason and is indispensable to the maintenance of sound government.

Moreover, there is discernible a growing realization that the sound effectiveness of law and government is critically dependent upon the people's religious faith and practice of morality in such basic institutions as the home. For cumulative evidence proves that, when marriage is violated and parental authority is neglected or abandoned, then appalling additional burdens fall upon law and government in functions which are alien to the true nature of the state.

What are the causes of these evil results? Surely we may properly indict that spurious teaching of an exaggerated personal freedom which sometimes seems to condone even license under the guise of protecting the constitutional guaranty of personal liberty. The true measure of constitutional freedom is not absolute liberty. That teaching is dangerous which fails to inculcate the duty of a willing self-discipline which is the only justification and firm foundation of American freedom. Some of our courts have not been immune from the effects of such a false philosophy when they attempt—without the support of history or logic—to impose the innovation of a hierarchy of constitutional rights to the prejudice of religion and morals. In a few leading cases, such courts have minimized the historic positive moral purposes of law and struck down statutes aimed at evils threatening to corrupt morals and to encourage licentiousness and degeneracy. Semantics became the cunning instrument for voiding such reasonable and necessary laws. The sound good sense of the masses of the people is not deceived by such techniques. For they remember, in contrast, the traditional ability of common law courts—without statute, to punish criminally those assaults which would weaken and destroy the moral fiber of the people and, in particular, would corrupt the morals of the young.

Our constitutional democracy can survive only if there be acceptance not only of the supremacy of the law but as well the interpretation of laws and governmental power in terms of the highest moral insights regarding man's true nature in relation to God.

Hopefully, we are awakening as from a drugged slumber to an acute realization of the shocking damage to law and government by those who have ridiculed religious truths, denied moral values, and dismissed traditional ideals of law and ethics as no longer useful. There error is fatal even if their purposes are sincere. For when the rationalists declare that the only basis of law and government is "a compact of force or utility," or the historic evolutionists defined government as "the blind unfolding of an inexorable pattern"; or the pragmatists dismissed basic principles and ideals in favor of "the unfettered experimentation of expedience"—all were advocating, whether consciously or not, a philosophy which leads inexorably to state absolutism and the essential evil of Communism which we abhor—the reduction of the individual to a puppet of the tyrant state.

Fortunately, there is widespread evidence of a deepening ground swell of reasoned conviction which repudiates such false philosophy and demands a greater emphasis upon the ethical training of all our youth including law students who will be our future lawyers and judges. These unmistakable signs point to a renaissance of ethical ideals and the strengthening of moral standards in law and government. Such a praiseworthy trend may well be an integral part of the contemporary phenomena of a growing awareness and appreciation of religious values in American life which we pray may became a permanent reality.

Only a few weeks ago, several hundred judges, legislators, lawyers, and historians met at the Harvard Law School for several days in a conference on "Government under Law" on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Chief Justice Marshall.

Now, it is of historic significance that this large and notable group were united in enthusiastic reaffirmation of three historic Christian foundations of American law and government:

First, the affirmation that the purpose of government and society is the good of the individual;

Second, that constitutionalism is a moral precept; and

Finally, that there must always be a vigilant concern for "the criteria of goodness in law and in government."

Well, may we ask the reason for this surprising unanimity among scholars of so many varied schools of jurisprudence.

Perhaps it was because they had come to the realization that no greater evil can befall a nation than the denial of the reality of evil.

Or, perhaps they, as all of us, have learned that the defiance of any moral authority—parental, school, or community—leads to the swift decline of the rightful authority of law and government and leads even to disloyalty to the nation itself.

Or, perhaps it was due to the tragic realization that materialism, victory in war, and trust in the cooperation of allies in peace had successively failed to fulfill our hopes and instead brought bitter frustration.

Or, finally, perhaps it was because in the anguish of their souls they saw clearly that the only hope for the survival of our way of life or the alternative of the holocaust of civilization lies in the restoration of the moral foundation of law and justice between nations.

Whatever be the reason or reasons of this solemn profession of faith, we rejoice and thank God that in these critical days good and humble men are not afraid to proclaim their trust in God and His moral law. Surely, then, this becomes our prayer in this Red mass and always that God may enlighten our minds and strengthen our wills to enshrine this criteria of goodness in this our beloved nation of free men as we work out our destiny "under God and the law."

Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of RCA, before the National Security Industrial Association on January 26, 1956. I invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the proposal of Mr. Sarnoff for a national educational reserve. Mr. Sarnoff's address is very challenging, and I commend it to Members of the Senate for study.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript will make approximately 3 pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $240.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY

(Address by David Sarnoff, chairman of the board, Radio Corporation of America)

I am deeply and humbly grateful for this high honor the National Security Industrial Association has chosen to bestow upon me.

The James Forrestal Award is an accolade of unique distinction. It bears the name of a great patriot and symbolizes a great ideal to which he was devoted: The ideal of free and full cooperation between industry and Government, in the interests of the Nation's security. The fact that its first recipient was President Dwight D. Eisenhower adds a special luster to the award for me, as it will for all subsequent recipients.

Like so many others here tonight, I had the privilege of knowing and admiring James Forrestal. He was a man of immense talent, energy, and insight, and these he gave unstintingly to his country. In a time of general complacency after the war, when our military might was being dispersed in an excess of optimism and fatigue, he had the wisdom to discern the Soviet threat and the courage to fight for renewed preparedness. He was among the first to see the true face of communism and to recognize that only an alert America, morally mobilized, militarily strong, and economically sound, could hope to preserve freedom on this earth. He understood the tremendous power of America when Government and industry are marshaled on a common front. That is why he founded this association as a bedrock of national security, and it stands today as a living memorial to his foresight.

THE BASIC CONFLICT

The central reality of the present-day world is the struggle between communism and freedom—a struggle in which the United States and Soviet Russia are cast as the chief protagonists. The past year has demonstrated once more that this reality cannot be wished away or smiled away.

Now the brief summer of Moscow's bogus cordiality is over. The more dangerous of the illusions which flourished in the balmier climate are dying in the wintry blasts of renewed Communist attacks clear around the world. Everywhere the Soviets are today sowing mischief, sharpening existing troubles, tossing lighted matches into powder kegs.

The challenge being spelled out in Asia and Africa, in the Near East and Latin America, in the recent French elections and the spreading rash of so-called neutralism, is one that will impose upon us heavy burdens and sacrifices for a long time to come. Meeting it calls for clear heads, bold measures, and patriotic dedication. The reality is grim, but it is less dangerous than wishful thinking and delayed planning.

Such is the background as we gather to think together about our national security, in the spirit of men like James Forrestal.

The United States has given abundant evidence of its deep desire to maintain peace and of its devotion to the ideals of freedom and individual dignity. Unfortunately, however, we must face the fact that there are others in this world who are not motivated by the same high principles. And the bitter facts of experience in the present struggle place certain obligations upon all of us.

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Our first and obvious obligation is to achieve the strongest practicable military power and to maintain it "at the ready." This is indispensable survival insurance, whatever else we may do to contain and resist communism

This is the obligation not alone of government but of the entire citizenry. Modern weapons and methods of war-making have become too complex to be determined solely by budgets and appropriations. They demand many-sided cooperation by every segment of our economy and our society. We must be prepared to fight on land, sea, and in the air, and under the sea. We dare not settle for less than adequate well-balanced land power, sea power, and air power, impregnable in their efficiency and mobility.

In his state of the Union message to Congress, this month, the President spoke of "an effective flexible type of power calculated to deter or repulse any aggression and to preserve the peace." He spoke of "the maintenance of this strong military capability for the indefinite future." All Americans, I believe, subscribe to this basic concept and program.

There is a growing body of opinion which discounts the possibility of war on the theory that it has become too obviously suicidal. No doubt there is an element of truth in this view. Even Soviet Russia would think long and hard before unleashing the final catastrophe. But the stakes are too high to justify a gamble on this logic. As long as ruthless fanatics who disdain human life and over regards themselves as the chosen instruments of history control modern weapons, we dare not rule out the risk of a surprise attack upon us geared to confidence in a quick victory.

We know that the embers of limited local wars are smoldering at this very moment in a dozen highly inflammable regions. We know that the masters of the Kremlin are deliberately using the bellows of their propaganda to blow little fires into major conflagrations. We have no guaranty that small wars can remain localized. On the contrary, every one of them packs the danger of an unlimited global showdown.

Besides, the argument that war is outmoded because of its supreme destructiveness rests on the premise of a military stalemate, an equilibrium of forces between hostile worlds. But, merely to maintain that stalemate, based on a concept of dreadful parity, calls for unflagging military preparedness, especially in weapons still in the experimental stages.

What might have been the rate of the world if Soviet Russia, rather than America, had enjoyed a monopoly of the atom bomb for a number of years? What may be its fate in the future if the Kremlin should come into possession of even more devastating weapons before we do?

I was in the Army in London when German buzz bombs rained from the skies of Britain. But those bombs, terrifying in their day, seem like BB-gun pellets compared with modern ballistic missiles that can carry thermonuclear bombs and soar through space at fantastic speeds. The fact is that oceans, hemispheric distances, and Arctic wastes have been turned into highways for carriers of weapons that can destroy cities and their populations on a scale never before experienced by man. Scientific developments have wiped out the last margins of the immunity once enjoyed by our American Continent. But the habits of complacency bred by the long immunity still linger. Here, our obligation is to recognize the changes which have come upon us so suddenly and to adjust our sights accordingly.

GUIDED MISSILES

I have in mind especially the challenge of guided missiles, not only the intercontinental ballistic missile but the types, of shorter range but no less destructive, that can be launched from submarines.

The guided missiles—the so-called ultimate weapons—will greatly influence political as well as military thinking throughout the world, until and unless a reliable defense against them is achieved.

Our able Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, was reported in the press on December 20, 1955, to have "estimated that the intercontinental ballistic missile, capable of carrying a nuclear bomb for a warhead, might be attained in 5 years." The same press reported quoted Mr. Wilson as having said that he did not know whether this country was ahead or behind Russia in guided missiles. He pointed out that Russia had taken a great interest in this field since 1945.

Five years is a very short time, even as measured in the life of individuals, let alone nations. And we know that dictators can and do use their power to force the last ounce of strength from their people on crash programs. Standards of life, places of residence, choice of occupation, hours of labor, and rates of pay, are determined for the workers by their masters.

By these brutal methods, supplemented by stealing secret information from free people, Soviet Russia advanced its time schedules and achieved a position in the field of nuclear weapons and airpower that endangers the survival of freedom in this world.

We abhor these brutal methods of compulsion practiced in the slave world. We want not part of them for ourselves or for others. But to secure the blessings of freedom and to preserve the dignity of the individual we must be willing and ready to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary. We must meet the menacing competition whereby world communism has perverted science and technology to its evil purposes.

It would be folly for us to take too lightly the warning by Soviet Premier Bulganin, only a few weeks ago, that "rocket missiles which have been developed, particularly over the past few years, are becoming inter-continental weapons." This long-range missile—the so-called ICBM—carrying a cargo of nuclear devastation, is expected to be able to leap the Atlantic in a matter of minutes.

For the sake of our own security and the survival of our civilization, we dare not permit the Kremlin to acquire even a temporary monopoly of such horror weapons. The Moscow leaders would not hesitate to exploit the advantage in order to blackmail the rest of the world. Not necessarily the use of these weapons, but the mere threat of their use could serve the Soviets' purposes in the cold war they wage so relentlessly.

Under President Eisenhower's stimulation, certain organizational steps are now being taken to improve the coordination of our efforts and to accelerate practical developments in this area. It is conceivable that the time can be cut. And we have reason to fear that it is being cut by the enemy. The crucial factor is the degree of acceleration that can be brought to bear on this critical problem. The question is how quickly will the new organizational concept be translated into dynamic action at all working levels?

The peculiar nature of the missile-bird—especially the ICBM—poses extraordinary problems of research, development and production, all at the same time. This calls for the mobilization of men with the best brain power, imagination, ingenuity, initiative and drive, that can be found and obtained. Fortunately, a number of such men, directly and indirectly connected with our armed services, already are hard at work on this project.

Responsibilities can be delegated and organization charts can show them clearly. But leadership and decision are not supplied by charts. The system for securing the required results—in good time—must be built around men as well as departments. This is especially true in huge and complex establishments.

The dividing line between research and production is always a difficult problem that calls for wisdom and experience. In this extraordinary situation, it calls for even more. It demands bold, prompt, and definite decisions if a useful product is to be made available in time to meet the possible emergency.

We are fortunate that our Nation has the men, the resources, and the experience with which to meet this pressing problem. In the existing circumstances and present stages of development, it would be impractical to duplicate the physical and operational setup of the Manhattan project which developed and produced the A-bomb, or to create a new agency independent of the Department of Defense, such as the Atomic Energy Commission which developed and produced the H-bomb.

But the lessons learned and the experience gained in producing these nuclear bombs—where happily we did win the race—must not be ignored in our present efforts to develop and produce guided missiles. They indicate the type of leadership, direction, coordination, and supervision that must be supplied continuously by the topmost echelons. They emphasize the urgency of avoiding interservice rivalries and of resolving them promptly where they do appear.

As commander in chief and chairman of the National Security Council, the President should have presented to him, at frequent intervals, realistic reports which would enable him and the Council to keep a close check on progress or lack of progress in this area. Their superior authority permits them to take whatever action may be necessary to expedite results.

Because of the incalcuable importance of the guided missiles program, I believe that an informed public and an informed Congress will understand and support whatever it may take to meet the pressing and dangerous situation. It was Lord Nelson who said long ago, "Five minutes may make the difference between victory and defeat." Today we must edit his dictum to read: "The first 5 minutes may make the difference."

TECHNICAL MANPOWER

In this and in all fields affecting our national security, research and engineering are of surpassing importance. There is no substitute for brains, or for practical training in a technical age. Our safety and our industrial strength rest upon our success in expanding the Nation's reservoir of physicists and scientists, trained engineers and technicians. Our economy and national security alike will suffer seriously unless we solve this problem promptly and vigorously.

Science and technology are the very hallmarks of American civilization. It comes as a shock, therefore, to be told that Soviet Russia is turning out engineers at a higher rate than we are. Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, the able Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, is in a good position to appraise the problem. His warnings must be taken seriously.

"Too many of us," he said recently, "have fallen into the easy attitude of assuming that the Russians * * * could never match use in scientific initiative and progress. This was dangerous self-delusion. Actually, the emphasis which the Soviets are placing on science and particularly on the training of new young scientists and engineers, presents a real and growing challenge to the free world." He summed it up well when he said: "This is the cold war of the classrooms."

According to one study, Soviet Russia in the 26 years between 1928 and 1954 graduated 682,000 engineers as against 480,000 in the United States. Last year Russia graduated twice as many engineers as we did. One reason for this, of course, is that a police state can compel its youth to enter careers most useful to the state. It conscripts brains even as it conscripts bodies.

A lack of qualified teachers has developed at grade levels for subjects like physics, chemistry, and mathematics. In some areas, New York City for example, teacher recruitment in mathematics and the sciences is causing considerable concern. Certainly the fact that teachers are underpaid, that the ablest of them can do better in private jobs, is an important factor in the present situation that needs to be remedied. But we cannot wait for long-term remedies. Unless the immediate lack is met quickly, it will show up a few years hence in an even more critical shortage of trained personnel.

NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL RESERVE

In the presence of so many leaders of industry, I wish to offer a suggestion. It may not solve the problem completely but could go a long way toward a solution.

I propose the establishment of a National Educational Reserve comprising qualified teachers in mathematics, physics, chemistry, engineering, and related subjects, to be drawn from the technological ranks of industry. I have in mind the release—and with full pay for at least a year—of a reasonable number of men and women for teaching assignments in their local schools. This unique reserve could also mobilize those who have reached the retirement age but whose knowledge and experience would make them inspiring teachers. In addition, it could include qualified people willing to volunteer their services to teach in night schools without giving up their industry jobs.

The number of teachers recruited from any single organization would be too small to entail hardship for any one—but the total number comprising the corps could be drawn from such an extensive list of organizations that it would be large enough to give new impetus to teaching of the sciences in our school system. This would be especially true at the high-school level which is our present major bottleneck.

This educational reserve would, of course, have to be strictly an interim program, let's say for 5 years, to help meet an immediate situation. Moreover, whether the initiative is taken by industry or government, the plan itself would naturally be drawn with the consent and cooperation of school authorities who would prescribe the courses and regulate the instruction.

In some degree, such a plan would amount to the restitution by business of personnel it has siphoned off from the school system. Men and women who normally would have become teachers of the sciences have instead gone into industry, where the rewards are more enticing. I think it is fair to say, in fact, that in the current crisis industry has an obligation to help develop this kind of educational reserve.

Obligation aside, industry would be well advised as a matter of self-interest to help replenish the reservoir of trained men and women by stimulating relevant studies at the lower educational levels. Industry will need more and more technically trained people for its own expanding operations.

Because of their practical experience, teachers in the educational reserve corps would bring the breath of living reality into the classroom. They would help restore the sense of adventure to technical careers and inspire many an able and imaginative student to follow the scientific and technological disciplines into the college years. Enthusiasm is contagious.

To make the project attractive, teachers in the reserve corps should be given recognition and status, through membership in an organization somewhat similar to the various military Reserves. It should be set up on a national basis, perhaps created by an act of Congress.

I have presented this concept in broad terms. There are many details to be discussed and formulated by educators, representatives of industry and interested official agencies. But I trust that the basic idea has enough potential merit to justify closer examination.

MILITARY RESERVE FORCES

This reference to an educational reserve brings to mind the no less vital problem of military Reserves. When we think and plan for robust defense, we cannot overlook the need for large and strong Reserve contingents. These are essential elements in any long-range military planning. Indeed, the traditional American scheme has always been a relatively small active force backed by trained civilians who can be mobilized on short notice to meet an emergency.

The tremendous importance of this aspect of our security has been sharply impressed upon me in recent months, since my appointment by the President as Chairman of the National Security Training Commission, which has specific duties to perform under the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

It is common knowledge that our Military Reserve strength is now far below requirements. The purpose of this act is to recruit and train enough civilians to make our country safe and strong over the long pull. The job is to get the story more clearly and effectively to our young manhood and their parents. Efforts in this direction are now underway and we hope for a better response than there has been so far.

CIVIL DEFENSE

No discussion of national security would be complete without earnest consideration of the knotty subject of civil defense. We have a solemn obligation to be as well prepared as possible to cope with any emergency caused by war, and especially with the consequences of a surprise attack upon us with nuclear weapons.

It is true, alas, that we cannot prevent colossal destruction of life and property. But that, far from canceling out civil defense, makes it more important. Its job is to reduce the magnitude of the destruction, to guarantee the country's ability to carry on, and to maintain its capacity for effective retaliation regardless of the extent of the damage inflicted. We must be geared to absorb losses and to minimize their effects.

A negative, defeatist attitude has no place in a program for victory. The fact that there are limitations on what even a well-prepared civil defense can accomplish is certainly no excuse for failure to plan as effectively as human foresight, ingenuity, and devotion allow.

The very existence of a first-rate civil-defense program would serve as a deterrent upon a would-be aggressor tempted to seek conquest through a surprise attack. He would hesitate if he knew that, no matter how deadly his initial blows, nothing could prevent us from striking back and carrying on.

Some months ago I was asked by the Governor of my home State—Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York—to outline my thoughts on this subject for presentation to the governors' conference held in Chicago on August 5, 1955. In response to his request, I prepared and submitted a memorandum on civil-defense planning. I pointed out that our present effort suffers from at least two basic weaknesses:

First, despite the fact that nuclear bombs do not respect State lines, there is no comprehensive and coordinated national plan. Instead we have a confusion among three largely autonomous levels: Federal, State, and local.

Second, we lack clarity in the relations between civil and military high commands, though under the new conditions the problems of military and civil defense are practically inseparable.

It seems to me imperative that these weaknesses be cured promptly. I think you will agree that civil defense, involving the entire population, demands as much discipline and as clear lines of authority as does military organization. The alternative is chaos. Today the penalty for failure in civil defense, too, can be defeat.

COLD WAR

I come, finally, to the phase of national security which has long seemed to me second in its urgency only to purely military preparedness—the cold war.

As I said at the outset, the Soviet masquerade of moderation is ended. We have learned that the Communists, like Hamlet's uncle, can "smile and smile and be a villain still." The cold war—pronounced dead prematurely by some—is alive and on a rampage. It is back to monkey business as usual, and bursting through our defenses into ever new regions tagged for Communist conquest.

We are faced squarely and sharply by what the President has just described as methods of "division, enticement, and duplicity." We can anticipate new explosions of Communist-inspired subversion and civil strife, new and more vicious anti-American lies, riots, bluster, and blackmail.

Do we have the clearheaded wisdom to meet this crowding menace as resolutely and as massively as we would meet a hot war? Evidently President Eisenhower had this in mind when, in his state of the Union message, he prescribed: "The waging of peace with as much resourcefulness, with as great a sense of dedication and urgency, as we have ever mustered in defense of our country in time of war."

James Forrestal was well aware that a nation's security is not measured by military factors alone. "The great mistakes we made during the war," he wrote in his diaries, "were caused by America's failure to realize that military and political action must go hand in hand."

This insight into the last World War is even more pertinent to the present world-wide cold war. The challenge to our civilization is posed by an enemy whose most effective weapons are political and psychological. His victories are being scored primarily by propaganda, infiltration, incendiary diplomacy—and occasionally through our own mistakes.

Precisely because we are determined to head off a nuclear showdown, we must forge adequate counterweapons in areas where we are being outmaneuvered and routed by the enemy. Last April I submitted a memorandum to the President outlining "A program for a political offensive against world communism." It received considerable attention at home and even more in Soviet Russia, where their attacks upon me in their press and over their radio flattered and amused me. The Kremlin hierachs are understandably alarmed when anyone trespasses, even in words, upon their dominance in cold-war strategy and tactics. In that memorandum I said: "The primary threat today is political and psychological. That is the active front on which we are losing and on which, unless we reverse the trend, we shall be defeated. For the United States and other free nations defeat of this sort would be as catastrophic as defeat in a shooting war. Whether we freeze to death or burn to death, our civilization would be equally finished."

Everything that has happened since Geneva seems to me to have underscored the reality and urgency of that threat. The American people have never refused to make sacrifices in time of emergency. They should be apprised that the cold war is a real and continuing emergency. We must avoid the wishful thinking that seeks refuge in theories of peaceful coexistence or hopes that the mad bear will somehow evolve into a gentle lamb.

Our responsibility is to bring to the conduct of the cold contest the necessary efforts and brains and resources for clear-cut victory. Our political counter-strategy has to be at least as broad, as intensive, as minutely planned and as flexible as the enemy's

One of the recommendations in my memorandum suggests the manner by which I believe such a mission could best be accomplished:

"We should organize our efforts to win the cold war on a basis comparable to our organization for winning a hot war which we seek to prevent. To this end it is recommended that a Strategy Board of Political Defense be set up to function as the cold war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the military side. Top representatives of the State and Defense Departments, CIA, and USIA should be members of this Board. Its activities must be effectively coordinated with all departments and agencies of our Government concerned with this effort. This new strategy board should function directly under the President and its head should have Cabinet status."

I am aware that committees already exist to coordinate the efforts of Government departments and agencies in the field of psychological warfare, or, as I prefer to call it—psychological peacefare. However, these committees function at subordinate levels and their authority is correspondingly limited.

Of course, it is wise to coordinate, but it is vital to create new ideas, to initiate new plans, and to devise new methods for meeting the shifting scenes and the constant challenge on the global fronts of the cold war. That is why I recommended a Strategy Board for Political Defense whose responsibility and authority would be equal to those now assigned to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for Military Defense.

With an affirmative policy to win the cold war and an effective organization to implement that policy, I firmly believe we can win this battle for the minds of men. We can crash through the fogs of falsehoods and curtains of jamming. We can make the truth more productive than the Kremlin's lies.

Our country's voice—not only the Government's but that of our trade unions, farmers, veterans, women, religious and cultural leaders—should be heard around the world. We must speak for the silenced in the dark expanse of Soviet tyranny, and enable those who have escaped to freedom to speak to their countrymen.

The foremost American spokesman for labor, George Meany, said recently in urging an all-out cold war offensive:

"We must exploit the political differences and economic difficulties within the Soviet empire. We must do nothing to ease Moscow's difficulties with the satellites. * * * In the diplomatic field, we should do nothing to help build up the authority of the new regime among the Soviet peoples."

Only this kind of thinking, translated into courageous and imaginative action, can keep us from losing the cold war which the Communists now wage on economic as well as political fronts. The ruble now competes with the dollar and our economic Marshall plan is being imitated by a Marshal Bulganin plan.

What the Kremlin fears most is a forthright alliance between the free world and the restive, discontented masses in its prison-empire. Comrade Khrushchev jumped as if he had been stung when the President and other Americans beamed Christmas messages to the satellite peoples holding out the hope of ultimate liberation. That's the most vulnerable spot in Moscow's political anatomy.

Let the West and its allies make it clear that they will not permit the fulfillment of the Soviet boast that this will be the century of Communist triumph. Let them proclaim, as clearly as the Communists proclaim their intentions, that the victory of freedom for people in the entire world, the Russian people included, is our inflexible goal.

Let us reaffirm our conviction that the free-enterprise system, operating under a free government, can defeat any economic offensive launched by the Communists. We must carry that conviction, particularly to peoples in the critical and strategic areas, by wise and bold policies and by resolute and diplomatic actions in the fields of foreign trade and foreign aid.

Any intelligent American who surveys the world we live in knows that the conflict between communism and freedom is the problem of our time. Because we do not hear the thunder of falling bombs, we sometimes find it hard to grasp that a decisive conflict

is now underway, and that if we lose it mankind may need a thousand years to escape from the ensuing nightmare.

It is not my intention to spread alarm. I am simply urging that our young and vigorous Nation, the strongest on earth, resolve not to lose its own freedom and thereby the freedom of all humanity by doing too little too late. This applies to political strategy, military strength, civil defense, economic and scientific vitality, and the challenge of the cold war.

These and more comprise the elements of a gigantic and closely intermeshed task confronting our Nation as the year 1956 gets underway. It will test to the limit not only our physical stamina and material resources but our moral fiber.

I do not doubt that we shall meet this test as America has met and fulfilled other major obligations on the road to greatness. We enjoy one supreme advantage. Unlike the enemy, we do not have to rely on distortion and chicanery. The weapons we can wield are freedom, justice, peace, faith in God.

Let me conclude by drawing on the wisdom of James Forrestal, to whose memory this gathering is dedicated. This is what he said in October of 1947:

"The surest way to avoid war is to make it clear to any possible group of enemies that the risks of engaging us are too great to make it worthwhile. At the same time we must exercise the patience that should also accompany the possession of strength."

American Prestige Here and Abroad Demands a Home for the National Collection of Fine Arts—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the present session I introduced a bill, H. R. 7974, to amend the joint resolution of May 17, 1938, to provide for the construction and maintenance of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum on the site set aside for an art gallery thereunder, and for other purposes.

My reasons for introducing this measure and some facts regarding the National Collection of Fine Arts are developed in the following statement:

AMERICAN PRESTIGE HERE AND ABROAD DEMANDS A HOME FOR THE NATIONAL COLLECTION OF FINE ARTS

(By Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey)

It is because I believe that the few thoughts and hopes I am going to address to you today are deep in the heart and the conscience of every American that I shall speak with candor and, I trust, with conviction the feelings I have long nourished for the creation of a national collection of fine arts museum.

It is because this is an audience sympathetic to American art and its flowering tradition that I am convinced I can embark on my adventure of this afternoon and know that I shall have henceforth cooperative allies in you—men and women of the arts.

For this is a scheme to establish here in the Capital of the United States the world's greatest reservoir and monument to the artistic values of civilization.

We propose—while including all great art—to emphasize in the national collection of fine arts museum the genius of America.

We are emerging—I said I would be candid—from a dismal, long-held national inferiority complex.

Against this setting on the cultural side we have seen radiating to mankind everywhere from this sacred soil in the Capital of the United States, a vast consciousness of the grave and profound responsibility for leadership that rests on our people and on their elected leaders, in the limitless struggle we are now in between the slave and the free world. The immediate weight of this leadership and this responsibility is expressing itself in a congeries of programs that serve to protect the free world globally.

It is expressing itself in diplomatic arrangements of the most vital consequence. Upon these factors the survival of our kind of world depends. We see its focus in the United Nations. And again we are making our passion for peace and freedom manifest by a system of giving and helping which, for our purposes this afternoon, we may simply call: Foreign aid.

All of these extraordinary acts of American leadership since World War II, history, I believe, will applaud down through the ages and as long as the chronicles of our time are written and read.

But at the base—as of now—we have one major, one shameful, one incredibly witless blank, one zero, in our national life. I prefer to believe that we lack on the art front of American life the business aggressiveness and the habit of attack and success we have so brilliantly cultivated in our commercial, our industrial, our financial levels of action. As an American I rather regret than John Singer Sargent and James A. McNeill Whistler found life abroad so much more hospitable to them than life in America. I rather regret that American genius had first to be recognized in London and Paris before it won appreciation in the United States.

How many generations is it now that we in the United States have been harboring a depression of the arts, and a rude and unjustified self-abasement toward American culture?

It is this we now propose to remedy.

For it is my conviction that the United States—and particularly the Capital of the United States—stand at this moment on the threshold of a great American renaissance. These beginnings of a golden cultural dawn are manifest in our national concern for architecture related to our own environment. They are manifest in our genius for the creation of new materials, art serving as the handmaiden to utility. We manifest it in our concern for art collections as national treasures in contradistinction to individual holdings. The renaissance is dynamically manifest in the sweeping proposals for bold architectural changes in the Capital, in the rehabilitation of whole areas, in proposed changes to the Capitol Building itself, and in plans for expansion and improvement on all sides with an eye both to the artistic and to the utilitarian.

For wherever it is fitting we propose to join beauty with usefulness in a single mold.

This manifestation of the American renaissance is not lacking certainly in science, which is a corollary of art in the advance of civilization. And it is brilliantly apparent in American literature where we have always been strong and where today we have an increasing number of Nobel prize winners. Will it be denied that we stand now perhaps in the forefront in the art of the theater and its related fields, and foremost in the field of communication media?

For the fine arts in their many fields we have an ambitious project afoot. It forms part of the over-all plan for the Capital. It comes under the aegis of the recently established District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, to plan a national civic and cultural center in Washington. The project I am discussing today, however, is limited to a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum. Those of you who attended the hearings held by the District of Columbia Committee on my bill and others to create the new Commission may recall that I said it was my hope, as the original sponsor of the legislation, that the Commission when established would assist in the early building of the National Collection of Fine Arts Museum. I said at that time that it was this great museum, authorized by the Congress in 1938, that I had in mind for the fine arts part of my proposal which called for a national "civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center." These projects, and others, such as the Zeckendorf Southwest Redevelopment Plan, for beautifying our Capital City form part of the superb sweep of ideas that accentuate what I have been perhaps extravagantly calling the American renaissance.

All I ask as an elected Representative of the people, and all that is asked by the dedicated Americans in Congress, in the arts, in the civic, the industrial, the financial life of this Nation, who are joined with me in this great endeavor—all that all of us ask—is that this dynamic upsurge of valid American pride in America, be given its logical focus here in the Capital of the United States of America. Here all the 48 States, here all levels of American life, can be united and joined in a common endeavor for the prestige our people have earned by their own striving and achievements. It is this prestige in the arts, mostly the American arts, that we hope to use as a counterbalance to the enormous progress we have made as a Nation of wealth and production. Thus we can display what we have known all along, but what the rest of the world has been induced to ignore: That this is a Nation devoted as much to greatness in the arts—its own and the arts of other peoples—as it is devoted to democratic government, to creature comforts, to the internal combustion engine, and to unprecedented progress in invention, in industry and in finance.

There are two points I must clarify at once lest we fall into the great error of undignified self-adulation and act as if this proposal for a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum is some happy, bright idea we have suddenly and accidentally stumbled upon.

The emphasis to be sure will be on American art.

But the distinguished people already active in this project and who, of course, understand its magnitude, do not propose that we shall in our museums and galleries here in the Capital, juxtapose a collection of American art, in any spirit of competition or rivalry with European and world art. For of course European art goes back into antiquity; ours is only 150 years old. We aim rather to show each to its best advantage, permitting the whole to reveal the universality of art. We propose giving American genius its due as we have so lavishly given European and other genius their due. In giving the fullest regard for the high points in all civilization we shall at the same time give some courteous recognition to our own, providing it with a niche for itself commensurate with its distinction, and with our means. We want a magnet here in our Capital, a magnet of cultural eminence which mankind everywhere will appreciate and honor.

We have already done all this for European art through the Mellon Gallery and other galleries. What—if we succeed—we are doing now, is giving at long last to our own, our American art, a uniquely national home, on a uniquely national plane of dignity and grandeur, compatible with our po-

sition as the Nation which Winston Churchill has described as the greatest since the Roman Empire.

There you have broadly the essence of the idea.

Far from being a bright idea that just happened along it has, in principle, a long history:

The Congress directed more than a century ago that the Smithsonian Institution, then being established, form a gallery of art for the Nation. The Congress had even before that granted an act of incorporation to the National Institute, a private society, whose collections were later to be given to the United States. In 1840 this chartered association began its assembling of art objects. In 1849 the Smithsonian Institution began the collection of painting and sculpture.

These were united in 1862 in the Smithsonian.

Now it happens that the Smithsonian, because of its congressional sponsorship in 1846 under the terms of the will of James Smithson, of London, England, and because of the high caliber of its administration down through the years and at present, has always been the organizational center and keystone of the Federal outlook on American art. It is built into the American tradition and it has built into it the executive, the legislative and the judicial authority. Its head is the President of the United States. Its membership includes the President's cabinet, the Vice President, and the Chief Justice of the United States. It is governed by a board of regents which includes representatives of the three branches of Government and six private citizens. Policy is carried out by an executive officer who is the Secretary of the Institution. The present incumbent is Leonard Carmichael, a former college president.

Thus the seed for a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum took root a full century and more before our day. In time the Institution's art collections—as they grew—began to earn recognition. Names like Mrs. Harriet Lane Johnston, niece of President Buchanan; Charles L. Freer, William T. Evans, Henry Ward Ranger, Alfred Duane Pell, Ralph Cross Johnson, and others, are identified with bequests that won the Smithsonian national and international fame. In fact, by 1920 Congress decided to provide the Smithsonian collection with a director and staff.

Here, even before the beginning of the Mellon Gallery, was one of the signs that Federal guardianship of American art and other art had come of age. I cannot find in the history of the relationship of Congress to American art, that Congress has been penurious, or limited, or narrow in its horizons. On the whole I incline to the feeling that in this area at least Congress has even been ahead of the public consciousness. I find that in 1924 Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, a forbear of the present Representative to the United Nations, tried to author a project approximating what I am recommending today and might have succeeded but for his untimely death. In 1930—which was not a good year—the Smithsonian struggled and failed to get funds to house its collections, greatly increased by the $5 million Gellatly bequest of the year before. This failure had the effect of turning the only space the Smithsonian had into a monumentally cluttered attic and an overcrowded curiosity shop.

America's relationship—governmentally—to American art had now come to an impasse.

We had the artists.

We had the art.

We lacked the space.

American Prestige Here and Abroad Demands a Home for the National Collection of Fine Arts—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Congress directed, more than a century ago, that the Smithsonian Institution, then being established, form a gallery of art for the Nation. The Congress had even before that granted an act of incorporation to the National Institute, a private society, whose collections were later to be given to the United States. In 1840 this chartered association began its assembling of art objects. In 1849 the Smithsonian Institution began the collection of painting and sculpture.

These were united in 1862 in the Smithsonian.

The text of my bill, H. R. 7974, "to amend the joint resolution of May 17, 1938, to provide for the construction and maintenance of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum on the site set aside for an art gallery thereunder" appears at the end of my statement.

The concluding portion of my statement regarding the need for a gallery to house the $10 million worth of art represented now in the National Collection of Fine Arts follows:

That was the situation until 1937. Then the Andrew W. Mellon collection and a magnificent $15 million building—modeled after and much bigger than the Emperor Hadrian's Pantheon in Rome—broke like a new dawn on the melancholy status of art in the United States. That, and the impetus of the world situation since then, projecting the United States into a position where the leadership of mankind was thrust upon her, compelled a mantle of dignity which clothes us today. It is to this new height that we are now raising the stature of our pride. The dual Mellon gift—the collection and the building—is what we know officially today as the National Gallery of Art, on the north side of the Mall between Fourth and Seventh Streets, in Washington, D. C.

It is an incomparable palace of mostly European art.

It too is an integral part of the Smithsonian Institution of which it is one of the Bureaus.

Thus the Mellon gift is now the National Galley of Art. The Smithsonian's collections come under a separate and independet heading as the National Collection of Fine Arts. For this we now propose to establish a museum. That explains the name: National Collection of Fine Arts Museum.

Neither the National Gallery of Art nor the proposed National Collection of Fine Arts Museum impinges on the other. Each has its special emphasis which marks a place for it in what you have noticed I delight, it seems, to call the American renaissance.

The two galleries joined together would be incongruous, culturally, and artistically undesirable, even if it were feasible.

Separately they make sense within the complex of bureaus constituting the Smithsonian Institution.

But my idea for a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum has even firmer and more positive roots in recent legislative history. The 75th Congress on May 17, 1938, authorized an appropriation of $40,000 to secure, preferably by competition, designs for a Smithsonian Gallery building on public ground on the Mall (S. J. Res. 599). Congress wisely authorized—and I hold this one of the most important features of this legislation—that private funds be accepted for its construction. Private funds were also authorized for the purchase of works by living artists. The legislation made possible the right to acquire private funds for the financing of exhibitions everywhere in the country both of current and of past works of art.

Consequently the Alice Pike Barney Memorial Fund—now $34,000—poured into the Smithsonian to encourage American painting, sculpture and design through exhibition and purchase. In 1951 a traveling exhibition service was established. This is today cooperating with the Department of State and the United States Information Agency to present American art, historical and contemporary, abroad.

Here is one phase of the free world's struggle for the minds of men.

But this congressional authorization which goes back 18 years has lain fallow. It is my aim to spearhead in this Congress measures which shall breathe the breath of life into it anew. It is one of the abiding satisfactions of my career in Congress that I introduced House Resolution 21, calling for a music, fine arts and mass communication center and that this legislation, signed by the President, is now Public Law 128. This measure established the D. C. Auditorium Commission.

The posture of this whole Capital picture is therefore this:

We have, as a matter of tradition, the Smithsonian Institution, created precisely for—I quote—"the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." We have the National Gallery of Art, the Mellon Gallery. We have in prospect, under remarkably competent and public spirited leadership, the civic center and auditorium for the Capital, another $15 million enterprise, for the support of which I am proud and eager to give—as I already have—all my heart and all my effort. We have in the Smithsonian collections some $10 million worth of art looking desperately for a decent home, a collection to which we propose to give as much as possible a definitively American emphasis. It is for this that we are recommending the proposed Capital domicile for these neglected art treasures to be called the National Collection of Fine Arts Museum.

It is with this project that we shall be bringing to realization the legislation of authorization of 1938. As it stands now this legislation is a dead letter and a reproach. It stands as a document proclaiming that the will of the Congress was never implemented. What we have is a form of words that turned its back on the deed and made the Congress say what never bore fruit.

To rejuvenate this 1938 legislation, to give it body, strength and action, I have myself as recently as January 3, this year, introduced into the Congress H. R. 7974. My resolution asks that the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution shall utilize the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commis-

sioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. The task is to be borne of mutual understanding and the settlement made upon expert and pertinent advice. There are 21 members of an advisory board to be appointed by the President from among our private citizens. The resolution authorizes the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary, in addition to the funds otherwise received, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

That's the story as of now on the action front.

What my plan strives for is the elimination quickly of all ground for dispute and differences of view by common consultation on plans for geography, for financing, for organization. It is to be integrated with kindred projects on a grand scale. We seek to keep this sweeping design for the expanded grandeur of our Capital above the clash of politics and aloof from battle. This proposal bears the imprimatur of the Congress of the United States expressing what we all feel is the will of the people. It will be welcomed by the owners of the great private art collections all over the world, many of whom may become its benefactors. The President, himself an amateur artist, is not without consciousness of this project, and, on the basis of his past actions, is certainly sympathetic. Former President Truman has always had a warm spot for planning of this sort.

It has, of course, the support of such men as Chairman David E. Finley, of the Commission of Fine Arts; of Secretary Leonard Carmichael, of the Smithsonian Institution; of Lloyd Goodrich, chairman, Committee on Government and Art; of Harold Weston, vice chairman, Committee on the Arts and Government; and of many other cultural leaders. Many of its stanchest devotees are among my colleagues in the House and the Senate.

But, unless I guess the American people wrong, it is they who have the awareness that will seize upon this American renaissance and make it work for the good of America and the world and for the prestige and dignity of the Capital of the United States.

When it is all said, what are we asking for?

We are asking that America, in the arts as in other fields of human endeavor, live up to the great destiny that is now hers. No American city as of this hour can lay claim to being the art center of the United States. But the Capital of this country should be. New York City has wealth and diversity. Its art collections are enormous and highly worthy. But they are lost in the vast and overwhelming traffic of commerce and business, banking and industry, shipping and municipal affairs, and the hurried and harassed problems of New York's own enormous population. We know that we cannot by legislation setting up a museum of art collections turn on a faucet that will yield us a generation of artistic genius. But we can provide what genius we have with a hospitable environment and thus nurture a climate in which greatness may develop. The project is in keeping with our greatness. The time for lifting ourself as a nation out of the doldrums of artistic depression is now.

Here the Capital of the United States presents a plateau which has architectural majesty. It is nationally representative. It signifies prestige. It cannot be blurred by the rivalry of great trade and the concentration of industry, finance, and enormous populations in congested zones.

Here it is elevated into an atmosphere of national dignity.

It is this dignity that overwhelms the visitor to the Capitol.

What in the end we shall have is an art center both national and international, just as our influence as a Nation has become global. We shall have a national collection of fine arts museum that will be expressively American. It will supplement and complement the National Gallery of Art which is essentially European in its content.

Both will grace our Capital as our Capital will grace the art center.

Dare we in this age of conflict for men's minds—dare we neglect the opportunity for education and persuasion offered us by the 10,000 people who daily come to see the Capital of the United States—2 million every year—18½ million of them having visited the National Gallery of Art alone in the last 10 years? Visitors—our own and from abroad—should always be persuaded to think of us as a people devoted to their political self-respect, to a high standard of living, and—eminently—to an enthusiasm for the best of western civilization.

There is the core of the argument that will earn us the respect we must have to fulfill the requirements of our leadership.

This art center, this National Collection of Fine Arts Museum would therefore not be just a cultural ship that, so to speak, merely passes in the night and is faintly remembered. It would not be a library hopefully shipped abroad on a sea of controversy. It would not be an exhibit even that goes on for a week and disappears. All of these strivings I am sure have their worth and are not to be disparaged. But this National Collection of Fine Arts Museum would be an enduring monument. It would serve as a sublime gravitational force made up of man's noblest achievements attracting here, on a note of respect and esteem, artists, scholars, art lovers, admiring peoples from everywhere, the world's youth and its students.

It would say its say in the language universal, the language of art against the background of the Capital of the United States and in rhythm with the very heartbeat of its Government. This city would then carry the message of America—that has been so sadly neglected—showing all peoples that ours is a Nation indeed of progress and of power, of respect for the individual, and of political justice, and it would—with great impact—show them that this progress is interwoven with our reverence for the greatness of the past, and our devotion to the art and the culture that testifies to the freedom of the spirit of man.

H. R. 7974

To amend the joint resolution of May 17, 1938, to provide for the construction and maintenance of a National Collection of Fine Arts Museum on the site set aside for an art gallery thereunder, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to set apart public ground for the Smithsonian Gallery of Art, and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1938, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (hereinafter referred to as the 'Regents'), in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, are hereby authorized to appoint an architect or architects and other necessary experts and consultants, and to secure appropriate designs for a building to be constructed on the site above described. Such building shall be designed so as to permit its future expansion, with adequate parking arrangements and provision for landscaping its surroundings.

"(b) In carrying out subsection (a), the Regents shall utilize the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, the National Capital Planning Commission, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, and the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, which shall upon request render such assistance and advice.

"(c) There is hereby established an advisory board (hereinafter in this joint resolution referred to as the board), which shall advise and consult with the Regents in carrying out their functions under this joint resolution. The board shall consist of 21 members appointed by the President from among private citizens of the United States who are widely recognized for their knowledge of or experience in, or for their profound interest in, one or more of the arts. In making such appointments the President shall give due consideration to the recommendations for nomination submitted by the leading national organizations in the fields of the fine arts represented in the National Collection of Fine Arts Museum. The term of office of each member of the board shall be 6 years; except that, of the members first appointed, 7 shall be appointed for terms of 2 years, 7 for terms of 4 years, and 7 for terms of 6 years. No member of the board shall be eligible for reappointment during the 2-year period following the expiration of his term. The board shall meet at the call of the Regents, but not less often than twice each year. The President shall from time to time, on the basis of the recommendations of the board, designate a member of the board to be its chairman."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3 (c) of such joint resolution is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The name of the building shall be the National Collection of Fine Arts Museum (hereinafter referred to as the 'Museum'), and it shall be under the supervision and control of the Regents and the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution."

(b) Section 3 of such joint resolution is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, in addition to the funds received under subsection (a) of this section, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution."

SEC. 3. Sections 4 (a), 5, 6, 7, and 8 of such joint resolution are amended by striking out "Gallery" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Museum."

Address by Senator Potter at Salute to Eisenhower Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. POTTER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the Salute to Eisenhower Dinner in Chattanooga, Tenn., on January 20, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first thing I want to say to you folks tonight is "thank you." It is a real pleasure and a great honor to be here with you tonight.

Right at this moment in more than 50 cities across the country over 70,000 persons have gathered with one purpose in mind and that is to render a well-deserved salute to a truly great man, our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I have always been a hearty supporter of President Eisenhower and extremely fond of him as a man and an individual and I hold the greatest respect and reverence for him as the most inspired leader of our day. The

record of Tennessee's support of Mr. Eisenhower proves that you feel as I do about him. And so I say "thank you" for the signal honor you have conferred upon me in inviting me to be here with you tonight.

The historic significance of this area forms a great chapter in the history of our country. Your land is beautiful, your recreation facilities are unlimited, the enthusiasm and progressiveness of your industrial and civic development is outstanding.

So my visit here is not only an honor but a real personal pleasure. Again I thank you for the warm and genuine welcome you have given me.

I'm willing to stand up here or anywhere and tell anyone that I think we've got the best political system in the world. Right away I'll agree with you that it's not perfect and it may never be perfect, but in this day and age it's far better than any other system anywhere in the world. It's a system that will involve everyone in the country if they're willing to be involved. It welcomes the participation of any and all.

Our political system is responsive to the participation of its citizens. It is flexible and it is sensitive to changing times and, as we all know, it's even good for a few laughs once in a while. One of the chuckles that I get out of our present political system is the fact that we can always seem to find members of our particular party not only at any place in the country but at any time in history. All we have to do is read a history book, pick out someone we like in times past and say, "Well, now, he is a good Republican." Funny thing about it is, a Democrat can pick up the same book and say, "Why, he's a good Democrat."

It is a natural desire to want to associate ourselves with the men who have been great leaders. It is history itself which outlines to us the great men of past ages but it is not always easy to see the great men of our own times. It is only occasionally that a man of our own times stands out so distinctly by his own character and his own accomplishments that he is known and acknowledged as a great man during his own lifetime.

It is a happy thing that our President today is such a man. It is a happy thing that our President is such an outstanding Republican. It is a happy thing that we can point today to his own outstanding personal achievement and to the outstanding achievements of the Republican Party under his leadership. Fortunately it is not necessary for us to wait for history to outline these achievements for us.

President Eisenhower in his own day has brought to this Nation the accomplishment of the Republican standard of "progress, peace and prosperity."

And so our purpose here tonight is not the erection of a great stone monument to a great leader of past history—ours is the much more pleasant task of merely throwing the spotlight of attention on the great monument of achievement which has risen before our very eyes under President Eisenhower's inspired leadership.

I can think of no better way to direct our attention to these achievements than through the President's own words in defining the Republican Party as the party of progress, peace and prosperity.

Said the President last September in Denver, "We want to be known for what we are—the party of progress. And if we are the party of progress, we must be the party of peace and prosperity because this is implicit in the term progress." Now progress is a relative thing. We have to know which direction we are heading, where we came from, where we were yesterday, where we are today and where we hope to be tomorrow.

One of the most discouraging things to a man cast adrift on the ocean in a lifeboat is the fact that the ocean looks all the same and as his boat drifts helplessly along he does not know whether he has progressed in any particular direction—he does not know how far he might have gone and he certainly does not know where he is going.

So to clarify our position, we need landmarks or stars upon which we can sight to determine our progress. There's no simpler way of doing that than to turn to the pages of our recent history and compare where we were 3 or 4 years ago with where we are today.

First of all, when the Eisenhower administration took office, we were at war. The Korean war which some chose to characterize as a police action was daily claiming the lives of American servicemen and claiming untold dollars that should have been devoted to constructive purposes rather than destructive purposes. Yes; we were involved in a Korean war which we dared not lose but which through a weird shackling of our own hands by the administration in office then we were forbidden to win.

When the Eisenhower administration took office, we were suffering from a certain kind of bigness. Now from time to time we've heard comments criticizing big business or big labor or something else that's grown so big as to endanger our public and national welfare. The bigness we suffered from then was big government. The Government was the biggest thing in the country and proud of it. It was a government whose instinct was to solve every problem through Federal interference, through Federal control or policing. Taxes and Government spending were the biggest they had ever been in the history of our country. And at that time government was trying to get even bigger.

Plans were being promoted which would have injected government into areas of private lives and private enterprise. Yes; big government was growing even bigger and crowding itself more and more into the lives and interests of the individual citizens of our country. And those were the landmarks just about 3 years ago.

Today we are at peace. The Korean war was concluded and we can thank God that an enlightened foreign policy under President Eisenhower's able guidance has prevented us from being swept over the brink into any more disastrous wars or police actions.

Today no lives of American servicemen are being sacrificed in futile combats anywhere in the world. Today no American dollars are being thrown into the bottomless well of destructive warfare. And today, although the cost of national defense has been cut, we have developed the most powerful United States Armed Forces the Nation has even maintained when not in a shooting war. This administration has discarded a crisis policy and adopted a policy of continuous combat steadiness for any contingency and in the President's own words, "Our security posture commands respect."

And as peace was secured, peacetime prosperity replaced wartime inflation in our national economy. We have experienced the highest employment in history. Our economy is approaching the $400 billion mark. It is at an all-time high. Inflation has been halted. Today people have more dollars to spend and each dollar buys more.

The decline in the buying power of the dollar has been stopped under President Eisenhower's Republican administration and it has not required big government to accomplish this. As a matter of fact, the Government has been removed from many activities competing with private business. For instance, the Government has sold synthetic rubber plants, sold the Inland Waterways Corporation (which incidentally had been operated for years at a loss). The Government no longer is competing with coffee roasting plants, has gotten out of the bakery business and the laundry business.

This Republican administration has stopped numerous Government commercial activities such as clothing repair shops, furniture repair shops. It is closing numerous activities of the same nature. And what's more, all Federal agencies continue to survey their commercial-type operations to recommend those that can be terminated.

The nature of the Government of the United States is important not only to the citizens of this country but to all peoples all over the world. As President Eisenhower has said, "Our world policy and our actions are dedicated to the achievement of peace with justice for all nations."

He has suggested positive moves to prevent further inroads of communism. His realistic program contains such points as continuing to maintain an effective system of collective security—use of the awesome power of the atom as a guardian of the free world and of peace—keeping in the forefront of human consciousness grave injustices which are still uncorrected, such as the bondage of millions of persons.

To sum it up, the President has said, "We must act in the firm assurance that the fruits of freedom are more attractive and desirable to mankind in the pursuit of happiness than the record of communism."

Now in order to maintain the peace and the prosperity which we enjoy, the President has set forward very realistic ideas. He says, "Over the long term a balanced budget is a sure index to thrifty management in a home, in a business or in the Federal Government."

"I earnestly believe that a tax cut can be deemed justifiable only when it will not unbalance the budget."

To anyone who has ever been responsible for keeping the books of the company or corporation or even for the housewife who keeps count of her own expenses in the home, that is clear thinking.

These things that I relate are only a few of the many major points on which our peace and prosperity rest today. Now you know that you can't enjoy such things as peace and prosperity by pure chance. The United States did not stumble into these conditions that we enjoy today. Peace and prosperity are the result of progress. And progress has to be based on philosophy.

In President Eisenhower's own words, "I don't believe that you can sloganize the kind of honest philosophy that the Republican Party is trying to promote in the United States. If we can live by that philosophy, however, then I think we have proved our worthiness to be the instrument through which the people of the United States carry on the job of government of the people, by the people,and for the people."

And he also referred to another quotation of Lincoln's to this effect, "The function of government is to do for the people what the individual cannot do at all or so well for himself and in all those things which the individual can do for himself the government ought not to interfere."

Experience in our own country has proved that when we free ourselves of unnatural governmental restrictions, then the intelligence and the initiative of individual people, and individual companies, and individual organizations will make us prosper.

And the Eisenhower Republican administration has redirected focus of authority so that it bears on the welfare of the individual. It has sought to lift up the American farmer, the American businessman (both large and small) and the American workingman, to change them from being just a unit in a big impersonal plan. Instead—to make each individual secure with his own human personality and dignity has been its goal.

That's a mighty good philsophy to have and there could be no greater man to carry it out than President Eisenhower.

The Presidency of the United States is today the most important and most exacting job in the world. By the grace of God we have a man who more than meets that task.

After a long and distinguished military career and after distinguishing himself in the field of education, now in three short years Dwight D. Eisenhower has proved that he is the world's greatest leader.

In the face of complex problems, highly divergent opinions, and controversial issues, he has built a teamwork in Government unlike anything ever before achieved.

If we will think back just a few years, we can easily remember that it was his great capacity for creating teamwork that so vitally influenced the outcome of World War II—welding together the often divergent policies of the many countries who were allied in their efforts to defeat nazism. He led the team onward until victory was achieved.

Now his Republican administration has established policies that have set this Nation on an unprecedented upward course. He has solidified our Nation's position as the indisputable leader of the free world.

In Dwight D. Eisenhower there is that combination of qualities which this troubled world of ours needs so often and finds so seldom. A man among men—a leader among leaders.

The President is indeed a remarkable man.

He has great reverence, great wisdom, and enormous patience for important things. He commands the respect of millions and the devoted loyalty of his close associates.

He dreams great dreams for the advancement of the people of his country and for all mankind, but is practical in their application.

His eyes are on the far horizons but his feet are firmly on the ground. He has a friendly and disarming smile and a delightful and contagious sense of humor which draws people to him.

In short, he has all the stature and yet all the humbleness of a truly great man.

Our progress under his administration has been great and we can expect that progress to continue to be great as we follow the enduring objectives of the Republican administration as outlined by Mr. Eisenhower in his recent state of the Union message. Here they are:

1. The discharge of all world responsibility.
2. Constant improvement of our national security.
3. Fiscal integrity.
4. Fostering of a strong economy and
5. Response to human concerns.

"Progress," Mr. Eisenhower said, "will be realized only as it is more than matched by a continuing growth in the spiritual strength of the Nation. Our dedication to moral values must be complete in our dealings abroad and in our relationships among ourselves.

"We have single-minded devotion to the common good of America.

"Never must we forget that this means the well-being, the prosperity, the security of all Americans in every walk of life."

He continued, "The vista before us is bright—the march of science—the expanding economy—the advance in collective security toward a just peace. In this threefold movement our people are creating new standards by which the future of the Republic may be judged."

Mr. President, there is real happiness in our hearts today because of your remarkable recovery since you were taken ill last fall. There is real happiness in our hearts for your great and undimished leadership of the Republican administration and of the United States.

Mr. President, there is great happiness in our hearts that we are able to recognize your greatness now, and that we may express this happiness that we have—and our thanks to you today.

Mr. President, we salute you for the unparalleled contribution which you have made to your country and to the world.

Address by Senator Lehman Before the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of an address I delivered at the congressional dinner of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee, held at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D. C., on January 28, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN AT THE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER OF THE NATIONALITIES DIVISION OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 28, 1956

Tonight the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee has come of age.

This notable gathering is an assembly not only of the nationalities division, but of the Democratic Party itself. It is an eloquent reflection of America, proud of its varied heritage, rich in its far-flung roots and traditions.

I am personally much moved and deeply gratified. Throughout my political and public life, which spans almost half a century, I have tried to represent in the councils of the Democratic Party the common interests of those many national strains which have poured into America across the years, and which made America. Tonight I see in this assemblage as impressive a cross-section of the Democratic Party, and of the Nation, as I have ever seen gathered in one group.

In this room I feel one of the strongest pulses of the Democratic Party. In this room I sense the heartbeat of America.

The nationalities division, and its leadership, are to be congratulated for a fine job of mobilization, and of inspiration too.

I congratulate that young and still rising star of the Democratic Party the four-times chosen governor of his State, who, in the brief period of his leadership of the nationalities division, has shown not only a deep understanding of its potentialities, but has given it a truly dynamic leadership—Gov. G. Mennen Williams.

My congratulations, too, to that patient, persistent, and pioneer worker in this field—an old, tried and true friend of mine, the mainspring of the nationalities division, Mish Cieplinski, our executive director.

And, of course, all praise to the chairman of this dinner, the first chairman of the nationalities division and now its honorary chairman, my beloved colleague and the dean of us all, Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

And finally, but perhaps preeminently, congratulations are due to those devoted and dedicated men who make possible the achievements of the nationalities division, the day-in and day-out captains of the troops, the section chairmen, representing the individual nationalities.

But we are not gathered here tonight to exchange congratulations. This dinner, after all, is not the summit of achievement, but only the beginning of it. This gathering is but a mobilization for action in the field. The real work of the nationalities division is carried on, and must be carried on, at the State, district, and precenct level. The people who need to be informed, to be aroused, and to be politically activated, are there.

And so we come to the fundamental question: What is the appeal of the Democratic Party to those who can be reached through the nationalities division? What are the issues which will bring the American citizens represented here tonight to rally to our cause?

What do we stand for?

First of all, we of the Democratic Party accept, with our whole hearts, the premise that all who are American citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin—regardless of how recent or distant their roots in America—are equal before the law, and are equally good Americans.

We, of the Democratic Party, reject absolutely the concept of second-class citizenship, whether by law or by administrative practice.

I am not so sure that the Republican Party rejects this concept, too. For instance, it is alleged that there exists a pattern of discrimination, in Government employment, against naturalized citizens, and second generation citizens. And nothing very effective is being done about it.

And still today, after 3 years of Republican rule, the discriminatory citizenship provisions of the misbegotten McCarran-Walter Act stand unamended on our statute books. Nor has a single proposal been made by this administration to amend or modify those provisions.

Those proposals for amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act belatedly proposed by President Eisenhower, in this election year, make no mention whatever of the degrading status of second-class citizenship impressed on our naturalized citizens by that shameful law.

I shall not rest, you will not rest, and the leading spirits of the Democratic Party will not rest until the discriminatory citizenship provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act are amended. We are going to wipe out the insidious distinctions between naturalized and native-born American citizens now established in our law.

We are going to restore the status of American citizenship to what the Founding Fathers originally conceived it to be—a charter of equal membership in a great society of equals. Today, under the McCarran-Walter Act, citizenship is a kind of temporary license held at the pleasure of the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Justice Department and the Passport Division of the State Department.

Let me tell you—you who do not know all the evils in the McCarran-Walter Act—that even native-born citizenship is not left undisturbed in this law.

If a native-born citizen goes abroad and gets a job with a foreign government, or with a company owned by a foreign government, he may be stripped, without even knowing about it, of his American citizenship.

I know of the case of a man born in Texas by the name of O'Brien who went to Mexico for a year and took a job with the Mexican National Railway as an engineer. Our Government ruled that under the McCarran-Walter Act, because the Mexican National Railway is owned by the Mexican Government, Mr. O'Brien, of Texas, has forfeited his American ictizenship.

A native-born citizen can lose his citizenship by voting in an election abroad. Some of you may recall how the State Department urged Americans of Italian extraction to return to Italy to vote in the Italian elections a few years ago and then took away the American citizenship of those who had voted.

Yes, my friend, these provisions of the law have got to be amended. And if they are going to be amended, it will take, I believe, a Democratic administration to do it.

I have referred only to the citizenship provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act, and to only a few of those.

There are also, of course, the immigration provisions. At long last, in this year of 1956, President Eisenhower has made some recommendations for the amendment of our basic immigration law. Some of these proposals are good. Most are inadequate. But I want to see the specific legislative amendments which the administration will advocate and support. So far we have heard only the President's general words on this subject.

Is this administration move to amend the McCarran-Walter Act going to be just a political show? Or is the President going to make a real effort to see that the act is amended? Is he going to use what the newspapers call his tremendous personal prestige to fight for these amendments? Or will he, having said some of the right words in his state of the Union message, sit back and let nature take its course? Which means, let the matter die—until campaign time? Will we have just some more pledges, and more hedges?

I hope, with all my heart, that President Eisenhower will, in this case, take a fighting stance and battle a bill of substantial amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act through the Congress. I will support him, insofar as the amendments are substantial. This is not a partisan matter. This is a matter transcending all considerations of politics and partisanship.

I want to say, however, in regard to one of the President's recommendations for amendment of the McCarran-Walter Act—the so-called pooling of unused quota numbers—that I regret very much the President's failure to recommend the total elimination of the discriminatory and bigoted national origins quota system. What a shame that we should have on our statute books a proclamation that we consider a Greek only one-two-hundredths as good American citizenship material as an Anglo-Saxon, and an Italian only one-twelfth as good. Yet the administration is not even willing to recommend that these disgraceful provisions be expunged completely from the law of the land.

If we are going to wipe out the national origins quota system and eliminate it completely in favor of a system of selection based on individual worth and merit, and not on the discriminatory ground of national origin, we shall need to arouse the American people. And then we shall need to elect a Democratic President to lead the fight that must and will be fought to achieve success and victory.

This entire benighted law, with all its discriminatory and unjust features, must go. It must be replaced by a fair and humane law which bars the undesirables and subversives yet opens the gate wide to the worthy and desirable. We must pledge ourselves, and the Democratic Party must pledge itself, to this task.

I said a few moments ago that the question of amending the McCarran-Walter Act is not a partisan question. I would be less than fair if I did not point out that there are, unfortunately, some Democrats who strongly favor this discriminatory law in its present form. There are Democrats who are just as blind and as xenophobic as many Republicans. But the spirit of our party strongly denies this narrow attitude and affirms a high faith in America, the melting pot; in America, the refuge of the oppressed and the downtrodden; in America the home of equality and opportunity.

There is another issue—which is also nonpartisan in theory—but where the hope of the future, in my judgment, also lies in the Democratic Party. I refer to foreign policy.

I judge that there are none in America who feel the importance of our foreign policy more keenly than Americans of foreign birth and recent foreign descent. There are none more vitally interested in our relations with the rest of the world, and in the victory of the cause of freedom over the cause of totalitarianism.

All of us, I know, wish only for that which is good for America. The goal of America in foreign affairs is peace, justice, and security for all nations—strength, unity, and understanding for the nations of the free world—and freedom, fulfillment, and well-being for all men and women everywhere.

All of us, or at least most of us, subscribe to these goals, regardless of party.

But these are ultimate and general objectives. Concerning them there is no real controversy. The real questions at issue involve specific policies toward specific areas of the world and toward specific countries: specific policies in terms of military and political strategy, trade policy, and foreign aid.

These will be the foreign policy issues of 1956. These will constitute the heart of this year's great debate.

President Eisenhower has urged that foreign policy should be excluded from the arena of political debate. And only this week Secretary Dulles came forth with a proposal that specific aspects of foreign policy, such as our policy in the Middle East, should be so exempt.

As to the first proposal, it is most unwise and, I may say, somewhat presumptuous. First, the administration takes us three times to the brink of war, or so Mr. Dulles—or his ghost writer, Henry Luce—says. At the same time, the same administration proclaims that it stands for peace, peace above everything.

Indeed, the Soviet leaders have, in recent days, declared their confidence in President Eisenhower's sincere desire for peace. I am willing to agree that President Eisenhower wants peace, although I would rather not base my conclusions—and I hope the American people do not—on words emanating from the Kremlin. I do not think they know or understand the meaning of either truth or sincerity.

But still I want to know: Is the policy of our Government the one expressed by President Eisenhower at Geneva, or the one expressed by Secretary Dulles in Life magazine? Who is the architect and who is the conductor of American foreign policy? It would seem from Life magazine that it is Secretary Dulles.

The administration wants to be all things to all men, especially to all the voters in the United States. The Republican Party wants to be the party of peace, and, at the same time, the party of massive atomic retaliation.

Having merchandised these slogans throughout the Nation, the administration now wants to call a halt to political debate, and to maintain the status quo. Of course they do. That would be a good bargain, if ever there was one—good for them but not good for the country.

This transparent proposal has been, of course, forthrightly rejected by most of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

As for Mr. Dulles' latest stratagem, the proposal to exempt the Middle East situation and the administration's policy in the Middle East from public debate and criticism, I hope that we Democrats are not going to accept that either.

I, for one, will not be a party to it.

In the Midlde East, the administration has permitted us to be projected into a most dangerous situation—dangerous to our most vital interests, dangerous to the cause of peace, dangerous to the security of the free world, and dangerous to the very existence of our sister Republic of Israel.

Communist influence is suddenly running rampant in the Middle East. The Arab nations throb with riot and unrest. Anti-Americanism has been given a new impetus throughout the area. And in the face of all this the administration can manage only to wring its hands and appeal for bipartisan silence and immunity from criticism.

It seems to me that the administration is pleading the fifth amendment on its past mistakes in this area.

Speaking for myself, I am willing, not to shut off debate nor to exonerate past errors, but sincerely to support the administration, if it is ready to steer a new course and follow a new and positive policy.

I am ready to praise and advocate an administration policy that promises peace in the Middle East—peace, well-being, and security for all nations, without sacrifice of any, without appeasement of any, but with aid and assistance to all.

I will support such a policy. The American people will support such a policy. But I am not willing to seal my lips and leave it trustfully to this administration to get us out of the mess they have gotten us into.

For me, this is not a partisan nor a political matter. In this situation the lives of millions of people, the fate of democracy in the Middle East, and the peace of the world are at stake. I will not seek political advantage, and hope no Democrat seeks political advantage, from this common peril which confronts us all.

But we cannot speak of bipartisanship in a situation in which the administration has deliberately altered the course followed by previous administrations in the Middle East, has excluded Democrats from participation in the formulation of this fallacious policy, and now asks for a Democratic moratorium on criticism.

I could say almost the same thing about other vital aspects of our foreign policy.

Many of you here tonight are especially concerned about the problem of our relations with the Soviet Union, first as it affects peace, and, second, as it affects the enslaved peoples of Europe—the subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

All of us are becoming aware that all-out war is an impossible solution for any of our international problems. There is simply no practical alternative to peace. The thought of war, using hydrogen bombs, is too shocking today to entertain, unless we have reconciled ourselves to the suicide of civilization as we know it.

In our continuing conflict with the Soviet Union and the forces of communism we have no alternative but to engage in vigorous but peaceful competition—the competitive use of nonviolent means—to achieve our objectives.

Our objectives must include bringing to an end, as soon as possible, the enslavement of the satellite peoples. We must actively and persistently support their desire for freedom.

Our efforts must be directed to loosening their chains, so far as is possible, to giving them hope for the future, comfort in the present, and the assurance that we will never abandon their cause for any reason whatever.

We must avoid raising and dashing their hopes in alternate strokes, as this administration has so consistently done. We must not promise to do that which these peoples know cannot be done. We must not speak brash and meaningless words about liberation in a context which implies all-out war, and means total destruction.

And certainly we must not make any agreements with the Soviet Government which would lessen the enslaved peoples' prospects for freedom, or impair their confidence in our true concern for their condition.

What has been the administration's record on this front? It has not been a bright one. It has been a shadowy one, made up again of brash words and weak actions, a policy of inconsistency and of weakness.

Even our policy toward the free nations of Europe has deteriorated from what it was. A strong and united free Europe, with complete confidence in our motives and in our leadership, is the strongest deterrent to the spread of communism. But we have fumbled, and blustered, and have illustrated in general the maxim of too little and too late.

This administration has not departed entirely from the Truman-Acheson policy in Western Europe, but has weakened it. That policy must be renewed and strengthened. A Democratic administration can and will do it.

In Asia and Africa, we have again fallen between the stools of indecision. We have failed to make clear our strong hatred for colonialism—we who once knew what it was to be a colony—180 years ago. We have failed to give comfort to the reasonable forces of nationalism, and the legitimate aspirations of colonial peoples for independence. We have failed to identify ourselves with the traditions of independence and anticolonialism, in which our own Nation was conceived and born.

We could do this and win the hearts and minds of these newly awakening peoples, while yet defending the basic interests of our western allies. But we have done neither.

A Democratic administration will, I am sure, do differently and do better.

Take Cyprus, for example. Our great and good ally, Britain, holds Cyprus and wants to keep it. And, indeed, the free world needs Cyprus for security purposes.

But the will of the people of Cyprus must surely be taken into account—or doesn't this administration believe in the principle of self-determination?

Of course the security interests of the free world must be considered. Of course the rights of the Turkish minority in Cyprus must be safeguarded. But within the framework of these considerations, we should and must stand staunchly with the people of Cyprus for their right to have a voice in their own future status.

Atrocities against minorities must be forthrightly condemned and denounced, wherever they occur, whether in Asia or Africa, or behind the Iron Curtain against the Czechs, the Poles, or the Ukrainians.

But our Government is as silent about some of these specific acts as it is about the Genocide Pact still gathering dust in a pigeonhole of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A Democratic administration will, I believe, do differently.

There is much more to be said about foreign policy. Much more must and will be said in the months ahead.

If the Republican administration really wants to isolate certain subjects and place them beyond the pale of debate, there are, indeed, certain things on which both parties can agree.

We can agree that neither party is soft on communism, and that both parties are opposed to communism, both domestic and international.

We can agree that neither party is opposed to free world unity, and that both desire to achieve it.

We can agree that both parties support the United Nations, and neither seeks to destroy or undermine that organization.

We can agree that both parties desire peace, and not war.

These can and should be above debate. On these four points, at least, and perhaps more, there could be a perfect bipartisanship.

But as for the means of opposing Communism, the means of unifying the free world, the means of supporting the United Nations, and the means of achieving peace—these can and should be subject to full public debate and review.

And in the months ahead, these means are going to be discussed. These issues are going to be aired. As far as I am concerned, the public is going to be consulted and taken into our confidence.

Of course we must avoid extreme, or irresponsible, criticism. We must avoid narrow partisanship. We must avoid criticism for the sake of criticism, and attack for sheer political advantage.

Our criticism must be restrained, factual and constructive.

Our Party must continue to show that it is a responsible Party, careful in its judgments, worthy of leadership, and more concerned about policy than power.

If we follow such a discipline, and keep faith with our traditions—if we reflect the humanitarianism which is our Party's heritage, and our faith in the people's wisdom, which is our pride—then we will deserve to win, and we will win.

School Construction Assistance Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very outstanding address made before the Georgia General Assembly by Representative JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., a Member of the House of Representatives from the Fourth District of Georgia, before a joint session of the Georgia General Assembly on January 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE FOURTH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE GEORGIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY, JANUARY 24, 1956

Lieutenant Governor Vandiver, Mr. Speaker Moate, members of the senate and house of representatives of the general assembly, my fellow Georgians, I bring you greetings from the Georgia delegation in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress—the distinguished and charming lady from the Eight District and the nine men, including myself. I shall not attempt to speak for any of them in my remarks which follow—but I know at least some of them concur in the thoughts I shall bring to you.

As for myself, I stand here in complete humility, fully cognizant of my many shortcomings, my faults, and my failures. At the same time, a feeling of pride pulsates through my body. This feeling of pride is motivated by the fact that I once served as a member of this general assembly and that my colleague, Judge DAVIS, and I now have been invited to address you in joint session—an honor and an invitation which, so far as I know, has never before been extended to a Member of Congress from Georgia. I am truly honored, and I am deeply and sincerely grateful. I hope that I deserve it—I pray that I always shall.

A moment ago I reminded you that I once served in this general assembly. I would be derelict in my duty to you if I did not tell you that I considered it then as I consider it now—one of the greatest privileges and honors which can be conferred on a Georgia citizen. I have been a member of many groups and I bear witness to the fact that I have never served with nor known a finer or more dedicated group of men and women than the 258 other members of the general assembly with whom I served in 1947–48. I know you of this present general assembly measure up to or surpass the general assembly in which I served.

You are the equal in ability, in intelligence, in appearance, and in courage to any house and senate in the Nation, including the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States—and I believe you are superior to most.

But, my fellow Georgians, you did not invite me down here to conduct a lodge meeting of a mutual admiration society. You invited me to come back home, among my home people, and to discuss with you, and I emphasize to discuss with you, the bill now pending in Congress known as H. R. 7535, called the Kelley bill, sometimes called the Federal aid to education bill, sometimes called the School Construction Assistance Act of 1955.

Let's briefly discuss this legislation.

Very seriously, if I could be shown one good reason why I should support this legislation, I might do it. However, I've studied this bill backward and forward, up and down, front to back, back to front, from cover to cover, left to right, right to left, from Rabun Gap to Tybee Light; from Vogel Park to Attapulgus, from the Okefenokee Swamp to Lookout Mountain; and I cannot find one thing in it that looks like good legislation to me.

On the contrary, it has the earmarks of the most insidious, treacherous and vicious group of words ever assembled as one document since Karl Marx wrote Das Kapital and Earl Warren wrote the Supreme Court opinion which he delivered on that black Monday, the 17th of May 1954. In my opinion, these two documents can be very close compared upon careful analysis, and the philosophy of the one is just as communistic as the philosophy of the other.

This bill, which in a sense is an effort to bolster the weak position of the Supreme Court decision, is a hydra-headed, five-fanged, cloven-hoofed and forked-tailed combination of polecat, mad dog, and rattlesnake. It strikes not only at the vitals of our way of life in Georgia, but stabs cold steel into the heart of the United States Constitution. It tolls the death knell of State sovereignty; all the while shedding alligator tears, and at the same time laughing the hyenalike laugh of a madman who has just destroyed his dearest possession and now envisions its total and permanent destruction.

A reckless charge? Listen to this language—and I quote from the bill itself:

"SEC. 103 (a). Any State which desires to accept the benefits of this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan which shall * * *" and then proceeds to specifically list seven subparagraphs including "a provision for fiscal control and establishment of certain standards."

My fellow Georgians, need I tell you and need I define their definition of "fiscal control" and the "establishment of standards"?

Under this same provision, section 103 of the bill as drawn, the Commissioner of Education is empowered and authorized to write

any regulations he desires and to require any such reports from State education departments notwithstanding the language of the statute and notwithstanding any other provision of law.

Why, this places more power in one man, the Commissioner of Education, than a Caesar, a Hitler, and a Mongolian potentate ever had all put together. Its advocates say there is a right of appeal from any unjust decision. What kind of an appeal? One that would wind up in the Supreme Court of the United States, and you know what that Court would do, since they have shattered the Constitution of the United States, destroyed the Bill of Rights, overturned every known legal precedent, and have adopted in their stead the crazy, pseudo-sociological reasoning of a Swedish Communist named Gunnar Myrdal, who by his own admission hates America and everything which forms a part of the American way of life.

That unlimited and unrestricted power it gives the Commissioner of Education is bad enough, but that is the least of the three principal objections to it.

Number two of the principal objections is that it would confirm by an act of Congress the line of the Supreme Court decision which says each State must integrate its public schools, and destroy every element of local self-government and local self-determination—including the greatest of all freedoms—the freedom of choice. It would destroy the right of a sovereign State and its people to be let alone by outside meddlers and interlopers who are interfering with a matter of which they have nothing but a smattering of ignorance.

To force Georgia and 11 other sovereign States to comply with that decision and with the philosophy embraced in this Federal Aid to Education bill would destroy the progress we have made in both education and solution of race problems and shatter beyond repair the educational, social, religious and economic life of every State where integration and desegregation is forced on a people against their will, and I believe I speak accurately and correctly when I say against the will of the overwhelming majority of both the white and Negro people in every State in the South.

And before I go any further, I want to state without any reservation, or evasion, that I am here and now willing to take a solemn oath that I hold no malice, hatred or prejudice whatsoever in my heart or mind or soul against any man or group of men, living or dead, because of his race or the color of his skin. I think I have demonstrated and proved that by nearly 20 years as a lawyer, an assistant United States attorney, as a soldier in the United States Army, Solicitor General, member of the General Assembly, and Member of Congress. In each instance over these 20 years—indeed over the 41 years of my life—I have sought to give to every man and woman every dignity to which he is entitled as a human being and every right to which he is entitled as an American citizen.

And yet, I just as firmly and sincerely believe that to completely integrate in communities and States where each race constitutes a large proportion of the population would unquestionably weaken both races and even destroy one or both.

No nation in the history of mankind has ever mixed and amalgamated two races without destroying itself, all of its people, and both races in the process. Carthage, Egypt, and Rome are examples. People now inhabit each of the areas once populated by the Cathagenians, the Egyptians, and the Romans, but they are no more like their ancient counterparts than day is like night, and their national strength and power are long since gone and forgotten.

Yes, I'm willing to take such an oath that I have no prejudice, malice, or hatred against any person or race; and I'm willing to take yet another solemn oath—that I will expend every ounce of my strength, every drop of my blood, even my life itself to resist the efforts of the United States Supreme Court to force complete integration on the people of Georgia against our will; and I'll not knowingly vote for a bill in Congress which I believe is designed to do just that.

Those are two reasons why I oppose the Federal aid to education bill, but they both fade into insignificance compared with reason No. 3, which I'll come to in just a minute.

But before I go to reason No. 3, I want to say this to the thousands of school teachers and school administrators:

If and when the Federal Government and the United States Commissioner of Education take over control of our schools that this same United States Commissioner of Education in his little white tower will take charge of the hiring and firing, standards of teaching, prescribed courses of study, salary scales, and every phase of our educational systems; and in my considered opinion and in my best judgment, we shall be not nearly so well off in Georgia as we are now.

There is not a State in the United States which has made the progress in education that has been made in Georgia in the past 10 years. We can only judge the future by the past. I am confident that the progress in education in Georgia will continue and that in Georgia our educational system will be equal to any and superior to most.

Georgia is a desirable place in which to belong to the teaching profession. I'll make this statement and let the statisticians tear it apart—there are more alumni of schools located outside of Georgia teaching in and seeking employment in Georgia schools than there are Georgia college graduates teaching in at least 20 other States. They come into Georgia from all over the United States, because (1) Georgia is a good place in which to live; (2) it is a good place in which to teach; (3) they like it better here than anywhere else; and (4) they are here by their own choice and of their own free will and accord. This applies to white and Negro teachers alike.

Now about the Negro members of the teaching profession in Georgia. There are more Negro school teachers in Georgia and South Carolina together than there are in New York, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, California and Machigan combined; and the combined population of that latter group of States has over ten times the total population in Georgia and South Carolina.

I once asked a Negro school teacher friend of mine why he came to teach in Georgia instead of going to some other State. He was a good teacher and a highly intelligent person, and his honest reply was this: "I couldn't get a job up there teaching. Up there they love me as a race and hate me as a person; down here you segregate my race, but you respect me as a person and as a human being." He might have added, but he didn't, that he and his wife and children are not a race—they are people and human beings.

If Georgia should be suddenly forced to desegregate, the group which would suffer most would be the thousands of Negro teachers in Georgia and the many more thousands of Negro school children who are today getting a better education than they would anywhere else in the world. My fellow Georgians, the results would be utter chaos and you know it.

Now comes reason No. 3 why I expect to vigorously oppose H. R. 7535 and any companion bill, substitute, or counterpart:

There is absolutely no constitutional authority for it, either expressed or implied. Nowhere in the Constitution of the United States of America is there any delegation of power to Congress or to any branch of the Federal Government to operate or support a public school system. That is a right and also a power absolutely reserved and guaranteed to the several States to operate, support and maintain as each of the several States shall determine and decide.

Congress has absolutely no constitutional authority, power, or right to appropriate money to operate schools within the States or to support them and exactly no constitutional authority, power, or right to use tax money to pay such an appropriation.

The skeptics and the wide-eyed dreamers will immediately shout—"What difference does it make whether it's constituional or no?"

And I'll just as quickly reply, "It makes all the difference in the world. If the Federal Government, by act of Congress, can support, operate, maintain, or construct schools in the school systems of the several States and have that declared to be constitutional and a part of either the expressed or implied powers of Congress—then grab your hats, and let's go; it's all over. The lid has blown sky high and there is no limit or restriction on the power of the Federal Government."

If that happens, the last stanchion, the last bulwark, the last symbol of the sovereign rights of a sovereign State, like Georgia, is gone and gone forever. There'll be no calling it back.

If that happens, they might as well abolish all 48 State constitutions, all 48 State general assemblies, the courts of law and order of the 48 States, and the rights and privileges of every individual citizen. If that happens they might as well close up all 48 governors' offices and tell all 48 State governors, it's all over boys—you are out of a job.

If that happens, the American Bill of Rights is shattered and gone too—because if they can effectually abolish State control of schools, they can just as easily abolish habeas corpus, trial by jury, freedom of speech and press, freedom of religion, and every other personal right and emblem of liberty which no human being ever had guaranteed before the American Bill of Rights was added to the United States Constitution.

And when that time comes, we'll be a totalitarian government like Germany under Hitler and Russia under the Communists.

The thing that has made and preserved us a great Nation is the fundamental premise that the United States is an indissoluble Union of indestructible States. Our Federal Government is based upon the inviolate concept of separation of powers so that neither the executive, the legislature, nor the judicial branch can go completely wild and destroy the sovereign rights of the sovereign States.

And there'll be no one left to stop it. The supposed defenders of the Constitution—the black-robed justices of the United States Supreme Court will be leading the carnival parade riding the chargers of dictatorship and tyranny like the four horsemen of the Apocalypse. I hope that time never comes—I humbly pray that it won't. I believe our United States Constitution is a sacred thing—the most sacred and devinely inspired instrument produced by the brain and purpose of man since God gave the Ten Tablés of the Laws to Moses on Mount Sinai and since the Man of Galilee delivered His sermon on another mountain nearly 2,000 years ago.

Yes, the United States Constitution is a sacred thing. It protects and defends the weak and the oppressed against tyrants and would be tyrants of strength and power; it protects the minorities from the vastly greater majorities; it protects the humblest cottage and the most stately mansion with equal sanctity; it protects the least of us from the powers of tyranny and despotism.

It has caused us to have the greatest way of life ever experienced, ever known or ever dreamed of by the mind of man.

It has been defended by many thousands of Americans who have died to save it, and yet who died with smiles in their souls because they had helped save it; and it has been defended by countless millions more who have lived and so lived that our Nation, a Nation under God and under a divinely inspired Constitution, might be strengthened, and might never perish from this earth.

Let me urge you to give serious consideration to two propositions.

Firstly, whether you wish to go on record urging all of your Members of Congress to unanimously oppose Federal aid to education and thereby do all you can to urge the citizens of other States to so urge their representatives to do likewise.

Secondly, let us join hands with our nearby States of Virginia, Alabama, Mississippi and others and consider the adoption of a resolution of interposition.

Since May 17, 1954, Georgia has led the way under the courageous leadership of our Governors and State leaders, including an overwhelming majority of the members of the general assembly of this State. We took a courageous stand when we ratified amendment No. 4 in the general election in 1954.

I believe that if Georgia had failed to take a firm position and courageous stand on this subject that the rest of the Southern States would have lost heart and abandoned the fight. Some of my friends from Virginia, who believe in constitutional government and who believe in the rights of soveign States, have very recently told me that their fight in Virginia was made much easier and was crowned with success because of the example which had been previously set by Georgia.

Two weeks ago, yesterday, the Commonwealth of Virginia voted by more than a 2-to-1 majority to call a constitutional convention to write into the Constitution of the State of Virginia what we in Georgia did with amendment No. 4 in the general election in 1954.

Let the General Assembly of Georgia express its firm resolution to maintain and to defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State, against every attempt, either foreign or domestic, to undermine the dual structure of dual government, and to destroy those fundamental principles embodied in our basic law, by which the delegated powers of the Federal Government and the reserved powers of the respective States have long been protected and assured.

Let this general assembly explicitly declare that the powers of the Federal Government result solely from the compact to which the States are parties, and that the powers of the Federal Government, in all of its branches and agencies, are limited by the terms of the instrument creating the compact, and by the plain sense and intention of its provisions.

Let the terms of this United States Constitution, and its plain sense and intention, apparent from the face of the instrument, be that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to delegate certain of their sovereign powers, but only those sovereign powers specifically enumerated, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and let all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States be reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Let the State of Georgia declare in positive language that the Supreme Court of the United States has no authority to amend the United States Constitution by judicial order or judicial decree.

By its decision of May 17, 1954, in the school cases, the Supreme Court of the United States placed upon the Constitution an interpretation, having the effect of an amendment thereto. Georgia emphatically disapproves this interpretation.

The State of Georgia did not agree, in ratifying the 14th amendment, nor did other States ratifying the 14th amendment agree, that the power to operate racially separate schools was to be prohibited to them thereby; and as evidence of such understanding of the terms of the amendment, and its plain sense and intention, the people of Georgia know that the very Congress which proposed the 14th amendment for ratification established separate schools in the District of Columbia; further we know that in many instances, the same State legislatures that ratified the 14th amendment also provided for systems of separate public schools; and still further, we know that both State and Federal courts, without any exception, recognized and approved this clear understanding over a long period of years and held repeatedly that the power to operate such schools was, indeed, a power reserved to the States to exercise "without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

With the Supreme Court's decision aforesaid and recently approved acts of the General Assembly of Georgia, a question of contested powers has arisen: The Court asserts, for its part, that the States did, in fact, in 1868, prohibit unto themselves, by means of the 14th amendment, the power to maintain racially separate public schools, which power certain of the States have exercised daily for more than 80 years; the State of Georgia, for its part, asserts that it has never surrendered such power.

This declaration upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court itself to usurp the amendatory power that lies solely with not fewer than three-fourths of the States.

We in Georgia, mindful of the resolution by which we ratified the 11th amendment to the United States Constitution, and cognizant of similar resolutions adopted by other States, both North and South, again assert this fundamental principle: That whenever the Federal Government attempts the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for preserving the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them.

Failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clearly reserved powers would be construed as tacit consent to the surrender thereof; and such submissive acquiescence to palpable, deliberate, and dangerous encroachment upon one power would in the end lead to the surrender of all powers, and inevitably to the obliteration of the sovereignty of the States, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created.

In times past Georgia has remained silent—we have remained silent too long—against interpretations and constructions placed upon the Constitution which seemed to many citizens of Georgia palpable encroachments upon the reserved powers of the States and willful usurpation of powers never delegated to our Federal Government; we have watched with growing concern as the power delegated to the Congress to regulate commerce among the several States has been stretched into a power to control local enterprises remote from interstate commerce; we have witnessed with disquietude the advancing tendency to read into a power to lay taxes for the general welfare a power to confiscate the earnings of our people for purposes unrelated to the general welfare as we conceive it; we have been dismayed at judicial decrese permitting private property to be taken for uses that plainly are not public uses; we are disturbed at the effort now afoot to distort the power to provide for the common defense, by some Fabian alchemy, into a power to build local schoolhouses.

We in Georgia, as American citizens, anxiously concerned at this massive expansion of central authority, nevertheless, have reserved our right to interpose against the progress of these evils in the hope that time would ameliorate the transgressions; now, however, in a matter so gravely affecting this State's most vital public institutions, we can remain silent no longer. Recognizing, as the people of Georgia do, the prospect of incalculable harm to the public schools of this State and the disruption of the education of her children, we are in duty bound to interpose against these most serious consequences, and earnestly to challenge the usurped authority that would inflict them upon our citizens.

Therefore, we must invoke that Divine guidance impleaded by our people on July 4, 1776, when first they declared themselves a free and independent State, and appeal now to our sister States for that decision which only they are qualified under our mutual compact to make; and we respectfully request them to join us in making proper application for interposition.

We pledge our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably, legally, and constitutionally available to us to resist this illegal encroachment upon our sovereign powers, and to urge upon our sister States, whose authority over their own most cherished powers may next be imperiled, their prompt and deliberate efforts to check this and further encroachment by the Supreme Court, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of the States, and that all laws and the Constitution of the State of Georgia shall and do remain in full force and effect within the confines of this State.

Let us state in no uncertain terms that we shall not be bound by an unconstitutional act, decision, or decree of the Supreme Court.

Let us say in language that cannot be misunderstood that we swear allegiance to the Constitution of the United States of America, reaffirm our faith in it as the guardian and defender of our most sacred rights, and that we shall scrupulously obey its provisions, its orders, and its mandates.

Let us also clearly state that we respect and will obey all lawfully constituted decrees of all courts and that we reaffirm our abedience and allegiance to the principle that the Government of the United States of America is a government under law and not a government of men alone.

Let us clearly state that we in Georgia respect and will obey the Constitution and laws of the United States, but that we also expect to respect and obey the constitution and laws of the State of Georgia and demand for every other State the right to have its constitution and laws respected, as the constitution and laws of a sovereign and indestructable State as part of an indissoluble union under the Constitution of the United States.

And, finally, let us unmistakably state in language that cannot be misunderstood that we have always, do now and shall ever obey laws; but that we as part of a sovereign people in a sovereign State will never subject ourselves to nor will we obey men—even nine in number—however white the marble of the building which houses that once hallowed courtroom or however black their judicial robes or their pseudo-sociological hearts—so long as they disregard the Constitution, overthrow judicial precedents and admittedly base their decisions on the insane rantings of that Swedish Communist named Gunnar Myrdal.

Let us take renewed courage in our fight; let us be of even stouter hearts than before; let us move onward and forward to and for a greater Georgia, a stronger America, and a future even brighter than our glorious past.

Let us convince the people of all other States of the rightness of our position. Let us exhort them to put aside prejudices they

may hold against us because of geography, latitude, or ignorance.

Let us urge them all to join us in our desire and our efforts to preserve a constitutional government.

We know we are right. Your recent unanimous votes on bills designed to reaffirm our position is ample proof of that.

The people of the State of Georgia have placed confidence in you, their chosen representatives in this general assembly, as they have placed confidence in those of us who serve as Georgia Representatives in the Congress of the United States. The future of our State and the future of our Nation depend on the positive action which we must take in fulfilling our responsibilities, our duties, and the oath which each of us takes when we assume the elective office to which we have been chosen.

We shall not falter, and we shall not fail.

Cargo Preference for the American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, frequently in recent months it has been alleged that the cargo preference law, Public Law 664, has retarded the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. It will be recalled that the cargo preference or 50–50 law requires that at least 50 percent of Government financed or Government owned cargoes be transported by the American merchant marine.

Since, in my humble opinion, these suppositions are based on misinformation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Facts for Farmers and Other Americans," which I prepared for the November 1955 issue of the Forwarder magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS FOR FARMERS AND OTHER AMERICANS

(By Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland)

In many respects the last 2 years have brought encouragement to those of us who believe in an adequate American merchant marine. On the legislative side, we have seen the enactment of new laws to encourage shipbuilding and ship operation; on the administrative, the development of new designs and formulas to facilitate ship replacement. Within the industry, decisions have been made to replace many aging passenger vessels, and long-range building programs are being formulated. New operating techniques involving roll-on, roll-off vessels may revive the coastwise and intercoastal trades.

While all these signs of maritime progress quite properly gratify us, we would be imprudent to assume that our merchant marine has now been, or is about to be, extricated from its perennial problems and difficulties, and that we now have in prospect only clear sailing and prosperous trading. Several sobering facts must be kept in mind, as warnings and incentives to further effort. One is that, in spite of everything, these favorable developments have not arrested the shrinkage of the privately owned fleet, which now numbers 1,101 ships as against 1,255 just 24 months ago. A second, even more disturbing, is that the percentage of our foreign trade which moves in American-flag ships has also continued to decline. For March 1955, the latest month on which figures are available, it is 24.5 percent as against 29.3 percent for March 1953.

More serious than either of these is the very real threat of a major legislative attack on American shipping within the next few months; a blow which might well have disastrous consequences not only for the maritime industry but for the country as a whole. This is the danger that the continuous sniping at our 50–50 law by both native and foreign opposition may create misunderstandings of sufficient magnitude as to suggest crippling legislative revisions in the next session of Congress. This is an immediate threat. It demands immediate action.

To be effective, this action cannot be that of the few. It must be a united effort of every friend of American shipping, whether he draws his livelihood directly from the industry or not. It should, in fact, be the effort of every politically informed citizen, for on the outcome of this controversy depends a part of the security, and a part of the well-being, of each individual American.

Our efforts should, I believe, have three objectives: (1) To explain to American and foreign critics why this country needs a merchant marine and why the 50–50 law is essential to the fulfillment of that need; (2) to explain, especially to foreign maritime nations, why the law does not deserve the condemnation and denunciation which their shipping interests have so piously bestowed on it; (3) to explain to American agricultural interests exactly how the law works, and the manner in which they are being misled by this propaganda.

Under the first heading, it should scarcely be necessary, in the light of contemporary history, to assert the positive necessity of an American merchant marine. From the defense aspect, our failure to recognize that necessity in advance cost us approximately $20 billion in two world wars to provide makeshift tonnage at breakneck speed. It cost our allies (and present critics) countless lives and agonizing delays, because we lacked the ships to throw into the battle when they were needed.

From the commercial aspect, we need American ships on the sea routes, and American lines in the shipping conferences, in order among other things, to protect American importers and exporters (including farmers) against a deadly variety of economic missile. Commercial export markets are highly competitive, and the control of such markets can be manipulated by foreign dominance of the ocean freight structure in a manner which will automatically operate against any trading country which loses a voice in the forum where rates are set.

Fully as evident as the need for American-flag shipping is the fact that it cannot prosper unassisted in a world where shipping under every other flag operates at much less than half the cost which our wage and living standards entail. The Merchant Marine Act recognizes this disadvantage and the 50–50 law represents the indispensable minimum of Government assistance. A merchant marine cannot survive without cargo, and if our Government desires to have one, the least it can do is to assure that a reasonable proportion of its Government-generated business goes to support American vessels. In my opinion, cargo preference is the most practical method of extending such assistance.

Under my second heading, the primary tactic of the act's foreign opponents has been to condemn 50–50 as flag discrimination. When it is emphasized in reply that a careful line has been drawn between governmental and commercial cargoes and that the 50–50 rule applies only to the first class, the critics shift their ground and concede the general principle. However, they assert that the application of the rule to agricultural surplus disposal transactions, involving payments in foreign currency, infringes on the principle and invades the realm of bona fide commercial sales.

So weak is this argument that it must be taken as only a subterfuge for detaching what is at present a most substantial and lucrative segment of public cargo from the coverage of the 50–50 rule—after which the complete repeal of the law will be much easier to attain. Actually, the agricultural disposal transactions (under title I of Public Law 480) have almost none of the features of commercial sales. There is no prospect of profit involved, the object being to dispose of something which we ourselves cannot use but which can be of great benefit to other countries. The agreements of sale are between governments, not commercial traders. The surpluses sold were originally paid for by all American taxpayers, and are now disposed of for much less than cost. Finally, well over half of the foreign currency accepted in payment is loaned or given back to the purchasing country to be applied in economic improvement programs either for its own benefit or for that of a designated third nation. In other words, these sales are just as much a form of "foreign aid" as those involved in the original Marshall plan, except that a somewhat smaller percentage of the payment is returned to the purchasing nation forthwith.

However, this contention, transparent as it is, has been strenuously pressed in this country, and has been echoed by several agricultural organizations, along with other objections to the 50–50 law as applied to agricultural surpluses, all of them equally ill-grounded. Unfortunately, such arguments are just plausible enough to be convincing to people who have little direct contact with shipping and no knowledge of the actual administration of the 50–50 law to date. The following are some of the most serious of these charges, on which we must get the true facts to the American people, and particularly to American farmers:

(1) That application of the law is delaying the agricultural surplus disposal program. Available data indicate that, so far, the program is ahead of schedule. Two-thirds of the original 3-year authorization was committed under agreements signed during the first year. In fact, sales are going so well that the Congress, at its last session, was asked to increase the ceiling from $700 million to $1.5 billion. This was done.

(2) That the program will be obstructed by unavailability of American ships. This is impossible under the terms of the act itself, which makes the 50–50 rule applicable only to the extent that American-flag tonnage is available. So far, there is no shortage.

(3) That application of the law will increase the cost to the purchaser and thereby restrict the sale of agricultural surplus. This charge, also, is contradicted on the face of the act. Purchasing nations buy at world market prices. Our Government makes up any difference.

(4) That the financing of ocean freight which stems from the 50–50 rule will so increase the cost of the disposal programs as to reduce seriously the quantity of surplus which can be disposed of under the authorization. This contention rests initially on the false assumption that all ocean freight costs which are dollar financed stem from the 50–50 act. This is untrue. Actually, one-half of all of the ocean-freight costs incurred to date are the result of dollar financing undertaken as a condition of

sale completely independent of the 50–50 rule. Furthermore, on berth liners, which are expected to carry a substantial portion of the cargo, rates established by conference agreements are identical with those of foreign vessels plying the same routes. Hence, the only real difference in shipping costs arises from the differential between American tramp rates and the rates which would have been charged by their foreign competitors. The added cost resulting from this differential has amounted to about $2.15 million to date. This item of expense is therefore running at about 12 cents per dollar of ocean freight financed by the United States, and somewhat less than 1.5 cents per dollar of total program costs.

(5) That the 50–50 law forces farmers to subsidize the United States shipping industry. This is related to the foregoing costs which, it is claimed, are a subsidy of shipping by the farmer. How can this be true when the commodities involved in the disposal program are owned by the Government, not the farmers? Any cost involved is paid by the Government—i. e., all the taxpayers—not the farmers. Moreover, the legislation from which the surplus disposal sales originate is in a large measure foreign policy legislation. For example, the major portion of the local currency proceeds are disposed of in the mutual security program in furtherance of our foreign policy. It has always been the policy of our Government to have various segments of our economy, including ocean shipping, benefit where possible in the carrying out of such programs. To the extent a subsidy of American shipping is involved its costs are met by the public from Government funds.

Furthermore, any reduction in the total of sales which might be attributed to expenditures incurred by the 50–50 act could not take effect until the cost ceiling ($1.5 billion) established by Congress is about to be reached. Actually, because of certain revolving fund characteristics the ceiling of total sales may well exceed this amount by as much as 20 to 25 percent—the added financing coming from funds appropriated to other Government agencies. Thus, it is not only difficult to establish any point at which it might be claimed the total of sales would be affected by the cost of cargo preference but, even if established, the sales affected would be those stemming from other than agricultural appropriations.

As one of the principal users of ocean shipping—even though he is often not aware of his reliance upon it—the American farmer stands to lose as much as any other citizen by the loss or breakdown of our merchant marine. The foregoing facts must be made available to him, and soon, before he is led by skillfully disseminated misinformation into supporting legislation which could cause such loss or breakdown.

Birthday Tribute to Mrs. O. D. Cook, Veteran Oregon Union Organizer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, democracy can succeed only when devoted citizens work for good government. After all, it was Elihu Root, a great Secretary of State in President Teddy Roosevelt's Cabinet, who said that "politics is the practical exercise of self-government, and if we are to have self-government, somebody must be in politics."

In my community of Portland, Oreg., one of the most devoted and sincere citizens in politics and public life is Mrs. O. D. Cook, who, on January 21, 1956, celebrated her 76th birthday anniversary. She is a notable Oregonian.

Portland Central Labor Council, under its president, William H. Way, paid a deserved and merited tribute to this grand and stalwart crusader for democracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story and an editorial from the Oregon Labor Press of January 27, 1956, describing this event in honor of Mrs. O. D. Cook, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL—COUNCIL HONORS MRS. COOK WITH 76TH BIRTHDAY PARTY

A 76th birthday party for a grand young lady was the highlight of this week's Portland Central Labor Council meeting.

The guest of honor was Mrs. O. D. Cook, veteran union organizer and delegate from the Commercial Telegraphers' Union, who had celebrated her 76th birthday on January 21.

A standing ovation greeted Mrs. Cook when she was introduced by council president Bill Way. She was presented with dozens of letters, honoring her 53 years of service to the labor movement, from local unions and councils, from Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and from Congresswoman EDITH GREEN.

Vice president Glenn Blake, who had organized the birthday party, presented a handsome gift to Mrs. Cook (who is universally known as Cookie.)

Sam Kimeldorf, president of Cookie's own local union, presented her with a life membership in Commercial Telegraphers Local 92. It was the first life membership ever granted by the union Mrs. Cook helped to organize.

George Brown, executive secretary of the Oregon CIO Council, joined in the tribute.

Briefly, Mrs. Cook told of her career in the labor movement which began in 1903 when she joined the Telegraphers' Union in the deep South. She told of her early work as an AFL organizer in the South, of bitter strikes and terrorist strikebreaking, of her long personal friendship with Samuel Gompers, founder and president of the AFL, and of her last meeting with Gompers in Portland in 1923.

"I have gone through hell for this labor movement," she concluded, "but the bread I cast upon the waters has been returned to me tenfold."

The council's tribute ended with the delegates singing, "Happy birthday, dear Cookie, happy birthday to you!"

WE'LL THINK OF COOKIE WHEN TEMPTED TO COMPROMISE

Mrs. O. D. Cook celebrated her 76th birthday on Saturday, January 21, and 2 days later the Portland Central Labor Council had a birthday party in her honor. It was a great and heart-warming occasion.

Letters poured in from dozens of local unions, from Senators MORSE and NEUBERGER and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, praising Cookie for her 53 years of service to the labor movement.

All too briefly Cookie recalled some of the highlights of her union career which began when she joined the Telegraphers' Union in 1903. She told of her career as a union organizer in the Deep South in the years when bullets and starvation were the standard strikebreaking weapons—of her close personal friendship with Samuel Gompers, founder of the AFL—of the strikes, the organizing campaigns, the victories and defeats.

She concluded with these words: "The bread I cast upon the waters has been returned to me tenfold. My purpose in life is to serve the labor movement, and I'll do that until the day I die."

To us who are comparative newcomers to the labor movement Cookie's example of courage and devotion is valuable beyond all price.

When we are tempted to play it safe or to take the easy road of compromise with principle we hope we will have the courage and good sense to follow her example. There is no such word as "compromise" in Cookie's vocabulary.

She has made our labor movement a finer and stronger instrument for economic justice and social progress.

A Farm Program That Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE D. AIKEN
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Farm Program That Works," which appeared in the January 1956 issue of the New England Dairyman, reprinted from the Boston Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FARM PROGRAM THAT WORKS

Next month the price of milk to farmers serving the Boston market will take its most precipitate drop—about 2 cents a quart. In March, April, and May there will probably be other cuts, so that by May 1 the price will be 4 cents under the present. If all this is passed along to consumers, milk that now costs 26 cents a quart delivered, will fall to 22 cents.

This reduction conforms to a formula which takes into account costs of production, the buying power of consumers and the balance of supply and demand. It is an impartial, impersonal adjuster now well accepted by producers, dealers and consumers.

What stands out like the sun in the fog of our national farm problem is that here is a farm program that works.

There is an overproduction of milk today, and we are heading into the flush spring season of higher production. But we meet this, not by some expedient of subsidizing farmers at this excessive level of production, but by a built-in price incentive for a better balanced production.

In the next 5 months the farmers are going to suffer a 28-percent cut in the price of that part of their production sold for fresh fluid milk. This offsets price increases they have enjoyed since last summer, but it is still hard to take. Yet the farmers are willing to take it, just as the consumers took last year's price increases.

The result of this system is that we are getting enough milk without any unwieldy surplus. New England is nearly self-sufficient in dairy products. We used to import our cream from the West, but last year we had to bring cream in only in July and August.

Our farmers are not adding to the $7,700,000,000 mountain of CCC stored commodities. Yet they are making a living, and we are getting plenty of good milk.

What's wrong with that?

Statement by Association of Catholic Trade Unionists on Proposed Immigration Policy of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent statement dealing with our present immigration policies. The statement was prepared under the direction of Mr. Frank Andolina, national director of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists. Since its foundation in 1937, the association has rendered meritorious service in industrial areas, conducting labor schools, and providing assistance and advice to workers. Indicative of its dedication to a just social order is this fine statement dealing with a subject of concern to us all.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists and I as its national director would like to express our gratitude for the opportunity which this subcommittee has presented to us to put forth our views on the immigration policy of this Nation.

In order for you to realize the factors which prompt us to make a statement on this matter, allow me first to briefly describe the nature of our organization and the basis of our interest in this subject.

The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists is composed of Catholics who are members of various trade unions in this country interested in the promotion of just and sound ethical principles and the application of these principles to the social order. We have banded together, united in the understanding that matters affecting the social and economic realms are not divorced from the norms and standards of morality.

We have consistently struggled for the creation of a social order based on and cognizant of these norms. We seek in particular to apply them to the trade-union movement as a whole and the trade unions of which we are members.

To avoid any possible misconceptions, may I state explicitly that we do not seek for this reconstruction of the social order through the medium of so-called Catholic unions. Recognizing the pluralistic nature of American society, we rather attempt the accomplishment of our aims by the modification of existing institutions and the creation of new ones as the necessities of justice and charity for all men dictate.

Thus desiring to create a sound social order, firmly established upon the twin foundation stones of justice and charity for all, we are concerned with many aspects of such a social order. A part of this picture includes the capacity of this society to welcome newcomers to its ranks and integrate them effectively into its tradition, enriching both the newcomer's way of life and the established tradition as well. The effect of the newcomer's migration upon the society, the labor force, and productive capacity of the society and himself is a matter of vital national concern. The question of immigration policy has been of much interest to the association, not only because of the reasons cited above, but also for the very human reason that we are all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants ourselves.

Our position on the McCarran-Walter Act, which constitutes the present immigration policy of the United States, has been clearly and univocally stated on a number of occasions. We believe that this law is unjust in the assumptions upon which it is based, unsound as a matter of foreign policy, and unwise in its detrimental effects on American society and the American tradition.

Our objections to this law are primarily prompted by the national origins quota system which lies at the heart of the act. This type of a quota system has stood in sharp contradiction to the ideal of democracy and equality of opportunity for all men which has characterized much of American history. It was a scandal to the Nation when first introduced into our immigration acts during the 1920's and remains so to this very day.

The national origins quota system is blatantly discriminatory, even in theory. It rests upon the fallacious argument that some ethnic groups are inherently superior to others. Gross intolerance for the inhabitants of certain areas of the world is imbedded in the system by design. The only appropriate word to describe this theory is racism.

We firmly maintain that all men are created inherently equal. To assume the native supremacy of one race or one ethnic group is a direct blasphemy upon the goodness and intelligence of its Creator. Such an assumption of racial supremacy is an affront to our religious faith as well as our democratic heritage.

The workings of the national origins quota system in practice confirms our judgment against it in theory. We see here the flagrant mockery of our faith in the dignity of man. This is shown, for example, by an assignment of quotas which results in India's having the same quota as Iceland.

Coupled to this system which expresses the trust of the Nation in the worthiness of only those who reside in western Europe or the British Isles, we find an added insult given to the nations of the eastern half of the globe. This is created in the act through the medium of a provision covering the so-called Asian-Pacific triangle. Not only are the national quotas of the countries in this area as near a minimum as possible, but all those who are related by as little as half of their ancestry to residents of the "triangle" are forced to enter the United States through the quota of the nation within the "triangle" where that half of their ancestors resided. As if the quota system by itself was not restrictive enough, we find that the policy of "mortgaging" quotas embodied in the refugee legislation has completely barred the doors to this land for the people in many nations.

To further amplify our position on the national origins quota system, I would like to make reference to an editorial which appeared in the Labor Leader, the national organ of the association, on November 15, 1952. The editorial states in part:

"The present system of quotas is unjust, hypocritical, and wasteful.

"It is unjust because it does not meet the needs of all men. In the old Immigration Act, upon which the McCarran Act is modeled, Italy is given a quota of 5,000 immigrants a year, Great Britain had 65,000, and Germany 26,000. During the past 18 years, less than 44 percent of the quotas of the northern European countries have been utilized. In the meantime, millions of Italians were deprived of the opportunity of coming to America. Since the big quotas of Germany, Britain, and Ireland were not used, only about half the amount of people were admitted to the United States as could have been. This is a violation of justice.

"The McCarran Act is a two-headed hypocrisy. While one head tells the world our foreign policy of 'equality of all men,' the other head talks 'nordic supremacy.' We are discriminating against our allies on the basis of an arbitrary formula founded on the fanciful notion that the 1920 racial composition of American was supreme. These people desiring to immigrate ask one gift—American citizenship. McCarran says: 'No.' This is a violation of charity.

"It is uneconomical to refuse immigration. In a recent Department of Labor survey it was proven that the States with the highest number of immigrants had an average annual per capita income of about twice the income of the States with the smallest number of immigrants. This is a violation of man's reason."

Though the national origins quota system prompts our most basic objection to Public Law 414, it is by no means the only provision of the law that cries for revision. We may cite, for instance, the status of the naturalized citizen under this act. A sharp and unwarranted distinction in citizenship is established between the native-born and the naturalized citizen. The latter, whom we might add in many cases takes greater pride in his citizenship, is placed in constant jeopardy of losing that citizenship for reasons that may only be the result of human oversight.

An enumeration of all the other inequities of the McCarran-Walter law would be so lengthy as to preclude its inclusion here, though I trust that the witnesses before the committee will have pointed them out in detail.

Aside from this consideration of the basic violations of the Judeo-Christian precepts of justice and charity and of the traditional role of the United States as the haven of the oppressed which are embodied in the present immigration policy of this country, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not make mention of the necessity for a change in this policy in the immediate future.

First of all, a complete revision of the present policy and a reversal of many of its facets is called for, if only on the grounds of correcting the inequities of the existing act. Our duty to ourselves demands this change.

Moreover, our position as a bastion of freedom in the present world crisis also makes such a change mandatory. How can a nation command the respect of large and vitally important areas of the world, when she has so flagrantly expressed here discriminatory attitude toward their peoples? A national policy of intolerance and an assumed attitude of racial superiority is fundamentally inconsistent with our proud struggles against the twin totalitarianisms of communism and fascism.

Thirdly, we are discriminating against ourselves in our adoption of the present immigration law. In effect, we are depriving ourselves of the talents and cultural contributions of many peoples. It was through the importation of such talents in the past that has made possible our achievement as a Nation. To continue such a policy seems certain to lessen our potentiality for further accomplishments.

Having established the necessity of this change, the only question remaining is the direction which this change should take. The examination of this issue has been exhaustively undertaken by many groups and at this point I would merely wish to record the Association's endorsement of the recommendations contained in the report of the President's Commission on Immigration and Citizenship and as embodied in the bill presently before the Senate sponsored by Senator LEHMAN and a number of his colleagues (S. 1206).

I would point out that this bill strikes at the core of the injustices in the McCarran-Walter law by abolishing the national origins quota system and replaces it with a set of "preference groups" which would effectively aline our immigration policy with the goals and needs of this country. In addition, many of the other hardships of the

present policy have been corrected or substantially alleviated in this bill.

I would conclude by again expressing grave concern for the necessity of immediate change in the Nation's immigration policy. In conscience we owe it, not only to the rest of the world, but also to ourselves as well, to reassert our belief in the equality of all men and the bond of brotherhood that exists between them under the fatherhood of God. It is urgent that we undertake this task at once, preserving the tradition so assiduously developed by our immigrant forebears.

The Rhodes Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, so many false and misleading articles are published from time to time about the Rhodes Scholarships that it is a pleasure to read an editorial on the subject that is well ifnormed and fair. Mr. Speaker, Rhodes scholars differ in their political opinions just as any other group of citizens. It was a Rhodes scholar, Frank Holman, of Seattle, who, I believe, did more than anyone else to initiate the idea of the Bricker amendment. Other Rhodes scholars will take leading parts in opposing it. This is only one illustration of the absurdity of supposing, as some people have, that Rhodes scholars represent a bloc of opinion about public questions.

I am happy to append the following editorial from the Boston Herald of January 21 last, entitled "Rhodes' 2,633 Pass Test."

RHODES' 2,633 PASS TEST

The Rhodes scholarships are now entering their second half-century, an occasion to take stock.

The record is one a sensible person might have predicted in 1900. These scholars were bright boys, the scholarships were and are generous and Oxford was, and is, a great university.

The top achievements are achievements indeed: the Order of Merit, a share in a Nobel prize, peerages, knighthoods, membership in Supreme Courts of the Dominions and of the United States, and, especially in the Dominions, high political leadership. Even in the United States, however, the Rhodes scholarship has not proved the kiss of death in competitive politics. Witness Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas; our own Yankee Congressman, HALE, of Maine; and a number of others from Congressmen to mayors.

The general average is high. In law, in medicine, in journalism, in academic life, Rhodes scholars have attained distinction. Twenty-four are heads of institutions of higher learning. There are Anglican bishops, missionaries, foundation executives—naturally—poets, novlists, a sculptor, and even an officer of the FBI.

There are certainly failures among them. Still, the chances are that that seedy fellow who cadged a drink on you in a Paris bar was not the Rhodes scholar he claimed to be, nor even a Harvard man.

Statistically, the 2,633 Rhodes scholars from this country and the Dominions have clearly done better for themselves, and, one trusts, for the world, than any but the most carefully selected groups of promising lads anywhere.

So might a sensible commentator have predicted at the start of the scholarships. But in early 1900's there were, especially in the United States, many not very sensible commentators, and some are still apparently afraid that the Rhodes scholars are going to bring the British Hanoverian dynasty back to rule this country.

One thing is clear from the record: American Rhodes scholars have not become the kind of innocent, tweedy, lovers of things British it was fearfully predicted in 1900 they would turn out to be. Among so many there were, of course, a few snobs. Oxford sometimes went to the heads of young Americans, just as Harvard or Princeton sometimes goes to the heads of young men from west of the Alleghenies (Yale, of course, never does). But there were very few, and most of them got over it.

Organized plotters for undoing the work of the American Revolution the Rhodes scholars never were.

One is, indeed, a leading writer and lecturer in the cause of Union Now, union between the United States and the free peoples of the world, English-speaking or not. This may be the residue of truth that remains in the accusation that the American Rhodes scholars are not "100 percent Americans."

In spite of the insistence in Cecil Rhodes' will establishing the scholarships that his scholars be picked for character, potential leadership, and love of sports as well as for conventional, bookish scholarship, the fact is that American selection committees, especially after the first few years, have always put scholarship firmly first.

Now it is also a fact, regret it though we may, that in this century bright bookish American boys tend, as a group, toward Leftish nonconformity. They are not Communists, not for the most part perhaps even "Liberals" in the American sense. But they are likely to be internationalists, even New and Fair Dealers, and not good rock-ribbed Republican isolationists.

This must seem to most of us, however, well short of treasonous.

Personalities of Those Delivering "Friendly Letters"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, during this trying period in the world's history we should carefully consider the personalities of those delivering "friendly letters." The Pittsburgh Press of January 26 comments very forcibly on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSENGER OF PEACE?

The White House says Soviet Ambassador Zarubin delivered a "friendly letter" from Premier Bulganin to President Eisenhower on the general subject of peace.

Pending more information about the contents of that letter it may be appropriate to look at the messenger of this peace epistle—Zarubin.

If Hollywood were casting about for a big tough-looking muscle man in a gangster film, Zarubin would fill the bill. He not only looks the part but has had considerable experience in the shadier side of international life.

He was ambassador in Canada when the Soviet atomic spy ring operated there.

He was ambassador in Britain when the Fuchs atomic spy case was broken.

He has been identified by a Polish colonel who escaped the Katyn mass slaughter of Polish prisoners of war as an NKVD secret police general in charge of the prison camp where the victims were kept before being murdered.

An appropriate background for a messenger to deliver a Soviet "peace" message.

Communism and How To Combat It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a friend of mine who is very active in one of the great organizations of this country, the Knights of Pythias, has called my attention to a list of recommended reading on communism and how to combat it.

I ask unanimous consent to have a statement issued by the Knights of Pythias and the suggested reading list printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and reading list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME LODGE KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS,
Cincinnati, Ohio, September 30, 1954.

To: College and university presidents and librarians.

From: Order Knights of Pythias.

Subject: Recommended reading list on communism and how to combat it.

Colleges and universities have been criticized often for failure to provide good background reading and reference materials explaining and exposing the conspiracy and tactics of communism. Occasionally they have been unjustly criticized for their selections of materials to perform this function. In both instances they have found their inability to lend more assistance in this exposure and understanding of communism based on a lack of a reliable reference list of such books and pamphlets.

The Order Knights of Pythias takes pride in its long record of positive contributions to the building of a strong, self-reliant and God-fearing America. Herewith it offers another contribution toward keeping America strong through a comprehensive recommended reading list of books and pamphlets designed to expose the nature and tactics of communism.

The accompanying list of available books and pamphlets has been compiled for the Pythians by a board of stable and competent advisors convened by the All-American Conference to Combat Communism. This conference is composed of representatives of more than 50 large national organizations representing fraternal, veterans, religious, professional and business groups. Its comprehensive recommendations and activities are without bias or slant.

It is the hope of the Order Knights of Pythias that this list may prove to be an effective aid to universities and colleges in their search for reliable reading materials and may promote a greater interest and activity in the understanding of our common peril.

SUGGESTED READING LIST ON COMMUNISM AND HOW TO COMBAT IT

(Prepared under the auspices of the Order Knights of Pythias, Cincinnati, Ohio, in cooperation with the All-American Conference, to Combat Communism, Washington, D. C.)

BASIC

The Accused—(Weissberg), Simon & Schuster.

Brain Washing in Red China—(Hunter), Vanguard.

Eleven Years in Soviet Prison Camps—(Lipper), Henry Regnery.

Religion Behind the Iron Curtain—(Shuster), Macmillan.

Seeds of Treason—(DeToledano & Lasky), Funk & Wagnalls.

The Web of Subversion—(Burnham), John Day.

Witness—(Chambers), Random House.

1984—(Orwell), New Am. Lib. of World Lit. Paper binding.

1984—(Orwell), Harcourt Brace.

THEORY

The Appeals of Communism—(Almond), Princeton University Press.

Communism and Christ—(Lowry), Morehouse-Gorham. Paper binding.

The God That Failed—(Editor Crossman), Harper. Paper binding, Bantam Books.

Handbook on Propaganda for the Alert Citizen, Carlson-Foundation for Social Research.

I Believed—(Hyde), Putnam.

The Techniques of Communism—(Budenz), Regnery.

The Theory and Practice of Communism—(Hunt), Macmillan.

COMMUNISM—U. S. S. R.

Age of Terror—(Paul), Beacon Press.

Assassins at Large—(Dewar), Beacon Press.

Communist Guerrilla Warfare—(Dixon & Heilbrunn), Frederick A. Praeger.

Country of the Blind—(Counts & Lodge), Houghton Miffin.

El Campesino—Life and Death in Soviet Russia—(Gonzalez & Gorkin), Putnam.

Forced Labor in the Soviet Union—(Dallin & Nichoaevsky), Yale University Press.

How Russia Is Ruled—(Fainsod), Harvard University Press. Text Ed.

I Chose Freedom—(Kravchenko), Scribners.

I Spied for Stalin—(Marray), Wilfred Funk.

Imperial Communism—(Bouscaren), Public Affairs Press.

The Iron Curtain—(Gouzenko), Dutton.

Jews in the Soviet Satellites—(Meyer et al), Syracuse University Press.

Jews in the Soviet Union—(Schwartz), Syracuse University Press.

Lenin, a Biography—(Shub), Doubleday.

My Life in the Red Army—(Virski), Macmillan.

My Ringside Seat in Moscow—(Nyaradi), Crowell.

One Great Prison—(Fehling), Beacon Press.

One of Fifteen Million—(Prychodko), Little Brown.

Our Secret Allies—(Lyons), Little Brown.

The Real Soviet Russia—(Dallin) Yale University Press.

Russian Assignment (Stevens), Little Brown.

The Secret Front (Hoettl), Frederick A. Praeger.

The Secret History of Stalin's Crimes (Orlov), Random House.

Slave Labor in Russia (Free Trade Union Committee), AFL.

The Terror Machine (Klimov), Frederick A. Praeger.

Total Terror (Kalme), Appleton-Century-Crofts.

The Ultimate Weapon (Anisimov), Henry Regnery.

Under Two Dictators (Baber-Neuman), Dodd, Mead.

The Yalta Betrayal (Wittmer), the Caxton Printers (paperbound).

COMMUNISM—WORLD

Asia Aflame (Van der Vlugt), Devin-Adair.

Cockney Communist (Darke), John Day.

The Communist War on Religion (MacEoin), Devin-Adair.

Conquest by Terror (Stowe), Random House.

The Enemy Within (DeJaegher & Kuhn), Doubleday.

Formosa Beachhead (Fitch) Henry Regnery.

The Front Is Everywhere (Kintner), University of Oklahoma Press.

I Was Stalin's Prisoner (Vogeler), Harcourt Brace.

New Soviet Empire (Dallin), Yale University Press.

No Secret Is Safe (Tennien), Farrar, Strauss & Young.

The Reds Take a City (Riley & Schramm), Rutgers University Press.

Shanghai Conspiracy (Willoughby), Dutton.

Strategy for Survival (Kieffer), David McKay.

Total Empire (Walsh), Bruce.

Tragedy of the Baltic States (Swettenham), Frederick A. Praeger.

Verdict of Three Decades (Steinberg), Little Brown.

The Yenan Way (Ravines), Scribners.

Now I Can Tell (Huang), Morehouse.

COMMUNISM—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

America Faces World Communism (Bouscaren), Vantage Press.

Communism Versus the Negro (Nolan), Henry Regnery.

Communist Trail in America (Spolansky), Macmillan.

Containment or Liberation (Burnham), John Day.

The Cry Is Peace (Budenz), Henry Regnery.

Know Your Enemy (Mares), Banks Upshaw (paperbound, clothbound).

The Lattimore Story (Flynn), Devin-Adair.

Men Without Faces (Budenz), Harper.

Out of Bondage (Bentley), Devin-Adair.

Red Masquerade: Undercover for the FBI (Calomiris), Lippincott.

The Rosenberg Case, Fact and Fiction (Fineberg), Oceana Publications.

The Secret War for the A-Bomb (Evans), Henry Regnery.

Spies, Dupes, and Diplomats (DeToledano), Little Brown.

While You Slept (Flynn), Devin-Adair.

The Whole of Their Lives (Gitlow), Scribners.

SATIRE AND FICTION

Animal Farm (satire) (Orwell), Harcourt Brace.

The Case of Comrade Tulayev (novel), (Serge), Doubleday.

The Darby Trial (novel), (Pearce), Lippincott.

Darkness at Noon (essays), (Korstler), Macmillan.

The Devil's Advocate (novel) (Caldwell), Brown Publishers.

The Fall of a Titan (novel), (Gouzenko), W. W. Norton.

The Great Idea (novel) (Hazlitt), Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Neither Five Nor Three (novel), (MacInnes), Harcourt Brace.

When the Gods Are Silent (novel), (Soloviev), McKay.

ADVANCED

Century of Conflict (Possony), Henry Regnery.

Communism in Western Europe (Einaudi et al.), Cornell.

Communist Party in Action (Rossi), Yale University Press.

European Communism (Borkenau), Harper.

The Organizational Weapon (Selznick), McGraw Hill.

The Russian Revolution, 1917–21 (2 volumes) (Chamberlain), Macmillan.

Sociology and Psychology of Communism (Monnerot), Beacon Press.

PAMPHLETS, REPRINTS, AND BOOKLETS

Brief of Communism (American Bar Association), Ave Maria Press, Notre Dame, Ind.

The Challenge of Communism (Malik), (reprint), the Christian Century, Chicago, Room 1101, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

Communism, Where Do We Stand Today? United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington 6, D. C.

Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications (House Committee on Un-American Activities), Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. No. 82–2; H. rp. 137.

Let Freedom Ring, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Catalog No. S 1.71:67.

Program for Community Anti-Communist Action, United States Chamber of Commerce, Washington 6, D. C.

Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

The Shameful Years, 30 Years of Soviet Espionage in the United States, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. Catalog No. 82–2: H. rp. 1229.

Soviet Atomic Espionage, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. No. 82–2: H. rp. 137.

Soviet Imperialism Plunders Asia (AFL Free Trade Union Committee), Box 65, Radio City Station, New York, N. Y.

War and Peace (Malik), National Committee for Free Europe, 301 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

N. B.—The Government Printing Office, Washngton 25, D. C., will mail upon request a mimeographed price list of all publications relating to communism and subversive activities available for sale at that office.

Address by DeWitt Nelson, Director, California Department of Natural Resources, Before the National Conference on Water Resources Policy

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, DeWitt "Swede" Nelson is the director of the California Department of Natural Resources. He joined that department in 1944, after 20 years with the United States Forest Service in several national forests in California. He is a graduate forester and was named California State Forester in 1945. He has held his present position since September 1953. Mr. Nelson is president of the Society of American Foresters and a director of the American Forestry Association. At the

national conference on water resources policy in St. Louis, Mr. Nelson addressed several hundred of the Nation's water leaders on the subject of upstream water conservation. The following is the text of his address:

I live and work in a region of great extremes in topography, in soil, in temperature and in precipitation. As a result of these extremes we have areas of overabundance and areas of great deficiency in rainfall. These extremes range from the desert areas with as little as 2 inches of rain per year to the "rain forests" with more than 100 inches of annual precipitation. To make the problem still more complex most of our precipitation falls as rain or snow during the winter months followed by summers characterized by high temperatures and little or no precipitation.

To further emphasize these extremes, northern California and southern Oregon are only now digging out from under two floods, one of which was the worst on record, while southern California is still forced to irrigate its citrus groves, and the winter grain crops are being decimated by drought.

With three-fourths of our precipitation falling in the mountainous areas we are forced to impound and transport this seasonal runoff to areas of need for agricultural, industrial, and urban requirements. Even in those areas of high annual rainfall we experience months of local deficiency during the summer season.

Speaking for the Pacific Coastal States, our problem is not that of water shortage when the total available supply is considered; but rather the problem of retaining and distributing the surplus flow to meet the urgently needed requirements in all areas.

Accustomed as we are to the use of charts and graphs, I would like to sketch a brief mental picture of the feeder streams to a river system. I believe the feeder streams can be likened to the roots of a tree which furnish the food which builds the great trunk. As the roots of a tree spread out through the soil they create a feeder system comparable to the small tributary streams that reach out over the land, picking up the collection of raindrops where they first begin to accumulate. These accumulations are gathered together by the large roots and tributaries of the main channels, then to the trunk where great storage may be provided. The branches in turn may represent the canals distributing the water which causes the landscape to bloom and prosper. Seriously injure the roots of a tree and you endanger its very existence or reduce its productive capacity. Similarly, mistreatment of the headwaters and feeder tributaries of a river will be reflected in the nature and duration of water flow as well as the quality of water produced. Possibly the planners of this panel recognized that fact when they placed the upstream water conservation subject first on the list.

While I speak from the western point of view in dealing with upstream problems I believe the fundamental principles of upstream treatment and management are quite universally applicable, even though some of the techniques may be different. Every State has uplands that may be classified as wildlands on a relative basis. Most all States have some lands which are used for forest, forage, or woodland crops. A great number of the States are mountainous in varying degrees. Such areas perform valuable watershed functions and the resource management and land treatment problems are similar in many respects. Probably one of the major differences between the West and the rest of the country is our dependence on great water distribution systems for irrigation purposes. But here again I understand that other parts of the Nation are studying the application of irrigation to take the drought out of dry periods. With this new concept of water use in other areas it is possible that over the long pull we will all be following very similar practices.

As I visualize the problem of water conservation and use I view it as a total problem reaching from the headwaters to the points of use and consumption. The problem cannot be stratified between upstream and downstream; nor should it be considered by itself without regard to the proper conservation and use of the related resources of soil, forests, forage, and other watershed cover types.

There is an interdependence of all our resources and certainly there is a close relationship between the proper use and conservation of those resources and the stability of our total economy. Probably one of the most vulnerable links in this chain of interdependence is the relationship of the watershed to the production of this precious crop of water upon which we are so dependent.

The point I wish to emphasize is that no single resource can be properly treated and managed by itself, but that all of the related resources should be treated and managed as integral parts of the whole. In dealing with water problems this type of integrated resource management has not been given the level of consideration that it must ultimately receive. There are a few exceptions, of course, where given watersheds have been acquired and dedicated to the primary purpose of water production and yet one or more other resources have also been managed and used. An excellent example of this is that of the city of Seattle where timber cropping and water production are being successfully integrated on the city-owned watershed.

We speak of and are endeavoring to manage our wildland areas on a multiple-use basis. The intensity of this type of management varies greatly between the dominant uses to which the lands are put and the attitudes of the landowners. Since all lands receive their proportionate share of rainfall, I believe we can consider all lands as watershed lands. Therefore, the soil stability of all lands, together with their contribution to water conservation and water yield, is important to the whole. This is true of both the upstream and downstream areas and calls for the integrated management of all the resources and crops.

The problem of harmonizing all of these uses is no simple one because of the competition for the resources of timber, forage, wildlife, and recreation, and because of the complex land-ownership patterns. I believe that, if these resources are properly managed for their best yield and use, they will naturally contribute to the maximum production of high-quality water. In other words, if we manage all of the agricultural, range, and forest lands to the full capabilities of the soil, we will be meeting the responsibilities of watershed-resource management to a large degree.

Until recently our national and regional organized efforts have been directed primarily to the downstream water-development programs. These have been great and often spectacular projects of either single or multiple purpose nature. The need for these projects has been urgent and the ratios of benefit to cost have generally been large. Even in the face of such requirements and values there has been opposition to their development. It required courage and long-range vision to forge ahead on many of those projects which have since proven their worth. What would be the condition of southern California today were it not for the courage and vision of the men who, many years ago, made the Los Angeles metropolitan aqueduct a reality?

Today many of the upstream water-conservation programs and projects are going through that same process of evolution. Preceded by a few test cases in the form of "pilot projects," it was not until the 83d Congress, through Public Law 566, that the upstream watershed program received full recognition and statutory support with a modest appropriation for activation. Yet, in spite of the growing need for the conservation and development of all water on a nationwide basis there are those who do not support it. This is the first broad watershed program that integrates water conservation, flood prevention, and land treatment. It fills a broad gap between the major flood-control projects handled by the Corps of Army Engineers on the one hand and the small local projects which can be developed by individuals or small groups on the other hand.

The upstream program calls for coordinated and complete watershed planning, development, and conservation. It is the type of program that can be broken down to units of most any desirable size and as the individual units are finished they should ultimately encompass the upper watersheds of a complete river system. It is truly long range and it is doubtful if any of us here today will see the completion of any major river system's upstream program. But we can and will see a strong start on many river systems. Much of the water saved through this upstream program will be the cheapest available water for it will be local water for local use. The theory is that the water should be conserved and stored on the land on which it falls through small dams, channel improvement, land treatment, and local water controls.

However, in the West, this theory is far from being generally applicable because most of the precipitation falls in the headwaters which are not agricultural lands but which are forest, range, and recreational areas, often referred to as wild lands, and are in large part in public ownership. We must, therefore, look high into the hills, for it is here that the streams gather their volume and their velocity. Here is the place where we need proper resource management, small reservoirs, stream clearance, check dams, and the all-important forest-fire prevention and control. I call this last an all-important item and as an illustration I give the following example. In 1953 there was a 3,000-acre forest fire in the San Bernardino watershed mountains. The following winter we experienced only moderate rainfall. As a result, 750,000 cubic yards of silt had to be removed from the downstream water spreading grounds which are so vital to recharging the underground water supplies. This removal cost 15 cents per cubic yard. Another million cubic yards are hanging on the mountain slopes ready to be washed down with the next heavy rains. Protection from fire is a part of the land treatment program. In these watersheds above and beyond the local agricultural areas, financial help and leadership in resource management and land treatment will be required. In addition, there is need for more knowledge as to how our wild land watersheds should be managed. Therefore we have great need for research.

Here again we find the close relationship and interdependence between the lower and upper reaches of the watershed, whether we are dealing with a large or small watershed problem. There are a few outstanding examples where overall integration has proven successful. Such an example is to be found in the Muskingum Conservancy District of Ohio. In many areas the design, construction, and operation of the physical improvements will be much simpler than the design, application and operation of the resource management and land treatment methods to be applied to a complex landownership pattern in the rugged headwaters of our streams.

We talk about our basic resources of soil, water, forests, forage, and minerals. Of these, soil is the foundation from which all of our renewable natural resources are produced. Yet soil is one of our least stable resources because it can be depleted or lost so easily. Here again is an interdependence, for the crops produced from the soil depend upon the soil's productive capacity and at the same time the soil is held in place by the vegetative crops it produces.

The Small Watershed Act, Public Law 566, 83d Congress, is basically sound and provides a means by which the Federal Government may cooperate with local agencies in planning complete watershed treatment for flood prevention. As I previously stated, it bridges a gap betwen the small soil and water-conservation program for which assistance is provided by the Department of Agriculture and the large flood-control projects of the United States Corps of Engineers. It emphasizes land use and land treatment for water conservation to help take the peak off of large flood flows. In this respect it is companion with and supplemental to the major downstream projects. It is not anticipated that upstream watershed work will ever replace the major structures needed for downstream protection and multiple-purpose uses.

In speaking of the law I join with many who believe its provisions are too limited to properly meet the problems and to secure maximum values from investments that will be made within its authorization. In this regard I suggest (1) that the watershed limitation of 250 acres be liberalized and that the 5,000 acre-feet of water storage capacity behind a single structure be enlarged to possibly 10,000 acre-feet; (2) since water conservation implies water use and since conservation and use are both vital elements to a coordinated program, it is urged that Federal funds used for water storage in this flood prevention program be also applicable to water conservation and to water storage for irrigation. This would permit Federal cost sharing in water conservation, flood prevention and water use; and (3) the law requires that the benefits shall exceed the cost of the improvements. In evaluating projects it is required that current prices be used for construction costs but that long-range projected prices be used in evaluating all benefits in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Circular A–47. Long-range projected prices assume that average prices over the next 50 years will be about two-thirds of present prices. The result is that the present value of project benefits must be discounted about one-third and therefore many projects that appear highly desirable turn out to have unfavorable cost-benefit ratios. Certainly to be equitable and practicable both the cost and benefit figures should be based on the same evaluation standards.

Recently I talked with a man who has spent a lifetime in developing and distributing mountain water and managing a large water organization. I asked him what he considered important in the upstream water program. His reply was short but to the point. "(1) Build upstream reservoirs as rapidly as possible; (2) protect the watershed cover; and (3) maintain a balanced use of the resources in the headwaters so as to produce a full yield of high quality water." In those few words he summed up the interdependence between water, land and vegetative cover.

I believe it is also well to emphasize that no single type of program is sufficient unto itself. A completely integrated program will encompass both downstream and upstream projects. It is important that we proceed with both programs in an agressive manner, for each will complement the other and build for a stronger America.

The Canning Industry in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to point out that California has the most diverse type of agriculture in the Nation. Under the permit to include extraneous matter, I include a list of the members of the Canners League of California.

Also some answers and questions about canned foods.

Finally I include certain interesting facts about the canning industry in California under the heading "Did You Know?":

MEMBERS OF THE CANNERS LEAGUE OF CALIFORNIA

Aron Canning Co., F. M. Ball & Co., Beech-Nut Packing Co., F. E. Booth Co., Inc., California Packing Corp., Escalon Packers, Inc., Filice & Perrelli Canning Co., Inc., Flotill Products, Inc., Gerber Products Co., Golden Gate Products Co., Harter Packing Co., Hawaiian Pineapple Co., Ltd., H. J. Heinz Co., Hershel California Fruit Products Co., Inc., Hickmott Canning Co., Hollister Canning Co., G. W. Hume Co., Hunt Foods, Inc., Lake County Cannery, Inc., Libby, McNeill & Libby, Manteca Canning Co., Mor-Pak Preserving Corp., George Noroian Co., Planada Packers, Pratt-Low Preserving Co., Puccinelli Packing Co., Richmond-Chase Co., S and W Fine Foods, Inc., Santa Clara Packing Co., Schuckl & Co., Inc., Stanislaus Food Products Co., Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., Sun Garden Packing Co., Thornton Canning Co., Tri-Valley Packing Association, Turlock Cooperative Growers, United States Products Corp., Ltd., Walnut Creek Canning Co., Western California Canners, Inc., Wood Canning Co., F. G. Wool Packing Co.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ABOUT CANNED FOODS

1. What is canning?

Canning is a method of preserving food by heating; either just before or after it is sealed in air-tight containers.

2. Are foods grown especially for canning?

Yes. Canning crops that are especially adapted to canning are grown in the parts of the country best suited to their production.

3. Do canners use leftover marketing produce?

No. Produce for canning is especially grown for that purpose. Growing fruits and vegetables for the canning industry is a specialized branch of farming.

4. Why do canned foods keep?

Because sufficient heat is applied to sterilize the food, that is, to kill organisms, such as bacteria, yeasts, and molds, that would otherwise cause spoilage.

5. How do commercial canners know how long to heat the food?

Scientists have worked out the exact length of time that each food must be cooked to sterilize it.

6. Is anything added to make canned foods keep?

No. Heat is the only thing used to make canned foods keep.

7. Of what is a tin can made?

Tin cans are made of a sheet of steel completely covered with a thin layer of pure tin.

8. Why are gold-colored enamel-lined cans used for some foods?

Enamel-lined cans are highly desirable to retain an attractive appearance for some kinds of foods.

9. Is it safe to leave unused portions of canned foods in the can after it is opened?

It is perfectly safe to leave opened food in the can. The Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture, in a news release entitled "Oh, Sure! You Can Keep It in a Can," said: "It is just as safe to keep canned food in the can it comes in—if the can is cool and covered—as it is to empty the food into another container."

The important thing to remember in storing any unused portion of canned food is to put it in the refrigerator, just as any other cooked food is kept.

10. Does rust on the outside of a can harm the contents?

Not unless the rust is severe enough to make the can leak. Never use food from any can that leaks.

11. Do dents harm the contents of the can?

Not unless the dent causes the can to leak.

12. What effect has freezing on canned foods?

Except for a slight breakdown of texture of a few products, a single thawing and freezing does not usually affect canned foods adversely.

13. Where should canned foods be stored?

In a cool, dry place. Avoid storing near steam pipes or on shelves near a stove.

14. Are canned foods as nutritious as other cooked foods?

Yes. Scientific experiments have proved this is true.

15. Are the vitamins retained in canned foods?

Yes, vitamins are retained very well in commercially canned foods.

16. Is water added to all canned vegetables?

No. Tomatoes are canned in their own juice.

17. What is the liquid in a can of vegetables?

It is plain water, or water to which either salt or sugar is added.

18. Should the liquid on canned vegetables be used?

Yes, because it contains some of the nutritive value, minerals, vitamins, and flavor of the vegetable.

19. What is the liquid on canned fruits?

Usually it is a syrup of sugar and water. Sometimes fruits are canned unsweetened and, if so, it is stated on the label.

20. What are dietetic canned foods?

A number of different canned foods are being canned without the addition of salt or sugar. This provides foods that are palatable, economical, and easily prepared for persons who are on low-sodium diets, or are restricted to a low sugar allowance by their physicians.

21. Are canned foods ready to eat when they come from the can?

Yes, they are cooked foods and ready to eat just as they come from the can. Canned vegetables are generally mildly seasoned so they may be seasoned to suit individual taste. In addition, canned foods may be used in many different ways to make interesting dishes.

22. Should foods be heated in the can?

It is better to remove the food from the can before heating it. An unopened, or unpunctured can should never be heated except under water. Dry heat, as in an oven, or in the pan in which a can is being heated boils dry, may produce such pressure in a can as to cause it to burst. Sometimes on a camping trip or picnic it may be most convenient to heat the food in the can. If so, always open the top of the can before heating.

23. What information is always on all food labels?

The net weight or the volume of the contents, the name of the canner or distributor, and the name of the product appear on all labels.

24. Is there any other information on the label?

Yes, many labels describe the contents of the can, giving definite, practical information to help in buying, such as the variety of the product, the amount in the can by cupfuls, servings, or number of pieces; seasonings and sweetness of sirups.

25. Does the law protect the buyers of canned foods?

Yes, there are State and Federal laws to safeguard the wholesomeness of canned products.

DID YOU KNOW?

That the California canning industry packs over 3 billion cans of fruits and vegetables each year.

That this California production is about one-third of all the canned fruits and vegetables packed in the United States.

That over 85,000 workers are employed by the California fruit and vegetable canning industry at the peak of the canning season.

That this California industry uses more than 200 million pounds of sugar each season.

That the annual production of the California fruit and vegetable canning industry has an estimated retail value of about $675 million.

New Jersey Fights Cancer—The George E. Stringfellow Awards Are Part of the Ammunition

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, 10 years have passed since a statewide organized effort to fight cancer in New Jersey was started. The crusade, begun when the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society was chartered on December 26, 1945, has made great progress toward the day when cancer will be conquered.

One means of alerting New Jersey's more than 5 million residents to the dangers of cancer and educating them on steps they can take to lessen its threat in the future is the annual cancer editorial contest for the State's daily and weekly newspapers.

Winners of these contests are presented with the George E. Stringfellow Award. George E. Stringfellow, a longtime friend of mine, is senior vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc. A man who never hesitates to give his time to efforts that will help his community, his State, and his Nation, George E. Stringfellow was the first president and a founder of the New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society.

I think we Members of Congress will gain an impression of the effective work he is doing in the fight against cancer by taking time to read the George E. Stringfellow award-winning weekly and daily newspaper editorials for 1955.

The Blairstown Press won the 1955 award in the weekly competition. The editorial was written by Rita Fuller, wife of the paper's publisher, C. Raymond Fuller. Mrs. Fuller won the award for her husband's paper in 1954, too.

This is Mrs. Fuller's editorial:

ST. GEORGE AND YOU

Once upon a time, long, long ago and far, far away lived a monstrous dragon which terrified the countryside. Armies were sent forth to slay it, but still it menaced the city, belching fire and smoke. To save themselves, the townspeople daily tossed it a couple of sheep and, when the supply ran out, varied the beast's diet by sending one of their hapless fellows to keep him pacified. "Their lot spared no one," says the grim tale, "rich or poor, high or low, someone must each day be sacrificed."

Finally, the princess herself was drawn by lot and despite the king's offer of half his realm if she might be spared, the frightened people insisted that if they must die so must his daughter. As she stood weeping bitterly by the pond where the dragon lived, along came a Christian young man of noble bearing whose name was George and who had been told in a vision to go to the city to rescue the maiden in distress. Despite her pleading that he fly while still he could, George went boldly forward to meet the beast when it rose with a great bellowing from the waves. Raising his spear, he pierced its scaly neck and pinned it to the ground. Then, while the grateful people hailed him as their deliverer, he smote off the dragon's head with his sword.

Well, this is 1955 in America, the land not only of the free and the home of the brave, but also of the healthiest, wealthiest and happiest of people. Yet we, too, have our dragon. We, too, each day sacrifice to it some of our own whether they be rich or poor, child or oldster, high or low. No one is safe from this frightful beast who lives in our midst—his name is Cancer.

We suppose that every family calendar has its share of red letter days—birthdays, anniversaries, family reunions. Next Friday should be such a day for us, but it won't because the one whose birthday we would celebrate was senselessly, brutally murdered by the dragon, Cancer. She was a gentle person, this baker of cakes, drier of tears, grower of incredibly huge gladioli and sweetpeas—she was my mother. A great believer in birthdays, she would certainly have enjoyed her own, especially the grandchildren she never saw with their beribboned gifts and many candled birthday cake. It is a double tragedy, for those same grandchildren have been robbed of one of childhood's greatest blessings—a doting grandmother to love, spoil, and baby them.

Surely we do have a monster loose in our midst—but equally certain, we have a St. George in our scientists, day by day patiently trying, discarding, trying again the experiments that will some time lead to the total rout of the terrible disease that attacks impartially the mother or the child, the breadwinner or the town drunk.

But just as St. George needed his spear to capture the beast and his sword to slay it, so the scientist must have the tools to free us of our scourge. And that is where you come in, for the experiments cost money and even scientists must eat. Give as much as you possibly can during this month's cancer drive. And don't consider it charity. It may be your own life you are ransoming from the dragon.

ANOTHER WINNING EDITORIAL

The Paterson Evening News, published by Harry B. Haines and edited by Abe Green, won the 1955 George E. Stringfellow award for the best cancer editorial of the year in the New Jersey daily newspapers. The winning editorial, Cancer Workers Calling Tonight—Be Generous, was written by Editor Abe J. Green, who has been intensely interested and active in the fight against cancer for many years. He has won similar awards for the Paterson News in the past. Here is his editorial:

CANCER WORKERS CALLING TONIGHT—BE GENEROUS

Tonight is cancer night—in Paterson, Hawthorne, Little Falls, and West Paterson.

Between the hours of 7 and 9, workers will call at your home with proper credentials. They will be members of a vast army of volunteers, working in the cause of humanity.

Be good to these visitors, neighbors. Treat them as your very own. They are working for you, and you, and you.

This is one case where money may soon be buying your health, your very life. If not your own, at least of someone you love. The $24 million being raised in the country in 1955 to fight cancer is to provide for the vital research which soon may turn up the heaven-blessed cure to end this terrible scourge.

Do you realize that:

It is estimated 1 of 4 people in America will be visited by cancer in the future. That means 40 million people threatened by the shadow. Narrowed down to Paterson, it means 35,000 in a city of 140,000. Last year 20,000 men died of lung cancer in the Nation.

Polio has finally been cured, thanks to the valiant research of men like Dr. Jonas Salk. Thousands of equally dedicated and competent scientists are working around the clock to cure cancer.

This could be the year.

Your contributions helped to cure polio—your dollars can do the same for cancer.

It may be true, but it is true nonetheless—that the life you save may be your own.

Light up your porch tonight, between 7 and 9, and when the workers call at your home for contributions—be good to them in spirit and in generosity.

This could be the year.

It could also mean the life of someone you love.

Give generously to help attain the county goal of $70,000 and Paterson's goal of $30,000.

And if, perchance, the volunteers fail to call at your home, mail your contribution to Cancer, 625 Broadway, Paterson.

MOVED TO HELP

One can easily imagine how many New Jersey residents are moved to help in the fight againts cancer, by these editorials. It is not only the Paterson Evening News and the Blairstown Press that write these editorials; it is newspapers across the State. In other words, the award offered by George E. Stringfellow is acting like a catalyst and enlisting more and more people in our State in the fight against cancer. I am pleased with the opportunity to commend his effort here.

The New Jersey division of the American Cancer Society has a chapter in each of the State's 21 counties. Previous to its organization, the cancer crusade was carried on by a group of enthusiastic women known as the Field Army. From a membership of 4,000 volunteers, the volunteer service program of the division has grown until there are 19,075 volunteers in 1199 different units.

Keeping stride with the ever increasing number of cancer cases, the New Jersey division has set up a six-point medical program that has won a citation from the American Cancer Society. Ten years ago the medical committee of the divi-

sion approved 52 projects for the various county chapters. Last year 131 projects were approved. These projects include the purchase of deep X-ray therapy units and other equipment; the support of 46 clinics now being operated by hospitals with American Cancer Society help through grants-in-aid; medications, nursing service and home care for the State's cancer patients.

Assistance for the cancer patient has kept pace with the ever increasing number of cancer cases. Ten years ago, when the activities were started under State auspices, the establishment of clinics was a main object. Later many chapters organized motor corps and started loan closets. Nursing service was provided for patients on their return from hospitals, and about two years ago, home care was added. This has proven to be a boon especially in the cases of ill mothers and children.

An idea of the extent to which this program has grown is evidenced from the fact that during the last 12 month fiscal period, 3956 patients received dressings; 1819, articles from loan closets; 1383, home care, and 578 transportation. The approximate money spent in the service program during this time was $43,080.

In fund-raising the New Jersey division has been one of the top leaders in the country. In 1946 the residents of the State contributed $716,904. In 1955 they gave $1,050,202, the first time the State reached the million dollar mark.

Alerting the public to the dangers of cancer is carried on through the cooperation of newspapers, as was shown above, through radio, television and other like media. It is carried on by means of exhibits at conventions and county and State fairs, and through films, both for lay and professional groups. Chapters in 15 counties maintain information centers and a mobile cancer information unit is taken to communities throughout the State. Millions of pieces of literature are distributed and hundreds of meetings are held yearly for many industrial, civic and other groups. I feel that everyone in New Jersey can be thankful for the fine work its citizens are doing to help them in this crusade.

Social Security Amendments of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT before the Senate Finance Committee on January 26, 1956, in support of H. R. 7225:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES ROOSEVELT BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, JANUARY 26, 1956

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, may I express my deep appreciation to you for the privilege of being here and the opportunity of joining my remarks with those other Members of Congress in support of H. R. 7225. It is my firm conviction that this bill contains most needed amendments to the Federal Social Security Act.

The strong public opinion behind H. R. 7225 was evident when on July 18, 1955, the House gave the bill its approval by 372 votes for and only 31 votes against it.

The proposed legislation corrects many inequities and brings many of the benefits to a more nearly up-to-date status. Amongst these are:

1. Disability insuranc benefits to be provided at age 50 and over for workers who can meet certain coverage requirements. It is estimated that this will affect about 250,000 persons in the first year.

2. The age of eligibility for all women beneficiaries—widows, wives, and women workers—will be lowered from 65 to 62. It is estimated that in the first year these benefits would be paid to almost 800,000 additional women. If I have any regret on this provision it is that the age could not be lowered to 60 and also be applied equally to men. Reluctantly, it is seemingly necessary to accept the fact that these additional and worthy changes are not financially feasible at this time.

3. Disabled children who are disabled before they are age 18 would continue to receive benefits after age 18. It is estimated that eventually 5,000 children and their mothers will receive benefits.

4. Coverage would be extended to lawyers, dentists, osteopaths, veterinarians, chiropractors, naturopaths, optometrists, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Home Loan Bank employees, and gun naval store employees. It also clarifies present law dealing with self-employed sharecroppers.

5. Provides that at least 2 years before social-security taxes are scheduled to increase, an Advisory Council would be appointed by the Secretary of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department to take a look at the system, the benefits and income, and make recommendations on these items.

6. These new benefits and coverage provisions are not made irresponsibly from a fiscal point of view, for the bill makes provision that they be paid for by a tax increase of one-half percent on both the employer and employee—a total of 1 percent, plus a three-fourths percent tax on self-employed persons.

Considering the times, the economy and the needs of the people of this country, the amendments as contained in H. R. 7225 are long overdue. I have read some criticism that these changes were rushed through without due consideration. You gentlemen know much better than I do that most of these amendments have been reviewed and deeply considered at least over the last 10 years.

As long ago as the Eightieth Congress the Advisory Council appointed by the Senate recommended disability insurance payments by a vote of 15 to 2 and unanimously recommended that the eligibility age for women be lowered not to 62 but to 60 years.

What right thinking person can argue against extending coverage to disabled children over 18 whose deceased parents helped to pay for such coverage or that benefits continue to be withheld from workers disabled at age 50?

Understanding the problem that women over 35 years of age have today, in seeking employment, how can anyone deny them old-age and survivors benefits at age 62?

H. R. 7225 seeks to embrace under social-security coverage certain professional people not now covered, thereby assuring them of a small measure of security in their old age. The vast majority of the professional people affected have indicated their earnest desire that they be included in this coverage.

But, gentlemen, much as I am in favor of the provisions of H. R. 7225, I earnestly and deeply hope that the Members of the Senate and that this committee will realize that it only does half the job, that it leaves undone much which not only needs to be done but should have been done many years ago. I have brought most of these features which pertain to title 1 of the Social Security Act, in contrast to the fact that H. R. 7225 is wholly devoted to title 2, into the bill which I introduced late in the last session. It is numbered H. R. 7848. I, therefore, respectfully urge that the members of this committee turn an eye toward amending the provisions contained in H. R. 7225 but add these suggested amendments to title 1 of the Social Security Act. In general, my suggestions would amend the public assistance provisions to provide increased income, eliminate certain inequities and restrictions, and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds.

It would appear fair and just that the Congress establish a single standard of qualification for the applicants and recipients—thereby creating a more uniform administration of the Public Assistance Act throughout the Nation.

In the event that old-age and survivors insurance benefits are lowered to age 62 for women, it follows that the public assistance section of the act should likewise be lowered to age 62 for women applicants and recipients. My bill provides for that.

It is generally found that the survivors and old-age benefits payments are so low—especially among women—that to exist they must apply for public assistance to augment their income. Surveys made of those on public assistance in the various States all reveal a far greater percentage of women recipients than men.

While director of the Department of Social Welfare of the State of California, Charles D. Schottland, now Federal Social Security Administrator, made a study on the social and economic characteristics of old-age assistance recipients and issued a report in March 1954. His report showed that almost two-thirds of the case load consisted of women, and that the dependency rate for women is 1½ times greater than that of men.

It was found that three-fifths of the women on aid were widows, whereas one-fourth of the men were widowers.

The substantially higher dependency rates for women derive from many factors. Among the most important are the following: (1) Women have traditionally assumed a more dependent economic role in our society, concentrating on home management rather than outside employments. (2) Because of limited employability, they require public assistance at an earlier age. This is confirmed by the fact that there is a larger concentration of women at the younger age levels of 65 years.

We are all aware, I am sure, of the great increase in the cost of living and this applies not only to the well-to-do but perhaps in even greater degree to those who are forced to seek public assistance. I would, therefore, suggest that the ceiling on the matching of Federal funds to the States, which is now restricted to $55 a month, offering the States little incentive to provide properly for their needy, be raised. That Congress must encourage the States to grant the needy enough to meet the increased cost of living and to bring about a more realistic and uniform standard of payment is made obvious when we look at the December 1955 social security bulletin, issued by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and study the amounts paid during the month of September to those on public assistance.

Two million five hundred fifty-two thousand five hundred ninety-six recipients of old-age assistance received a nationwide average of only $52.50. The average payments per month in the individual States

ranged from $86.57 a month paid by Connecticut down to $27.70 paid in West Virginia.

One hundred and four thousand two hundred and fifty-six recipients of aid to the blind received a nationwide average of only $57.03 per month. The average payments in the individual States ranged from $93.26 a month paid by Connecticut down to $31.94 paid in West Virginia.

Two hundred and forty thousand eight hundred and seventy-seven recipients of aid to the permanently and totally disabled received a nationwide average of only $55.23 per month. Connecticut paid $114.07, and the States ranged down to a payment of $24.59 in Mississippi.

Two million one hundred and ninety-one thousand three hundred recipients of aid to dependent childaren, including 1 adult relative, received a nationwide average of only $24.12 per month. The average payments in the individual States ranged from $43.13 a month paid by Connecticut to $7.44 paid in Mississippi.

Public demand has compelled many States to pay their aged, blind, and physically handicapped more than the $55 a month. The Federal Government will not pay more than a total of $35 toward a recipient to whom the State is paying $55 a month or more.

This same unrealistic approach is practiced in the aid to dependent children were the Federal Government will not pay more than a total of $19.50 to 1 needy child and adult where the State is paying the maximum monthly allowance.

In order that it may be clear what the formula which I have included in H. R. 7848 would mean to the Federal Government in its contribution to the individual States, I include the following examples of Federal contributions on the varying State payments to the aged, blind, physically handicapped, and in aid to dependent children:

State	Per capita income, 1954, percent of United States	Present law, October 1955		State's share under H. R. 7848 if benefit not changed	Average benefit under H. R. 7848 if State continues present benefit pay	State percent of contribution benefits above $25 but below $100 (H. R. 7848)
		Average aged aid	State's share			
Louisiana	74	$51.15	$18.07	$14.68	$60.32	37
Colorado	95	92.73	57.73	37.17	96.28	47.5
Delaware	134	42.88	13.94	13.94	42.88	50
Georgia	70	37.97	11.48	9.54	43.51	35
Oklahoma	83	61.87	26.87	20.30	69.41	41.5
Utah	84	59.83	24.83	19.63	66.45	42
Virginia	84	30.37	7.68	7.26	31.38	42
California	122	70.20	35.29	27.60	85.40	50

May I now point out a few of the greatest injustices that now exist in title 1 of the Social Security Act.

An aged or handicapped recipient, under present laws imposed by Congress, is sentenced to idleness and prohibited from earning even the smallest amount under the threat of having such earnings deducted from their aid payment.

Under H. R. 7848, the aged and handicapped would be allowed to earn up to $50 per month. This privilege already is granted by Congress to the blind.

Children, especially of school age, should be encouraged to better their lot, instead of being forced into idleness because of the Federal provision that all "outside income and earnings" be deducted from the amount of aid granted them.

My bill would permit needy children to earn up to $30 per month to supplement their assistance and encourage self-reliance.

A floor under the ownership of real and personal property would be established and a provision that there be no imposition of a lien on such a home as a condition to receiving aid.

Some years ago, the Federal Social Security Agency adopted the following policy: "Compulsory transfer of control of property in order to qualify for assistance violates cardinal principle on which the Social Security Act is based—that needy persons should not be differentiated by reason of their need and that recipients of assistance have the same right of self-determination by reason of their need in the use of their resources as others in the community."

H. R. 7848 eliminates practices whereby the public assistance laws of certain States are used to enforce collections from recipients' relatives.

Again, some years ago, the Social Security Agency recommended the elimination of these clauses from State welfare codes in a statement, which read in part as follows:

"We recommend that provisions conditioning eligibility for assistance on the ability of relatives to support the applicant be eliminated from public assistance laws.

"The assistance laws in many States provide not only that assistance received from relatives shall be taken into account in determining an applicant's need, but also that the existence of relatives considered able to support shall make an applicant ineligible for aid.

"In some instances it may be known that the relative is actually not contributing to the support of the applicant and yet, because of the State law, assistance must be denied. * * *

The income and resources of an applicant that are considered in determining need should be actual and not merely potential.

"The general support laws of the States provide the means of enforcing support from relatives if the individual or State wishes to take such action. The public assistance laws should not be used as a means of enforcing the support laws of the States."

Lastly, I would add a few features which may seem minor but which are of the greatest importance to those involved: That the needy need not be penalized because of marriage; persons receiving aid shall not be deemed paupers or their names published for the purpose of shaming them off the rolls; that the program be administered in each State to insure uniform treatment in all of its political subdivisions.

Now the inevitable question arises: "How do we pay for these improvements?"

It is, I hope, well known and recognized that payments under title 2 are secured by the levying of taxes paid directly into the Social Security fund. Benefits under title 1 have always been paid from general revenues and appropriations. I do not propose that further taxes be levied or that any different system be adopted. It would seem more equtiable to continue paying such additional costs as will be necessitated from general revenue. Concretely, it would seem to me that, if we are going to be successful in defeating communism and in making democracy an example of the best system of government to provide for the just and proper needs of people, we first need to pay attention to our problems here at home. I am a strong supporter of economic aid to our allies and potential friends but I also firmly believe that we can cut down in the waste of our military expenditures and that, if necessary, we should curtail the amount of our billions that we are planning to spend abroad to the extent that it is necessary to do so in order to pay for these improvements here at home. At worst, it will be a small percentage of the money we are willing to spend for economic aid abroad. Certainly, our own most needy citizens have a prior claim.

In my opinion and that of many others, improvements in the Public Assistance Section of the Federal Social Security Act have been shamefully neglected. The laws of no two States are alike. Congress has the responsibility to correct this and to make our public assistance laws uniform throughout the Nation.

I respectfully urge that the members of the committee not only adopt H. R. 7225, but also amend into it the features of H. R. 7848, and give our needy aged, blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children their right to human dignity.

Thank you.

The Altoona (Pa.) Tribune Reached the 100th Milestone in the Field of Journalism January 3, 1956

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the centennial edition of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune, issued January 12, 1956, presented a nostalgic review of world-shattering events that transpired during the past century.

Through a series of reprinted articles and photographs, the reader enjoyed not only a refresher course in American and world history but likewise a chronological review of the transformation of the Altoona area in 1849 from its pastoral setting into a thriving industrial section of Pennsylvania which takes pardonable pride in the fact that it is the site of the famous Horseshoe Curve on the Pennsylvania Railroad and the home of the largest railroad shops in the world.

The Pennsylvania Railroad was only 3 years old when in 1849 it purchased farmland in Blair County, Pa., and began the erection of the railroad shops and yards which were destined to transform Altoona into an important railroad center of the Pennsylvania Railroad system.

The Altoona Tribune over the span of a century has recorded the growth and development of the Pennsylvania Railroad and other industries in the Altoona area with the result that today in the American tradition of free enterprise Altoona is a bustling city of diversified industries.

Pictures of locomotives and the railroad yards before the turn of the century, as shown in the centennial edition of the Altoona Tribune, are graphic illustrations of America's marked progress in the field of science and invention.

For example, there are reproduced early pictures of the American "Iron Horse" while another page carries an advertisement by the Pioneer Fast Line

organized in 1837 to provide transportation facilities.

The advertisement promised fast service of 3½ days between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, adding that the journey was made possible "by railroad cars, canal pockets, and steamboats carrying the United States mail."

Depicting the American scene at the national level, the Altoona Tribune reported the war clouds gathering over the Nation as the threat of a civil war became imminent.

When Fort Sumter was fired upon, war became a stark reality and there followed the sequence of events of that fratricidal blood-bath that divided a nation.

Among these events was the famous conference of the Civil War Governors held in the swanky Logan House, Altoona, Pa., which at that time was one of the Nation's finest hotels. This conference is regarded by many historians as the turning point in the Civil War.

The famous Gettysburg Address was printed in the Altoona Tribune in regular fashion and with no idea that it was destined to become an historic and immortal masterpiece of thought and diction.

In addition to the surrender of General Lee, there was recorded the horrifying account of the assassination of the beloved Abraham Lincoln.

The chronology of historic events at home and abroad proceed with the Altoona Tribune's reporting of President McKinley's proclamation and the entrance of the United States into the War With Spain.

The 20th century approached and brought with it the continued growth and expansion of the United States and also depressing events such as World War I and World War II, the Korean conflict, and the global struggle to control the minds of men made necessary by the ruthless tactics of Soviet Russia in seeking dominance over all mankind.

The panoramic view by picture and the printed word encompasses the horse and buggy area to the present atomic age, thus revealing the important role played by the Altoona Tribune, as a disseminator of news in the 100 years of its existence.

In addition, the nostalgic review in the centennial edition of events of the last 100 years is a lesson in capsule form of America's joys and tribulations experienced by the young republic on the road to maturity and to the exalted position of the greatest nation on the face of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, to trace the history of Altoona's popular morning newspaper, I should like, at this point, to include in my remarks the following article that appeared in the centennial edition of the Altoona Tribune on January 12, 1956, and an accompanying editorial entitled "The Tribune Looks Forward" from the pen of its erudite and versatile editor, Mr. Robert W. Boyer, whose timely editorials have won wide acclaim for clarity and cogency in appealing for a dynamic brand of Americanism:

FIRST TRIBUNE PUBLISHED ON JANUARY 3, 1856—ALTOONA HAS BEEN BIG NEWS TO THE TRIBUNE FOR 100 YEARS

The Altoona Tribune has been a familiar name in Altoona and Blair County for 100 years, this month.

Journalism still was in its infancy when the Tribune first began operations January 3, 1856. The date of formal incorporation is listed as January 1, 1856.

Thus, the Altoona Tribune has seen, and reported, some of the most eventful times of world history, and, certainly, it has reported all of the story of the growth of our own community.

But, in looking back through our files, only a few of which remain from this early period, we found that many of the great events of our Nation had not yet found a dramatic spot in history, and were treated as very prosaic news.

The report of President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation was published on an inside page, and for example, nowhere does that familiar title appear in the wording.

The meeting of the loyal war governors here at the Logan House is regarded as a turning point in the Civil War. Imagine how we should treat such an event in our news columns today.

But, this simple item appears in the columns of the Tribune, Thursday, September 25, 1862:

"Meeting of Governors."

"On Wednesday, last, the Governors of all the loyal States with the exception of the Governor of Minnesota, who was detained by Indian difficulties, and Governor Morgan, of New York, were present either in person or by proxy. Their sessions were secret and although a number of reporters have given sketches of their proceedings, we are inclined to the thought that there was considerable guesswork about the reports. The convention adjourned to meet again in Washington City, and the Governors have gone thither."

NO BIG HEADLINES

The day of headlines had not yet been ushered in by Willam Rendolph Hearst, and the story of the Civil War appears in The Tribune in a series of brief, sketchy dispatches, seldom with anything more than a small, one-line heading.

This, of course, was in the day of slow communications. The telegraph had come into general use only shortly before the Tribune saw the light of day, and its service was limited, and often interrupted by broken lines.

There were no telephones, and even the mails were slow and irregular.

Through all this, the Tribune carried on, endeavoring by such means as were available to keep the people of the community informed.

The development of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. here was reported steadily through the years; the industrial expansion of the city, the annexations, the social and cultural growth, and, among the most vital news to our people, the reporting of their own doings, their meetings, their accidents and tragedies, their marriages, births and deaths.

The first newspaper in Blair County was The Altoona Register published for a short time by William H. and J. A. Snyder in the spring of 1855. After its suspension it was succeeded by The Tribune, Jan. 1, 1856, McCrum & Allison, proprietors.

On May 1, 1858, William M. Allison of the Altoona Tribune disposed of his interest to H. C. Dern. On July 19, 1875, the interest of Ephriam B. McCrum passed into the hands of Hugh Pitcairn who for many years conducted the paper with Mr. Dern.

An April 14, 1873, McCrum and Dern began the Daily Tribune. The firm of Dern-Pitcairn took over January 28, 1878, continuing until Mr. Dern's death in 1905. At that time the company was reorganized as the "Altoona Tribune" with Dr. Pitcairn as president, Henry C. Dern as treasurer, and Alonzo D. Houck as general manager.

Col. Henry Shoemaker purchased the Tribune and became president and publisher November 12, 1912. Hr. Houck retired as general manager and became first vice president upon the retirement of Enos M. Jones in 1916.

MERGER

In January of 1920 the Altoona Times merged with the Tribune. Colonel Shoemaker continued as president with Bert Leopold as vice president. A. D. Houck became vice president and general manager of the job printing plant with A. M. Whitaker general manager of the newspaper. Charles K. Kelley who had been editor of the Times retired. W. H. Schwartz, editor of the Tribune, continued in that post.

Colonel Shoemaker purchased the Times interest in January of 1921.

Adam J. Greer was editor of the Tribune for a number of years in the early days of publication. He was succeeded February 1, 1881, by Wesley H. Schwartz, native of Williamsburg, who resigned as editor in 1922 to be succeeded by A. O. Vorse, J. V. Taylor, J. Herbert Walker, Henry T. Baldwin, Thomas C. Langdon, Robert O. Price, and James F. Brantinger who preceded Robert W. Boyer, present managing editor.

OTHER OFFICIALS

Other Tribune officials since 1923 have included Parson H. Crawford, advertising manager; Herbert D. Brauff, business manager; B. I. Levine, advertising manager; and Robert Keys, advertising manager. First directors of the organization headed by Colonel Shoemaker were Enos H. Jones, John D. Meyer, J. C. Quiggle, J. H. Chatham, Joseph Arbuckle, and William F. Gable. Prior to the purchase of the Tribune by Shoemaker, E. Warren Everhart was city editor for many years and William W. Witherow was circulation manager a long time. John Kelly was city editor before being called into the service several years ago, and is now stationed in Germany. Joseph Berger served as city editor several years before accepting a position with the State Department at Washington, D. C.

Several years ago Colonel Shoemaker sold his interest in the Altoona Tribune. Col. Theodore Carter is now owner. A. B. Crane is now vice president and publisher; and Joseph A. Faul is general manager; John P. Nardella, business manager. Leo P. Carroll is advertising manager; Bernard Krauth, head of circulation; Robert W. Boyer, managing editor; and Donald N. D'Elia, city editor.

Close to the time of the Spanish-American War the Tribune proprietors erected a neat and substantial three-story brick building especially designed as a printing house between 11th and 12th Avenues, fronting 32 feet on 12th Street, with a depth of 60 feet. This edifice is still in use.

THE TRIBUNE LOOKS FORWARD

(By Robert W. Boyer)

As we look backward across the years during which the Altoona Tribune has served Altoona, and all of Blair County, we become conscious, humbly so, of a oneness, a perfect unity, which exists, and has existed for all the long years of its life, between the Tribune and the community of which it is so vital a daily part.

For a full century, this month, the Tribune has served as a voice of the city. Sometimes it has been raised in exhortation, sometimes in denunciation, but, by the records, always on behalf of the city, always defending, ad-

vising, suggesting, striving always for a better city, a more informed people.

A century is a long time to serve a community. The very thought of the past, dwindling faintly into the depths of the distant years, and of the men and women, the brilliant and the able, and the mediocre who have worked here, who have kept finger to pulse while the community lived its daily life, leaves us humbly casting about for a way to express our own feelings as we mark this 100th anniversary.

There is so much to say to sum up a hundred years. What can we say? Shall we become dull and dreary with figures? Shall we belabor the columns, and the reader, with pile upon pile of statistics?

No. A century of recording the life of a community is more than a stack of statistics, more than dusty columns recounting the chronological events, people and dates, in every local organization and group through the years.

We were astounded to read an editorial in a paper of 1866 advising the people of Altoona that someday they would need more different types of industries.

The Tribune urged diversification of industry at the very beginning of the industrial age.

And so, we are not looking forward with the vain regrets of old men who lament the passing years, and to whom only the old days were good.

We do not delve into the ancient records to bewail the past, nor to shed tears for a day that is no more. But, to pull aside the curtain of time and glance backward momentarily can serve to give us a deeper appreciation of today, and of the life's struggle of the many who have gone faithfully through their daily tasks, and, step by step and year by year, built a better world, a better Nation, and a better city.

There are many things to be learned in a hundred years, whether it is a man or a newspaper which has lived them.

And only a very amateur philosopher is required to see that the wisdom of the years point toward a better tomorrow.

That is the thought and the urge which drive men and communities forward.

It is the future that counts. For the future is the very stuff of life itself.

One can go adventuring through the files of the Tribune, and through its pages of history, and one can look with interest backward through the years, and see the tiny village of Altoona, and its mud streets, and hear the lonely wail of a locomotive's whistle coming up the valley, heading bravely toward the ramparts of the mountains, and the newly opened West beyond, but, at the threshold of another century of service, the Tribune and all who now comprise its personnel, look forward to the future with zest, proud of an ancient masthead, but interested only in tomorrow, for, our past is now history.

Mr. Speaker, the worth of any institution to the community, State, and Nation is measured by its record of service in the common good. In this respect the Altoona Tribune has earned its laurels in the field of journalism as evidenced by the warm messages of congratulations that flooded its editorial offices the week of January 3, 1956.

These expressions of widespread commendation came from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, United States Senator Edward Martin, United States Senator James H. Duff, Gov. George Leader, State Senator Charles R. Mallery, State Assemblymen Charles A. Auker, Daniel H. Erb, Harold G. Miller, and Mayor Robert W. Anthony, of Altoona, along with scores of congratulatory messages from other business, industrial, church, and civic leaders throughout Pennsylvania and the Nation.

It was highly pleasing to me to be able to join in extending centenary congratulations in my capacity as Representative in Congress of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which is comprised of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, because I belong to the Tribune alumni, having been employed in the folding room and also as a newsboy delivering Altoona's popular morning newspaper while a grade student in the Altoona schools.

I have many pleasant memories of my boyhood employment with the Altoona Tribune and feel that the training I received there in my early youth proved helpful to me in developing into manhood.

It has been my good fortune to have known personally many of the officials and employees of the Altoona Tribune over the past 50 years.

On the occasion of this centennial observance of one of Pennsylvania's leading daily newspapers I extend best wishes to the present publishers and staff for continued success in their efforts to meet the challenging future as ably as their predecessors met the test since 1856.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said often that if you wish to probe the sincerity, honesty, and ability of a man, ask his neighbor.

This admonition of an age-old adage aptly applies to the newspaper field because in the not too distant past members of the fourth estate in their publishing activities were not reluctant to repeatedly attack policies and personalities of a rival newspaper. This practice of verbally lambasting another newspaper is happily on the wane but it has always proved foreign to the precepts of journalism as practiced in the Altoona area with the result that all newspaper editors respect each other and as a result dwell in amity and contentment as they cooperate in promoting the best interests of the community.

There is no stronger evidence of the cordial relations that prevail among the newspaper fraternity in Altoona than the glowing editorial of cordiality and goodwill that appeared in the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror on January 12, 1956, warmly congratulating the Altoona Tribune on its 100th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, as a fitting conclusion to this tribute to the publishers and the staff of the Altoona Tribune, I wish to include at this point in my remarks the Altoona Mirror editorial and to add the two fine articles by Mrs. Grace K. Ebright, staff writer of the Altoona Mirror, in saluting the Altoona Tribune for its contribution through able and learned journalists in promoting the best interest of the newspaper profession in my home city of Altoona:

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 12, 1956]

TRIBUNE ANNIVERSARY

For 100 years residents of Altoona have welcomed the daily arrival of one of the city's first newspapers, the Altoona Tribune, and this anniversary year of that newspaper finds the officers of the company, the newspaper staff and its readers all celebrating the birthday event.

Birth date of the Altoona Tribune is January 3, for the first issue appeared back in 1856, and the newspaper has continued as a morning paper ever since.

The Altoona Mirror heartily congratulates the Tribune and its newspaper family on its centenary year. An existence of 100 years is an achievement most outstanding in any business, and the Tribune, ancient in its years, but up-to-date in its operation, starts a second century with the finest of greetings and the heartiest of congratulations.

For 82 years of the 100 years of existence of the Altoona Tribune, this newspaper, the Altoona Mirror, has traveled side-by-side in the production of a newspaper and the promotion of a progressive Altoona, and the association has been most friendly.

The 100-year-old Altoona Tribune has had a most interesting history, dating as it does back to a period 10 years after the formation of Blair county. The Tribune was antedated only by the Altoona Register, which appeared in 1855 and this paper was purchased to launch the Altoona Tribune. For a brief span it was known as the Daily Tribune, the title Altoona Tribune being first applied in 1905.

In 1914 the Tribune acquired the Altoona Gazette, an afternoon paper, which early began as the Altoona Sun. In 1920 the Altoona Times, a morning paper, was procured and the paper was issued as the Times-Tribune, the present title continuing however since 1923.

The Altoona Tribune is rich in newspaper tradition and in personnel, newspapermen of outstanding ability being associated with the business. On this anniversary date are recalled the names of E. B. McCrum and William H. Allison, first owners; Henry C. Dern, Dr. Hugh Pitcairn, Alonzo D. Houck, Enos M. Jones, Col. Henry W. Shoemaker, as owners.

The dean of Altoona newspapermen, the late Wesley Howe Schwartz, served the paper from 1881 up until a few years prior to his death in 1937. Miss Lizzie Akers is remembered as the faithful editorial room employee. Long in the service were J. Virgil Taylor, Parse H. Crawford, Karl Isenberg, Matthew Smith (now the Monsignor Smith of Denver) and a host of others, all who achieved fine newspaper reputations. Many continued to other positions distinguishing themselves.

To the present officers and staff, President Theodore Arter, Jr., Publisher A. B. Crane, Editor Robert W. Boyer, General Manager Joseph A. Faul and Advertising Director Leo Carroll, the very best of anniversary wishes and hearty congratulations on the historic edition. May the future add to the bright pages of the Altoona Tribune.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 16, 1956]

MEMORIES

(By Grace K. Ebright)

This is being written before seeing the 100th anniversary issue of the Altoona Tribune, but the very fact that the morning paper is celebrating its 100th anniversary brings a flood of memories that goes back to more than half that period of time, when I deliberately left high school to fill a vacancy in the editorial office of the city's morning paper, as assitsant to Wesley Howe Schwartz, a self-educated man of towering literary ability who was then the Tribune's editor.

Educators today would certainly frown on my temerity. I had little "book larnin" as such. My earlier school years were spent in a 1-room country school. Before I could enter high school I was obliged to take a year and a half in grade school—the Adams

School—where, under the most efficient training of Della K. Yingling, I had many of the rough edges polished off.

In high school my Latin teacher was John S. Fair—a most ambitious young man with a leaning toward Army life, but filling in the interim with a heavy double schedule of teaching Greek and Latin by day, working on the morning newspaper by night.

Colonel Fair—as he later became—took an interest in my longing to write, and it was he who first introduced me to the inside of a newspaper office when he took my sister and me on a tour of the Tribune office.

Later he encouraged my early attempts at column writing. Because I was shy and retiring, I did not sign my name. Instead, I used the Greek initials for my name—Gamma Kappa—I learned the Greek alphabet through listening in to class recitations during what was supposed to be study periods. I can still hear the clear, ringing voice of the teacher reading passages from the textbook in a way to make them sound like sublime music—even though I did not understand the words.

Sue Schwartz, a daughter of the Tribune's editor, was at that time editorial assistant, and when she began planning her marriage to Prof. Joseph Barker—everyone called him Professor Barker—I set my sights as next in line for the job.

I was a real greenhorn. Today I would not have the courage to ask for a job in a newspaper office, but I did make good. Like Barkis, I was "willin'" to learn, and under the kind and patient tutelage of Mr. Schwartz I soon became familiar with editorial duties, reading proof, writing heads for inside copy, editing the country correspondence and, a little later, being sent out to cover educational or religious meetings of importance in the city.

I never learned shorthand, I never learned typing. Like my teacher, Mr. Schwartz, I began with a hunt-and-peck system on an old typewriter at home, though in the office it was all pencil work.

Sometimes I held copy while the editor did the proofreading on the ads, or statistics of various sorts.

And every now and then Oliver Danley, foreman in the composing room, would shout down the little well for more copy to be put in the tiny box and pulled upstairs by a rope.

I have never regretted leaving high school, for the experience I had under the tutelage of Wesley Howe Schwartz was to me priceless. Like the noted Msgr. Matthew Smith, now dean of Catholic publications, and famous editor of the Catholic Register, in Denever, Colo., who also served as proofreader and reporter on the Altoona Tribune, I feel that my association with Mr. Schwartz was in itself a liberal education. Just as Monsignor Smith gives credit to the wise and capable teaching—more by example than precept—of Wesley H. Schwartz, so do I feel that those 4 years of working side by side with this great man was far, far more valuable to me than any college degree I might have won, had I been able to go to college.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror of January 18, 1956]

A GREAT MAN

(By Grace K. Ebright)

Addressing Williams College alumni almost a hundred years ago, President James A. Garfield made the immortal statement concerning Mark Hopkins, the president of the college, 1836 to 1872: "Give me a log hut with only a simple bench, Mark Hopkins on one end and I on the other, and you may have all the buildings, apparatus and libraries without him."

The famous quotation has been often used as "Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and I on the other," to express the powerful influence of a great man's mind.

And it is with a feeling of a reverence somewhat like that of Garfield when I pause to pay tribute to the helpful influence on my mind that was given in the few years I was privileged to be an assistant to Wesley Howe Schwartz, editor of the Altoona Tribune for 40 years where, through his scholarly editorials and wise presentation of facts, he became a great influence for good and was considered one of the brainiest men of his day and time.

He was self taught. All his life books wielded a powerful influence over him and he told me that the first dollar he ever made went for a book.

How his reading was guided and directed I do not know, unless by Providence, but he soon cultivated a taste for the best in books and periodicals and once a week he would go down to Joe Bridenstein's newsstand on 12th Street and come back with an armload of the best in magazines—Harper's Bazaar, Atlantic Monthly, Review of Reviews, to mention just a few.

His family had to live in a big house, in his later years, to make room for his big library—one of the finest in the city. As I visited often in the home, I remember how crowded bookcases were to be found in every room, the halls, all the bedrooms and even the kitchen.

In later years the family moved to a big brick house in Fairview and there was a spacious sunporch where Mr. Schwartz did his writing and most every time I visited there, 1 or 2 of the huge Maltese cats would be found fast asleep on the desk top, amid the pages he was writing, or on the books he kept ready to browse in.

Unobtrusively, Mr. Schwartz was a good influence on my reading habits, lending me good books to read. And a good book was always my pay for carrying on, as best I could, in the office in his absence.

He was frequently called on to speak before religious or educational groups and he was absent on lodge nights and if he went out of town he was sure to bring me back a good book on his return.

He gave me the golden key to the treasure house of the printed page and through him I learned that with a mind fortified with good reading, or with good books at hand, one need never be idle or lonely and never beset by the present-day plague, even in young children, that constantly demands entertainment.

For many years he wrote a popular column which he signed "The Saunterer" and which, though often of a personal nature, carried a fund of worthwhile information.

In his later years he wrote often and much of his experiences as a youth when he worked on the Juniata Canal, long since passed into oblivion; but hearing him tell of those long-ago days it seemed to me I could recapture the magic of the slow-moving barges on the still waters—barges drawn by mules on the well-worn towpath alongside the canal.

Passengers and freight were hauled and nobody then complained about lack of speed. Travelers or shippers were too glad of any means of transportation in the fairly new country.

The States and Watershed Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the January issue of State Government contains an article prepared by Dr. Robert J. Morgan, associate professor of political science at the University of Nebraska, relative to the development and operation of watershed projects under the act which was enacted some 2 years ago.

In view of the expanding nationwide interest in the watershed protection and flood prevention program, this article is most timely. Believing that it will be of interest to Members, under unanimous consent, I include this article in its entirety:

THE STATES AND WATERSHED DEVELOPMENT

(By Robert J. Morgan)

With the adoption of the Department of Agriculture's program of pilot watershed projects in 1953 and the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954,[1] sufficient progress has been made in this significant addition to the Nation's water programs to note some related problems. In particular, these are problems that concern State and local governments.

The watershed management program of the Department is designed, in part, to develop works of flood prevention or control in the tributary watersheds upstream from the larger rivers. Two types of construction are embraced in a completed watershed. B measures consist of such soil conservation practices as terracing, revegetation, land use management, and other practices. A measures are small dams—not to exceed 5,000 acre-feet in capacity, stabilizing structures, diversion ditches and dikes, stream channel improvement and other structures designed to minimize flood damages on the uplands of watersheds and to benefit urban localities situated downstream.

Public Law 566 (the Hope-Aiken law) differs from the authorization for pilot projects only insofar as the latter permits the Department of Agriculture to assume nearly all costs, although it is limited to a period of 5 years. The Hope-Aiken Law permits the Secretary of Agriculture to assist local organizations which apply to him for aid in planning and executing works of improvement for flood prevention and for the agricultural phases of water utilization, conservation and disposal. Watersheds not to exceed 250,000 acres in area may be treated as a single project, but contiguous areas may be joined as parts of a larger watershed. Local organizations authorized to act may include agencies of a State or its political subdivisions which have power to carry out, maintain and operate works of improvement. Such agencies are responsible for developing work plans, entering into contracts for construction, acquiring easements and rights of way, assuming a share of costs, securing water rights and operating and maintaining completed structures. Irrigation features may be included, but they cannot be paid for out of Department of Agriculture funds under this program.[2]

Considerable experience has been gained so far in the four Nebraska pilot projects being developed concurrently with 61 other watersheds scattered through the Nation. Undoubtedly many of the issues pressing for solution in Nebraska will be paralleled in other States. Actually, however, every State must determine whether watershed development is to be administered as a Federal-State, Federal-local or mixed Federal-State-local program. Certainly, as it is visualized by its proponents, this addition to conservation policy will, if it is widely accepted, force a reevaluation of the role of State and local governments affecting structure, functions and finance in carrying it into execution.

Three important assumptions concerning the functions of Federal, State, and local governments underlie the Hope-Aiken Law. The first is that, theoretically, the initiative in developing a watershed will come from the

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

State or local interests involved and that the Department of Agriculture will not impose a project which does not have the approval of these interests through the action of the Governor or his delegated subordinate. The second is that the Secretary of Agriculture is merely assisting local interests with technical and limited financial aid. The third is that local beneficiaries will bear as much of the cost as they can. (The act does not clearly distinguish between local governments as that term is traditionally understood and State government proper.)

Public Law 566 provides that applications from "local organizations" shall be approved by a State agency or by the Governor, if no such agency exists. In Nebraska the Governor has created an advisory committee composed with an eye to giving representation to the soil conservation districts (the predominant interest), the watershed associations, the State soil conservation committee, and industry. This committee is charged with advising the Governor to approve or reject applications arising in the State for assistance under the law. So far the committee has worked without a planning staff (except for data supplied by the Soil Conservation Service) and has not announced publicly the standards on which it will recommend approval or rejection of projects. Thus at present the committee is not in a position to deal with the watershed program within the broad framework of an integrated resources program related to other Federal activities in the area or to the economic and physical needs of various areas of the State.[3] Once a project has been approved by the Governor it is sent to the Secretary of Agriculture for further screening at his discretion, after which it goes to the agriculture committees of Congress via the Bureau of the Budget and the President's Office.

The assumption of Public Law 566 that local governments will bear a reasonable share of the costs poses a problem for the States and their subdivisions. Nebraska has not appropriated funds, nor has it provided credit facilities for this program, nor is there any apparent likelihood of such action in the near future. Undoubtedly, however, this issue must be met unless the watershed program is to face difficult odds in competition with the Army Corps of Engineers, who are able to construct dams almost wholly at Federal expense.[4]

The principal problems which have emerged so far have been those occurring in the planning stage, since most of the structures completed to date have not yet presented operational difficulties, although several can be foreseen.

The most obvious deficiency, structurally speaking, on the local level is lack of a single agency responsible for initiating the planning and overseeing the execution of watershed projects, and capable of doing this. Although planning in many instances so far, as will be the case in the future, is in terms of small watersheds less than 250,000 acres in area, even such undertakings usually have involved several legal subdivisions of the State. It can be anticipated that future projects, such as Oak-Middle Creek in Nebraska, wil present even more formidable problems of coordination.

To date the only means of securing coordination has been the development of ad hoc coordinating committees, which apparently have relied very heavily on the Soil Conservation Service for central guidance. In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that the Conservation Service has exerted dominant influence and has been the centrifugal force in project development.

Although it is a "pilot" project, the upper Salt-Swedeburg Watershed in Nebraska illustrates the multiplicity of agencies participating and the dimensions of the task in securing cooperative action.

The initiative in securing assistance and promising local support was assumed by the Salt-Wahoo Watershed Association, a corporation formed in 1950 to stimulate flood control for its watershed by securing cooperation between the Department of Agriculture and the Corps of Engineers; by the board of supervisors of the Lancaster County Soil Conservation District; and by the Six County Soil Conservation Committee, consisting of members from the counties within the Salt-Wahoo watershed. A resolution of August 11, 1953, served as evidence to the Soil Conservation Service of local willingness to supoprt the project. An office memorandum from the chief of the Conservation Service to the regional director contained the authority to commence formulation of a work plan. After the work plan was completed in September 1954, the board of supervisors of the Saunders County Soil Conservation District joined in sponsoring it in that county.

The work plan itself represents at least a year of planning and negotiations, especially with landowners to be affected by accelerated land treatment measures and construction. Additional arrangements had to be made with other related agencies. The two county soil conservation districts, the watershed association, and the extension services of the two counties assumed responsibility for the educational and promotional phases. Actual negotiations with landowners to secure easements, rights-of-way, and acceleration of land treatment measures were the special task of the soil conservation districts. The boards of commissioners of the two counties entered into memoranda of understanding with their respective soil conservation districts to cooperate in incorporating floodwater retarding features in certain designated structures—culverts and bridges. The board of Stocking Township in Saunders County agreed to establish roadside erosion control within its boundaries, and to furnish dirt for grade control retarding structures.

Several State agencies are involved in the project. The Nebraska Department of Roads and Irrigation has agreed to cooperate in redesigning selected highway structures and in constructing special appurtenances to them. The bureau of irrigation, waterpower, and drainage within this department has consented (or rather has not imposed theoretical powers to intervene) to the design of dams retaining flood waters. This agency has been required by State law, however, to demand the payment of filing fees for submission of plans; to date the necessary funds have come from the watershed association, since the soil conservation district has virtually no means of raising funds. The game, forestation, and parks commission has cooperated in an extensive program of multiflora rose and shrub planting, and is assisting in development of recreational potentials in the numerous small ponds to be impounded behind dams. The State conservation and survey division, affiliated with the University of Nebraska, has made available its relatively extensive geological and hydrological data, especially regarding the ground water supply. The university's college of agriculture is participating to evaluate the effects of the project on runoff, erosion, sedimentation, and water evaporation.

This evaluation program is actually a cooperative project within itself, involving not only the college of agriculture but also the United States Weather Bureau and the United States Geological Survey. Sharing with the Soil Conservation Service the costs of this research, these agencies expect to obtain invaluable and hitherto unavailable data from instrumentation stations in the area. With such information it is anticipated that the effectiveness of watershed management techniques can be determined with scientific accuracy either to substantiate past claims of usefulness or to modify present construction practices.

Other Federal agencies have coordinated their efforts. The primary assistance is by the Soil Conservation Service which, of course, has the responsibility for giving technical aid to landowners and operators in applying soil and water conservation plans, layout and proper construction, and for assisting local agencies in planning, designing structures, securing easements, supervising construction, and preparing and letting contracts to advance flood-prevention measures. The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service has made the maximum payments allowable to individual farmers under existing legislation, to the extent of approving 100 percent Federal payments for approved conservation practices. It has, in fact, diverted funds to those counties in which watershed projects are under construction, and it has encouraged farmers to pool resources for building structures common to two or more farms. The Forest Service has given technical assistance in planning tree plantings. The Federal Housing Administration has indicated its willingness to extend credit to individual farmers who need assistance in terracing lands before other flood-prevention structures can be started. The Agricultural Research Service supplies data in hydrology, sedimentation, and the economics of costs and benefits to the Soil Conservation Service.

Despite the glowing evidence of intergovernmental coordination in the execution of this project, it is apparent that many problems, involving a mixture of policy, administration, and law, must be solved.

On the Federal level it is not clear whether Congress, in enacting the Hope-Aiken law, anticipated genuine coordination among the Department of Agriculture, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in developing the many phases of water management. The act may merely mark a further division of labor in this already crowded field, in which it is prayerfully hoped that the agencies—like three young lions consuming their spoil—will come into as little contact as possible. Conservationists in many States find, however, that the irrigation, drainage and water-management features of the act are as important as its flood-control provisions. Any conflict of agency interest must be resolved on the Federal level if there is to be a reasonable prospect of cooperation on the local project level.

Moreover, there is need for the Secretary of Agriculture to inform the States of the standards he will use in evaluating projects to be assisted. States with limited resources cannot benefit fully from the program, for example, if the Soil Conservation Service prefers to emphasize the development of areas capable of sharing a large percentage of the costs at the expense of impoverished areas much in need of Federal financial assistance. The provision of Public Law 566 requiring State approval of projects will insure that no State must accept a project that it does not want, but it is scarcely calculated to insure that a State will get the ones it does want. Since the President is required to submit project plans to the agriculture committees of Congress, it appears that the final evaluation of project worthiness will be a legislative task. It is reasonable to expect, under such circumstances, that organized groups and the views of individual Congressmen will play an influential role in the matter.

It is also uncertain whether the watershed protection and flood-prevention program is to be administered on a Federal-State basis or a Federal-local one. There is considerable evidence that the Soil Conservation Service would prefer to continue to direct the pro-

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

gram through the soil-conservation districts, with whom relations are generally very congenial. In fact, in the view of the Conservation Service, a prime consideration in undertaking development of a watershed project is the degree of cooperation it can anticipate from a functioning district. Such a relationship, involving a minimum of contact between the Soil Conservation Service and State agencies would leave the latter a doubtful role in planning projects, even if the State were to assist local units with administrative guidance and financial means. But, despite its preference for planning and executing individual projects through the soil-conservation districts, the Conservation Service has found them lacking in financial powers to undertake many projects, so that some other agency must assume the burdens of construction and maintenance.

In such a situation what is the function of State government? Conceivably, the State could undertake an active administrative direction of planning, could supply localities with technical advice and supervision, and could render financial assistance either in the form of direct appropriations, grants-in-aid, or credit facilities for local governments. Or, apart from giving the governor an advisory committee, it could confine its administrative role to designating a single agency responsible for coordinating the contributions of existing agencies to individual watershed projects. On the other hand, it could assume its more traditional role in the field of resources development by enacting permissive legislation which would fix the powers of local subdivisions to enable them to undertake the development of projects. Other legislation could define water rights not now existent, such as the right of prior appropriation in most Eastern States, or determine such rights as the right to flood and the ownership of waters impounded behind dams.

If the first of these approaches is selected, cries will be raised that the initiative and vitality of local governments are being sapped. But if the States do not undertake some direction and assistance, it can be predicted that the Federal Government will step in, as it has done in the "pilot" projects, with direction and money.

The effect of the watershed program on the structure and functions of local government has only recently become a subject of careful discussion. Advocates of the program have devoted most of their efforts so far to securing public acceptance of it from a technical standpoint. One of the virtues claimed for watershed flood prevention is that it attacks the problem where it is found, irrespective of existing political boundaries. In the Salt-Wahoo area, for example, the final project will embrace all or parts of six counties. Should a new unit of local government, such as the watershed district (authorized by enabling legislation in Nebraska and Kansas in 1953 and in Minnesota, Tennesee and Nevada in 1955) be adopted?[5] The functional nature of such an agency, empowered to deal with the total problems of development and maintenance, has its advantages, but the creation of such a district adds further to the hotch-potch of local government. Nebraska has not yet formed such a district, partly because there is suspicion of any new agency with taxing powers, partly because the original law (amended in 1955) required a rather complex procedure for proposing and organizing a district, and partly because urban-rural conflicts over the allocation of benefits and costs are certain to arise. It also appears that most existing local units, such as municipalities, counties and soil conservation districts lack adequate powers to undertake the obligations required under the Hope-Aiken Act.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Specifically necessary are adequate powers of eminent domain and taxation, as well as power to enter into agreements with Federal agencies. Units also must be able to construct and maintain works of improvement, to assess costs and benefits resulting from construction, and to secure easements and rights-of-way—including flowage rights and the right to flood. It may also be necessary to empower local units to purchase equipment, hire technical and administrative personnel, enact flood zoning ordinances, and borrow money. Moreover, some coordinating devices, formal or informal, are necessary in watersheds covering any appreciable area. Not least in importance is the need for adequate economic resources from which to draw funds even in political subdivisions already possessing adequate legal powers in this regard.

Experience in Nebraska to date illustrates several specific problems involving the need for adequate structure and powers on the part of local units. The success of the program starts with the individual land owner and farmer. The Soil Conservation Service does not possess and does not wish to have the power of eminent domain. Farmers must be convinced by education that they need the program, as urban dwellers do in many instances. The Service has extensive contacts with the former group, but virtually none with the latter. Thus it is essential that some local agency, public or private, undertake the task of demonstrating the value of the program to the public. The watershed associations in Nebraska have been remarkably successful in this regard.

In addition, the Conservation Service will be hard pressed to supply sufficient technical personnel once the program is accelerated, and State and local units will be equally hard pressed to find adequately trained men of their own. It is difficult to say what assistance the Extension Service and land grant colleges might give. The Lincoln area office of the Conservation Service had added seven men in the past 18 months to cope with the projects being developed under its jurisdiction.

It has been found on the pilot projects that it is not easy to secure easements for the construction of the larger structures, and in fact it is doubtful whether areas of class I land larger than about 4 square miles have the resources to support the program. In many cases justice demands that payment be made for easements, but Federal funds are not available for this purpose. Moreover, it appears that funds must be available to reimburse farmers who grant flowage rights (right to flood temporarily) as well as to purchase land for areas to be flooded permanently. Experience in this State with drainage districts indicates that serious litigation can grow out of damages incurred as a result of flooding.

Furthermore, if the land is purchased for the permanent pools behind dams, who is to own the water and be responsible for its use and control? It has also been found that coordination with county boards in the reconstruction of bridges and culverts requires patience, skill and, sometimes, fortuitous contacts. It is equally apparent that satisfactory relations and coordinated effort must be worked out with the State highway department in planning construction touching upon watershed projects. In Nebraska, as in some other Western States, the Bureau of Irrigation has extensive powers to authorize and oversee the construction of dams and the beneficial uses of water. This power must be either subordinated to or coordinated with Federal and State agencies developing watershed structures.

Structures requiring extensive local financial participation are as yet only in the planning stage in this State. But there is some disposition to rely on the soil conservation districts and watershed associations to initiate the projects by arousing local enthusiasm and by giving assurances that means will be found to construct and maintain the completed structures. Various solutions have been proposed, but none has gained widespread acceptance.

In 1953 counties were authorized to enter into compacts with each other and to contract with Federal agencies to undertake flood prevention projects. In 1955 additional legislation reduced the number of signatures necessary to propose a watershed district and the percentage of affirmative votes necessary to approve the creation of a district. Each county also was authorized in 1955 to impose a one-fourth mill levy, and to enter into agreements with Federal agencies, cities, drainage districts, other counties, or any other body politic or persons, for the construction, maintenance, repair, or operation of flood-control works authorized by Congress to be undertaken by Federal agencies. It is this last approach, that of using the county as the primary agency to finance and operate structures, that has gained some favor in Nebraska.[6]

It is probably unnecessarily and hopelessly utopian to insist that governmental agencies frame a rational and integrated program of water and land resources, despite the pressing need for such action. Given the American preference for political improvisation that results in a pragmatic approximation of the ideal, we undoubtedly shall have to settle for partial, tentative, and ad hoc solutions. Logical arrangements will have to give way to negotiations of the possible, and institutional forms will have to reflect the compromise of conflicting interests. Whether standardization will prevail because of the influence of Federal legislation, or traditional diversity in local institutions will hold, is uncertain. Rational reflection ought to aid in fixing the proper functions to be performed by national, State, and local units of government in the administration of this program.

In any event, it might be well for us to ponder De Tocqueville's observation that "It is not the administrative, but the political effects of decentralization that I most admire in America."

---

[1] Public Law 156, 83d Cong., 1st sess., 67 Stat. 214 and Public Law 566, 83d Cong., 2d sess., 68 Stat. 666.

[2] See Gladwin E. Young, Local Responsibilities for Watershed Protection Programs, State Government, vol. XXVII, No. 12, December 1954, pp. 255 ff.

[3] Six States have provided the Governor with such an advisory committee. Twenty-six States utilize the State soil conservation committee, board, or commission. Three States use the conservation department or a similar agency. Six States use the State engineer, department of reclamation, or a water resource board. Four States use the department of agriculture. Tennessee has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Tennessee Valley Authority to supply the State with technical assistance under Public Law 566.

[4] Three States, California, Vermont, and New Hampshire, enacted legislation in 1955 authorizing State agencies to participate financially in the Hope-Aiken law. Ch. 1886, Statutes of California, 1955; H. J. Res. 6, New Hampshire Legislature, 1955; Public Act No. 234, Vermont Acts of 1955.

[5] A survey and summary of legislation in response to Public Law 566 is to be found in Kirk M. Sandals' and L. M. Adams', "Progress in State Legislation Relating to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act" (Washington: Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, August 1955) mimeographed.

[6] Laws of Nebraska 1953, ch. 48; legislative bill 384 and legislative bill 21, 67th session, 1955.

Ten Factors in the Global Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the present world crisis when the complexity of issues give rise to various suggestions of procedure in solving them, it is helpful to have the careful analysis by competent authorities of the dominant factors in the struggle for control over the minds of men.

With that thought in mind, I wish to call attention to the address by Dr. Robert T. Oliver, head of the department of speech, the Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa., delivered to the convocation of Juniata College, Huntingdon, Pa., November 30, 1955.

Dr. Oliver, who is a constituent of mine, chose as his subject Ten Factors in the Global Struggle. In addition to his position at Pennsylvania State University, Dr. Oliver is Adviser to the Korean Delegation at the United Nations and is the author of Syngman Rhee, Verdict in Korea, Four Who Spoke Out, and so forth.

The address which appeared in the January 15, 1956, issue of the magazine Vital Speeches of the Day follows:

TEN FACTORS IN THE GLOBAL STRUGGLE—ANALYSIS OF OUR STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES

(By Robert T. Oliver, professor and head, department of speech, the Pennsylvania State University)

The cold war presents our generation with problems in international relations that are not only more severe but that are also different in kind than any that had existed previously. At the so-called summit conference in Geneva last July, the four heads of state clarified this difference—though it has been in existence for some time. The essential consideration governing international affairs at present is the recognition that major war has finally been rendered suicidal by development of weapons so destructive that they simply cannot be used.

This fact—which was stated explicitly by President Eisenhower at Geneva, but which underlay the strange restraints of the Korean war and which has dominated diplomacy for the past decade—makes it necessary for our leadership to devise fundamental changes in our basic national approach to international issues. Such a change is impossible in a democracy unless the public is brought to understand far better than it now does the truly radical effects of the simple conclusion that neither side dares risk a conflict of hydrogen bombs, intercontinental guided missiles and bacteriological warfare.

The classic relationship between diplomacy and war was stated in the famous dictum of Clausewitz, that "war is the extension of diplomacy by other means." This dictum, which has been axiomatic through 6,000 years of recorded history, became outmoded at Eniwetok, if not, indeed, at Hiroshima. It must now be restated and reassessed as follows: "Diplomacy must develop pressures short of total war to enforce decisions across sovereign boundaries."

Someday, perhaps, the sovereign state may be dissolved into a global federation capable of enforcing one uniform set of laws upon all its members. Under present conditions, however, sovereignty remains unquestionable. As is evidenced by the divisions of Germany and Korea, the Russian-American armaments race, the Iron Curtain, and the impasse at the United Nations, there is no legal power in existence to force agreements upon nations that choose to disagree.

This has been true, of course, all through history, and diplomacy has developed upon the hypothesis that, finally, "God is on the side of the heaviest battalions." Diplomats have always been constrained to negotiate from strength. That is to say, one of their skills has been to make it clear to their opponents that in case agreements are not reached war will be unleashed.

Under present conditions diplomats must develop a new strategy based upon the cardinal fact that war no longer is the court of final appeal. They must negotiate from the strength of other sanctions than total war—sanctions which will be powerful enough to create an atmosphere of tension sufficiently threatening to make it impossible for the opposition to maintain stubbornly an attitude of cynical disagreement.

The events of the past decade, in which Russia has extended its effective control over 800 million people outside the Soviet Union, make it indisputably evident that thus far the Communist distatorship has been far more successful than has the democratic leadership in understanding the new problems and in developing a new strategy of diplomatic force.

The confidence of the Soviet rulers, which I believe is real and not a mere pretense, was expressed last month, on the anniversary of the Russian revolution, by Deputy Prime Minister Kaganovich, when he said: "The 20th century is the century of the triumph of socialism and communism." And the nature of this anticipated triumph was spelled out explicitly back in 1922 by Nikolai Lenin, when he said: "First we shall take eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia. After that we shall surround and undermine the United States, which will fall into our laps like overripe fruit, without a struggle."

"Without a struggle" meant, of course, without a major war. There has been, and there will be, an intensive struggle—but (as the Russians realize better than we have done as yet) it will be a struggle under the new conditions in which cold war is the only kind we dare to wage. Our problem, then, is to make an analysis of all the kinds of pressures short of total war which the diplomats can, and must, organize to enforce their negotiations.

The first such pressure is propaganda. It is a weapon made possible by the development of mass mediums of communication and by the tremendous worldwide increase in literacy. The primary importance of this weapon is indicated by the frequency with which we use the term "psychological warfare" as a rough synonym for the cold war. And propaganda is a skill in which, in the considered judgment of Edward L. Bernays, the great public relations counselor, the Soviet Union is a full generation ahead of the United States. We are all aware of how greviously our military leadership and our public opinion has been disturbed by hints that Russia may be 6 months or a year ahead of us in research to develop an intercontinental guided missile. Yet if the assumption stated by President Eisenhower at Geneva is correct, that total war has become a practical impossibility, then the tremendous superiority of the Communists in propaganda techniques will be of fundamental and perhaps of decisive influence.

One indication of the differing emphasis upon propaganda is the fact that the Soviet Union is currently spending about $3 billion a year upon its global propaganda efforts; whereas, the American budget for overseas information consists of only $75 million—about 3 percent of what Russia is spending.

And as for the results, we might mention the spread of neutralism among the nations of southeastern Asia, the Communist victory at the polls in Indonesia, the stimulated unrest in the Middle East, and the Russian success in selling the idea of relaxing tensions at the very time when we most need to increase (not decrease) our efforts. Or, for a very specific example, we might note that the United States has supplied India with some $450 million; whereas Russia has given India almost nothing except praise and promises—yet the Indian press and Government speak often and loudly of Russian generosity as contrasted with what they term American selfishness. If something similar happened as between an American business and one of its competitors, the board of directors would immediately undertake an intensive reconsideration of its sales and public relations programs. To improve our American propaganda must be an immediate goal.

A second form of pressure used in the cold war is subversion and infiltration. This is a method utilized extensively by the Communists, who have a Communist Party, directed from Moscow, in every nation of the world. Dramatic evidence of the way in which this cold war weapon is employed has been furnished in the revelations of the espionage successfully carried on within our own and allied governments by such men as Burgess, McLean, Hiss, Fuchs, the Greenbergs, and others. Everyone knows, of course, of this utilization of parasitic political parties, which eat away at our vitals while—under protection of our laws—paying abject homage to the dictates of Moscow. However, effective as it is for the Communists, it is not a method that we would choose to utilize or that we could, under our democratic ideals of government. Nevertheless, we must recognize its effectiveness as used by the Soviet Union and we have to find some instrument of our own that we can use in our own way to counterbalance it.

Perhaps the best counterbalancing form of pressure, and one that should be wholly open to us, is the prohibition of strategic trade with the Communist nations until they will consent to honest and honorable negotiation. Actually, this is a weapon ready to our hands and denied to the Communists by the simple fact that they need a great many products from the free world; whereas we do not need products from areas presently dominated by Moscow. Even so, this has proved to be a difficult instrument of pressure to utilize in the past. Even during the course of the war in Korea, some of our Allies very strongly resisted our insistence upon the denial of strategic imports to Red China. In view of the fact that a million Red Chinese soldiers were actively in the field fighting against the United Nations, we did manage to secure a fair degree of concurrence with the prohibition of items on an agreed list of strategic goods. But this list was never a very realistic one. Rubber, for example, was always sent by our Allies into Red Chinese ports, on the grounds that it was needed for shoes for the peasants, as well as for tires for military vehicles. Also sent into Red China, even during the actual course of the fighting, were vast quantities of food, textiles, machine tools, and raw materials which did a great deal to sustain the economy of our and the United Nations' enemy. We may conclude that the pressure of an economic blockade is one that should theoretically offer us considerable advantages, but that it is very difficult to enforce so long as the free nations are heavily dependent upon foreign exports to maintain their standards of living.

A fourth factor in the cold war is the very nature of the international alinement of the two sides in the global struggle. Russia has surrounded herself with a body of satellites who never dream of being allowed to pursue any independence in their foreign

policy. A striking example is the instance in which Czechoslovakia made the mistake in 1948 of indicating that it would accept the free economic assistance that the United States offered under the Marshall Aid plan—but instantly withdrew its acceptance upon instructions from Moscow. Another instance is the absolute solidity of the Communist voting bloc in the United Nations. On the other hand, the free world alliance is extremely loose and disjointed.

At this very moment in the United Nations the United States is widely split from its principal allies on the questions of the package deal for admitting 17 (or 18) new members and on the question of whether Yugoslavia or the Philippines should be elected to the Security Council. We are split on the issue of the recognition of Red China and the defense of Formosa. We are split on the vital issue of whether it is wise to make additional concessions to the Communist demands. And in many ways, on many other issues, there is widespread disagreement among the so-called democratic nations regarding the tactics to be pursued in stemming further Communist aggression.

This looseness of the democratic alliance has been exploited by the Communists to create another—and one of their most effective—instruments in waging the cold war: namely, neutralism.

We all recall the great joy that spread through the entire free world when Yugoslavia announced, back in 1948, that it was asserting independence of Moscow's domination of its foreign policy. We seized upon "Titoism" as the most hopeful development of the entire postwar era. Ever since then, our fondest hope has been that we might somehow be able to encourage the spread of "Titoism"—and most specifically that we might be able to persuade Mao Tze-tung to become a second Tito.

Well, as a matter of fact, Titoism is no longer unique; it has become almost endemic. But, unhappily, it is not in the form of a neutralist desertion from the Communist camp, but of a neutralist movement led by India of separation from the democratic alliance. This spirit of neutralism has spread rapidly in southeast Asia, throughout the Arab-Asian bloc, and into parts of Europe as well. Undoubtedly it is fanned by the thought that if war should break out, the safest course for many nations to pursue is to stand aside from it and to emerge after the holocaust still strong and undamaged after Russia and the United States shall have battered themselves into helplessness. Meanwhile, these neutralist nations have greatly weakened the propaganda effectiveness of the democratic idcal by their insistence that they see little to choose between us and Russia.

A sixth factor in the cold war, which also, unfortunately, is much to the advantage of the Soviet Union, is the nature of the population of wide areas of the world. It is a simple fact that three-fourths of the people of the earth live in poverty, with little immediate hope of bettering their condition. It is relatively easy for Russia to tell them that the United States and Western Europe are monopolizing the means of creating wealth, and that their best hope lies in joining with the Soviet Union in taking away from us that which we have. And allied to this characteristic of many peoples is the concurrent fact that they have existed for many generations under tyrannical governments and do not have very high ideals of personal freedom. Hence, the police terrorism of communism is not by far as shocking to them as it is to us. They will, in fact, accept the tyranny if it is accompanied by promises, however fanciful, of improvement in their economic circumstances.

A seventh factor, arising out of these conditions, is the development of future effective allies by granting economic assistance and technical guidance to underdeveloped peoples around the world. A striking example of what may be accomplished in this respect is the fact that the Republic of Korea, which we have helped since 1945, now has the fourth largest armed force in the world and is devotedly and dependably on our side in the effort to develop collective security among nations. However, we must soberly take note of the fact that at just this period in history the tendency in our country is to taper off our foreign-aid programs; whereas at this same time, the Soviet Union is for the first time beginning to offer assistance of this kind. This, most assuredly, is not an area of endeavor in which we should permit ourselves to relax our efforts.

The noted historian, Arnold Toynbee, has laid special stress upon another aspect of the global struggle which he considers of great importance—namely, the dissatisfaction of large areas of the world with the colonial relationship which they have had under the rule of western nations. In terms of his cyclical interpretation of history, Toynbee has pointed out that the Anglo-American and Western European nations have enjoyed vast advantages, especially in the 19th century, and must now pay the price of seeing these formerly subordinated peoples rise against them. Obviously, the chief need which we have in this situation—especially since the colonial rule of western nations is all but ended—is to make clear to the former colonials that Russian designs upon them are nothing but a neocolonialism in a far worse form. But this is a task for enlightened and skillful propaganda, and in this respect, as I have pointed out, Russia most unfortunately for us is far in the lead.

A ninth factor in any struggle is the question of the unifying ideals for which the struggle is waged. As has often been said to me by orientals I have met, in the Far East people are inclined to think of national strength in three categories: Military, economic, and ideological. In the first two forms of strength the United States has definite superiority and is capable of surpassing the Soviet Union to a marked degree. Moreover, historically, the strength of our democratic ideals has been the chief weapon in our national arsenal. It was so when our own Colonies were inspired by the love of independence to carry on for 8 years a seemingly hopeless war against Great Birtain. It has been so in more recent times, when Wilson's 14 points and Roosevelt's 4 freedoms proved to be rallying points for peoples around the world.

However, it is precisely in this realm of ideology where the Soviet Union appears, paradoxically, to have one of its greatest advantages. To state the matter bluntly, it is all too clear that Russia knows what she wants and is determined to try to get it at any cost. And, on the contrary, it is dismally evident that the free world, including our own country, seems often unclear as to our world aims and indecisive in pursuing them. To many peoples of the world it seems that the country which knows where she is going is most likely to get there—and thereby there is created a "bandwagon psychology" of the inevitability of eventual Soviet triumph. This is especially true in parts of Asia and that fact, more than anything else, accounts for the successes of communism in China, in Indonesia, and in other areas of Southeastern Asia and the Middle East.

Finally, the tenth of these factors of influence in shaping the world struggle is the basic difference in the moral system under which that struggle is waged. The free world believes that promises are made to be kept; whereas, the Communist nations believe that agreements are only stratagems to achieve an end and that there is no point whatsoever in abiding by them. An immediate case in point is the flagrant, violent, and continuing violation by the Communists of the truce in Korea.

The difference in morals may be illustrated by an analogy drawn from war. We would feel pretty smart if, under battle conditions, we were able to camouflage a tank as though it looked like a haystack, and by that stratagem were enabled to destroy an unsuspecting body of attacking troops. Far from being ashamed of such deceitfulness, we would be proud of it, and might well give a medal to the commanding officer capable of pulling it off. Now, to the Communists diplomacy is only a form of war which they are waging for the ultimate destruction of all capitalistic nations. Therefore, to them, a treaty, a promise, or a speech in the United Nations is nothing whatsoever except a stratagem in a continuing war. If by ambiguities, hypocrisy, or lies they are able to maneuver our side into any concessions or into a position of weakness, they do not feel at all ashamed of doing so but instead pride themselves upon their cleverness.

The great pity, of course, is that such a system of morals on their side makes normal diplomacy impossible and negotiation as we understand it nothing but a dangerous hoax. Yet, this is precisely the kind of psychology with which we must learn eventually to deal.

The foregoing analysis has not been intended to sound either optimistic or pessimistic, but merely a sober analysis of crucial elements in the world situation as it now confronts us.

At the Geneva Conference in July, the four heads of state agreed implicitly that any resort to all-out warfare has become an impossibility. Of course, we have no way of knowing that the time may not come when the Soviet Union may, nevertheless, undertake a surprise attack in great force upon us, hoping for a knockout total victory. In any event, we are required by sheer commonsense to try to maintain at least an equality of armaments so long as the hostile conditions persist.

But the Geneva spirit never did mean that agreements were going to be reached or that the world struggle would be halted. Lenin's stated goal of surrounding and undermining the United States, until we fall into the Russian lap like overripe fruit, remains unchanged. What the Geneva spirit does do is to emphasize for us that we must devise means of winning the global struggle by means short of and other than total war. My purpose has been to suggest some of the problems which must be identified and solved, in order that we may begin to wage cold war more effectively. Much remains to be done.

Aid to Israel Before It Is Too Late

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, today President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Sir Anthony Eden are beginning a series of meetings to discuss various international problems, including the situation in the Middle East. For some time now it is known that Mr. Eden is proposing that Israel make territorial concessions to the Arab countries by giving up a fourth of its area, which would leave little Israel even smaller than

it is and rob it of any opportunity for economic self-sufficiency for its people.

This morning's Washington Post and Times Herald carries a short statement on the subject which is endorsed by many leading persons, Christians and Jews, in all walks of American life. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the views expressed in this statement. I want to add my voice to that of these distinguished Americans who urge our Government to support Israel before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert this statement and commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. The statement is as follows:

BEFORE IT IS TOO LATE

We believe it to be our duty to call the attention of our Government and our fellow citizens to the continuing grave crisis in the Middle East, which threatens the existence of the State of Israel and the peace and security of the entire free world.

The State of Israel came into being on May 14, 1948. Its establishment by action of the United Nations General Assembly honored a historic right and redressed an ancient wrong. A tortuous history of agony for Jewish communities in lands of persecution ended in a monumental opportunity for self-determination and independence. Multitudes of people in all countries were deeply stirred by the revival of this nation, which in its earlier age of independence in its own land, had given priceless spiritual and ethical gifts to civilization. The world community considered that the Arab peoples, who in the past generation have secured a wide sphere of independence in eight sovereign states, would welcome a kindred people in their new-found freedom. Israel's area of 8,000 square miles and 1,800,000 population is not a threat to 8 Arab states which extend over 2 million square miles of territory and support over 40 million people.

With the moral and material aid of the people and Government of the United States and of friends of freedom everywhere, Israel in fewer than 8 years has built a free and democratic commonwealth in the Middle East. It has provided a haven for hundreds of thousands of hapless victims of persecution. It has constructed a humane society in a corner of the earth which has known for centuries past wasteful neglect and exploitation. Israel has fulfilled in substantial and earnest measure the trust and high hopes of its well-wishers throughout the world. Where it has failed, that failure has been due in large measure to inordinate provocation which, we feel, no nation in similar circumstances would have tolerated with so much patience.

Israel's widely acclaimed achievement is today in danger. Its enemies, encouraged by lavish supplies of weapons of destruction from the Communist world, are making rapid preparations to unleash a new round of war which their leaders assert will destroy Israel. A renewed war against Israel would set the whole Middle East aflame, endangering the peace of the world.

We cannot accept the view held by some of our British friends that war can be forestalled or prevented by applying pressures to Israel to yield territory to the Arab States. We recall the historic failure of the Munich Conference to avert World War II by forcing democratic Czechoslovakia to surrender its teritories to Nazi Germany. The appetite of aggressors feeds upon appeasement.

We ask our Government to stand firm and support with vigor our sister democracy of Israel.

As a first step in restoring equilibrium and creating a more favorable climate of stability and peace in the Middle East, which has been deeply disturbed by the supply of Communist arms to Egypt, we appeal to our Government to make available to Israel without delay the legitimate means for its self-defense. We also urge our Government to conclude as soon as possible security treaties with Israel, and those of her neighbors who desire peace, guaranteeing their present frontiers against alteration by force. Such measures would clear the way for the Arab States and Israel to negotiate a peace settlement fair to all. Such measures, further, can lead to that renascence of the spirit so vital to the development of the area's resources, both Israeli and Arab.

We believe that these positive actions by the United States Government will be welcomed by the overwhelming majority of the American people. In the name of justice, humanity, and America's good name among the nations, we urge our Government to act firmly and decisively before it is too late.

SIGNATORIES TO THE STATEMENT

Prof. James Luther Adams, federated theologic faculty, University of Chicago; Dr. Dewey Anderson, Public Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.; Dana Andrews, Actor; Martin C. Ansorge, Attorney, New York City; Joseph Applebaum, Vice President, Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union; Prof. Kenneth J. Arrow, Stanford University; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, church leader, New York City; Judge William Hawley Atwell, Dallas.

Rev. Karl Baehr, executive director, American Christian Palestine Committee; Barney Balaban, president, Paramount Pictures; Fritz Bamberger, executive director, Coronet magazine; Margaret Culkin Banning, author; Prof. Salo W. Baron, Columbia University; Dr. Simon H. Bauer, University of California, Los Alamos scientific laboratory, Joseph Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America; Dr. Samuel Belkin, president, Yeshiva University; Charles Joseph Bensley, commissioner, Board of Education, New York City; Dr. Joseph Berkson, Mayo Clinic; William S. Bernard, American Federation of International Institutes; Leonard Bernstein, composer, conductor; Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. John Biegeleisen, Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.; Dean Adele Bildersee (retired), Brooklyn College; Algernon D. Black, Ethical Culture Society; Hon. William Alden Black, Denver; Prof. Felix Bloch, Stanford University, Nobel prize winner for physics; Manchester Boddy, former publisher, Los Angeles Daily News; Prof. Joseph S. G. Bolton, Skidmore College; Mrs. Garda Bowman, specialist intercultural relations, New York City; Prof. LeRoy Bowman, Brooklyn College; Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor, the Watchman-Examiner; Rev. Dr. Dwight J. Bradley, Edgehille Community Church, Spuyten Duyvil, N. Y.; Rev. Dr. Preston Bradley, People's Church of Chicago; Rev. Dr. Raymond B. Bragg, All Souls Unitarian Church, Kansas City, Mo.; John E. Breidenbach, president, Central Union of AFL; Rabbi Barnet R. Brickner, president, Central Conference American Rabbis; Dr. George Brodschi, director International Center, University of Louisville; Rev. Dr. Frank R. Brown, president, Hood Theological Seminary, Salisbury, N. C.; Dr. William Eustis Brown, dean emeritus, College of Medicine, University of Vermont; Rev. Dr. Emory S. Bucke, Abingdon Press, Nashville; L. S. Buckmaster, president, Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America; John P. Burke, president, International Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Workers; Dr. Melvin L. Burkholder, president, Huntington College, Indiana; Prof. Henry Miller Busch, Western Reserve University; Frank W. Buxton, member Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine (1946); Dr. Harry C. Byrd, former president of University of Maryland.

Dr. John Tyler Caldwell, president, University of Arkansas; James B. Carey, president, IUE, AFL-CIO; John Roy Carlson, author; George A. Cavender, president, Colorado Federation of Labor; Dr. Nathan K. Christopher, NAACP, Cleveland; W. Dale Clark, chairman of the board, Omaha National Bank; Rev. David Harris Cole, First Universalist Church, Chicago; Rev. Charles W. Conn, editor, Church of God Evangelical, Cleveland, Tenn.; Prof. E. Merton Coulter, University of Georgia; Floyd Crews, attorney, New York City; Bartley C. Crum, member, Anglo-American Committee on Inquiry on Palestine (1946); Bishop Ralph S. Cushman, Raleigh.

Leigh Danenberg, editor, Bridgeport Herald; Prof. Taraknath Das, Columbia University; Prof. Levett Jay Davidson, Denver University; Dr. Philip Grant Davidson, president, University of Louisville; Charles Kotselimba Davis, businessman, Worcester, Mass.; Elmer Davis, author and news analyst; Agnes de Mille, Choreographer; Dean Raimundo De Ovies, Protestant Episcopal Church, Atlanta; Earl B. Dickerson, attorney, Chicago; Helen Gahagan Douglas, actress; Melvin Douglas, actor; Nicholas C. Dragon, AFL-CIO (representative of Arizona); Dr. Jeremiah K. Durick, St. Michael's College; Winooski, Vt.; Prof. Richard E. Duwors, Bucknell University.

Dr. Sherwood Eddy, author, religious leader; Dr. William W. Edel, president, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.; Dr. Henry M. Edmonds, clergyman, columnist, Birmingham Post-Herald; India Edwards, consultant on development, New School for Social Research, New York City; Prof. F. Scott Elliott, Newberry College; Rev. J. Edward Elliott, Congregational Church, Stockbridge, Mass.; Dr. Richard A. Elvee, president, Northwestern School, Minneapolis; Dr. William Emerson, honorary president, American Association for the U. N.; Dr. I. Lynd Esch, president, Indiana Central College, Indianapolis; Prof. H. J. Ettlinger, University of Texas; Rev. Dr. John Evans, religion and education editor, the Chicago Tribune; Lulu Evanson, director of education, North Dakota Farmers Union.

Rev. Dr. Don Frank Fenn, St. Michael and All Angel's Church, Baltimore; Dr. Howard W. Ferrin, president, Providence-Barrington Bible College, Rhode Island; Dr. Jacob Fine, professor, Harvard Medical School; Dr. Jack E. Fink, San Jose State College; Dr. Louis Finkelstein, chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary; Harry W. Flannery, public relations, Washington, D. C.; Prof. D. F. Fleming, Vanderbilt University; Dr. George D. Flemmings, president, Fort Worth NAACP; Rev. Dr. George B. Ford, Corpus Christi Church, New York City; Dr. Henry W. Fowler, Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia; Prof. Raymond M. Fuoss, Yale University; Prof. James Franck, atomic scientist, Chicago.

Dr. Paul Leslie Garber, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga.; Prof. Paul W. Gates, Cornell University; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, New York; Dr. Nelson Glueck, president, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion; Rev. William Gold, executive secretary, Liberal Religious Youth, Boston; Dr. Israel Goldstein, president, American Jewish Congress; Patrick E. Gorman, secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen; Dr. Morton Gottschall, dean, Arts and Sciences, College of the City of New York; Prof. Bernard S. Gould, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bishop A. Raymond Grant, Portland, Oreg.; Dr. Harry J. Greene, president, Philadelphia NAACP.

Victor W. Haflich, president, Kansas Council on World Affairs; Rev. Dr. Frank Hall, Pearsall Presbyterian Church, Wrightsville Beach, N. C.; Rabbi Harry Halpern, president, Rabbinical Assembly of America; Prof. Oscar Handlin, Harvard University; Dean R. J. Hannelly, Phoenix College; Dr. S. Ralph Harlow, professor emeritus, Smith College; Rev. Donald Harrington, the Community Church, New York City; Rev. Ladislaus Harsanyi, First

Magyar Presbyterian Church, New York City; Moss Hart, playwright; Dr. A. Eustace Haydon, Chicago Ethical Society; Van Heflin, actor; Dr. Charles L. Hill, president, Wilberforce University; John Hoban, former Deputy Commissioner, United States FOA, Tel Aviv; Prof. Milton J. Hoffman, New Brunswick Theological Seminary; Sal Hoffman, president, Upholsterers International Union of North America; Rabbi David B. Hollander, president, Rabbinical Council of America; Judge Thomas L. Holling, Buffalo, N. Y.; Prof. Sidney Hoos, University of California; Dr. Harvey D. Hoover, professor emeritus, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.; Rev. Paul Franklin Hudson, Pleasant Hills Community Presbyterian Church, Pittsburgh.

Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, specialist, International Relations, New York; Rev. Dr. T. Christie Innes, Collingswood Presbyterian Church, Toledo; Spencer Irwin, associate editor, Cleveland Plain Dealer; Prof. Reginald R. Isaacs, Harvard University; Dr. Andrew C. Ivy, vice president, Illinois University.

Prof. Oscar I. Janowsky, College of the City of New York; Earl W. Jimerson, president, Amalgated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America; Dr. Leonard B. Job, president, Ithaca College, New York; Prof. J. S. Joffe, Rutgers University; Dr. Alvin S. Johnson, president emeritus, New School for Social Research, New York City; Dr. Charles S. Johnson, president, Fisk University; Judge Carl R. Johnson, Kansas City, Mo.; Willard Johnson, director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Chicago; Prof. Howard Mumford Jones, Harvard; Bishop Robert E. Jones, Waveland, Miss.; Dr. Herman E. Jorgensen, editor, Lutheraneren, Minneapolis.

Prof. Horace M. Kallen, New School for Social Research, New York City; Joseph D. Keenan, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D. C.; Alan H. Kempner, director, Farrar Straus Co., New York; William P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; Prof. Jerome G. Kerwin, University of Chicago; Leon H. Keyserling, economist, Washington, D. C.; J. Donald Kingsley, executive vice president, Welfare and Health Council, New York City; Freda Kirchwey, contributing editor, The Nation; Prof. Flemmie P. Kitrell, Howard University; Rev. Dr. A. J. Kligerman, Presbyterian Board of Missions (retired); Philip M. Klutznick, president, B'nai B'rith; Prof. I. M. Kolthoff, University of Minnesota; Prof. Milton R. Konvitz, Cornell University; Dr. Harold Korn, specialist in international affairs, New York City; Prof. Richard Kroner, School of Theology, Temple University; Prof. Simon S. Kuznets, Johns Hopkins; Victor Lasky, author.

Prof. Owen Lattimore, Johns Hopkins University; Rev. C. E. Lemmon, Christian Church, Columbia, Mo.; Dr. John H. Lewis, president, Morris Brown College, Atlanta; Dr. Howard M. LeSourd, dean emeritus, Boston University; Prof. Fritz Lipmann, Nobel prize winner for medicine and physiology; Prof. Sebastian B. Littauer, Columbia; Prof. Robert Sabbatino Lopez, Yale; Rev. Donald G. Lothrop, Community Church of Boston; Dr. John L. Lounsbury, president, San Bernardino Valley College; Bishop Edgar A. Love, Baltimore; Prof. Adolph Loewe, New School for Social Research, New York City.

Helen Douglas Mankin, attorney, Stonewall, Ga.; Fredric Mann, National Container Corp.; Rev. Dr. Leland W. Mann, First Congregational Church, Grinnell, Iowa; Dr. J. Paul Mather, president, University of Massachusetts; Louis B. Mayer, motion-picture producer; Mrs. L. J. McCaffrey, past president, Florida Federation of Women's Clubs; J. Elroy McCaw, president, Gotham Broadcasting Co., New York City; William L. McFetridge, president, Building Service Employees International; Dr. George J. McMorrow, Nazarene College, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Dr. Allan S. Meck, president, Theological Seminary of the Evangelical and Reformed Church (Pa.); Dr. Ernest O. Melby, dean, School of Education, New York University; Dr. Walter Scott Meyer, president, Colby Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Arthur Miller, playwright; Rabbi Irving Miller, chairman, American Zionist Council; Nathan Milstein, violinist; Judge Alfred Modarelli, Newark, N. J.; Dr. Alonzo G. Moron, president, Hampton Institute, Virginia; Dr. John A. Morrison, president, Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Indiana; Bishop Arthur W. Moulton, Salt Lake City; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, syndicated columnist; Prof. Herbert J. Muller, scientist, West Lafayette, Ind.

Bishop Norman Burdett Nash, Boston; Robert R. Nathan, economic consultant, Washington, D. C.; Dr. A. A. Neuman, president, Dropsie College.

Prof. Victor Obenhaus, federated theological faculty, University of Chicago; Bernard O'Shea, publisher, the Courier, Vermont.

Rev. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, First Unitarian Society, Chicago; Miles Pennypacker, president, Voltare Tubes, Inc., Norwalk, Conn.; Bishop Glenn R. Phillips, Denver; Rev. Dr. Wendell Phillips, Christ's Church, Rye, N. Y.; Rev. Lee C. Pierce, First Christian Church, Tyler, Tex.; Dr. Thomas C. Pollock, dean, Washington Square College of Arts and Science, NYU; Jacob S. Potofsky, president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; P. L. Prattis, executive editor, Pittsburgh Courier; Hon. Joseph M. Proskauer, New York City.

Dr. William Quillian, Jr., president, Randolph-Macon Women's College.

Prof. Harris Franklin Rall, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.; Dr. Harold W. Reed, president, Olivet Nazarene College, Kankakee, Ill.; Dr. Carl M. Reinert, president, Creighton University; Victor G. Reuter, educational secretary, CIO; Walter P. Reuther, vice president, AFL–CIO; Eddie Rickenbacker, president, Eastern Air Lines; Victor Riesel, syndicated columnist; Emil Rieve, president, Textile Workers of America; Hon. Simon Rifkind, New York City; Prof. Herbert Robbins, Columbia University; Frank Roche, State president AFL, Miami, Fla.; James N. Rosenberg, attorney, New York City; Frank Rosenblum, general secretary-treasurer, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; Prof. J. Coert Ryaarsdam, federated, theological faculty, University of Chicago; Dr. Walter H. Ryle, president, Northeast Missouri State Teachers College.

Dr. Abram L. Sachar, president, Brandeis University; Dr. M. E. Sadler, president, Texas Christian University; Maurice Samuel, author; Dr. David J. Saposs, industrial economist, Washington, D. C.; Prof. George E. Sarton, Harvard University; Irwin Savelson, New York Daily Mirror; Dore Schary, executive vice president, MGM Studios; Prof. Oliver Schroeder, Western Reserve University; Rev. Dr. Paul M. Schroeder, Salem Evangelical and Reform Church, Rochester, N. Y.; Budd Schulberg, author; Prof. Frederick L. Schuman, Williams College; Lisa Sergio, commentator; Dr. Harlow Shapley, Harvard College Observatory; Rev. Waitsill H. Sharp, the Unitarian Church, Moline, Ill.; Rev. Dr. G. Vaughn Shedd, general secretary, Lord's Day League of New England; Prof. W. E. Sikes, Univerity of Denver; Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, Cleveland, Ohio; Charles H. Silver, president, board of education, New York City; Prof. Rosedith Sitgreaves, Columbia University; Dr. Leon E. Smith, president, Elon College (N. C.); Walter E. Soderstrom, executive vice president, National Association of Photo-Lithographers; Andrew J. Sordoni, president, National AAA; Prof. E. A. Speiser, University of Pennsylvania; Samuel Spewack, playwright; Philip Sporn, president, American Gas & Electric Co.; Rev. Dr. Fred E. Stemme, president, Burton College and Siminary, Manitou Springs, Colo.; Isaac Stern, violinist; Dr. A. H. M. Stonecipher, dean, Lebanon Valley College, Pa.; Rex Stout, author; Leland Stowe, journalist, author; Prof. E. E. Stringfellow, Drake University; Ed Sullivan, syndicated columnist, TV personality; Rev. Alfred W. Swan, First Congregational Church, Madison, Wis.; Gerard Swope, former president, General Electric Co.; Herbert Bayard Swope, chairman, executive committee, Freedom House.

Dean John B. Thompson, Rockefeller Memorial Chapel, University of Chicago; Rev. Dr. W. C. Timmons, Southern Pines, N. C.; Bishop Donald H. Tippett, San Francisco; Dr. Earl Hollier Tomlin, executive secretary, Rhode Island Council of Churches; Willard S. Townsend, president, Transport Service Employees of America; Bishop Henry St. George Tucker, Richmond, Va.; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president, Macalester College, St. Paul; Dr. William D. Turkington, dean, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Ky.

Prof. Lloyd Ulman, University of Minnesota; Prof. Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago; Mark Van Doren, author.

Rev. Dr. King Vivion, Vineville Methodist Church, Macon Ga.; Dr. Andriew Voet, Scientist, Borger, Tex.

Judge Carl E. Wahlstrom, Worcester, Mass.; Dr. Bruno Walter, conductor; Howard D. Walton, persident, Florida State CIO; Dr. Melvin M. Watson, president, Morehouse College, Atlanta; Prof. David Wdowinski, New School for Social Research, New York City; Dr. Joseph J. Wehrle, president, Gannon College, Erie, Pa.; Dr. George Ross Wells, Hartford Theological Seminary (retired); Prof. F. W. Went, California Institute of Technology; Dr. Charles H. Wesley, president, Central State College, Wilberforce, Ohio; Dr. Roscoe L. West, president, New Jersey State Teachers College; William M. West, chairman of the board, Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Co.; Prof. Henry H. Weiman, Grinnell College; Dr. Clair S. Wightman, former president, New Jersey State Teachers College; Prof. Albert N. Williams, executive director, Associated Colleges of Illinois; Dr. H. Franklin Williams, vice president, University of Miami; Henry A. Williams, editor, Paterson Morning Call, New Jersey; Dr. Alan S. Wilson, president, Hillyer College, Hartford, Conn.; Shelley Winters, actress; Hon. James H. Wolfe (retired), Salt Lake City; Prof. J. Wolfowitz, Cornell University; Prof. Harry A. Wolfson, Harvard University; Rev. W. H. Woolard, First Christian Church, Abilene, Tex.; James Wooten, president, Protection Mutual Insurance Company of Philadelphia; Herman Wouk, author; Prof. Jesse E. Wrench, University of Missouri.

Dr. Levi Edgar Young, Church of the Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City; Dr. William Lindsay Young, vice president, National Conference on Christians and Jews, Los Angeles.

Fred Zinnemann, screen director.

Texas Schoolmen Offer Plan for Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER ROGERS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the House this week will begin debate on the question of Federal aid to education. As a firm believer in the principle that there should be no Federal control over our public school system and that local people can best assume such responsibility, I am encouraged by a plan sent to

me by the board of education of Corpus Christi, Tex. It seems to me some such program, as outlined here, whereby the States could retain a portion of tax moneys within the State to be used for school construction, is worthy of serious consideration.

For that reason, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following plan offered by the Corpus Christi Board of Education:

SUGGESTED WAYS AND MEANS OF FINANCING PUBLIC EDUCATION, GRADES 1–12

It is obvious that the increase in students will necessitate a corresponding increase in the cost of public education. Therefore, a substantial amount of new money will be necessary immediately to continue adequately the operations of our public schools. In view of the heavy over-all tax load with which America is burdened today we feel that new taxation is absolutely unnecessary.

I. We recommend that 10 percent of the Federal income tax be withheld at the State level for public school education (grades 1–12) and that—

(a) Distribution of this money be made to the respective school districts in accordance with the income tax derived from the district.

(b) A State board of equalization be established with authority to adjust assessed valuations and determine minimum tax rates for each school district in the State.

(c) Each school district, in order to be eligible for Federal income-tax money, comply with the requirements of the State Board of Equalization.

(d) The Texas Education Agency, when authorized by the State board of equalization, be empowered to certify payment of such funds to the respective school districts.

(e) These funds be used at the discretion of the local school board, in accordance with State laws, for school operations and building construction.

(f) All such funds be accounted for and be audited annually by a CPA for public and official information and the report published.

(g) Proposals submitted not be construed or designed for the purpose of reducing local district school taxes.

We feel the recommendation relative to Federal income-tax withholding would lead to the following results:

1. This would provide for the adequate operation of our public schools when the program is placed into operation.

2. This would avoid a State sales and income tax which, under present conditions, appears to be inevitable.

3. This would eliminate the necessity of voting any new taxes for public school purposes for many years.

4. This would approach the basic American philosophy of all the people paying for the education of all the children in grades 1–12.

5. This would attract and hold more and better qualified teachers (men and women) to the teaching profession.

6. This would further assure security to members of the teaching profession.

7. This would create a never-ending interest in public education since all people would now be paying school taxes.

8. This would enable us to increase salaries of members of the teaching profession.

We feel confident that this proposal would be generally accepted because—

1. There is nothing as close to the heart of American parents today as the education of their children.

2. Withholding the tax money at the State level to help finance public education would be more appreciated by American parents than just reducing the Federal income tax.

3. Reduction of the Federal income tax will not benefit the educational system at all.

4. Withholding the Federal income-tax money at the State level and distributing it in accordance with State and local regulations would eliminate the complexing problems which would be encountered if Federal aid to education, as now being considered, were distributed at the national level.

5. Ten percent of the Federal income tax withheld at the State level for public education would assist in giving the permanent shot in the arm to American economy which many of the experts state will be necessary.

6. Ten percent of the Federal income tax withheld at the State level would, with prevailing local and State taxes, solve permanently the tremendously increasing problem of financing public education.

II. We recommend that the Texas Education Agency establish procedures by which the objectives of public education in the State can be determined and that—

(a) State funds and Federal income tax money be used only to accomplish these objectives.

(b) Any program extra and beyond these objectives be financed by the local district after all other financial requirements have been met.

We feel that the interest on debt service in Texas, amounting to many millions of dollars, could be substantially reduced, thereby eventually releasing this money for the maintenance and operations of our schools. This is, of course, in addition to prevailing school funds, State and local. The tremendous amount of school buildings necessary will, under present provisions, cause this debt service to substantially increase.

III. We recommend that the Texas Legislature establish a public school building fund to lend money to school districts burdened with unusual buiding problems.

(a) School districts would qualify for loans according to their bonding capacity and ability to pay after having met all requirements of the State board of equalization. (We feel that this particular fund would not be needed more than 10 years if suggestions relative to Federal income tax withholding and State board of equalization were enacted.)

Shall the Jury System Be Sacrificed on the Altar of Economy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and a privilege for me to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Mr. Justice Walter R. Hart of the Supreme Court of the State of New York on the occasion of the approval of a certificate for the incorporation of the Committee for the Preservation of the Constitutional Rights to Trial by Jury, Inc.

This is a very timely article by an outstanding jurist, in view of the great debate now going on with respect to this subject in many parts of the country. Mr. Justice Hart was a distinguished lawyer and legislator before ascending the supreme court bench of New York. He is eminently qualified to speak on this subject. I am certain that his views will be greatly appreciated by my colleagues.

Justice Hart's statement is as follows:

SHALL THE JURY SYSTEM BE SACRIFICED ON THE ALTAR OF ECONOMY?

(Statement by Mr. Justice Walter R. Hart)

There has been submitted to me for approval a certificate for the incorporation of the Committee for the Preservation of the Constitutional Right to Trial by Jury, Inc.

In view of the historic background of the jury system and the fact that the right to a trial by jury in a civil case is guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of every State of the Union except Louisiana and Utah, the necessity for the organization of a committee such as this might be questioned.

CLOUDS ON THE HORIZON OF DEMOCRACY

During the past 5 years, however, proposals have been advanced that trial by jury be denied in actions brought to recover damages for personal injuries.

These proposals have received widespread publicity, probably due to the fact that they have been advanced by high-ranking members of the judicial system.

Numerous addresses have been made upon this subject by Presiding Justice David W. Peck of the appellate division, first department. A short time ago, while appearing on station WMCA, referring to the verdicts of juries, he said:

"I have no complaints about jury trials or the result of jury trials. The only thing about it is that the process of jury trial is so slow that you can't keep up with the rapidity of accidents in a congested community like New York City, and therefore you are presented with the problem of either changing the process of trial to get one which is more speedy or having a lot more court buildings, judges, and jurors around to try cases."

Supreme Court Justice Samuel H. Hofstadter (first department) in an article in the New York Times (February 21, 1954), is reported to have said:

"By a bare majority the trial justices of the first department last May (1953) registered their approval of a move to abolish jury trials in civil actions, with some exceptions, as under the English system."

United States Court of Appeals Judge Jerome N. Frank, in an article in Collier's magazine (December 9, 1950), said

"Since in none of the democracries other than ours today is the jury held in high esteem, it cannot be considered an essential part of democratic government."

One might be tempted to ask, where are the democracies "other than ours", and then cite the highly relevant comment made approximately 260 years ago by 1 of the justices of His Majesty's Courts of Common Pleas, Sir William Blackstone, Knt., viz:

"And, therefore, a celebrated French writer, (Mon. esq. Sp. L. xi, 6) who concludes, that because Rome, Sparta, and Carthage have lost their liberties, therefore those of England in time must perish, should have recollected that Rome, Sparta, and Carthage, at the time when their liberties were lost, were strangers to the trial by jury." [1]

ARE AWARDS OF JURIES AND JUDGES THE SAME?

In the New York State Bar Bulletin of April, 1953 (p. 117), Presiding Justice Peck states:

"Over all, there is no reason to think that results before judges would be any different from those before juries, although a more even and less spasmodic justice could be anticipated. In the one State where I know that comparisons can be made, the State of Massachusetts, where they have two courts of coordinate jurisdiction, one trying cases with juries and the other without, with no distinction in the class of cases or the monetary jurisdiction of the two courts, the fig-

Footnotes at end of speech.

ures show that the percentage of plaintiff's and defendant's verdicts is the same and the amounts of the awards are the same."

On the other hand, we find Chief Justice Arthur T. Vanderbilt, of the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, quoting Chief Justice Stern, of the Common Pleas Court of Pennsylvania, as having used the following language with respect to the disposition of actions without a jury: [2]

"The plaintiffs expressed satisfaction because they were getting a prompt hearing of their cases, with resulting prompt payments. * * * On the other hand, the defendants were equally pleased because they felt protected from the danger of reckless and extravagant verdicts, and were satisfied that the amounts found were fair and reasonable."

Associate Justice Botein, of the appellate division, in his admirable book "Trial Judge," states (at p. 142):

"A case was tried before me involving the death of a man in his thirties, who was survived by a widow and three small children. For some reason, the lawyer representing his estate did not demand a jury."

Mr. Justice Botein then goes on to discuss the facts, as found by him, as follows:

"The defendant was driving his car at an excessive rate of speed, that he had passed another car dangerously close to a curve, and that as he entered the curve his left wheels were on the wrong side of the white line bisecting the road. His car collided with that being driven by the decedent, in the opposite direction. The latter suffered internal injuries which resulted in his death in a hospital 2 days later. Unquestionably the defendant had operated his automobile negligently. * * *

"That the decedent had attended a bachelor party where he had a few drinks, and * * * that he, too, was straddling the white line. The conclusion was inescapable that the decedent had been as much to blame as the defendant."

Mr. Justice Botein then concludes:

"Under the circumstances, I had no alternative but to decide in favor of the defendant. Had I found in favor of the plaintiff, who was the widow acting as administratrix, I would have given her a verdict of sixty thousand to seventy thousand dollars. It was no comfort to me to feel that a jury might have found in her favor, or given her half that amount as a compromise verdict. Rendering a decision for the defendant was a distressing judicial duty."

The sole basis for the decision in the above case was the determination by Mr. Justice Botein that the witnesses who testified that the deceased "was straddling the white line" were telling the truth. While any other judge might have come to the same or a different conclusion from the same state of facts, the necessity for performing such "a distressing judicial duty" could have been obviated if it were not for the fact, as Mr. Justice Botein says, "For some reason, the lawyer representing his estate did not demand a jury." [3] At any rate, it is apparent from the language of this learned associate justice of the appellate division, that he is not in accord with the view expressed by the presiding justice, that "Overall there is no reason to think that results before judges would be any different from those before juries." [4]

THE FUNCTION OF A JURY

The principal function of a jury is to evaluate the credibility of the witnesses who testify before it, and attempt to come to a conclusion as to which witnesses are telling the truth, and render its verdict on that basis in accordance with the instructions from the court. Neither the jurors, in rendering their verdict, nor the judge in a case tried without a jury, in rendering his decision, pretends to know what actually happened at the time of the incident upon which the cause of action is predicated.

Presiding Justice Peck recently stated:

"On the civil side, where you are talking about whether the light was red or green, whether the car was on the wrong side of the road, how fast it was going, and those questions, I think that a judge without a jury can handle the situation as well as a jury." [5]

I repeat that no judge or jury knows whether a "light was red or green," or whether "a car was on the wrong side of the road, or how fast it was going." As hereinbefore stated, they can but listen to the testimony of the witnesses and decide the case on the basis of credibility, which I shall hereinafter demonstrate, by quotation from competent authority, can be more efficiently done by 12 citizens called from every walk of life than by the most competent and experienced judge.

REASONS ASSIGNED FOR DENIAL OF JURY TRIAL

It will be noted that no one has made an attack on the jury system upon the ground that it does not promote the interests of justice. The abolition of trial by jury is urged upon the ground that such a trial takes longer than one without a jury, and, therefore, causes congestion of the calendars in our courts. It has been said that in order to continue the jury system it will be necessary to increase the number of judges, and may even necessitate the erection of new courthouses, all of which will entail great expense.

It has been stated that jury trials belong to the horse-and-buggy age and that the advent of the motor vehicle and the resultant personal injury claims incidental to the operation of automobiles in our city streets have resulted in an increase in litigation to the extent that the calendars of our courts are congested.

The history of this State demonstrates the falsity of the contention that calendar congestion in the Supreme Court is due to the advent of the automobile. As far back as 1828 Gov. DeWitt Clinton, and in 1834 Gov. William L. Marcy, commenting on the judicial system, said it needed to be enlarged "to meet the demands of accumulated business and to prevent delays which amounted to a denial of justice." This message was repeated by Governor Marcy in 1835, 1836 and in 1837, at which time he "recommended an enlargement of the Supreme Court."

The legislature apparently found it inconvenient or impracticable to give the subject the attention it deserved but appointed a commission to investigate the circumstances. In 1839, Gov. William F. Sewart, in his annual message to the legislature, stated, "Every other vice of government is more endurable than delay in the administration of justice." Gov. William C. Bouck, in 1943, urged that the legislature make "adequate provision for the expansion of the judicial system with the increased population and business of the State."

The situation is ably summed up by Charles Z. Lincoln, who in his work entitled "Constitutional History of the State of New York" says:

"The bench and the bar and the people generally were studying the subject, and numerous plans of greater or less merit were brought to public attention. It was conceded that the situation demanded relief, but great diversity of opinion was manifest from the failure to repass many amendments, and from the failure to repass amendments which had been agreed upon by a previous legislature. The result was that no progress was made except in the presentation and comparison of plans and a general and continued discussion of the whole subject."

It is apparent from the foregoing that congestion has existed in our Supreme Court for upwards of 125 years, due solely to the fact that the legislature has failed to recognize that with the growth of population, industrial expansion and devices created by inventive genius, additional judicial manpower was not only necessary but, as heretofore pointed out, was recommended by practically every governor since DeWitt Clinton in 1828 and by almost a score of committees and commissions on the judiciary appointed during that period.

In 1894, after the consolidation of the various courts with the supreme court, there were 76 justices of the supreme court in this State which then had a population of less than 6 million people (1 judge for each 80,000 population). At that time there were no personal injury actions resulting from automobile accidents. In fact, there were no automobiles. In 1956 we have 132 justices in New York State with a population of approximately 17 million, or 1 for each 128,785 population and in the second judicial district we have approximately 1 justice of the supreme court for each 160,000 population.

I have studied the judicial history of the State and carefully examined the minutes of the various constitutional conventions, and although I found that on several occasions proposals were advanced in favor of changing the provision for a unanimous jury verdict, I could not find a single word spoken by any delegate or person in authority in support of a proposition that the right to a trial by jury be denied in any case where it had theretofore existed.

WITNESSES CALLED IN DEFENSE OF THE JURY SYSTEM

It might not be considered appropriate, and it might even be immodest, if I were to take issue with the illustrious jurists who have argued in favor of the abolition of trial by jury in personal injury cases. So I will call as witnesses historic and revered members of the bench and bar.

Sir William Blackstone: [6] "Upon these accounts the trial by jury ever has been, and I trust ever will be, looked upon as the glory of the English law. And, if it has so great an advantage over others in regulating civil property, how much must that advantage be heightened, when it is applied to criminal cases. * * * it is the most transcendent privilege which any subject can enjoy, or wish for, that he cannot be affected either in his property, his liberty, or his person, but by the unanimous consent of 12 of his neighbors and equals. A constitution, that I may venture to affirm has, under Providence, secured the just liberties of this Nation for a long succession of ages."

JURORS BETTER QUALIFIED TO FIND FACTS

As to the question as to whether a jury or a judge is better qualified to find facts, Blackstone stated:

"It is wisely therefore ordered, that the principles and axioms of law, which are general propositions, flowing from abstracted reason, and not accommodated to times or to men, should be deposited in the breasts of the judges, to be occasionally applied to such facts as come properly ascertained before them. For here partiality can have little scope: the law is well known, and is the same for all ranks and degrees; it follows as a regular conclusion from the premises of fact preestablished.

"But in settling and adjusting a question of fact, when intrusted to any single magistrate, partiality and injustice have an ample field to range in; * * *. Here therefore a competent number of sensible and upright jurymen, chosen by lot from among those of

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

the middle rank, will be found the best investigators of truth, and the surest guardians of public justice. For the most powerful individual in the State will be cautious of committing any flagrant invasion of another's right, when he knows that the fact of his oppression must be examined and decided by 12 indifferent men, not appointed till the hour of trial; and that, when once the fact is ascertained, the law must of course redress it."

As to the voice of the people in the judicial system, Blackstone observed:

"This therefore preserves in the hands of the people that share, which they ought to have in the administration of public justice, and prevents the encroachments of the more powerful and wealthy citizens."

With respect to the suggestion that the issues of fact in actions for personal injuries be disposed of by an administrative body or commissions, the remarks of Justice Blackstone, though uttered in the 18th century, are prophetic, and the warning given by him should be given heed at the present time. He stated:

"Every new tribunal, erected for the decision of facts, without the intervention of a jury (whether composed of justices of the peace, commissioners of the revenue, judges of a court of conscience, or any other standing magistrates) is a step towards establishing aristocracy, the most oppressive of absolute governments."

"It is therefore upon the whole, a duty which every man owes to his country, his friends, his posterity, and himself, to maintain to the utmost of his power this valuable constitution in all its rights; to restore it to its ancient dignity, if at all impaired by the different value of property, or otherwise deviated from its first institution; to amend it, wherever it is defective; and, above all, to guard with the most zealous circumspection against the introduction of new and arbitrary methods of trial, which, under a variety of plausible pretences, may in time imperceptibly undermine this best preservative of English liberty."

After noting the defects existing in the jury system even in those days, Blackstone continued:

"I have ventured to mark these defects, that the just panegyric, which I have given on the trial by jury, might appear to be the result of sober reflection, and not of enthusiasm or prejudice. But should they, after all, continue unremedied and unsupplied, still (with all its imperfections) I trust that this mode of decision will be found the best criterion, for investigating the truth of facts, that was ever established in any country."

FORMER JUDGE JOHN F. DILLON

My next witness is former judge John F. Dillon [7] of the Circuit Court of the United States for the 8th Judicial Circuit, and also chief justice of the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa, who was Storrs professor at Yale University (1891–1892), who emphatically stated: [8]

"Consonant with the popular character of our institutions are the grand and petit jury. They are expressions of the free and practical spirit of the common law. They have a value, a deep value, too often overlooked, beyond the specific functions they exercise. The jurors acquire and disseminate a knowledge of the laws among the local communities from which they come, and to which they return. * * * I will * * * reaffirm that in my judgment the jury is both a valuable and an essential part of our judicial and political system. It is not simply to be venerated as a reminiscence, but to be prized for its usefulness. Its roots strike deep into the soil, and cling to the very foundation stones of our jurisprudence. The system belongs to free institutions, and tends to fortify and perpetuate them. * * * I protest against the continentalization of our law. I invoke the conservative judgment of the profession against the iconoclast who in the same of reform comes to destroy the jury; against the rash surgery which holds not a cautery to cure, but a knife to amputate. Twelve good and lawful men are better judges of disputed facts than 12 learned judges."

FORMER ASSOCIATE JUSTICE SAMUEL F. MILLER, UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

May I now call as a witness former Associate Justice Samuel F. Miller, of the United States Supreme Court: [9]

"And I must say that in my experience in the conference room of the Supreme Court of the United States, which consists of nine judges, I have been surprised to find how readily those judges come to an agreement upon questions of law, and how often they disagree in regard to questions of fact, which apparently are as clear as the law. I have noticed this so often and so much, that I am willing to give the benefit of my observation on this subject to the public, that judges are not preeminently fitted over other men of good judgment in business affairs to decide upon mere questions of disputed fact."

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE GEORGE SUTHERLAND

Associate Justice George Sutherland of the Supreme Court of the United States stated the position of that Court as follows: [10]

"Maintenance of the jury as a factfinding body is of such importance and occupies so firm a place in our history and jurisprudence that any seeming curtailment should be scrutinized with the utmost care." (This was a civil case.)

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JOSEPH STORY

Justice Story of the United States Supreme Court, a most learned jurist, expressed himself as follows: [11]

"The Constitution would have been justly obnoxious if it had not confirmed it (right to trial by jury) in the most solemn terms."

PERSONAL VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT

If, after hearing what has been said or written by these illustrious jurists, anyone should happen to be even slightly interested in my views, I will take the liberty of stating them as follows:

Not a single logical reason has been advanced for the proposal to discontinue the right to a trial by jury in personal injury actions. I do not believe that the citizens of our great State will ever sanction such action solely upon the theory that to retain such right will involve the expenditure of money.

One of the grievances against King George the Third in the Declaration of Independence was that he had deprived us "in many cases of the benefits of trial by jury." This precious heritage, secured for us at the price of the blood of our ancestors, should not be sacrificed on the altar of economy.

To argue to the contrary would be as illogical as to contend that the right of the citizens to vote should be curtailed because the increased population required new polling places and additional election officials.

I cannot agree that a jury trial, while important in a criminal action, is unnecessary in a civil action. I have witnessed, during my years at the bench and bar, the horrible tragedies that have fallen upon plaintiffs in civil actions, and their families, where accidents have resulted in loss of life, limbs and eyesight. There have been carried into our court on stretchers, wheeled in on wheelchairs, walked in on crutches or artificial limbs, plaintiffs who claimed that their injuries were due to the negligence of a defendant. It certainly cannot be disputed that the impact of an unfavorable result would be far more drastic than a conviction would be to a defendant in the majority of cases where he stands accused of a crime.

No other example need be cited to emphasize the importance of a jury in a civil action than the one referred to by Mr. Justice Botein.[12]

I should like to see engraved over the portals of our new courthouse the immortal words: "The right to trial by jury as heretofore used shall forever remain inviolate."

But should we fail our ancestors who gave their lives to preserve for us this precious right, should we permit it to be abridged and in time wither and die, as it descends in silence to the grave let no man write upon its tomb a single word. When the years have passed and the impact upon our democracy shall have been fully realized, if I do not greatly deceive myself, impartial posterity will inscribe an epitaph on that tomb, expressive of profound veneration.

Gentlemen, it is with a feeling of satisfaction that I sign this certificate of the Committee for the Preservation of the Right to Trial by Jury, Inc.

---

[1] Commentaries on the Laws of England, book the 3d, 12th edition, p. 378.

[2] Challenge of Law Reform, Vanderbilt, p. 95.

[3] Supra, Trial Judge, p. 142.

[4] New York State Bar Bulletin, April 1953, p. 117.

[5] Address on radio station WMCA.

[6] Supra, pp. 378 et seq.

[7] Judge Dillon was also author of Commentaries on the Law of Municipal Corporations; member L'Institut de Droit International; late professor of real estate and equity jurisprudence in Columbia College Law School. (The lectures were published by Little, Brown & Co., 1894.)

[8] Lecture 5, p. 166.

[9] Quotations from an article by Mr. Justice Sam F. Miller (U. S. Supreme Court), The System of Trial by Jury, American Law Review, vol. 21, pp. 859, 861, 863.

[10] *Dimick* v. *Schmidt* (293 U. S. 474, 485).

[11] 2 Story on Constitution, p. 1779.

[12] See footnote 3, supra.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Address by Boyd Campbell, United States Chamber of Commerce President, Before the National Conference on Water Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Boyd Campbell, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, is a top business executive with considerable experience in the field of human relations. He is chairman of the Board of the Mississippi School Supply Co., of Jackson, Miss. He has been a director of the National Chamber since 1949, a vice president since April 1954. He is director of the First National Bank of Jackson, the Mississippi Power and Light Co. and the Gulf, Mobile and Ohio Railroad. He addressed the National Conference on Water Resources Policy at St. Louis on January 25, 1956, as follows:

There is an old Chinese proverb—so old that its origin is lost in the mists of an-

tiquity—that tells us that "Water is feared less than fire, yet fewer suffer by fire than by water."

But here we are—in the last half of the 20th century—and we are still confronted by the constantly recurring problem of too much water when we do not want it—and too little water when we do want it.

The lack of water stunts our crops or utterly destroys them. It hampers industrial operations in a thousand different ways. It affects the comfort of our homes. It limits recreation. The financial losses of too little water are incalculable.

Too much water washes out our crops, takes lives, kills livestock, devastates cities, and destroys property. Our flood losses in 1955 are estimated at $1 billion, and the average loss from floods for the past 10 years is more than $300 million per year.

And yet we are a people who pride ourselves on our mastery of physical forces.

We can split the atom, control epidemics, and fly in the stratosphere, but no man can predict with any great degree of certainty the onset of a searing drought or a devastating flood. The ancient Chinese proverb still holds true.

In light of our pretensions to scientific genius, this thought is rather humbling. The pushbutton world is a long way away, and nature's greatest secrets remain a mystery.

We cannot rule out floods or droughts by resolution or by legislation, but there is one think we can do: We can stop waste which results from too much water or too little water. Perhaps we cannot teach nature any new tricks, but we can control the rampage of floods, and we can alleviate the suffering of drought. Why haven't we done it?

Partly, I suppose, because our memories are short. When it rains, we forget about the dust bowl. When it is dry, we forget about floods. That is one reason why I am glad we are holding this National Conference on Water Resources Policy. We are focusing attention on the water problem and reminding our fellow citizens of the vast influence that water brings to bear on their affairs. An aroused public is an absolute must in this recurring struggle with nature's disastrous whims.

A few score thousand water-conscious men and women constitute only a hard core for action on the water problem. We need recruits by the millions. We need a water-conscious public, for in the end, the public will decide the ways and means of coping with our water problems—and—more importantly, perhaps—the time.

All thinking citizens could be enlisted for the active support of old but urgent water problems such as conservation, elimination of waste, pollution abatement, flood control, watershed protection and salt water conversion. Essentially, such problems—like national defense— are outside the realm of politics and noncontroversial.

Then why is this country dragging its feet? Certainly not because of the cost—when compared to the waste that results from flood or drought.

The reason seems to be that we are forced to spend so much time and energy debating the water power issue that the basic problem of water supply is obscured in a flux of words, and the public is confused.

We are forced to consume time and energy debating whether private enterprise or Government should develop our water resources—which is a question that could be solved in no time at all if the hopes of minor political advantage were subjugated to the greater good of all.

There is a place for Government in the development of our water resources. There is also a place for private enterprise. Government and private enterprise ought to work in partnership. It is almost as simple as that.

When the issue of waterpower is stripped of all the ideological doubletalk, the question of resource ownership, development, and use could be resolved by a program which would allow the most ready, willing, and able partner to do its share of the total undertaking.

Under these conditions our national policy would say that it is ridiculous to try to prevent a well-established, efficient power company from producing usable electricity from the falling waters of the Snake River.

It would say that New York State should put its $400 million proposed for power facilities at Niagara into public-works projects of benefit to all residents of the State, allowing private firms to go ahead with expansion of existing powerplants to use Niagara water.

It would proclaim that the plan for Federal Government and local interests to share in the cost of building the mighty John Day Dam, on the Columbia River, is the only wise plan to get the kilowatts so urgently needed by the people of the Pacific Northwest.

Under these conditions of getting on with the job—with each eligible member of the team undertaking the part he can best perform—our national policy would decree that anyone in need of additional water supply or electric energy should assume the responsibility for it without hindrance from others on the team.

In this way, the large industries of the Tennessee Valley would build their own generating plants; the larger cities would plan and construct municipal power stations; power-short communities and cooperatives would purchase energy from nearby utilities; and the Federal Government would have sufficient power capacity for all its legitimate defense needs in the Tennessee Valley area.

A balanced national policy on water resources would entail a four-way partnership of the Federal Government, the States, communities, and individuals. Such is the position of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The Federal Government is responsible for adequate legislation and administration of resource matters in the national interest. It should adopt the Hoover Commission recommendations on water resources and power.

It should approve private development at Niagara, partnership development at John Day, local responsibility for power supply in the TVA area, and it should act in cooperation with State and local agencies.

The States should cooperate with the Federal agencies and with each other in pollution control and abatement, and they should upgrade their programs of research, investigation, construction, and operation regarding water use, control, and conservation.

We also know today that supplementary irrigation is a coming thing in our Eastern States. This is something rather new, and pressures are being generated for changes in State laws to insure the proper allocation of water supply as, for example, between agricultural needs and municipal needs. In revising existing law to meet new conditions, cautious study will be necessary. For instance, it is not at all clear that substitution of the western doctrine of prior appropriation for the historic eastern system of riparian rights would be the answer.

Local communities with water problems should organize for action as soon as possible. This includes action on the National and State levels, as well as locally. Local effort and attention to issues of national interest often are coordinated in a chamber of commerce. Here, or elsewhere, watershed associations or water conservation districts should be organized to undertake whatever local problem exists in the area of water resources. Assistance in this activity is available from a number of national organizations, and from Federal agencies.

Individuals have always been the key to progressive programs at local or higher levels. Businessmen get group action on all sorts of issues through their chambers of other organizations. Water problems need be no exception.

The waterpower issue can be translated in terms of self-help versus centralized authority—as free enterprise versus controllism—and as opportunity versus Government monopoly.

As more people recognize this truth, the closer we will come to solving our basic water problem of supply—whether insufficient or in surplus—drought or flood. Confusion will diminish and, in the words of Pindar, the ancient Greek poet of the fifth century before the birth of Christ, water will become "the best of all things."

A Significant Victory for Public Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to report to the House what I consider a significant victory for public power. I wish to direct your attention specifically to the circumstances surrounding the sale to the Niagara Mohawk Power Co. of electricity generated by the atomic reactor located at West Milton, N. Y. My concern in this matter was aroused by information, which first came to my attention shortly before Congress adjourned last August, that the preference clause Congress had so carefully written into the Atomic Energy Act had not been complied with in any sense. As early as August 8, 1955, I called on the Atomic Energy Commission to "make a full public statement of the facts concerning the distribution of this—West Milton—power at once."

As more facts came to light, the state of affairs involving the disposition of the West Milton power grew progressively worse. On October 7, 1955, I made public the fact that a letter I had received from the Atomic Energy Commission on September 23, 1955, showed beyond peradventure of doubt that "construction of generating equipment and the disposal of the power to Niagara Mohawks was entirely arranged by General Electric in August and September of 1954 while availability of the power was effectively concealed from the public bodies entitled to a preference under the Atomic Energy Act until January 1955."

In an effort to give the facts in this situation the benefit of unmistakable clarity, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point in my remarks a chronological fact sheet on disposal of West Milton Atomic Electrical Power by the Atomic Energy Commission:

CHRONOLOGICAL FACT SHEET ON DISPOSAL OF WEST MILTON ATOMIC ELECTRIC POWER BY THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

1. The West Milton facility: The West Milton facility is an experimental Submarine Intermediate Reactor (SIR) Mark A. It was initiated by the AEC in 1950 and is the proto-

type for the SIR Mark B to be used in the submarine *Seawolf*.

2. The preference clause: Atomic Energy Act of 1954, section 44 (42 U. S. C. 2064) provides that "if energy is produced * * * in experimental utilization facilities of the Commisson, such energy may be used by the Commssion or transferred to other Government agencies, or sold to publicly, cooperatively, or privately owned utilities or users at reasonable and nondiscriminatory prices. If the energy produced is electric energy, the price shall be subject to regulation by the appropriate agency having jurisdiction. In contracting for the disposal of such energy, the Commission shall give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives or to privately owned utilites providing electrc utility services to high-cost areas not being served by public bodies or cooperatives."

3. Negotiations with private corporations:

A. On August 18, 1954, General Electric Co. proposed to the AEC that excess steam being generated at West Milton could be utilized to generate electricity and made a specific propostiion to the AEC that included the following (1) Title to the facilities would remain in GE; (2) facilities would be available for 3 years and would cost GE a million dollars and the Government nothing; (3) about 10,000 kilowatts of electric power would be available by the summer of 1955; (4) Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. would take the power on an "if, as, and when" basis at a price of 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. (This is the same price as that to be paid by Duquesne Light Co. for power from the civilian nuclear plant at Shippingport, Pa.)

B. On September 3, 1954, representatives of GE and the AEC met in Washington to discuss GE's proposal. The preference clause in section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act was discussed.

C. On September 24, 1954, Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. proposed to AEC that it would purchase the power generated by GE on an "if, as, and when" basis for 8 mills per kilowatt-hour.

D. On October 7, 1954, GE sent a report to AEC concerning the possible sale of West Milton power to preference utilities. In this report GE indicated its opinion that it was completely impractical for even the nearest public power body to use the West Milton power.

E. On October 18, 1954, General Electric again wrote to the AEC declaring that it was impracticable for anyone other. than GE to operate the generating facilities at West Milton. (The Westinghouse Electric Corp. operated and constructed the experimental submarine thermal reactor (STR) Mark I at the National Reactor Testing Station in Idaho previously.)

F. Finally, on November 3, 1945, the Commission approved the GE proposal to generate power from the excess steam at West Milton.

G. On January 4, 1955, the AEC discussed with General Electric the sale of the West Milton power.

4. Negotiations with public utilities:

A. As the initial step prior to contacting the preference utilities the General Electric Co. wrote to the AEC and provided the Commission with a list suggested by Niagara Mohawk as contacts in the 26 public and cooperative power organizations located within 100 miles of West Milton.

B. Following receipt of this information the Commission on January 13 and 14 communicated by telephone with only these 26 utilities and also contacted 3 other private utilities.

C. The following obstacles to use of the power by the public bodies were set up by the Commission: (1) All power available would have to be taken by the prospective purchaser; (2) no amount of power, however, could be guaranteed; (3) what power would be produced would first be available by July 30, 1955, and all transmission arrangements would have to be made by the purchaser; (4) an initial 2-week time limit was set by the Commission.

D. Of the notified utilities three, Holyoke, Mass., Gas and Electric Department, Ilion, N. Y., Board of Light Commissioners, and the New York State Rural Electric Cooperatives Association, were interested in obtaining the power from the outset. All three remain interested in obtaining the power being produced at West Milton (February, March, and April).

E. For the next 3 months, the Atomic Energy Commission consistently refused to put a price on the power to be available at West Milton and persisted in trying to obtain an offer from the preference customers.

1. On March 9, 1955, the Acting Chairman of AEC wrote to the general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association refusing to set a price and soliciting an offer.

2. On March 24, 1955, the manager of the AEC Schenectady office wrote to the Delaware County Electric Cooperative (a member of the New York State Rural Electric Cooperative Association), reasserting the obstacles in the path of the public utilities.

F. Extensions of time were granted to the public utilities in making their proposals and on April 13, 1955 the AEC contacted the General Electric Co. to ascertain whether such extensions were all right with GE. On April 19, 1955 representatives of the AEC restated the unfirm nature of the prospective power and its indefinite timing and quality.

G. On May 11, 1955, the public utilities were for the first time informed that Niagara Mohawk had offered 8 mills for the West Milton power.

H. On May 17, June 4, June 6, June 8, June 21 and June 22, 1955, General Electric Co. contacted the AEC informing it of the imminent completion and then of the completion of the installation of the generating facilities and GE's desire to expedite the sale of the power.

I. On June 8, 1955, the Commission set a deadline of 2 weeks for the submission of proposals by the preference utilities.

J. On June 15 and June 17, 1955, the Municipal Electric Association of Massachusetts and New York State Rural Electric Association and the Ilion Board of Light Commissioners proposed purchasing of the power at a price of 3 mills per kilowatt hour. The Ilion Board proposed that the power be delivered to Niagara Mohawk and in exchange for Niagara Mohawk transmitting it, Ilion would take 1 kilowatt hour for every 2 Niagara Mohawk received at West Milton. Ilion would pay for all the power received by Niagara Mohawk.

K. On June 22, 1955, General Electric, AEC and Niagara Mohawk reportedly discussed contract terms.

L. On June 29, 1955, the Commission established a price of 3 mills per kilowatt hour for the West Milton power. It also approved sale of the power to Niagara Mohawk since it knew that the preference utilities had been unable to make transmission arrangements.

M. On July 13, 1955, a 3-month contract with Niagara Mohawk was signed by the AEC.

N. On July 18, 1955, in well-publicized public ceremonies General Electric produced electricity from atomic energy which was delivered to Niagara Mohawk at West Milton.

O. On July 19, 1955, the President of Niagara Mohawk formally rejected the preference utilities 2 for 1 offer.

P. On October 11, 1955, the contract between AEC and Niagara Mohawk expired.

Mr. Speaker, this chronology indicates clearly, as you will note—point 3, section G—that Niagara Mohawk offered the AEC a price of 8 mills per kilowatt-hour on September 24, 1954 and that the preference groups were not notified of the Niagara bid until May 11, 1955, 9 months later—point 4, section G.

Furthermore, the chronology shows—point 3, section G—that on September 24, 1954, Niagara Mohawk proposed to the Atomic Energy Commission that it would purchase the power generated by the reactor on an if, as, and when basis and that it was not until January of 1955, 4 months later, that the Commission for the first time notified the preference groups of the fact that there would be an available source of electricity at West Milton—point 4, section B.

In point 4, section C of the chronology, the various obstacles to utilization of the electrical power by the public bodies which were thrown up by the Atomic Energy Commission are set forth. It seems to me that they indicate the somewhat less than subtle technique employed by the Commission to debar the preference groups from any opportunity to contract successfully for this power.

As these facts and the others in the chronology were brought to light, Mr. Speaker, I felt they clearly showed an attempt by the AEC to prevent and subvert the congressional intent in enacting the preference clause. The conduct of the AEC I consider to be a scandalous example of the giveaway philosophy of the present Republican-led administration. As a result, a considerable amount of correspondence ensued between my office and the Atomic Energy Commission. I should like to report on the most recent of these letters, because they most clearly reflect the victory that is here claimed.

On October 6, 1955, in a letter to Chairman Strauss, I indicated among other things that since the agreement entered into with Niagara Mohawk would expire on October 11, the Commission was presented with "an ideal opportunity to review this situation and enter into an agreement with the interested preference utilities under section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954." Receipt of my letter was acknowledged on October 11 and on November 4, 1955, I was advised in the reply from the Commission that the preference groups had been granted an extension of time for the submission of bids, in order to give them additional time to arrange for transmission of the power to their systems and that in an effort to afford every opportunity to municipal and cooperative bodies to obtain the advantage of the preference provision of section 44 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the Commission is giving such groups a further extension of time to January 1, 1956, within which to submit firm proposals for the purchase of West Milton power at the bus bar at the established price of 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Then, Mr. Speaker, on December 29, 1955, the Atomic Energy Commission sent me the latest letter in our exchange of correspondence. In that letter, Mr. K. E. Fields, General Manager of the Commission, informed me that the Commission had been told "by one of the

preference groups that negotiations are underway with Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. on arrangements for transmitting the power, but that additional time beyond the January 1, 1956, deadline for the submission of firm proposals to purchase the power would be required. In response to this request, the time is being extended to February 1, 1956. All interested preference groups are being notified of this extension."

In view of the fact that the deadline for these negotiations is but a few days away, I believe it appropriate at this time to place this matter in its entirety before the House. I am sure that each of my colleagues will watch, with an interest equal to my own, for developments leading to a successful conclusion of these negotiations between one of the preference groups an Niagara Mohawk. There can be no doubt that the public interest will be best served by the consummation of such an agreement.

I hope that you, Mr. Speaker, and that my colleagues in the House will forgive my feelings of hopefulness. The consideration that preference utilities are now being afforded is heartening indeed, for it was the intention of Congress in enacting the preference clause that they should be given the first opportunity to purchase this atomic electric power if they desired it. That the congressional intent is now, finally, being complied with and followed is a significant victory for small rural communities, the farmer and modest municipal utilities who for so long have been deprived of cheap, firm electric power by the utility monopoly.

Another Study of the Farmers' Ills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Another Study of the Farmers' Ills," which appeared in the January 23, 1956, issue of the Madisonville Messenger, of Madisonville, Ky.:

ANOTHER STUDY OF THE FARMERS' ILLS

Measures designed to help farmers attain a high and rising standard of living in the present good times without continuous Government accumulation of surpluses, and without production controls, are proposed by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, Washington.

In a detailed study of the farm problem, the committee recommends, the Messenger notes, that the costs of necessary economic readjustments for agriculture be shared by the country as a whole, rather than being borne entirely by farmers. Says the study:

"The Nation faces an accumulation of problems that have become urgent and that, because of their size and character, agriculture cannot handle by itself. There is no quick and easy way out of our present farm difficulties."

The committee identifies three fundamental problems which in its opinion require public action:

1. Too much production of some farm products.

2. Too much instability of farmers' incomes.

3. Too many full-time farm families with very low incomes.

To deal with the problem of surplus crops, the committee recommends a combination of continued price supports at gradually reduced levels, coupled with a program to pay farmers to take some land out of production. Governmental rental of this land should be geared to bringing production and consumption into balance over a period of perhaps 5 years, it suggested.

To deal with the problem of unstable incomes, the committee recommends "moderating extreme price fluctuations through a system of flexible price supports or income payments and a storage program. These devices would not be used to affect the long-run movement of prices, but would protect farmers against sharp and temporary swings of prices and income."

To alleviate the problems of 1 million farmers in areas of persistently low incomes, the committee would encourage movement of people out of the areas, stimulating such movement by increasing the amount of information available about jobs in urban areas. To this rather doubtful expedient the committee adds, the Messenger notes:

"The possibilities of offering financial aid to families who want to move, and of encouraging industrialization in rural areas, should also be explored. Farmers who remain in the low-income areas should be assisted in obtaining larger farms. For this, special credit arrangements and training in new methods will be required in many cases."

The committee opposes continuation of high, rigid price supports as wasteful and self-defeating. It also opposes using a two-price system to dispose of surpluses abroad at prices lower than prevail in our own country.

The committee, it seems to the Messenger, has tackled the vast and complex problems of agriculture in rather pat and learned fashion, in a report which makes good reading but which is easy to compile, compared to the superman job of putting it into practical operation. Like other typewriter and paper solutions of the sort, the farmer must now wait and see what comes of this one.

Nixon Defends Policy That Maintains Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am calling attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Illinois State Journal, a newspaper I consider to be one of the very best in the country:

NIXON DEFENDS POLICY THAT MAINTAINS PEACE

Apparently the hierarchy of the Democratic Party couldn't think up a sound answer to Vice President RICHARD NIXON's hard-hitting salute to Eisenhower speech in which he declared that "indecision, weakness, retreat, and surrender do not bring peace in dealing with dictatorial, aggressive communism."

The statement was a rebuttal against Adlai Stevenson's sarcastic "Russian roulette" statement. Stevenson had said that Secretary of State Dulles was playing Russian roulette with the fate of the Nation by using threats of military force to stop Communist aggressors.

NIXON posed a question that the American voter ought to think seriously about before ever casting a ballot for Adlai Stevenson, if Stevenson becomes a candidate: It was this: "What does he (Stevenson) offer?"

"Nothing except a return to the Acheson foreign policy," NIXON said.

He answered: "Whether it brings war or peace."

NIXON's reference to Stevenson's quavering attitude on the Formosa and Quemoy issue hardly needs elaboration. This newspaper pointed out Stevenson's attitude on Quemoy and Matsu last spring when the issue was hot. Stevenson implied that it was far better to give the Reds the islands than to face them with military force.

If the United States had done that, the Chinese Reds would have gained tremendous face in Asia and the United States would have been made out a coward.

But Stevenson wasn't President, thank God.

1956 National Champion Flying Wheels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Flying Wheels of the Long Beach Veterans Hospital are in Washington today on their 10th coast-to-coast nonprofit, noncommercial trip to play the Nation's top-ranking wheelchair basketball teams and provide inspiration and free entertainment for hospitalized veterans and to call America's attention to the National Paraplegia Research Foundation.

Each member of the team is a veteran, paralyzed from the waist down. Yet the vigorous game of basketball on wheelchairs has given him the opportunity to become a national champion in athletics. The example of the Flying Wheels is an example and inspiration to all who are handicapped.

Those who saw the Flying Wheels defeat the Bulova Watch Co. squad at Bethesda Naval Hospital last night will testify that wheelchair basketball is fully as exciting as the regular game. They saw the team play that won the 1955 national championships held at Chanute Air Force Base.

Funds on their annual trips throughout the Nation were first raised by Mr. John B. Old through personal solicitation of his friends in the sports, theatrical, and business worlds. For the fifth year, their trip has been sponsored by the Los Angeles Herald-Express through Mr. David Hearst, publisher, and Mr. Vic Dunsmore, business manager.

The following information furnished by the Flying Wheels should be of interest to all:

MEDICALLY SPEAKING

An excerpt from Veterans' Administration Technical Bulletin TB 10-503, page 36, paragraph 5, reveals:

"The importance of competitive games for physical and psychological rehabilitation of paraplegics must not be forgotten. These games maintain the musculature in good condition, improve coordination and put to severe test the paraplegic's ability to balance as in a fast basketball game conducted from wheelchairs.

"The mental goal achieved by such competition is a loss of self-consciousness and a gain of self-reliance.

"It is medically desirable that tournaments be regularly arranged between the several paraplegic centers in the Veterans' Administration."

Dr. Ernest Bors, medical chief, paraplegic section, Long Beach Veterans' Hospital, observes:

"Having witnessed the very beginning of the athletic rehabilitation of paraplegic patients, I am impressed with the beneficial effect wheelchair basketball has on the morale and on the physical well-being of the paralyzed veterans.

"Successful rehabilitation of the severely disabled person is contingent upon the mental approach. It is evident that the self-consciousness of patients, who are bound to use a wheelchair, has been greatly relieved by competitive performances before spectators. Good muscle function, so vital to the patient with a spinal cord injury, is obtained through participation in wheelchair basketball.

"The patient's desire to play wheelchair basketball makes his mental and physical rehabilitation a voluntary pleasure."

BEST YEARS OF THEIR LIVES

Paralyzed veterans are fine young Americans. Many will never walk again. They're paralyzed from the waist down. Most of 'em are victims of an enemy bullet in the spine. Others are victims of polio or tragic accidents. All served their country gallantly.

Many are continuously bedridden. Others find themselves chained to wheelchairs for the rest of their life, compelled to return periodically to VA hospitals for check-ups and medical attention.

Their incentive to live isn't the same as most people—or so you might reasonably assume. Not so with the courageous members of the Flying Wheels, all-star wheelchair basketball squad of the Long Beach, Calif., Paralyzed Veterans' Association.

They're out to prove to themselves, to their less fortunate bedridden PVA brethren, polio victims everywhere and the world at large that the years to come should not be wasted in self-pity or vain regrets sitting on the sidelines of life. They're participants.

The agonies of the soul which all hopelessly crippled young veterans must have suffered can only be imagined. What gutty guys like the Flying Wheels are doing today takes more courage, in a way, than they were called on to display against the enemy.

Although their mode of living is limited, they have but one code: "Ability, not disability, counts." Wheelchair basketball is doing much to keep that spirit alive and contagious.

It all started early in World War II at the now discarded Birmingham VA hospital, Van Nuys, Calif. Hunting a way to inspire bedridden patients, Bob Rynearson, of the Recreation Department, hit upon the idea of wheelchair basketball—played just like able-bodied teams do with only slight variations—such as two pushes on the wheels, while the ball rests on a player's lap, is the equivalent of a dribble.

Occasionally a veteran would wheel down to the gym. On the court self confidence was bolstered. Returning to his ward, he'd brag of his shooting—a direct challenge to wardmates to get out of bed. As the competitive spirit lurks in the heart of every American youth, many accepted. Later more and more. For most of the paraplegics it was their first real inspiration "to get out of bed—back into the American competitive way of life" if only to beat a bunkmate.

Once on the court they gained physical benefits far and beyond the reach of calisthenics. A new and hopeful mental outlook was born. They bit heavily into the challenge to excel, found they were no longer cognizant of their handicap. Now all wheelchair basketball players love crowds—especially when backward fellows with similar handicaps are watching. Their brilliant court play is inspiring proof positive that "ability, not disability, counts."

Because of its proven value, wheelchair basketball is now played wherever PVA groups assemble. Unfortunately for the southern California group, there is no other VA paraplegic center west of Kansas City. Hence these annual coast-to-coast, nonprofit, noncommercial tours. The Flying Wheels want to meet and beat the best wheelchair teams in the country.

Hail to the gallant crusading Flying Wheels, national wheelchair basketball champions.

FLYING WHEELS' RECORD

In nine coast-to-coast wheelchair basketball tours, the famed Flying Wheels have amassed the sensational record of 62 games won, 22 lost, in 84 intersectional engagements.

To date the Californians, 1955 national champions (they captured the title last year at Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.), have averaged 35 points per game—a remarkable percentage for the unique sport.

Prior to starting their current junket, the Flying Wheels boasted a record of 13 straight triumphs—9 last year, a final game victory in 1954, and 3 in the 1955 titular tourney.

Here's the record achieved by the Wheels since their inception in 1948:

	Won	Lost
1948	12	1
1949	7	4
1950	10	1
1951	3	6
1952	3	3
1953	9	1
1953 [1]	1	2
1954	5	4
1955	9	0
1955 [2]	3	0
Total	62	22

[1] National Tourney, New York City, N. Y.
[2] National Tourney, Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Ill.

FLYING WHEELS SCHEDULE, 1956

January 27: Play St. Louis Rolling Rams at Concordia Seminary.

January 29: Play New York Bulova Watchmakers at Bethesda Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md.

January 30: Play Charioteers at McGuire Hospital, Richmond, Va.

February 1: Play Jersey Wheelers at 62d Columbus Armory, New York City.

February 2: Play Pan-Am Jets at Forest Hills High, Long Island.

February 4: Play New York Spokesmen at Yonkers.

February 6: Play Whirlaways at St. Albans, Brooklyn.

February 8: Play Illinois "Gizz Kids" at Navy Pier, Chicago, Ill.

February 9: Play Rolling Pioneers, Kansas City, Mo.

THE FLYING WHEELS SQUAD ROSTER FOR 1956

(California Paralyzed Veterans Association, Long Beach VA Hospital Chapter)

John McGinley (3), center, Army.
Dick Thomas (4), forward, Seabees.
Bill Johnson (5), center, Air Force.
Morris Moorhead (6), guard, Marine Corps.
Bill Fairbanks (10), guard, equipment manager.
Dick Kaiser (11), center, Navy.
Gus Morrill (15), forward, Marine Corps.
Al Halverson (16), forward, Army.
Gene Haley (20), forward, Navy.

1956 FLYING WHEELS ABLE-BODIED PERSONNEL

Coach: Bill Patterson, Long Beach, Calif., Miliken High School.

Physician: Dr. John F. Fahey, Los Angeles, Calif.

Trainer: Dave Flores, Los Angeles Baseball Club.

Publicity director: Sam Schnitzer (Los Angeles Examiner).

Tour director: John B. Old (Los Angeles Herald-Express).

Air service: Trans-World Airlines.

FLYING WHEELS EXPENSE

All traveling expenses for this tour—and last four years—paid by the Los Angeles Herald-Express through the courtesy of Mr. David Hearst, publisher; and Mr. Vic Dunsmore, business manager.

Expenses for the other five coast-to-coast tours were raised by Mr. John B. Old through personal solicitation of his friends in the sports, theatrical, and business worlds.

Lee and Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Lee and Jackson," which appeared in the January 24, 1956, issue of the Irvington Herald, of Irvington, Ky.:

LEE AND JACKSON

Gen. Robert E. Lee and Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, Confederate heroes, were born on January 19 and 21, respectively, although not in the same year. Their birthday anniversaries especially Lee's, are observed in a number of States.

The hero of a lost cause generally misses his chance of immortality because the old adage that "might makes right" relegates his cause to a losing effort, a repressed one. Occasionally an individual, or more than one individual, stands out above the ordinary stress and strain of his times, and his reputation survives almost untarnished.

In the case of both Lee and Jackson, there are few people today who doubt that they possessed a strength of convictions, not surpassed by their fellow men. In addition, they had an almost impossible task to perform, and they attempted to perform it courageously, to the end.

In the case of Lee, he hoped to the last that the Union would not divide. He had freed his own slaves and had turned down an offer to command the Union armies prior to the beginning of the war. He believed sincerely that his first duty lay with his State, Virginia, and that he could not draw his sword against his native State.

In those days, there were about as many Americans who believed that States could secede as there were those who held convictions to the contrary. Certainly, there were honorable and intelligent men who differed on this great question, and who were bound to act on faith in their convictions.

As a military leader, Lee had no peer in American history nor has he any today.

Nor has Stonewall Jackson, who was killed by his own troops, through error, in 1863. One reason why the United States has not produced military leaders who have outshone these two Confederate generals is the fact that the United States has never since been outnumbered in a war or faced the odds that the Confederate armies faced in 1861–65.

Be that as it may, the military achievements of both Lee and Jackson are admired, and studied, the world over today. But, more than that, their personal lives are examples of devotion to duty, honor, and courage, and the last measure of sacrifice. The fact that they fought for a lost cause does not deny them a place in history, or the admiration of Americans in all parts of our great country.

Address by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, at The Citadel, Charleston, S. C., January 28, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Gen. Nathan F. Twining:

I am certainly glad to be here with you today, and I want to thank you for inviting me down. I am sorry that I have been unable to accept previous invitations. Now that I am at The Citadel I realize the experience was worth waiting for.

Needless to say, I have been impressed by the military snap and precision of your cadet organization. I must admit that I was prepared for this and was not surprised by your military proficiency. When General White, Vice Chief of the Air Force, returned from his visit to The Citadel last March, he told me of the fine review you put on for him. Now I have seen the reason for his glowing remarks.

You might be interested to know that General White gave me another piece of timely intelligence. He warned me that on any Saturday morning I would be up against fierce competition for your attention. He said that shortly after his Saturday morning talk last year, the campus was invaded by dozens of the prettiest young girls in South Carolina.

Your tradition is one of gallant resistance to aggression. Nevertheless, I understand that on Saturday afternoons you lose your taste for combat and that you even encourage these weekend invasions of your historic grounds.

I cannot say that I blame you if your attention this morning wandered to thoughts of a pleasant interlude this afternoon. Therefore, I will take General White's advice to me, and make what I have to say to you rather brief.

There are two points I would like to discuss this morning. First, what air power and atomic weapons mean to our Nation. Second, a few probable effects that air power and atomic weapons will have on any future war.

A war winning potential is not the greatest value of air power and atomic weapons to the United States. Their great value lies in their potential for preventing war. Specifically, the capability of our nuclear armed Air Forces allow leaders of the United States to think, plan, speak, and act from a position of paramount strength. Only with great strength to back it up, can this Nation be free to do what we think is morally right.

Without this power to back us, in times of crisis, we would either have to back down or expose ourselves to great danger.

We did not always have the strength to back our moral stands. You here at the Citadel undoubtedly recall the historic XYZ drama in which Charleston's Charles Cotesworth Pinckney played a prominent part.

You will remember that in 1797, the United States was in an uncomfortable position between two hostile nations—France and England.

When President Adams took charge, American relations with France were especially difficult. Our foreign minister had been recalled from Paris the year before, and President Adams felt it necessary that we again be represented in the French capital. He therefore sent a misson of 3 men to see what could be gained by diplomacy.

The three envoys included Charles Cotesworth Pinckney. When they arrived in Paris, they were rebuffed and could make no headway at all. While waiting to be received by the French leaders, the three envoys were approached by blackmailers who purported to represent the French leaders. They proposed that the United States lend France $10 million and in addition, present a gift of $250,000 to Talleyrand as a price to reopen diplomatic negotiations.

The alternative was, of course, continued diplomatic stalemate plus threats of force against the United States.

Charles Pinckney answered this proposal, and his answer is immortalized on a monument in St. Michael's Church here in Charleston.

You all know this phrase which became a rallying cry throughout America. It was, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

This has gone down in history as a magnificent gesture. Indeed it was—but it was also the loud assertion of a newborn nation struggling for a place in the world. The United States Government was less than 10 years old. Our Nation's muscles were only beginning to develop, and its land did not extend beyond the Mississippi. Our Army was insignificant and our Navy had its hands full with the British on the Great Lakes.

Nevertheless, we shouted our youthful defiance and prepared for war with France.

Clearly we did not have the strength to back up our valiant words. Nevertheless in 1797, we survived that crisis.

Today a weak United States could not survive a similar crisis. We are dealing with a potential enemy who has demonstrated his lack of respect for anything but power.

The strength of our nuclear air power has been the insurmountable obstacle in the path of Communist aggression. As President Eisenhower mentioned in his state of the Union message, the Comunists have been forced from other aggression to other means of achieving their goals.

Our position of power has enabled us to rally our free world allies into an effective force to resist the spread of communism. It has enabled us to help our allies, and it has lent strength to the entire free world.

Our ability to deliver as many high-powered, nuclear weapons as necessary, anywhere in the world, has been the principal deterrent to war. It may be the prime reason we are not now at war. As such, we must continue to improve our air strength because, for the time being, it offers our best hope for peace.

The hopes for peace, however, are not necessarily any more than just hopes. As long as the Communists covet the world, and as long as the Soviet war machine continues to rumble, we face the possibility of war. This is why we must maintain an Army, a Navy, and our Air Force. This is also one of the many important reasons for military colleges like this one.

We must study war and actually plan the strategy of hypothetical wars at the same time we try to avoid one. We have talked of the value of nuclear weapons and air power to our Nation during peace. To complete the picture, we must also examine the impact of atomic weapons on war.

Here at The Citadel, you have studied history's great battles. I need not elaborate on the way that we have defeated the enemy in past conflicts. Our armies and navies resisted attacks and then counterattacked. Our land, sea, and air forces have had to seek out the enemy, and then fight either to destroy him or to force him to surreunder.

In World War II we defeated Hitler by overwhelming him. It was true then as it had been in all wars—decisions have always gone to the side that applied the most power at the right place.

From man's first conflict, fighting power has been roughly proportional to manpower and supplies. Whether using stones, clubs, rifles, cannon, or TNT the victorious side was the side with the most armed forces in position to fight. Of course, there have been historic battles in which superior forces were defeated by superior tactics, but the great wars and campaigns have been won always by volume of effective pressure.

To exert the necessary pressure in both World Wars, we had to arm and send forth millions of men. Following the principles of mass and concentration of force, we used huge numbers of men, rifles, tanks, ships, and airplanes. Keeping these tremendous forces going required mountains of supplies—millions of tons of ammunition, gasoline, oil, food, and clothing. Mobilizing this force and placing it into position to fight took months—even years.

We won the war because we put more men in position to fight. They fought with rifles, tanks, ships, and airplanes—but always they were massed at decisive points.

Now how would that work today?

The atomic bomb has not magically cancelled the principle of mass, but it has altered the way mass is used. When one considers that a single aircraft can unleash more explosive force than all the bombs dropped in World War II, it becomes obvious that mass is no longer measured in manpower but in megatons.

This is a military advantage to the United States. If we are ever forced to fight the Communists man for man, we are indeed in trouble. Communist China is the world's most populous nation. Soviet Russia is the third most populous nation. Furthermore, the Communist armies are equipped with modern weapons that compare favorably with those in the hands of our troops.

In America, manpower is our most precious asset. Not only that, but man-hours are our most expensive resource. In every product that we buy, from refrigerators to jet bombers, labor costs—man-hours—are the biggest part of the price.

Obviously, if we must meet a challenge, we should fight on our terms and with our own strengths, not the enemy's. We must use the products of our technology so that we can be most effective at the least cost of men.

It seems to me that we cannot but incline toward a nuclear strategy in reaction to aggression by a major enemy.

Let me add that it will not be very long until every potential enemy will have a nuclear capability. We are approaching, if not already in, an era of nuclear plenty.

Although the Communist satellites may have no atomic bombs of their own yet, how long will this situation last? We must as-

sume that many, if not all, of the satellites will be provided with or will develop some degree of nuclear capability just as they are now being provided with modern jet planes.

For a few years, the possibility of a nonnuclear peripheral action may be with us. However, we are rapidly approaching the day when any conflict would be waged with nuclear weapons.

Although we recognize that we are committed to a nuclear strategy in a major war, we intend to retain within our force structure the capability for limited conventional actions. The Air Force can now provide all the airlift for the Army that is now required by joint agreement. We are continuing to expand and improve this capability. Within the next few years, new turboprop transports will multiply our airlift capacity.

Furthermore, all our combat aircraft can put nonnuclear weapons on any target.

But you must remember that our capability to fight conventional action is limited. Our Armed Forces could not be successful against a major aggressor unless we do exploit our nuclear capability.

Maintaining a dual capability to fight a major enemy might be desirable, but doing this would double or triple our defense budget—an unlikely event. Can you imagine how many divisions, guns, airplanes, and bombs, it would require to be successful in a conventional campaign against the well-equipped Communist armies and air forces of Asia and Europe?

This is the reason that all three services are making great efforts to enlarge and improve their atomic capability.

Faced with the prospect of atomic war, what form could we expect to take?

Let us look at the most significant aspect of a nuclear conflict. That is time. The trade of nuclear blows would be necessarily swift. Unlike past wars, the peak of destruction would come at the very beginning instead of near the end of the war, after years of intensifying effort.

The largest stockpile of atomic weapons could be delivered in a few days. Since this time is so short, people have difficulty in assessing the probable effects of the atomic duel. Some visualize that airmen will complete this exchange of bombs quickly and that the real war will then go on in the traditional manner.

Yet, even a limited trade of atomic weapons would mean an exchange of more firepower than the total of all wars of history. Could anyone really believe that war in the traditional form could follow this opening phase? Even in the unlikely event that our land, sea, and air forces were to emerge unscathed, the devastation of communications, supplies, ports and bases would prohibit the use of these forces as they were used in past wars.

In all likelihood this initial exchange of atomic blows could be the dicisive phase.

I am not describing a short war. I want to emphasize that no Air Force spokesman has ever said that a future war would be short. We do say that the first phase, lasting only a few weeks may well be the decisive phase, but the war could and probably would last much longer.

There is another point I would emphasize here. Although we believe the first furious phase will be characterized by intense air action, no responsible Air Force spokesman has ever implied that foot soldiers have become obsolete.

Under our system of collective security each member contributes the strength it is best suited to furnish.

Ground troops are the type of force that many of our allies are best able to contribute, but they do not now have an equal ability to build and maintain the air power needed in a major war.

When the peak of the atomic exchange has been passed, then the ability to go on and show the enemy that he is defeated would depend on how well the foot soldiers of the United States and our allies have weathered the early days. This is when the forces that can exercise and exploit control of land and sea will begin to play an important part.

But while the atomic exchange is going on, the land and sea arms of both sides will be primarily occupied by attempts to survive.

Real effort to improve and enlarge the flying arms of the other services demonstrates their realization of the importance of air operations.

Airmen welcome this belated acceptance of the importance of air operations. But of course there is always concern that this trend could result in duplication and waste of our air effort and our national resources.

Looking at the overall prospects of future war, if forced into one, we are faced, then, with the probability that we would have to follow a nuclear strategy. In this case, the air battle is likely to be not only the first but also the short and decisive phase.

What is the effect of these concepts on all our planning? On our military organizations? On our preparations, our mobilization, and our stockpiling?

These questions and others like them are ones which military planners and military students like yourselves should be giving serious study. I hope you are.

There is one thought I would like to reemphasize and leave with you.

The better our atomic weapons and the more skillfully we can employ them, the less become the chances of war. If we have at last reached the time when the function of military forces is to prevent war rather than to fight them, we and the world have come a long way.

The ability of the United States of America to speak and to act with respected authority has been fostered by the atomic-air power. This air power has also presented us with the prospect of modern war with its quick, terrible destruction and early decision.

It is up to us to make sure that war becomes a diminishing prospect and that peace becomes an increasing reality.

I promised to be brief so I will omit any further summary.

Let me thank you again for this opportunity to speak. It has been a real pleasure to visit with you.

Water for Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Water for Growth," which appeared in the January 23, 1956, issue of the Messenger and Inquirer of Owensboro, Ky.:

WATER FOR GROWTH

The national water need, now at 200 billion gallons a day, will rise to an estimated 350 billion gallons within the next 2 decades, a presidential advisory committee of 3 cabinet secretaries foresees. To meet this need, it made a 2-year study of the water resources of the country, with recommendations which have been passed on to Congress with the President's recommendation for legislation.

"Lack of adequate planning threatens to impose a water scarcity, which can become a limiting factor on the growth of some of our cities while at the same time flood damage in many areas continues to be great," the committee declares. It emphasized the fact that shortages of water both for industrial and agricultural need was already frequent.

However, the remedies the committee suggests do not seem to be far-reaching or clear-cut. Citing the fact that some 25 Federal agencies are involved in some phase of water resources development—the most important being the Soil Conservation Service in the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Reclamation in Interior, and the Army Corps of Engineers in Defense—the committee suggests that a coordinator of water resources be authorized in the White House. A new independent board of review would also be established to analyze the engineering and economic feasibility of water resources projects.

But, unfortunately, no dynamic policy as such is outlined to satisfy the water needs foreseen or to reduce floods and channel their waters to domestic uses.

Polish Seamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill at the request of the Polish Immigration Committee at 25 St. Marks Place, New York, N. Y. The Right Rev. Msgr. Felix F. Burant is president and director of this organization for relief of Polish immigrants.

Last year, at Monsignor Burant's request, I introduced private legislation for the relief of certain Polish sailors who refused to return to Poland and stayed in Formosa.

Just recently, it was disclosed in the newspapers that three of these boys returned to Poland. They were the victims, the report states, of pressures—moral, physical, and psychological. The remaining members of this crew are greatly concerned about their status.

Enclosed is a letter regarding these men which was received from Monsignor Burant asking me again to reintroduce legislation that would assist them in acquiring American citizenship.

Inserted also in the RECORD for the benefit of Members of the House are the views of a person intimately concerned with the problems of such people as these Polish seamen. This person prepared a special report based on 2 or 3 of his interviews with each and every Polish sailor who remained in Formosa. An extract of his report follows:

"The boys complained distinctly about the fact that their immigration status in this country has not been settled. They said that they were informed on their departure from Formosa that they would be given the right of permanent residence and that, following this right, they would be able to continue to serve as seamen. Many of them would like to continue in their profession. And yet, after their arrival in the United States, they were surprised by new hearings and screening. As they see it, the sense of

insecurity in this country could have contributed to a certain extent to the decision of the trio."

Incidentally, the minds of the remaining boys cannot conceive the idea that American authorities tolerate this kind of invavasion of private residences by the regime officials, the harassing of people in their homes and blackmailing them by delivering private mail from their families. They are also at a loss to understand how the trio could so easily leave the United States.

To them this is a symptom of the West's helplessness in its fight against the Communist agents hiding behind the mask of diplomatic representatives. I am leaving to the proper factors the evaluation of this opinion.

As far as the matter of stabilization of the residence of the group of the seamen from Formosa is concerned, I wish to point out that the private bill filed in their behalf by Congressman SIEMINSKI, from New Jersey, at our request grants them only the right to request later the legalization of their stay here within the framework of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act. In other words, after the bill will have been passed, they will have to start anew through another phase, to file again the requested applications, to once more go through all the hearings and wait another year for the final settlement of their case. I am afraid that this is absolutely too much for their nerves and imaginations. We must not forget that most of these men spent almost a year and a half in Formosa before they reached the United States. That is why it seems to me that, after termination of the investigation of each of them, now being minutely carried out by the immigration authorities, the United States Congress should pass an ultimate decision on their remaining in this country.

POLISH IMMIGRATION COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., December 16, 1955.

Re Polish seamen from Formosa.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: We are taking the liberty of writing to you in reference to the 22 Polish sailors from Formosa for whose relief you were good enough to introduce on February 10, 1955, a private bill H. R. 3981.

As you have probably heard by now three of this group to it: Kedzierski, Tauzowski, and Wegrzynowski under the pressure brought on them by their families in Poland and due to persuasive talks by agents of the Communist Warsaw Embassy at Washington, left for Poland. Since the vigorous campaign launched by the regime of Poland to induce refugees to return home, that group of sailors from Formosa was receiving special attention of the Warsaw Embassy agents, who are trying to get them by coaxing or scaring.

We have not written to you on the subject before, however, in view of the approaching session of the Congress we think it will be imperative to take this matter up in order to obtain for them the right of permanent residency in the United States. The bill introduced by you tends to grant them the right to apply for adjustment of their immigration status under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. If the bill will have been passed it would take another year or so to have the case settled. Taking into consideration that they have been promised permanent residency in the United States when in Formosa, their disappointment is considerable and their anxiety great; added to this were faked letters sent to them from their families which sapped their energy not to a small degree. We have proven that the letters in question are written under duress, clearly evident from their styling when compared with other letters previously written to them, or even recent letters, but on subjects not related to their suggested repatriation. On the other hand, it is known that these families are persecuted by the Warsaw regime.

It would be of great importance and we shall be extremely grateful if adjustment of their immigration status might be definitely settled in the nearest future and we appeal to you for assistance.

We are taking this opportunity to enclose herewith a copy of a report on those seamen throwing some new light on the situation. The material enclosed has been sent by us to the immigration authorities and other government agencies interested in the matter.

With best wishes and all kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
REV. FELIX F. BURANT,
Polish Immigration Committee.

Price Supports on Hogs and Cattle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I am including for the RECORD a copy of a telegram sent to President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson by the presidents and boards of directors of farm bureaus in the Midwestern States, signed by Mr. Roger Fleming, secretary-treasurer of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which discusses the matter of price supports on hogs and cattle. The telegram is as follows:

Farm bureau leaders from 12 Midwestern States, in Madison, Wis., for a regional farm bureau program meeting, are gravely concerned over proposals for price supports on hogs and cattle.

These leaders, officers, and board members of 12 important corn-hog State farm bureaus, are elected by and represent approximately 800,000 farm families who produce the bulk of the hogs grown in the United States, and feed large numbers of cattle.

Price supports on hogs, in our opinion would immediately encourage further overproduction of hog numbers; would encourage large numbers of new producers, principally outside the Corn Belt, to get into the hog business in view of available feed supplies produced on diverted acres; would, within a short time, force the Government to limit the number of hogs each farmer could produce for market.

The real answer to the problem lies in the control and reduction of surplus feed produced on acres diverted from price-supported crops.

The most direct approach to the situation is in quick congressional action on the farm bureau's soil-bank program.

The soil bank is designed to reduce total production with special emphasis on the diverted acres which are now largely being used to increase feed production.

We have seriously considered the problems of livestock producers. We are rededicating our efforts to improving the real income of livestock producers, so essential to our area. At the same time we firmly believe that politically inspired price supports would wreck—not save—the livestock industry.

Address by W. W. Horner Before the National Conference on Water Resources Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Wesley W. Horner, consulting engineer of St. Louis, Mo., has had a distinguished career as a civil engineer beginning in 1905 with the city of St. Louis. He has served on several national boards as a specialist on flood reduction and water damage abatement. Professional honors have come to him in the form of elections to director, American Society of Municipal Improvements, president of American Public Works Association and president of American Society of Civil Engineers. Mr. Horner served as chairman of the National Water Policy Panel of Engineers' Joint Council. He was chairman of the task group on flood control of the Hoover Commission Task Force on Water Resources and Power. The National Conference on Water Resources Policy in St. Louis on January 24, heard him speak on flood control. The following is the text of Mr. Horner's address:

In 1950, the Engineers' Joint Council's Panel on National Water Policy organized a task force of about 80 engineers and associated specialists; through their efforts there was prepared and presented to the President's Water Resource Policy Commission, an extensive brochure outlining desirable policy in the water resource field.

In 1951, after reviewing the report of the President's Commisison, the panel prepared its document entitled "Principles of a Sound National Water Policy." EJC transmitted this document to all Members of Congress and urged that the Congress itself create a commission to make an exhaustive study and recommendation.

The second Hoover Commission, set up in 1953, was, along with other matters, given this assignment. It may, therefore, be considered in part as the response by Congress to EJC's request. The Hoover Commission in this phase operated through its Task Force on Water Resources and Power, which in turn worked, in part, through four subgroups. Flood control was the assignment of one group.

We now have the Commission's report on water resources and power, which is quite brief, and deals primarily with broad principles; the report of the task force, which is extensive—1,763 pages; the report of the flood-control group, much more detailed in its field—125 pages; and the reports of special consultants on specific matters. These documents, as I read them with respect to the flood-control phase, are in full agreement as to basic principles. They differ somewhat in detail as to implementation and organization. Mr. Hoover states that the task force's report, with its related documents, represent "the most exhaustive study of our water problems that has yet been undertaken."

Since I cannot attempt to review the reports here, I will recommend them to your reading. I offer briefly my personal reaction to the material presented; to the findings and the recommendation I add my idea of where

we stand in our effort to abate flood damages and a suggestion as to how we might proceed from here.

1. Flood control is a misnomer; our interest is in abatement of flood damages by whatever means are applicable, and to the extent that the investment can be economically justified.

2. The program carrying the designation flood control is related to flood damages to the extent of about 50 or 60 percent. The remainder of the program covers other classes of water development, such as hydropower, reclamation, drainage, and navigation.

3. There appears to have been no orderly and consistent approach in the making of the program; the Congress has asked for surveys and reports, later it authorized projects or in some cases it approved an overall plan, as in the Missouri Basin. When such approval is given there has been a strong tendency for the Federal construction agencies to construe it as an authorization of all parts of the plan while the plan itself is open to modification and extension; despite the fact that the House Appropriations Committee has said that it does not consider the Missouri plan an authorized project.

4. The program is a matter of the last 20 years. Up to 1917, Congress had appropriated less than $100 million for flood control, from 1917 to 1936, not a great deal more. In contrast, under the 1936 Flood Control Act:

(a) Congress has authorized 1,033 projects presently estimated to cost $11.1 billion.

(b) Of these, 433 are completed or under construction, at the cost estimate of $5.7 billion.

(c) Of the remainder, 290 are classified as ready for construction, with the cost estimate of $3.3 billion.

(d) As of now, 310 projects have been deferred for restudy or classified as inactive, with a cost estimate of $2.1 billion.

(e) Congress has been appropriating about $300 million a year for flood control on the average. At this rate, about 18 years would be required to complete appropriations for the current "active" program of the Corps of Engineers.

5. The Task Force has estimated that the ultimate capital cost of the flood control program visualized by the Chief of Engineers in 1948 would be about $25 billion.

6. The programs of the Department of Agriculture related to soil conservation and improved land management, may appreciably reduce floods along upland streams, but can be effective to a minor degree only with respect to the larger river systems. The Department of Agriculture, under the 1936 act, received authorization to carry out some flood control programs; these did not depart greatly from the character of the Department's regular programs; the Jones Subcommittee has stated "The welfare of the Nation requires that sound practices for the conservation of the fertility of the soil be undertaken. The need is sufficiently important that it does not need to be disguised as flood control."

The Department of Agriculture has also undertaken flood control demonstration projects of the "upstream engineering" type and has spent some millions of dollars for demonstration work, primarily small flood control dams.

The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act of 1954 authorized the Secretary of Agriculture "to assist local organizations in preparing and carrying out plans for works of improvement." These works will be primarily headwater dams to reduce flooding of lands below them. The act was presented and publicized as a conservation measure, which it is not. It is aimed strictly at flood control on small streams and it may involve dams of considerable size. The task force has estimated that such a program could ultimately involve a cost of $17 billion. How much of this would be paid by the Federal taxpayers remains to be determined; if it develops that a large part must be contributed locally, I believe that the program would shrink to a small part of this figure.

7. Neither the $25 billion main stream program nor the possible $17 billion upstream program represents the whole cost to the taxpayers. If interest, which the taxpayers would have to pay over a 50-year amortization period is added, the total might be on the order of $65 billion or about one-fourth of the present national debt.

8. The program is a Federal program, not only in terms of planning and administration, but also in payment of the cost; the Federal Government pays the entire cost of reservoirs, including land; for "local protection projects, local interests provide lands, and assume responsibility for damages." Study of a representative sample of local protection projects indicates that on the average non-Federal interests pay about 6 percent of the capital cost and the Federal Treasury about 94 percent.

9. The program to a very considerable extent is one of land reclamation. The Chief of Engineers has stated in 1951 that "The improvement of agriculture production made possible or to be made possible by the Federal flood-control program is equivalent to the reclamation of 8 million acres of land." When this fact is coupled with the negligible cost sharing mentioned above, it would appear that the program must be providing very extensive windfall profits to owners of agricultural lands; the same finding would apply to urban areas where both industry and housing have been located in flood plains and are now bailed out at the Federal taxpayer's expense.

10. In the earlier years of the program, pressure by groups in individual congressional districts resulted in the production of disconnected local projects, some of which were mutually self-defeating.

Some progress has been made in coordinating projects through overall basin plans. But it must be said that in general, there still exists a disturbing lack of coordination between projects in the same basin. Moreover, in the planning of systems of projects, a great deal of waste has been occasioned by arbitrarily fixing a uniform degree of protection without regard to the economics of the individual problems. To make matters worse the degree of protection selected is often fixed by engineering judgment at a much higher value than economically justified. To insure that public funds are wisely invested there must be careful studies of combinations of measures, and selection of the most economic combination. Failure to achieve this goal may result in the wasting of the taxpayers' money. An outstanding illustration of this is in the Kansas River Valley, where the official plan provides primarily for flood reduction by reservoirs, with additional local protection of urban areas. Engineering consultants to a State agency developed an alternate plan involving channel improvements and zoning of agricultural lands, which was thought to provide abatement of about 75 percent of the damages at only about one-fourth of the cost.

11. The task force could find practically no examples of projects or plans in which it was clearly demonstrated that all methods of damage abatement had been fully considered. To some extent this is due to the engineering approach; the natural tendency of the engineering profession in general, and the Federal engineers in particular is to structural measures with respect to which they are adept, and to avoid such things as floodway and flood-plain clearance, and flood-plain zoning which would involve difficult human relation problems. This tendency, of course, is aggravated by the pressure groups who prefer those projects for which local contributions are a minimum. The importance of such overall plans is strikingly apparent in the case of the recent New England floods, where the narrow valley had become choked and the floodways greatly restricted by the development which had grown up in the flood plains. After these floods, EJC issued a press release strongly pointing out the need for replanning of the valley lands and the return of the floodways to the rivers.

There is a growing interest in this type of solution, as evidenced by the symposium on the American Society of Civil Engineers' program in October of 1955. I was particularly impressed by the paper by Joseph I. Perrey, Chief Engineer of the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission. His thesis throughout was that flood damage abatement should be first approached by insuring the "protection of the water carrying capacity of floodways."

12. The current program has been defective in the field of economic analysis. The task force found that the methods of appraising benefits quite often resulted in values which were unrealistic, and that the original estimates of cost did not fully reflect revision and expansion of projects which came about during design. As a result, there was more than a suspicion that many projects reported as economically justified, and later authorized, would be at least marginal, if properly reappraised today.

13. Present procedures by the Congress provide for not analysis of desirable priorities within the program. As a result, those projects go into construction which have the strongest pressure groups behind them.

In summary, the current program under the 1936 and subsequent Flood Control Act involves an estimated cost of $11 billion. A long-range program under this act involves a capital cost of at least $25 billion. If the Department of Agriculture's upstream program under the 1954 act, is carried out largely at Federal expense, the total visualized cost to the taxpayers for flood control might be as much as $65 billion, a figure equal to one-fourth of the present national debt. The downstream program development is in the hands of Federal agencies, and the cost to the extent of over 95 percent comes from the Federal Treasury. It does not constitute an orderly and consistent whole, and does not satisfactorily reflect alternate measures of damage abatement. It includes a strong element of land reclamation and of windfall profits to the owners of marginal lands. New projects which may be authorized could not be undertaken in the near future, unless the sponsors can constitute a strong enough pressure group to push other projects farther back on the schedule.

Some of the disadvantages (to use a mild word) of the present program and procedures could be removed by Executive order, or even by changes in attitude in the approach to project planning, but the more serious features are imbedded in the act of Congress, among these, the assumption of full responsibility by the Federal Government, and the failure to require direct beneficiaries to pay a fair part of the cost.

In view of this, it may be well to review the circumstances under which the 1936 Flood Control Act was devised.

The 1936 act stated for the first time that the Federal Government assumed the responsibility for the abatement of flood damages, anywhere in the United States; that the Federal taxpayers would pay the cost, except for a nominal percentage covering rights-of-way, easements, and in some cases, operation; and that projects would be undertaken whenever the benefits to whomever they accrued, exceeded the cost.

The record shows that the act was passed under what appears to be almost hysterical conditions, related to devastating damages in certain major cities out of the floods of the middle thirties, to the recognition of the depression situation, when most of the

cities were on the verge of insolvency, and the need for a work relief program. None of these factors are operative today. Yet the policies which they brought into being are still in effect. This is a striking illustration of the fact—often stated by students of bureaucracy—that Government programs and policies, once initiated, rarely recede from their high-water mark; even when the causes which gave rise to them have disappeared.

The act was strongly opposed by some of the more conservative Members of Congress, and the then Chief of Engineers, General Markham, insisted that the Federal Government should not pay the entire cost. The late Senator Vandenburg stated in the course of the debate:

"Let it not be overlooked that this is the first time in 150 years of American history when it has been proposed to assert that floods upon practically all the rivers of the United States constitute a menace to national welfare and are a Federal responsibility * * *.

"The human imagination can hardly encompass the total extent of the burden and responsibility which is thus laid at the door of the Treasury of the United States, by the adoption of this policy."

To summarize again at this point, it would seem that after 20 years of experience with the 1936 act and its amendments, the time has come when the Congress, with reasonable consideration of the Federal taxpayers, should take a new and objective look at the whole question of Federal flood control responsibility.

The situation today represents a nearly complete reversal from that of 1936. The cities and States instead of being on the verge of insolvency, are in a good position to use their credit. On the other hand, the rate of Federal appropriation appears to have about reached its maximum limit. Public attention is focused in the direction of a balanced budget and a decrease in taxes, and in the face of this, Congress is not likely to greatly extend the rate or appropriation for civil works. Yet, the very great Federal expenditures for Federal flood control appear to be completely inadequate in the light of the apparent needs of today. The New England floods of last summer and fall, and now, those in California, indicate the necessity for a flood control program, with broader coverage and an accelerated pace. I cannot imagine that this year's flood sufferers would care to wait for a Federal program which might not be initiated until the present backlog is cleaned up 12 or 15 years hence. In New England, there is good evidence of orientation in the direction of local and regional responsibility. California has been moving in that direction for some years.

The Hoover Commission, in its Nine Point Program (recommendation No. 1), stated that "water resources development should be generally undertaken by drainage areas—locally and regionaly, and that the Federal Government should assume responsibility when participation or initiative is necessary, to further or safeguard the national interest, or to accomplish broad national objectives, where projects, because of size or complexity or potential multiple purposes or benefits, are beyond the means or the needs of local or private enterprise.

"Under other circumstances, the responsibility for development should be discharged by State or local Governments, or by local organizations, or by private enterprise."

Elsewhere, the Commission states "non-Federal agencies, communities, and private business interests that benefit directly from water resource development, also have a basic obligation to share in financial responsibility in proportion to the benefits they receive."

The task force and the flood-control group spelled this matter out in more detail, but possibly as an expedient, compromised somewhat by recommending that direct tangible beneficiaries should pay in proportion to one-half of the benefits accredited to them.

I would have little hope that the Congress could be persuaded to revise the flood-control legislation in the direction of these recommendations, if the approach to it was solely that of improved procedure, or a consideration of the equities as between the unvocal Federal taxpayer and the active lobby groups representing the desire of direct beneficiaries to get something for next to nothing; but we might hope with the Federal appropriations reaching a static limit, and an urgent need which cannot be deferred for another generation, that the flood sufferers will begin to press Congress for a revised act under which they can get action wtihin reasonable time, even though they themselves pay a considerable part of the bill.

I have frequently been asked that disingenuous and silly question: "Would the adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations have prevented floods like those in New England?" The only possible answer would be "No." If, however, the question were more honestly, realistically stated, such as, "Would the adoption of the Hoover recommendations make it feasible within a reasonable time to prevent and avoid the terrific and disastrous condition which occurred in New England?" I think the answer would clearly be "Yes," and this might be backed up by the following suggestions:

Drainage basin plans, in which local and regional agencies have a leading part, would involve a careful appraisal of means of damage abatement other than expensive structures. In my opinion, the projects which could be economically justified should be materially less expensive. It would seem to follow that the dollar cost of adequate programs would be reduced; then of this smaller capital program, local and regional agencies would provide a considerable portion of the funds, again reducing the call on the Federal Treasury. I have no doubt that the Federal taxpayers would still be called upon to maintain something like the current rate of appropriation, but the program as a whole might well be accelerated 100 percent or more.

America's Educational Needs Today and in the Foreseeable Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, America is becoming aware of the startling shortcomings of its rather gangling public-school system. In this—the Nation of multicolored, chrome-plated, zippy automobiles, super duper, bigger-than-before movies and spectacular color television we are faced with these not-so-super facts:

The current accumulated deficit of public-school classrooms is 250,000 and it is estimated that this figure will increase to 470,000 by 1959.

Fires damaged 4,000 school buildings during one recent year.

Seven hundred thousand public school children were attending school on part-time sessions.

More than 83,000 teachers left the profession during the last year.

Of the 86,696 persons who were graduated last year with standard preparation for teaching, only 56,800 actually entered teaching.

This year our public schools lack 141,300 qualified teachers.

In this—which we like to believe is the most modern Nation in the world—we have 140,000 classrooms that are makeshift or badly outmoded. Included in this category are buildings without plumbing, those without heating, others that are worn out, structurally weakened or potential "tinderboxes."

Last year for each dollar spent for schools in the United States $2.96 was spent for defense, $1.60 for new automobiles, and 45 cents for roads. Look at it this way—the United States is spending about 2½ percent of its national income on education. In contrast to this, it spends 4 percent on recreation. In one recent year—1951—the amount spend for advertising for every family in this Nation was $1.99 per family, while the amount spent for primary and secondary education was $1.52 per household. As one person pointed out: "The national outlay for educating citizens is substantially less than the outlay for educating customers." It has also been estimated that in order to maintain the present pupil-teacher ratio in the face of our heavy population growth, the teaching staffs of our schools will have to be enlarged by 500,000 in the next 10 years. To meet this, "more than half the college graduates during the next 10 years will have to enter the teaching profession."

Is this too plain a fact for us to comprehend—the future of this Nation is in its educational system. At present this all-important system is understaffed and inadequately housed. It should be clear that we must increase both our interest in our schools and the money made available for their support.

Perhaps this information might help you to see the urgency of my plea. On good authority, we know that the Soviet Union's scientific and technical education system presents a formidable challenge to the free world. The Soviets are currently graduating more university students in the sciences than we are—about 120,000 to 70,000 in 1955. They "will graduate about 1,200,000 in the sciences in the 10 years from 1950 to 1960, while the comparable United States figure will be about 900,000."

We are training less than half of the scientists and engineers we need today. The head of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Lewis L. Strauss, warns:

> This situation is going to get worse for us before it can possibly become better; it is going to get better for the Soviets before it can possibly get worse.

He stressed this alarming situation further when he said:

> Already dangerous, within less than a decade [it] could become disastrous.

This lag cannot be solved without concerted effort from many forces in the United States. Currently, few college students are being prepared to teach mathematics and the sciences at the high school level. High school enrollments are mounting steadily, the need

for scientists is skyrocketing, while the proportion of college graduates who qualify to teach high school mathematics and science continues to decrease.

Perhaps all of this sounds like we have opened "Pandora's box," because the obstacles we have looked at seem insurmountable. It should be remembered, however, that along with all of the unpleasant things in Pandora's box there was a quality—hope. With hope and hard work we will be able to meet the challenges I have outlined. I am sure, however, it will take 90 percent hard work and 10 percent hope.

The Tinkling Cymbal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the city of Rochester has recently been the target of a concerted effort, emanating from behind the Iron Curtain, to lure refugees back to the Soviet orbit. In the past weeks, more than 500 letters have been received by Rochesterians of Lithuanian descent, urging them to return to the "workingman's paradise." Someone ought to tell the Kremlin masterminds that they are wasting their time and money. Anyone who has had an opportunity to live in the stimulating atmosphere of freedom could hardly be lured back behind the Iron Curtain by anything short of blackmail. Rochester is happy with its new residents and there is every evidence that they are happy in their new home. They have no intention of returning to the tyranny of the Reds. The enticements are no more than a tinkling cymbal.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Democrat and Chronicle of Rochester for January 23, 1956, commenting on this rather flattering but futile effort:

"COME HOME TO SLAVERY"

In their crude appeal for Lithuanian-Americans to return to their native land, the Soviet propagandists pay our country the highest kind of tribute. It is betrayal, nicely documented, that they are deeply, perhaps desperately, worried about the attractions of the West.

Rochester was one of the focal points of a mail barrage straight from East Berlin. More than 500 letters extolling the wonders of the land where "the workingman rules" were received here. Because Rochester through the years opened its arms to displaced persons, subsequent appeals to our residents of other extractions would surprise no one. As expected, the "come home, all its forgiven" letters did not get the kind of response desired in Moscow.

Of all the developments in the East-West cleavage, none has counted more heavily against the Communist high command than the amazing exodus of refugees from the Red satellites. It has been a simple matter of overwhelming choice that can't be talked away or ignored.

If the full account of the thousands who have fled the Iron Curtain countries, many of them landing in our own neighborhood, ever gets into print, the high adventure story of all time will be with us. They are the men and women who defied danger to seek a new life. They are our new citizens, integrating themselves with astonishing speed into western life.

Why should they, reveling in the excitement of a new life, filling positions of high responsibility, raising families in an atmosphere of freedom, go back to the chains of Soviet rule? As well ask the moon to quake when the hound bays.

Department of Agriculture Should Act Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an editorial from the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times on the position of the swiss cheese industry and its effort to prod the Department of Agriculture into doing something about the distressed swiss cheese situation. There are section 32 funds available to help this industry out and there would seem to be no good reason for procrastination at this time.

The editorial follows:

USDA'S OPPORTUNITY TO ACT IS NOW

Last November, we accompanied the local swiss cheese industry representatives to Washington to plead the case of the swiss cheese price squeeze before United States Department of Agriculture officials.

At that time, we reported the reception given us by the USDA group and the apparent sympathetic understanding of the plight of farmers supplying milk to the swiss cheese industry were encouraging.

We described it thus because we came away from the conference with a feeling that Government purchases of grinder swiss for school lunch and other needs, at a price insuring proper return to farmers, were a distinct possibility.

Now we're not so sure we were right. Nor, are we sure the USDA people we saw understood that the future of an entire industry was at stake because of hardships resulting from the Government's decision to put artificial props under only one type of cheese, American.

Our feeling of disillusionment wasn't alleviated to any degree this week by remarks of USDA spokesmen at the regional meeting in Stevens Point for the National Milk Producers Association.

That meeting was told it will be March, at the soonest, before the USDA can reach a decision on dairy price supports, or even on a dairy program—unless Congress changes the laws immediately.

In the meantime, the spokesmen said, the dairy industry, and especially the hard hit cheese industry may have to sweat it out.

One of these spokesmen said: "We must face the fact that the cheese (surplus) inventory is staring the whole dairy industry in the face and is certain to be noted by the Secretary in arriving at a decision."

We understand that surplus problem, and we have commented on it from time to time. That is why we joined in the appeal for swiss cheese assistance through buying for actual use instead of by mere price suppport purchases.

It is our belief—and it was expressed at Washington—that price support buying was a mistake in the first place, a legislative mistake. But, we feel, just because such a mistake was made, there is no reason why the handicaps that mistake puts on swiss cheese should be allowed to continue without exercise of the relief method open to the USDA through section 32 of the agricultural act. That section permits the purchases of distressed dairy products for Government programs, military service, school lunch and other needs.

We understand those USDA officials, who promised to consider the grinder purchase plan when the distress situation again became apparent, are being notified directly by the local industry that the "time now is at hand for action."

The grinder market is drying up once more, and the factory price on November grinders is down 2 cents.

The response by the USDA to that appeal will be of great interest to milk producers in this area, as well as to the rest of the industry. It should be prompt and clearcut.

We believe Congressman LAWRENCE H. SMITH of our district, Congressman MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Marshfield, Congressman GLENN DAVIS, of Waukesha and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY have given the USDA full evidence of the cheese industry's distress. They have done all they can to impress the Government with the problems, especially for swiss cheese.

Their comments certainly have been sufficient confirmation of the local delegation's testimony at Washington.

Now let's see what happens to the grinder purchase appeal. A friend, wise in the ways of Government agencies in his role as a leading industrialist, had an interesting comment when we told him last November of our encouragement following the meeting with the USDA:

"I'm happy to hear you feel that way, but my experience in Washington has been that you never know how long those fellows will stay put."

He was not speaking of the USDA, of course, and we were confident at the time he was being unduly pessimistic.

The Department now has the chance to prove our friend was wrong, either by expedient action on the grinder-purchase appeal or through a frank and unmistakable statement as to our prospects for early help.

Gas Tax on Gasoline Used in Farming Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, may I say that I regret, exceedingly, that I will have to be absent on Monday, January 30, when the bill comes up to exempt farmers from Federal taxation on gasoline and fuels used in farming activities.

I have favored such legislation for quite some time, and if it were possible for me to be here when it comes to the floor of the House, I would vote for it.

I make this explanation because I must be absent Monday, Tuesday, and possibly longer, due to being called to my home in Salem, Ill., on Sunday just passed, because of serious illness in my family.

I have asked my colleague, the Honorable SID SIMPSON, to insert in the RECORD the reason for my absence today.

America Will Not Forget Gen. Douglas MacArthur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our country needs help and direction in the Far East, our greatest authority, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, is not consulted.

Mr. Speaker, General MacArthur is the victim of petty politicians and while they may not want to use his services, the American people are disappointed that our greatest military leader is not called upon to render a final service to his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including two articles, one by Bob Considine, and the other by George E. Sokolsky, both articles having appeared in the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel on January 25, 1956:

MACARTHUR: SECLUDED BUT NOT FORGOTTEN

(By Bob Considine)

Douglas MacArthur, the Nation's most famous but least consulted authority on Far Eastern matters, will be 76 years old Thursday. In quiet but determined opposition to the policies of the last two administrations, the former supreme commander has not yet found that peace of mind he sought upon announcing that he planned to fade away.

MacArthur, one of the most remarkable figures in modern world history, has become virtually a recluse. But it is a splendid isolation he has imposed upon himself. He lives with his vivacious wife and their studious 17 year old son, Arthur (who would like to make music his profession), in a magnificent apartment high in the Waldorf towers in New York City. He is seen less and less outside its memento-filled and Orientally-decorated confines.

Contact with MacArthur is not readily made. The bulk of his still heavy mail, which features stacks or requests for autographer pictures, is forwarded to the office which the Army maintains for him at 90 Church Street in deference to his permanent on duty status as a five-star general. Other mail is sent to the occasionally visited office which is set aside for him in the executives' mansion of the Sperry Remington Rand Corp., headquarters near Norwalk, Conn. MacArthur serves as the corporation's board chairman at $60,000 a year.

Phone calls to MacArthur seldom penetrate the Waldorf switchboard and ascend to apartment 37–A. Most calls are referred to 90 Church. The calls that do get through are from visiting dignitaries (MacArthur recently received the President-Elect of Brazil) and from old colleagues in arms, trusted friends, and an occasional Member of Congress.

But the calls seldom, if ever, are answered by MacArthur. Conrad Hilton, MacArthur's landlord, complained to a friend not long ago that he had been trying to get his famed tenant on the phone for weeks. The caller whose call gets closest to MacArthur personally finds himself talking to Maj. Gen. Courtney Whitney, MacArthur's close aide, friend, and business associate, whose new book, MacArthur: His Rendezvous With History, probably is the ultimately intimate assessment of the hero. It is not believed that MacArthur will write his autobiography. General Whitney mainly decides who will see MacArthur and who will not.

Though he is impeccable in his respect for the office of the Presidency, and has in the past spoken highly of Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower, MacArthur is still gripped with a cold indignation over the manner in which he was relieved of his command by Truman and is hurt by the indifference of the administration headed by his one-time aide Eisenhower.

He has never forgotten, of course, the galling final military campaigns of a fabled military life when restrictions the old soldier will never be able to comprehend were imposed upon him by the Truman administration and the United Nations. He was not permitted to attack the area in which the enemy was supporting its entire campaign.

To close friends, including General Whitney, who outlined it in his book, MacArthur has since revealed what he would have done in Korea if given his head. He would have augmented his American and U. N. forces with 30,000 troops from Chiang Kai-shek's army and made big amphibious landings, simultaneously, at the northeast and northwest tips of Korea. Each would have been assigned to drive inland along the southern side of the Yalu and join in north central Korea, closing off the supply lines from across the river.

When these were disposed of, MacArthur would have proposed that a belt of radioactive material be spread across the waistline of Korea over which no future invader could move his men and supplies.

The creator of this mighty dream and the major architect of victory in the great world wars hears the din of battle only in thoughtful retrospect today. He frets over "the way things are being run down there," meaning Washington, and recently told a friend he wouldn't be surprised if Adlai Stevenson and a depression arrive at the White House simultaneously, after which the people will install a conservative Republican administration.

MACARTHUR: A REFRESHING FIGURE IN ERA OF YES-MEN

(By George Sokolsky)

As one lies here in the hospital and thinks of men and events and the courses and tides of history, it comes to me that tomorrow, Gen. Douglas MacArthur will celebrate his 76th birthday.

His birthday ought to be marked in some manner for this is an extraordinarily truthful man in an era of mediocre timeservers. His is a philosophic outlook on the history and future of his country rather than an overspecialized emphasis on personal self-preservation. He is acknowledged in his own occupation to be our greatest general, perhaps the most competent military mind we have produced since Robert E. Lee; so he was kicked out by military lackies, most of whose names we have already forgotten. They may have gotten rid of MacArthur from the Army but not from his place in history.

And as he remains alive, we must ask him about Gen. Matthew Ridgway's disclosure that a report to the Nation was faked and who was responsible for faking it. For MacArthur suffered much from the moral irresponsibility of the Penatgon where men become so engrossed in detail that they never think of the consequences of what they do.

I met General Ridgway at a dinner shortly after he returned from Korea, and his conversation was all in one direction, that MacArthur had been right and the politicians in Washington all wrong and he spoke privately of how the lives of our sons were endangered because of arms shortages. Many crimes have been committed in the name of politics, or loyalty to the "commander-in-chief," whatever that may be in American life. But now the honest men are talking up and it is not going to be easy to answer. Nobody can answer Ridgway's charge of lying to the American people.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, as a military man, could not understand why he was instructed to go into a war to achieve a defeat. There was never a question of insubordination because he led his Army to defeat as he had been instructed to do. But how to understand these orders? How to interpret them? How to make them fit a philosophy of war? That he could not do. And so he spoke out and got fired after serving his country from West Point to a commander of a theater.

When men speak of morale in the Army or clergy, in schools or anywhere, they really speak of that quality of pride that men have in their work and their associations. The "old tie" may be a phrase for amusement but it represented just this high quality of loyalty to a service that held better than all the rules books ever devised. When Gen. Douglas MacArthur was dismissed summarily, without even a face-saving device, a blow was struck not at him but at the morale of our armed services. A noble overtone of service disappeared. It all became nothing but a job for those who learn how to stand in right, who know just what to say at the right moment, the apple-polishers.

Efficient and competent as they may be, and nobody doubts that, they lack a moral elan and their lack is conveyed down the line to the men. A hero's breed must be heroic and these men who knifed MacArthur to please politicians were not heroes. And where are they today?

And so there he stands, as noble as ever, Douglas MacArthur, from whom has even been withheld a nominal honor, the title, "general of the armies." On his birthday, I congratulate him that time has proved him a noble figure in a confused era.

New York Is Alarmed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the 84th Congress a considerable portion of the debate on the floor one afternoon was devoted to a discussion of the merits of deepening of the channel of the Delaware River from Philadelphia to Trenton, N. J. In addition to the time spent on that debate considerable time was also spent during the course of the year to hearings on the merits of the proposed deepening, which incidentally had already been approved by a previous session of the Congress. On that afternoon last year a sufficient number of my colleagues remained unconvinced of the merits of the proposal to defeat the bill

temporarily. However, those of us who feel that the bill was not only worthwhile, but urgently necessary for the continued economic health of the entire Delaware Valley region have by no means given up hope that Congress this year will see fit to change its collective mind.

In the interest of helping to convince my colleagues I should like to include, at this point in the RECORD, an editorial which appeared recently in the Philadelphia Inquirer. Economic growth must be continuous if any area is to avoid stagnation, and I think it is clear that the deeper channel is urgently necessary if the Delaware Valley is to continue to grow.

The editorial follows:

NEW YORK IS ALARMED

On the same day that the Delaware River Port Authority issued a report showing that the port of Philadelphia had its busiest year in history in 1955, the New York Herald-Tribune was lamenting editorially the continued sag in New York's port business and warning of Philadelphia's challenge to it.

The newspaper's fears have statistical justification. Philadelphia has become the Nation's No. 1 import port. Total waterborne commerce for 1955 was more than 85 million tons, a gain since 1948 of about 50 percent.

In foreign commerce, the authority report shows, the tonnage increase here was even more impressive. The 1955 figure was more than double that of 1948.

While it is pleasing to know that the port of Philadelphia is thus raising alarm in New York, it is obivous that it cannot rest on its laurels. New York is discovering tardily that it must maintain up-to-date facilities to keep and increase shipping business. Philadelphia has recently spent more than $6 million to improve pier and loading facilities, and these services have already demonstrated their worth.

But additional improvements are needed, in the shape of modern piers and in adequate approaches to them. Efforts should be made also to attract more passenger shipping here. A basic need is that for a deeper channel in the upper Delaware to give access to ocean-traveling ore ships. We have one of the world's finest ports; to maintain and to better its position, there can be no letdown in port development programs.

Opposition to Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a timely editorial from the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette which sets forth clearly its position opposing Federal school aid and the bill which is now pending.

The editorial follows:

OPPOSING FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

Education has never before faced such pressures for expanding schools, classrooms and for teachers, due to the influx of "war babies" now in the lower grades. Almost every community foresees the growing demand. Some do something about it, some procrastinate, waiting for possible Government help.

Now President Eisenhower, apparently under constant pressure to lend Federal aid, especially to the poorer States, has proposed a program totaling about 2 billions in Federal help. But his program favors poorer States at the expense of the richer States, of which Wisconsin is one.

This newspaper has always opposed Federal aid to education for, as the President recognizes, "responsibility for public education rests with States and local communities." He also recognizes that "Federal action which infringes upon this is alien to our system."

Then he said that States and localties cannot meet the demand for classrooms by themselves and early enough. So it is proposed that the American taxpayer pay 2 billions in taxes to Washington where it would be redistributed, the northern States getting less aid, the Southern States getting more.

Public education is a local issue and a State issue. Tax dollars sent to Washington never reach their destination as 100 cent dollars. The further Government is removed from the people, the less control they have over it and the more it costs them. Also the more waste and loss there is. To get the most from our tax dollars we must keep control close to home.

How far would 2 billions go in building new school rooms? It would be only a starter.

Remember when we started big billion foreign aid? It was supposed to be a stopgap, a temporary aid to recovery of the war-ravaged nations. That was 10 years ago and for 1956 the proposal is for 4.9 billions in foreign aid, with commitments over a period of years, even though billions already committed are as yet unspent.

So it would be with Federal aid to education. School buildings and classrooms are terribly costly, as every taxpayer in this area knows. Tens of millions are being spent right here, within a radius of 50 miles of Janesville. But not one cent of these already planned or constructed projects comes from Washington handouts. The citizens here want to be independent. They are shouldering the burdens without going to Washington with their hands out. They are doing something about education here and now.

Meanwhile, Southern States priding themselves upon their ability to attract new industries, have to admit that many of these industries have moved south from Wisconsin. Why? Because the Southern States offered all kinds of inducements, including no taxes or low taxes. Now they would have Wisconsin taxpayers pay for schools they could build if they taxed industry as Wisconsin does.

One sidelight on this issue is that some politicians find it good politics—giving something to everyone.

There is no hocus-pocus about getting money to build schools. It calls for some sacrifice and hardheaded financing. The easy way out is to run to Washington politicians for the biggest handout—at the expense of northern taxpayers.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, may I say that I received the following telegram from the board of directors, Illinois Agricultural Association, urging the necessity of early action upon the part of this Congress to pass farm legislation. I am including this telegram for the benefit of the Members, and sincerely hope, and urge, the earliest possible action on the part of both bodies of Congress, to pass constructive farm legislation at the earliest possible date:

Early enactment of soil bank and related legislation is necessary, to be effective and helpful in 1956. Farmers are now making plans and ordering seed and supplies. Seeding small grain will start in March. We urge that the basic program upon which there is substantial agreement be enacted immediately leaving details and controversial matters for later consideration.

ROGER FLEMING,
Secretary-Treasurer,
American Farm Bureau Federation.

Plant Trees To Solve Newsprint Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, I discussed the farm crisis, the current acute shortage of newsprint, and suggested that one means of making the soil-bank proposal, particularly the acreage reserve aspect, economically justifiable was to encourage the planting of softwoods so as to provide the raw materials for an expanded domestic newsprint industry.

When I reached my home that evening and settled down with the evening newspaper, I noticed three articles, all from the Associated Press, which coincidentally pointed up the shortage, and suggested the desirability of expanding the domestic industry beyond present plans.

I think the three articles speak for themselves. Certainly the item describing the offer of Russia to supply to Mexican newspapers all the newsprint they require has serious and alarming overtones.

I wish to assure our good friend, the Delegate from Alaska, that in inviting the attention of the House to the suggestion for an Alaskan TVA, I am not taking a position against the development of this great area. But I should like also to suggest that the recommendation from the American Newspaper Publishers' Association that an Alaskan TVA-type project be undertaken is headed for a dubious reception from an administration which looks upon TVA as creeping socialism.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the three news items, all of which are from the Washington Star for Thursday, January 26:

NEWSPRINT CURB WINS QUEBEC VOTE

QUEBEC, January 26.—A bill to freeze newsprint prices for Quebec consumers has been approved, 51–21, by the Quebec Provincial Assembly on its decisive second reading.

Date of the third and final reading has not been announced.

Conservative (Union Nationale) Premier Maurice Duplessis urged unanimous support for the measure on the second ballot last night, but met the solid opposition of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Duplessis earlier this month said the newsprint industry would be put under controls because the industry rejected his request that Quebec newspapers be exempted from a recent $4 price increase. The Premier said the controls would not affect newsprint exports.

The bill would set up a four-man board with vast powers over the production, distribution, and sale of newsprint. Prices to Quebec newspapers would be frozen at the September 1, 1955, level until March 1, 1957. Newsprint quotas to publishers would be based on the peak month of November 1955.

Liberal Leader Georges Lapalme, in opposing the bill, said the question of press freedom in Quebec "is still at stake." He said the measure would save newspapers a few dollars, but at a cost of placing themselves under the protection of the Newsprint Board.

SOVIET NEWSPRINT OFFERED TO MEXICO

MEXACO CITY, January 26.—Russia has offered newsprint to Mexican newspapers. It was the Soviet's first gesture to Mexico since Moscow's recent announcement that it wanted to help Latin American nations.

Although Mexican newspapers badly need newsprint, the offer met little response. The newspaper Excelsoir this morning devoted one paragraph to the offer.

The embassy issued the announcement yesterday that Russia "would attend to all requests for newsprint from Mexican newspapers" in serious need of paper.

There were no further details of the offer.

PUBLISHERS' AIDE URGES TVA FOR ALASKAN PAPER

A spokesman for newspaper publishers suggests the Government could help relieve the newsprint shortage by developing power in Alaska to operate paper mills.

All the forests there mean nothing in providing newsprint unless there is power, Cranston Williams, general manager of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association told a House Commerce Subcommittee yesterday.

Mr. Williams suggested the Government could build a kind of TVA in Alaska.

Other than the Alaskan power suggestion, Mr. Williams said, "I don't know of a specific thing Congress can do today" that private investment couldn't do to help relieve the scarcity of newsprint—the paper on which newspapers are printed. The subcommittee is studying the problem.

North American mills have announced plans for expansion to add 1,709,572 tons to their capacity by 1958, Mr. Williams, said. But, he added, the ANPA anticipates a need from half a million to a million more tons than that by 1960.

A Rallying Heart Prayer for President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the prayers of hundreds of thousands of devout Americans in every corner of our land speeded the splendid recovery of President Eisenhower. The affection of a nation for one of its greatest leaders in history was manifest by the immediate and wholehearted response of all our people in sincere prayer and supplication for the President's full recovery.

Prayers of thanksgiving and for the continued improvement of the President's health are now being given since President Eisenhower is back on the job at the White House.

One of these, a tribute to our great President and a moving prayer for his continued improvement, is the following by Rabbi Max John Merritt, of Los Angeles, Calif. Rabbi Merritt's prayer was included in a broadcast from Los Angeles radio station KMPC during the program, The Free World Faces the New Year, on December 26, 1955. It is a prayer in which we may all sincerely join.

The prayer follows:

A RALLYING HEART—A PRAYER FOR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

(By Rabbi Max John Merritt, broadcast in station KMPC program, The Free World Faces the New Year, December 26, 1955)

You knew how awful was war's fiery breath,
You surveyed the fields whose harvest was death.
You drew the plans only youth could apply,
Though by the thousands you knew youth must die.
Yet the soldier spoke not for war but for peace,
Your heartfelt plea was that mass murder cease.
Millions hailed your call as to a fresh start,
Now the free world prays for your rallying heart.

Doubt and suspicion clouded men's reason,
The fog of mistrust ruled from season to season,
All channels of meeting were silted with fear,
Curtains, iron and bamboo, divided our sphere,
Then through the fog that misted men's eyes,
As a bright beam of light strikes from the skies,
Your voice blasted the evils that hold men apart,
Now the free world prays for your rallying heart.

Through all the ages the clear truth has stood,
That men of all races form one brotherhood.
Across bloody ages tragic dramas unroll
As the race presses on to a far distant goal.
Then the dark of our night was lit by a beam
That renewed waning faith in a great prophet's dream.
You tore the web of the warmongers apart,
Now the free world prays for your rallying heart.

Never Was Nor Can Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial that appeared in the Denver Post, Denver, Colo., on Wednesday, January 25, 1956.

The editorial is as follows:

NEVER WAS NOR EVER CAN BE

There is something terribly wrong in the communication of policies, decisions and actions by the Government to the people. This is becoming more and more apparent—and annoying. Somebody has no faith in the public's ability to digest unpleasant facts, to make calm judgments in the midst of controversy. They just do not believe the public's business is public—if it is touchy or complex and emphatically if it is dangerous.

Reporters cannot get straight answers to straight and valid questions. Why? Is there a conspiracy of silence or calculated delusion to cloak dishonorable acts or to cover up mistakes? We believe not. Why, then, cannot the press of this country help blow away the fog of doubletalk (some call it "rewritten history") which is so obscuring great issues? Well, because candor in the discussion of official business is at a low ebb. Again, why? Perhaps the examples that illustrate our dissent suggest the answers within themselves:

Four of the most sensitive areas of Government today are foreign affairs, defense, atomic energy, and internal security.

Secretary of State Dulles has said that President Eisenhower decided to use atomic arms against Manchurian bases in the event that hostilities were renewed in Korea. Mr. Dulles also said that the President concurred in the destruction of Communist Chinese staging bases in South China if the Red Chinese intervened during the Indochina crisis. Both statements were in a Life magazine article which has since been confirmed, in substance, by the Secretary himself.

Did the President so decide and concur? Is it important that we know? Perhaps the American people, directly and through their Representatives in Congress, would have agreed to such a course of action. Then again, perhaps they would not have. As the record stands, Mr. Eisenhower is committed to one position by his Secretary of State, and to another by his own statements to the people. Which are we supposed to believe? Or are we to know, along with our allies, only when such policies are to be implemented with action?

Directly related to foregoing contradiction is the issue raised by General Ridgway's angry complaint against misrepresentation of his views while on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Ridgway objected to what he believed to be overemphasis on nuclear weapons in United States military planning. His objection was a professional one. It bore upon budgetary considerations, but more importantly upon our capacity to support such decisions as those revealed by Mr. Dulles—without embarking upon world war III.

But General Ridgway's minority dissent, delivered as an unclassified document to Secretary of Defense Wilson, was classified as unprivileged for public consumption and filed away. Then, either through honest error of interpretation or by design, the President was led to believe that the joint chiefs were unanimous in their views on the balance of forces recommended by Mr. Eisenhower, and the President so informed Congress and the country.

Here again, as in the case of Mr. Dulles' personalized history of recent diplomatic maneuvering, there was a serious breakdown in the communication between the Government and the people. And the general has turned to a popular magazine to tell his side of the story.

Almost a full year passed before the Atomic Energy Commission revealed the character and extent of radioactive fallout from the super bomb that was set off in the Pacific, March 1, 1954. There are many scientists today who feel that the Government is failing to inform the American people fully about the nature of the threat which is posed to civil defense in this country.

Finally, almost 2 years passed before patient congressional digging was able to separate and distinguish between cases of proven or implied disloyalty, and cases involving personal aberrations in the Government's security-risk firings. The press was completely frustrated in its efforts to obtain clear explanations of the actions. The figures were thrown around in the 1954 congressional campaigns to prove that the present Government had achieved an astonishing housecleaning job on Reds in Government.

Now, why are we having such exhausting experiences with men in high office? We think there are several reasons:

First, many of the men running our present Government are accustomed to dealing with the press only on their own terms. They make public only what, in their opinion and in the view of public relations counsel, is helpful to them and their objectives. This may not reflect adversely on their abilities. But it does not commend their concepts of public responsibility.

Second, tailored information—given appropriate color, timing, and emphasis—can enhance a program, even though illuminating it imperfectly. Achievement of objectives is more important than understanding them in the view of some. The comprehension and, of course, approval will follow. Meanwhile, why slow things up with endless and fruitless debate that would follow full disclosure?

Third, some confusion over purpose and performance in the conduct of the public's business is politically expedient. It disarms one's enemies while permitting one's friends to concentrate on generalities with indisputable appeal, i. e., peace and prosperity.

We believe the people have the same right to demand the facts on great questions of national policy as they have to the records of their courts, their school boards, and their city councils. But many of those facts, the answers to questions that bear upon justice and oppression, war and peace, life and death, are being withheld.

The people are being told, by strong inference, that their helmsmen are guiding the ship of state through dangerous waters with exceeding devotion and skill—that what they are doing is more important than why or how they are doing it. But that is a fatal course in a free nation. For as Thomas Jefferson said: "A nation which expects to be both ignorant and free, expects something that never was nor ever can be."

Boys' Clubs of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the year 1956 marks the golden anniversary of Boys' Clubs of America and it is my wish, today, to pay tribute to that organization.

Even if juvenile delinquency were not one of our foremost problems, the contribution of Boys' Clubs of America would be of incalculable value. But the problem is undeniably there, and we must all be deeply grateful for the firm line of defense against youthful frustration, disillusionment, dispair, and crime which the boys' clubs across the country have erected.

In my district, the city of Toledo has a thriving boys' club of which we are all proud. The boys tell me that they plan their program under the slogan, "Building Boys Is Better Than Mending Men." Here, I think, we have the essence of the Boys' Clubs program.

Anyone of us can harken back to his own boyhood and remember the driving energy, the spirit of competition and combat, the yearning for adventure, the urge to explore and the need to be a member of the gang, which motivated many youthful ventures, many boyhood escapades.

These are important drives in youth, drives we do not want to destroy, but guide, instead, into constructive channels. This is the job Boys' Clubs of America has tackled, and the record of that organization over the past 50 years has been most heartening.

Since 1906 more than 400 boys' clubs have been established throughout the country, with a membership of some 400,000 boys—boys who are finding outlets for their energies and interests in sports, arts, crafts, and wholesome social activities. The boys' clubs have made available to them facilities valued at some $120 million and ranging from clubhouses to sports equipment, games and books.

The boys' clubs answer the basic need of boys to belong—to a club, a group, a team. Their programs place special emphasis on the needs of underprivileged boys. In congested cities the membership is drawn from the crowded areas, and in towns where other similar opportunities are not available, club members represent all economic levels. The clubs are nonsectarian. Membership fees are low enough to permit the poorest boy in the community to belong, and programs are varied enough to appeal to boys of every interest and capability.

The contribution of Boys' Clubs of America in building for good citizenship, preventing delinquency and developing latent talents in our boys cannot be overrated. The place which this organization has earned in our society is unique; its work is vital.

It is my purpose, today, Mr. Speaker, to call attention to the great work being done by Boys' Club of America and to urge that, in this anniversary year, Americans everywhere commend and support this program which must, of necessity, be close to the hearts of all who wish for American youth a bright and happy future.

The Great State of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the remarks of Gov. C. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, which he made at the Michigan State Society dinner on Friday, January 27, 1956, held at the Raleigh Hotel here in Washington.

The Governor's remarks follow:

It is a great pleasure to dine with and visit with a group of friends who share my own devotion to our beautiful State of Michigan.

Your pride in our great State of Mitchaw Sagiegan, a pride which is suitably evidenced by your activities in this nearly century old State soceity, is no more surprising to me than mine can be to you.

We have much to be proud of in Michigan, including—yes, most of all—our energetic and imaginative people, who have done so much to make the most of the great resources and other blessings which have been showered in our State from the beginning.

It is not only from the days of 1787, when we were incorporated into the Northwest Territory, but even from our earliest beginning, when Etienne Brulé and his companion, Grenoble, first explored our beautiful land of the Great Lakes in 1618 that the products of Michigan have been enriching the lives of people, products which include both the first furs and pelts from our vast wilderness of the early 17th century and the automobiles, airplanes, electronic machines, and wonder drugs of the twenties.

Four flags have flown over Michigan in those years: French, British, Spanish, and our own American flag. (The inclusion of the Spanish flag may possibly be a surprise to some. The fact is that Spanish troops captured Fort St. Joseph, where the city of Niles now stands, and held it for several days in 1781). But no matter what flag flew over it, Michigan, a French terirtory, a Spanish territory in part, a British territory, and finally the 26th State of our own Union (in 1837), has made its unforgettable contribution to the civilization of the times.

Nature richly endowed Michigan with natural resources. In their prime, our great forests were one of the Nation's main sources of lumber.

More than 100 years ago, in 1844, our great Superior iron ranges began pouring their ore into the Nation's industries. Even today, there is only one State, Minnesota, which mines more iron ore than we do.

Our fabulous copper mines were opened at about the same time, and at the turn of the century the deposits in Michigan mines were the most important single product in the world market.

Our rich earth enjoys top rank in the production of calcium, magnesium, chlorides, gypsum and salt. We are second in the commercial production of bromine, sand and gravel. We are third in natural magnesium compounds. We are fourth in stone and peat.

We have the largest underground iron mine in the world, the largest commercial limestone quarries, and we supply almost all of the graphite used in lead pencils.

What the world thinks of when it thinks of Michigan, is automobiles, and for good enough reason. But our 10,000 factories rank first, not only in automobiles, but also in boat building, gray iron making, cutting tools, woodworking machinery, baby foods, magicians' equipment, breakfast food, and in the repair of calliopes. More than 80 percent of all the different kinds of manufacturing is done in Michigan.

In Kalamazoo, Michigan boasts the world's largest drug products plant under one roof.

In Dearborn, of course, we have the world's largest automobile plant; in Alpena, the world's largest cement plant; and, again in Kalamazoo, the world's largest guitar factory.

And that isn't all.

Detroit is the Nation's first city in pharmaceutical products, adding machines, machine tool accessories, foundry products, heating devices, paint and heavy chemicals.

Detroit, although there may be some who will not believe it, is the healthiest big city in the world and also the wealthiest.

It has the lowest death rate of any large city, and its per capita income averages out at more than $4,000 per year, which is the highest in the world.

It also has the largest proportion of homeowners of any large city in the Nation.

The Detroit River is the world's busiest waterway, carrying more tonnage than the Rhine, Thames, Seine, and Volga combined.

But Michigan also is a mighty agricultural State. In the production of the Nation's 20 most important crops, Michigan ranks tenth or better in each.

It leads the Nation in the production of tart cherries, navy beans, cantaloupe, celery, cucumber pickles, strawberries, gladioli bulbs, and chicory.

It is second in the production of plums, carrots, field beans, cauliflower, red clover seed, onions, and blueberries.

It is fourth in sugar beets, and it produces 21 percent of the Nation's peppermint and wintergreen.

Michigan farmers have won national awards for potatoes and butterfat, and world championships in milk production and wheat growing.

Michigan is the fourth largest tourist State. The beauty of the State itself, in addition to its industries, is the attraction. A few hours' drive from the Nation's biggest factories, we have some of the Nation's biggest forests. Six million acres of our State are covered by State and National forests. In and near these forests, we have a deer herd of more than 700,000, the largest east of the Rockies; the only elk herd east of the Mississippi; and one of the few moose herds in the United States, not to mention bear, bobcat and other game.

Michigan—or Mitchaw Sagiegan, to revert again to its old Chippewa name—has 11,000 lakes and 36,000 miles of streams.

To open up this great water wonderland to our fellow Americans, not to say to our Canadian friends and others, Michigan built the first cement highway in 1899, and the world's longest international bridge at Detroit.

The longest suspension bridge in the world, the Mackinac Bridge, is now being built to link the two peninsulas of the State. Including anchorages, but excluding approaches, it will extend 8,614 feet across the Straits of Mackinac. If we include approaches, the total length will be 26,195 feet, which is just less than five miles.

Engineers have said it would be impossible to build this bridge. They drew blueprints and submitted innumerable data to prove that it could not be done.

Michigan is doing it!

So far, we have discussed what Michigan is, what it has done. Our lumber helped build the cities, towns and farms when the Nation was young. As time passed, we put not only the Nation but the whole world on wheels. More recently, we helped save democracy by becoming its arsenal. But I can say to you that our best years, our most prideful years, are just now upon us.

The whole Nation, right now, is entering a brand new era. It is an era in which automation, the science in which miracle machines powered by miracle energy sources, including the power of the sun itself, will free men, at last, from the backbreaking tasks to which they have been chained for so long.

And Michigan is taking its place, and will continue to hold its place, in the very van of this great new forward surge into a new kind of civilization in which all Americans, continuing to look to Michigan's genius in the future as they have in the past, should be enabled to enjoy an abundance of everything—including, for the first time since Adam and Eve were driven out of Paradise, an abundance of leisure to devote to the development of their whole persons—physical, mental, spiritual.

The products which have poured out of Michigan's 10,000 factories up to now are as nothing compared to the products which will flow out of them from now on, with one machine doing the work now done by 4 or 5 men. We are headed into an era such as the world has never known, or even imagined, up to now, and Michigan is leading the way.

As man begins to fill his hunger for goods he will seek more and more leisure. Then, truly, the wonderful peninsulas of Michigan, with their great natural resources and rich historical inheritance, will become a mecca of happy vacation-bound people not only from our own farms and factories but from many States of the Union.

It is part of our inheritance to lead. Ours is an illustrious tradition, and we are proving ourselves worthy inheritors. Our future is circumscribed only by the limits of our courage and our initiative, and I myself have seen that the limits are boundless.

Our history is a great one. Our future will be even greater.

Ladies and gentlemen, with you, I salute our great State, Mitchaw Sagiegan, the beautiful land of the Great Lakes.

Air Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, the problems of air pollution are countrywide and are increasing in severity and frequency of occurrence at an alarming rate. Some of these developments and the measures being taken to combat them are summarized in the following excerpts from a recent address by Dr. Lauren B. Hitchcock, president of the Air Pollution Foundation in Los Angeles. They are a timely reminder to this Congress that, while we have made a start toward research in this field, much more must be done, and soon.

The address follows:

AIR POLLUTION AFFECTS NEARLY HALF OF UNITED STATES POPULATION

Seventy-six million residents of the United States, approximately 46 percent of the entire population, are living in areas which have atmospheric pollution, Dr. Lauren B. Hitchcock, president of the Air Pollution Foundation, said.

And solutions for the Nation's steadily growing air pollution problem can be produced only as fast as the public acknowledges its seriousness and supplies the money needed to bring the menace of smog under control.

Dr. Hitchcock traced the spread of air pollution in urban centers across the continent at a Pacific southwest regional meeting of the American Geophysical Union at Kerckhoff Hall on the UCLA campus.

Far from being an isolated problem characteristic of Los Angeles or such cities as Chicago and New Orleans, he said, air pollution is causing concern in the East as well.

"Of the 76 million residents of United States areas which are experiencing air pollution, 40 percent live in the six Eastern States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania," he reported.

Speaking on "Smog—Its Causes and Probable Cures," Dr. Hitchcock asserted that unless air pollution is combated successfully on a nationwide scale, the cost of smog during the next 25 years "may exceed the total cost of all our wars of the last 50 years."

Cost factors include $1 billion worth of unburned gasoline emitted from auto exhausts and adding to smog each year, unreckoned losses of other partially burned fuels, at least $1 billion a year in smog-caused laundry bills and cleaning of buildings, furnishings, and automobiles, and untallied millions of dollars in crop damage, plus corrosion and deterioration of metals and other materials.

"And who would attempt to put a price tag on the health and welfare of our citizens?" Dr. Hitchcock asked. "Who will advocate that we experiment with this generation or the next to determine how much insult man can endure?"

But this is one gamble man does not have to take, he said.

"At the cost of a few millions now, we can effect savings to the country of billions in the years to come, plus far-reaching health benefits."

He pointed out that statistics of higher incidence of lung cancer in cities, though not yet proven to be a cause-and-effect relationship, are being taken very seriously by our highest medical authorities.

The foundation president emphasized that air pollution "parallels the increasing metropolitan concentrations of man and his machines."

He pointed out that "over one-third of the air-polluted population in the United States live in the three metropolitan areas of New York-northeastern New Jersey, Chicago, and Los Angeles," and added that "metropolitan areas along the eastern coast from Boston to Washington, D. C., are fast coalescing into one continuous metropolis."

Air pollution is now being noted in varying degrees in 30 metropolitan areas of the Nation having populations of more than 500,000, and in 71 other centers of lesser populations, Dr. Hitchcock said.

In addition, reports of atmospheric pollution in Mexico City, Bogota, Sao Paulo, London, Liverpool, Manchester, Paris, Cologne, Copenhagen, Sydney, Melbourne, and Tokyo, indicate that at least 33 million persons in other parts of the world live in heavily-populater, air-polluted centers.

Dr. Hitchcock warned that "the air supply of any community is fixed by nature, by winds and weather, beyond the control of man," and explained that "a large part of air pollution is the result of our growing requirements for energy in an age of mechanization."

A problem not under control of scientists and engineers, Dr. Hitchcock reminded, is "the willingness of the community—which includes business, industry, the public, and Government—to spend the necessary money and to accept the necessary controls."

Concession on Echo Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the December 27 issue of the Cincinnati Times-Star on the upper Colorado River project is timely and exceptionally well written. I am, therefore, inserting it in the RECORD so that

my colleagues may have the benefit of the arguments it makes in opposition to the project:

CONCESSION ON ECHO PARK

One of the questions which Congress will face when it reconvenes in January is the controversial upper Colorado River project. And this time it may stand a better chance of passage because the dam at Echo Park, in Dinosaur National Monument, has been eliminated.

The Echo Park Dam brought forth the opposition of conservationists and lovers of the national parks all over the Nation. The dam would have inundated a beautiful canyon in one of the West's most scenic spots. And there was always the question of whether it was really vital to the upper Colorado project.

Members of the House Rules Committee eliminated the Echo Park Dam from the House bill last spring. The proponents have now conceded defeat and are willing to leave Echo Park alone. But they are still beating the drums for the rest of the project.

Congress may buy their altered goods. If it does, however, it will not be getting an unmixed blessing. Several other features of the upper Colorado project are also of dubious value. Engineers are not certain some of the dams are practical. No one seems to agree on the cost, which may run into hundreds of millions, and there is disagreement over whether the benefits from it, such as irrigation, recreation, and electric power, will make it self-supporting.

Above all is the questionable policy of spending huge sums to create new agricultural lans at a time when the Government is so plagued with surplus crops that it is proposing to take millions of acres out of cultivation and put them in a soil bank. Echo Park or no Echo Park, Congress had better take another long look at this proposal.

Address of Hon. George M. Leader, Governor of Pennsylvania, Before the Nationalities Division of the Democratic National Committee, January 28, 1956, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

When I was a boy we used to sing a piece of jargon that went like this:

"Run, get the ax; there's a flea on Willie's head."

Even as children we thought it ridiculous. Even as children we realized it was a foolish way to kill a flea—unless you didn't mind killing Willie in the process.

I don't know why I say "even" as children we thought it ridiculous, for it seems to me that a good many grown-ups, living in today's United States, find it completely reasonable.

These are the people who are so anxious to kill the fleas of communism that they swing their axes at our Constitution, our Bill of Rights, and our tradition of fair play.

In the very act of combating communism, they swing the ax of communism.

The swing the ax of terror.

And while the brave among us shudder, the frightened cringe.

All of us know that we are living in an atmosphere of hysteria: Most of us are familiar with the kangaroo courts and the star-chambers of our present-day America.

This is the age of insecurity—for security reasons.

It has come about because we have allowed some of our Government administrative agencies to bypass the courts and even to bypass our lawmaking bodies.

By administrative decree—which can be changed by one stroke of a bureaucratic pen—men are being labeled as disloyal and, by implication, potentially treasonous.

Take the Ladejinsky case, for example. Secretary Benson was finally forced to admit that it was unjust to call Mr. Ladejinsky a security risk. Secretary Benson now says that the loyalty-security tag pinned upon him was simply a pretext.

For Secretary Benson's real reason for dismissing Ladejinsky was his belief that everybody in the Department of Agriculture should be a native-born American.

Those of us meeting here tonight are particularly concerned with the problems of foreign-born or first-generation Americans. This is the reason why I have touched upon the dangers of the present security program.

For, if native Americans are themselves facing the menace of trial-by-bureaucrat, what is ahead for the nationalities groups? What of the foreign-born American, or the American whose parents came from another country, or the American who still has relatives in another land?

I must admit that the question is rhetorical. All of you know the answer as well as I.

All of you know that their problem is infinitely more critical than it is for the native American.

As Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I know a good deal about nationality groups. Within our State we have more than three-quarters of a million foreign-born citizens, and another two million who are either of foreign or mixed parentage. This is a high proportion, even in a Nation which numbers nearly 34 million of its citizens among the foreign-born or first generation.

For my part—I am a Pennsylvania Dutchman.

It is true that my ancestors came to America nine generations ago, but I am still a Pennsylvania Dutchman and I pride myself upon it.

My identity as such is only a part of my complete identity as an American, of course. But this is equally true of the newly naturalized citizen. He may speak accented English; he may read a newspaper printed in his native language; he may affiliate himself with a group made up of other Americans sprung from the same stock; he may preserve his language, his customs, and his inheritance of national culture and folk wisdom. But he is still as much an American as I am, or anybody else is.

This is as it should be. After all, our pride in our origin does not disqualify us as Americans.

All of us, whether naturalized or native-born, are Americans and citizens, and even those of us whose families came here hundreds of years ago spring from immigrant stock.

The thing that counts is the actuality of citizenship.

Now traditionally, American citizenship is given without reservation and without disclaimer. There are no strings attached. No trick clauses are hidden among the fine print. And no one is expected to start out with a fractional degree of citizenship and build it up to the complete whole over a period of years by seniority or bureaucratic endorsement.

We have always believed in this country that the newly made citizen of half an hour ago was as much an American as the descendant of John Smith, or Priscilla Alden, or Peter Stuyvesant.

Why then should a new American, or an American with relatives abroad, or an American who has fled the Iron Curtain, face discrimination?

He shouldn't. But all too often he does.

For there is little doubt that in our present hysterical era he suffers more from the erosion of American civil rights than his native-born fellow citizen.

Yet we are the people who for so long have prided ourselves on our nerve, our balance, and our acceptance of every man at face value.

We are the people who have prided ourselves upon our design for freedom and our zealous defense of liberty.

But we, those same people, see hardly a week go by without another affront to the freedoms we treasure.

Undoubtedly, there are a few disloyal Americans and certainly we should like them to be removed from sensitive areas. But in the process we must not cast aside our heritage and our law.

This is too high a price.

You know, speaking as a layman, it has always seemed to me that civil rights are too often construed in the negative sense. Too often we think of them as protective devices. Too often we consider them to be simply defenses against the invasion of our individual freedoms. Too often we relegate them to the courts, to the lawyers, and to the due process of the law itself.

Judge Learned Hand, one of our Nation's great jurists and great men, has said something very pertinent about this:

"What do we mean," Judge Hand asked, "when we say that first of all we seek liberty? I often wonder whether we do not rest our hopes too much upon constitutions, upon laws, and upon courts. These are false hopes; believe me, these are false hopes.

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it. While it lies there, it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it."

Let us, therefore, stand up and be counted. Let us endorse sanity and abjure fear. Let us proclaim our faith in one another as Americans, and let us do it loudly enough to make our voices heard.

For we are all of us immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants; and we have in common not only our search for liberty but our conviction that we can best find it here.

And we are all of us members, in one way or another, of minority groups. At least, we are mavericks enough to think so. We are, in fact, individuals who find kinship in our independence, in our varied approaches to government, but also in our basic similarity of purpose. We have found that all our minorities have, together, become the majority we call the Democratic Party. We have found that our party is the sum total of our viewpoints, of our tolerance for one another, of our conviction that democracy is best achieved and best preserved in the United States by the Democratic Party.

Before I leave this meeting here tonight, I should like to quote a few more words from the thoughtful pen of Judge Learned Hand.

"What, then, is the spirit of liberty?" he asked. "I cannot define it; I can only tell you my own faith. The spirit of liberty is the spirit which is not too sure that it is right; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which seeks to understand the minds of other men and women; the spirit of liberty is the spirit which weighs their interests alongside its own without bias; the spirit of liberty remembers that not even a sparrow falls to earth unheeded; the spirit of liberty is the spirit of Him who, near 2,000 years ago, taught mankind that lesson it has never

learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest * * *."

And so tonight, within the four walls of this room, we are gathered together as Americans whose national origins cover the world—as men and women who believe that all of us are children of one Father and brothers in the same land.

For myself, there is no greater cause in life than our common cause of brotherhood; for it is, after all, the cause of liberty. And I wish for liberty not only in America but throughout all the world.

Let us pray, therefore, that the conscience and courage of Americans can create that spirit of liberty of which Judge Hand spoke so well; and that they will safeguard the very liberty they have created.

Only then will our Nation be secure in the armor of its freedom.

Worries of the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, through sickness and otherwise—mostly otherwise—the President has had a hard time of it for the past few months. He will completely recover from his sickness, but I doubt that his worries will end.

Many members of his Cabinet seem to be suffering from the hoof-and-mouth disease, and it is apparently spreading. Defense Secretary Wilson led off in his speech in Chicago—spoke entirely out of turn and expressed his own views and not those of the President. That simmered down, but not until the damage removed some Republican Members of Congress.

Along comes Dulles and authors an article he never saw or read which appeared in Life magazine, telling how we had been on the brink of war many times, but that through dextrous handling and political jujitsu he had avoided war as often as it was threatened, and a general "hoo rah" for Dulles. Another storm broke, and through the heroism of the editor of Life, Mr. Luce, who assumed all the blame, the administration ship righted itself and started to sail again. This course was short lived, however, because another administration officer who had neither written nor read an article appearing in Harper's, stating that support prices were the bunk, sent in a letter stating that the article was excellent.

Benson had trouble before sporting around with sliding scales and Senator AIKEN, but this last blast shook the Federal buildings in Washington. The President, speaking in the last campaign, said that the farmers were entitled to 90 percent of parity, and that they could count on him to maintain support prices, and now his Secretary of Agriculture settles the whole farm question in a hurry, and the article says the support program is out.

There is one redeeming feature about Benson's blunder. He admitted it and took full responsibility. That only confirms what I think of him. He is a very nice, honest man, much better than the usual run of Secretaries, but his knowledge of what to do to straighten out agriculture is on a par with what I know about the hereafter.

These Secretaries seem to have contracted the dread foot-and-mouth disease, because every time the yopen their mouth they get their foot in it. In this political fly time the President should insist that the Secretaries wear muzzles, and I doubt that muzzles would stop the appearance of letters in the magazines under the name of a Secretary who never saw or read or signed the publication. That presents a mysterious situation. In my small way I have been correctly quoted, misquoted, and had my statements rewritten until I could not recognize them, but I never have yet seen an article in any magazine attribtued to me which I did not write, did not read, and did not sign. Gosh. This Secretary business is dangerous, when a Secretary cannot tell from 1 minute to the next what he will say when he has not said anything. The magazines should be fair enough to permit any Secretary to read what he is about to say. I just would not have anything to do with a magazine which would not let me see what it had concocted. If he cannot read, let someone read it to him. This promiscuous appearance of articles and letters emanating from the administration headquarters ought to be approved by somebody before the publication comes out.

I think the President will survive his heart trouble if the situation is not aggravated, but the action of these promiscuous statements appearing in magazines, which the President knows nothing about, will give a well man thrombosis of the heart, liver, or any other vital organ.

Somewhat, Yes Very, Confusing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1956

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of the House will take 2 minutes to read the following editorials from the Rockaway (N. J.) Record, and the Los Angeles Herald Express.

They say in a few words, what I am sure a great many Congressmen are asking themselves. That is: "How can we approve the upper Colorado River project, which would bring into production more than half a million acres of new agricultural land, and at the same time propose that 40 million other acres be taken out of production?"

Here we have the situation of our left hand not paying any attention to what our right hand is doing.

I am sure that all Members are sincerely struggling to devise ways and means for solving the great problem of our surplus foods. With inconsistencies such as this, however, we cannot arrive at an equitable solution.

Such projects as the upper Colorado should not be approved to increase the headache of our farm problem. Such projects are unjustified and foolhardy in the face of the present situation.

I strongly commend the following analysis:

[From the Rockaway (N. J.) Record of January 12, 1956]

MEMO FOR A POSTAL

It's impossible to read all the material sent to us from Washington, but one piece this week commanded our enthusiastic attention.

For the past couple of years we've been hearing about a multi-billion-dollar scheme of the Federal Bureau of Reclamation, called the upper Colorado River project, to irrigate land in high, barren, remote areas of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California (he must be a Republican; Senators HARRY BYRD, WALTER GEORGE, and RICHARD RUSSELL are the only Democrats we know of in Congress who aren't hell bent on squandering the taxpayers' money) has come up with a report that ought to blast the project for good. He has found there are nearly 21 million acres of fair to excellent farm land lying idle in the East, Midwest, and South, where there is ample rainfall and a long growing season. This total does not include woodlands, pastures, or Government lands. The figures were supplied by the United States Soil Conservation Service.

Against this he contrasts the upper Colorado project, that would irrigate about half a million acres at a cost of at least $5,000 per acre, in an area where there is little population, few roads, no metropolitan markets, few towns. The cost of establishing local governments, police forces, schools, and building highways and new towns would have to be added to the irrigation costs, whereas the good land now lying idle is close to markets and population centers, with roads and transportation running through them, and with schools and municipal governments already established.

"It is an unbelievable proposal for the purpose of growing more farm products of the kind already in great surplus while there are these millions of acres of good idle land," he says.

Well, that's bureaucracy for you. How could the parasites in the Reclamation Bureau justify their salaries if they didn't try to reclaim something—anywhere, just so it keeps them busy?

How about dropping a postcard to PETE FRELINGHUYSEN in the House Office Building? Or would you prefer to pay your share of that $5,000 per acre to grow more surplus to be bought with more of your money?

Here is another editorial from the Los Angeles Herald-Express which reviews the same problem:

SOMEWHAT CONFUSING

The President has called for farm legislation the core of which is the soil bank and other methods of inducing farmers to cut back on their production.

But the President also recommended that Congress act to authorize construction of the upper Colorado River Basin water storage dams to throw open half a million new farm acres to agriculture.

We are told that our Government storage bins are filled to overflowing with surplus farm products which must be sold here or abroad, even in Iron Curtain countries, and that is why we must pay farmers to stop production on a good part of their acreage.

If the upper Colorado project is built at a cost of billions of dollars, it will take away water that should come to southern California from the lower Colorado and that is a major concern of everyone in this section of the country.

California's Republican Congressman CRAIG HOSMER, of Long Beach, has thrown another monkey wrench into the confusion machinery by announcing that he will present to the House evidence that nearly 21 million acres of the best American croplands are lying idle and unused for any purpose.

"With millions of acres of the best farmland awaiting the plow in areas where the rainfall is heavy and the growing season long, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation would force this great new burden of the upper Colorado River project on the American taxpayers," HOSMER stated.

HOSMER said that the cost of bringing millions of idle farm acres into full production would run only from $15 to $150 an acre.

"Compare that with the $5,000 an acre cost of building the upper Colorado project," he added, "and you see how inconceivable the Reclamation Bureau's scheme is."

It would seem that while we are talking about a soil bank for the farmers already having their land in full production, we should think a little about keeping these virgin lands around the upper Colorado project locked in their present soil bank until we have use for them.

Politics and the Generals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Post of Thursday, January 26, 1956:

POLITICS AND THE GENERALS

Gen. Matthew Ridgway has now joined a lengthening list of general officers of the Army whose dissenting views of the defense policies stemming directly from the Commander in Chief are a symptom of some deep-seated defect of our Nation's high command.

General Ridgway has been supreme commander in the Far East for U. N. forces, supreme commander of NATO, and Chief of Staff of the Army. These are posts which gave him some competence in commands which General MacArthur and President Eisenhower have held, a wider experience, in fact, than either MacArthur or Eisenhower. Eisenhower never commanded directly in the Far East for U. N. forces, and MacArthur never commanded NATO.

It cannot be charged then, that General Ridgway's criticism of the political decisions which he says have marred the military preparedness of this country, stems from frustrated ambition. Other general officers have had similar experiences with the pressure of politics. Generals Clark, Wedemeyer, Collins, Bradley—even General Marshall—and others of recent memory have experienced overt political pressure. General Ridgway has taken his case to the people, while the others, from one consideration or another, never succeeded in registering an effective protest.

No efforts will be spared by the coterie of incompetents surrounding Secretary of Defense Wilson to smear General Ridgway. But he has said something which needed to be said, and uncovered a story which was hinted at for so long that it needed documentation.

An Expression of Public Opinion on Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the January 23, 1956, issue of the Santa Rosa (Calif.) Press-Democrat carried an editorial entitled "What Foreign Policy Would Adlai Suggest?" which is a timely expression of public opinion on the current foreign-policy controversy.

I believe the opposition is going overboard in their many times silly criticism of the Eisenhower administration. Never in the history of our country have we had more capable and honest men of reputation leading our important and sensitive departments of Government. I would warn those who criticize not to go too far, it may be a long way back.

The editorial follows:

WHAT FOREIGN POLICY WOULD ADLAI SUGGEST?

When Adlai Stevenson officially became a candidate for President, a lot of people wondered whether he was making a mistake by announcing too early.

His pronouncements recently on a magazine article quoting Secretary of State Dulles that the United States has been on the brink of war 3 times in 3 years will make even more people wonder whether Mr. Stevenson would have increased his chances of nomination and election by remaining in the background a little longer.

Mr. Stevenson is one of the most polished phraseturners of our times. When the magazine quoted Mr. Dulles, Candidate Stevenson promptly got into print by accusing the Secretary of playing Russian roulette with our entire Nation at a time when our military might was being reduced for political purposes.

It sounds good. The only trouble is that it isn't accurate. And a lot of people may be better informed than Mr. Stevenson thinks.

There is no mystery about the foreign policy of the United States.

In both Europe and Asia, we have drawn lines. Communist Russia and Communist China both understand clearly that if those lines are crossed, we will fight.

Few people in the United States do not realize that the Communists would start a war at any time they are convinced they could defeat us. In essence, our foreign policy is that we do not propose to let our enemy nibble away at our defense perimeters, communizing other nations, until they have reached the point where the United States is isolated and ripe for attack.

This foreign policy is in sharp contrast to that of Mr. Truman.

Far from a clear-cut thus far and no farther policy, Mr. Truman's administration let it be known that we did not consider Korea within our defense perimeter. The Communists promptly invaded South Korea—and we blundered into a shooting war in defending it.

There have been no similar misadventures under the Eisenhower administration. If the Communists invade, we will fight. They know it, and the American public knows it. So does Mr. Stevenson.

If we have been on the brink of war during crises over the Korean armistice, in Indochina and Formosa, and Mr. Dulles says we have, it is because our enemy has been tempted to gamble on whether we mean what we say. If there has been no war, and there has not, it is because our enemy has decided it's not safe to take the gamble.

What would Mr. Stevenson substitute for this policy of strong defense and clear understanding? Would be return to the policy of weak defense and uncertainty that plunged us into the Korean mess?

He doesn't say. He doesn't even criticize our present foreign policy in a clear-cut and understandable manner.

All he does is coin a smooth phrase about "Russian roulette."

Whether he's running for President too soon remains to be seen.

But since he's running, he should let the people know in what direction he proposes to take the United States if nominated and elected.

The People Trust President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial appearing in one of the outstanding newspapers of my district, the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News. In well-chosen words, it clearly defines the position of our President and recognizes that his performance in office confirms the feeling of trust and confidence that the people of our Nation have for him. The records will show, Mr. Speaker, that President Eisenhower has dedicated himself to the preservation of peace. The people trust him, Mr. Speaker, regardless of politics. He has given us full employment without war. He has balanced the budget without jeopardizing defense or any other segment of our economy. He has cut waste and unnecessary expenditures and has given dignity to his office.

MORE POPULAR THAN EVER

President Eisenhower has now completed three-fourths of the term to which he was elected in November 1952. That is a sufficient span to allow the American people to judge him as Chief Executive.

The celebrations honoring him at this milestone bear a largely partisan Republican stamp. But the evidences suggest that many millions of Americans would happily associate themselves with such homage.

For Mr. Eisenhower is an extremely popular man, as much or more so than the day he was elected with an all-time record of nearly 34 million votes. Judged in these terms, his tenure of office thus far has been a smashing success.

The verdict of the historians may or may not coincide with the popular judgment, but it is bound to be affected by it.

There is not really a great deal new that can be said in explanation of this popularity that was not uttered at the time of the President's fateful heart attack last September. At that time he learned, as few living men do, in what esteem his countrymen held him.

In the beginning it seemed to be chiefly a matter of trust. Mr. Eisenhower was a man who had taken a big role in bringing the American people safely through a great war and preparing the defenses against the prospect of another.

His performance in office tended to confirm that feeling of trust. The President revealed himself as a man intensely dedicated to the preservation of peace, the cause most Ameri-

cans wanted to see served with full devotion.

In the domestic realm his tenure was linked first with a moderate economic decline and then with a resurgence that carried the Nation to new peaks of prosperity. Here again the great majority of Americans appeared inclined to credit him with striving earnestly to better their lot in life.

Almost beyond these things, Americans came to view Mr. Eisenhower as a man of such innate sincerity and decency that he has stamped the fresh imprint of these qualities on the country's public life. He has quieted, if he has not stilled, the angry currents being stirred by the extremists when he assumed the Presidency. The tenor of public discussion is calmer, and there is more unity in the United States than in many a day.

His critics in his own party think he has been too much a Democrat. His Democratic adversaries think—or say—he has benefited form the illusion rather than fact of peace and prosperity.

If President Eisenhower should decide to run for a second term, those who would prove these circumstances illusionary have their work cut out for them. For most people show no signs today of doubting the substance of these favorable conditions.

They have watched the President for 3 years. And they like what they have seen.

Flynt Speaks for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. J. J. FLYNT, JR., made an address to a joint session of the General Assembly of Georgia, wherein he opposed the Federal aid-to-education bill.

That speech met with approval in the general assembly, and the Griffin Daily News wrote the following editorial which should be of interest to this body, to wit:

FLYNT SPEAKS FOR THE SOUTH

(By Quimby Melton, Jr.)

Congressman JACK FLYNT, of Griffin, made a fighting address to a joint session of the General Assembly of Georgia yesterday. In it he said clearly that he opposes the Federal aid-to-education bill in Congress because it would remove local control of schools and transfer it to Washington.

Discussing the issue of segregation, he had some reasonable arguments to offer. As one of the leaders in Congress for continued segregation of the races, he made a statement which should be published through the Nation. It is:

"I want to state without any reservation or evasion that I am here and now willing to take a solemn oath that I hold no malice, hatred, or prejudice whatsoever in my heart or mind or soul against any man or group of men, living or dead, because of his race or the color of his skin. * * * I have sought to give every man and woman every dignity to which he is entitled as a human being and every right to which he is entitled as an American citizen.

"And, yet, I just as firmly and sincerely believe that to completely integrate in communities and States where each race constitutes a large proportion of the population would unquestionably weaken both races and even destroy one or both."

That statement, in a nutshell, explains the South's opposition to segregation. It tells the Nation clearly that the white southerner does not hate Negroes as so many people out of our section believe we do. It explains that the fight for segregation is not a fight for bigotry or prejudice.

To the contrary, the white southerner is the best friend the Negro race ever had.

And like Congressman FLYNT, we have neither malice nor hatred toward the Negro race. We admire and respect the race's achievements and accomplishments in a relatively few number of years. We believe that Negroes are entitled to fair treatment, a proper standard of living, good education, and the right to the pursuit of happiness.

But, again, like Congressman FLYNT, we believe that integrating the races in the South might well lead to the destruction of either or both races.

And though we bear no ill will whatever toward Negroes, we do loathe, abhor, and despise the political and sociological meddlings of troublemakers from outside our State who seek to overthrow the Constitution, wreck the good will between the races, and cram an illegal and unconstitutional decision down our throats.

Congressman FLYNT has spoken out in terms even the Supreme Court and even the rabble rousers of the leftwing elements can understand. Let his words be heard throughout the Nation.

Retiring Admiral Shepheard Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of January 26, 1956:

RETIRING ADMIRAL SHEPHEARD HONORED

A Who's Who list of leaders in the maritime industry paid tribute last night to a man often called the best friend of the American merchant marine.

He is Rear Adm. Halert Clifford Shepheard, Chief of the Coast Guard Office of Merchant Marine Safety. After almost 40 years as naval rating and officer, civilian shipping industry employee and Coast Guard officer, he will retire on Tuesday.

Admiral Shepheard entered the Naval Reserve Force in March 1917 and won a provisional lieutenant's stripes before he was separated in March 1928. For the next 5 years he was associated with private steamship lines but then joined the old Steamboat Inspection Service of the Department of Commerce.

When the inspection service was transferred to the Coast Guard in 1942, Admiral Shepheard was commissioned a Reserve captain and named Chief of the Merchant Marine Inspection. He saw service with the Navy in World War II and won the Legion of Merit. He was promoted to rear admiral in 1948.

In his long career, the admiral won the respect of many shipping-industry executives who honored him last night at the Commodore Hotel. To "Shep," as he is affectionately known, they could look for sympathetic and fair handling of their maritime safety and inspection problems.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, knowing that in the State of Washington we have been short some 2,725 school classrooms, I followed the White House Conference on Education with great interest. It was obvious the problem of the shortage of education facilities was nationwide—due to a lag of construction during World War II, plus a soaring birth rate. Like others who feared Federal dictation in the field of education, I had to admit that although I felt the providing of proper schooling for our children is not a Federal responsibility; nevertheless, many localities presently are either unable or unwilling to meet this responsibility. It has become a Federal problem.

Under the State of Washington constitution, every child is assured an education by the State—so if the local community falls short, the State, as I see it, must fill the need. The frills of education—and I do not use this term in a derogatory sense—can be voted up or down on a grassroots basis, but in my State a child's basic education is a State responsibility. By and large, I gather the same is true in most other States.

The difference between States seems to be that some States have made more effort than others to fill their responsibilities. Comparisons are not fair, but I have heard that California under the impact of population growth, due to the trend of westward migration, has issued $300 million of bonds to meet their needs. In our State of Washington, we have gone in debt to try and meet the shortage—unsuccessfully. It appears that certain other States have not needed to go into debt or are not of a mind to do as much.

The Eisenhower program to alleviate the shortage of public-school classrooms was unprecedented. Critics say it was too little and too late, but a Democratic-controlled Congress which failed a year earlier to act would have to share any such criticism with a Republican administration.

However, Mr. Speaker, sound programs require study and I, myself, question if anyone has the right answer yet. Certainly I am disillusioned by H. R. 7535.

Need, under the Eisenhower recommendation, was to be the basis for grants to States. This penalizes those communities which have acted on their own to build the needed schools. But this much should be said for the administration plan: it would cut off States and communities from getting aid if they had their own resources to build schools, yet failed to use them.

If the Federal Government gets into the solution of school maintenance problems—costs of and raising the standard of salary levels—I see a danger of Federal dictation but, in aiding a program

to meet the classroom backlog, we assume the Government in time will step out of the picture. The requirement for matching contributions by the States is one provision to insure local payments, and local participation means local control under the Hospital Construction Act so it can be retained under a Federal grant program.

Anyway, I am favorable to giving apathetic or hard-pressed communities a Federal lift in catching up. I hope it will have the effect of encouraging local efforts to raise the standards of teachers pay. If the States have reason to feel the Federal Government is going to enter the teacher-salary field, I fear for the effort. It will be a case of let Uncle Sam do it.

Now I want to say I am very unhappy about the proposed formulas for allotments to the States. I have looked over the tables issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in connection with S. 2905 which, as I understand it, is the administration's recommendation. Then I have before me figures developed by the Tax Foundation of New York City showing how the various States would fare under H. R. 7539, the so-called Kelley bill. Both formulas leave me very cold. It is not necessarily that my State of Washington will pay more into the Federal Government in taxes for the program than it gets back. I am used to that. The sore point with me is that the tables show that we States, who in relation to our total State-tax revenue have bonded ourselves highly or gone into debt, fare worse than many States who have not incurred debts. Mind you, I am not criticizing those States who do not have big bonded indebtedness. I envy them.

Another point I raise is that the State of Washington is exceeded by only one State, New York, in expenditures for school purposes from State and local sources from current revenue receipts on a basis of per pupil in daily average attendance. It appears to me under H. R. 7535 our State does not get enough credit for what we are doing, and I come from a heavily taxed industrial area, Seattle and Kitsap County, that has been trying to meet its school needs in a local way as well as through the State level. Meanwhile, certain rural areas of our State who will not raise their assessed valuations for tax purposes to a fair figure are not paying a proportionate and fair amount of the effort the State is making.

However, that is a local problem. What I wish to emphasize as far as the Federal school construction program is concerned is that States like mine should be studying the basis of State allotments.

Frankly, our State Educational Association has wired me it favors H. R. 7535, the Kelley bill. But later when I have to explain to the taxpayers of my district my support of a bill which is not equitable, that wire from the Washington Education Association will not help much.

For example, Arizona's tax collections in 1954 were 26 times her outstanding debt. Yet Arizona under H. R. 7535 will get more aid than the cost of the Federal school construction program to her based on her share of Federal tax payments. She gets back more than her cost.

Wisconsin's taxes collected in 1954 were 52 times the outstanding State debt, yet she benefits in a greater degree than she would pay. In other words, the formula is wrong. A great many States benefit unduly in the same way. Notwithstanding, I am committed in my conscience to support a Federal education-aid measure which I hope will encourage people in every State as well as my own to meet the emergency. To vote down this bill, bad as it is, means no legislation this year.

There are only two provisions I insist on. I will compromise on the basis of allocating the funds to States. I am willing to see my constituents pay more than their just share provided, first, that the fair labor standard of the Davis-Bacon type is included, and second, that assurance is given one way or another that no funds under this program go to any school district in defiance of the United States Supreme Court as to segregation of races. If assurance is given that legally funds can be withheld by administrative action of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I will waive the requirement of an amendment as to this latter point. But otherwise I personally will stand firm on both points.

Meanwhile, I urge a corrected formula for State distribution. A State with a heavy debt like my State of Washington is entitled to get back at least as much as the program costs her taxpayers.

A Humane Society Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

A HUMANE SOCIETY PROPOSAL

There are times when the objectives of the well-meaning humane societies are worthy of public support.

Such an instance is the proposed legislation before the Congress to require that meat animals be slaughtered "by humane, rapid, and efficient means." The legislation would not impose anything brand new and untried on the packing industry. Already 15 American packing companies are said to use approved methods of slaughtering and laws like the bills before the Congress have been in effect for years in Great Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and Switzerland.

Any one of three bills, whose authors are Senator HUMPHREY and Representatives HIESTAND and GRIFFITHS, would be satisfactory to the humane groups. It should be possible for the Congress, whose Members surely are in sympathy with the objective, to reach agreement on legislation to accomplish it.

The Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, 1956, the distinguished columnist, Mr. Bill Henry, wrote an excellent column which appeared in the Los Angeles Times. Bill Henry has analyzed some of the reasons for the outstanding service performed by Vice President NIXON.

The article follows:

BY THE WAY

(By Bill Henry)

WASHINGTON.—No matter whether Dwight D. Eisenhower runs or doesn't run for the Presidency it is quite clear that much of the Republican Party's campaigning is going to be done by RICHARD MILHAUS NIXON. His are capable hands.

DICK NIXON

It is unfortunate that most people have never heard the Vice President in normal oratorical effort, for, thanks to his amazing skill as a political campaigner, he has had to spend most of his time carrying the ball for his party. The fact is, though, that NIXON is a past master at other facets in the field of talk. He is extremely good at the small, cozy address to groups of limited size on subjects which are only incidentally political. And in addition he is amazingly skillful at the banquet type of oratory. Truth is that in just about every way of meeting people he is extremely successful, as his handshaking tours of the world and the Latin American countries will testify. As is the case with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, most of the enmity which exists against NIXON comes from people who have had little direct contact with him.

DIRECT

Part of NIXON's skill lies in the simplicity of his approach to subjects. When, for instance, at the Chicago salute-to-Eisenhower dinner he reduced Adlai Stevenson into what one Republican described as a quivering, spineless heap of quips and wisecracks, NIXON did it in the simplest possible way and in the shortest space of time. He opened by skeletonizing his speech which, he said, would deal with four topics: (1) The conditions the Eisenhower administration inherited; (2) the condition now after 3 years of Eisenhower leadership; (3) some of the major complaints of the critics of the administration; and (4) the great vista for the future if the Republicans remain in office. The third point dealt with, and pretty well disposed of, Adlai by noting that Stevenson offered only criticism, no remedy except a return to the policies which got us into much of our international trouble.

SIMPLICITY

Here in Government circles they're forever talking about the way in which Nixon addresses groups of, say, district attorneys or attorneys general. He has a tremendous ability to "bone up" on any topic and when he addresses them he quickly displays an amazing understanding of their problems, their possible remedies, and of the law with which they are most intimately concerned. He usually knows a large number of them personally, knows the peculiar problems of their individual areas and displays an astounding comprehension of their jobs. This is no accident. He takes his job seriously and he takes every speech seriously, making

sure that he provides them with something more than a collection of canned platitudes or even of political argument. He saves his political barbs for such special occasions as seem appropriate.

EPIGRAMS

For instance, the other night when he was presented with the gold medal of Philadelphia's Poor Richard Club on the occasion of the 250th anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, Nixon's speech showed the same painstaking preparation which always characterizes his public efforts. He carefully outlined and narrowed down his discussion of Franklin before this group of Franklin experts, limiting his remarks to Franklin in his role as a public man and a public servant. Then having carefully chosen his Frankliniana, he applied a couple of dozen aphorisms of the great man to present-day problems and cited Franklin's remarks in such a manner as to show how the thinking of the man in Revolutionary times could be used in meeting today's seemingly new and more complex situations. It was quite a masterpiece of making use of pioneer American thinking in the light of today's, and tomorrow's developments. It is Nixon's ability to speak simply, clearly, and convincingly that gives him such stature as we plunge into the haggling of this political year.

Arms for Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of a statement issued by Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt on her own behalf, and on behalf of former President Harry S. Truman, and on behalf of Walter P. Reuther, vice president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations. This is the same item I referred to during my remarks on the floor earlier today:

ARMS FOR ISRAEL

The future of Israel and the Arab lands of the Near East is inextricably intertwined. Present antagonisms and fears have forced both Israel and the Arab lands to channel human and material resources into arms when they are desperately needed for the peaceful development of the Middle East. The threat to peace in the Middle East is a threat to world peace. Border clashes with increasing frequency may at any time erupt into war which may spread far beyond the Middle East. The problems which have arisen between the Arab States and Israel, difficult though they are, can be solved, given goodwill and the sincere desire for peace.

It is essential that America should do all that lies within its power to prevent war and lay the foundation for permanent peace in the Middle East.

The State of Israel is a great and irrevocable historic fact. It represents the rebirth of a nation that has given to the world one of its greatest traditions. When it proclaimed its independence in 1948, the United States was the first government to give Israel recognition. In doing so, our Government gave practical expression to an ideal and policy supported by every administration since World War I, and repeatedly endorsed by bipartisan resolutions in Congress and the platforms of both major parties.

ACHIEVEMENTS ARE NOTED

This country has extended the hand of friendship and given assistance to the Arab States, through its support of the cultural interest of the Arab world and its participation with the Arabs in the exploitation of the region's rich natural resources. Through the United Nations and through our own assistance programs, we have aided the Arab governments to meet their economic and social problems. Our technicians and diplomats are laboring to bring into being vast projects in the Jordan and Sinai which promise great benefits to the Arab world. We have been prepared to enter into mutual security agreements with the Arabs for the defense of their frontiers and those of the free world. Secretary Dulles has made clear the willingness of the United States to extend financial and economic assistance and to help settle the refugee problem.

Israel, with the help of scientists, technicians, and administrators drawn from every land, has shown how the desert can be transformed by human skill and perseverance. Israel has demonstrated the tremendous possibilities for economic and social development in this area, where there is both belief in and the practice of democracy. Peace would make these skills and achievements available to the whole Near East and help the region to achieve a new flowering, unparalleled since Biblical days.

In facing the real problems of the Arab refugees, it must be recognized that Israel cannot economically or politically afford to admit more than a small number. Though a significant part. Israel is only a small part, and is by no means the most richly endowed part of the Middle East. The opportunity for the settlement of nearly a million Arab refugees is far more promising in the vast Arab lands tht surround Israel than in the small State of Israel under any conditions that could possibly be created there. America, together with other countries ready to give financial and technical assistance for the resettlement of Arab refugees, has the right to expect the goodwill and full cooperation of the Arab lands and of Israel to the extent of its ability to provide financial compensation.

The United States must pursue an unequivocal policy in regard to the Middle East. It must make clear that any change in the status quo by force will not be recognized or tolerated. No constructive purpose could be served by gnawing at or seeking to roll back the boundaries of Israel. No part of Israel has ever been part of Egypt or Jordan. The Arab States and Israel are bound by the United Nations Charter not to use threats of force or force as an instrument of national policy. They are bound by armistice agreements that forbid alteration of boundaries by the use of force. Changes of boundaries can, therefore, be brought about only by mutual agreement.

ARMS RACES DEPLORED

It is for the United States to restate and implement its basic principles in such a way that there can be no uncertainty as to where it stands. The cynical invitation to an arms race, the spreading of confusion, and the exciting of mutual fear and hostility by the shipment of Communist arms to Egypt can be offset only by the clarification of our position, persistent efforts toward mutual confidence, and our active efforts toward achieving peace. We must counteract every attempt by the Soviet Union to upset the present precarious balance of power in this area. This requires that the United States should now provide the defensive arms needed by Israel to protect itself against any aggression made possible or incited by the introduction of Communist arms.

The tripartite declaration of 1950, under which the United States, the United Kingdom, and France committed themselves that "should they find that any of these states were preparing to violate frontier or armistice lines" they would "immediately take action within and outside the United Nations to prevent such violation" must now be strengthened by incorporation into treaties offered on equal terms to Israel and the Arab lands. Because of Soviet intervention, such treaties can no longer be conditioned on either acceptance by both sides or by mutual agreement in regard to border changes, since such conditions would, if imposed, only delay the enactment of treaties that are essential to maintaining peace in this area.

Peace is the highest American interest in the Near East. What is at stake is not only the survival of the small State of Israel, for which we have long avowed, our firm friendship, but, as the President has reminded us, the peace of the world.

United Nations Vote on New Members Called a Blow to Morality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article from the New York Herald Tribune by David Lawrence which shows that the Court of International Justice rendered an advisory opinion sought by the United Nations itself in which the Court declared that package deals are illegal. Despite this, package deals persisted.

The article follows:

U. N. VOTE ON NEW MEMBERS CALLED A BLOW TO MORALITY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, December 15.—The United Nations has revealed itself as just another logrolling organization, with less regard for principle and morality than for political expediency. It's a blow from which the organization may never recover. For, once respect is lost, it is rarely regained.

The controversy over admitting new members was on the same low plane that one would find in Tammany Hall in New York City or in the smoke-filled rooms of political conventions where deals and packages are manipulated with all the artful barter and selfishness of the market place.

Nationalist China, alone, by her veto of Outer Mongolia, stood out as the courageous champion of morality. Yet it is a sign of the decadence of the times that newspaper dispatches are telling already of the intention of some governments to punish the Nationalist government next year and give her seat in the United Nations to unmoral Red China just because the Nationalist delegate didn't bow to expediency.

RECALLS KOREA TOLL

The day that Red China goes in the U. N., the demand for America to step out will be resumed. For it was Red China's murderous commanders who in Korea helped to bring about the death of 33,000 American boys and the wounding of 110,000 others. The same

U. N., which declared Red China an aggressor now is reported to be ready to take that regime unto its bosom.

But the amazing thing is the way that supposed champions of virtue—those who extol the U. N. as the last word in international morality—are themselves surrendering principle and rejoicing that Soviet Russia did finally condescend to let sixteen members come into the organization. The cry is for "universality" at any cost, as if numbers rather than the qualifications of the members to carry out the obligations of the U. N. charter were the real criterion of effectiveness.

EXPEDIENCY, SPENDER SAYS

It was Sir Percy Spender, of Australia, president of the Security Council, who, with startling frankness, said the other day: "It is not principle with which we are concerned here but expediency—the expediency of inexorable political circumstances."

This then is the new doctrine of the U. N. which in all the schools and colleges of America has heretofore been praised as the paragon of international virtue and as the last great hope of civilization to settle its disputes.

Having failed to command universal support for armed intervention to repel the aggressor in Korea, the United Nations has since been compelled to rely primarily on moral force. But even this moral force now has deteriorated. For there can be no respect throughout the world for an organization that violates its own principles of law and order. The Court of International Justice, for example, in an advisory opinion sought by the U. N. itself, ruled in 1943 that package deals are illegal and that admission must be on individual merits of the member rather than dependent or conditioned on the acceptance of other members.

All this now has been brushed aside and the new slogan seems to be "numbers for numbers' sake."

Under such circumstances, it is logical for the United States now to ask that all its 48 States be admitted to the U. N. It would augment the number of members considerably. After all, each of the 48 States is sovereign and, while the charter uses the term sovereign equality, there is no inclination today in the U. N. to examine the qualifications of members too carefully. Also it would solve the controversy here over the Bricker amendment, for if the various subsidiary bodies of the U. N. are to make treaties or agreements binding this country on certain domestic affairs, at least each of the 48 States would have some sort of opportunity to veto such legislation.

If Outer Mongolia, which was a part of Red China, is to be a member—and Russia now insists that Outer Mongolia must be admitted or else Japan can't be admitted—then it does seem that a case can be made also for British Columbia or Quebec or Ontario, though the British Government seems to have fared pretty well in voting strength with such sympathetic partners as Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the Union of South Africa already members of the U. N.

Only the United States among the major powers has been left with a single vote. For in due time Soviet Russia will want more of her provinces admitted, just as were the Ukraine and Byelorussia. Some day, if Red China does come into the U. N., she will demand that Inner Mongolia be accepted to balance Outer Mongolia, and so the game goes—the great hope of mankind for a union of peace-loving organizations with a devotion to idealism, instead of to materialism, has been crushed under an avalanche of brazen deals and packages set loose by unmoral politicians.

Liquor Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include a letter which I have received from Mrs. Norma Burgess Moore, president, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, Inc., with an enclosed petition. I ask unanimous consent that the petition with the names of those signing it be also made a part of the RECORD.

The letter and petition follow:

THE WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN
TEMPERANCE UNION OF
CONNECTICUT, INC.,
Hartford, January 20, 1956.

Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Again we are reminding you of the wave of public sentiment against the liquor advertising over the air and in publications. Even people who are not with us in wanting total abstinence deplore the ads, which get bolder and bolder in their glamour to get more people to drink.

After all, how ridiculous it is to allow the glamorous advertising of a product that is the cause of so much misery and crime in the world. How the liquor traffic must gloat over the ignorance and indifference of good people.

To actually allow a group of money-seekers to ruin our civilization with their poisonous product isn't very bright. Alocholic beverages contain a very powerful narcotic and are habit forming. The few clinics we have could never begin to care for the alcoholics, which increase all the time.

Over 20,000 alcoholics in Connecticut who are a burden on society, dependent financially, and a hazard to have loose.

Please take this seriously and study the problem, so as to take a definite stand on it and do what is best for all concerned. Civilization is at a pretty low ebb in many ways.

Many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

NORMA B. MOORE.

P. S.—Enclosed petitions with 240 names. Please record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers, by passing legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless to us by alcoholic beverage advertising, and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by means of such advertising.

Helen N. Ryan, Evelyn C. Hewitt, Agnes H. Smith, Anna Zlatoklarck, Helen B. Hagen, Mable E. Rogers, Mrs. G. H. Rogers, Middleton, Conn.; Ada M. Stewart, Cobalt, Conn.; Ida J. House, Hilda N. Hitchcock, Lura A. Bailey, Ursula R. Rich, Ruby E. Hilla, Ruth D. Berwick, Helen S. Dow, East Hampton, Conn.; Lucy Hall, Moodus, Conn.; A. B. McEwen, Mrs. Hazel Boston, Rachel I. Gregorg, Ruth E. Codding, Ruth A. Fiske, Danielson, Conn.; Elizabeth W. Holden, Sterling, Conn.; Mabel J. Warren, Mrs. E. Fredikson, Viola Langwin, Winifred Robillaird, Ethel A. K. Holehouse, Danielson, Conn.; Lottie R. Hildreth, Brooklyn, Conn.; Nina E. Wood, Myra M. Hand, Edna K. Bamford, Danielson, Conn.; Joseph S. Adams, A. B. Goodyear, Fannie P. Adams, Lila E. Allen, Charles F. Banning, Lucy R. Banning, Elsie S. Wigley, Pricilla A. Marsden, Baltic, Conn.; Fannie P. Adams, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. Theodore Mauk, Mrs. Lee Clegg, Norwichtown, Conn.; Mr. Donald Jacobson, Stella Coen, Norwich, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Carl W. Brown, Gales Ferry, Conn.

Mary M. Eldridge, Henry A. Eldridge, South Killingly, Conn.; Shirley M. Chase, Dayville, Conn.; Lucy D. Richardson, Elizabeth N. Chase, Danielson, Conn.; Carrie L. Drew, Bertha E. Davis, East Killingly, Conn.; Ethel Chase, Dayville, Conn.; Iola Coolidge, Anna J. Lippens, Helen T. Pellett, Danielson, Conn.; Lottie A. Beckwith, Willimantic, Conn.; Mrs. Carrie E. Robbins, North Grosvenor Dale, Conn.; Sarah Lonvia Hadley, Canterbury, Conn.; Olga Mitchell, Mrs. Iola B. Coolidge, Danielson, Conn.; Mrs. Laura Carroll, East Killingly, Conn.; Alfred C. Greene, Eden Q. Stilwell, Danielson, Conn.; Nettie M. Carroll, Dayville, Conn.; Madeline I. Langlois, John Mourlle, W. C. Nordst, Waterford, Conn.; Mrs. W. H. Lipthostt, Groton, Conn.; Bernice M. Greene, New London, Conn.; Shirley Beckwith, Helen T. Williams, Mrs. George Beckwith, Lulu M. Williams, Waterford, Conn.; Mrs. C. Williams, W. E. Roath, Genevieve Lewis, New London, Conn.; E. D. Daniels, Geneva Daniels, Lester Flora Packham, R. D. Dunkaid, Alice Williams, Susie Craven, Mrs. Abucu Shephard; Rene J. Douglas, Waterford, Conn.; Rev. Roy I. Bohanan, New London, Conn.

John R. Herbert, Voluntown, Conn.; Burten W. Robinson, Alma D. Robinson, Norwich, Conn.; John M. Post, Ledyard, Conn.; Elmer G. Page, Mr. and Mrs. B. D. Lathrop, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Mader, Mrs. Floyd L. Bombard, Ruby E. Vaughn, Norwich, Conn.; Henry Bufithes, Elizabeth Bufithes, Uncasville, Conn.; Arthur Dawley, Agnes Dawley, Preston, Conn.; Betty Fauss, Norwichtown, Conn.; J. R. Gambill, Norwich, Conn.; Signe Post, Ledyard, Conn.; W. L. Grover, Mrs. Luella H. Packer, Mr. and Mrs. A. W. Benner, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Clegg, John A. Coggeshale, Ruth A. Hamilton, Mrs J. W. Jones, Mr. J. W. Jones, Emery H. Davis, Edna M. Phillips, Robert J. Storms, Anna C. Terry, Norwich, Conn.; Lucy R. Saunders, John B. Post, Ledyard, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. G. Wyman Carroll, Jr. Norwich, Conn.; Lester and Flora Peckham, Rene J. Langlois, Susie Craker, Waterford, Conn.; John Mourlie, Chesterfield, Conn.; W. C. Mordstrom, Waterford, Conn.; Mrs. L. H. Lipthrott, Groton, Conn.; Bernice M. Greene, Alma Stockford, New London, Conn.; Shirley Beckwith, Helen T. Williams, Mrs. George A. Beckwith, Lulu M. Williams, Waterford, Conn.; Mrs. L. Williams, W. E. Roath, Genevieve Lewis, New London, Conn.; E. O. Daniels, Geneva S. Daniels, Vince Guy, Alice Williams, Madeline I. Langlois, Waterford, Conn.; Rev. Roy I. Bohanan, New London, Conn.

Mary M. Eldridge, Henry A. Eldridge, South Killingly, Conn.; Shirley M. Chase, Dayville, Conn.; Lucy D. Richardson, Elizabeth N. Chase, Helen T. Pellett, Iola Coolidge, Anna J. Lippens, Danielson, Conn.; Carrie L. Drew, Bertha E. Davis, East Killingly, Conn.; Ethel Chase, Dayville, Conn.; Lottie A. Beckwith, Willimantic, Conn.; Mrs. Carrie E. Robbins, North Grosvenordale, Conn.; Sarah Louise Hadley, Canterbury, Conn.; Mrs. Everett S. Mitchell, Mrs. Iola B. Coolidge, Danielson, Conn.; Mrs. Laura Carroll, East Killingly, Conn.; Mr. and Mrs. Alfred C. Greene, Eden S. Stilwell, Danielson, Conn.; Nettie M. Car-

roll, Dayville, Conn.; Mrs. Frank I. Royce, Mrs. Raymond L. Pierce, Mrs. Gertrude T. Ambury, Mrs. E. Judson, Mrs. Winifred M. Blackledge, Mrs. Gladys T. Gray, Mazie I. Stamm, Mrs. Fred Laycock, Thomas Funnell, Mrs. Ellsworth Robinson, W. E. Johnson, Thomas Sumpki, J. Bernard Sebastian, Frank C. Huntley, John Hargreaves, Mrs. June Britt, C. H. Benker, Clarence E. Winsor, Mrs. Annie Frink, Mrs. Ruth Mann, Mrs. Lucinda E. Ross, Norwich, Conn.; Myrtle F. Chism, Stafford Springs, Conn.; Ruth P. Ramsay, Rev. Arthur J. Dorr, Marion Walbridge, Edith M. Pecott, Conrad Paul Mohr, Miriam Mohr, L. J. Dorr, Mrs. Mabel Depeau, Mrs. Mabel Jenkins, Stafford, Conn.; Mrs. Nettie Hayes, Mrs. Electra Sacherek, Mrs. Helen Hancock, Grace B. Comins, Caroline E. Comins, Stafford Springs, Conn.; Frederick V. Horsman, Mabel C. Horsman, Pearl E. Szych, Ruth Pouga, Maude G. Smith, Stafford, Conn.

Mrs. Anna J. Lippens, Mrs. Dorina Bissonnette, Mrs. Eva Bolves, Danielson, Conn.; Mrs. Julda Leaman, Brooklyn, Conn.; Lewellyn Richardson, Dorian A. Edwards, Mrs. Rose Parkhurst, Rev. G. Emery Pratt, Danielson, Conn.; Mrs. Mary C. Webb, Rogers, Conn.; Mrs. Mary Richardson, George A. Richardson, East Killingly, Conn.; Mrs. Loreen Warrender, Leo C. Bissonnette, Wallace Bowden, Danielson, Conn.; Mary E. Dolloff, Mrs. Dora Dolloff, John Dolloff, Lucy Richardson, Mrs. Elpy Regen, Brooklyn, Conn.; Mae Longbottom, Goodyear, Conn.; Floyd I. La Bombard, Edith Davis, Mrs. Louis Ortmann, Mrs. J. B. Parker, Mrs. C. R. Williams, Mrs. Susan P. Elder, Mrs. Katherine Poole, Mrs. Annie E. Agard, Imojen G. Fitch, Mrs. Paula Rexhead, Mrs. Marion P. Bailey, Mrs. Evelyn F. Cafrella, Mrs. George M. Ellsworth, Mrs. Luella Packer, Mrs. Maude M. Wyman, Norwich, Conn.; Mrs. John R. Herbert, Voluntown, Conn.; Sadie S. Fields, A. W. Benner, Raymond A. Dins, Norwich, Conn.; Kathryn A. Mader, Norwichtown, Conn.

"Everybody, Grown a Little Taller"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the following speech by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, as printed in the December 17, 1955, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

"EVERYBODY, GROWN A LITTLE TALLER"

(Speech delivered by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, on the occasion of the dedication and unveiling service of the historical marker at the Eisenhower ancestral home, Elizabethville, Pa.)

We are met on a site that marks an important stage in the development of an American heritage. It is a heritage not of accumulated wealth, nor social position, nor intellectual genius. What was planted in this beautiful valley of the Susquehanna long ago was the seed of a family line which in its flowering perpetuated a name to represent to the world in troubled times the best hopes of mankind. * * *

The first of the family line, Nicholas Eisenhower, stepped from a sailing vessel in the port of Philadelphia one day in 1741. He had a son Peter, who in turn had a son Frederick. Frederick was the father of Jacob F. Eisenhower who, with his wife, Rebecca Mather, was to establish the family in this pleasant valley, build the ancestral home where we are gathered, and become the grandfather of the 34th President of the United States. * * *

As I said in the beginning, the Eisenhower heritage * * * is not unique. It is as typically American as anything I know. The only thing unusual about it is that it has been used so well by so many for the benefit of so many others. Yet that heritage by itself does not explain all that we know about these brothers.

What, for instance, is the ingredient, and where did it come from that produced a leader so beloved at home and abroad as Dwight D. Eisenhower? * * * What is the magical element in a man that can draw trustingly to him other men of many minds, contrary interests, varied fortunes, diverse backgrounds, and contrasting temperaments? I asked myself that question just a month ago on that cheerless Saturday that gave to the country the news that the President was seriously ill.

Never have I seen such genuine outpouring of concern and good will for any public figure. It came from all levels of society—big people and little people, Democrats and Republicans, the poor and the prosperous, the cynical and the sentimental, the godless and the devout. * * *

What is it that can do this to people? I asked. Is it the profundity of a man's knowledge? the sureness of his judgment? his organizational ability? the eloquence of his utterances? I have known men having all these qualities in varying combinations and degrees but without the slightest ability to command the respect and affection of people in the mass.

I have been thinking it over for a long time. I think I have the answer.

What is it that everybody wants more than anything else? Is it money? Health? Security? No, he only thinks he does. These are conventional, surface desires. Satisfy them all and the universal yearning, the deeper dissatisfactions still exist. What everybody wants fundamentally is to establish identity with what I may call, for lack of a better term, the spirit of man.

What I mean is this. We can be surrounded by family, friends, and neighbors and be as lonely as a hermit * * * A man may be known to hundreds, yet be known by none. The ego, the psyche, whatever it is that is the real person is held apart from that element in everybody else. It is encased by walls of selfishness, layers of lethargy, barriers of timidity and reserve, barricades of inhibition, introversion, and all kinds of mental and spiritual blocks. More than anything else, we want to break from these shackles in an effort to find understanding and true communion with other human beings.

If we could do it, that would be, of course, the ideal state. We may never find this condition outside utopia. But once in a while, once in a long while, a man comes along with those rare personal gifts that enable him to penetrate the barricades. His presence melts the walls. He has an uncommon power of understanding and of making others feel they are understood. Such a man is Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Like every man who has ever had personal contact with the President, I have felt that power and seen it in action. The instances I am thinking of are little, unimportant, everyday episodes, but they are examples of the power that Khrushchev felt at Geneva, the power that prompted Bulganin to say: "Your President we can talk to. We trust him." That's one proposition, anyway, on which the Russians can get a majority vote from the American people anytime.

A man who is a world figure and another who is not known beyond the street where he lives have a common quality for Mr. Eisenhower. They are both people. To him, everybody is important.

That quality was apparent so many times 2 years later in Chicago where he was nominated for the Presidency. Early one morning he was walking briskly through the lobby of the Conrad Hilton Hotel with 2 or 3 aids. Not many people were about yet, but a young GI with a camera spotted him and tried to get a picture. Because the General was walking fast, the youth could not quite get the focus. As Mr. Eisenhower was about to pass, the boy reached out impulsively and touched his sleeve. "Please, Sir," he said, "could you wait just a second?"

One man in the party tried to brush off the young soldier.

"You have only 10 minutes to make your appointment," he said to Mr. Eisenhower as the General paused. "That's all right," the boss said. "This won't take long." He reached for the GI's camera and looked at it. Passing it to another of his attendants, he said, "Do you know how to work this thing? Get over there and take a picture of both of us, this soldier and me together." The picture taken, he said to the boy, "Thanks, son, and good luck," and went his busy way.

Somewhere in America there is a young man who will never forget that act of kindness, and the picture of himself standing alongside the General of the Army will always be his most prized possession.

Some of Mr. Eisenhower's political foes have spoken of such incidents as play-acting. Well, the oldtimers in Abilene will tell you that whatever it is, it isn't play-acting. They say that Ike was never worth shucks at acting. When he was in high school he could do everything else, he could ride and box and play ball, but in dramatics, the only role he could play was that of Ike Eisenhower. That's the way it's always been.

Thinking of it that way, I guess that's why we love him. He's always just himself. He never shuts us out with barriers of pretense, and so, when we look at him, we find just the plain man, a man who resembles the kind of person that each of us feels himself to be. Trusting him, then, is just like trusting our own best selves. As someone once said of Abraham Lincoln, he's everybody, grown a little taller.

James Reston, now the chief of the New York Times Washington Bureau, summarized it well one day in Chicago during the 1952 convention: "What impressed me is that Mr. Eisenhower—you may smile at the old-fashioned word, but I can't describe him any other way—Mr. Eisenhower is a 'good' man. You can't be around him long without feeling that goodness. It is a positive power, instilling confidence. Frankly, I have reached a conviction in these weeks that this goodness is something that America needs right now more than anything else."

Dilemmas of a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a speech I made before the Command Management School, at Fort Belvoir, on January 19, 1956:

DILEMMAS OF THE CONGRESSMAN

No one group of people has been on the receiving end of jokes than have the Members

of Congress—or, for that matter, the members of any legislative body, either in these times or in history, ancient and modern. I know a hundred such cracks, some of the most caustic of which were made by Mark Twain:

"Reader, suppose you were an idiot. And suppose you were a Member of Congress. But I repeat myself."

And:

"Fleas can be taught nearly anything that a Congressman can."

The British Parliament took its share of ribbing at the hands of such critics as Walter Bagehot, who defined Parliament as nothing less than a big meeting of more or less idle people," and Gilbert and Sullivan, who recorded thus the success story of a Member of Parliament:

"I always voted at my party's call
And I never thought of thinking for myself at all.
I thought so little, they rewarded me
By making me the ruler of the Queen's Navee."

—*H. M. S. Pinafore.*

Will Rogers had his fun at the expense of Congress, but innocently denied it: "I don't make jokes," he said, "I just watch the Government and report the facts." And Eugene Field remarked:

"Some statesmen go to Congress and some go to jail. It is the same thing, after all."

But, as the comedians say, don't get me wrong. I love it. And so say we, all of us. And to prove it, I have run for, and won, this office 16 times, and I am looking forward with the keenest of pleasure to running again. I have 33 years of battle and retreat, of small triumphs and bigger defeats.

I have chosen for my topic today Dilemmas of the Congressman, not because, believe me, the sensitive soul is hurt by the judgment of our humorists, but to get down to the serious business of the day, I am convinced that the structure of the democratic process cannot be wholly understood unless the people who live under a representative government know the dilemmas that are faced time and time again by the men and women they have selected to represent them.

I want to discuss first the apparent dilemma faced by every Congressman, and I think it can best be billed as "National Interest versus Regional Sentiment."

We see this at play in practically every major bit of legislation before us. A member of Congress, for example, is convinced that the national interest demands a low tariff. He recognizes that trade is a two-way street; that if we wish to export, we must also import; that if others are to buy our products, they can only earn the dollars with which to buy these very products by selling to us.

But let us suppose you represented a district whose present economic strength lies largely in, shall we say, the manufacture of blouses, which is meeting heavy competition from Japan. It is most difficult for people who must eat here and now to be persuaded that in the long run they and the country will fare better if the tariff on Japanese imports is reduced.

It has been proposed in many quarters that this conflict be resolved by re-training of workers for other industries and payments sustaining the workers during such period of re-training. The adoption of such a concept, however, is a long way off. Ways of compensation should be found for those who have invested in business and have been forced out by foreign competition. How does the Congressman vote—in what he believes to be the national interest, or in view of his district's present needs?

If he votes for the national interest as he sees it, does he face defeat?

Perhaps he can persuade the major part of his constituency of the soundness of his views, but I doubt if he can do so with those of his constituents who work in and with the manufacture of blouses.

Another such example is in the area of immigration legislation. Let us assume that the Congressman is convinced that a liberal immigration policy serves the best interests of his country; that such liberal policy will play an important part in cementing foreign friendships; that a liberal immigration policy means the bringing of new skills into the country, leading to new industries, greater purchasing power, and the enrichment of our culture.

But suppose his district, fearful of the foreigner, rejects this ideology. In what direction does he, representing his district, move: toward the national interest or toward the appeasement of regional sentiment?

We have seen this dilemma again in the matter of compulsory military training. A Member of Congress is convinced that the national interest demands the institution of a system of compulsory military training in these hazardous times. The constituents in his district who think—and must necessarily do so—in terms of the future of their children, their husbands, their fiances—are thinking in terms of single family units and hence urge against compulsory military training.

Shall the Member risk defeat and vote in the national interest, or does he, knowing the hearts of mothers and wives, take it upon himself to express the sentiment of the people who sent him to Congress? Which shall prevail, according to the Congressman's convictions—the national interest or the regional sentiment?

We see this dilemma at work among certain Congressmen who are face to face with the desegregation decision of the Supreme Court. Here emotion has risen high. Let us assume that the Congressman is elected by a district where the prevailing feeling against desegregation is intense. He personally believes in the principle of the equality of opportunity for all peoples. He feels that segregation is a mockery of democratic principle, that the color of skin has nothing to do with merit or potential, that it is wrong to put a fence around a people because of color, or to keep them on the lowest economic footing and to deny them entry into schools supported by public funds. And he believes that all children are God's children.

But his constituents will not have it so. They feel the lowering of educational and physical standards in the schools. They believe that this break with tradition is too painful for their children to face.

In which direction does the Congressman face? Does he represent the national interest or the regional sentiment?

For those who have been in Congress for many years and whose constituents are thoroughly familiar with the quality of their work, it is easier to say that the national interest shall prevail. But for those who are serving only their first, second, or third terms, it is a dilemma of large proportions.

There is another dilemma which rears its Janus heads in instances too numerous to be comfortable. This I have called the all or nothing or little bit of something dilemma. As a Congressman seeking election, you have stumped through the district and taken your firmest stand on the question of public housing, the urgent need for increased numbers, etc.

On the floor of the House you are confronted with a measure which cuts public housing to a minimum and ties it to a slum-clearance project. You have, then, the choice of voting your protest against the minimum program, thus helping to defeat the bill, with the end result of no public housing at all. Or you can vote for the bill and face accusation throughout your district that you have sold out to special interests.

There are times when you are accused of the kind of flexibility that ends up with your having no backbone at all, and there are other times when you are accused of being so rigid that you could not bend without cracking.

Does a Congressman trade? Does a Congressman compromise? If so, how much? Does he vote with the public-opinion polls? Or does he endeavor to persuade his constituents to join with him in his viewpoint?

It is safe to say that majority wins. But is it always the truth to say that the majority is always right?

I have found myself in the position of being the only Member on the floor to cast a dissenting vote. It is a lonely position, carrying with it the penalty of being conspicuous and inviting abusive letters from people all over the country. I knew when I voted that, at best, I could expect two people to vote with me. This was a dilemma which had to be resolved in the fraction of a minute.

I have to point again to a curious position in which a Congressman finds himself when, upon examination of the facts, he changes his point of view. I recall at the time of the vote on the aid to Greece and Turkey bill—which, as you know, was a forerunner to the Marshall plan—I had conducted my own poll in the district and the replies from my constituents numbered 2 to 1 against such aid. I followed the mandate of my constituents.

Following the vote, I probed more deeply into the subject and I became firmly convinced that I had been wrong. I have been a supporter of foreign aid programs since that time, and I have had to face the charges of inconsistency in each election campaign. I can only answer the charge when it is placed before me. But the process of growth and maturing leads to fuller understanding and different insights which require the freedom of mind to change your position if you so wish.

No one can solve these dilemmas for the individual, nor can there be any single solution to fit all cases. Each dilemma carries with it factors which are peculiar to the situation and a conclusion to one is not necessarily transferred to a conclusion to another. It is a part of the trust of government, and it is well for you that you understand it, for it is all part of living, and, I suppose, fundamentally no different from the experiences of all men and women in the paths they have chosen to travel.

Red Publicity Stunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star Ledger, January 28, 1956, entitled "Red Publicity Stunt":

RED PUBLICITY STUNT

The comedy team of Khrushchev and Bulganin, traveling political acrobats, have come up with their latest international publicity stunt—a friendly letter to President Eisenhower to promote world peace.

In it, according to authoritative reports, they have proposed a treaty of friendship, a

sort of a nonaggression pact pledging both the United States and the Soviet Union to settle all differences within the framework of the United Nations Charter and to avoid interference in each other's internal affairs.

This, we submit, is nothing less than another propaganda move by the masters of the Kremlin in their continuing campaign to bamboozle the world into thinking that Russia is the only nation that sincerely desires peace.

For any nonaggression pact with Russia would only be binding on Russia itself, not on its satellites, other nations under Communist control such as Red China, or the world Communist movement, including the fifth column in this and other countries.

On the other hand, the United States, which has no satellites, would be legally and morally committed not to attack Russia, which, after all, is the seat of world communism. Therefore, the United States would have to insist on such a pact including the entire Communist world, a proposal which would be certain to be met by the Red-created myth that Russia has no control over communism outside its own borders.

United States policy on this newest Soviet propaganda move should be clear.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly told Bulganin and company that the only way the Soviet Union can prove to the United States and the world that it seeks peace is through deeds, not words.

If Bulganin wants to truly demonstrate to the world that Russia wants peace, let him:

1. Disperse the huge Chinese Communist arms buildup opposite Formosa—a buildup that proceeded unchecked even as Bulganin's friendly letter was delivered to Ike.

2. Still the rumbling of Communist artillery over the tortured island of Matsu—a continuing barrage that reached its highest intensity the day after Bulganin's letter reached the President.

3. Halt the rattling of Communist arms now rolling through Communist Yugoslavia from Communist Czechoslovakia toward the tense and troubled Middle East.

These are deeds that Russia can do now to prove she is genuinely interested in world peace. To accomplish them, no treaties, nonaggression pacts or friendly letters are necessary.

We do not believe the United States should let this latest publicity stunt go unchallenged. We think it should be turned to our advantage, countered and shown up for the quackery it is. Russia should not be allowed to make diplomatic capital out of it.

But basically, we believe President Eisenhower's policy of "deeds, not words," should prevail.

GOP Favored for Prosperity, According to Gallup Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD, the Gallup poll of January 27, 1956, which indicates that the people of America recognize that the Republican Party is the party of prosperity.

The article follows:

GOP FAVORED FOR PROSPERITY

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N. J., January 26.—Important indications that America's voters are beginning to link the symbol of prosperity more with the Republican Party than with the Democratic Party are revealed in a survey of national sentiment just completed by the American Institute of Public Opinion.

For the first time in a decade, more people say good times in the immediate years ahead are more likely under the Republicans than under the Democrats.

The institution put the following question to a cross-section of voters throughout the country:

"Looking ahead for the next few years, which political party—the Republican or Democratic—do you think will do the best job of keeping the country prosperous?"

The vote:

Which party can best keep America prosperous?

	Percent
Republican	38
Democratic	34
No difference	10
No opinion	18

Although the GOP advantage is a small one, the fact remains that in breaking through the "prosperity barrier," the Republican Party has gained a foothold in an area that has been the almost exclusive claim of the Democrats.

It is interesting to compare today's survey figures with identical studies conducted by the institute last November and also in November 1951.

November 1955

	Percent
Republican	37
Democratic	39
No difference	15
No opinion	9

November 1951

	Percent
Republican	29
Democratic	37
No difference	19
No opinion	15

Replies to the question, of course, vary sharply according to the political party preference of the individual.

The important political fact, however, is that more independent voters—the "in-betweeners" in United States politics—have come to believe that the Republican Party can best keep the country prosperous than think the Democrats can, as follows:

Independent voters

	Percent
Republican	35
Democratic	22
No difference	13
No opinion	30

Rank-and-file GOP voters are somewhat more confident that their party can do a better job than are Democrats, as the following tables show:

Republican voters

	Percent
Republican	75
Democratic	4
No difference	9
No opinion	12

Democratic voters

	Percent
Democratic	65
Republican	9
No difference	10
No opinion	15

Two other interesting patterns emerge from an analysis of the survey figures:

1. So far as occupational groups are concerned there is considerable disagreement over which party can do the best job of keeping the country prosperous.

On the one hand, professional and business people and white-collar workers lean substantially toward the Republican Party.

Skilled workers are about evenly divided, while unskilled manual workers and farmers, on the other hand, lean toward the Democratic Party. Union members by a vote of 4 to 3, have more faith in the Democrats.

2. By sections of the country, the industrial East is considerably more inclined to believe that the Republicans can do a better job than the Democrats of keeping the country prosperous, while the South is most convinced that the Democrats can.

Sentiment in the Midwest and Far West is about evenly divided.

Assistant Secretary of Interior Appointees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Harold Titus, conservation editor of Field and Stream, published in the February issue of that magazine.

As a firm believer in sound conservation policies, I am deeply concerned in seeing that the post of Assistant Secretary of the Interior in charge of public land management be held by a man who has the true interests of conservationists as his primary concern. Mr. Titus' article follows:

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay seems to be having an unenviable time getting an Assistant Secretary for Public Land Management who will be regarded as something better than a calamity by most of the country's conservationists. The latest appointee—ex-Representative Wesley A. D'Ewart—will be up for Senate confirmation about the time these words reach print. If senatorial declarations made at the time of his nomination in October hold good, there will be lively goings-on in the upper Chamber of the Capitol.

The individual holding this post is charged with final responsibility for the administration of the 180 million acres of public grazing lands, of national parks, refuges, and Indian lands. The first to hold it under the McKay regime was Ralph A. Tudor of California. This man distinguished himself by departing from long-established precedent and demoting a career man as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, replacing him with the favorite son of a west coast pressure group. He then identified himself to millions by announcing this under his own byline in a periodical of vast circulation. And without a trace of shame or regret.

The next occupant of this office was Mr. Orme Lewis, of Arizona. He immortalized himself in the minds of the continent's wildlife administrators at their annual meeting in Seattle in September 1954. His mission there was to sell Mr. McKay's brand of Fish and Wildlife Service to the State officials, and in the course of his prepared speech he said, "One of our major objectives * * * is to restore the crusading spirit and the evangelism which once characterized the conservation movement, but which, in recent years, has tended to become lost in bureaucratic practices." He actually said this to an assemblage that for months had watched with alarm as the fire and dash which had once characterized the Service staff drained away because of lack of inspiring leadership. The Commissioners were flabbergasted and thereafter awaited impatiently Mr. Lewis' retirement, which came in October.

And now Mr. D'Ewart, a man with a strangely mixed record as far as his attitude toward resources is concerned. As a Congressman he occasionally rendered excellent service to national parks. After his retirement he gave support to a measure that finally cleared up the mess resulting from filing unwarranted mining claims on national forests. But while still in office he introduced a bill that would have been no improvement whatever over the old statute which authorized those fraudulent practices. He was floor manager for the noisome Ellsworth timberland exchange bill in the 83d Congress. The bill was designed to give some large timber-interests title to choice parcels of our national forests, but citizens like you Field & Stream readers helped beat it. But Mr. D'Ewart is most widely known for his introduction of the stockman's land-grab measure in 1953 which would have given a minority of cattle and sheep men special privileges on national forests. That bill went down to stunning defeat because civic leaders in every State in the Union declared their opposition.

The reaction to his recent appointment was significant. Newspapers from coast to coast, regardless of party preferences, stormed at and ridiculed the choice and scored Secretary McKay for it. Among other things, this reaffirmed the growing realization that resource management is not a partisan issue. The country wants a good job done, and party affiliations are no guaranty of immunity from castigation when a responsible individual fails to measure up to his responsibilities.

Who's Fooling Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, who among us cannot recall an incident of our boyhood involving if not ourselves, a playmate, coming home from a brawl and getting a thrashing—no, not one, but two whippings. The first one because the other fellow gave us the black eye and the second because we followed the parental advice of standing up and fighting back.

It is even so with nations.

We lose respect for the little country that does not fight back, and we condemn it when it does.

The real big brother steps in and stops the fighting.

I commend the following article, which appeared in the January 1956 issue of the American Zionist, to the attention of our colleagues:

WHO'S FOOLING WHOM?—HISTORY OF RETALIATION BY BIG POWERS

(By Eliezer Whartman)

One of the most amazing spectacles this country has ever witnessed took place a few weeks ago when the American Ambassador to the U. N. arose before that august body to declare that the United States was shocked by Israel's retaliatory raid against Syria on December 11. Students of American history can only assume that Ambassador Lodge either ignored what has been American policy when her borders have been infringed upon, or that he was engaging in double talk.

Less surprising was the fact that he was joined in this denunciation by Britain, France, and Russia. An observer could draw cold comfort from the fact that here at least was one issue they could all agree upon: U. N. censure of Israel.

Almost at the very moment Britain was delivering herself of a diatribe against "Jewish aggression," one of her expeditionary forces was busy liberating the Bureimi Oasis along the far-off Persian Gulf. The fact that just a few weeks before British airplanes had strafed a number of Aden villages as retaliation for the sniping at British convoys apparently didn't deter her U. N. representative from taking a grave view of the Israel raid.

France, of course, at the same time was killing off literally thousands of Berber tribesmen in the Atlas Mountains as a retaliatory measure for the shooting of French citizens in Morocco.

Russia, which pressed the condemnation resolution most strongly, was busy showering Egypt wtih millions of dollars worth of tanks, guns, planes, and submarines while writing in Pravda that Nasser's government was a peace-loving nation.

Of course we could hardly have expected anything from Russia, but we could have expected a more understanding attitude on the part of the United States. A glance at our own history provides the answer to the question: what would we have done under similar circumstances?

Our relations with out southern neighbors is a case in point.

UNITED STATES GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

In 1845 President James Polk, desirous of expanding the country's frontiers southward and westward, demanded that Mexico sell the United States the territories of New Mexico and California. When Mexico refused Polk dispatched General Zachary Taylor with an expeditionary force into Mexico to take possession of an area up to the Rio Grande River. This Polk did, and built a fort on the northern bank. The following year a Mexican patrol on the north side of the Rio Grande killed a few American soldiers, whereupon Polk announced to Congress that "after reiterated menaces Mexico had passed the boundary of the United States, invaded our territory and shed American blood on American soil." Congress replied by appropriating $10 million and authorized the raising of an army of 50,000 men for the prosecution of a war with Mexico.

Thereafter the expression became well known: "The Constitution follows the flag." During the next 70 years American expeditionary forces were busy protecting American lives and interests in Hawaii, Samoa, Nicaragua, Chile, Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic, Venezuela, the Philippines and even far-away China. The loss of life caused to these countries was considerable.

It is significant—in view of the circumstances surrounding the Israeli retaliation for Syrian attacks on Jewish vessels—that the Spanish-American war started as a direct result of the sinking of the battleship *Maine*, a mystery which even to this day remains unsolved.

America's attitude to what she considered an assault on her rights was succinctly stated by President Theodore (Talk-Softly-But-Carry-a-Big-Stick) Roosevelt, who replied thus to criticism of his seizing the Panama Canal Zone from Colombia:

"I am interested in the Panama Canal because I started it. If I had followed traditional, conservative methods, I should have submitted a dignified state paper of probably at least 10 hundred pages to the Congress and the debate would have been going on yet. But I took the Canal Zone and let Congress debate, and while the debate goes on, the Canal does also."

When Colombia continued to protest, Roosevelt wrote to Mark Hanna: "It might be well to warn those jack-rabbits that great though our patience has been, it can be exhausted. The Colombians are entitled to precisely the amount of sympathy we extend to other inefficient bandits."

A few years later Gen. Victoriano Huerta seized power in Mexico. Fearing that he might do violence to Americans living near the border, President Wilson instructed the United States Navy to stop shipments of arms coming into Mexico and to seize the port of Vera Cruz. On April 22, 1914, Admiral Frank Fletcher seized the port in fighting which cost 200 Mexican and 19 American dead. The United States held the port for six months before returning it to a regime which it approved.

Again in 1916 American forces crossed into Mexico to safeguard American border settlers. A band of brigands under Gen. Francisco Pancho Villa that year entered American territory and without provocation killed 17 American citizens in the town of Columbus, N. Mex. Wilson, with the enthusiastic support of Congress, at once dispatched a force under Gen. John J. Pershing to seize Villa. Pershing marched into Mexico and scoured the country from Merch 1916 to February 1917, catching up with and killing off the infiltrators.

The above are simply a few instances which indicate how America has acted to safeguard her interests and her borders. In every case American retaliation was immediate and sharp and had the desired effect. If we want to be completely candid we must admit that in many instances the threat to our security was slight and the United States casualties which precipitated the retaliation were few.

PATIENCE UNREWARDED

Compare this with the carnage that has been taking place along Israel's borders. From the signing of the armistice agreements in the spring of 1949 until October 1955 Israel suffered the following at the hands of her neighbors:

Killed and wounded	1,139
Armed clashes	2,231
Cases of sabotage	272
Cases of armed robbery	237
Cases of theft	5,467

She has registered over 400 complaints with the U. N. Mixed Armistice Commission about violations of her borders by the Syrians. The surprising thing is not that she retaliated, but that she took so long in doing so.

That Britain and Russia are prepared to sacrifice Israel to secure a foothold in the Middle East is apparent to even the most naive. What hurts is when our own country becomes a party to the crime. The next time our Ambassador excoriates Israel for doing something America has done over and over, someone should ask him whether he is prepared to denounce America's actions. In short, who's fooling whom?

Red Sun Shines Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the January 27, 1956, issue of the Newark Evening News entitled "Red Sun Shines Again":

RED SUN SHINES AGAIN

The Kremlin, which suits its moods to its purposes, is turning its friendly face to the United States again. The warmth of

its smile is reminiscent of the "spirit of Geneva."

Mr. Bulganin sends a friendly note to President Eisenhower. Coincidentally, Mr. Khrushchev confides to his old crony, Marshal McDuffie how highly he regards the American executive—a man of peace if there ever was one.

It was only a few weeks ago that the two Russian leaders were publishing throughout southeast Asia their suspicions of American imperialism. It was only a few days ago that Mr. Khrushchev was saying harsh things about Mr. Eisenhower because he sent a message of hope to Moscow's European satellites. Suddenly things have changed. Why?

Washington takes a cautious attitude. The White House withholds the Bulganin note from publication until it can study the possible motives. It conveys some ideas of Mr. Bulganin on peace. Moscow's ideas on peace often carry strange undertones.

Prime Minister Eden, of Britain, on his way to Washington to confer, suspects the timing of the note has some bearing on these talks. To Mr. McDuffie, Mr. Khrushchev avows that he has no thought of trying to split the Anglo-American alliance. He has a pat for Mr. Eden as a man of peace, also.

The sunshine has been turned on, Soviet style. How long will it last? What clouds are lurking just over the horizon? For that is Soviet style, too.

Resolution of West End Post, No. 147, Atlanta, Ga.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
January 5, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Atlanta, Ga., is only a 300-bed capacity. When Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta was abandoned, we were promised that in lieu of Lawson General Hospital with its 524-bed capacity, the Veterans' Administration hospital—Peachtree Veterans' Administration Hospital—would be enlarged to a capacity of 500 beds. This promise has not been kept. The 300-bed capacity is woefully inadequate to fill the needs for hospitalization of our veterans in the Atlanta area.

It is shameful that in this populous area, one of the fastest growing sections of the United States, no provision has been made within the last 15 years to take care of the ever increasing needs of our veterans in this area. Instead of increasing the facilities, they have been decreased by the closing of Lawson General Hospital. The situation is so deplorable now at Peachtree Veterans' Administration Hospital that there is not an adequate waiting room for applicants for admission, or for relatives of patients who come to visit them at the hospital; there is no space for a consultation room for physicians, and only makeshift quarters for religious services and chaplain's use.

The inadequacy of the facilities at Peachtree Veterans' Administration Hospital is well known to veterans and nonveterans alike, and all recognize the great and pressing need for improvement of the situation.

I attach hereto a resolution adopted by the West End Post, No. 147, of the American Legion, in Atlanta, on October 6, 1955, and approved and endorsed by the fifth district executive committee of the American Legion, on December 18, 1955, which resolution was forwarded to me on January 24, 1956. I commend this resolution to the earnest and sincere consideration of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the membership of this body:

"RESOLUTION BY WEST END POST, NO. 147, ATLANTA, GA., AND FIFTH DISTRICT, DEPARTMENT OF GEORGIA, THE AMERICAN LEGION

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this post and other posts in this district, that the facilities provided veterans at the veteran's hospital, 5998 Peachtree Road NE, Atlanta, Ga., is grossly inadequate to serve the designated area covered by this hospital. That it is next to impossible to obtain a bed in said hospital for veterans, who, in most cases are, and should be classed as emergency cases; and

"Whereas when a veteran makes application for admittance it is necessary that said application be made months in advance or the veteran must be put on a waiting list which means that he may get a bed, if he is lucky, in 6 month's time: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That sufficient appropriation be made to add more beds to the number now in said hospiptal; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That West End Post, No. 147, at its regular meeting held October 6, 1955, does hereby go on record as recommending the foregoing action and it is hereby ordered, that this resolution be submitted to the fifth district executive committee, Department of Georgia, for its approval and forwarding to Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, Fifth District Congressman, of Georgia.

"This 6th day of October, 1955.

"WEST END POST, NO. 147,
"JAMES HOGAN, *Commander*.
"HENRY D. HANCOCK, Sr.,
"Adjutant."

The above and foregoing resolution read at the district executive committee meeting in regular session at East Point, Ga., December 19, 1955, and the same is hereby approved and endorsed.

Let the same be certified by the district adjutant and forwarded direct to Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS, Member of Congress.

By order of the district commander.

This the 19th day of December, 1955.

LEWIS J. SAUNDERS,
Adjutant.

Good News About TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD H. BAKER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial entitled "Good News About TVA," from the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Knoxville, Tenn., on the subject of TVA:

GOOD NEWS ABOUT TVA

The story of the progress thus far made on the TVA self-financing bill by the Senate Public Works Committee in Washington is good news for our valley and for TVA. (See the article from our Washington bureau on page 1).

It appears that the basis is being laid for bipartisan support for the self-financing proposal. This is greatly to be desired.

The news from Washington about the developments thus far seem important to us because of two aspects:

1. The Senate committee apparently is going to impose reasonable controls, by responsible and conventional officers of the Government, both executive and legislative, on TVA's issuance of bonds. This makes sense. After all, it's all one Federal Government. No agency, no matter how good or vital to our valley, should be wholy autonomous.

2. The Senate committee is giving serious attention to putting a fence around TVA—limiting the territory of its operations. We advocated just this when self-financing was first proposed. We do not fear that TVA will make any vast increases in the scope of its operations—we know it will not try to go, say, into Birmingham, or Atlanta, or Chicago. But there is some fear that TVA, using its own money derived from its own bonds, would expand excessively. We favor restricting the TVA operations to their present boundaries, with some provision for minor extensions, where absolutely necessary. Frankly, we want to see TVA power kept here for our own use and our own growth.

The problem of TVA's repayments to the Government of money already invested in its power system by appropriations from the Treasury remains to be settled. We hope the committee, in reaching its conclusions, will not saddle TVA with unnecessary and unworkable controls. TVA has proved that it is ready, willing, and able to amortize the appropriations spent on its power system. It should retain control over its depreciation reserve.

It should, in short, be permitted to set up its finances so that its bonds will be one of the most attractive investments in the country.

We know they will be sound because they will be investments in our growing, thriving, prosperous Tennessee Valley.

To the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an editorial by one of the Nation's great newspapers calling upon the President to continue his service to the people of the United States. This admirable editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of January 30, 1956, speaks for itself:

TO THE PRESIDENT

President Eisenhower has announced that he is marshaling all the factors which bear upon the imminent and fatefully historic decision he must soon make.

We know it will be a decision free from personal ambition. We know it will be a decision free from personal reluctance to continue the burdens of the Presidency if he feels he can discharge the responsibilities of the Presidency. We know his continued leadership during another 4 years can well make a decisive contribution to the unity, strength and peace of America and the free world.

No one should presume to substitute his judgment for Mr. Eisenhower's as to whether he can run for a second term.

We believe, however, that it will be helpful to the President and welcome to the President for him to measure how others marshal the factors which are pertinent to his decision.

ON THE PRESIDENT'S HEALTH

We are glad that Mr. Eisenhower is not allowing any of his more political-minded associates to persuade him to dismiss lightly the factor of his health, his physical ability to do justice to his awesome job if he is elected again. We are glad that he is weighing this factor frankly, realistically, and openly.

We would not want the President to run, we would candidly counsel against his running if he felt he could not discharge the indispensable and pressing functions of the office. We know that the Presidency cannot be cut down to half-size to fit half a man, and we know that Mr. Eisenhower would never be party to such a delusion. The President knows that however much may be done to conserve the energies of the President by reducing the lesser administrative duties of the Presidency, you only free the President to devote more of his time to the largest responsibilities of his office.

No President, no private individual, can know for a certainty that he will survive the rigors of his labors for any given period. We are convinced that Mr. Eisenhower will and should accept renomination only if he is satisfied within his own good conscience, that he is equal to the task after measuring his recovery at full pace.

ON THE "INDISPENSABLE MAN"

Mr. Eisenhower has frequently remarked that he does not look upon himself as an indispensable man—or an indispensable President. He is right. He isn't. We wish that others in the past had been as clear and as humble. But we hope that Mr. Eisenhower will not become entangled by a false concept of the dispensable man. The traditions of our democratic system have not developed out of dogma and theory. They have developed out of the tests of experience and practice and wisdom. It is one of the best of our traditions that the two parties want their elected President to give the Nation the continuity of 8 consecutive years of service if he can possibly do so. To give the American people the opportunity to have a two-term Chief Executive is normal and desirable and constitutional. It is no expression of the indispensable-man theory to make it possible.

ON THE ISSUE OF PEACE OR WAR

Every loyal American wants to do his part to serve the cause of peace without appeasement. Today no one is doing so much to serve the cause of peace without appeasement as President Eisenhower. By his transcendent good faith and integrity he has become the embodiment for the whole free world of America's peaceful, world-minded leadership. There is no position anywhere from which so much can be done for peace as the Presidency of the United States. Mr. Eisenhower's voice is raised tenfold when it speaks from under the Presidential seal of the White House. It would inevitably be muted should he step from the White House and close the door.

Mr. Eisenhower has the capacity and the talent and the trust to make a unique contribution to the cause of peace which America needs and which the world needs at this crisis period of the hydrogen age. He is the right man in the right place at the right time to deal with the one issue which towers above all others—the cause of peace or war.

ON THE ISSUE OF NATIONAL UNITY

By his moderate, forward, unpartisan leadership, President Eisenhower has done much to dissolve the bitterness, erase the harsh, divisive controversies which tended to stalemate Government for so long. He is the symbol and chosen instrument of national unity. His election, we believe, sprang from the determination of the American people to break through the divisions of the past and rally the good will and energies of the whole Nation behind whatever needs to be done to meet the present.

Moderateness is the mood and necessity of these times. It is a constructive, accomplishing mood. We believe that the need to implement this mood has not changed and we believe that it can best be implemented by the man who proved he could best evoke it and bring it to fruition.

ON THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM

It is our conviction that President Eisenhower has enunciated a philosophy and a program of action designed to buttress the best of a free society, to maintain fiscal integrity and to preserve an economic strength essential to safeguard the free world. It creates the climate and the conditions which permit our private-enterprise economy to produce the most for labor and ownership and it fortifies this society with humanitarian measures to help meet the human needs of the people. It puts a floor under security and lifts the ceiling on initiative.

It is a philosophy of the middle road wherein the Government can effectively act. It seeks to strengthen the Federal system where local and State action is insufficient and to return to local and State government functions which they can better perform. It does not seek power for the sake of power, nor to maintain Big Government when it is not necessary.

We believe that in 1952 this was the fundamental change in government for which the American people voted after 20 years of one-party rule and of war and regulation. Another 4 years of President Eisenhower's leadership is essential to deepen, widen and secure the great liberal measures on which he is working.

The President's task is well begun but it is far from completed, far from securely moored.

The President's galvanizing, unifying leadership is needed to carry it forward, for if it is not decisively carried forward in the next 4 years, there is the gravest risk that it will be decisively carried backward.

ON THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

Dwight D. Eisenhower has no overriding obligation to the Republican Party but the Republican Party has a great obligation to Mr. Eisenhower. It would be a derogation of his sense of duty to suggest that he run primarily to save the Republican Party. It would not, we believe, be a derogation of his sense of duty to suggest that one of the compelling reasons why he should accept renomination is to secure the two-party system—by making sure that the Nation has a party which is liberal and effective because it is freed from the extremes of either the right or the left.

In a remark free of any comforting vagueness Vice President Nixon has stated the Republican problem in these words: "The Republican Party is not strong enough to elect a President. We have to have a presidential candidate strong enough to get the Republican Party elected."

The blunt and objective truth is that the Republican Party faces the very real danger of defeat this fall unless President Eisenhower remains at its head, its prestige-laden leader, its two-term presidential nominee.

IN CONCLUSION

Mr. Eisenhower has said that he wished the American people who voted so decisively to make him President, could decide for him whether he should offer himself as President for another 4 years.

That decision, Mr. President, is already in. If it is the wish of the President to be guided where the American people as a whole hope his course lies, then Mr. Eisenhower's decision is marked out. Every test of public opinion shows that the Nation, with both eyes open to the problem of his health, wants Mr. Eisenhower to continue in the White House.

The Gallup poll of December 18, before the President was as well as he is today, showed the country voting 3 to 2, higher than in 1952, in favor of the President. The Gallup poll of December 25, found 3 out of 4 Americans giving Mr. Eisenhower a decisive vote of confidence, 75 percent approving his handling of the Presidency, a higher percentage than before his illness.

The United States and the free world today stand poised between an era of unprecedented freedom and the dark portent of an age of slavery.

Because the hour is grave and the promise of a peaceful atomic era is so nearly within our grasp, we, Mr. President, feel it our solemn responsibility to avow our hope and prayer that nothing short of the most commanding reasons will keep you from accepting the call of this Nation and freemen everywhere.

The Vatican and Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the January 29, 1956, issue of the Il Progresso Italo-Americano which points up another phase of communistic propaganda:

THE VATICAN AND MOSCOW

We recently had the occasion to discuss the categoric instructions issued by Palmiro Togliatti to entice into the coexistence movement the greatest possible number of the fair sex, using his "dialogue with Catholic women" as bait. Evidently, the head of the Italian communism does not only set his sights on gaining a greater number of female votes in the next administrative elections, but they are aimed at facilitating and hastening a conciliation between the church and communism.

We must not forget, in this connection, that the campaign of the outstretched hand between the Vatican and Moscow has found authoritative followers in Italy and France; followers who are animated by the burning desire of preventing the interruption, for no one knows how long, of missionary activities in the East, and they are disposed to experiment with the attempt to "christianize communism."

Such agitation could not escape the directors of Soviet propaganda who have begun to encourage the slight differences in the Catholic world with clever maneuvers like inviting the Jesuit astronomers of the Castel Gandolfo observatory to visit Moscow on the occasion of the congress which will be held there in 1958.

THE POPE'S WARNING

There was a moment in which the Communist propaganda maneuver was about to succeed but for the immediate intervention of the Vatican organ, Osservatore Romano, which warned the Catholics that the good nature of the new Moscow leaders was only simulated.

The credit for giving impetus to the actual offensive against the attempt to "baptize communism" goes directly to the holy father who, in his Christmas radio message, specifically declared:

"We reject communism as a social system by virtue of the Christian doctrine and, for the same reason, we also reject the opinion that Christians today must view communism as a phenomenon or a milestone in the course of history, almost a necessary evolutionary part of it and, therefore, accept it as decreed by divine providence."

The mistaken belief that places the salvation of the world in the ever-increasing process of social production, is a superstition of our rationalistic industrial era, which is so much more dangerous, because it causes us to consider economic crises impossible; crises which are always accompanied by the risk of a return of dictatorship.

After all this superstition is not even apt to erect a solid bulwark against communism because, since it is shared by Communists and non-Communists, a tacit understanding develops between them which causes the deceived ones of the West to dream of a possible true coexistence.

Naturally, the Christians must not be content with anticommunism based on the defense of a liberty without substance. They must try to found a society in which the security of man must rest on the moral order which reflects true human nature.

The Christians know better than others that the Son of God, incarnate, is the only sound support of humanity even in historic and social life and He, assuming human form, has confirmed its dignity as the foundation and rule of the moral order.

THE CHURCH WELCOMES ALL

Communism has deprived the peoples it dominates of their freedom. It has degraded human dignity and has perpetrated the most abominable persecutions against ministers of worship to extirpate the seed of faith from the hearts of the believers.

The church is the mother of all and is ready to welcome, in its maternal arms, all the members of the great human family who turn to her, enlightened by the light of repentance. It cannot, however, subordinate or submit its high spiritual power to temporal autocracies. Christians must unite among themselves to conduct those activities willed by God for the benefit of the great human family. They must always remain open to every sound enterprise and to every genuine progress toward moral and material elevation. They must not isolate themselves as though separated from the rest of the world. Inspired by a desire to promote the common welfare, they must not disdain the others, because, if those who have gone astray are amenable to the force of reason they must, sooner or later, accept the doctrine of Christianity or at least that part which is founded on the inviolability of natural rights which are the very foundation of the inalienability of human rights.

Partnership or Giveaway?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my regarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the following article, by the Honorable SAM COON, of Oregon, entitled "Partnership or Giveaway?" which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald on January 28, 1956:

PARTNERSHIP OR GIVEAWAY?

I feel compelled to make some comments regarding a section of an article which appeared in your issue of January 15, under the heading, "A Partnership or a Giveaway."

The section to which I refer concerns legislation which would permit non-Federal financing of a major portion of the John Day Dam on the Columbia River.

I am the author of that legislation. The person who is credited with writing the article did not call on me nor did he call on any member of my staff. The reference to the John Day legislation is so grossly inaccurate and misleading, it would appear that your reporter concerned himself only with the viewpoint of Senator MORSE and others in the Pacific Northwest who for selfish political reasons are attempting to choke off the development of that region.

The John Day bill, H. R. 5789, authorizes Federal development of the John Day project on the Columbia River with participation in financing by non-Federal public and private electric utilities.

The single purpose of the John Day bill is to expedite construction of this critically needed navigation, flood control and power project. It was authorized by Congress in 1950. To this date, not 1 cent has been appropriated for its construction.

In order to get the money required to build this project, my bill provides that the power from John Day can be sold in advance to any qualified utility.

Your story says that participation in this project is limited to three private utilities in the Pacific Northwest. This is a completely false statement. The bill very clearly states that participation is open to any organization, public or private, engaged in or authorized to engage in the production, transmission, or distribution of electric power. To this date, the city of Seattle, the power commission of the State of Washington, several Oregon municipal utilities, and three private companies have indicated an interest or a desire to participate in the project.

Your allegation that the participants will receive tax free revenue and low cost Government loans is ridiculous.

Equally incorrect is your statement that the participants will be under no obligation to advance any funds. The advancement of funds is the entire purpose of the bill.

Briefly, the bill provides that the local participants will pay to the Government, in advance, the entire cost of the project allocated to power. Further, the local agencies will pay all maintenance and operation costs allocated to power, transmission costs, replacement costs, and any charges for upstream or downstream benefits. In return for these payments, the participants will receive 50-year contracts for power in proportion to the amount of money advanced. The project is at all times owned and operated by the United States.

In other Federal projects, the United States Treasury advances the funds needed to build and operate the dam. The portion of this amount allocated to power is returned to the Treasury over a 50-year period—through sales of power to utilities and industries in the region.

My bill simply provides that these sales be made in advance. Thus the Federal appropriation required to construct this project is reduced from $310 million to less than $40 million.

The basic purpose of the John Day bill is to implement the program of hydroelectric development in the Pacific Northwest. All responsible power agencies in the region, including the Federal agencies, agree that 600,000 kilowatts of new capacity must be built each year for the next 10 years if the area is to avert a crippling power shortage. This will require $3 billion.

Congress has appropriated less than half that amount for Pacific Northwest power projects during the past 10 years. It is apparent to all who give our problems honest consideration that additional sources of funds must be used if the power program is to proceed. The people of the region are anxious to do their share.

SAM COON,
Member of Congress From Oregon.

The Arizonian, Modern Successor to the Weekly Arizonian, the Territory's First Newspaper, Established in 1859

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Arizonian, which is the modern successor to the Weekly Arizonian, the Territory's first newspaper, established 1859. This editorial was written on the occasion of the world symposium on applied solar energy which was held in Phoenix, Ariz., on the first days of November 1955. I respectfully recommended this article to all who are interested in the future of solar energy:

A LOOK BACK IN THE YEAR 2000

Now in those days (little more than four decades ago, but they might have been centuries) man, a fumbling and contradictory being, had discovered coal and oil in the bowels of the earth, the invisible force of electricity, and even gold in the barren wastes where a more logical creature would never have looked for anything. But man had not discovered the sun, which from the beginning of time had hung high in the heavens for all to see.

In that primitive era, men depended upon a smelly, inflammable liquid called gasoline to power their cars, their homes and, ergo, their lives were entangled in a snarl of wires conducting electrical current to their lights, their wireless radio sets, their thousand and one devices to serve the home.

A fuel mined in underground gloom and danger in one State would be shipped thousands of miles to heat homes and besmirch cities in a far-off State. Waterpower to generate electricity was a complicated industry in itself, keeping hundreds of thousands too busy to look at the sun, much less enjoy its ready benefits—except on vacation, when they frantically offered their bodies to its rays to be transformed into a burnt sacrifice to their pitiful ignorance of solor potentials. There it was, God's sun, intended for man's great benefit, shining alike on the factories of New England, the farms and forests of the South, Kansas wheat and Iowa corn, and Colorado rangelands, and California forests and cities, and Pacific-washed beaches—and all of the rest of man's world, too—and no man knew it for what it was.

A few scientists, to be sure, ventured singly to probe the mysteries of solar significance. While other men fooled childishly with pitiful man-contrived sources of power, these visionaries sought the revelation of solar power.

Obviously, the breathtaking import of what it could do for mankind was too fantastic for the normally conditioned human brain

to contemplate, but maybe, possibly, just suppose.

In this present year of our Lord 2000, the manner of life of less than 50 years ago seems quite unbelievable. The sun's servitude to all mankind has enabled man to take more tremendous strides ahead than in all the earlier years since the birth of Christ.

Today every schoolboy knows that the era of solar employment came into being on a date more significant for mankind than 1066 or 1776—the first days of November 1955, when the world's greatest scientists met for the first world symposium on applied solar energy in Phoenix, Ariz.

There and then began the world we know today.

Restrictions Against Pan American Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I brought to the attention of this body the inequities of a situation wherein Pan American Airways was denied access to the Orient via the great circle route while its strongest Pacific competitor enjoyed exclusive privileges over a route 1,200 miles shorter than that flown by Pan American.

At that time, I quoted from, and had inserted in the RECORD, a graphic illustration of this situation written by William H. Hessler in the Cincinnati Enquirer.

Apparently that effort, and others by several of my colleagues, has borne fruit. Recently the President directed the Civil Aeronautics Board to reexamine its decision denying Pan American the right to fly to the Orient over the same route as that flown by Northwest Airlines.

And Mr. Hessler is still as graphic as ever on the subject. In this column in the Enquirer on January 22 he has again made such a convincing argument in favor of reconsidering the restrictions against Pan American that I invite its reading by all my colleagues.

The article follows:

AIRCRAFT DESIGN OUTRUNS REGULATORY CONCEPTS

(By William H. Hessler)

In Arabia, a camel still has the right-of-way as against a railway train. And when they collide, as occasionally happens, it is the railroad, not the camel's owner, who pays any damages. Furthermore, every camel killed in these regrettable encounters on the king's iron road has turned out invariably to be the finest pack camel to be found between Mecca and the Persian Gulf.

All this is easy to understand. The camels were theire first. And the khadis, the judges who enforce the Moslem law, find nothing in their basic lawbook, the Koran, giving railway trains any standing whatever before the immutable laws of Islam.

This is not a very serious matter for the Saudi Arabian Government railroad, because camels usually get out of the way, from a deep instinct of self-preservation. Besides, the common camel has never read the Koran and does not know his rights. In addition, the king owns the railroad and doesn't care whether it makes money or not.

The underlying principle, however, is important. This is an example of how technology tends to outrun the development of law. We have the problem in many of our cities. To insure safe structures, we write into the building code many detailed requirements—as to electric insulation, thickness of walls, types of materials allowable, and so on. Then scientists and engineers go ahead and develop new, safer, stronger materials, permitting more economical construction. But it may be forbidden by building codes written a decade or two earlier.

Fortunately, our law changes more readily than that of Saudi Arabia.

Just now, there is one interesting case involving overseas air transport. Four flights across the Pacific and 12 across the Atlantic do not make me an expert in air transportation. But they have created an interest in its problems.

Years ago the American Government decided against handling all overseas routes to any "chosen instrument," any single airline, as many foreign governments have done. The principle adopted here is to foster competition on those routes—not unbridled competition, but enough to provide the incentive to give good service economically.

Ccross the Atlantic, there is plenty of competition, both between two major American flag lines and among many foreign flag lines—and from steamship service as well. But in the Pacific, a tougher problem, the competition is not realistic or effective.

Under existing Civil Aeronautics Board regulations, Northwest Airlines flies the Great Circle route—the shortest possible—between Seattle and Tokyo, and other such points. But Pan American Airways remains bound by much earlier reguations to stop at Honolulu or Wake Island. The Great Circle route is 4,770 miles. Via Honolulu is is 6,970 miles. That is a 2,200-mile handicap, plus the loss of time entailed in a stop. Even between San Francisco and Japanese cities, the Honolulu route is 1,000 miles longer.

That requirement of a midocean stop made sense some years ago, when aircraft did not have the range to cross the Pacific without several stops. But as we have noticed above, the engineers do not stop work. Technological advance countries. The DC7C, now coming into service with many improvements, has the range to make the Seattle-Tokyo run nonstop, with safety.

There is another side to it, of direct interest to the taxpayer. Over the years, we have been reducing the subsidies paid to our overseas airlines, as well as most domestic airlines. All major airlines within the United States are now off subsidy, pay taxes, and stand on their own feet. Last year Trans-World Airlines, with many profitable routes in the United States and some advantageous Atlantic routes, went entirely off subsidy.

Pan American has had a tougher problem, having no domestic routes at all. And for years it was subsidized in a substantial way, because it was considered in the interest of the United States to have many long overseas routes flown by at least one American-flag airline. Despite this handicap, however, Pan American has been able to operate with smaller and smaller subsidies. Last year it dropped from a subsidy of more than $20 million annually to something like $2 million.

If Pan Am were relieved of the burden of the long route across the Pacific, it could go entirely off subsidy and save the taxpayers that much more. For as things stand now, these weekly round trips by the circuitous route (not the great circle route) cost the Government $220,000 a year.

All this has to do with a problem that has emerged in advance of the long-range jet passenger plane. With the DC7C, it has become uneconomic to require an arbitrary midocean stop, even on flights over the broadest of the oceans. And when the jet plane comes into its own, flying at even greater altitudes and speeds, nonessential stops imposed by antiquated regulation will be even more uneconomic and an even greater brake on progress in transportation.

The Saudi Arabs, as I found for myself last month, are beginning to reexamine the whole business of the camel and the king's iron road. As the enormous advantages of rail transport over the camel caravan become better understood, the khadis are thumbing the Koran a little more earnestly. Eventually, they will find something in the law of the prophet to justify a better break for the railway against the camel.

Our problem is the same, in different degree. We don't happen to use the Koran, but we have learned to stretch the Constitution to meet the realities of a changing technogoly. Now we must make sure we do not let the accumulated red tape of past administrative regulations, those of the CAB, for instance, stand in the way of the progress made possible by technological change.

Annual Observance of the Birth of President William McKinley Sponsored by the Mahoning Valley McKinley Club, Niles, Ohio, January 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver the principal address on the occasion of the annual observance of the birth of President William McKinley sponsored by the Mahoning Valley McKinley Club at Niles, Ohio, January 28, 1956.

The address follows :

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON THE OCCASION OF THE ANNUAL OBSERVANCE OF THE BIRTH OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM MCKINLEY, SPONSORED BY THE MAHONING VALLEY MCKINLEY CLUB, NILES, OHIO, JANUARY 28, 1956

It is an honor to have been selected to participate in this annual program sponsored by the Mahoning Valley McKinley Club in observance of the birth of the 25th President of the United States—William McKinley.

As a student in the public schools of Altoona, Pa., I recall with much pleasure our observance of McKinley Day and more recently as a Member of Congress of the recognition given to this great American by the annual custom of wearing a red carnation in honor of his memory.

Then, too, I am reminded that annually on the birthday of William McKinley, Congress pauses in its deliberations to permit Members of the Ohio delegation to honor a man who by his service to his community, State, and Nation won the love, admiration, and respect of all Americans.

William McKinley brought honor to his home State of Ohio by his outstanding public career.

For seven terms he ably represented the 16th District of Ohio in the Congress of the United States.

The affection and esteem in which he was held by the people of Ohio is evident by the fact that he was elected twice as Governor of the great Buckeye State.

William McKinley by devotion to duty and an outstanding record of service to the people of Ohio found a wider sphere of activity

and a fitting climax to his public career when he was elected as the 25th President of the United States.

He was a great President because he had executive ability and administrative experience coupled with a thorough understanding of domestic affairs and international problems.

His successful handling of the war with Spain endeared him to the people of the Nation.

President McKinley was a man of unusual talents.

He was kindly yet firm in his insistence on justice and fair play, which with his honesty and sincerity of purpose, earned him nationwide affection and acclaim.

Furthermore, he had a fine military record, having served his country with honor and distinction in the Civil War.

His participation in the Battle of Antietam revealed his courage to such a degree that it is recorded as one of the heroic instances of the Civil War.

When death by assassination in 1901 summoned William McKinley to join Abraham Lincoln and James A. Garfield in the role of a martyred President, Americans became fully conscious of the loss of an able leader and a great President.

Since his assassination, volumes have been written in praise of this great American, who as an outstanding soldier and able statesman, revealed such a depth of love of country that his memory is forever enshrined in the hearts of the American people.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a coincidence that at this hour we have as President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, a great American general with a brilliant military record, and who, like William McKinley, finds himself at the helm of Government during a great crisis with the monumental task of leading the free nations of the world in achieving a just and lasting peace.

It is reassuring to realize that unlike William McKinley, our present Commander in Chief has at his command a fully modernized and highly developed Military Establishment.

When President McKinley issued the call for volunteers for the Spanish-American War, the United States had an Army and Navy of 2,143 officers and 26,040 enlisted men; while Spain had one of the largest navies in the world, and an army of 500,000 with over 192,000 in Cuba alone.

In addition, with the exception of Great Britain, all of Europe was solidly behind Spain which enjoyed the prestige of being regarded as one of the world powers.

When the Spanish crisis developed, as a Nation we were recovering from a civil war that sought to divide us and destroy our unity.

The challenge hurled by Spain, however, found us a united Nation as some 483,000 American youths served in the Spanish-American War, 20,000 of them losing their lives in battle or as victims of yellow fever contracted in the disease-infested jungles.

Under William McKinley as President of the United States, victory over Spain was achieved.

That victory resulting from the courageous decision of the United States to face the issue, made certain that Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other islands of the West Indies were not conquered by hostile European nations.

What is more important is the likelihood that our defeat in the war with Spain would have placed Haiti, Guam, and the Philippines under Russian rule.

The result of our victory against Spain made possible the security and solidarity in the Western Hemisphere that we prize today as we watch with eternal vigilance Russia's avowed determination for world domination.

It is significant that a soldier President was Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces in the war with Spain for it was this Nation's initial battle on foreign soil in defense of liberty and freedom.

Since the days of William McKinley, the United States has fought two World Wars on far-flung battlefronts and in addition, the so-called police action in Korea with its heavy toll of death and injuries to American youths.

All of these global conflicts were costly in the loss of human life; in providing proper medical and hospital care for the maimed and wounded, and in the heavy drain on our natural resources in maintaining and supporting the war effort.

The prosecution of these world conflicts has had a devastating effect on our national economy forcing us to realize that the cost of modern warfare can bankrupt even the most powerful nation in the world.

This fact should prove a sobering influence to all Americans because it is commonly known that the prime objective of the Soviet Union according to the Russian timetable is to bleed America white by a series of so-called police actions and phony crusades for peace and then when our economy collapses to move in for the kill and take over this great Republic without firing a shot.

This formula for conquering the United States was first proclaimed by Marx and Lenin and subscribed to by Stalin and his successors.

For example, Dimitry Z. Manuilsky, of Russia, Presiding Officer of the U. N. Security Council in 1949 in defining Russia's policy of crushing capitalism summed it up several years ago as follows:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable.

"Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack.

"Our time will come in 20 or 30 years.

"To win we shall need the element of surprise.

"The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.

"So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record.

"There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions.

"The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction.

"They will leap at another chance to be friends.

"As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

However, this lone approach in conquering the United States is threatened by present-day developments in modern warfare.

The march of progress in the field of science has revealed the possibility of eventual war between the United States and Russia because of the development by both nations of modern weapons so death-dealing in their effectiveness that they stagger the imagination.

For example, after witnessing the destructive effects of the A-bomb we were further amazed to learn of the H-bomb and of its potential use in exterminating the human race.

Along with the development of these weapons of massive destruction has been the announcement that guided missiles have advanced to the stage of where it will be possible within a year or so to test a long-range missile able to carry the H-bomb to a target 5,000 miles distant.

It is no secret that tests will be made soon of a missile carrying an H-bomb with a 1,500-mile range while the immediate objective is to extend mileage to 5,000 miles at a speed 3 times that of a rifle bullet.

Thus we have on one hand the continuing threat of the cold war with Russia and her hope that we can be drawn into fringe warfare all over the globe while she sits on the sidelines.

The only other alternative since Russia is not interested in a just and lasting peace is the threat of direct war when she feels able and has had time to perfect an intercontinental missile and to build up a sufficient stock of A-bombs and H-bombs to warrant an all-out atomic attack.

In view of these breath-taking developments in the field of modern warfare, it is well for us on the anniversary of the birth of President McKinley to review the history of the United States since 1901 when he met death from an assassin's bullet.

William McKinley, as President, rallied this Nation in time of peril—and America responded—by meeting successfully the challenge to our liberty and freedom.

Since his time and after three successive world conflicts, we find that world peace is not within the grasp of the family of nations as long as the scourge of communism holds sway.

Ladies and gentlemen, the average American citizen has a fairly well defined knowledge of the evils of communism, but unfortunately, even with the utmost vigilance, Moscow dupes by escaping detection have infiltrated many segments of American life.

It has been proved possible that once the Communists-inspired individual is discovered he can be shadowed and finally exposed.

However, to our sorrow we know that these cunning stooges of Moscow operating in groups or alone have invaded our Government and succeeded in obtaining highly classified documents for Soviet Russia that revealed secrets concerning the development of the atomic bomb.

There is no doubt in anyone's mind that these traitors have made it possible for the Russians to make marked progress in developing the A- and the H-bomb.

In addition, they stole secret papers from the Department of State and the Department of Defense concerning our defense plans and sold them to Soviet agents thus becoming traitors to the flag they lived under while masquerading as loyal American citizens.

The irony of the situation is that these Moscow-puppets when apprehended and questioned about their Communist affiliations in a defiant manner invoke the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States—the very same Constitution they have sworn in Moscow fashion to nullify and destroy.

Unfortunately we have among us groups of American citizens who knowingly or unknowingly protect and aid these traitors by demanding in petitions or by newspaper advertisements that their civil rights be respected.

These so-called "liberals" have been found among newspapermen, radio commentators, educators, college professors, school teachers and lawyers, with a sprinkling in many other walks of life.

When taken to task for their interest in the pinkster element they cry that like the Commies their profession is being persecuted and their livelihood threatened, yet they have no apology for aiding those who would overthrow our form of government and with it destroy our cherished American principles of liberty and freedom.

It is revolting to realize that many so-called Americans are willing tools of Moscow and that despite their academic degrees and other claims of knowledge and intelligence, they refuse by their sinister actions to voice appreciation for the priceless heritage that they enjoy as citizens of this great Republic.

These self-styled Americans know in their hearts that a citizen of Russia is regarded as having no human dignity and that he is regarded as merely a creature of the state.

They know that under the Russian emblem—the hammer and the sickle—a Russian cannot own a foot of land, a shoeshine stand, a grocery store, or employ anyone.

There is but one employer—the state.

You work or you starve in Russia.

There is one political party, one ticket, one choice.

You hear, see, and read what the state permits—and no more.

You cannot remain away from work; labor cannot strike; nor can one travel without a permit or be friendly with a foreigner.

There is no freedom of assembly; no freedom of speech; or religion; or of the press.

In short, there is no freedom behind the Iron Curtain.

There is no such thing in Russia as a trial of justice and equity as we know it in America.

There is no jury trial.

You may not be charged with a serious crime if you steal something in Russia—but let you utter one word against the government and before sunset you are on your way to a slave labor camp.

It is reported that about 1 Russian in every 13 is in a slave labor camp.

The total population of these camps is over 15 million.

No one seized by the secret police. whether innocent or guilty, has any right to protest; and only 5 percent are ever released.

The rest die a slow death.

By contrast here in America, we enjoy the blessing of living in the greatest country on the face of the earth.

We inherit at birth the God-given heritage of liberty and freedom.

Since the birth of this Nation, American youth have fought to preserve these cherished principles.

Therefore, it is an insult to those who fought our Nation's battles, many of whom died, to tolerate in our midst any individual who directly or indirectly engages in or aids subversive activities.

Despite three world conflicts since 1917, the American people spent billions of dollars in trying to aid foreign nations to recover from the effects of war.

We have extended a helping hand to all nations, even to those hostile to our concept of government.

In return, we have received an empty hand and an almost threatening demand to continue the role of Santa Claus or the begging nation will embrace communism.

How long can the United States continue to carry the world on its shoulders and at the same time support a national defense policy at home that requires 65 cents out of every tax dollar, and which for the next fiscal year will cost American taxpayers over $35 billion.

In this connection, our guided missile research-demelopment program alone is costing us at the present time over $1 billion a year.

Meanwhile, it is reliabily reported that Russia has secretly overhauled the Red war machine, almost completely modernizing its Army of 2½ million men with emphasis on mobility and armor for the quick grouping and scattering required in atomic warfare.

Informants disclose that the Kremlin has put emphasis on bombers, jet fighters, and atomic weapons, but, in addition, has spent billions of dollars in remodeling the Russian Army into a first-rate ground-fighting force.

The modernization discloses that since Russia has mostly dirt roads, the remodeling plans contemplate atomic-type warfare in areas with hard-surfaced highways.

Comparison with the horse-drawn Red army of World War II discloses the tremendous gain that is being made in mobility through the reported acquisition by Russia of advanced types of trucks and helicopters.

The battle order of the Red army is said to continue to provide a total of 175 divisions, 30 of them assigned to East Germany and satellite countries in Western Europe, with 60 more divisions available on short notice to move in and support those on the Western front.

Special emphasis is also being placed by Moscow on radar-controlled aiming devices for accuracy to replace Russia's former dependence on massed artillery fire.

While the Soviet Union continues its huge military-modernization program, it has announced a 5-year plan for bolstering its economy.

Thus, the mad race for superiority in armaments proceeds as the United States and the free world struggle for peace among all nations.

To meet the cost of an adequate national defense, it is fortunate for us that, due to the American principle of free enterprise, we experienced a prosperous year during 1955, with more people employed than ever before in the peacetime history of this country.

Unemployment is low, although in some areas there is suffering because of a labor surplus.

The plight of these areas has been mentioned by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message, and undoubtedly his program for relief will be sanctioned by Congress.

Prosperity is reflected in the average weekly pay envelope which shows an increase in wages while at the same time the cost of living has not been permitted to skyrocket, but in fact has been stabilized the past 3 years.

The net result is that the value of the dollar shows improvement the past 3 years—but what is more important—we are at peace and the Nation as a whole is in a prosperous condition.

It is gratifying to realize that we are enjoying this prosperity despite the fact that 3 years ago the prophets of gloom and doom were predicting a terrible depression if the Korean war ever ended.

Thanks to the ability, sincerity, honesty, and wisdom of President Eisenhower, hostilities have been ended in Korea and the ghastly casualty lists are no longer occupying their grim position on the front pages of our daily newspapers.

Ladies and gentlemen, with another McKinley-type President in the White House, we have made the transition from a wartime economy, based on the blood and sufferings of American youth, to a peacetime economy with over 64 million Americans gainfully employed and unemployment reduced to an all-time low in peacetime.

Tonight, through the grace of God and the wisdom and courage He has given our beloved President, everything is booming but the guns.

We Americans who pride ourselves on being citizens of this great Republic, founded under God, recognize the frenzied desire of the heartless and atheistic Russian leaders to banish all belief in a supreme being.

The godless Russian regime has virtually exterminated religion not only in the Soviet Union but has cruelly persecuted every form of Christian worship in the hapless countries that now find themselves behind the Iron Curtain.

We cannot review the life of the martyred McKinley without being reminded of his religious fervor and his complete dependence upon the love and mercy of Almight God.

It is recorded that one of his favorite hymns was the beautiful and inspiring "Nearer My God to Thee."

In this supersonic and ultrasonic age when death-dealing weapons of war are hurled through space at a speed greater than sound, we should be grateful that God in times of crises has given us such Presidents as William McKinley and Dwight D. Eisenhower, both of them unashamed like the martyred Lincoln to publicly admit their complete dependence on divine providence.

President Eisenhower in his inaugural speech confounded the Communists by his sincere, yet simple, appeal for God's continued blessings on this Nation.

At the same time he rekindled America's faith in the eternal truth that God is the fountain from whom all blessings flow.

The President's emphasis of the need for a deep spirituality in our daily lives has been acclaimed by persons of all religious faiths who realize that without recourse to prayer and worship of our Creator, we do not deserve to be protected from the atheistic horde of Communists who are plotting the destruction of this Nation.

It is by dedication to lofty moral principles that we as a nation can hope to wage a successful battle against the godless philosophy of the Communists who have characterized religion as the "opiate of the people."

Ladies and gentlemen, in these perilous days, we need a revival of the Spirit of 1776 that inspired the spirit of 1898 and which under President McKinley's guidance brought us victory.

Later that same spirit was reflected in the indomitable courage displayed by American youth in three successive world wars.

God grant that we may avoid atomic warfare and that Russia may someday soon depart from its evil program of worldwide domination and ruthless persecutions, and instead, make an honest effort to dwell in peace with all nations.

But until that happy day is realized, as a nation of free people respecting the human dignity of mankind, we have no choice but to guard and protect this country against the wiles of the cunning and crafty Communists.

We owe it to generations yet unborn, to make certain they will find that we have preserved for them the precious legacy of liberty and freedom which we inherited when we were born as citizens of the greatest Republic on the face of the earth.

With God's help and a sincere desire to protect and defend America, we cannot fail in this important mission, because America, "the land of the free and the home of the brave," is the free world's last best hope for survival.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. The money derived from such sales shall be paid into the Treasury and accounted for in his annual report to Congress, and no sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*_____Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*_____
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Barkley, Alben W., *Ky*_____
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*_____The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*_____
Bender, George H., *Ohio*___120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*__
Bible, Alan, *Nev*_____
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*_____The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*_____
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*_____
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*_
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*_____The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*___The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*_____Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*_____
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*_____4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*____3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*_____The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*_____
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*_____
Daniel, Price, *Tex*_____
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*____
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*_____
Duff, James H., *Pa*_____
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*_
Eastland, James O., *Miss*___5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*_____
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*__
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*_____
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*____
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*__
George, Walter F., *Ga*_____The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*__
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*_____
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*_____
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*_____
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*__Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*____
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*_____
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*__
Jenner, William E., *Ind*____
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*__
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*_____
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*_____4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*____
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*_____
Kilgore, Harley M., *W. Va*__3834 Macomb St.
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*__
Langer, William, *N. Dak*___2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*__Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*_____
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*__
McClellan, John L., *Ark*____
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*_____
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*____The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*_____
Martin, Edward, *Pa*_____
Martin, Thomas E., *Iowa*____
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*__
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*_____5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*____122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*___The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*__
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*_____
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*_
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*___
Purtell, William A., *Conn*__
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*___
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*____
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*_2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*_____
Smathers, George A., *Fla*___
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*__Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*____4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*_____
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*____
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*____
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*_____
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*__
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*____4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*_____2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*_____
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*__Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Anderson, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, Kilgore, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Johnson of Texas, Barkley, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Barkley, Morse, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Thurmond, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Long, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Scott, Bible, Neuberger, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Thurmond, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Kilgore (chairman), Eastland, Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Douglas, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Neely, Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, Symington, Thurmond, McNamara, Neuberger, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Appendix

Speech by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Before Neenah (Wis.) Junior Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege last night to speak before the junior chamber of commerce at Neenah, Wis. I ask unanimous consent that the address which I made be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SAYS RESPONSIBLE CITIZENS SHOULD URGE INTENSIFIED UNITED STATES EFFORT IN COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE RACE—ANNOUNCES COSPONSORSHIP OF BILL TO MAKE PERMANENT PRESIDENT'S TRADE FAIR PROGRAM ABROAD, PLUS CULTURAL, ATHLETIC EXCHANGES

I am happy to attend your distinguished service award banquet, to pay tribute to your Jaycee program, and to this outstanding young man of your community.

If I may, I'd like to use your criteria for your distinguished award selection—achievement, leadership, service to the community, and personal ability and character—as a foundation upon which to build my talk with you tonight.

EVERY CITIZEN PLAYS A DUAL ROLE

In our great country, each citizen plays a dual role.

First, each of us leads a private, personal life. We work at our vocations; we build our homes and care for our families; we pursue our personal careers and goals in life.

Second, each of us is a member of a community, with a civic responsibility. Our country is not kept free and dynamic by a "Let George do it" attitude on the part of our people. The successful working of a representative democracy requires selfless service and dedication by all of us—at the local, State, and National, and now, international level.

Tonight, we are honoring a young man for achievement both in his personal life and in service to the community—a fine example of the dual role we all must assume.

ROLE OF ALL JAYCEES

As members of a great nationwide organization of 160,000 Jaycees, you are all projected into the forefront of activity and progress on the American scene.

You have put yourselves in the category of people who are big enough to live beyond themselves, to become responsible members of community life.

You have concerned yourselves with the problem of education, finance, taxes, sanitation, and general progress of your community.

As dual role citizens, you have concerned yourselves with the problems at the State and National level. You are attempting likewise to achieve a constructive knowledge of international problems, and of how these reflect upon yourselves and our country.

As members of the Jaycees you are molding, not only the future of Neenah, Menasha, and Winnebago County, but of the State and Nation, and yes, the world, as well. Of this, I shall have more to say a bit later on.

AMERICA'S BEST FRUITS ARE ITS PEOPLE

There are different ways by which to measure our progress and success.

For myself, I believe that the most important achievement of our great country of 165 million people is not necessarily a political system, although ours is the best in the world; not our economic progress, although we have attained the highest standards of living in the history of mankind; and not our scientific and technological developments, although these are unsurpassed.

Instead, I hold the firm, unshakable belief that the best fruits of our years of work and progress are our people—free, humble, creative, independent people, dedicated, under God, to the preservation of human dignity; devoted to high ideals and progress; believing strongly in the principles of representative democracy, aware of the opportunities and responsibilities in our atomic-nuclear age; and, all of us, strong in our conviction that freedom is a must for all peoples, yes, including the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

ERA OF PERIL; ERA OF PROMISE

The cycle of history has indicated two kinds of future prospects: an era of peril, and an era of promise.

ERA OF NUCLEAR PERIL

The era of peril, of course, has been created for us by the existence of a fanatic political and economic theory—communism—whose ultimate goal is still the conquering of the world.

In recent times, the dictators of the Kremlin have been traveling about the world under the disguise of "social reformists," attempting to deceive new peoples and nations on the real nature of totalitarian rule.

Meanwhile, the long tentacles of communism, above ground and underground, reach into all countries on earth.

COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE

As you well know, the relatively new Communist line of "competitive coexistence" is being intensified.

The "line" definitely does not rule out the possibility of war.

It does, however, indicate that the Communists have entered a new phase of operation—trying by so-called soft means to alienate our friends, undermine our prestige, and subvert new peoples to communism.

Basically, the aimof the Kremlin is to discredit, weaken, and ultimately destroy our own political system, our Republic, our way of life.

ACCEPT "COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE" OPTIMISTICALLY

I think, however, that we ought to accept the challenge of "competitive coexistence" optimistically. For this is the thing we are best at—providing good things for a better life.

We have achieved the best kind of life for our people at home.

And we have helped its progress in many countries around the world by sound economic aid and technical assistance.

IMPROVE SALESMANSHIP OF UNITED STATES ABROAD

However, we must improve our salesmanship of the United States abroad.

The United States Information Agency has been doing, generally speaking, a great job abroad. However, because of many obstacles it faces and because of the massive Soviet propaganda effort (which expends many times what we do), this fact emerges:

The true story of the free way of life unfortunately, isn't getting to the people of the world, as well or as fully as it should be.

Particularly in the so-called neutralist countries our capitalist system is frequently misrepresented. Our national character is often smeared. We are called "imperialist" and "colonialists" even though:

(a) Our entire history, from the days of our Thirteen Colonies' revolution, onward, refutes that charge:

(b) Not in man's history has there been a more savage, heartless, or widespread imperialism and colonialism than that of the Soviet Union (and it, of course, is the source responsible for most of the false charges against us).

And, so we must strengthen our salesmanship. We have the best product in the world to sell—freedom. And we must back up our salesmen—our United States Foreign Service, our United States Information officers, and others abroad, who are ably displaying our products.

COSPONSORSHIP OF BILL TO MAKE TRADE AND CULTURAL PROGRAMS PERMANENT

One of the ways by which we can do so is by making permanent what has thus far been merely temporary and on an emergency basis the authorization for the United States to participate in international trade fairs and to help defray expenses in sending our artistic troupes throughout the world.

Our participation in trade fairs and particularly, our sending of dance, theater, orchestral, athletic and other groups and individuals abroad—have met with spectacular success.

On this cultural point, I emphasize that man lives "by more than bread alone." He lives for and reveres the things of beauty in this world: great music, great art, great poetry, great drama, great literature, great ballet.

We want to share the fruits of American culture with other peoples, and I say, incidentally, we are willing and eager to enjoy more of the fruits of their cultures as well.

We Americans, we Wisconsinites are not "crass materialists" as the Reds like to picture us. We are vitally interested in the things of the spirit.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATER AND ACADEMY

Fortunately, we have a grand instrumentality which has been helping to perform our overseas cultural presentation for us. It is the splendid American National Theater and Academy, chartered by the Congress, functioning through its International Exchange Program. This is a program in which Wisconsin performers, among others, I am glad to say, have contributed in full measure, and in which all the other rich artistic resources of America are fully represented.

United States ambassador after ambassador, now representing our country abroad, has written to me, praising our theater and other groups overseas. They have told me

that the visit of a single artistic group, like the famed "Symphony of the Air" in music-minded Japan, has done more to get across the truth regarding America's cultural interests, its devotion to the good life, to the ways of peace, than would mountains of speeches or press release "handouts."

I shall, therefore, in the next few days be cosponsoring legislation to make authorization for this type of activity permanent, precisely as President Eisenhower has wisely recommended. I point out to you that up until recent times the Soviet Union and its satellites had tended to be ahead of us in the trade fair and cultural troupe program. The Reds, with vast expense budgets committed to the task, had already achieved considerable success.

Fortunately, we are now catching up. Fortunately, too, the business world of America and the artistic world have so fine a product, so to speak, to display before the world, that we know we can surpass the Soviets in any fair competition.

But we must not allow this program to lag.

I want all the world to see what the free American enterprise system has produced. Let trade fairs in Indonesia or India or Pakistan display the skills of Green Bay industry, for example. And let audiences, especially, in the neutralist world, see what the great artistic talent of America has achieved.

WHY EACH ADDITIONAL COUNTRY IS SIGNIFICANT

We want no free nation—large or small—to drift into the Communist orbit, or to be softened up by the Reds for new aggression or internal revolution.

Each country that is kidnaped from the free world behind the bamboo or Iron Curtain is a potential military base for further subversion and aggression elsewhere.

Each country that falls or is pushed behind these curtains provides a reserve of natural and economic resources that will be raped and pillaged to support the Communist war machines.

Each captured country provides a reservoir of manpower that the Communists will not hesitate to use as cannon fodder in acts of aggression, now or in the future.

We must face these facts realistically, and strengthen our program to deter communism at every possible point.

Aggressive communism is a universal menace, even across the once wide Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. There are no longer any real natural barriers. There are no shelters anymore. All places are vulnerable. On the military front, a Communist-launched guided missile could hit Neenah and Menasha in less than 30 minutes from takeoff from a Soviet base. We are no more than 6 hours away from jet-bomber bases in Siberia.

INTERNATIONAL SCENE

As you know, on the international diplomatic scene, we are faced with a multitude of new and old problems. Most of these are serious, for a spark anywhere might emblazon the whole world in atomic fire. We must, therefore, keep constantly informed of the actions and events around the globe that may determine our own future. For example:

1. The recent announcement of a new 5-year plan by Russia warrants that we review our own programs and progress as regards strategic economic goods.

2. In Asia the stepped-up air and artillery action around Quemoy and Matsu Islands—off Formosa—requires us to take a new look at that hot spot.

3. In Latin America the bait that is being dangled to the 20 Republics merits our and our friends' careful scrutiny, for we Americans must above all safeguard our Western Hemisphere.

4. The fighting in and around the Holy Land and unrest throughout the Middle East and Africa require our alert and skilled efforts to avoid more explosions.

5. We must strengthen our allies in NATO, SEATO, the Middle East pacts and other agreements and mutual-support treaties.

There is no area in the world in which we can relax and say "this is safe." For the Communists are working, propagandizing, and subverting on a succession of insidious 5-year plans.

ERA OF PROMISE

We must, however, remember also that we live in an era of promise.

We have attained great and unprecedented heights of prosperity and standards of living.

We have more jobs, automobiles, TV sets, and stations, radios, and household appliances than ever before. We have better homes and more comforts of living than anywhere else in the world.

We live in an air-jet age and travel at supersonic speed.

We produce goods in automatic factories.

Our scientists have equipped us with electronic eyes and ears.

Yes; as we approach November 1956 we can even hazard election predictions with such complicated devices as Univacs.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Domestically, one of the great landmarks of our times of course, is the St. Lawrence seaway. At completion, this great seaway will mean to the trade of Wisconsin and the United States what the Panama and Suez Canals have meant to the trade of the world.

It will open new markets, both foreign and domestic, for the products of our farms, dairy plants, paper mills, machine shops, and other industries. It will transform many of our Wisconsin cities into true, deep-water world ports.

Every one of you can help create the most effective seaway by giving your personal and organizational support to legislation now before the Senate Public Works Committee. This legislation, for which I testified only last Thursday, would authorize the deepening of the connecting channels, west of Lake Erie to 27 feet.

ECONOMIC OUTLOOK BRIGHT

Economically, if we are alert and act on opportunities, the outlook for Wisconsin and the country is of course excellent.

That fact is confirmed by the President's latest economic report. We are at the highest level of prosperity in our history. Our national income is at the $327-billion level. The total national product is almost to the $400-billion mark. Over 65 million people are employed—the most in our history. And the best is still to come.

FARMERS NOT SHARING IN NATIONAL PROSPERITY

Yet, as we review our problems, there is one segment of our economy that is not sharing proportionately in our national prosperity: farming.

A price "squeeze" has caught the farmer between rising costs of production and falling prices for his milk, pork, beef, and other products.

As you know, the Senate concluded hearings on farm parity proposals last week. The drafting of the final bill is expected to take about a week.

We must come up with some good, nonpartisan constructive legislation to relieve the distress in price-depressed farm areas—and we must do so now.

For myself, I believe that the price-support program needs a real overhauling. As for example, milk—which we produce, in amounts of 16½ billion pounds a year in Wisconsin—certainly should receive equal treatment under the law with the so-called 6 basic commodities.

OTHER LEGISLATION

To cope with other problems—foreign and domestic—which we face today, there is additional legislation pending before the Congress.

These concern such important matters as defense, tax reforms, social-security liberalization, aid to education, modern road construction, mutual security, yes, too, the dangerous natural-gas bill, and many others. They are of vital interest to all of us.

The best judgment of Congress and the Nation must be applied to these issues so as to result in a sound, comprehensive program.

MINIMIZE PARTISAN POLITICS

This is an election year, and, of course, it will be difficult to keep politics out of the legislative work.

But I, for one, have made this fact very plain: I consider the times too critical, and the consequences of failure, or even delay, on top international issues too great to allow ourselves to become overly involved in petty partisan politics.

NEW FRONTIERS

In our complicated, complex world, we face new frontiers of outer space with a so-called space satellite, new frontiers of atomic-nuclear development, and of improved human relations.

We need dedicated people—willing to work, study, think, and act—to resolve those many problems.

WE NEED YOU

We need you—every last one of you—to assume the dual role of citizenship, to take up the challenge of our times, to guide our Nation through the uncharted future, at home and abroad.

Man does not live by bread alone.

Man does not live for himself alone. So let us rally to our Republic, beacon of the world.

Albert Gallatin and Our Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, January 29 marked the 195th anniversary of the birth of a distinguished Pennsylvanian who rendered noble service to his State and to his beloved America. Albert Gallatin was born in Geneva, Switzerland, and came to this country at the age of 19. He fought in the Revolutionary War, later taught at Harvard, and settled in the farmlands of western Pennsylvania. He was later elected to the House of Representatives, served as Secretary of the Treasury, and as an American minister in Europe.

As a public official, Gallatin translated his economic theories into the practical reality that characterized the era of Thomas Jefferson, and so reduced the national debt. As an American diplomat, still many years ahead of his time, he strived hard to end the destruction caused by warfare through the conclusion of trade conventions with foreign nations.

Typifying the good trade relations between our two countries is the recent revelation that my own State of Pennsylvania profits to the extent of about $10 million annually in Swiss trade.

This information was carried in the Latrobe (Pa.) Bulletin on December 8, 1955, and I insert the article in the RECORD under permission granted by the House:

STATE SENDS MANY PRODUCTS TO SWISS

The State of Pennsylvania sold $9.4 million in goods to Switzerland in 1954 to rank among the top 10 of the 48 American States exporting a grand total of $150.4 million to the small Alpine democracy, best cash customer for United States products in Europe.

This is revealed in an eight-page study published by the Society for Friendship with Switzerland to commemorate the 105th anniversary of the Treaty of Friendship and Commerce signed by the two nations November 25, 1850.

Coal, wool products, metals, machinery and chemicals were Pennsylvania's chief exports. Twenty-eight States annually have been selling from $1 million to $16 million in goods and services to Switzerland as their share in a postwar yearly total average of more than $150 million.

The society study was done to show how trade activity between the two countries has accelerated since the signing of the 1936 American-Swiss reciprocal trade agreement and has benefited producers in all areas of the United States.

The annual United States exports to the Swiss just prior to the signing of this pact averaged about $7 million. In the past decade, the yearly average has been over $150 millon, compared with annual Swiss exports to the United States averaging just over $100 million. This makes for a total postwar favorable trade balance to the United States of about $500 million.

Swiss watch exports represent 50 percent of the dollar value of products Switzerland sells to the United States. Within the past month, American political and business leaders have been voicing increasing concern over present and projected United States tariff curbs on watch imports.

The Privilege of Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Fairbanks (Alaska) Daily News-Miner of January 4, 1956:

WHEN THE NEXT CONGRESS MEETS?

The opening of the 2d session of the 84th Congress is highly significant, since it comes in a presidential election year. The main issues of the presidential race this year will be fought out in the Halls of Congress from now until adjournment, which will probably come in July or August.

Perhaps the one dominating issue, and one which will have a great effect on the political campaign this fall, is the farm problem. Conditions for the farmer, particularly the small farmer, have become almost critical and there is sentiment to do something about it in both parties.

The question is whether the Democratic solution or a Republican solution will be tried in 1956, or if both these attempted solutions will be checkmated for political reasons.

The Democratic proposal to restore 90 percent parity price supports has already been passed by the House. If it is passed by the Senate, and this seems likely, then the Democratic program to alleviate suffering among farmers will go to the White House. The decision by Mr. Eisenhower, whether to sign or veto this bill, will be a highly significant and perhaps dramatic one.

The Republicans are proposing other avenues of correction. The soil bank is one of them. The President traditionally outlines the general approach to such problems in his speeches to Congress.

It is probably not an exaggeration to say that the party which gets the credit for alleviating current farm distress, or the party which gets blamed for its continuance—if it is continued—will feel the results in the November election. We believe the results might even be decisive in this year's presidential race.

We can't help but feel, too, that the stand (if any) either party takes during early 1956 regarding statehood for Alaska and Hawaii will have some bearing on the presidential race.

We are well aware that Mr. Average Citizen in the States who has the privilege of casting a vote (quite a privilege that is to us "second class" United States citizens residing in Alaska) is primarily concerned with seeing Congress act on matters which affect his pocketbook and matters of particular interest to himself. * * * But he is also interested in seeing Alaskans and Hawaiians treated as fellow citizens of the United States. The political party which gives citizenship rights (other than the privilege of paying the highest taxes in the land) to the people of America's two great Territories will gain the respect—and in many cases the vote—of Mr. Average Citizen.

We have a feeling of envy as we watch the elected Representatives of our fellow citizens from the 48 States reconvene the 84th Congress. * * * We too, would like a voice in how the taxes we contribute to the greatest country in the world will be spent.

We will continue to pray, and to hope, and to work (and to pay our taxes) perhaps—

When the 85th Congress convenes.

The Charm of the U. S. A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a song poem written by one of my constituents, Mr. Ernest J. Pegelow, of Baltimore:

THE CHARM OF THE U. S. A.

Out where the sky meets the ocean,
The sentry on New York Bay,
Holds forth the great lamp of freedom
The charm of the U. S. A.
Greeting the weary traveler,
A welcome to those who despair,
Liberty offers a haven,
To those so oppres'ed "over there."
Miss Liberty; My Country 'Tis of Thee,
Millions of hearts proclaim.
Miss Liberty: Forever you shall be,
The symbol of Old Glory's fame.
For Columbia the Gem of the Ocean,
A vigil you keep night and day.
God Bless the Statue of Liberty,
The charm of the U. S. A.

—*Ernest J. Pegelow, Author.*

The Natural Gas Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON L. LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, again my hat is off to the Wall Street Journal for plain speaking and straight thinking. With leave of the Speaker, I am including an editorial which appeared in the Wall Street Journal for Monday, January 30, 1956, relative to the natural gas debate.

It is certainly encouraging to see that writers of the ability and intelligence such as displayed by the writer of this editorial are coming to see what so many of us in the South have been saying recently about the assumption on the part of the Supreme Court of the power to legislate invested by the Constitution in the Congress of the United States. Frankly, this tendency on the part of the Supreme Court to decide cases not upon the law as it is but as they believe it ought to be, is one of the most dangerous trends of our times. Unless it is reversed and unless the Congress asserts its right to legislate and fights vigorously against the assumption of its power and duty to legislate from encroachment by, not only the Supreme Court but the executive department, the Congress will soon be only a rubber stamp.

The editorial follows:

THE NATURAL GAS DEBATE

There is a great deal of heat surrounding the debate in the Senate on whether the Federal Government ought to control the price of natural gas at the well. Unfortunately, some of the arguments have obscured two important points.

One is whether the Supreme Court ought to legislate Federal controls through interpretation, as the Court did in 1954. Not only did the Supreme Court do by decree what the Congress refused to do, the Court actually overrode an exemption written into the 1938 Natural Gas Act which left producers of natural gas free of the controls the act placed on pipelines. The dissenting justices pointed out that the majority opinion transgressed this specific exemption and they said that "good faith" required the Court to interpret the act as "its terms read, and as we have, until today, declared it."

But talk of "windfalls," "giveaways" and somber predictions that the national householders' gas bill will go up $800 million if the price of natural gas is not controlled at the wellhead—all this is what the Senate is hearing instead of a debate on a constitutional issue.

Another point that ought to be discussed is the fairness in asking for Federal controls over natural gas when there are no similar proposals for coal and oil, which also are used for generating power and heating homes. Nobody tells the coal and oil companies they can charge this much and no more for their product at the mine and the well. Why single out natural gas?

One reason the controllers give is that the price the producer gets affects the price the consumer pays. Of course it does, to some extent. But the price of gas, like the prices of electricity, are set by public service commissions in the different States. The power to say what utilities can get for their gas is a powerful deterrent to any producer who

might like to "gouge" the utilities, and thus the consumer.

Further, Federal power to control the price the producers can get doesn't mean lower bills for the consumer. As Senator FULBRIGHT explained in a recent speech, even if the producers were made by Federal law to give their gas away, there is no Federal law which can pass on the savings to the consumer. So that argument for Federal regulation is fallacious.

But it is easy to understand why the argument is being made. There are about 4,000 producers and about 25 million consumers of natural gas and those who want Federal controls would like to see the issue decided on the basis of choosing between the interests of the two. The basis admittedly has political appeal, but it is not a good basis for the writing of fair law.

Our comments here are not meant to be an argument for the particular measure the Senate is now debating. Our argument is for debating the question on the main points.

The main points are two. One is whether a Federal bureau ought to dictate the price a man can get for natural gas while possessing no such controls over other fuels. The other is whether the Congress ought to surrender to the Supreme Court its responsibilities for writing the Nation's laws.

Officers of the Future for Ships of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Rear Adm. Gordon McLintock, USMS, Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, at joint meeting of the Propeller Club, Port of New Orleans and the National Defense Transportation Association, at New Orleans, La., January 10, 1956:

OFFICERS OF THE FUTURE FOR SHIPS OF THE FUTURE

May I express to you my thanks and appreciation for the opportunity to address you at this luncheon jointly sponsored by the Propeller Club of the United States, Port of New Orleans, and the National Defense Transportation Association, both of which organizations render such great service to American shipping and the allied industries.

I am glad to say I am far from being a stranger to New Orleans. For some years I ran between New Orleans and Los Angeles, Mexico, Montevideo, and Buenos Aires, in the Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co. I passed for second mate in New Orleans. In addition I have the Mississippi River pilot's license from South Pass to Destrehan, some 30 miles above New Orleans, which I have kept current, although I should hate to have to use it again without some preliminary breaking in. I certainly hope you have straightened out the South Pass Bar so that ships no longer have to make that oblique approach with a hard right rudder at the crucial moment. Among my friends of those days were Mr. P. J. Dromgool, our marine superintendent; Mr. Cecil N. Bean, supervising inspector of the Steamship Inspection Service, who was one of the signers of my application when I took the examination for that service; Capt. Harry Koch who for some years has been vice president of the Avondale Marine Ways Inc., and is now also president of Koch-Ellis, Inc. In recent years I have made more friends and in addition have had the pleasure of meeting many of your shipping and transportation executives in the course of their visits to New York.

I am very grateful for the opportunity to meet with you here in New Orleans to discuss one of shipping's valuable assets—the United States Merchant Marine Academy. There has always existed a strong link between the shipping and transportation interests of the Gulf region and Kings Point, extending back to the time our basic school was established at Pass Christian in 1943 to cope with the increased demand for both merchant and naval reserve officers during World War II. This bond has become strengthened as more and more of our graduates have entered your employ as officers aboard your ships, and as a number of them, having become chief engineers and masters have been promoted into your shore employ. As an example I need only to invite attention to your Propeller Club of New Orleans vice president, Capt. J. V. Clark, and vice president of the Delta Line, a graduate of the Merchant Marine Cadet Corps, Class of 1940; Mr. Bartley W. Farrell, vice president, Standard Stevedoring Co., class of 1945; Capt. Richard E. McNeely, river pilot and secretary, Crescent River Port Pilots, class of 1943; Mr. Erik F. Johnsen, operations manager, States Marine Line, class of 1945; Mr. Lawrence J. Hill, average adjuster, C. A. Sporl & Co., class of 1943; Mr. David M., Brown, Jr., southern representative, the American Waterways Operators, Inc., and president of the Kings Point alumni chapter here, class of 1944; and other distinguished graduates too numerous to mention at this time.

The merchant fleet is one of our country's greatest assets. We prepare our cadets to be the servants of the merchant fleet in peacetime and in time of war.

I do not intend to go into what I am sure would be repetitious details of when the Academy was established, why it was established, the construction of its buildings, or the record of its accomplishments during World War II, or the details of its wartime courses. I do believe, however, that you will be interested in knowing a little more about what we are doing now in the way of training officers for a career at sea in the merchant marine, with a collateral status as Naval Reserve officers. Also you will be interested in knowing what our courses of the future will embrace insofar as we can see the picture at this time.

During World War II the courageous and heroic actions of Kings Pointers serving aboard merchant ships in war zones throughout the world won well deserved credit for themselves and the Corps from distinguished military leaders—Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz paid us a handsome tribute when he visited Kings Point and afterward sent me a photograph of the signing of the Japanese surrender on board the U. S. S. *Missouri*. He had written underneath: "In recognition of the part the Cadet-Midshipmen of Kings Point played in making the above scene possible." From Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the following telegram:

HONSHU, HOKKAIDO, JAPAN,
October 16, 1945.

SUPERINTENDENT, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY,
Kings Point, N. Y.:

I have directed that the surrender sword of Vice Admiral Ugaki, who commanded the Japanese naval forces of northern Honshu and Hokkaido be forwarded to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., as a memento of the valiant service rendered by the sons of the Academy in our struggle in the Pacific.

MACARTHUR,
Commander in Chief,
American Forces, Pacific.

Many a Kings Pointer spent long days and nights in a lifeboat after being forced to abandon ship after torpedoing. Many of them were lost with their ships right off the mouth of the Mississippi during the early days of the war. The percentage of casualties sustained by the merchant marine during the war was nearly as large as the 4 percent experienced by the Army and Navy. Kings Pointers numbered only 3.6 percent of the entire complement of the merchant marine but the Academy is proud of the fact that her sons won 6 percent of the distinguished service medals for outstanding acts of heroism. Two hundred and twelve Kings Pointers paid the supreme sacrifice in combat action during the war.

The Academy was formally accredited by the Middle States Association and has since then awarded the bachelor of science degree. We did not seek accreditation per se, we sought to graduate a highly professionally trained and well rounded officer, and we were awarded the accolade of accreditation because of the successful manner in which we were accomplishing our mission. We believe that today's merchant marine officer must be judged in terms of his general education, his physical superiority, and good practical ability, his belief in democracy, his attitude toward America's leadership in world affairs, his readiness to serve his country as well as his developed professional abilities to perform new and complex shipboard duties as he enters upon his sea career. We endeavor to inculate in him and to foster and mold the qualities of courage, loyalty, and integrity. In the confused and critical years which lie ahead he will be called upon to use more than a little of each. Education is essential. At the same time, without character and leadership, nothing is of any avail.

The young man who is admitted to the Merchant Marine Academy prepares for a definite goal: If he is to become a deck officer he takes one specified curriculum; if he aspires to be an engineering officer he takes another. In order to assist in promoting a proper working relationship between the deck and engine departments and to increase the efficiency of the ship as a whole, our deck cadets are given the rudiments of what we call engineering knowledge for deck officers, and, similarly, our engine cadets are given elementary instruction in the rudiments of navigation, etc.

To enter the Academy, he must take a competitive scholastic examination. To be eligible for consideration for appointment he must stand well up among those taking the examination. Then he is accepted for appointment within the population-determined State quotas and on the basis of demonstrated ability and promise. It is not believed the new permanency bill for the Academy will fundamentally change this procedure.

All of our cadet-midshipmen, so-called, must become accepted in the Reserve component of the Navy as a condition of their appointment to the Academy, and upon graduation they receive commissions as ensigns in the Naval Reserve.

I believe it is typical of a Kings Pointer that he is forehanded and efficient and knows how to obey and to command. It is necessary that our cadets learn to discipline themselves in order that they can discipline others. It is essential for a merchant officer just as it is for a naval officer. We have been complimented on the appearance of the Kings Point cadets. I want to tell you that except for our regular Saturday morning inspections we have no drill periods in our cur-

riculum, and the high standard which observers have been good enough to attribute to us comes, I believe, from that esprit de corps which is an integral part of every Kings Pointer.

You will note that in much the same way that the United States Military Academy is referred to as West Point, the United States Merchant Marine Academy is, because of its location in the village of Kings Point, known as Kings Point, and the cadets as Kings Pointers. Less than a mile away is the much larger village of Great Neck, and but for this accident of geography we might easily have been known as Great Neckers.

The Academy has enjoyed, indeed has been inspired, by the encouragement and cooperation it has received from the shipping industry.

The individual steamship companies and the organizations in which they are grouped demonstrate an active interest in the Academy and are most cooperative. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you gentlemen here, representing the steamship companies of the gulf area, for your demonstrated interest in our cadets during their course of training and for the employment opportunities you have offered them and continue to offer them upon their graduation. Knowing that most of you are active in the Propeller Club I should also tell you how much we appreciate the fine resolution with respect to Kings Point, and merchant marine officer training, sponsored by your group at the American Merchant Marine Conference in October last year.

For the betterment of Academy courses and the development of new ideas for the program, the advice and recommendations of the industry are sought. This applies not only to steamship operators but to companies related to maritime activities or serving the industry with machinery, boilers, and a variety of other equipment. A great many of these companies have responded most generously by giving us equipment and a number have stimulated interest on the part of cadet-midshipmen through the establishment of prizes for award at graduation.

I must also mention the assistance and encouragement we have always received from the armed services—the United States Merchant Marine Academy has always enjoyed a close liaison and the full cooperative support of the Navy, the Army, the Air Force and the Coast Guard, and the citizenry. When President Eisenhower was inaugurated the Navy very kindly transported our entire student body by ship to Washington, D. C., in order that it might participate in the inaugural parade. In addition, the Navy offers our first classmen the opportunity of making training cruises in naval vessels from time to time.

The Army has given Kings Point, as a Federal Academy, pride of place in the Armed Forces Day parade line of march in New York City immediately behind West Point.

These are, of course, highlights, but there is a constant interchange of helpful information and a continuing readiness on the part of the armed services—the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard to help Kings Point achieve its mission in every possible way.

On the 10th anniversary of the dedication of the Academy, President Eisenhower sent a congratulatory telegram which expressed the hope that "the United States Merchant Marine Academy continue in the years ahead to prepare young Americans for leadership in our modern merchant marine."

Senator Lachèvre, head of the French Senate Committee for Merchant Marine Affairs, visited the Academy last year in connection with a French program to coordinate all of their scattered training schools in one federal institution. He appeared to be very favorably impressed with Kings Point, and in fact this concluding comment was: "C'est magnifique." We were constrained not to disagree with him. Subsequently we received a very nice letter from the French Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Maurice Couve de Murville.

The enrollment at Kings Point is approximately 750 in residence, with a class, the third class, of about 220 at sea. We take in something over 300 cadets each year and each year graduate in the neighborhood of 200—that is to say, 100 deck officers and 100 engineer officers. While no one knows better than you, gentlemen, the fluctuations of the maritime industry and the varying periods of overemployment and underemployment, it is generally agreed that on a long-range basis a minimum of 1,200 replacement officers are required annually. Of this number, the Federal academy and the State maritime academies are now providing nearly 500. It will be seen, therefore, that opportunity for advancement from the ranks remains open for outstanding, unlicensed personnel. At present, the balance of the annual required replacement is furnished from the unlicensed categories—some 700.

I should like, here, to pay a tribute to those officers of the merchant marine who have come up "through the hawse pipe." This includes some of our outstanding merchant marine officers. There are always a goodly number of cadet-midshipmen at Kings Point who have come from before the mast, and naturally they are among our best, having chosen the sea as their profession and then having done something about bettering themselves.

In our studies of the background, educational and employment experiences, of the young men who come to Kings Point, we have noted with satisfaction that the number of candidates who have had previous service aboard a ship is increasing from year to year. In our present plebe class, which entered the Academy last August, 41 of the three-hundred-odd entering cadet-midshipmen, or 12 percent, had previous sea experience. It is interesting to note, too, that in this class over 100 of the young men have near relatives who have served in either the merchant marine, Navy, or Coast Guard as a career. We believe this to be a good sign, indicating that men of the sea are influencing the careers of their sons and nephews, bringing to the profession men with salt water in their veins.

We are not completely satisfied with the number of candidates from the sea. We are making every effort to increase the percentage and have begun a program which we hope will lead to a still greater number of applications from young men who have already gained experience at sea and have found it to be the career of their choice. We are embarking upon a program to distribute press releases concerning scheduled entrance examinations to officials of all seamen's unions. These releases include general information regarding basic eligibility requirements and tell how one can obtain additional detailed information about entering Kings Point. We will attempt to secure space in various union periodicals for the purpose of regularly and periodically presenting information about entrance requirements. We are going to endeavor to arrange, through union officials, for the display of Academy posters and information on bulletin boards in union hiring halls. Finally, our cadet-midshipmen themselves, when they go aboard ship during their second year, will be better prepared in the future to tell the story of Kings Point and its opportunities to any qualified young man with whom they are shipmates.

We do, as many of you know, credit an applicant who has had previous sea experience with a bonus of 5 points on the competitive scholastic test and, in addition, a waiver in age is granted up to age 23 for men who have been in the Merchant Marine and in the Armed Forces. It has been suggested that this allowance be increased. Our problem here, however, is the danger of accepting a young man who does not have the ability to complete the program. It would be quite unfair to a young man if we accepted him for appointment, knowing ourselves that his standing in the examination indicated his inability to keep up with the course of study.

It is our hope that a good percentage of the young men serving aboard ships of the American merchant marine today will set Kings Point as their goal. We hope they will continue to study at sea, prepare themselves for the competitive examination as well as in those subjects that constitute the courses of studies at the Academy. The United States Maritime Service Institute formerly conducted courses for men at sea, but it is our understanding that they are now being successfully handled by the Maritime Studies Institute in New York City, a private organization.

Reverting to our curricula and training procedures, I should like to say that in keeping with postwar trends, extensive use is made of training aids, both audio and visual, but mention of the practical aspects of the curriculum is hardly complete unless reference is made to the conventional laboratories, such as the drafting room, navigational chartroom, physics, chemistry, thermodynamics, strength of materials and hydraulic laboratories. Certain special laboratories, however, are also provided: the gyro lab, the planetarium, the steam and diesel laboratories, the engine-repair laboratory, and the electrical laboratory. The electronics laboratory deserves particular mention. Here the deck cadet-midshipmen are taught theory and practical use of radiotelephones, depth finders or fathometers, radar, and loran.

At the Academy we are alert to changes within the industry which indicate the desirability of changes in our curriculum. For example, indicative of a new marine trend, there will be a gas turbine powered converted liberty ship operating next summer. We have offered gas turbine instruction for some time, and this ship, the *John Sargent*, will have a Kings Pointer, Mr. William Van Cott, as her chief engineer.

Our preparations for nuclear training are further illustrative. On November 11, 1955, addressing the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers at its annual meeting in New York, the Honorable Clarence G. Morse, the Maritime Administrator, said: "This very week we have invited proposals and prices from manufacturers covering a nuclear propulsion plant for a merchant ship. We are asking them, contingent on Congressional approval and funds, to furnish us with a nuclear propulsion plant to be fitted in a tanker-type vessel by June 1959. We are also asking them to submit other proposals for design studies and developments for a nuclear propulsion plan which may offer greater technical and economic advantages for the purpose of having a second ship in operation by June 1961."

Anticipating developments such as these, we at Kings Point have long been planning the program which will be required to train the officers of the future for the ships of the future. Our first task was to determine the qualifications required of the engineering officers of these nuclear ships-to-be. Fundamentally, the marine nuclear engineer will need to be a well qualified steam engineer with "something plus," and this something plus will involve additional education in nuclear physics, nuclear engineering, and prac-

tical experience in the operation of a reactor. * * * The responsibility of the Academy then is to produce engineers with a sound knowledge of marine steam propulsion plants, a background in nuclear physics and study in nuclear engineering.

For the past 14 years we have been in the business of training marine engineers, and the competency of our graduates is a matter of record. As early as 1949, we undertook to develop in our cadet-midshipmen an interest in nuclear energy, and at that time we sponsored at the Academy a public forum the Citizen in the Atomic Age, with Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves as the principal speaker. Since that time, we have arranged for a number of exhibits on atomic energy, including a permanent panel display showing the schematic flow of nuclear power from the point of its generation in the reactor, through the heat exchangers, to the turbine, to the generator, constructed by Westinghouse and given to us by the Hayden Planetarium; a model of a nuclear-powered merchant ship, provided through the courtesy of the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co.; a model of the *Nautilus* loaned by the General Dynamics Corp.; a power reactor exhibit loaned by Babcock & Wilcox; and a research reactor model provided by the American Machine & Foundry Corp.

In 1950 we gave our first course in the fundamentals of nuclear energy to a selected group of cadet-midshipmen. Since that time time there has been an increasing demand on the part of the young men for this course which as it is now given, includes a detailed study of the atomic structure and atomic particles, of electrons, protons and neutrons, of radiation instrumentation, of nuclear reactions, and of that most important of all known reactions—the fission of uranium—235.

As I said previously, our courses must be geared to the needs of the industry. It now seems that a nuclear-powered merchant ship may be authorized. We are now prepared to undertake the nuclear engineering phase of our program. In preparation for this day, several members of our engineering faculty have been doing graduate study in the field of nuclear engineering. With the beginning of the new term, in March, we hope to offer a course which will treat with nuclear theory, reactor types, and construction features; fuel and fuel elements, shielding problems; types and characteristics of coolants and coolant pumps; heat exchangers; radiation control; radiation detectors and permissible dosages; safety devices and instrumentation; shielding and insulation; radioactive waste disposal; operation, maintenance, and permissible repair procedures as applied to shipboard operation of a marine nuclear-power plant.

Ultimately, the training in reactor operation will need be a part of the engineering program at the United States Merchant Marine Academy. As more and more atomic reactors power our merchant fleet, the number of engineers trained in their operation must be expanded. At that time, the Academy should have its own training reactor in operation. While that day is still far in the future, we must continue to look ahead and plan in order that we may have ready the officers of the future to man the ships of the future.

A year or two ago, Mr. Jimmy Jemail, the inquiring photographer of the New York Daily News, asked me what I thought about flying saucers. I managed to get around that one by telling him that if and when flying saucers came into general use Kings Pointers would navigate them. I should like to say now, but in a more serious vein, that when atomic ships make their appearance, Kings Pointers will definitely operate them—not exclusively, but certainly well in the van.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Hon. Frank G. Clement, Governor of Tennessee, Addresses Dinner Honoring Cordell Hull, Statesman—Author of Good Neighbor Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday evening, last, the Washington Committee of the Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education held a dinner meeting to honor the great Tennessean and also to discuss further plans for the education foundation which will honor Cordell Hull, distinguished Tennessean and late Secretary of State. The principal address of this occasion was delivered by Gov. Frank G. Clement, of Tennessee.

Governor Clement is one of the Nation's outstanding young men in public life and service and is a speaker of renown. As chairman of the board of directors of the Cordell Hull Foundation, Governor Clement is lending his energies and fine abilities to the promotion of this splendid work—to the creation of a living memorial and the perpetuation of the memory of Cordell Hull.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the address of Governor Clement before the Washington Committee of the Cordell Hull Foundation in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Governor Clement's address follows:

GOVERNOR CLEMENT'S ADDRESS BEFORE CORDELL HULL FOUNDATION DINNER, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 27, 1956

Tennessee politicians used to tell an anecdote on Cordell Hull. It may since have been attributed to others, but the old timers insist it originated with Hull. It was said that the then Member of the National House of Representatives was returning to Tennessee on the train in company with a fast-talking friend who, observing as they looked out of the window at a greening hill, a flock of sheep that had been newly sheared, said, "Why, look at these sheep; they've been sheared." And Hull, after a deliberate inspection, agreed, "Why, yes; they do seem to have been sheared on this side."

That aspect of Hull's nature was well known to his friends and acquaintances. But Cordell Hull was not only a cautious and matter-of-fact man, he also was a visionary.

It was the combination of his commonsense and his vision that made a reality out of our good-neighbor policy.

Good-neighbor policy. That phrase, as introduced by President Roosevelt in his inaugural address in 1933, had not been intended to designate any particular locality. But Cordell Hull then saw, as he later said—I quote him: "I felt that our principles could have little effect in the world unless they produced a bounteous harvest in our own neighborhood."

He then set out to make it mean something right here in the Americas. It was an arduous, and some thought, Quixotic undertaking, for the relations between the United States and the American republics to the south of us at that time were indeed vexed.

How well Hull succeeded is dramatically implied by the fact that the term "good neighbor policy" came to be the peculiar name by which United States inter-American relations were designated.

Yet, my distinguished listeners, I am not sure that even that tribute measures for us the significance of Mr. Hull's success, or the range of his vision.

Let us pause for a moment to place his arduous and quixotic undertaking in historical perspective.

When President Monroe enunciated his famous doctrine in 1823, we had but recently broken the political bonds of our own colonial condition and our main concern with the American Colonies to the south of us was that they not give way to a new and perhaps aggressive imperial power. Internally we were absorbed in the conquest of our own continent and could give no interest to the internal problems of Latin Americans. We remained sideline rooters during the following years in which Latin American republics established their independence and repelled aggression, until the final round. We did intervene in 1898, in what we called the Spanish-American War.

Under President Theodore Roosevelt, and then beginning to feel our industrial might, we developed what might be termed a big brotherly interest in the younger members of the American family of republics. It also bore the name of intervention.

World War I ushered us, with whatever misgivings, into the place of a world power—and the years following, chiefly because of our mass-production-technology system, increased our industrial might fantastically. We were beginning to mature. Yet our attitude of provincial impatience toward our fellow American republics did not change until Mr. Hull took office.

He has summarized the inter-American situation at that hour.

"Over a long period until almost 1933 the United States had pursued policies toward some of the Latin American nations of so arbitrary—and what some of those countries considered so overbearing—a nature that prejudice and feeling through Central and South America against our country were sharp indeed.

"Our inheritance of ill will was grim. It was probated under the name of intervention: intervention in Panama to separate Panama from Colombia and build the Panama Canal; intervention in Mexico; intervention in Cuba; intervention in Haiti; intervention in Nicaragua.

"Piled high on political antagonism was economic resentment. The high tariffs of preceeding administrations, coupled with the panic of 1929, had brought grave economic distress to the Latin American countries."

Some of you may remember that our Latin American trade shrunk by three-quarters between 1929 and 1933. And the year before the Democrats came in, some of the Latin American countries, stung by our high tariffs, actually conferred with one another to form a customs union for defensive action against us.

"Good neighbor policy." Hull saw that it had—in his own words, "to embrace a broad and basic set of mutually beneficial principles, political, economic and moral. But policies and principles were not enough. * * * We should have to give them acts as well as words * * * but action, even though right, was not enough. It also had to be highly delicate and tactful."

And he made the bedrock of those mutually beneficial principles: "A religious adherence to nonintervention."

Coming from the reconstructed South, Mr. Hull knew something about intervention from the Latin American point of view.

"Highly delicate and tactful"; in those words Hull expressed the essential quality of the action that has developed good neighborly relations among the Americas, and in

those words he still points the way to the future.

Even in the disorganized and dismal days at the beginning, he spoke of the future with confident prophesy. "I think that commerce will develop and progress more during the next generation through the leadership of the people of North and South America than any other people on the planet."

And true to that prophesy we in the United States today find that Latin America provides our greatest nondomestic market—our trade last year amounted to about $3½ billion each way, or 40 percent of all our foreign trade.

I will not labor here a record that I am sure you are all familiar with. It should suffice for me to recall the four inter-American conferences in which Hull personally led the United States delegations in the succeeding 7 years—Montevideo in 1933, Buenos Aires in 1936, Lima in 1938, and Habana in 1940, where his now historic Pact of Habana, guaranteeing hemisphere solidarity in case of armed attack, was adopted unanimously. Actions taken at these meetings formed the keystone of the present Organization of American States.

I believe we can all agree that the good-neighbor policy among the Americas will take its place alongside the Monroe Doctrine in its historical significance and that Cordell Hull is its father.

Perhaps more clearly than any other North American of his day, Cordell Hull saw how much good neighborliness among the Americas depended on mutual understanding. As clearly, he saw the role of reciprocal education in developing it.

A group of leaders who believed in his vision and were concerned for the development of inter-American relations established in Nashville about 5 years ago the Cordell Hull Foundation for International Education, with his blessing.

"I am deeply grateful for the honor you have conferred upon me by associating my name with this foundation for closer cultural cooperation between the peoples of our own, and the other American Republics, with whose leaders it was my privilege to be associated so many years," he said.

"Better understanding and collaboration among the free nations of the world, and more intimate contacts among their citizens, are desperately needed in the present world situation. It is especially important that the citizens of each of the independent countries of this hemisphere cultivate a proper knowledge and appreciation of the institutions and civilizations, the accomplishments and aspirations of all the others. There is no more effective way in which to further this cause than through a properly organized educational interchange such as that in which your organization is engaged.

"Only through such activities can we hope that men and women everywhere will keep alive and constantly renew faith in the dignity of the individual, in institutions of government founded upon the consent of the governed, and in enduring peace based on freedom and justice. These are the abiding values of a truly Christian civilization, and their preservation requires faith in their eternal worth, stanch determination to uphold them and willingness to make whatever sacrifices may be needed to that end."

The foundation's development and progress originally was assigned to Vanderbilt University. The leaders found, however, within a short time, that it needed wider horizons and contacts than we were able to provide in Tennessee, and at this juncture International House in New Orleans renewed its previous offer to administer the work since it was embarked upon similar educational activity and had accumulated much experience and background in educational matters.

About 2 years ago, the foundation was transferred from Vanderbilt University, with Tennessee's blessing, to New Orleans where International House generously undertook by contract for $1 a year, to carry forward this great program.

After Mr. Hull's death a few months ago, the late Mr. R. S. Hecht, Mr. A. E. Hegewisch, and Mr. Charles Nutter, officers of the foundation, paid me a call in the State capitol in Nashville, and offered me the chairmanship of the board. In my capacity as Governor of Tennessee, I accepted immediately and henceforth the governor of the State that gave Cordell Hull to the world will hold this high honor.

It is in behalf of the foundation and its 5-year campaign to raise $10 million endowment that I come before you this evening—come before you, I may say, wholly convinced of its importance.

Wholly convinced that the $10-million endowment will prove to be, not a donation on the part of those who contribute it, but an investment.

An investment that will repay itself in the stimulus it will bring to economic development of undeveloped areas in the Americas—an investment that will multiply and fortify many opportunities there for profitable enterprise.

An investment that will repay itself in the peace and security of the Americas.

And my conviction in this matter, my friends, does not come of hearsay. Nor do I have it merely on the authority of others. A few weeks ago, I completed a month's tour of South America. That inspection has deeply impressed me with the importance of the Cordell Hull Foundation's inter-American aims.

There are many here who know much more about South America than I do. My brief brush with that continent and our mutual problems and opportunities there has not qualified me as an expert. But I offer myself as exhibit A: An average American citizen who has been given the unusual opportunity of a 30-day tour in the company of a select group of Latin-American-minded businessmen, a tour through nearly every South American country, where in each country leaders received us sympathetically and to whom we listened and with whom we exchanged views about our mutual problems.

I assure you I am not an expert. But no man can travel 15,000 miles on a mission, visit 10 countries and 16 cities, talk with the presidents of 5 Republics, the ministers of education of 9 with hundreds of other people from ambassadors to oxcart drivers, without forming some impressions and even a few opinions. I will try to confine this to my impressions.

The Americas. God and geography made us neighbors. What with one small hemisphere among us, nothing could be more obvious than the need to be good neighbors. And we have been, since 1933, increasingly good neighbors.

Let me remind you how good with a few summary facts and figures—and how great the need to be good.

Latin American markets are as important to the United States as all of Europe and more important than Asia, Africa, and the Oceania combined.

About 30 percent of all United States private long term foreign investment is in Latin America—more than $6 billion.

The economic wellbeing of every section and every special interest group in the United States is affected by our relations with Latin America.

Latin American military strength is relatively small, yet Latin American resources are vital to the strength of a free world.

Therefore, the strength of the United States is an essential to the freedom, independence, and prosperity of the other nations of this hemisphere.

Highly disciplined groups of Communists are busy, night and day, illegally and openly, in the American Republics. Their success anywhere in Latin America would quickly change all security maps.

None of my fellow Americans that I met on the southern continent was looking for a handout. What they did seek universally was an exchange of goods and services for mutual profit. They lack highways, they lack industry, they lack industrial know-how—in most of the South American countries. But their undeveloped resources are enormous and South America's population and wealth are growing faster than any comparable territory in the world today.

The present rate of 2.5 percent population increase per year exceeds that of any other major region of the world, and is at least twice that of the world average.

The rise in wealth and economy is double that of the population rise.

No one denies that these nations face great problems but the opportunities they offer are far greater.

If we have been important to each other in the past, it is my belief that that is not even a preview of what we can be to each other in the future, and it is scarcely a glimpse of the mutual political, economic, and cultural worth that a closer relationship might bring to us. There is, however, a condition to our attainment of this happy state.

A distinguished citizen of Bolivia, last year reviewing the wide cultural differences between Latin America and the United States, concluded, "then the Latin American and the North American ought to admit, man to man, that no fit of enthusiasm, over a couple of cocktails, can make either of them start a new life just to please the other fellow."

I agree with the soundness of that view. But even that sort of a man-to-man agreement calls for a greater understanding of our differences than many of us now have.

"Abiding cooperation between the United States and the other nations of this hemisphere will not be the result of wishful thinking or mere accident," said Milton Eisenhower's report to the President. "Rather, it will flow only from adherence to consistent programs, honorably and consistently observed." Let me say amen to that and continue to quote as he puts first things first—I quote:

"The first requisite for good relations among nations is, as we have said, genuine understanding—understanding among governments and peoples." End of quote.

And there is no other known way of bringing about genuine understanding, save by education—education in some one form or another. And, as such, Cordell Hull recognized the importance of the educational foundation in behalf of which I appeal to you tonight.

The idea is not new to us. Already thousands of Latin American students are attending our universities, and we have opened our doors and our hearts to them all. They come among us in increasing numbers each year, and we learn things from them and about them, and they take home the things we know to use in development of their own countries. We welcome this contribution to a developing profitable relationship—we want to expand it.

Doctors trained in this country joined Latin-American-trained doctors in stamping out many diseases which help to keep the population increase in check, a factor promarily responsible for the phenomenal population growth noted. Our engineers, our scientists, our chemists and others have done much to train Latin Americans for work in Latin America, and American equipment has moved in rapidly behind this trailblazing.

The student of today is the leader of tomorrow—be it in finance, business, industry or government. Within 20 or 30 years from

the day a Latin American student graduates we may expect to find him in a position of importance and trust.

But we have little more than brushed the surface. And there seems to be in this country among many a faulty conception of the sort of educational interchange that is needed. It seemed to me better understood everywhere I went among the South American countries.

Every minister of education, every President with whom I talked was alert to the opportunity that the Cordell Hull Foundation offered for training and educating the youth of their respective countries. And they were enthusiastic about it.

Many of them were ready to take immediate advantage of the foundation's scholarships. For example, in Argentina, Dr. Atilio Dell 'Oro Maini proposed at once to send a doctor to the United States to make specialized studies in tuberculosis and to observe United States development in this field.

And I might add here incidentally, that since Tennessee has one of the best tuberculosis experimental centers in the country, I offered to make the way smooth for him with the State institutions, should he be sent to Tennessee—we were doing a brisk business there right away.

And again in Ecuador, Dr. Hector Romero Menendez of the University of Guayaquil, proposed to bring a group of from 12 to 15 students from his school of economics over here for a 7-weeks intensive course in English, history, economics and United States business know-how.

As I said, the South American educational leaders were alert to the importance of education to our mutual understanding and they were warm in their endorsemnt of the Cordell Hull Foundation, but everywhere they said the same thing.

The affable and witty President of Uruguay, Luis Batlle Berras, put it pleasantly. When we told him that we were promoting a reciprocal education program through the Cordell Hull Foundation, he said quickly, "We are way ahead of you in that respect. If you will stop any school boy in my country, be he in the city or the country, you will find out he knows a lot about your country."

Then he shrugged and added with a smile, "I plan to be in the United States soon, but I will not embarrass any American school boy during my visit by asking him the same question about Uruguay."

Yes, everywhere we went educational leaders were intensely interested in the Cordell Hull Foundation and their chief interest was in the reciprocal aspect of the educational interchange of our program. This is an aspect of mutual understanding that we in the United States have been inclined to overlook. In viewing the undeveloped areas of various American lands to our south, we are sharply aware of what they lack in the material form of roads, and mills and sewers and plumbing and automobiles and in the skills of merchandising and manufacturing and technical know-how generally, that contribute to modern industrial production. In short, we have been keenly aware of their educational needs to understand and deal with us, but we have been unaware of what we need to know—or how we need to know it—to understand and deal with them.

It is the purpose of the Cordell Hull Foundation to promote among the peoples of North and South America a reciprocal educational program.

Our incidental mission on the southern continent was to reorganize the committees, local to each country, for promoting interest in the foundation scholarships and screening applicants and to organize new committees in countries where they did not exist. This was successfully carried out and we are prepared greatly to extend the service that the foundation may perform.

We hope that the funds we plan to raise will educate at least 300 worthy and needy students annually in a wholesome interchange between the United States and the other American republics.

This prospect would warm the heart of Cordell Hull because he had a vibrant and constant interest in education as a means to fuller understanding between the peoples of the Americas.

We feel that it does us honor in Tennessee to honor the memory of one of us who came from the Tennessee hills to leave his mark upon the world—

Who served 12 troubled years, longer than any other man, as Secretary of State of our Nation.

Who established the good neighbor policy in Latin America and launched reciprocal trade treaties that still stand as the most concrete advance toward the removal of trade barriers.

Who fathered the United Nations, man's current forum for peace and order in the world and civilization's best assurance against another fatal world war.

And whose career of international achievement won him the Nobel peace prize, man's greatest recognition and accolade to man.

And we feel that there is no more fitting way to honor him than through the living memorial of this educational foundation that bears his name.

The General Assembly of Tennessee found the Cordell Hull Foundation of sufficient worth as a perpetual memorial to an illustrious son—and of sufficient worth to the future peace and development of Tennessee and the United States to make an appropriation for the foundation 2 years ago. I confidently expect to see the next General Assembly of Tennessee renew and increase the amount of that appropriation.

Yet the foundation program is not a local enterprise, either in its service or in our responsibility for it and I recommend it to the consideration of our national Government as well as to the consideration of private citizens in all parts of this country.

And to you who have or seek to have a material Inter-American interest, I repeat that this continent to the south of us is the fastest-growing region on earth. In the next half century, Latin America's population is expected to double that of the United States and Canada. The greatest market the world has ever seen or perhaps will ever see, is growing with explosive force before your very eyes.

Collectively, on both continents, we have still greater and higher aims. We are mutually interested, in the first place, in peace with honor. In the interest of this honorable peace we put up a united front in the family of nations. We must not be content, however, to be united and weak in spots; hence, our mutual economic development is essential to bring to this union all the strength we can muster.

In the name of the Cordell Hull Foundation, I want to propose a further and natural development in the Good Neighbor policy—and one that would warm Cordell Hull's heart—to the end of introducing a new era among us. I want tonight to dedicate the Cordell Hull Foundation to the achievement of that new day—the day in which good American neighbors grow into best friends.

Friendship is a two-way street. We can accomplish only half of our purpose by bringing South American students to the United States. We must send our boys and girls to Latin America, if we are to beget the understanding on which real fellowship builds.

The Master said, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of God." Now we know that that won't keep a rich man out of Heaven, but it does give him a heavier responsibility than those more lightly burdened. As with a man, so with a nation. And let us remind ourselves, those of us who constitute figuratively rich Uncle Sam that we have the greater responsibility—the responsibility to stand united and strong, but also to offer hope to the hopeless and relief to the distressed of the world.

At our last stop, Bogota, Colombia, I sat in the office of the Minister of Education, Dr. Gabriel Betancur Mejia. I had told him we were already good neighbors, now we wanted to be become best friends. He smiled and replied, "I agree. But friendship can only come through faith; faith in each other, and in God."

One day, during my stay in Brazil, I stood on top of Corcovado Mountain at the foot of the famous statue there and looked back toward the valley, where, below a broken strata of fleecy clouds, there appeared mistily the spires and towers and structures of the distant city of Rio de Janeiro and, abutting it, the bright water of the bay and beyond, the plain, stretching away out of sight. And I remembered I was so high up that far below me, I could see a transport plane, like a metallic dragon fly, approaching the city.

Then I looked upward at that giant, white, marble figure of the Master—that mountaintop, overshadowing, watchful, gentle-faced figure of Jesus Christ—and I knew in my heart that I faced the symbol of inter-American unity. I knew in my heart that, whatever our future human failures might be, as long as the spirit here venerated watched over us and received our worship, the way to fast friendship was sure.

I thank you.

Statehood and Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring to the attention of the Members an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner reprinted in the January 14, 1956, issue of the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times:

FIVE MILES AWAY

The political news from Washington gives the strong impression that Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood bills in the new session of Congress will have the support of the administration, and if true this is important news.

For some inexplicable reason the Eisenhower administration opposed statehood for Alaska at the last session, although approving the same status for Hawaii, and since the two matters were considered jointly both fell by the wayside.

This was unfortunate for many reasons, first because Alaska and Hawaii are equally and fully entitled to full membership in the American family of States, and their people have been rated as second-class citizens and Americans too long.

The second and bigger reason is that the progress and prosperity of the whole Nation would be served in a major way by taking Alaska and Hawaii into the Union.

The third reason and biggest of all is that the security of America urgently requires that Alaska and Hawaii be integral parts of the United States and not remain as vulnerable appendages and mere expendable outposts as they are now and will continue to be as long as statehood is denied them.

For a background against which this third and biggest reason may be properly viewed,

we recommend the appraisal given by Gen. Joseph H. Atkinson, the American military commander in Alaska, in a copyrighted interview with the magazine U. S. News & World Report.

His primary interest is of course in Alaska, and since there is not much controversy over Hawaiian statehood any more—it simply got boxed out in the Alaska debate—his remarks apply particularly to the wisdom and the need of getting our northern outpost into the family.

What General Atkinson said was that the people who think of Soviet Russia as being remote from America are making a bad mistake.

Declaring that if America is ever attacked by Soviet Russia the shortest route and quickest way for the enemy to reach us will be from the Murmansk area and the Siberian Peninsula across the polar basin, he said this puts the Russians not thousands of miles but a mere stone's throw away.

"Their seacoast peninsula out there through the Bering Strait is only 55 miles from Cape Prince of Wales, American territory on the Seward Peninsula, so that the 2 peninsulas are only 50 miles apart. Of course, our closest geographical point of contact with the Soviet Union is at the Big and Little Diomedes—Big Diomede belonging to the Soviet, and Little Diomede belonging to us, and that's only a difference of 5 miles."

With our potential enemy 5 miles and fewer minutes away, it is suicidal folly to leave anything undone that might make Alaska less vulnerable to attack.

Until Alaska is made a State, we have not done all that is necessary and all that is in our power to make the risks of war too great for taking by the Russians.

Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations, of which I am a member, submitted its report.

The committee made no attempt to interpret the data presented, and I have no quarrel with the report. However, I do believe that it is possible for the report to be misinterpreted unless additional facts are given. Knowing that the committee under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY] does not want such misinterpretation to result I submit for the RECORD the statement of the United States Post Office Department analyzing the report:

STATEMENT OF THE UNITED STATES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT ANALYZING THE REPORT OF JANUARY 30, 1956, OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND POSTAL OPERATIONS, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON GENERAL AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, DECENTRALIZATION, AND REORGANIZATION OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, JANUARY 30, 1956

The Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations (of the House of Representatives Committee on Post Office and Civil Service) has released its report of January 30, 1956, entitled "Report on General and Financial Management, Decentralization, and Reorganization of the Post Office Department."

While the report disclaims any intention of interpreting figures, it nevertheless presents data which, standing alone, could lead to incorrect inferences unless accompanied by fuller analysis.

The Post Office Department has therefore prepared the accompanying statement in an effort to provide an authoritative and more complete interpretation of the figures reported in summary in the subcommittee's report.

The Department believes that the statements, figures, and facts herein will clarify any inquiry that might be prompted by a reading of the subcommittee report.

FISCAL ADMINISTRATION

The subcommittee report, by not interpreting the figures used, unfortunately fails to give the present postal administration deserved credit for the economies it has initiated and the savings it has captured.

Table C of the subcommittee report shows a reduction, between 1953 and 1955, of $62 million in the operating deficit; this is described as being related to mail volume and management activities. At the bottom of page 2, the report implies that costs increased substantially for personnel, facilities, and management, and that these increases were overcome by relief from airline subsidies and savings in transportation.

The $62 million figure, being a single net amount which combines the effect of increased volume, savings, capital expenditures, and many other elements, effectively obscures most of the facts about the operational savings achieved by postal management since 1953. The implication that expenses increased considerably and that these expense increases were largely offset by relief from subsidies and transportation savings is similarly unfortunate.

An accurate method of measuring improvement in efficiency of the Department is to compare the change in operating expenditures between 1953 and 1955, and then take into account the change in total volume of mail handled. To do this, of course, actual expenditures must be adjusted, as the subcommittee report does to some extent in its table C, to eliminate the effect of wage-rate increases and other items not equally affecting the various years, and other factors not relating to the efficiency of operations.

Exhibit I, attached hereto, is a summary showing the various major elements making up the changes in figures between these years. It is based upon and ties into the subcommittee's summary statement of 1953 and 1955 expenditures appearing in its table A.

This new comparison in exhibit I shows that the Post Office Department decreased its operating costs in 1955 from 1953, despite the fact that it handled 8.4 percent more mail in 1955 than it did in 1953:

[In millions]

	1953	1955
Total costs (table A subcommittee report)	$2,722.6	$2,712.2
Deduct airline subsidies and other subsequently eliminated costs	93.2	----------
Total	2,629.4	2,712.2
Add amounts borne in 1955 for subsequently added costs of pay increases, fringe benefits, and railroad rate increases	78.5	----------
Total	2,707.9	2,712.2
Less increase in capital expenditures	----------	13.5
Comparable costs	2,707.9	2,698.7
Percent decrease	----------	.4
Mail volume (millions of pieces)	50,948.2	55,233.6
Percent increase	----------	8.4

In terms of cost per piece of mail handled, the foregoing table reveals that in 1953 the cost averaged 5.32 cents compared with 4.89 cents for 1955, a reduction of 8.1 percent.

Even the foregoing is not complete in measuring efficiency. As shown in exhibit I, one of the major increases in cost in 1955 was the deliberate and necessary expansion of the city carrier service to meet the needs of the growing geographical spread of urban and suburban populations. In order to meet these uncontrollable service needs, the Department added more than 7,000 carrier routes in the 2-year period and thereby increased its expenditures for carrier services in 1955 about $44.7 million over 1953 (excluding the wage increase).

The significance of this service expansion may be measured by the fact that the number of man-years of carrier service increased by 10,000 in 1955 over 1953 (8 percent); the number of carrier routes increased 7,000 (9.3 percent), and the number of families served increased by 3.5 million (11.3 percent).

If this abnormal service situation had not existed, the comparable expenditures in 1955 would have been 2 percent lower than 1953, and the unit cost of handling a piece of mail would have shown as 4.81 cents compared to 5.32 cents for 1953, a reduction of 9.6 percent.

With all items on a basis of accounting comparability and with increases in capital expenditures and abnormal circumstances eliminated, these statistics are the measure of the management efficiency of the Department during this period. This is the way the efficiency of any business would be measured.

The statement of the subcommittee report that the reduction of the deficit is due to the absence of major increases in cost coupled with some postage-rate increases and relief from airline subsidies overlooks some major factors. The data in the preceding analysis and in exhibit I includes all factors, and the favorable results shown thereby are supported by data as to the usage of manpower in handling the increased mail volume.

The following is a table making this comparison between 1953 and 1955:

	1953	1955	Percent change
Total man-years	510,439	512,047	+0.3
Less city delivery	124,312	134,254	+8.0
Man-years excluding city delivery	386,127	377,793	−2.2
Mail volume (billions)	50.9	55.2	+8.4

Thus, despite the 8.4 percent mail volume increase the total years of employment increased only three-tenths of 1 percent.

Actually the record of this administration of the Post Office is better than that. If city-delivery service is excluded as a factor of comparison (since as previously indicated it is influenced primarily by residential expansion and not by increase in mail volume) there has been an actual decrease in manpower usage in post offices and elsewhere of 2.2 percent since 1953. With an 8.4 percent increase in volume this indicates an increase in working efficiency of more than 10 percent.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS REDUCED

The subcommittee report on the savings effected by the Department in the area of transportation is accurate, as far as it goes, and reflects considerable credit on the present administration.

It is true as the subcommittee report states that (after eliminating the effect of railroad rate increases) there was a saving of $47.3 million in the transportation of mail by rail.

But again, this is only a fraction of the story available by reference to all the figures.

The subcommittee properly notes the fact that certain events occurred to reduce trans-

portation costs which are not really creditable as economies realized by the postal management.

Specifically these items consist of $70.7 million in relief from airline subsidies; reimbursement from the military for the cost of transporting surface mail to the Armed Forces overseas (actually amounting to $2.5 million); and reduction in backlog in foreign terminal and transit charges in 1953 (the amount applying to prior years is actually $7.1 million). The sum of these costs borne in 1953 but not in 1955 is $80.3 million (see exhibit I).

As the subcommittee's table A clearly shows, the net reduction in all transportation costs from 1953 to 1955 was $118 million, after absorbing a railroad rate increase of $31.3 million. This means there was a total reduction in transportation costs of $149.3 million in 2 years. Of this only $80.3 million was the result of the relief from airline subsidies and other items ctied by the subcommittee.

The management savings in transportation, therefore, amount to $69 million in the 2 years ($149.3 million less $80.3 million). This amount includes savings in rail transportation (as stated by the subcommittee), air transportation (including savings resulting from rate reductions ordered by the CAB upon petition by the Department), and miscellaneous net savings in all other transportation costs.

This is a reduction of 13.6 percent in transportation costs achieved in the face of an 8.4 percent increase in mail volume.

Two further points regarding transportation in the subcommittee's report warrant comment. One is that the discontinuance of considerable weekend RPO service which it mentions as a factor in producing savings was a discontinuance of unnecessary service that did not affect the delivery of the mails adversely.

The other is that the acknowledgment that the Department saved $27 million per annum under new arrangements with the railroads does not credit the fact that this was the result of many hundreds of individual actions negotiated by the Department to bring railroad charges to a space-used basis in order to make these charges competitive with other transportation means.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION PROGRAM

As the subcommittee report states, decentralization of postal operations was urged as early as 1908 by the Penrose-Overstreet Commission. It was also urged at various times in the 45 intervening years as the accumulation of redtape in the Department grew increasingly serious.

By November 1953, when the program was begun by the present administration, the postal system had grown to five times the size it was in 1908, when the need was first officially advanced.

The report, while not actually attacking the principle of decentralization itself, implies criticism of the manner in which the Department has put it into effect.

The subcommittee report states that the Department did not follow the recommendations of the first Hoover Commission to the letter. Actually, the Department established its regionalization under the guidance of the firm of management consultants that had first investigated the Department for the Hoover Commission and formulated its recommendations.

There were some slight departures from the original recommendations, since refinements and modifications are bound to take place in any such massive undertaking when broad plans are being translated into actual operations.

It should be added that the Hoover Commission recommendation for decentralization was made during the previous administration and was available to the then Postmaster General and his Deputy for 3 years, but was not acted upon in that period.

There is in the subcommittee report an implication that regionalization is resulting in an elaborate superstructure of supervision with the addition of numerous new positions.

The implication is not supportable. In any case, the subcommittee report does not indicate that most of these people are either handling workloads previously handled in Washington or in the field, or they are performing specialized and technical functions that did not previously exist. The effect of decentralization has been to contribute to a reduction of total payrolls, not to increase them. This subject is discussed in detail in the section of this memorandum entitled "Cost of Reorganization."

The subcommittee report states that decentralization now "sets up three new levels of supervision and administration."

This is an unfortunate conclusion. By decentralizing the postal service the Department has actually removed many excessive layers of supervision which were superimposed on postmasters within the Department in Washington itself and has reduced those levels to a maximum of three. A postmaster with a problem today finds his answer, depending on its scope, from 1 of these 3 levels, and these levels are close at hand. The general function of the headquarters staff is rapidly being converted to that of a policy-making, research, executive-control, and program-review body only.

The subcommittee report also suggests that the creation of the position of district manager "will create a serious impediment to postmasters in the management of their offices."

The exact opposite appears to be the case in actual experience. On January 16, 1956, the executive committee of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States went on record, at their regular annual meeting, with the following resolution:

"Whereas Postmaster General Summerfield, through the progressive program of decentralization, now nearing completion by the Post Office Department, has given home rule to the postal establishment, and

"Whereas the aforementioned program of decentralization has not only improved the efficiency of the postal establishment but has also added dignity and security to the position of postmaster, and

"Whereas the postmasters of the United States have been immeasurably helped in the performance of their duties by the highly qualified regional staffs appointed by the Department, and especially by the district managers with whom they work on the closest possible terms: Be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States, meeting in regular session January 16, 1956, at Washington, D. C., commend and thank Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield for his courageous pioneering and planning in carrying out this massive program of decentralizing the great United States Postal Establishment."

Department files are filled with letters from grateful postmasters commending the decentralization program in general and their district managers in particular. State organizations of postmasters have passed similar resolutions.

A typical observation, from the editorial column of the September-October 1955 issue of the Gator Postmaster (official organ of the Florida chapter of the National Association of Postmasters) seems particularly relevant:

"Assistant District Manager Johnny Thornton (district 7, Miami) was by our post office today. His visit brought to mind what a fine, capable hardworking team, District Manager Eugene Dunlap and Assistant Manager Thornton make for district 7. It also reminds us of how much nearer the postmasters feel to the Department under decentralization. Requests and questions get so much quicker response than in the past. We can only feel that with a huge operation of the magnitude of the Post Office Department, the region and district setup make for a much more efficient organization. The district manager, the assistant district manager and the regional office, know much more about our individual offices than could ever be possible with a centralization of authority in one location. May I comment that all sentiment which has come to the attention of the editor has been 100 percent in enthusiasm for the new program. The regional and district offices have been lavish in their praise of our cooperation. We want them to know we feel the same way."

To imply, as the subcommittee report does, that regionalization will mean making the postmaster an impotent figurehead and could lead to the elimination of the office entirely, is to create a straw man. The Department has no more intention of doing this than it has of eliminating the mail service itself. The purpose of regionalization is to help the postmaster do a more efficient job for his patrons at less cost to the taxpayer.

The district manager represents the backbone of the entire regionalization program.

The substance of the matter is:

1. Decentralization was badly needed when the present administration undertook it.

2. Decentralization is working amazingly well, considering the short time it has been in effect, both from the point of view of better service and from that of greater economy.

3. Decentralization is a decided factor for better morale among all employees since they can have their problems settled swiftly by informed personnel on the spot, instead of having to wait months and even years, as they did in the past, to get answers to their questions.

4. Decentralization is welcomed and praised by those the subcommittee is most concerned about, the postmasters themselves.

COST OF REORGANIZATION

Under this heading, the subcommittee report appears to demonstrate two major points: (1) That the new organization of headquarters and regional offices has caused an increase of 1,446 in personnel in 2 years but no region is completely organized and fully staffed at this time. (2) That the cost of general administration functions in 1956 will be $15 million more than the cost for general administration in fiscal 1953.

These are wholly incomplete indications as to the staffing and cost of the present administration's reorganization. Both figures require analysis.

The fact is that many functions and a large amount of workload have been transferred from post offices to regional offices and now appear in administrative costs for the first time. Although appearing to increase general administrative expenses, these transfers have actually resulted in material savings to the postal service as a whole. Furthermore, important amounts of the increased costs have nothing whatever to do with the reorganization program but are new or augmented management functions that will pay for themselves many times over in operational savings.

The total increase in staffing in administrative positions in Washington and in the regional offices, between January 1, 1953, and

October 31, 1955, was 1,674 (excluding inspectors). This increase included the following:

Increase in positions in the regional controller offices caused exclusively by the transfer of workloads from post offices to permit centralized disbursing, vehicle accounting, retirement accounting and mechanized payrolls	883
Transfers of supply functions and vehicle supervision from post offices to the regional offices	175
Addition of professional and technical personnel in the fields of industrial engineering, rate research, internal auditing, statistical analysis, personnel, transportation research, systems and procedures, and others, in headquarters	243
Total	1,301

Apart from these listed changes, none of which is due to the decentralization of management, the total increase in administrative staffing is only 373 persons. The 883 persons added to the regional controller offices in the accounting and disbursing area (when increased by 280 more authorized) will ultimately absorb an estimated workload of more than 4,000 persons previously engaged in this work by old-fashioned methods in post offices. This program is well under way and will be completed in 1956.

The increase of $15 million in apparent dollar costs of general administration is subject to the same kind of analysis. The following table shows the factors which have brought about the increase in this category of expense from 1953 to 1956:

[In millions]

Financial and disbursing functions transferred from post offices to regional offices (resulting in reduction in post office expenses by about $18.4 million)	$4.6
Increase in inspection service to meet conditions of increased depredations, greater volume of business, etc	2.5
Establishment or expansion of industrial engineering, rate research, internal auditing, statistical analysis, transportation research, systems and procedures, etc	1.5
Increased research and development work on labor-saving devices	0.6
Total not related to regionalization program	9.2
Increases that might be attributable to regionalization	6.6
Total increase, 1956 over 1953	15.8

At the most, therefore, the increase in general administrative expenses attributable to the regionalization is only $6.6 million. This is less than half of the savings achieved simply by transferring certain finance functions from the post offices and mechanizing them in the regional offices. The value of the technical and professional people added to the administrative staff has been well demonstrated by the substantial savings realized in transportation, personnel, and other costs as already demonstrated by the Department. It is confidently expected that these savings will not only recur each year under the new organization, but will continue to grow as the full benefits of modern business methods and skills are felt throughout the entire postal service.

NOTE.—The Department intends to give full consideration to the seven recommendations of the subcommittee. This does not mean that the Department agrees at this time with any or all of them.

EXHIBIT I.—*Post Office Department analysis of changes in expenditures, fiscal years 1953 and 1955*

[In millions]

	Expenditures as shown by table A of subcommittee report		Increase or decrease (−)	Changes attributable to management action and volume changes		Capital and major service expenditures		Changes attributable to other causes	
	1953	1955		Increases in costs	Decreases in costs	Increases in city carrier service	Increases in capital expenditures	Increases in costs[1]	Decreases in costs[2]
Personnel:									
Postmasters	$133.5	$136.1	$2.6		$0.1			$2.7	
Supervisors and clerks in post offices	926.7	943.5	16.8		1.7			18.5	
City and special delivery	502.2	556.9	54.7			$44.7		10.0	
Rural carriers	192.4	194.9	2.5		1.3			3.8	
Custodial salaries	58.0	59.5	1.5	$0.3				1.2	
Vehicle service salaries	32.0	33.3	1.3	.7				.6	
Postal transportation service salaries	181.0	180.2	−.8		4.4			3.6	
Total field salaries	2,025.8	2,104.5	78.7	1.0	7.5	44.7		40.4	
Facilities:									
Rents, including allowances, 4th class	31.3	36.3	5.0	5.0					
Local vehicle transportation and carfare	24.0	27.4	3.4	3.4					
Purchase of vehicles	1.0	5.4	4.4				$4.4		
Communications service	1.9	2.4	.5	.5					
Field utilities, building supplies, and maintenance	13.3	19.7	6.4	2.9			9.1		
Equipment shops and field supplies	28.3	33.9	5.6						
Stamps and accountable paper	14.5	7.4	−7.1	.5					$7.6
Total facilities	114.3	132.4	18.1	12.3			13.5		7.6
Transportation:									
Water transportation	17.5	12.0	−5.5		3.0				2.5
Foreign terminal and transit charges	17.3	6.2	−11.1		4.0				7.1
Truck transportation	70.9	72.9	2.0	2.0					
Railroad	313.1	297.2	−15.9		47.2			31.3	
Air transportation	135.9	48.5	−87.4		16.7				70.7
Total transportation	554.7	436.8	−118.0	2.0	70.9			31.3	80.3
General administration	21.5	29.5	8.0	7.6				.4	
All other expenditures	6.2	9.0	2.8	1.7				6.4	5.3
Total expenditures	2,722.6	2,712.2	−10.4	24.6	78.4	44.7	13.5	78.5	93.2

[1] Salary and fringe benefit increases required by law, and railroad rate increases.
[2] Airline subsidies and other costs in 1953 subsequently eliminated.

NOTE.—Figures do not necessarily add, owing to rounding.

Reds Winning Asia on United States Fumbles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a good many of us are increasingly concerned over the obvious failure of our policies to make headway in Asia. The short-term consequences of this failure are becoming more and more obvious. The long-term consequences are incalculable.

A succinct and important analysis of our present difficulties in Asia has just been prepared by Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, the distinguished director of the University of Chicago's Center for the Study of American Foreign Policy. Mr. Morgenthau has recently returned from a trip to the Far East, and his article appeared in the Washington Post on January 29, 1956.

I commend the article for reading by my colleagues, because I think it places proper emphasis on some shortcomings in the policies which are presently being pursued.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS WINNING ASIA ON UNITED STATES FUMBLES

(By Hans J. Morgenthau)

The traveler returning from Asia carries with him three lessons for American foreign policy:

That communism is irrelevant as an ideological issue; that the Soviet Union and Communist China are winning the cold war, and that the deterioration of the American position is due primarily not to its intrinsic weakness, but to our identification with political, military and economic policies which are foredoomed to failure.

Wherever communism has been successful or has made inroads in Asia, it has done so

not because it has been able to attract the masses to its philosophy, but because it has offered, or seemed to offer, remedies for specific grievances. Similarly, the relative lack of success of Communist infiltration in Hongkong, Cambodia and Thailand is directly proportionate to the relative lack of grievances which Chinese communism could exploit.

Conversely, the three mass defections from Chinese communism must be attributed not to anticommunism per se but to specific and in a sense unique circumstances.

The Chinese soldiers who refused to return to Communist China after they had been captured in the Korean war were members of former units of the Nationalist army who had most recently been captured or surrendered and whom the Chinese Communists wanted to get rid of as liabilities.

The overwhelming majority of the approximately 800,000 refugees who left the Communist part of Vietnam for the south are Catholics who had lived in the north in compact communities and left in a body under the leadership of their priests; the balance is composed of the families of soldiers of the army of South Vietnam who happened to live north of the demarcation line.

Taking these lessons to heart, the Communist offensive tries to meet the actual concerns of the peoples of Asia. All Asians, as are all men, are afraid of atomic war; thus the Soviet Union poses as the defender of peace. All Asians are opposed to colonialism; thus the Soviet Union poses as the enemy of colonialism. The educated classes throughout Asia seek technological development; thus the Soviet Union poses as the champion of that, too.

Communist China, on the other hand, uses four more specific weapons to extend its influence: general cultural propaganda, the cultural domination of the Chinese communities throughout southeast Asia, control of labor unions and economic domination.

From Japan and southeast Asia, an unceasing stream of visitors enters Communist China to return with reports which uniformly reflect satisfaction if not enthusiasm. What these visitors are satisfied and enthusiastic about is not Chinese communism but the restored dignity and power of a great nation. And the delegations which Communist China is sending (for instance, to Japan) make their impact by identifying themselves not with Chinese communism but with the great tradition of Chinese culture.

To understand the influence which Communist China exerts in the Chinese communities of southeast Asia, one must keep in mind that the oversea Chinese are essentially nonpolitical. They have only two primary interests: to pursue their businesses and not to be molested in their community life by the majorities among which they live.

For protection they look, as they have always done, to China, and they do not pay much attention to its ideological coloration.

However, many of the gifted youth of these Chinese communities in southeast Asia go Hongkong to study and from there disappear into Communist China. Others accept the scholarships which Communist China offers them to study there. Thus Communist China trains an elite which may well take over the leadership of the Chinese communities of southeast Asia.

The other natural opening which Communist China has in the Chinese communities of Southeast Asia is the labor unions. Their very existence testifies to grievances which await exploitation.

Finally, Communist China has recently started an economic offensive which swamps Southeast Asia with cheap consumer goods. In so doing, it tries to make Chinese businessmen—and non-Chinese as well—economically dependent.

How does the United States meet the Communist challenge in Asia? With a policy which is ineffective and in good measure self-defeating; one composed of blunders, bluffs, and military and economic measures conceived without regard for their intrinsic merits or their political consequences.

One such blunder was Secretary of State Dulles' statement that Goa is a Province of Portugal. This statement exploded like a bomb among our friends, spreading consternation, derision and regret. The Hong Kong Standard in an editorial praising the United States for its anti-colonial record in Asia, called the statement "poorly timed and undiplomatic and * * * apt to be seized upon as ammunition for propaganda against the Western powers * * *"

The Ceylon Daily News called it a glaring example of the "shortsightedness of American diplomacy in relation to the East * * * The back-slapping Krushchev is no model of diplomatic finesse, but it is not surprising that with such a clumsy rival as Dulles he is streets ahead in competition for Asian good will."

Only a week later, Secretary of the Army Brucker provided an example of our policy of bluffs. After a 2-day visit to South Vietnam, he declared in Saigon that "with a little more training, the Vietnamese army will be the equal of any other army in its ability to combat the enemy and will be able to defend itself against the Vietminh if attacked."

My visit to South Vietnam happened to coincide with that of Brucker, and I asked the question—which he answered so confidently—of a great number of American, Vietnamese and other officials. They were unanimous in their conviction that at present and for the foreseeable future the army of Vietnam is no match for its Communist opponents.

Yet our tendency to meet a real threat with a bluff is not limited to verbal utterances. SEATO, the codified military alliance of the United States, France, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand, is a case in point.

I happened to be in Bangkok when the deputies of the SEATO powers met. It was a distressing performance. Only the United States, on the one hand, and Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines, on the other, seemed to be really serious about the business—and for entirely different reasons.

We seem to have convinced ourselves that Thailand and Pakistan are military assets of considerable magnitude on the mainland of Asia. There is nothing in the actual situation which would justify such enthusiasm. Little needs to be said about Thailand, a traditionally misgoverned state with a traditionally quiescent population whom the revolution of Asia has bypassed. Pakistan, on the other hand, is a monstrosity of a state in whose viability, let alone defensibility, even few Pakistanis believe.

It is, then, not surprising that neither Thailand nor Pakistan takes its membership in SEATO quite as seriously as we do. Strong neutralist tendencies have recently come to the surface in both countries. For the Asian members of SEATO, and that goes for the Baghdad Pact as well, membership is primarily an entering wedge into the Treasury of the United States.

Thus we give military and economic aid to anybody in Asia who declares "to be on our side," and we don't seem to care about either the intrinsic merits of such aid or about its political consequences. Since we have not chosen our allies but they have chosen us, we are receiving the uncertain support of the weak while alienating the strong.

Such a policy can be advertised as a great success in the short run, but we should know that we are deceiving nobody but ourselves.

In the long run, such a policy can neither be improved nor reformed nor even continued as it is. If catastrophe is to be averted, it must be abolished.

In Memoriam: Harry Sandager

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 of this year, several Members eulogized a former Member of this body, Harry Sandager. Harry had ably represented the Second Congressional District of the State of Rhode Island immediately preceding my tenure of office. Among his many accomplishments, Harry Sandager was a driving force in one of Rhode Island's most vigorous and active trade associations, the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association.

The executive secretary of that organization, Margaret T. Boodry, has recently sent me an In Memoriam published by the association. This article gives some indication of Harry's tireless and devoted efforts in the interest of the better welfare of all the people of my State. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include that In Memoriam in the RECORD:

IN MEMORIAM: HARRY SANDAGER

Seldom is an association, particularly a trade association, as fortunate as the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association has been in having a member such as Harry Sandager. Among the many qualities which characterized him were integrity, sincerity, a broad knowledge of human nature, and a disposition to render unto every man his just due. To these qualities was added the ability to perceive how an act or policy would affect the general good and, in addition, he had the charity of viewpoint that permits an individual to forego a selfish advantage if such advantage in any way might result in disadvantage to the generality. Because of this uncommon virtue, Harry Sandager was a great boon to our organization.

Harry Sandager was born in Cranstone, the son of Maurice and Louise (Larsen) Sandager. His Danish and German background was manifest in his disposition to look in apparently cool fashion at the things that might be incendiary to an individual with a different racial background. United with these characteristics was a quick mental response and a wit so spontaneous as to be considered Irish. As a school boy he earned money harvesting vegetables at the Budlong Farm. Upon graduating from Cranston High School he became a reporter and later sporting editor of the Pawtucket Times. It was while in this capacity the opportunity presented itself to go to Washington in the capacity of secretary to Congressman Walter R. Stiness. This was the start of a political career which eventuated in his own election to Congress in 1938 and later as national Republican committeeman from Rhode Island.

About 1922 he became associated as an executive with Dutee Wilcox Flint, then operating the largest automobile dealership in the world. In 1931 the Flint empire was broken up and Harry purchased the Cranston

branch, of which he had been manager. At that time he organized Harry Sandager, Inc., and the business has been conducted at 721 Reservoir, Avenue, Cranston, since under that name.

While in Washington with Congressman Stiness he studied at George Washington University and Georgetown University, obtaining degrees from both institutions. As a member of Georgetown's first class in the School of Foreign Service, he was a classmate of Ambassador Willard L. Beaulac, of Pawtucket, who is now Ambassador to Chile. While at Georgetown he was awarded the James A. Farrell award for highest general average in the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University.

In 1928 he was elected to the State legislature from Cranston and in January 1936 was elected Republican minority leader in the house. In 1938 he was elected to Congress and during his career on the Hill developed a friendship with Senator Taft of Ohio and Speaker JOE MARTIN. Their confidence in him and their opinion of his political sagacity was such that he was frequently called upon by them for information and advice. As a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1948, and again in 1952 when he was an alternate, he worked for the nomination of Senator Taft. He was popular with Republicans and Democrats alike, and though he held political convictions, he frequently expressed regard and admiration for the man to whom he lost his seat in the House, Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY.

When the Rhode Island Motor Vehicle Dealer's License Commission was created in 1945, he was named as a member and he continued as a member to the time of his death.

In his newspaper days he had been president of the Southern New England Football Association and later president of the National Roller Polo League.

About a year ago the Cranston Lions Club, of which he was a member, gave a dinner in his honor entitled "This Is Your Life." This dinner was a testimonial to the high regard in which he was held by his associates in the Lions Club, and was notable for the presence of teachers whose pupil he had been in school days, newspaper associates, sport enthusiasts, automobile dealers, and legislative and political leaders.

A cultural appreciation with a background of study and reading reinforced by an extraordinarily acute memory made Harry both an unusual conversationalist and a wonderful companion.

His activities for the welfare of automobile dealers were generous and never ending. Hours and hours of his time went into collating material of interest to the dealers and the development of news items for the newsletter of which he was editor. In addition, he had served the association as president, and director, being director at the time of his passing.

To his widow, Mildred A. (Fitzpatrick) Sandager, to his surviving sisters, Mrs. Harry Paye of Attleboro, Mass., and Mrs. Frank Fearney of Lake City, Fla., and to his associates, Robert F. Halligan and John Marchant, and the employees of Harry Sandager, Inc., the Rhode Island Automobile Dealers Association conveys deep sympathy.

The manner of his passing on December 24, 1955, was expressive of his generous instincts because he had just presented gifts and conveyed yuletide greetings to some friends. Perhaps this was just as he would have wished it and to him preferable to "drawing the draperies on his couch about him and lying down to pleasant dreams."

RHODE ISLAND AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION.
JANUARY 21, 1956.

Research and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 27, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent address entitled "Research and You," delivered by George R. Seidel, eastern district manager of the extension division, public relations department, of the E. I. du Pont de Nemours Co., of Wilmington, Del., which it was my privilege to hear at a meeting of the Rotary Club in Ithaca, N. Y.

I am informed that the cost of printing the address in the Appendix of the RECORD will be $200. Notwithstanding that estimate, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH AND YOU

(Address by George R. Seidel, eastern district manager, extension division, public relations department, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Wilmintgon, Del.)

It certainly is a privilege to be here today. When one considers the value of an audience's time any sincere speaker, before he accepts an invitation, must ask himself what he can possibly offer that justifies the acceptance of an invitation—what can he bring that will be new, fresh, interesting, or amusing.

I asked myself this question, not in regard to this particular meeting but before undertaking any talks of this sort. In other words, what personal experiences could I share with you that might be unusual and perhaps contribute to a different outlook on life.

This is a tough asisgnment for any man and calls for a good deal of humble soul-searching. It is obvious, because I stand before you, that the question was answered in the affirmative and so it is equally obvious that I owe you an explanation. The reason is this: For 19 years I worked in the research laboratories of a large chemical company and the lessons learned there might, it seemed to me, be interesting and valuable to you.

Research workers approach problems on a small scale—through a microscope so to speak—in order to evaluate the potentialities of a big, new idea. So let me start with what is to me a startlingly big figure and later focus the microscope. Our records show that we spend $63 million per year on research, and that only one chemical idea in a hundred proves successful and results in a new product. These are extremely long odds and no ball team could win a pennant with such a batting average. It is for this reason that I appreciate and value the significance, worth, and scarcity of a successful experiment. These occur so seldom and after the expenditure of so much money and hard work that I have come to place any winning experiment on a high pedestal.

As citizens of the United States, you and I are privileged to share the most successful experiment in human endeavor that the world has ever known. Under God, not one of us can lay much claim to our wonderful way of life. But the hard work and faith of our forefathers and those who have been working shoulder to shoulder with us have resulted in a way of life that the dreamers never imagined and the theorists said just couldn't happen. They couldn't have predicted such a complex society as ours, much less understand how it works. As a matter of fact, no one could have forseen the magic result of free men being allowed to invest their best in cooperation with other free men of good will. There have been far more than 100 countries and civilizations that have sought the key of successful living that we posses. If, per chance, we should happen to let this successful experiment slip through our fingers, it is probable that it could never be regained. We should, therefore, appreciate the value of these United States and dedicate our lives to the continuance of those principles and ideals upon which they have been built and made strong.

It seems to me that our society—the table upon which our daily bread is served—is supported by four legs: The church, home, school, and factory. Much that I have to say to you will deal with the technical aspects of our industrial system but let me assure you that we agree with the physician who, addressing his fellow doctors, reminded them that medicine must always remain more an art than a science. By this he meant that the general practitioner must understand and know his patients better than his medicine. Applied to industry, this means that the right treatment of people is the most important aspect of doing business—more important by far than the most modern and well-equipped laboratory, or factory, or salesroom or home office, for each of these is only as effective as the men and women who make them tick. I would therefore like to discuss with you something of our industrial system and end with a spiritual appeal.

American industry—which includes the products of the farm—is based upon so many attributes that only a relative few can be listed at this time. It is hoped that you will continue the list where I leave off, but it seems to me, that ingenuity is certainly one factor that is responsible for America's industrial might. We used to speak of Yankee ingenuity but this virtue cannot be ascribed to any section of this country. American ingenuity has allowed us to tackle the impossible and often times succeed against 100 to 1 odds.

A successful company must be frugal. I lived among the Pennsylvania Dutch and know something of their careful habits. In the same sense, let me assure you that an efficient, well-managed plant doesn't just happen—it is the result of careful planning and know-how regarding the operations of every detail of the business. Waste and laxness are luxuries that are unknown to any successful business.

Americans like to work hard; they rejoice in the privilege of facing each day's job as a strong man ready to run a race. We all hope and pray that the day will never come that we won't know the satisfaction of an honest day's toil. Only one thing is possibly better; the peace and blessing of the solid night's rest that follows. Some pelicans lived on the waste of a fishing village in California and later died of starvation when the fish waste was converted to fertilizer. The villagers had become fond of the pelicans and hated to see them die. But how to teach them to fish again? Some hard working pelicans who had not known the luxury of free meals were imported and soon taught the starving pelicans how to fish again. We pray that Americans will be given sufficient time to teach the peoples of the world the virtue and satisfaction of honest, fruitful work.

Our wonderful political system was deliberately excluded as one of the legs supporting our table of plenty. Ours is a government of,

by and for the people and as such it is our servant. So it is that free enterprise and political noninterference are two more basic principles upon which our civilization is built. Men are free to try their hand at anything they think they can do as well as or a little better than the other fellow and they are also ready to assume the responsibility of failure or reap the rewards of success. Political noninterference means that Americans have never had a king, or dictator, or hierarchy, or bureaucracy that presumes to know enough or be so wise as to guide the overall actions of our lives and the livelihood of our people. Perhaps, as a result, there is some lost motion here and there but while a few are following the wrong track, the majority is building a better society and an ever higher standard of living. The point is amply proven by the impressive record of our accomplishment in almost every realm of human endeavor.

Finally, so far as this listing is concerned, mass production is of prime importance. Many more than 1 in 100 of the experiments we try in the laboratory are scientifically sound, but industry never considers a small scale model as successful. Enough of the new product must be profitably made so that everybody can buy it in the market place. To this end we have reduced to practice the best ideas the world has to offer so that all of us benefit by the discoveries made here and abroad. Not only that, we are ready, willing, and anxious to share our know-how and philosophy of plenty with the rest of the world. The record also shows that America's might is based on and shared by the individual's well-being. What we make and what we have does not go to build an arsenal or stock a warehouse. Our wealth is made for and shared by the average citizen to a degree that has been unknown by every society but our own.

Hard work, frugality, ingenuity and the rest are useless until they are brought to life by human endeavor. In most large companies this is accomplished by a team of five. Parenthetically may I add that this team has no crystal ball, no magic wand and no secret formula. The things that flow from the laboratories and plants of America do not just happen—they must be made to happen. This means lots of hard work against steep odds.

And now let us focus the microscope; our first team member is research. The search for new knowledge and the never ceasing improvement of established products is basic to the chemical industry and the du Pont Company. But let me repeat, there is nothing magic about research beyond the willingness to work hard and invest large sums of money without any assurance of dividends. More specifically, creative research depends upon individual initiative, keen perception and, perhaps, the conversion of established raw materials into products that had not been previously made. This can be illustrated by an example from our own laboratories.

For many years, the research efforts of a number of us had been concerned with dissolving a black sea sand in sulphuric acid to give a black solution from which a white pigment is made. Some years ago we were asked to find a new use for this sand. Theoretically it appeared that the black sand could be converted into titanium tetrachloride which could be purified by distillation, thus simplifying our manufacturing procedure. However, the new process involved the handing of highly corrosive liquids in very special equipment at high temperature so that this proved to be one of the toughest engineering jobs ever tackled by du Pont—the Hanford Atomic Energy Plant being the most difficult. Many millions of dollars were spent and there were dark moments when failure seemed inevitable. This problem was eventually solved so that commercial amounts of a clear, fuming, distillable liquid that we call "tickle" were available—what next?

The literature indicated that titanium metal had been made in small quantities by reacting tickle with metallic magnesium. We confirmed this in the laboratory but building a full size plant was another major undertaking. Suffice it to say that today we are making titanium in competition with a number of other companies. The metal is as strong as stainless steel and half as heavy; it is as corrosion-resistant to sea water as platinum; it has good elevated temperature properties. To date, the proposed use for titanium is in the blades and disks of jet engines and in airplanes generally for fasteners, structural members and skins. It strength, lightness, and elevated temperature properties permit the design of an airplane that will outmaneuver, outperform and, if necessary, outfight a rival made of conventional metals. I'm glad that America has titanium metal.

Another factor that the research man must keep in mind is the application of known technology to new problems. In the case of titanium metal, we had learned to handle corrosive liquids at high temperatures in special equipment. What else could we do with this new know-how? Every chemist has a chart of the periodic system behind his desk so it was apparent that silicon—a first cousin to titanium—might be studied. Silicon dioxide is sea sand and therefore one of the most abundant compounds in the earth's crust. Furthermore we discovered that the good properties of titanium were quickly lost if common impurities such as carbon and nitrogen were present in small amounts. In other words, what unique properties might very pure silicon possess? (Silicon of approximately 90-pereent purity has been known for years and used in large quantities to make special grades of steel.) We made some hyperpure silicon whose purity is measured in parts per million. The electrical industry melted this in an induction furnace to form a single crystal of even greater purity. It was then discovered that silicon is not a true metal, for one criterion of a metal is that it conduct electricity—silicon is a semiconductor of electricity and as such can be used to replace a vacuum tube in many electronic circuits. Hyperpure silicon now has to sell for $380 per pound but only a nickel's worth is used in a transistor although at this early stage in development a transitor costs as much as a radio tube. It is expected that costs will be reduced as experience is gained but even on a break-even basis, the transistor has the advantages of extremely low current demand, ruggedness, long life, and smallness.

Tackling the so-called impossible is one of the main reasons that our batting average is so low and our successes so unexpected. The new products of Dacron polyester fibers and Mylar polyester films are two products that owe their existence to the faith and technical tenacity of 1 or 2 men. More than 20 years ago chemists argued that it was impossible for a polyester (chemically similar to alkyd paint vehicles) to be as strong and tough as Nylon. Dr. E. F. Izard, of this country, and Dr. J. R. Whinfield, of England, undertook the impossible. There were literally millions of different substances that can be reacted to form a polyester but since chemistry is a science, some intelligent choice and elimination was possible. Suffice it to say that, after 20 years of hard work, both men concluded independently that there are only two molecules that can be reacted with one another to form a unique polyester that we now call Dacron, as a fiber, and Mylar, when formed into a sheet.

So, another new product was born. What is it good for; what chance does it have on the market place? Mylar polyester film is unique because its properties are so well balanced; it is tough, resistant to many chemicals, has good electrical and thermal properties. Other materials may excel in 1 of these 4 qualities. Teflon is more chemical and heat resistant; mica has better electrical properties—I don't know any plastic material that is tougher. Therefore it is possible to build an electrical motor that is almost one-half the weight of its predecessor partly because of Mylar wrappings; movie films made from Cronar (as Mylar is called in the motion-picture industry) should be tougher, less moisture sensitive and almost unaffected by age as compared to former movie film. It should be very satisfactory as liners for bottle caps and large drums. Here are samples of metallized and decorative films that are being evaluated for use on acoustical tile and panels.

Let me emphasize that this development wasn't luck. It took almost 20 years of painstaking research, the investment of a man's lifetime, the best of research facilities, sympathetic management, helpful associates, adequate resources to support all these and—faith.

The second member of our team is the engineer. It is he who must develop the chemist's idea to the point where a practical plant can be built; it was he who designed a plant for the manufacture of titanium metal—the second most difficult engineering task ever tackled by Du Pont. Without the engineer's help many new products would never see the light of day.

The third member of the team belongs to the manufacturing department. It is his job to turn out material in good yield, of excellent quality, and at a price to meet competition. They must be able to cope with any variation in raw materials, any disruption in services, and have the foresight to minimize such dislocations. They are the ones who keep the miracle of our mass production operating at peak capacity, 24 hours a day and 365 days a year. The near miracle that too many of us take for granted is well represented every time we drive into a filling station and say: "Fill 'er up." For gasoline—and thousands of other products—to flow in never-ceasing abundance requires a know-how and devotion to duty that is uniquely American.

The salesman is the fourth member of the team. Many times I have called upon a customer with one of our salesmen and tried to utilize their equipment for the handling of a new product. Never were we refused, for no businessman can long compete if he thinks that his product or process is good enough—even against 100-to-1 odds. In general, it was necessary for us to return to our laboratory and pilot unit to devise a different approach or design special equipment to solve the problem and then try again. The cooperative spirit that is thus developed between the salesman and his customer is an important contribution toward the constant improvement and change that characterizes America's industrial advances.

The last and perhaps most important member of the team is top management. It is their responsibility to separate the chaff from the wheat; to lend encouragement at dark moments; to supply capital with wisdom and courage; to furnish overall direction in a fast moving and challenging age. Perhaps the role of management can be illustrated by a story. Many years ago, a salesman who had apparently known better days called on me. His clothes were somewhat overworn and he was literally run down at the heels. Even so, there was a trace of having held a highly responsible position. After he left I inquired as to his background and learned that he had been the owner of a wooden box company when corrugated boxes came on the market—he scornfully kicked a hole in them to emphasize his conviction that corrugated boxes would never replace wooden boxes. As his

business declined, he poured his personal fortune into the company—until it failed. When I knew him he was a salesman for corrugated boxes. So, the responsibility of top management is to avoid the manufacure of wooden boxes at the beginning of the corrugated box era.

This is the team of a big company and yet these functions, in varying degree, are essential to all businesses regardless of size. The main thing about companies—large and small—is their dependence upon one another. This can be illustrated by taking a drive, in your mind's eye, through the streets of any city and on to the outlying areas. Small shops, banks, hotels, grocery stores, filling stations, restaurants and department stores give way to automobile assembly plants, huge refineries, research centers hiring hundreds and even thousands of highly skilled technicians and scientists, plants for making paint or rubber or textile or ocean-going liners. It is incomprehensible that each enterprise fits into the overall success story of these United States of America—but, strangely enough, the experiment works and wonderfully well. Little stores and huge factories are as essential to one another as the need of the factory owner for a loaf of bread and the corner grocer for a new automobile.

To further illustrate the interdependence of large and small businesses, let me cite a few examples:

Had I spoken to your children in high school today, they might have tried to make cellophane in your bathroom tub tonight—and they could do it. Depending upon their skill, the product would have to sell for $50 to $500 per pound and it would be brittle, cloudy, and yellow in the sunlight. To make cellophane and sell it on today's market place requires the investment of $20 million and a wealth of skill and experience. For whom is the cellophane made? The butcher—all meats are now wrapped in transparent films—the baker, and the candlestickmaker. I thought this a clever phrase and questioned my wife as to why candles should be wrapped in celolphane. She looked surprised and simply said, "Of course candles should be wrapped in cellophane." The women folks had spoken and no mere man questions such authority.

The resources and technical skill required to make nylon are beyond the scope and abilities of any stocking manufacturer or textile mill. Yet, it would be equally impossible for us to knit stockings or weave fabrics. We are absolutely dependent upon innumerable textile and knitting mills to use our products.

We estimate that 2,000 workers in a modern neoprene plant can produce as much rubber as 80,000 Malayans sweating in the jungles of Indonesia. Why? The modern industrial worker has equipment, machinery, and tools valued at more than $20,000 per man; the native laborer works with a hoe and a machete worth about $2. In other words, the American worker produces more, is worth more, and is paid more.

Still another example: Because of tractors, weed killers, insecticides, fungicides, fertilizers, defoliants, improved seeds, etc., the farmer of today produces many times as much as his forebears raised some 150 years ago. It used to be that 90 percent of our people lived on the farm, now 10 percent are engaging in farming. This has greatly raised the standard of living of the farmer and at the same time provided a full market basket for everyone—and still our cup runneth over.

The industrial capacity of America is brought home when we realize that 530 million pairs of shoes are made in the United States every year. This is more than 3 pairs for every man, woman, and child in this Nation. And don't think your wife has them all, mine has a few pairs, too. This illustrates how our productive capacity is made for and distributed to everyone and is not stocked or set aside for an emergency. What we make, everyone uses and enjoys.

Besides their interdependence, all companies in a free society must make a profit—they must succeed—in order to stay in business for any length of time. Your business and my company, regardless of who "we" are, are successsful when the consuming public—which means each of us and particularly our wives—walks into your store and buys our product. In other words, American industry is particularly indebted to the collective appetities and the insatiable list-of-wants of the buying public.

No matter what we have today, the average American fully expects that next year's model will be better and hastens to the market place to sign on the dotted line. I bought a new car in 1953 and my 16-year-old daughter said it would be impossible to build a better automobile. Today, my 18-year-old daughter is trying to convince her dad that the old jalopy is ready for the scrap heap. Our wives open their crowded closets and exclaim with feminine accord that they don't have a dress to wear. If, however, she wore her dresses until they were threadbare the textile industry would collapse. Have you analyzed the soundness of a man's argument when he is about ready to buy a new car? The battery is dead so, he explains to his wife, we might just as well buy a new car.

Some critics claim that we overemphasize the value of our automobiles, improved plumbing, automatic devices, and the world's greatest steel tonnages. We no longer defend our material blessings; we are only anxious that our critics have as many, for this would help to solve the world's problems and ease its tensions. Nature's bounty is unlimited and the productivity and energy of freemen is boundless. America is pointing the way toward shared plenty.

But if we stopped here—and so many folks do—we would have told the least important half of the story. We lead the world in libraries, art museums, hospital beds, parks and playgrounds, and we have sufficient leisure time to enjoy them. We voluntarily support the Red Cross, community chests, and our churches. As a matter of fact, there has been a 70-percent increase in church membership during the past generation, outstripping the population growth by 2 to 1.

In other words, the United States of America is the most winning team that mankind has ever placed on the field of human endeavor. This is a powerful fact to remember as we face a world which is divided into two warring ideologies. For a time, it appeared that free men might be doubting their own abilities and were uncertain as to the rightness of the path they were following. Although we are still not complacent, and I trust we never will be, the average American is becoming accustomed to accepting world leadership. He confidently and humbly believes that the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God is vastly superior to that ideology which lauds the supremacy of the state and the diety of superman.

Please don't misunderstand me. No one is saying that we can let down our guard and rest on our laurels. The climb ahead may be steeper and more difficult than any we have tackled in the past. But I am saying that I believe America is on the right track and has the strength to climb to any height. The incentive to work hard is ever present and the rewards, both material and spiritual, were never greater.

One of the few and really serious dark clouds on the horizon is the fact that our colleges and universities are graduating half as many engineers as they did 5 years ago. During this same short period, Russia is reportedly graduating twice as many scientists and engineers. The net result is that Russia is supposedly graduating 50,000 technically trained men per year as compared to 25,000 reciving degrees per year in the United States of America. I don't think it would be safe to conclude that our graduates are better trained than theirs. Rather, it may be true that our students are selecting the easy courses and thus avoiding mathematics, English, physics, chemistry and other difficult studies. If this be the case, a moral decline is indicated which would have far reaching effects. As parents and civic leaders, it is our solemn responsibility to face and reverse this trend.

To end on a cheerful note, let me tell you of meeting with a service club in Simsbury, Conn. It was the first meeting they had held since their town had suffered from Diane's floods. The narrow Farmington River had risen many feet and spread out a mile wide. Many homes were destroyed beyond reclamation but some were found to be solid even though flooded above the second floor. On a Friday noon, teams of six men from this service club rapped on the front doors of those homes which could be repaired. The young man telling me the story said that his team was met by a husband and wife who were dirty, in tears, and ankle deep in muck. The look of gratitude on the faces of man and wife was more pay than money could ever measure. Six pairs of willing hands make a big difference when added to those of a heartbroken two. The first tasks were undertaken with shovels, then they reached the scrub-bucket stage, followed by ripping up flooring and even replacing floor beams. Then came paint and wallpaper. There are seven warehouses full of furniture and supplies ready to install as soon as they are needed.

At the meeting, 50 percent of those present were new members for it was an honor to belong to such a club. People are anxious to help one another and to be challenged to do their best. It's incomprehensible that such a spirit will ever die, so that by the continued effort of everyone doing their best and working together, free men should meet each challenge with confidence and thus continue to build a better tomorrow here and, by example, to end of the world.

Mayor Oliver Reelected for 24th Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I feel it fitting to pay tribute to the fine mayor of Baldwin, Fla., who has just been reelected to that office for the 24th time. He is Mayor Lonnie Oliver. When the Jacksonville Journal's reporter, Jim Massey, talked with him on the occasion, a large portion of the success was attributed to understanding human nature, but another large portion was attributed to loyalty, "loyalty to my people and loyalty to my oath of office." I believe that his loyalty and honesty are the qualities which his constituents most admire. His warmhearted affection for folks and his sense of humor are also qualities which everyone admires in him. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I include a part of Mr. Massey's article:

The election news that came in from Baldwin today told an old familiar story. Mayor

L. C. Oliver has been reelected for the 24th time.

His knack of winning in every election since 1928 was again demonstrated yesterday when he emerged the victor over J. G. Cross by a vote of 277 to 50 for another 2-year term.

"I'm very happy and, of course, very thankful," Mayor Oliver said today, who does other things beside being Baldwin's chief executive.

He's also the municipal judge, the freight and passenger agent at Baldwin's Seaboard station, a deacon in his church, owner and operator of a hotel, and he's the chamber of commerce besides.

Only once in his long political career was Mayor Oliver defated. That was in 1933. He did not seek relection in 1947. Otherwise he has served consecutively and has had opposition in every race expect one.

Words America Lives By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article by the distinguished historian, Bruce Catton. His article is on the subject Words America Lives By.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORDS AMERICA LIVES BY

(By Bruce Catton, editor, the American Heritage)

The British officers saw nothing unusual about it. They had caught a spy inside their lines at New York. Under the laws of war his life was properly forfeit, and they were going to execute him. That was all there was to it.

So the file of Redcoats led the way to the execution. The prisoner, bound, stood with the rope about his neck. He was a young man, the name of him Nathan Hale, and he had a quiet dignity that impressed his captors. Just before he was swung off into eternity one of these, moved by sudden sympathy, asked if he had any last message. He replied calmly:

"I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

Then the signal was given, the execution was performed, the body was cut down and buried without marker or headstone, and everything was over.

Except that the words young Nathan Hale uttered kept on living. Something was involved here that the executioner's rope could not kill, not the rope, or the file of musketeers, or all the might of the British Empire. That something was the simple patriotism that this new country had inspired in the breasts of men who were fighting and dying to make the country free. Hale's words spoke for everybody—for the patriots who fought and won the American Revolution, and for the millions of their descendants who, since then, have put their lives in the balance whenever the country needed them.

Hale's own story is extremely simple.

He was born at Coventry, Conn., in 1755, was educated at Yale, and became a schoolteacher. When the Revolution began he joined a Connecticut regiment, serving at the siege of Boston and winning promotion to captain. When the British seized New York in 1776, his regiment was sent down to that vicinity, and Hale had a part in a daring little expedition that captured a British provision ship under the very guns of a man-of-war.

When the American command needed information what the occupation troops were doing. Hale volunteered to act as a spy. Disguised as a Dutch schoolmaster, he got inside the British lines, did his dangerous job effectively, and was finally caught and hanged. He was 21 at the time of his death.

That is all there is to his story * * * but it is a vital part of the heritage of all Americans: our real national wealth, that goes on yielding returns generation after generation, inspiring men to greatness, keeping the Nation alive and strong. If we ever forget the story we lose something priceless. From 1776 to the present day, it has been the battle cry for all men who have loved their Nation and its future a little more than their own well-being:

"I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

The Spirit of Jacksonville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Louis Riviere, of Jacksonville, Fla., a beloved and respected veteran leader in our community, has sent to me a poem he has written on the history and spirit of our hometown. Under leave previously granted I herewith submit the poem:

THE SPIRIT OF JACKSONVILLE

(By Louis Riviere)

It was May the third, nineteen hundred one,
That dreadful holocaust laid our city low;
But ere those fiery embers died away,
Stout hearts were planning again to grow.
With determined zeal those thirty thousand,
Vowed that rebuilding would be their theme;
With their small resources and dauntless courage,
They went to work as one magnificent team.
Trainloads of lumber and shiploads of brick,
A bright new city was showing its face;
Soon those scars began to fade from view,
A new Jacksonville was setting the pace.
Outside capital showed an interest,
To make investments they could hardly wait;
And ere the decade had passed o'er the rim,
Three ten-story buildings, first in our State.
Another decade broke over the Saint Johns,
Greater expansion of her utilities;
Then war-clouds thundering o'er the horizon,
Potent danger to her inherent liberties.
Five thousand of her stalwart citizens.
Laid aside their work and answered the call;
Ere the din of war had ceased its roar,
Eightscore of those men had given their all.
The nineteen twenties brought blessings of peace,
The dream of a St. Johns River bridge came true;
Fine school facilities for growing children,
Rewards for the trials she had struggled through.
Railway terminals and a radio station,
A growing airport showing her civic pride;
Municipal docks to meet the great ships—
That came steaming in with the rolling tide.
Nineteen thirties brought financial distress,
Those early thirties were a lesson indeed;
Retribution is no respecter of persons,
A people must pay for their vice and greed.
But Jacksonville's pride arose once again,
A great naval air station was the score:
And shipyards turned out great ships of steel,
For all mankind was restless to the core.
World war number two broke in all its fury,
December seventh we shall never forget;
All Jacksonville with one mighty heart throb.
Vowed with the Nation this attack must be met.
During this conflict thirty-three thousand,
Of her citizens marched away to war;
Those staying at home built a hundred ships,
To back up the cause they were fighting for.
Population of one quarter million,
Confidence abounds where her people live;
Twenty million invested in church properties,
And untold moral values those churches give.
War activities brought many new people,
A friendly welcome caused thousands to stay;
And twenty thousand new housing units—
Kept men and factories busy everyday.
Sixty thousand happy, carefree children,
Growing up to take their places among men;
Nineteen million dollars in school facilities,
To develop their minds so they can win.
Jacksonville, where the railroads meet the ships,
Helping speed the flow of maritime trade;
As those swift airplanes make their daily calls,
Jacksonville, Florida, where friendships are made.

The Tragedy of the Unmet Bed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "The Tragedy of the Unmet Bed," by Arthur Feigenbaum, superintendent of the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital, of Brooklyn, N. Y.:

THE TRAGEDY OF THE UNMET BED

(By Arthur Feigenbaum, superintendent, Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital, Brooklyn, N. Y.)

The Great Architect of the Universe, in drawing up plans upon His trestleboard for the construction of man, conceived one of the most intricate mechanisms that has never been duplicated. Man's anatomy is so constructed that every sinew, fiber, blood vessel, nerve, and organ has a specific function to perform, and the proper teamwork and coordination of each makes for a healthy individual.

Unfortunately, like all structures, time, stress, and often abuse wear out parts bringing with it disability, impairment, and death, or chronic ailments of long lingering duration. Millions of victims each year are stricken with chronic diseases—atherosclerosis, hypertension, kidney disorders, cardiac conditions, asthma, diabetes, and to this list are added many of the numerous mysterious maladies that continue to take a heavy toll,

such as Parkinsonism, muscular dystrophy, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, and mental disorders.

Fortunately for civilization, medical science has within the short span of the last 100 years found effective ways and means of combating many of the infectious diseases by vaccines, sera, sulfa drugs and antibiotics. As a result, many of the infectious diseases such as typhoid fever, diphtheria, smallpox, yellow fever, bubonic plagues, and poliomyelitis, are being eradicated from the face of the earth. Even as this is being written, tuberculosis is slowly but surely being wiped out bringing about the closing of many tuberculosis hospitals. The appearance of INH, combined with streptomycin and PAS may be the means of preventing tuberculosis. In the State of New York, the Neponsit Hospital, Seton Hospital, Trudeau Sanitarium, and Brooklyn Thoracic Hospital have already closed their doors, with the Bedford Hills division of the Montefiore Hospital scheduled for an early closing. Antitoxins and other prophylactic measures have been used for many years to prevent diphtheria, smallpox and to lessen the harsh effects of whooping cough, measles, scarlet fever, and others.

Tragedy still lurks in the corners and the blot on the escutcheon of civilization is the increase in the magnitude of the chronic disease problem. An impression exists that chronic diseases affect only the aged, but statistics prove the contrary. At the present time it is estimated that 25 million persons, or more than one-sixth of the population, have a chronic disease, bringing with it nearly 1 million deaths annually, and the loss of almost 1 billion days of productive activity.

In 1900, there were in the United States 3,500,000 persons over 65 years of age. In 1955, this number increased almost fourfold, with the number of 12,500,000 persons 65 years of age, and with the prediction that in 1980, this number would reach 18 million. It is estimated that 467.1 out of every 1,000 individuals between 65 and 75 will become a victim of a chronic disease with prolonged or permanent impairment. Chronic or long-term diseases take a heavy toll in all age groups—almost 50 percent of the chronic illnesses affect people below the ages of 45, and 16 percent of the chronic illnesses affect people below the ages of 25, with more than three-quarters of the persons in the productive years from 15 to 64 years of age. Thirty percent of these numbers will require hospitalization. This certainly will create a catastrophic situation in the near future if we do not take proper precautions. Statistics listed below show the number of unmet beds, and with it lack of rehabilitation centers, research areas, and diagnostic clinics as part of these units.

The record as it now exists, shows little though given to the construction of appropriate facilities and long-range planning. Action is needed now with appropriations set aside for construction of hospitals, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, etc., after study by a special committee appointed by the President or by the Commission on Chronic Illnesses.

The building programs for future facilities for chronic diseases should include facilities for prevention with appropriate clinics for diagnosis and followup of discharged cases, including:

1. Home care planning with periodic checkups at the hospital;

2. Teaching facilities for members of the medical staff, medical students, and allied professions;

3. Rehabilitation sections;

4. Research centers with an animal experimentation division for the study of problems of chronic diseases and of aging;

5. Appropriate clinics of special type for ambulatory patients;

6. Operating rooms for general and special surgery as cardiac, and neuro-surgery;

7. Sheltered workshops to teach the chronically ill to become self-supporting and self-sufficient;

8. Recreational facilities with consideration and inclusion of music therapy;

9. Educational facilities;

10. Vocational guidance; and

11. Team work with all specialists included.

These hospitals should be furnished with all equipment of a generalized hospital, plus all specialized equipment needed for diagnosing these ailments.

The Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital of Brooklyn is one of the outstanding examples of what a chronic disease hospital should be, as it incorporates practically all facilities as indicated above.

The writer is a fellow of the American College of Hospital Administrators; past president of the Hospital Council of Brooklyn, Long Island and Staten Island, and at present a member of its executive board; holds memberships in the American Public Health Association, American Hospital Association, the Hospital Association of New York, and the Greater New York Hospital Association.

Bed facilities, 1954

	Chronic diseases [1]	Mental	Tuberculosis
STATES			
Alabama	329	3,351	814
Unmet beds	5,777	11,934	930
Arizona	34	1,544	790
Unmet beds	1,941	3,326	1,440
Arkansas	116	2,700	1,653
Unmet beds	3,536	6,430	678
California	6,423	40,469	6,884
Unmet beds	16,911	17,866	2,721
Colorado	34	5,399	1,022
Unmet beds	2,814	1,721	
Connecticut	1,779	8,530	1,663
Unmet beds	2,577	2,360	
Delaware	336	804	223
Unmet beds	364	946	136
District of Columbia	50	5,728	1,167
Unmet beds	1,590		
Florida	998	8,867	1,942
Unmet beds	5,338	6,973	
Georgia	843	10,924	2,096
Unmet beds	6,248	6,546	
Idaho		1,298	100
Unmet beds	1,200	1,702	25
Illinois	2,884	28,439	5,065
Unmet beds	15,546	24,489	
Indiana	232	6,282	1,154
Unmet beds	8,174	14,722	891
Iowa	805	8,465	641
Unmet beds	4,365	9,641	
Kansas	100	2,550	500
Unmet beds	3,820	7,250	140
Kentucky	312	7,015	1,324
Unmet beds	5,544	7,625	1,428
Louisiana	372	7,609	1,497
Unmet beds	5,172	6,251	313
Maine	156	2,532	454
Unmet beds	1,600	1,912	298
Maryland	2,197	8,441	1,884
Unmet beds	2,847	4,210	746
Massachusetts	4,316	15,926	2,848
Unmet beds	5,348	8,234	
Michigan	[2]	20,679	5,264
Unmet beds	[2]	324	
Minnesota	517	9,534	1,759
Unmet beds	5,577	5,701	
Mississippi	27	3,591	650
Unmet beds	4,256	7,049	530
Missouri	2,344	12,888	2,048
Unmet beds	5,688	7,192	214
Montana		1,950	313
Unmet beds	1,248	1,170	
Nebraska	322	5,255	290
Unmet beds			
New Hampshire		2,180	89
Unmet beds	528	460	125
New Jersey	2,784	19,030	3,075
Unmet beds	7,716	7,220	
New Mexico	155	1,150	752
Unmet beds	1,349	2,610	
New York	8,849	81,865	11,562
Unmet beds [3]	21,889	10,202	[3] 3,668
North Carolina	415	9,672	2,733
Unmet beds	7,849	10,988	
North Dakota	60	1,818	350
Unmet beds	1,210	1,357	
Ohio	1,281	19,472	4,157
Unmet beds	15,415	22,268	3,406
Oklahoma	580	8,298	1,147
Unmet beds	3,884	2,862	
Oregon	76	4,807	591
Unmet beds	3,192	3,363	
Pennsylvania	1,586	29,593	4,019
Unmet beds	19,688	23,592	2,737

Bed facilities, 1954—Continued

	Chronic diseases [1]	Mental	Tuberculosis
STATES—continued			
Rhode Island	1,291	2,979	622
Unmet beds	297	991	
South Carolina	44	3,904	889
Unmet beds	4,298	6,951	424
South Dakota	42	1,896	118
Unmet beds	611	1,368	
Tennessee	1,166	8,878	1,738
Unmet beds	5,522	7,990	899
Texas	16,480	41,200	5,490
Unmet beds	15,640	28,493	938
Utah	20	1,575	100
Unmet beds	1,424	2,601	22
Vermont		1,828	167
Unmet beds	742	270	65
Virginia	60	11,133	1,421
Unmet beds	6,734	10,146	2,593
Washington	411	7,249	1,933
Unmet beds	4,330	4,961	
West Virginia	160	2,865	1,240
Unmet beds	3,778	6,980	
Wisconsin	803	17,050	2,120
Unmet beds	6,290	5,489	
Wyoming		772	50
Unmet beds	612	758	
Total:			
State	61,789	509,984	88,408
Unmet beds	250,479	327,494	25,367
TERRITORIES			
Alaska	41	366	472
Unmet beds	264	660	784
Guam		7	208
Hawaii	866	1,024	1,232
Unmet beds	734	1,518	
Puerto Rico	281	3,396	2,675
Unmet beds	4,161	7,709	3,252
Samoa	30	2	60
Unmet beds	10	1	15
Total:			
Territories	1,218	4,795	4,647
Unmet beds	5,169	9,888	4,051

[1] Excludes mental and tuberculosis.
[2] Unavailable.
[3] Unsuitable.

Baldwin Junior Class Opposes 18-Year Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following thoughtful letter from the junior class of Baldwin High School, Baldwin, Fla. They indicate a high regard for the privilege of voting, and modestly suggest that the privilege may be best earned and best fulfilled if the voters have had in appreciable degree, some of citizenship's normal experiences of earning a living, paying taxes, and so forth. As the Congressman from this district of Florida, I am indebted to them for their thoughtfulness in considering the subject and writing about it. The letter is as follows:

BALDWIN SCHOOL,
BALDWIN, FLA., *January 23, 1956.*

Hon. CHARLES E. BENNETT,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the junior class, have debated on the question of 18-year-olds voting. Our committee reached the conclusion that 18-year-olds should not be allowed to vote. We would like for you to present our views in the coming session of Congress. The reason for our decision was based on the opinions of students that most 18-year-olds

are interested in getting a job and making a living. At the age of 21 they are usually settled and have time to be concerned about politics.

Yours truly,

JUNIOR CLASS,
MARIE BELL, *Chairman.*

His Nephew Tells the Shocking Truth About Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Cardinal Mindszenty has now entered the eighth year of his imprisonment by the Communists. His defiance of communism is an example to the entire world. On November 20, 1955, the American Weekly published the first of three articles on Cardinal Mindszenty by his nephew, Laszlo Szamosfalvi, one of the first of his relatives to escape through Hungary's Iron Curtain. I direct the attention of our colleagues to this article which is as follows:

HIS NEPHEW TELLS THE SHOCKING TRUTH ABOUT CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

(By Laszlo Szamosfalvi, as told to Helen Mamas Zotos)

A veil of deliberate secrecy and silence has shrouded the name "Mindszenty" since my uncle's "trial" and imprisonment, nearly 7 years ago. The circumstances of his confinement, his whereabouts, his illnesses, all details of his martyrdom, which I shall reveal, have been as closely guarded as countless other secrets the Communists skillfully withhold until a propitious time.

Such a time came momentarily this past July when the Iron Curtain lifted for an announcement that stunned the world and left in its wake, as the Communists intended, the false impression that Hungary's prince primate has been "released."

As the cardinal's nephew and the first of his relatives to reach safety in the free world, I shall tell his story as he himself might wish it told. I am encouraged to do so because he cannot now speak for himself and because he believes that one of our greatest weapons against communism is the truth. His whole life has been dedicated to truth; he never wavered, and it would be fitting at the last if the truth should set him free.

I have known my uncle intimately, having spent a great part of my boyhood years in his household. After my own mother's death, Mindszenty's mother, who is my mother's sister, took her place for me. (In Hungarian tradition, he is my uncle, although his mother is my aunt.) My personal experience with communism, together with information from the Hungarian underground, from "indiscreet" Red agents and other sources, enables me to call the Communist "bluff."

My information includes letters from the cardinal's mother, excerpts from a diary kept by a fellow prisoner and smuggled, bit by bit, out of prison, reports on the violent fate met by those who were his persecutors, and recollections of my own three perilous missions of mercy to the imprisoned primate, from the free world.

In Budapest on July 16 of this year Hungarian Communist authorities announced a so-called "interruption" of the Cardinal's life sentence. The news came buried among numerous other items over Radio Budapest's 8 o'clock evening roundup, "Chronicle of the Day." It said: "The Ministry of Justice has granted Jozsef Mindszenty, upon his as well as the Roman Catholic Bishops Conference's appeal, interruption of his imprisonment, taking into consideration Mindszenty's old age and state of health. As residence, he was assigned a building of the church appointed by the Bishops Conference." Then, as quickly as the curtain lifted, it fell again, locking further comment away from Western ears.

This announcement, timed as a display of Soviet good faith at the opening of the Geneva summit conference, was a hoax. My uncle was not freed. Perhaps he will be some day, but at this writing he remains a Red captive.

I received word from the Cardinal's mother following this proclamation. She said: "You are pleased about the release of dear uncle, but it did not happen.

"Naturally the radio broadcast the news, and everybody was overcome with joy as everybody thought that it really happened.

"My dear, I visited him—thank God he is healthy and well, but only the good Lord knows when he will be set free."

As a prisoner Cardinal Mindszenty has not been treated any differently than the criminal behind bars. In an attempt to disgrace him in the eyes of our people, the Communists have prevented him from wearing his clerical robes. He has been deprived of his breviary, his rosary, his crucifix and prohibited from saying Mass and confession. He has been kept under constant surveillance, incommunicado, with even reading and writing materials denied him. Nevertheless, as communism failed to stifle the soul of the Hungarian people, so have untrustworthy officials been found in prison who, risking their lives, did befriend him and treat him with the respect due his holy office.

Because such men exist, we have been able to learn what went on inside Vacz prison where Mindszenty was kept captive many years. It was with their aid that a diary from the pen of Dr. Laszlo Toth, a leading Catholic journalist, my uncle's friend, a codefendant at the trial and a fellow inmate in prison, was slipped out of Vacz and Hungary. These excerpts help construct the cardinal's story:

"VACZ, *May 1949.*

"Saw him in the prison yard for the first time since the trial, but could not speak to him. The ordeal of the last 6 months has cast its shadow on his saintly face, and hardened its softness into a frozen mask; he has aged terribly."

"MIDDLE SUMMER, 1949.

"The hero of the 4-year struggle with the atheistic forces in Hungary occupies a privileged position among Vacz prison inmates. His trial and sufferings are known to everyone in the prison, and with every week that passes the grandeur of his figure, which true piety constructs, is increased through the stories circulated around the prison cells. In the history of modern peoples, there is scarcely any other example of a man, who, a half-year after his trial, became a martyr in the eyes of his countrymen. The cardinal looks pale and thin. The heat is oppressive in the cells and it is impossible to sleep."

"WINTER, 1949–50.

"The cardinal is slowly recovering his mental and physical strength; the marks of strain on his face have begun to disappear. Thank God. The first sign that the turn for the better had taken place in his general condition was when the cardinal asked the prison warder to try to get him a book—The Imitation of Christ.

"The warder told me, however, that the governor of Vacz prison had never heard of that book. Instead, he sent the Cardinal 10 volumes of the complete works of Lenin!

"From time to time I meet the cardinal during the daily half-hour walk. He says very little, but never has his diction been more lucid and pointed. What he does say is very simple: that every suffering has a deep meaning, and that we must trust in God. In his mouth these words acquire a remarkable wealth of meaning and authority. They travel swiftly from cell to cell, from floor to floor. Their effect has been quite marked upon the 2,000 inmates of this prison.

"Every day I see practical proof of the fervent and pious love of the inmates of Vacz prison for Cardinal Mindszenty. When passing his cell they take off their caps and cross themselves.

"It is a bitter winter's morning; the first heavy fall of snow came during the night, wrapping the prison yard and buildings in an impenetrable white silence. The food situation is getting desperate; every night deaths ocur; two priests died last week."

"MARCH 1950.

"We are shivering in our cells both from hunger and from cold. The bread ration has been cut again. A moving scene occurred yesterday in the prison yard. A youth fainted and then collapsed while clearing away the mud. The cardinal, who happened to be taking his daily walk, was the first to help him get up.

"'I am hungry; I can't stand this any more,' whispered the youth.

"'Take the loaf of bread from me, please,' the cardinal whispered back, although he himself had little to eat.

"With tears in his eyes, the youth kissed the cardinal's hand. When they parted, the cardinal told him, 'I shall pray for you.' For more than 4 weeks the cardinal sent his loaf of bread every second day to that boy. This noble gesture was commented upon both by the inmates and the prison's warders."

Undated, presumably 1951:

"When the cardinal was transferred to Vacz, it was estimated that among the inmates there were many unbelievers, especially liberal Marxists who quarreled with the Orthodox Communists of Stalin's school.

"But the cardinal's presence in the prison has had a tremendous influence on the revival of faith among the 2,000 inmates. In the cells of Vacz prison religion has become a living spiritual force. I have witnessed many cases when the atheistic Marxists—former avowed enemies of all religion—have rejected Marx's dialectical materialism and embraced the Catholic faith * * * Such occurrences have given me consolation for my sufferings."

Undated, presumably spring, 1952:

"The cardinal has been removed from the general prison's ward somewhere else. I am sorry that I won't see him any more during the walk in the prison yard. But he has been carrying the burden of the prisoner's life with nobility and dignity. We do not see him any more but we feel his presence everywhere in prison." (End of diary.)

As I think back to the days before my uncle's arrest, I remember the words of his final pastoral letter, circulated seven years ago last week (November 18, 1948), in which he forecast his own fate. "None of my predecessors was so without means of defense as I am * * * compelled to face untruths * * * as I am * * * (but) when compared to the sufferings of my country my own fate is unimportant."

Mindszenty might repeat those words today, for certainly few Christians have been more persecuted for their faith, more defamed and tyrannized, or more selflessly persistent in their dedication to truth and liberty since Christ carried His Cross to Calvary.

At the time, Mindszenty was speaking of the diabolical plot that was to lead to his debasement at AVH political police headquarters at Budapest's 60 Andrassy Street (renamed Stalin Street). He knew that arrest

was imminent well ahead of the fateful hour when 16 policemen surrounded the palace of his Holy See at Esztergom the day after Christmas in 1948. He laid aside his robe, bade good-by to his mother and alerted his priests with these words: "If a live Cardinal cannot help defend his country, perhaps a dead one can."

Hurriedly he scribbled on the back of a worn envelope a message to his bishops. It was to become an immortal indictment of communism and the Cardinal's best-known declaration.

"I have partaken in no conspiracy whatsoever," he said. "I shall not resign my episcopal See. I shall not make any confession. If * * * you should read that I confessed or * * * resigned, and even see it authenticated by my signature, regard that as merely the consequence of human frailty; and in advance I declare such acts null and void."

My uncle is a man of immense courage. He foresaw what would happen at 60 Andrassy Street. He had been there times before to protect the unjustly accused and tormented. However grim, however humiliating his own experience there was to be, he was prepared to face it. "Other men possess far greater talents," he had said to me, "but I have nerve."

At Red police headquarters Mindszenty was starved, tortured, brainwashed, drugged. Irrefutable documentary evidence has been brought out of Hungary and submitted to Western intelligence by eyewitnesses, as well as by officials who assisted in the conspiracy and who later fled. They included a doctor who gave Mindszenty drugs, a graphologist who forged damning documents, and two public prosecutors who detailed precisely how Cardinal Mindszenty's will was shattered.

The man who shared my uncle's cell for a time preceding trial escaped recently to bring me this fresh account: "Mindszenty was threatened with death if he would not confess according to Communist dictates at the trial. He collapsed many times in our cell when they brought him back from interrogation; he had recurrent nightmares. For days at a time he was not fed, but was given ice-cold enemas, stimulant pills and injections which I myself saw the doctors administer."

Mindszenty's crackup followed on the 25th day of arrest, and 13 days later, authorities were able to bring him, shockingly different from the man Hungary knew, to a so-called "trial" before a "People's Court."

There the churchman was made "publicly" to "confess guilt" to charges of treason, of plotting to overthrow the government and of illegal dealings in foreign currency.

On February 8, 1949, a life sentence was imposed, and the cardinal was whisked away, never to be seen again except by his captors, for a time by fellow prisoners, and rarely, with special permission, by his mother.

Mindszenty, as martyr, rallied all Christianity to his cause, and his voice, silenced, cried out louder through prison walls. Fear of reprisals, public demonstrations, pilgrimages, liberation attempts (which were made and will be related later), and fear of real release by "unreliable" prison warders, compelled the Red regime not only to hide the cardinal but to change his whereabouts at regular intervals. Before last July's announcement, there were in fact numerous "interruptions" of his sentence.

Since 1949, he has been in a dozen different prisons and detention villas, not only in Hungary but in Czechoslovakia. Once when the Russians became afraid, he was even moved to Soviet territory. Such precautions were taken to cover these movements that often three different points of confinement were designated simultaneously for him in three different regions, leaving wardens to argue who was responsible for the prisoner, while Mindszenty was shunted to a fourth unnamed place. There were times when my uncle himself did not know where he was.

One of my uncle's principal concerns throughout his lifetime has been the welfare of political victims of Hungary's ever-changing governments, of Nazi and Communist tyranny. To see justice rendered to them, he would carry their complaints from internment camps and prisons even up to Parliament. Now who in Hungary can look after him, can see if he has enough food, a bed to sleep on, a crucifix to pray before? Who is there to champion his rights?

The Communist conspiracy did not end with the imprisonment of my uncle. His persecution continued, and in Csehimindszent, Hungary, the village of his birth, the conspiracy extended to our family. We were made to suffer not only his loss, but Communist abuses and retaliations for his alleged crimes.

His Nephew Tells the Shocking Truth About Cardinal Mindszenty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second in a series of three articles on Cardinal Mindszenty by his nephew, Laszlo Szamosfalvi. This article appears in the November 27, 1955, issue of the American Weekly:

HIS NEPHEW TELLS THE SHOCKING TRUTH ABOUT CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

(By Laszlo Szamosfalvi, as told to Helen Mamas Zotos)

Last July the Hungarian Communist authorities gave the world the false impression that Cardinal Mindszenty had been released after serving nearly 7 years of his shameful life sentence for "treason and espionage." He is still a prisoner behind a veil of secrecy and silence.

In my opening chapter of this story last week, I was able to lift that veil for the first time—because of my personal experience with communism, with the help of the Hungarian underground and "indiscreet" Red agents, excerpts from a diary kept by one of my uncle's fellow prisoners, and letters from his aged mother.

This is the story of her tragic martyrdom.

In Csehimindszent, Hungary, the village of Jozsef Cardinal Mindszenty's birth, the shadow of his cross has fallen over those dearest to his heart. The martyrdom of his family, particularly of his aged mother whom he adores, has been no less courageous than his own.

With my uncle's imprisonment in February 1949, the Communists turned their fiendish conspiracy upon our home, and we were made to suffer not only our grief at his ordeals but also abuses and arrests.

It is on the face of Mindszenty's mother, the widow Janos Pehm as she is known, that the lines of his anguish are most perceptibly drawn. To her the Communists imparted the painful task of wrestling with the sorrow of her heart and comforting her son in prison. As his only visitor in the last 7 years, she has shared most of his suffering. It became her poignant duty to attempt to undo the torments of his persecutors.

Following the Hungarian Communist announcement of my uncle's "release" last July—the first official news of him since he vanished from the Budapest "courtroom"—Mindszenty was removed (our underground discovered this secret) to a villa in southwestern Hungary. This villa formerly was the summer residence of the bishop of Pecs. It is located a few kilometers to the northeast of Pecs in Puespok Szent Laszlo, a village in the Mecsek Mountains, some 25 miles from the Yugoslav frontier.

There, Mindszenty's mother was permitted her latest visit with him. On a prearranged date recently, a car of the AVH security police manned by plainclothesmen called for her in Csehimindszent, as it always came to take her, each time alarming the people of our village who feared her arrest.

Of this visit she was soon after able to tell me:

"I want to see the freeing of my poor son. The only difference is that he is not in prison but in a villa situated in a dense forest, like others he has been in. He has three rooms. A priest is with him. I can tell you the poor soul would have preferred to go to his Holy See at Esztergom, but they took him instead to this resting place. It pains me that our Jozsi has been imprisoned now 7 years and they do nothing. Last year I requested that they release him to me or to a cloister, but they never answered, so all is in vain. * * *"

In another message she explained: "There has been great confusion because the radios broadcast they would release him; while they have made no move. Only the dear population made inquiries about him. Some said that they had seen him in Esztergom, others, in Csehimindszent, and still others in Budapest, saying Mass at St. Matthew's Church. The population became very excited. They did not want to believe that nothing had happened."

To be confined in a villa may seem better than to be locked up in prison. Nevertheless house arrest cannot be stretched to mean freedom, and while Cardinal Mindszenty's physical surroundings appear superficially improved, the Communist act of clemency remains a grotesque Communist bluff.

In this villa Mindszenty continues to be completely isolated from the outside world. He speaks to no one, receives no newspapers, not even Communist Party organs, and cannot move about at will, appear in public, or communicate with his church and his people.

All roads leading to the village of Puespok Szent Laszlo have been closed by police forces and are heavily partolled. Access to the area is further prohibited by a new government warning that uranium is being mined there, a convenient pretext to keep the Hungarian people from discovering his whereabouts and trying to see him.

In no manner, in fact, has the outrageous wrong inflicted upon the Cardinal been corrected. His sentence has not been nullified; his church rights have not been recognized. His title as Hungary's Prince of the Church, stripped from him with all his church properties at his trial, has not been restored. Nor has his innocence been affirmed.

Even the priest-companion assigned to him—in a seemingly magnanimous gesture—is no priest at all, our underground informs me, but a Communist "suggester" who carries on the sinister job of brainwashing in the hope that the primate will give up his unrelenting opposition to communism.

Mindszenty's guilt in 1949, and now, has been only his refusal to betray God and surrender his church to atheism. In his villa-prison his spiritual dedication has not weakened. Despite his atheist keepers he carries on the humble requirements of his office, celebrating morning mass and devoting many hours to prayer and contemplation. Once each week, as has been his ritual for some 40 years, he fasts on bread and water and sleeps not on a bed but on the bare floor.

Meantime, in Csehimindszent, our family attempts to endure the penalties pressed upon us by the Communist conspiracy. In a police state any penalty short of death is no penalty, and only Moscow's intervention saved Mindszenty from execution. Immediately after my uncle's trial the Communists sought to purge our family and to cut us away from our means of subsistence.

Four sons of Mindszenty's elder sister were arrested because, they were told, "Mindszenty is your uncle." One of them, my cousin Gyula Tarlo, recently reached Austria after imprisonment in Hungary and many efforts to escape. He had been arrested five times.

The son of the cardinal's second sister, with whom Mother Pehm lives, was also jailed and sentenced to slave labor—a punishment that still continues—because he wrote a letter to the authorities for Mindszenty's mother, asking permission for her to visit her captive son. The list of other more distant relatives forced to work at farm labor is endless.

Nevertheless we kept together as we could, cherishing as peasants our Magyar inheritance of three traditions—freedom, the soil, and the cross—which Communist treachery has temporarily taken from us and from all of Hungary. We took much encouragement from the heroism of our matriarch, Mother Pehm.

In the house where she brought young "Josi" into the world 63 years ago—a house which is now in ruins and under constant police surveillance—Mrs. Pehm continued to live in the way of humility and self-effacement that has characterized her life. She is a small, fragile woman, always dressed in black. At 86 she is one of the very old ones in the village. Being long accustomed to the hard labors of the peasant, however, she still works from dawn to dusk in the vineyard.

Mother Pehm regarded her cardinal son as her "little wealth." and often she is heard to whisper now in her martyrdom, "They have taken away my 'little wealth'; now I have nothing." When he was only 10, she decided to send him away to school—an extraordinary act for a peasant woman and one that drew comment from our neighbors that, "Those Pehms have bitten off more than they can chew."

While she had not urged (but certainly quietly inspired) Mindszenty to become a priest, she wept for joy at his ordination. The telegrams that came on the day of his first mass gave her an opportunity to say, "You see, the good God helped us chew what we bit off."

Last summer Mother Pehm worked with special patience in the vineyard. She had been bedridden throughout the previous winter—her asthma is very troublesome—and she had seen the cardinal but once in nearly a year. On her next visit she wanted to take him a gift from home and thought, "What better than a bottle of wine from his own vineyard."

That fall she brought from the field the sweetest, roundest grapes in the community and she pressed the grapes into a wine of the right pungency for the cardinal's taste.

Beneath her black shawl, on visiting day, she carried her treasure with her—only to have it smashed against the wall by a laughing prison guard.

Mindszenty's love for his mother has been no less tender, and in his early twenties he wrote two books—banned by the Communists—on Christian motherhood, which are a testimonial to his own mother's love.

A passage from the Face of the Heavenly Mother, wherein he describes Mother Mary's sufferings with Christ, was prophetic of the sorrow that he and his mother now share:

"Continual grief united mother and son just as firmly as moments of joy. When Mary looked into Jesus' eyes, she saw the mortal anguish on Mount Olivet. * * * But a time came when she was mortally wounded by the swords. * * * As once the Lord turned her love to mother's milk so now He turned her sorrow to tears. * * *

"Jesus and Mary met. * * * They stood gazing into each other's eyes. One glance of the mother uncovered everything that had happened the previous evening, during the night and that morning. The sweat of blood in Gethsemane, the traitor's kiss, the 30 pieces of silver, the trial * * * the stripping of garments and the scourging, the mocking, and the crowning with thorns * * * the mother knew all these things."

It fell to the Cardinal's mother to reconstruct, during her visits with him, the events of his bitterest days. For Cardinal Mindszenty has no personal, real recollection of the harrowing period between his arrest and imprisonment. He remembers nothing of 60 Andrassy Street, the torture chamber of the Communist secret police where he was drugged and brainwashed. Nor does he recall his confession to charges of treason and conspiracy before a so-called people's court. It was his mother who had to lift the curtain of this blackout, during which, as he later told her, "I thought I was dead."

Six weeks passed after the court sentenced my uncle to lifetime imprisonment on February 8, 1949, before Mindszenty's mother was permitted her first visit with him. In the last 7 years, she has been allowed to see the Primate only 30 times, the visits totaling but 25 hours.

Her first appeal to see him brought no reply but the arrest of her grandson. So great became her desperation that by March she pleaded in a wire, reply prepaid: "I am his mother. I cannot be forbidden to see my son." After this wire she was taken to Budapest to see him for the first time since he had bade her farewell on the day of his arrest. His last words were, "Don't cry, mother. If I should die, it will be for the freedom of Hungary."

With a grill between them and two policemen in the room, Mindszenty learned from his mother's cautious words of the Communist outrages inflicted upon him during the early days of his martyrdom.

"My son, you have been sentenced to life imprisonment," she told him. "You will be here forever."

"Mother," the cardinal consoled her, "it will be all right one day."

"Everyone in the family, everyone in the country, in the whole world, is praying for you," she said, trying to reassure him.

"Mother," he said, "they shall not pray for me; they shall pray for the same thing I am praying for."

In the year 1950, Mother Pehm saw her imprisoned son only once, despite repeated entreaties. Later it became evident she was kept away because he was gravely ill and had been sent out of Hungary to convalesce.

By January 1951, Mrs. Pehm learned his whereabouts. Without asking permission, she went to a Budapest villa—and found him. Behind a guard's back, she dashed into the house—just as Mindszenty appeared from his room.

Opening his arms to her, and weeping, he called out, "Mother, I dreamt you would come." Comforted with the sight of him, and fearing to stay beyond this embrace, she darted swiftly out again. Only then did the guard notice her. "Rotten old witch, beggar," he shouted, "be on your way."

Since the cardinal's arrest Mrs. Pehm has stopped counting the years, for fear they will all pass away before her son is freed. In letter after letter she writes me:

"I pray for the release of my poor suffering son * * * that our gracious Jesus should liberate him * * * But I fear I will not be alive then, as I am old * * * If I can only live long enough to have a long talk with him; this is all I wish."

The Fate of Cardinal Mindszenty's Betrayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have previously directed the attention of our colleagues to two articles on Cardinal Mindszenty by his nephew, Laszlo Szamosfalvi. The third and final article of the series appeared in the American Weekly for December 4, 1955, and is as follows:

THE FATE OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY'S BETRAYERS

(By Laszlo Szamosfalvi, as told to Helen Mamas Zotos)

The irony of communism is that it destroys itself. Those who push it along its sinister course very often are trapped in the web of their own treachery.

In my country we believe "God writes straight with crooked lines." We are a religious people, and, in trying hours, take hope in knowing that from suffering will come good, and, from evil, punishment for the evildoer.

So it was that in the aftermath of my uncle's imprisonment, in 1949, the Communist conspiracy boomeranged, and God turned His wrath upon Cardinal Mindszenty's persecutors.

By imprisoning our primate, Hungary's Reds virtually elevated him to sainthood. Instead of destroying him and the faith of our people, which was their design, they created a hero and a martyr and brought upon themselves the anger of all Christianity. As Mindszenty had prophesied, a dead Cardinal was worth more to the cause of freedom than a live one, and before an aroused world he became, in the Communists' blood-stained hands, a liability of fantastic dimensions.

God's vengeance swiftly swept over the Communist Party and they saw, too late, the dreadful mistake they had made. In doubt and panic, crucifier turned against crucifier to strike down all who could be blamed. Of some 31 'respectable" Communists entrusted with my uncle's arrest and conviction, only 3 remain at liberty in Hungary today. Two successfully escaped to the West. Twenty-six met a violent fate.

Trapped in the web first were the three Ministers of Interior who served before, during, and after my uncle's trial. Minister Laszlo Rajk, who seated the Cardinal's doom years ahead of the courtroom scene, was hanged as a traitor in 1949. Janos Kadar, his successor, who grilled my uncle at the trial, was imprisoned until recently. Sandor Zold, who inherited the ministry after successfully conducting an anti-Mindszenty scare wave, became so hysterical through fear that he shot himself and his family.

Justice Minister Istvan Riesz had served faithfully in his post 6 years before colleagues conveniently discovered that he was an American spy. His sentence before another mock court was 25 years, but in his cell vengeful prisoners terminated it promptly by beating him to death.

In 1947 I spent 6 months at 60 Andrassy Street, headquarters of the AVH secret police and the same horror chamber to which my uncle was brought following arrest for trial preparation. I had refused to join the Communist army, and was beaten up by the notorious Gabor Peter—the same man who, by terror and intimidation, built up the

case against the cardinal. A Moscow-trained police chief and professional hatchet man, Peter was arrested in 1953. A recent jailbreak attempt failed and he is now fulfilling his life sentence.

His sidekick, Lt. Col. Gyula Decsi, arrested my uncle and was most directly responsible for his physical breakdown. He had charge of the brainwashing and personally extorted the cardinal's "confession". But in doing his job, he, too, committed an antistate crime and was imprisoned.

Of the 16 arresting officers only one managed to escape the Communist sword by fleeing to the West. The leader of the group, Gyula Oszko, also tried to escape, but failed. He was shot by Soviet guards on the Austrian frontier. A third policeman was found dead at headquarters, while the remaining unlucky 13 were sped out of Hungary into Siberian slave labor.

These were not all. The handwriting expert at the trial, two of the doctors assigned to Mindszenty, and the propagandist in Communist party boss Matyas Rakosi's private office also have died. A third doctor went insane, while the prison warden himself, was imprisoned 4 years. The cardinal's defense attorney, Kalman Kiczko, who was forced on my uncle in place of the one he had chosen and who put up no case at all, also died, repenting not having performed my lawyer's duty.

Vilmos Olti, the judge who pronounced sentence, and the young public prosecutor avoided the dire fate of the other conspirators, but both for a long time were out of a job.

Time and again in the years of my uncle's captivity the Communists have had shocking reminders of their mistake in daring to desecrate Cardinal Mindszenty. Even before his ordeal his fame as a protagonist of freedom was widespread and he was held in veneration by the world. In prison he became a glowing symbol of the Communist debasement of religious faith and of the dignity of man. His message, though muted by prison walls, rallied Christians the world over to save him.

In 1949, shortly after his imprisonment, an attempt to liberate him was made by elements of the Hungarian and Polish undergrounds and friends in America. The Cardinal at the time was in a prison hospital at Koebanya, a suburb of Budapest. Hungary's borders were freer then, and contact was easily established with prison guards to ensure his safe delivery.

A demonstration was arranged to divert the authorities' attention, and detailed maps of the prison grounds traced the path he would follow to freedom. The gateway was to be made by seaplane which was to land on the Danube River near the hospital at a given time. Everything was well prepared, when Red counterspies intercepted a message and the plot failed.

Hungary's announcement of my uncle's "release" last July was an attempt to cover the Communist mistake. Months before the Soviet smile at Geneva the Kremlin had decided that this single act of "relaxation" would make an impression on the free world. Within Hungary it was aimed at appeasing the Cardinal's devoted flock, about to start work on the harvest. Because of the critical food situation this phony gesture was made to induce cooperation.

The announcement itself was riddled with lies which left holes for Communist retreat. The Reds referred to Mindszenty neither as cardinal nor archibishop of Esztergom. Thus they stripped him of his titles to show that the regime still refuses to recognize his sacred office.

They said my uncle and the board of bishops had asked for clemency. This was false. In fact, throughout his lifetime my uncle has tenaciously refused to direct any appeals to communism. As for the board of bishops, they are under the cardinal's jurisdiction, not he under theirs.

The Communists claimed clemency had been granted because of Mindszenty's old age and poor health. My uncle's "old age" is 63, and his health, as the Communists well know, has never been better in prison.

Apart from its propaganda motivation and lies, the announcement stemmed from a longing to be rid of the primate forever and to white wash the whole Mindszenty affair. More than anything, the Communists would like today to disengage themselves from their prisoner but under terms that would save the face of the Communist state in Hungary.

Early in 1954 they offered him a release conditional on his leaving Hungary. The cardinal asked his captors how many other Catholic priests were still imprisoned. When they told him some 623 he declared, "Then I shall be the last to think about leaving."

Later they modified their terms and offered to free him on condition that he: (1) renounce the Vatican and authority of the Pope; (2) abdicate as primate and go into village exile as an ordinary priest; (3) not resume his anti-state activities; (4) not issue any uncensored statements concerning his imprisonment; and (5) personally express desire for clemency.

These had long been the aims of the Communist antichurch drive. They were in fact the very alternatives offered to Mindszenty before his imprisonment. Even in jail he turned them down, refusing to compromise with communism. "I have my own conditions—not those you put before me," he told them on many occasions.

The Communists never really wanted to imprison my uncle. They would have much preferred to exile him or kill him "accidentally."

I myself intercepted a top-secret paper drawn up by the Communist hierarchy proposing his murder by a fake accident in September 1948. Only three copies of this document existed. Party Boss Rakosi's plan was simple—an army motor truck was to "accidentally" collide with a car carrying my uncle on the road near his palace.

Frantically, I dashed from Budapest to Esztergom to alert the cardinal. His only comment to me on this, the last time I saw him, as I remember, was: "A dead Mindszenty will be more useful to the Hungarian nation than 100 live Rakosis."

Although the Reds wished so desperately to be rid of him, they were afraid. when the test came, to have him die their prisoner. During periods of long illness they gave him the very best care.

For three years following the cardinal's "trial," he was mentally not himself. He suffered from the tortures of his brainwashing and was physically and spiritually exhausted. He suffered an attack of pneumonia and underwent a thyroid operation.

During these years I ran missions of mercy for my imprisoned uncle from the free world. Three times I crossed the borders of Hungary from Austria to visit my aunt, the cardinal's mother, in Csehimindszent and to bring her wonder drugs—antibiotics and penicillin—that she could carry to the cardinal. Each time I made my way safely in and out again—at the risk of my life.

Apart from by uncle's blackout concerning the "trial," today he is in good physical health and has complete use of his mental faculties.

Throughout his lifetime Mindszenty has been an unyielding foe of communism and a patriot. There never was any doubt in his mind as to his eventual arrest, imprisonment, and perhaps death at the hands of his foes. Even the Pope cautioned him when be bestowed the red hat upon him in 1946: "You may be the first whose red blood will stain the blood-red of the cardinal's cap."

He could have escaped but would not. Time and again, when it was suggested that he leave Hungary, he shook his head and said, "I must stay home with my people. We are in a period of storms and disturbances but the Hungarian Church has outlasted the storms of centuries. She is under the protective wing of God."

A curtain of silence has again been lowered over Mindszenty since the false news of his release. It covers a great Communist dilemma. Who can predict how the Reds will extricate themselves from their own conspiracy? Knowing that my uncle, too, remains under the protective wing of God it is my hope that God will swiftly "write straight these crooked lines."

In court Mindszenty had the last word. He ended his final plea for justice with a prayer. It would seem fitting to give him the same last word here. "God give us peace in these days, not merely in the future but in these days," he said. "I ask for this peace for my church, the love of which is constantly with me, for the Hungarian state to which I have shown by obedience, and for my own soul."

The case of Mindszenty is not closed.

To Help the American Farmer, Why Not a National Institute of Agriculture for Research and Development?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, though I do not have one farm in my congressional district, nonetheless our people are greatly interested in the farmer's welfare.

While I am not an expert in agriculture or legislation dealing with it, I do nevertheless have an idea that I wish to bring to the attention of the House that might conceivably help the people in agriculture throughout the United States.

Everyone seems to be concerned about surpluses, but precious little is being done about it. I am wondering if the Congress could wisely go into the question of whether there should be created a new agency entitled "The National Institutes of Agriculture." This agency would concern itself wholly with research and development within the agricultural field. Who knows what research might bring? Surpluses may be turned to good use; a new farm product might be developed, and so forth. There are unlimited fields and horizons in agriculture that have not as yet been touched by our scientists. Would it not be wise to start such a program?

I enclose a letter that I received from the Assistant Secretary, Mr. E. L. Peterson, which is self-explanatory. I also enclose a list showing the "amounts available for research and related man-years for fiscal year 1956 within the Department of Agriculture."

As the session goes on, I expect to talk further about this National Institutes of Agriculture.

The letter and table follow:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1956.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SIEMINSKI: This is in reply to your letter of January 10, 1956, re-

questing certain information on the Department's research programs.

The attached table shows for fiscal year 1956 amounts available for research by the various agencies of the Department and the estimated man-years of employment related to this research in total for each agency.

Under provisions of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, the Department has authority to enter into contracts with States, agencies of States, private firms, institutions, and individuals for research and service work, making and compiling reports and surveys, and carrying out other functions relating thereto when these services or functions to be performed will be carried out more effectively, more rapidly, or at less cost than if performed by the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1956, provides that not less than $1,500,000 of the Department's appropriations for research and service work shall be available for contracting in accordance with our authorizations.

The Public Health Service is not conducting any research for us in the agricultural field; however, in carrying out certain phases of our research, there is close cooperation with the Public Health Service to enable both agencies to keep each other well informed.

We hope this information will be helpful and we appreciate your interest in the Department's research programs.

Sincerely yours,

E. L. PETERSON,
Assistant Secretary.

United States Department of Agriculture—Amounts available for research and related man-years, fiscal year 1956

Agency and project	Amount available	Man-years
	Thous.	
Agricultural Research Service:		
Salaries and expenses:		
Crops research	$14,222	------
Farm and land management research	7,331	------
Livestock research	6,682	------
Administration of payments to States, and Territorial research	841	------
Home economics research	1,526	------
Utilization research	9,665	------
Total, salaries and expenses	40,267	5,914
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico	24,754	[1] 60
Foot-and-mouth disease research	1,945	263
Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials	316	50
Allotment from school-lunch program	32	7
Total, Agricultural Research Service	67,314	6,294
Farmer Cooperative Service	281	36
Forest Service:		
Forest research:		
Forest and range management research	4,530	------
Forest protection research	1,388	------
Forest products research	1,303	------
Forest resources research	1,016	------
Total, Forest Service	8,237	1,174
Agricultural Marketing Service:		
Marketing research	5,798	------
Economic and statistical analysis	1,366	------
Total, Agricultural Marketing Service	7,164	950
Foreign Agricultural Service	185	26
Library	250	43
Total, research	83,431	8,523

[1] Excludes special items related to facilities as follows: Research facilities for investigation of foot-and-mouth and other animal diseases and animal-disease laboratory facilities.

Hitting Where It Hurts—Iron Curtain No Barrier to Radio Free Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hitting Where It Hurts—Iron Curtain No Barrier to Radio Free Europe," appearing in the Boston Globe of January 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HITTING WHERE IT HURTS—IRON CURTAIN NO BARRIER TO RADIO FREE EUROPE

(By John Crosby)

No one has ever satisfactorily succeeded in measuring the reaction of an audience to a program or, for that matter, even in measuring the size of the audience.

An infinitely more complex job is that of measuring the results of radio programs beamed to the other side of the Iron Curtain—to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Still, the job is done and done pretty well.

Chief of the audience research section of Radio Free Europe is Robert C. Sorensen who find out how many of RFE's programs are getting through and what they are accomplishing through three sources—refugees, travelers, and sailors who have been in the target countries; newspapers, magazines, and radio broadcasts from behind the curtain; and letters from listeners.

Interviews with refugees and travelers take place along the periphery of the Iron Curtain in Munich, Stockholm, Hamburg, Frankfurt, Vienna, Rome, Athens, Instanbul. Some of them take as long as 10 hours.

The hardest part is getting the interviewed to stop telling what he thinks the interviewer wants to hear and tell what he really knows.

If the RFE is hammering away at Soviet agricultural policies, for instance, it wants to know what the people really think about those policies.

RFE also wants to know what the people want to be informed about, it being difficult on this enlightened side of the curtain to tell precisely where the areas of ignorance are.

Soviet broadcasts and press reveal a lot about RFE's effectiveness. It has been attacked by Soviet press or radio more than 1,800 times in the last 19 months, more than any other foreign radio group including Voice of America.

For angry reaction, President Eisenhower's Christmas greetings probably set some kind of record. The broadcast was attacked by Khrushchev himself and his remarks were repeated in 34 different attacks by the Soviet-controlled radio and press in satellite countries.

Letters indicate that the favorite type of program is news, especially news about western thinking. Listeners like to hear comparisons between western salaries and their own.

They like comedy with a political slant, the sort of thing that shoots barbs in the Communist way of life.

They like music, particularly that of composers barred for political views.

Most dramatic example of RFE's effectiveness took place in January last year when there was a major shakeup of the Polish secret police, including the removal of the Minister of Security and the arrest of three of his top officials.

This followed 3 months of broadcasting by Joseph Swiatlo, formerly of the Polish secret police, who revealed over RFE all the corruption and intrigue within the organization.

RFE has ways of measuring audiences at least as good as Nielsen in this country. In the 5 countries they broadcast to there are 5 million radio sets that can receive the programs, and it is known that 3 to 5 people are generally clustered around each set.

Moreover, listening is not—as in this country—casual; because it is illicit, people listen with intense concentration so as not to miss anything.

Now that the Kremlin is making an effort to be friendly with the United States, attacks on our Government have decreased.

But attacks on Radio Free Europe have greatly increased.

Last October, in Geneva, Molotov claimed that the people from the five satellite countries who have escaped to the West and gone to work for RFE are "the scum of society thrown out of the people's democracies."

That was, the RFE people feel, about the most flattering thing Molotov could have said. To deserve an epithet like that, RFE must be hitting where it hurts.

Our Greatest Need: Wisdom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful and timely article by Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, New York City.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR GREATEST NEED: WISDOM

(By Dr. Julius Mark, senior rabbi, Temple Emanu-El, New York City)

Our world needs many things today, but its chief requirement is wisdom.

We have made incredible progress in unveiling the secrets of nature. We have made the earth yield more abundantly than ever before in human history. We have pushed back the frontiers of disease with wonder drugs and vaccines. We have witnessed the human life-span prolonged to a remarkable extent. We have unlocked the door of the atom, resulting in an inexhaustible source of power not only to destroy, but to build, to heal, and to open new avenues for making life healthier and happier.

In view of the astonishing progress that has been made by science and technology, one might think that ours would be an age of optimism, serenity, and hope. Yet, as we look about us, we find that the very opposite prevails. Our world, alas, suffers from fear, tension, and insecurity. It is obvious that there is lacking in modern life something which prevents us from enjoying the fruits of man's prodigious progress.

More than 2,000 years ago, the author of the book of Job in the Bible, examining his own times, was as bewildered as are we, when he declared: "Man putteth forth his hand unto the rocks; he overturneth mountains

by the roots; he cutteth out rivers from among the rocks; he buildeth the floods from overflowing. That which is hidden, man bringeth to light, but where is wisdom to be found? Man knoweth not the price thereof." (Job 28: 9 ff.)

Despite astonishing progress made since the days of Job, man himself has hardly changed, a fact which is in a large measure responsible for the present-day spirit of pessimism and defeatism. Our knowledge has been increased immeasurably, but man has remained substantially the same. How few and puny are his achievements—as a human being. From the beginning of this century up to the outbreak of World War I, our horizon was filled to overflowing with the wildest of dreams and most extravagant of hopes.

Sociologists believed that they would soon abolish poverty and eliminate crime. Scientists felt that, through the conquest of disease and the prolongation of human life, man would not only be healthier and live longer, but would be happier. Industrialists claimed that the machine age would provide man with so much leisure that universal education and culture would be inevitable. Religionists dreamed of the brotherhood of man being near at hand, since closer relationships were being developed through advances in communication and transportation.

The fallacy inherent in these dreams consists in this: While we considered the amazing progress that had been made in the conquest of nature, we left out of account human nature, which is man himself. Because our material progress has not been paralleled by moral progress, the wonders man has achieved have come to represent a threat rather than a promise—which only wisdom can achieve.

What is wisdom? For one thing it is not synonymous with knowledge, since men possessing knowledge may be cruel, vindictive, destructive. Wisdom is a combination of discernment, discretion, and sagacity. It involves a certain amount of knowledge, to be sure, but it is principally the knowledge of human beings and the mutual respect, mutual sympathy, and mutual understanding which may be derived from that knowledge. "Give me understanding," cried the Psalmist, "and I shall live!" (Psalms 119:144.)

The tragedy of our times is that we have succeeded in splitting the atom before acquiring the wisdom to unite humanity. Our major need today is not for more knowledge as to how to fly through the stratosphere, but more understanding of how to walk upon the face of the earth like human beings created in the image of God. Not more science do we require, but more of the milk of human kindness. Not more bombs to destroy should be our aim, but more of the balm of healing and building up the wounds of mankind fallen into disunion. Not more "know-how," but "know-why"! Not more knowledge is our greatest need, but more wisdom!

Footnote to Mr. Truman's History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Footnote to Mr. Truman's History," written by Arthur Krock, and published in the New York Times of Tuesday, January 31, 1956, which illuminates another phase of the important public service of the late James Forrestal, our first Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—FOOTNOTE TO MR. TRUMAN'S HISTORY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 30—In his clear and factual account (in the New York Times of January 27) of the origins, assertions and first congressional execution of the Truman doctrine of 1947, Mr. Truman apparently did not estimate certain Navy activities in the Mediterranean in 1946 as pertinent to the background. But those who had first-hand familiarity with these activities believe that in promoting and initiating them the late James V. Forrestal, as Secretary of the Navy, laid an essential foundation of the Truman doctrine.

A year before President Truman went to Congress in person to submit the Greek-Turkish aid bill, a measure which was the first step in the doctrine that eventually included the Marshall plan, the Communist rout in the Italian elections of 1948, the successful Berlin airlift, the Atlantic Pact and NATO, Forrestal was seeking ways to meet the deteriorating allied situation in the Mediterranean. Forrestal had been copying in his diary dispatches from Ambassador Averell Harriman in Moscow that ceaselessly warned this Government of the aggressive Russian policies since manifest to all. Through Navy intelligence the Secretary knew of the steady weakening of British power and realized the disastrous effect this could have on the interests of the free world in the Mediterranean.

About this time shipping conditions in that area made it at last possible to return to Turkey the body of its wartime Ambassador, Ertegun. When the late Adm. Forrest Sherman proposed to Forestal that the body go home on a battleship he saw an opportunity to make a show of United States power in the Mediterranean as a reminder of it to the Russians and as reassurance to the hard-pressed anti-Communist nations in that region.

By February 28, 1946, Forrestal had chosen his battleship—the celebrated *Missouri*. The ship had three significances: it was one of the most powerful of war vessels; the Japanese surrender terms had been signed aboard; it was named for the President's home State. In approving the plan Secretary of State Byrnes suggested that the mighty Navy task force also designated for the area should escort the battleship. The task force was unable to join the *Missouri* for some months. But meanwhile the great warship, after delivering Ertegun's body to his nation, visited Piraeus, Algiers, Tangier, and Naples. Finally, accompanied by 2 aircraft carriers, 7 cruisers, 18 destroyers, and 7 auxiliary craft, she called at 40 Mediterranean ports.

A WORLDWIDE ALL-OUT EFFORT

The effect was, as Forrestal had foreseen, to impress the Soviets and the Mediterranean peoples threatened by them with the reality of a nation strong enough to resist Moscow, and with its forces in a state of readiness to do so. Mr. Truman, referring to his first submission to Congress of the Truman doctrine in the form of the Greek-Turkish aid bill, wrote: "America had served notice that the march of communism would not be allowed to succeed by default." But the beginning of that notice could fairly be credited to Forrestal's dispatch of the *Missouri*, which President Truman, of course, fully understood and had approved.

The retreat of Moscow from aggressive threats and pressures in Iran removed one source of tension in the Mediterranean area. But on February 24, 1947, the British Ambassador informed the State Department that the British no longer could supply financial-military support to Greece and Turkey. Forrestal at once concentrated his mind and energies on the problem with which he had first grappled with the dispatch of the *Missouri*.

He recommended to Secretary of the Treasury Snyder an immediate mobilization "of brains and talents." On March 4, he beat this gong at a lunch with a group of Senators, ambassadors, and Cabinet members. On March 5 Forrestal was expounding his ideas to Clark M. Clifford, the President's special counsel. The consequence of that meeting was a memorandum that reflected the thinking of Forrestal and Clifford, also of Marx Leva, a Forrestal aide who later became Assistant Secretary of Defense. According to that document:

"This country cannot afford the deceptive luxury of waging defensive warfare. * * * By providing outstanding economic leadership this country can wage its attack successfully. * * * This product will have to prove its superiority to the commodity Russia has been peddling. * * * We must create the conditions under which a free world society can live * * * by an all-out effort on a worldwide basis [to] assure productive enterprises directly useful to the country involved and to world trade."

A week later the President presented the Greek-Turkish aid bill to Congress. This was a lineal product of the dispatch of the *Missouri* to the Mediterranean in 1946.

Address by Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, at Wisconsin Dells, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the past weekend I was pleased to deliver an address in Wisconsin Dells in my State, in the course of which I referred to one of the most significant problems affecting the fourth estate in our country and, indeed, affecting every American citizen. I refer to the shortage of newsprint.

I send to the desk the text of my address, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY SAYS THAT CONTINUED UNITED STATES PROSPERITY CALLS FOR BOLD PROGRAM OF ECONOMIC INSURANCE—SUGGESTS THAT EXPANSION OF NEWSPRINT PRODUCTION IS A KEYNOTE TO OUR FUTURE ECONOMY—URGES ACCELERATED AND EXPANDED PROGRAM OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ON NEWSPRINT

It is a real privilege to be present at this testimonial dinner for Miss Isabelle Drumb.

For 20 years Miss Drumb has been with you in Wisconsin Dells.

She came to this community one day to help her esteemed father in his time of need and stayed to help all of you. Wisconsin Dells is a finer, better and more prosperous place to live, because she did her job well as publisher of your paper.

Isabelle, your many friends and neighbors here tonight know and respect you as an

effective crusader for community betterment.

Your many colleagues from Wisconsin's newspaper fraternity, who are here tonight, know you and respect you as a most ardent champion of the constructive role that the press plays in America.

The fact that we are tonight paying tribute to the tremendous contribution that Miss Drumb has made to this community and to the newspaper profession, sugegsts the main themes for my comments tonight.

I wish that we had time tonight to review the past—to examine these last 20 years. They hold many important lessons for the future.

But I am certain tonight that Miss Drumb would like to have me look to the future and share a few facts and thoughts on a subject we are all interested in—America's present and future prosperity.

FACTS ON UNITED STATES BRIGHT ACHIEVEMENTS

What are a few of the facts of our economic prosperity?

1. We have all heard a lot recently about reaching the threshold of a $400 billion economy.

Consider that fact in this perspective:

When you sent me to Washington as your Senator 17 years ago, I recall that the gross national product—that is, the dollar value of our total output of commodities and services—was only $70 billion.

Last year it was $388 billion, and now we are well on the way to the $400 billion mark.

2. The number of persons employed is another index of our prosperity.

In July 1953, when we reached another peak in our economic growth, nearly 62½ million were employed. Our employment reached nearly 65 million this December.

3. This record prosperity has brought income disbursements to an annual rate of $318 billion.

Because our average consumer prices have stayed the same, while taxes have been somewhat lower, this increase has given our country nearly $2 billion of increased buying power.

4. This expanding income has shown up in an increased weekly wage to more segments of our population.

For example, the average weekly wage of manufacturing workers was at a new high—nearly $80 a week at the end of last year.

5. We are able then to spend more. Our spending has increased from $248 billion in early 1954 to $275 billion in the last months of 1955.

In nearly every area of economic activity there is evidence of progress and prosperity.

These multi-billion-dollar figures may not be too easy to comprehend, but they do translate into more dollars and cents right here in Wisconsin Dells and elsewhere throughout Wisconsin and all America, in United States savings banks' deposits, savings and loan associations' accounts, defense bonds, equities in homes and farms, home appliances, shares in United States corporations, life insurance, and other readily tangible yardsticks of our well-being.

INCOME PRODUCING SOLUTIONS FOR FARMERS OUR MOST URGENT PROBLEM

Now, unfortunately, there are important exceptions in our booming economy.

We are quite aware of the widespread condition of depressed farm income.

This, of course, is the sobering fact which casts the darkest shadow on our economic prosperity.

Farm income has definitely not kept pace with the soaring income of our general economy.

This is not the occasion for a speech on the farm problem. So, let me simply say that there are few more urgent problems before Congress and the American people than to provide sound and realistic income-producing solutions for our farmers.

The cornerstone of a bold new program of economic insurance for future United States prosperity must be an adequate farm program.

EXPANSION OF NEWSPRINT PRODUCTION A KEYSTONE TO FUTURE ECONOMIC HEALTH

Tonight, I should like to devote the bulk of my comments to another phase of insurance.

I want to refer to your own profession, and one of its most significant problems—the shortage of newsprint and the related problem of the price of newsprint.

Ninety-four percent of all the newsprint consumed in our country is for the printing of newspapers. And the plain fact of the matter is that our papers simply aren't getting enough newsprint.

NEWSPRINT ONLY A PART OF THE PAPER PICTURE

Let me set forth a few facts on the newsprint situation. I don't presume to be an expert on it, but I have studied it, to a fair extent, as opportunity permitted.

We are all, of course, aware that the tremendous complexity of American industry, our terrific output of goods and services has skyrocketed the uses of paper and paper products in our country.

For example, paper containers are being used in virtually every single step of American production, distribution, and consumption today.

Newsprint production and consumption, although a considerable part of the paper picture, nevertheless represents only one phase of the huge expansion in paper needs. Thirty-four and one-half million tons of paper were used last year—417 pounds per person.

It is estimated that a baby born today in America creates a lifetime demand for no less than 15 tons of paper—for all types of needs.

WISCONSIN'S AND AMERICA'S GREAT PAPER INDUSTRY

The flourishing paper industry of America is one of the great miracles of America.

The paper industry of Wisconsin is one of the great pillars of Wisconsin's economy. From the paper industry have come not only the sinews of economic health for our State, but great contributions in terms of leadership in every community throughout our State.

Meanwhile, newsprint demand is also soaring.

It is estimated that the demand for newsprint in our country in 1956 will be 6.7 million tons. This will represent an increase of 125,000 tons over 1955.

By 1965, newsprint requirements will have further increased, and to such a point as to involve a potential deficit of 1.3 million tons of newsprint per year. That represents an exceedingly serious situation facing the newspapers of the United States.

Few developments could strike harder at the heart of future American prosperity than to be faced with stringent restrictions on the capacity of American newspapers to reach the American consumer. The recent experiences during the press stoppage in Detroit showed that the lack of this vital advertising medium, for example, was directly responsible for a drop of 25 percent in the sales of used cars.

SMALL PAPERS PARTICULARLY AFFECTED

The newsprint shortage is a source of particular concern to the small weekly newspapers of America. A weekly paper with a circulation of, say around 3,000, and with a varying number of pages from 8 to 16, uses around 1,000 and 2,000 pounds of newsprint per week.

This newspaper cost for newsprint would be anywhere from $65 to $130 per week. It is estimated that the cost of newsprint represents around 15 percent of the total cost of the average small weekly, and up to as much as 55 percent of the total cost of large metropolitan dailies.

NEWSPRINT EXPANSION COSTLY, DIFFICULT

The big problem, obviously, is to assure an adequate and continuing supply of newsprint and at a fair price. But the expansion of newsprint production is not an easy or quick matter.

The capital investment required for a new newsprint mill is enormous, around $100,000 to $120,000 per daily ton. Thus, the total capital outlay for 1 new mill could run from $30 million to $48 million, and that wouldn't include the cost of the purchase of any forest lands.

It is estimated that a mill of minimum economic size requires, on a sustained yield basis, nearly 500,000 forest acres. And they must be located near enough to the mill site to permit economic transportation of pulpwood.

These, then, are but a few of the aspects of this situation. I could refer at length to the situation up north with our good neighbor. I note, for example, that the president of the Canadian Pulp and Paper Association estimates that demands for Canadian newsprint will rise from 6.2 million tons last year to 12½ million tons by 1980.

But time does not permit too detailed a presentation on my part.

MANY FACTUAL STUDIES

Now, there have been study after study made of the newsprint shortage.

Congressional committee after committee has surveyed the subject, and they have made a considerable number of important recommendations and findings.

What we need, however, basically, is more newsprint, and not simply more volumes of studies.

Of course, the studies can contribute to getting more newsprint, and I am in favor of them.

Thus, the Department of Commerce believes that it would be desirable to expand the collection of statistical information on the United States paper and publishing industry, and on world consumption and production of newsprint. These surveys would be carried on in cooperation with the newsprint manufacturing and newspaper publishing industries.

As the long-term trend in production and consumption becomes more clearly understood, all sections of the industry would be in a better position to cope with the problem.

But studies must provide a basis for action, and it is definitive action that is required.

EXPAND PAPER RESEARCH

One type of action which is required is to speed and expand our research and development programs into new methods of obtaining inexpensive and large supplies of newsprint.

Already there have been considerable experiments with bagasse. There has been research and expanded use of hardwoods, research and experimentation on expanding the production of newsprint from waste paper.

In my judgment, every encouragement should be given to the private sources working on all phases of such experimentation and research. And the fullest possible use of our own governmental facilities, particularly our great Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, should be directed to this task.

Research and development on newsprint will pay impressive dividends, tangible and intangible.

The time to start is now. The quicker we get underway on expanding the program, the better off we will be. Each passing day of action in low gear will cost us something in the days and years to come. Pennypinching in Federal research is not only short-sighted; it is self-defeating.

We can ill afford to have weekly or daily newspapers go out of business because of shortage of modest-priced newsprint, or because of any other solvable problem.

A healthy American newspaper industry is a sure standard for a healthy economy as a whole.

An informed America will be a safe and secure America. An America denied adequate newsprint can hardly be sufficiently informed of all the tremendous problems at home and abroad requiring our attention.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, may I say that I am sure none of us are interested only in setting new records of material prosperity. The life work and philosophy of the person we are honoring tonight suggest the real and abiding goals of our Nation. We want to see an America healthy in mind and body. We want to see more useful work for everybody. We want greater opportunities for education and greater protection against the problems of complex, modern life.

We must constantly seek out solutions that will protect and strengthen our Nation from foreign peril and help keep the world at peace. We, in Wisconsin, can take pride in the fact that we have pioneered in finding constructive solutions to our problems.

We can take pride in the example set for us by Isabelle Drumb.

Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States, on October 26, 1955, at a meeting sponsored by the mayors' committee of Baltimore, Md., commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of John Marshall.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is pleasant to find myself in the company of so many judges and lawyers; I am enjoying a busman's holiday.

Appropriately enough, the senior United States Senator from Maryland, is here. Not only does he bear the proud name of John Marshall, but he is associated in an important way with these ceremonies, which are a part of a nationwide program begun by the President and the Chief Justice at the Philadelphia convention of the American Bar Association last August. Senator BUTLER was appointed a member of the general committee by the Vice President, and at the instance of Chief Justice Warren the Senator was named to the executive committee which has direct supervision over the entire plan of the committee. I am glad to greet him in his several capacities.

I also note with satisfaction the presence of many laymen; and this is well, for we are not in a meeting of the bar association. We are gathered for a community celebration to commemorate the birth 200 years ago of a man who is the possession not of a single professional group but of the entire American people.

The character of this assembly would be sufficient warning, if warning were needed, not to be excessively professional or needlessly philosophical. If you want the elaborate details of Marshall's life and his public service, and a scholarly discussion of his decisions, I commend to you the classic Life of John Marshall by the late Senator Beveridge. If any of the lawyers here thirst for erudition in constitutional law, I respectfully refer them to the Bar Library. In the minutes to which I am necessarily limited I shall avoid minute biographical treatment of the subject and any pretense to legal profundity. The most that I can possibly hope to give, even in barest outline, is some intimation of the significance of John Marshall in our national life.

It is undeniably true that, more than any other man, Marshall gave utterance to principles which have guided our Nation from its infancy even to this day. More than a half century ago Mr. Justice Holmes, himself a revered figure in American jurisprudence, state it for us with poetic beauty: "If American law were to be represented by a single figure, sceptic and worshipper alike would agree without dispute that the figure could be one alone, and that one, John Marshall." The intervening years confirm that judgment.

The traditional portrait of Marshall's personality does not do him full justice. We are likely to think only of his gravity and dignity. Marshall showed that a man can be earnest and able in his work without being dull or stuffy in his human relations. The testimony of his contemporaries discloses that he was no mere legal machine, but a warm and delightful human being—simple, fun-loving, interesting in public speech and private conversation, informal off the bench, full of anecdote, a good family man, a courteous, friendly, even convivial companion and neighbor, and not averse to an occasional mint julep. His judicial colleague for 24 years, Joseph Story, pays him this superb compliment: "I am in love with his character, positively in love." Also he said, "I love his laugh; it is too hearty for an intriguer."

Marshall was our fourth Chief Justice, and President John Adams, who appointed him, boasted that his gift of John Marshall to the United States was the proudest act of his life.

It was during Marshall's tenure that the Court first achieved great prestige. The power and the dignity of the Court had not yet been recognized when he ascended the bench. So lightly was the office esteemed before it was transformed under Marshall's leadership that the first Chief Justice, John Jay, had accepted appointment from George Washington with great reluctance and gladly resigned his post to run for Governor of New York. John Rutledge resigned from the Supreme Court, to become chief justice of South Carolina. When the seat of the Government was moved to Washington, no provision was made for the Supreme Court, and it was assigned space in a committee room in the basement under the Senate Chamber. Patrick Henry refused the Chief Judgeship. And if you will pardon a provincialism, I wish to note that Robert Harrison, a Marylander, preferred the Chancellorship of Maryland to a seat on the Supreme Court of the United States. He must have thought Annapolis more exciting.

Later, when Oliver Ellsworth resigned as Chief Justice, Adams, at Marshall's suggestion, offered to reappoint Jay to his former post, but the latter refused, saying that he had "left the bench perfectly convinced that under a system so defective, it would not obtain the energy, weight, and dignity which is essential to its affording due support to the National Government, nor acquire the public confidence and respect which as a last resort of the Justice of the Nation, it should possess." Marshall then recommended one of the Associate Justices, Patterson, but the President did not approve. Instead, he named Marshall himself, who took a week before formally acknowledging and accepting the appointment.

John Marshall was born on the Virginia frontier. He was a cousin of Thomas Jefferson. They were antagonists all their lives, and in truth it must be said that their differences were not only on the lofty level of ideas. Jefferson has been referred to as the "unloving and unloved cousin."

Marshall attended a course of law for less than 2 months at William and Mary College. This is the extent of his formal legal education, but it by no means marks the limit of the preparation in mind and character which equipped him for his great career. He met with early success at the bar. In the Revolution he had served as a soldier for 6 years, participating in many campaigns and attaining the rank of captain. His undaunted courage and humor in adversity cheered and inspired his men. He went through the gloom and agony of Valley Forge. Knowing the woes that flowed from the weakness of the Confederation, Marshall felt deeply the need for an effective National Government, and this was a passionate faith with him. He declared that he entered the Army a Virginian and left it an American.

It has been said of Michelangelo, whose present fame rests on his painting, that his contemporaries recognized his preeminence as sculptor, architect, and poet. So it is, in a measure, with Marshall. Although his fame justly rests upon his career as a great Chief Justice, there were many facets of his early experience which earned him high distinction and, what is more important, this experience doubtless enriched his service on the bench. His was a considerable activity both in law and politics. Office holding included membership in the Virginia House of Burgesses, the State council, and again in the State legislature when the question was whether to call a State convention to consider ratification of the new Constitution of the United States. Marshall's voice was raised in behalf of a Constitution Convention and he was ably supported by Madison; but powerful pleas were made in opposition, notably by the eloquent and influential Patrick Henry.

This is not the time to recount the struggles, great and momentous, which led to final ratification. It is sufficient to note that Marshall had an important part in formulating the Constitution and in its final adoption, and his intimate association in the convention with men from the North as well as from his own section, we may be sure, also left a deep imprint upon his thought on the subject of nationalism.

From its birth, storms and dangers surrounded the infant Republic, particularly in its relations with England and France, who were at war with each other. Each was capturing with impunity American merchant ships.

In our generation we have seen how difficult is the position of a nation that wishes to maintain its neutrality. The difficulty is increased if the would-be neutral is a small or militarily feeble country. The belligerents feeling that they need not respect the rights of a neutral unable to enforce them, often direct their efforts to compel the neutral to aid them by discontinuing commercial relations with their adversary. The young Republic desired only to remain at peace with both.

Marshall was sent on a diplomatic mission to Paris to gain recognition for the rights of American commerce and respect for our flag on the seas. With Marshall, Charles C. Pinckney and Elbridge Gerry were our envoys

extraordinary to Frace. Theirs was no easy task.

To those of you who seek relaxation in novels portraying high intrigue, devious diplomacy, and fraud, both plain and fancy, allow me gently to commend instead the spirit of historic inquiry. I refer you to a grotesque but absolutely authentic chapter of history. It is, in short, the story of the corruption of Talleyrand, the wily French Foreign Minister, an unfrocked bishop, an adroit and utterly unscrupulous man, a sort of land pirate in striped trousers. When Marshall and his colleagues sought an audience with Talleyrand they were put off for many weeks and allowed to cool their heels. Then, through his agents, known in history as X, Y, and Z, Talleyrand brazenly sought to induce the American representatives to pay him a bribe as the price for officially receiving and treating with them.

The United States was then a weak and struggling country but President John Adams had frankly and publicly resented the insolent and altogether outrageous behavior of Citizen Genêt, sent by Talleyrand to this country to stir up internal dissension. (Does this have a modern ring?) Talleyrand sought to avoid the subject which brought the Americans to Paris, namely, French depredations on American commerce. Instead, he tried to make it appear that France had been insulted by Adams and was the truly aggrieved nation. He got his agents to suggest to the Americans that to solace France and repair the hurt to its honor, the United States should make it a loan of money. It was further proposed and persistently pressed upon the American envoys, that for an additional sum of $250,000 it could be arranged to soften M. de Talleyrand, and that then the American ministers would be publicly received and the negotiations for which they had come could proceed.

The American envoys were bombarded with every form of argument and pressure. A veiled threat of war was presented as the alternative. It was urged upon the envoys that their weak country could not afford such a war and the bribe to the French foreign minister would be a cheap price for peace.

John Marshall rejected this naked blackmail. He behaved throughout with a firmness and a sense of honor which does eternal credit to his reputation. The mission was finally abandoned and the envoys returned home. Marshall and his colleagues exposed the whole sordid business in a report which is one of our national glories. This was the occasion of the famous remark attributed to Pinckney: "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

Marshall later, at the urging of George Washington, ran for Congress and was elected. Thereafter, Adams appointed him Secretary of State and a year later Chief Justice. Thus began the great service, which was to last 34 years and become the capstone of Marshall's monument.

Let us pause to consider the extraordinary equipment which Marshall brought with him to the bench. His firm and exalted character and his powerful and well ordered mental faculties are, of course, important components. But in addition to these endowments, board and rounded experience in life prepared him for his historic role as expounder of the Constitution. Good character and a measure of ability and learning are indispensable in a judge, but the insights of wisdom are not often developed except through life's experience. Books can supply judges, as well as laymen, with only part of their resources. All experience fashions a man, and strive as he may for release from human bias and prepossessions, no man completely frees himself of the experiences and conditions—of which he is the product. Here was one who had been seasoned in the field of war; in the active practice of law, where he attained the coveted prizes of success; by long and arduous political combat; by the part he played in the legislative arena, both in his State and the national sphere; by engaging in diplomatic contest with crafty adversaries; and finally by service as Cabinet officer. In touching life, and public life particularly, in so many aspects, Marshall came to know the nature and complexities of government. Can it be doubted that in this process he assimilated a variety of influences which converged to ready him for the unprecedented task of judicial statesmanship for which he was destined?

In a series of decisions during the incumbency that stretched over three decades, Marshall "unveiled the Constitution," to borrow Lord Bryce's words, thus giving our Federal system its distinctive nature. His guiding principle and purpose was to achieve a permanent union of the States as a nation and to avoid repetition of the disastrous sectional divisiveness and inadequacies of the old Confederation which washington called a rope of sand. He firmly established the power of judicial review and the authority of the judiciary to declare invalid legislation found to be in violation of the Constitution. This function, original in the art of government, is now accepted as an established feature of American institutions. He defined the relation of the Union to the States and fixed the national character of the United States as a sovereignty created by the people themselves rather than a mere league of states.

Reconciliation of conflicting claims between State and Nation remains as an ever-recurring problem in the Supreme Court and to this day the opinions of Marshall are beacons to light the way. He gave vitality to the commerce clause of the Constitution which is designed to protect interstate and foreign trade from crippling encroachments by rival States; yet he was careful to leave ample scope for the exercise of State power in its legitimate field. When John Marshall became Chief Justice constitutional law was a virgin field and there were no precedents to guide him. His task was to create precedents and his chief reliance had to be on broad principles of justice and reason. This called for deep independent thinking and the exercise of the highest qualities of a lawyer. No scissors and paste-pot performance would do.

Marshall's colleagues on the Court were not weak men. They were men of marked ability, but so complete was their recognition of the wisdom of the course he charted, that in only one constitutional decision did he find himself in dissent from his brethren. In a majority of the cases he wrote the decision of the Court.

Even in this sketchy treatment of Marshall's work as a judge, I cannot fail to mention one celebrated trial in Richmond over which he presided while "riding circuit" as Supreme Court justices were called upon to do in those days.

In the prisoner's dock, charged with treason against the United States, was a man of the highest distinction—Aaron Burr. Burr had served as Attorney General and as Vice President. He had failed by only a single vote to win the Presidency in his contest with Jefferson. He had been a lifelong opponent of Marshall in politics. Moreover, Burr, you will recall, is the man who in a duel had shot Marshall's friend, Alexander Hamilton to death.

If, in such circumstances, the hand that held the scales of justice should quaver, it would be understandable. But Marshall's hand did not quaver. He remained imperturbable and impartial in his rulings, despite the fierce clamor against the defendant from the mob and from Burr's enemies in high places. Finally, Marshall instructed the jury to acquit the defendant, chiefly because under the Constitution no person may be convicted of treason unless on the testimony of two witnesses to the commission of the same overt act or on confession in open court. The prosecution, Marshall declared, had failed to meet this constitutional imperative. Marshall's decision brought down on his head an avalanche of denunciation and abuse. He was burned in effigy and there was foolish talk of impeachment.

After the trial, William Wirt, later Attorney General, who was the prosecutor for the Government in Burr's case, was asked why he did not tell the Chief Justice that the people of America demanded a conviction. Wirt's reply is as eloquent praise of Marshall as could be given any judge. "Tell him that. I would as soon have gone to Herschel (the renowned astronomer), and told him that the people of America insisted that the moon had horns as a reason why he should draw her with them."

To select a particular decision or an isolated expression from Marshall's pen, in order to denominate it as his superlative contribution, would be an undertaking from which I should shrink as being too presumptuous for me. But it is permissible to quote an illustrious modern interpreter of the Constitution, Mr. Justice Frankfurter. He has said that the familiar sentence, "we must never forget that it is a constitution we are expounding," expresses the core of Marshall's constitutional philosophy and is the most important utterance in our constitutional law.

We may well accept this evaluation. Today the words are so familiar as to appear axiomatic, a platitude almost; but we are indebted to Marshall for its coinage and for the powerful influence it has exerted. It is a constant reminder that a constitution is to be read not mechanically but with deep understanding of its nature and underlying purpose; for it is intended, as Chief Justice Marshall said, "to endure for ages to come, and, consequently, to be adapted to the various crises in human affairs." It expresses a majestic conception of the duty that falls to judges when questions of great delicacy and far-reaching implications are raised between the Government and its citizens, and between Nation and State. It indicates the temper of mind specially needed when making specific application of necessarily indefinite provisions of permanent law.

Again, it was Holmes who warned that it is idle to appraise a man apart from the circumstances in which he lived. "A great man," he said, "is a strategic point in the campaign of history." How fortunate for us and for future generations that in the crucial formative period of the United States a man of Marshall's character and intellectual endowments, his extensive experience and deep comprehension, occupied for a third of a century the exalted seat of the Chief Justice.

Marshall's generation is not alone in having had to face crises. The founders of our Government foresaw "various crises in human affairs," and sought to provide a charter firm but flexible enough to meet the changing needs of an expanding society. We, too, have problems and perils, many of which are fundamentally not unlike those that challenged Marshall's genius. It was Adams who wrote into the Declaration of Rights in the Massachusetts Constitution the doctrine of the separation of powers "to the end that it may be a government of laws and not of men." Commenting on this, Woodrow Wilson who, before becoming President, was a distinguished professor of political science, said: "Constitute them how you will, governments are always governments of men, and no part of any government is better than the men to whom that part is intrusted * * * So far as the individual is concerned, a constitutional government is as good as its courts; no better, no

worse. Its laws are only its professions; it keeps its promises, or does not keep them, in its courts. For the individual, therefore, who stands at the center of every definition of liberty, the struggle for constitutional government is a struggle for good laws, indeed, but also for intelligent, independent, and impartial courts."

The two statements are not inconsistent. We do not permit justice to be administered according to personal caprice but under the rule of law; but laws are not self-executing and their administration is necessarily by men. It is essential, therefore, that they be men of integrity, judgment, and independence. Marshall's generation had suffered the affliction of a subservient judiciary and this is one of the grievances enumerated in the Declaration of Independence.

To the struggle for good laws and an able and impartial judiciary, John Marshall dedicated his great powers. His fame will endure as the master builder of our Federal judicial structure. Beyond this, he remains 120 years after the close of his life indisputably the exemplar of the great judge.

Competing Demands for the Use of Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding statement on conservation by Mr. Virlis L. Fischer of the Sierra Club, presented on December 9, 1955, at the annual convention of the Western Forestry Association in Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Fischer, it seems to me, makes a convincing and effective case for preserving what comparatively little remains of our original natural heritage. His statement is so well documented and so clearly presented that I believe it should be called to the attention of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPETING DEMANDS FOR THE USE OF LAND

(By Virlis L. Fischer, Sierra Club, presented December 9, 1955, at the Convention of the Western Forestry Association, Portland, Oreg.)

The Sierra Club is indeed grateful for this invitation to be represented at the 1955 convention of the Western Forestry and Conservation Association. While the 9,500 members of our organization come from all walks of life, we are united in the common bonds of love of the outdoors. Our membership includes a number of professional foresters, and many of us, by the very nature of our appreciation of the outdoors, become amateur foresters. Most certainly, we are interested in forestry conservation, and we have a great deal of admiration for your industry for its program of tree-farm development and technological progress in greater utilization. We think it highly commendable that you are looking ahead to being in business several hundred years from now, and we should like to express our confidence in the ingenuity of the forestry profession to solve the future problems of the industry.

We are also grateful for many instances of cooperation which have helped in the preservation of the redwood groves, sugar pines, and a number of parks. It is therefore with some feeling of kinship that we approach the "competing demands for the use of land," which certainly are diverse and not restricted to the lumber industry.

If someone were to take a knife and slash a gaping hole in a priceless painting, we would call it an act of vandalism. But when someone proposes building a modern high-speed highway across the Joshua Tree National Monument, we don't call it vandalism. We consider it to be one of the "competing demands for the use of land." Yet the effect would be about the same.

On the one hand, this national monument was set aside to preserve an absolutely unique and irreplaceable desert flora and landscape for the enjoyment of the American people for all time. On the other hand, certain commercial interests in a nearby town were eyeing the payroll spending of a military base located on the opposite side of the monument. In order to attract this payroll to the cultural advantages the town had to offer, which incidentally were not unique, they operated on the theory that the shortest distance between two points is a straight line. In this case the straight line would be across the middle of a great national monument. That such a highway is not conducive to enjoyment of the park did not matter. It would bring a volume of traffic whizzing by, not to see the features for which the park is noted, but merely to get someplace else in a hurry. And it could be expected that in time the roadside would become littered with the usual debris—and the unique desert flora would be graced by a new species known as the kleenex bush.

In recent years, this case could be multiplied many times over. We have just gone through the greatest conservation battle in recent history—the threat of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. There have been various threats to several national parks, wildnerness areas, and wildlife refuges. Currently, there is the plan to build dams on the superbly beautiful upper McKenzie River—a plan engineered in such a way as to suggest we can have our cake and eat it, too. But what is not realized is that the cake will be spoiled.

When it should be rather obvious that our dedicated lands have been set aside to preserve outstanding examples of the most magnificent scenery in America, or features so unique as to be irreplaceable once destroyed, it might be well to take a good look at the underlying causes resulting in what we are calling "competing demands for the use of land." It should be remembered that the conservation movement is only about 50 years old in the United States. It was a revolutionary idea. Perhaps it is expecting too much that all of us can be brainwashed in 50 years.

In general, the pressures against our scenic and recreational resources arise from the desire of local interests to exploit their commercial values. The motives are often made to appear quite altruistic. But these are public lands, belonging to all of us, and not to just the local interests. When we get away from the immediate area public support for such plans is usually nonexistent. For instance, it was not the people of Ohio advocating Echo Park Dam, nor New Yorkers urging a highway across Joshua Tree National Monument. Even in the case of the Mount Ranier tramway proposal, when you got as far away as Portland, public support largely vanished. Although not the purpose of the parks, economic benefits in tourist trade do accrue from their proximity. But sound management dictates that this be regarded as a byproduct, and, welcome though it may be, it is not something to be milked dry at the expense of the park's grandeur.

It is perhaps a human failing that many of those living nearest great scenery appreciate it the least. There appears to be a tendency to accept as commonplace those treasures near at hand. But behind this seeming lack of appreciation is something deeper and more basic. It has to do with the cultural level of a young nation. As a nation only about 150 years old, in the mad quest for personal gain, we have squandered our resources at a rate the like of which the world has never known. It is illustrated by the old forest policy of cut out and get out; by the slaughtering of the vast hordes of buffalo; by the tragic extinction or virtual extinction of 40 species of birds and mammals in our short history.

Fortunately, enlightenment has come, but it hasn't yet reached us uniformly, nor pierced all the dark corners. Our attitude toward our heritage of scenic beauty is reflected by the coins and debris so thoughtlessly tossed into Morning Glory Pool in Yellowstone; by the acts of vandalism in carving names in public places; by the carelessness of those who have made the litterbug problem a national disgrace. It is even reflected by those who cannot look at a beautiful waterfall without wanting to divert it through a penstock and measure it in terms of kilowatts. It is reflected by the visitor to Crater Lake who, standing at the rim of one of the world's most inspiring natural wonders, remarks, "Look at all the timber going to waste." And it has happened.

Our attitude is further reflected in our failure to provide adequate funds for protection and maintenance. Not to mention new facilities, nor expansion to provide for the rapidly growing needs of an impending population of 300 million people with leisure time and the means to enjoy it.

It does not necessarily follow, however, that our remaining scenic lands are doomed to commercialization. For it is inconceivable that our vast industrial progress, bringing with it an increasing standard of living, will not be accompanied by an advancement in our social thinking. We are therefore optimistic that America's great heritage of scenic beauty can be enjoyed and yet preserved, intact and unspoiled, for the enrichment of our lives—and for the future.

It is encouraging, indeed, to note that progress toward this end is being made. The broad public support aroused on the side of conservation in all of these recent issues is significant. Without doubt, Dinosaur National Monument is the outstanding example. Here was a place only a handful of people had ever seen, and yet tens of thousands instinctively rose up on the side of park preservation to opopse this needless invasion. And they won in spite of almost insuperable odds. It should be an object lesson for a long time to come to all those willing to comprehend its meaning.

We can be proud that the national park idea was born in America. It was such a splendid idea that other nations have borrowed it. It gets away from the estates of the feudal barons, which amounted to private parks for the privileged few, and replaces them with a system of parks to be enjoyed by all. And we are convinced that the overwhelming majority of visitors, and they reached 50 million in the national parks alone last year, like the parks and want more of them, not less. Is it any wonder, then, the public resentment at every attempt to destroy or despoil them?

When we read of the staggering increases in attendance at our State and national parks, wildlife refuges, and in our national forests for a variety of recreational uses, we can only conclude that outdoor recreation is here to stay. And here to stay also are the means of providing it.

Perhaps it would be informative to call attention to what Japan has done—a nation with an older civilization than ours and one which takes pride in the beauty of its countryside. It is a nation with 90 million people

living in an area the size of California. Here in this crowded space where land is at a premium, 4½ percent of her total area has been set aside in national parks. This compares with the 1½ percent in our national parks and wilderness system.

Or, let's make a comparison closer home with Canada—a culturally superior nation in several respects. In the Province of British Columbia, over 9 million acres have been set aside in the Provincial park system and over 1 million acres in national parks—a total of over 10 million acres in one province, all dedicated for the recreational enjoyment of her people. E. G. Oldham, Forester, British Columbia Parks and Recreation Division, explains it in the following statement:

"British Columbia is noteworthy for its enchanting, colorful, and rugged scenery. With the conviction that recreation was a vital part of everyday life and that certain beauty spots were the heritage of all, British Columbia has set aside nearly 10,000,000 acres as Provincial park lands. We extend a hearty welcome to everyone to visit and share the enjoyment of this natural wonderland.

"Everything possible has been done to preserve the aesthetic beauty of these areas and any improvement work done has been with a view to accenting the feeling of being close to nature's unspoiled wonders.

"The name 'parks' in the more accepted definition of the word could not apply to most of the areas set aside for your enjoyment. In many cases they are vast stretches of primitive and rugged paradise for those who wish to escape from the confines of modern civilization."

The contrast in these comparisons is such as to lead us to wonder not whether we have saved too much, but too little. Therefore, we would like to suggest a long and thoughtful look at the words of Newton B. Drury in speaking of our scenic lands: "Surely we are not so poor that we need to destroy them, nor so rich that we can afford to lose them." To heed these words will accompish three things. First, it will end many bitter controversies; second, it will be regarded as a real service to your fellow man; and, third, it will enable you to practically write your own ticket in public goodwill.

Food Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. George McLain, chairman of the National Institute of Social Welfare, before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MCLAIN, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL WELFARE, BEFORE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE, JANUARY 19, 1956

Mr. Chairman, my name is George McLain, and I am chairman of the National Institute of Social Welfare, whose Washington address is 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., with main headquarters located at 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

The text of my talk before you today hinges upon this question: "Why would the Congress of the United States rather spend $700,000 per day to rent warehouses in which to store billions of dollars worth of surplus food bought with taxpayers' money, or give it to other nations, than distribute it to our own needy Americans?"

During the holiday season each year, for the past few years, Harold Stassen, then head of the International Cooperation Administration, announced that our Government was busy making up Christmas baskets, stuffed full of fat turkeys and all the trimmings, for the needy of foreign lands. When will such charity and benevolence be bestowed upon our American needy?

Over the radio, on television, and in large paid ads we are urged to contribute to CARE to pay for the transportation of more of these food packages to the needy of the world. Why are the needy in our country prohibited from receiving CARE packages?

In the summer of 1953, at the request of the President, $15 million worth of surplus food was given to Communist East Germany.

President Eisenhower included in his 1956 state of the Union message a proposal to repeal section 304 of Public Law 480, which prevents us from selling food commodities to Russia or her satellites.

Such an effort to relieve a food shortage in Communist countries, if one exists, while at the same time arming ourselves and our allies to the hilt in order to resist aggression from the same source, is a type of diplomacy that I—and I think most of my fellow Americans—find hard to understand or accept.

A proposal was made just a few days ago by several Members of this Congress that our surplus farm crops be disposed of by providing for increased industrial use—in the manufacture of rubber, industrial alcohol, motor fuel, plastic, and other products.

It is my opinion that there is enough produce grown which is not fit for human consumption to supply these needs without snatching grade A food from the mouths of hungry Americans.

We spend billions of dollars each year trying to impress every other human being on earth with our superior form of Government; our universal prosperity. Our international by-word seems to have changed from "land of plenty for all" to "land of plenty for all, and then some." These people in foreign nations are supposed to think that such is the result of our form of Government.

But, I ask you, what is the good of spending all these billions of dollars when these selfsame foreign people can pick up their newspaper most any day and read where some poor soul in this country has died of malnutrition or starvation?

To illustrate that point, I should like to take you back to last October when two tiny brothers, aged 6 and 7, died of poisoning. Doctors said they died from eating poisoned mustard during their forage through garbage cans in search of food.

The younger brother, 6-year-old William Baughman, Jr., died with this plea on his lips: "Please, may I have a ham sandwich?"

A neighbor told newspaper reporters that she was kept awake at night by screams of the hungry children.

Mrs. Helen Baughman, mother of the 2 boys plus 5 girls, had applied for relief at the Louisiana Welfare Department 1 whole month before the death of her 2 sons.

She got no results. The welfare worker didn't see any urgency in her case.

Neighbors told how the seven children scrounged through the area for food.

Mrs. Nelson MacClure, who lived on a nearby street, said the children came at all hours of the day and night with pleas for food.

I say to you, there is no true food surplus; there is only a lack of equitable distribution of American produce. I further emphasize that these surplus foods, because of lack of proper distribution, have endangered the economy of our Nation, not to mention the health of those persons who should right now be receiving it.

We propose that United States surplus food stamps be created and portioned out to the unemployed, victims of disaster, and to low-income groups to supplement their income, including those on public assistance and general relief. The needy will benefit through such a program; and the American people will receive a return on their tax dollars invested in this surplus-food program.

In 1954, Congress amended Public Law 480 which made available to the States, surplus food which which could be distributed to nonprofit school-lunch programs, charitable institutions, needy Indians, nonprofit summer camps for children, and on occasion, to the victims of floods and other disasters.

Under present law, surplus foods may also be distributed to persons or families who have been determined to be needy by appropriate State or local agencies, which would include those on public assistance such as the aged, the blind, physically handicapped, and dependent children.

But distributing this food to the needy has been left up to the States. As a result, hardly a dent has been made in the reserves of surplus foodstuffs, because most of the States refuse to appropriate the necessary funds for the storage, handling, and distribution—even though the Federal Government is willing to deliver these commodities to the States free of charge after satisfactory arrangements for distribution has been made.

For instance, in California, the State left the receipt of surplus food commodities up to the 48 counties. Only a few responded.

As a result, when rain delayed the usual 6-week pea-picking season in San Luis Obispo County, in March 1954, schoolchildren of migratory farm workers fainted in the classrooms from hunger. Their families had been living on flour and water gravy. Interested citizens went from door to door in the town asking for canned food, etc., for these hungry people.

I ask you—why should these people have to dig deeper in their pockets to help feed hungry neighbors when they have already—as taxpayers—spent billions of dollars to buy up farm surpluses?

In January 1955, more than 1,000 members of farm-labor families—put out of work by continuous heavy rains—were found to be starving.

The Fresno County Supervisors refused to give these migratory workers relief—even United States surplus foods—because they did not meet the residence requirement of 3 years established by the counties of California. Only through much pressure from irate citizens was a state of emergency declared and some of the food released.

Here again, interested ranchers and other citizens had to make pleas to the public for the donation of canned food, potatoes, beans, and other staples for distribution to these starving families.

Public Law 480 as amended so far by Congress is not the answer—the answer is in the issuance of surplus food stamps.

The issuance of such stamps would immeasurably benefit low income American families; would help the farmer in solving the problem of over-abundance of produce; and would raise the standard of living and strengthen the economy of all America.

A bill to accomplish this has been authored on a bipartisan basis by Republican Senator AIKEN of Vermont, Democratic Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, and Republican Senator YOUNG of North Dakota. Demo-

cratic Senator KERR of Oklahoma, has also sponsored a similar bill.

To realize more fully how desperately recipients of public assistance need this surplus food, take a look at the amount of monthly payment they receive which must not only cover the cost of food, but of clothing, shelter, medical care, and the many other necessities of life.

In the Social Security Bulletin dated October 1955, issued by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we find 298,000 cases wherein the families on direct relief received a nationwide average of only $53.55 per month. Two hundred thirty-eight thousand, seven hundred and seventy permanently and totally disabled recipients received a national average of $55.24. Two million, two hundred and nine thousand, four hundred and sixty-seven persons receiving aid to dependent children had a national average payment of only $23.98 per month. One hundred and four thousand, one hundred and forty-four blind persons received a national average payment of $56.71 a month, and 2,550,130 on old-age assistance received a national average of $52.55 per month.

In considering the Surplus Food Stamp plan there most certainly should be a provision that domestic need have priority over foreign consideration and that no political subdivision of the United States shall impose any residence requirements against applicants or recipients.

In closing, may I again emphasize that there is no true food surplus; there is only a lack of equitable distribution of this American produce, and I believe that the issuance of surplus food stamps to the needy of America is the answer to the now existing surplus.

Thank you, and may I add the following:

HOW THE SURPLUS FOOD STAMP PLAN OPERATED

Excerpts from a letter sent by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, to the editor of the Washington Post:

"The food stamp plan was tried with considerable success before World War II, abandoned during the war, and never revived.

"It operates by supplying to low income consumers additional purchasing power, which they could use in any retail store to buy any of a list of surplus food. Its aims were to reduce farm surpluses and to improve the dietary standards of those whose need was the greatest.

"Operations under the plan were simple. Local welfare agencies certified families as eligible to purchase food stamps. Such families were permitted to purchase regular stamps, which were orange in color, up to the value of their customary food purchases. This averaged about $1 per week for each member of the family. These orange stamps could be used to purchase any food product.

"With each dollar of orange stamps that they purchased, they received in addition, 50 cents worth of free stamps, which were blue in color. These blue stamps could be used to purchase only those foods which had been declared to be in surplus supply by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"The purpose of making the receipts of the free stamps contingent upon the purchase of the regular stamps was to be sure that the free stamps represented a net addition to the total demand for surplus food. The stamps were treated as cash and could be spent in any retail store. The retailers pasted the stamps on $10 cards and redeemed them through their wholesalers, banks or local offices of the Department of Agriculture. The plan functioned through the normal channels of trade.

"The distinctive feature of the plan is that any expenditure made on it would increase farm income by about the same amount. This would come about as a result of the fact that those participating under the plan would, of course, increase their purchases, while higher income consumers would be expected to purchase just about as much as before. This is really the distinctive feature of the plan.

"All of the increase in consumer food expenditure under this plan will be reflected in growers' income.

"One of the most desirable attributes of the food stamp plan is its flexibility, as supply and demand conditions change, new products could be put on the surplus list and others taken off. The amount of free stamps given with each purchase of regular stamps could be varied with changing conditions. The general classes of recipients could be altered from time to time. The plan would also lend itself to emergency conditions. Finally, its overall scope, which is determined by the number of free stamps issued, could be increased or decreased at will. We could always know its cost because it would be determined in advance."

What of the Small Operator?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What of the Small Operator?" published in the Pendleton East Orgeonian of December 14, 1955.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT OF THE SMALL OPERATOR?

The East Oregonian has said many times that the present trend of the Federal program for agriculture may result in the demise of the family size farm. Knowing full well what would happen to the business economy of Umatilla County if wheatlands were controlled by a few big operators, we have repeatedly urged that first concern in the development of a new farm program must be for the small operator.

The present program of flexible price supports and acreage reduction has seriously crippled the owners of small wheat-producing acreages in this region. They are summer fallow farmers and having to take a one-third reduction in that land on which they can produce wheat, plus a reduction in the price per bushel they receive for that wheat has drastically reduced their incomes.

We seriously question whether the soil bank plan proposed by the Department of Agriculture would be of much help to the small operator. Of course it would help him if he were paid sufficient to keep land out of production. But we doubt the Department of Agriculture is considering payments of size that would help the small operator to the extent that he needs help.

The man who produces on small acreage can make it if he is permitted to produce all that his land will give. That is why we have thought the domestic-parity plan was the best solution for him of all the solutions thus far offered to the wheat grower. He would get 90 percent of parity for that wheat he sold for domestic use, and he could put all the rest he produced into the market for feed and export for what it would bring. He could produce to a maximum and therein lies his only opportunity to keep the man with the mortgage away from the door.

There are many men in agriculture who do not share our concern for the small operator. They believe the trend in agriculture has reached the point that only the big operator can survive and that the agricultural picture would be improved if only the fellow who farms profitably on a large scale were producing. This does not take into consideration the fact that many small operators are better farmers than the big fellows, and are caught in an economic squeeze only because of their size.

Perhaps it is not possible to make a good argument strictly on the basis of economics against the big farmer getting bigger and the little farmer locking the barn door and placing himself on the labor market. Perhaps it would be easier to plan and operate a farm program if all the small operators were liquidated.

We have been unable, however, to distinguish between the end results of the application of this thesis to agriculture and business. We doubt that many readers of this newspaper would want all the small businesses in their communities to be liquidated as the result of a Federal program. We are convinced their sympathies are with the small-business man, that they would not want him to be gobbled up by the big-business men.

The day may come in business and agriculture when Federal programs will make it almost impossible for the little guy to survive. But the day has not yet come that we can afford to adopt a program that will have that result. The farm program will have that result within a very short time if people outside of agriculture are not awakened to the full impact of that result and rouse themselves to speak out against it.

Liberalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Liberalism," which I wrote some months ago, and which was published in the American Scholar, in its issue for the autumn of 1955.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERALISM

(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

Liberalism, as a political philosophy, is based on the assumption that freedom is essential for the full development of the human personality and that, therefore, men should be free. The ancestry of liberalism may be traced back to the beginnings of literate man, but its name and formal identity did not become current until early in the 19th century, when it was adopted as a party label in Spain and by a British reformist bloc of radicals and Whigs.

The roots of liberalism are religious, philosophical and scientific. The doctrine represents the culmination of a development which goes back at least to the words of the Hebrew prophets, the teachings of the Greek philosophers, and the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount.

The fusion of these influences—some of them largely incompatible with the secular humanism of the Renaissance and the enlightenment of the 18th century—combined with the political and economic en-

vironment of the 19th century to create the philosophy and form the movement of liberalism. In its essence, liberalism was antiauthoritarian; its one distinctive aim was the liberation of man from traditional restraints.

Equating liberalism with freedom, as we have, and taking note of liberalism's ancestry help us to understand the confusion which today is frequently associated with the term. Although the emancipation of man has been the enduring hallmark of liberalism, the variable ingredient, which has differed with men and with the passing of years, is emancipation from what? The practical application and, in fact, the relevant definition of liberalism thus vary with the forces, institutions and traditions which restrain men. The problems of freedom are quite different in a feudal age from what they are in a technological age.

The authors of the liberal creed are heterogeneous. There is a broad gulf between the Whig aristocrats, content with the revolutionary settlement of 1689, and the Benthamite radicals of the 19th century. There are profound differences among the Physiocrats, preoccupied with the problems of French agriculture, the Manchester economists of England's industrialized Midlands, the Founding Fathers and the Jacksonian "Democrats." It is argued—and with good reason—that their agreements far exceed their differences and that they all partake of the same tradition; but the fact that vital differences do exist makes the use of the term "liberalism" quite difficult in political communication. Difficult as an understanding of the term may be today, however, the growth of liberalism is indeed the story of man's striving for civilization and dignity.

The evolution of the liberal creed paralleled the progress of western society from a status-based church-dominated culture to an ever more democratically oriented civilization. The striving for freedom in every age helped change the structure of society. This in turn meant that the locus of power criticized by liberals shifted from church to state and from state to private concentrations of economic power.

In the late Middle Ages and during the Renaissance, the prevailing society was organized on the basis of status: the rights and responsibilities of the individual were determined by his place in the stratified and hierarchic system. The social stress was upon acquiescence and conformity.

Tendencies toward liberalism are early discernible in generations of protest against this authority. The protest was twofold: the religious revolt was closely associated with a desire for economic freedom.

The medieval system was bound to be challenged successfully as both theological and economic forces strove for freedom from the existing order. The bearers of the challege were aided by the development of new needs and interests, generated by the slow commercialization and urbanization of Europe, which in turn fostered the emergence of a new middle class.

The new commercial class was the most active force throughout Europe in the struggle for freedom from the restraints of the medieval order. It was the natural enemy of the medieval political organization, primarily because the divisions and disorder of the feudal "state" constituted a serious barrier to trade and commerce. In the late medieval period, therefore, the new middle classes alined themselves with the monarchs against the nobility and, through the success of this alliance, gained freedom from the complicated and conflicting economic regulation of the feudal aristocracy.

Once the claim of the monarchy was successfully established and a unified system of law imposed within the new nation-states, the middle classes turned their attention to means of controlling the "divine right" of the kings they had brought to power. Freedom was now conceived as a problem of the ruler and the ruled. The ruled, in this case the commercial classes, now demanded a rule of law binding upon king as well as subject. The work of Hobbes and Locke focused on the problem of liberty as it related to ruler and ruled, and while their specific conclusions differed, they agreed with each other and with later liberal thinkers that governments were instituted to serve men.

This individualism was a basic characteristic of 18th-century thought. Since liberalism as a coherent and defined philosophy was a product of a series of great economic, social, and intellectual changes which culminated in the 18th century, it even today bears the stamp of the Enlightenment. The period of the Enlightenment was characterized throughout Europe and America by a more or less unified set of principles, attitudes and beliefs. It was a period of optimism and revolution, of naive faith and debunking. It was, above all, a period of emancipation in religion, politcis, economics, and art. The unifying concept of the Enlightenment was the belief in natural law. The discoveries of Newton had been interpreted as proof that there was a natural order of things in the universe, that the laws of this order might be discovered by human reason, and that these laws furnished absolute and immutable standards for the conduct of governments and men. The implications of this doctrine were many.

First, it suggested that the potentialities of human reason were limitless. If reason could discover the laws of God and nature, there was nothing it might not do. Man could reform himself, his society, and his government. And if he could accomplish all this, was he not good and, even more important, was he not perfectible? The optimism of the century was based on this view of man's relationship to society and the universe. Problems were to be solved by an application of reason, and defects of character were to be removed by education. Men of the enlightenment could, to a certain extent, agree with Condorcet that at last reason had burst into history and progress was inevitable. The enlightenment's linear concept of progress saw all history as a process of progressive emancipation from superstitution and restraints. Not only the mind of man, but history as well, was a blank tablet on which each generation could write its own record.

Second, the concept of natural law as applied to the political scene became the doctrine of innate natural rights inherent in each individual. This concept of natural rights has been persistent in the history of Western civilization. It was expounded by both the cynics and stoics in the ancient world, systematized and expanded by St. Thomas Aquinas for the medieval church, and formed the basis of the 18th-century struggle for political freedom. In this latter period the doctrines of natural rights and individualism were joined to produce the belief that all men had the right to possess that which they acquired by their own labor, to speak and write as they chose, to petition and to form combinations, and to worship according to their consciences. There is no clearer embodiment of these principles than the Declaration of Independence and the American Bill of Rights; and there was no clearer exponent of these principles than Thomas Jefferson.

Third, in economics the doctrine of natural law again combined with individualism to become the basis of 18th-century laissez faire. The economists, beginning with Adam Smith, maintained that there were certain simple, universal laws governing the economic realm, which if left to function undisturbed would bring order out of chaos and general welfare out of private interests. The content of these laws was not only known by their exponents, but was pressed upon the populace with a rare, religious vigor. These simple, immutable laws were as follows: (a) All men were born with the natural propensity to trade and barter; (b) human actions were dominated by the profit motive; (c) the profit motive stimulated maximum productivity; and (d) maximum productivity was the greatest social good. Therefore, the pursuit by each individual of his own self-interest, or profit, resulted inevitably in the greatest degree of social welfare.

The liberalism of the late 18th and early 19th centuries had much in common with the attitudes described above, as well as with the earlier concepts of Hobbes and Locke. Although Bentham discarded the doctrine of natural law as "nonsense upon stilts" and substituted the principle of utility, the economists associated with utilitarianism retained its content in developing the principle of the natural harmony of interests. Ricardo, Malthus, and later, Herbert Spencer described the preestablished harmony of the economic realm in much the same terms as Adam Smith.

Liberalism indeed showed itself to be a product of the enlightenment. Individualism, unrestrained independence, the individual as a law unto himself, and pseudo-anarchism characterized the spirit of liberalism for that day. Liberalism was thus a reflection of the political, social, religious, and economic aspirations of a rising middle commercial class, influenced by scientific naturalism and the spread of rationalism and secularism. The influence of the Christian faith of human brotherhood under a common father likewise remained strong, even though the Reformation had destroyed the concept of an intervening priesthood. In fact, the elimination of the priestly hierarchy caused individual personality and conscience to acquire even greater significance. Each individual had the responsibility even for salvation.

Individual initiative was also of paramount importance economically. The introduction of private enterprise replaced the rigid system of status by a more flexible system of contracts. Privilege based on birth was being destroyed by enterprising individuals. Francis Bacon's lesson that knowledge is power fitted well with the growth of science, and man saw new knowledge challenging old authority.

Liberalism had barely begun to express itself as a formal political philosophy when it ran into the impact of industrialism. It grew out of an essentially preindustrial, commercial environment and yet almost immediately had to cope with the economic, social, and intellectual consequences of the industrial revolution. The rise of huge concentrations of wealth which dwarfed the individual rendered obsolete the society of small enterprisers which Adam Smith and Jefferson had in mind. The human values of liberalism were threatened by industrialism; and the political and economic noninterventionist doctrines of liberalism made it difficult for liberals to act to protect those values.

The economic manifestation of 18th century liberalism, already referred to above, based itself on a "natural harmony of interests." If individuals were left free to pursue their self-interest in an exchange economy, based upon a division of labor, the welfare of the group as a whole would automatically result. The classical liberals described a self-equilibrating economic mechanism free from all teleological influences. Moral goals and ethical criteria were to be available for passing ultimate judgment on the system but did not play a part in determining the sequence of events. The one propelling force was the self-interest of the individual which was harnessed to the public good because, in an exchange economy, man must serve others in order to serve him-

self. The free market operated in accordance with the free choices of individual buyers and sellers, which determined the allocation of resources in the society. The assumption was that in a freely competitive economy, in which no one would be prevented by status from engaging in economic activity, the income received from such activity would be a fair measure of its value to society.

The logic of such an economic creed implicitly supported the institution of private property. Private property, however, accompanied by the onward rush of industrialism, led to the development and triumph of free capitalism and the institution of the factory and its accompanying evils. The development of absentee ownership, which stemmed from private property, further accelerated the difficulties faced by a liberalism geared to a commercial small-entrepreneur economy. With the state abdicating many important areas of activity, private interests readily stepped in to fill the vacuum. To meet these new problems, liberalism in the 19th century split in a number of directions.

The Manchester laissez-faire school, represented by Cobden, Bright, and Herbert Spencer, tended to remain orthodox and insisted on restricting the role of the state. Cobden opposed factory legislation, and Spencer, in the name of liberalism, opposed almost every state activity. Spencer, idol of two generations of American businessmen, would even forbid government, either local or national, to assume responsibility for the paving, lighting and sanitation of cities.

The radicalism of Bentham and Francis Place represented a school which was prepared to make some adjustment in the antistatist philosophy in order to preserve the human values of liberalism, although Bentham's chief advice to the state was "Be quite."

The political thinking of John Quincy Adams, as a part of American federalism, represented another approach to the problem. His ideal of abolishing poverty was to come into being by exploiting and distributing the technological fruits of science through state industries, and he thus strikingly anticipated some American liberal departures of a century later. However, the defeat of Adams by Jackson in 1828 put an end to this brief era, and presaged the beginning of a new concept of government serving as a balancing and regulatory force in the political economy.

The career of John Stuart Mill, the most articulate of the 19th century liberals, summed up the transformation of liberalism under the impact of industrialism, from laissez faire to radicalism to a near-socialism. Caught between theory and fact, die-hard utilitarians at first opposed measures such as child labor regulations as unwarranted interference with economic laws and individual liberties. The moral and economic dilemmas of this position, however, were soon felt, and a new collectivist approach developed. Living conditions of the poor, as Marx and others pointed out, belied the assumptions of classical economists. This new thinking embraced such odd allies as Owenite Socialists, old-line Tory paternalists, trade unionists, Church of England moralists, and romantic-humanitarian followers of Southey and Coleridge. Soon John Stuart Mill's concessions to collectivism signalized British liberalism's withdrawal from doctrinaire individualism toward compromise with the necessity of state controls. The contributions of T. H. Green played an important part. In a series of such compromises, British liberalism broadened its ideological base to include progressivism of all stripes, from individualism to Fabian socialism. America alone remained a stronghold of classical laissez faire. In America, the enlightened conservatism, which in England as early as the 1820's, exerted a decisive restraint upon economic individualism, did not play the same role. Here enlightened conservation was diverted by the slavery issue.

In historical perspective, we can see that the complex forces which comprised liberalism yielded emancipating principles. The feudal system was destroyed. Capitalism replaced the static society of the Middle Ages. A functionless aristocracy was removed from control. Tyrants were challenged and curbed. The middle class was left free to employ its creative energies in expanding the means of production and vastly increasing the wealth of society. In setting about to limit the sovereign power, liberals helped make constitutional government, with its accompanying civil liberties, a reality. Liberalism, as formulated in the 18th and 19th centuries, indeed seemed relevant to its time.

One other major byproduct of this liberalism was the impetus given to political democracy. Most of the early liberals were not democrats and feared popular government, but democracy, as expressed by representative government, was the logical outcome of their position. The names of liberals like Jefferson, Bentham, Mills, and de Tocqueville became inseparably linked with the struggle for universal suffrage.

The identity of democracy and liberalism, however, was by no means universally granted and still is a subject of serious discussion. Guido de Ruggerio wrote in his History of European Liberalism:

"From a formal point of view, democracy does not deny the right of private associations and local bodies; but, in substance, it corrupts them by its failure to understand the constructive value of the liberty which should govern their creation and operation. * * * Thus, the democratic state is the result of depriving the citizens of their rights and conferring them upon a general will, a single and indivisible sovereign people. * * * The general will, as democracy demonstrates in practice, is only the will of the numerical majority. The omnipotence of the majority is the practical corollary of democracy; and the formal respect for the rights of minorities loses all effectual sanction just because the individuals have forfeited all power to insist upon their rights, by conferring them bodily upon the state.

"The concentration of an immense power in the hands of an often fictitious majority is genuinely tyrannical; and it is therefore no error to place democracy and despotism on the same plane. * * *"

Efforts were made to harmonize the objectives of liberalism with the processes of democracy. The term liberal democracy was used by some to breach the gap in an attempt to modify majoritarianism and relate it to the concept of individualism. Many liberals, of course, denied that a gap existed and used the terms liberalism and democracy interchangeably. In fact, however, a clash was inevitable between democracy and liberalism as it developed and reached fruition in the 19th century.

The new industrial society which came into being in the late 19th century brought with it problems not contemplated by the philosophers of the 18th and early 19th centuries. A new power came into being. It was represented by concentrations of vast wealth in relatively few hands and was used to influence and control government, destroy competition, and increase the maldistribution of wealth. Here, then, was a new menace to freedom, as threatening to the individual as the power of a 17th-century despot, which required new strategy and new attitudes from those desiring to protect individual liberty.

Anatole France incisively expressed the dilemma of the liberal whose "law, in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets, and to steal bread." It became clear to many that more than political liberty was needed to achieve freedom for man.

It was in such circumstances that a new generation of liberals, hostile to concentrations of power which threaten the individual and keep him from realizing his potentialities, began to call upon government to intervene in behalf of preserving freedom and restoring balance in the society. This new liberalism came to see that the same forces which had once released the productive energies of Western society now restrained them; and that the very forces which had demolished the power of despots now nourished a new despotism.

Twentieth-century liberalism thus tried to adjust itself to the realities of an industrial civilization. It met with both partial success and tragic failure. The failure was in Europe. Only in England under a brilliant Lloyd George government before World War I was a belated effort made to catch up with industrial realities. In France, the Radical Socialist Party (Liberal) participated in the Popular Front of the 1930's, but even here the efforts were too late and the forces of economic power too great. Instead of liberalism, socialism, communism, and fascism seemed to represent a more specific response to the industrial challenge and therefore swept the working populations and the middle classes.

In the United States, liberalism did seem to make the turn and remains today a dominant political force. An expanding frontier and the blessings of natural resources were partly responsible. They provided greater freedom for action, delayed the rise of the trade union movement, and, in turn, severely handicapped efforts of Marxism to gain a foothold here. Partly responsible too were a series of brilliant political leaders who helped reshape liberalism into an instrument for dealing with industrial society. They included Theodore Roosevelt, who first saw the democratic possibilities in big government and the need for big government to meet big business; Woodrow Wilson; and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who completed the transformation of American liberalism from an antistatist creed to a philosophy willing to use the State to achieve freedom—an end shared with traditional liberalism.

It would be well here to refer to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's observation with regard to liberalism in America. In 1938 he wrote:

"Generally speaking, in a representative form of government there are usually two general schools of political belief—liberal and conservative. The system of party responsibility in America requires that one of its parties be the liberal party and the other be the conservative party. This has been the division by which the major parties in American history have identified themselves whenever crises have developed which required definite choice of direction. In Jefferson's day, in Jackson's day, and in Lincoln's and Theodore Roosevelt's and Wilson's day, one group emerged clearly as liberals opposed to the other—the conservatives.

"One great difference which has characterized this division has been that the liberal party—no matter what its particular name was at the time—believed in the wisdom and efficacy of the will of the great majority of the people, as distinguished from the judgment of a small minority of either education or wealth. The liberal group has always believed that control by a few—political control or economic control—if exercised for a long period of time, would be destructive of a sound representative democracy. For this reason, for example, it has always advocated the extension of the right of suffrage to as many people as possible, trusting the combined judgment of all the people in political matters rather than the judgment of a small minority.

"The other great difference between the two parties has been this: The liberal party

is a party which believes that, as new conditions and problems arise beyond the power of men and women to meet as individuals, it becomes the duty of the Government itself to find new remedies with which to meet them. The liberal party insists that the Government has the definite duty to use all its power and resources to meet new social problems with new social controls—to insure to the average person the right to his own economic and political life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That theory of the role of government was expressed by Abraham Lincoln when he said, 'the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities.'"

Liberalism today stands generally committed to the qualified use of state power to achieve the values of freedom and human dignity. Like their ancestors, modern liberals recognize that concentration of power, whether in private or public hands, is the enemy of freedom.

In the economic realm this has led the mainstream of American liberalism in the direction of a form of mixed economy which would include within it a diversification of ownership. Government power would be exercised through the indirect controls of fiscal and budgetary policy, rather than through direct physical control and central committee planning. This has been accompanied politically by an emphasis on the preservation of rights, particularly as they relate to the need for dissent and opposition within a democratic society. The guideposts of Justice Holmes have thus been an essential element of modern American liberalism.

In Europe this new resurgent liberalism is attempting to find a home within the social democratic movement. An increasing number of liberal socialists have come to see that total concentration of economic power in the state apparatus is a threat to political freedom, and that economic planning through the price mechanism and a relatively free market is, in many respects, more efficient than planning by state direction.

The liberalism of today does not seek the abolition of the price system, but it does seek the regulation and control of the profit system so as to bring about modifications to suit the requirements of a changing world. In thus invoking the agency of government to protect and assist the individual, liberals call attention to two profoundly important changes which government itself has undergone since the day when Gournay, the 18th-century Physiocrat, proclaimed the ideal of laissez faire.

First, despite the notorious shortcomings of bureaucracy, the techniques of public administration are incomparably superior to the prescientific methods of the 18th and 19th centuries.

Second, and foremost, the Government agency invoked by liberals is one democratically controlled and subject to the will of people who speak, write, and assemble freely and who are effectively organized into political parties, trade unions, business and professional groups, fraternities, religious, and other independent associations.

Accordingly, liberals have evolved a program of government action which, by a striking consensus of both critics and adherents, has come to be known as the welfare state.

The welfare state is based, in the first place, upon acceptance of collective responsibility for providing all individuals with equality of opportunity. This implies, as a minimum, the elimination of disparities brought about through racial and religious discrimination, and the universal availability of adequate educational facilities.

Second, in a society as richly endowed as our own, the welfare state assumes responsibility for the basic economic security of those who are unable, through no fault of their own, to provide such security for themselves. This implies aid to those who are disabled by reason of accident, illness, youth, or old age; minimum wage legislation and unemployment insurance for all workers; and aid to economically disadvantaged groups through support of labor unions, consumer organizations, small farmers, and independent business.

Third, the welfare state assumes the responsibility for reducing great disparities in the distribution of wealth and bringing about a closer coincidence between the income of the individual and his contribution to society. This implies an appropriate tax policy and a forthright attack upon monopoly and other business arrangements which exaggerate differences in income.

Finally, the welfare state assumes the responsibility for promoting the full employment of our manpower and the full utilization of our resources. These, in turn, spell the objective of full production within the limits of an intelligent human and natural resources conservation and utilization program. Thus, contrary to the contention of its critics, the welfare state is concerned with the production of wealth as well as with the spending and distribution of wealth.

One other modern challenge to traditional liberalism is represented by Sigmund Freud and the development of psychoanalysis. As man began to learn more about himself, some of the earlier conceptions of liberalism came into sharp question. The liberal faith had been based on the judgment of man as a reasonable and good being. By acquiring knowledge and applying the scientific method, man could discover the laws of the universe as they related to his problems and solve them. The end result would be good, since man was good.

Man's study of his own psyche, however, raised disturbing doubts about these presuppositions of liberalism. Even with education, men were not necessarily guided by reason; and psychoanalysis discovered that evil was perhaps as essential an ingredient of man as good. In the latter sense, the psychoanalytic challenge to liberalism came close to the Christian theological notion of original sin, which has had its modern political expression in the works of Reinhold Niebuhr. Since men could be children of light and children of darkness and since man's subconscious was a cauldron of complexes and neuroses which interfered with the supremacy of reason over emotion, the liberal's faith in man's reason, man's goodness, and the scientific method was severely undermined. The Nazi eruption was the cold historical symbol of man's capacity for evil.

How liberalism responds to this challenge will in large measure determine its propensities for survival. The new discoveries need not in any way lead us to doubt that the goals of liberalism are as valid today as they always have been. The new insights into man which we have achieved now make our earlier faith appear naive, but this new understanding can give us strength and direction as it places the problems faced by liberalism into clearer focus. One essential adjustment which we must make is the need to embrace morality as an active, aggressive force in modern life. We can no longer take morality for granted and assume its superiority in man or its eventual victory over the forces of evil.

The liberalism of today, therefore, must strive to achieve freedom for man within the context of the problems which now face him. It should have no set of fixed dogmas concerning the kind of society in which individuals most fully realize themselves. Beyond a basic commitment to the dignity and worth of the individual, the content of liberalism from age to age and from nation to nation will vary with varying conditions. Liberalism may one day challenge and another day cherish the church; in one age it may seek less government intervention in economic affairs, and in another age, more; it may at one time be hospitable to the specific interests of the business community and at another time it may be hostile. The liberal approach must be experimental, the solution tentative, the test pragmatic. Believing that no particular manifestation of our basic social institutions is sacrosanct or immutable, there should be a willingness to reexamine and reconstruct institutions in the light of new needs.

Liberalism, therefore, lacks the finality of a creed, and thus it is without the allure of those dogmas which attract the minds of men by purporting to embody final truth. Whether liberalism can survive in a world seeking security and finality cannot now be predicted. If it does not, our civilization perishes with it. Our task, therefore, is to strengthen and support it with all of our energies and intelligence. We must release ourselves from the shackles of yesterday's traditions and let our minds be bold. Our striving for liberty, must relate itself to and come to terms with the historic demands of equality—which, likewise, has a noble tradition tracing back to the Stoics and the Christian Fathers. With Hobhouse, we must remember that "liberty without equality is a name of noble sound and squalid results."

Finally, liberalism must cement its destiny with that of democratic self-government and the need to protect democrary against its totalitarian enemies from within and without. In the struggle for survival between democrary and totalitarianism, liberalism finds its own struggle for life intimately interwoven. Liberalism, therefore, even as it recognizes the necessity to preserve the spirit and fact of dissent in the political community, must recognize its ultimate loyalty to a majority-rule society and to the protection of all the factors which make such a society possible.

Our faith is that liberalism will survive and prevail. Our faith is bolstered by awareness of man's disquieting sense that no individual and no generation can discern the content of freedom for all time. We state for all to hear that liberalism possesses a durability as strong as man's eternal quest for freedom.

The Refugee Problem as an American Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, several months ago a survey was made of the Polish refugee and emigrant centers in Europe by Mr. Walter Zachariasiewicz, executive secretary of the Polish Immigration Committee in New York. This survey was made on the basis of his personal inspection tour and study of these centers made in May and June of 1955.

His report is very valuable to all who are interested in an equitable solution of the problem of the refugees from the American point of view. It is based on facts and his vast knowledge and understanding of this problem. Since his survey is typical of the problem of refugees

of all nationalities, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith portions of the report together with some of his recommendations.

The report and recommendations follow:

At the very outset I wish to express my opinion and fear that the impact of the new policy of coexistence may cause profound changes in countries behind the Iron Curtain and among refugee groups.

We are dealing with a problem that is at once: humanitarian, political, and social. It is an American problem.

The President of the United States stressed this problem (April 22, 1955) in the following statement:

"It is imperative that we join with the other nations in helping to find a solution to these grave questions. These refugees, escapees, and distressed peoples now constitute an economic and political threat of constantly growing magnitude. They look to traditional American humanitarian concern for the oppressed. International political considerations are also factors which are involved. We should take reasonable steps to help these people to the extent that we share the obligation of the free world."

These words are of the same importance as of today.

The statement made by Eisenhower from which I have quoted, stresse mainly the social phase of this problem. During and after the Second World War forced migrations of millions of individuals created perhaps the greatest upheaval in the history of mankind. It has become an international problem fraught with incalculable social consequences and pressures, not to mention the political dynamics behind them.

Political observers realized the political importance of these elements only recently when Soviet Russia suddenly radically changed her political strategy which still puzzles our diplomats and political observers.

Our foreign policy has until now been dominated by a justified fear and danger of war with Russia. The same applies to Soviet Russia. In a review of their means and strength the Soviets could not overlook the danger of having hostile satellites in case of war. Hostile millions of Poles, Czechoslovaks, Lithuanians, etc. would constitute a great menace to them in case of war.

This fact, among others, had perhaps an important bearing on the new attitude and policy of the Kremlin.

But the United States also realized that the peoples behind the Iron Curtain are an extremely valuable potential in our favor. America knows that the freedom loving oppressed peoples, now in bondage, are our close and reliable allies. Hence the activities of the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and other agencies. Their aim is: To encourage the peoples behind the Iron Curtain as well as the refugees and old emigrant groups on this side of the curtain, to resist communism and prevent cooperation and subservience, to block penetration and fifth columns in the free countries. In other words: American policy was directed toward one goal, namely, to support and strengthen millions of our allies in their resistence to communism. The task of allying the nations now enslaved, and their refugees, with the cause of America grew in importance the closer the danger of war grew. This concern and appreciation should continue to be seriously considered in our foreign policy.

REFUGEES AND OLD POLISH COMMUNITIES

Our Government (together with private civic organizations), has in this endeavor strong support from refugee groups. Their influence, their voice, and moral encouragement still play an important role in the activities of our agencies abroad. One should also mention the part millions of Americans of Polish descent played in this program of strengthening the Polish people in their resistance to communism as a valuable contribution toward our growing success in the cold war against the Soviets.

The Polish refugees have a splendid record: the Polish underground during the war, the services of Polish groups in French, Belgian, and German undergrounds during the war, the part the Poles played as contingents of the allied forces—all this and more, rendered in the common cause on the side of the allies—distinguishes them and qualifies them for special consideration and trust.

The nations behind the Iron Curtain and their refugee groups all over the world, as well as the old emigrants, now citizens of many countries, relentless and uncompromising in their attitude towards communism, rely exclusively and wholeheartedly on the United States whose destiny they conceive as that of the liberator and crusader of democracy and christianity. They still are, in spite of disastrous political defeats, our devoted friends, most reliable in faith and loyalty. A good deal of this attitude may be attributed to the splendid work of Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, and the humanitarian mission of many American institutions.

I realized that during my contacts with various groups of different countries. I watched their attitude, I listened to their opinions, hopes and fears, also to their frustrations. These groups follow attentively the programs of free Europe. They implicity trust and account whatever is sent to them over the waves. They still see themselves not as wrecks but as soldiers of a cause common to all who ardently desire the freedom of Central and Eastern European countries, which is also the American cause.

FUTURE AMERICAN CITIZENS

"It is well for us, however, to remind ourselves occasionally of an equally manifest fact: we are one and all immigrants or the sons and daughters of immigrants" (President Eisenhower in his first state of the Union address, Feb. 8, 1953).

Several thousand refugees will soon come to this country under the existing laws. They will establish themselves and grow into America's soul and soil. Their roots will be cities and farms, their life will flow into the broad, deep stream of American life.

The medical and political screening which everyone of them now has to undergo (under conditions that defy description) is but a superficial scrutiny that does not tell the story.

Of importance is their spiritual value. Let us not forget that there will always be the danger of red fifth column in this country, as everywhere. No matter what shape the new Communist deal will take, there will always exist the danger of red fifth column.

In these immigrants the United States will always have stanch, faithful, and valiant defenders of our democracy against the inroads of Communist fifth column. This thought contributed greatly toward any approach and evaluation of what I have seen and heard.

TO MAINTAIN THE SPIRIT

It seems to me that we are somewhat derelict in one particular field, in the field of conditioning the prospective immigrants to whom we are to open the gates. We must not break their spirit or shatter their fondest hopes. It is now that they need our help and encouragement. In trying to evaluate my experiences and observations I came to the conclusion that it is important now to assist the groups that will remain where they are, as well as those who will eventually come to the United States. I am convinced that assistance should be offered all Polish refugee groups as well as groups of old Polish emigrants in many countries to maintain the spirit of resistance to Communist infiltration.

We have an ideological, political, and financial investment there. We have for years maintained spiritual intercourse with them, we have spoken to them daily through our agencies over microphones, conveying to them the voice of America about a free Europe. What we have been telling them everyday became their spiritual spine, their faith in us.

What now?

It is my conviction that we should continue to support them financially and morally. We must continue what we have started. Our assistance at this moment is essential, necessary, and important to our cause.

To let them down now would be disastrous in effect.

Especially now.

One may ask: Why now?

My answer is: Because they are now exposed to the most dangerous influence from Moscow and Warsaw.

LURING REFUGEES TO RETURN HOME

As you will see in my report the Communists have become very much interested in the emigrants and refugees. It is no secret that the Cominform is now luring refugees to return to their homelands. Special boats carry hundreds of children from France to Poland for free vacations. Warsaw agents, supplied with large amounts of money, finance and patronize Polish schools in Germany, France and Belgium (mostly among old emigrants), innumerable cultural and social activities. Polish Communist agents have behind them: consulates, embassies, and unlimited amount of * * * money.

They persist in their wooing of the refugees because they know how great is the influence of these groups on the morale and resistance of the Polish people in Poland. To illustrate: The Guild of Free Polish Newspapermen in France issued an appeal dated July 29, 1955, to the Polish groups in France, from which I quote:

"During the last few months the Communist Warsaw regime started among the Poles in France and in other countries an intensive campaign: 'return to your country.' This campaign is politically a part of the widespread attempt of diversion conducted by the Soviet Government and the Communists among political emigrees from all countries behind the Iron Curtain.

"The Guild of Free Polish Newspapermen therefore considers it its duty to remind you that every such campaign initiated by the Soviets, its agencies and the Communists among the emigrees from behind the Iron Curtain has only one purpose namely to weaken the strength of resistance of our people and their desire for independence."

The present lure is aimed at importing as many "witnesses" as possible to have them spread disbelief, to encourage others to surrender to a status which they call "reality."

Those who are watchful and experienced know that the Communists are masters in their calculations "a la longue." They know why Communist agents are spending millions of dollars to penetrate, indoctrinate and bring back to Poland and other countries refugees as witnesses. They are now hard at work to establish new lines of propaganda and break down the resistance of the nations behind the Iron Curtain because their resistance played an important role in exposing the weakest point of the Soviet menace.

The aim of the Soviets in their new political attire is to strengthen their weak strategic and political position at home by wining over the Poles and Czechoslovaks, the Lithuanians, Rumanians, Hungarians, etc.,

preparing themselves for future action. The refugees are their convenient and desirable target. The Soviets are bent on breaking the resistance of the satellite countries using the refugee groups for that purpose.

The Communists are now smiling not only at their enemies but also at their victims.

AFTER GENEVA

I am submitting this report after the Geneva conference where a wave of optimism and reconciliation has been set in motion.

"Tolerance," "cooperation," "mutual understanding," "better atmosphere" are the slogans behind this new philosophy and policy, which perhaps may be acceptable to the United States and Great Britain since it denotes only a policy as it touches only the outer spheres of an experiment from which there is an escape and return should it become exigent to return and withdraw.

But to the nations behind the Iron Curtain and to refugees strewn over the world there would be no way of return should they accept the policy of coexistence.

To them it means surrender.

There can perhaps be a kind of coexistence between the totalitarian strong and the free but there can be no coexistence between the strong and the weak, between the oppressors and the oppressed, between a powerful Soviet Empire and her satellites without radical changes and new international guarantees based on justice and freedom.

The refugees know that.

They fear the new trend which they believe is based on generalities, slogans and wishful thinking, on illusions and calculations and perhaps miscalculations. Hence their despair and struggle against the lure from Moscow and Warsaw, Prague, Budapest or Bucharest.

Their anxiety is now greater than ever before.

Greater therefore now is the need of our support.

I am afraid that should this come-home campaign even moderately succeed a radical change would occur in the attitude of the enslaved nations.

We well remember what good use we have made in our own propaganda when Polish fliers Jazwinski and Jarocki, Professor Korowicz, and Jan Hajdukiewicz, Cwiklinski, Panufnik, Klimowicz, and other escapees, including Swiatlo. They became valuable assets to our propaganda. On can imagine what the Communist propaganda machine would do with a few hundred witnesses as returnees; how they would exploit the disappointments of their new captives, how destructive such a campaign, if sucecssful, would be on the morale of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain.

I have been under the impact of these elements during my visits and conversations. I have sensed the danger of this new threat.

I have gone into great detail in describing conditions in various Polish communities abroad to show how dangerous are the new stimuli, how unhappy those who still refuse to abandon their creed and their hopes.

My report is in a way an alarm addressed to those who are interested in this sector of the front in our cold war:

"Do not abandon them now after having fed them day in and day out messages of the Voice of America about a free Europe. Now is the time, regardless of the political and diplomatic course we have adopted, to stand by, to continue even increase our moral and financial support of those who remain our most faithful and loyal allies."

We are morally responsible for them and for their plight. They are not yet expendable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Immigration

I have no intention and no authority to go into the differences of opinions in the matter of the existing Immigration Act or Refugee Relief Act as expressed in various bills and debates. I only take the liberty of submitting suggestions and recommendations regarding the operation of the existing provisions to alleviate shortcomings and injustices so prevalent and deeply felt everywhere among the refugees.

(a) Asylum for political escapees: It seems to me that the Department of State should have special, discretionary powers in granting immigration visas or legal status in this country for deserving escapees. This would save in many instances prolonged and complicated action by Congress.

(b) United States Health Service restrictions: One of the redtape injustices quite prevalent and causing immeasurable suffering is the provision that excludes those who are afflicted, even in the smallest degree with TB from obtaining immigration visas.

Tuberculosis has long ceased to be a dangerous social disease. The progress of medicine has now produced means of checking and combating TB. Under proper care and in favorable conditions applicants for permission to emigrate to the United States would quickly overcome this handicap. With rest, proper food and care these TB applicants would soon be able to live a normal life, especially in America. To wreck their life, their future, because of this, regardless how serious affliction—imposed by a stiff and heartlessly invoked provision seems to me to call for revision. I have seen many victims of that rule who undoubtedly merit the highest consideration, such as victims of concentration camps, underground heroes, separated families—unfortunately they were sentenced to slow death, denied the only opportunity to escape, because they have tiny spots on the lungs. Once legislation like Refugee Relief Act is to some extent a humanitarian measure it shouldn't apply the same medical standards to victims of persecution or long camp life as we apply to regular immigrants living normal lives in free countries. In many cases the rejection of one person denies from immigration the whole family including quite often many children.

(c) Interpretation of misdemeanors: An applicant whose record shows two sentences for misdemeanors is automatically excluded and rejected. The nature of these misdemeanors and the circumstances under which sentence was pronounced need be studied and properly interpreted and evaluated. Many of them are of such trivial nature and direct result of semihuman conditions that to use the sentence in denying the refugee a chance of starting a new life seems to be cruel.

(d) Necessity of coordinating medical examination with political screening: It happens not infrequently that due to protracted political screening applicants are not receiving their visas during the 4 months validity of medical examination. In such cases they have to undergo troublesome and costly medical examination for the second time.

(e) Call for more discreet investigation: Not a little embarrassment is caused in many cases by local police investigators trying to collect confidential information on applicants. They approach mostly neighbors of the applicants asking about applicants' political affiliations and beliefs, whether they are not Communists. That, of course, creates suspicions since the neighbors are not aware of the prospective emigrant's plans and do not know in what connection the investigation is being conducted. The complaints of this nature reached me in Belgium and Austria.

II. Refugees and escapees welfare

(a) Liquidation of substandard camps in Germany and Austria: We should not relax our pressure on now sovereign Germany and Austria in connection with closing those dreadful camps which are not fit to live in. Some more suitable settlements should be provided for the refugees who should also more closely be integrated into economical life of Germany and Austria.

(b) Problem of employment: One of the greatest sources of distress among refugees in Germany results from the fact that some refugee camps and settlements in rural sections in that country offer the refugees no chance of employment. This should be remedied. The camps or settlements should be placed in or near industrial centers or large cities to enable the refugee to earn money and be occupied. It seems to me that this claim of refugees is justified and would be helpful. The presence of so many refugees in Germany is not an act of German tolerance or charity but a result of their war crimes. It imposes upon them continuous duties and obligations.

(c) Shelter for escapees in Germany: There is an obvious necessity of establishing an adequate center for recent escapees in Germany, under joint administration and control of German and allies' authorities.

(d) Transfer evacuated United States Army housing projects to refugees: Since the United States Army is evacuating built by themselves housing projects in Austria there is an opportunity to improve the refugees' lot by shifting at least some of them to the evacuated premises.

(e) Refugee and escapee camp at Trieste: The living conditions in that camp need improvement very badly and might perhaps be subsidized from USEP or FOA funds. The present place is gloomy, overcrowded, with poor light.

(f) Disposal of seized property from enemy aliens: It would be a good idea to use part of the enemy aliens' World War II property seized from them by the United States Government for raising standards of living and helping rehabilitation of refugees in Germany, Austria, and Italy.

(g) Deciding date for escapees: Great relief and justified improvement in the situation of escapees would come from an extension of the date which qualifies the escapee to benefit from USEP's assistance. The dateline for those who escaped from the geographical boundaries of Soviet Russia is drawn along the year 1945, whereas January 1948 is the date for escapees from other countries.

(h) Expansion of USEP's field offices: USEP do extremely good work—but only there, where they operate. But escapees who happen to be in countries where there are no offices of the USEP are deprived of its assistance and protection. Hence my recommendation that the extension of the USEP should be widened to embrace also Scandinavian countries.

(i) Escapee assistance to their families: It often happens that refugees, especially escapees leave behind them their families. Their natural desire, after escaping from an oppressed country, is to help their families, especially when those families are thrown out of their homes. Unfortunately some escapees are in no position to send packages to their families since they remain idle for a long time in camps.

I should therefore suggest that such escapees should be assisted in sending packages to their families behind the Iron Curtain as a sign of their new better life.

(j) FOA, CARE parcels: I would kindly recommend that the FOA and CARE parcels service continue and even be extended. The moral, psyscological and social effect of FOA cannot be described or measured. It is invaluable.

(k) Cooperation with refugee groups: Many American organizations and foundations operating in European countries among refugee groups jeopardize their own work by

disregarding existing local refugee organizations. The consequently make many mistakes. It seems to me that those who operate there would benefit greatly by inviting local emigree groups to cooperate in their plans and execution of their plans as consultant agencies. This would eliminate many grievances and mistakes and much waste.

The Harris-Fulbright Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD a letter which I have just written to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch along with the editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch to which I refer.

I am very disturbed about the smear attack which seems to be gaining momentum which has been embarked upon by certain groups who disagree with the philosophy of the Harris-Fulbright bill. There is plenty of honest argument on both sides of this issue and there should be no occasion whatsoever to resort to this kind of procedure. Incidentally, if what has been referred to as the gas and oil lobby has been using improper or possibly illegal tactics in promoting this legislation, these matters should be investigated and brought to light. However, there seems to be no specific charges made against the gas and oil lobby of improper or illegal conduct. Unless a bill of particulars is forthcoming I think, in fairness, the attacks should cease inasmuch as they would then properly be dubbed smear attacks.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1956.

EDITORS,
St. Louis Post-Dispatch,
St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: I read with interest your editorial appearing in the Monday, January 23, 1956, Post-Dispatch, entitled "The New Gas Gouge," in which you discuss the proposed Fulbright-Harris bill to exempt natural-gas producers from Federal regulation.

I am enclosing for your consideration an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of January 23, 1956, a newspaper which has the reputation of being independent and liberal in its thinking. I think this would be excellent material for your Mirror of Public Opinion so that your readers will realize that there is more to this issue than the activities of what your editorial refers to as the oil and gas lobby.

Tragically, your editorial is geared to impugning the motives of those with whom your editors disagree instead of presenting the facts and logic of your own position. Can't we keep public discussion on a higher plane? It appears to me that the smear approach is resorted to when facts and logic are absent. If this is so we, all being interested basically in the consumer, are hurting the consumers' interest when we avoid honest debate.

Yours very truly,
THOMAS B. CURTIS.

P. S.—I am also enclosing some comments made on the floor of the House and the additional prepared remarks appearing in the January 25, 1956, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in which I call attention to what on the surface appears to be a serious smear attack by the Columnist Drew Pearson on the integrity of the majority of the House Members who supported the Harris bill. Knowing that your newspaper carries Drew Pearson's syndicated column and being a newspaper which has the reputation of being a responsible journal, my remarks are quite pertinent to your policy of publicizing Mr. Pearson's statements.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]
THE NEW GAS GOUGE

Almost every St. Louis householder uses gas in some form—in stoves or furnaces or water heaters. Industries here are heavy gas customers. To each of these consumers, and to millions more across the country, the present Senate debate on the Fulbright bill should be a matter of personal concern. For the bill would cost gas consumers money.

The oil and gas lobby, which the Wall Street Journal reported was spending $1.5 million to promote the bill, naturally denies this. Gas producers argue that their prices will not rise rapidly if Federal controls are prohibited by the Fulbright bill. Suspicious consumers might then ask why the lobby is putting so much money and effort into its campaign if it expects no return.

This has been a most persistent campaign. Repeatedly the gas industry has tried to prevent or escape from field regulation by the Federal Power Commission. The Moore-Rizley bill of 1947, the first attempt, did not pass. The Kerr bill of 1949 was vetoed by former President Truman.

In 1954 the Supreme Court held that producers were subject to FPC regulation, and the new legislation is an attempt to escape from the High Court's ruling. The House passed the bill by 209 votes to 203. If the Senate passes it, President Eisenhower is expected to sign it. Then what?

In 10 years the field price of gas sold to pipelines has increased more than 100 percent. Testimony on the present bill referred to further increases up to 15 cents per thousand cubic feet, which would make the price about 25 cents. Consumers would have to pay this added expense of unregulated gas prices, but that is not all they would have to pay.

Much of the gas consumed locally goes to industries at a low rate because they agree to burn other fuels when a utility needs their gas for residential heating. This gas already is sold at less than 25 cents. If the price rises to that figure, many industries will convert to other fuels. The residential consumer will have to pay for this loss of revenue to utilities and pipelines.

Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, who has fought the gas-oil lobby constantly, estimates that the full effect of a 15-cent gas field-price rise would be to add 27 cents to the residential consumer's bill. That would be a 35-percent increase.

There are more than 18 million residential gas customers in the Nation. Their average annual gas bill would be increased $23.45, Senator DOUGLAS believes. In Chicago's colder latitude (and this would be true of St. Louis, too), the average gas-heating bill would go up by $41.25.

Senate opponents of the Fulbright bill think it would gouge consumers out of some $600 million to a billion dollars a year in behalf of gas producers. Of course the lobby denies this, too, and the answer all depends on just what price increases the producers intend if they are free from Federal regulation.

If the lobby does not really intend to increase prices much, then why all the long fuss and bother about escaping from price regulation? That is the unanswered question which should make millions of gas customers and their elected representatives suspicious of the Fulbright bill.

Led by big oil companies, the lobby is making one more desperate effort to avoid utility regulation. Let the customers beware. Let the Senators who represent the consumers stand up and be counted for them when the vote comes.

Let's Try Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Let's Try Patriotism," written by the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. J. Addington Wagner, and published in the American Legion Magazine for February 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LET'S TRY PATRIOTISM"

(By J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion)

During February Legionnaires will have two opportunities to try a little experiment. On February 12th we will celebrate Lincoln's Birthday, and on the 22d we will mark the day of Washington's birth. On both those national holidays observe carefully what happens. Walk or drive around your community and see to what extent the flag is displayed. It will of course appear before public buildings, but the chances are you will not find it waving in front of 1 house out of 4 or 5. If you do, your community is indeed unusual.

This neglect of our flag does not mean that many Americans have no love of country. Nor can it be said that they are unpatriotic. But the sad fact is that most Americans are apathetic when it comes to our national colors and this apathy is a dangerous symptom. Another danger sign is the sneering way in which some people talk about patriotism and flag waving in attempting to prove how progressive and sophisticated they are in their thinking.

Actually such people prove something quite different—that they are ignorant of this Nation's history and the reasons for its greatness. Still, it is something worth thinking about. It cannot be dismissed lightly because it indicates far more than the ignorance of an individual. It expresses an attitude that must have been fostered because it is an unnatural concept.

Since the beginning of time man has taken pride in his native land. Some of the greatest pages in history tell of men who have shown this love of country by heroic actions in its behalf. These men were not merely patriots; their actions made them superpatriots. And many of them were flag wavers, literally as well as figuratively. We have had a great many such men in our own history. As a matter of fact, it is because of such men—more than a few of whom have been Legionnaires—that we are a free, independent, and great Nation. What has happened in recent years to cause some Americans to talk about patriotism with a sneer,

scoff at the display of our flag, and deride fellow Americans who happen to take pride in their country, and believe that this Nation should come before all others?

This is something that is relatively new, an attitude that has been developed only in the past two or three decades. Prior to that time there was no compulsion about patriotism. No American used to salute the flag or stand for our national anthem with a self-conscious feeling that this was something he had to do. Those earlier Americans did more than show respect for their flag; they felt something deep inside them that ofen made Old Glory look a bit blurred as it went by.

To many of our modern-day sophisticates such a reaction is incomprehensible. They consider it sloppy, sentimental poppycock. If they have taken certain courses at certain institutions of higher education they are likely to couple patriotism with a 5-ruble word, "chauvinism." This show of education still does not alter the fact that such a person is not quite as bright as he pretends to be. The fault may be his own since he may have been exposed to a proper education about this country, and it didn't take. On the other hand, he may be another victim of a certain segment of educators whose allegiance is not to the United States of America we know, but to some fuzzy concept of one-worldism or totalitarianism.

Let me emphasize as strongly as I can that the great majority of professors and teachers in this country are loyal, dedicated Americans who are doing their utmost to instill in our children a love of country based on understanding. Unfortunately, there are a few educators who have set a different goal for themselves. Aiming to prepare our boys and girls to be citizens of the world, or pawns in a highly organized collectivist society, they decry love of country as something shameful, reeking of the poisoned air of nationalism. Fortunately, such teachers are a small minority, but they do a lot of harm and can undo a lot of the fine work being done by the loyal and patriotic majority of teachers.

However, education is not the only field in which such subversives operate. The attempt to weaken this country by fraying the ties of patriotism that bind us together is not restricted to classrooms. It is a widespread campaign that operates on many fronts, and its danger is expressed in the Biblical injunction: "If a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand."

We now understand, in general, how Communists operate within a country. We know that one of their major objectives is to set class against class so that in the resulting choas they can move in and seize power. Think how easy we will make their task if we permit ourselves to be broken up not into fragments but into millions of human particles without the strong, cohesive force of patriotism to bind us together!

We can take it for granted that the Communists are part and parcel of the conspiracy to make patriotism unpopular. However, it is a grave mistake to think that they are the only ones who are involved in this project.

Americans are inclined to oversimplify things, and this seems to be especially true when it comes to communism and other forms of subversion. Too many people have the naive notion that the Communists are bushy-bearded Russians who speak in heavy foreign accents. This comic-book caricature of a Communist lingers in many minds even though we have seen far different types exposed as dedicated Communists and Soviet agents.

Just as there are different kinds of Communists, many of them difficult to spot, so there are various manifestations of communism. Even Stalin was unable to achieve absolute conformity to his idea of communism, though he murdered millions in his attempt to do so. It should not be surprising therefore to find that communism outside the Iron Curtain has not always measured up to the rigid standards prescribed by the Kremlin bosses.

Expert opinion has it that today there are only about 25,000 Communist Party members in this country. That low figure has given many Americans a false feeling of security. To them this is proof positive that there aren't enough communists left in this country to worry about. To their way of thinking all the rest of the commies and the pro-commies have seen the error of their ways and are now conservatives or even reactionaries. Nothing could be more fallacious than this strange notion, and few concepts are more dangerous. The simple fact is that most of the trouble we are having within our country stems from the activities of people who, while not communists, have repeatedly acted as stooges for communist causes.

Since the Bolsheviks staged their first blood bath in 1917, hundreds of thousands of people in this country have participated in Communist activities. Many of them did so innocently, and backed away from the conspiracy when they learned the truth about it. At the other extreme are people who have participated in Communist swindles for decades, zigging and zagging with every twist of the party line. Yet in many cases these people never allied themselves with the Communist Party technically, and scream indignant denials if anyone dares to hint that they are actually Communists or pro-Communists.

These subversive characters have as devoted allies another type of person who can best be described as a collectivist. Such an individual is a Communist of a sort, in that he subscribes to a certain tenet of Marxian doctrine without going all the way as a doctrinaire Communist must. In some cases a person of this sort may even oppose the Russian variety of Marxism as a thing to be bitterly deplored.

Still, this does not keep the collectivist from joining hands with the Communist when the chips are down. And the chips are likely to be down when any individual or any organization does something which will hurt communism. Shouting loudly that they hate communism, the collectivists move in a body to annihilate their hated enemies, the anticommunists. Psychologists may offer a better reason for this strange phenomenon, but it could arise from the fact that communism and the ideology espoused by these people have common roots. When anyone strikes at communism he is bound to hit a raw nerve in the collectivist anatomy.

Thanks in large part to such people, we have committed one folly after another in our foreign relations and in our domestic affairs. They are the kind who in the 1920's and 1930's became at least emotionally involved with the bolshevik revolution, and propagandized this country into making its greatest diplomatic blunder—the recognition of Red Russia. Many of these people eventually recognized their error, and wanted nothing further to do with Russian communism. But even so, a great many of them changed their ideology in only one major respect. They turned not from communism but from the Kremlin's particular brand of communism.

Overlooking the fact that the all-powerful totalitarian state inevitably means a police state, these people dream of utopias in which everyone will be taken care of from cradle to grave by a benevolent and all-wise government. As prime movers, they will of course have important roles to play in this brave new world, but they will undertake this because of their great love for the comman man who so needs their guidance.

Certainly there is no law against dreaming, but too often the collectivists who specialize in this sort of stuff are guilty of selling their phony notions under false pretenses. Their streamlined version of the world of the future is made to look so dazzling and plausible that many people never notice that it bears a trademark that looks amazingly like a hammer and sickle.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to dismiss these people as visionaries or crackpots. Most of them are well educated and they are likely to be persuasive talkers. Many of them occupy strategic positions where they can command attention, if not respect. While they may not always succeed in selling their collectivist doctrine, they often do an extremely effective job of undermining faith in American traditions and ideals. And in so doing they aid and abet the Communist conspiracy.

The third group that presents a serious problem to us are the one-worlders, the people who are diligently trying to bring about a world government. Like many collectivists, these people really believe that their globalistic nostrum will cure mankind of all its ills. But in their headlong rush toward the millenium they blithely overlook realities. And one hard reality is that their one-world would be achieved largely at the expense of our United States. That this fact does not trouble them is evident in the way they persist in whittling away at our national sovereignty, but I need hardly point out that the American Legion is not going to sit idly by while such people try to persuade the American people that national suicide is in their own best interest.

This is not to say that we should become isolationists. That is neither desirable nor practical in our present world. There are 2 billion people on this earth, and we must learn to live with them. Indeed, we are learning; and I dare say that Legionnaires, thanks to their service in the great wars and in Korea, had an unusual vantage point for their lessons in international living. Because of this advantage, which unfortunately many one-worlders lack, we discovered a highly important and basic fact. From practical experience we know that this country and the citizens of this country can count on being respected only as long as the United States remains strong. We know from bitter experience what happened to our prestige after World War II ended and it began to appear that the United States was no longer the same mighty Nation that had won victories around the globe. That is just one reason, but a compelling one, why we as citizens and veterans are unalterably opposed to those foolish people who want to weaken this Nation's sovereignty and limit its power in their do-good attempts to promote world government.

However, we know what we are up against in opposing these people because we have learned of the power they possess. This was demonstrated when the American Legion ran head on into the UNESCO propagandists. When a preliminary report by an obscure committee gave these people an opportunity to circulate a story that the American Legion might reverse its previous stand against UNESCO, that story made favorable headlines and editorials from coast to coast. When the American Legion reiterated its former opposition to UNESCO, by an overwhelming vote at the national convention in Miami, powerful newspapers, magazines, and broadcasters distorted the story and viciously smeared our organization for failing to toe the mark of the one-worlders, as they toe the mark.

Naturally, we don't like this sort of thing but we can take it. Indeed we are used to it. We have been similarly attacked, time and again, because we have performed what we felt was our patriotic duty by calling attention to the activities and records of individuals and organizations operating in manners detrimental to our country's welfare. For thus daring to discuss Communists and col-

lectivists the American Legion has even been denounced as subversive and un-American. However, that is just another indication of the fact that it is high time Americans started pulling together to fight the powerful forces that are arrayed against us—the forces of communism, collectivism, and one-worldism.

What should our strategy be?

Bear in mind that these three forces sometimes operate independently of each other, sometimes they work as a team, and on some occasions they seem to be pitted against each other. However, they show remarkable harmony and unity when it comes to opposing traditional Americanism, the Constitution of the United States, and people who love this country and despise its enemies. At all costs, and using all sorts of trickery, they work incessantly to discredit and destroy all three.

Obviously the best way to foil these people is to form a united front based on a strong, uncompromising, and undivided allegiance to this Nation, its Constitution and its Flag. In short, the need today is for positive, forthright, and outspoken Americanism.

And that in turn calls for a greater pride in our Nation. This is something that can best be developed by a better knowledge of this country's history, so that we may know precisely why this Nation and this Nation's system of government are the best that man has been able to devise. Too many people are ignorant of these things and are therefore easy prey for un-American propagandists. This lack of knowledge is the reason why too many American GI's succumbed to Communist brainwashing in the Orient. It also explains why so many Americans fall for the brainwashing that is constantly being practiced on them by the Communists, the collectivists, and the proponents of world government.

For the past few years we have been suffering from a growing inferiority complex of international dimensions. This causes us to worry about the opinions of even such fellows as Krishma Menon and Jawaharlal Nehru. As a result we have been easy marks for our enemies and a source of dismay to our friends. If we intend to win the present cold war, it is esesntial that we get over this weakness and develop some faith in ourselves. As the next step we must express that faith by showing the world what we believe and how far we will go to defend our beliefs. Only in this way will we stop the constant probings and humiliations practiced on us by the Kremlin bosses, and end the doubts of our friends and allies.

But first we must pick up where we left off a long time ago, and show some patriotism.

India: Neutral Against Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the so-called neutrality of India is a matter of concern as this Congress approaches the question of foreign aid to India. As part of my remarks, I am including an article by Freda Utley which appeared in Human Events on January 28. This article by Miss Utley is pertinent and timely and I commend it to all Members who are interested in India's attitude toward the United States.

INDIA: NEUTRAL AGAINST WHOM?

(By Freda Utley)

On January 17 Senator KNOWLAND said:

"Can our economic system survive prolonged burdens of building a system of collective security and a system of neutralism at one and the same time? * * * If the neutralists are to receive the benefits and have none of the responsibilities of those in the collective defense system, will not this act as an incentive plan to build up the fence sitters?"

India, to whom we have sent half a billion dollars of unrequested aid in gifts and loans, is the prime example of our futile and dangerous policy of being equally, or more generous to "neutrals" than to proven allies. This policy, as the California Senator also warned, will be reappraised "on the main streets of America" if the Executive and Congress fail to abandon it. Let us leave aside the fact that India, whose Congress Party is dedicated to the nationalization of basic industries, has so discouraged private investment that General Motors and Ford have suspended their Indian manufacturing activities. Let us consider only the political consequences of our self-defeating foreign aid policy.

The triumphant, flower-strewn progress of Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev during their recent visit to India has proved that Nehru's land is no longer even neutral, but the friend of our enemies. This has begun to be realized by the British press, if not yet by the American public and Government.

Newspapers such as the liberal Manchester Guardian, together with the London Times (whose enthusiasm for peaceful coexistence with the Communist totalitarian tyrannies has matched its former advocacy of an understanding with Nazi Germany), have been equally perturbed by the evidence that the Soviet Empire is as hostile to Britain as to the United States. In the words of the consistently anti-Communist Spectator, there was such panic at Khrushchev's diatribes against British imperialism, that even the Manchester Guardian and the Times were impelled, on the same day, to publish leading articles in which the liberal conscience could be seen chasing its tail over the sins of our fathers who were not sufficiently brotherly toward their colonial subjects.

According to Taya Zinkin, the able and witty correspondent of the Manchester Guardian in India, Nehru's attitude toward his excessively honored guests, was like that of an "eager mother presenting her daughter and straightening a last strand of hair before the curtsy." As she also reported from New Delhi on November 18, "The visit to India of the Russian leaders marks a decisive phase of Indo-British relations: it is the end of the honeymoon."

Since the British worm is turning, maybe it is not too much to hope that the most patient of all beasts of burden, the American taxpayer, may begin to ask what is the sense of giving economic aid to an India whose President on November 18 proclaimed that his country and Communist Russia "are very close to each other," and that "every day the bonds of friendship between the Soviet world and India are being further strengthened."

Nehru's and U Nu's methods of enforcing "popular enthusiasm" for the Communist leaders smacked of the totalitarian compulsions employed in the U. S. S. R. to ensure attendance at mass demonstrations. According to the London Economist, in both India and Burma, the well-rehearsed, cheering, slogan-shouting school children lined the route by order. As one Indian newspaper, the Madras Mail, had the courage to point out, "What could not have been done in 10 years indoctrination [of the future young voters of India] may have been achieved in one red-letter day"—at the instance of the Indian Government. A note of humor is added by the report from Burma, where the children shouted their pro-Soviet slogans off pieces of paper supplied by the authorities, that a Western newspaper correspondent had no difficulty in also getting them to chant obediently "Long live Dulles" and "Long live Coca-Cola." What is most ominous is that communism has been made to appear respectable and admirable, and the West odious in the eyes of the masses, by the deliberate action of the governments of India and Burma.

As was to be expected, we have our own powerful voices in the American press, and on radio and television, telling us that we should not be deterred from aiding India simply because Nehru loves Russia; or because he has learned from his totalitarian friends in Moscow and Peking how to force or bribe his people to parade and shout and strew flowers, or otherwise express their master's voice in paying enthusiastic tribute to the rulers of the Soviet empire. But it would be worse than folly for us to listen to their voices. We had far better take cognizance of the still, small voice of our friends in Asia who tell us that appeasement is not the road to peace, and that the surest way of bringing on a third world war is to continue our present policy of disheartening our friends and convincing the world that only the Communists need to be feared and conciliated.

There is need for us to be generous, but let us decide, intelligently, to give our aid and support only to those prepared to share with us the heat and burden of the day in the worldwide struggle against the Communist menace. Who, in his senses, can advocate that we continue, unconditionally, to aid India which, under Nehru, has definitely proclaimed itself "neutral" against us? Why should we be generous to such friends of our enemies as Nehru and Tito, and so niggardly to proven allies such as Chiang Kai-shek, Syngman Rhee and Turkey, who are finding it increasingly difficult to stem the dangerous tide of inflation caused by their exposed position, uncompromising hostility to Communist imperialism and consequent need to maintain armies beyond their strength.

If it was wise to promise dollar aid to Nasser to build the Aswan Dam in Egypt, why should we have waited to do so until he had threatened us with securing Russian — probably mythical — help? Why should we teach the world that the easiest way to get American aid is to threaten us by establishing economic, military or political relations with our enemies; and the most likely way to insure America's rejection of support is to be loyal to us? Why should we continue to pour out our wealth for no purpose except to make our actual and political enemies believe us to be so weak that we need to resort to bribery, and cause our friends to despair of our resolution to resist their enemies and ours? In a word, trying to buy friendship or ward off enmity with dollars is equivalent to building the edifice of our security on sand.

"All the American billions poured into Europe since the war, with their immense beneficial effect, have only made America more hated than ever."

This extreme and questionable verdict was not pronounced by an unreconstructed American isolationist. It is to be found in a remarkable book published in Calcutta and called, Blowing Up India. The author, Philip Spratt, is an expatriate Englishman who chose India as his country and an Indian woman as his wife, a quarter of a century ago, after spending several years in British prisons because of his revolutionary activities. As an old-vintage ex-Communist, he is mainly concerned in awakening his adopted country to the real and present danger emanating from Peking and Moscow; in trying to cure them of their neurotic complexes about a no longer existent Western imperialism; and, in demonstrating that

there is no valid basis for their belief that America "being a capitalist power, must try to establish an empire and take over India from the British."

Philip Spratt tells us frankly that all our generosity will avail us nought in this world. The richer countries, he thinks, ought to aid the poorer, but they should have no illusions that this will stop communism since "the main drive of the Russo-Chinese leaders is for military power." China, he writes, "will soon have a standing army of 20 million and a little more rice is no answer to that." With old-time British realism, he concludes:

"In 20 years Russo-China will possess unchallengeable military superiority to the rest of the world. * * * All they will (then) need to do is to address ultimata to other countries to compel them to submit on pain of extinction. * * * The idea that China can be bought out of the alliance by trade or loans is childish. The Chinese Communists are not nationalists. * * * If we continue to make conquest easy for them, there is no reason why (Moscow and Peking) should quarrel; they will go happily ahead to their glorious destiny of ruling the world, and will postpone the question who is to be the eventual boss till it arises."

Thus, he concludes, as every rational American also should, that the only hope of promoting a split between Russia and China is to put up the stiffest possible resistance to the latter's aggression.

Similarly, with regard to India, Philip Spratt tells us, in words reminiscent of Senator KNOWLAND, that our Asiatic policy amounts to one of "gradual surrender" which demoralizes the people on our side. There are, he writes, many Indians who are sufficiently realistic and informed to know that "without American support, free Asia is doomed," and who realize that there is "no reason to doubt" our good intentions because "the interests of America coincide with those of the free Asian countries." But, he continues, there has been a revulsion against us even among our best friends in India, on account of our "painfully weak" policy.

He cites, in particular, our shabby and stupid treatment of Chiang Kai-shek whom we "secretly undermined," prevented from "pressing his advantage and finishing off the Communists, when he seemed likely to do so"; and to whom we "cut off arms aid when he began to lose." Similarly with regard to Korea, he reproaches America for having "weakly allowed herself to be dissuaded by the neutralists and faint-hearts in the U. N." to conclude an armistice at the moment when we had obtained military supremacy and "were in a position to drive the Chinese out of the peninsula and unite Korea." Thus we not only restored "the explosive status quo in Korea," but also "enabled Communist China to claim the advantage in the military exchanges and consequently to obtain an enormous accession of prestige."

All these blunders have naturally disheartened our erstwhile Indian friends, who now "tend to fall into line with the easy, popular neutralism." Hence, the ever-increasing influence of Nehru's evil genius, and representative in the U. N., Mr. Krishna Menon, whom Spratt describes as belonging to "that considerable band of people in important positions in the free world who, though not technically party members, are in fact disciplined Communists." Even if this is disputed, there is indeed "something anomalous in a convinced partisan of the aggressor masquerading as a neutral mediator."

As regards Nehru himself, Spratt does not think that he is "deliberately working for the Communists," although he sometimes fears it in view of the fact that, "with scarcely an exception, he has exerted his considerable influence on the Comumnist side." Nehru reminds Philip Spratt of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He characterizes them both as "consistent democrats at home and consistently pro-Communist in world affairs." He suggests as the explanation not only FDR's and Nehru's "kindegarten innocence about communism," but other shared characteristics, such as their "passion for applause, excessive confidence in their own judgment, a certain failure of intellectual effort," and "an unwillingness to think things out and to grapple with harsh realities." He considers that whatever Nehru's subjective motives may be, objectively he is leading India "rapidly and almost unresistingly into—or at least dangerously near—the Soviet bloc."

This book was written after Nehru had pronounced his enthusiastic eulogy of Stalin after the dictator's death, but before he embraced Bulganin and Khrushchev. After reading it, one wonders why the State Department or the United States Information Services do not devote a few thousand dollars to promoting its sale all over Asia and Europe, and in furnishing copies to all our libraries abroad. It would also be extremely useful if it were published and widely read in America instead of being available only in a paperbacked edition published in Calcutta. Surely money thus expended would avail us infinitely more than some tons of rice given to feed the inexhaustible hunger of India's millions.

What is the solution to our dilemma? Perhaps the London Economist has the answer. In its issue of December 17, it advocated our calling Soviet Russia's bluff by welcoming Moscow's proclaimed readiness to take on its "fair share of the job of aiding poorer countries."

"How long," says the Economist, in an editorial entitled "The Happy Hypocrites," "will it take for Soviet aid to become taken for granted, for Asian recipients to fret at its nakedly bilateral and choosey forms and urge Moscow, as they have urged the West, to channel it through multilateral systems such as U. N. and the Colombo plan?"

In a word, why should we worry because the Kremlin has chosen to meet us on our own ground? "If Russian economic offers are of a kind that helps them (Asian recipients) to avert difficulty and disorder, as western aid does, so much the better." As the Economist implies, if Russian economic aid proves to be a myth and a delusion, so much the better for the free world. Meanwhile, why don't we give aid and comfort to our proved and loyal friends, and let India enjoy the doubtful blessings of friendship with our enemies, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and its younger brother the People's Government of China?

In a word, let the Communists and their friends stew happily in their own juice, while we help those who can be counted upon to stand by us in spite of all the threats and blandishments of Moscow and Peking.

Distinguished Federal Judge, Los Angeles, Renders Significant Decision Regarding Fraud on Government by Citizen Admitting Communist Party Membership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, notwithstanding that the Government Printing Office estimated it would make 4½ pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $360, I now present to you and all the Members of this distinguished United States Congress the text of what manifestly is a very important and very informative decision by one of the distinguished Federal judges of the United States District Court, Southern District of California, Central Division; to wit, Chief United States District Judge Leon R. Yankwich, on June 8, 1955, in the case of United States of America, plaintiff, against Sam Title, also known as Sam Teitelman, defendant. I recommend its careful reading.

As a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, it frequently comes to my attention that many of those persons who appear before said committee as witnesses, and who plead the constitutional privilege of the fifth amendment, are many times those about whom it is established that they have procured their passports to travel abroad by concealment of fact or misrepresentation of what country they are going to or what their mission abroad is.

This important decision deals with a set of facts dealing with the subject of aliens desiring American citizenship which I believe to be very pertinent in connection with our presently existing Federal statutes on such matters.

The text of the case follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF *v.* SAM TITLE, ALSO KNOWN AS SAM TEITELMAN, DEFENDANT, CIVIL NO. 17368, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, CENTRAL DIVISION, JUNE 8, 1955

Action by United States to revoke and set aside defendant's admission to citizenship and to cancel a certificate of naturalization on ground that they were procured by concealment of material fact or by willful misrepresentation. The district court, Yankwich, chief judge, held that concealment of active membership in Communist Party on part of alien seeking admission to citizenship of United States, was a fraud on Government for which citizenship could be subsequently revoked.

Order accordingly.

1. Aliens (71 (1)): Because citizenship is valuable right, once it is obtained by an alien, courts must jealously guard its revocation.

2. Aliens (71 (18)): Revocation of citizenship can be granted only if evidence establishing ground upon which revocation is sought, whether fraud or other, is clear, unequivocal, and convincing.

3. Aliens (71 (18)): In action by United States to revoke and set aside defendant's admission to citizenship and to cancel his certificate of naturalization on ground that they were procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation, record showed continuous participation in affairs of Communist Party, distribution and sale of literature of party, attendance at conventions where policy was determined and pattern of conduct on part of defendant which continued to date of naturalization. (Immigration and Nationality Act, par. 313 (a) (1, 4), 316 (a) (3), 340, 8 U. S. C. A. pars. 1424 (a) (1, 4), 1427 (a) (3), 1451.)

4. Aliens (71 (18)): In action by United States to revoke and set aside defendant's admission to citizenship and to cancel his certificate of naturalization on ground that they were procured by concealment of material facts or by willful misrepresentations, evidence established that pattern of

revolution was taught by Communist Party at time defendant was active participant therein, which was during 10-year period previous to his application for citizenship. (Immigration and Nationality Act, par. 313 (a) (1, 4), 316 (a) (3), 340, 8 U. S. C. A. pars. 1424 (a) (1, 4), 1427 (a) (3), 1451.

5. Aliens (71 (6)): Concealment of active membership in Communist Party on part of alien seeking admission to citizenship of United States, was a fraud on Government for which citizenship could be subsequently revoked.

6. Aliens (71 (4, 6)): Concealment in a naturalization proceeding of a material fact, whether it bears on character of person or relates to membership in forbidden organization or to advocacy of views which are not consistent with attachment to principles of Constitution of United States, is fraud.

7. Aliens (71 (6)): One who embraces a totalitarianism which extolls achievements of party which attained its objective by violent revolution and civil war and which openly and avowedly repudiates democracy and liberty as we understand them cannot be said to be attached to principles of Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to good order and happiness of United States.

8. Aliens (71 (6)): Where Congress of United States imposed conditions for naturalization, nonexistence of which called for its denial, concealment of facts which would have led to discovery of nonexistence of any of prescribed conditions was fraud, for which naturalization once obtained could be revoked, especially when concealment related to membership in organization which advocated forcible overthrow of government.

9. Aliens (71 (18)): In action by United States to revoke and set aside defendant's admission to citizenship and to cancel a certificate of naturalization on ground that they were procured by concealment of material facts or by willful misrepresentation, proof supporting basis for revocation of defendant's citizenship was clear, unequivocal and convincing.

Laughlin E. Waters, United States attorney, by James R. Dooley, and Arline Martin, assistant United States attorneys, Los Angeles, Calif., for plaintiff.

Richard L. Rykoff and Robert L. Brock, Los Angeles, Calif., for defendant.

Yankwich, chief judge.

The action was initiated by the Government under section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (to be referred to as "the act of 1952") which authorizes the institution of proceedings to revoke and set aside orders admitting to citizenship and to cancel the certificate of naturalization on the ground that "such order and certificate of naturalization were procured by concealment of a material fact or by willful misrepresentation."[1]

This section merely carries over into the present act the provision of subsection (a), section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (to be referred to as "the act of 1940") and similar provisions in preceding acts beginning in 1906. Such statutes have been sustained upon the ground that it is within the constitutional power of the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing a method for determining, by an orderly judicial proceeding, whether "one who claims the privilege of citizenship under the certificate of a court has procured that certificate through fraud or other illegal contrivance."[2]

The act of 1952 added additional grounds for denaturaliaztion. However, in this action we are concerned only with the provisions of sections 305 and 307 of the act of 1940 because the naturalization certificate was issued to the defendant on October 24, 1941.

Footnotes at end of speech.

I. THE ACT OF 1940

[1, 2] Section 305 of the act of 1940 provided, in part:

"No persons shall hereafter be naturalized as a citizen of the United States— * * *

"(b) * * * who is a member of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches—

"(1) the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States * * *.

"The provisions of this section shall be applicable to any applicant for naturalization who at any time within a period of 10 years immediately preceding the filing of the petition for naturalization is, or has been, found to be within any of the clauses enumerated in this section notwithstanding that at the time petition is filed he may not be included in such classes."[3]

Section 307 of the act of 1940, read, in part:

"(a) No person * * * shall be naturalized unless such petitioner * * * (3) during all the periods referred to in this subsection has been and still is a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States."[4]

Because citizenship is a valuable right, once it is obtained legally by an alien, the courts, must jealously guard its revocation.[5] And revocation can be granted only if the evidence establishing the ground upon which revocation is sought, whether fraud or other, is clear, unequivocal, and convincing.[6]

In the case before us the Government seeks revocation of citizenship under both sections. In count one of the complaint the Government alleges that the naturalization was procured by concealment and willful misrepresentation, i. e., fraud. The second count is based upon the nonexistence of required qualifications, and states that the defendant was not a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States.

Behind these allegations is the alleged fact of membership of the defendant in the Communist Party and affiliated organizations within a period of 10 years immediately preceding the filing of the petition.

We restrict our inquiry as to the latter by pointing to the fact that, while in the present state of public opinion, adherence to communism or approval of its doctrines reflects on a person's character, to such an extent that it is libel to falsely accuse one of such adherence or approval of ideas[7]—the "good moral character" in the naturalization statute has reference to the sum total of tendencies or personal qualities which, in our life, induce us to act in accordance with the accepted moral standards of the time—"the commonly accepted mores."[8]

Attachment to the principles of our Government implies full adherence and loyalty to the letter and the spirit of American institutions.[9] Suppression and willful concealment of a material fact may indicate a lack of good moral character. For good moral character implies frankness in one's dealing with one's fellow man and with the Government, and full disclosure when a situation demands it, either morally or legally. In this context, evasiveness may be just as reprehensible morally as direct concealment. So the entire problem turns upon the question of the defendant's Communist membership and affiliation. This is at the root of the Government's case.

In one respect this case is unique. In many of the adjudicated cases in which the criteria of proof were laid down[10] the court had before it the contradictory testimony offered by the defendant himself or by witnesses who testified in his behalf. In the case before us the defendant did not offer himself as a witness. Called to the witness stand by the Government as an adverse party[11] the defendant, other than admitting his signature to certain of the documents executed during the naturalization process, pleaded the privilege against self-incrimination as to all questions relating to his associations or membership in the Communist Party. In this he was sustained by the court, being given the full benefit of the latest declaration of the Supreme Court on the subject.[12]

Having sustained the assertions of this right, I draw no unfavorable inferences from the fact of assertion, adhering to the view stated repeatedly that the contrary attitude does violence to the spirit of our constitutional guaranties.[13] Nor shall I draw the justifiable inferences permitted from failure to produce evidence which it was in the power of the defendant to produce.[14] However, as stated at the trial, the failure to testify leaves the record without any defensive matter except such as is contained in the cross-examination of the Government's witnesses and some documentary evidence offered by the defendant. For the testimony of the two character witnesses has little significance in a case of this character where, as already indicated, the character of the plaintiff is not challenged, except insofar as he is charged with certain deliberate and fraudulent concealments of fact. And if these occurred in the naturalization proceedings, the testimony as to good character by witnesses, at least one of whom showed complete unfamiliarity with the charges made in this proceeding, does not help the defendant's cause.

So we are back to the fundamental problems involved, the character of the Communist Party, the defendant's membership in it, his knowledge of its character, and the concealment of the fact of membership in the proceedings leading to naturalization.

Footnotes at end of speech.

II. THE IRREFUTABLE FACTS

The defendant was born in 1907 in Nilesht, Bessarabia, which, at the time of his birth, was a part of Rumania, but is now a part of Soviet Russia. He entered the United States at Port Huron, Mich., on June 7, 1923, from Montreal, Canada, his last place of foreign residence. He claimed naturalization by reason of marriage to an American citizen.[15] In his petition for naturalization and in his testimony before the naturalization examiners on July 30, 1941, he made oath, in substance, as follows:

"It is my intention in good faith to become a citizen of the United States and to renounce absolutely and forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which at this time I am a subject or citizen, and it is my intention to reside permanently in the United States.

"I am not, and have not been for the period of at least 10 years immediately preceding the date of this petition, an anarchist; nor a believer in the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or sabotage; nor a disbeliever in or opposed to organized government; nor a member of or affiliated with any organization or body of persons teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government. * * * I am, and have been during all the periods required by law, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States."

On October 24, 1941, immediately prior to admission to citizenship, he took the oath which, at that time, read:

"I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or

Footnotes at end of speech.

which I have hereofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion: So help me God."

The petitioner also asked that his name be changed from Sam Teitelman to Sam Title, which he had used for some years because of "simple spelling."

The evidence in the record shows clearly that within the 10-year period prior to his application for naturalization, the defendant was a member of the Communist Party, his membership dating, at least, to 1936, when he became a member of the Young Communist League, later becoming a member of its County Committee. The Young Communist League was, at that time, an affiliate of the Communist Party, controlled by it, the key positions in it being held by members of the Communist Party.

In 1937, the defendant became a member of the Communist Party. There is in evidence a duplicate membership book issued to the defendant evidencing by stamps the payment of dues for the months of November and December of that year. There is also a receipt in his own handwriting, dated December 1, 1937, acknowledging receipt of membership book for that year. During that year he was a member of a downtown Los Angeles unit, being later transferred to another. In 1938, he attended a convention of the Communist Party of the United States, which was open only to the members of the Communist Party, chosen as delegates or elected by groups or units.

The defendant participated in the affairs of the convention and listened to the speeches, and was present when the Communist Party organizer for Los Angeles County made one of the important speeches. The defendant attended the convention of the party in Los Angeles County in 1940, which only key members of the party attended. There is evidence that the defendant attended Communist Party gatherings as one of the party leaders in 1941 and 1942. A document published in 1939, entitled "two Decades of Progress" and attempting to depict the activities of the Communist Party of Los Angeles for the period 1919–39, contains a page of greetings from the Communist Party branch of the 14th Congressional District. This lists Lou Rosser, one of the witnesses for the Government in the case, as organizer for the 14th Congressional District and the defendant as organizer for the 44th Assembly District. There is also evidence showing that defendant was a member of the executive committee for the 14th Congressional District and was present at its meetings.

3. So this is not one of the cases in which former party members or informers seek to pin membership on a person who may have occasionally been seen at a Communist meeting, but as to whom there is no showing of active participation.[16] Here, uncontradicted evidence—some of it in the defendant's own handwriting—shows activities, first in the Young Communist League and later the Communist Party, dating back to 1935 or 1936. From his brief appearance and conduct on the witness stand, from the manner in which he answered in writing questions relating to his occupation, residence, and the like, in the documents he was required to file in the naturalization proceeding and the answers given in his deposition which the court had to consider in determining the question of privilege asserted during the taking of the deposition, one gathers the impression that the defendant is a person above average intelligence and education, with good command of the English language, showing no trace of accent, such as may be found in persons to whom English is not a native tongue. This, of course, is due to his long residence in Canada and in the United States. All these lead to the inevitable conclusion that his membership in the Young Communist League and the Communist Party was not fortuitous, but a matter of deliberate choice by a person who understood its purposes and who, beginning with the task of distributing the literature of the party, rose to trusted position of leadership at the county level. Granted that gregariousness is one of the American characteristics and that persons may join many groups without full knowledge of their object, we are not confronted in this case with such a situation. The record before the court shows a continuous participation in the affairs of the party, distribution and sale of the literature of the party, attendance at conventions where policy was determined, a pattern of conduct which continued to the date of naturalization.

III. THE PATTERN OF REVOLUTION

During the period with which we are concerned, 1936–41, a showing of membership in the Communist Party was not, of itself, a bar to citizenship. The proof in this case must, therefore, show that at the time the defendant made the statements and representations alluded to and took the oath of allegiance, and within the 10-year statutory period preceding, the Communist Party was an organization which advocated the overthrow of the Government of the United States by "force and violence."

4. The evidence in the record, oral and documentary, including the documentary evidence offered on behalf of the defendant, shows conclusively that this was the teaching of the Communist Party at the time.

We eliminate from consideration ancient historical documents such as the Communist Manifesto which was issued by Marx and Engels in 1848. It is a historical fact that in the year 1848 and the years preceding it, authoritarian governments all over Europe were crushing by force all democratic movements and aspirations. Indeed, men like Carl Schurz, Louis D. Brandeis and others, who have achieved greatness in American life, were émigrés or sons of émigrés who participated in the political and social agitations which were being suppressed all over continental Europe at or about the time the Communist Manifesto came into being.

So it may be conceded that Marx and Engels used language which sounds inflammatory to us, but which, in the atmosphere of the day, merely opposed violence from below to force and suppression from above used to destroy what we in the United States have considered legitimate democratic agitation.

We need not, therefore, resort to that ancient document to determine the character of the Communist Party. For historical purposes, the Communist Party as it is known in more recent times, is the party which grew out of Russian Bolshevism and which in 1919, held its first meeting in Russia, at which only one country other than Russia, namely, Germany, was represented. This fact is commonly accepted by scholars and historians in the field.[17] Indeed, the commemorative pamphlet to which we have already alluded, and which carried the name of the defendant as an organizer of the Party in Los Angeles County, treats the history of the Communist Party as beginning in 1919, and quotes with approval the preamble of the Constitution of the Communist Party of the United States, which states as its object—

"* * * the establishment of socialism, according to the scientific principles of the great teachers of mankind, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, embodied in the Communist International."[18]

This constitution, adopted in 1938, was introduced by the defendant. It shows, as do other documents to be referred to, that the American Communist Party "ties" its aims to those of the Communist International. And in the literature it sponsored and circulated and which is before the court, the teachings of Marx and Engels are accepted only insofar as they are modified and put into practice by Lenin, Stalin and the Communist International.[19] And these teachings, without deviation, urge not a change of the social system by the use of democratic institutions or legal means, but a revolutionary change by force and violence.

So far as Lenin is concerned, the pattern, through the years, is unchanged. On December 1, 1917, and for a brief period thereafter, he recognized the Constitutent Assembly.[20] But a little over a month later, on January 19, 1918, in announcing its dissolution, he stated:

"And by the will of the Soviet power the Constituent Assembly, which has refused to recognize the power of the people, is being dissolved. * * *

"The Constituent Assembly is dissolved. The Soviet revolutionary republic will triumph, no matter what the cost * * *."[21]

His writings for the year 1917–18, which were also introduced by the defendant, and which bear the subtitle "After the seizure of power," defend the forcible seizure of power and the need for "the centralized organization of force, the organization of violence."[22] speak of the needlessness of a "special apparatus of repression" to suppress individual excesses likely to occur.[23] He condemns Parliaments as "institutions alien to the toiling masses."[24] In a note of exultation he writes:

"In Russia the bureaucratic apparatus has been completely smashed up, razed to the ground; the old judges have all been expelled, the bourgeoisie Parliament has been dispersed—and far more accessible representation has been given to the workers and peasants; their Soviets have replaced the bureaucrats, or their Soviets now control the bureaucrats, and their Soviets now elect the judges."[25]

Practically the entire volume is devoted to merciless attacks on German and other European Socialists and social democratic leaders and elements, who advocated change through democratic means and criticized Lenin's tactics.

So far we have confined ourselves to documents introduced by the defendant. How anyone can find in them any advocacy of lawful means for effectuating the aims of communism or even "lipservice" to democratic institutions is beyond our comprehension. For there is none, as appears more fully from other writings by Lenin which are in the record. In one of them he states that the proletarian state can only be achieved "through a violent revolution."[26] This is repeated elsewhere.[27]

The Sixth World Congress of the Communist International held in 1928 stated emphatically that Leninism is the dominant approach and that "the overthrow of capitalism is impossible without force, without armed uprising, and proletarian wars against the bourgeoisie."[28]

This interpretation is adopted by Stalin who expresses it in this manner:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on the use of force against the bourgeoisie."[29]

We have already referred to the fact that the Communist Party of the United States and the local branch to which the defendant

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

belonged adopted the gloss which Lenin, Stalin, and the Communist International placed on Marxist teachings. The literature in the record shows that American Communist conventions and American Communist writers pointed not only to these teachings as correct but to the practice embodied in the Russian Revolution and the Communist dictatorship enthroned by it as the way out. The following brief quotations will suffice:

"The experience of the victorious workers of the Soviet Union before, during, and after the seizure of power, throw a brilliant light showing the path which must be followed in every land, the path of Bolshevism, of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." [30]

"A time comes when there is demoralization above, a growing revolt below; the morale of the army is also undermined. The old structure of society is tottering. There are actual insurrections; the army wavers. Panic seizes the ruler. A general uprising begins.

"Workers stop work, many of them seize arms by attacking arsenals. Many had armed themselves before as the struggles sharpened. Street fights become frequent. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, the workers organize revolutionary committees to be in command of the uprising. There are battles in the principal cities. Barricades are built and defended." [31]

We are far away from any advocacy of peaceful action. What is described and expounded is the technique of revolution to be followed in America. And again:

"As the leader and organizer of the proletariat, the Communist Party of the United States of America leads the working class in the fight for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the establishment of a Socialist Soviet Republic in the United States, * * *". [32]

In one of the speeches delivered by Stalin in the American Commission of the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the Communist International in 1929, he referred to "Comrade Bittelman" and expressed the hope that he and another could be kept in Moscow for a time in order to cure "the American Communist Party of factionalism" and save "it from disintegration." [33] Whether he was so kept or not, we do not know. But in a pamphlet circulated by the Party, he had evidently accepted the Soviet aims and the means of achieving them in America as proper American Communist tactics:

"The only form of government that is truly democratic, a government which belongs to the overwhelming majority of the population and is built and operated by all its toilers, is the Soviet form of government. This, too, is a dictatorship of a class (no government can be anything else), but it is a dictatorship of the working class, which rests upon the alliance between the working class and the toiling population of the farms (the small and exploited farmers), and functions for the sole purpose of suppressing capitalist counterrevolution; abolishing capitalist, landlord, and imperialist exploitation; and building a socialist society—the first stage of communism—for the benefit of all toilers." [34]

From what precedes, the following facts emerge: The Communist Party from 1919 onward has condemned libery and democracy and all the ideals of democratic nations as a means of achieving its aims. To the contrary, it has advocated force and violence as the only means for attaining its objectives. The dictatorship which it once urged as a transition is now, in tragic culmination, advocated as permanent. The American Communist Party has endorsed, approved, and urged application to the American scene of these norms.

Footnotes at end of speech.

We fail to find in any of the documentary evidence produced by the Government or the defendant in this case their disavowal. On the contrary, throughout, there is identification of the American Communist Party with both the aims and the methods of achievement taught by the Soviet leaders and the Communist International. It is immaterial whether the forcible overthrow of the Government is "the immediate" or "the ultimate" aim in the United States. For the statute we are interpreting makes no distinction between immediacy and futurity of such advocacy. It bars membership to anyone who belongs to an organization or group that "believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches" the proscribed doctrine.

IV. CONCEALMENT AS FRAUD

5. What precedes shows the nature of the Communist Party during the period under discussion. The documentary proof was confirmed by oral testimony as to what was taught officially at gatherings attended by the defendant and others. The defendant having helped distribute the type of literature we have analyzed and having otherwise participated actively in the affairs of the party, as an organizer and in other capacities, the evidence is sufficient to charge him with full knowledge of the methods it taught for attaining them by force and violence. More, there is nothing in the record showing any disavowal of these teachings by the defendant at any time. A person holding such views was not entitled to naturalization under the Nationality Act of 1940.[35] The concealment of active membership in such organization was a fraud on the Government for which citizenship must be revoked.[36]

6. The information which the defendant was required to furnish was important to the Government. Disclosure of membership in the Communist Party would not have ipso facto brought about immediate denial of citizenship. But it was a material fact which would have initiated an inquiry to determine (a) whether the Communist Party advocated the overthrow of the Government by force and violence or (b) whether its repudiation of the democratic process and ideals is such as to warrant the conclusion that one who espouses its doctrines is not "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States." The concealment in a naturalization proceeding of a material fact—whether it bears on the character of the person [37] or relates to membership in a forbidden organization or to advocacy of views which are not consistent with attachment "to the principles of the Constitution (of the United States)" [38] is fraud.

Speaking of the dictatorship of the proletariat which is the aim of all modern-day communism and the need to break resistance to it by force, Lenin wrote:

"It is clear that where there is suppression there is also violence, there is no liberty, no democracy." [39]

It has already been shown that the American Communist Party, during the period under discussion, embraced not only all the aims, but also the methods used in Russia and advocated and defended by Lenin and Stalin, and the Communist International, of which it declared itself a part. One of the writers who was especially referred to as an American leader by Stalin in 1929 wrote:

"Our party is the United States section of the Communist International which is a world Communist Party and each one of us is therefore a member of a world party. In this lies the greatest hope and promise of success for the world's proletarian revolution and all oppressed and exploited in their struggle against capitalism." [40]

And in the issue of the Communist of September 1939, devoted to the 20 years' history of the Communist Party of the United States, introduced in evidence by the defendant, the same writer, who was one of the editors, characterized the development of the party in the United States in this manner:

"The two decades of our party's life could be summed up as the history of building an American Marxist-Leninist Party, orientated toward making it as good and influential a party as the Bolshevik party of Lenin and Stalin." [41]

In the same issue another writer summed up the attitude of American communism toward Soviet communism in this manner:

"The people of America and other countries are beneficiaries of the achievements of the Russian Communards, who, in 1917, stormed the heavens, and who today have established a socialist society on one-sixth of the earth." [42]

These declarations imply not merely a theoretical approval of the aims of communism as taught by Lenin and Stalin and as practiced in Russia, but acceptance of its antidemocratic technic and strategy by the American Communist Party.

7. One who embraces a totalitarianism which extolls the achievements of a party which attained its objective by violent revolution and civil war and which openly and avowedly repudiates democracy and liberty as we understand them cannot be said to be "attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States." [43]

CONCLUSION

Dissent from accepted governmental principles in a manner which may "collide with cherished American ideals does not necessarily prove want of devotion to the Nation." [44]

This is the spirit of America, as of every free society. We should be careful, in a proceeding for denaturalization, not to retroject into the past, prenaturalization period, current and post-naturalization expressions of ideas which do not differ from those expressed by many native born Americans.[45] But when we are dealing with the qualifications which are conditions precedent to naturalization we should bear in mind that they—residence, moral character and attachment to the principles of the Constitution—are "exacted because of what they promised for the future, rather than for what they told of the past." [46]

And if these qualifications do not exist, or the information which would lead to the discovery of their absence is concealed or evaded, there is "wongful use of a beneficent law." [47]

[8] American culture is the product of various national cultures. No one is required, as a condition of naturalization, to surrender the individual culture or heritage which he or his forebears brought to this country. For such heritage, in the main, is a part of Western European culture, of which American culture is a branch and a continuation. There is richness in culture diversity.[48] And we should tolerate variations in the cultural pattern although they involve a departure from some cherished ideals.[49] But the Congress of the United States has imposed certain conditions for naturalization, the nonexistence of which calls for its denial. Hence the concealment of facts which would have led to the discovery of the nonexistence of any of the prescribed conditions is fraud, for which naturalization once obtained must be revoked. This is especially true when the concealment relates to membership in an organization which advocates the forcible overthrow of government.

Heirs to the English tradition, we eschew force as a means of achieving social change. The prevalence among certain radical ele-

Footnotes at end of speech.

Footnotes at end of speech.

ments of contrary doctrines in 1940 and before, led to the legislative proscription against naturalization of one who belongs to an organization or group advocating such forcible overthrow.

[9] Ours is the task to apply judicially the conditions prescribed by the Congress. Because of the high worth of American citizenship and the severe implications of a judgment canceling a naturalization certificate, there is imposed upon the courts the burden of requiring that proof leading to revocation be "clear, unequivocal, and convincing."[30]

The burden has been met in this case. The certificate of naturalization is ordered revoked.

---

[1] 8 U. S. C. A., par. 1451.

[2] *Johannessen* v. *United States* (1912, 225 U. S. 227, 242, 32 S. Ct. 613, 617, 56 L. Ed. 1066). And see *Luria* v. *United States* (1913, 231 U. S. 9 24, 34 S. Ct. 10, 58 L. Ed. 101); *United States* v. *Ginsberg* (1917, 243 U. S. 472, 37 S. Ct. 422, 61 L. Ed. 853; *Bindczyck* v. *Finucane* (1951, 342 U. S. 76, 71–82, 72 S. Ct. 130, 96 L. Ed. 100); *Orth* v. *United States* (4 Cir., 1944, 142 F. 2d 969, 970); *United States* v. *Siegel* (2 Cir., 1945, 152 F. 2d 614); *United States* v. *Hauck* (2 Cir., 1946, 155 F. 2d 141, 143).

[3] This was codified as section 705 of title 8 U. S. C. A. Its essence is embodied in the present section 1424 (a) (1 and 4) of the same title.

[4] This was codified as section 707 of title 8 U. S. C. A. Its essence is embodied in section 1427 (a) (3) of the same title.

[5] *Sweet* v. *United States* (6 Cir., 1954, 211 F. 2d 118, 120).

[6] *Schneiderman* v. *United States* (1943, 320 U. S. 118, 125, 63 S. Ct. 1333, 1336, 87 L. Ed. 1796); *Baumgartner* v. *United States* (1944, 322 U. S. 665, 670, 64 S. Ct. 1240, 88 L. Ed. 1525); *Bergmann* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 1944, 144 F. 2d 34, 38); *Kanuer* v. *United States* (1946, 328 U. S. 654, 657–658, 66 S. Ct. 1304, 90 L. Ed. 1500); *Sweet* v. *United States*, supra.

[7] Yankwich, Recent Developments in the Law of Creation, Expression and Communication of Ideas, 1953, 48 N. W. L. Rev., 543–551; Yankwich, Trends in the Law Affecting Media of Communication, 1953, 15 F. R. D. 291, 300–305.

[8] See, Petitions of Rudder (1947, 2 Cir., 159 F. 2d 695); *United States* v. *Francioso* (1947, 2 Cir., 164 F. 2d 163); *Schmidt* v. *United States* (2 Cir., 1949, 177 F. 2d 450).

[9] *Orth* v. *United States, supra*, Note 2, *Allan* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 1940, 115 F. 2d 804); *Wixman* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 1948, 167 F. 2d 808). And see, *United States* v. *Hauck* (2 Cir., 1946, 155 F. 2d 141, 143). In *Stasiukevich* v. *Nicolls* (1 Cir., 1948, 168 F. 2d 474, 477), the Court gave the origin and meaning of the phrase "attached to the principles of the Constitution":

"The phrase goes back to the Naturalization Act of January 29, 1795, 1 Stat. 414. It is hardly to be supposed that the Members of Congress of that day, having so recently completed a successful revolution, conceived that the phrase 'the principles of the Constitution' comprehended only one principle; namely, that changes in the basic law must be effectuated only by the procedure laid down in article V. The statutory word is in the plural—'principles,' not 'principle.' It is true enough, as Holmes, Justice, noted in his dissent in *United States* v. *Schwimmer* (1929, 279 U. S. 644, 654, 49 S. Ct. 448, 451, 73 L. Ed. 889) that 'if there is any principle of the Constitution that more imperatively calls for attachment than any other it is the principle of free thought—not free thought for those who agree with us but freedom for the thought that we hate.' But it does not follow from this that the Congress would wish to admit to the privilege of citizenship aliens who were so far out of sympathy with our established form of government that they would like to see it supplanted by a totalitarian regime under which all individual liberties, including freedom of thought and freedom of speech, are swept into the discard. A person is not attached to the kindred principles of free thought and free speech when he invokes the protection of those constitutional freedoms in aid of the struggle of his party to achieve power, being all the while intent upon suppressing the exercise of those very freedoms by others as soon as his party comes to power. In the absence of an authoritative ruling by the Supreme Court on the point, we accept the view expressed by Stone, Chief Justice, dissenting, in the Schneiderman case (*Schneiderman* v. *U. S.*) (320 U. S.) (118) at p. 181, 63 S. Ct. (1333) at p. 1363, 87 L. Ed. (1796) 1798, that there are principles of the Constitution, within the meaning of the Nationality Act 'and that among them are at least the principle of constitutional protection of civil rights and of life, liberty, and property, the principle of representative government, and the principle that constitutional laws are not to be broken down by planned disobedience. I assume also that all the principles of the Constitution are hostile to dictatorship and minority rule; and that it is a principle of our Constitution that change in the organization of our Government is to be effected by the orderly procedures ordained by the Constitution and not by force or fraud.'"

The test thus laid down was approved by the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *Tauchen* v. *Barber* (9 Cir., 1950, 183 F. 2d 266, 267). Cf. *United States* v. *Rossler* (2 Cir., 1944, 144 F. 2d 463, 465). For comments on the tests for determining "attachment to the principles of the Constitution" as laid down in these cases, see note, 1949, 47 Michigan Law Review 702; Serena B. Colvin, 1949, Attachment to the Principles of the Constitution in Naturalization Cases, 1949, 1 Alabama Law Review 228.

[10] See cases in note 6.

[11] Section 43 (b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, 28 U. S. C.

[12] *Quinn* v. *United States* (1955, 75 S. Ct. 668); *Emspak* v. *United States* (1955, 75 S. Ct. 687).

[13] *United States* v. *Shibley* (9 Cir., 1954, 112 F. Supp. 734, 752–753); see, Yankwich, Some Challenges to Our Constitutional Ideals, 1954, 28 Southern California Law Revue 1, 15–16.

[14] Jones on Evidence, Civil Cases, 3d ed., 1924, secs. 19–20. See *Kirby* v. *Tallmadge* (1896), 160 U. S. 379, 382, 16 S. Ct. 349, 40 L. Ed. 463; *Interstate Circuit, Inc.*, v. *United States* (1939), 306 U. S. 208, 225–226, 59 S. Ct. 467, 83 L. Ed. 610; *Tendler* v. *Jaffe* (1952), 92 U. S. App. D. C. 2, 203 F. 2d 14, 18–19).

[15] See former section 310, now section 1430 (a), 8 U. S. C.

[16] See, Richard H. Rovere, The Kept Witness, 1955, 210 Harper's Magazine, pp. 25–34.

[17] Max Beer, Communism, 1937, 4 Enc. of Soc. Sci., p. 81; Lewis L. Lorwin, Communist Parties, 1937, 4 Enc. of Soc. Sci., p. 86; Communism, Columbia Enc. 2d Ed., 1950, p. 432; Communist Party, Columbia Enc., 2d Ed., 1950, p. 433; A. Rossi, Physiologie du Parti Communiste Français, 1938; Kommunismus, 2 Der Kleine Brockhaus, 1952, pp. 656–657. See also, Hans Kelsen, The Political Theory of Bolshevism, 1948, pp. 28–33; Jaspers, Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte, 1949, pp. 220–247.

[18] Two Decades of Progress 1939, p. 3.

[19] When this is borne in mind, Friedrich Engels' statement in the 1886 preface to the English edition of Karl Marx's "Capital," offered in evidence by the defendant, to the effect that in England, "the inevitable social revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means" (Karl Marx, Capital, 1954, Moscow ed., vol. I, p. 6), loses all meaning. The truth of the matter is that Marx himself did not conceive the possibility of an economically backward country like Russia or China passing to socialism from feudalism or semifeudalism, and he so stated in the preface of July 25, 1867, to the first German edition:

"One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth-pangs." (Karl Marx, Capital, op. cit., p. 10.)

But Lenin and his followers used force in attempting to impress socialism upon a country which had only the most rudimentary industrial organization.

[20] Lenin, Selected Works, 1939, vol. 6, pp. 437–438.

[21] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., p. 459.

[22] Lenin, Selected Works, vol. 7, p. 26.

[23] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., p. 83.

[24] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., p. 134.

[25] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., p. 136.

[26] Lenin, Selected Works, op. cit., pp. 20, 73.

[27] Lenin, Left Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder, 1940, pp. 66–67.

In the text references are limited to such of Lenin's works as were introduced in evidence. However, the same contempt for the democratic process and advocacy of violent means of achieving them are found in subsequent volumes of Lenin's works. Illustrative are the following:

"We declare that we are fighting capitalism as such, the free, republican, democratic capitalism included, and we realize, of course, that in this fight the banner of freedom is a fraud if it contradicts the interests of the emancipation of labor from the oppression of capital." (Lenin, Collected Works, 1923, vol. XIV, pp. 80–81, 203–240.) * * *

"No parliament can in any circumstances be for Communists an arena of struggle for reforms for betterment of the situation of the working class. * * * The only question can be that of utilizing bourgeois state institutions for their destruction." (Ibid., vol. XXV, p. 566.) * * *

"A Communist must be prepared to make every sacrifice and, if necessary, even resort to all sorts of schemes and stratagems, employ illegitimate methods, conceal the truth, in order to get into the trade unions, stay there, and conduct the revolutionary work within * * *" (ibid., vol. XVII, pp. 142–145). (As quoted in David Shubb, Lenin, A Biography, 1948, pp. 390, 392–393.)

Stalin carried these teachings into effect. "Lenin is our teacher," Joseph Stalin told Harold Stassen in 1947, "and we Soviet people are Lenin's disciples." (Hugh Gibson in Preface to Shub., op. cit., VI.)

These teachings postulate permanent dictatorship, under which, as Lenin stated in 1917, there "cannot be liberty or democracy." See Yankwich, the Nature of Our Freedom, 1950, pp. 103–105, and references in notes 30 to 34, pp. 118–134 of that text.

[28] The Struggle Against Imperialist War and the Task of the Communists, 1932, p. 10.

[29] Stalin, Foundations of Leninism, 1939, p. 53. In the same work, he sums up Lenin's teaching as to the dictatorship of the proletariat in this manner:

"Briefly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a rule enjoying the sympathy and support of the laboring and exploited masses (The State and Revolution)" (op. cit., loc. cit.).

[30] Manifesto of the 8th Convention of the Communist Party of the United States, as reprinted in The Way Out, a Program for American Labor, p. 53.

[31] M. J. Olgin, 1933, Why Communism, p. 75.

[32] J. Peters, 1935, The Communist Party, a Manual on Organization, p. 8.

[33] Stalin's speeches on the American Communist Party, 1929, p. 17.

[34] Alex Bittelman, The Communist Party in Action, 1932, p. 16.

[35] See notes 3 and 4; *United States* v. *Ginsberg* (1917, 243 U. S. 472, 37 S. Ct. 422, 61 L. Ed. 853).

[36] See cases in note 2.

[37] See, *United States* v. *Ascher* (2 Cir., 1945, 147 F. 2d 544); *Del Guercio* v. *Pupko* (9 Cir., 1947, 160 F. 2d 799); *United States* v. *Shapiro* (D. C. Cal., 1942, 43 F. Supp. 927); *Stevens* v. *United States* (7 Cir., 1951, 190 F. 2d 880); *United States* v. *Corrado* (D. C. Mich., 1953, 121 F. Supp. 75); *United States* v. *Anastasio* (D. C. N. J., 1954, 120 F. Supp. 435); *United States* v. *Gelbert* (D. C. Ill., 1954, 121 F. Supp. 414).

[38] *United States* v. *Chomiak* (D. C. N. Y., 1952, 108 F. Supp. 527); *United States* v. *Charnowola* (D. C. Mich., 1953, 109 F. Supp. 810); *United States* v. *Polites* (D. C. Mich., 1953, 127 F. Supp. 768); *United States* v. *Sweet* (D. C. Mich., 1952, 106 F. Supp. 634). The judgments in these three cases were affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in *Sweet* v. *United States* (6 Cir., 1954, 211 F. 2d 118). See, *Orth* v. *United States* (5 Cir., 1944, 142 F. 2d 969); *Allan* v. *United States, supra,* Note 9, *Weber* v. *United States* (9 Cir., 1941, 119 F. 2d 932, 934); *Tauchen* v. *Barber* (9 Cir., 1950, 183 F. 2d 267, 268).

[39] Lenin, State and Revolution, 1932, p. 72.

[40] Alexander Bittelman, The Communist Party in Action, 1932, p. 33.

[41] The Communist, vol. XVIII, No. 9, September 1939, pp. 771, 782.

[42] Alexander Trachtenberg, The Soviet Union and The American People, The Communist, supra, note 41, p. 886.

[43] Section 307 of the Nationality Act of 1940, sec. 707 of title 8 U. S. C., now embodied in sec. 1427 (a) (3) of title 8 U. S. C. A.

[44] *Baumgartner* v. *United States* (1944, 322 U. S. 665, 674, 64 S. Ct. 1240, 1245, 88 L. Ed. 1525).

[45] *Meyer* v. *United States* (5 Cir., 1944, 141 F. 2d 825, 826–828).

[46] *Luria* v. *United States* (1913, 231 U. S. 9, 23, 34, S. Ct. 10, 13, 58 L. Ed. 101).

[47] *Luria* v. *United States, supra,* 231 U. S. at p. 24, 34 S. Ct. at p. 13.

[48] *Baumgartner* v. *United States, supra* note 44; *Knauer* v. *United States* (1946, 328 U. S. 654, 659, 66 S. Ct. 1304, 90 L. ed. 1500).

[49] "If, in our more explicit and self-conscious moods, we tend to give the primacy to our Anglo-Saxon inheritance, it is because we identify this tradition with those ideals of liberalism and democracy which we rightly hold as paramount. The contribution of these diverse national and racial stocks to our common American life exemplifies the subordination of the past to the future, of origin to function, of the hold of mere tradition to the potentialities of freedom, liberation, and self-expression." (G. P. Adams and Others, Knowledge and Society, 1938, p. 387.)

[50] See cases in note 6.

The West Is the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an address of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER before the Advertising Association of the West, Paradise Inn, Phoenix, Ariz., January 21, 1956:

THE WEST IS THE FUTURE

(Address of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER before the Advertising Association of the West, Paradise Inn, Phoenix, Ariz, January 21, 1956)

When you honored me by asking me to speak with you this afternoon, I accepted readily, because it not only gave me a chance to visit my native Arizona again, but it also provided me with an opportunity to fly once more across this great land of America. It always rekindles my pride in being an American to travel over the vastness of this country—to see the greenness of its farms, the sprawling bigness of its cities, and the compact tidiness of its small towns; to go through State after State, and to realize as I go that the people I see are Americans like I am, and that, in their hearts, beats the same intense pride of that possession.

Yes, America is God's land, with its mountains and its canyons and its lakes. It is God's land for these things, and His, too, because our concept of freedom, as coming from Him, has given us the spiritual will to create the material might that is also ours. Our material accomplishments of the past can be nothing as compared with the almost unimaginable potential that we face today as a Nation.

Part of this great future stems from the tremendous expansion of our population which is taking place at the present time, and which will continue. Another part of our future rests with what man does with his new knowledge of the atom. Its promises of peacetime developments almost stagger the imagination of men. Another part of our future comes from the exer-expanding and dynamic free enterprise system, which is our system of economy. This is a material expression of our spiritual might—the expression of a people constantly seeking higher standards of living, constantly seeking and achieving greater opportunities, and constantly endeavoring to build a better America.

Included in this future will be the ever-increasing demands for goods, services, and jobs from this new population; the constant demands for a higher standard of living from the current population; and the overall increased needs for schools, hospitals, churches, highways, power, and water and sewage facilities. All these, and more, are the needs of a dynamic society.

Naturally, in this future, is included the future of business, and business is potential. But business, as potential, means not only opportunity, but also problems and responsibilities. Business must provide the jobs and job opportunities for the expanding labor force. It will take money to provide these jobs. That means new capital for investment, expansion, production, distribution, research, and product development.

You, as citizens of this great community of America, face a great potential, likewise, and, in this potential you, too, have responsibilities and problems. Your particular responsibility is better advertising, more vigorous promotion, and better dessimination of knowledge, so that business can more readily sell its new goods to the new population. As advertising people, your responsibilities also embrace the selling of our free-enterprise system and our constitutional form of Government.

America faces a future that challenges the imagination; and, in that future, the West looms dominantly. Here, in the western part of these United States, we will see the real great growth of this country in the coming years. Here, in the West that is still new and, in many respects, undeveloped, we will see the marvels of tomorrow unfold. Here is our challenge. Here in the West are the opportunities for tomorrow.

I hesitate to bore you with figures on this happy day, but, nevertheless, figures are necessary to prove my point that America's future lies in the West. Nowhere in the Nation has the growth been more rapid, or, likewise, the potentials or the problems greater than here in the West. For the 11 Western States, the 10-year period from 1950 to 1960 is certainly a decade of opportunity. During the previous 10-year period, from 1940 to 1950, the center of the population of the United States took its greatest strides toward the open spaces of the West. In fact, that movement westward is the greatest since the period between 1880 and 1890. Between 1940 and 1950, the West had a 40.9 percent increase in population, while, during that time, no other region increased by more than 13.3 percent. Of the 11 States comprising what we call the West, seven increased their population by percentages ranging from 25 to 53 percent, and in only one of the Western States was the increase less than 10 percent.

During the decade between 1940 and 1950, more than 3 out of every 5 counties of the West increased in population. At the same time, in the United States as a whole, nearly one-half of the counties lost population, and nearly one-fourth lost 10 percent or more—this, despite the record gain of 19 million in population. This extreme rate of growth is further evidenced in the cities of the West, and, to mention but a few, Denver, Colo., increased 38 percent in that period; Los Angeles, 49.8 percent; and this great, thriving city of Phoenix had an increase in population in that 10-year period of over 78 percent. These figures compare with a 22 percent overall average increase for the standard metropolitan areas in the Nation.

All of that took place between 1940 and 1950, but, the latest figures available show that the West continues to be ahead of the Nation in the rate of population growth since the last census. These figures show that, since the census was taken, the population of the West has increased by 11.6 percent, or twice the national average of 5.1 percent. The Pacific Division alone shows a 12.1 percent growth, and the Mountain Division 10.3 percent. Of the 28 States in the Nation that increased by 5 percent or more, 9 were located in the West. Of the 9 States which increased by 10 percent or more, half were Western States.

Looking into the future at our population estimates, the Bureau of the Census predicts a 35 percent increase for the Western States, against 17 percent for the United States as a whole for the current decade. Prof. Morris E. Garnsey, who wrote the interesting book, America's New Frontier, has said that it is not inconceivable that the population for the Western States should provide residence for as much as 33 percent of the Nation's population by 1975. This same economist predicts a 1975 population for the United States of 200 million, which would mean, if his predictions are true, that between 60 and 65 million people would reside in the West by 1975.

Yet, I said earlier that this growth brings problems, and these problems are reflected in the West by an increasing need for labor and capital investment funds. This rapidly growing population has had to find jobs, and jobs have been created for them, jobs in industry that have moved from the East, or industries which have been born and grown in the West.

Arizona is a typical example of industrial progress in the West. In the middle 1930's, manufacturing was practically nonexistent in this State, and yet, today, manufacturing contributes the largest share to our total State economy. Arizona's remarkable rise in the manufacturing fields can be matched by other States of the Far West, but I use this State because it is my home State, and I have a natural and deep regard for it. You

will pardon, then, these exclusive references to Arizona statistics.

The Bureau of the Census estimated that our population would be 1,036,000 in 1960. It has already exceeded that figure, and is approaching 1,200,000. The labor force in 1950 was 265,000, but the estimate for 1960 is 362,600. This means an estimated investment in Arizona of slightly over $1 billion.

To bring this down to more reasonable and more understandable figures, I might remind you that this population increase in Arizona is running along at the rate of slightly over 1,400 persons per week. A new population means new jobs. New jobs mean new capital to provide money for jobs, job opportunities, and for goods and services. We can expect to see growth in a number of business firms maintain the same ratio as it has always had, and we find, in studying this, that, as human population grows, so does business population. The ratio of growth between the two has been fairly constant in the past. Now, to give you some idea of what we here in Arizona can look forward to in the way of new business firms, let us recall that, in 1950, Arizona had 18,900 business firms. By 1960, using the ratio of the number of firms to nonfarm population, we can expect to see something in the neighborhood of 32,000 businesses in operation in Arizona by 1960. In fact, if we use this same ratio figure and apply it to the projected population of the West, we westerners can expect to be doing business in 1960 with an excess of 750,000 new businesses.

You ladies figure prominently, too, in this new picture we are viewing, for, in 1950, in the State of Arizona, there were 68,000 of you employed, and, by 1960, we can expect that figure to be approximately 100,000.

To provide power for this expanding population and economy of the West will require capital expenditures in excess of $5 billion in the 1950–60 period. I mention this figure only to show you the tremendous amount of capital that is going to be needed in our West as we grow.

One might sit here and listen to these astounding figures and think that this migration to the West has just started. In truth, it has been going on ever since the early days of our history, but it has only reached these gigantic proportions in the last 10 or 15 years. What is the reason for this continuing trek toward the West?

The West is new, and the West will be new tomorrow and for many tomorrows to come. We are not bound by tradition. Our legislatures have kept up with the modern needs, and we find new laws, instead of antiquated ones, existing in most of the Western States. Young men and young women have come to the West from the East with new ideas, and they have developed these ideas unhampered by existing local traditions or laws, both of which, in many cases, are obsolete for the times.

To these young people who have come to the West, we who were born in the West owe our undying thanks. The pioneer of yesterday was important in laying out the land and describing its boundaries and in settling this great country, but the pioneers of today have provided the youth and the vision and the capital and the know-how to build this West into the thing that it is, and to keep it growing in the future. As the population swings to the West, more of the need for factories and distributing points in the West grows with that population, so that we can see more and more of this migration from the East and central portions of the United States.

The challenge which exists in this growth is not only to fields of capital, but also, to you, as I mentioned earlier. Upon your shoulders rests the job of selling these products, and upon your shoulders rests the job of selling that which has made this country and this West the thing that it is, both in the field of economy and in the field of government. Yours must be a constant vigil to see that the freedom of our enterprise is maintained: to see that our young people understand this great system of economy, and realize that no other system in the world has produced so much for so many people—and no other system in the world can do it, because all have been tried in the thousands of years of recorded history. None has produced like the free enterprise system, and the only obstacle which I can see on the horizon is that which rests in the apathy of our people toward our freedom, whether that freedom be the personal freedom of man or the freedom of our enterprise.

There are far too many in this country who, whether knowingly or unknowingly, advocate a little bit of socialism. There are too many people who feel that the Federal Government should have a greater and greater hand in guiding our local destinies. I like to be charitable to these people, and think that they know not what they do, and I like to devote my time to attempting to change their views.

Ours is a freedom that comes from God, and by our adherence to that concept, we have become a strong, spiritual people; and because of this spiritual strength, we have, likewise, become strong materially. Freedom, not the Government, has created this material wealth. Nothing comes from Government that is not first put into Government; and if we ever forget that to the point that we fail to live by our spiritual standards, if we ever forget that to the point that we fail vociferously to proclaim our allegiance and belief in that concept, then this great constitutional government of ours will go, and with it will go the economy that has produced more for more people than any in the history of the world.

Yes, you have a grave and abiding responsibility in this future of the West; just as I and all the people of the West have. Under our guidance and work, the West can grow to unbounded proportions, but its growth can be directed, and we can profit by the mistakes of the past that have been made in other sections of the country. Out of this, someday, our children can gather and thank us for our firm belief in the things that have made America good, just as we, today, thank our fathers and our mothers and those who came before us to settle this land and to give it to us in the form that we received it.

Tax Relief From the Federal Excise Tax on Gasoline and Special Fuels Used on Farms

SPEECH
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, while it is possible that some of my remarks that will follow may be critical of the Eisenhower farm program in general, I would like to assure the distinguished membership of this august body that I rise in support of the legislation pending before us at this time.

H. R. 8780, as explained by our beloved chairman, the Honorable JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, and others who have preceded me in addressing the House today, would provide tax relief to the farmers from excise taxes imposed on gasoline and special fuels when these fuels are used on the farm for farming purposes.

This legislation was endorsed in principle in the President's farm message as presented to the Congress on January 9, 1956. However, it is significant to note that one of my very able and distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable A. SIDNEY HERLONG, of Florida, had a proposal similar in purpose pending before the committee since March 10, 1955. His legislation, H. R. 4804, was never reported on by the Treasury Department despite the fact that such a request for a report was made by the committee on March 25, 1955.

We should not fool ourselves into thinking that we are solving the Republican farm problem by the enactment of this measure. The total revenue loss to the Federal Treasury from the bill is estimated to be $60 million per year. Treasury officials advise us that they anticipate 5 million claims for refund will be filed as a result of this refund procedure. By simple arithmetic you can arrive at a very small average annual refund that might result. But the relief is even more distorted than that when it is realized that many of our small farmers do not own mechanical equipment used on the farm that consume either gasoline or special fuels. Therefore, I suggest that while some farmers will realize no gain from this provision, the large corporation farm may realize another Republican windfall.

I do not quarrel with any economic relief that might be granted to any farmer. We all recognize that little benefit has befallen our American agriculture since the Eisenhower administration took office. The Democrats are anxious to do everything possible to assist the small farmer, the medium size farmer and the big farmer in their present Republican plight. We Democrats want to restore to our entire farm population the prosperity and economic well-being that was enjoyed by that important segment of our economy under Democratic administrations. I would suggest that the time is long overdue for the Congress to relieve the American farmer of the shackles of the "dynamic conservatism" for agriculture that has been imposed upon him to his economic detriment by the Eisenhower administration.

My congressional district is essentially industrial in character. The people I represent come from the factory, the shop and the store but like the farmer they are Americans who work with their hands and with their minds. They join me in realizing that the farmer's economic well-being means their economic well-being. For that reason I have always supported forward-looking farm legislation because I knew that my vote was not only a vote for my constituents but also a vote for the economic integrity of America.

I believe it important, Mr. Speaker, that we make it clear that by granting this tax relief to agriculture we are giving no suggestion of endorsing the principle of earmarking funds so that Federal revenues derived from highway uses

would be solely used for highway purposes. I believe it would be dangerous if an inference should be drawn from this legislation that the Congress intends such an implication of earmarking. Rather than being intended as earmarking legislation, this measure has been favorably reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means to partially relieve the farmer from the price-cost squeeze that has been imposed upon him by the irresponsible and short-sighted Republican farm program.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Eisenhower administration will see fit to support other meritorious tax legislation that will grant more substantial tax relief to not only our American farmers but to all our American taxpayers. It is essential that such tax reduction, particularly granting relief to low-income taxpayers, be enacted during this session of Congress so as to restore balance to the Federal tax burden borne by our citizens. This balance was distorted by the tax cuts given primarily to corporations and to high-income families during the Republican 83d Congress. I would suggest to the responsible fiscal officials of the Eisenhower administration and to my colleagues in the House that tax reduction which would restore our taxing system to the principle of taxation according to ability to pay is long overdue. In the meantime, I support the enactment of H. R. 8780.

The Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave extended to me today, I include herewith the address by the Honorable JOHN BYRNES of Wisconsin before the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation:

TEXT OF REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN W. BYRNES, OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE WISCONSIN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, GREEN BAY, WIS., NOVEMBER 15, 1955

I face you with mixed emotions. I am, of course, honored that you include me on your program. I've greatly admired your organization and its splendid and constructive work at National, State, and local levels. On the other hand, I recognize that I am a novice speaking to experts. That puts me on a bad spot.

You are farmers. You have spent your lives building the dairy industry into the principle economic force in Wisconsin. You have intimately experienced the problems of that industry. As Representative in Congress from this area and this State, I have been only a student of your problems. My endeavor has been to learn about them as best I can in order to judge what Government can and cannot do to assist in solving them—not only for your best interest but for the best interest of all of our people.

I hope you will excuse my presumption, therefore, in speaking to you about the dairy industry. I promise to confine myself to those aspects with which I am most familiar—the economics and politics of the dairy problem.

We're hearing a lot from the politicians these days about the role of the Federal Government in solving the dairy problem.

In the western part of the State, Congressman JOHNSON calls for the maintenance by the Government of a fixed, high price for milk—with the details worked out pretty much by the Farmers Union.

Congressman REUSS, who represents the lush green pastures of Milwaukee, calls for Federal payments to farmers to make up any deficit in their income—with the details to be worked out by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Adlai Stevenson opposed high rigid Government price supports from this same platform last month. Within a few weeks, however, he changed his mind and supported them.

Our junior Senator from Wisconsin wants the Government to provide 100 percent support for milk. And our senior Senator wants the Government to guarantee a minimum return for milk with direct subsidy payments to make up any difference.

These are all political solutions for the dairy problem. They are political because they rely entirely upon massive action by the Government for success.

We will never solve the dairy problem, or the farm problem, as long as politicians feel they must compete with one another in offering bigger and better pie-in-the-sky in the hope of getting the farm vote. A basic responsibility of the politician, it seems to me, is being honest and practical in dealing with public questions.

These political solutions fail on both counts.

The vote-catching gimmicks each one offers are of dubious practicality. The dairy problem will not be solved with gimmicks.

On the score of honesty, each plan suffers from a lack of candor. They stress what they hope you will get, not what you have to give.

Each one of these political solutions would necessarily put the Federal Government smack in the middle of your milk house, watching you like a hawk every time you patted the rump of your best producer.

Make no mistake about it. Every plan that makes it mandatory for the Government either to maintain high prices through loans or purchases, or provide producer subsidies in the form of deficit or production payments, must inevitably provide for Government control of the volume or amount to be produced. To work at all, such plans must include effective controls because, without controls, they are doomed to failure before they even start.

Their purpose is to provide a Government-guaranteed high return for milk. Unless curbed in some way, the natural result of such guaranteed high return is greater production and no program can long be continued which produces milk for which there is no market.

We can't forget that the overall 7 percent increase in milk production in 1953 and 1954 under 90 percent supports, piled up over a half-billion dollars worth of dairy products in Government warehouses, resulting in storage charges alone of $1¾ million a month. And, costly as a high support purchase program is, the cost of direct producer payments is even more. A direct payment program, at 90 percent of parity, based on present levels of production, would result in a charge of $1¼ billion a year upon the Federal Treasury. What it would be under the vastly increased production which would result from such a program without production controls is impossible to estimate.

Let us also face the political realities.

Such programs will never be authorized by Congress without production controls—no matter what the politician promises in his speeches.

The House of Representatives had an opportunity to vote for higher milk supports last May. The House turned the amendment down overwhelmingly, much to the chagrin of those who had so glibly promised the adoption of a higher milk support program during the congressional election just 7 months earlier.

It was made clear during that debate that, if you want higher milk supports from Congress, you have got to take production controls to get them.

The chairman of the House Dairy Subcommittee put it squarely on the line. He said, "when dairy farmers ask for a control program and are willing to accept marketing quotas in consideration of 90 percent supports * * * I will be on their side." His position was confirmed by the chairman of the full Committee on Agriculture and other committee members.

Let me repeat.

Adoption of any of the political dairy plans we have heard throughout Wisconsin this fall means imposition of production controls upon the Wisconsin dairy farmer. Without controls, they will not work. Without controls, they have no chance of being enacted.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is high time we took a close look at milk production controls. With high-ranking politicians criss-crossing the State all proposing programs which lead to such controls, we have a heavy obligation to ourselves and to this great dairy industry in Wisconsin to find out exactly what they would mean. Already, some farmers in Wisconsin, attracted by the wraping on the package have indicated they are ready to buy. The time has come to take a closer look at the price tag, and when I say "price tag," I mean more than just dollars and cents.

What are the problems involved in Government control of milk production? How will it work, and how will it effect the Wisconsin dairy farmer?

Fortunately our experience with Government controls a few years back is still fresh in our minds. Price controls, rent controls, wage controls, indirect production controls by means of allocation, we had them all. Our memories certainly are not so short that we have forgotten the redtape, the inequities, the individual hardships resulting from these programs. Let me say this. Those inequities, redtape, and hardships will be like child's play compared to those which will raise from any program to control milk production.

Leaving aside the problems of determining overall production levels, enforcement, and the administrative complications, let's take a brief look at the problem of distributing any sales quota among over 3½ million farmers producing milk.

Keep in mind that the object of these controls will be to reduce the amount of milk being produced. That means that some dairy farmers are going to be forced to cut back their present volume. Will the cutback be applied to all areas proportionately? Of course not. It will be necessary to define certain areas—such as those serving fluid-milk markets—as nonsurplus areas. Because of the problems growing out of the distribution of milk, the tendency will be to select certain areas for exemption and to define other areas as surplus producing areas. The cutbacks will be applied, of course, to the farmers in so-called surplus producing areas.

In addition to the area distribution problem, there is the problem of determining individual quotas within an area. For the same reason that areas with a high volume of manufacturing, or surplus, milk will bear the brunt of control, so the individual farmer within an area who is shipping to processing plants will bear the chief burden of the cutbacks.

It must be expected that individual quotas will be allocated on the basis of actual production during some arbitrary period which

may or may not represent normal production. If a farmer was just starting operations during that period, or if he had met with some unfavorable production conditions, his quota will be lower than it should be. His entire operations will be frozen by what is bound to be an arbitrary and discriminatory formula. He will be at the mercy of some Government bureau.

Now, let's turn from generalities to the specific. Let's examine a production control for milk which has seriously been proposed by a national organization which purports to speak in the interest of the farmer—the Farmers Union.

The president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, as a matter of fact, presented this program to Congress last June.

Under the plan, a national quota would be set and then distributed to the States, by the States to the counties and by the counties to the individual farmers. Compliance would be obtained by depriving noncooperators of support payments as well as fining them for every pound of milk sold above the quota. Farmers with less than 5 cows, or less than 30,000 pounds in sales, or farmers selling class I milk under a Federal order, would be exempt from quotas.

The Farmers Union plan sounds simple. Combined with high support prices, it may even sound attractive. It is neither. It is a snare and a fraud upon the Wisconsin dairy farmer.

Note the exemptions. Note those who will not be controlled, who will not have to cut back their production but who, if they desire, can even increase their production.

First, it removes the 5-cow or less than 30,000 pound producer. That doesn't cut out many Wisconsin farmers, but it does exempt a lot of other farmers in the country. It exempts, in fact, over 2 million of the 3½ million farms with milk cows.

More important, it exempts all farmers "producing solely for class I sales under a Federal or State milk order."

In Wisconsin, about 22 percent of our milk falls in this exempt category. That means that 78 percent of our production would be subject to control. Take a look at some of the other big dairy-producing States. In New York, 80 percent of the milk is sold under Federal or State milk order. In Pennsylvania, 100 percent of the milk is sold under such orders. Mr. Hones has concocted a device which puts a lovely squeeze on Wisconsin farmers, exempting every pound produced in Pennsylvania, 8 out of every 10 produced in New York, and controlling 80 percent of Wisconsin's production. Keep in mind that these fluid milk areas would be free of controls even though a good share of their milk goes into manufactured products.

When I say the burden would fall upon Wisconsin farmers under the Farmer Union plan, let me get specific. That plan would have resulted in 9-percent reduction on the 107 million pounds produced in 1954. But this 9 percent would have to come from the 60 billion pounds produced in nonexempt areas outside of the marketing-order areas. Instead of a 9-percent reduction, it would have amounted to a 15-percent cut in production for nonexempt farmers—8 out of 10 Wisconsin farmers. If the quotas furthermore, as Mr. Hones implies, apply to milk sales only and do not include sale of farm-separated cream, the reduction required would have been 20 percent.

Let me make it clear that the disastrous results of the Farmer Union plan upon Wisconsin dairy farmers apply equally to almost any production-control plan devised. Wisconsin is a surplus-milk-producing State. We produce 13½ percent of the Nation's milk with only 2 percent of the population. We are the No. 1 State in the production of manufacturing milk. With 10 percent of the milk cows, we produce over 20 percent of the milk used in manufacturing in this country. In any production-control plan, as I mentioned earlier, Wisconsin will be considered the No. 1 State as far as surplus production is concerned. Wisconsin will be the No. 1 State so far as cutback in production is concerned. The Wisconsin farmer will bear the brunt of any control program which can be devised.

The exemption of marketing order producers will put the Wisconsin farmer at a further disadvantage. The exempt farmer, already overproducing beyond the needs of the fluid-milk area, under the impetus of high prices would do everything he could to further increase his production—and profits. The Wisconsin farmer would be a controlled farmer forced to reduce his herd and his milk volume. The New York or Pennsylvania farmer would be a free farmer, taking advantage of Government-guaranteed prices with unlimited opportunity to increase his production and sales.

I am amazed that such a plan could be authored and fostered by an organization representing Wisconsin farmers. Mr. Hones and the Farmers Union would serve the Wisconsin farmer better by fighting such a plan every step of the way.

Yes, the price tag of milk-production controls comes high.

In my opinion, to shackle the Wisconsin dairy farmer with such controls would be a disaster not only for him but for his industry and the general economy of our State. Nationwide, it would be a long, possibly fatal step along the path toward Government regimentation of the farmer.

Yet, that is the price that must be paid for the pie-in-the-sky schemes offered by those who have become panic stricken as the result of the unfavorable price developments in the milk industry during the past 2 years.

They seize upon such calamitous solutions because they ignore the causes of this decline and are seemingly unaware of what has happened since.

We have had falling milk prices because of two great economic forces at work at the same time. In 1953, urged on by high milk prices in 1952, we had a gigantic increase in milk production. In the same year, we had the lowest per capita rate of milk consumption in our history. The result was inevitable—drastically lower milk prices. Such prices, combined with high production costs, have produced a tragic decline in net income to the dairy farmer.

Certainly, we must all be concerned with this development. We cannot turn our backs on it. We'd better make up our minds, however, that there is no simple and easy panacea for our troubles.

Fortunately we have had a Government which unlike some politicians, has refused to panic. It has taken the hard, unpopular, undramatic steps necessary to correct these two great maladjustments. Those steps are aimed at leveling off production and increasing consumption. In taking them, the Government, and particularly the Secretary of Agriculture charged with executing its policies, has incurred the wrath and resentment of many dairy farmers.

This search for a handy whipping boy is understandable in view of the hardships which falling milk prices have brought about.

It's time, now, however, to be honest with ourselves and ask whether it is realistic to blame our troubles on those taking the painful measures needed to correct a critical condition, or if it is not more in accord with the economic facts to place the blame where it belongs—on the war and rigid supports which largely caused the disastrous overproduction and the lowest per capita consumption in our history.

The time has come, too, to decide whether we wish to accept political solutions which would go far toward destroying our industry, or whether we wish to give wholehearted support to a program, however painful at the start, which has taken us through a critical period and is putting us on the road to recovery.

The panic-stricken have failed to consider what is happening in the dairy industry today. They have failed to read the signs pointing toward a solution to the dairy problem in the market place—where the only sound solution to our problems is possible.

Under the policies pursued by your Government, there has been a dramatic change in the outlook for the dairy industry.

Whereas, 2 years ago, milk prices were headed down, today they are headed up.

Whereas, consumption then was hitting all-time lows, today it is steadily growing.

Whereas, then, production was increasing way out of proportion to demand, today it is leveling off to manageable proportions.

Government stocks of cheese have been cut from 120 days supply to 80, butter stocks from 120 days supply to 28, and powdered milk stocks from 300 days supply to 18. We are disposing of dairy products in Government hands faster than we are purchasing them.

Of particular note are the dramatic increases in dairy products shipped abroad which your Government has been able to achieve. In the last fiscal year, we sent overseas 25 percent more powdered milk, 4 times as much cheese, 10 times as much butter oil, and 15 times as much butter as in the year before.

Barring a large increase in production next year, we can look forward to a comparative balance between production and consumption which will have a beneficial effect upon milk prices everywhere.

This is no time, I respectfully submit, to trade a working program for a gimmick and a noose.

I do not contend that the present program is perfect or complete. No program ever is. One of the particularly urgent problems which must be solved is the problem of keeping acres diverted from basic crops out of milk production. Such diversion is a major factor in bringing about large, sudden increases in milk production with their disastrous effect upon prices. The soil-bank program, on which the administration is working, and on which it is receiving such valuable advice from your federation, holds great promise. And, it goes without saying, there is much more that can be done, through cooperation between producer and government, to bring about increased efficiency in production and distribution and increased consumption.

Combined with realistic price supports, these steps will give us a dairy program which looks to the market place, instead of a Government bureau, for the farmer's income.

That market place in 1960, I am advised by the Census Bureau, will comprise 179 million people. This means that, in 5 years, there will be 14 million more people to feed with a potential consumption of 10 billion more pounds of milk each year.

To capture and hold that market we must cultivate it. We will not cultivate it by pricing ourselves out of it, by accepting Government-imposed cuts in production, or by making ourselves unprepared to serve it. It will be captured like any other market in America—by furnishing the best possible product in the quantities needed at the lowest profitable price.

It is this choice we must make.

I urge your rejection of any solution which places your economic freedom in the hands of a few men in Washington and your income in the lap of a fickle Congress. If you choose wisely, I for one have no doubt concerning the future of dairying in Wisconsin. It will continue, as it has in the past, to form the solid economic base upon which we can build, in this great State, the good life for us and our children.

The Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that during the visit of Prime Minister Anthony Eden of Great Britain to this country, many decisions will be made, as to future policy in the Middle East. The subject of arms to Israel to maintain the balance which existed in that area is a very vital and important one to us. We should not make the mistake of appeasing the Arabs either to please Great Britain, or the Arab nations, because of our interest in the oil which we are getting and hope to get from that area.

Along these lines I include an article written by Max Lerner in the New York Post on January 27, 1956, entitled "Burning Daylight in Middle East," a resolution adopted by the Manhattan region of the Zionist Organization of America at a meeting held on January 22, 1956, at the Hotel Westover in New York City, and a statement entitled "Which Shall It Be, American Arms or American Armies" issued by the Committee To Save the Middle East From Communism:

[From the New York Post of January 27, 1956]

BURNING DAYLIGHT IN MIDDLE EAST

(By Max Lerner)

We are burning daylight in the Middle East, and the hour of total darkness is fast approaching.

The U. N. censure of Israel avoids the real problem, which is how a full-scale war is to be prevented. While the lights in the Middle East go out, one after another, our administration waits and waits. For what?

Are we waiting for Nasser to offer peace? Why should he do so when he is getting stronger every day? The only thing keeping him and his allies from attacking is that they are still learning how to use the new Communist MIG jets, tanks, and submarines. If, by May or June, the 150 Communist technicians now in Egypt have taught Nasser's men how to use the new weapons, he will start the war.

One reason for the paralysis of the American Government is that the State Department is as pro-Arab as the British Foreign Office. A second is the fear of alienating the Arabs. But behind both these reasons is a third one.

It is oil.

If you want the facts about Middle East oil, there is a long and difficult but wholly objective new book, called "The Middle East, Oil, and the Great Powers," by Benjamin Shwadran (Frederick Praeger, $7).

The facts that emerge are stark enough. The Middle East contains more than half—56 percent—of the world's oil reserves, about 83 billion barrels. It is producing 20 percent of the world's oil. For this the Arab monarchs and governments got $600 million in 1954, with Aramco (Arabian American Oil Co., dominated by our big oil concerns) paying Saudi Arabia $260 million in royalties.

But not all the profits go to the Arabs. Big ones come to the American companies. Aramco was capitalized in 1933 at only $700,000. In 1954 its net profit was $424 million after United States taxes. Oil costs less to produce in the Middle East than anywhere in the world, but it sells at cartel prices, so that the profit spread is enormous.

This sheds light on why the Eisenhower administration has thus far made no response to the sale of Communist arms to Egypt. But it isn't only a question of oil profits. It is also a question of the role of oil in war. The Russians want to control the Middle East oil, while we fear that any move which might anger Egypt would give the Russians a stronger foothold than they have.

You might argue that the real defense against Communist penetration would be stable Arab states based on the welfare of the Arab people. The Shwadran book shows that out of the huge oil royalties we pay Saudi Arabia, only a minute fraction goes to health, education, and welfare, and much bigger sums go to maintaining the king and his wives in luxury and bribing the sheiks to support him.

You might also ask what it will profit us if Israel, the only Middle East democracy, is destroyed by Arabs using Russian arms. Nonetheless Dulles and Eisenhower seem to be succumbing to the Arab politics of blackmail.

We show our surrender by just doing nothing. Henry Byroade, who was stupid enough as our Ambassador in Cairo to let the Russians pull their diplomatic coup while he was asleep, is now back in Washington arguing that Nasser will be angry if we sell arms to Israel. George Allen, who ought to know better, is saying that surely Israel cannot expect a plane-for-plane and gun-for-gun equality with the Arabs, since there are so many more Arabs—a curious argument which says that to those who have numbers will also be given more guns. Allen is preparing American opinion for a State Department "solution" which will dribble out a few arms to Israel—too little and too late to do any good.

The only thinking there is in Washington is wishful thinking. The vestpocket Machiavellis of the State Department are saying hopefully that is Nasser feels strong enough he may make peace with Israel. This, you may remember, was what the British and French appeasers once said about Adolf Hitler.

There is a clear and sensible approach to the problem of Middle East peace, if only we dare take it.

The fact is that Nassar is part of an army junta in Egypt that wants to destroy Israel, but only if it can be sure of winning the war. It will not risk another humiliating defeat, as in 1948–49, and thus risk its own overthrow. If we act to sell arms to Israel, which will restore the balance of arms between both sides, Nasser and his junta will flee a war like the plague, and will make peace.

If war does break out because of our inaction, the Israelis are tough enough to prolong it, and it will end as a world war. It would be ironic if world war III, like World War II, were to begin because an ambitious dictator wanted to wipe out the bothersome Jews, and the Western World was too complacent and paralyzed to act in time.

RESOLUTION OF MANHATTAN REGION OF THE ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA

We, the assembled members and friends of the Manhattan region, of the Zionist Organization of America, viewing with alarm the Communist arming of Egypt and other Arab states, the mounting Arab threats to the security of Israel, the attacks upon American institutions and the insults to the American flag in Arab countries, call upon the Government of the United States to strengthen the American position in the Middle East, by supplying arms for defense to Israel, a staunch friend and reliable ally of the United States.

We welcome the effort of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to establish peace between Israel and her neighbors, but we call upon our Government to reject the proposal of the Prime Minister of Great Britain to appease the Arab dictators and to force the surrender to them of parts of Israel's territory. We trust that the United States will not swerve from the path of justic and will continue determinedly to uphold Israel's independence and the integrity of her borders.

WHICH SHALL IT BE, AMERICAN ARMS OR AMERICAN ARMIES?

(Statement by Committee To Save the Middle East From Communism)

An all-out attack on Israel is expected before summer. So say close observers in Washington.

Egypt is being armed with feverish haste by Communist Russia for this attack. MIG bombers and jet fighters, machine guns, tanks, rifles, and ammunition are being unloaded at Egyptian ports from Russian ships.

Egyptian officers are in Russia studying the use of these modern weapons. Hundreds of Communist officers are in Cairo training and indoctrinating the Egyptian Army.

Why?

Who supplied the North Koreans with MIG's and tanks? Who supplied the Vietmin? And before that, where did the material and tacticians come from that enslaved 600 million Chinese under Communist rule?

History repeats itself, indeed.

The same techniques that subdued most of the Far East to Communism are now being used in the Middle East.

It is no longer just a squabble between Arabs and Israelis. Russia is using the Arab-Israel conflict as a smokescreen. They have succeeded in confusing good Americans into demanding "get the Middle East out of domestic politics" instead of "get the Russians out of the Middle East."

Meanwhile, Russian submarines, for the first time in history, are preparing to enter the Mediterranean under the Egyptian flag.

The issue is no longer Arab League versus Israel, or Israel versus Arab League. The issue confronting us is this: Russia has launched her campaign to conquer the Middle East, the doorway to Africa and the backdoor to Asia.

Let us assume that Egypt defeats Israel—then who will be sitting astride the Suez Canal? Or if Israel makes territorial concessions in the Negev, as Britain is said to be suggesting, who would then have the free world's lifeline to Asia under control?

Egypt, you think? But Nasser's Egypt is today Russia's cat's-paw and unless stopped will be a Communist satellite tomorrow.

The Arabs may not realize it, but the fact is that Russia is turning them into North Koreans. Biblical Gaza will become the new 38th parallel. If Egypt attacks Israel this summer, it will be in reality a Russian attack.

How long will it take our State Department to realize that June 1950 in Korea is being restaged for June 1956—on the Mediterranean this time?

Must we be surprised again?

Must we wait until it becomes imperative to send American GI's—our sons, husbands, and brothers—to fight again in distant lands—to protect America's vital interests in the strategic Middle East?

Let's beat the Russian plan. The Arab League well remembers its crushing defeat by Israel in 1948. It will only dare attack if Israel remains defenseless against the vast modern arms given to Egypt by Russia.

An American pledge to give Israel sufficient arms for defense will frustrate the Russian plan and prevent an Egyptian attack. This is the urgent need. This is the only way to stop further Russian penetration. This cannot be achieved by trying to

outbid the Russians for Arab friendship. It is wise to help friends. It is folly to try to buy friends.

How many allies will we have left if we pursue a policy of rewarding those who collaborate with the Russians and turn our backs to our democratic friends?

That's why we ask: American arms now, or American armies later?

Which will it be? The answer is up to you.

Your voice raised with those of your fellow Americans can do it. This is the way of democracy.

Join with us in demanding that our Government immediately give to the Republic of Israel, adequate arms for defense.

Once this is done, or even announced, the threat of war can be averted and there will be time to develop an energetic and imaginative American foreign policy to strengthen the free world's position and permanently block the Russians from the Middle East.

We are animated by feelings of equal sympathy for all the peoples of the Middle East. We, therefore, call upon our Government to impress upon all the nations of the Middle East the fact that the vital interests of the free world are at stake there, and that, therefore, the conflicts between them have become relatively minor and must be settled in a manner fitting neighbors faced by a common enemy.

To this end we urge our Government to:

1. Invite representatives of the Middle East nations to an emergency conference in Washington to jointly plan a realistic peace program for the Middle East.

2. Take the initiative in the organization of a Middle East alliance which, as an extension of NATO, would include both Egypt and Israel and the other nations of that area, replacing the abortive, British-sponsored, Bagdad Pact. This alliance will also undertake a vast program of economic and technical assistance to all the peoples of the Middle East.

Powerful Arab and Communist propaganda machines are at work in our country, inflaming the bigotry, fears, and psychoses of various elements in our Nation. Our committee will counteract this vicious, one-sided propaganda and bring the truth to the American people. We will mobilize them in a concerted effort to stop a second and bloodier Korea from erupting in the Middle East.

Time is running out. We need your voice. We need your support. The scope and success of our undertaking will depend on your response. Send us your contribution so that we can arouse the Nation in this emergency.

Your dollars now can save lives tomorrow. Act now.

Resolution by West Virginia Legislature Urging Congressional Action To Effectuate Sale of the Institute Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings tomorrow on Senate Resolution 197, introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT. Senate Resolution 197 would disapprove the sale of the Institute Rubber Producing Facility, at Institute, W. Va. I shall appear at the hearings in opposition to Mr. FULBRIGHT's resolution. I am sure that the Members of this House are sufficiently aware of the importance of proceeding with finalization of the Institute sale. I know that they are cognizant of the beneficial effect which the sale of this plant would have upon the State of West Virginia, especially in view of my State's recent history of unemployment.

As an indication of the importance of the Institute sale to the people of West Virginia, the legislature of that State, presently in session, on January 30 passed a resolution memorializing the Congress to oppose any and all measures the purpose of which would be to disapprove and block consummation of the sale of this facility. I am inserting a copy of the memorializing resolution at this point in the RECORD:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Whereas there is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate of the United States a resolution to disapprove the negotiated contract for the sale to private ownership of the Federal Government's synthetic rubber facility at Institute, W. Va.; and

Whereas the report to Congress of the Synthetic Rubber Facilities Disposal Commission shows the pending sale to return to the Government by far its most favorable recovery, on the basis of net book value, of all of the copolymer plant sales; and

Whereas the Disposal Commission's report further shows clearly and conclusively that the pending sale contract fully meets the requirements of the disposal act with respect to—

1. Procurement of fair value price.
2. Market protection for small business.
3. Protection of competitive health of rubber industry.
4. Protection of public against any monopolistic trend; and

Whereas acceptance by Congress of this sale will provide immediate activation of this large facility which has been idle all but 2½ years since 1947, thus giving lucrative employment to hundreds of persons with prospect of steady work at substantial wages by private employers; and

Whereas the entire State of West Virginia, by the United States Department of Labor classification, has been for the past 2 years a class IV–B labor area (meaning highest level of unemployment) and the pending sale would alleviate this condition; and

Whereas the terms of the pending Institute sale contract are equal or superior to those upon which each of the other 12 copolymer plants have been sold to private ownership during the past year, and there appears to be no just reason why the pending Institute sale as the last one should be measured by any other standards than those which have governed the preceding copolymer plant sales; and

Whereas the rejection of the Institute sale contract apparently could have no other result than to deprive West Virginia of a great industrial operation in a facility ready for use, since the willing purchaser could provide himself with the same facilities elsewhere, without limitation as to size other than the limitation he places on his own investment risk: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring therein), That the Legislature of West Virginia, in regular session assembled, does hereby respectfully and earnestly memorialize and petition the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate of the United States to reject the disapproval resolution on the sale of the Institute plant, now pending before it; and further

Resolved, That, should such a resolution be reported to the Congress, that the Members of Congress be hereby respectfully and earnestly memorialized and petitioned to reject the same; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House, to all members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, to all West Virginia Members of the Congress and, should any disapproval resolution reach the floors of Congress, to all Members of the House and Senate thereof.

An Outstanding Analysis of President Eisenhower's Letter to the Kremlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, the January 30, 1956, edition of the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star carried an editorial which I believe to be an outstanding analysis of the triumph scored by President Eisenhower in his letter rejecting the Kremlin's hollow proposal for a treaty of friendship and cooperation.

With polite firmness the President minimized the Kremlin's latest propaganda move. He did not close the door on continued attempts of the American people to achieve an honorable and lasting peace, but made it clear to the world that we have no intention to jeopardize our efforts by the stroke of a pen when what is really needed is a change of spirit on the part of Soviet leaders.

This editorial comment by one of our Nation's most respected newspapers, entitled "Not by a Pen Stroke," is worthy of wide attention and I desire to include it with my own remarks, as follows:

NOT BY A PEN STROKE

Although maintaining a polite and amicable tone, President Eisenhower has not beaten around the bush in his reply to Premier Bulganin's letter. Instead, while leaving the door wide open for further peace-promoting discussion, he has forthrightly rejected the Soviet leader's proposal for a 20-year Russo-American "treaty of friendship and cooperation." And he has done so in a way that should effectively minimize whatever propaganda advantage the Kremlin may now seek to gain from this latest exchange of missives "at the summit."

In view of its timing, of course, and also its headline-winning personal delivery by Soviet Ambassador Zaroubin, the Bulganin letter unquestionably has been motivated in large part, if not entirely, by propagandistic considerations. There is ample reason to assume, for example, that it has been designed to have a diversionary impact on world opinion in connection with the important talks beginning today between British Prime Minister Eden and Mr. Eisenhower. In addition, since the men of the Kremlin must have realized in advance that the President's response to it could hardly have been "yes," there is solid ground for suspecting that another of its objectives has been to put the United States in the position of seeming to spurn Russia's proffered hand of friendship.

However, even though the so-called neutralists in India and elsewhere may be gulled (as usual) by this Soviet maneuver, the President's letter is so persuasive, and

so much in accord with the realities of the world, that it more than holds its own in the propaganda field. Thus, in explaining why our country takes a dim view of joining Russia in the sort of treaty proposed by Marshal Bulganin, Mr. Eisenhower has emphasized that the full substance of such a pact already exists in the multilateral United Nations Charter. And he has further emphasized that the words of that solemn agreement have not prevented the present state of international tension. And why have they failed in that respect? The answer is simple: Because they have been honored more in the breach than in the observance by the Soviet Union.

President Eisenhower has not stated the case quite so bluntly as this. Nor has he made any direct reference to the Kremlin's recent denunciation of its friendship treaties with France and Britain, or its past shocking violations of similar pacts with countries like Finland. But he has said enough, and eloquently, to make clear why the United States is in no mood to sign an agreement of this sort with Russia—a mere paper accord that might actually "work against the cause of peace by creating the illusion that a stroke of the pen had achieved a result which, in fact, can be obtained only by a change of spirit." It is the change of spirit that is needed most of all right now—a change that would translate the Soviet Union's fair words into deeds of comparable fairness as regards such issues as German unification, self-determination for the satellite countries, and disarmament.

Certainly, it cannot be said that the Kremlin's performances on these matters have lived up to its promises. In Mr. Eisenhower's words, there is no honorable thing that the United States would not do to promote world peace, but what is imperative above everything is some concrete evidence of Russian good faith.

Millions of Acres and They Want More

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, there is bipartisan agreement that our biggest domestic problem concerns the surplus of farm commodities. The President has wisely recommended the creation of a soil bank to prevent adding to that surplus.

But despite this surplus, we face a bill which would build a series of dams in the upper Colorado River States, thereby creating more farm acreage to add to our surplus of crops. I call it the upper Colorado River boondoggle.

Just how inconsistent can we get?

I direct your attention to an able editorial in the Los Angeles Times of January 26, 1956. I am sure most Members will agree it makes sense.

MILLIONS OF ACRES AND THEY WANT MORE

The Bureau of Reclamation argues that the upper Colorado project is needed for the future. This is the answer to those who point out that our regular surpluses do not indicate the need for the half-million acres which would be brought into cultivation (at a cost of about $5,000 an acre) in the upper Colorado country. The Bureau insists that a growing population will need one day the food and fiber which can be nursed from this feeble land with costly injections of river water.

Representative CRAIG HOSMER has documented the best reply to this crystal gazing. He says there are 21 million acres of good cropland lying idle in 19 Eastern, Southern, and Midwestern States. "They are not woodland or pastureland. They are good, unused farmland in soil classes I, II, and III."

These 21 million acres are in addition to the 40 million acres which the administration proposes to retire from production temporarily in a soil bank and reserve. The total of good, unused farmland under the soil-bank plan therefore would be around 61 million acres, and that's nearly twice as much as all California's farmland, good, bad, and indifferent.

Mr. HOSMER got his figures from the United States Soil Conservation Service. The unused land, all privately owned, is in humid States, where irrigation is unnecessary. Some of it has been cultivated but now lies unused. All of it could be brought into production at costs ranging from $15 to $150 an acre. It lies in States from Florida to Minnesota, from Arkansas to Ohio.

How far into the future is the Bureau of Reclamation looking? First, we have our surpluses to consume. Then, as the needs of a growing population call for it, 61 million acres of fruitful land can be reconverted. And then the Bureau can call for its billions for reclaiming the lean and frosty Colorado River highlands—or even for a project on the moon. For certainly we are not going to need the upper Colorado land before moon communications are established.

Taxes on Gasoline and Special Fuels Used on Farms

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I hope there will be no opposition to this bill. The American farmer is suffering from what is probably the worst farm depression since the early thirties. The exemption of fuel used on the farm from Federal gasoline taxes will lower the cost of farm production very little, but in the light of the farmers' present plight, he needs all the help he can get.

Mr. Speaker, many suggestions have been advances for alleviating the farm situation which is admittedly drastic. Last year, the House passed legislation restoring a fixed 90 percent parity support for basic commodities. Should this bill pass the other body and become law, I am certain it will be of a great deal of help to the farmer.

There is no need to deceive ourselves, however, into believing that any domestic program we may adopt will be the answer to our problem. If we are to solve this crisis, we are going to have to recapture our world markets which we have lost through vacillating foreign policies. We will never recapture our world markets until we wake up to the fact that we are subsidizing our foreign competitors with our tax money. American farmers are being taxed to subsidize their competitors all over the world. Such inane policies are slowly but surely driving our farmers out of business.

The time has come to face up to the facts. Foreign aid is slowly but surely wiping out the family farm.

U. S. News & World Report recently made public a survey showing that the average southern cotton farmer received only 7 cents an hour for his labor, while the average industrial worker received well over $1.50 per hour. The latter has no investment while the farmer has his life's earnings invested in land and machinery. No interest is earned on this investment, of course.

Anniversary of Ukraine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on January 22 the observance of the 38th anniversary of the independence of the Ukraine was celebrated all over the world, that is, all over the free world, where people could give expression to their thoughts and feelings, without fear of reprisal.

This observance should cause us all to pause and think again of the wonderful blessings of liberty and the terrible price which has been and still is being paid to regain and preseve freedom.

As far back as the ninth century, the Ukrainian Kievan State has been struggling to maintain its independence. Ukraine was one of the first victims of the Communist conspiracy, but despite the destruction of its national churches, the horrible famines, the mass murders, purges, and deportations, the fires of patriotism have not been extinguished. On the contrary, these scourges have but served to strengthen their national pride and loyalty and their determination to continue their fight for freedom and independence.

What does all this mean to the citizens of our country? It means that we must use every resource at our disposal to make known to those nations which are still free, the real meaning of communism, with its policy of enslavement, domination, and destruction of all personal liberties. We must encourage them, and our own people also, to be constantly vigilant and alert to the spread of communism, so we may all be enabled to fight it at every turn, to retain our freedoms.

It means also that we must, by whatever means it can be done, let the people of the Ukraine know that we are in sympathy and full accord with their efforts to regain their freedom and stand ready to do everything in our power, as a nation, and through the United Nations, to help them, so they may again be restored to the community of free and independent nations of the world.

Tax on Gasoline and Special Fuels Used for Farm Purposes

SPEECH
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, of course, I support H. R. 8780. It is a bill which will relieve farmers of the necessity of paying an excise tax on gasoline purchased by them and consumed by them on the farm. This bill corrects an injustice of long standing and by permitting this tax exemption it places Congress in line with our own State Legislature of Louisiana in this respect.

The Federal road program is and should be largely a program providing interstate highways. These highways are needed for national-defense purposes, and they stretch from one end of the land to the other. They are not local in their purposes but are intended to facilitate commerce throughout the land.

We are about to pass another huge road program. This program will provide billions of dollars for interstate highways, needed largely for national defense. It is proposed, however, that such a bill be financed by an addition to our gasoline tax. The farmer is not interested especially in this program. It will provide no special benefit to him any more than to any other individual in the country, and I think it is an act of simple justice that he be relieved of the burden of paying the tax on gasoline and diesel fuels that has nothing to do with the road program.

It has well been said by an able Representative from the State of Tennessee on this floor in the past 2 days that the American farmer is now caught in a price squeeze. While our industrial economy hums on at high pitch, the farmer's condition has steadily declined. Prices for things he purchases continue to mount and his expenses increase with the high cost of doing business in an inflated economy. At the same time, the prices which he receives for his own commodities steadily decline. Unless he is exempt, he faces the possibility that the Federal road tax may be further increased and his burden of taxation may be increased at a time when his financial condition does not permit him to reach out and assume new obligations.

This bill will save our American farmer $60 million. Farmers will file applications to be relieved of the excise tax on gasoline and farm fuels once a year, at the end of the fiscal year. They will receive from the Treasury a check for the amount that they have paid in, representing the tax paid for farm-used gasoline and diesel fuels. In our free economy the sum of $60 million is a small amount. To the average farmer it is a saving which will be of great assistance to him in this period of economic pinch which is pushing him slowly into an intolerable position.

Iowa's Warren County NFO Prepares Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the membership an article in the Record-Herald and the Indianola Tribune, Indianola, Iowa, on January 26. This article deals with the present farm problem and sets forth the Warren County National Farm Organization resolutions:

WARREN COUNTY NFO PREPARES RESOLUTIONS—ORGANIZATION NOW HAS 1,100 MEMBERS

The National Farmers Organization of Warren County has progressed beyond the mere protest stage and has adopted the skeleton of a farm plan for which it will stand. The resolutions were outlined at a meeting of county and township officers at the courthouse January 16. A copy of the final draft has been furnished for publication.

The organization now has 1,100 members and is growing, according to John Goodhue, county president. The Fifth Congressional District is fully organized. Mr. Goodhue says organization is going forward in other districts and it is hoped to have the State organized within a short time.

The resolutions call for a universal restricted production, according to need, with restrictions on bushel, rather than acreage, production. The plan, in its entirety, would apply not only to grain, but to livestock, dairy, and poultry as well. It would provide for cross compliance so that a farmer, restricted on corn or wheat, could not put the retired acreage in some other feed or fiber crop.

The resolutions are as follows:

WARREN COUNTY RESOLUTIONS

"We, the members of the NFO of Warren County, Iowa, believe that—

"1. No farm program should be inaugurated unless it has the approval of 65 percent of the producers by popular vote.

"2. That the administration and regulation of any and all farm programs should start at the township level as indicated by popular vote and progress systematically up to the county, the district, the State, etc.

"3. If we insist on 100 percent parity (which we believe we are entitled to) it will be necessary to control production of all grains, fiber crops, livestock, and livestock products, including dairy and poultry.

"4. It will be necessary to have what is known as a cross compliance program. In other words, a producer would not merit the benefit of controlling the production of any one farm commodity if he failed to meet the requirements of control of any and all other farm commodities.

"5. All grain and fiber quotas should have a provision for penalty for exceeding that particular quota by an amount equal in value to that part which was in excess of the established quota."

COUNTY COMMITTEE

"6. All administration, regulation and operation of quotas to be placed in the hands of an elected county committee who with the aid of townships or parish committees shall grant, establish and allocate allotments to comply as near as possible with regulations outlined by the State, regional, and national committee. Any producer, if dissatisfied shall have the right of appeal to an agency expressly set up for that purpose.

"7. Farm and feedlot progress and efficiency should be maintained, and we pledge our cooperation in the furthering of better and cheaper production. But in view of the fact that there are many small farms that will be severely handicapped by the application of quotas both as to grains and livestock, we respectfully ask that very consideration be given these smaller operations as to establishment of quotas.

"8. We believe that as far as possible the grain feed allotments be made on an acreage rather than a historical base. We realize the importance of history in the formation of quotas for wheat, malting barley, flax and other related crops.

"9. In the establishment of livestock quotas, that an allotment should be established with history being a primary factor, but that other factors such as adaptability, facilities already established and potential and type of farm should also be considered."

WORLD LICENSE PROCESSORS

"10. A representative group of our organization should be selected to work with the Secretary of Agriculture on research work to enact and embody into law granting the United States Department of Agriculture the right to license processors and to negotiate with the processor for a parity price based on the orderly marketing of the required number of units of any particular commodity required by the consuming public, and to further set up requirements and grades as agreed upon by the processor, the producer, and the United States Department of Agriculture and the consuming public.

"11. We further believe that the storing and sealing of crops and commodities be regulated to a point that it would be consistent for the protection of all parties concerned against drought, pestilence, war, or any other hazard. We believe that any additional storing constitutes a burden depleting our soil for no advantage whatsoever and for that reason we ask that bushel allotments be put on wheat rather than acreage allotments.

"12. That there should be an immediate halt called to the reclamation of arid lands, and as far as feasible discontinue the leasing of Government owned lands for the production of meat animals."

The Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following article from National Review magazine entitled "The Third World War" by James Burnham:

THE THIRD WORLD WAR
(By James Burnham)

PANGS OF FRIENDSHIP

It was reported from Karachi a few days ago that a number of Pakistani political leaders want their country to cancel its present agreements with Washington, and to withdraw from the Anglo-American sponsored Baghdad Pact. They have a plain argument. The United States, they point out, is not supporting Pakistan in either of

its two major international difficulties—the dispute with India over Kashmir, and Afghanistan's campaign to form a new "Pathan" nation (Pushtunistan) by combining northwestern Pakistan with southeastern Afghanistan.

Both of these issues are decisive for Pakistan's national survival. The source of Pakistan's principal rivers are in Kashmir. The Afghan-promoted new nation would include the Khyber Pass, and thus open up Pakistan's strategic frontier not merely to the Afghans (who are subordinate actors in this scene) but to the Russians a step beyond.

For several years, Pakistan has been one of the firmest among the new countries in resisting Soviet encroachments and combatting internal communism. Except on certain colonial matters, she has usually been willing to line up with us, or at any rate her record, from the American point of view, has been a big jump better than that of the "neutralist" nations. (A "neutralist" nation, roughly defined, is one that professes to be on neither side and acts on Moscow's side.)

The Pakistani doubters ask, not unreasonably whether their country's circumspectly pro-American policy makes sense. For the risk, the great risk, that even the faintest pro-Americanism runs in their part of the world, what does Pakistan get out of it?

REWARD FOR BLOWS

Two days following these Karachi reports there came a dispatch from New Delhi that must have added a new piquancy to Pakistani pondering. India has just consented to accept an American gift of $10 million worth of steel. (That brings our Government's 6-year gifts to India up to $250 million, besides loans of nearly $200 million and private foundation grants of about $50 million.) The sequence of events is obscure to no one. The Indian Government officially promotes the triumphal tour of Khrushchev and Bulganin. At its conclusion, Nehru and his Soviet visitors issue a joint declaration of solidarity on the most important international issues. Throughout the just concluded meeting of the U. N. Assembly, India is a consistent supporter of the Soviet position, a consistent and harsh opponent of the United States position.

Ergo, the United States gives India another $10 million—with much more, apparently, soon to come. It is by such performances that our State Department makes itself the world's laughing stock.

LESSON IN LOGIC

What possible conclusion is there for a Pakistan official, or any man with a small minimum of commonsense, to draw? One only, from the evidence: show your friendship with the United States, your opposition to the Soviet Union and to communism, and Washington will be indifferent to you at best, if it does not kick you in the face; play up to Moscow, echo Communist language, sabotage American plans, and the sky is the limit so far as Washington is concerned.

This Pakistan example is only a particularly crude cutting on a well-worn pattern. Colonel Nasser in Cairo has learned his lesson from Professors Nehru and Tito. The obsolescent Czech arms that he is buying may not be worth much to Egypt's Army, but they are powerful enough to blow wide open the vaults of the United States Treasury. Tito has worked the dodge for a take of a billion dollars. Or consider the reverse example of Guatemala: how Washington's generous alarm, interest and promises dried up once Arbenz and his Communists were defeated. If Castillo Armas doesn't want to go broke, he had better discover a renewed Communist threat before long.

It is all very well for the Voice of America to quote the Declaration of Independence and to praise liberty over slavery. But the Voice of America won't guarantee Pakistan's water supply nor man the Khbyer pass; nor will it provide favorable conditions for Pakistan's necessary economic development.

The fathers of our country never tired of repeating that a nation's foreign relations are in general governed by interest, not by gratitude or abstract principle—and properly so. But we seem to be the exception.

CONDITIONED AID

One key to these troubles is the absurd, hypocritical and immoral doctrine of "unconditioned aid" which we have been accepting as a principle of our last decade's foreign policy. "Absurd," because if the aid is truly unconditioned, it is pointless. "Hypocritical," because we and everyone else know that we hope for something in return. And also "immoral," because no government has the moral right to spend the substance of its citizens unless on a reasonable assurance of a recompense to them. In governments the virtue of charity is transformed into a disguised breach of trust.

Specific, well-understood conditions are the only excuse for a gift by one government to another (or another's citizens). For every quid there should be a balancing quo—if not always dollar for dollar, then harbors or airfields, strategic materials, radio stations, military training agreements, even diplomatic help, but always something, something specific, something to one's own national interest.

We shoud treat the neutralist fuss over conditions on aid with scorn, as the blackmail it is. And if we always demand something in return for what is given, the result will be to improve, not embitter, our relations with the other parties to the bargain. We will be treating them as moral peers, not as beggars to whom we toss a handout. By showing that we want something from them and are willing to pay honestly for it, we can only add to their self-respect, and thereby—as always follows—to their respect for us.

A New Citizen Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Citizen Board," appearing in the Middletown Bulletin of January 20, 1956.

Although one may not necessarily agree with the views expressed by the editor, I am sure everyone will find his comments a challenge and worthy of careful scrutiny and thoughtful analysis.

A NEW CITIZEN BOARD

(By Max Convo)

On Friday of last week President Eisenhower appointed an eight-man board to periodically review the activities of the intelligence organizations of our Nation.

President Eisenhower himself spelled out the functions of this new Board and placed particular emphasis on a review of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, this Nation's most important data-gathering organization in the field of foreign intelligence.

Theoretically, the President was activating a recommendation made on several occasions by the special task force of the Hoover Commission which studied the intelligence capability of our Nation, but in reality, the creation of this supervisory Board sidestepped the intended objective of the Hoover Commission which was that a joint congressional committee should be created to supervise these very sensitive activities of our Government.

While the appointment of this Board by the President did not make national headlines, it nevertheless constitutes a further step by the executive branch of the Government to retain strict control over the activities of the agencies involved and leaves a wide gap in the necessary control which should be exercised over such agencies by the legislative branch of the Government.

These is no question that the security problems faced by an agency such as CIA are difficult but they are no more difficult than those faced by the Atomic Energy Commission which has the responsibility of developing and maintaining the upkeep of the so-called ultimate weapons on which this country's future may very well depend. And yet, even the AEC has a joint congressional committee looking into its activities.

It is no secret that the CIA has been constructively criticized for its shortcomings in the field of intelligence gathering and its lack of proper direction, but it is also no secret that Allen Dulles, Director of that organization, has thus far headed off all congressional scrutiny by appealing to the White House periodically and waving the "security bogey." Obviously, he has sold the President the idea that even the men who appropriate the money for his operations do not have the right to look in and see what is being accomplished.

In selecting the national intelligence supervisory board, the President has been careful to appoint men who are held high in the national esteem, but while these men are allowed to get a glimpse of what is going on, they will have no authority to rectify situations or exercise even nominal control over the organizations whose activities they must oversee.

The Central Intelligence Agency was created through an act of Congress and its operating funds, while masked in the budgets of other Government organizations, must still be voted on by Congress. Its functions, which are or should be carried out on a worldwide scale, are vital to the formulation of high national policy and while the direction of such policy is a function of the executive branch of the Government, it is also a responsibility of the legislative branch, for in the ultimate stages of national policy, ony Congress has the authority to declare the existence of a state of war.

The fact that CIA activities have been openly criticized by task forces of the Hoover Commission and that Gen. James Doolittle gave only a creditable rating to the organizations all-important German activities should clearly indicate the need of a closer look-see by a permanent joint congressional committee.

It is vital to ascertain just how much intelligence is being independently gathered by CIA in the so-called critical areas of the world and just how much that organization relies on the intelligence gathering activities of such foreign organizations as the Gehlen chain, SIMFA, the Deuxemme bureau, and independent operators.

While these foreign organizations may provide valuable and sometimes vital data, it is imperative from the point of view of our very national existence, that our intelligence organizations be capable of standing on their own legs. By the same token, it is foolish for anyone in CIA to fear a select body of our own lawmakers, while at the same time important tasks and objectives are being assigned to foreign organizations.

In this day and age when total extinction is no longer a writer's fantasy and when a single mistake may spell national doom, this

Nation cannot afford the luxury of relying on the judgment of one person or a tightly knit group of persons whose long-term batting average can be defined by a creditable rating. We cannot, as a Nation, place blind faith in the estimates and judgments of an organization which is supervised by a citizen's committee shorn of all authority to undertake even remedial action.

Supervision must be the task of an impartial joint congressional committee representing the people of the Nation and wielding a measure of authority. The powers of national policy will still rest with the executive, but in a sense, the responsibility will and must be shared with Congress.

There is no novelty in the proposition of dual responsibility, for even the President, not too long ago, applied this rule to secure a free hand in the matter of the off-shore islands guarding the approaches to Formosa—and Congress generously responded.

Last but not least a final point was scored by Hanson Baldwin, noted military analyst of the New York Times, in a recent article on the subject:

"* * * uncontrolled secret intelligence agencies are in a position to dominate policy making and hence government. Their very secrecy gives them power; there are few to accept or reject their findings * * * few, even in the executive branch, know what they do * * * the CIA, for instance, by the very breadth of its charter, is beyond the normal checks and balances of the law. An overpowerful secret intelligence agency is dangerous, not only for the formulation of sound policy, but to the viability of democratic institutions."

Ridgway Charges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of January 26, 1956, entitled "Ridgway Charges":

RIDGWAY CHARGES

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, retired Army Chief of Staff, has renewed bitter accusations against Defense Department officials in a second Saturday Evening Post article. He has so far offered no proofs, cited no specific incidents to support his sensational charges.

The general is unquestionably a capable Army man, an officer with a splendid career record. He deplores what he considers political determination of service policies, as constituting a grave danger to the country.

Yet by charging that Defense Secretary Wilson made military decisions for reasons of political expediency, forcing Army leadership to follow a party line, General Ridgway plunges spang into politics.

These are grave allegations. One wonders why the general did not make them several years ago, when the conditions he asserts were supposed to have been created.

Of course, he would have risked loss of the top Army post, but if the things he complained of were true, then was the time to air them. He would thus have served his country better than if he retained the Chief of Staff job.

General Ridgway is not ingenuous enough not to recognize his charges now, in an election year, carry a heavy load of political shard, aimed at the Eisenhower administration. Since the general has indulged in political indictment, it is fair to ask what his own party affiliation is, if any.

Possibly General Ridgway speaks out so bluntly simply because he resents cuts made in Army personnel and perquisites. Possibly he interprets these as unjust and perilous because of long conviction the ground forces are still of paramount importance in a strategic air age.

Instead of believing the Pentagon policymakers acted to bolster the air arm and Navy, rather than the Army, for reasons of overall security, perhaps he considers politics of economy alone dictated the programs. This thesis is hardly borne out, when the President asks $1 billion more for defense in this election year.

At all events, General Ridgway's accusations demand verse and chapter of proof, if any can be adduced. He should promptly be called before a congressional committee and asked to substantiate his blanket charges.

1956 Events Bring Reminders of 1939

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert the following editorial by David Lawrence from the Evening Star of Janurary 30 entitled "1956 Events Bring Reminders of 1939":

1956 EVENTS BRING REMINDERS OF 1939—FOE'S DUPLICITY AND FRIENDS' PARTISANSHIP PREVAIL AS EDEN AND EISENHOWER MEET

(By David Lawrence)

These are dangerous times in the world. The news dispatches read strangely like those that appeared just a few months before World War II broke out.

There are the same sinister moves by aggressor governments.

There is the same reckless partisanship inside the national legislatures of the democracies, thus encouraging the aggressor government to think that peace-at-any-price is the underlying policy of all political parties in America, France and Britain.

There is the same duplicity behind the scenes as the aggressor builds up armament while piously proclaiming peaceful motives.

There is the same cry that the democracies are unprepared militarily and that they are sacrificing guns for butter, even as the plaintive call comes for more air power to match the enemy's growing strength.

Perhaps the foregoing will strike a note of reminiscence to Sir Anthony Eden, England's Prime Minister, who this week confers here with President Eisenhower. For the famous British diplomat played a conspicuous role in the prewar years and saw the gathering storm from the inside of the Chamberlain government before he resigned dramatically as Foreign Secretary in February 1933. Ahead lay the appeasement of Munich in September 1938 and then all-out war in September 1939.

Few men have had such an intimate experience with the chicanery of totalitarianism, particularly the Russian maneuvers and tricks, as has Anthony Eden. Few in parliamentary life know so well how foreign policy can be made a football of politics to the detriment of a nation.

Many Americans probably have forgotten that as late as 6 months before the war broke out Prime Minister Chamberlain, already disillusioned about the empty promises given by Hitler at Munich, proposed that a draft law be passed but was met by the bitter opposition of Clement Attlee and the Socialist Labor Party. Mr. Attlee on April 27, 1939, told the House of Commons:

"We are opposed to conscription. It will weaken the country. If there is to be a gesture, it should be the conscription of wealth. There is no need for conscription so far as men are concerned. The navy and the air force are up to strength and there are no arms for more men."

All this has a familiar ring—political parties seeking partisan advantage by playing on the emotions of an uninformed citizenry. Here was Mr. Chamberlain, on the brink of war, struggling to make a show of firmness to Hitler, only to be frustrated by a party in opposition that was strong enough to threaten defeat at an election, perhaps on a peace-at-any-price basis, if the Prime Minister didn't accede.

It was this state of affairs which caused Sir Samuel Hoare, Home Secretary until 1939 and later a member of the war cabinet, to write in retrospect:

"The truth was forced upon us that until the people were faced with the stark dangers of actual war, it was impossible to introduce war methods of production and organization, and to form a national government for a single purpose."

These same comments could be written today about the divided Government in the United States. One party controls Congress and the other party controls the White House.

Despite the strong voice of Senator GEORGE, many Democrats in Congress keep up a constant sniping which inevitably must encourage the shrewd men in the Kremlin to believe that this is the time for them to muddy the waters here.

Hitler used the same strategy with his peace offers just before each act of aggression. In fact, he proposed and Mr. Chamberlain signed in 1938 a statement saying the two nations agreed "never to go to war with each other."

The latest effort of the Democrats is to put the Eisenhower administration in an embarrassing position because it has rejected the same kind of offer—a treaty proposed by Bulganin to eliminate war between Russia and America. Some of the Democratic spokesmen in Congress are saying about the President's reply that they were "not consulted on details"—as if direct negotiation with foreign government was ever a constitutional prerogative of Congress—while other Democrats say they don't like "the way it was handled."

What does it all mean? What can be done about it? Public opinion, which trancends petty politics, can command the answer. Hitler understood only one language, just as do the dictators in the Kremlin. That's military force plus economic force. Hitler was allowed almost until the outbreak of war in September 1939, to trade freely and get supplies for his armament machine from every country.

The sooner the free world begins to sacrifice pounds, francs, and dollars of trade and cuts off vital raw materials from the enemy, and the sooner the military power of the United States and its allies is built up at whatever cost is required, the sooner will there be a feeling of real security that a world war can be prevented.

For the assumption that the Kremlin would not dare to start a world war is as spurious as the assumption too often made early in 1939 that Hitler wouldn't dare take on both Britain and France.

America's indecision, too, in those prewar days was an encouragement to Hitler.

Even after the fall of France and after Russia had entered the European war in June 1941, and just a few weeks before Pearl Harbor, the House of Representatives almost defeated the extension of the draft bill. It was passed by a single vote on Auguist 13, 1941.

These are perilous times, especially since this is an atomic age, when political bickering and procrastination can be fatal. It is to be hoped the conferences between Mr. Eden and Mr. Eisenhower will help to strengthen allied solidarity and to bring forth a fearless definition of America's objectives. This definition was sadly lacking in 1939. A lear definition of policy for the United States today is again being befuddled by selfish politics.

Logan International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Brag About Logan," which appeared in the Boston Post of Sunday, January 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S BRAG ABOUT LOGAN

Boston, long one of the great seaports of the United States, has become one of the great air centers of the world. But too few people, here and abroad, know the facts. We need to brag a little about Logan International Airport.

World travelers know that in most ways Logan is superior, and in many ways unique. There is, for instance, no other great commercial airfield so close to a great city.

If you land at London Airport, it takes three-quarters of an hour out the Great Western Road to get downtown. From New York's Idlewild, the distance is longer. There are long rides from the fields nearest Rome, Madrid, Lisbon, and Paris, too. Here, you can ride from east Boston to State Street, on the MTA in 15 minutes, for 20 cents.

Logan is, also, closer to Europe by an hour than New York. In a 3,000-mile run, an hour is of some consequence.

The airlines know the truth about Logan. It is no accident that most of the great ones fly from here regularly. Although it is necessary to go to New York to board a liner for most European ports, you can fly from here direct to the British Isles, overnight.

According to figures released by the Aircraft Owners and Pilots' Association, the total number of planes in and out of London in 1955 was 98,808. In a comparable period, Logan International Airport saw 90,939 takeoffs of commercial and private craft. It is worth keeping in mind that London field serves all of England, a matter of more than 40 million people.

There are now only 12 airports in the world equipped with proper runways and other facilities to fly jet transports. Boston is 1 of the 12.

The Logan International Airport needs nothing—except a concerted campaign by Bostonians to call its advantages to the attention of the whole world.

In the 18th century, it was neither nice nor necessary to brag about our city. Its eminence was self-evident. In the 19th century, our position in trade, in finance, and in literature, was also very high and very widely acknowledged. This is the 20th century, however, and in the great clamor of the cities for place, our past reputation means little except to sightseers.

A hundred years ago, we were the hub of the universe in the intellectual sense of the term. By a curious irony of progress, we might well become in the next few years the actual hub of the universe because of Logan Airport.

It won't happen, however, unless we blow the trumpets with great loud blasts.

The American Bill of Rights: A Living Force—Address by Hon. Clyde Doyle, 23d Congressional District, California, December 12, 1955, Before Members of the Press, Radio, and Television, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the approval of yourself and all the Members of this House of Representatives, I have heretofore been granted unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the following address given by me at a luncheon of the Bill of Rights Commemoration Committee, at the Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., on December 12, 1955.

It seems that this was the 15th annual such luncheon and said luncheon is held in honor of the members of the press, radio, and television. Also present were members of the board of supervisors, city council, city attorney's office, attorneys, judges, leaders of women's groups, community and civic groups—over 100 persons were present, I am informed.

Upon receiving the invitation of the commemoration committee to make this important address on such said occasion, I was interested, and pleased, to be informed that the reason I was thus invited was on account of my membership on, and work as a member of, the House Un-American Activities Committee, and that members of the press, television, and radio family in Los Angeles County had suggested to the Bill of Rights Commemoration Committee in charge that I be the guest speaker on this significant occasion.

The address follows:

THE AMERICAN BILL OF RIGHTS: A LIVING FORCE

(Address by Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress, 23d Congressional District, California; member of House Armed Services Committee and House Un-American Activities Committee; now serving his 5th term in Congress; address given at luncheon of Bill of Rights Commemoration Committee, December 12, 1955, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles; Mr. Joe Crail, chairman)

Mr. Joe Crail, chairman, and all members of the committee; honored guests; members of the press, radio, and television; friends, I most cordially compliment the Bill of Rights Committee for making this timely event possible. For many years I have observed the splendid emphasis the committee has placed upon recognition of the importance of the American Bill of Rights to the destiny of our American way of life. For certainly, what protects and defends the freedoms and the rights of individual American citizens, indelibly marks our national pattern of conduct for better or for worse. In my humble but considered judgment, the Bill of Rights is today a living force which we must not hesitate to defend and observe with our utmost diligence and vigilance.

In submitting my brief remarks for your consideration, I know you understand that I can only share out of my own personal experiences, largely gained from 30 active and pleasant years as a practicing attorney at the California bar and over 9 years now, as a Member of our National House of Representatives, where I am privileged to serve as a member of two major committees, the House Armed Services Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee.

My acceptance of the kind invitation extended me to be your main speaker on this very important and pleasant occasion, naturally caused me to dig deeper into the history and significance of our American Bill of Rights to all American citizens, regardless of national origin or economic station in life. So, it may well be that I today am the chief benefactor, because I am confident my restudy of our Bill of Rights has not only refreshed and strengthened my dedication to its high purposes, but, it has made me more determined to take advantage of every opportunity afforded, to be more vigilant in my protection of the freedoms and rights of all American citizens. Out of my own recent experience thus gained, I advocate that each American citizen not only read the Bill of Rights this very week, we are here observing, but that each also studiously read some of the pertinent history relating to these especially cherished amendments to our Constitution.

It is well that we remember that the American colonists, beginning with early Virginia, were settled under royal charters, granted by the Kings of England. You will also recall that these charters almost always contained very strict and extremely burdensome reservations in favor of the English Crown. They did not fail to enumerate limitations and restrictions upon the exercise of civil and political liberties which must be strictly observed by these early emigrants from England. These colonists did not acquire civil and political liberties as they were then known in England. In fact, as early as 1612 the Virginia colonists protested to the English Crown, against the deprivation of these rights. So, eventually, the Revolutionary War came about.

It is well to remember that only 13 years passed between the signing of our Declaration of Independence dated in Congress at Philadelphia, July 4, 1776, and the date of the passage by Congress of these 10 amendments on September 25, 1789. Thirteen years is a very short span of time, as the history of Nations occurs. It was a very, very short period of time in our early national history. It is also well for us to remember that a total of 124 amendments to our original Constitution of 1789 were actually proposed for inclusion in the Bill of Rights, so determined were the States, that before they would finally accept the new form of Government, they must be guaranteed the civil and political liberties we are today appropriately honoring and reviewing our allegiance to. Seventeen of the 124 amendments were duly accepted by the House of Representatives and 2 of these 17 were later rejected by the Senate. That left 15 proposed amendments of the original 124; these were reduced to an even dozen before Congress approved. Then, on submission to the

States, 2 of this dozen were rejected by the States, thus leaving the 10 we now revere as our Bill of Rights. Yes, it was a real living force to our forefathers. It cannot be less than a real living force to us of this generation, if we would profit by the experience of dedicated men who fought and died, that they might have individual freedom and have it more abundantly.

Each time I visit that certain historical church, St. Johns in Richmond, Va., where Patrick Henry stood at the Virginia Convention of delegates on March 23, 1775, he having been a delegate from Virginia to the First Continental Congress, it gives me an actual sense of renewed and increased devotion for, on each such visit to the church pew from which he spoke, I hope you will not misunderstand me when I say, I can almost hear this great American say:

"There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations.

"Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have?

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty, or give me death."

Granting that it is a fact that we today do not face the immediate physical dangers of which Patrick Henry spoke, am I placing it upon a level or plane too high above us this day, to urge nevertheless that we have the same attitude and spirit possessed by him?

Whenever I reflect upon the place of these 10 amendments to our Constitution as an historical fact, I also reflect upon the place of the preamble to our Declaration of Independence, also written and declared by daring Americans devoted to the cause of individual freedom at least equal to any in our national history.

I, therefore, submit the proposition that what was then set forth in the preamble to our Declaration of Independence, must logically have had a direct bearing upon the thoughts and attitudes of the framers of our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. To me, with only 13 years spacing these two destiny-making documents, it is crystal clear that the Bill of Rights to our Constitution was written with the awareness by the authors of each of these 10 amendments, that their predecessors in the fight to guarantee individual liberty and justice for all men, had boldly written these for the allegiance and guidance of all Americans for all time—as follows:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Granting that these express words are not in the Bill of Rights, I respectfully submit that we cannot approach a crystal-clear appreciation of the true intent and purpose of the Bill of Rights, unless we read into them the high spiritual level declared only 13 years before in our basic Declaration of Independence.

Who is there that contends the 10 amendments are not inalienable? Who is there that contends that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are freedoms for less than all Americans? Who is there that contends that all Americans are not created equal by the same Creator?

No, all the amendments known as the Bill of Rights are, by the plain fact of all American citizens having the same Creator, possessed of the same and equal inalienable rights before that Creator, and, therefore, must be in the sight of manmade laws. The fact that all men are created equal in the sight of the same Creator, is what makes the liberties and rights guaranteed in the Bill of Rights—each and every one of them—inalienable. Not to recognize this basic premise for our Bill of Rights, is to place it on such a low and material level in our thinking, that the whims of evil and designing men could change ours into a Nation governed by mere man rather than by established and revered law.

It must be self-evident, therefore, that, ours being a government of laws and not of men, no American citizen, in or out of public office can choose to respect or enforce less than each and all of the Bill of Rights, as to all American citizens, regardless of their national origin or economic station in life. Our forefathers conceived and established the Bill of Rights as a living and necessary force for all Americans. Just to the extent to which we as a Nation practice what we preach about the Bill of Rights making all men equal in the sight of our laws, just to that extent, will we deserve the blessings—the blessings of our Creator. Just to that extent, will we make for strength or weakness of the spiritual forces which also must be taken into consideration as factors which make our Nation truly a great Nation of freedom-loving men.

Let us here briefly look at the makeup of the Bill of Rights, sometimes also called a Bill of Prohibitions, sometimes called a Bill of Restraints. They make up an integrated list of "don't" for the United States Congress to bear in mind in their legislative processes. Without giving you the full text of each, let me enumerate briefly:

Amendment I guarantees freedom of religion; freedom of speech; freedom of the press; right of peaceable assembly.

Amendment II: Right to bear arms.

Amendment III: No quartering of soldiers in private homes in peacetimes, excepting with consent of the owner.

Amendment IV: Security of persons in their homes; against unreasonable searches.

Amendment V: No person shall be compelled to be a witness against himself in any criminal case.

Amendment VI: In all criminal prosecutions, accused shall be entitled to speedy trial; be confronted with witnesses, and have assistance of counsel.

Amendment VII: Right of trial by jury.

Amendment VIII: No excessive bail or cruel punishments.

Amendment IX: The enumeration of certain rights shall not deny others retained by the people.

Amendment X: The powers not delegated to the United States, by the Constitution, are reserved to the States, or to the people.

It having been suggested to me that some of your many members of the press, radio, and TV present would like to have me briefly discuss the work of the Un-American Activities Committee, which is 1 of my 2 major committee assignments, I will gladly do so. Whatever I say will necessarily be my own opinion.

This committee was made a permanent House committee at its creation in the 79th (1946) Congress; it has only 9 members and all are lawyers excepting 1. It operates under Public Law 601 which, by its express terms charges the committee "to investigate and report to the House the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, and the diffusion within the United States of subversive propaganda within the United States, whether this is instigated from foreign countries or of domestic origin and which attacks the form of government guaranteed by our Constitution, and all other questions in relation thereto, which would aid Congress in any remedial legislation."

As time does not permit of more than just a few comments, I will say that I believe this committee does a very necessary, but a very trying and difficult duty, considering the nature of its task and the types of people it very frequently has to deal with, it is entitled to your commendation for its betterment in procedures, especially as relates to the rights of witnesses.

The House of Representatives itself, last April, adopted the Doyle resolution, House Resolution 151, unanimously. This resolution, amongst other things, eliminates one-man investigations in all House committees. It does not apply to Senate committee investigations.

When I was again yesterday asked how far I went in recognizing the right of a person, under the Bill of Rights, to dissent from my views, I again replied that I would fight for a man's right to say and print and preach whatever he wished, provided he did it within the four corners of the United States Constitution as set out by established law.

The right to patriotically disagree is inherent with American citizenship and the right to be wrong, if not a violation of established law, is another right, guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Men who find it a burden to think frequently and clearly on the subject of civil rights for all American citizens, are not contributing toward making our beloved Nation, a living force for civil rights as guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

I again restate, as I have many times, that I do not criticize a witness before our committee for standing on his constitutional rights as provided in the fifth amendment in the Bill of Rights, if that witness is in good faith with his oath, himself, and the Congress. But, it is disgusting to have a witness raise it when the known facts frequently show that he is merely following the known Communist line of cheating on the committee, even though there is no good faith, honesty, or integrity present in his claim of the constitutional privilege.

Unless President Eisenhower was in error in his state of the Union message of 1954, the objects of the Congress, under Public Law 601, are necessary and of vital importance. The President said:

"The subversive character of the Communist Party in the United States has been clearly demonstrated in many way, including court proceedings. When a citizen knowingly participates in the Communist conspiracy, he no longer holds allegiance to the United States."

The President's reference to court proceedings causes me to say that I am always pleased when a high court clearly states the law, as applied to any of our committee hearings, for much clear statement by the court is needed in this regard.

In Public Law 831 of the 81st Congress in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, Congress declared as follows: section 2—

"As a result of evidence adduced before various committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, there exists a world Communist movement, which, in its origin, its development, and its present practices, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups (governmental and otherwise), espionage, sabotage, terrorism, and any other means deemed necessary to establish a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in the countries throughout the world, through the medium of a worldwide Communist organization."

The Second World Congress of the Communist International, Moscow, July 17–August 7, 1920, adopted resolutions spelling out denial of the right of free speech and of the press when it said—

"Communism repudiates parliamentarianism as the forum of the future—it repudiates the possibility of winning over parliaments; its aim is to destroy parliaments. The work within the parliaments consists chiefly in making revolutionary propaganda from the parliamentary platform."

Who is there who fails to recognize that the resolution adopted in 1920 is still in active force and effect in 1955?

When I was in China, Japan, Italy, England, Spain, and other foreign countries, last, I asked certain intelligence officials whether or not the activities of the Communists in their country were part of well-defined world plans. Their unanimous answer was in the affirmative.

But, in meeting this subversive conspiracy, we must not throw the Bill of Rights out the window. There is no need of doing so. To imitate or copy totalitarian security procedures would be totally disastrous to our American way of life. It would make of the Bill of Rights a corpse instead of keeping it a living force. We must continuously be on the alert lest those who are careless in differentiating between our security needs and our freedoms, under the Bill of Rights, take the easiest path, which does not necessitate noninterference with guaranteed rights. Due process of law must hold preeminence if individual rights and liberties are to be truly preserved as intended by our Bill of Rights. This is essential to make it a living force.

In closing, may I invite you to share with me the proposition that the perpetuity of the Bill of Rights deserves the best of whatever we are in individual patriotic vigilance, vigor, valiant protection of the rights and freedoms of all men, and that by our dedicated lives we increasingly help make our Bill of Rights a greater living force; that this Nation, under God, shall continue to be even a richer blessing to all Americans, everywhere, and in perpetuity.

Small Business Failures Continuing Upward Despite Boom for Big Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the exaggerated claims of universal prosperity, I think it might be sobering for our Republican friends to read today's issue of the Journal of Commerce, which points out that the number of business failures jumped up again in the week ending January 26 for a fourth consecutive time and is now at a postwar peak. Most of these failures, of course, were in the small-business field, and particularly in the retail trade field.

The article follows:

BUSINESS FAILURES

Business failures continued upward to 284 in the week ended January 26 from 269 in the preceding week reported Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. Rising for the fourth consecutive week, the total was considerably higher than a year ago, when 255 failures occurred in 1954 when there were 233.

Although at a postwar peak, failures remained 26 percent below the prewar level of 385 in the comparable week of 1939.

Most of the week's increase centered in retail trade, where failures climbed to 154 from 125. Slight upturns appeared in wholesaling with 30 as against 26, in construction with 33 as against 32, and in commercial services with 20 as against 19.

Manufacturing showed the only decline. Its toll dropped to 47 from 67 a week ago. Fewer concerns failed than last year among manufacturers and wholesalers, but other lines exceeded the 1955 level. The most notable upswing from a year ago took place in retailing.

The White House Comments on the Livestock Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, the entire Iowa delegation in the Congress met with the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, on Monday morning, January 9, 1956, for the purpose of discussing the distress of livestock producers.

On Monday morning, January 23, 1956, the entire Iowa delegation had a lengthy conference at the White House, which was attended by the President's personal assistants and top officials of the Department of Agriculture. At these meetings, the members of the Iowa delegation had opportunity to express their views and to make suggestions for alleviating the acute situation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from the White House which was addressed to me under date of January 27:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 27, 1956.

The Honorable HENRY O. TALLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TALLE: This letter follows up the visit we had with your delegation last Monday in regard to the current livestock situation.

As you well know, the most important factor causing the sharp decline in hog prices in recent months has been the large supply of hogs marketed. Marketings during the past 2 or 3 months were at record or near-record levels. Moreover, this is the first time on record that the hog and cattle numbers cycles have both crested together. As a result of these supply conditions, prices have felt the impact.

To provide assistance to hog producers, the Secretary of Agriculture promptly took a number of actions. Early in the season the Secretary called in a group to advise as to the actions which the Government should take in the light of the developing hog situation. He has attempted faithfully to carry out those recommendations. A pork- and lard-purchase program has been undertaken as a surplus removal operation to help strengthen prices to hog producers. The purchase program has utilized the kinds of pork products for which there are definite outlets. Through January 21, the Department had purchased a total of 95 million pounds of pork products, at a cost of approximately $41 million. Additional purchases are continuing at weekly intervals to fill maximum needs.

The Department of Agriculture also has been cooperating closely with the hog producers and the meat industry in an intensive pork-promotion program. This widespread promotional effort has provided great assistance in moving the near-record pork output readily into consumption and thereby has been of considerable benefit to the hog industry. The Department has also pointed out to producers the advantages of marketing their hogs at lighter weights in order to reduce the supply and produce a more acceptable product for consumers. Also, the meat industry has been encouraged to adopt improved processing practices and to reflect higher prices to producers for the higher-quality hogs. The industry, in turn, has adopted closer trimming of fat from pork cuts to encourage pork consumption.

The pig-crop report issued by the Department of Agriculture on December 22 indicated that hog producers planned to make a 2-percent downward adjustment in their production of 1956 spring pigs. Marketings of sows and gilts in recent weeks indicate that an even greater reduction might be made. A smaller spring pig crop would, of course, mean improved hog prices next summer, and particularly in the fall, when hog prices usually decline seasonally.

We have been encouraged by the recent substantial improvement in hog prices. There has been an advance in hog prices of more than $2 per hundred pounds in a week. If marketings continue at the currently reduced rate further price improvement in the near future seems likely.

We have received many suggestions from people throughout the country on means of providing assistance to hog producers. These proposals range all the way from completely controlling production, marketing, and prices, to the diametrically opposite view of maintaining a completely hands off policy in the situation.

Some people, as you know, have requested that the administration institute a program of buying live hogs from producers in order to support hog prices. I believe you recognize the difficulties that would have to be successfully dealt with in undertaking a live-hog purchase program, including caring for the animals, and having them slaughtered and the products processed. You can easily imagine the kind of problem that would be encountered in disposing of all of the products which would be produced. It is clear, too, that any such plan would require an effective production control as a corollary.

Other proposals have included supporting hog prices at specific levels, but without suggesting a practical means of doing it. In order to do this the Government would have to devise ways and means of buying any and all hogs or equivalent products which could not be sold in the market at above-support levels.

On the other hand, we have received a large number of communications from people requesting that there be no direct price supports on hogs. Many of these came from farmers and farm leaders who honestly feel that the swine industry would be badly served by such an approach.

As the President stated in his special message on agriculture, the administration is stepping up its hog-purchase program by developing new outlets for pork products. This was one of the proposals presented by your group, and action on it is proceeding vigorously. Certain other proposals which you presented in our conference will be fully explored on January 31 by Secretary Benson at a meeting with the National Swine Industry Committee in Chicago. The Secretary has called this special meeting to discuss with that group what additional steps should be taken to alleviate the current hog situation.

As regards the emphasis placed by several members of your group on the credit needs of farmers, and especially young veterans, I can report to you that a careful canvass is being made of that situation. The Secretary is determined that these needs be promptly and fully met. Yesterday, for example, the Farmers' Home Administration allocated $1 million extra to Iowa for production and subsistence loans.

Our discussion the other morning with you and your associates was very valuable, and we deeply appreciate your taking the time to meet with us. I am certain that much good will come of that meeting for the benefit of the hog and cattle producers of this country. We genuinely seek, as you do, to carry out the most constructive program we can

devise in the interest of producers, both in the short run and over the longer time plan.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

SHERMAN ADAMS,
Assistant to the President.

Detroit Slowdown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the news has traveled far when it reaches the front page of the Wall Street Journal. On the morning of January 30 there appeared in the aforementioned paper an article entitled "Detroit Slowdown." It would behoove everyone to read this story, for it carries an ominous message.

We have heard a great deal recently about the high level of prosperity throughout the country. Mr. Speaker, Detroit has always been a barometer, an indicator of the Nation's economic progress. The facts brought out in the Journal's columns show that conditions are not good, and the effect is being felt in the country's No. 1 industry. It might well be said that as Detroit goes, so goes the Nation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD the forceful article "Detroit Slowdown":

DETROIT SLOWDOWN—AUTO WORKERS PUT OFF BUYING CARS, TV SETS AS OVERTIME VANISHES—CHINESE LAUNDRY GETS FEWER SHIRTS; MARS FURNITURE'S SALES DOWN TO 10 PERCENT FROM 1955—A "DINGER" SAVES HIS CASH

(By John D. Williams)

DETROIT.—Mayhoup Mithar, a Ford worker who hails from far-off Yemen, a tiny land on the Red Sea, is sending less money home.

Through most of last year heavy overtime pushed up his Ford wages to $100 a week. The folks back home got from $25 to $37 weekly. Since mid-December he's been on straight time at $80 a week and his family now gets from $12.50 to $25 weekly.

Saleh A. Mohamed, another Yemenite who somehow wound up here in the auto capital, still is sending $40 a week to his family. But he has cut down on his spending. "I buy 6 cans beer a week now," says Saleh. "Before I drink sometime 12 cans."

BUDGET SQUEEZE

The auto industry's sharp cuts in overtime just before Christmas are squeezing the budgets of many auto workers. With spending plans geared to high overtime pay, they're now putting off purchases of homes, cars, television sets, major appliances, furniture, carpeting, and dozens of other items. Some are slowing down payments on 1955 purchases. Many retail shops here report a sharp slump in sales.

Alex Work Supplies, a small store about a half block from the Chrysler division assembly plant on East Jefferson Street, is taking in $65 a week now, compared with $80 when Chrysler was working overtime. The owner, who sells such diverse items as work gloves and sandwiches, says: "The fellow who used to drop in for a sandwich and coffee now just takes coffee."

"Our customers are talking this way now—'I like that, but I want to see what will happen at the plant first,'" says an executive of Mars Furniture Store, where 80 percent of the customers are auto workers. He says sales this month are down 40 percent from December's Christmas levels and 10 percent from January 1955.

Banks and finance companies are braced for a rise in delinquencies. "We are turning down twice as many credit requests as a year ago," says an official of a big concern handling retail appliance credit. "The number of requests is about the same as last January." Despite such caution, the company says delinquent accounts now amount to about 4 percent of total outstanding credit, compared with 3 percent to 3½ percent in January 1955.

THIRTY-HOUR WEEKS?

"We're looking for some increase in delinquencies and are trying to be prepared for it," says a credit official at one of Detroit's biggest banks. He adds an ominous prediction: "These auto fellows may have to adjust themselves to 30-hour weeks before it's over."

There's a chance, as the banker suggests, that things may get worse before they get better. As of last week, the industry still was rolling out cars at an annual rate of 7.3 million, well above the most optimistic industry forecasts for the full year. Much more serious than loss of overtime, of course, is the possibility of a further rise in auto industry unemployment. The jobless total in the auto-oriented Detroit area has risen from 52,000 in mid-1955 to an estimated 70,000 now. Much of this rise is due, directly or indirectly, to auto output cutbacks.

The significance of the auto cutbacks extends far beyond Detroit. Ford division alone has 15 assembly plants, from Mahwah, N. J., to San Jose, Calif. Chevrolet has 11 assembly plants around the United States. Parts makers and other suppliers dot the Nation.

Even those Detroit retailers who so far have noted no sag in sales are worried about the future. "Since our welfare is keyed to the health, employment, and pay envelopes of the auto industry, the cut in overtime could have no other effect than a bad one," says an official of a big downtown department store.

BIGGEST READJUSTMENTS

Perhaps the biggest budget readjustments are being made by employees of Ford Motor Co., which for the past 2 years has used overtime more extensively than any other auto maker.

A Wall Street Journal reporter a few days ago dropped in at the United Auto Workers Local 600 union hall, where dozens of Ford workers were lined up to get help with income tax returns (minimum fee: 50 cents for the short form and $1.25 for the long form). Chats with the workers and their wives turned up ample evidence of scaled-down buying plans.

"I think we'll hold off a while on the new furniture we planned to buy," said the wife of a paint department worker whose present $83 a week compares with a 1955 high of $160. "We're spending all we make now, while before we could save $50 a month."

Loss of overtime forced another Ford worker to refinance his car, reducing monthly payments from $100 to $56.

Top weekly take-home pay of a Ford tool shop employee last year was $135. Now he's getting $80. He had big buying plans before the cutback: A $2,000 addition to his $10,000 house (monthly payment: $65) to make room for an expected third child; a $200 TV set to replace a 1951 model; $400 worth of living room furniture; and a new Ford to replace his 1954 model. Said he: "Of course, everything is going to have to wait now."

SAVING FOR A HOUSE

"We had been saving as much as $55 a week toward a small house we hoped to buy," recalled a Ford paint spraygun operator, whose pay has slipped from $120 a week to $85. He's not sure now they'll go through with their home-buying plans.

Across the street from the union hall—within view of the towering smokestacks of Ford's giant River Rouge plant—there's a long row of bars, cafes, shoe stores, groceries, drug stores, card parlors and pool halls. With a few exceptions these small-business men report business is slower.

The Chinese laundry is ironing 33 percent fewer shirts than a month ago. Sales at the Wolverine Cleaners this month are down 10 percent from December. The Hide-Away Bar finds a bright note: "It's slow during the week but week-ends are busier because they're not all working Saturdays now."

The friendly, elderly proprietor of a shoe store offers these economic indicators: In the week ended January 20 his shoe repair volume was $43.55, up 25 percent from the like week of December. But his new shoe sales dropped to $191.24, down 25 percent from December.

Chrysler workers had experienced less overtime than Ford employees. But its elimination brings budget problems, nonetheless. Seated on a bench near the assembly line at lunch time, one worker at Chrysler Division's assembly plant here talks about his finances. "I figure I have to take home $70 a week to keep from going into the hole," he says. His check now runs about $72 a week. Last year he averaged $85 a week—his best earnings ever. With 6 children he has to watch his spending closely. He picks up odd jobs when he can, driving a beer truck and pumping gas.

PLENTY OF WANTS

He has plenty of wants—his De Soto is 6 years old, his TV set dates from 1953, and his major appliances are about 8 years old. But without overtime he sees no way to replace them.

Down the assembly line is a man whose job it is to polish and touch up gleaming new Chryslers. Unmarried, he supports his father. He'd like to spend $175 on a fresh coat of paint for his house and a tree for the front lawn. But he's putting it off. When he was taking home $110 weekly last fall he used to go out four times a week. Down $58 a week now, he stays home all but 2 nights a week.

Based on their current take-home pay, some of the workers probably could spend a good deal more than they do. But they're worried about the future. The Chrysler workers talk more of the prospect of short workweeks than of the overtime pay they've already lost.

Take the "ding" man, for example. He's been working at Chrysler 30 years and has been "dinging" for 25. (A "dinger" takes out small car dents, incurred during assembly, without spoiling the paint finish.) Says he: "We need new carpeting in the living room and the dining room. I'll buy it if I see things pick up late in the summer. But I don't like to take money out of the bank." He has $6,500 there.

TV SET, STORM SASH

For 3 months of 1955 he worked 7 days a week and drew up to $190 a week before taxes. During that period he bought a new TV set and put $940 into new screens, storm sash and a garage door. Now that his pretax weekly pay is down to $79, he's putting off trading in his 1953 Dodge on a new car.

Down the street two blocks from the Chrysler plant is the Jefferson Army Store. Its manager reports: "November was a beautiful month for us, but sales started falling off 3 weeks before Christmas and are now 25 percent below a month ago." He notes an increased customer tendency to shop for lowest prices.

Also near the plant is a Worth Clothes store, devoid of customers despite a big sign

out front: "Going out of business sale—40 percent to 60 percent off." A spokesman says Worth is closing its 4 Detroit stores and points to 2 newly vacated shops in the same block, both of which bear big "for rent" signs.

At the Chevrolet plant at Flint, Mich., a worker admits to busy buying during 1955, when overtime pushed up his weekly take-home pay to about $100. He bought a TV set, an automatic washer, a drier and home insulation. His debts on these items still total about $1,000. What's he to do now that his take-home pay is down to about $55 a week? "Our essentials will come first, even if it means repossessions on some of the things I bought," he says.

NO MORE BOND BUYING

This Chevrolet worker still has $200 worth of United States savings bonds. But he cashed 2 bonds 2 weeks ago to pay his car insurance bill and last week he stopped buying bonds through payroll deductions.

A Pontiac machine operator at Pontiac, Mich., likely will put off trading in his 1948 Pontiac for a used 1954 model and has definitely abandoned plans to buy a television set, although he has $800 in savings. Last June he was working 60 hours a week and pulling down $155 weekly. Now that he's down to $91 a week, he's cutting down on entertainment: "Me and my wife don't go out as much any more."

Due partly to overtime, Ford's total payroll last year shot up to a record $1,117,000,000, compared with $962 million in 1954 and with the previous high of $988 million in 1953. Its hourly workers averaged 44.2 hours a week, with some employees on the job as much as 60 hours a week. That compares with an average of 41.5 hours in 1954 and with 42 hours in 1953.

General Motors' 398,000 wage earners worked more hours last year than in any previous year. Final figures for 1955 aren't available yet, but for the first half of the year the average was 43.5 hours a week, up from 40.1 in 1954 and from 41.9 in 1953.

Three Wishes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently ran across, read, and was deeply moved by a poem by Nick Kenny that I think worth reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Its author is a New Yorker who has made an outstanding reputation for himself as a journalist.

As a member of the staff of the metropolitan newspaper, the New York Mirror, and as columnist and feature writer, he has endeared himself to millions of readers.

Moreover, Mr. Kenny, skillful as have been his journalistic achievements, has done more; he has given innumerable indications of his concern for the human needs of the people of his city and country, and has associated himself with many causes that serve the public welfare. As a newspaperman, as radio and TV personality, as popular poet, and, above all, as a man, he has left and is leaving his mark on millions of his fellow Americans.

The poem follows:

THREE WISHES

I wish I had a telescope
To scan the starry skies
But, since I have no telescope,
I'm glad I have two eyes.

I wish I had a kitchen run
By push-button commands
But, while that kitchen's still a dream,
I'm glad I have two hands.

I wish I had a super car
To give my friends a treat
But, till that new car comes along,
I'm glad I have two feet.

Two eyes to look to God above,
Two hands to clasp in prayer,
Two feet to carry me to church,
Why, I'm a millionaire!

—*Nick Kenny.*

Now Let Us Hear From the Automobile Owner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks now congressional committees have been hearing from automobile manufacturers and dealers. Each group has been telling how good they were and the faults of the other.

There is a third side to this story: that of the consuming public.

Following is an item I received unsolicited, which is the consumers' story. I am afraid it is all too typical. Incidentally, it confirms one phase of my testimony before a committee of the other body. The item follows:

YOU ARE HELPING TO SEND TENS OF THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS TO THEIR DEATHS EVERY YEAR BY FAILING TO PUT A STOP TO THE FLAGRANT ABUSE OF THE CONSUMER BY THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Abuse through—

1. Cars with engines designed for constantly increasing power "to meet competition"—in spite of the fact that the cars' chassis, the cars' safety elements, our public highways, and the maturity of our drivers are not necessarily able to handle this power safely.

2. Cars assembled so rapidly as to breed possible carelessness. (Buick was producing 67 an hour, when I went through the plant in August.)

3. Frequent dishonesty in servicing, with the average consumer unable to know what has to be done or, after he gets the bill, what was done.

4. Making excuses for defects to customers, often as if they were imagined by the new car owner, instead of admitting them and either correcting them properly or seeing to it that the customer gets a corrected car either this year or adequate adjustment when such corrections had been made.

5. Refusal to accept responsibility for a defective product, forcing customer either to accept it or to buy a new one.

6. Lack of any definite pattern in costs to the automobile owner in servicing, parts or gasoline products, with many of these products overpriced, especially by dealers and in tourist areas.

7. Constantly increasing prices for cars with constantly decreasing quality in workmanship, while the companies boast constantly increasing net profits.

8. Dealer policies that result in the cheapest kind of bargaining tactics to sell cars, with the customer never knowing exactly what he is paying, and for what.

The following is a record of servicing required by my 1955 Buick super convertible (cost, $4,086.29):

The first 6 months of servicing is one small evidence of the foregoing.

Please note that many of the "subsequent servicings" reported below were necessitated by careless, inefficient dealer servicing originally. * * * And almost all of the original dealer servicing would not have been necessary if the factory had produced the proper, efficient engineering and workmanship for which the customer pays so highly when purchasing a car.

Picked up car March 11, 1955. Back plastic window had flaw in it. Was replaced.

Trunk flooring torn and sloppy. Replaced, but in process floor greased up and stained.

Left door hanging 1 inch off frame—both doors rattling and banging against locks; when car 10 days old left door jammed and could not be opened. Serviced March 22, March 24, April 11, April 28, May 2, June 1, June 21, July 5, September 27. Apparently, because of body shake and poor engineering originally, these doors always will rattle and bang—and periodically the left door will shimmy out of position so badly that it will jam. It wasn't until fifth servicing that left door was hung flush with dash. Then I was advised that lock had been welded into wrong place. Rattling continued. When Buick servicemen unjammed left door on March 22, they sprung it. When they righted this on March 24 they broke the inside trim. There also is a dent under lock outside. Car had two different locks on doors when new. This was corrected and new striker plates were installed April 28 and again June 21, but chucking noise did not disappear. Body shake of car, caused by only slightly bumpy roads, jiggled doors out of position during summer months until noise became unbearable and left door became more and more difficult to open. I advised Buick that left door was on its way to jamming again. Their eastern service manager insisted nothing was wrong. On September 20 it jammed shut again. They opened it, but door continues to bang around in its frame causing irritating noise that interferes with driver's control of car. Right door also rattles and bangs, but eastern service manager refused to do anything about it when he had the car in New York for going over, because "we might damage something else in trying to reposition this door." In spite of above servicing, I am left with a noisy, unsafe car in spite of original investment of over $4,000 for what should have been a well-engineered, carefully, and accurately assembled car.

Carburetor needed adjustment March 22. Constant thudding noise; low gas mileage. Serviced April 2, 11, 28, June 1. After first adjustment car stalled. Buick man readjusted and cut off all air so had to stop on road for another readjustment same day (April 2). Gas mileage still poor—do well when we average 13 miles per gallon.

Speedometer cable needed readjustment March 22. Serviced April 11. Buick admitted this defect in 1955 Supers. Failed to repair first time. Now O. K.

Top leaked at left side. Serviced March 22 and September 20. Still leaks. Also air pours through the top.

Air coming through vents March 22. Air still is objectionable unless heat is on.

Discovered through skidding noise under car when it stopped or slowed that motor that runs the top was loose. Serviced March 22. Now okay.

Reverse gear caused car to hop March 22. Repaired.

Left front tire fell apart at seam. Had reported "feel steady thump as if tire was bad" on March 22. They could find nothing.

On June 3, after 3 days in Buick shop when the factory representative was supposed to see what he could do to improve ride, a customer, watching as they started to drive out the car for delivery to me, discovered a 5-inch gash in front left tire; it had fallen apart at seams after only 3,000 miles of driving. (Not one of the many men who worked on the car spotted it, although front end was supposed to have been checked.) US Royal (a subsidiary of General Motors) agent insisted that I pay $5 for mileage used, although they admitted it was defective, and although tire was still on warranty, according to Buick. Buick paid when I refused to. Bouncing noise continued in right rear tire which Buick replaced July 9–16. Bad front end of the car wore down these brand new tires which I had put in front in less than 3,000 miles.

Right rear window failed to close; wires were so badly taped, according to Buick dealer who serviced that they short-circuited. Serviced April 4, 11, and 28. Wires were repaired by District of Columbia dealer, but upholstery was not properly restored. It took two follow-up servicings by my own dealer to get it right. Now O. K.

Boot that covers top was improperly designed so that it took three men to snap it on. Serviced April 3 and July 9. Buick sent new boot from factory, same size, but they sent snaps separately for dealer to install on outer rim. Boot still too tight; seams are ripping open.

Left visor was sprung. Rattled and fell into line of vision. Serviced April 11, April 28, and July 9. It's now sprung again.

Front floor carpeting not laid properly; ended below front seat, underlining exposed. Serviced April 11 and July 9. Was relaid first time, but it blew up when the top was down. Reinstated. Now O. K.

Reported oil leak—either from engine or Dynaflow, or both. Serviced April 28, August 22, and September 8. On August 22, when oil was changed at service station, was advised that there was no gasket in engine oil equipment—then they found it. Also on August 22 a Buick serviceman informed me, when I needed a quart of Dynaflow oil after only 6,000 miles that they "all leak." In Flint, Mich., the Buick plant, when I complained that I had needed 2 quarts of engine oil in the last 1,000 miles, they said they were instructed to tell customers that "that's normal for a Buick." When I returned to my own independent serviceman at end of a trip on September 8, he discovered that the gasket in engine oil drain was faulty (Buick dealer admitted "we have had some of those") and the Dynaflow still was leaking. Buick repaired Dynaflow.

Talked to factory representative on May 20 after returning from trip on New York State Thruway in wind when car was impossible to handle, and rattles were unbearable. He asked to go over car himself the next week or so. We made date for June 1 after my frequent calls to pin him down.

On June 1 factory representative supervised checking of car. He said front end needed correction, and wheels were alined. He also tightened power steering wheel to degree where it was hard to handle. I later was advised that this could damage steering gear over period of time. Front end continues to be weak and car still is difficult to handle. Car has had front-end correction and wheel alinement and balancing 4 times in 13,000 miles.

As result of my advising the president of GM that my unanswered letters to him would be left with my insurance papers and that my family were being instructed to sue GM to the hilt if I should lose my life in this unsafe car, the eastern service manager for Buick flew up to see me on June 21. He drove car and insisted it was normal. He did admit a strange noise from rear left tire * * * admitted to chucking of left door against lock * * * and he did suggest that either I bring the car to New York for the Fisher Body man to go over under his supervision, or he would send the man up here to go over it. I chose New York in order for the manager to supervise, hoping this would result in more positive results than in the past. Later was advised that it was against GM policy to reimburse me for the train fare involved in so doing. It was at his instruction that two new striker plates were installed on the doors.

Following is his list of repairs (on a car still new and already serviced as this record indicates so far): Left rear tire was replaced. Front floor carpeting reinstalled. Right quarter drain hole was opened (this had been neglected at factory). Left vent window spring was repositioned. Top boot cover was restitched. Left visor again was realigned. Both door garnish mouldings were reset but the manager telephoned me to say that he would not reposition the right door (which I complained was chucking, rattling, and obviously out of position) because they "might damage something else." He also told me during this call that my complaint of overheating was unjustified—these motors "run hot." Dealer later found that thermostat was defective. Fan belt and power steering belt were replaced.

Brought car to dealer on July 25 to be put in completely safe condition for cross-country trip. Pointed out that motor was running hot, and car pulled to right, especially when brakes were applied. (Note that this was less than 10 days after car was gone over in New York City Eastern Service Division shop.) I also had them put two new tires on front.

Dealer discovered that thermostat was defective.

When I got car on road, found pulling had not been eliminated. Car war almost impossible to handle on road from here to California, and in San Diego (August 15) brought it in to an oldtime wheel alignment specialist who reported the front end to be extremely loose. He corrected this, balanced wheels and changed the cam and caster.

When I returned to tell him car handled better, but still pulled when I applied the brake, he advised that there must be grease on the brake lining. (See story on this after I got home.)

A serviceman who lubricated car (August 8) discovered inner tread of each front tire was worn from defective front end (less than 3,000 miles after brandnew tires were put on front), with compensating wear on rear. He also showed me a drawer full of Buick transmission differential plugs he had to keep on hand because they regularly broke off when he opened them.

Stopped at Buick plant at Flint August 31, where we saw cars coming down assembly line with sprung doors, just as I had complained of in March.

Visited Consumer Service Office, Flint, August 31 to complain of following:

Excessive consumption of engine oil.

Excessive consumption of Dynaflow oil.

Excessive body shake, resulting in loose doors and general noise and discomfort.

Advised that left door was on way to jamming again.

Car scraping bottom on inclines.

Poor handling of the car on the highway.

Young man's comment on use of oil was, "Two quarts per 1,000 miles is normal. We must tell you that, but I wouldn't want it on my car."

Regarding other complaints, he said they would be forwarded to New York City service office (where car already had been serviced.)

Tired of Buick's constant motions without action in correcting faults reported herein, and concerned about continual risk of life entailed by car's poor performance, on September 8 I took car to my own serviceman upon return from coast. He discovered:

Defective rear axle oil seals had leaked so much grease on my brake linings that although right lining could be cleaned, left brake lining had to be replaced.

Defective drain plug gasket had caused leakage of engine oil.

Dynaflow still was leaking.

Tailpipe was hitting against differential as result of body shake.

Because of design of this car, repair of brake linings and rear axle oil seals was an expensive job. This repair bill, including complete servicing was $60, greater than I ever had in the 6 years and 90,000-mile history of my 1949 car (including replacements).

In talk on September 9 with spring man who had corrected the front end of the car, which again was in bad shape as result of 3,000 miles driving over good highways, he advised that in 1 week he had had 3 new Buicks in for change of shock absorbers because of poor performance of those on the Buick.

Brought car to Buick dealer September 12 for repair of Dynaflow leak—also brought along left brake lining to show them. Also to ask for repair of left door which was banging around and about to jam.

Eastern service manager happened to be in that day. He insisted that "there was no trace of grease on the lining." When I picked it up I got grease all over my suit. He also drove the car and assured me that "nothing was wrong with the door."

September 27 left door jammed and could not be opened. Buick dealer opened door. Said car must have been jacked up causing chassis to "spread," thus admitting poor structure of car. Car had only been raised on standard lubrication rack.

Other defects: Body shake caused hood spring to loosen, causing hood to vibrate as you drive. Knobs of heater controls fall off periodically. Car continues to handle badly, and to be uncomfortably noisy as doors shake in their frames.

This car is not "an isolated case" (the term used by General Motors to pass off dealers' reports on customer complaints, and continually used until, according to my own dealer, defective cars reported amount to 3 to 4 percent of sales, a sizable percentage of over a million cars) but is typical of careless engineering in an effort to turn out cars for rapid sales, is indicated by:

The record showing that, while denying the defects verbally and failing to correct them through servicing, General Motors (Buick) picked up the dealer's bills for servicing this car and did some servicing themselves.

Reports from Buick owners and both Buick and independent servicemen whom I met all over the country, plus the Consumer Report on 1955 cars revealing the same problems.

The promotion sent by Buick's main office to all Buick owners, urging wheel switching ever 2,000 to 4,000 miles to prevent tire wear.

Advertisements for the 1956 Buick, claiming new front end geometry, newly balanced chassis, new shock absorbers (although the 1956 cars generally have not been changed basically).

The public is helpless against the literally deadly competition between automobile companies. The reckless pricing and poor quality of auto products and auto servicing. The constantly increasing power of cars. The slowness with which safety factors are being added, and then only as extras. The pack and other price policies that make it impossible for a customer to know what he is buying and for what price.

Isn't it time for Government regulation of the automobile industry?

Miss JANE BARTON,
Albany, N. Y.

(Who has never owned anything but a Buick and had never expected to own anything else.)

Politics Is Not a Dirty Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Yonkers Herald Statesman of October 6, 1955, entitled, "Politics Is Not a Dirty Business":

POLITICS IS NOT A DIRTY BUSINESS

On the testimonial he is listed as the Honorable James A. Farley. He was in his time State chairman and national chairman of the Democratic Party. He was the man who managed the first two campaigns of President F. D. Roosevelt, in whose Cabinet he served for two terms as Postmaster General. And now he is head of a large soft-drink international sales corporation.

But to many who "knew him when," here in Westchester, he is still just plain Jim Farley, from Nyack across the river. Even among Republicans he is accorded the prestige of being one of the smartest politicians of our era. That is why it is worth reviewing his words Monday evening at the testimonial dinner to our new Westchester county judge, George A. Brenner, of Yonkers.

Political ethics, holds Mr. Farley, should be as rigid as the moral code.

"It must be recognized," he told the testimonial diners, "that politics and morality are one and indivisible. * * * Power to do good is the true and lawful end of political inspiration. This power to do good is not to be confused with political zeal, which can be good but which is often mistaken. Politics should bring man ordered progress toward general convenience and usefulness."

Admitting that political power carries with it the responsibility for wise, judicious use, Mr. Farley advised:

"Seek power but love liberty." In acknowledgment of his increasing years, the Democratic Party's elder statesman advised:

"My generation is passing. Maybe we did not handle our problem too well. Maybe we were too tolerant of political transgressors among us. That could be. If so, as a member of an older generation, I would be most remiss if I failed to appeal to young people to take up politics, so that the world may go on to its rendezous with moral destiny.

"We must not shrug off our responsibility by washing our hands of politics as a dirty business. Politics is not a dirty business unless we allow it to become so. It is rather a most serious business which has need of the most high-minded and the most generous-hearted among us.

"Politics should be a joyous dedicated companionship toward advancement of man on earth, just as religion is a glorious companionship toward bringing final, happy fulfillment in eternity. Moral strength must arm the political leaders of the future if we are to keep the country free and by example set the world free."

To those wise words from an experienced man with exceptional political background, we say a hearty "Amen." And particularly we hope the words fall upon receptive ears of our young people. In their hands lies our political future.

Economic Freedom and the Automobile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the Congress and as an automobile dealer, it affords me a great deal of pleasure to commend to the Members of this body for reading, an address by Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Senator from Wyoming. It was delivered yesterday to the annual convention of the National Automobile Dealers Association assembled here in Washington.

This is typically an American statement in that it offers encouragement to small businessmen throughout America who are in the automobile business. Senator O'MAHONEY recognizes the right of an individual under our free enterprise system to choose his destiny without fear of reprisal or undue pressure from the giants of the automobile industry. It calls for a spirit of fairness and equality for these dealers in their contractual relationship with the automobile manufacturers.

The remarks of the Senator are fair and, I feel, indicative of the viewpoints of every franchised new car dealer in this country.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

(Address of Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Wyoming, before the 39th annual National Automobile Dealers Association convention, Sheraton Hall, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.)

Two congressional investigations of 1955 have, without a single line of legislation having been written, already produced some beneficial results in the automobile industry. I know that Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, who headed the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I, who had the honor to be in charge of the work of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, agree that without the cooperation and assistance of NADA and of the automobile dealers of America little could have been done, so I begin by expressing my deep appreciation to this organization and to the thousands of automobile dealers all over this country who wrote me and who responded to the questionnaire sent out under Senator MONRONEY.

The staffs of both of these committees worked diligently and effectively to assemble the information which you presented us, and by the public hearings we were able to place the facts in a written record for all to see. For the first time, in our hearing dealers and manufacturers were enabled to sit around a congressional table in an open hearing and state their views, face to face. Open discussion is good for the soul. It can now be said that signs are already appearing to indicate a better relationship between the factory and the dealer. The pressures which the dealers felt were used by the factories to compel them to distribute at their own loss more cars than the market could soundly absorb are apparently disappearing and there come to the Senate Office Building expressions from men who ought to know that 1956 may see a new spirit of good will.

FACTORY PRESSURES CAUSE BOOTLEGGING

We shall make a mistake, however, if we believe that the problem of factory-dealer relationship can be solved, or that a rule can be developed which without the sanction of law will preserve the economic freedom of local dealers from the power of central management. It is true that bootlegging in the automobile business was generated because the factories were manufacturing more automobiles than the market would absorb, and that the manufacturer, while insisting upon full payment at the factory gate, pushed more cars upon the individual dealer than he could profitably handle. Indeed, the manufacturer could not have been oblivious to the evils that resulted including the operations of the vacant-lot dealer who, without salesroom or repair shop, entered into competition with the distributor holding a formal franchise from the factory.

The inventory of unsold automobiles at the beginning of 1956 is actually greater than it was at the beginning of either 1955 or 1954 and, if the fears of financial failure which so many dealers entertained before the problem was brought to Congress are to be allayed, the relationship between the manufacturer and the dealer must be placed upon a more equitable, sound and bilateral basis than it has heretofore been. The factory in its own interest must work through contented distributors, whose charters of operation cannot be modified by telephone orders, or private tips from factory representatives who, with or without the knowledge of central management, have presumed to tell the dealer what he must do or else.

No one will deny that automobile manufacturers, the six of them that are left, are managed by able, efficient gentlemen who, in man-to-man dealings, follow a high standard. No one can doubt, however, that a system which places all the risk on the distributor while the manufacturer receives cash on the barrelhead is obviously one which in the end would be as bad for the manufacturing corporation as it has proved to be during 1954 and 1955 for the dealer. A system which allows the manufacturer to convey his orders orally and without record establishes an atmosphere of arbitrary power which inevitably breeds not only discontent, but fear, and finally resentment that is bound eventually to explode to the detriment of all concerned.

THE FRANCHISE SHOULD PROTECT DEALERS' INDEPENDENCE

In my opinion there can be no sound and stable relationship established between automobile manufacturers and automobile dealers unless there is an agreement binding upon the manufacturer that whatever suggestions or orders management desires to convey to the dealer shall be in written form.

The dealer by his reports to the manufacturer lays bare his whole financial status. He has no secrets from the central offices of management and he has no security from the desires and plans of central management or its spokesmen so long as they can be transmitted to him without a record upon which the dealer may make his appeal.

In this position, he stands helpless before an appeal to a board made up by management.

The American system of settling disputes among citizens is through an impartial court sworn to do justly by all parties to the dispute. That is why in almost every community throughout the land we see above the courthouse as the symbol of justice, the goddess with the scales in her hand and the

blindfold on her eyes to shut out all impressions that might tempt her to allow the scales to be tipped by anything but the truth.

The lawbooks are full of cases which dealers have lost in their suits against central management because the nature of the sales agreement under which they operated was such that they had signed away their basic rights and had in fact voluntarily made themselves little more than vassals of the manufacturer. Baseball players and even football players, who are bought and sold by their managers like chattels, have nevertheless contracts which are enforceable in the courts, contracts under which both parties have rights and responsibilities. The defect of the automobile franchise is that the manufacturer's right of termination is an instrument by which the car dealers are reduced to a defenseless position. Despite all the protestations of manufacturers that they wish to be fair and just to the dealer, they have contrived by the common form of franchise to put themselves in an impregnable position, while the dealer is at their mercy. When the holder of a 1-year franchise finds himself approaching the renewal date he is in no position to bargain. Even though he may be a dealer who has made large profits during the post war years when the public was ready to buy anything that ran on four wheels, he is nevertheless just as powerless as the poorest dealer in the land when he sits across the renewal table with the spokesmen for the manufacturer.

DEALERS HELPLESS AGAINST GIANT INDUSTRY

This is not the American pattern under which business is carried on at arm's length by equals whose obligations are assumed by mutual consent. It is a new pattern which has been developing in the fields of industry in which individuals find themselves dealing with large corporations by which they are as clearly outclassed as a featherweight would be in the same ring with Marciano.

Sometimes the man on main street engaged in business with his friends and neighbors imagines that he belongs in the same class as the mighty corporations which deal in interstate and foreign commerce. Let us see how completely dissimilar are the individuals who are the local distributors of motorcars and the manufacturers who make them. The local distributor, even when it is a local corporation, is still primarily an organization that is owned and managed by the same persons. That is not the case with automobile makers like General Motors, Ford, and Chrysler. These corporations are owned by thousands or hundreds of thousands of stockholders whose only participation in the handling of the money they paid for their stock is to sign a proxy for the managers. In the case of the General Motors Corp., the owners or stockholders number over half a million and, as shown in the General Motors Handbook of Information, although more than 90 percent of the stockholders are individual persons, no one individual owns as much as 1½ percent of the common shares. These shareholders live in every State and in many foreign countries, and more than 60 percent own 50 shares or less. In the economic state, which General Motors can properly be called, the individual owner sinks to insignificance. But at least he has a vote, while in the new plan just announced by the Ford manufacturing company little people with small sums of money to invest have been invited to buy voteless stock of the Ford corporation so that they do not have the right even to sign a proxy as in the case of General Motors.

GM A PRIVATE ECONOMIC STATE

In General Motors the 50 largest stockholders own 38.9 percent of all the outstanding stock. The 15 largest own 32 percent. Every lawyer and every business expert who is at all familiar with the control of large-scale corporations knows that the group which can control 30 percent of the outstanding stock in any corporation, in which the great majority of the individual stockholders are the owners of only a few shares, are in fact in control of the corporation. These few stockholders are the rulers of an economic state, the geographical extent of which exceeds local, State, and even international boundaries.

General Motors, for example, has plants in 64 American cities and in 18 foreign countries through subsidiaries created under the laws of those countries. It does business in every State of the Union. The raw materials it buys from steel to plastics, wood, glass, fabrics, copper, chrome, and countless other commodities constitute the economic life of many communities in which they are produced and fabricated. General Motors boasts in its Information Handbook that it has 21,166 suppliers, located in every State and ranging in size from small shops with a dozen or so employees to large mass-production companies in the steel, rubber, and chemical industries.

The dictionary of complimentary adjectives does not contain words enough to praise the engineering skill, the manufacturing efficiency, the managerial genius of the men who have built this organization. Its products include the tools of other industries, the household appliances that make housework so easy and comfortable for the modern housewife, tanks and guns, rockets, guided missiles, and ammunition with which to make war, and its financial strength is so great that imagination can scarcely place a boundary on the activities in which it may engage.

Add to its 500,000-plus stockholders, its 600,000-plus employees, the employees of its 21,000 suppliers, and of its 18,000 dealers, you find that the population of this economic state is greater than the population of some of the States and of most of the cities in the United States. Its gross revenues, which in 1955 were approximately $12 billion, are more than one-third of the total gross income of all the farms and ranches of America in the same year. I make this comparison because the farm industry is carried on by individuals for the most part, while the manufacture of automobiles is carried on by huge corporations. In the instance of General Motors, the world's largest manufacturing corporation, its gross revenue amounting to more than one-third of the gross revenue of the entire agriculture industry, illustrates the nature of the problem that this generation must solve if it is to preserve political and economic liberty for the people of the United States, to say nothing of the people of the world.

While the economic status of the farmer is deteriorating that of the great corporations is improving and by means of steadily increasing mergers and combinations they are exercising such control over the whole national economy that the States have lost the power to protect the public interest while the pressure for the expansion of Federal power continues apace. Federal boards and commissions multiply in number and assume more authority over the lives of the people.

Regulation of private activities by Government was never popular and is not popular now. During both World Wars in which this Nation was engaged, when Congress found it necessary to mobilize all our industrial resources to win, it passed laws giving Government the power to regulate prices, to allocate materials, to place restrictions upon many peacetime businesses in order that the terrible business of war could be carried on to a successful conclusion. In every such act Congress provided that the power should end as of a certain date. When victory did not come as speedily as had been hoped, these grants of emergency power were extended, and even now, in the name of defense and in international relations, the Federal Executive asks authority greater than Congress likes to give—witness the request for power during the next 10 years to make commitments for foreign aid.

Only a few days ago the President, in submitting his annual economic report, advocated a study of the problem of restoring the Government's power to regulate the terms of consumer installment credit, saying that "installment credit has repeatedly been tested and found excellent." He went on to say that, "nevertheless, installment credit sometimes accentuates swings in the buying of automobiles, furniture, television sets, and other consumer durables, thereby exposing the rest of the economy to the hazard of widened fluctuations."

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER CHANGING OUR SYSTEM

What I am pointing out is that concentrated economic power has grown so great that it is changing our entire economic system. It is changing the relationship of citizens to one another, the relationship of citizens to corporations, the relationship of corporations to Government, and, above all, the relationship of Federal Government to the States and to the people. Our system is changing before our eyes, but we don't see it.

Government has the responsibility imposed upon it by the Constitution to regulate commerce in time of peace and in time of war, but Congress has always been slow to regulate and rigidly reluctant to impose Government controls over the activities of its citizens. It yields to such grants only in times of emergency when the life of the Nation itself is at stake. In normal times of peace it desires only to exercise its constitutional power of regulation. By regulation we mean only the establishment of those rules under which the citizen may pursue his private life without the intervention of the Government to say what he may or may not do. The American people are instinctively loyal to the Jeffersonian principle "that government is best which governs least."

The members of this organization, however, have learned from their experience in the last few years that government is not the only institution which assumes the power of control. I dare say it was one of the most important events of the 20th century when the automobile dealers of America in 1954 and 1955 became aware of the fact that they as individuals had to submit to the controls of the manufacturers whose products they thought they were selling as free and independent enterprisers. Now they know that though they themselves were the owners of the properties they operated, they were frequently compelled to surrender their own judgment as to what they thought was best for their business affairs by the pressure of factory representatives who bore no responsibility for the orders they gave or for the results that followed.

Lest it be through that I am overemphasizing the General Motors Corp. in this discussion of the concentration of economic power, I want to point out that it has been known to economists and others for almost 50 years that in modern organized business the giant units which have appeared have separated ownership and management and have stepped with controls into the vacuum Congress left by failing to regulate. The stockholders don't manage. They merely furnish the capital. Management is concentrated in a few hands, and a comparatively few such organizations are greater in economic power than many of our States and cities.

Statistics available in the Library of Congress show that there are 25 corporations in the United States whose revenues are larger than those of any State or municipality, except the 5 largest, namely, the city of New York, and the States of Pennsylvania, California, New York, and Ohio. New York City ranks second to the Federal Government

among all the public bodies of this Nation in the amount of revenue it collects. In 1954 our largest city received total revenues amounting to $2,866,000,000. Six corporations, national and in some cases international in scope, collected more money from the people that year than did New York City. They are, in the order of their magnitude, (1) General Motors, (2) Standard Oil Co. (N. J.), (3) American Telephone & Telegraph Co., (4) United States Steel Corp., (5) Sears, Roebuck & Co., and (6) General Electric Co.

The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. collected $2,176,000,000, which is more than the State of Pennsylvania, the largest revenue gatherer of all of the States. Chrysler Corp. collected $2,072,000,000, or more than the State of California, the State of New York, or the State of Ohio, the revenues of which were respectively $2,300,000,000 for California, $1,924,000,000 for New York State, and $1,090,000,000 for Ohio.

"SO WHAT?" TOTALITARIANISM

This is a situation which cannot be waved off with a toss of the head or with the derisive jibe "So what?" We know now that the economic decisions which are reached behind closed doors in the offices of these great economic states reverberate throughout the land and affect business not only in every State, city, and county, but affect likewise whole segments of the population. Our very way of life is being altered and methods of totalitarianism are succeeding the methods of democracy.

National business of the size above indicated cannot be conducted without affecting all interstate and foreign commerce. The Constitution gave to Congress the power and the duty to regulate such commerce in the public interest. If that constitutional authority is not exercised so as to preserve our economic freedom, political freedom itself will be in danger. We cannot afford to close our eyes to the cold war which envelops the world for it is an economic war. There are two contrary principles involved in this conflict. One is the principle of Soviet Russia that the dictators of the proletariat shall tell all the people of the world what they can or cannot do, both economically and politically. The other principle is the one which we have inherited from the framers of the American Constitution, namely, that no individual, no dictator, no group, no class can govern this land, either politically or economically, according to its own will. To the latter principle all Americans still adhere.

If we wish this principle to prevail, then we must quickly get about the task of providing through the Federal Government the rules—not the controls—under which our economic system shall work, the laws to guide business, not the discretionary boards to control it.

THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY HAS LEARNED THE FACTS OF LIFE

The automobile dealer has learned the economic facts of life the hard way. Management in the automobile industry has likewise seen the writing on the wall and seems ready to make adjustments. To be just, however, these adjustments must have the force and effect of law. They should be adjustments of freedom, not mere adjustments of control. They must be adjustments that will clearly define powers, duties, and responsibilities. If that be done, we in America can show all the peoples of the world that dictatorship of any kind need not be tolerated because social justice can be achieved by the people themselves.

There are certain steps which it seems to me should be taken immediately. I shall not here discuss proposals which the Committee on Antitrust and Monopoly have before it covering the larger field, but I do not hesitate to express the first step which I feel should be taken by which the automobile industry can lead the way on the road back to economic liberty.

LET'S WRITE A CONTRACT ENFORCEABLE IN THE COURTS

The first step would be the negotiation of a sales contract between automobile manufacturers and dealers carrying provisions of mutual responsibility and enforceable in the courts.

Such a contract should eliminate completely all oral orders or suggestions to the dealers by factory spokesmen with the threat of force.

Such a contract might well be flexible enough to protect the dealer and the factory in years of high or low public demand, of high or low production. It might be feasible, for example, that the allotment of cars to distributors for sale could be made annually by mutual consent upon the historic basis of public demand with a provision for a bonus of extra cars for the distributor with a good record in an area of high demand, and a provision to the effect that in times of high inventory and difficult sales the factory bear a part of the loss resulting from over production.

If dealer councils are necessary to maintain a sound basis of mutuality between the factory and the dealer, then both the manufacturer and the dealer should have an equal hand in selecting the persons to sit upon the councils. The dealers should have the right to organize in their respective regional areas and elect the members who are to represent them on such industry councils.

The pattern of procedure should be established by Federal law so that it would have a permanent status, and not be subject to fluctuation with the changes of managers.

This should be a rule of order ratified by the national Congress, and it would point out to every other industry how a self-governing economic system could be established, abolishing arbitrary powers for either management or Government, but establishing under written contracts mutual rights to which all parties concerned could appeal in case of disputes to the judicial system established by the Federal Constitution.

Grand Opportunities in Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Grand Opportunity," appearing in the Boston Post of Sunday, January 29, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAND OPPORTUNITY

Deputy Prime Minister William Norton of Ireland, who visits Boston this weekend, is a refreshing change as a visiting statesman. He asks for no handouts, no charity, no loans. Instead he offers American industries a chance to make some money in Ireland by taking up free land, hiring plentiful labor, accept cash grants and tax concessions.

Whether this highly individualistic approach to relations with a nation long friendly and intimately entwined in Irish-American cultural sympathies will work out is in the lap of the future.

But, here is an opportunity for many well-to-do Americans of Irish ancestry and sympathy to really do something for the Old Sod. They have long praised it, celebrated its glories on St. Patrick's Day, and wept over its tribulations. Here is a practical way to offer some substantial testimony of their sincerity.

Eire has done a magnificent job of hauling itself up by the bootstraps. The air age opened a gateway to Ireland of immense importance. The merits of a great people are obvious. Their needs are plain. It's about time to stop crying into the beer about the Old Sod and do something about it.

Does Greater Boston Suffer From Hardening of the Arteries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following radio address I delivered over station WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Saturday, January 21, 1956:

DOES GREATER BOSTON SUFFER FROM HARDENING OF THE ARTERIES?

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, greetings. What happens to Boston, the nerve center of New England, is not only of importance to people living in the city and in the metropolitan area, but has an effect on everyone who visits Boston to shop or to transact business.

Boston is an old city, that must adjust itself to many new and compelling circumstances.

Realizing this need, and in an effort to focus attention on the most urgent problems so that solutions may be forthcoming, Boston College has sponsored a series of seminars to explore the economic, fiscal, and political problems of this key city.

Public officials, leading merchants, professional men, and citizens contributed their valuable comments on all aspects of the situation.

I cannot possibly cover or do justice to all factors in this brief broadcast. So, I am taking the liberty of selecting some of the highlights that will be of interest to the average citizen.

Any diagnosis of Boston would have to include a recognition of the need for regional planning and the seriousness of Boston's financial problem.

Because I do not have the time to report what the conference of last year had to say on these vital issues I have decided to bypass them in my remarks and dwell instead on some aspects of the transportation problem. For the motor age is exerting the greatest impact on our cities.

Mr. P. A. O'Connell, general chairman of the second annual conference, presented some revealing facts on the parking problem.

He stated that "parking is absolutely necessary if we are to attract people to trade and do business in Boston."

He stressed the fact that suburban cities and towns are taking a substantial amount of business away, because people cannot find a place to park in the traffic jungle of Boston.

Christmas retail trade, nationwide, was the largest in history. Yet a recent report tells us that trade in Boston, during December of 1955, was less than the corresponding period in 1954. The colder-than-average weather

of last December, plus the press of all-day parkers in the center of Boston, were given as reasons for the failure of trade to keep up with the national average.

It was almost 10 years ago that the State legislature gave Boston permission to arrange with private parties for the construction and operation of a garage under Boston Common, in an effort to meet parking demands. At long last the project appears to be shifting into first gear, but in the meantime, the congestion has become much worse.

In the center of Boston, there are 50 million square feet of general business accommodations. Office space accounts for 48 percent of this total; retail facilities 29 percent; manufacturing space 18 percent. Three hundred and fifty thousand people a day use these accommodations. One hundred and fifty thousand come by passenger cars. As of last May there were about 21,500 parking spaces in the downtown business district, of which 15,700 were off-street, and 5,800 on-street. Unless a tremendous effort is made, thousands of cars carrying potential customers will never find room to stop in the business district. Their only alternative is to stay out of Boston.

By contrast, the city of Washington, D. C., with a population about the same as Boston, has parking facilities for 27,000 cars in an area much smaller than Boston's. The Washington Board of Trade cooperates by printing and distributing maps showing where the parking spaces are located for the convenience of shoppers. In the midtown area alone there are 170 off-street parking places.

Failure to provide accommodations for the automobile is costing downtown merchants in Boston, not only a lot of customers, but also a considerable real estate investment.

Other cities, as Mr. O'Connell pointed out, are desperately trying to catch up with the automobile age as they finally realize that major adjustments are necessary. One of them is the sprawling community of Los Angeles. In 1919, the downtown area did 74 percent of the business of Los Angeles County. By 1950, it had dropped to 35 percent, and in 1954, to 29 percent. Dallas, Tex., has had the same experience. Retail sales in downtown Dallas, through 1947 to 1953, stayed at $170 million, while total retail sales for the metropolitan area rose from $226 million to $837 million, or a gain of $611 million. Downtown marked time while the outskirts picked up all the new business.

In 1929, Harvard College paid $510,000 for the property located at 161 Tremont St., in Boston. In 1954, it was sold for $80,000, or less than one-sixth of its original cost. In 1924, Harvard paid $612,000 for the property at 165–6 Tremont Street. In 1954, it was sold for $100,000. These deteriorating values are tied up with the fact that, when business leaves downtown in order to reach the customers who cannot, or will not, brave the battle for parking space, it seldom if ever returns.

Municipal off-street parking is good business. It helps the city government, the taxpayers, industrialists, merchants, customers, and citizens.

The United States Chamber of Commerce figures that each new off-street parking space generates about $20,000 in retail sales and creates new jobs.

With each passing day, there are more cars on the streets.

It is imperative that we provide more space for them, both at rest, and in motion, if downtown business is to survive.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts with great courage and realism, is building great arteries to free the circulation of motorcars upon which the economic life of Boston depends.

The modernization of highways, which is the largest program of the State government, bears witness to the need of providing room for the vast number of people who are transported by automobiles.

In this connection, I want to speak of a new public instrumentality that has been developed to meet the situation.

It is the toll-financing method.

By it, the legislature authorizes the creation of a revenue authority, that is able to build certain facilities with greater speed, and at less cost, than they can be built as a purely public undertaking.

The first one, and it is highly successful, is the Mystic River Bridge Authority.

It built—and it operates—the great double-deck bridge that links Boston with Chelsea and the north shore.

Ephraim A. Brest, chairman of the authority, testified concerning the problem, and how it was conquered.

For nearly half a century there had been proposals to replace the old drawbridge, but they were chilled by estimates of cost, and by lack of funds.

Finally, when draw openings had mounted to more than 7,000 a year, creating a bottleneck of not only vehicular traffic, but waterborne traffic as well, the long-deferred job had to be done.

The Mystic River Bridge Authority was organized, and it went to work. The bridge was completed in less than 23 months.

It was a model of efficiency during construction.

And it is operating in the black.

At no stage was it hampered by the bureaucratic redtape which hampers even the best of State officials. For example, the authority had to relocate 700 families to make way for the structure. There were many understandable protests that might have delayed and even defeated the project if it were beholden to political pressures. In the public interest, the families had to be relocated, but the authority was sympathetic and cooperative. Arrangements were made for the moving of 54 two-decker and three-decker houses in Chelsea, to a new location 2 miles away. In the movement, the tenants were not forced to leave their homes for even one night, because temporary utilities were provided for them.

Boston could well use similar authorities.

The consolidation of several vehicular facilities with the airport, and the port of Boston under one revenue bond authority, the combined responsibility to be self-sustaining, would help to solve another Boston problem.

The mystic River high-level bridge was built, and is operated, without cost to the Commonwealth or the cities that are joined by it. Not one penny of Federal funds is involved.

Another element of transportation that is directly tied in with the automobile, is Logan International Airport in East Boston. Potentially, because it is nearest to Europe, and because of its size, it could be the finest in the world.

It has the longest commercial runway in the United States. In 1954, it handled more than 5 milion pounds of mail; more than 7 million pounds of express, and 25 million pounds of freight. It was an air terminal for one and one-half million passengers.

Arthur D. Cronin, former member of the State Airport Management Board, reiterated the fact that commercial airports have just scratched the surface of their revenue potential. This does not refer to the revenue that comes directly to an airport from rentals, leases, and fees from the airlines themselves. He emphasized the much greater revenue that could be built up from nonaviation revenue * * * from restaurants, parking concessions, sightseeing facilities, observation decks, etc.

In 1954, the observation roof at the Newark Airport took in paid admissions of more than $350,000, while the airport restaurant grossed more than a million dollars.

In the same year, and although it was handling more passengers, Logan produced less than one-half in one category, and less than 10 percent in the other category.

The reason?

According to Mr. Cronin, this was due to the lack of an adequate terminal building at Logan despite repeated requests to the legislature for appropriations for such a building, and even though the need was recognized and plans were drawn and accepted for such a building as far back as 1945.

Again, we come up against the problem of parking.

There is plenty of land available for parking on the 2,200 acres, but there were facilities a year ago for only 530 cars. Both travelers and visitors complain about the congestion.

The management must go hat in hand to the legislature for funds, instead of being able to act efficiently under a self-sustaining independent authority with the right to raise and spend its own money.

Transportation is but one of the many problems affecting the economy of Boston.

The College of Business Administration of Boston College is to be commended for promoting the series of conferences that will lead to a better future for the city that is the very heart of New England.

Thank you for listening.

None Are So Low as the Narcotics Pushers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks today, I wish to include an editorial from the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of January 17, 1956, which is most timely in view of the continued investigation and hearings by my Subcommittee on Narcotics of the Ways and Means Committee.

The editorial follows:

NONE ARE SO LOW AS THE NARCOTICS PUSHERS

Police authorities are making a determined drive to rid the city of drug peddlers and users. It is good to see a couple of pushers arrested for a change. The victim of the narcotics habit is a medical as well as a criminal case. But there is not much that can be said in extenuation of the characters who make money from the sale of narcotics. They should be put out of circulation for a long time.

When you lift up the narcotics log, you are likely to find a lot of strange things under it. One thing turned up by the recent arrests was the apparent solution of a mysterious death. Another was a sidelight on the high cost of living as a narcotics addict. One of the victims testified to police that he had spent $3,700 in 6 months for narcotics.

With this as a base figure it is not difficult to see how narcotics addiction is tied to other kinds of crime. The addict is living way beyond his means even if he doesn't spend a penny for room or board. And, as the addiction grows deeper, the amount of narcotics needed grows greater. Thus the addict digs a pit that gets deeper and deeper. There is no way out until the addict either dies or is arrested and placed in an institution.

Of all the forms of criminality few are as low as that of seducing the young and pan-

dering to the weaknesses of the addict through the sale of narcotics. Let us hope this renewed activity by local police and Federal authorities will mean the end of the road for the pushers.

Our Civil Defense Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, frequently our civil-defense agencies are criticized unfairly. Rarely are the fine accomplishments of these agencies given the publicity they deserve. The enclosed article from the Sunday supplement of the Palo Alto Times, Palo Alto, Calif., is an exception to the rule, and I submit it herewith for insertion in the RECORD:

THE NIGHT OF THE FLOOD—CD'S CHANCE TO "PUT UP OR SHUT UP"

(By John Hubbard)

("Civil defense," the man said, "is a laugh. It's a bunch of guys playing a game. Just wait until something really happens and then watch them fall flat on their foolish faces.")

No one knows exactly when the fateful logjam started building up in the culvert that channels San Francisquito Creek under a Bayshore Highway bridge and directs its flow out toward the bay.

Maybe it was during the early evening hours of December 22, 1955, when the muddy current, already badly rain-swollen, swept high along the creek banks west of Palo Alto and in the city itself, and began pulling down debris that had previously been considered safely above the high-water mark.

Or maybe it wasn't until later, until the night, when the winds howled with hurricane fury and the dark clouds unleashed the total power of their torrential contents and the creek became a surging, enraged river.

The time it happened is not so important. But the fact that it happened is.

Because the logs and the other debris laid a dam in the culvert, created a freak barrier that stopped the water from following its natural course and sent it rolling back toward the city.

About midnight, then, the inevitable occurred.

The creek, fed by an unprecedented runoff from the high flatlands and foothills to the west and choked off at Bayshore to the east, swept over the tops of the levees in one of Palo Alto's finest residential areas, timidly and tentatively at first, then—gathering momentum—with increasing violence.

It coursed waist high along the streets, ran through the back yards and flower gardens, and came rushing into scores of homes, shocking into confused wakefulness hundreds of unsuspecting men, women, and children.

At the city hall City Manager Jerry Keithley, informed of the spillover, conferred hastily with his aides, thought for a moment, then announced his decision:

"It's more than our own personnel can possibly handle. Call out civil defense."

("Civil defense," the man said, "is a laugh. It's a bunch of guys playing a game. Just wait until something really happens and then watch them fall flat on their foolish faces.")

Keithley's words set into motion a crucial chain of events. For this was the moment toward which 6 years of preparation had been directed. This was the peninsula's first big-scale, under-fire test of a volunteer organization that had been alternately intensively trained, then neglected; hopefully praised, then maligned.

This was the acid examination of the paper planning and the mock drills that had begun brightly with the Korean war, only to sputter uncertainly in the years of peace that followed.

This, in the teeth of the worst storm in recorded peninsula history, was civil defense's chance to put up or shut up.

Acting on Keithley's instruction, City Personnel Officer Wilbur Wagstaff, who doubles as Palo Alto's deputy civil defense director, and Fire Chief Louis Ledford, the assistant civil defense director, went rapidly to work.

With the help of other key workers operating in the city hall's civil defense nerve center, they notified the Red Cross that hundreds of people would have to be evacuated from the danger area; they contacted civil defense transportation boss Worth Prine to tell him the floodwaters were already too high for automobiles to bring out the threatened residents, that bigger vehicles would be required; they called Eric Edberg, representative of the local radio "hams" who had signed up for civil defense duty; they saw to it that an evacuation center would be established at Jordan Junior High School, which had been previously designated as an emergency shelter; they asked Dr. Herbert Brown, head of the civil defense medical unit, to send doctors and nurses to the school.

All these contacts, and others, took only a few minutes, because the procedures had been set down in black and white long before.

But then the civil defense leaders sat back to wait, perhaps with figurative fingers crossed, to see how soon—and how effectively—the reactions would come.

The wait was surprisingly, gratifyingly short.

Almost immediately the "hams" were on the job, keeping the air waves crackling with coordinating reports, water-level bulletins from critical creek areas other than the flooded districts, evacuation information.

Quickly, too, the Red Cross took charge at Jordan School, arranging for beds, preparing hot food for the evacuees.

In less than an hour, Palo Alto Transfer & Storage Co. vans were slogging along flooded streets, gathering up human cargoes from the water-swept houses, carrying them to the shelter.

When the water became too deep even for the vans, amphibious equipment was called in from Moffett Field to aid in the life-saving project.

And as the evacuees arrived at the school, the doctors and nurses were there to tend to their needs.

But, fortunately, not much medical work was required.

The evacuation went so smoothly, so rapidly that physical suffering was held to an almost unbelievable minimum.

Despite the fact that nearly 1,000 people had to be evacuated, there was not a single drowning, not even a recorded serious injury.

As Keithley said later:

"I think it was a miracle no one was killed. That water was running mighty high and mighty hard. I know; I was out in it. It could have knocked somebody over easily and swept him away. Every one of the 600 or 700 people who helped fight this flood deserves nothing but the highest compliments."

Added Ledford: "Without civil defense, the evacuation might well have been utter confusion. And that could have had deadly results. All those people waking up out of a sound sleep to find water racing through their houses. Why, when they came out to be evacuated, they had no idea of which way to go to reach safe ground because the water was flowing from several directions. That indecision could have been fatal if CD workers and other personnel hadn't been there to show them the way out."

And Wagstaff: "I saw a lot of military operations snafued during the war, when things were supposed to be planned down to the last detail. By comparison, this went incredibly smoothly."

And Gardner Bullis, disaster relief chairman of the local Red Cross chapter: "Watching the evacuation, you could definitely see the advantages of CD planning. You could see all those drills and paperwork sessions paying off. I thought the order, the lack of confusion were quite remarkable."

("Civil defense," the man said, "is a laugh. It's a bunch of guys playing a game. Just wait until something really happens and then watch them fall flat on their foolish faces.")

That's what the man said. But if he was in Palo Alto that night of December 22, 1955, he's saying it no more.

Proposed Parkway Along C. & O. Canal Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, once again I feel I have a duty to call attention to one of the most amazing turnabouts I have ever witnessed within our Government. My reason for trying to get the facts to as many persons as possible is that the C. & O. Canal Parkway issue is not merely a so-called local problem but, in reality, is an integral part of our entire program for highway safety and defense transportation. There are many aspects to the matter which merit widespread consideration, and they were summed up in an extremely fine fashion by J. William Hunt, editor of the Cumberland (Md.) Sunday Times, in that newspaper's edition of January 22, 1956. I therefore ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hunt's excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACROSS THE DESK

(By J. William Hunt)

TWO YEARS OF STUDY AND SURVEYS PRECEDED 1950 RECOMMENDATION THAT PARKWAY BE BUILT ALONG C. & O. CANAL ROUTE—SOME FACTUAL DATA THAT MAKES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE REVERSAL OF ITS POLICY UNDERSTANDABLE CAUSE FOR AREA INDIGNATION

On August 7, 1950, there was sent to Congress from the Secretary of the Interior (then the Honorable Oscar Chapman serving in the Cabinet of President Harry Truman) the reports asked by the 80th Congress on a proposed parkway along the route of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal between Great Falls and Cumberland.

A letter of transmittal accompanied the joint survey reports of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, and of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Two years had been spent by these Federal agencies in a thorough survey of the advisability and practicability of constructing a parkway.

A bill introduced by J. GLENN BEALL (then Representative of the Sixth Congressional District) authorized the expenditure of $40,000 for a joint reconnaissance study by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service * * * to determine the advisability and practicability of constructing a parkway along the route of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal, including a report of estimated cost.

This authorization was approved by Congress on June 10, 1948.

Note that the original bill made the parkway a definite and important part of the survey.

Before any selfish interests had intruded on the scene; in an atmosphere unclouded by controversy, and in the careful thorough manner of doing a job assigned to them, the two Government agencies spent 2 years on reconnaissance surveys.

With what result?

In the 1950 letter of transmittal, signed by Dale E. Doty, Assistant Secretary of the Interior (acting for Secretary Chapman and with his approval) wrote to House Speaker SAM RAYBURN:

"I believe that the study has brought out the fact that it is entirely practical to construct a parkway along this canal and that it is advisable to do so, provided that the necessary additional right-of-way can be obtained."

In line with this proviso of additional land, the last session of the Maryland General Assembly authorized purchase of the needed acreage between Cumberland and Hancock.

It is our intention this week to trace this whole parkway situation factually from its beginning, and we hope the reader will follow the step-by-step accounts already given, even though it may seem like dull statistics. At the proper time our pent-up indignation at last week's complete reversal of attitude, over the signature of Conrad L. Wirth, now Director of National Park Service under Secretary Douglas McKay, may well break out in a manner competent to reflect the amazement and anger of the Cumberland area over one of the most high-handed and arbitrary actions of an Interior Department that has already incurred sharp criticism for some of its other policies and actions on a national scale.

What has changed the attitude of the National Park Service under McKay and Wirth?

Read this portion of the August 7, 1950, letter from the Department of the Interior to Speaker RAYBURN:

"Many advantages would accrue from construction of the proposed parkway:

"(a) The parkway would function as an approach to the National Capital in which capacity it would connect with the George Washington Memorial Parkway. It is important and fitting for the national status of the Capital area to be so recognized.

"(b) Recreation developments which have lagged far behind the population increase in this area could be provided by the proposed parkway.

"(c) The Government's investment in canal property which has not been utilized anywhere near its possibilities for recreation would be permitted to develop to the maximum on both local and national levels.

"(d) The parkway would provide a controlled access road facility from Washington into the mountains with the assurance of rapid uninterrupted traffic in time of need.

"(e) The project would have outstanding scenic and historical interests that could be developed on the theme of "The historic gateway to the westward."

And here is the concluding paragraph from the Department of the Interior 5 years ago:

"I concur wholeheartedly in this report as I believe that the study has fully disclosed that such a parkway would be both practical and advisable in addition to being economical to construct."

In the namby-pamby statement issued by the present Director of the National Park Service (Wirth) are several instances of a lack of comprehension of the facts.

Here is one illustration:

"A road should not be built on it (the canal)," Wirth writes.

The 1950 report does not propose building the parkway on the canal bed. As alternatives in locating the parkway, the original report mentioned two road locations that would not obliterate the canal bed, and as a third location merely mentioned that this last of three "possible" roadways would "involve the full use and practical obliteration of the canal prism * * * but very little of the length of the canal would require this type of location."

Here is the part of the 1950 report the present National Park Service director should read:

"One type of location would be on the towpath and extending outside the towpath so as to leave the entire canal prism intact. Where a two-lane divided roadway was needed in such cases, one roadway might lie on each side of the canal. * * * A second type of location would lie on the towpath extending into the canal prism, and leaving only a trace of the ditch."

Thus the first mentioned location and type of construction would preserve the canal and also provide for a parkway.

All honor to Senator Beall and Representative Hyde and to Senator Charles M. See and the Allegany County delegation for their splendid work in behalf of the parkway, and to all others who have "fought the good fight" for this most desirable public improvement. Senator Beall inaugurated the project and if we know our fellow countian he is not the kind to give up such a worthy undertaking without a battle.

This is only an opening shot. Let us all fight harder than ever for the parkway and against the mysterious reversal of policy that stems from the present occupants of the posts of power in the Department of the Interior!

Tax on Gasoline and Special Fuels Used for Farm Purposes

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, as a farmer myself and as a Representative from the Fifth District of Indiana that boasts of some of the finest farm land in the United States, I feel that I am deeply conscious of the fact that the farmer is not sharing in this Nation's unprecedented economy. Many letters come from farm friends and I have visited hundreds and thousands of farmers.

The big majority suggest that some help in solving their problem will be appreciated. The elimination of the excise tax on gasoline and lubricating oils used for agricultural purposes is one of the measures that will bring immediate relief to farmers.

I introduced a similar measure, H. R. 8586, and appreciated the prompt action taken by the Ways and Means Committee on these measures. It is hoped that the Committees on Agriculture in the House and Senate will give prompt attention to other proposals helpful to the farmers.

Fast Depreciation in the Jet Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT P. MORANO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1956

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a news story which I released today concerning the plight of homeowners victimized by vibrations caused by jet airplanes.

According to the Armed Services Committee, this problem is becoming a national headache, with no suitable solution in sight.

As a matter of fact, I have noticed many mysterious cracks appearing in the walls and ceilings of our own house in Greenwich, Conn., situated in the vicinity of the Westchester Airport, White Plains, N. Y. The only trouble is that, try as I may, I cannot identify the make and branch of service of the planes, nor am I certain they are the culprits. Up to now my hobby has been bird-watching, a most relaxing and rewarding pastime in the quiet country. Perhaps now the Nation will be swept by a new pastime, jet-watching, although eyes much sharper and reflexes much quicker than mine are required.

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues in hopes that perhaps someone might arrive at a solution to this growing problem:

Air Force and Navy jets are not only breaking the sound barrier, but are breaking up a lot of houses throughout the country, Representative ALBERT P. MORANO, Republican of Connecticut, learned this week.

MORANO stumbled upon this nationwide problem when he took a constituent's complaint to the House Committee on Armed Services.

One of Morano's Fairfield County constituents, Joseph Friedman, of 64 Rippowam Road, Stamford, Conn., wrote the Congressman early this week stating that his house had just been redecorated, but that jet planes flying overhead were causing shocks below that cracked his ceilings and walls. Since his insurance company had no sound barrier policy, Friedman took his case to his Federal representative.

Robert W. Smart, chief counsel for the Armed Services Committee informed MORANO that the situation confronting Mr. Friedman was rapidly becoming a nationwide problem with similar type complaints arising at many places throughout the country.

Procedure for victims of the sound-barrier house-breaking phenomenons are instructed to make sure of the identity of the planes, establish the amount of damage, and be able to establish that the damage was caused by excessive vibrations of jet aircraft, according to Smart. They are then advised to contact their staff Judge Advocate at the Air Force installation nearest them, where they will receive blanks for filing claims.

If the claimant is denied compensation for damages, his next recourse is to proceed with a suit in the court of claims.

Morano said that the chief counsel told of at least one claimant, living in a Southern State, who was successful in action before the Court of Claims.

Because of this the committee has had to authorize the purchase of additional land in the approach and takeoff zone of bases where jet aircraft are operated. The committee has also authorized the acquisition of avigation easements covering areas adjacent to jet fields, in an attempt to minimize the liability of the Government, while at the same time giving adequate compensation to adjacent landowners for the unrestricted use of the air above their land.

"Even these actions present no final solution to the problem," Smart told Morano, "because, with the increasing speed of jet aircraft, it is now commonplace for such aircraft to pierce the sound barrier in normal training operations. This, in turn, results in the so-called sonic boom the violent vibrations of which often result in damage to homes and other property on the ground."

Smart said all Government agencies having any connection with the problem are making every effort to find a solution. He said it was a problem of great magnitude to which there was no answer at this time.

Middle East Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a speech I made before the Farband Labor Zionist Order on January 21, 1956:

Eight hundred Israeli lives have been lost by the daily incursions of Arab infiltrators into the territory of Israel. Thousands of dollars' worth of property have been destroyed or stolen by the infiltrators. The Arab economic boycott of Israel has resulted in the impeding of economic growth to a scandalous extent.

We do not hear any anguished cries against the Arab nations by any power individually or collectively in the United Nations. The headlines do not scream with motions for censure, strong censure, motions for compensation, motions for dismissal, against the Arab tactics. When Israel hits back, the air immediately becomes thick with condemnation, postures of horror are struck, from the United Nations comes motion after motion of censure against Israel.

I think it is pertinent to ask, "Where is the United Nations in all these acts of vandalism and murder perpetrated by the Arabs?" and again, "Where was the United Nations when seven Arab countries attacked Israel in 1948 in an unprovoked aggressive war?" Are we to conclude from this that the drip, drip, drip method of torture indulged in by Arab countries, that the rabid hate propaganda of the Arab nations against Israel, that the economic boycott, are to be dismissed by the United Nations, that in weighing the evidence, Arab provocations are to be thrust aside and ignored by the United Nations. Whether Israel's retaliatory acts are right or wrong is not at issue. What is at issue is that the world understand, and understand rightly, what is happening in the Middle East, what really are its tensions, and unless the world understands and sees the full picture, not only in part, not only the slice United Nations so far presents, but all of it, totally, will peace be served. I was in Israel in 1948 during the siege of Jerusalem. I was in Jerusalem when the Arab bullets whistled through the air and the whir of Arab planes beat upon our ears throughout the night, and the rest of the world was silent. The defense of Jerusalem, the Holy City devoted to three great religions, was left completely to the Israelis to defend. Is it that the world, thrusting justice and balance aside, is permitting itself to be blackmailed?

First the Western World seemed to be paralized by the fear that if Arab sensibilities were wounded, the Arabs would turn to the Soviet world to give it comfort. Now that the Arab world is playing games with the Soviets and the satellite nations, the free world stands trembling with fear before it, and the game goes on to wrest them away from complicity with communism. What the Arabs are say actually is "Heads I win, tails you lose." In the cold war Arabs have placed themselves in the enviable position of playing one faction off against the other, and at this time it seems as if they are succeeding.

The United States has announced its policy that the United States would help that side in the Middle East dispute which acts for peace. To me that is a very odd statement, not because on the face of it it is not a sensible and just attitude, but because the United Sates officialdom knows, and knows it well, that since 1948 the Arabs have refused to make peace, have talked about a second war, have excited their people to live in constant hatred, have refused to acknowledge and accept the existence of the State of Israel, have perpetrated act upon act of murder and destruction. Officialdom knows that tiny Israel has been forced to place frontier guardsmen around the edges of the small country, guardsmen who work all day and watch all night. Officialdom knows that the Arab nations have kept alive the problem of displaced Arabs, have refused to cooperate in any matter of resettlement, have refused even to discuss any regional water plan, and have been successful to a large degree in their economic boycott. All this officialdom knows. But this, officially, we do not say.

There are 40 million Arabs and only a million and a half Israelis. There are seven Arab nations and one little democracy. Shall history say of the Western World that so great was its desperation that one little nation, which it itself brought into being, had to be sacrificed in the name of expediency? That in its struggle to preserve the conscience of mankind, dedicated to democratic principles, the Western World concluded that one little nation itself a democracy could be deemed expendable, while the Arab nations sat back righteously and smiled inwardly at the success of its maneuvers? That a little democracy, the only democracy in one region of the world, could be left alone to be pushed into the sea? Surely, we cannot believe that.

In the meantime, the United States does not act upon Israeli's request for defensive arms. And while the United States waits, Soviet penetration of the Middle East grows deeper and deeper.

Israel must have arms. Let us remember this: Wherever you stand in Israel, you can see a border line with scarcely the twist of a neck. Thus, if there is an attack upon Israel and Israel is unprepared to meet it, Israel will be forced into the sea before any aid whatsoever can be rushed to her.

The only defense Israel can have against an attack is to be able to meet it head on. A Pearl Harbor would mean the end of Israel. There is no space for retreat.

Israel asks for arms for another reason which, above all else, most certainly should be understood by the United States. The United States has consistently pursued the policy that the most effective deterrent against war is to maintain adequate arms for herself and her allies. To that end, we have devoted the major portion of our budget, keeping strong our Armed Forces and trying to keep ahead in military developments and supplying our allies with military aid.

Is it, therefore, unreasonable—can we possibly view it as unreasonable—that Israel, small and friendless, should likewise view an adequate defense as the best deterrent against war, and as the best assurance for peace? We in the United States have sought, through a system of defense pacts—NATO, SEATO, and the encouragement of pacts like the Baghdad Pact and the Northern Tier arrangements—to promote the cause of peace in the world. Is it, therefore, unreasonable that Israel, in her isolation—the only democratic country in the world so isolated—should seek a pact with the United States, the country which once befriended her, the country which once, through legislative action and through Presidential proclamation, gave so much sympathy and understanding to the ideals of the Jewish homeland?

The situation in the Middle East has deteriorated where it now constitutes one of our weakest points, securitywise. Through our lack of firmness, our obvious indecisiveness—so open to the Arab States that they played the East against the West—we now face Soviet penetration of the Middle East. Right now we seem to be running around in circles, crying loudly at the Communist apparition in the area, obviously distraught, now patting the Arab nations on the head, now murmuring sympathetically to Israel, promising and withdrawing, promising and withdrawing again.

Let us make no mistake about it. We have been less than forthright. The Western World has reason for its alarm.

To me it is amazing that the Western World, dedicated to the preservation and even to the expansion of democracy, should have turned its back on the one practicing democratic nation in that area of the world. The British Government is openly pro-Arab, so openly pro-Arab, so vigorously pro-Arab, that the voices of protest are heard around the land.

Great Britain has been feeding the Egyption maw great supplies of arms, including 64 Centurion tanks, scores of jets, and some 180 to 190 reconditional British Valentine tanks.

A shipment of these arms is part and parcel of Eden's policy of Arab appeasement. Eden is like a man who keeps feeding steaks to a tiger in the hope of making him a vegetarian.

Is it that the Government of Great Britain considers Israel a small price to pay for Arab favor? Even if we accept this shabby thought, is Arab favor dependable? Can Eden on one hand deprecate an arms race in the Middle East and on the other condone the supply of arms (all out of proportion to that of Israel) to the country of declared and open hostility?

Eden will soon be in the United States conferring with our officials on tensions in the Middle East. We have reason to believe that Eden will press for a Caesarian operation upon the body of Israel, to truncate the Negev, or ask that Israel cede a portion of her territory so that a corridor can be formed across the Negev, connecting Egypt and Jordan. Aside from the fact that historically such a corridor had not previously existed, under the Ottoman rule or the mandatory rule; aside from the fact that again it is Irsael which is again and the only one asked to cede territory; aside from the fact that such concession could not relieve the tensions of the Middle East nor compel the Arab nations to sue for peace; aside from the fact that it can only further whet the appetite of the Arab nations, leaving them with the knowledge that the louder you cry the more you get, aside from all this, the fact remains that such a corridor would mean that the

Soviet personnel now operating in Egypt would have another road opened to them, enabling them to proceed ever further. For make no mistake about it, the presence of Soviet arms and the personnel to train Egyptians is a most acute danger signal for the Western World. Even now there are submarines in Mediterranean waters flying the Egyptian flag, manned by Soviet personnel.

In all this, where is United States policy? Will our leadership go by default?

We cannot, of course, conclude—since we do not know—that our Government will steer the wrong course. We do know that there has been too much reliance on wishful thinking. We do know that there has been—and still exists—a split among the State Department advisers. We do know that our diplomacy has failed in Egypt. But the course must be set and set soon—with realism, with staring of the facts straight in the face. We cannot afford any conflagration in that area in the name of our own security.

As Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion said, eloquently and with wisdom, in a recent address to the Knesset, the Israeli Parliament: "We know that any war—one even in which we gain the upper hand—involves ruin and destruction for both parties and intensifies hatred between nations. We know that, after our victory in one war, a second round is possible, and after our victory in a second war, a third round may come, and there is no end to this business."

Trees and the Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, further referring to remarks made by me on Thursday, January 26, relative to the encouragement of tree planting on land taken out of production under the soil bank plan submitted by President Eisenhower, I invite the attention of Members to an editorial published by the Tacoma, Wash., News Tribune for January 23, 1956:

A NEW SOIL BANK IDEA

With official administration blessing, a "soil bank" plan of farm relief stands a very good chance of adoption at this session of Congress. Most of the plans suggested—the Department of Agriculture is studying nearly a score of them—would have the Government rent farmland in order to take it out of production of crops now in surplus supply. More recently has come the interesting suggestion that the plan be extended to build up the Nation's timber resources.

Forest products are one crop not in surplus and not likely to become so. Instead of paying farmers to plant grass on soil bank land, it is argued, why not let them plant trees—especially the disappearing hardwoods?

The idea has obvious political appeal and would ease the overproduction fears of cattle raisers. Some side benefits from devoting soil-bank payments to reforesting include:

1. Better water storage capacity in the land.

2. Arrested lowering of water tables, fewer droughts.

3. More recreational areas. Add to that the Forest Service contention that the Nation's 4½ million woodlots, many of them on farms, need greater replenishment. Too many farmers are simply stripping them of saleable trees without adequate replanting, it points out.

There are weaknesses in the woodlot plan. Merely to care better for existing woodlots would have little bearing on farm crops and surpluses; to plant now productive farm land to trees would tie that land up far longer than might be wise. Soil-bank acreage planted to grass can be thrown back into crop production any time it is needed, but that cannot be done with a newly planted woodlot, unless the new trees are to be sacrificed.

Somewhere, however, there should be a place for woodlot encouragement in the many soil-bank plans under consideration. Inclusion of this feature would do much to sell it to the nonfarming public.

What a Difference Between Now and Then in the Adoption of the Appropriation for Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today we have under consideration a subject that through the years has proved to be of inestimable importance to the welfare of our Nation and its people.

I refer to the continuing activity of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House. This committee has had probably more bitter criticism expressed against it than any other Committee of Congress. There is an old saying that under certain circumstances a knock is a boost. Certainly this had been true in its application to the unjust criticism that has been directed against this committee by Communists and other subversive factors in our midst. I can well remember the caustic, untrue, and deceptive charges made against Hon. MARTIN DIES, of Texas, in the early days when fighting communism and subversive activities in our Nation was no easy task. In those days it was a constant encounter between the patriotic forces under the leadership of Congressman DIES and those who sought to break down our American way. Congressman DIES did not receive all the help he was entitled to have in those days. Our people were not as fully aware of the dangers involved as they are today. It can be said to the everlasting credit of MARTIN DIES that he never faltered nor did he deviate in the slightest degree from the patriotic course he had set for himself to pursue. In that day of trial that tested the courage of many in the Congress there was always sufficient to gain the victory when the issue was whether funds sufficient in amount would be granted by the Congress to carry on this great work of ferreting out those who did not believe in our form of Government and would destroy it if they could.

Today, we have before us a resolution—House Resolution 352—from the committee which now has jurisdiction of the same subject, appropriating $275,000 to carry on the work of the committee. Under the leadership of the present chairman of the committee, Hon. FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, we have confidence that he and his distinguished committee will continue to carry on effectively and forcibly the work of the committee in the future as in the past. But, as we adopt this resolution, I cannot help notice the ease with which it passes as compared to that day long ago when MARTIN DIES fought almost single-handed. His accomplishments in this respect will ever be a monument to his patriotism and courage.

Constitutional Liberties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
Tuesday, January 31, 1956
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a news story about my speech before the Serra Club at Gardner, Mass., on November 2, 1955.

The material follows:

"The enemies of religion, democracy, and patriotism constitute a powerful active force attacking our way of life," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN before the Serra Club at Gardner, November 2, 1955, "and it will require not only continuous vigilance, but united, responsible leadership to mobilize American public opinion against them.

" 'Divide and conquer' is their slogan as they drive the abrasive wedges of racial hatred, religious intolerance, and class animosity into the very foundation stones of our great free system," PHILBIN said.

"The un-American zealots who spread hate between various groups of our people are the very ones who also discredit our most precious spiritual principles, make a mockery of the Bill of Rights and foster the absolutism and economic determinism of the police state.

"They cast aspersion and doubt on the sanctity of the human family. They mock and deride our parliamentary institutions. They denounce patriotism as an obsolete tomfoolery. They pillory and misrepresent the servants of the people. They scorn and insult the Constitution and hurl epithets and invectives at our great free enterprise economic system that has served to give us the highest standards ever enjoyed by man.

"These people are not alone the radical doctrinaires of Union Square. Many of them hold influential positions in American life. There is hardly a place in American life where they have not set up their cells of subversion, of conspiracy, against this representative Government and this economic system.

"America will either soon find the way to cope with this grave problem, or American freedom, as we have known it, will face greatest peril. No nation can live half slave and half free, and this Nation cannot preserve its vigor and strength, its Bill of Rights and its Constitution, its liberties for the individual and its basic freedom unless our citizens unite to combat the poisonous anti-religious, antidemocratic, antipatriotic propaganda and conspiracy that is brazenly operating in the Nation.

"This task challenges every one of us, because the poison of subversion and anti-

Americanism reaches every part of the land and every part of the land must move to fight and counteract it."

Calling for renewed respect for constitutional principles and safeguards, PHILBIN declared that "in this task let us not fall prey to the folly and the fallacy of violating, in letter or in spirit, our great Constitution, in order to check the malefactors who would destroy it.

"Let us remember that in this Nation above all nations, every man is entitled to a fair hearing and a fair trial and we must never let star chamber proceedings and hysteria be substituted for the processes of equal justice under the law for everyone regardless of race, class, creed, or persuasion.

"And remember this," said the Congressman, "the man who hates or discriminates against another because of his religion or his race is not a good American.

"From Nero to Hitler, men and women have been beaten and slaughtered for their faith and for their political ideals, but love of God, like liberty, is immortal, and it can no more be killed than the human soul."

ILO-United States Money Promotes Communist Propaganda Efforts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. George E. Sokolsky which is pertinent to a matter that will soon be considered in the House. It is my understanding that a request will be made for a considerable increase in the money previously appropriated to support ILO.

Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of our anti-Communist propaganda this Congress should consider eliminating our financial support to ILO.

The article follows:

UNITED STATES PLOWS MONEY INTO ILO, BUT REDS REAP THE PROFITS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

The United States has become a member of a large number of international organizations in addition to the United Nations. Most of these organizations come quite expensive because the United States quota usually runs to about one-third of the budget. It is difficult to assess the value of all these international efforts; some are useful, others are only continuous.

The International Labor Organization is one of the least useful and effective.

To the ILO we send Government, employer, and labor delegates. For many years, prior to 1954, Soviet Russia stayed away from the ILO, but in that year Soviet Russia came in with three members to every other country's one member. The three were the Soviet Union, the Ukraine, and Byelorussia. To them must be added the five satellite countries whose policies are determined by the Kremlin, namely, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Albania, and Czechoslovakia.

As the American employer representative, W. L. McGrath, of Cincinnati, says in his report:

"At annual ILO conferences, Communist orators, outnumbering ours in the ratio of 32 to 4, will tell the representatives of 69 nations about the decadence of the free enterprise system, the superiority of the Communist system, the exploitation of the working man by the American capitalists, and our greed and desire for war. These speeches will be reprinted by the ILO and circulated all over the world. One cannot imagine a better readymade vehicle for the promotion of Communist indoctrination. Do we want to continue to finance this Communist operation?"

McGrath objected to seating the Russian employer delegates. As all industry in Soviet Russia is owned by the government, who are these employers? How, in a country which forbids private ownership of an industry, can there be an employer? If there is an employer, is he not merely an official of the government? That really means that all the Russian delegates are government officials and that there are none who represent employers—by which is meant private employers—or for that matter, represent the workers as the government sets up the labor unions in Russia and controls them.

This may not be an exciting argument, except that the reason for the existence of the ILO is to have Government, employers, and labor-union heads meet together to lay down certain policies concerning labor and working conditions on a universal basis. That this cannot be accomplished with the varieties of standards of living in the various countries is obvious from the small accomplishments of the ILO which came into existence after World War I, but the excuse that is being given for its continued existence is that it is useful to have such a cooperative body. McGrath, however, correctly raises the question of the propriety of one country sending only Government delegates because it has no employers and permits none to exist.

McGrath says: "If we are simply to accept the present situation in the ILO, the end result is, to my mind, inevitable. The Communists, with 8 nations to our 1, and 32 votes to our 4, will remain firmly entrenched and will progressively dominate the ILO. It will become merely an international forum for the dissemination of Communist propaganda, financed to at least 25 percent by the taxpayers of the United States. In fact, at its next session, our Congress will be asked to raise the ceiling for the United States contribution to the ILO from $1,750,000 a year to $3 million a year."

Peace Needs Good Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years I have been honored by the Marlboro, Mass., Chapter, Disabled American Veterans by being designated as guest speaker at the annual banquet of this fine group. On October 29, 1955, I addressed the organization and ask unanimous consent that part of my remarks before the Marlboro DAV be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

"Veterans are the most important single force defending the Nation against subversion," said Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, addressing the DAV banquet at Marlboro last night.

"You who know the real meaning of patriotism are best fitted to guard our institutions," said the Clinton Congressman, "and your spiritual strength, unity and loyalty furnish an inspiring example to all our citizens."

Outlining current world conditions at some length, PHILBIN declared that the Soviet Government is now playing its old, dual role in international diplomacy—"playing a waiting game until she can catch up to the free world in terms of hydrogen bombs and other scientific weapons, and at the same time brazenly continuing the internal penetration of weaker nations.

"Smiles have replaced scowls on the faces of her diplomats, but her world objectives remain the same and she is pressing them with unabated vigor, skill and persistency.

"There can be no permanent peace in the world until the Soviet negotiates pending questions in sincerity and good faith, and in a willingness to do justice to the oppressed and the tyrannized," he said.

The American Government must continue its own zealous efforts to secure enduring peace, but we cannot permit our armed strength and potential to diminish, in fact, "implemented with fantastic new weapons growing more amazing every day, we must continue to build even more powerful military strength because that is our best safeguard against possible aggression in a world filled with conspiracy and intrigue."

PHILBIN gave the veterans an assuring report on the current status of national veterans programs. "Congress will always safeguard and seek to strengthen basic laws in behalf of veterans and their dependents because that is what the American people want for those who have done so much for the country."

The Congressman congratulated the local post for conspicuous interest and invaluable work for the cause of the veteran. "You can be proud that you have cooperated so loyally and effectively with the other great veterans organizations in carrying out this work," he said.

Beastiality of Red China Communists Now Fully Exposed—Red China Must Not Be Admitted to United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am including an article that appeared in the Washington Daily News for Monday, January 30, written by Mr. John Troan, of the Scripps-Howard staff, after an interview with Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw, who was recently released by the Chinese Communists. The story by Dr. Bradshaw should be printed upon the records of this Congress so that every American citizen may be on notice as to the kind of people who now seek admission to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, the Scripps-Howard newspaper, through the Washington Daily News, is to be commended for its forthright reporting of the true situation on the kind of treatment received by American citizens imprisoned in Red China. Other articles will appear. The first one follows hereafter:

FIVE YEARS OF TORTURE: "HOW COULD ONE HUMAN BEING DO THIS TO ANOTHER?"

PITTSBURGH, January 30.—Dr. Homer V. Bradshaw's flight to freedom from behind the Bamboo Curtan ended on a recent freezing cold night at the Pittsburgh Airport when he limped off a plane behind his wife, Wilda, in a wheelchair, both of them pale and wasted, after 1,753 days of imprisonment by Chinese Communists.

The pitiful sight of this silent, wasted woman and her haggard husband was enough to make your heart weep.

An airport policeman, helping them to a waiting auto, said:

"How could one human being do this to another?"

"The answer," says Dr. Bradshaw, "is that the Communists are just plain beasts."

He should know. He and his wife spent about half of their lives with a Presbyterian mission in China. Their reward was almost 5 years of torture by the Reds. It was from this agonizing 5 years that they have just been freed.

It was on another cold night, back in March 1951, in the mountain village of Linhsien, 250 miles northwest of Canton, when their long horror began.

THE REDS INVADED THEIR HOME

The Bradshaws were just preparing to retire for the evening. A band of Communists, armed with pistols and automatic rifles, invaded their home and placed them under arrest.

What followed was a Red nightmare.

In the course of their imprisonment, Dr. Bradshaw suffered a physical crackup and his wife a mental breakdown.

The doctor was permitted to talk to his wife only 3 times while they were in jail, and for almost 4 years he couldn't even find out if she was still alive.

Seventeen times the Communists grilled him about his alleged espionage activities, with one inquisition lasting from midnight until past 6 a. m.

Over and over, the Reds tried to get him to sign a confession that he was a spy, finally dangling hints of an early release in their vain efforts to bait him into signing.

Once, peevish at his obstinacy, they made the doctor eat and sleep with handcuffs on.

His bed was a quilt, spread on boards just off the floor. Two blankets and a mosquito net, for which the doctor had to pay with impounded mission funds, rounded out his bedroom furniture.

HE HAD TO FORCE HIMSELF TO EAT

Most of the time, Dr. Bradshaw was given only two meals a day. And the food got so bad he finally had to force himself to eat.

He was permitted no matches, no cigarettes, no metal objects of any kind, a rule which eventually cost Dr. Bradshaw even the zipper on his trousers.

He wrote letters but some were returned to him by the Communist censors and most of the others never got out of the country. Mail from the United States was intercepted and frequently destroyed.

He wasn't permitted a watch, but they let him keep track of the days by scratching X's on a homemade calendar in his cell.

For almost 4 years, the only exercise he could get was a walk from his cell to the prison washroom across the corridor.

His reading was confined to Communist Chinese newspapers, full of anti-American lies.

Indeed, lying is so much a part of communism, Dr. Bradshaw explains, that you can't even believe them on those rare occasions when they do happen to tell the truth.

Thus, when the doctor was told last December 18 that his 5-year sentence had been commuted by about 2½ months, he still couldn't be sure he was going to be released.

And he wasn't convinced until 2 days later, when he and Mrs. Bradshaw finally hobbled across the barbed-wire border at Kowloon (Hong Kong) and set their feet on free soil again, realizing that, shattered and broken, this was the heartbreaking culmination of their careers of selfless service to the Chinese people.

HE HAD LEARNED TO LOVE CHINESE

In 27 years—he first went there with Mrs. Bradshaw on their honeymoon in 1928—the doctor had learned to love the Chinese and they, in turn, had come to regard him as a cherished and trusted friend.

On their first assignment to the Presbyterian mission in southeastern China, the Bradshaws stayed for 6 years, returning to the United States in 1934.

The following year, Doctor and Mrs. Bradshaw went back to China under the same auspices, the American Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, which operated a hospital, a small church, a grade school and a high school in Kwangtung Province.

A routine furlough came up in the summer of 1941. And with it another vacation in the United States.

The Bradshaws fully expected to return to China in 1942. But they hadn't reckoned with Japan's war in China.

Try as he did, Mr. Bradshaw couldn't get United States Government permission to return to China in 1942.

"So," he said, "I enlisted in the Air Force."

HE BECAME A FLIGHT SURGEON

Actually, Dr. Bradshaw was made a flight surgeon with the Second Air Force with the rank of captain. He spent more than 2 years with the outfit in this country.

But China remained on his mind.

So, one day, Captain Bradshaw wrote a personal appeal to Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, chief of the Flying Tigers, who wrote their fame over China's skies in World War II.

"I told him I liked China very much," Dr. Bradshaw explains, "and I told the general I thought I ought to have a chance to contribute to driving the Japanese out."

On March 31, 1944, Captain Bradshaw was in China. He had been requisitioned by General Chennault, though neither knew the other, to serve as a flight surgeon with the 14th Air Force.

Ambassador John E. Peurifoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in these days of international crises the sudden, tragic death of Ambassador John E. Peurifoy was a great loss not only to our Nation but to all of the free world. Jack Peurifoy was a brilliant diplomat and a fine example of the career public servant. He devoted his life to his country and to the cause of world peace. Assigned to the trouble spots of the world he served with great distinction as Ambassador to Greece, Guatemala, and Thailand.

Ambassador Peurifoy was born on August 9, 1907, in Walterboro, S. C., and came from a family of lawyers and jurists. He resigned from West Point in 1928 and completed his education by attending night school at American University and George Washington University. Entering the Department of State on October 1, 1938, as an economic analyst he rose rapidly and on January 23, 1947, at the age of 38, he was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Administration, then the third ranking position in the Department.

Ambassador Peurifoy was in charge of the United Nations Conference in San Francisco in 1945 and served as Deputy Secretary General of the American Delegation at the first meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in London in January 1946.

Joining the career Foreign Service in 1950 at the top, he was appointed ambassador to Athens. It was my good fortune to visit with him in Athens during the period he served as ambassador to Greece and to observe first hand the skill with which he handled his difficult task.

Perhaps Jack Peurifoy will be best remembered as the man most responsible for uprooting the first Communist-infiltrated government established in the Western Hemisphere. The overthrow of the Communists in Guatemala was a major victory for the United States and the credit belonged to Ambassador Peurifoy.

It was my privilege to know Jack Peurifoy as a friend for many years and I shall miss him greatly. My deep sympathy goes to his lovely and devoted widow Betty Jane, and to his young son, Clinton, to whom he left a rich heritage.

Albert Gallatin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am today inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks at ceremonies on January commemorating the 195th birthday of Albert Gallatin:

ALBERT GALLATIN

(Remarks of Congressman HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, at ceremonies on January 29 commemorating the 195th birthday of Albert Gallatin)

It is a privilege for me to participate in this ceremony honoring the 195th birthday of that great Swiss-American patriot and statesman, Albert Gallatin. I feel it a personal privilege, for two reasons in particular. First, Albert Gallatin served in the Congress as a Representative from western Pennsylvania and it has been my good fortune to serve as Representative in Congress from the same area. Secondly, Albert Gallatin's most important contribution as a Member of Congress was to conceive and establish the Committee on Ways and Means of which he became the first chairman. It has been my honor to be a member of that committee.

Of all the tributes that one can rightfully shower on his name, it seems to me

that it is most fitting today to mention Albert Gallatin's abiding concern for fostering commerce between nations as the keystone of international amity. Gallatin believed and worked for the principle that lower tariffs, not higher tariffs, were the way to expanding international trade to the mutual benefit of the trading partners. Such mutuality of interest, he felt, was the essential mortar that bound nations together in an amicable partnership. The wisdom and virtue of this philosophy are of compelling importance today.

I am drawn to speculate about what Albert Gallatin would think, were he alive today, of the actions that have been taken to limit the mutually beneficial trade between the United States and his native land, Switzerland. The imposition of higher tariffs on Swiss watch imports by the administration violates the high principles laid down by this famous Founding Father and would cause the Swiss-American statesman great dismay and anguish.

Thus, in honoring the memory of Albert Gallatin, we honor the principles and ideals that were the guideposts of his life. The greatest honor we can accord him today is to reaffirm our own deep commitment to one of his major guiding principles that world peace will be fostered if trade among nations is encouraged to grow and expand.

Dulles' Difficulty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Galesburg Daily Register Mail, Saturday, January 21, 1956.

DULLES' DIFFICULTY

There appears to be very little wrong with Secretary of State Dulles that a good editor couldn't cure.

He really live two lives. In one he is the man of action, and here his accomplishments are many. In the other he is the man of verbal statement, and in this he finds himself again and again in hot water.

One of his principal troubles seems to be that he permits too flashy a lead to be put on what he says. An example is his latest difficulty, an article in Life magazine which quotes him liberally on how the United States has met specific crises in Korea, Indochina, and Matsu-Quemoy in the past 3 years.

According to Dulles, this country three times went to the brink of war but was saved from it by threats of stern action, including atomic retaliation.

Democrats have assailed these declarations and accused Dulles not only of historical inaccuracy but of contradicting his own secret testimony before a congressional committee.

British and French diplomats likewise have questioned his accuracy, and have announced their shock that he would talk glibly of seeing the United States go to the brink of war.

The matter of Dulles' accuracy can only be settled by recourse to the documents, a process which will require days and weeks.

What evidently disturbs his critics most, however, is the brink-of-war philosophy ascribed to him in the article.

Said Dulles: "The ability to get to the verge of war without getting into the war is the necessary art. If you cannot master it, you inevitably get into war. If you try to run away from it, if you are scared to go to the brink, you are lost. * * * We walked to the brink and we looked it in the face."

In the European view no man or nation should walk that close to all-out war in this atomic age. Yet it is very likely that, as he has often done before, Dulles has overstated his case in trying to make his point. That's where the good editing ought to come in.

Nevertheless, he has a point that is fundamentally sound—clear willingness to use force if pushed too far is a deterrent against aggression. Had we evidenced that willingness in early 1950, the Communists never would have attacked South Korea. They thought we would not fight to save it.

Furthermore, the "show of force" deterrent is an age-old device of European diplomacy. Britain and France did not hesitate to use it when they held power. Today we, not they, have the power and are looked to for preservation of the peace. Europe's reported shock at hearing we have employed the weapon of deterrence seems something less than a realistic response.

In standing behind Dulles as the best Secretary of State he has ever known, President Eisenhower pinned his defense on policy grounds—not Dulles' words. He stressed that America must stand firm in its program for waging peace with justice. If that be interpreted as standing at the brink, he said, then that is because other nations are creating the circumstances that produce the perilous situation.

After all, Dulles did not create the crises in Korea, Indochina, and Matsu-Quemoy. He did not lead us to the brink just to see how close we could get to war. He was concerned to avoid it, but he was convinced the way to do that was to let the enemy know exactly what he could expect from us.

It is not what Dulles has done but what he said that has brought him fresh difficulty. His choice of language has alarmed a good many. But his policy of deterrence should shock no friend of freedom. It has worked where negotiation—or silence—has failed and led us into war.

Red Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, it is generally agreed that the latest Bulganin note to our Government was another bold step in the Communist propaganda offensive. Let us examine, therefore, a few general aspects of Red propaganda.

Soviet propaganda is characterized by its totality, fictionalism, militancy, and flexibility. It is colorful, massive in scope, easily available and extremely vitriolic. On the one hand, it is negative and destructive; on the other it appeals to the nobler sentiments of mankind. Through it real values become unreal fictions. Soviet propaganda is achieved through mass action, and mass action is to Soviet propaganda what space is to geopolitics.

Jacob Spolansky, in the Communist Trail in America, makes a most appropriate comment on Communist propaganda when he states: "The Communist doctor never seeks to cure the afflicted patient: he wants to be able to make a propaganda speech at his bier."

The Goal of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1955, it was my privilege to address the Southbridge, Mass., Veterans' Council at its annual Veterans' Day banquet. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD part of my remarks to this outstanding patriotic organization.

The material follows:

Speaking November 5, 1955, at the Armistice Day celebration of the Veterans Council at Southbridge, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN declared that "the best way to honor those who fought and died for the Nation is to intensify our efforts for peace."

"The veterans of every war who paid the supreme sacrifice, or who offered their lives to preserve our freedom, are enshrined in the hearts of the American people in grateful remembrance," said PHILBIN, "but their unselfish work will not be complete until peace and security shall come to this troubled world."

Stressing the dilemma of our present international position, he said: "The fact that another world war would bring untold death and desolation must prompt world leadership to speed its work for peace, regardless of obstacles and disappointments."

The Congressman touched on the power of modern weapons.

"No nation can afford to remain unmoved by the dreadful power of modern weapons," he said. "If there are those in the world who insist upon putting idealogical penetration and plans for conquest before peace, this Nation and the free world have no choice than to build effective strength to protect their liberties.

"It is most discouraging that our many repeated proposals for worldwide disarmament and control of nuclear energy have been rejected up to this time, but we must vigorously press these questions with the Soviets and before the bar of world opinion, and we must never lose an opportunity to employ every means of argument and persuasion, and every resource we have, to drive home to the Communist world the paramount urgency of peace."

Hailing historic American foreign policy, PHILBIN said: "Our Government has already proclaimed and emphasized on numerous occasions the traditional American policy against aggressive war and designs on other nations. It remains for the Soviet to give similar assurances, not by words alone, but by deeds, that it will keep the peace, and that it will desist from further conspiracy against the territorial integrity and political independence of other nations.

"As a nation we have no right to barter away the freedom of oppressed peoples and any agreement looking toward lasting peace must be predicated on complete justice and liberation for enslaved nations and all others.

"Since there can never be any compromise of our basic liberties, or of the principles of

our Constitution, failure to attain the goal of peace will require us, for our own protection, to maintain armed forces of great power and magnitude, lamentable though that be in this age of advanced civilization when real international amity and coperation could bring such great blessings."

PHILBIN hailed the leadership of veterans as "a most potent force in keeping the Nation militarily, economically, and spiritually strong. Let us all emulate their great faith and courage, and the good Lord will continue to strengthen our cause."

Wiretapping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Alexander M. Campbell, former Assistant Attorney General of Fort Wayne, Ind., reveals some illuminating facts which expose the wiretapping evil practiced generally by officials and others throughout the country:

WIRETAPPING

(Address by Alexander M. Campbell before the Quest Club of Fort Wayne, Ind., November 11, 1955)

This effort to give you both sides of a raging issue on our national scene comes from actual fact, not fantasy, from real experience in thousands upon thousands of both public and private investigations. Yes, from supervising the investigation, prosecution, trial, and conviction of world-famous spies, international Communist leaders, murderers in Federal cases, corporate executives engaged in war frauding, labor racketeers, workers engaging in sabotage, subversives, and gangsters—infamous characters all—and the question of the use of wiretapping as an instrumentality of detection and prosecution is argued pro and con.

In the end, I will, as always, conclude leaving no doubt where I stand on the issue now before Congress.

First, the technique.

How is it done, where, and by whom?

Electronic snooping devices are produced by a dozen manufacturers. Phones are tapped and eavesdropping accomplished in several different ways. There is a device for finding one pair of telephone wires in a jungle of hundreds of others. The device has 36 tiny neon bulbs on it. From each bulb runs a pair of wires tipped with clips. Attach the clips to 36 terminal pairs at one time in the crossbox in the basement. Dial the number of the phone you are seeking; one neon bulb will light up, identifying the pair of wires of the unsuspecting taxpayer. Then follow those wires to the next bridging point many blocks away and set up the recording plant.

The earphone plant is old-fashioned, outdated, and mostly in the discard.

The recorders run for 13 hours and turn on only when the "bugged" phone rings.

Wiretapping is a common practice engaged in by Government agents, State officials, local police, "private eyes," business competitors, labor racketeers, blackmailers, divorce seekers, and some Senators and Congressmen.

In fact, anyone, for a fee, can have a peepshow view of anyone else's life.

The wiretapping eavesdropping gadgets, include induction coils, microphones, shortwave receivers, microphones that can be concealed in the sleeve, phone tap recorder, phone-tapping unit, pocket wire recorder, phone line locator, earphones, voice activator, parabolic microphone, and high power transmitters with 100-mile range.

Second, Legal history.

Eavesdropping is now big business. The scientific age in which we live has enabled men to thwart the spirit of the Constitution of the United States which provides in the fourth amendment as follows: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized."

In 1928 in a dissenting opinion in the Olmstead prohibition wiretapping case, the late Justice Brandeis said: "The makers of our Constitution—conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone—the most comprehensive of the rights of man and the right most valued by man." *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438 (1928)).

In handing down United States Supreme Court's majority decision by a vote of 5 to 4 in that famous case Chief Justice Taft said: "The amendment does not forbid what was done here. There was no searching. There was no seizure. The evidence was secured by the use of the sense of hearing only. There was no entry of the house or offices of the defendants."

Opposition to that decision, as to prohibition enforcement practices generally, led Congress to pass in 1934 the Federal Communications Act which provides in section 605 that: "* * * no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, meaning * * * of such intercepted communication to any person * * *" (47 U. S. C. sec. 605).

That is the law today and the United States Supreme Court has held that wiretapping—though not unconstitutional—is illegal and that evidence so obtained or evidence obtained from clues discovered from wiretapping is inadmissible in Federal courts.

Third, arguments pro wiretapping.

Arguments for legalized wiretapping may be grouped in three general headings:

(a) The no-novelty argument.

This is to the effect that the law already admits evidence obtained by an informer, an eavesdropper, or a policeman hidden in a closet, and even evidence obtained by means of a transmitter concealed on an agent's person.

(b) Great-need argument.

Attorney General Brownell, who favors wiretapping, in a statement prepared for testimony before a Senate Judiciary Committee, April 20, 1954, page 3, said in part: "How can we possibly preserve the safety and liberty of everyone in this Nation unless we pull Federal prosecuting attorneys out of their straight jackets and permit them to use intercepted evidence in the trial of security cases?" He points out that criminals may go free if wiretapping is the only way to obtain evidence against them.

(c) Little-danger argument.

There are those who believe that the actual danger of abuse is slight and that we should trust our duly elected and appointed officials.

The arguments con include:

The brilliant presentment by Justice Hofstadter of the Supreme Court of New York County in the New York Journal, January 12, 1955, page 2, includes the following: "A tapped wire is the greatest invasion of privacy possible * * * a telephone interception is a far more devastating measure than any search warrant. A search warrant is confined to a definite place and to specific items, or, at least, to items of a stated class or description. Those in possession of the searched premises know the search is going on and, when the officer has completed his search, whether successfully or not, he departs. Not so in the case of telephone interception. The interception order is obtained ex-parte, and the person whose line is to be tapped is, of course, in ignorance of the fact. The tap is maintained continuously, day and night. Everything said over the line is heard, however foreign to the stated objective of the law-enforcement officers. The most intimate conversations, personal, social, professional, business, or even confidential, of an unlimited number of persons may be laid bare. in effect, the line to everyone who is called from or makes a call to the tapped line at any time is being tapped during the maintenance of the tap. When a line in a public telephone booth is tapped, as has on occasion been done, the conversations of people having no relation of any kind to the operator of the place in which the booth is situated or the person whose line is tapped are overheard."

The late United States Supreme Court Justice Brandeis said in 1928: "Even general warrants are but puny instruments of tyranny and oppression when compared to wiretapping."

(d) Inadequate result argument.

What are the results of wiretapping? My own observations revealed so few usable results from wiretapping. The very nature of espionage and sabotage causes subversives to do practically all of their work by personal presence or contact. I saw little actual help from wiretapping. It does help keep track of the doings of suspects and develops some leads. This may be done, however, by surveillance where there is far less chance of false identification. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has 6,000 special agents and a multimillion dollar budget.

(e) Overwhelming danger argument.

Official and legal wiretapping in the hands of many public officials will turn this grand free country into a police state.

We are thankful for the integrity of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but he is only one mortal man. What about his successor? His predecessor was Gaston B. Means, the biggest crook, fraud, and blackmailer in Government history who used the Government's Bureau of Identification for those nefarious purposes.

They tapped wires in Nazi Germany, they tap them now in Russia, they tap them all over the United States, at this very hour. Wiretapping is the tool of totalitarian thinking and planning.

We investigated hundreds of Communists, spies, and subversives from 1948 to 1950 during my privileged term as Assistant Attorney General of the United States. We indicted 50 leading Communists, spies, and subversives, including the 12 top Communists in New York, Alger Hiss, Judy Coplon, Harry Bridges, and Harold Cristoffel, the Communist Labor Leader, whose case I argued for the Government, before the United States Supreme Court in 1949. In all of these cases convictions were eventually obtained by the Government—save one, Judy Coplon—whose conviction for espionage was reversed by a United States court of appeals in 1950.

Thousands of interested citizens across the country have since asked why the clever, diabolical, and hateful top woman spy in modern times never went to prison. The answer is wiretapping. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, unbeknown to me, had tapped her telephone wires.

The New York Times and Charles Grutzner said on February 27, 1955, that: "Federal

wiretapping is nothing compared to that of local police and private investigators across the country. A former law enforcement officer told this writer a few days ago: 'Detectives use wiretaps on maybe half of all the important police cases in New York, and many use wiretaps as a routine thing to pick up leads on bookmaking, prostitution and other crimes without bothering to get court orders or even to let their captains know they're tapping.' Not all police, and certainly not all private investigators, limit their use of eavesdropped talks to those conversations they set out to hear. Blackmail and sale of business secrets, though incidental, have been found lucrative to crooked operators."

On January 19, 1955, the Wall Street Journal editorially said: "We see no need for chipping away at the rights and privileges of people who are not Communists in order to catch Communists. Perhaps the latter can be more easily trapped through wiretapping; certainly it will make the job of our police easier * * *. The job of the police would be made easier also if they could go about arresting anyone they chose and if they could break down any door and if they could hold in prison a suspect as long as they wished. But restraints were placed on Government and on police so that these things could not happen."

Thorsten Sellin, distinguished editor of Internal Security and Civil Rights, copyrighted 1955, has said: "All life is a choice among values, and among risks; and a free society—to remain free—must take almost all of its risks on the side of freedom."

As the Government lawyer in the supervision of the Coplon cases, I now look in retrospect and say it is better that one traitor go free than to pull down the sacred constitutional safeguards of American judicial freedom.

There are those who take a minimal safeguard position and advocate:

1. Wiretapping should be permitted only to Federal officials, in cases involving treason, sabotage, espionage, or kidnaping. (In kidnaping cases, parents' wires should be tapped only with their prior consent.)

2. The authority to grant permission for wiretapping should be vested in one Federal judge assigned by the Supreme Court for a 10-year period for each district.

3. Only the Attorney General should be allowed to apply directly to the judge for permission to tap a wire. All requests for permission should be channeled through him.

4. No wire tap should be authorized except upon sworn statement of fact demonstrating reasonable basis for belief of actual, as distinguished from potential treason, sabotage, espionage, or kidnaping.

5. An application should include the names of the suspect and of the telephone subscriber, and the number of people who use the line.

6. Complete records of all applications and approvals should be kept.

7. Only recordings, sealed and preserved in a central place, should be used in evidence. If so employed, all recordings made in connection with an investigation should be made available to the defendant at Government expense. Irrelevant material that might injure innocent outsiders should be exercised, upon agreement between Government and defendant. Recordings should be destroyed only on court order.

8. Taps should be authorized for a maximum of 90 days, with a 90-day renewal permitted.

9. Strict penalties should be provided for any person tapping a wire illegally, and each year a Federal grand jury should be convened to consider possible illegal tapping.

10. The present provisions of the law should remain in effect against any unauthorized tapping or disclosure of information obtained by tapping, whether authorized or unauthorized.

11. The press and public should be informed by monthly and annual reports of the number of taps sought for each type of case; the number granted; the number resulting in prosecution; and other pertinent data. With all of these words I disagree.

In supervising internal security grand jury investigations in New York, the District of Columbia, Pennsylvania, Louisiana, California, Colorado, Illinois, Ohio, and Indiana, I did not use a wiretap or authorize its use in a single case and an American jury returned a verdict of guilty in every case where a grand jury indictment was returned—upon legal evidence—presented in a court of law, where the defendants were confronted face to face with the witnesses against them, with the right of cross-examination afforded them, with all of the God-given constitutional guaranties protecting them—despite their treasonable acts of espionage, fraud, or crimes of violence.

America does not want or need wiretapping. If the Federal Bureau of Investigation is as good as they say it is, and it is, mistake not that, they need no wiretapping aid.

Furthermore, with the use of electronics in this atomic age they are able to detect conversations with the aid of the Parabolic microphone which picks up voices hundreds of feet away without the use of wiretapping.

We can set a device on this table in this briefcase and pick up a conversation a block away. What more does the United States Attorney General need? Give them wiretapping rights and the next step will be opening your mail. Government agents steam open mail occasionally now.

The electronic eavesdropper has practically superseded the telephone wiretapper now, but still they ask for a law which would permit the Federal Government to use in Federal courts evidence obtained by tapping telephone wires. There are more than 53 million telephones in daily use in this country. What a field day they would have.

The snoopers, paid informers, reformed revenue collecting Communists, purveyors upon gullible and unsuspecting citizens, shakedown artists in Government, overzealous prosecutors, a few rabble rousing Congressmen and some demagogs in the Senate, would foist upon this Nation a hysteria and eventual police state.

Former Senator BRIDGES did it to Howard Hughes; Serge Rubinstein, notorious and international financier, whose defense in a Federal prosecution in New York I once declined after leaving Government service, tapped phones before his recent murder. The former Mayor O'Dwyer, of New York, according to Bernard B. Spindal, professional wiretapper and electronic eavesdropper, and Ethelbert Warfield, former law partner of New York City, Police Commissioner Francis W. H. Adams; the Knoedler Art Galleries, and the pharmaceutical firm of E. R. Squibb & Sons all have had their phones tapped and so have I. The Palmer days of the sedition cases after World War I; the Klan era which followed; the McCarthyism of our time, which produced not a single treason or espionage conviction, all ran their hysterical course and then the great American free press destroyed each in turn almost as quickly as they built them up.

We must depend in large measure upon our free press to keep bringing to light these evil abuses as has been recently done in the exposé of the New York wiretapping mess.

The greatest social achievement in the history of civilization is the Anglo-Saxon-Christian-Judian principles of justice as announced by the elder Pitt in 1765 when he said: "The poorest man may, in his cottage, bid defiance to all the force of the Crown."

Or as Justice Brandeis said: "The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect * * *."

My friends, to approve the Attorney General's proposal is to weaken our code both legally, morally, and ethically. To hide an accuser behind an iron curtain is the Russian way, not the American—said the distinguished world historian Claude G. Bowers on the occasion of his recent intellectually dynamic visit to his home town of Fort Wayne.

Wiretapping is but one facet and only a prelude to an infamous procedure wherein faceless people will be allowed to present their whispered rumors and yet escape the test and torture of cross-examination.

I, for one, am unafraid of hysteria, and slovenly thinking, and over-ambitious prosecutors, but we plain citizens must stand up against these forces. Arise, oh, Citizen, speak out before it is too late. Write your Congressman and Senators to vote against this dirty business in that America may remain free, our people secure in their private property, work, education, homes, and faith.

Contributions of Ahepa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on November 13, 1955, I spoke at the anniversary banquet of the Ahepa in my hometown of Clinton, Mass. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a news account of my remarks at this affair.

The material follows:

Before the Ahepa anniversary banquet at Clinton November 13, 1955, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN hailed the local chapter as an inspiring example of Americanism—a fine group devoted to blending the highest values of Greek civilization with the best traditions of America.

Lauding Dr. Nicholas Despotopolus, Ahepa district governor, for his vigorous leadership in promptly seeking aid for Greek coreligionists recently persecuted and outraged in Turkey, PHILBIN declared that in response to his own strong protests, the State Department had advised him that it had taken urgent action and had been assured that there would be no repetition of these outrages and that damages would be indemnified.

Denouncing the outrages as diabolical and to a degree Communist inspired, the local Congressman asserted that free religious worship was not only a most precious American possession, but should be safeguarded zealously by all nations in and out of the United Nations. We must pledge our efforts to that end, he said.

Commenting on the Cyprus question, PHILBIN said that the real issue is whether the right of self-determination, for which this and other nations fought, would be respected. This is a basic right of free men and women and it must be protected and observed at all times and all nations save the Soviet police, slave state recognized that fact.

PHILBIN paid tribute to the contributions of Ahepa and stated that the town of Clin-

ton is famous for many things, but for none more than its strong, loyal attachment to constitutional principles and ideals, particularly its devotion to toleration and respect for the right of every creed and race to enjoy and be protected in their faiths and beliefs.

"I am proud of your friendship, your contributions and your patriotism," he said, "and I wish for you the successful continuance of your great work."

The Lawyer-Accountant Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 5, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, I have just read in the January 1956 issue of the National Public Accountant, published by the National Society of Public Accountants, a reprint of a speech delivered by Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School, at a luncheon meeting of the section of taxation of the American Bar Association, held at the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia, Pa., on Sunday, August 21, 1955, on the so-called lawyer-accountant controversy.

The learned dean has obviously devoted a great deal of thought to the proper place of the accountant and the lawyer in the field of taxation, and is to be commended for his efforts in seeking an answer to this problem.

He recognizes that both professions contribute much to the efficient administration of our tax laws—much to help the ordinary citizen who is so frequently left bewildered by the ever-increasing complexity of our revenue-raising techniques.

In the dean's most lucid analysis of the problem he notes that most lawyers and accountants practice together in a spirit of cooperation and harmony. The difficulties which have arisen between accountants and the organized bar have, for the most part, concerned situations arising in the gray undefined area in which the legitimate activities of the attorney and the accountant seem to overlap and intertwine.

In treating with one aspect of this problem, practice of accountants through the administrative levels of the Internal Revenue Service, Dean Griswold notes that the certified public accountant is admitted to practice, as are lawyers, on the basis of his having qualified via a recognized examination. He expresses concern, however, over the possibility that certain revisions in Treasury's regulations may be adopted with the result that persons with no professional status whatsoever could qualify for admission to practice. He cites as an example the possibility of a disbarred attorney gaining special enrollment by passing the Treasury Department's examination. This possibility is extremely remote if, indeed, it exists at all. Any practitioner, before being granted special or general enrollment, must pass a rigid character check and satisfy the Director of Practice that he is of good character and reputation.

In this and other areas Dean Griswold alludes to the problem of distinguishing between the qualified public accountant and the unqualified practitioner. He has no difficulty with the certified public accountant, however, while he recognizes that there are many qualified public accountants who are not certified, he contends that he can find no benchmark against which to measure this group.

Mr. Speaker, I practiced as a public accountant in California prior to my election to Congress, and in my State, as in several others throughout the country, we have a statute which regulates the practice of accountancy and it covers public accountants as well as certified public accountants. In the above mentioned jurisdictions I would suggest the licensing requirement would serve as a reliable measure for judging the qualifications of the public accountant. There also exists another valid criterion which I commend to Dean Griswold's consideration. On the national level the National Society of Public Accountants represents qualified and ethical public accountants in every State in the Union. Members of this organization—which includes both public accountants and certified public accountants—are qualified and reputable practitioners who are bound by the strictest rules of professional conduct. I consider it a privilege to claim membership in this fine accounting society and I was proud beyond measure when they honored me as their "Man of the Year" in 1955.

I believe many of the real and imagined differences betwen the two great professions of accountancy and law could be resolved if the American Bar Association, representing the legal profession, and the American Institute of Accountants and the National Society of Public Accountants, representing the accounting profession, would gather around the conference table and discuss their mutual problems.

As Members of the House know, I introduced legislation in the 84th Congress, 1st session, H. R. 2416, to clarify the accountants status in the matter of Treasury practice. I am convinced that this legislation is desirable; however, I also realize that the ultimate and overall solution to this so-called controversy between accountants and attorneys in tax practice must come through voluntary action of the three interested parties. As a member of the National Society of Public Accountants, I believe I can assure Dean Griswold, members of the American Institute of Accountants and the American Bar Association that the National Society of Public Accountants is ready and anxious to cooperate with our fellow professionals in working out a solution, not alone in the interest of accountants or lawyers, but in the interest of the American taxpayer and his Government.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Printing and binding for Congress, when recommended to be done by the Committee on Printing of either House, shall be so recommended in a report containing an approximate estimate of the cost thereof, together with a statement from the Public Printer of estimated approximate cost of work previously ordered by Congress within the fiscal year (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 145, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

DISTRIBUTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

To the Vice President and each Senator 100 copies; to the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, each, 25 copies; to the Secretary, for official use, not to exceed 35 copies; to the Sergeant at Arms, for use on the floor of the Senate, not to exceed 50 copies; to each Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress, 68 copies; to the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, each, 25 copies; to the Clerk, for official use, not to exceed 50 copies; and to the Doorkeeper, for use on the floor of the House of Representatives, not to exceed 75 copies; to the Vice President and each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner in Congress there shall also be furnished (and shall not be transferable), 3 copies of the daily RECORD, of which 1 shall be delivered at his residence, 1 at his office, and 1 at the Capitol.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

PRINTING DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS

Documents and reports of committees with the evidence and papers submitted therewith, or any part thereof ordered printed by Congress, may be reprinted by the Public Printer on order of any Member of Congress or Delegate, on prepayment of the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 162, p. 1940).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.